

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Erika Jasionytė-Mikučionienė

GRAMMATICALIZATION IN LITHUANIAN: THE RISE OF MODAL MEANINGS

Summary of doctoral dissertation

Humanities, Philology (04 H)

Vilnius, 2014

This doctoral dissertation was written at Vilnius University in 2008–2013.

Research supervisor:

**Prof. Dr. Habil. Aurelija Usonienė** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

The dissertation will be defended at the Council of Philology of Vilnius University.

Chair:

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jurgis Pakerys** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Members:

**Prof. Dr. Habil. Evalda Jakaitienė** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

**Prof. Dr. Ineta Dabašinskiė** (Vytautas Magnus University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

**Prof. Dr. Dalia Pakalniškienė** (Klaipėda University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

**Dr. Vilma Zubaitienė** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Opponents:

**Prof. Dr. Habil. Axel Holvoet** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

**Prof. Dr. Johan van der Auwera** (University of Antwerp, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

The public defence of the dissertation is to be held in the meeting of the Council of Philology of Vilnius University at 14 o'clock on 3 March 2014 in the Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University.

Address: Universiteto st. 5, LT-01513, Vilnius, Lithuania.

The summary of the dissertation was sent out to relevant institutions on \_\_\_\_\_.

The dissertation is available at the library of Vilnius University.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Erika Jasionytė-Mikučionienė

GRAMATINIMAS LIETUVIŲ KALBOJE: MODALINIŲ REIKŠMIŲ  
SUSIDARYMAS

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka  
Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04H)

Vilnius, 2014

Disertacija rengta 2008–2013 metais Vilniaus universitete.

Mokslinis vadovas:

**Prof. habil. dr. Aurelija Usonienė** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos mokslo krypties taryboje.

Pirmininkas:

**Doc. dr. Jurgis Pakerys** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Nariai:

**Prof. habil. dr. Evalda Jakaitienė** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

**Prof. dr. Ineta Dabašinskienė** (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

**Prof. dr. Dalia Pakalniškienė** (Klaipėdos universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

**Dr. Vilma Zubaitienė** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Oponentai:

**Prof. habil. dr. Axel Holvoet** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

**Prof. dr. Johan van der Auwera** (Antverpeno universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Filologijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2014 m. kovo mėn. 3 d. 14 val. Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakultete.

Adresas: Universiteto g. 5, LT-0513, Vilnius, Lietuva.

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2013 m. vasario mėn. \_\_\_\_\_ d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

# GRAMMATICALIZATION IN LITHUANIAN: THE RISE OF MODAL MEANINGS

## INTRODUCTION

**The object of the research** is the Lithuanian modal verbs *gauti* ‘get’, *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’. As has been observed in the latest studies on the *get* verbs in English (Gronemeyer 2001a, b), Swedish (Viberg 2002), Thai (Takahashi 2006), and German (Lenz 2008), and on acquisitive modals in the languages of Northern Europe and South(east) Asia (van der Auwera et al. 2009), these verbs are highly polysemous and have a modal meaning of possibility and/or necessity. The *need* verbs have been also investigated cross-linguistically: they are described as being liable to undergo grammaticalization and develop different modal meanings of necessity (Bybee et al. 1994; Taeymans 2006; Loureiro-Porto 2009). The present study is concerned with a synchronic as well as diachronic variation of three polyfunctional verbs in Lithuanian: the acquisitive verbs *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and the impersonal verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’. In order to establish the degree of grammaticalization of the impersonal verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’, it is compared with another impersonal verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’, which is widely used as a modal verb in Contemporary Lithuanian.

**The purpose of the research** is twofold: firstly, it aims to reveal the range of modal meanings expressed by the Lithuanian acquisitive verbs *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and the impersonal verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’; secondly, it intends to analyse the potential of the grammaticalization of the verbs under consideration in Lithuanian. To achieve these aims, the following tasks were set:

1. To investigate the morphosyntactic properties of the verbs *gauti* ‘get’, *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ in Contemporary Lithuanian as well as in Old Lithuanian writings (the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> c).

2. To provide quantitative findings of the main patterns of use of the verbs under consideration and to compare them in Contemporary Lithuanian as well as in Old Lithuanian writings.
3. To explore the distribution of non-modal as well as modal meanings of the verbs *gauti* ‘get’, *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’; also to compare the frequencies and distributions of non-modal and modal senses of the affirmative as well as the negated forms of *gauti* ‘get’, *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’.
4. To compare semantic properties of the verbs *gauti* ‘get’, *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ in Contemporary Lithuanian and in Old Lithuanian writings and to draw parallels between the Lithuanian modal verbs and their equivalents in the Circum-Baltic languages.
5. To discuss the tendencies and pathways of the semantic development of the Lithuanian modal verbs under consideration.
6. To analyse the course and degree of the grammaticalization of the Lithuanian modal verbs *gauti* ‘get’, *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ along the parameters of frequency and semantic bleaching.
7. To compare the Lithuanian modal verbs *gauti* ‘get’, *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ with modal verbs of European languages in respect of the nature of grammaticalization.

**The novelty and the relevance of the research.** The *get* type verbs have been discussed in some languages of Europe and South(east) Asia (van der Auwera et al. 2009; Lenz and Rawoens 2012). In the paper by van der Auwera et al. (2009), the given type of use of *get* verbs is referred to as acquisitive modals (resp. *acquisitive modality*). Though the authors investigate the languages of Northern Europe that include two Baltic languages (Latvian and Lithuanian), no Lithuanian data have been analysed. Thus, one of the goals of this study is to fill in the gap by analysing the two Lithuanian acquisitive verbs: *gauti*

‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ that are used in different types of syntactic constructions<sup>1</sup> and can express both participant-external possibility and participant-external necessity.

Recently, Lithuanian modal verbs have become an important object of research. There are several in-depth studies of Lithuanian modal verbs and particles (Holvoet 2007, 2009, 2011; Usonienė 2004, 2006, 2007, 2012). However, Lithuanian modal verbs have not been investigated in a corpus-based and systematic way in different types of discourse (periodicals and fiction) and in Old Lithuanian writings. Besides, this research complements the inventory of the modal verbs in Lithuanian: the verbs *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ have not been discussed as modal verbs so far.

**The following theses are to be defended:**

1. The verbs *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ function as modal verbs in Lithuanian; the verb *gauti* ‘get’ is on the periphery of the Lithuanian modal system.
2. The differences in the modal meanings of the investigated verbs are determined by a different argument structure of the verbs. The impersonal verbs *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ typically realize participant-external necessity, while the personal verb *gauti* ‘get’ favours participant-external possibility. In this respect, the verb *gauti* ‘get’ is similar to its correspondences in the Circum-Baltic languages.
3. The analysis of the structural properties of the verbs *gauti* ‘get’, *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ indicated that they are similar to the modal verbs of other European languages: they do not exhibit any morphological or morphosyntactic properties that set them apart from other (non-modal) verbs; besides, they retain their non-modal meanings alongside modal ones.
4. The modal interpretation of the verbs *gauti* ‘get’, *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ is very much context-dependent.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Gauti* ‘get’ as a modal verb appears in personal constructions, while *tekti* ‘be gotten’ as a modal verb comes in impersonal constructions.

5. The semantic development of the investigated verbs is related to the process of subjectification: modal meanings shift from objective towards more subjective ones..

**Review of the previous research on grammaticalization and modality.** There has been a great interest in the process of grammaticalization over the past few decades (Lehmann 1995 [1982]; Heine and Reh 1984; Heine et al. 1991; Traugott and Heine 1991; Bybee et al. 1994; Wischer and Diewald 2002; Heine and Traugott 2003; Trousdale 2008; Narrog and Heine 2012 among others). Meillet (1912) first applied the term *grammaticalization* to refer to the process by which lexical items turn into grammatical ones. However, more recent approaches to grammaticalization have refined the concept. The modern view on grammaticalization claims that not only lexical entities, as was suggested by Meillet (1912), but also grammatical ones can be the subject to the process of grammaticalization (cf. Kuryłowicz 1965).

Lehmann 1995 [1982] was the first to introduce a comprehensive framework of six parameters and processes of grammaticalization. He argues that loss in the autonomy of a linguistic sign is the primary feature of grammaticalization and identifies three aspects of linguistic autonomy: weight, cohesion and variability. For each aspect, he defines a corresponding paradigmatic and syntagmatic parameter. Cf. Table 1 below:

	<b>Paradigmatic</b>	<b>Syntagmatic</b>
<b>Weight</b>	Integrity	Structural scope
<b>Cohesion</b>	Paradigmaticity	Bondedness
<b>Variability</b>	Paradigmatic variability	Syntagmatic variability

Table 1. Lehmann's parameters (Lehmann 1995 [1982]: 123)

Lehmann's parameters have become classics in grammaticalization studies. However, some scholars have put some of them into question (cf. Mortelmans et al. 2009). Hopper and Traugott (2003), for example, claim that in the early stages of grammaticalization semantic loss (or loss of semantic autonomy) may be compensated for by semantic



enrichment through implicature (see Traugott and Dasher 2002), through generalization (see Bybee and Pagliuca 1985), and through subjectification (see Traugott 1989). Besides, not all of the six parameters are relevant to a grammaticalization change and not all of them can be applied in the early stages of grammaticalization.

Boye and Harder (2012, manuscript) have recently proposed the usage-based theory of grammaticalization. The main idea is that grammatical expressions (morphemes, words, complex constructions) cannot themselves convey the main point of a linguistic message, but are conventionalized as providing secondary (background) information, and that grammaticalization consists in the development of such expressions. In other words, grammaticalization is the diachronic change which gives rise to linguistic expressions which are discursively secondary (Boye and Harder, *ibid.*). Though the usage-based theory of grammaticalization provides criteria for distinguishing grammatical expressions from non-grammatical ones, the task to distinguish between discursively primary and discursively secondary expressions is not always easy (see Boye and Harder, *ibid.*).

