

LINDITA SEJDIU-RUGOVA, DALIAN ZOGAJ

University of Prishtina (Kosovo)  
Faculty of Philology

## Epistemic modality expressed through modal verbs in Albanian

**Key words:** modality; epistemic; necessity; possibility; modal verbs; *mund* ‘be able to’; *duhet* ‘must/have to’ and *do*

**Słowa kluczowe:** modalność; epistemiczny; konieczność; możliwość; czasowniki modalne; *mund* ‘móc coś zrobić’; *duhet* ‘musieć’ i *do* ‘robić’

### 1. Introduction

Modality covers a very broad semantic concept that can be expressed by many forms. Portner (2009) asserts that the right way to study it is to begin with some of the areas of language which most obviously involve modality, to understand these as well as possible, and then to see whether that understanding is also helpful when applied to new features of language (Portner 2009: 1). In Albanian grammar books, modality has not been studied thoroughly and it is rarely used as a term, modal verbs are treated very briefly within the verbal system and are described as verbs with a modal value (‘Folje me vlerë modale’), (ASHSH 2002: 261). Therefore, this semantic concept is hardly known, studied or compared with other languages by Albanian-speaking scholars. Considering this lack of studies, the best strategy to start exploring this fascinating area is to deal with modal verbs first, particularly with

modals that express epistemic modality. Hence, the overall aim of this paper is to identify and to classify modal verbs that express epistemic modality in Albanian.

This will be achieved by conducting a literature review in the semantics of modality, specifically within the context of linguistic epistemic modality and its expression through modal verbs by finding out the characteristics and features of epistemic modal expressions specific to Albanian. The main objectives are:

- to present a clear picture and to frame the epistemic modals in Albanian,
- to identify and analyse all possible modal meanings of the most dominant modal verbs in Albanian: *duhet* and *mund* in different text types, and
- to compare and contrast different grammatical categorizations of the epistemic modal *do* vs. tense particle *do* within the same context.

For example, uninflected *duhet* followed by the subjunctive is the typical modal to express necessity. The modal *duhet* also had its equal inflected form, which expresses epistemic modality. *Mund* typically expresses possibility followed by the subjunctive. Possibility in Albanian is also expressed by the fully inflected modal verb *mund* without any noticeable semantic change. Epistemic modality was also expressed by the verbal particle *do*. *Do* is combined with present and past situations to express a reasonable conclusion. With the verbal particle *do* Albanian, just like English, seems to complete the system of three types of judgments proposed by Palmer (2001): speculative – expressing uncertainty; expressed through *mund*, deductive – indicating an inference from observable evidence; expressed through *duhet* and assumptive – indicating inference from what is already known; through *do*. Having in mind the above-mentioned features of the modals expressing epistemicity in Albanian, one could hypothesise that: modal verbs *mund* and *duhet* are the most indicative grammatical units with epistemic modal meaning, and the verbal partial *do* + is more epistemic than tense indicator category since beside expressing futurity as a time concept within a particular verb tense form, it can express epistemic modality, too.

## 2. Methodology

The research will focus on the corpus selected from Albanian National Corpus (<http://web-corpora.net/AlbanianCorpus/>). Examples of modal verbs

will be extracted co-textually from literary and nonliterary contexts. From literary works we have selected: Ismail Kadare – *Kronikë në gur* (Chronicle in stone) 1980 and *Gjenerali i ushtrisë së vdekur* (the general of a dead army) 1963, Kim Mehmeti – *Vitet e urithit* (The Age of Mole) 2007 and Adem Demaçi – *Alb Prometeu* (2008), whereas from non-literary: Zeri's 2013 publications. The selected corpus will be represented by filtered sentences that contain modal verbs. By selecting both literary and non-literary texts, it is expected that a deepened understanding of epistemic modality expressed through modal verbs in Albanian will emerge. The frequency of epistemic usage according to Palmer's notions and concepts on epistemic modality, within a particular context, will be taken as an indicator for showing the modality type and possible modal classification of the verbs analysed.

There were more than one thousand sentences consisting a modal verbs extracted from the corpus by using the filters and search tools offered in Albanian National Corpus.

It is worth mentioning at this point that this research does attempt to directly contribute and comment on the entire concept of epistemic modality in Albanian language. Overall, the value of this research is the description and definition of modal verbs expressing epistemic modality, which has never been thoroughly done before among Albanian linguists and will set ground to the following linguistic studies on other types of modality, too. Furthermore, corpus evidence selected for this purpose of this study itself has limitations. The selected corpus in this study is essentially just a simple selection, which by definition can never contain all the possible instances of a given language or particularly the feature chosen to be studied here.

### 3. Theoretical discussion on Epistemicity

Following Coates' division, epistemic modality is concerned with the speaker's assumptions or assessment of possibilities, and in most cases, it indicates the speaker's confidence or lack of confidence in the truth of the proposition expressed (Coates 1995: 55). 'Subject orientation' is taken to imply a grammatical subject-predicate relationship that is located in time by clausal tense. Epistemic modals are 'speaker oriented' in that the modal qualifies the speaker's subjective attitude toward the factuality of the proposition e.g. *Sue may be at home* (Gueron et al., 2008: 6). Root modality, on the other hand, en-

compasses meanings such as permission and obligation, and also possibility and necessity. This means that the root/epistemic distinction cuts across the necessity/obligation and possibility/permission distinctions, (op.cit). According to Coates, root modals are ‘subject oriented’ in the sense that a sentence with a root modal is true if the state of obligation/permission holds of the subject, regardless of whether the eventuality occurs or not.

