 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКАЯ, ПРИКЛАДНАЯ И СРАВНИТЕЛЬНО-СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНАЯ ЛИНГВИСТИКА/THEORETICAL, APPLIED AND COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS

DOI: https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2026.83.4 EDN: QJDBMA

METHODS AND FEATURES OF TRANSLATING NON-EQUIVALENT GRAMMATICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH AND TAJIK (ON THE EXAMPLE OF MODAL VERBS)

Research article

Sodiqova R.A.[1,*]

[1] Khujand State University, Khujand, Tajikistan

* Corresponding author (jafar83[at]mail.ru)

Suggested: 23.08.2026; Accepted: 19.10.2026; Published: 09.11.2026

Abstract

The given article dwells on the methods and features of translating non-equivalent grammatical units in English and Tajik. The analysis focuses on four key English modal verbs – can, must, should, and may/might – examining their semantic-functional scope and the range of Tajik equivalents employed in translation, including independent modal verbs (тавонистан, бояд), modal words (шояд, мумкин), lexical-grammatical constructions (имкон ёфтан, мумкин аст + infinitive), and verbal moods. The findings reveal that while isomorphism exists at the conceptual level – both languages possessing means to express core modal meanings of possibility, necessity, probability, and permission – significant allomorphism is observed in the grammatical forms, morphological composition, and functional distribution of these means. The research concludes that the systematic study of non-equivalent modal units is of considerable theoretical and practical significance, contributing not only to translation theory but also to comparative linguistics and the methodology of foreign language instruction.

Keywords: translation, modality, modal verbs, equivalence, non-equivalence, grammatical transformation, comparative linguistics, isomorphism, allomorphism.

МЕТОДЫ И ОСОБЕННОСТИ ПЕРЕВОДА НЕЭКВИВАЛЕНТНЫХ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И ТАДЖИКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ МОДАЛЬНЫХ ГЛАГОЛОВ)

Научная статья

Содикова Р.А.[1,*]

[1] Худжандский государственный университет имени академика Бободжана Гафурова, Худжанд, Таджикистан

* Корреспондирующий автор (jafar83[at]mail.ru)

Предложена: 23.08.2026; Принята: 19.10.2026; Опубликована: 09.11.2026

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматриваются методы и особенности перевода неэквивалентных грамматических единиц в английском и таджикском языках. Анализ сосредоточен на четырех ключевых английских модальных глаголах – can, must, should и may/might – с изучением их семантико-функциональной области применения и диапазона таджикских эквивалентов, используемых в переводе, включая независимые модальные глаголы (тавонистан, бояд), модальные слова (шояд, мумкин), лексико-грамматические конструкции (имкон ёфтан, мумкин аст + инфинитив) и глагольные наклонения. Результаты исследования показывают, что, хотя изоморфизм существует на концептуальном уровне – оба языка обладают средствами для выражения основных модальных значений возможности, необходимости, вероятности и разрешения – в грамматических формах, морфологическом составе и функциональном распределении этих средств наблюдается значительный алломорфизм. Исследование приходит к выводу, что систематическое изучение неэквивалентных модальных единиц имеет значительное теоретическое и практическое значение, внося вклад не только в теорию перевода, но и в сравнительную лингвистику и методологию обучения иностранным языкам.

Ключевые слова: перевод, модальность, модальные глаголы, эквивалентность, неэквивалентность, грамматическая трансформация, сравнительная лингвистика, изоморфизм, алломорфизм.

Introduction

The issue of equivalence and non-equivalence of grammatical units in comparative linguistics and translation theory is considered one of the most significant problems. Since each language possesses its own specific grammatical system, in the translation process we frequently encounter units that lack a precise structural or formal counterpart in the other language. In such cases, the translator is compelled to overcome translation challenges by employing descriptive means, substitution, or structural transformation.

One of the clearest examples of grammatical non-equivalence is English modal verbs in relation to the Tajik language. This special class of verbs, limited in number, performs a crucial semantic and functional role in English. They serve to express the speaker's attitude towards an action, the degree of certainty, necessity, possibility, and so forth. In Tajik, despite the existence of various means for expressing modality (verbal moods, modal words, adverbs, etc.), there is no system of auxiliary modal verbs grammatically similar to the English modal verbs [16], [17].

The aim of this article is to determine the methods and features of translating English modal verbs into Tajik, to analyze the degree of equivalence of existing modal units, and to propose effective translation strategies.

