Katarína DUDOVÁ

Faculty of Arts, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Slovakia

Slovak grammaticalized modal verbs from the perspective of traditional and cognitive linguistics

Summary

In the paper we are dealing with modal verbs whose development in Slovak language led to various degrees of grammaticalization. A relatively high rate of polysemy of these grammatical units, which originally had a full lexical meaning, is the result of this process in the semantic field. The traditional linguistic approach to polysemy of modal verbs does not show a number of meanings in their semantic relationships as well as in their original motivation. This linguistic approach addresses neither whether semantic grouping of meanings is accidental nor whether there is some mutual motivation present. Therefore we have found the approach of cognitive linguistics more appropriate. The works of cognitive linguists derive one meaning from the other relying on a specific meaning set in man´s physical experience with the world he lives in. We are able to understand the target domain, i.e. the conceptualization of modal meanings of possibility, necessity and evidentiality in Slovak via the source domain (natural category) of polysemic modal verbs.

Keywords: grammaticalization, polysemy, cognitive linguistics, modal verbs, Slovak language.

Introduction

Different language phenomena are interconnected with cognition – the ability to regulate the creation and usage of meanings formed by society, culture or nation. The meaning motivates the existence of all lan-

guages. Modality represents various meanings including possibility, obligation, request or persuasion. In comparison with other language units (semantic, synsemantic etc.), this semantic area includes a complex of meanings representing the complicating relationship between man and reality. In many languages this semantic base is expressed by various means including modal verbs. According to the research done in the field of grammaticalization in geographically related languages (Besters--Dilger et al. 2005, 24), modal verbs are a specific type of auxiliary verbs present in all Slavonic languages and many other languages as well. The theory of modal verb grammaticalization in inter-linguistic relationships points to both their specific character and difference from other full verbs and auxiliary verbs, not only in the area of morphology and syntax, but also in the area of semantics – the main scope of cognitive linguistics. From the outlined points of view, we are going to analyze Slovak modal verbs polysemy in more detail.

1. Grammaticalization of Slovak modal verbs

The paradigm of basic modal verbs in the Slovak language is systematically and semantically qualified and relatively grammaticalized. Modal means in Slovak (and other Slavonic languages) are grammaticalized, but not on the same level as in English. These modal means do not specify their own nominal arguments (they do not influence the selection of the subject), but they are mostly dependent on a full verb argument structure in the infinitive. The other aspects of grammaticalization are connected with the fact that these verbs mostly do not have two mode forms and the imperative. Morphological and syntactic qualification of modal expressions is inseparably connected with the presence of the so--called modal polysemy. Modal expressions do not have a rich semantic structure which in some modal verbs (especially *môcť* 'can' and *chcieť* 'want') points to relations with numerous synonyms, most frequently the synonyms with one modal meaning. It is a very unstable and dynamic group and in Slovak and Czech linguistics, it is usually referred to as *polomodálne slovesá* 'semimodal verbs' (Oravec and Bajzíková 1986, 55); *modálno-vecné slovesá* 'modal full verbs' (Ďurovič 1956, 61) and *modálne slovesá v širšom zmysle* 'modal verbs in a broader sense' (Grepl and Karlík [1986] 1998, 153). In comparison with basic modal verbs (modal expressions), these verbs have not undergone the grammaticalization process and only have one modal meaning.

Despite the difference in the intensity of grammaticalization between semimodal and basic modal verbs, it seems that it is not a great rupture in all cases. Moreover, even the verbs which MSJ (Morphology of Slovak language 1966, 366) categorizes into modal expressions are not grammaticalized on the same level. To sum up, Slovak modal verb grammaticalization is not the same in different verbs while there is a different proportion between the grammatical and semantic aspect of a verb. We are going to analyze these facts in specific modal verbs.