Bybee and Fleischman (1995, based on Bybee 1985) support the division used in Coates (1983). Based on their analysis and conclusions markers of obligation, desire, ability, permission and non-deontic root possibility predicate conditions on an agent with regard to the completion of an action referred to by the main predicate, (Bybee and Fleischman 1995: 6). They assume that epistemic modality concerns the truth as the whole, and rather than relation an agent to an action, it deals with the speaker’s commitment to the truth of proposition. Bybee and Fleischman (1995) refer to the term ‘root’ modality as ‘agent-oriented’ modality: in order to reflect the shared semantic feature on which their categorization is based. Many linguists consider the “root” vs. “epistemic” distinction as a part of a division, which extends far beyond modality, or even language. According to Larreya (2009) these two categories belong to two different domains of human mental activity: the domain of affect and/or action and the domain of knowledge (Larreya 2009: 9). He conveys that there is a general agreement among linguistics on the definition of these terms, but avoidance of the problem by focusing on a set of expressions, such as modal verbs in English, modality is then taken to include whatever these expressions mean. Thus, Coates (1983) fails by analyzing only the meaning and use of English modals in corpus data, without attempting any definition of the term modal (op.cit.).

For this purpose, Huddleston (1984) proposed for English grammar a strategy to treat grammatical categories as having a core and a periphery. This approach was considered one of the most acceptable strategies in typological studies and was adopted in a number of recent grammar books of English, such as Greenbaum (1996), Biber et al. (1999), Collins (2009), Salkie, Busutil, Auwera (2009) etc. In modality, this strategy was applied in English by Huddleston and Pullum (2002) who say that:

*“Modality is not sharply delimited or subdivided, so that we shall need to make reference to the concept of prototypical features and to allow for indeterminacy at the boundaries of the categories”* (Huddleston, Pullum 2002: 172).

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002) within modal system of modal verbs it is difficult to decide how many different senses should be recognized for a given modal auxiliary; certain broad categories can be motivated by clear cases of ambiguity and differences with respect to such matters as the scope of negation, (Huddleston, Pullum 2002: 177). Huddleston and Pullum (2002) adopt the tripartite scheme of the concept of modality between epistemic, deontic and dynamic modality. According to Huddleston and Pullum, prototypically, epistemic modality concerns the speakers' attitude to the factuality of past or present time situations, deontic modality concerns the speaker's attitude to the actualization of the future situations, and third dynamic modality concerns with properties and dispositions of persons.

When it comes to epistemic modality, most linguists agree to some extent that this domain of modality can be defined as modality expressing the speaker's attitude towards the proposition. According to Lyons (1977), epistemic modality is concerned with matters of knowledge and belief, and it is the speaker's opinion or attitude towards the proposition that the sentence expresses or the situation that the proposition describes (Lyons 1977: 452). In other words, it has to do with how committed the speaker is to the truth of the proposition.

To describe and define the concept of epistemic modality in terms of "the speaker's opinion or attitude" as Lyons states, leads to a very broad domain, it would also include such notions as the expression of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the event or situation described which is grammaticalized to a certain extent in some languages. Palmer (1990) states that in terms of complexity epistemic modality is the simplest type of modality to deal with in both its syntax and its semantics; it is the kind of modality that is most clearly distinct from the others and has the greatest degree of internal regularity and completeness (Palmer 1990: 22). According to Palmer, there are two basic degrees of epistemic modality: possibility and necessity. Further, Palmer narrows it down by defining epistemic modality only for those categories that indicate to what he says 'the degree of commitment by the speaker' plus the information on which the speaker bases his utterance, (Palmer, 1986: 49). According to Palmer (1986: 51) there are at least four ways in which a speaker may indicate that his speech utterance is not based on fact but:

- that he is speculating about it
- that he is presenting it as a deduction

- that he has been told about it
- that it is based on sensory evidence which may be incorrect

These four ways according to Palmer, can be subsumed under two sub-notions of epistemic modality, namely Judgments and Evidentials. Judgments refer to the notions of possibility and probability of the truth of an event or situation. The difference between these two is the degree of confidence the speaker has in his own utterance. This is illustrated by the following examples from English:

- 1) *John may be at home.*
- 2) *John must be at home.*

The difference between the two sentences is that sentence (2) denotes a higher degree of confidence of the speaker in his utterance than sentence (1).

Even though, epistemic modality has been subject to considerable research effort and there seems to be general agreement, it is still one of those phenomena, which keeps on puzzling linguists. According to Nuyts (2000), what seems to be confusing though besides the agreement, is the precise extension of the definition; what are linguistic instances of epistemic modality and what not, whether the category should be further subdivided in types (and if so, how), and how it should be demarcated from a number of other, related semantic categories, (Nuyts 2000: 22).

The semantics of epistemic modal expressions in natural languages are sometimes analyzed in terms of modal logic that involves reasoning or inference with regard to necessity and possibility. However, semanticists and logicians have different approaches and goals. The primary goal of the semanticist is to provide a precise theory of the meanings of modal expressions across languages, which yield an accurate description of the facts and an explanation of linguistically important generalizations (Portner 2009: 29). Whereas, the goal of the logician is to systematize and understand important features of reasoning with the concepts of necessity, obligation, and so forth (ibid.).

