

AN ACCOUNT OF EPISTEMIC MODALITY IN SHABAKI

العبارات المعرفية في اللغة الشبكية

Asst. prof. Dr.

Abbas H. J. Sultan

University of Kufa - College of Education

Abstract:

The present paper aims to propose a classificatory and descriptive account of epistemic modal expressions in Shabaki to recognize their syntactic categories and semantic interpretations. The corpus is based on the data excerpted from everyday communication. Results suggest that Shabaki makes a rich use of expressions to express epistemic modality. Modality in Shabaki is expressed differently from other languages. Shabaki language displays an interesting interaction between epistemic modal expressions and negation.

KEY WORDS: Shabaki, modality, epistemic expressions, negation, possibility

1 Introduction

Epistemic modality is concerned with the certainty or probability or possibility of the truth of a proposition. It is related to the speaker's knowledge of facts (what is known) and belief. It is concerned with the degree of speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition that forms the complement of the modal, or the assessment of the likelihood of something being, or having been, the case (Biber et al., 1999; Kearns, 2000; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002; Palmer, 1986, 1990; Quirk et al., 1985). In this paper, epistemic includes Palmer's judgments only and, therefore, they are used interchangeably.

According to Palmer (1995, 2001), judgments are concerned with opinions and conclusions. They denote the degree of epistemic commitment or confidence in the reality of a proposition on the part of the speaker, ranging from weak possibility (English epistemic may, e.g. She may be a dentist) to strong necessity (English epistemic must, e.g. He must be a dentist). By saying that something is possible or probable, the speaker commits himself (at least partially) to whether what is said is true or not. There are three subtypes of judgment modality: the speculative which encodes a state of doubt (e.g. She may be a dentist);

the deductive which indicates an inference from other observable information (e.g. She must be a dentist); and the assumptive which expresses a reasonable conclusion drawn from what is generally known (e.g. She will be a dentist) (Palmer, 2001:24-25).

The general purpose of this paper is to determine the particular features, meanings and forms related to epistemic modality expressions in Shabaki. The name 'Shabaki' is both the name of an ethnic group and the language that they speak. Shabaki language is spoken by over seven hundred thousand speakers in Iraq. This group of people can be found in the north-east and south-east of Mosul, in Hamdaniya, Bashiqa and Nimrud towns and villages. This region is called Sahl Nineveh (Nineveh plateau). Shabaki, together with Zaza-Dimli, Gorani, Gaspian Dialects, South Dari and Hawramani, are classified as a modern Iranian northwest of the Indo-Iranian family. This paper seeks to fulfill the following objectives:

- (1) To bring novel data from Shabaki to bear on the debate in linguistic literature over epistemic modality expressions and consequently to provide an analysis of the full range of this type of modality in Shabaki on semantic grounds.
- (2) To identify linguistic devices that can be considered carriers of epistemic modal meaning in this language.
- (3) To identify the semantic range of Shabaki epistemic modal expressions.
- (4) To explore their interaction with negation and possibility.

The paper is built up as follows. In section 2, the research method is discussed. Section 3 will be devoted to the lexical classification of epistemic modal expressions in Shabaki which will set the stage for the remainder of this paper. In section 4, I demonstrate the gamuts of epistemic modal expressions that fall within the definition of modality that are of various semantic types. In section 5, the position of epistemic modality expressions in Shabaki in relation to negation and actual entailment is discussed. In section 6, I will try to propose a scale for possibility in Shabaki. And finally, section 7 draws a few conclusions.

2. Research Method

The present paper studies the underlying structures, meanings, and uses of epistemic modal expressions in Shabaki. The data were collected by participant observation of native Shabaki speaking in the summer of 2013. Natural occurring utterances were collected and written down by hand. The data collection was done over three months. The data are

comprehensive and reflect different discourse contexts. The data were recorded using an audio tape-recorder, and an MP3 player. The audiotapes and files were written and double-checked. For this purpose I proposed an alphabetical writing system for Shabaki based on the Latin system. The entire archive of data will be used as arsenal corpora for future research. The data were categorized, analyzed and then tabulated. The following subsections 3 and 4 try to demonstrate the most representative structures, uses and meanings of epistemic modal expressions in Shabaki.

