

Članci – Articles - Artikel

UDC 811.163.42'255'367.625:34=111  
Original scientific paper  
Received on 05.04. 2011  
Accepted for publication on 01.09. 2011

Božana Knežević  
Irena Brdar  
University of Rijeka

## Modals and modality in translation: a case study based approach

This paper reports on findings from a recent study. On the basis of corpora, two legislative pair texts, cross-linguistic issues around modals and modality in Croatian and English were investigated. In addressing modality in the two texts, the study explored the semantic areas that included *obligation*, and whether or not something was *necessary*, *desirable*, *permitted* or *forbidden*. The aim was to capture the translatability of Croatian deontic modals into English, and to describe a possible shift in modality that occurred in translation. An account that describes the similarities and differences in translation of the source text into the target text is provided.

**Key words:** modal verbs; deontic modality; shift; translation.

### 1. Introduction

In this paper we will discuss similarities and differences in the form and usage of modals that express deontic *possibility* (i.e. *permission*) and deontic *necessity* (i.e. *obligation*) across the original Croatian and translated English texts. We will be using modals as a case study to look at significant similarities and differences between the two parallel texts. The differences that emerge between the modals in the two texts have consequences regarding the degree of the subject's and addressee's commitment to rules and regulations, and the context they are used in.

While modals have been the subject of much investigation across languages,

but not Croatian, the study presented here differs firstly in differentiating between modals and modality in translated and original texts, and secondly in encouraging further interests in syntax and semantics.

### 1.1. Theoretical framework

A substantial body of work has been done on modals “a polyfunctional expression of modality ... that does not select its own nominal argument but influences the encoding of the arguments of the verbal form” (Hansen 2007: 34), and modality, a syntactic-semantic category associated with the speaker’s attitude and/or opinion about what is said. The view that *possibility* and *necessity* are central to modality is widespread and traditional. In terms of function of the meanings, modality is traditionally referred to as epistemic, that is the speaker’s assessment of the actuality of a state of affairs in terms of the speaker’s knowledge, and deontic, that is the speaker’s assessment of the actuality of a state of affairs in terms of social, moral or legal norms or in Lyons’(1994: 823) words, “the necessity or possibility of acts performed by morally responsible agents.” Deontic modality is performative in the sense that it is about *possibility* and *necessity* of actions in terms of which the speaker grants permission or imposes an obligation for the performance of action. There are two degrees of *possibility* and *necessity*: deontic *possibility* marked by *may* and *can* that convey *permission*, and deontic *necessity* marked by *must* and *shall* that imply an *obligation*.

Relevant to the study is Kratzer’s (1991) theoretical framework of possible worlds semantics. A brief summary of it follows. Modal worlds are analysed as existential or universal quantifiers over possible worlds. The quantificational part of the modal is defined along a *conversational background*. Kratzer (2008: 309) claims that at least two elements are involved in the interpretation of modals: “a *conversational background* contributing to the premises from which the conclusions are drawn, and a modal relation determining the *force* of the conclusion.” A conversational background determines the set of accessible worlds (modal base), and an ordering of these worlds (ordering sources). The ordering source imposes an order on the modal base and let the quantification range only over the closest worlds in the modal base. Consequently, modal meaning is a product of the interplay of the modal base, the ordering source and the force (*possibility*, *necessity* and the grades between them). A deontic conversational background is then a function  $f$  such that for any world  $w$ ,  $f(w)$  represents the content of a body of laws or regulations in  $w$  (Kratzer 2008: 315). The ordering would thus favour the world that is based on a body of laws and regulations, and

would disregard the world where the right thing will not be done or the right action will not be taken.

## 1.2. *Brief overview of morphosyntactic features of modal verbs in Croatian and English*

Croatian fully-fledged modals are: *moći* ('may'), *morati* ('must'), *trebati* ('need'), *valjati* ('ought to'). They are polyfunctional because they express (more than at least) two types of modality (Hansen 2007: 34) for example, *moći* (deontic: *permission* and epistemic: *probability*), *morati* (deontic: *obligation/necessity* and epistemic: *probability*), *trebati* (deontic: *obligation/necessity* and epistemic: *probability*), *valjati* (deontic: *obligation/necessity* and epistemic: *assumption*).

Deontic *valjati* ('should, ought to') and *trebati* ('need') express an *obligation/necessity*, and when used as such they occur in impersonal, agentless form. Jonke (1964: 397–398) claims that *trebati* when used as a modal verb means a little more than *valjati* and a little less than *morati* ('must'). In comparison with *morati*, both *valjati* and *trebati* express a weaker degree of *obligation*. The present tense of *morati* indicates an *obligation* while *advisability* is associated with the conditional tense.

Unlike the modals *valjati* and *trebati* which have kept their lexical meanings (*valjati* = *vrijediti*—'to be of value'; *trebati*=*imati potrebu, potrebovati*—'need'), *moći* ('may') has modal meanings only.

*Smjeti* ('may') is a semi-modal. It lacks modal polyfunctionality and is restricted to deontic modality—*permission*. *Smjeti*, however, shows syntactic properties of auxiliaries: it combines with inanimate subjects, and allows for passive transformations (Hansen 2005, 2007).

*Biti dužan* ('to be obliged to'), a modal lexeme, expresses deontic modality: an *obligation*. While investigating morpho-syntactic typology of modals, Hansen (2007: 34) compares *biti dužan* ('to be obliged to') with *morati* ('must'), and concludes that both express deontic *necessity* that is an *obligation*. In such cases *biti dužan* can be replaced by *morati*. *Morati* is also found in epistemic functions where it cannot be replaced by *biti dužan*.

English modals are grouped into a) core modal verbs: *can, could, may, might, will, shall, would, should, must*, and b) semi-modal verbs: *dare, need, ought to* and *used to* (Carter & McCarthy 2006: 638). Unlike in English, co-occurrence of

modals is acceptable in Croatian: *Moraš moći učiti* \*You must can learn. The initial position in the verbal phrase of Croatian modals is also usual, though a change of word order is possible: *Govoriti mogu, ali vikati ne smijem* vs. *ʔTalk I can but shout I mustn't*, cf. *Mogu govoriti, ali ne smijem vikati, I can talk but I mustn't shout*. And the negative particle “ne” precedes the modal verb to form the negative: *Ne možeš to očekivati* vs. \*You not can expect that. Both Croatian and English modal verbs are polysemous, that is, they have more than one meaning (Kalogjera 1982: 15–16).

### 1.3. Problem statement

On the basis of the data collected from the two parallel legislative texts, one in Croatian (source text—ST), and one in English (target text—TT), and on the basis of their nature, the following questions are posed:

1. How are modal verbs that express deontic *possibility* (i.e. *permission*) and deontic *necessity* (i.e. *obligation*) translated from Croatian into English?
2. What are the shared meanings, what are the similarities, and what are the reasons for them? What are the differences?
3. Has a shift in modality occurred in translation?