It is generally agreed that grammaticalization involves both structural and semantic change. Semantic change either precedes structural change (Givón 1991) or both go hand in hand (Bybee et al. 1994; Hopper and Traugott 2003). The supporters of grammaticalization as a process influenced by semantic factors orient their studies towards the investigation of semantic change (cf. Sweetser 1988: 400–401; Hopper 1991: 19; also Heine et al. 1991: 43–44; Hopper and Traugott 1993: 97–98). Three types of semantic mechanisms are found to be involved in the development of modal meaning:

- Metaphor (Sweetser 1988, 1990);
- Metonymy (Goosens 1999, 2000; Traugott and Dasher 2002);
- Conventionalization of context-induced inferences (Bybee 1988; Brinton 1988; Traugott and König 1991; Traugott and Dasher 2002).

It is argued that context has a considerable influence on the development of grammatical meaning. (cf. Heine 2002: 83). According to Traugott (2006), the following context variables are important for the development of modal meaning:

- the subject of the modal verb (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> person; animate or inanimate);
- the semantics of the complement verb, its grammatical features (tense and aspect);

– other formal markers, such as negation markers or modal adverbs.

In the present thesis an attempt is made to account not only for the semantic development of the modal verbs *gauti* ‘get’, *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and *reik(è)ti* ‘need’ but also for the above mentioned context variables as well as for other different features such as semantic bleaching, frequency of use, reduction of syntagmatic variability and syntacticization that have been traditionally been associated with grammaticalization.

Modality, one of the widely discussed issues in linguistics, has generally been considered as a semantic category. Typically, modality is defined by describing its types. Scholars distinguish either two (epistemic and deontic) (Lyons 1977) or three types of modality (epistemic, deontic and dynamic) (Palmer 2001; 2003). Moreover, another distinction has been proposed by Bybee et al. (1994). They give four types of modality: epistemic, speaker-oriented, agent-oriented and subordinating. In the present study, the framework of modality proposed by van der Auwera and Plungian (1998) has been adopted. The central notion is non-epistemic necessity, which embraces participant-internal and participant-external necessity, including the latter’s subtype of deontic necessity. However, following Nuyts et al. (2010), a broader understanding of deontic modality has been taken into account. Deontic necessity is restricted to the notion of obligation in van der Auwera and Plungian (1998), as illustrated in the following example:

(1) *John must leave now.*

(van der Auwera and Plungian 1998: 81)

Nuyts et al. (2010: 16-34) consider deontic modality as “an ‘attitudinal’ category, quite like epistemic modality, i.e. a category indicating the degree to which the ‘assessor’ (typically, but not necessarily, the speaker [...]) can commit himself/herself to the SoA [state of affairs] in terms of certain principles (in this case: ‘moral’ principles [...])” (Nuyts et al. 2010: 17). Thus, *pure* deontic meanings are defined in terms of assessment of the degree of moral acceptability of the state of affairs. As a consequence, the authors exclude the meanings of permission and obligation from the domain of deontic modality and consider them as *directive* meanings. In the present study, the corpus data have shown that

the verbs under analysis encode the speaker's subjective assessment of the state of affairs regardless of whether it is carried out *directively* or not. My understanding of deontic modality thus embraces both notions of deonticity proposed by van der Auwera and Plungian (1998) as well as by Nuyts et al. (2010).

The most common expressions of English modality are modal auxiliaries. They are said to be grammaticalized to the greatest extent. Modal auxiliaries feature the so-called NICE properties (Heine 1993: 22–24). They exhibit certain morphological as well as morphosyntactic properties that set them apart from the other verbs. As for the Lithuanian modal verbs, they are not as grammaticalized as the English ones, and there are no auxiliary modal verbs in Lithuanian, but grammarians distinguish between personal and impersonal lexical verbs used to express various modal meanings (Balkevičius 1998). As it has been recently observed by Holvoet (2007, 2009), Lithuanian modal verbs do not form a clear-cut or closed class and do not have a set of morphological and syntactic properties that distinguish them from lexical verbs. All Lithuanian modal verbs, except the verb *galėti* ('can/may'), are said to retain their lexical meanings alongside modal ones. Moreover, they do not demonstrate any tendency of phonetic attrition and do not develop into grammatical markers (affixes). They can be inflected for all the tense and participle forms, can undergo nominalization, and form other derivatives. The fact that the majority of Lithuanian modal verbs have not developed any epistemic meanings (except the modal verbs *galėti* 'can/may' and *turėti* 'have') would also support the claim that there is a low(er) degree of grammaticalization in Lithuanian modal verbs.

The feature that all Lithuanian modal verbs have in common with modal verbs in other languages is their infinitival complementation. Here, mention should be made that in their non-epistemic use, Lithuanian modal verbs can be followed by a prepositional phrase or an adverb, which is also apparent in the Germanic languages (Mortelmans et al. 2009). Thus, the criteria distinguishing the Lithuanian modal verbs seem to be mainly semantic. However, if not systematic, occasional grammatical restrictions of realization concerning modal meanings still exist. In Lithuanian, like in other languages, epistemic modal meanings do not seem to be compatible with the passive, imperative, and future tense forms of modal verbs. Some of non-epistemic meanings, including (non-epistemic)

acquisitive ones, cannot be expressed by passive or imperative forms. The defective morphological paradigm of the acquisitive verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ (among others) demonstrates a strong tendency of non-epistemic necessity to be expressed by impersonal modal verbs in Lithuanian<sup>2</sup>.

## METHODS AND DATA

The data have been collected from the Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language (CCLL) (<https://donelaitis.vdu.lt>). Currently, the size of the CCLL is 140 million words. Only two types of sub-corpora have been used, namely, news and fiction. The former represents contemporary written Lithuanian, while the latter is closer to spoken Lithuanian. When accessed in December 2010, the fiction subcorpus (hereafter, CCLL-Fiction) had 15,765,554 words. It consists of texts that have been written over the last two decades.

To sketch the usage as well as types of meanings of the impersonal verbs under analysis in the earlier stages of Lithuanian, old written Lithuanian texts have been studied. A more detailed analysis of Mikalojus Daukša’s *Postilė* (1599), Jonas Bretkūnas’ *Postilė* (1591) and Konstantinas Sirvydas’ *Punktai sakymų* (1629; 1644) has been carried out. *Punktai sakymų* by Konstantinas Sirvydas is an original collection of his sermons. The first volume of the collection was published in 1629, while the second – in 1644. *Postilė* by Jonas Bretkūnas is the first printed collection of Lithuanian sermons, which includes original and compiled texts. *Postilė* by Mikalojus Daukša is a translation from Polish. The concordances of the Old Lithuanian texts have been extracted from the Database of Old Writings set up by the Institute of the Lithuanian Language (<http://www.lki.lt/seniejirastai/>). In the three analysed Old Lithuanian texts, 116 examples of the verb *gauti* ‘get’, 23 examples of the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and 355 examples of the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ have been found. It must be noted that the discussion about the semantic development of Lithuanian verbs causes problems since not all texts of

---

<sup>2</sup> A similar tendency is observed in the behaviour of verbs of necessity in the Slavonic languages (Besters-Dilger et al. 2009).

Old Lithuanian are the original ones. Moreover, they are written in different language variants. So only tentative observations could be made with regard to the evolving tendencies of their semantic development.

The data illustrating contrastive aspects of the analysis come from the Parallel English-Lithuanian Corpus at CCLL (**ParaCCLL**<sub>E>LT</sub>: 2,084,159 words) and a bidirectional parallel corpus of English-Lithuanian-English fiction (**ParaCorp Fiction**<sub>E><LT</sub>: 1 million words) that has been compiled by Dr Audronė Šolienė (Usoniene and Šolienė 2010; Šolienė 2013). In order to verify some of the tendencies of use attested in the mentioned corpora the Corpus of Academic Lithuanian (*Corpus Academicum Lithuanicum* – CorALit; <http://www.coralit.lt/>) has also been used. This specialized synchronic corpus of written Lithuanian includes academic texts published from 1999 to 2009. It represents the language of the main fields of study and research developed in Lithuania.

All the corpora are not annotated: for this reason, the linguistic analysis had to be carried out manually, though the data search itself (i.e. form extraction) was automatic.. Manual selection has been carried out for the following types of constructions: (NP.<sub>NOM</sub>/NP.<sub>DAT</sub>) + V + NP and (NP.<sub>NOM</sub>/NP.<sub>DAT</sub>) + V + INF.

Use has been also made of two online Lithuanian dictionaries: Modern Lithuanian Dictionary (**MLD**: <http://www.autoinfo.lt/webdic/>) and Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language (**DLL**: <http://www.lkz.lt/startas.htm>).

In total, from the CCLL-Fiction 3,169 examples have been filtered out for the verb *gauti* ‘get’; 3,417 examples for the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and 6,966 examples for the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’. The overall number of occurrences of the verb *gauti* ‘get’ in news is 14,655, while the number for the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ – 19,255. The most frequently used morphological forms have been investigated, viz. the present tense forms (*ne*)*gauna* ‘(NEG.)get.PRS.3’, (*ne*)*tenka* ‘(NEG.)be.gotten.PRS.3’, (*ne*)*reikia* ‘(NEG.)need.PRS.3’, the past tense forms (*ne*)*gavo* ‘(NEG.)get.PST.3’, (*ne*)*teko* ‘(NEG.)be.gotten.PST3’, (*ne*)*reikėjo* ‘(NEG.)need.PST.3’, the habitual past tense forms (*ne*)*gaudavo* ‘(NEG.)get.PST.HAB.3’, (*ne*)*tekdavo* ‘(NEG.)be.gotten.PST.HAB.3’, (*ne*)*reik(ė)davo* ‘(NEG.)need.PST.HAB.3’, the future tense forms (*ne*)*gaus* ‘(NEG.)get.FUT.3’, (*ne*)*teks* ‘(NEG.)be.gotten.FUT.3’,

*(ne)reik(ė)s* ‘(NEG.)need.FUT.3’, as well as the subjunctive forms *(ne)gautų* ‘(NEG.)get.SBJV.3’, *(ne)tektų* ‘(NEG.)be.gotten.SBJV.3’ and *(ne)reik(ė)tu* ‘(NEG.)need.SBJV.3’. Realizations of modal meaning are expected to be most common in these forms.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS

**Acquisitive verbs *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ in Contemporary Lithuanian.** There are two main syntactic realizations of acquisitive verbs in Lithuanian. The first construction is the possessor-oriented structure with X in the nominative case (identical to the possessive *turėti* ‘have’) and Y in the accusative or genitive and in some cases in the nominative as well. The second type is the possessed-oriented structure taking X in the dative and Y in the nominative. The verb *gauti* ‘get’ occurs in the transitive possessor-oriented construction with the possessor (X) realized as the subject and the possessed (Y) realized as the direct object. The verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’, on the contrary, occurs in the intransitive possessed-oriented construction with the possessor (X) realized as the oblique object and the possessed (Y) realized as the subject.

