

THE METAPHORICAL EXTENSION OF KISWAHILI MOOD

Mary N. Ndung'u, MA
Tutorial Fellow
University of Nairobi
P.O Box 30197 – 10100 Nairobi, Kenya
Email: maryndungu@uonbi.ac.ke

Abstract

This chapter takes a metaphorical analysis of the Kiswahili mood. Mood is a grammatical category of the Kiswahili verb, and the verb form is used to express mood distinctions. Kiswahili verb can distinguish various mood forms, that is, epistemic and deontic modality.

Key Words: mood. Modality, epistemic modality, deontic modality, force dynamics, construe

1. Introduction

Mood is the speaker's expression of his or her own communication role, and of the role the speaker assigns to his or her interlocutors, Halliday (2004). Mood is analyzed as a strand of meaning that represents organization of participants in speech situations where there is a performer or addresser and an addressee, that is, the speaker or writer and the listener or reader respectively. Each speaker adopts for him/herself a particular role, for instance that of providing information in a declarative clause. He/she on the other hand assigns the listener a complementary role which he/she wishes him to adopt in his or her turn.

On the other hand, modality is the speakers or writers attitude towards the world. A speaker or writer can express certainty, possibility, willingness, obligation, necessity and ability by using modal words and expressions. Speakers often have different opinions about the same thing. These speakers are looking at the same thing. In grammar and semantics, modality refers to linguistic devices that indicate the degree to which an observation is possible, probable, likely, certain, permitted or prohibited. The expressions in language are commonly - though not exclusively - expressed by modal auxiliaries. Modality reflects the speaker's attitude toward the situation being described (Linguistics Perspectives on English Grammar, 2010).

2. Mood and Modality in Metaphorical Interpretation in Kiswahili

There is epistemic and deontic modality. Epistemic modality is a type of grammatical marking that encodes the speaker's judgement resulting to his or her knowledge about the possibility, likelihood or certainty of the proposition expressed by the sentence, Langacker (1991:272). For example in Kiswahili, epistemic modal verbs include *atakuwa* (will) *anaweza* (can), *huenda* (might), etc. as in:

1. *Lakini wazo hili usilitupe. Libebe ulipeleke nyumbani. Lipige darubini. **Huenda** ukagundua kwamba lina thamani kama dhahabu.*
 (But thought this you not it throw. It carry you it take home. It beat stethoscope. **Might** you realize that it has value like gold).
 (But don't discard this idea. Carry it home. Ponder about it. You might realize it is worth gold.)

The epistemic modal verb *huenda* (might) in example (1) show that the speaker expresses to the listener the possibility that the idea or thought shared to him can be useful or meaningful at sometime in the future if s/he does not discard it. A modal is regarded as epistemic when its sole import is to indicate the likelihood of the designated process, in example 4, the process that there is a possibility that the idea can be meaningful to the listener in the future.

Deontic or root modality expresses the speaker's judgement in relation to obligation (moral or social) permission or prohibition. Deontic modal verbs carry meanings that are to do with an ability to control things. The root modality has some conception of potency directed toward the realization of a certain process; a notion of obligation, permission, desire, ability, etc. Consider the following example:

2. *Lakini pia **lazima** ukumbuke kwamba mhitaji ni mtumwa.*
 (But also **must** remember that needy is servant.)
 (But you **must** also remember that a needy person is a servant.)

From example (2), *lazima* (must) is a deontic or root modal verb that expresses deontic modality (Langacker (1991: 269) that a moral or social obligation must be met by the recipient; that of remembering that a needy person is a servant. Kiswahili modals agree in person with the subject in verbs like *ninaweza* (I can), *unaweza* (you can) and *anaweza* (he/she/it can) where the subject agreement is *ni-* (I) in *ninaweza* (I can) and *a-* (he/she/it) in *anaweza* (he/she/it can). The root or deontic modal has some conception of potency directed toward the realization of a given process, that is, some notion of obligation, permission, desire, ability etc.

The distinction between root/deontic and epistemic modals is not always easy to maintain because a root modal verb can be used in a construction to construe the meaning of an epistemic modal verb. For example, in a construction with a root modal verb like:

3. *Unaweza kunipatia kalamu hiyo?*
(**Could** you me give pen that?)
(Could you give me that pen?)