Hence, from a cognitive and functional perspective, there are strong arguments to assume that humans do think in terms of a scale. According to Declerck (2011), epistemic scale consists of a number of factuality values, which, as he asserts, are irrelevant; we can split the continuum into as many categories as we want, (Declerck 2011: 36). But, Palmer (2013) admits that natural

languages do not usually follow very strict rules of logic, only some of the relationships between the modals, follow along logical lines, (Palmer 2013: 9). Thus, in the most well-known semantic approaches, most linguists deal with epistemic modality not in terms of a scale, but in terms of discrete categories, usually possibility and necessity; the semantics of necessity is based on entailment, whereas the semantics of possibility is given in terms of compatibility. This difference is found in the different paraphrases for the interpretations ('It is possible that', and 'It is possible for'). Consequently, it seems clear to conclude that possibility and necessity are central to epistemic modality in English, and many other languages. In other words, necessity modals are treated as universal quantifiers over accessible worlds, and, on the other hand, possibility modals as existential quantifiers over accessible worlds. Therefore, we can assume that when it comes to the semantics of epistemic modals, in general they are based on entailment or compatibility by what is known.

Across languages, modal meanings are expressed by various morphological, syntactic, and lexical categories like: modal verbs, mood, modal affixes, lexical categories, modal tags (parentheticals), modal particles and modal case. As the best way to begin studying modality is by first studying certain central modal verbs, hence, this paper focuses primarily on them.

#### 4. Epistemic modal verbs in Albanian

In terms of morphological type, Albanian is an analytical language (Demiraj 1982). Adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections are non-inflecting whereas nouns, pronouns, articles, adjectives and verbs are inflecting. Modal verbs in Albanian according to Topalli (2010) are analytical grammatical forms which have been gramaticalised over time and show various degrees of reduction of their inflection by being used with some other verbs in order to express modality; especially possibility and necessity.

In general, there are only a few superficial studies conducted on the field modality and Albanian modals so far. Probably, one of the first linguists in Albanian to have mentioned these analytical grammatical verb forms and different domains of modality they express was the Albanian linguist and Albanologist Selman Riza (1997). According to him, verbs like: *dua*, *mund* and *duhet* in their lexical form express psychological and moral concepts, such

as: the concept of necessity, possibility, volition, obligation and permission. He called these verbs as ‘*folje të pa-vetmjaftueshme marrdhëniore*’ (non-self-sufficient relational verbs\*) due to the fact that they do not have a full independent lexical meaning on their own when they are followed by another verb (Riza 1997: 89). However, his terminology and classification were not considered at all by later scholars in later studies of modals and modality. Newmark (1982) in his study of Albanian language claims that in Albanian, modal verbs express the attitude of the speaker toward the action named by the following verb, in respect to its possibility or necessity, and that these verbs include: *mund* ‘can, could’ and *duhet* (or *lipset*) ‘should or ought’ (Newmark 1982: 72). On the other side, Beci (2004) assumes that besides *mund*, *duhet*, *lipset* and *do* categorized earlier as modals by Newmark (1982), *kam* and *jam* followed by infinitive form ‘*për të larë*’ also express modality (Beci 2004:150). However, Breu in his latest study on modality in Albanian (2009) concludes that *mund* and *duhet* together with the normally fully inflected *dua* expressing volition are to be understood as the ‘center’ of the functional category of modality in Albanian (Breu 2009: 231).

According to Rugova/Sejdiu-Rugova (2015: 178, 179) modality in Albanian is expressed through modal verbs, like: *duhet*, *mund* and *do*, through lexical verbs with semi-modal function: *le* (let), *lejon* (allow), *bën* (do/make), *di* (know) dhe *guxoj* (dare), the two last are borrowings from Serbian to Albanian in Kosovo, as in the examples:

*Ai di me ba sherr*

(He knows how to quarrel\*)

*Ai nuk guxon me t’prekë, se e mbys.*

(He doesn’t dare to touch you, because I’ll kill him)

Modality in Albanian according to Sejdiu Rugova (2015) is also expressed through mood (optative, admirative and subjunctive mood with unrealistic/unlikely meaning – irrealis mood), through lexical means, such as modal adverbs: *ndoshta* (probably), *patjetër* (certainly), *me siguri* (surely) etc. *Patjetër që do të vij me ty!* (I will surely come with you.) to express epistemic modality.

Through modal adjectives like: *e sigurt* (confident), *e dyshimtë* (suspicious), *e detyruar* (obligated).

*Ai është i sigurt për këtë informacion*  
(He is confident about this information)

As well as through modal names like: *gjasë* (likelihood), *aftësi* (ability), *siguri* (security), *urdhër* (command), *këshillë* (advice), *lutje* (prayer), *kërkesë* (request) etc. for example:

*Ka gjasë që ai nuk vjen fare.*  
(It is likely that he will not come at all\*)

*Ky njeri ka aftësi të flasë bukur.*  
(This man has the ability to speak beautifully.)

*Ai e pati një kërkesë: të shkosh në shtëpi sa më parë!*  
(He had a request: to go home as soon as possible!)