<b>X ,Y</b> POSSESS	<b>possessor-oriented (X)</b> <b>X-NOM + Y-ACC</b>	<b>possessed-oriented (Y)</b> <b>X-DAT + Y-NOM</b>
<b>TURĖTI</b> ‘have’	<i>Turiu knyga.</i> have.PRS.1SG book.ACC ‘I have the book’	
<b>GAUTI</b> ‘get’	<i>Gavau knyga.</i> get.PST.1SG book.ACC ‘I’ve got the book’	
<b>TEKTI</b> ‘be gotten’		<i>Man teko knyga.</i> I.DAT be.gotten.PST.3

		book.NOM Lit. ‘The book was bestowed to me’
--	--	---

Table 2. Basic syntactic realizations of verbs of possession in Lithuanian

The main morphosyntactic difference between the two constructions is based on casemarking semantics, which shows variation in the language-specific conceptualization of the role of the possessor in the act of acquisition. The possessor NP casemarked in the nominative in Lithuanian can be interpreted as implying more volition. It is opposed to that in the dative which cannot have any control over the situation described. This syntax-dependent semantic opposition is usually referred to as the nominative-dative alteration. Compare the following examples: whereas *gauti* ‘get’ as a lexical verb is used in the imperative, the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ is utterly unacceptable:

- (2)     ***Gauk***/***\*tek***                     *man obuolių.*  
get.IMP/be.gotten.IMP    I.DAT apples.GEN  
‘Get me some apples’

The given case marking opposition of the subject nominative vs. dative can be seen as an illustration of a semantic contrast between the volitional subject-agent and the non-volitional subject-experiencer, where the latter has no control of the situation described (cf. Butt 2006). Similarly, the alternation of the dative recipient with *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and the nominative recipient with *gauti* ‘get’ illustrates the two different ways acquisition situations may be construed. Thus, the Lithuanian *gauti* ‘get’ casemarks its agent-recipient in the nominative while the referent of the dative recipient of *tekti* ‘be gotten’ is non-volitional and incapable of controlling the act of acquisition. Hence, a transitive dynamic verb *gauti* ‘get’ can passivize and can be used with verbs of volition, which is unacceptable for the less dynamic *tekti* ‘be gotten’. The given morphosyntactic behaviour of the lexical intransitive *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and its semantics offer some basic clues for the explanation of the emergence of an impersonal modal construction and the meaning of participant-

external necessity. The modal verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ is used with the dative subject and is complemented by an infinitive.

The morphosyntactic distribution of the two acquisitive verbs under analysis varies dramatically. The verb *gauti* ‘get’ is a full conjugated lexical verb. It is rarely used with infinitival complements and its potential to express modal meanings is very weak. This verb seems to be more common in spoken Lithuanian and dialects rather than in written Lithuanian. On the contrary, the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ is very often used as a modal verb, although in written Lithuanian it has only 3<sup>rd</sup> person forms<sup>3</sup>. In contrast to *gauti* ‘get’, the paradigm of the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ can be regarded as defective because it is only 3<sup>rd</sup> person forms that are found to function in lexical personal as well as in modal impersonal constructions. Thus, when the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ acquires a modal meaning, it is used in impersonal constructions with the subject in dative and functions mainly as a modal verb of participant-external necessity. It is worthwhile to pay attention to the close interplay between impersonality and the modal meaning of necessity. Not only are the impersonal forms of the acquisitive verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ accidentally or exceptionally used to encode non-epistemic necessity in Lithuanian; the other verbs of necessity, i.e. *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’, also *derėti* ‘fit’, *užtekti* ‘suffice’ (the latter has the meaning of prohibition) etc., or the neuter form of the adjective like *būtina* ‘necessary’ are used impersonally as well.

In the study on impersonal modals of necessity in the Slavonic languages, Besters-Dilger et al. (2009: 190) provide a semantic explanation of the given interplay: “Necessity is felt as something outside the person, hard to influence, therefore it was originally not expressed by a personal verb which would reflect a certain freedom of action of the individual.” This explanation is also valid for the Lithuanian impersonal modals, and in particular for the acquisitive verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’, which encodes an uncontrolled physical acquisition. Semantically, it can further extend to the non-volitional acquisition of various abstract phenomena like necessity: a referent of the dative recipient (resp. dative subject), who unintentionally “receives” an obligation to perform an action.

The inherent meaning of acquisition is realized in structures with a nominal complement. In the case of the verb *gauti* ‘get’, the meaning of abstract acquisition allows

---

<sup>3</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person forms of the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ are attested in some Lithuanian dialects.



a variation in its complement realizations. It is not only a noun denoting physical contact that can follow the acquisitive verb in Lithuanian. Another alternative to express the same semantic content is the infinitive complement, e.g.:

- (3) *Gavau pylos/barti.*  
 get.PST.1SG telling-off.GEN/scold.INF  
 ‘I got a telling-off’

Thus, an infinitival complement itself is not an indicator of a modal meaning. When acquisitive verbs are followed by infinitival complements they can express both modal (4) and non-modal meanings (5), as illustrated in the following examples:

- (4) *Gal jam pasiseks <...> ir gaus žaisti.*  
 Maybe he.DAT succeed.FUT.3 and get.FUT.3 play.INF  
 ‘Maybe he’ll be lucky and he will get a possibility to play’

- (5) *Čia <...> gavau patirti nežinomų dalykų.*  
 here.ADV get.PST.1SG experience.INF unknown.GEN things.GEN  
 ‘Here I got to experience unfamiliar things’

The modal meanings that acquisitive verbs express belong to the type of participant-external modality and very rarely can express participant-internal modality (van der Auwera and Plungian 1998). Participant-external necessity is predominant in the use of the Lithuanian modal verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’, while participant-external possibility is more common in the use of the verb *gauti* ‘get’.

The reading of participant-external necessity is very much context-dependent. As a rule, the given interpretation is most common when the whole situation is seen as being very unfavourable, energy-consuming, or bearing some negative effect upon the participants. This is in line with the observation made by Gronemeyer (2001: 59), whose

explanation is based on “the speaker’s evaluation of the embedded event as negatively affecting the subject”. Consider the following examples that illustrate the point discussed:

- (6) **Gausi**                      *palaukti/pasukti*      *galvą.*  
 get.FUT.2SG              wait.INF/rack.INF    head.ACC  
 ‘You’ll have to wait/rack your brain’

Another type of context that seems to favour the reading of participant-external necessity, which de Haan (2005: 17) calls “*purpose-oriented necessity*”, is in cases of complex sentences with adverbial clauses of purpose, or other expressions explicitly indicating the reason why the action has to be performed, e.g.:

- (7) *Norint sumokėti skolas,*      **teko**                      *parduoti butą.*  
 CNJ    pay.INF    debts.ACC    be.gotten.PST.3sell.INF    flat.ACC  
 ‘To pay the debts one was obliged to sell the flat’

The two Lithuanian acquisitive verbs do not seem to express the meaning of participant-internal possibility attested in some Northern European and South(east) Asian languages (see van der Auwera et al. 2009: 286-291). However, if we follow the claim made by Bybee et al. (1994: 190-191) that the meaning of success in fact demonstrates ability, then the verb *gauti* ‘get’ does seem to denote a successful outcome of an attempt made, e.g.:

- (8) *Daug pastangų prireikė,*      *kol gavo*                      *išsinuomoti patalpas.*  
 much effort.GEN need.PST.3    till get.PST.3    rent.INF    premises.ACC  
 ‘Much effort was needed till she managed to rent some premises’

The verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ does not seem to have any potential to express the discussed meaning. It is most commonly used to encode a chance attainment of some non-specific goal or an accidental occurrence of an event:

- (9) <..> *teko*            *rasti*            *informacijos,*            *kad* <...>  
 be.gotten.PST.3    find.INF    information.GEN    that.CPLZ  
 ‘...one happened to find some information that...’

It should be noted, however, that cases of participant-external possibility have been detected in the use of the two Lithuanian acquisitives as well. As has been said, the meaning of permission is more common for the verb *gauti* ‘get’. This verb, like its English correspondence *get*, is also a dynamic verb (Gronemeyer 2001). The reading of participant-external possibility in Lithuanian is preferable in situations where outer circumstances seem to be more favourable and grant the acquisition of the possibility, which in its turn can extend to permission, e.g.:

- (10) *O*    *čia*            *gaunu*            *skaityt už*    *dyką.*  
 and here.ADV    get.PRS.1SG read.INF    for gratis.ACC  
 ‘And here I can read for free’

Potential for participant-external possibility follows from the non-modal semantics of the verbs *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’. In their non-modal use, *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ describe acquisition. The fact that the lexical markers having the reading of acquisition tend to develop the meaning of possibility has been attested cross-linguistically (see van der Auwera et al. 2009). However, participant-external possibility makes up only 0.9 % of the overall use of *tekti* ‘be gotten’ with the infinitival complements. An externally motivated possibility, in fact, semantically is very close to chance semantics: the outer circumstances are favourable to receive the possibility or a lucky chance. The similarity of meanings is responsible for the ambiguous cases between the non-modal meaning of chance and the modal meaning of possibility, especially with the negated forms of *tekti* ‘be gotten’. A slightly higher frequency of the meaning of possibility across the negated forms may be due to the fact that the non-modal meaning of chance dominates among the negated forms.