The verb *unaweza* (could) in example (3) may refer to a physical ability, willingness or to a social obligation, therefore making the root modal an epistemic modal. Langacker (1991:273) referring to Sweetser (1982, 1984, propose that modals are best analyzed in terms of force dynamics, which are applicable either to the domain accounts for the contract between the root and epistemic senses. These ¹force-dynamic values can be exemplified by *-naweza* (may) construing the absence of a potentially present barrier, *lazima* (must) which means compelling or irresistible force, *-naweza* (can) meaning positive ability, and *-taweza* (will) which means a completed path to a goal. Also consider the following example:

4. *Unaweza kuyaambia yaka yasikilize.* (Root/Deontic)
(You now may tell them they stay and they listen.)
(You may tell them to stay and listen.)

The use of the modal verb *unaweza* (you now can) in example (4) means that the listener is not barred by the speaker or any other source from remaining and listening to the conversation or from taking necessary action.

5. *Anaweza kuwa amechoka sana.* (Epistemic)
(She now may be tired very.)
(She may be very tired.)

From example (5) the use of the modal verb *anaweza* (s/he may/can) imply that the speaker is fully certain or not fully certain that the referent is very tired. In another example:

6. *Lazima uyaambie yaka yasikilize.* (Root/Deontic)
(Must you they tell they stay they listen.)
(You must tell them to stay and listen.)

¹ “Force dynamics” is a schematic system that pertains to the linguistic representation of force interactions and causal relations occurring between certain entities within the structured situation” (Talmy 2000: 12). The schematic system “Force dynamics” is first defined by Talmy as a fundamental semantic category in the realm of physical force and is viewed in particular as a generalization over the linguistic notion of “causative” (see Talmy 1981, 1985, 1988, 2000: 409–70). Metaphorical transfers subsequently generalize force-dynamic conceptions to the domains of internal psychological relationships and social interactions. As such, for instance, the system of English modals is analyzed in force-dynamic terms.

the direct force of the speaker through the use of the modal verb *lazima* (must) in example (6) compels the listener to take the directed action of telling them (his/her ears) to remain and listen. In the following example:

7. *Lazima awe amechoka.* (Epistemic)
 (Must s/he be s/he tired.)
 (She must be tired)

The available evidence through the use of the modal verb *lazima* (must) in example (7) compels the speaker to the conclusion that the referent is tired. Some modal uses pertain to the future and others to the present situations that are not yet part of known reality, for example:

8. a. *Lazima alikuwa amechoka.* (past)
 (Must s/he was be s/he tired.)
 (S/he must have been tired.)
- b. *Lazima atakuwa amechoka.* (future)
 (Must s/he will be s/he tired.)
 (S/he will be very tired.)
- c. *Lazima awe amechoka.* (present)
 (Must s/he be s/he tired.)
 (S/he must be tired.)

Example (8a) pertains to the past, meaning that she could possibly have been tired (8b) to the future that she must get tired ,and (8c) to the present meaning that she may be tired right now (without the speaker knowing it). A future time modal is already quite subjective in its construal of directed potency or ability, but it is still concerned with what might happen in the world. A present time modal pertains to a situation whose status as part of reality or non reality has already been determined - it is just that the speakers knowledge of present reality, whose continued evolution must be assessed and projected into the future.

The modal verb *lazima* (must) is used in deontic or root modality to mean that the recipient has no alternative but to partake the action dictated. This means that the direct force or authority compels the recipient to do an action without any objection. The use of *lazima* (must) in the deontic or root domain in example (9a) below can be extended metaphorically into the epistemic domain in example (9b).

9. a. *Lazima Juma aende.*
 (Must Juma he go.)
 (Juma must go.)
- b. *Huenda Juma alienda.*
 (May be Juma he went.)
 (May be Juma went.)

From example (9a), the deontic modal verb *lazima* (must) construe the speaker as the doer of the action but after metaphorical extension of the root modal in the epistemic domain the epistemic modal verb in example (9b) construes the speaker as the recipient of the information in the construction, that there is a possibility that *Juma* went.

