

Björn Hansen  
(Regensburg)

## A MORPHO-SYNTACTIC TYPOLOGY OF CONSTRUCTIONS WITH MODALS IN SERBIAN

ABSTRACT. The paper deals with the morpho-syntax of constructions containing modals in Serbian. It is shown that modals differ from fully lexical expressions of modality both in semantics and morpho-syntax. Serbian modals are heterogeneous and form different types of morpho-syntactic constructions. The modal constructions vary in respect to the syntactic encoding of the privileged syntactic argument, the assignation of the agreement marking to the modal and/or the main verb and the marking of tense and mood either on the modal or the main verb.

KEY WORDS: syntax, modals, Serbian

### 1. Introduction

This paper deals with the morpho-syntax of constructions containing modal elements like *moći*, *morati*, *trebati* etc. The aim is to draw a line between grammatical and lexical markers of modality and to describe the syntax of the grammatical markers. It is shown that modality is not only a purely semantic category, but that modals, i.e. grammaticalized expressions of modality, show a specific morpho-syntactic behaviour. After giving a short overview over the state of research on modals in Serbian, we shall describe the category of modals from a cross-linguistic perspective. We demonstrate the essential semantic and syntactic properties of modals in contrast to lexical items with modal meanings. The proposed morpho-syntactic typology of modal constructions is meant to be a contribution to the description of the syntax of analytical predicates in modern Serbian.

### 2. The terms ‘modality’ and ‘modal’

In contrast to the treatment of modality in the new ‘Sintaksa savremenoga srpskog jezika’ (Piper 2005a), we shall understand MODALITY in a narrow sense and include only the meanings ‘necessity’, ‘possibility’ and ‘volition’; i.e. we reduce the extension of the polycentric functional domain of modality to what

Bybee & Perkins & Pagliuca (1994) call ‘agent-oriented’ and ‘epistemic’ modality. Due to the lack of space, we cannot discuss the structure of the semantic domain as a whole<sup>1</sup>. In Serbian, like in any other language, ‘necessity’, ‘possibility’ and ‘volition’ and their semantic subtypes are expressed by different means. Apart from modals, which are in the focus of the present article, Serbian possesses a wide range of explicit lexical means for coding the modal notions of possibility, necessity and volition, such as:

- lexical verbs like *umeti*,
- nouns like *mogućnost*,
- adjectives like *dužan* or *kadar*,
- sentence adverbs: *verovatno*.

Modal meanings can also be expressed by syntactic constructions:

- impersonal reflexive construction: *Pije mi se pivo*.
- independent *da*-construction: *Šta da radim?*

### 3. ‘Modalni glagoli’ in Serbian linguistics

The terms ‘modalni glagol’ and ‘modalnost’ are well established in Serbian linguistics.<sup>2</sup> One part of the studies touching upon modality in Serbian deals with theoretical questions concerning the structure of the semantic domain of ‘modality’ and its realisation in the syntax and the lexis of Serbian (e.g. M. Ivić 1972, Piper 2005a). Modal verbs have also been dealt with in works analysing the competing usage of the infinitive and the *da*-construction (e.g. M. Ivić 1970). Other works treat specific problems of the morpho-syntax or the semantics of selected modals; e.g. several shorter articles in some detail describe the modal *trebati* which occurs in a remarkably wide range of different syntactic constructions some of which are not accepted by the norms of the standard language (e.g. Tanasić 1995, Kordić 1997). Đukanović (1994) offers an exhaustive analysis of the morpho-syntax of the two modals *trebati* and *valjati*. Another part of research work on modality has been carried out in the context of contrastive studies comparing Serbian with Germanic languages, e.g. with German (Engel & Mrazović 1986 and Djordjević 1983).<sup>3</sup> These works are based on a unilateral contrastive analysis which takes the German modal system as point of departure and look for translational equivalents in the target language. Their descriptive value notwithstanding, these works do not capture the morpho-syntactic structure of Serbian modal constructions be-

<sup>1</sup> For exhaustive treatments of the internal structure of the polycentric semantic domain of modality see Bybee et al (1994), Frawley (2006), Bondarko (1990), Piper (2005a) and Palmer (2001).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the list of references in Piper (2005a).