The meaning of the Lithuanian *tekti* ‘be gotten’ can be either ambiguous (either the meaning of necessity or the meaning of possibility) or non-modal because it is much less dynamic and, as has been mentioned before, can be regarded as a non-dynamic lexical correlate of the verb *gauti* ‘get’. Thus, an inherent meaning of non-volitional or uncontrolled physical acquisition always imports the aspectual meaning of chance success or accidental occurrence of some event which cannot be controlled by the recipient. This interpretation is most common and obvious in the cases when the situation described allows either an iterative reading, contains a clear indication to a happening by lucky chance, or is seen as a particularly fortunate coincidence. Hence, the most common expressions to be found in the given situations are the adverbs like *kartą* ‘once’, *kartais* ‘sometimes’, *kada nors* ‘ever’, *dažnai* ‘often’ etc. Accidentally experienced events or activities are not necessarily purposeful and can happen unintentionally, e.g.:

- (11) *Kartais            tenka                    pamiegoti tik porą valandų.*  
 sometimes.ADV    be.gotten.PRS.3    sleep.INF only few.ACC hours.GEN  
 ‘Sometimes one can [get a chance to] sleep only for a few hours’

The meaning of chance is very common with verbs of perception, such as *girdėti/išgirsti* ‘hear’, *(pa)matyti* ‘see’, *patirti* ‘experience’, e.g.:

- (12) *Man    neteko                    matyti            tokios    operacijos.*  
 I.DAT    be.gotten.NEG.PST.3    see.INF            such.GEN operation.GEN  
 ‘I have not [got a possibility to see] seen such an operation’

The fact that the acquisitive verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ is specialized for expressing participant-external necessity may be explained by comparing this verb with another frequently used impersonal modal verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ that is also employed as a marker of necessity.

**Quantitative findings.** The normalized frequency of various *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ forms in CCLL is given in Table 3:

<b>GAUTI ‘get’</b>	<b>CCLL (140,921,288) per 1000</b>	<b>TEKTI ‘be gotten’</b>	<b>CCLL (140,921,288) per 1000</b>
<i>Ne-gavo</i> (NEG/PST.3)	0.15	<i>Ne-teko</i> (NEG/PST.3)	0.24
<i>Ne-gauna</i> (NEG/PRS.3)	0.09	<i>Ne-tenka</i> (NEG/PRS.3)	0.16
<i>Ne-gaus</i> (NEG/FUT.3)	0.04	<i>Ne-teks</i> (NEG/FUT.3)	0.1

Table 3. The normalized frequency of various *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ forms in CCLL

Of special importance for the given study is the distribution of patterns of use and their meanings. The quantitative analysis of the forms of the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ in CCLL has shown that the most common complement for all the impersonal forms of the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ in Lithuanian is the infinitive and the dominant meaning is modal. On the contrary, nominal complementation dominates with the verb *gauti* ‘get’ and the meaning expressed is that of acquisition. Table 4 shows the distribution of the structural patterns of the Lithuanian acquisitives with nominal and infinitival complements in CCLL-Fiction:

Pattern	GAUTI ‘get’ %	TEKTI ‘be gotten’ %
V + NP	88.6	14.2
V + INF	5.2	83.5

Table 4. The distribution of the structural patterns of the Lithuanian acquisitives with nominal and infinitival complements in CCLL-Fiction

The Lithuanian acquisitives complemented by infinitives usually express participant-external modality. The total number of occurrence of the modal *tekti* ‘be gotten’ in both registers under analysis is 14,021 while that of the modal *gauti* ‘get’ is only 149, thus the ratio is 94:1. The normalized frequency of the modal *tekti* ‘be gotten’ versus the modal *gauti* ‘get’ is illustrated in Table 5.

V+ INF	Modal <i>gauti</i> ‘get’ (f/1000)	Modal <i>tekti</i> ‘be gotten’ (f/1000)
News & Fiction	0.01	<b>0.56</b>

Table 5. Frequency of modal *gauti* ‘get’ and modal *tekti* ‘be gotten’ in news and fiction

It has been found out that *gauti* ‘get’ as a modal verb is a bit more frequent in fiction than in news. Compare the findings in Table 6.

V+ INF	News (f/1000)	Fiction (f/1000)
Modal <i>gauti</i> ‘get’	0.002	<b>0.006</b>

Table 6. Modal *gauti* ‘get’ in fiction and in news

In this respect, *gauti* ‘get’ is similar to its English correspondence *get*: the latter as a modal verb is more frequently used in spoken English (cf. Gronemeyer 2001).

The most frequent modal meaning of the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ is participant-external necessity which makes up 74.1% of the overall use of this verb with an infinitive. When the verb *gauti* ‘get’ functions as a modal verb, it is the meaning of possibility (permission) that is more frequent than the meaning of necessity. The meaning of possibility makes up 57.6% of all the occurrences of the verb *gauti* (‘get’) with infinitival complementation while the meaning of necessity makes up 42.4%. This behaviour is in line with its Swedish or English correspondences (Viberg 2002; Gronemeyer 2001). The other Lithuanian

acquisitive verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ has a very low percentage of the modal meaning of possibility, which constitutes only 0.9% of the overall use of *tekti* ‘be gotten’ with infinitival complements.

Comparing the usage of the affirmative and negated *tekti* ‘be gotten’, the twofold difference emerges. First, the negated forms of *tekti* ‘be gotten’ show the lower degree of modalization in comparison with the affirmative forms: the proportion of the modal meanings across the negated forms is smaller than that across the affirmative forms. The modal meanings take 81.8 % of the use of the affirmative *tekti* ‘be gotten’ followed by the infinitives, while the negated *tekti* ‘be gotten’ comprises 38.9 % respectively. Since the verb does not seem to be advanced in expressing subjective modality, the scope of negation is over the modal predicate: the negated *tekti* ‘be gotten’ conveys a lack of necessity motivated by external circumstances. Second, semantic distribution among the affirmative as well as negated forms followed by the infinitives differs. The participant-external modality takes the leading position among the affirmative forms of the verb, whereas the chance, or happen-stance, meaning predominates among the negated forms: the latter makes up 47.5 % of the overall use of the negated *tekti* ‘be gotten’ with infinitives.

Besides, a very slight difference in the frequency of participant-external possibility can be observed: the negated *tekti* ‘be gotten’ realises the lack of participant-external possibility better: 19 out of 337 instances of the negated *tekti* ‘be gotten’ with the infinitives show the meaning under discussion, while only 7 out of 2,517 occurrences of the affirmative *tekti* ‘be gotten’ are associated with participant-external possibility. It is so because the negated *tekti* ‘be gotten’ favours the chance, or happen-stance, meaning and, as discussed earlier in the previous section, the latter at times implies the modal interpretation of possibility. In line with Wälchli (1996: 45), it may tentatively be concluded that negation strengthens the possibility reading in Lithuanian. The verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ is nevertheless proved to be specialised as an expression of participant-external necessity in Contemporary Lithuanian.

**Acquisitive verbs *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ in Old Lithuanian.** The Lithuanian acquisitive verbs *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ come from the earliest written

Lithuanian texts (the 16<sup>th</sup> century). The verbs typically come in personal constructions. They predominantly carry the meaning of dynamic (concrete or abstract) possession, e.g.:

(13)

<i>[R]áftas</i>	<i>búwo</i>	<i>žiedas</i>	<i>aũkso /</i>	<i>kurís</i>	<i>iam</i>	♦ <i>têko.</i>
found.PTCP	be.PST.3	ring.NOM	gold.GEN	that	he.DAT	get.PST.3

(DP 539,43)

‘A golden ring was found and given to him’

With regard to the modal use of the acquisitive verbs in Old Lithuanian, only few examples have been attested that are likely to carry the meaning of participant-external possibility. The verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ in its modal use is present in the impersonal construction with the dative subject and the infinitival object complement, e.g.:

(14)

<i>ŝkubinkimes:</i>	<i>idánt’</i>	<i>mú=mus</i>	<i>wêikei</i>	<i>ŝu</i>	<i>ieis</i>
hurry.up.IMP.1PL	that	we.DAT	soon.ADV	with	they.INSTR
<i>bûť /</i>	<i>ir wêikei</i>	<i>Chriřtaufŝ</i>	<i>atêit’</i>	<i>têktu</i> <...>	
be.INF	and	christ.ALL	come.INF	get.SUBJ3	
	soon.ADV				

(DP 543, 42)

‘Let’s make haste so that we can soon be with them and go to heaven’

However, the single example comes from *Postilė* by Mikalojus Daukša, which is a translation from Polish, hence, the influence of the source language should not be overlooked. In the original text we find the Polish verb *dostać* ‘get’ that expresses either participant-external possibility or movement.

As for the verb *gauti* ‘get’, a few examples expressing participant-external possibility have also been found. In the original as well as non-original parts of *Postilė* by Jonas Bretkūnas we find such examples as:

(15) <i>Giwafis</i>	<i>žmogus</i>	<i>ŝu</i>	<i>numirufiu</i>
living.ADJ	person.NOM	with	dead.INSTR



*negaun*                      *fuffikalbeti.*  
 get.NEG.PRS.3              communicate.INF

(BP II 407,24)

‘A living person cannot communicate with a dead one.’

In the given example the form *negaun* ‘get.NEG.PRS.3’ expresses the meaning of inability, i.e. its paraphrase could be *negali* ‘get.NEG.PRS.3’: the subject of the verb *gauti* ‘get’ is a living human being who cannot talk with a dead person any more. The modal use of the verb *gauti* ‘get’ in the original and unoriginal parts of *Postilė* allows one to assume that the verb could have expressed participant-external possibility in the 16<sup>th</sup> century already.

There has not been found any examples conveying participant-external necessity that is frequent in the use of the verbs under consideration in Contemporary Lithuanian. The chance or happenstance meaning that is quite frequent in Contemporary Lithuanian has not been attested in the text under investigation either. Hence, the impersonal constructions with *teki* ‘be gotten’ might have entrenched over time and the verb might have developed the meanings of chance as well as participant-external necessity somehow later. According to the MLD, the chance meaning (‘end up with; come about (along)’) was attested in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, whereas the meaning of necessity was grasped at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. As has been noticed, modal interpretation of participant-external necessity is a matter of context: the given interpretation arises when the whole situation is perceived as negatively affecting the subject.