 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

In translation theory, the concept of equivalence is one of the central concepts [7]. A grammatical equivalent is the relationship between grammatical units of two languages that perform the same communicative function in the translation process [13]. However, in most cases, due to structural and inflectional differences between languages, a complete or formal equivalent does not exist, and we are confronted with the phenomenon of non-equivalence. Y. Naida [9, P. 142] emphasizes that in such cases, the translator must resort to structural transformation and functional substitution. With regard to modal verbs, equivalence manifests primarily at the morphological level, since these verbs possess a special grammatical system in English that has no parallel in Tajik. According to the research of D.Z. Istamkulov [6, P. 117], the modal verb "can" is directly translated into Tajik via the verb «тавонистан» (to be able), but this equivalent is incomplete, as the modal verb «тавонистан» is a full-meaning verb and differs morphologically from the modal verb "can". Similarly, J. Zokirzoda [15] demonstrates that the modal verbs "must" and «бояд» (must/should) exhibit both isomorphism (similarity) and allomorphism (difference) between them. In cases of non-equivalence, the translator is often forced to express the modal meaning through descriptive means, pragmatic changes, or structural transformation [15].

Research methods

This study employs a comprehensive methodological framework that integrates comparative, descriptive, and functional approaches to investigate the translation of modal verbs between English and Tajik. The research is grounded in the theoretical principles of contrastive linguistics and translation studies, with a particular focus on the concepts of grammatical equivalence, non-equivalence, and functional substitution as elaborated by scholars such as Y. Naida [9], R. Quirk et al. [20], and F.R. Palmer [10].

The empirical basis of this research is drawn from a dual corpus of linguistic data. The primary data consist of illustrative examples extracted from a literary-historical text in Tajik and its authorized English translation (cited as [1] throughout the study). These examples were purposefully selected based on their representative use of modal constructions, providing authentic contextualized instances of how modality is rendered across the two languages. Secondary data include metalinguistic descriptions and classifications of modal verbs and modal words from authoritative grammatical descriptions, reference grammars, and specialized monographs on modality in both English [19], [20], [21] and Tajik [2], [4], [11], [12].

The analytical procedure was carried out in several sequential stages. First, English modal verbs (can, could, may, might, must, should) were identified in the source text segments alongside their corresponding Tajik renderings in the target text. Second, the identified Tajik equivalents were classified into distinct structural types:

(a) independent lexical verbs with modal semantics (e.g., тавонистан, бояд);

(b) modal words and particles (e.g., шояд, мумкин);

(c) lexical-grammatical constructions (e.g., имкон ёфтан, мумкин аст + infinitive);

(d) verbal moods (e.g., imperative, conditional).

Third, for each pair of corresponding units, the degree of equivalence was assessed by comparing their grammatical properties (person, number, tense, morphological composition) and semantic-functional scope. Fourth, the specific translation strategies employed – lexical substitution, structural transformation (transposition), descriptive rendering, and emphatic addition – were identified and categorized based on the nature of the transformation observed.

A qualitative analytical method is predominantly applied throughout this study. Given the grammatical and functional nature of modality and the limited, closed-class status of English modal auxiliaries, the emphasis is placed on contextual, semantic, and functional equivalence rather than on quantitative frequency counts. The analysis adopts a case-study approach, examining each example in depth to illustrate the interplay between isomorphism (formal and functional similarity) and allomorphism (structural and functional divergence) between the two linguistic systems. This method allows for a nuanced exploration of how translation choices are influenced by syntactic constraints, pragmatic context, and stylistic considerations.

The theoretical underpinnings integrate Western and Tajik/Russian linguistic traditions to ensure a balanced comparative perspective. The classifications of modal meanings (epistemic, deontic, dynamic) proposed by Palmer [10] and Coates [18], alongside the structural descriptions of Tajik modality provided by Uspenskaya [12], Niyozi [8], and Abdurahmonov [2], serve as the primary analytical lenses. By triangulating data from authentic translated texts with theoretical models from both language traditions, this research aims to provide a systematic and empirically grounded account of the methods and features of translating non-equivalent modal grammatical units.

Main results and discussion

Modality, viewed as a conceptual category, encodes the speaker-determined relationship between an utterance's propositional content and objective reality. Both languages employ a range of modal exponents – moods, modal verbs, modal words, adverbs, intonation, and others – yet these devices differ in their nature and functions.

English modal verbs (can, could, may, might, must, shall, should, will, would) comprise a distinct class of auxiliaries with specific grammatical properties. They generally lack person and number marking (except have to and need to), have restricted tense forms, and combine directly with the bare infinitive to form a compound modal predicate. Crucially, they are devoid of independent lexical meaning and serve to introduce modal shading into the semantics of the main verb.