2. Intensity of grammaticalization in Slovak modal verbs in the area of semantics and grammar

On the basis of the contact of modal systems in geographically related languages (Hansen 2005, 81–98), we can see three levels of grammaticalization on the morphological, syntactic, and semantic level of the Slovak language: the low level of grammaticalisation (1), the medium level (2), and the high level (3). Table 1 shows the areas and levels of grammaticalization.

Table 1. Grammaticalization in Slovak modal verbs

MODAL EXPRESSIONS	*Musieť* 'must'	*Môcť* 'can'	*Mať* 'hsve to'	*Smieť* 'may/allowed to'	*dať sa/dať* 'can/could be'	Overall degree in particular systems	*Chcieť* 'want'	*Vediet* 'know'
Absence of mode pairs and imperative	3	3	3	3	2	**16**	2	2
Intensity of polysemy	2	3	3	1	3/1	**12**	1	1
The scale of dependance on a full verb in the infinitive	3	1	1	3	1	**10**	1	1
Overall degree of grammaticalisation of particular modal expressions	**8**	**7**	**7**	**7**	**6/4**		**4**	**4**

Grammaticalization of Slovak modal verbs (modal expressions) has appeared in three outlined areas of the language system (indicated by numbers 16, 12, 10) and in three forms (indicated by numbers 8, 7, 6/4).

The first one is represented by the modal verb *musieť* **'must'** which comes from the German word *müssen*; it is significant for its strong morphological and syntactic grammaticalization. We suppose that the origin of this modal expression can explain the absence of a particular lexical (non-modal) meaning. Most other basic Slovak modal verbs, which from an etymological perspective do not show any foreign elements, have - apart from their modal meaning – also a full lexical meaning (except for the modal verb *smieť* 'be allowed to').

The second group is represented by the verbs *smieť* **'be allowed to',** *môcť* **'can'** and *mať* **'have'** with the medium degree of grammaticalisation, which is indicated by number 7. In all three verbs, the grammaticalisation has been fully present on the morphological level. Differences have appeared on the level of semantics and syntax which show that the verbs *môcť* 'can' and *mať* 'have' have the strongest semantic grammaticalization and the weakest syntactic grammaticalisation. In contrast, in the verb *smieť* 'be allowed to' the grammaticalization is the strongest on the syntactic level and the weakest on the level of semantics. From this point of view, Slovak equivalents for 'can', 'have', and 'be allowed to' are inter-complementary.

The expression *dať sa* **'can'/'could be'** is indicated controversially with (6/4); in the contemporary Slovak language, it stands between basic modal verbs and semi-modal verbs. Here, we encounter an interesting situation whereby according to dictionaries, this verb is polysemantic for its different modal meanings (indicating will, possibility, acknowledgement and permission); but its modal meaning is strongly deontic. Moreover, nowadays, we can see the tendency to limit the use of a modal verb to express the idea of possibility to perform an action – which does not exclude the use of this verb as a full meaning and phase verb.

The categorization of the verbs *chcieť* 'want' and *vedieť* 'know' is even more controversial because of their low level of grammaticalization which is close to the grammaticalization of semi-modal verbs. However, these data need to be thoroughly analyzed, with the main focus put on the frequency of the imperative and their auto syntactic position in a sentence.

To sum up, the grammaticalization of Slovak modal verbs is characterized by the absence of mode pairs and the imperative, as well as by intensive dissociation of a modal expression. In none of modal expressions can we observe the presence of both mode pairs and the imperative and their function as an auxiliary verb in a complex predicate without being present in another distribution on the auto syntactic level. Grammaticalization on the level of semantics is the least stable, the most

differentiated and it ranges from the highest level of polysemy to monosemy. Moreover, the chart indicates that polysemy is questionable in case of the verb *dať/ dať sa* 'can'/'could be' and it is completely absent in case of the monosemic modal expression *smieť* 'be allowed to'. In consequence, we are going to focus on the syntactic polysemy of three modal expressions: *môcť* 'can', *musieť* 'must', *mať/mať sa* 'have'.