## 5. Analysis of Findings

MUND, DUHET and DO in the corpus selected were found mainly with deontic meaning of necessity or obligation and many other instances with ambiguity of meaning between epistemic and deontic readings. However, there are also considerable instances with clear epistemic meanings.

### 5.1. Modal verb DUHET

The modal *duhet* in Albanian is called a semi-auxiliary verb by Albanian grammarians. *Duhet* with reduced reflection is the typical modal to express necessity in Standard Albanian (Breu 2009). *Duhet* is not inflected for person and number when it governs the subjunctive, but inflected for tense (present *duhet*, imperfect *duhej*). *Duhet* is used to express strong objective assumption, like:

- 1) *Mbledhja **duhet** të ketë filluar tashmë.*  
(The meeting should have started already)
- 2) *Emrat e tyre **duhet** të ishin të njëllojtë, ashtu si medaljoni që mbanin në qafë, – vazhdoi gjenerali.*

(They should all have the same name, just as they all wear the same medallion round their necks," the general went on.)

- 3) *Ju duhej të ankoheshit*  
(You must have put in a protest)

The modal *duhet* also has its equal inflected form which continues to express modality. With the participle construction *duhet* is classified as a fully inflected modal verb, whose inflection is determined by the subject.

- 4) *Presidenti i Kosovës, Hashim Thaçi, tha se rezultatet e PISA-s duheshin marrë me "seriozitetin më të madh.*  
(The President of Kosovo, Hashim Thaçi, said that the PISA results should be taken with utmost seriousness.)
- 5) *Kemi bërë gabime, shumë mendoj, që s'duheshin bërë.*  
(We have made mistakes, many I think, that we shouldn't have)

Inflected *duhet* is the etymological source of uninflected *duhet* + subjunctive. This modal with its different degrees of reduced inflection, goes back to the mediopassive of *dua* 'want' or 'love', e.g. *duhem* 'I am wanted/love', *duhen* 'they love themselves/each other', (op.cit.). The modal *duhet*, when not followed by another verb in subjunctive or past participle, but by a noun or pronoun which function as its subject, according to the Grammar of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Albania (2002), does not express modality. In these cases *duhet* is used as a verb with full lexical meaning, for example:

- 6) *Për këtë duhet punë.*  
(You need to work for this)
- 7) *A duhem më unë këtu?*  
(Am I needed here any longer?)

Negated *duhet* just like *mustn't* is very rarely found in epistemic use (Demiraj 1986: 869), Buchholz and Fiedler (1987) call this a feature of the colloquial language. Their example is a negated one, with no evidence of epistemic use in their corpus only deontic like:

- 8) *Po edhe në vend nuk duhet të qendronim.*  
*(But we were not even allowed to stop)*  
*S' duhej shkuar atje. Ne s' duhej t'i braktisim ata.*  
*"We shouldn't have gone. We shouldn't have desert them."*

The fully inflected verb *kam* 'have' is also used to express necessity in Standard Albanian. In this function it is normally combined with the final complement construction or "Tosk infinitive" of the type *për të*, (Buchholz and Fiedler 1987: 85–86). The verbs '*jam*' and '*kam*' may both be used as pseudo-auxiliaries followed by infinitive constructions of the type '*për të larë*' to express the modal meaning of necessity in a somewhat softer form than with *duhet* and *do*. This is the same construction that is used to express future. The strength of its modal sense depends on the context.

Forms constructed of the future subjunctive of *kam* (*jam* for passives) + participle, of the type *do të kem punuar* 'I will have worked' are not used often in Albanian. Future perfect is often used to express the probability that an action is already completed by the time of the moment of reference. In this usage it is like the perfect subjunctive preceded by a verb with the modal value of "could or 'might': which is to be completed before some future point of time.

Necessity can also be expressed by *lipset* (*lypset*) + subjunctive or passive participle, for example:

- 9) *Diamanti lypset të ketë një vlerë shumë të madhe.*  
*(Diamond must be of enormous value)*
- 10) *Mirëpo, esenca e pikturës do të varfërohej nëse unë do ta fusja veshin në lojë, sepse nëse tani e bëj, në një mënyrë realiste, atëherë lypset të jenë edhe flokët.*  
*(However, the essence of the painting will be impoverished if I kept my ear into the game, because if I do it now, in a realistic way, I should include the hair also.)*

However, this construction is considered dialectal (non-standard) by Buchholz and Fiedler (1987:189).

## 5.2. Modal verb MUND

On the other hand, *mund* in Albanian is also called a semi-auxiliary verb by Albanian grammarians, (ASHSH, 2002: 262), due to its position between fully inflected auxiliaries as *jam* (be) and *kam* (have), used to form complex tenses. *Mund* typically expresses possibility followed by the subjunctive mood. The modal *mund* has no influence on the government of the full verb, (op.cit.). Examples of weak assumptions below show that in addition to the present and the imperfect, the perfect can be in subjunctive:

- 11) *Sot mbledhja në OKB mund të ketë lidhje me Kosovën*  
(Today, the meeting in UN might be related to Kosovo)
- 12) *Shoku im, Milaimi, mund të ketë shkuar në Turqi.*  
(My friend, Milaim, might have gone to Turkey.)

The modal *mund* can be negated to express all modality levels. In the case of external negations it is combined with the proclitic negative particles *nuk* or *s'* (Breu 2009: 233).