In Tajik, modality is manifested through several mechanisms. The principal one is verbal mood, which is more differentiated than in English and includes the indicative, conditional, imperative, and conjectural moods [15]. Another mechanism involves modal words, which are highly significant in Tajik. For instance, the particle шояд ("perhaps") is multifunctional and can convey diverse modal meanings, whereas English typically resorts to a range of grammatical devices. A third mechanism consists of independent lexical verbs with modal semantics, such as тавонистан ("to be able"), бояд ("must/should"), лозим аст ("it is necessary"), зарур аст ("it is essential"), мумкин аст ("it is possible"), among others. Unlike English modal verbs, these Tajik items are independent verbs possessing the full set of verbal grammatical categories (person, number, tense, mood). For example, тавонистан inflects for person and number and has tense forms.

 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

The present study analyses four central English modal verbs (can, must, should, may/might) and assesses their degree of equivalence with Tajik from the standpoint of various translation strategies.

The modal verb can and its formal Tajik counterpart тавонистан. In English, can primarily denotes physical or mental ability, permission, and possibility. Research indicates that although тавонистан is accepted in Tajik as the formal equivalent of can, substantial grammatical divergences obtain. Tajik тавонистан is a full lexical verb marked for person, number, and tense, whereas English can has only two forms (can for present and could for past).

In the authoritative grammar by R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik, A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language, can and could are examined within the treatment of modal meanings. The authors distinguish three principal meanings: possibility, ability, and permission [20, P. 223].

The Russian scholar E. I. Belyaeva, investigating the category of modality and its expression, analyses modal verbs semantically. In particular, with can, the meaning of physical ability is realised in combination with verbs denoting concrete action, movement, and influence upon an object. It is this position that the Tajik researcher D. Istamkulov invokes in his analysis of can – тавонистан [3, P. 202].

Within Russian grammatical theory, N. Yu. Shvedova treats modality as a means of expressing the speaker's attitude toward the content of a statement, emphasising that the speaker may adopt varied attitudes toward the veracity of the reported event [14, P. 237].

From this perspective, English can, depending on context, may express ability, possibility, and permission; in Tajik it can be rendered not only by тавонистан but also by other modal means, including мумкин аст ("it is possible"), имкон дорад ("there is a possibility"), and иҷозат аст ("it is permitted").

Example: Қиммати молҳои арабҳо ба даст даровардаро ба ҳамин фаҳмидан мумкин аст, ки чунончи дар боло қайд карда шуд, мӯзаи ба ғанимат афтодаи бухорхудотзанро дусад ҳазор (танга) нарх карданд.

Translation: The value of the goods that Arabs acquired can be understood from the example (mentioned earlier), that the trophy boots of Bukhor Khudat sold for two thousand dirham (tanga) [1, P. 85].

In this example, the Tajik modal construction "фаҳмидан мумкин аст" is rendered in English by means of "can be understood": "Қиммати молҳои арабҳо ба даст даровардаро ба ҳамин фаҳмидан мумкин аст..." – "The value of the goods that Arabs acquired can be understood..." [1, P. 85]. In Tajik, the meaning of possibility is expressed by the construction "мумкин аст + infinitive", while in English the same meaning is conveyed by the modal verb "can". Therefore, in the translation process, "мумкин аст – can" constitutes a grammatical transformation. In this case, the modal verb "can" expresses the possibility of understanding the value of the goods and functionally corresponds to "мумкин аст". This example can be interpreted as a grammatical transformation – the substitution of the means of expressing modality. This is because the English modal verb "can" in the translation is rendered not by the verb "тавонистан", but by the modal construction "мумкин аст". Thus, when transferring a Tajik modal unit into English, the translator changed the grammatical form while preserving the modal meaning of possibility. This case is a clear example of grammatical transformation in the translation of modal verbs from Tajik into English.

Another example: Дар он вақтҳо дар Кӯфа Абӯсаламабинни Сулайман ном як каси соҳибнуфуз буд, ки вай дар хусуси ин ки агар имкон ёбанд, Алавиёнро ба рӯи кор оранд, бо Абӯмуслим ҳамфикр буд (албатта, Абӯсалама аз мақсади охирини Абӯмуслим хабар надошт).

Translation: In Kufa, at that time an influential called Abu Salama ibn Suleiman, who shared Abu Muslim's goal to bring Alids to the throne, if he could find an opportunity (of course Abu Salama did not know about Abu Muslim's ultimate objective) [1, P. 85].

In the sentence "...ки вай дар хусуси ин ки агар имкон ёбанд, Алавиёнро ба рӯи кор оранд, бо Абӯмуслим ҳамфикр буд" the modal meaning of possibility is expressed by the construction "имкон ёфтан" (to find an opportunity). In the English translation, this construction is rendered as "if he could find an opportunity" [1, P. 85]. In Tajik, "имкон ёфтан" means to get a chance for favorable conditions to appear for performing an action. In English, this same meaning is conveyed using the modal verb could and the main verb find. Consequently, in the translation process, the Tajik modal construction "имкон ёфтан" is transformed into "could find an opportunity", where the means of expressing modality shifts from a lexical-grammatical compound to the modal verb "could". The modal verb "could" in this case carries the meaning of conditional possibility and is linked to the conjunction "if". Thus, the translator preserved not the surface form of the Tajik structure, but the modal meaning of possibility, rendering it through a grammatical means specific to English. This example demonstrates that when translating modal units between Tajik and English, grammatical and lexical-grammatical transformations can occur simultaneously.

