A CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF TURKISH AND ENGLISH MODALITY WITH REFERENCE TO SPEECH ACT THEORY

Veysel KILIC

School of Foreign Languages, Beykent University

vkilic@beykent.edu.tr

Abstract

This article provides a syntactic and pragmatic comparison of the use of Turkish and English modal auxiliaries in the expression of modality in the frame of speech act theory. The validity of neither approach will be disputed, but a number of serious shortcomings of the syntactic approach will be emphasized.

Keywords

Modality, Speech Act Theory, function, performative, ability, necessity, probability, permission

UN ESTUDIO CONTRASTIVO DEL TURCO Y DEL INGLÉS CON RELACIÓN A LA TEORÍA DE LOS ACTOS DE HABLA

Resumen

Este artículo proporciona una comparación sintáctica y pragmática del uso de los modales auxiliares de los idiomas turco e inglés, en la expresión de modalidad en el marco de la teoría de lo actos de habla. No se discute la validez del enfoque, pero sí que se hace hincapié en una serie de deficiencias de la aproximación sintáctica.

Palabras clave

modalidad, teoría de los Actos de habla, función, rendimiento, capacidad, necesidad, probabilidad, permiso

1

1. Introduction

This article presents a view of the notion of modality in general. The Turkish and English modal auxiliaries are analysed in the frame of speech acts both syntactically and semantically.

The purpose of this study is threefold:

a) to describe the semantic and pragmatic sources of epistemic and deontic modalities in both Turkish and English;

b) to describe modal verbs with reference to the speech-act theory. Languages typically express modality through the lexical category of modal verbs (e.g. *must, had better, should, will, can)* and the inflectional of mood (imperative, subjunctive, conditional, optative, inferential/evidential and the like); see Bybee (1985);

c) to examine some problems of contrastive analysis of Turkish and English modality. I tried to compare modality of both relevant languages in the frame of semantics and pragmatics. How modal auxiliaries are used in both languages and what kind of syntactic rules are involved in their usage was observed.

The different communicative functions of language presuppose a certain organization of messages in a sentence or in discourse. The situational context and the speaker's attitude towards the listener (receiver), or the subject of discourse, result in the assignment of different communicative values to individual elements in a sentence.

2. Theoretical Framework

The discussion of what is generally known as modality, modal verbs, and the modal concepts of necessity, probability, possibility, can be traced back to Aristotle and classical Greek philosophy. Such notions might have been inferred from the fact that human beings for the most part categorizes their attitudes, behaviours, and experiences in terms of the way things might or might not be.

In the typological tradition categories tend to be defined semantically. This means that a morpheme is classified as modal if it has a modal meaning (epistemic, deontic etc). Modal meanings are expressed by various morphological, syntactic and lexical categories (Haan 2005: 19).

The major devices involved in the organization of the information conveyed by the sentence, utterance, text or discourse are suprasegmental devices such as stress, intonation and pitch, as well as segmental, such as lexical ones. Among these lexical devices, certain acts are carried out by certain verbs with reference to ability, necessity, probability, possibility, permission etc. These verbs are labelled as modal auxiliaries.

Modality is a particular way in which the information is to be encoded for presentation to listeners or readers. "Modality is defined as a notional/semantic category expressing the speaker's subjective attitude with respect to the propositional content of the message" (Palmer 1986: 51). Modality has been the subject of increasing interest and linguistic investigation for quite some time (Palmer 1986, Bybee *et al.* 1994, Bybee & Fleischmann 1995, Erguvanlı 2000: 133). Modality is a type of sign indicating the status of reality ascribed to or asserted by a sign, text or context. In language, modality is the subject concerning modal auxiliary verbs such as *can*, *could*, *should*, *must*, *ought to*, etc. Thus the semantic domain of modality may find shape in languages through grammaticalized moods, lexicalizations and/or particles/clitics. Turkish makes use of these different means to encode modal notions; namely, it employs mood markers (*-(y)Ebil*, *-Ir*, *-mEli*, etc.), or lexical expressions like adverbs (*belki* 'maybe', *mutlaka* 'definitely', etc.) and verbal or non-verbal predicates (*dile-* 'to wish', *gerek* 'necessary', etc.) (Taylan 2000: 133) customarily used to modify the meaning of other verbs. Mood and modality are terms to designate a wide variety of linguistic functions, which have been much discussed from a logical and semantic point of view. "Mood is a marker on the verb that signals how the speaker chooses to put the proposition into a discourse context. The main function of this definition is to distinguish *mood* from *tense* and *aspect,* and to group together the well-known moods indicative, imperative, subjunctive and so on" (Bybee 1985: 165).