**The impersonal verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ in Contemporary Lithuanian.** The verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ realizes its non-modal semantics in an impersonal intransitive construction. It is a two-place predicate that takes one argument in the genitive and another argument in the dative, e.g.:

- (16) *Man tikrai reikia atostogų.*  
 I.DAT really need.PRS.3 holidays.GEN  
 ‘I really need a holiday.’

It is worthwhile to note that the verb appears in two versions in Contemporary Lithuanian: as a suffixal verb *reik-ė-ti* ‘need’ and as the primary verb *reik-ti* ‘need’. The corpus data have shown that both verbal variants are used with identical meanings. In its non-modal reading, the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ denotes the state of the referent of the dative argument: the (non-)human referent refers to the locus of internal compulsion or need for something (see example (15)). The non-modal meaning of *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ accounts for 21.3% of all the occurrences of the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ complemented by nominal phrases as well as infinitives. Non-modal semantics is more frequent among the negated forms of the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’. However, the proportion between the non-modal and modal meanings of *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ is slightly different than those with *tekti* ‘be gotten’. The percentage of non-modal semantics across the negated forms of *tekti* ‘be gotten’ is almost three times as big as the percentage of the non-modal meaning with the negated *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’. Thus, the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ might be seen as more advanced in expressing modality. The latter point may be proved by the following statistical findings: the normalized frequency per 1000 words of the modal *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ in the CCLL-Fiction is 0.3, while the normalized frequency per 1000 words of the modal *tekti* ‘be gotten’ is 0.2.

The verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ mainly realizes the modal meanings of necessity in Lithuanian. The modal semantics conveyed by the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ makes up 61.3 % of the overall use of the verb. Participant-external necessity accounts for 81.3 % of all the occurrences of this verb with the infinitive. In comparison to the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’, the affirmative *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ slightly prefers deontic necessity to non-deontic one. The ratio of participant-external necessity and its deontic subtype is nearly equal: 40.2 % and 41.1 % respectively. Participant-internal necessity is the least frequent and accounts for 7.6 % of all occurrences of the verb with infinitives.

As a rule, non-deontic participant-external interpretation arises when external circumstances or some external unspecified source prompts the need to carry out the action, e.g.:

- (17) *Žinai, Maskvoje tokios kainos,*  
 know.PRS.2SG Moscow.LOC such prices.NOM  
*kad net bulves reikia iš*  
 COMP even potatoes.ACC need.PRS.3 from  
*Lietuvos vežtis.*  
 Lithuania.GEN bring.INF.REFL

‘You know, in Moscow prices are so high that we even have to bring potatoes from Lithuania.’

The affirmative forms of *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ convey the subjective deontic meaning. In this case, the modal source coincides with the speaker who directly or descriptively expresses his/her subjective attitude towards the state of affairs. The affirmative 3<sup>rd</sup> person present tense form *reikia* and the subjunctive form *reik(ė)ty* tend to invoke subjective deontic interpretation. In the majority of cases, the modal source is the speaker who gives a piece of advice, makes a suggestion, or simply describes the correct course of action for the particular situation. In cases where the speaker’s recommendation is directed at a specific addressee, the speaker tells the addressee how (s)he should (or should have) behave(d) in certain circumstances, e.g.:

- (18) *Ženytis, Adom, tau reikia, -*  
 marry.INF Adam.VOC you.DAT need.PRS.3  
*pasakė [dėdė].*  
 say.PST.3 uncle.NOM

‘You should get married, Adam, said the uncle.’

As a rule, deontic (as well as non-deontic) interpretation arises in a prototypical deontic context: the referent of the dative subject is human and the infinitives denote actions. Generally, it is worthy of note that in expressing participant-external necessity, the dative subject of the impersonal modal constructions with both verbs *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ is restricted by the feature ‘+human’. It is because the dative subject

is semantically determined by the embedded infinitive that always denotes actions carried out by the referent of the dative subject. To put it differently, the active verb requires the subject with human reference. The human dative subjects and the semantics of the infinitival complements are typical indicators for non-epistemic interpretation of necessity.

Since the usage of the affirmative as well as negated forms of the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ reveals a quite considerable potential of the verb for realising subjective, i.e. deontic modality, the verb may be associated with the process of subjectification in the sense of Traugott (1989): *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ is subjective in that its meaning is to some extent “based in the speaker’s subjective belief state/attitude towards the proposition” (Traugott 1989: 311). However, deontic interpretation appears to be a matter of context. It is strengthened in the conversational environment, where the modal source coincides with the speaker, and it is pragmatically inferred.

As has been noticed, another impersonal verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ has also quite highly developed modal meanings of participant-external necessity in Contemporary Lithuanian. However, the deontic subtype is not as well developed as it is in the case of the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’. In this respect, *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ is somehow further on the grammaticalization (resp. modalization) cline that the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’.

**The impersonal verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ in Old Lithuanian.** To begin with, the predicative constructions with the copular *būti* ‘be’ and the noun *reik(i)a* ‘need’ (like *buvo* ‘be.PST.3’ / *būtu* ‘be.SUBJ.3’ *reik(i)a* ‘need.NOM’ etc.) are found in *Postilė* by M. Daukša (as well as in *Postilė* by J. Bretkūnas) instead of the contemporary verb *reik(ė)ti*. In Contemporary Lithuanian, the form *reikia* is interpreted as the 3<sup>rd</sup> person form of the modal verb *reik(ė)ti*. It must be noticed that the modal expressions of non-verbal origin are characteristic of the Slavonic languages too (Hansen 2004: 250). Consequently, having in mind that *Postilė* is a translation from Polish, one could assume that the predicative construction with the copular *be* was patterned upon the analogical source construction. However, the predicative constructions with *būti* ‘be’ have been attested in other Old Lithuanian texts as well: Holvoet (2007: 47) has pointed to the analogical use of the source constructions of the verb *reik(ė)ti* in Chyliński’s *Bible* (the 17<sup>th</sup> century) that is the translation from Dutch. That has enabled him to establish the common non-verbal origin

for the modal expressions in the Baltic as well as Slavonic languages (Holvoet 2007: 45). It is interesting to observe that in *Postilė* by M. Daukša the copular constructions are likely to be interchangeably used alongside the random verbal forms of *reik(ė)ti* (cf. the predicative construction *reikė būtu* ‘need.NOM be.SUBJ.3’ alongside the subjunctive verbal form *reiktú* ‘need.SUBJ.3’). The copular *būti* ‘be’ is not surfaced when the construction is used in the present tense: it is represented in other tenses or in the subjunctive mood. Besides, in the present tense negation is found with the form *nerėikia* ‘NEG.need.PRS.3’ rather than with the predicative construction *nėra reik(i)a* ‘NEG.be.PRS.3 need.NOM’, which also presupposes the interpretation of the form *reik(i)a* as a verb and not as a noun. Hence, the verb *reik(ė)ti* might have been already emanating from the source copular construction in the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

The attested predicative constructions with the copular *be* and the noun *reik(i)a* carry lexical as well as modal meanings in Old Lithuanian. The construction takes the nominal phrase, the infinitive or the subordinate clause with the complementizer *idant* ‘so that; in order to’ as its complements. Lexical meanings favour the constructions with nominal complements or with the *idant*-clause, whereas modal meanings favour the constructions with infinitival or clausal complementation. Since the use of the impersonal constructions with *būti* ‘be’ and *reik(i)a* is restricted to religious contexts, the modal constructions mainly convey ‘objective’ obligation: the ‘speaker’ is not the source of modality; rather, (s)he reports the set of the rules regarding one’s behaviour according to the religious convention or to God’s will, e.g.:

(19)

◆ <i>Rėikia</i>	<i>tad</i>	<i>tikėt</i>	<i>ir</i>	<i>ne maž</i>	<i>ne abėioi</i>
need.PRS.3	therefore	believe.INF	and		doubt.NEG.INF
/ <i>ioğ</i>	<i>Diėwas</i>	<i>yrá</i>			
that	God.NOM	exist.PRS.3			

(DP 222,51)

‘Therefore we have to believe in God and not to have any doubts about his existence’

The deontic reading is evident when the impersonal modal construction goes in the sentences with the reportative evidential markers or in the clauses subordinated to the main predicate of speaking or thinking. In Contemporary Lithuanian, in turn, the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ is much more frequent in the reading of participant-external as well as deontic necessity (see the previous section). The contexts where the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ can be used have extended and the deontic meaning is not restricted to the religious contexts anymore: rather, obligation arises in the direct environment and the source of it is often the speaker. In fact, Hansen (2004: 254) has established a very similar semantic path of necessity for Russian: over time, the Russian modals conveying ‘religious obligation’ developed ‘subjective’ obligation alongside ‘objective necessity’.

## CONCLUSIONS

The two Lithuanian acquisitives belong to the domain of possession and realize one of the aspects of possession, i.e. an onset of possession or acquisition. Like other verbs of possession, they develop modal meanings of necessity and can be subsumed under the domain of non-epistemic necessity in Lithuanian. An acquisition situation may be construed in two different ways: the verb *gauti* ‘get’ occurs in the transitive possessor-oriented construction with the possessor realized as the subject and the possessed realized as the direct object. The verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’, on the contrary, occurs in the intransitive possessed-oriented construction with the possessor realized as the oblique object and the possessed realized as the subject. This is the reason why the verbs *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ exhibit semantic differences in encoding modal and non-modal meanings.

The non-modal meanings of the verbs under consideration favour the constructions with nominal complementation. The modal meanings, in turn, are typically realized in structural patterns with infinitival complements. The verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ is frequent with the infinitival complements and functions a modal verb in Contemporary Lithuanian, while the verb *gauti* ‘get’ is frequent with the nominal complements and is on the periphery of the Lithuanian modal system.