Another example: Албатта Абӯмуслим дар ин маврид рӯирост тарафдории Абӯсаламаро карда ва ӯро ҳимоя намуда наметавонист.

Translation: Of course, in this case Abu Muslim could not openly take Abu Salama's side and could not protect him [1, P. 101].

In the sentence "Албатта Абӯмуслим дар ин маврид рӯирост тарафдории Абӯсаламаро карда ва ӯро ҳимоя намуда наметавонист", the modal meaning of impossibility is actualised through the verbal form наметавонист ("could not"). In the English translation, this modal value is rendered by the analytical construction could not + infinitive: "Of course, in this case Abu Muslim could not openly take Abu Salama's side and could not protect him" [1, P. 101]. In Tajik, наметавонист is the negative form of тавонистан and expresses the impossibility of performing an action in the past. In English, the corresponding meaning is conveyed by the negative form of the modal verb could. Accordingly, наметавонист – could not exemplifies a grammatical transformation from a Tajik verbal structure to an English analytical modal structure. Simultaneously, in the English text, could not is repeated in relation to two successive actions – taking Abu Salama's side and protecting him – whereas in the Tajik text наметавонист occurs only once. This structural modification is a translation-specific device intended to preserve the clarity and semantic autonomy of both actions carrying modal shading. Semantically, could not in this context expresses past impossibility and is functionally equivalent to наметавонист.

 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

The English modal verb should serve to express advice, recommendation, and mild obligation. In Tajik, it may be translated by several means: бояд (in the sense of advice), беҳтар аст (“it is better”), сазовор аст (“it is worthy”), мебояд (“it is necessary”), or the imperative mood.

The modal verb should occupy a significant position in the research of several English grammarians. M. Swan analyses should as a means of expressing obligation, recommendation, and probability, noting that in the expression of obligation it is relatively weaker than must [21, P. 520]. J. Eastwood examines the grammatical features of should as a modal verb and demonstrates its use in expressing advice and necessity [19, P. 115]. R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik consider modal verbs from the perspective of both grammatical characteristics and modal meanings [20, P. 223]. F. R. Palmer regards the distinction between deontic and epistemic modality as important for the analysis of should [10, P. 99].

In Tajik linguistics, the means of expressing necessity and obligation have been studied primarily within the framework of analysing the verbal and modal structures of the Tajik language. The Grammar of the Modern Tajik Literary Language discusses the grammatical structure of the verb and the means of expressing grammatical meanings [4, P. 44]. In J. Z. Istamkulov’s comparative research, the relationship between the English modal verb should and the Tajik modal means бояд/боистан is analysed directly, with should presented as one of the means of expressing necessity [6, P. 113].

Example: Зиндонии ӯ низ набояд баъд аз соли 149, вақте ки сохтмон ба анҷом расида буд, бошад.

Translation: His imprisonment should not be also after 149, when the construction was completed [1, P. 118].

In the sentence “Зиндонии ӯ низ набояд баъд аз соли 149, вақте ки сохтмон ба анҷом расида буд, бошад”, the modal unit “набояд” (should not) conveys the meaning of rejecting a supposition or inference derived from available evidence. In the English translation, this modal meaning is rendered by the construction “should not be”: “His imprisonment should not be also after 149, when the construction was completed” [1, P. 118]. In Tajik, “набояд” constitutes the negative form of the modal unit “бояд” and, in combination with the verb “бошад” (to be), forms a modal predicate structure. English expresses an analogous modal relationship through the combination of the auxiliary modal verb “should” and the negative particle “not.” Thus, the correspondence between Tajik “набояд ... бошад” and English “should not be” represents a grammatical transformation through which the synthetic and lexical-syntactic organization of the Tajik modal construction is adapted to the analytical grammatical structure of English without loss of its basic modal semantics.

From a semantic perspective, “should not” in this context does not primarily express deontic prohibition or obligation. Rather, it functions as an epistemic marker indicating a logical inference and the rejection of a particular probability. On the basis of the temporal evidence provided in the sentence, the author infers that the person's imprisonment most probably did not take place after the year 149. Consequently, the English modal construction preserves the inferential and probabilistic character of the original Tajik utterance.