The concept of modality doesn't cover tense, aspect and mood, although Turkish uses some morphemes to express tense, aspect and mood together. In Turkish the concept of mood is an unspecified phenomenon whose distinctive features of tense and aspect have not been analyzed in traditional grammar studies. Therefore, tense, aspect and mood categories are interwoven with modality. "Modality is a grammatical unit which shows under which psychological conditions the process indicated by the verb occurs, or could as, personal feelings, intent and desire. When it comes to the number of

modalities, this number is neither five nor ten, it is equivalent to the number of psychological moods" (Dilaçar 1971: 106-107).

According to Palmer (1986: 51), the notion of modality is much vaguer than the notions of tense and aspect, and it leaves a number of possible definitions. On the other hand, Crystal (1991: 47) claims that modality refers to a set of syntactic and semantic contrasts. Semantically, the speaker's attitude towards the factual content is important.

In this paper I would like to examine some of the problems that have to be coped with if one tries to set up a contrastive modality of English and Turkish in the frame of semantics and pragmatics, with special emphasis on their occurrence with performative verbs. I will therefore mainly be concerned with comparing modal auxiliaries of English and Turkish syntactically and semantically. Syntactically, I will focus on how the modal auxiliaries are used and what kind of syntactic rules are involved in their usage. Semantically, the use of modal auxiliaries is important, i.e. their function in a sentence. I will also try to critically review both approaches and the assumptions behind them. I will not dispute the validity of either approach; however, I would like to point out certain undesirable consequences of the syntactic approach and to offer some suggestions in the light of performative analysis. Two kinds of modalities are epistemic, i.e. those that signal the degree of commitment the speaker has to the truth of the proposition. Those modalities are usually said to range from certainty to probability. There are modalities such as deontic modalities of permission and obligation, because they describe certain conditions on the agent with regard to the main predication. Some of the English modal auxiliaries have both an epistemic and a deontic reading. The following two examples illustrate the deontic function of obligation and permission, respectively:

(1)   Sally must be more polite to her mother.

(2)   The students may use the library at any time.

The epistemic functions of these same auxiliaries can be seen by putting them in a sentence without an agentive subject:

(3)   It must be raining.

(4)   It may be raining (Bybee 1985: 166)

4

In the first part of this paper, I will briefly describe how the modals in both languages are used in the syntactic framework, and how they are used with performative verbs. In the final part of this paper, I will try to show the use of some modals in both languages in different syntactic environments or contexts.

3. Data Analysis

Various ways have been proposed to classify predicates in English. In English there are a number of modal auxiliaries*: ought to, used to, need, dare, had better, must, should, will, would.*

Each modal auxiliary is used in different contexts and it has also different functions.

The situation is entirely different in Turkish. Although modality exists in Turkish, it is not as clearly marked as it is in English. Since there are no modal auxiliaries in Turkish like the ones in English, modality is usually marked on the main verb.