3 A lexical classification of epistemic modality expressions in Shabaki

The lexical categories which denote epistemic modality expressions in Shabaki include modal auxiliaries such as 'garak' (may, I think, it is possible that), 'yamkan' (may), modal verbs such as 'xalâ' (to think), 'matâwi bâçi' (I can say), modal particles such as 'hiç' (never) + simple past or future and 'qat' (absolutely) + simple past or future; modal prepositional phrases such as 'am xalâm' (I think), 'bakefi' (up to sb's wish), 'ba hiram' (I think, I thought), 'ba hiram mand' (it stuck to my thought); modal noun phrases such as 'gişt aqlam' (I deeply believe that), 'gişt fakram' (I deeply believe that), modal adverbs such as 'râsti' (honestly).

4. A semantic classification of epistemic modality expressions in Shabaki

Now let's consider the typology of epistemic modal expressions in Shabaki.

4.1. Speculative judgments

According to Palmer (1986), speculative judgments indicate that there is some tentativeness or conjecture about the truth of a proposition. This group includes four subtypes in Shabaki.

1. Modality of prediction

The following modal expressions express prediction and intention. What is highly probable is predictable in a general sense, and hence characteristic of some entity or event. Examples of this kind include: 'am mâçi naqu' (I foresee that), 'naqu' (roughly going to), 'mugu' (will).

(1) Am mâç-i naqu Ali ba-kat-o nasâğ . 1&2

I.NOM say.PRES-1SG will Ali FUT-fall.INF-3SG sick.

I foresee that Ali will fall sick.

In (1), 'am mâç-i' (literally i say) is a verba dicendi reporting verb in Shabaki but in this context it is used to tell the hearer a prediction.

2. Modality of truth

Modal expressions which present the proposition as a truth include purposive adverbs such as 'râsti qasa kari' (to say the truth), 'ba râsti' (to speak honestly), 'râsti bâçi' (to utter the truth, honestly speaking), 'bâwar kar' (believe me, trust my word), repetition of the subject, repetition of the verb, swear words and Arabic adverb 'akid' (certainly).

Shabaki modal expressions presenting the proposition as a truth contain items that do not constitute a well-defined natural class, such as a purposive adverbs in examples (2 & 3), repetition of the subject of the sentence in (4), repetition of the main verb in (5), the use of the Arabic adverb 'akid' in (6), and the use of the swear words in (7). Sentences (2-7) constitute a continuum from the weaker to the stronger. Other purposive adverbs such as 'râsti bâçi' (to utter the truth) or 'ba râsti' (honestly) are similar in meaning to 'râsti qasa kar' in (2).

(2) Râst-i qasa kar-i, Ali dazi-ş kitâb-i.

Truth-DEF talk say.PRES-1SG.NOM, Ali steal.PST-3SG book-DEF.

To say the truth, Ali stole the book.

(3) Bâwar kar bana-m, Ali dazi-ş kitâb-i.

Believe do.PRES-3SG.NOM with-1SG.ACC, Ali steal.PST-3SG book-DEF.

Believe me, Ali stole the book.

(4) Ali, Ali dazi-ş kitâb-i.

Ali, Ali steal.PST-3SG book-DEF.

It is Ali who stole the book.

(5) Amâ amâ Ali.

Come.PST come.PST Ali.NOM.

I assure you that Ali came.

(6) Akid, Ali dazi-ş kitâb-i.

Certainly, Ali steal.PST-3SG book-DEF.

Certainly, Ali stole the book.

(7) Wallah, Ali dazi-ş kitâb-i.

Wallah, Ali steal.PST-3SG book-DEF.

I swear by Allah, Ali stole the book.

3. Modality of doubtlessness

'Be dro' (no lie, no doubt), 'be za□ali' (no tricks, honestly), 'be mil gardâ' ('without neck turning': absolutely), 'râsti râsti' ('honestly honestly': beyond any doubt) are expressions which orchestrate a proposition beyond doubt. They are also similar in form in that they are disjunct adverbs. The example in (8) includes a repetition of the modal adverb 'râsti' which expresses an absolute truth or a truth beyond any doubt.