The English modal verbs “may” and “might” are generally associated with the semantic domain of possibility, while “may” may also perform a deontic function and express permission. In contexts involving epistemic possibility, “might” normally indicates a lower degree of probability or a more tentative assumption than “may.” In Tajik, the principal lexical means used to express possibility, supposition, and probability is the modal word «шояд» (perhaps, possibly). Linguistic evidence demonstrates that «шояд» is functionally multifunctional and is capable of expressing a broad spectrum of modal meanings depending on its syntactic environment, verbal form, and contextual interpretation.

R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik, in A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language, distinguish the semantic properties of “may” and “might.” According to their analysis, “may” indicates a possibility that is perceived as relatively close to reality, whereas “might” does not function merely as the past-tense counterpart of “may.” It can also signal a reduced degree of probability, uncertainty, tentativeness, or hypothetical possibility, thereby indicating a lower degree of the speaker's confidence in the realization of the event [20, P. 223].

F. R. Palmer, in Modality and the English Language, likewise differentiates the functional and semantic domains of the two modal forms. At the epistemic level, “may” expresses the proposition that something is possible, whereas at the deontic level it denotes permission. “Might,” by contrast, is predominantly associated with epistemic modality and serves to express a tentative or less certain possibility. Its use consequently places greater emphasis on the limited degree of the speaker's commitment to the truth or realization of the proposition [10, P. 96].

J. Coates, in The Semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries, also examines the semantic relationship between “may” and “might.” Her analysis demonstrates that “might” frequently functions as a hedging device in both spoken and edited discourse, reducing the categorical force of a probabilistic statement. The principal distinction between the two modal forms is therefore manifested in the degree of certainty or commitment attributed to the proposition by the speaker [18, P. 143].

Within Tajik linguistics, the modal word «шояд» is regarded as one of the principal lexical-syntactic means of expressing possibility, supposition, and hypothesis. Its structural and functional characteristics have been examined in a number of linguistic studies. Sh. Z. Niyozi, in the dissertation Noun and Some Modal Words in the Modern Tajik Literary Language, emphasizes the semantic autonomy of «шояд» and identifies it as one of the principal linguistic devices for expressing the speaker's attitude toward reality. According to the scholar, its semantic interpretation is not restricted to a single modal value: depending on intonation, contextual conditions, and the grammatical form of the accompanying verb, «шояд» can denote a relatively strong probability, a weak supposition, a hypothesis, doubt, or hesitation. Its historical derivation from the verb “шоистан” (to be worthy) also indicates a semantic development from the notions of permission and possibility toward the specialized expression of probability and supposition [8, P. 45].

L. V. Uspenskaya, in her monograph The Category of Modality in the Tajik Language, analyzes the interaction between «шояд» and different verbal forms. She considers this modal word to be a functional counterpart of many modal verbs and modal expressions found in European languages, including “may” and “might.” Its functional versatility becomes particularly apparent in its interaction with different tense and mood forms. In combination with present-future forms, including the aorist, «шояд» can express a real or relatively immediate possibility, whereas its combination with past-tense forms or conditional-

 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

conjectural constructions conveys hypothetical, uncertain, or weak possibility, corresponding in certain contexts to the English construction “might have been” [12, P. 89].

The Grammar of the Modern Tajik Literary Language also emphasizes the syntactic significance of “шояд.” It is characterized as a central lexical-syntactic device through which the speaker's attitude toward the factual status of the information is expressed. Within the sentence, the modal word establishes different degrees of possibility and hypothesis and thereby contributes to the organization of the modal meaning of the entire utterance [11, P. 118].

A. Abdurahmonov, in his study The Category of Modality in the Modern Tajik Literary Language, further points out that «шояд» has numerous syntactic and functional counterparts. Through its interaction with different verbal forms and changes in the structure of the predicate, it is capable of expressing a broad continuum of modal meanings, ranging from a relatively weak possibility to a probability approaching certainty or factual reality [2, P. 71].

The comparison of English “may/might” and Tajik «шояд» therefore demonstrates both functional correspondence and structural divergence between the two languages. In English, epistemic possibility is primarily grammaticalized through modal auxiliaries whose semantic interpretation is closely connected with the degree of the speaker's commitment to the proposition. Tajik, by contrast, frequently employs a lexical-syntactic modal word whose interpretation is determined to a considerable extent by the verbal form with which it combines and by the broader syntactic and contextual environment. Consequently, the translation of «шояд» into English cannot always be reduced to a mechanical correspondence with “may” or “might.” The translator must take into account the specific degree of probability, hypothesis, uncertainty, or tentativeness conveyed in the original Tajik construction. This demonstrates that the translation of modal units between Tajik and English involves not only formal grammatical substitution but also the preservation of semantic and pragmatic distinctions within the category of modality.

Example: Шумо метавонед онҳоро сад ё бештар ҳисоб кунед.