Modalities in most cases are conveyed covertly in sentences in Turkish. They are not used with performative verbs in Turkish. Semantically, *requests, necessity*, *condition* and *imperative*s are the main modal performatives in Turkish. Modality acts like an aspect of the verb in a sentence. It is the realization of the act that the verb of the sentence undertakes. Modality indicates the situation of the act. Modality and tense are different entities in Turkish. It is possible to find modality in any tense, but not the other way around. Some models such as *bildirme kipi* (information conveying) modals have got tense. Due to the syntactic structure of Turkish we cannot show a class of modals as we can in English, but it is possible to compare modality between languages as far as the use of language is concerned. Turkish uses verbal suffixes to convey certain modal meanings with respect to the speaker's attitude. I will explain and exemplify the English modals and give examples of their Turkish counterparts.

In terms of their functions, modals in Turkish can be classified as follows:

Indicative
Conditional
Imperative

Optative (expression of a wish or request)

Necessitative or obligative

Potential (ability to do something)

Permissive

Certainty

Monitory (warning)

As I have mentioned before it is almost impossible to find one-to-one correspondence of modals between languages. For the sake of clarity I would like to start with functions (acts) which are performed with the help of modality and try to give their Turkish counterparts.

3.1. Ability (*be able to, be capable of, know how to*)

The verbs *be able to*, *be capable of*, *know how to* can be expressed with the modal auxiliary *can*. *Can* denotes positive ability on the part of the doer. Besides ability, permission and theoretical *possibility* are expressed by using the modal auxiliary *can*.

(5) He can speak English but he cannot write very well.

(6) I can see it from this window.

3.2. Permission (*be allowed to, be permitted to*)

(7) Can I see your books?

(8) Can I smoke here?

3.3. Theoretical possibility (*factual possibility*)

(9) *Anybody can make mistakes.*

(10) *The building can be closed.*

In Turkish *ability* is expressed with the morpheme *-(y)Abil* which appears before tense/aspect markers and person marking and varies in accordance with the verb it is

6

attached to. Morphophonemically it is *e-bilir edebilir*, *gelebilir*, *çözebilir*, *yazabilir*. The morpheme is *-ebil* or *-abil* whereas ***-ir*** is the third person singular. For the first person singular it is *-im* in the present simple, *-yorum* in the present progressive, *-dim* in the simple past, *-ceğim* in the future form. For the second person singular it is *-sin*, *-yorsun*, *-din*, *-eceksin*. For the second person plural it is ***-siniz***, *-yorsunuz*, *-diniz*, *-eceksiniz*. For the first person plural it is *-iriz*, *-iyoruz*, *-idik*, *-eceğiz*. For the third person singular it is *-irler*, *-iyorlar*, *-irlerdi*, *-ecekler*.

(11)

İngilizce	konuş	-abil	-ir	-im
English	speak	Abil	Aor.	1. sing

"I can speak English"

*A-bilir: oku*y***abilir***, *yaz***abilir***, *oynay***abilir***, etc. For the sake of simplicity the examples are for the third person singular. Due to the vowel harmony in Turkish the suffix which indicates modality is either ***e-bilir*** or ***a-bilir*** depending on the vowels in the verbs. "The potential also sometimes referred to as the abilitative, as for example in Underhill 1976: 145) is expressed by the suffix *-(y)Abil*. This suffix consists of the verb **bil** 'know' and the harmonizing vowel"" (Kornfilt 1997).

It can also be followed by a full range of tense/ aspect suffixes:

(12)	Yaz	**-abi**l	-eceğ	-im
	Write	Abil	Future	1. sng

"I will be able to write".

(13)	Yaz	**-abil**	**-iyor**	**-um**
	Write	Abil	Present prog.	1. sng.

"I am able to write".

(14)	Yaz	**-abil**	-di	-m
	Write	**Abil**	past	1. sng

"I was able to write".

In Turkish, the negation suffix (*-mA* or *-mE*, *-ma*) comes after the first vowel of the suffix. The lexical part of the suffix is omitted.

(15) Yaz   -a   **- ma**   **-) m**
      Write **Abil Neg**   1.sg
      Yaz-a-ma-dı-m
      "I am not able to write".