2.1. Polysemy of modal verbs *môcť* 'can', *musieť* 'must', *mať* 'have' from the point of view of traditional linguistics

We can study the polysemy of the mentioned modal verbs from the point of view of traditional or cognitive linguistics. The former defines polysemy as a lexical phenomenon, with a wide range of meanings, denominating various contents. As in the case of homonymy, which originates in the adversive process, it is characterized by a certain degree of ambivalence and ambiguity. According to traditional theory, polysemy is a semantic change or dissociation of a modal expression, while sustaining its phonetic (formal) qualities. As a result, every Slovak 1000 words (not exclusively modal verbs) have 2500 different meanings; out of which about 75% are monosemic and 25% are polysemic (Mistrík 2002, 142). Our analysis of the modal verbs polysemy is based on dictionary explications according to which the verb *môcť* **'can'** has eleven different meanings (KSSJ – The Short Dictionary of Slovak Language 2003, 341; SSJ – Dictionary of Slovak Language 1959–1968, 185); the modal verb *mať/mať sa* **'have to'** has eight modal meanings (KSSJ 2003, 318; SSJ 1959–1968, 105–110) and the verb *musieť* **'must'** has only six meanings (KSSJ 2003, 345).

The problem of the traditional approach is that it explains neither why a lexical unit has more meanings, nor the structure of these meanings. Apart from the description of a number of meanings, it cannot state which meaning is central and most representative. The existence of multiple meanings is, hence, solved in such a way that it tries to find some common abstract meaning for all derived meanings. This meaning (or meanings) is so general that it loses the particularity naturally perceived in a language (Lakoff 2006, 402).

Since the research of Frank R. Palmer (1986) and John Lyons (1995, 329–331) the meanings of modal expressions have been semantically centralized into two areas. Frank Palmer (1986), following the research of Lyons, states that all basic modal categories are hierarchically categorised into Wrights' two types of modality – epistemic and deontic modality (Palmer 1986, 26). *"Epistemic modality which is concerned with matters*

of knowledge, belief or opinion rather than fact and deontic modality which is concerned with the necessity or possibility of acts performed by morally responsible agens" (Palmer 1986, 18). The expressions "epistemic" and "deontic modality" have been used in the Slavic circle. Danuta Rytel (1982) elaborates lexical modal expressions in Czech and Polish, with the main focus put on their categorization into epistemic, deontic, and alethic modality. According to her, epistemic modality is connected with the certainty or doubt of a speaker if the statement corresponds or does not correspond with objective reality (the speaker does not say anything objective about the reality). Deontic modality brings forward the possible worlds which are obligatory, forbidden or permitted via the modal subject (the speaker) (Rytel 1982, 14). From the outlined definitions, we can assume that traditional linguistics struggle to define a modal expression closely as it tries to generalize the semantics of modal expressions on the basis of a very complicated relation between a speaker and a proposition:

Based on the traditional linguistics approach, 2 semantic centres and representative meanings (in the Slovak verbs *musieť* 'must' and *môcť* 'can') or 4 semantic centres (in *mať* 'have to') have been defined. They are marked with plus (+) in Table 2.

Table 2. Semantic centres of modal verbs

	DEONTIC MEANING		EPISTEMIC MEANING	EVIDENCIALITY/REFERENCE	
	possibility (concessed alternative)	necessity (excluded alternative)	certainty (high degree)	certainty (low degree)	other opinion
môcť 'can'	+	–	–	+	–
musieť 'must'	–	+	+	–	–
mať 'have'	+	+	–	+	+