<sup>3</sup> A similar study for Croatian-English is Kalogjera (1982).

cause they map the Germanic category onto a Slavonic language. However, as recent typological research shows (Hansen & de Haan in prep), Germanic modals are unique among the languages of Europe because they show homogenous dedicated morpho-syntactic marking. As a matter of fact, modals universally do not tend to form clear cut categories with a specific morphological paradigm. The available studies on Serbian modals are characterised by a focus on semantic features of modal elements and many authors point out the partial synonymy between elements like e.g. *moći* on the one, and *biti u stanju* or *kadar* on the other. The authors use the term ‘modalni glagol’ and give an open list of the most important (‘najvažniji’ Stanojčić & Popović 1995, 247) or the most frequent ones (‘najčešći’, Piper 2005a, 638). Stanojčić & Popović (ibid) claim that modal and phasal verbs are ‘glagoli nepotpunog značenja’ which form complex predicates (‘složeni predikati’) and distinguish them from predicates plus verbal complement which are treated as either ‘predicate plus object’ (224 f.) or as complex sentences containing ‘izrične rečenice’ (295ff). A similar position is taken in the ‘Sintaksa savremenoga srpskog jezika’ (Ružić 2005, 549, Piper 2005b, 312) which treats predicates with modals as ‘analitički predikati’. Piper (ibid) claims that all predicative elements with modal meaning form the same type of analytical predicates. These observations on the grammatical character of ‘modals’<sup>4</sup> will be the point of departure for our proposal for the treatment of modals. However, we will try to define the term ‘modal’ or ‘modalni glagol’ in a more precise way.

#### 4. Modals as a cross-linguistic category

In this paragraph, we shall develop an understanding of modals as a cross-linguistic category and apply it to Serbian.<sup>5</sup> Modals are a specific type of AUXILIARIES; these can be characterised as elements with word character which are used in the predicate position and which despite their morphological form fulfil grammatical functions. They do not form a closed set and can only be determined by being located on a grammaticalization chain extending from content words to fully fledged auxiliaries. Heine (1993, 70) defines auxiliaries as “linguistic items covering some range of uses along the Verb-to-T(ense)A(spect)M(odality) chain”. An auxiliary “is no longer a fully lexical item, but not yet a grammatical inflection either, and it is likely to exhibit properties that are characteristic of the intermediate stages” between fully lexical items and inflectional forms (Heine 1993, 86). We understand modals as means of expression of modality, which have undergone a grammaticalization process; they express the basic no-

<sup>4</sup> A similar stance is taken in Czech linguistics; cf. Benešová (1971).

<sup>5</sup> For a more detailed account of this approach see Hansen (2001, 2004, 2006) and Drobnjaković (in prep.).

tions of ‘necessity’, ‘possibility’ and ‘volition’ and show syntactic properties of auxiliaries. Modal is a gradient category; there are prototypical and peripheral instances. We can define modals in the following way:

A MODAL is a polyfunctional expression of modality. It always occurs with main verbs in the predicate position and opens one and only one argument position, which is filled by a lexical verbal stem. A modal does not select its own nominal arguments but influences the encoding of the arguments of the verbal form.

Modals are to be located at the ‘grammatical periphery’ and tend to form a kind of fully analytical paradigm of the verb. Typical modals are polyfunctional in the sense that they express no less than two types of modality. One usually distinguishes dynamic, deontic and epistemic modality. Modals are polyfunctional, while so called modal content words, i.e. words with modal meaning which are not subject to an auxiliarisation process, have only one modal meaning. Let us compare the fully-fledged modal auxiliary *moći* ‘can’ with the modal content word *umeti* ‘to be capable’. The former can express ‘capability’ (dynamic) (ex. 1), ‘objective possibility’ (dynamic) (ex. 2), ‘permission’ (deontic) (ex. 3) and ‘medium degree of probability’ (epistemic) (ex. 4), while the latter is confined to ‘capability’ (ex. 1):<sup>6</sup>

(1) *Ujak je umeo/mogao da izjavi ljubav na četiri jezika, ovo je naučio iz priručnika Ljubav u celom svetu, sa sličicama (B. Ćosić). (capability)*

(2) *S pasošem sam bar mogao slobodno da se krećem (Ilustrovana Politika). (objective possibility)*

(3) *Niko ne može glasati bez podnošenja dokaza o svom identitetu (Vreme). (permission)*