### 1.4. Method

We studied legislative texts because of the great relevance of deontic modals to legislative discourse, and because of the genre a specific legal discourse community uses. Descriptive data were obtained from two legislative texts and official documents: “*Plan prihvata broda u nevolji*” (2008), and its English translation “*Plan for the Acceptance of a Ship in Distress*”. The document is an integral part of the “*Pravilnik o mjestima zakloništa*” (“*Ordinance on places of refuge*”), which establishes the basic guidelines and the legal framework which applies to the procedure in the case of a request for a place of refuge, to the responsibility of the authorities, and their accountability in procedures following request for a place of refuge, and procedures for securing financial warranties for liability in the event of damage. Using this small corpus of 23,140 words, we investigated similarities and differences between modal verbs, and we further explored if a shift in modality occurred in translation. The document did not provide information on who signed the translation (a native or non-native speaker of English).

Our first step was to isolate and describe the morphosyntactic properties of

the modal verbs in the ST. A total of 113 modal verbs were analysed. This was followed by an analysis of their semantic functions and pragmatic uses (a specialised usage for stating rules and legal provisions). The next step taken was to look for the translation equivalents in the TT, and investigate if a change on the syntactic and semantic level occurred in translation. Several problems came up. Firstly, we needed to decide whether to study modal verbs only or modal particles, modal expressions and substitutes as well. After consideration of the corpus in detail, and for reasons of space, we decided to drop out modal particles, modal expressions and substitutes, despite their paramount role in linguistic analysis, and analyse modal verbs only.

Secondly, it was a problem to categorise the use of the modal as the same modal form can be used with different meanings, and vice versa. We decided to keep meanings under verb headings.

### 1.3.1. Terminology

In this paper the term *modality* refers to a set of modal meanings attributed to an identical semantic basis. It allows the deontic source to express a degree of commitment to a proposition. In the framework proposed here deontic *obligation* i.e. *necessity* was graded according to the following degree of commitment: 1. *obligation* for strong *obligation*; 2. *necessity* with respect to regular procedures for weaker *obligation*, and 3. *advisability* where some authors would suggest an *obligation* which may not be fulfilled (Quirk 1985); moral *obligation* or *desirability* or what the speaker considers to be the ideal or desired state of affairs (Zandvoort 1960: 70). The notion of *potentiality* in deontically interpreted sentences is based on the following grounds. Deontic modality involves a modal source and a modal agent. A deontic source assesses the *necessity* and *desirability* of an action to be taken, and lays down rules to be applied in the case. Deontic statements do not assert the potential existence of a proposition or the potential occurrence of an event, act or state-of-affairs in some past, present or future state of the actual world. What they assert is the existence of *permission* and *obligation* in some particular extensional world or of propositions which describe the content of the *permission* and *obligation*. The notion of *potentiality* in a deontically interpreted sentence is not to be associated with the existence of the referent of the nominalised sentential complement of the modal verb, but is to be incorporated within the complement itself (Lyons 1994: 843).

### 1.3.2. *Typography in the paper*

Double quotation marks are used for a) quotations from other authors, and b) for quotations from the corpus. *Italics* for a. semantic functions, and for b. extracted words and samples in Croatian. Asterisk is used for grammatically incorrect propositions, e.g. \**You must can learn*.

## 2. Results

### 2.1. *Comparison and data analysis*

The analysis below offers the findings obtained through this case study. One hundred and thirteen modals (*moći, valjati, morati, and trebati*) and a modal lexeme (*biti dužan*) were found in the ST (see Tables 1 and 2). *Smjeti*, a semi-modal that expresses *permission*, was not found in the ST. The translation of the selected Croatian samples is only to help understanding of the extracted samples. A translationally relevant analysis is presented later.

Table 1. Distribution of modal verb *moći* (syntactic and semantic analysis).

Modal verb	Total	Potentiality	Permission	Agent		Agent-less passive	Impersonal	Tense*		Aspect*	
				H	NH			P	C	Per	IM
<i>Moći</i>	20	■ 55%	■ 45%	■ 20%	■ 10%	■ 10%	■ 60%	■ 100%	■ 90%	■ 10%	
<b>Total</b>	20	11	9	4	2	2	12	20	18	2	

\*Key: H=human, NH= nonhuman; P= present tense, C= conditional tense; Per= perfective verb, IM= imperfective verb

Table 2. Distribution of modal verbs *valjati*, *morati*, and *trebati*, *biti dužan* (syntactic and semantic analysis).

Modal verb	Total modal	Obligation	Necessity with respect to regular procedures	Advisability	Agent		Impersonal	Tense *		Aspect*	
					H	NH		P	C	Per	IM
<i>Valjati</i> (should)	15 (8 + 7)		53%	47%			100%	100%		40%	60%
<i>Morati</i> (must)	12 (9 + 3)	75%	25%		42%	42%	16%	100%		50%	50%
<i>Trebati</i> (need)	4 (2 + 2)		50%	50%			100%	100%		50%	50%
<i>Biti dužan</i> (to be obliged to)	62	100%			90%	10%		100%		87%	13%
<b>Total</b>	93	76%	14%	10%	66%	12%	22%	100%		73%	27%

\*Key: H=human, NH= nonhuman; P= present tense, C= conditional tense; Per= perfective verb, IM= imperfective verb

### 2.1.1. Croatian modals

#### *Moći*.

The analysis demonstrated that the modal verb *moći* (may) was the most frequent (N=20) of all modals in the Croatian corpus (see Table 1). *Moći* appeared in the present tense in 100% of the cases. It combined with perfective verbs (90%), and imperfective verbs (10%). Active *moći* represented 30% of the cases, the agentless passive voice amounted to 10%, and impersonalisation represented 60% of the cases respectively. *Moći* took on verbs with human (20%) and non-human agents (10%).

The analysis of the occurrences identified two meanings, the most important

being *potentiality* in 55% of the cases, and *permission* in 45% of the cases. The proposition in (1a-b) qualifies for the deontic modal force. Moreover, *permission* in (1a-b) is semantically strengthened by the verb *dopustiti* (to permit). In other words, *permission* in *moći* (may) is associated with a lexical verb *dopustiti* (to permit), they both constitute the meaning the legal framework covers in the legal document.

- (1) a. *Namjerno nasukanje broda može se dopustiti ako se:*
- *mjesto nezgode nalazi u neposrednoj blizini dijela obale gdje je dno mora odgovarajuće dubine, nagiba i sastava; ... (moći - permission).*
- b. *Intentional running aground of a ship may be permitted if:*
- *the location of the incident is in the immediate vicinity of the part of the coast where the bottom of the sea is of a suitable depth, slope and composition; ...*

The proposition in (2a-b) does not contradict the deontic modal force. The reading of *moći* in the *potentiality* meaning is retrieved from the context. This means that the deontic reading evaluated in (2a-b) can be true depending on (1a-b). The reading in (2a-b) is thus considered to be compatible with the proposition in (1a-b). The objective of intentional running aground of a ship is aligned with regulations of the 7. 3 section, i.e. “Intentional running aground of a ship,” of the analysed document. As such it is interpreted as the ship is informed that, under certain conditions, for example when the ship is under threat of sinking, she is permitted to intentionally go aground. The deontic meaning of the sentence (*potentiality*) is incorporated in the complement of the modal verb.