(8) Râsti râsti hâpo-m orgel-â alâ žan-eş.

Frankly frankly uncle.GEN.1SG.NOM return.PST.3SG to wife.GEN.3SG

Undoubtedly, my uncle returned to his wife.

Shabaki also uses certain morphological items to express absolute certainty. In (9) below, for example, certainty seems to be suggested by the enclitic '-na', a monosyllabic item which has no independent meaning of its own but serves to deliver the perfection of the action message when placed at the end of the base verb.

(9) Ali orgelâ-na ça kâr.

Ali.NOM return.PRES.3SG-PERF from work.

Ali has returned from work.

4. Modality of doubt

It is worth noting that any sentence in Shabaki uttered with a sentence-final rising intonation may convey the sense of uncertainty and unbelievability. In the right context, it may mean that the speaker is not certain of a state or event. The set of expressions which can be used to hedge or mitigate a proposition in order to express doubt include: 'am xalâm' (I thought that), 'çam xalâm' (I thought that), 'ba fakram' (I believe that), 'ça fakram' (I believe that), 'ba aqlam' (I believe that), 'am frâtar mâçi' (I am rather inclined to believe that), 'namazâ' (I don't know) + positive statement + 'yân' (or) + negative statement, 'namazâ aga' (I don't know whether), 'balki' (maybe, perhaps), 'garak' (possibly), 'mâçi' (to say, I can say), 'gi' (approximately, about to).

(10) Fakr-am bâr-şân kard ça şâr.

Think-1SG mobilize-3PL do.PST from Mosul.

I think that they mobilized from Mosul.

'Fakram' (in my view) in (10) expresses speaker's opinion or attitude (i.e. epistemic type towards the truth value of the sentence). The pronoun 'I' functions as the source of opinion or attitude or the semantic source. These expressions denote the epistemic type of opinion or attitude without indicating the source of meaning. In addition to selecting a proposition to specify the situation under consideration, these modal expressions of doubt are required to co-occur with a noun phrase to spell out their source of opinion or attitude. This is why in (11) the presence of implicit 'I' and that of the proposition are both necessary. Both 'namazâ' and 'namazâ aga' are always followed by a verb form. They convey the epistemic sense of uncertainty. They cast doubt on the likelihood of existence of the state or occurrence of the event.

(11) Na-maz-â aga Ali dazi-ş kitâb-i.

Not-know-1SG whether Ali steal.PST-3SG book-DEF.

I doubt whether Ali stole the book.

A point that merits attention here is that the speaker uses speculative ‘garak’ to suggest that on the basis of available evidence it can be concluded that ‘somebody possibly does something.’ The force of this modal approach seems to be certainty but it is not equivalent to certainty. It allows for an error margin, however slight it might be. A present tense verb can follow ‘garak’ (as in 12) in order to encode a state of doubt having to do with present states or events. This construction seems identical to English ‘may’.

(12) Ali garak may-o.

Ali.NOM possible come.PRES.3SG.

Ali may come.

4.2. Deductive judgments

In this section, the gamut of constructions that are scoped under deductive judgments will be demonstrated. They include the following:

1. Modality of the known

The set of modal expressions which present a proposition as known or admitted in Shabaki such as ‘mazâninyo’ (is admitted that), ‘mazânme’ (it is known to us that), ‘zânim’ (it became known to me that) is derived from the verb ‘zân’ (to know) with various tenses, aspects and grammatical subjects.

The modal expression ‘zânim’ in (13) presents the proposition ‘Ali dazi-ş kitâb-i’ as a known piece of information deduced by speaker’s judgment.

(13) Zâni-m Ali dazi-ş kitâb-i.

Know-PST-1SG.NOM, Ali steal.PST-3SG book-DEF.

I know, by deduction, that Ali stole the book.

2. Modality of the state-of-affairs

Modal expressions which present the proposition as belonging to the normal state of affairs include the following items among others: ‘lâzam’ (must), ‘mazânme’ (we know), ‘zânimân’ (we knew), ‘diyâr mado’ (it seems)

(14) Ali lâzam lawân yâna.

Ali-NOM must go-PST-PERF.3SG home

Ali must have gone home.