- 13) *Nuk mund të ketë qenë e vërtetë.*  
(It could not be true)

In internal negation, the full verb in the subjunctive is negated by the negative particle *mos* placed after the modal, between the subjunctive particle and the main verb, (ibid.).

- 14) *Kryetari i Aleancës për Ardhmërinë e Kosovës, Ramush Haradinaj mund të mos kthehet në Kosovë deri më 13 shkurt.*  
(The president of the Alliance for the Future of Kosovo, Ramush Haradinaj may not return to Kosovo until February the 13<sup>th</sup>).
- 15) *Megjithatë mund të mos vejë puna gjer atje.*  
(Nevertheless, it could be that the matter won't go up to that point)

Possibility in Albanian can also be expressed by the fully inflected modal verb *mund* without any obvious semantic difference. However, the uninflected modal *mund* cannot be combined with an aorist of the main verb because

the aorist expresses completed states of affair, which means in the case of *mund* the original possibility becomes reality, for example:

- 16) *Kombëtarja shqiptare **mundi** ta fitonte ndeshjen e fundit për kualifikim në kampionatin evropian 2016.*  
 (*The Albanian national football team could win the last match for the European Championships 2016 qualifications\**)

The modal *mund* when it's not followed by another verb in subjunctive, according to ASHSH (2002) it doesn't express modality, by it is used as a verb with full lexical meaning, for example:

- 17) *Nga koha kur romakët **mundën** Teutën dhe zotëruan detin, shqiptarët u detyruan të mbështeteshin me shpatulla në male.*  
 (*From the time romans defeated Tetuta and took control over the sea, Albanians were forced to move back to the mountains.*)

### 5.3. Epistemic particle DO +

Epistemic modality in Albanian can also be expressed by the verbal particle 'do'+. According to Newmark (1982) *do* is a verbal particle that serves to mark future tense and conditional mood (Newmark 1982:105). The proclitic *do* is used in these compound constructions with a following subjunctive form of a main verb as the future tense forms and conditional mood forms of that verb. *Do* is uninflected in such constructions, and that the person, number, and voice of the construction is determined by the verb in the subjunctive. According to Newmark (1982), *do* followed by present subjunctive is used to form the future tense in Albanian like: *do të punoj* (I will work) *do të shkoj* (I will go), *do të bëhem* (I will become) etc. When *do* is followed by an active form of *kam* or (non-active) *jam* plus the participle of the main verb it forms the future perfect tense like: *do të kem punuar* (I will have worked) *do të kem shkuar* (I will have gone), *do të jem bërë* (I will have become). When *do* is followed by a verb in imperfect subjunctive it forms the conditional mood, like: *do të punoja* (I would work), *do të shkoja* (I would go), *do të bëhesha* (I would become). When the following verb is composed of the conditional past form of *kam* (active) or *jam* (non-active) plus the participle of the given

verb, the particle verb is used to form the perfect conditional, for example: *do të kisha punuar* (I would have worked), *do të kisha shkuar* (I would have gone), *do të kisha qenë* (I would have become), (ibid).

Semantically speaking, there seems to be a problem though; the verbal particle *do* is identical with the modal verb *dua* in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person which expresses volition (a less central domain of modality). However, the ambiguity that arises in these cases for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person can be avoided by inserting the conjunction *që* (that) between *do* and the subjunctive particle *të*, or with the reflexive *vetë* between *do* and the subjunctive particle *të* to reveal the dynamic use of *do* expressing volition. On the other hand, epistemic *do* cannot be separated from *të* and could be categorised as proclitic to the verb. *Do* in the third person singular of the present tense followed by the participle of a main verb expresses the meaning of necessity somewhat weaker than *duhet* (*should be* or *ought to be* constructions in English), (Newmark 1982:103). According to Newmark, constructions like: *do shkuar*, *do drejtuar*, *do punuar* etc. are more common in the colloquial language, but do also occur in Standard Albanian.

Consequently, it seems obvious to conclude that there are three main uses of *do+* in Albanian in terms of expressing modality:

The first is the epistemic use in which *do* is combined with present and past situations to express a reasonable conclusion (assumptive) (Palmer 2001:6). In these instances *do* seems to be equivalent to central epistemic *will* in English (categorised as ‘central-epistemic’ by Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and ‘predictability’ by Coates (1983), for example:

- 18) *Ajo do të ketë ardhur tashmë.*  
(*She will have come by now*)

However, unlike *will* in English, when *do* is used epistemically in a present or past situation: it seems to convey the speaker’s confidence in the truth of the proposition based on evidence and knowledge. In these cases, *do të* somehow has lost its temporal function of referring to the future (prediction), therefore it simply expresses the speaker’s assumption about what could have happened, for example:

- 19) *Te disa të tilla menjëherë ndieni se njeriu që i ka shkruar ato, do të ketë pasur shumë më tepër për të thënë, në kontekste të ndryshme, që do të jetë njësoj e dobishme.*  
*(With some such you feel at once that the man who wrote them must have had a great deal more to say, in different contexts, of equal interest.)*
- 20) *Fshatrat pothuaj mbetën fare të shkreta dhe do të ishin dëmtuar të mbjellat.*  
*(Great neglect of village and household affairs must have ensued.)*