(4) *Žena je mogla imati 20 godina. (epistemic)*

Another example which illustrates the difference between modals and the open class of modal lexemes is *morati* ‘must’ compared to *biti dužan* ‘to be obliged’. Either can express deontic necessity, i.e. an obligation:

(5a) *Izborna komisija mora da donese rešenje na prigovor u roku od 48 časova (Vreme).*

(5b) *Izborna komisija je dužna da donese rešenje na prigovor u roku od 48 časova.*

*Morati* is also used in contexts of dynamic modality to refer to a situation of objective necessity. Apart from that, it is found in epistemic functions. In these contexts, *morati* can not be replaced by *biti dužan*; cf.:

<sup>6</sup> In our collection of data, we tried to take into consideration different registers of Serbian: belles-lettres (B. Ćosić, I. Andrić), newspapers (Ilustrovana politika, Vreme), colloquial language (Hinrichs/Hinrichs 1994), scholarly style and Serbian Internet sources searched by Google. Apart from that, we used examples from other studies.

(6) [*Kada se stanje u zemlji sredilo, vratio sam se sa nešto zarađenih para, koje su se brzo potrošile.*] *Morao sam ponovo da potražim neki posao, ali posla u Valjevu nije bilo (Ilustrovana Politika).*

(7) [*Odmah je izvadila malu žutu knjižicu od Vladimira Lenjina i upitala: 'Tko je od vas čito Korak naprijed, dva koraka nazad?' Ujak je zaključio: 'To mora da je udžbenik za tango!'*] (B. Ćosić).

Semantic polyfunctionality is not restricted to the three types of modality. Some modals have developed functions beyond modality, i.e. post-modal grammatical meanings. This term coined by van der Auwera & Plungian (1998) denotes meanings, which according to the universal semantic map develop out of modal meanings. This has happened with *hteti* which has adopted future meaning and with *imati* which can be used as a future in the past.

Most modals do not exhibit any fully lexical meanings beyond the modal ones. For example *moći*, like its English counterpart *can*, has exclusively modal meanings. In contrast to this, the modal *valjati*, in addition to its modal meanings expresses the 'to be of value' as in the following headline of 'Glas javnosti':

(8) *Nikako ne valja politika SAD.*

The fact that some modals retain original lexical meanings explains their hybrid character which has caused considerable confusion among scholars. On the surface modals look like content words but syntactically they share properties with grammatical markers. As the modal takes over the argument structure of the main verb, it does not influence the selection of the first argument. The following features show that fully-fledged modals syntactically behave like auxiliaries:

a) modals combine with humane or inanimate subjects:

(9) *Tata je zaključio: -Moraću da razmislim o tome!* (B. Ćosić)

(10) *Zaveštanje mora da sadrži datum sastavljanja.* (Wikipedia)

b) modals combine with avalent verbs (e.g. meteorological verbs)

(11) *Sutra može da grmi.*

c) modal constructions allow passive transformations without change in referential meaning:

(12a) *Žiri mora da nagradi najbolju glumicu.*

(12b) *Najbolja glumica mora da bude nagrađena od strane žirija.*

d) modals do not assign thematic roles to the subject:

(13) *Potrošač mora da zna šta kupuje (www.consumer.org.yu).* (thematic role: cognizer)

(6) *Morao sam ponovo da potražim neki posao.* (thematic role: agent)

It is important to note that these syntactic features are typical of auxiliaries and allows to distinguish modal auxiliaries<sup>7</sup> from lexical verbs, adjectives etc.

<sup>7</sup> The same holds for tense and aspect auxiliaries.