Translation: You may count them one hundred or more [1, P. 139].

In the sentence under analysis, the Tajik modal form метавонед (‘you can/may’) conveys the meanings of possibility or permission to perform an action. In the English translation, this modal unit is rendered by the modal verb may: “You may count them one hundred or more.” In Tajik, метавонед constitutes a finite personal form of the verb тавонистан and, together with the lexical verb ҳисоб кардан (‘to count’), forms a modal construction. In English, the same modal value is realised analytically through may plus the bare infinitive count. Accordingly, the transformation of метавонед ҳисоб кунед into may count exemplifies a grammatical transformation whereby a Tajik verbal modal structure is adapted to an English modal structure. In this instance, the choice of may is motivated by the semantic context and expresses possibility or permission to perform the action. Thus, the translator alters the grammatical form of the modal exponent while preserving the original modal meaning.

Another example: Албатта, ин рози худро пинҳон доштани Абӯслим ба дарҷаи маълум буд ва аз касоне буд, ки ба кори ӯ эҳтимоли халал расондан доранд ва ё ин ки рози ӯро фош мекунанд.

Translation: Of course, to what degree Abu Muslim kept his secrets became known, but he was among the people whose cause might be disturbed if his secrets were revealed [1, P. 102].

In the sentence under consideration, the meaning of possibility is realised through the Tajik construction эҳтимоли халал расондан доранд (‘are likely to cause disruption’). In the English translation, this modal value is conveyed by the modal verb might within the passive construction might be disturbed. In Tajik, эҳтимол (‘possibility/likelihood’) functions as a lexical exponent of the probability of an event, whereas in English the same meaning is encoded grammatically by the modal verb might. The transformation of эҳтимол into might therefore constitutes a lexical–grammatical transformation, since a Tajik lexical unit is rendered by an English grammatical unit – the modal verb. Concurrently, the construction халал расондан доранд (‘have the potential to cause disruption’) is transformed into the passive structure be disturbed. In this sentence, might expresses the epistemic modality of possibility, presenting the disruption of his affairs as a hypothetical possibility only. Thus, by modifying the grammatical means and verbal structure, the translator preserves the modal meaning of the source construction in the target language.

Based on the above analysis, we can identify the main methods for translating English modal verbs into Tajik:

1. Use of lexical equivalents: this method involves selecting an appropriate Tajik word or phrase for each modal verb. For example, the modal verbs can – тавонистан, must – бояд. However, it should be borne in mind that these equivalents are often incomplete and may not cover all the meanings of the modal verb.

2. Structural transformation (transposition): this method involves changing the grammatical structure of the sentence. For example, an English sentence with a modal verb may be transformed into a Tajik sentence with an imperative mood: You should go – Бирав! (Go!). This method is often used to translate meanings of advice and obligation.

3. Use of descriptive means: in cases where a precise equivalent does not exist, the translator can express the modal meaning through descriptive phrases. For example, "might" in the sense of very low probability can be translated as "эҳтимоли хеле кам дорад" (has very little probability).

4. Addition of emphatic words: to strengthen the meaning of modal verbs, emphatic words are often added in Tajik: ҳатман (certainly), албатта (of course), воқеан (indeed), and others.

The translation of English modal verbs into Tajik is one of the significant challenges of comparative grammar and translation theory. This challenge originates from the fact that the Tajik language lacks a system of auxiliary modal verbs similar to those in English. Instead, the Tajik language employs modal words (бояд, шояд), independent verbs (тавонистан, хостан), verbal moods, and syntactic means to express modality.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis has demonstrated that English modal verbs and their Tajik equivalents exhibit both isomorphism (similarity) and allomorphism (difference). Isomorphism resides in the fact that both languages possess dedicated means for

 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

expressing core modal meanings – possibility, necessity, probability, and permission. Allomorphism manifests itself in the grammatical forms, structural composition, and functional distribution of these means. The principal translation procedures for modal verbs include the use of lexical equivalents, structural transformation, the use of descriptive/periphrastic means, and the addition of emphatic elements. The selection of a particular strategy is conditioned by context, communicative purpose, and stylistic parameters.

Consequently, the investigation of the methods and specificities of translating non-equivalent grammatical units, particularly modal verbs, is of considerable significance not only for translation theory but also for comparative linguistics and language teaching methodology.

Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

Рецензия

Все статьи проходят рецензирование. Но рецензент или автор статьи предпочли не публиковать рецензию к этой статье в открытом доступе. Рецензия может быть предоставлена компетентным органам по запросу.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Review

All articles are peer-reviewed. But the reviewer or the author of the article chose not to publish a review of this article in the public domain. The review can be provided to the competent authorities upon request.