In case of the modal verb ***môcť* 'can'** the dictionary meanings are centralized into two abstract meanings – deontic possibility as a way of concession of another alternative of an action and epistemic low degree of certainty of a speaker about reality. The modal verb ***musieť* 'must'** is semantically represented by epistemic meaning of high degree of certainty of a speaker and greatly structured deontic category of necessity; the speaker thus perceives reality as necessary, obliged, needed, requested. The epistemic and the deontic category complement each other: excluding the other alternative shows that a speaker has enough infor-

mation to be convinced about the existence of only one possibility. The verb *mať* **'have'** has the same deontic meaning as *môcť* 'can' and *musieť* 'must', but with two contrast modal meanings: necessity and possibility. Another central meaning is the epistemic low degree of certainty (as in *môcť* 'can'). In contrast with the other two verbs, it also expresses some other opinion – the distance between a speaker and a statement about the veracity of a proposition. It is a post-modal meaning of evidenciality/reference – therefore the expression of a different, other opinion.

In terms of modal polysemy, a traditional linguistic approach does not point to multiple meanings in their systematic relations and original motivation. Although it is trying to find a common meaning (or meanings), it is so abstract and vague that it cannot explain the way of systematic categorizing of multiple meanings under one lexical unit (Ibarretxe-Artunano et al. 1999, 32–33).

2.2. Slovak modal verbs polysemy from the point of view of cognitive linguistics

Cognitive linguistics does not try to find the correspondence between language and reality, but "it tries to find the original meaning motivated by human perceptive and cognitive capacity" (Janda 2000, 12). Therefore, cognitive linguists explains the derivation of a meaning on the basis of a particular meaning based on the physical reality of man and world. This physical, factual, palpable contact of man and reality is the basis for our categorization of the world and it can be seen in prototype characteristics which represent a resource domain of polysemic expressions. Cognitive linguistics shows that such meanings are the cause and the origin of radial categories which are being further structured in the metaphoric and metonymic processes. The category is radially structured by respecting the number of subcategories. There is one central category and there are further non-central extensions, which create variations to the central one. The central model extensions are not coincidental, but they are motivated by the central model and some general principles of extension. In consequence, one or two meanings are central or more representative and their extensions result in the polysemy in the form of radial categories.

We can study it on the modal verb *mať* 'to have' whose meaning of *the other opinion* is the result of the grammaticalization process from the original meaning of *to own something* (*mieć* in Polish; *mít* in Czech, and *měć* in Serbian). In the mentioned Slavic languages, the basic modal meaning of this verb is concrete and factual: to own something. It is the

meaning based on some physical and close experience of owning the world that is a part of other cognitive processes which are getting more and more abstract. Direct interactions with the world become a target domain which helps us understand abstract concepts of an objective, unphysical domain. A good example of this may be the other opinion which can be understood by our direct contact with what we own.

The process from the source to the target domain is based on some conceptual schemes, metaphorical models, which depend on the common orientation of a man in the world and they correspond to his physical experience. As we can see, the verb *mať* 'to have' is present in many proverbs/phraseological expressions of unphysical phenomena deeply rooted in somatic processes:

(1) *Kto nemá v hlave, musí mať v nohách.* 'A forgetful head makes a weary pairs of heels' (Świerczyński et al. 2008, 47)
(2) *Lož má krátke nohy.* 'Lies have short legs' (Świerczyński et al. 2008, 86)
(3) *Strach má veľké oči.* 'Fear doubleth all' (Świerczyński et al. 2008, 171)
(4) *Zlé správy majú krídla.* 'Bad news has wings' (Świerczyński et al. 2008, 212)

The mentioned examples show that the *conceptualization of ownership* in the source domain has been realized by a metaphorical model of a *container* – by the idea of inside, borders and outside from one`s own body (Lakoff 2006, 441).