In (14), the speaker infers from some pieces of evidence that ‘Ali has gone home’. In this sentence, ‘lâzam’ (must) shows the speaker’s attitude towards the truth of the proposition. Therefore, in this sentence, ‘lâzam’

has epistemic readings with necessity interpretations and the proposition 'Ali has gone home' belongs to the normal state of affairs.

3. Modality of possibility

In (15 a), 'yamkan' (may) is used in a verbal sentence and shows the attitude of the speaker towards the truth value of the proposition i.e., the possibility of Ali's visiting the hospital. Therefore, it is an epistemic modal. It is worth noting that there are no root readings available for 'yamkan'.

(15) a. Yamkan Ali kat-ân-a xastaxâna.

May Ali.Nom fall-PST-3SG hospital.

Ali may have entered the hospital.

(15) b. Ali yamkan nasâ□â.

Ali may sick.PST.BE.3SG

Ali could be sick.

In (15 b), the modal auxiliary 'yamkan' is used in a nominal sentence. It shows the speaker's attitude towards the truth of the proposition; therefore, it is an epistemic modal expressing tentative possibility. In both sentences above (15 a & b), the speaker shows his attitude towards the truth value of the sentence. 'Yamkan' in (15 b) should be interpreted as expressing less speaker commitment to the truth of the proposition than 'garak'. Therefore, 'yamkan' in (15 b) is translated as 'could be' which expresses a lesser degree of possibility than 'yamkan' (may) in (15 a).

Sentence (16) expresses a weak degree of certainty on the part of the speaker. 'Mâç-i' (metaphorically mean: I can say) is always sentence-initial. Here, it is not used as a reported evidential but a piece of inferential evidence. He just infers that the person is crazy from his behavior. This example clearly demonstrates the way epistemic and evidential interpretations co-occur.

(16) Mâç-i şet-â.

Say.PRES.1SG crazy.BE.3SG

He behaves like a crazy.

'If' serves to express things which might take place. Some are real contingencies, others purely hypothetical. These two types of possibility can be distinguished by the choice of the verb. 3

(17) a. Aga kamar bakat-êş ça asmân na-lêm yâna-şân . (Past)

If stone fall.PST from sky, not.go.PST.1SG home.3PL.POSS

If stone fell from the sky, I would not have visited them.

(17) b. Aga asmân bakato sari zamê, na-mali yâna-şân.

If sky fall on earth.DEF not.go.PRES.1SG home.3PL.POSS

If sky falls on earth, I do not visit them.

'If' in (17 a & b) is coupled with the past subjunctive mood to express an impossible condition. In sentence (18), the ordinary indicative form of the verb 'was' is used to express a condition which a real possibility. In some expressions (such as 'namazâ'), there are connections between negation and conditional.

(18) Aga rê-t kat ba sar-şâno, i-maktub-i bada bana-şân.

If way.2SG.POSS fall on them this letter give.PRES.2SG to.3PL.

If you pass them by, hand them this letter.

4.3. Assumptive judgments

The two modal auxiliaries 'mugu' (will) and 'naqu' (roughly equals going to) in the following sentences are used epistemically to express assumptive judgments.

(19) a. Mugu Ali bab-o ba duxtar.

Will Ali.NOM be.INF-3SG to engineer.

Ali will be an engineer.

(19) b. Naqu Ali bab-o ba duxtar.

Will Ali.NOM be.INF-3SG to engineer.

Ali will to be an engineer.

The difference between these two modal auxiliaries is that 'mugu' is more factual and certain than 'naqu' because the action in (19 a) seems to happen earlier than the action in (19 b). In other words, (19 a) expresses an action which seems to take place nearer to present time than that in (19 b). This very idea makes it more factual.

The only Shabaki modal expressing probability as its principal meaning, 'ehtimâl' (probably), is borrowed from Arabic. Consider the following example in (20).

(20) Ehtimâl warân bo kameçe.

Probably rain fall.PRES after a while.

It probably rains after a while.