- (2) a. *Cilj namjernog nasukanja broda može biti:*
- *spašavanje broda, kada brodu prijete opasnost od potonuća, ili*
  - *sprečavanje većeg onečišćenja, kada na brodu postoji veća količina onečišćujućih ili štetnih tvari i kada prijete dugotrajno ispuštanje tih tvari s broda u more ako brod potone u području većih dubina (moći - potentiality).*
- b. *The objective of intentional running aground of a ship may be:*
- *salvage a ship, when the ship is under threat of sinking, or*
  - *prevention of major pollution, if there is a large quantity of pollutant or hazardous substances on board and, if the ship sinks in a deep sea area, long-term release of these substances from the ship into the sea is intimidating.*



*Valjati.*

*Valjati* ('ought to, should, need') was the second most frequent of all modals in the ST, as shown by the number of cases (N=15) yielded by the corpus (see Table 2). *Valjati*, which is by its nature impersonal, occurred in the present tense with a transitive verb + the object in the accusative that followed, for example: *valja smatrati, valja dati, valja uputiti* ('should consider, should give, should send'). In 60% of the cases *valjati* was followed by the imperfective verb *smatrati* ('to consider'), and in 40% of the cases it was combined with a perfective verb *uputiti, ograničiti, predložiti* or *dati* ('to send, limit, propose or give').

The semantic meaning covered the cases where *valjati* expressed *necessity* with respect to regular procedures (53%), and *advisability* (47%). As such *advisability* was embedded in the framework of strict rules, regulations, procedures or a series of actions. *Advisability* was thus a special case of the *obligation* meaning, it was incorporated into an already imposed *obligation* of the part of the deontic source—the authoritative institution i.e. the Ministry of Sea, Tourism, Transport and Development. An example which illustrates the difference between the two degrees of *obligation: necessity* with respect to regular procedures, and *advisability* is exemplified in (3a-b) and (4a-b). The evidential reading of *valjati* conveying *necessity* with respect to regular procedures meaning is based on the inference from the context. A possible explanation would be: In the case of the ship in immediate danger of sinking, capsizing or breaking apart, there is a standard procedure for selecting the place of refuge that has to be followed. The reading of implied potential danger does not thus allow *advisability* meaning here. As such the proposition in (3a-b) differs from the proposition in (4a-b) which demonstrates the *advisability* meaning.

- (3) a. *U slučaju da brodu prijete neposredna opasnost od potonuća, prevrta-  
nja ili loma, pri izboru mjesta zakloništa prednost valja dati:*
- *mjestu koje omogućuje bolje ograničenje odnosno prikupljanje one-  
čišćenja mora; ... (valjati - necessity with respect to regular proce-  
dures).*
- b. *In the case of the ship in immediate danger of sinking, capsizing or  
breaking apart, in the selection of the place of refuge precedence shall  
be given to:*
- *the location which would enable more efficient enclosing and col-  
lecting of polluted waters; ...*

The word *ako* ('if') in (4a-b) invites us to attach the meaning of *advisability* to *valjati* here. It does not express an epistemic judgement but a statement about

normal series of actions. The *advisability* meaning in proposition (4a-b) is contextually feasible. It depends on the context rather than on the verb: If after applying the principles in items (11) and (12), it is still not possible to give precedence to one location, then the advice on what place should be given precedence, e.g. all the considered places should be proposed as places of refuge, should be taken.

- (4) a. *Ako ni nakon primjene načela navedenih u točkama (11) i (12) nije moguće dati prednost jednom mjestu tada **valja** sva razmotrena mjesta predložiti kao mjesta zakloništa. Ukupan broj mjesta zakloništa **valja** ograničiti na najviše tri (valjati - advisability).*
- b. *If after applying the principles listed in items (11) and (12), it is still not possible to give precedence to one location then all the considered places **should** be proposed as places of refuge. The total number of places of refuge **should** be limited to three at most.*

#### *Morati.*

Selected data of *morati* ('must, have to') showed 12 occurrences of the verb (see Table 2). The analysis revealed a full verb paradigm form (3rd person singular in all cases except one when 3rd person plural was used) followed by a lexical verb in the infinitive. The analysis showed that 42 % of the cases accounted for the human agent (e.g. the on-duty officer or the Assistant Minister), 42 % of the cases exemplified the nonhuman agent (e.g. the ship/ships) while 16% were impersonalisation. The ratio of perfective to imperfective aspect was 50% to 50% of the cases.

*Morati* was distributed in two modal meaning classes. The most salient meaning of *morati* was an *obligation* represented in 75% of the cases, while *necessity* with respect to regular procedures *redovito; u pravilu* (regularly, as a rule), added up to 25% of the cases. All the meanings were expressed in the present tense. The selected examples illustrate this double meaning of *morati*. The *obligation* meaning in (5a-b) is further conveyed in the verb following *morati*: *mora biti odobreno* (must be approved).

- (5) a. *Radovi koje obavlja stručno osoblje odvijaju se u pravilu na mjestu zakloništa gdje je brod dovoljno zaklonjen od utjecaja vremena i mora. Svako premještanje broda iz mjesta zakloništa **mora biti odobreno** od dežurnog službenika Nacionalne središnjice (morati - obligation).*

- b. *Work conducted by specialized staff is, as a rule, carried out in the place of refuge where the ship is sufficiently sheltered from the impacts of the weather and the sea. Any relocation of a ship from the place of refuge **must be approved** by the on-duty officer of the RCC.*

In (6a-b) *necessity* with respect to regular procedures is semantically implied by an adverb *redovito* (regularly): reports must be made on regular basis during the procedure of “Sending specialised staff, and dedicated equipment from shore” (a section of the “Plan for the Acceptance of a Ship in Distress”), (Pravilnik o mjestima zakloništa. Plan prihvata broda u nevolji 2008: 17).

- (6) a. *Tijekom plovidbe broda prema luci gdje će se odvijati radovi kao i tijekom radova na brodu dežurni službenik **mora redovito** pribavljati izvještaje o stanju sigurnosti na brodu (morati - necessity with respect to regular procedures).*
- b. *During navigation of a ship towards a port where work is to be conducted as well as during the work on a ship, the on-duty officer **must regularly** be informed about the state of safety on board a ship.*

*Trebati.*

The analysis did not deploy a high number of occurrences, only four cases of *trebati* (to be necessary, need) were found in the ST (see Table 2). The impersonal structure of *trebati* occurred in the present tense with infinitive of a verb + the object in the accusative following. *Trebati* was followed by the perfective verbs *pozvati* (to bring in), and *evakuirati* (to evacuate, it is a two-aspect verb in Croatian) in 50% of the cases, and by the imperfective *sidriti* (to anchor) and *pribavljati* (to obtain) also in 50% of the cases. Looking at the four examples found in the corpus, there seemed to be a clear reference to the deontic source: the authoritative institution, the Ministry of the Sea, Tourism, Transport and Development.

Low occurrence of *trebati* (N=4), followed by transitive verbs as a rule, completed the following meanings: *trebati* had semantic functions of *necessity* with respect to regular procedures, (50%), as in (7a-b), and of *advisability* (50%), conditions that followed an *obligation—morati* (must), as in (8a-b). *Necessity* with respect to regular procedures, and *advisability* were embedded in the framework of strict *obligation*. The proposition in (7a-b) exemplified the meaning of *necessity* with respect to regular procedures. In case of ship accidents and breakdowns, a checklist of actions that must be done is given. In other words,

*necessity* stems from a set of regulatory activities which the person in charge is entitled to enforce.