Cognitive theory analyses the epistemic meanings of the modals in terms of metaphorical extension of their root senses into the epistemic domain. In metaphorical interpretation, the epistemic modal meaning is a metaphorical extension of their root meanings into the epistemic domain Sweetser (1990). The image-schematic structures of these two meanings are very similar, for instance in:

10. *Rehema anaweza kwenda.*
 (Rehema she may to go.)
 (Rehema may go.)

In example (10), the modal verb *anaweza* (she may) means that *Rehema* is not barred by any authority from 'going', that is, she is permitted to go. From example (10) there is some background understanding that if things were different, something could obstruct the chain of events, that is, permission conditions could change; and added premises might make the reasoned or the speaker to reach a different conclusion. For instance, in:

11. *Anaweza kulala?*
 (S/he can to sleep?)
 (Can s/he sleep?)

In example (11), permission might be denied or given. Metaphorical extension into the epistemic domain of example (10) would give:

12. *Huenda Rehema atakuwa pale.*
 (May be Rehema she will be there.)
 (May be Rehema will be there.)

Since *Rehema* has permission to go as in example (12), there is a possibility that she will be there, which is a metaphorical extension of the root meaning in example (10) into the epistemic domain in example (12). In the extension, some properties of the source domain will be eliminated owing to the differences between the source and target which may include exact nature of the forces and the

exact nature of the barrier. This rule violates the Invariance Principle (Lakoff 1990) that in metaphorical extension, 'all the image-schematic structure of the source domain is mapped onto the target.

The image schemas of deontic and epistemic modals have been shown to be considerably different. Both schemas contain a potential situation in the objective scene, but typical deontic schemas will also include an element of interacting forces between a permission giver/imposer of obligation—typically the speaker and the doer of some deliberate action. Speaker-permission giver/imposer identity is established as necessary through correspondence rather than direct inclusion into the scope of the predication as in the epistemic senses. Deontic senses are at most weakly subjective. Deontic and epistemic modals have almost identical syntactic construction:

13. *Yohana angekaa nyumbani.*
(Yohana he should stay home in.)
(Yohana should have stayed at home.)

Example (13) has the modal verb *angekaa* (should have stayed) which has the deontic meaning or modality that *Yohana* did not stay at home, compared to the following example:

14. *Lazima Yohana alikaa nyumbani.*
(Must Yohana he did stay home in.)
(Yohana must have stayed at home.)

From example (14) the modal verb *lazima* (must) imply that the speaker is not fully certain that *Yohana* did stay at home. It shows an epistemic modality; the possibility that *Yohana* stayed at home or not.

3. Conclusion

This paper has developed an interactive discussion mood and its implication on metaphorical interpretation in Kiswahili. The interrogation has realized that the metaphorical perspective of mood in Kiswahili is dependent on the language users encyclopaedia knowledge of the referents referred to in the past, present and future time.

REFERENCES

Bybee, Joan. (2003). "Cognitive Process in Grammaticalization." In *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure*, Michael Tomasello, ed, Vol. 2, 145–167. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. (1994). *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chalker, S. and E. Weiner (Eds) (1988). *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Endley, M. J. (2010). *Linguistic Perspectives on English Grammar: A Guide For EFL Teachers*. Hanyang: Information Age Publishing.

Halliday, M.A. K (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd Edition). Revised Edition. London: Edward Arnold.

Kovecses, Z. (2002/2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed., pp. 202–251). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (1980) (new edn. 2002). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Langacker, R. W. (1991). *Foundations of cognitive grammar*, vol. 2. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (2004). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Beijing: Peking University Press.

Leech, G. N. (1978). *Meaning and the English Verb*. London: Longman Group Limited

Linying Cao¹ (2012). 'A Tentative Study of the English Tense from a Metaphorical Perspective'. In *International Journal of English Linguistics*; Vol. 2, No. 5 Canadian Center of Science and Education.

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, & J. Svartvik. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman Group Limited.

wa Mberia, K. (2004). *Maua Kwenye Jua la Asubuhi*. Nairobi: Marimba Publications.