Список литературы / References

1. Айнӣ С. Қаҳрамони халқи тоҷик Темурмалик. Исёни Муқаннаъ / С. Айнӣ; тарҷума ба забони англисӣ ва сарсухани профессор А. Мамадназаров. — Душанбе : ЭР-граф, 2022. — 156 с.

2. Абдураҳмонов А. Категорияи модалият дар забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик / А. Абдураҳмонов. — Душанбе : Дониш, 1998. — 184 с.

3. Беляева Е.И. Функционально-семантические поля модальности / Е.И. Беляева. — Москва : Русский язык, 1990. — 210 с.

4. Грамматикаи забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик. Ҷилди 2: Ибора ва ҷумла. — 1986. — 380 с.

5. Исмоилзода Э.С. Грамматические особенности конструкций с модальными глаголами в таджикском и английском языках : дис. … канд. филол. наук / Э.С. Исмоилзода. — Российско-таджикский славянский университет, 2011. — 180 с.

6. Истамқулов Д.З. Семантические особенности модального глагола can в английском языке и его таджикского эквивалента тавонистан / Д.З. Истамқулов // Вестник Таджикского государственного университета права, бизнеса и политики. Серия гуманитарных наук. — 2024. — Т. 1, № 1. — С. 113–120.

7. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты) / В.Н. Комиссаров. — Москва : Высшая школа, 1990. — 253 с.

8. Ниёзӣ Ш.З. Исм ва баъзе калимаҳои модалӣ дар забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик / Ш.З. Ниёзӣ. — Сталинобод : Нашр. давл. Тоҷикистон, 1954. — 112 с.

9. Найда Ю.К. К науке переводить / Ю.К. Найда // Вопросы теории перевода в зарубежной лингвистике. — Москва : Международные отношения, 1978. — С. 114–142.

10. Palmer F.R. Mood and Modality / F.R. Palmer. — 2nd ed. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2001. — P. 96–99.

11. Рустамов Ш. Грамматикаи забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик / Ш. Рустамов, Р. Ғаффоров [ва диг.]. — Душанбе : Дониш, 1985. — Ҷ. 1. — 544 с.

12. Успенская Л.В. Категория модальности в таджикском языке / Л.В. Успенская. — Душанбе : Дониш, 1970. — 168 с.

13. Швейцер А.Д. Теория перевода: статус, проблемы, аспекты / А.Д. Швейцер. — Москва : Наука, 1988. — 215 с.

14. Шведова Н.Ю. Средства формирования и выражения субъективно-модальных значений / Н.Ю. Шведова // Русская грамматика: в 2 т. / гл. ред. Н.Ю. Шведова. — Москва : Наука, 1980. — Т. 2. — С. 214–237.

15. Зокирзода Д.З. Наклонение – одно из средств выражения модальности в английском и таджикском языках / Д.З. Зокирзода // Russian Linguistic Bulletin. — 2025. — № 12(72). — DOI: 10.60797/RULB.2025.72.16.

16. Ashrapov B.P. Comparative Analysis of Morphological Peculiarities of Adverbs of Manner in Tajik and English / B.P. Ashrapov // Russian Linguistic Bulletin. — 2025. — № 5(65). — DOI: 10.60797/RULB.2025.65.2. — EDN: AJGBZH.

17. Ashrapov B.P. Morphological Peculiarities of Present Simple Tense in Tajik, Chinese and English (a comparative analysis) / B.P. Ashrapov // Russian Linguistic Bulletin. — 2025. — № 6(66). — DOI: 10.60797/RULB.2025.66.3. — EDN: UWGYBZ.

18. Coates J. The Semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries / J. Coates. — London : Croom Helm, 1983. — 247 p.

19. Eastwood J. Oxford Guide to English Grammar / J. Eastwood. — Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1994. — P. 114–115.

20. Quirk R. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language / R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech [et al.]. — London : Longman, 1985. — P. 221–223.

21. Swan M. Practical English Usage / M. Swan. — 3rd ed. — Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2005. — P. 519–520.