The dominant modal meaning of Lithuanian acquisitives concerns the meaning of participant-external modality. The acquisitive verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ mainly functions as the verb of participant-external necessity, while the verb *gauti* ‘get’ is relatively more frequently used as the verb of participant-external possibility. It should be noted that Lithuanian acquisitive verbs often express actualized necessity or possibility and the distinction between modal and non-modal meaning is not always clear: the modal interpretation is very much context-dependent. However, in contexts where the verbs under analysis are complemented by the infinitives denoting perceptual situations or accidentally occurring events, modality disappears and the acquisitives express the actualized event and/or chance of happening. As a rule, it is negative context or unfavourable external circumstances that are the crucial factor triggering the modal interpretation (namely, the reading of necessity) of the acquisitive verbs.

In the analysed Old Lithuanian writings, the acquisitive verbs *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ predominantly carry the meaning of dynamic (concrete or abstract) possession. Only few examples have been attested that are likely to convey modal meanings: the verbs *gauti* ‘get’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ express participant-external possibility. There are no examples conveying participant-external necessity, which is frequent in the use of the verbs under consideration in Contemporary Lithuanian. However, since the modal use of the acquisitive verbs is scarce in the analysed texts, we may only tentatively assume that the verb *gauti* ‘get’ could have expressed participant-external possibility in the 16<sup>th</sup> century already and that the meaning of participant-external necessity might have developed somehow later.

The semantic change of the Lithuanian acquisitives follows a universally observed line of development from physical to abstract acquisition, and then it proceeds further to a more abstract meaning which is modal or aspectual, hence more grammatical than lexical. The verbs lose their main lexical content and start to convey information which is even more abstract.

The results of the corpus-based study of the impersonal verbs *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ support cross-linguistic observations that impersonal modals are less polyfunctional than personal modals and they do not develop epistemic values. The

semantic overlap between the verbs is noticeable within the participant-external domain: both predicates have developed participant-external necessity to the greatest extent. This is due to the nature of the impersonal constructions the verbs occur in: inability to control necessity emanating from some external source is reflected by coding the target of necessity in the dative subject. Most of the time, the impersonal constructions occur without the overt subject, therefore the modal meanings conveyed by *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ seem to be general, directed at the generic modal target and, at the same time, very much context-dependent.

The impersonal verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’, in contrast to *tekti* ‘be gotten’, has got a greater potential to convey deonticity, viz. the subjective deontic meaning. Thus, the main difference between the verbs *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ can be characterised in terms of subjectivity as it is understood by Traugott (1989). On the one hand, different distribution of the non-epistemic values may be due to the fact that the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ often appears in dialogical situations and deontic interpretation arises through conversational implicatures, viz. the modal source is the speaker expressing (or implying) his/her attitude towards the state of affairs. On the other hand, the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’, or rather its source construction with the copular *būti* ‘be’ and the noun *reik(i)a* ‘necessity’, was extensively used to convey modality in Old Lithuanian (in the 16<sup>th</sup> century). As a result, the verb *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ may be somehow further on the grammaticalization (resp. modalization) cline than the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ and it has become advanced in expressing subjective modality.

The modal use of the negated forms of the verbs *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ appears to be not so frequent as with the affirmative forms. Thus, the affirmative *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ are advanced in expressing modality in comparison with the negated forms. Considering the cross-linguistic observation made by Bybee et al. (1994: 230; 237) that grammatical meanings tend to arise in the affirmative contexts firstly, the fact that the modal use of the negated *tekti* ‘be gotten’, in contrast to the negated *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’, appears to be rarer allows me to claim that *tekti* ‘be gotten’ is modalized to a lesser degree than *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’.



Following the point of view that grammaticalization is a process that occurs in the context of a particular construction and that the beginning of the path is considered to be a shift in the combinatorial possibilities of the verb, namely use with the infinitive signals that it might be on the way towards grammaticalization. The process might be regarded as latent but there seem to be clear manifestations of the onset of grammaticalization. The Lithuanian impersonal modal verbs *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’ seem to have made the first step towards the path of grammaticalization: they are frequently used with the infinitival complements and mainly function as modal verbs in Contemporary Lithuanian. The verb *gauti* ‘get’ can also take infinitive complements, but it does not use this possibility much. The verb mostly functions as a full lexical verb to express acquisition of possession in the V+NP pattern. It is difficult to say why the possibility of use in the infinitival pattern is not fully realized in practice. One of the reasons might be the existence of a highly frequent full modal verb *turėti* ‘have’. On the contrary, the verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ makes full use of this possibility and its paradigmatic integrity seems to split. The non-modal meanings are realized by the personal forms of *tekti* ‘be gotten’, while the modal meanings are expressed by the impersonal forms of the verb. Thus, the morphosyntactic potential of *tekti* ‘be gotten’ gets reduced or we may speak of an emergence of a new unit in the paradigm of impersonal verb forms.

# GRAMATINIMAS LIETUVIŲ KALBOJE: MODALINIŲ REIKŠMIŲ SUSIDARYMAS

## Santrauka

**Tyrimo objektas.** Disertacijos objektas – lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžiai *gauti*, *reik(ė)ti* ir *tekti*. Pasirinkti būtent šie veiksmažodžiai, nes iki šiol nei *gauti*, nei *tekti* nebuvo nagrinėjami kaip lietuvių kalbos modalumo sistemos nariai. Be to, jais realizuojamas vienas iš modalumo tipų – akvizityvinis modalumas, būdingas Šiaurės Europos kalboms. Išsiaiškinus, kad veiksmažodis *tekti*, vartojamas beasmenėse konstrukcijose, išplėtojęs modalines reikšmes dabartinėje lietuvių kalboje, ir siekiant nustatyti kalbamo veiksmažodžio gramatinimo polinkį, jis lyginamas su kitu, įsitvirtinusi lietuvių kalbos modalumo sistemoje beasmeniu modaliniu veiksmažodžiu *reik(ė)ti*.

Tyrimo **tikslas** – ištirti lietuvių kalbos modalinius veiksmažodžius *gauti*, *reik(ė)ti* ir *tekti* iš gramatinimo reiškinių perspektyvos, išsiaiškinti, kurie gramatinimo parametrai relevantiški (jei išvis relevantiški) nagrinėjamiems lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžiams, išnagrinėti šių veiksmažodžių modalinės semantikos ypatumus, modalinės reikšmės susidarymą lemiančius veiksnius, taip pat pateikti modalinių veiksmažodžių *gauti*, *reik(ė)ti* ir *tekti* semantinį profilį ir aptarti vartosenos ypatumus senuosiuose XVI a. lietuvių kalbos raštuose ir dabartinėje bendrinėje lietuvių kalboje.

Šiems tikslams įgyvendinti keliami tokie **uždaviniai**:

1. ištirti veiksmažodžių *gauti*, *tekti* ir *reik(ė)ti* morfosintaksės ypatybes dabartinėje ir senojoje (XVI-XVII a.) lietuvių kalboje;
2. palyginti nagrinėjamų veiksmažodžių formų ir jų komplementų struktūrinių tipų statistinę distribuciją dabartinėje ir senojoje lietuvių kalboje;
3. išanalizuoti veiksmažodžių *gauti*, *tekti* ir *reik(ė)ti* semantines ypatybes, taip pat ištirti modalumo raišką nagrinėjamais veiksmažodžiais teigiamuose ir neigiamuose sintaksiniuose kontekstuose, t.y. modalumo raišką teigiamomis ir

- neigiamomis veiksmažodžių formomis, nustatyti, kiek modalumo raiška pažengusi tarp skirtingų veiksmažodžių formų;
4. palyginti nagrinėjamų veiksmažodžių *gauti*, *tekti* ir *reik(ė)ti* semantinį potencialą dabartinėje ir senojoje lietuvių kalboje, taip pat su analogiškų kitų kalbų, konkrečiai areališkai artimų – Baltijos jūros regiono kalbų, modalinių veiksmažodžių semantiniu potencialu;
  5. ištirti galimas veiksmažodžių *gauti*, *tekti* ir *reik(ė)ti* semantinės raidos tendencijas iš nmodalinių modalinių reikšmių link;
  6. analizuojant modalinių veiksmažodžių *gauti*, *tekti* ir *reik(ė)ti* morfosintaksines bei semantines ypatybes, pritaikyti gramatinimo reiškiniui skirtuose darbuose pasiūlytą modalinių žodžių ir konstrukcijų aprašymo modelį;
  7. palyginti lietuvių kalbos modalinių veiksmažodžių *gauti*, *tekti* ir *reik(ė)ti* gramatinimo tendencijas su Europos kalbų modalinių veiksmažodžių tendencijomis, apibendrintomis lingvistinėje literatūroje.

**Darbo naujumas ir originalumas.** Skirtingai nei pasaulio lingvistikoje, lietuvių kalbotyroje modaliniai žodžiai nėra atskirai aprašyti ar išsamiau tyrinėti. Nei *DLKG* (1996), nei *LKG* (1971) ar *KTŽ* (1990) nevartojamas modalinio veiksmažodžio terminas, neskiriama modalinių veiksmažodžių grupė (tik paskutiniame *LKE* leidime (2008, 357) pateikiamos *modalinio žodžio* ir *modalumo* apibrėžtys). Kai kurie kalbininkai užsimena lietuvių kalboje esant pagalbinius modalinius veiksmažodžius (Sirtautas, Grenda, 1988, 79; Labutis, 1998, 234) ar leksinius veiksmažodžius, turinčius modalinę reikšmę (Laigonaitė, 1967, 9; Valeckienė, 1998, 76; Balkevičius, 1998, 82–86), tačiau neapibrėžia tokių veiksmažodžių paradigmos, neišryškina diferencinių šios paradigmos narių požymių. Iki šiol išsamaus tyrimo, skirto pavieniams modaliniams žodžiams ir paremto autentiška tekstyno medžiaga, nėra. Atskirai minėtini Holvoeto (2007, 2009, 2011), Usonienės (2004, 2006, 2007, 2012) darbai, kuriuose pateikta svarių teorinių svarstymų ir apibendrinimų visos lietuvių kalbos modalumo sistemos atžvilgiu, tačiau jie nėra paremti išsamia empirinės medžiagos baze. Darbų, analizuojančių modalumo raiškos priemonių vartosenos ir apskritai modalumo sistemos ypatumus senuosiuose lietuvių kalbos raštuose ir

lyginančių su dabartinės lietuvių kalbos modaline sistema, visai nėra. Todėl svarbu tirti modalinius žodžius dabartinėje kalboje ir senuosiuose raštuose: toks tyrimas padėtų apčiuopti modalinių vienetų raidos tendencijas lietuvių kalboje, modalinių vienetų vartosenos ypatybes, leksinį bei gramatinį statusą. Be to, darbas aktualus tuo, kad tiriama iki šiol mažai dėmesio sulaukę arealiniai Baltijos jūros regiono reiškiniai: akvizityvinio modalumo (ang. *acquisitive modality*), lietuvių kalboje reiškiamo veiksmažodžiais *gauti* ir *tekti*, bei beasmenių modalinių konstrukcijų su veiksmažodžiu *reik(ė)ti* problematika.