5. Modality and negation

The interaction of negation and modality considered a complex aspect of linguistic semantics. They function as operators modifying the meaning of the phrases in their scope. Negation is used to deny or reject statements. It is expressed via a variety of grammatical forms. Sentential negation in Shabaki, for example, is achieved via a negation morpheme *na-* pro-cliticized to the beginning of the verb. In simple verbs, it attaches to the beginning of the whole verb complex. In compound verb

constructions, it is prefixed onto the light verb rather than onto the preverbal element. In future, the negative pro-cliticized appears at the beginning of the main verb rather than the modal auxiliary. It has been well-known in linguistics that the negation of modality, in general, results in interesting semantic implications. The interaction between epistemic modal system and negation in Shabaki also seems interesting and too rich to be explained in this brief section. In English, negating an epistemic necessity results in a possibility that something is not the case (i.e. impossibility) as in the (21). It is possible that x = it is not necessary that not x.

(21) Your car can't be started. (It is impossible that you car can be started.)

In Shabaki, on the contrary negating necessity does not result in impossibility but results in a lack of necessity as in (22a). Impossibility is expressed by negating statements containing simple present inchoative light verb as in (22b & c).

(22) a. Lâzam na-wâ bay-o.

Must not-BE.PRES come.INF-3SG

It is not necessary that he come.

(22) b. Trombel-at kêr na-ma-kar-o.

Car-3SG.POSS operation not-IMPF-do.PRES-3SG

Your car is not operating.

(22) c. Sayâqana warân na-ma-bo.

Clear-3SG-BE-PRES rain not-become-FUT

It is clear and will not rain.

Negating a possibility in English results in a necessity that something is not the case as in the following example:

(23) Long time sitting can't be safe to your health. (long time sitting is necessarily hazardous to your health.)

Likewise, negating a possibility in Shabaki also results in a necessity that something is not the case as in (24).

(24) a. Hawr-ê garak warân ba-bo.

Cloudy-3SG-BE-PRES may rain become-FUT

It is cloudy and may rain.

(24) b. Sayâqana garak warân na-bo.

Clear-3SG-BE-PRES may rain not-become-FUT

It is clear and may not rain.

Table (1) offers a global overview of the meanings of negated necessity and negated possibility found in the data above in comparison to English.

Table (1)
English and Shabaki possibility and necessity and their negated forms

	English		Shabaki	
Positive	Epistemic necessity	Possibility	Epistemic necessity	Possibility
Negation	Impossibility	Necessity	Impossibility	Necessity

In its epistemic sense in English, ‘must’ is only used in affirmative sentences expressing necessity (25). It is necessary that x = it is not possible that not x. The modal verb used to express the corresponding negative epistemic modality, i.e. impossibility, is ‘can not’ (26). In Shabaki epistemic sentences, ‘lâzam’ (must) and ‘halbât’ (should) are only used in affirmative sentences expressing necessity (27 & 28). Nonetheless, the modal verb ‘matâwi’ is used to express the corresponding negative epistemic modality, i.e. impossibility, in verbal sentences (29). In nominal sentences, the inchoative BE preceded by negative marker is used to express impossibility (30).

(25) Your car must be repaired very soon.

(26) Your car can’t be repaired very soon.

(27) Ali lâzam law-ân yâna.

Ali-NOM must go-PST-PERF.3SG home

Ali must have gone home.

(28) Halbât Ali law-ân yâna.

May Ali-NOM go-PST-PERF.3SG home

Ali may have gone home.

(29) Marda-gal na-ma-tâw-â orgel-â.

Dead-PL not-can.PRES-3PL return-3PL.

The dead can’t come back to life.

(30) Na-ma-bo nân-i bor-I be ki kut-aş kari.

Not-PRES-BE bread-DEF without cut-3SG-ACC do-LV

One cannot eat a loaf of bread without cutting it.

To round off the discussion in the present section, it can be concluded that negation in combination with modality actually does a very complex issue. In addition to negated modality, the main verb may also be negated in the sentence but this issue will be explained in a separate paper.

It is worth pointing out that root modals trigger an actuality entailment in the perfective aspect in a number of languages that morphologically mark the perfective/imperfective distinction (cf. Bhatt 1999; Hacquard 2006, 2010; Homer, 2010). Current accounts of this phenomenon predict

that such an actuality entailment would only occur in root modality (as in 31a & b) but never occur for epistemic modality. Shabaki presents a counterexample to this prediction: ‘garak’, which marks epistemic modality when it occurs with a verb in the imperfective (as in 32a & b), results in an interpretation of an actual event when the verb is in the perfective aspect. ‘Garak’ is a perfect marker in its occurrence with the perfective.