with modal meaning. Thus, for example, the lexical verb *umeti* combines exclusively with animated subjects (-feature a), does not combine with avalent verbs (-feature b), does not allow for passive transformation (-feature c) and assigns the thematic role ‘agent’ to the subject. Thus, we would say that *umeti* forms a predicate with a verbal object and not an analytical predicate. There is ample evidence to claim that modal constructions differ in their syntax from other constructions with containing *da*-clauses or infinitives. As Drobnjaković (in prep.) shows, *da*-constructions have been divided into several subtypes. *Da*<sub>1</sub>-clauses can take any tense occurring within a main clause; they function as reported statements. *Da*<sub>2</sub>-clauses, on the other hand, can contain the present tense; they appear after verbs of volition or function as a reported imperative, and are referred to as the infinitive substitute. However, after having applied Noonan’s (1985) classification of complement-taking predicates on Serbian, and analysed the morphosyntactic features of *da*-clauses complementing them, Drobnjaković comes to the following conclusions. *Da*<sub>1</sub> type complements occur with verbs denoting utterance (*kazati* ‘say’, *reći* ‘tell’, etc.), propositional attitude (*misliti* ‘think’, *verovati* ‘believe’, etc.), knowledge (*znati* ‘know’, *razumeti* ‘understand’, *shvatiti* ‘realize’, etc.) and ‘perception’ (*videti* ‘see’, *čuti* ‘hear’, etc.). *Da*<sub>2</sub> type complements are found with desideratives (*želeti* ‘want’, *hteti* ‘want’, etc.) and manipulatives (*narediti* ‘order’, *naterati* ‘make’, *ubediti* ‘persuade’, etc.), whereas a distinct type of *da*-clauses, that we will refer to as *da*<sub>3</sub> type, complements modal, as well as tense and aspectual auxiliaries, i.e. TAM verbs. Apart from the characteristics shown above, *da*<sub>3</sub>-clauses display two additional restrictions: the pro-drop, as well as co-reference between the subjects, are obligatory. These two restrictions which do not hold for the volitional verb *hteti* are illustrated in (14) and (15), respectively.

(14a) *Hoću da ja idem sa tobom (a ne Ivan).*

(14b) \**Moram da ja idem sa tobom (a ne Ivan).*

(15a) *Hoću da ideš sa njima.*

(15b) \**Moram da ideš sa njima*

Drobnjaković concludes, that a *da*<sub>3</sub>-clause is not a finite clause in the proper sense of the word. Compared to *da*<sub>1</sub> and *da*<sub>2</sub> it displays reduced syntactic properties, very close to those of the infinitive, and it deserves, therefore, the ‘infinitive substitute’ tag even more than its *da*<sub>2</sub> counterpart.

If we apply our definition of modals to Serbian, we see that only the four verbs *moći*, *morati*, *trebati* and *valjati* fulfil the semantic and syntactic criteria of a fully-fledged modal (see table 1). *Hteti* can only be considered a semi-auxiliary, on the one hand it is polyfunctional (volition, future tense and epistemic), but on the other hand, volitional *hteti* behaves syntactically like lexical verbs. *Smeti* and *imati* are semi-modals, because they lack modal polyfunctionality;

i.e. both are restricted to deontic modality, ‘permission’ and ‘strong obligation’ respectively. They do, however, show syntactic properties of auxiliaries (combine with inanimate subjects, allow for passive transformations etc.)

(16) *Naprotiv, ova reč ima biti shvaćena u smislu mešavine više boja koje ipak daju samo jednu novu* (<http://borislavpekic.blogspot.com>)

(17) *Biračko mesto nijednog trenutka ne sme biti ostavljeno bez nadzora* (*Vreme*).

In contrast to the Germanic modals forming a homogenous class, Serbian modals become part of different syntactic constructions which will be described in the following chapter.

Table 1: Modals in Serbian

Fully-fledged modals	dynamic	deontic	epistemic	auxiliary
<i>moći</i>	x	x	x	x
<i>morati</i>	x	x	x	x
<i>trebati</i>	x	x	x	x
<i>valjati</i>	x	x		x
Semi auxiliaries				
<i>hteti</i>		x	x	
<i>imati</i>		x		x
<i>smeti</i>		x		x

## 5. A morpho-syntactic typology of modal constructions

In this paragraph we shall develop a typology of modal constructions which is based on the analysis of the modal systems of a whole range of the languages of Europe (s. Hansen & de Haan in prep.) and apply it to Serbian. The typology reflects the morpho-syntactic coding of the arguments of the verb modified by a modal. Modal constructions vary in respect to A) the syntactic encoding of the privileged syntactic argument (=subject), and B) the assignation of the agreement marking to the modal and/or the main verb. For Serbian less relevant is C) the marking of tense and aspect on the modal or the main verb.