- (7) a. *Evakuacija ozlijeđenih?* ... [da ] [ne ].  
*Broj osoba koje **treba** evakuirati.*  
*(trebati - necessity with respect to regular procedures).*
- b. *Evacuation of injured persons?* ... [yes ] [no].  
*Number of persons **to be** evacuated.*

Contextual enrichment of the semantic content of *trebati* is shown in (8a-b). In the context of “Assessment of circumstances, selection of appropriate place of refuge and decision on admittance of the ship in distress to the selected place of refuge” it is stated that the on-duty officer must regularly be informed about the state of safety on board a ship, and advice on how to obtain reports is given. Namely the *advisability* meaning in (8a-b) is embedded in the framework of strict *obligation*.

- (8) a. *Tijekom plovidbe broda prema luci gdje će se odvijati radovi kao i tijekom radova na brodu dežurni službenik **mora** redovito pribavljati izvještaje o stanju sigurnosti na brodu. Ove izvještaje **treba** pribavljati od zapovjednika broda, djelatnika nadležne lučke kapetanije ili od ovlaštenih djelatnika remontnog brodogradilišta (trebati - advisability).*
- b. *During navigation of a ship towards a port where work is to be conducted as well as during the work on a ship, the on-duty officer **must** regularly be informed about the state of safety on board a ship. These reports **should** be obtained from the shipmaster, officer of the responsible harbourmaster’s office or from authorised employees of the shore facility.*

*Biti dužan.*

*Biti dužan* (to be obliged to), a modal lexeme, accounted for the most frequent modal expression, 62 occurrences in all (see Table 2). It occurred in the present tense. *Biti dužan* was followed by perfective (87%), and imperfective verbs (13%). It also combined with a human agent in 90% of the cases (e.g. the on-duty officer), and nonhuman agent in 10% of the cases (e.g. the RCC—the Rescue Coordination Centre).

Its meaning was *obligation*, and it accounted for 100% of all the analysed occurrences. The intent to inform the assistant minister of potential places of refuge, as in (9a-b), is not subject to an individual intention-action. It is a purely deontic i.e. imposed *obligation*. In fact, all cases of *biti dužan* communicated external *obligation*.

- (9) a. *Nakon utvrđivanja mogućih mjesta zakloništa ili utvrđivanja da takvih mjesta uz obalu nema, dežurni službenik Nacionalne središnjice **dužan je**, zajedno s kraćim obrazloženjem prijedloga na propisanom obrascu, izvijestiti pomoćnika ministra nadležnog za poslove sigurnosti plovidbe i zaštite mora od onečišćenja (biti dužan - obligation).*
- b. *After determining the potential places of refuge or determining that no such places exist along the coast, the on-duty officer of the RCC **shall**, together with a brief explanation of the proposal on the prescribed form, notify the assistant minister responsible for safety of navigation and protection of the sea against pollution.*

### 2.1.2. Translation of modals contrasted

The data demonstrated that in the majority of cases, the issuer of deontic *necessity* (i.e. *obligation*) or deontic *possibility* (i.e. *permission*) in the ST was a (non)human agent in *morati* (must), and *biti dužan* (to be obliged to), while impersonalisation was demonstrated by *valjati* (should), *trebati* (need), and *moći* (may). All deontic modal sentences in the ST had the present tense orientation. The findings follow the rule that the present tense is well-suited for rules and regulations as they are considered as “always speaking” (see Tables 1-2).

In this stage of the study, we found that the analysed Croatian modals conveyed five meanings: *potentiality*, *permission*, *obligation*, *necessity* with respect to regular procedures, and *advisability*. The following regularities, similarities and differences in translation were observed (see Table 3).

Table 3. Distribution of translation (non)equivalents.

Modal verb	Total modal	Potentiality	Permission	Obligation	Necessity with respect to regular procedures	Advisability	
<i>Moći</i> (may)	20 (11 + 9)	■ May 100%	■ May 100%				
<i>Valjati</i> (should)	15 (8 + 7)				■ Shall 87%	■ Should 100%	
					■ Should 13%		
<i>Morati</i> (must)	12 (9 + 3)			■ Must 89%	■ Shall 11%	■ Must 67%	■ Should 33%
<i>Trebati</i> (need)	4 (2 + 2)					■ to be + past participle 100%	■ Should 100%
<i>Biti dužan</i> (to be obliged to)	62			■ Shall 100%			
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>						

*Moći*

The semantic meaning of *potentiality* conveyed by *moći* (may) in the ST was translated into *may* in 100% of the cases in the TT, as in (10), while the semantic meaning of *permission* expressed by *moći*, as in (11), also relied on *may* in translation (100%).

- (10) *Na mjestu zakloništa brod može biti smješten sidrenjem u zaštićenom priobalnom području, uz izgrađenu obalu ili nasukavanjem na žal (potentiality).* *In places of refuge the ship may be accommodated by anchoring in a sheltered coastal area, alongside a port structure or by running aground on a beach.*

- (11) *Namjerno nasukanje broda može se dopustiti kao mjeru predostrožnosti u slučaju kada postoji značajna vjerojatnost skorog potonuća broda u području velikih dubina (permission).*      *Intentional running aground or beaching may be permitted as a safety measure in the case when a significant probability of imminent sinking of a ship exists in a deep sea area.*

*Valjati.*

The data showed that the central means of expression for *necessity* with respect to regular procedures, conveyed by *valjati* (should) in Croatian, was translated into *shall be* + past participle in English (87%), as in (12), and *should be* + past participle, as in (14), in 13% of the cases. The dissimilar translation of meaning, *valjati* does not convey a strong *obligation* in Croatian, was covered by *shall* in English. The translation choice, as in (12), means that the semantic function, as represented in the TT, but not in the ST, took a pragmatic usage into account. The entire Section 6 of the document, i.e. “Procedure for evaluation and selection of place of refuge” (Pravilnik o mjestima zakloništa. Plan prihvata broda u nevolji 2008: 17), defines procedures to be *strictly* followed. *Valjati*, as in (13), however, was translated into *should* (the meaning that refers to things that are advisable or desirable).

- (12) *U slučaju da brodu prijete neposredna opasnost od potonuća, prevrtanja ili loma, pri izboru mjesta zakloništa prednost valja dati:*
- *mjestu koje omogućuje bolje ograničenje odnosno prikupljanje onečišćenja mora ... (necessity with respect to regular procedures).*
  - *In the case of the ship in immediate danger of sinking, capsizing or breaking apart, in the selection of the place of refuge precedence shall be given to:*
  - *the location which would enable more efficient enclosing and collecting of polluted waters...*

Also, it is unusual to use *valjati* (should) in the ST, as in (13), for cases where the basic definition of a place of refuge is given. The proposition in (13) is one of many cases where the present simple in Croatian would be more natural for many speakers, for example: *Mjesto zakloništa je neprikladno ako ....* (A place of refuge is considered unsuitable if: ...).