- (31) a. Ali tâw-iş bay-o. (imperfective)
 Ali.NOM able.PST.3SG come.3SG
 Ali was able to come.
- (31) b. Ali tâw-en-aş bay-o. (perfective)
 Ali able.PRES.PERF.3SG come.3SG
 Ali has been able to come.
- (32) a. Garak Ali ay-e. (imperfective)
 May Ali.NOM come.3SG
 Ali may be coming.
- (32) b. Garak Ali amâ-n. (perfective)
 May Ali.NOM come.3SG.PRES.PERF
 Ali may have come.

6. Scale of possibility in Shabaki

The aim of this section is to propose a scale for possibility modal expressions in Shabaki. The sentences in (33, 34 and 35) represent the epistemic scale of likelihood (possibility). ‘Yamkan’ represents the least degree of possibility. ‘Namabo’ represents the highest degree of possibility in the scale. ‘Garak’ holds a halfway position. It can be assumed that the negated inchoative BE in Shabaki ‘na-ma-bo’ resembles the negated modal ‘can not’ in English. ‘Mabo’ (possible) is used in the imperfect form and marks logical probability (inference). Sentence (33) states that ‘it is possible that (he is at home)’ whereas (35) means ‘it is not possible that (he is at home)’. It is worth remarking that ‘garak’ in (34) has no negative form and it is paraphrased as ‘it is reasonable to conclude that he is at home.’ It is noteworthy that double negation in Shabaki may also encode the epistemic sense of possibility as shown in (36).

- (33) a. Yamkan ça yâna-na.
 Possibly at house.BE.PRES
 He is possibly at home.
- (33) b. Yamkan ça yâna na-wâ.
 Possibly at house NEG.BE.PRES

- He is possibly not at home.
 (34) a. Garak ça yâna-na.
 May at house BE.PRES
 He is supposed to be at home.
 (34) b. Garak ça yâna na-wâ.
 May at home NEG.BE.PRES
 He is supposed not to be at home.
 (35) Na-ma-bo ça yâna-na.
 NEG.PRES.BE at house
 He cannot be at home.
 (36) Na-ma-bo na-yo.
 Not-PRES-BE-3Sg not-come (it cannot be not come.)
 He possibly comes.

As a final point, we present table (2) to offer an overview of the scale of possibility, likelihood and certainty.

Table (2): Degrees of possibility, likelihood and certainty

I trombel xâsâ. (This car is good)	True
Lâzam i trombel xâsâ. (This car must be good)	Stronger
Halbat i trombel xâsâ. (This car should be good)	
certainty	
I trombel mabo xâsâ. (This car could be good)	Weaker
Garak i trombel xâsâ. (This car may be good)	
certainty	
Garak i trombel xâs bi. (This car might be good)	False
I trombel xâs nawâ. (This car isn't good)	

7. Conclusions

This paper tried to offer a contribution, albeit a very restricted and preliminary one, to the epistemic modal expressions in Shabaki. They are categorized semantically on the basis of their interpretations and their expression of modal concepts. In general, Shabaki seems to be able to express the full range of epistemic modal meaning present in other languages with different with some unique means such as repetition. Relatedly, Shabaki makes use of a wide range of morphological (perfective –an), lexical and grammatical resources to express epistemic modality. Epistemic expressions tend generally to appear at the beginning of sentences in order to announce speaker's opinion or attitude.

The most remarkable conclusion about Shabaki is that it does not seem to have strongly grammaticalized modality. Consequently, a variety of lexical items are employed to express the meaning of a single modal meaning. The semi-equivalents are not always exact synonyms and they do not form a natural class in Shabaki. The various bits of evidence

provided in the foregoing sections indicate that some modal expressions such as ‘garak’ in this language are polysemous. ‘Garak’ (may) stands for epistemic possibility (an uncertain supposition), or it may mean (must) for epistemic necessity (or probability). It should be pointed out that modal expressions involving certain epistemic commitments on the part of the speaker are not identical to the corresponding non-modal assertions.