A) We distinguish three types of coding of the privileged syntactic argument: it can be coded either in the Nominative, the Dative or it can be omitted. Compare:

(18) *Ivan<sub>Nom</sub> mora raditi.*

(19) *Valja nam<sub>Dat</sub> raditi na njivi.* (example from Đukanović 1994)

(20) *Valja Ø razmotriti ne samo razdoblje između dva svetska rata nego i ono koje mu je prethodilo (Brborić/ Radovanović)*

B) The agreement with the subject can be marked in three ways:

1. only on the modal

(21) *Ivan i Slobodan moraju<sub>Agf</sub> raditi.*

2. only on the main verb:

(22) *Ivan i Slobodan treba da rade<sub>Agf</sub>.*

3. or on the modal AND the main verb:

(23) *Ivan i Slobodan moraju<sub>Agf</sub> da rade<sub>Agf</sub>.*

Last not least, there are modal constructions, lacking subject agreement, as illustrated in (24):

(24a) *Treba mi spremi sve što je potrebno za put.* (example from Đukanović 1994).

(24b) *Treba raditi.*

C) Tense and mood is marked on the modal or on the main verb:

(6) *Morao sam<sub>TM</sub> ponovo da potražim neki posao.*

(25) *Vi mora da ste propatili<sub>TM</sub>.*

Not all logically possible combinations of the features are attested in Serbian. We find five types of modal constructions listed in table 2:

Table 2: Typology of modal constructions in Serbian

Construction type	A Encoding of the subject		B Agreement with the subject		C Tense and mood inflection	
	Nominative	Dative	modal	verb	modal	verb
Type 1	+	–	+	–	+	–
Type 2	+	–	+	+	+	–
Type 3	–	+	–	–	+	–
Type 4	–	+	–	+	+	–
Type 5a	+	–	–	+	+	–
Type 5b	+	–	–	+	–	+

CONSTRUCTION TYPE 1 (Nominative subject; modal = +agreement; main verb = –agreement; modal = +TM; main verb = –TM): The modal occurs in a construction with a subject in the Nominative case (pronouns can be omitted). The modal shows subject agreement with respect to person and number and



sometimes to gender and combines with a verb in the infinitive whereas the main verb is not marked for agreement.

(21) *Ivan*<sub>Nom</sub> *i Slobodan*<sub>Nom</sub> *moraju*<sub>Agr</sub> *raditi*.

Construction type 1 is realised with the fully-fledged modals *moći*, *morati* and the semi-modals *smeti* and *imati*. *trebati* is allowed in the standard language only in the past tense or conditional; cf. Piper 2005, 645: *Trebala je dosad stići*. Less acceptable are examples like *trebam ići*.

CONSTRUCTION TYPE 2 (Nominative subject; modal = +agreement; main verb = +agreement; modal = +TM; main verb = -TM): As shown above, we have the possibility to replace the infinitive with the *da*<sub>3</sub>-construction; i.e. the morpheme *da* plus the present tense form of the verb. Here, the agreement with the nominative subject is marked both on the modal and the main verb.

(23a) *Ivan*<sub>Nom</sub> *i Slobodan*<sub>Nom</sub> *moraju*<sub>Agr</sub> *da rade*<sub>Agr</sub>.

The verbal form with *da* carries the agreement features, but not tense or mood; these have to be assigned to the modal (cf. the term ‘nemobilnost prezenta’ M. Ivić 1970).

(23b) *Ivan i Slobodan su morali*<sub>Agr/TM</sub> *da rade*<sub>Agr</sub>

(23c) *Ivan i Slobodan bi morali*<sub>Agr/TM</sub> *da rade*<sub>Agr</sub>

Type 2 is used with the modals *moći*, *morati* and the semi-modals *smeti* and *imati*. The use of *trebati* is restricted in the same way as in the case of type 1: *Trebala je dosad da stigne* is accepted by the norm, whereas *trebam da idem* is not (Piper *ibid*).

CONSTRUCTION TYPE 3 (‘Facultative Dative subject’; modal: -agreement; main verb: -agreement; modal = +TM; main verb = -TM): In construction type 3, there is no Nominative subject and the first argument of the infinitival verb can be instantiated in the Dative case or can be omitted. As there is no subject agreement, the modal has the default ending third person singular neuter. This construction is formed by *trebati* and *valjati*.