 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

Список литературы на английском языке / References in English

1. Ayni S. Qahramoni xalqi tojik Temurmalik. Isyoni Muqanna' [The hero of the Tajik people Temurmalik. The revolt of Muqanna] / S. Ayni ; translation into English and preface by Professor A. Mamadnazarov. — Dushanbe : ER-graf, 2022. — 156 p. [in Tajik]
2. Abdurahmonov A. Kategoriyai modalijat dar zaboni adabii hozirai tojik [The category of modality in the modern Tajik literary language] / A. Abdurahmonov. — Dushanbe : Donish, 1998. — 184 p. [in Tajik]
3. Belyaeva E.I. Funktsional'no-semanticheskiye polya modal'nosti [Functional-semantic fields of modality] / E.I. Belyaeva. — Moscow : Russkiy yazyk, 1990. — 210 p. [in Russian]
4. Grammatikai zaboni adabii hozirai tojik. Jildi 2: Ibora va jumla [Grammar of the modern Tajik literary language. Volume 2: Phrase and sentence]. — 1986. — 380 p. [in Tajik]
5. Ismoilzoda E.S. Grammaticheskiye osobennosti konstruktsiy s modal'nymi glagolami v tadzhikskom i angliyskom yazykakh [Grammatical features of constructions with modal verbs in Tajik and English] : dis. ... cand. philol. sciences / E.S. Ismoilzoda. — Russian-Tajik Slavonic University, 2011. — 180 p. [in Russian]
6. Istamqulov D.Z. Semanticheskiye osobennosti modal'nogo glagola can v angliyskom yazyke i yego tadzhikskogo ekvivalenta tavonistan [Semantic features of the modal verb can in English and its Tajik equivalent tavonistan] / D.Z. Istamqulov // Vestnik Tadzhikskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta prava, biznesa i politiki. Seriya gumanitarnykh nauk [Bulletin of the Tajik State University of Law, Business and Politics. Series of Humanities]. — 2024. — Vol. 1, № 1. — P. 113–120. [in Russian]
7. Komissarov V.N. Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskiye aspekty) [Translation theory (linguistic aspects)] / V.N. Komissarov. — Moscow : Vysshaya shkola, 1990. — 253 p. [in Russian]
8. Niyozi Sh.Z. Ism va ba'ze kalimahoi modalī dar zaboni adabii hozirai tojik [The noun and some modal words in the modern Tajik literary language] / Sh.Z. Niyozi. — Stalinobod : State Publishing House of Tajikistan, 1954. — 112 p. [in Tajik]
9. Nayda Yu.K. K nauke perevodit' [Towards the science of translating] / Yu.K. Nayda // Voprosy teorii perevoda v zarubezhnoy lingvistike [Issues of translation theory in foreign linguistics]. — Moscow : Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya, 1978. — P. 114–142. [in Russian]
10. Palmer F.R. Mood and Modality / F.R. Palmer. — 2nd ed. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2001. — P. 96–99.
11. Rustamov Sh. Grammatikai zaboni adabii hozirai tojik [Grammar of the modern Tajik literary language] / Sh. Rustamov, R. G'afforov [et al.]. — Dushanbe : Donish, 1985. — Vol. 1. — 544 p. [in Tajik]
12. Uspenskaya L.V. Kategoriya modal'nosti v tadzhikskom yazyke [The category of modality in the Tajik language] / L.V. Uspenskaya. — Dushanbe : Donish, 1970. — 168 p. [in Russian]
13. Schweitzer A.D. Teoriya perevoda: status, problemy, aspekty [Translation theory: status, problems, aspects] / A.D. Schweitzer. — Moscow : Nauka, 1988. — 215 p. [in Russian]
14. Shvedova N.Yu. Sredstva formirovaniya i vyrazheniya sub''yektivno-modal'nykh znacheniy [Means of forming and expressing subjective-modal meanings] / N.Yu. Shvedova // Russkaya grammatika [Russian grammar] : in 2 vols. / ed. by N.Yu. Shvedova. — Moscow : Nauka, 1980. — Vol. 2. — P. 214–237. [in Russian]
15. Zokirzoda D.Z. Nakloneniye – odno iz sredstv vyrazheniya modal'nosti v angliyskom i tadzhikskom yazykakh [Mood – one of the means of expressing modality in English and Tajik] / D.Z. Zokirzoda // Russian Linguistic Bulletin. — 2025. — № 12(72). — DOI: 10.60797/RULB.2025.72.16. [in Russian]
16. Ashrapov B.P. Comparative Analysis of Morphological Peculiarities of Adverbs of Manner in Tajik and English / B.P. Ashrapov // Russian Linguistic Bulletin. — 2025. — № 5(65). — DOI: 10.60797/RULB.2025.65.2. — EDN: AJGBZH.
17. Ashrapov B.P. Morphological Peculiarities of Present Simple Tense in Tajik, Chinese and English (a comparative analysis) / B.P. Ashrapov // Russian Linguistic Bulletin. — 2025. — № 6(66). — DOI: 10.60797/RULB.2025.66.3. — EDN: UWGYBZ.
18. Coates J. The Semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries / J. Coates. — London : Croom Helm, 1983. — 247 p.
19. Eastwood J. Oxford Guide to English Grammar / J. Eastwood. — Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1994. — P. 114–115.
20. Quirk R. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language / R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech [et al.]. — London : Longman, 1985. — P. 221–223.
21. Swan M. Practical English Usage / M. Swan. — 3rd ed. — Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2005. — P. 519–520.