In the second use, *do* just like *will* in English, serves to mark future tense categorised as ‘futurity’ by Huddleston and Pullum (2002), ‘prediction’ by Coates (1983) and excluded completely from the epistemic category by Palmer who assumes that where there is reference to future action, it is difficult, and sometimes impossible, to distinguish epistemic use from futurity due to factual assertions these expressions involve that lack any element of speaker judgement (Palmer 1990: 57), for example:

- 21) *Unë këtë vit pushimet verore do t’i bëj në Sarandë*  
*(I will spent my summer holiday in Saranda this year)*

And last, *do* is used as the inflected form of the modal verb *dua* in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person expressing volition, a less central domain of modality, which sometimes may be confusing or ambiguous, for example:

- 22) *Si duket, ti nuk do të vish në pushime me ne. (ambiguous)*

However, as we discussed it earlier the ambiguity that arises in these cases between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> forms of inflected *dua* and the verbal particle *do* can be avoided by inserting the conjunction *që* (that) between *do* and the subjunctive particle *të* to reveal the actual meaning of this sentence, like:

- 23) *Si duket, ti nuk do që të vish në pushime me ne. (volition)*  
*(It seems that you do not want to come with us on holiday)*

Alternatively, ambiguity can also be avoided by adding the reflexive *vetë* between *do* and the subjunctive particle *të*, for example:

- 24) *Si duket, ti nuk do vetë të vish në pushime ne. (volition)*  
*(It seems that you do not want to come with us on holiday)*

Otherwise, when *do* is used epistemically cannot be separated from *të* because *do* is categorised as proclitic to the verb.

#### 5.4. Epistemic modals in Albanian and negation

Palmer (1990) assumes that there seems to be logical equivalences between possibility and necessity in terms of negation and later de Haan (1997) points out that it is not always the case that two negations cancel each other out in modal logic. Thus, ‘not (not possibility)’ does not lead to ‘possibility’, but to necessity, when one negation is used to negate the modal element and the other is used to negate the main verb.

Palmer (1995) does not suggest that all the modal forms fit precisely into this logical system, although this seems to be true to some extent of the epistemic modals in Albanian, where necessity forms are provided by the logical possibility equivalences, table (1) below.

<i>NECESSITY</i> <i>(Domosdoshmëri)-Nec</i>	<i>POSSIBILITY</i> <i>(Mundësi)-Poss</i>	<i>Formula</i>
<i>Ai duhet të jetë fajtor =</i>	<i>Ai s'mund të mos jetë fajtor</i>	<i>Nec = not+Poss+not</i>
<i>Ai duhet të mos jetë fajtor =</i>	<i>Ai s'mund të jetë fajtor</i>	<i>Nec+not = not+Poss</i>
<i>Ai nuk është domosdo fajtor* =</i>	<i>Ai mund të mos jetë fajtor</i>	<i>not+Nec = Poss+not</i>
<i>Ai nuk është domosdo jo fajtor* =</i>	<i>Ai mund të jetë fajtor</i>	<i>not+Nec+not = Poss</i>

**Table 1.** Logical relation between necessity and possibility

As we can see from the table, *necessity* in Albanian is equal to *not* (*not-possibility*), *not* (*not-necessity*) is equal to *possibility*. Thus, ‘*Ai duhet të jetë fajtor*’ is equivalent in meaning with ‘*Ai s'mund të mos jetë fajtor*’ etc. However, there is an irregularity with the negated *duhet* which is rarely epistemic and most frequently is used in internal negation. Just like its equivalent *must*

*not (mustn't)* in English *duhet* also when internal negated expresses deontic necessity (strong obligation = prohibition), clearly not identical in meaning with epistemic *duhet*. Here language and logic do not completely coincide. When *duhet* is negated the negative particles can be found mostly before the modal, but cases after the modal are also common where the obligation (prohibition) in question is very strong. However, there seems to be a vague meaning regarding the scope of negation of this modal like in the following examples:

25) *Ai nuk duhet të tregohet kaq i ashpër me të.*

26) *Ai duhet të mos tregohet kaq i ashpër me të.*

*(He should not be so harsh on him)*

Palmer claims that it is possible across languages to paraphrase such expressions as *'It is possible/necessary that ...'* in Albanian *'është e mundshme/ domosdoshme që...'* and by this means to indicate where the negation is semantically located (its scope). According to Palmer this is important, because it is assumed that in the ideal or regular situation the grammatical placement of the negative indicates the scope of the negation. If the modal is negated, the expected paraphrase will be *'It is not possible/necessary that...'* (*nuk është e mundshme/domosdoshme që...*), while if the full verb is negated, the paraphrase will be *'It is possible/necessary that... not (është e mundshme/domosdoshme që...të mos)'*. In such a way possibility and necessity are logically related in terms of negation; these relations are to some degree mirrored across languages. Therefore, in order to find the equivalent expression for *not+necessary* in Albanian into this logical system we can paraphrase the modal *duhet* with the lexical modal *domosdo (domosdoshmërisht)* which may be less idiomatic than the version with the modal verb, but it completes the system.

On the other hand, the modal *mund* can have both forms of negation without a change in meaning. When external negated, modal *mund* is combined with the proclitic negative particles *nuk* or *s'*. When internally negated the full verb in the subjunctive is normally negated by the negative particle *mos* placed after the modal, between the subjunctive particle and the main verb. *Mund* can also be double negated but with a change in meaning, accordingly *'not (not possibility)'* does not lead to *'possibility'*, but to *necessity*.