### **Ginamieji teiginiai:**

1. Veiksmažodžiai *tekti* ir *reik(ė)ti* įsitvirtinę lietuvių kalboje kaip modaliniai predikatai, o veiksmažodis *gauti* priklauso modalumo kategorijos periferijai.

2. Veiksmažodžių modalinių reikšmių skirtumus lemia skirtinga argumentų raiška. Beasmeniai veiksmažodžiai *tekti* ir *reik(ė)ti* dažniausiai realizuoja nuo situacijos dalyvio nepriklausančią būtinybę, asmeninis *gauti* – nuo situacijos dalyvio nepriklausančią galimybę. Pastarosios įsitvirtinimas *gauti* semantinėje struktūroje atliepia *gauti* tipo veiksmažodžių reikšmių pasiskirstymą Baltijos jūros regiono kalbose.

3. Lietuvių kalbos modaliniai veiksmažodžiai *gauti*, *reik(ė)ti* ir *tekti* struktūrinėmis ypatybėmis panašūs į Europos kalbų modalinius veiksmažodžius: jie neišsiskiria sisteminiiais struktūriniais požymiais, apibrėžiančiais modalinį jų statusą. Be to, nagrinėjamiems lietuvių kalbos modaliniams veiksmažodžiams būdingas reikšmių sluoksniavimasis: šalia modalinių, išsaugomos nedomalinių – šaltinio – reikšmės.

4. Modalinės veiksmažodžių *gauti*, *reik(ė)ti* ir *tekti* reikšmės sietinos su tam tikrais kontekstų tipais: jos formuojasi tam tikrame struktūriniame ir pragmatiniame kontekste.

5. Nagrinėjamų veiksmažodžių modalinių reikšmių susidarymui įtakos turi subjektyvizacijos procesas: klostantis modalinei reikšmei, svarbi kalbėtojo perspektyva, pragmatinės inferencijos.

### **Empirinė disertacijos medžiaga, tyrimo metodika**

Disertacijos empirinės medžiagos tekstyną sudaro pavyzdžiai, surinkti iš *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstyno* (DLKT) (<http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas/>), grožinės literatūros

(GL) ir respublikinės periodikos (RP) patekstynio, trijų senųjų lietuvių kalbos tekstų: Mikalojaus Daukšos „Postilės“ (1599) (darbe trumpinama DP), Konstantino Sirvydo „Punktų sakymų“ (1629; 1644) (PS) ir Jono Bretkūno „Postilės“ (1591) II-osios (originalios) dalies (BP). Medžiaga iš DLKT rinkta dviem etapais: nuo 2008 m. iki 2010 m. iš senosios DLKT versijos ir 2010 m. iš naujosios DLKT versijos, turinčios tekstų šaltinių nuorodas. Prireikė dviejų medžiagos rinkimo etapų, nes 2010 m. paieška DLKT buvo atnaujinta, tapo įmanoma atsirinkti duomenis pagal šaltinius, taigi pasinaudota šia galimybe ir duomenys iš DLKT, būtent iš GL patekstynio, perrinkti 2010 metais gruodžio mėnesį. Kad analizė būtų kuo tikslesnė ir autentiškesnė, atskirti originalūs, lietuvių autorių darbai nuo neoriginalių – verstinių šaltinių. Šiuo metu DLKT sudaro daugiau nei 140 milijonų žodžių. Grožinės literatūros patekstynis sudaro 11,6 proc. viso tekstyno, jame – 15 765 554 žodžiai. Nuspręsta tirti grožinės literatūros kalbą, nes daroma prielaida, kad grožinės literatūros kalba artima sakybinei kalbai, be to, žanro požiūriu grožinė literatūra tinkama tyrimui: ji gali padėti atskleisti dabartines modalinių veiksmažodžių vartosenos tendencijas, sąsają su kalbėjimo situacija. Respublikinės periodikos kalba artima rašomajam kalbos variantui, oficialiajam stiliui. Kadangi DLKT morfologiškai neanotuotas, analizė atlikta rankiniu būdu.

Tirtos pagrindinės modalinių veiksmažodžių *gauti*, *reik(ė)ti* ir *tekti* formos: būtojo kartinio, būtojo dažninio, esamojo, būsimajo laiko ir nekaitomos bendraties formos. Veiksmažodžio *reik(ė)ti* pavartojimų skaičius DLKT labai didelis, todėl atrinkta po 1000 atsitiktinių kiekvienos formos pavyzdžių (jei pastarųjų buvo per 1000). Kad atsitiktinė atranka būtų kuo objektyvesnė, pasinaudota specialiąja programa, prieinama internete [randomizer.org](http://randomizer.org).

Iš GL patekstynio iš viso buvo išfiltruota 6966 veiksmažodžio *reik(ė)ti*, 3417 veiksmažodžio *tekti* ir 3169 veiksmažodžio *gauti* pavyzdžiai. RP patekstynyje tirta tik veiksmažodžių *gauti* ir *tekti* vartoseną, siekiant nustatyti jų, kaip modalinių veiksmažodžių, statusą. Nuspręsta palyginti kalbamų veiksmažodžių modalinę vartoseną sakybinei kalbai artimoje grožinėje literatūroje ir publicistiniame stiliuje, rašomosios kalbos variante. RP duomenys rinkti iš senosios DLKT versijos. RP dydis senajame DLKT – 24 803 732

žodžiai. Iš viso RP patekstinyje peržiūrėta 14655 veiksmažodžio *gauti* ir 19255 veiksmažodžio *tekti* pavyzdžių.

Be to, naudotasi lietuvių kalbos žodynais: *Lietuvių kalbos žodynu* ([www.lkz.lt](http://www.lkz.lt)), *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynu* (<http://www.autoinfo.lt/webdic/>), taip pat *Lietuvių mokslo kalbos tekstyno (CorALit)* medžiaga ([www.coralit.lt](http://www.coralit.lt)). Norint patikrinti vieną ar kitą analizuotų modalinių veiksmažodžių vartosenos ir raidos tendenciją, pasinaudota VU daktarės Audronės Šolienės sudarytu lygiagrečiuoju abikrypčiu anglų-lietuvių-anglų tekstynu (*ParaComp*), kurio dydis – 2 milijonai žodžių (plačiau apie kalbamą tekstyną žr. Usoniene ir Šolienė 2010; Šolienė 2013).

Kalbant apie nagrinėtus senuosius raštus, pasakytina, kad K. Sirvydo „Punktai sakymų“ (PS) yra ne verstinis, bet originalus darbas, kuriame pateiktos pamokslų santraukos, parašytos lietuvių kalba, šalia – vertimai į lenkų kalbą. Analizuotos I-oji ir II PS dalys. J. Bretkūno „Postilė“ (BP) – kompiliacinis darbas, kuriame pateikti paties J. Bretkūno sakytai pamokslai ir žymiausių protestantų teologų darbai, I-oji dalis – neoriginalios „Postilės“ perikopės. Analizuota II-oji BP dalis. M. Daukšos „Postilė“ – verstinis pamokslų rinkinys. Versta iš lenkų kalbos. Tiriant veiksmažodžių *gauti*, *tekti* ir *reik(ė)ti* vartoseną kalbamuose senuosiuose tekstuose, atsižvelgiama į tai, kaip skiriasi modalinių veiksmažodžių morfosintaksinės ir semantinės ypatybės originaliuose ir verstiniuose tekstuose, kiek įtakos veiksmažodžių vartosenai verstiniame tekste galėjusi turėti originalo kalba. DP analizei naudotasi Lietuvių kalbos instituto sudarytomis elektroninėmis senųjų raštų konkordancijomis. BP duomenys tirti iš fotografuotinio leidimo (sud. Aleknavičienė 2005), modaliniai vienetai išrinkti rankiniu būdu. Iš viso išanalizuoti 494 senųjų raštų pavyzdžiai: iš jų 116 – veiksmažodžio *gauti*, 23 – veiksmažodžio *tekti* ir 355 – veiksmažodžio *reik(ė)ti*.

## **Disertacijos struktūra**

Darbą sudaro penkios dalys:

1. Įvadas, kuriame pristatoma gramatinimo, modalumo, gramatinimo ir modalumo sąveikos, arealinių modalumo reiškinių problematika.
2. Trys tiriamosios dalys:

- a. pirmoji skirta akvizityvinio modalumo, kurį reprezentuoja du lietuvių kalbos modaliniai veiksmažodžiai – *gauti* ir *tekti* – aprašui lietuvių kalboje;
  - b. antroji – lietuvių kalbos beasmenių modalinių konstrukcijų su veiksmažodžiu *reik(ė)ti* problematikai;
  - c. trečioji, apibendrinamoji, skirta tirtų veiksmažodžių gramatinimo parametrams ir modalinio statuso pobūdžiui aptarti.
3. Išvados, literatūros sąrašas.