- (13) *Mjesto zakloništa **valja smatrati** neprikladnim i ako:*
- *se nalazi u neposrednoj blizini nacionalnih parkova, parkova prirode i drugih područja prirodnih bogatstava ... (necessity with respect to regular procedures).*
- A place of refuge **should also be considered** unsuitable if:*
- *it is located in the immediate vicinity of national parks, nature parks and other regions of natural wealth ...*

*Advisability* expressed by *valjati* in the ST was translated into *should be* + past participle in the TT, as in (14), in 100% of the cases.

- (14) *Ako ni nakon primjene načela navedenih u točkama 11 i 12 nije moguće dati prednost jednom mjestu tada **valja** sva razmotrena mjesta **predložiti** kao mjesta zakloništa. Ukupan broj mjesta zakloništa **valja ograničiti** na najviše tri (advisability).*
- If after applying the principles listed in items (11) and (12) it is still not possible to give precedence to one location then all the considered places **should be proposed** as places of refuge. The total number of places of refuge **should be limited** to three at most.*

*Morati.*

*Obligation* correspondence of *morati* (must) with the English counterpart was found in *must* (89%) and *shall* (11%), as in (15-16).

- (15) *U slučaju da zahtjev dospije do nekog drugog subjekta (lučke kapetanije ili njihove ispostave, obalne radio postaje, nadzorni centri lučkih uprava i dr.) on ga **mora** odmah **dostaviti** Nacionalnoj središnjici (obligation).*
- If request reaches another subject (harbourmaster's office or their branches, coast radio stations, port authority control centres, etc.) they **must** immediately **forward** it to the RCC.*
- (16) *Zahtjev za dodjelom mjesta zakloništa **mora sadržavati** najmanje: ime, vrst i zastavu broda; ... (obligation).*
- The request for granting a place of refuge **shall contain** at least the following:*
- *name, type and flag of the ship;*
  - *...*

The semantic meaning of *necessity* with respect to regular procedures conveyed



by *morati* in the ST was translated into *must* (67%) and *should* (33%) in the TT, as in (17-18).

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(17) <i>Tijekom plovidbe broda prema luci gdje će se odvijati radovi, kao i tijekom radova na brodu, dežurni službenik mora redovito pribavljati izvještaje o stanju sigurnosti na brodu (necessity with respect to regular procedures).</i></p>  | <p><i>During navigation of a ship towards a port where work is to be conducted as well as during the work on a ship, the on-duty officer must regularly be informed about the state of safety on board a ship.</i></p>   |
| <p>(18) <i>Pri namjernom nasukanju brod se mora postaviti u položaj u kojem što većom površinom dna trupa leži na morskom dnu radi smanjivanja nepovoljnog utjecaja valova i vjetrova odnosno umanjivanja opasnosti od naknadnog pucanja trupa (necessity with respect to regular procedures).</i></p> | <p><i>When intentionally running aground, the ship should be positioned in way that the greatest possible area of the bottom of the hull lays on the sea bed, as to reduce the unfavourable impact of waves and winds, and to reduce the danger of subsequent rupturing of the hull.</i></p> |

### *Trebati.*

When conveying *necessity* with respect to regular procedures meaning, *trebati* (need), as in (19), illustrates its translation pair *to be* + past participle (100%). *Trebati* was also translated by means of *should* when expressing *advisability* (100%), as in (20).

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(19) <i>Je li odlučeno, za najnepovoljniji odnosno za najizgledniji slučaj sljedeće:</i><br/>• broj ljudi koje treba pozvati? ... [da ] [ne ] (necessity with respect to regular procedures).</p> | <p><i>Is it determined, in worst case and for most probable case, the following:</i><br/>• number of people to be brought in? ... [yes ] [no]</p> |
| <p>(20) <i>Tijekom plovidbe broda prema luci gdje će se odvijati radovi kao i tijekom radova na brodu dežurni</i></p>  | <p><i>During navigation of a ship towards a port where work is to be conducted as well as during the work on a ship, the on-duty offi-</i></p>    |

*službenik mora redovito pribavljati izvještaje o stanju sigurnosti na brodu. Ove izvještaje treba pribavljati od zapovjednika broda, djelatnika nadležne lučke kapetanije ili od ovlaštenih djelatnika remontnog brodogradilišta, ako se oni nalaze na brodu (advisability).*

*cer must regularly be informed about the state of safety on board a ship. These reports **should be obtained** from the shipmaster, officer of the responsible harbour-master's office or from authorised employees of the shore facility, if they are present on board the ship.*

*Biti dužan.*

The analysis showed that *biti dužan* ('to be obliged to') conveying an obligation was granted one translation option in English, that is *shall* in 100% of the cases, as in (21).

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(21) <i>Prijem zahtjeva za dodjelom mjesta zakloništa Nacionalna središnjica <b>dužna je potvrditi</b> brodu od kojeg je zahtjev zaprimljen (obligation).</i></p> | <p><i>The RCC <b>shall confirm</b> the request for granting of a place of refuge to a ship from which the application was received.</i></p> |
|--|---|

### 2.1.2. Shifts in translating modals from Croatian into English

The data showed that a whole range of shifts occurred in translation from the ST into the TT (see Table 4).

Table 4. Shifts in translation from the ST into the TT.

A shift in	Total	From	To	Sample sentence - ST	Translation pair - TT
degree of modality	7	necessity with respect to regular procedures: <i>valjati</i> (should)	obligation (shall)	<i>U slučaju da brodu prijeti neposredna opasnost od potonuća, prevrtanja ili loma, pri izboru mjesta zakloništa prednost valja dati: mjestu koje omogućuje bolje ograničenje odnosno prikupljanje onečišćenja mora ...</i>	In the case of the ship in immediate danger of sinking, capsizing or breaking apart, in the selection of the place of refuge precedence <b>shall be given</b> to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the location which would enable more efficient enclosing and collecting of polluted waters...</li> </ul>
	2	necessity with respect to regular procedures <i>trebati</i> (needed)	obligation (to be+pp)	<i>Je li odlučeno, za najnepovoljniji odnosno za najizgledniji slučaj sljedeće: broj ljudi koje treba pozvati?</i>	Is it determined, in worst case and for most probable case, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>number of people <b>to be brought in?</b> ...[yes ] [no]</li> </ul>
	1	obligation <i>morati</i> (must)	advisability (should)	<i>Pri namjernom nasukanju brod se mora postaviti u položaj u kojem što većom površinom dna trupa leži na morskom dnu radi smanjivanja nepovoljnog utjecaja valova i vjetra ...</i>	When intentionally running aground, the ship <b>should be positioned</b> in way that the greatest possible area of the bottom of the hull lays on the sea bed, as to reduce the unfavourable impact of waves and winds ...
modal	7	<i>valjati</i> (should)	shall	<i>U slučaju da brodu prijeti neposredna opasnost od potonuća, prevrtanja ili loma, pri izboru mjesta zakloništa prednost valja dati: mjestu koje omogućuje bolje ograničenje odnosno pri-</i>	In the case of the ship in immediate danger of sinking, capsizing or breaking apart, in the selection of the place of refuge precedence <b>shall be given</b> to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the location</li> </ul>