Notes

1. Ā ā as in apple; A a as in about; Ç ç as in church; Ş ş as in shoe; Ž ž as in vision; X x as in Loch (in Scottish). The voiceless uvular fricative in English, Ġ ġ, corresponds a voiced uvular fricative in Shabaki. The voiced and the voiceless pharyngeal fricatives replace a and h in some Shabaki words respectively. The last two sounds are not part of Shabaki's phonology.
2. The abbreviations for the glosses and attributes used in this paper are 1 = First person, 2 = Second person, 3 = Third person, ACC = Accusative, AUX = Auxiliary, CAUS = Causative, CONJ = Conjunction, DAT = Dative, DEF = Definite, Ez(afe) = A morpheme used to express relation, FUT = Future, GEN = Genitive, IMPF = Imperfective, IND = Indefinite, INF = Infinitive, LV = Light verb, LVC = Light verb construction, NEG = Negation, NOM = Nominal, ONO = onomatopoeic, PASS = passive construction, PERF = perfect, PL = Plural, PPL = Participle, PRST = Present, PST = Past, PV = Pre-verb, REFL = Reflexive, SG = Singular, VP = Verbal phrase.
3. Dunmire (2008: 94) defines conditionals as statements that assert a logical relationship between two propositions, the protasis ('if' clause) and the apodosis ('then' clause), in which the proposition in the apodosis is dependent upon the proposition in the protasis. The function of conditionals is not to assert that an event has occurred, is occurring, or will occur; they merely assert the dependence of one proposition upon the truth of another. In other words, the proposition in the 'if' clause sets up an imaginary world in which the proposition in the 'then' clause is the case. Semantically, conditionals can be used as mitigators or polite markers. In this respect, Peters (2004: 122) suggests that the verb in the conditional sentence shows that an event or action may take place, not that it will. The conditional expresses the speaker's judgment that the fulfillment of the verb's action depends on something else.

ملخص البحث :

يهدف البحث الى تقديم وصف وتحليل للعبارات المعرفية والتي تصنف عادة ضمن العبارات الموقفية في اللغة الشبكية من اجل الوصول الى بناها التركيبية ودلالاتها. استخدم البحث جملا من واقع الحياة اليومية لهذه اللغة والتي تصنف ضمن اللغات

الهندوإيرانية الشمالية الغربية وتشبه هذه اللغة الهورمانية في العراق والجلالكية في إيران والزازائية في تركيا من جميع النواحي النحوية والدلالية. تعتمد هذه اللغة على مدى واسع من العبارات المعرفية وتختلف في استخداماتها عن اللغات الأخرى وهناك تفاعل متميز بين هذه العبارات وأدوات النفي في هذه اللغة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الشبكية ، العبارات الموقفية ، العبارات المعرفية ، النفي ، الامكان

References

- Bhatt, R. 1999. Covert Modality in Non-Finite Contexts. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Pennsylvania.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, J., Conrad, S. & Finegan E. 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. London: Longman.
- Hacquard, Valentine. 2006. Aspects of Modality. Ph.D. Thesis, MIT.
- Hacquard, Valentine. 2010. On the Event-Relativity of Modal Auxiliaries. Natural Language Semantics 18(1), 79–114.
- Homer, V. 2010. Domains of polarity items. Ms., UCLA.
- Huddleston, R. and Pullum, G. K. 2002. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Izady, Mehrdad R. 1992. The Kurds: A Concise Handbook, Washington, Crane Russak.
- Kearns, K. 2000. Semantics. London: Macmillan Press LTD.
- Palmer, F. 1986. Mood and Modality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, F. 1987. The English verb, Longman, London. Second edition.
- Palmer, F. R. 1988. The English Verb. 2nd ed. London; New York: Longman.
- Palmer, F. R. 1990. Modality and the English Modals. Second edition. London : Longman.
- Palmer, F. 1995. Negation and the Modals of Possibility and Necessity. In Bybee and Fleischman (eds.), Modality in Grammar and Discourse. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 453-72.
- Palmer, F. 2001. Mood and Modality (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sydney, leech, Geoffrey, Svartvik, Jan. 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English language. New York: Longman, 1985.