### **Tyrimo rezultatai ir išvados.**

Veiksmažodžiai *gauti* ir *tekti* realizuoja akvizityvinį modalumą lietuvių kalboje ir laikytini akvizityviniais modaliniais veiksmažodžiais. Abu *gauti* tipo veiksmažodžiai pasirodo skirtingo tipo konstrukcijose: veiksmažodžio *gauti* atveju semantiškai žymėtas ir vardininku reiškiamas posesorius, dėl to šis veiksmažodis sietinas su „į posesorių orientuotomis“ konstrukcijomis. Veiksmažodžio *tekti* atveju semantiškai žymėtas ir vardininku reiškiamas posesumas, dėl to šis veiksmažodis sietinas su „į posesumą orientuotomis“ konstrukcijomis. Tai, kad patekimo į posesyvumą būseną koduojama skirtingomis konstrukcijomis, lemia semantinius veiksmažodžių *gauti* ir *tekti* skirtumus.

Nemodalinių reikšmių lygmenyje vyrauja vardažodinė *gauti* tipo veiksmažodžių komplementacija, o modalinės – veiksmažodinė, be išimties bendratis. Veiksmažodžis *gauti* paprastai komplementuojamas vardažodžiais, o veiksmažodis *tekti* – bendratimis, taigi veiksmažodžio *gauti* semantinėje struktūroje dominuoja nemodalinės reikšmės, o veiksmažodžio *tekti* – modalinės. Tekstyno medžiaga atskleidė, kad *tekti* labiau sumodalėjęs nei *gauti*.

Modalinių reikšmių lygmenyje veiksmažodis *gauti* potencialesnis reikšti nuo situacijos dalyvio nepriklausančią galimybę, o veiksmažodis *tekti* – nuo situacijos dalyvio nepriklausančią būtinybę. Modalinių reikšmių pasiskirstymas veiksmažodžio *gauti* semantinėje struktūroje atliepia Baltijos regiono kalbų *gauti* tipo veiksmažodžių modalinių reikšmių pasiskirstymą: *gauti* tipo veiksmažodžiai pirmiausia išplėtoja neapibendrinamą galimybės reikšmę.

Pastebėta, kad akvizityvinių modalinių veiksmažodžių *gauti* ir *tekti* atveju modalinė neepisteminės būtinybės reikšmė susidaro neigiamai konotuojuose kontekstuose, t.y. tokiuose, kuriuos kalbėtojas vertina kaip nepalankius, galinčius atnešti jam (ar kam kitam) neigiamų padarinių.

Veiksmažodis *gauti* geriau dokumentuotas senuosiuose lietuvių kalbos raštuose nei veiksmažodis *tekti*. Ir originaliuose, ir neoriginaliuose analizuotuose tekstuose *gauti* užfiksuotas modaline galimybės reikšmė, kas leidžia daryti prielaidą, kad kalbama reikšmė XVI a. jau buvo išplėtotą kalbamo veiksmažodžio semantinėje struktūroje. Veiksmažodžio *tekti* modalinės vartosenos pavyzdžių analizuotuose senuosiuose raštuose neaptikta, išskyrus vienintelį atvejį neoriginalioje Daukšos „Postilėje“. Neatmestina prielaida, kad įtaką galėjusi turėti vertimo šaltinio kalba. Dabartinėje bendrinėje lietuvių kalboje situacija visai kitokia: skirtingai nei veiksmažodis *gauti*, *tekti* išplėtojęs modalines reikšmes ir dažniausiai realizuoja neepisteminį modalumą.

Šaltinio semantika ir *gauti*, ir *tekti* atveju panaši – abu predikatai perteikia dinaminį posesyvumą, tačiau veiksmažodžių galimybės reikšti modalumą kitokios. Dėl argumentų realizacijos, veiksmažodis *tekti* esti „palankesnis“ nuo situacijos dalyvio nepriklausančiai būtinybei reikšti: kaip ir dauguma kitų modalinių būtinybės predikatų, *tekti* modalumą reiškia beasmenėje konstrukcijoje. Modalinių reikšmių lygmenyje abu aptariami veiksmažodžiai perteikia tokio paties pobūdžio modalines reikšmes, vadinasi, pamažu modalumo kategorijoje įsitvirtino viena, labiau tinkanti modalumo sistemai leksema – beasmenis veiksmažodis *tekti*. Veiksmažodis *gauti* esti modalumo kategorijos periferijoje.

Kaip modaliniai veiksmažodžiai, beasmeniai *reik(ė)ti* ir *tekti* dažniausiai perteikia nuo situacijos dalyvio nepriklausančią būtinybę, kiek rečiau jos potipį – deontinę būtinybę. Dažniausiai beasmenės konstrukcijos su analizuojamais veiksmažodžiais esti be išreikšto datyvo subjekto sakinyje, todėl modalinė būtinybė, perteikiama veiksmažodžiais *reik(ė)ti* ir *tekti*, rodosi esanti netiesioginė, bendra, neturinti specifinio adresato, be to, ypač lemiamą pragmatinio konteksto, vartosenos diskurse. Vis dėlto tam tikri kontekstai ir jų tipai sąveikauja su tam tikromis modalinėmis reikšmėmis.

Veiksmažodis *reik(ė)ti* išplėtojęs modalinę semantiką senuosiuose XVI a. lietuvių kalbos tekstuose. Veiksmažodis tipiškas beasmenėse konstrukcijose, realizuojančiose



objektyvią deontinę (nuo situacijos dalyvio nepriklausančią) būtinybę. Nuo situacijos dalyvio priklausanti būtinybė, išplėtotą dabartinėje bendrinėje lietuvių kalboje, tyrinėtuose senuosiuose raštuose neužfiksuota.

Analizuoti veiksmažodžiai *gauti*, *tekti* ir *reik(ė)ti* tenkina dažnumo, polifunkciškumo, sintaksinės priklausomybės parametrus, vis dėlto veiksmažodžiai neišsiskiria griežtu sisteminiu struktūrinių požymių rinkiniu, kuris apibrėžtų modalinį jų statusą.

Semantinė analizuotų modalinių veiksmažodžių raida vyksta abstrakčių reikšmių link: iš nmodalinių reikšmių pereinama į modalinių reikšmių lygmenį. Modalinės reikšmės kinta subjektyvių reikšmių link: modalinėms reikšmėms susidaryti reikšmingą vaidmenį vaidina kalbėtojo perspektyva, pragmatinės inferencijos.

## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF DISSERTATION

1. Jasionytė, Erika. 2009. Lietuvių kalbos *gauti* ir *tekti*: gramatinimo aspektai. *Baltistica* XLIV(2), 263–280.
2. Usoniene, Aurelija & Erika Jasionyte. 2010. Towards grammaticalization: Lithuanian acquisitive verbs *gauti* ('get') and *tekti* ('be gotten'). *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, University of Copenhagen, Vol. 42, no 2. 199–220.
3. Jasionytė, Erika. 2012. Lithuanian Impersonal Modal Verbs REIKĖTI 'need' and TEKTI 'be gotten': A Corpus-based Study. *Multiple Perspectives in Linguistic Research on Baltic Languages*, eds. A. Usonienė, N. Nau, I. Dabašinskienė, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 206–228.

## CONFERENCE AND SEMINAR PRESENTATIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF THE DISSERTATION

1. *On the Grammaticalization of the Lithuanian verb GAUTI (,get')*. 4th International Conference „New Reflections on Grammaticalization“, Leuven, Belgium, 16–19 July, 2008.
2. *Polysemy of acquisitive GET-verbs in Lithuanian and Swedish: lexical and grammatical dimensions*. International conference „The Baltic languages and the Nordic countries“, University of Oslo, Norway, 19–20 June, 2009.
3. *From speech act verb to ingressive aspect marker: the Lithuanian verb ŽADĖTI ('to promise')*. 42<sup>nd</sup> international conference of Societas Linguistica Europea, Lisbon, Portugal, 9–12 September, 2009.
4. *Deontic expressions in Lithuanian: the case of impersonal modals*. Seminar at the Center of Grammar and Typology of the University of Antwerp, 10 April, 2011.
5. *On the Lithuanian impersonal verbs reik(ė)ti 'need' and tekti 'be gotten': the rise of modal meanings*. 45<sup>th</sup> international conference of Societas Linguistica Europea, Stockholm University (Sweden), 29 August – 1 September, 2012.

Erika Jasionytė-Mikučionienė 2006 m. baigė Lietuvių filologijos bakalauro studijas ir 2008 m. Lietuvių kalbotyros magistro studijas Vilniaus universitete. Nuo 2011 m. dirba Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakulteto Lietuvių kalbos katedroje.

2008 m. pradėjo Vilniaus universiteto humanitarinių mokslų doktorantūros studijas. Jų metu dalyvavo tarptautinėse mokslinėse konferencijose ir seminaruose, parengė tris publikacijas. 2008 m. buvo išvykusi trumpalaikiai stažuotei į Kopenhagos universitetą, į Daniją (stažuotės vadovas – dr. Kasper Boye). 2009 m. buvo išvykusi į doktorantų vasaros mokyklą, skirtą gramatikalizacijos problemoms (Kopenhagos universitetas, Danija). 2010 m. balandžio–liepos mėnesiais stažavo Kopenhagos universitete (Danija) (stažuotės vadovas – dr. Kasper Boye). 2010–2011 m. doktorantė pagal Erasmus studentų mainų programą buvo išvykusi studijuoti į Antverpeno universiteto Gramatikos ir tipologijos centrą (Belgija) (stažuotės konsultantas – prof. Johan van der Auwera).

Erika Jasionytė-Mikučionienė graduated from Vilnius University and received a BA degree (2006) and an MA degree (2008) in Lithuanian Philology. Since 2011 she has been working at the Department of the Lithuanian Language.

In 2008 Erika Jasionytė-Mikučionienė started her PhD studies in Vilnius University. During the studies she participated in international conferences and seminars and published three research articles. In 2008 she was on a short research visit in the University of Copenhagen (supervisor – Dr. Kasper Boye). In 2009 she attended *International Summer School in Grammaticalization* in the University of Copenhagen. Receiving a grant from the Education Exchange Fund of Lithuania, in 2010 (April – July) she was on a research stay in the University of Copenhagen (supervisor – Dr. Kasper Boye). In the the academic year of 2010–2011 she was on an Erasmus study visit at the Center of Grammar and Typology of the University of Antwerp in Belgium (supervisor – Prof. Dr. Johan van der Auwera).