				<i>kupljanje onečišćenja mora ...</i>	which would enable more efficient enclosing and collecting of polluted waters...
	2	<i>trebati</i> (need)	to be+pp	<i>Evakuacija ozlijeđenih?</i> <i>Broj osoba koje treba evakuirati. [da ] [ne]</i>	Evacuation of injured persons? Number of persons <b>to be evacuated.</b> [yes ] [no]
	1	<i>morati</i> (must)	should	<i>Pri namjernom nasukanju brod se mora postaviti u položaj u kojem što većom površinom dna trupa leži na morskom dnu ...</i>	When intentionally running aground, the ship <b>should be positioned</b> in way that the greatest possible area of the bottom of the hull lays on the sea bed, ...
	1	<i>morati</i> (must)	shall	<i>Zahtjev za dodjelom mjesta zakloništa mora sadržavati najmanje: ime, vrst i zastavu broda, IMO broj ...</i>	The request for granting a place of refuge <b>shall contain</b> at least the following: name, type and flag of the ship; IMO number ...
	62	<i>biti dužan</i> (to be obliged to)	shall	<i>Prijem zahtjeva za dodjelom mjesta zakloništa Nacionalna središnjica dužna je potvrditi brodu od kojeg je zahtjev zaprimljen.</i>	The RCC <b>shall confirm</b> the request for granting of a place of refuge to a ship from which the application was received.

### 3. Discussion

This case study investigated deontic *possibility* (i.e. *permission*) and deontic *necessity* (i.e. *obligation*) in two parallel texts, “Plan prihvata broda u nevolji,” and its English translation “Plan for the Acceptance of a Ship in Distress” (2008). A limitation of this study may be the exclusive analysis of the deontic *possibility* and *necessity*. This is, however, due to the great relevance of deontic modals to legislative discourse and the genre of the analysed text.

The results of the study show the occurrence of 113 modal verbs and the modal lexeme, *biti dužan* (‘to be obliged to’), in the Croatian corpus. The count of

the use of deontic *possibility* and *necessity* in the ST demonstrates that some modal verbs, for example: *moći* ('may'), *valjati* ('ought to, should'), and the modal lexeme *biti dužan* ('to be obliged to') are more frequently used than the others in the ST (see Tables 1-2). *Biti dužan* is clearly in the lead, followed by *moći* having a smaller number of occurrences. *Moći* ('may') is the sole verb conveying deontic *possibility* (i.e. *permission*) in the ST. Interestingly enough, *smjeti* ('may'), a semi-modal that expresses *permission*, was not found in the ST.

Deontic *necessity* usually implies that the agent is in a position of some authority, and is thus in a position to lay an obligation. The issuer of an *obligation* or *permission* in the ST is a (non)human agent in *morati* ('must') and *biti dužan* ('to be obliged to'). The agent in the ST thus clearly takes responsibility for the imposing of an *obligation* or for the granting of *permission*. On the other hand, impersonalisation is conveyed by *valjati* ('should'), *trebati* ('need'), *moći* ('may'), and by a small number of *morati* (must). All deontic modal sentences in the ST have the present tense orientation. As already pointed out, this supports the rule that the present tense is well-suited for rules and regulations as they are considered as "always speaking".

The findings support the scale of degree of deontic *necessity* proposed in the framework of this study. The first semantic value in the hierarchy of deontic *necessity* to be found is *obligation*, the second semantic value is *necessity* with respect to regular procedures and the third is *advisability*. The degree of deontic *necessity* depends on the pragmatics of the context, the interaction between semantic and contextual meanings. For example, the *advisability* meaning in proposition (4a-b) is contextually feasible. It depends on the context rather than on the verb. Another example is the proposition in (8a-b) where contextual enrichment of the semantic content of *trebati* is shown. That is, the *advisability* meaning in (8a-b) is embedded in the framework of strict *obligation*.

High degree of *obligation* in the ST is expressed by *morati* ('must') and *biti dužan* ('to be obliged to'), while the central resources to express the semantic value of *necessity* with respect to regular procedures are *valjati* ('should'), *trebati* ('need') and *morati* ('must'), in the running order. *Trebati* and *valjati* also convey the meaning of *advisability*.

The meaning of *potentiality* in a deontically interpreted proposition, and the meaning of *permission* is associated with *moći* ('may') in the ST. The approach to the analysis and interpretation of *moći* conveying *potentiality* is in line with the already quoted and applied Lyons' theory (1994), and Papafragou (1998: 6) who observes that "it is the task of pragmatic interpretation processes to decide

which of the two domains (root or epistemic) is the intended one, i.e. to resolve the structured polysemy in the modal semantics.” The deontic interpretation of *moći* thus arises in cases where modality involves a set of regulatory propositions which the person under an *obligation* is expected to enforce. This is also in line with what Wierzbicka (1987) claims when she writes that the different interpretations have more to do with the context than with the meaning of the modal. Or with Kratzer (1991) who argues that rather than treating the multitude of modal meanings as a case of (accidental) polysemy, it should be seen as the outcome of context-dependency. It is thus only in combination with the background context that modals take a particular meaning.

The relatively widespread use of *valjati* (‘should’) in the ST is interesting per se. As already noted, *valjati* (should) and *trebati* (need) are both modal and lexical verbs. Their syntactic and semantic character determines their semantic behaviour. Croatian linguists, however, disagree on the use of *valjati* and *trebati*. They analyse the properties of *valjati* and *trebati*, their modal (‘ought to, should and need’) vs. lexical meanings (‘to be of value’ and ‘need’); the use of the infinitive and/or the *da*-construction + the present tense; and personal vs. impersonal constructions. In his discussion of the verbs, Jonke (1964: 398) offers the following example as an illustration of a fully impersonal *trebati*. He goes on to elucidate the claim by saying that the sentence, as in (22),

- (22) *Treba čuvati zdravlje.*  
 3<sup>rd</sup> PSG<sup>1</sup> the infinitive object.  
 one should preserve health.  
 ‘One should preserve one’s health’

refers to everybody: “*Svi, znani i neznani*“, (Every one, known and unknown), and is thus more impersonal than the proposition in (23), where it is clearly stated who the supposed doer of the action is: *ja* (I am):

- (23) *Ja treba da napišem zadaću večeras.*  
 1<sup>st</sup> PSG 3<sup>rd</sup> PSG *da*-construction 1<sup>st</sup> PSG object adjunct  
 I should do (my) homework tonight  
 ‘I should do my homework tonight’

He argues that *trebati*, when used as a modal, should preserve the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular form + the infinitive or the *da*-construction. Consequently, Jonke (1964: 398) finds the proposition in (24)

<sup>1</sup> PSG (person singular).