The semantic potential of these expressions shows that the subject matter of a container, which a person owns, tends to extend to the idea of other – concrete (bread, friends, money etc.) and abstract meanings (intelligence, speed, confidentiality, and courage). E.g.:

(1) *Kto neriskuje, nemá.* 'Nothing venture, nothing have' (Świerczyński et al. 2008, 148)
(2) *Kto je bohatý, má veľa priateľov.* 'The rich enough that wants nothing' (Świerczyński et al. 2008, 18)
(3) *Všetko má svoj čas.* 'Everthing hath its time' (Świerczyński et al. 2008, 30)

This conceptualisation in the source domain shows that the meaning of ownership connected with the idea of human body is the reason and the origin of further radial categories: duty and obligation, the possibility to perform an action. In the process of the metaphorical formation of the verb *mať* 'have' based on the idea of a *container*, there is a central category represented by a full verb, a non-central extensions represented

by an auxiliary, modal verb. All mentioned phraseological constructions (mať + apellative / proper noun) with an idiomatic meaning can be transformed into a state or an action *byť* 'to be' (he is rich; patient; popular; etc.).

The following examples (1) and (2) show variations and extensions of the central category. The ownership moves from the idea of substance to the idea of an action (its reality or unreality) which is either admitted or excluded by the speaker.

(1) *V budúcnosti by sme mali čosi urobiť pre pamiatku našich mŕtvych.* 'In the future, we should do something in memory of our late ancestors'

(2) *Ako má zamestnávateľ motivačne pôsobiť na zamestnanca?* 'How should an employer motivate his employees?'

In (1) and (2), the verb *mať* 'have' has the meaning of both excluding (obligation) and admitting (possibility) another alternative of an action. While the first sentence excludes the possibility of not doing something in memory of the dead ancestors (it stresses the necessity/obligation to do something); the second sentence admits the possibility to motivate employees. The idea of admitting another possibility (of a different ownership) presumes its exclusion. We can clearly study the counteractive relationship between the verb *môcť* 'can' (admitting some other possibility of an action) and the verb *musieť* 'must' (excluding the other possibility). In some Slavic languages, this relationship is realised in the idea of semantic equality (can = don't have to; must = cannot) as can be seen in the following sentences:

(3) *Aj rímske židovské spoločenstvo muselo platiť* (*nemohlo neplatiť*) *veľkou cenou.*
'The Roman Jewish community also had to pay (did not have the option not to pay[17]) a high price'

(4) *Nemusíš ma znova klamať* (*môžeš ma neklamať*). 'You don't have to lie (you may not lie) again'

The modal verb *mať* 'have' has a similar function in the sentences (1) and (2).

(1) *V budúcnosti by sme mali niečo urobiť* (*musíme niečo urobiť = nemôžeme nič neurobiť*) *pre pamiatku našich mŕtvych.* 'In the future, we should do something (we must do something = cannot do anything) in memory of our late ancestors'

(2) *Ako má zamestnávateľ motivačne pôsobiť* (*ako môže pôsobiť = ako nesmie nepôsobiť*) *na zamestnanca?* 'How should an employer motivate (how can he motivate = how must not he not motivate) his employees?'

See (1) and (2), the speaker refuses to extend the subject matter of the container; he does not tend to own it; he closes the container. In contrast, in the sentences 2 and 4, the speaker seeks other possibilities and thus he is extending and opening the container. On the basis of the source domain of ownership, motivated by the conceptualisation of one`s own body as a container, we can understand the target domain of possibility as extending the ownership, wealth and obligations when the tendency to extend a container is annulled.