This also has the "invisible" aorist marker, *yazarım* vs. *yazamam.*

In English *can* co-occurs with some performative verbs. On the other hand, *can* does not usually occur alone in what would otherwise be a simple *performative senten*ce; rather it must be accompanied by some adverbials, such as now, finally, at last, etc. The following sentences are strongly performative. If we examine them carefully, we can notice that each sentence contains can, a performative verb, and a one of the adverbials.

(16) I can now *accept* that it was I who made that mistake.
      (Artık o yanlışı yapanın ben olduğumu *kabul-ed-ebil-ir-im*).
(17) I can finally *thank* you for helping me on my test.
      (Sınavda bana yardımcı olduğun için sonunda *teşekkür ed-ebilirim*).
(18) I can now *authorize* you to leave for a holiday.
      (Tatile çıkmanızı artık *onayla-y-abil-irim*).
(19) I can now *give you my word* that your paper is acceptable.
      (Bildirinizin kabuledilebilir olduğuna *sözver-ebili-im*).
(20) I can now *define* linguistics as science.
      (Şimdi dilbilimi bilim olarak *tanımlıy-abil-ir-im*).

Performative verbs are the verbs which accompany an act. Performative verbs of the above English sentences are *accept*, *thank*, *authorize*, *give you my word*, *and define.* The performative verbs of the above Turkish sentences are *kabul etmek onaylamak*, *teşekkür etmek*, *söz vermek*, *tanımlamak.*

8

3.4. Past ability

Past ability is expressed with the modal auxiliary *could* in English. The action is expressed by the lexical verb in both *can* and *could***.** In other words , the basic meanings of *can* and *could* are that there are no obstructions to the action of lexical verbs of which *can* and *could* are auxiliaries; that is to say, the action is free to take place.

(21) I never could play football.

I sat where I could watch the exit.

In negation it is always the meaning of *ability* that is negated; the results of past tense modification remain unaffected by negation.

(22) It was not exactly panic they gave way to, but they could not just sit there.

There were no chairs and you couldn't smoke and the cooling was overhead fans.

Past ability in Turkish is different from English. It is expressed in conditional sentences. It is part of the condition. The condition also includes requests in Turkish. The suffixes which indicate condition in Turkish are *-sA* or *-sE***.** One of these is added to the stem of the verb depending on the final vowel of the verb stem.

(23) Küçükken hızlı oku-ya-ma-z-dı-m.

(24) Küçükken hızlı oku-ya-mı-yor-du-m.

'First person singular: *al-sa-m*

Second person singular: *al-sa-n*

Third person singular: *al-sa*

First person plural: *al-sa-k*

Second person plural: *al-sa-nız*

Third person plural: *al-sa-lar*

According to some grammarians suffixes of conditionality were *-sar*, *-ser*. Those suffixes are believed to have undergone such a change in Turkish.

9

(25) Kel-ser-men   kel-se-men   kel-se-m   gel-se-m (If I come / I wish I could come)

Kel-ser-sen   kel-se-sen   kel-se-n   gel-se-n (If you come/If only you could come)

(Bozkurt 1995: 57)

Keşke size yardım ed- ebil- se-y-di-m

In some cases the word *eğer* 'if' is used mainly in the initial positions of conditionals in Turkish.

(26) Kukla   m   ol   sa   oyna sa   m

Puppet   my   be   Con.   play   Con.   I (I wish If I had a puppet that I could play with)

4. Permission (deontic)

When a modal verb is used to affect a situation by giving permission, etc. this is deontic modality.

In English, permission is expressed with the help of certain modal auxiliaries such as *can*, *could*, *may*, *might.*

4.1. Can (be allowed to, be permitted to)

In this case, *can* is used in a sincere situation.

(27) Can I see your books? (Am I allowed to see your books?)

(28) Can I smoke here?

4.2. Could

In this usage *could* is used like *can*.

(29) Could I smoke here?

(30) Could I talk to Selma?