- (24) *Ja            trebam    napisati   zadaću            večeras.*  
 1<sup>st</sup> PSG    1<sup>st</sup> PSG    infinitive object            adjunct  
 I            should    do            (my) homework    tonight  
 ‘I should do my homework tonight’

incorrect in terms of modality as the person-inflected *trebam* here takes on lexical rather than modal meaning. Katičić (2002: 470) supports Jonke by claiming that the modal *trebati* should be used in the 3rd person singular. The discussion on the use and meanings of *trebati* is ensued. Pranjković (2002: 32) argues that the propositions in (25) and (26):

- (25) *Treba    da                    trčimo.*  
 3<sup>rd</sup> PSG    *da*-construction    1<sup>st</sup> PPL<sup>2</sup>.  
 need       *da*-construction    run.  
 ‘We need to run’

- (26) *Trebamo   trčati.*  
 1<sup>st</sup> PPL       the infinitive  
 we-need     to run.  
 ‘We need to run’

do not reflect the difference in meaning at all. He refers to Jonke’s example of the fully-fledged impersonal *trebati*, “*Treba čuvati zdravlje*,” as in (22), and claims that it is no more and no less impersonal than “*Treba da se čuva zdravlje*”: *treba* + *da*-construction + *se* + *čuva* in the 3rd person sing. (everyone) or “*Treba da čuvaš zdravlje*”: *treba* + *da*-construction + *čuvaš* in the 2nd person sing. (you). He (2002: 33) does not see the clash between the two, and concludes that modal *trebati* is normally followed by the infinitive, e.g. *trčati* (to run) “*Trebamo trčati.*” Whereas *trebati* as a lexical verb is followed by a noun, e.g. *trčanje* (running) “*Treba nam trčanje.*” *Valjati*, on the other hand, is exclusively impersonal, and is followed by the infinitive “*Valja nama raditi*” (Hudeček et al 1999: 249). A disagreement in the approach of the two verbs is recognised and, apparently, it will take time to standardise the usage of *valjati* and *trebati* in Croatian.

The analysis of translation (non)equivalents offered a projection of the use of modal verbs and the modal lexeme in the two parallel texts. High correspondence of *moći* with the English counterpart is observed. The data confirm that the translation equivalent of the modal verb expressing *potentiality* and *permission* (Croatian modal verb *moći*) is *may* in English. *May* is clearly performative

<sup>2</sup> PPL (Person plural).

(Palmer 1980: 58), it gives *permission*. The translation of *moći* into *may* is entirely justified on semantic grounds, and in the use of the language. It may also be significant that *can* in one of its core meanings (*permission*) does not appear as a translation pair of *moći* in the TT. This again can be explained by the concept of (deontic) source of authority (Wierzbicka 1987), and the formality of the text. *May* is far more formal than *can* (Palmer 1995:60).

Most central Croatian meaning associated with *advisability* (Croatian modal verbs *valjati* and *trebati*) is translated into *should* in English. *Should* is used to place a requirement on the addressee. Deontic *should* is weaker than deontic *must*, but closer to *must* than to *may* (Portner 2009: 32).

The areas of *obligation* and *necessity* with respect to regular procedures (Croatian *valjati*, *morati*, *trebati*, and *biti dužan*) demonstrate the most divergent range of modal verbs in English, that is *must*, *shall*, *to be* + past participle and *should*. *Must* only appears as a translation equivalent of *morati* where the agent either imposes the obligation on himself or asks the person under an obligation (the addressee) to behave accordingly. Such cases exemplify performativity. *Must* is performative in the sense that it places a requirement on the addressee. Portner (2009: 190) explicates that the difference in strength between *must* and *should* might be analysed by saying that they use different subtypes of deontic accessibility relations.

While *must* uses an accessibility relation based on a set of rules backed up by serious consequences, *should* uses an accessibility relation based on a wider set of rules, including both rules which are backed up by potentially serious consequences, and those which might be violated without anything very terrible happening. If it is assumed that the set of rules which form the basis of *should*'s accessibility relation includes all of those which form of the basis of *must*'s, then it follows that *must p* involves *should p*; consequently *must p* is stronger than *should p* (Portner 2009: 33-34).

The results also demonstrate that several shifts occur in the process of translation from Croatian into English. The most significant ones are observed in the translation of the Croatian modals *valjati* (ought to, should, need) and *trebati* (must, have to, should, ought to, need, be required to, be necessary). A striking shift in the degree of modality, from *necessity* with respect to regular procedures meaning (*valjati* and *trebati*) in the ST to an *obligation* in the TT occurred. In this study an *obligation* is graded according to the degree of commitment: 1. *obligation* for strong *obligation*; 2. *necessity* with respect to regular procedures for weaker *obligation*, and 3. *advisability*. It is important to reiterate that neither *valjati* nor *trebati* express a high degree of obligation in Croatian. The transla-



tion choice, however, sees the move from *valjati* into *shall* and *trebati* into *to be* + past participle. Some previous research findings (Knežević & Brdar 2010) also attribute to the translation pattern of *trebati* and *valjati*, that is *valja / treba* + infinitive is always translated into the *be* passive. It (ibid: 45) was then stated that “Impersonal constructions like *valja/treba* + infinitive are used simply to hedge a message by attributing it to (an) unknown(s). ... It enables the author ... to avoid a direct commitment to a legislative act which active voice may create,” which is supported by the translation pair *to be* + past participle.

*Trebati* is the least frequent of all deontic modals in the Croatian corpus, only four cases were noted. According to some linguists *trebati* when used as a modal verb means a little more than *valjati*, and a little less than *morati*, and as such is impersonal (Jonke 1964: 397-398). In comparison with *morati* both *valjati* and *trebati* express a weaker degree of *obligation* (Hansen 2005: 226). However, when expressing *necessity* with respect to regular procedures meaning, *trebati* is translated in *to be* + past participle. As such *trebati* only appears in the checklists. And, as already seen in the case of *valjati*, the apparent intent to proceed with the use of the impersonal verb underlines the voice neutrality, the deontic source imposes a lower degree of *obligation*, and it equally imposes an *obligation* for an action to be performed.

The question of the grammaticality and normativity of the examples where *valjati* and *trebati* are used has to be left for future research. However, what can be assumed from the readings of the findings of the study is the following. The relatively high occurrence of *valjati* in the ST may be related to its impersonal character. In the majority of cases *valjati* is followed by *smatrati* (to consider) when conveying *necessity* with respect to regular procedures meaning. The implied meaning is a regulation that needs to be respected. The intention to highlight the impersonalisation is further shown in the voice neutrality. *Morati*, on the other hand, is mostly used as an active verb. The active modal lexeme *biti dužan* is represented in 100% of the cases. The translation counterpart for *valjati* when conveying *necessity* with respect to regular procedures meaning is mainly *shall*. Here, the translator may have been led by the International Convention on Maritime Search and Rescue—ICOMSAR (1979) which states that *shall* is used to indicate “a provision, the uniform application of which by all Parties is required in the interest of safety of life at sea” while *should* is used to indicate “a provision, the uniform application of which by all Parties is recommended in the interest of safety of life at sea” (International Convention on Maritime Search and Rescue 1979: 5). Linguistically, however, *should* is used to convey conditional *necessity* in the epistemic or the dynamic domain although Palmer (1995: 69) acknowledges that *should* can have deontic meaning, provided deontic is extended to include the uses where the speaker takes responsibility. As for *shall*,

Palmer (1995: 62) writes that *shall* is “stronger than *must*, in that it does not merely lay an obligation, however strong, but actually guarantees that the action will occur”, the meaning also implied by the Convention. Interestingly the counterpart for *morati* (a modal with the highest degree of obligation meaning in Croatian) is *must* in the majority of cases, while *shall* is the translation counterpart of *biti dužan*.