These two ways of knowing/owning the world (its actions and states) develop the central model and they participate in creating a so called radial category. The radial systematisation of possibility and necessity/obligation of the modal verbs *môcť* 'can', *musieť* 'must', and *mať* 'have' can be seen in the etymology of the verb *mať* 'have' which originated from the Old Church Slavonic word *imamъ* (inde. *imā-mi*) and its derivatives *imĕnъje* (*imétje* in Slovenian; *majetok* in Slovak; *majetek* in Czech; *and majątek* in Polish) (Machek 1968, 366). Similarly, the modal verb *môcť* 'can' probably comes from the Indoeuropean word *mog-otъ* in modern Czech *mohutný,* Moravian *mochnější, zá-možnejší* and other derivatives such as *veľmož* 'magnate' (the old title of an emperor); but also the Old Slavonic word *zmotati se na niečo* 'to achieve something with difficulty'; and the word *vъz-mošti* 'to gain strength'. In contrast, the Moravian-Slovak word *nemoha* suggests the idea of weakness, laziness (Machek 1968, 371). The Old Czech word *nemoc* means weakness as well. This is the negative form of the verb *musieť* 'must'. In its old forms *mositi, mušeti,* the alternative vowels *u/o* appeared pointing to the foreign vowel *ü* in the German verb *müssen.* From the three analyzed verbs, only *musieť* 'must' does not have a full lexical meaning in Slovak (its meaning is suggested by the words *nemoc, nemohúcnosť* 'illness', 'weakness') (Machek 1968, 383–384).

The other meanings of the mentioned modal verbs suggest that possibility or necessity/obligation are only a target domain (the result of projection – A') of the container A scheme. Apart from it, there are also the meanings of strength, intensity of conviction which originated from the container B scheme. Their projections B' are a subcategory of A' (Lakoff 2002, 442).

The points of intersection correspond with the source domain of ownership. This can be seen in Slovak proverbs which bring together the idea of certainty with the idea of excluding another alternative (the speaker refuses to extend the subject matter of a container). We could see this on the verb *musieť* 'must'.

(1) *Kde máš dobrý sed, tam seď!* 'Where you have a good sitting, sit there!' (Záturecký 2005, 356)

(2) *Kto má zdravie, pokoj, chleba, ten má všetko, čo mu treba.* 'Who has health, peace, bread, the one has everything what he needs' (Záturecký 2005, 234)

(3) *Drž sa toho, čo máš.* 'Hold by that what you have' (Záturecký 2005, 356)

(4) *Má od Boha dosť!* 'He has enough from God!' (Záturecký 2005, 244)

A great deal of certainty is expressed by *musieť* 'must' = *nemôcť* 'cannot' in the sentences (5) and (6):

(5) *Musel byť veľmi unavený, keď tak rýchlo zaspal.* 'He must have been very exhausted as he fell asleep so quickly'

(6) *Nemohla mu nepomôcť* (= *musela pomôcť*). 'She couldn't help giving him a hand/ She must have helped him'

In contrast, the verb *môcť* 'can' suggests the idea of admitting another alternative (extending the subject matter of a container); it expresses a low degree of certainty of a speaker.

(7) *Mŕtve telo mohlo plávať vo vode asi dva kilometre.* 'The dead body could have floated down the water for 2 kilometres'

A great deal of certainty is connected with the idea of a *closed container*. The more open a container is for more possibilities, the weaker is the degree of certainty. The meaning of a low degree of certainty of the verb *mať* 'have' (*má sa vrátiť o päť minút* 'he shall be back in five minutes') points to its concrete meaning as a full verb:

(1) *Kto má veľa, chce mať ešte viac.* 'Much would have more' (Świerczyński et al. 2008, 92)

(2) *Kto chce mať veľa, nesmie žiadať málo.* 'Ask much to have a little' (Świerczyński et al. 2008, 56)

(3) *Kto má moc, má i právo.* 'Might overcomes right' (Świerczyński et al. 2008, 97)

On the other hand, it shows the tendency to *open a container*: by losing certainty; up to the level of alienation in the sense of other opinion.

(8) *O dva roky tu má byť* (= *vraj bude*) *postavených niekoľko nových domov.* 'In two years, some new houses are to be built (= are said to be built) in this area'.

These radialisations of the concrete (source) meaning of ownership are confirmed by diachronic linguistics which shows that in many lan-

guages the idea of certainty developed from the meaning of possibility and necessity/obligation (Lyons 1995, 334; Ligara 1997, 68). According to Večerka (1984, 168), the modal meanings of certainty in the Old Church Slavonic were developed to a smaller extent than the meanings of possibility and necessity. The lower frequency of the verbs *môcť, musieť, mať* with their epistemic meaning compared with their meaning of possibility/necessity is the same in modern Slovak.