10

4.3. May (be allowed to)

May denotes lack of restriction on the part of someone else not on the part of the doer. In contrast to *can*, which has a single meaning discernable in all uses, *may* is somewhat more complicated. Instead of having a unitary meaning *may* is defined in terms of a continuum. In some cases *may* corresponds very closely with the basic meaning of *can* in this respect

It is useful to point out that in the sense of permission *may* is more formal than *can*. Instead of *may not, mustn't* is very often used to express strong negative permission.

(31) You may use my car if you like.

                 mustn't
(32) You are not allowed to   use my car.

           may not

According to Twaddle (1965), those three occurrences are the same. Although the sameness is left vague, it can be assumed that they are syntactically the same. Syntactically they can be used in the same context, but they do not precisely mean the same thing.

4.4. Permission (might) (rare)

(33) Might I smoke here?
(34) He said he might come in.

Permission (asking for permission and giving permission) in Turkish is expressed by using the suffix (*y*)-*Abil* which are used for ability. The only difference is the question form used for asking permission.

(35) Gid-   ebil ir- sin- iz
     Go   may Aor 2.per.pl (You may go)

(36) Siz- i(n)le- konuş -abil ir –   mi –   (y)im ?

  you with   talk   Abil Aor. question   1. sng

  "Can I talk to you?"

Asking for or giving permission in Turkish can be expressed not only in the present tense but in other tenses too.

(37) Gel -ebil -ecek – mi- (y)im?

  Come Abil future(question)   1. sng

  "Will I be able to come?"

5. Possibility (epistemic)

The expression of a speaker's confidence can be expressed with such tags as *I think, I guess, I believe.* Epistemic modality is relatively straightforward.

Possibility is expressed with the help of different modal auxiliaries in English.

5.1. Theoretical Possibility (factual possibility)

(38) Anybody *can* make mistakes.

(39) The building *can* be closed. (It is possible to close the building.)

5.2. Present possibility

(40) We *could* go to the concert.

(41) The road *could* be blocked.

(42) *Could* you possibly have lunch with me?

(43) The building *may* be closed (It is possible that the building is closed.)

We can say that this sentence is ambiguous, and we can assign it at least two different meanings.

12

(44) It is possible that the building is closed.

(45) It is possible for us to close the building.

5.3. Theoretical or factual possibility

(46) We might go to the cinema.

(47) What you say *might* be true.

       She had skipped her lunch in the fear that he *might* call while she was out.

Due to the structure of Turkish, it is more difficult to indicate any certain words or structures by which we can perform possibility. As it has been mentioned earlier, possibility is expressed by the modal auxiliaries *can*, *could, may* and *might* whereas it is expressed by suffixes in Turkish. The suffix which expresses potential ability also expresses possibility. This is *(y)Abil.* According to Underhill (1976), this suffix consists of the verb *bil* 'to know' and the harmonizing vowel A. The second vowel does not harmonize with the stem.

(48) gel   **-*ebil*** -ir -im

       come Abil Aor. Isg

       (I *can /may/might/could* come. It is possible that I *can/could/may/might* come)

(49) otur   **-*abil***   -ir   sin

       sit   Abil   Aor   2.sing.

       "You *may/can/are* allowed to sit".

Among the mood suffixes one of them consists of a verb. This suffix is only the one which can be followed by the full range of tense/aspect suffixes.

(50) Gel   **-*ebil***   -eceğ   -im

       Com   *Abil*   Future   1. sng

       "I will be able to come"

(51) Mary   John- un   evlen   -miş ol **-abil**-ece   -in -i   söyl-üyor'
(Yavaş 1981: 77)

    M.J. married PERF: be-may/can   FUT_ poss.-acc   say - PROG

    "Mary says that John may have got married (by now)"

6. The Imperative

This function is mainly expressed by verbs without suffixation. However, due to the structure of Turkish, the morphological paradigm for the imperative is mixed.