The observed shift in modality indicates that the lack of clear and unitary syntactic rules in Croatian may have resulted in the reported semantic differences. This study witnesses a generally widespread but arbitrary usage of *valjati* and *trebati* in legislative texts. It places great responsibility on authors of legislative texts, since the use of *valjati* and *trebati* may result in different interpretations. It is discussed elsewhere (Knežević & Brdar 2010) how important it is to see a more influential role of linguistics in translation, and how crucial the knowledge of linguistics and discourse analysis is for a translator.

#### 4. Conclusion

Starting with the current theory and difficulties involved in the analysis of modals this study aimed to investigate the modal verbs that express deontic *possibility* (i.e. *permission*) and deontic *necessity* (i.e. *obligation*) in the two parallel legislative texts. For this purpose their uses in the Croatian (ST) were compared with those in the English text (TT), and their occurrence and meanings were analysed in order to discover similarities and differences in translation, and investigate if a shift in modality occurred. This work is a linguistic analysis but also a study of how the notions of deontic *possibility* and *necessity* fit the particular usage. The study is evidence that the addressee is always positioned under an *obligation*, whatever degree it is. It is a semantic and pragmatic fact.

This case study was also intended to capture the translatability of Croatian deontic modals into English, and to describe a possible shift in modality that occurred in translation. An account that describes the similarities and differences in translation of the ST into the TT has been provided here. The effect of modality shift in translation has been described, for example: *valjati* (*necessity* with respect to regular procedures) shifted into *shall* (*obligation*), *trebati* (*necessity* with respect to regular procedures) shifted into *to be* + past participle (*obligation*), and *biti dužan* shifted into *shall*. Many similarities exist between Croatian and English modals in the meaning and the context where they are used. For example, deontic *moći* was always translated into *may*. These similarities facilitate translation. The fact that the findings of this study apply to the two legislative texts, other kinds of texts may bear out different findings, should not downplay

the following: the use of, in this study deontic, modals should be sensitive to the deontic source. Further discussion of modal verbs in general, and of the Croatian modal verbs *valjati* and *trebati* in particular, will have to await the later research.

To conclude, a more corpus-informed semantic and pragmatic analysis is needed to address stance about the relationship between semantics and pragmatics. However, this study advocates the knowledge of the theory of semantic notions, and a theory of how those notions are put into use which would facilitate the “speaker’s/administrative source’s” interactions with the addressee—and the translator. It will help translators navigate more successfully in these cross-linguistic but also cross-cultural waters.

## References

- Carter, Ronald, Michael McCarthy (2006). *Cambridge Grammar of English. A Comprehensive Guide. Spoken and Written English Grammar and Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hansen, Björn (2005). How to measure areal convergence: a case study of contact-induced grammaticalization in the German-Hungarian-Slavonic contact area. Björn Hansen, Petr Karlík, eds. *Modality in Slavonic Languages. New Perspectives*. München: Sagner, 219–237.
- Hansen, Björn (2007). A morpho-syntactic typology of constructions with modals in Serbian. Jasmina Grković-Mejdžor, Vladislava Ružić, Slobodan Pavlović, eds. *Sintaksička istraživanja: dijahrono-sinhroni plan*. (Lingvističke sveske 6). Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, Odsek za srpski jezik i lingvistiku, 31–44.
- Hudeček, Lana, Milica Mihaljević, Luka Vukojević, eds. (1999). *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje – Pergamena – Školske novine.
- International Convention on Maritime Search and Rescue (INCOMSAR)*. Hamburg, 27 April 1979.
- Jonke, Ljudevit (1964). *Književni jezik u teoriji i praksi*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Zagreb: Znanje.
- Kalogjera, Damir (1982). *The English Modals and Their Equivalentents in Serbo-Croatian. With Pedagogical Material by Mirjana Vilke*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy, Institute of Linguistics.
- Katičić, Radoslav (2002). *Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog jezika: nacrt za gramatiku*. Treće, ponovljeno izdanje. Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Globus.
- Knežević, Božana, Irena Brdar (2010). Passive and passive-like constructions in translation of Croatian legislative text into English. *Jezikoslovlje* 11.1: 23–49.
- Kratzer, Angelica (1991). Modality. Arnim von Stechow, Dieter Wunderlich, eds. *Semantics: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter, 639–650.
- Kratzer, Angelica (2008). The notional category of modality. Paul Portner, Barbara H. Partee, eds. *Formal Semantics. Essential readings*. Oxford: Blackwell, 289–323.

- Lyons, John (1994). *Semantics*. Reprinted. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, Frank, Robert (1980). *Modality and the English Modals*. 2<sup>nd</sup> impression. London – New York: Longman.
- Palmer, Frank, Robert (1995). *Mood and Modality*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Papafragou, Anna (1998). Inference and word meaning: The case of modal auxiliaries. *Lingua* 105: 1–47.
- Portner, Paul (2009). *Modality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pranjković, Ivo (2002). *Hrvatska skladnja. Rasprave iz sintakse hrvatskoga standardnog jezika*. Drugo, izmijenjeno izdanje. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Pravilnik o mjestima zakloništa. Plan prihvata broda u nevolji (2008). Ministarstvo mora, turizma, prometa i razvitka, Narodne novine broj 3. (“Pravilnik o mjestima zakloništa” (“Ordinance on places of refuge”))* The Ministry of Sea, Tourism, Transport and Development. Official Gazette 3).
- Quirk, Randolph, Simon Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Wierzbicka, Anna (1987). The semantics of modality. *Folia Linguistica* 21: 25–43.
- Zandvoort, Reinard, Willem (1986). *A Handbook of English Grammar*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Longman, Prentice Hall, Inc.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Anne Marie Foerster Luu and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on an earlier version of the paper.

## Authors' address:

Pomorski fakultet u Rijeci  
Studentska 2  
51000 Rijeka  
bknez@pfri.hr; brdar@pfri.h

## MODALNI GLAGOLI I MODALNOST U PRIJEVODU: CASE STUDY PRISTUP

U radu su prezentirani rezultati istraživanja provedenog na korpusu od dva paralelna pravna teksta: hrvatskom („Plan prihvata broda u nevolji“) i njegovom engleskom prijevodu („Plan for the Acceptance of a Ship in Distress“). Cilj rada bio je istražiti pitanja modalnosti i modalnih glagola u hrvatskom i engleskom jeziku, s posebnim osvrtom na semantička područja koja obuhvaćaju *obligaciju*, odnosno, na radnju koja je *potrebna*, *poželjna*, *dozvoljena* ili *zabranjena*. Naglasak je stavljan na prijevod hrvatskih modalnih glagola s deontičkim značenjem

na engleski te moguće promjene u modalnosti kao rezultat prijevoda. U radu su opisane sličnosti i razlike u prijevodu s izvornog teksta na jezik prijevoda.

**Ključne riječi:** modalni glagoli; deontička modalnost; promjena; prijevod.