Conclusion

Discussing Slovak modal verbs polysemy, it is not important that we work with multiple meanings (traditional linguistics), but that these meanings are related interdependently in natural and systematic ways. The process of grammaticalization has shown that high polysemy is the common denominator of basic modal verbs in Slavic languages. Moreover, it has helped to uncover the primary/original grammatical function of the full meaning verb *mať* 'have' with a specific lexical meaning of possession. This meaning (having something as property, owning something) was also confirmed in the etymology of modal verbs *môcť* 'can' and *musieť* 'must'. As it might be observed from the mentioned phraseological examples, the original meaning (the source domain) has its background in the physical experience of a man in the world around him. Through the conceptual model of the container, we explained the ability of Slovak modal verbs to form radial categories in the following way: concrete meaning of possession → possibility ↔ necessity → low rate of certainty ↔ high rate of certainty → foreign opinion.

References

Besters-Dilger J., Drobniaković A., Hansen B., 2009, *Modals in Slavonic languages*, [in:] B. Hansen, F. de Haan, J. van der Auwera (eds), *Modals in the Langues of Europe*, Berlin, p. 167–197.

Bybee J., Fleischman S. (eds), 1995, *Modality in grammar and discourse,* Amsterdam – Philadelphia.

Ďurovič Ľ., 1956, *Lexikálno-syntaktické vyjadrovanie modálnych a hodnotiacich vzťahov v slovenčine a ruštine,* [Lexical-syntactic verbalization modal and evaluative relations in Slovak and Russian languages], Bratislava.

Grepl M., Karlík P., 1998, *Skladba češtiny*, [Syntax of Czech], Praha.

Hansen B., 2005, *Ako merať geografickú konvergenciu jazykov: prípadová štúdia gramatikalizácie v dôsledku jazykového kontaktu v nemecko-*

-*maďarsko-slovanskej oblasti*, [How to measure geographic convergence of the languages: case study of grammaticalization in consequence language contact in german-hungary-slovak area], [in:] Jazykovedný časopis 56, s. 81–98.

Hansen B., Karlík P. (eds), 2005, *Modality in Slavonic Languages*, Mníchov.

Heine B., 1995, *Agent-Oriented vs. Epistemic Modality,* [in:] Bybee J. & Fleischman S. (eds.), *Modality in Grammar and discourse*, Amsterdam, p. 17–53.

Hvorecký M., 2001, *Lovci & zberači,* [Hunters & pickers], Bratislava.

Ibarretxe-Artunano B.I., 1999, *Polysemy and metaphor in perception verbs: a cross linguistic study* (Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor in Philosophy), Edinburg.

Janda L., 2002, *The conceptualization of events and their relationship to time in Russian*, "Glossos. The Slavic and East European Language Resource Center" 2, p. 1–10.

Kačala J., Pisárčiková M., Považaj M. (eds.), 2003, *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka*, [The Short Dictionary of Slovak Language], Bratislava.

Lakoff G., 2006, *Ženy, oheň a nebezpečné věci. Co kategorie vypovídají o naší mysli*, [Women, fire, and dangerous things. What categories reveal about the mind], Praha.

Ligara B., 1997, *Polskie czasowniki modalne i ich francuskie ekwiwalenty tłumaczeniowe*, [Polish modals and their French translation equivalents], Kraków.

Lyons J., 1995, *Lingvistic semantics. An introduction*, London.

Machek V., 1971, *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého,* [Etymology dictionary of Czech language], Praha.

Mistrík J., 2002, *Lingvistický slovník,* [Linguistic dictionary], Bratislava.

Oravec J., Bajzíková E., 1986, *Súčasný slovenský jazyk; Syntax*, [Actual Slovak language; Syntax], Bratislava.