Kornfilt (1997: 81) points out that the imperative second person plural suffix *-(y)InIz* is similar to the suffix *-sInIz* found in the regular finite tense forms, e.g. with the aorist, the present progressive, the future and the reported past, but without the initial *s*. Another difference is that the first part of the suffix *-(y)In* is more generally found (while the regular second person plural agreement suffix cannot be divided and still retains its plural function):

(52) Oku -yun   oku   -yun uz
      Read -2. pl. Imp.   Read   -2.pl. Imp
      Read (second person plural)!   Read (second person plural)! (Kornfilt 1997: 215)

(53) Gel!   Otur -un   konuş   -ma
      Come   sit   2.pl.   talk   Neg + 2.sng

It is obvious that when we look at the examples the second person singular has no special suffix. The imperative form consists of the bare stem of the root followed by the suffix expressing voice and negation.

In English, imperative is expressed by the bare stem in the surface structure. The *will* modal auxiliary is used in the deep structure.

(54) Go out!
      (You will go out) is the underlying structure
      Don't talk.

14

(55)   (You will not talk).

Tag questions are an indication of this. E.g. *Come here, will you!*

The imperative is expressed with the help of lexical verbs rather than auxiliary verbs in English. At least, it seems that lexical verbs are used to express this act on the surface structure. According to the Chomskyan type of Transformational Generative Grammar *will* is in the deep structure of imperative sentences.

It is very difficult to pinpoint a clear-cut distinction between requests and imperatives. The following sentences can be used for the same purpose or to perform the same act.

(56)   Pencereyi kapatabilir misiniz? ("Will you close the window?")

(57)   Pencereyi ne zaman kapatacaksınız? ("When will you close the window?")

Both sentences can be used to ask the addressee to close the window. Both sentences appear to be questions. Nevertheless, there is a fairly clear difference between (56) and (57). Sentence (56) rather bluntly tells someone to close the door, while (57) only hints at it.

There are certain idiomatic predicates that occur principally in imperatives, and those idiomatic predicates can also occur in sentences of the form (58), but not in sentences of the form (59).

(58)   Will you buzz off?

(59)   Buzz off, will you?

(60)   When will you buzz off?

If we assume that *Close the door* is unambiguously a request, the rule of request must be sensitive to the request significance, and we can say that the request significance of the question form sentence is an aspect of meaning.

(61)   Will the door be closed by you?

(62)   Will it be you who closes the door?

15

(63) Will it be the door which you close?

(64) When will the door be closed by you?

(65) When will it be you who closes the door?

(66) When will it be the door which you close?

The first sentence above can still be used to get a person to perform the desired act, but the inability of this sentence to take a sentence internal *please, demonstrates* that it does not have the sense of request.

The second sentence has the sense of indirect request. It is very hard to distinguish between a request and a command imperative at this point. If we consider the psychological conditions, the second sentence can be a request in one context, and it also can be an order in other contexts or situations. It is safe to say that the meaning depends on the role relations of the speaker and the hearer.

As I have mentioned above, the imperative suffix for the second person singular in Turkish is-*(y)In*, and for the second person plural it is *(y)InIz*. Let's list the imperative suffixes for the other pronouns:

(67) *-(y)In*   otur-un!   (Sit-2.per.pl.Imp)

(68) *-(y)InIz*   otur-un-uz!   (Sit-2.per.pl Imp)

(69) ------   otur!   (Sit 2. per.sng. Imp)

(70) *-sIn* otur-sun!   (Sit. 3.per.sng Imp)

(71) *-sIn(lar)* otur-sun-lar!   (Sit.3.per.pl. Imp)

There is no clear-cut boundary between imperative and request in Turkish. Kornfilt (1997: 81) says that "*(y)InIz* (oku -yunuz!) is the imperative suffix". It seems to be the request suffix in different contexts. Even if we take Kornfilt's example**:** "oku *-yunuz*!" can be a command and a request depending on the person to whom it is said. In other words, it all depends on the role relations of the speaker and the hearer.