## 6. Conclusion

Having in mind the discussion of the corpus analysed so far, it could be concluded that all epistemic modals we discussed so far were followed by a verb in a subjunctive mood. However, Albanian has a rich mood system. According to Breu (2010), Albanian has a rather complicated mood system with synthetic, joint, and analytical grammemes, the most important being (besides the indicative), the imperative, optative, subjunctive, admirative, jussive, and the conditional, existing either in all tense and voice combinations or restricted to some of them (Breu 2010: 448). Morphologically, the subjunctive mood is formed by the subjunctive particle *të* and a verb from which is identical with the indicative mood (hap – të hap) except for the 2nd and 3rd person singular present active, where the subjunctive mood has special morphological forms (*të punosh, të hapë, të ketë*). The subjunctive mood has two main tenses: the present and the past (with its subdivisions), but there is no subjunctive in the future, since the present form of this mood has the temporal meaning of the future. This explains the temporal meaning of the future that is related to the verbal group formed by the verb *dua* with a verb of the subjunctive mood (*do të shkoj*), where the temporal meaning is given to this form by the second verb in the subjunctive mood (Topalli 2010: 179).

When the present subjunctive is preceded by the modal *mund* expresses the modality of possibility. The present subjunctive expresses obligation or necessity when it is preceded by the modal *duhet* (or *lipset*) or by a word sequence that expresses the modality of obligation, such as *është e nevojshme*, ‘it is necessary’. When the present subjunctive is used in its own without an antecedent verb or verb phrase, it expresses possibility or obligation, usually with a future temporal meaning (Newmark 1982: 79).

Newmark assumes that the perfect subjunctive may be preceded by the modal *mund* in its uninflected form to indicate possibility in a way that corresponds to English *may have + participle*. When it is preceded by the modal *duhet* in its present tense form, the verb in the perfect subjunctive may, like English *is or (are) supposed to have + participle*, express the modality of presumed obligation (English *should have + participle*) or presumed probability (English *must have + participle*) (Newmark 1982: 84). When past perfect subjunctive is preceded by the antecedent modal *mund* in its uninflected form expresses past possibility and it is equivalent to English *might (or could) have*

+ *participle*. When it is preceded by the antecedent *duhet* in one of its imperfect forms, is equivalent to English *was (were) supposed to or ought to have + participle*, expressing past obligation (Newmark 1982: 85).

To sum up, the data analysed in Albanian seem to complete the system proposed by Palmer (2001), who claims that epistemic modality is expressed through three types of judgments that are common in languages: speculative – expressing uncertainty, deductive – indicating an inference from observable evidence and assumptive – indicating inference from what is already known. Palmer takes into consideration examples from English and claims that English uses three modals to complete this system: *may*, *must* and *will* (Palmer 2001: 25). He claims that there seem to be few languages that have a system with all three markers, but according to our findings, Albanian also completes the system using the three markers: the modal *mund*, the modal *duhet* and the verbal particle *do*, for example:

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| 27) | <i>Moti mund të keqësohet së shpejti.</i><br><i>(The weather may get worse soon)</i> | <i>a possible conclusion (speculative)</i>      |
| 28) | <i>Ai duhet të ketë pasur probleme.</i><br><i>(He must have had problems)</i>        | <i>the only possible conclusion (deductive)</i> |
| 29) | <i>Treni do të ketë ardhur tashmë.</i><br><i>(The train will have come by now)</i>   | <i>a reasonable conclusion (assumptive)</i>     |

### Bibliography

- ASHSH: Çeliku M., Domi M., Floqi S., Mansaku S., Përnaska R., Prifti, S. and Tontoni M., 2002, *Gramatika e gjuhës shqipe – Morfologjia*, 1st ed. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave.
- BECI B., 2005, *Gramatika e gjuhës shqipe për të gjithë*, Shkup–Prishtinë–Tiranë: Logos-A.
- BREU W., 2009, Modals in Albanian, In: B. Hansen, F. Haan (eds.), *Modals in the languages of Europe*, 1st ed. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 229–266.
- BREU W., 2010, Mood in Albanian, In: B. Rothstein, R. Thieroff (eds.), *Mood in the languages of Europe*, 1st ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 447–472.