Palmer F.R., 1986, *Mood and modality*, London.

Peciar Š. (eds), 1956–1968, *Slovník slovenského jazyka*, [Dictionary of Slovak Language], Bratislava.

Rytel D., 1982, *Leksykalne środki wyrażania modalności w języku czeskim i polskim*, [Lexical means expressive modality in Czech and Polish language], Wroclaw.

Świerczyński A., Świerczyńska D., Mrhačová E., 2008, *Slovník přísloví v devíti jazycích*, [Dictionary of proverbs in nine languages], Praha.

Večerka R., 1984, *Staroslověnština,* [Old Slavonic language], Praha.

Záturecký A.P., 2005, *Slovenské príslovia, porekadlá, úslovia a hádanky*, [Slovak proverbs, adages, apophthegm and riddles], Bratislava.

Gramatikalizované modálne slovesá v slovenčine z pohľadu tradičnej a kognitívnej lingvistiky

Zhrnutie

V príspevku sa venujeme modálnym slovesám, ktorých vývoj v slovenskom jazyku viedol k niekoľkým stupňom gramatikalizácie. Relatívne vysoký stupeň polysémie týchto gramatických jednotiek, ktoré mali pôvodne plný lexikálny význam, je výsledkom tohto procesu v sémantickej oblasti. Tradičný lingvistický prístup k polysémii modálnych slovies nevníma jednotlivé významy v ich sémantických vzťahoch a tiež nesleduje ani ich pôvodnú motiváciu. Tento lingvistický prístup neskúma, ako sú jednotlivé významy organizované do sémantických skupín a či je tam prítomná spoločná vzájomná motivácia. Preto za vhodnejší možno považovať prístup kognitívnej lingvistiky. Práce kognitívnych lingvistov sa opierajú pri odovdzovaní jedného významu od druhého o konkrétny význam zakotvený v telesnej skúsenosti človeka s okolitým svetom, v ktorom žije. Sme schopní porozumieť cieľovej doméne, napr. konceptualizácii modálneho významu možnosti, nutnosti a evidenciality v slovenčine prostredníctvom zdrojovej domény (prirodzenej kategórie) polysémických modálnych slovies.

Kľúčové slová: gramatikalizácia, polysémia, kognitívna lingvsitika, modálne slovesá, slovenský jazyk.

Gramatykalizacja czasowników modalnych w języku słowackim z perspektywy lingwistyki tradycyjnej i kognitywnej

Streszczenie

Tematem artykułu są czasowniki modalne, których rozwój w języku słowackim przyczynił się do powstania różnych stopni ich gramatykalizacji. Rezultatem tego procesu semantycznego jest relatywnie wysoka polisemia tych jednostek gramatycznych, które z początku miały określone znaczenie leksykalne. Tradycyjne podejście lingwistyczne do polisemii czasowników modalnych nie pozwala na pokazanie poszczególnych znaczeń w ich wzajemnych relacjach semantycznych, jak również ich pierwotnej motywacji. Takie podejście nie ujmuje również tego, w jaki sposób są zorganizowane znaczenia grup semantycznych i czy jest im właściwa wspólna, wzajemna motywacja. Bardziej adekwatne podejście do zrozumienia polisemii czasowników modalnych reprezentuje lingwistyka kognitywna. Prace lingwistów kognitywnych wyprowadzają jedno znaczenie od drugiego, które zależy od pierwotnego, konkretnego znaczenia, związanego z doświadczeniami człowieka ze światem, w którym żyje. Mamy zdolność do zrozumienia domeny celowej, tzn. konceptualizacji modalnych znaczeń możliwości, konieczności i ewidencjalności w języku słowackim za pośrednictwem domeny źródłowej (kategorie naturalnej) czasowników modalnych.

Słowa kluczowe: gramatykalizacja, polisemia, lingwistyka kognitywna, czasowniki modalne, język słowacki.