It is obvious that the above mentioned examples are commands (imperative) in Turkish. The request suffix *-mi (-mi,- mı, -mü, -mu*) is added to the beginning of the imperative suffix:

(72) *-mı sIn*   Kapı -(y)I   açar   mı   sın ?

"Will you open the door please?"

                                         door   the   open   REQ.   2.sng

(73) *-mı sInIz*   Kapı-(y)I   açar   mı   sınız?

"Will you open the door?"

Both sentences can take a sentence adverbial *lütfen* (please) as the first word of the sentence that describes the action being requested.

(74) Lütfen   kapı   (y)I   a-çar *mı*   *sınız*?

      Please   door   the   open   AORIST.   2.per.pl.

      "Can/will you please open the door?"

When this sentence adverbial *lütfen* occurs at the end of the sentence it gives the sense of command. This polite command is also a request.

(75) Kapı   (y)I   açar   mı   sınız,   *lütfen*

      "Can/will you open the door, please?"

Sentence adverbials may distinguish requests from non-requests in English as well. In the following examples, sentence (76) can take a sentence-adverbial *please* or *kindly* immediately before the verb that describes the action being requested, but (77) does not:

(76) *Will you* **please** *close the door?*

             kindly

(77) ** When will you* **please**   *close the door?*

                kindly

17

7. Obligation (deontic)

Obligation is expressed by different modal auxiliaries in English: *ought to*, *must*, *have to.*

7.1. Should

There are two major meaning groups of *should*, one of which is the normative meaning with its one overtone and many contextual variants, and the other is the group of meanings which derive from the past predictive *shall***.**

One of the normative meanings of *should* is obligation and logical necessity is *must*.

(78) You *should* do as he says (obligation)

(79) You *should* be at home by now (epistemic)

7.2. Ought to

As far as it can be determined, *ought to* acts as a synonym for the normative *should* in almost every respect. The exceptions to total mutual interchangeability are few and usually explainable without difficulty. An attempt to substitute may be made in place of *should* in ambiguous sentences, but only to the extent that part of the ambiguity involves the normative *should*:

(80) I don't understand why a white hotel *should* be down there.

(81) I don't understand why a white hotel *ought* to be down there.

We can say that the normative *should* and *ought to* are in free variation except in certain kinds of constructions made awkward by obligation and probability.

(82) You *ought to* start at once.

(83) They *ought to* be here by now.

(84) You *ought to* know that.

18

(85) This *ought to* simplify your life.

7.3. *Must*

The meaning of *must* is unitary, relatively simple and clearly evident in all the sentences where the modal appears. Other meanings include the best or only way to achieve an end, and the obviousness of the conclusion presented by the data. It comes out to be something like "the predication" required by some aspects of the state of the world. The rule or regulation, the nature of a sound piece of work or a change in the attitude of those among whom the speaker lives data:

(86)   The officer told me that both lists *must be* checked.

(87)   Smith must have committed the murder.

7.4. *Obligation or compulsion in the present and past tenses*

In obligation or compulsion cases, *be obliged to, have (got) to* are used, but in the past tense, except in reported speech, only *had to* (not must) is used.

There are two negatives:

a) *is not obliged to*; *needn't, doesn't have to*;

b) *is obliged not to*; *mustn't*.

(88) Yesterday, you said you *had to* be back by ten o'clock.

                              must

                              needn't

(89)   You   *don't have to*   be back by ten o'clock.

                   are not obliged to

Logical necessity: *must* is not used in sentences with negative or interrogative meanings, *can* being used instead.

(90) There must be a mistake.

(91) There can't be a mistake.

Must as a modal co-occurs in a strongly *performative manner* most often and with the largest number of verbs:

(92) I must say that you are not concerned.

(93) I must classify that job as inadequate.

(94) I must condemn him for saying that to you.

(95) I must request that you sit down immediately.

(96) I must suggest that you take it easy.

(97) I must forbid you from using it.

In old Turkish and Turkish dialects the most commonly used necessity or obligation modal is *gerek*. The suffix *-mA(K) + person* is added to the root of the verb to make the infinitive form and then the *gerek* or *lazım* words follow.