- BUCHHOLZ O., FIEDLER W., 1987, *Albanische Grammatik* Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopadie.
- Bybee J., Fleischman S., 1995, *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*, 1st ed. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co.
- COATES J., 1983, *The semantics of the modal auxiliaries*, London: Croom Helm.
- COATES J., 1995, The expression of root and epistemic possibility in English, In: J. Bybee, S. Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in grammar and discourse*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 145–157.
- COLLINS P., 2009, *Modals and quasi-modals in English*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- DECKLERCK R., 1991, *Tense in English. Its structure and use in discourse*, London – New York: Routledge.
- DECLERCK T., 2011, *Semantic multimedia*, Berlin: Springer.
- DEMIRAJ S., 1986, *Gramatikë historike e gjuhës shqipe*, Tiranë: Shtëpia Botuese „8 Nëntori“.
- DEMIRAJ S., 2004, *Gjuhësi ballkanike*, 1st ed. Tiranë: Shkenca.
- DEPRAETERE I., REED S., 2006, Mood and Modality in English, In: B. Aarts, A. McMahon (eds.), *The handbook of English linguistics*, 1st ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, p. 269–290.
- DOWNING A., LOCKE P., 2002, *A university course in English grammar*, London: Routledge.
- DOWNING A., LOCKE P., DOWNING A., 2006, *English grammar*, 1st ed. London: Routledge.
- EGAN A., WEATHERSON B., 2011, *Epistemic modality*, 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FACCHINETTI R., KRUG M., PALMER F., 2003, *Modality in contemporary English*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- GREENBAUM S., 1996, *The Oxford English grammar*, London: Oxford University Press.
- GRIFFITHS P., 2006, *An introduction to English semantics and pragmatics*, 1st ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Gruyter.
- HAAN F., 1997, *The interaction of modality and negation*, 1st ed. New York: Garland Pub.
- HUDDLESTON R., 1984, *Introduction to the grammar of English*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HUDDLESTON R., PULLUM G., 2002, *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*, 1st ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- KRANICH S., 2009, Epistemic Modality in English Popular Scientific Texts and Their German Translations, *trans-kom 2*, p. 26–41.
- LYONS J., 1977, *Semantics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- NEWMARK H., HUBBARD P., PRIFTI P., 1982, *Standard Albanian: A Reference Grammar for Students*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- NUYTS J., 2000, *Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization*, Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
- NUYTS J., 2001, Subjectivity as an evidential dimension in epistemic modal expressions, *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, p. 383–400.
- NUYTS J., 2005, The modal confusion: on terminology and the concepts behind it, In: A. Klinge, H. Müller (eds.), *Modality: Study in form and function*, 1st ed., London: Equinox, p. 5–38.
- NUYTS J., BYLOO P., DIEPEVEEN A., 2005, *On deontic modality, directivity, and mood*, Antwerpen: University of Antwerp.
- PALMER F., 1979, *Modality and the English modals*, London: Longman.
- PALMER F., 1986, *Mood and modality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- PALMER F., 1988, *The English verb*, London: Longman.
- PALMER F., 1990, *Modality and the English modals*, 2nd ed., London: Longman.
- PALMER F., 2001, *Modality*, 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- PAPAFRAGOU A., 2000, *Modality*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- PERKINS M., 1983, *Modal expressions in English*, London: F. Pinter.
- PORTNER P., 2009, *Modality*, 1st ed., Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- QUIRK R., 1985, *A Comprehensive grammar of the English language*, London: Longman.
- RIZA S., 1997, *Vepra 2*, Prishtinë: Akademia e Shkencave dhe e Arteve e Kosovës.
- ROTHSTEIN B., THIEROFF R., 2010, *Mood in the languages of Europe*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- RUGOVA L., 2015, *The ideology of “people’s language” in the development of standard Albanian language*, Harrasovitz publications, Sprache und Kultur der Albaner edition, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- SALKIE R., BUSUTTL P., AUWERA J., 2009, *Modality in English*, Berlin: M. de Gruyter.
- STOCKWELL R., BOWEN J., MARTIN J., 1965, *The grammatical structures of English and Spanish*, Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- TOPALLI K., 2010, *Sistemi foljor i gjuhës shqipe*, Tirane: Plejad.
- VAN DER AUWERA J., PLUNGIAN V., 1998, Modality’s semantic map, *Linguistic Typology* 2, p. 79–124.
- VAN LEEUWEN T., 2005, *Introducing social semiotics*, 1st ed., New York: Routledge.
- VERSTRAETE J., 2003, Subjective and objective modality: interpersonal and ideational functions in the English modal auxiliary system, *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, p. 1505–28.
- WÄRNSBY A., 2006, *(De)coding modality*, 1st ed., Lund, Sweden: Lund University, Dept. of English.
- WRIGHT G., 1951, *An essay in modal logic*, Amsterdam: North-Holland Pub. Co.

**Modalność epistemiczna wyrażana  
czasownikami w języku albańskim  
(streszczenie)**

Artykuł ma na celu analizę znaczeń epistemicznych wyrażanych za pomocą czasowników modalnych w języku albańskim, opartych na współczesnych semantycznych teoriach modalności. W artykule przyjęte zostało podejście Huddlestona i Pulluma, a mianowicie trójstronny system modalności epistemicznej, deontycznej i dynamicznej. Modalność epistemiczna wyraża nastawienie mówiącego do prawdziwości sytuacji przeszłych bądź teraźniejszych.

Według Huddlestona i Pulluma (2002) siła zaangażowania mówiącego stanowi podstawę do rozróżnienia pomiędzy modalnymi pojęciami konieczności i możliwości. W języku albańskim obie te kategorie zostały wyrażone za pomocą czasownika modalnego 'mund' określającego możliwość i 'duhet' określającego konieczność. Niestety standardowe gramatyki albańskie wciąż poświęcają zbyt mało uwagi lub też wcale nie skupiają się na ogólnym pojęciu modalności. Przedstawione badanie jest pierwszą próbą bardziej szczegółowej klasyfikacji jednostek strukturalnych modalności epistemicznej. Szczególny nacisk położony jest na główne epistemiczne czasowniki modalne. W artykule została także przeanalizowana frekwencja użycia i rodzaj modalności epistemicznej związanej z czasownikami modalnymi *duhet*, *mund* i *do*. Ponadto rozpoznane i scharakteryzowane zostały również inne typy czasowników wyrażających modalność epistemiczną.