(98) Gel- me-n   gerek
      Come-you   Oblig.
(99) Gel- me-niz   gerek
      Come you (pl) Oblig.
(100) Çok ye-me-mek gerek. (-mek infinitive marker/nominalizar)

In modern Turkish necessity or obligation is represented by adding *-mALI*. Suffixes are added to the root of the verb and then personal pronoun suffixes are added.

(101) Gel-   meli-y im
       Come   Oblig. 1.sg

The verbs which co-occur with must have an effect on whether a sentence is strongly performative or weakly performative: *appeal*, *bid*, *implore*, *petition*, *plead*, etc. The acts which have such performative verbs share the inherent property that the speaker is requesting from a position of powerlessness relative to the hearer.

Ask, *call on*, *forbid*, *insist*, *inquire*, *prohibit*, *request.* The acts which have such performative verbs seem inherently relatively neutral, from the stand point of power.

20

Command, *demand*, *direct*, *instruct*, *order*, *require*, *restrict.* These acts share the property that the speaker yields some power over the hearer.

The speaker-powerless and speaker-powerful positions are weakly performative, the speaker-neutral cases are strongly performative.

i) powerless: I must beg you to help me out of here.

                 appeal

ii) powerful: I must order you to help me out of here.

                 command

iii) neutral: I must ask you to help me out of here

                 request

8. Conclusion

In this paper I have shown that English modal verbs can be analyzed in the frame of speech act theory. Turkish modal verbs cannot be used with performative verbs; that is, why they cannot be analyzed in the frame of speech act theory.

English modal auxiliary verbs can be used with performative verbs in the same sentences. Performative verbs are verbs which accompany an act *(I can* accept *that it was I who made that mistake).* In Turkish performative verbs (morphemes) are attached to the main verbs *(Gid **-ebil-** ir sin- iz).*

The use of modal auxiliaries of both languages and their function was compared. Modality is usually marked on the main verb in Turkish; it is not clearly marked as in English. Since the modalities are not used with performative verbs in Turkish as they are used in English, the syntactic structure of Turkish does not allow us to show a class of modals. However, in some cases certain functions are mainly expressed by verbs without suffixation in Turkish as it is in English.

21

References

BYBEE, J. (1985) *Morphology: a Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

BYBEE, J. *et al.* (1994) *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*, Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

BYBEE, J. & S. FLEISCHMAN (eds.) (1995) *Modality in grammar and discourse*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

BOZKURT, F. (1995) *Türkiye Türkçesi*, İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.

CRYSTAL, D. (1991) *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, Oxford & Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing.

DILAÇAR, A. (1971) "Gramer Tanımı, Adı, Kapsamı, Türleri, Yöntemi, Eğitimdeki Yeri ve Tarihçesi", *TDAY Belleten,* TDK.

ERGUVANLI, E (2000) *Semi-grammaticalized modality in Turkish*, in A. GÖKSEL & C. KERSLAKE (eds.), *Studies on Turkish and Turkic Languages*, Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 133-142.

HAAN, F. de (2005) "Typological Approaches to Modality", in W. FRAWLG (ed.), *The Expression of Modality*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 27-69.

KORNFILT, J. (1997) *Turkish: Descriptive Grammar*, New York: Rutledge.

PALMER, F. R. (1986) *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres.

TAYLAN, E. E. (2000) "Semi -grammaticalized Modality in Turkish. In Studies on Turkish: and Turkic Languages", in A. Göksel & C. Kerslake (ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics,* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 113-143.

TWADDLE, W. F. (1965) *The English Verb Auxiliaries,* Brown University Pres.

UNDERHILL, R. (1976) *Turkish Grammar*, Cambridge: The MIT Pres.

YAVAŞ, F. (1981) *On the Meaning of Tense and Aspect Markers in Turkish*, Unpublished PhD dissertation in Linguistics, University of Kansas.