(24a) *Treba mi spremiti sve što je potrebno za put.*

(24b) *Treba raditi.*

CONSTRUCTION TYPE 4 (‘Facultative dative subject’; modal = -agreement; main verb = +agreement; modal = +TM; main verb = -TM): A syntactically interesting case is the construction of an impersonal modal with a dative subject plus *da*-construction. What is puzzling is the fact that the dative subject seems to trigger agreement with the verb in the *da*-clause. This construction is much closer to a bi-clausal structure than the preceding ones.

(26) *Cvijanu*<sub>Dat</sub> *je trebalo*<sub>TM</sub> *da ponovo radi*<sub>Agr</sub> *i da se psihički odmori*<sub>Agr</sub> *u promenjenoj sredini (Ilustrovana Politika).*

(27) *Valja<sub>TM</sub> mi<sub>Dat</sub> da priznam<sub>Agr</sub> da nisam mogao bolje.* (Example from Đukanović 1994).

This type is realised with the modals *trebati* and *valjati*.

CONSTRUCTION TYPE 5 (Nominative subject; modal = –agreement, main verb = +agreement): This construction type is characterised by subject agreement being marked exclusively on the main verb. According to the predicative features of tense and mood, we distinguish two subtypes. In Serbian we find a modal construction 5a where agreement is marked on the main verb and tense and mood on the modal (*trebati*):

(28) [*Mnoge reči imaju više od jednog značenja*] *mi<sub>Nom</sub> treba<sub>TM</sub> da izaberemo<sub>Agr</sub> ono značenje koje ima najviše smisla u datom kontekstu.* (*Wikipedia*)

(29) *To bi<sub>TM</sub> ja<sub>Nom</sub> trebalo<sub>TM</sub> vas da pitam<sub>Agr</sub>.*

Type 5b is represented by epistemic *morati* and *trebati*<sup>8</sup> which do not inflect at all and co-occur with a mobile verbal form; cf. with a verb in the present tense:

(7) [*Odmah je izvadila malu žutu knjižicu od Vladimira Lenjina i upitala: -Tko je od vas čito Korak naprijed, dva koraka nazad' Ujak je zaključio:] -To mora da je udžbenik za tango* (*B. Ćosić*).

or in the past tense:

(25) *Vi<sub>Nom</sub> mora da ste propatili<sub>TM/Agr</sub>*

(30) *Oni<sub>Nom</sub> treba da su takođe proizašli<sub>TM/Agr</sub> iz Hrama a otac Subiz, učeni majstor drvodeljstva, treba da je njihov osnivač.* (Example from Đukanović 1994).

Construction type 5b quite well illustrates the fuzziness of the category of modals, because it shows that a modal can partially overlap with or develop into an uninflected sentence adverb.<sup>9</sup> Type 5b is the base for the emergence of the adverbs *možda* and *valjda*. We are dealing with a cross-linguistically well attested path of language change (compare English *maybe*, Danish *kanske*, French *peut-être*, Russian *может быть* etc; cf. Ramat & Ricca 1998).

## 6. Conclusion

This article tries to give a consistent description of the category of modals in the Serbian standard language and is meant to shed some light on the distinction between grammatical and lexical means of expression of modal

<sup>8</sup> In Internet sources I also came across usages of *valjati*; e.g.: *Pokušavamo da ih izmirimo, ako se to može, da ukažemo gde greše i navedemo ih da misle da ako se brak i rastavi, oni valja da razgovaraju, zarađ mališana za koje, oni uvek jesu njegovi tata i mama* ([www.dnevnik.co.yu](http://www.dnevnik.co.yu)). The question of the grammaticality and normativity of these examples has to be left for future research.

<sup>9</sup> Compare also Slovene *lahko* (Roeder / Hansen 2006).

notions. We understand modals as more or less grammaticalized expressions of necessity, possibility and volition which form categories with fuzzy boundaries. Modals represent a special type of auxiliaries and are found not only in Germanic, but also in Slavonic, Romance and in many other languages. We have tried to show that modals differ from fully lexical expressions of modality both in semantics and morpho-syntax. Modals are polyfunctional and show the syntactic behaviour of auxiliaries. In contrast to Germanic, Serbian modals are heterogeneous and form different types of morpho-syntactic constructions. Serbian modal constructions vary in respect to the syntactic encoding of the privileged syntactic argument, the assignation of the agreement marking to the modal and/or the main verb and the marking of tense and mood either on the modal or the main verb. The next step should be the investigation of a) the correlation between the morpho-syntactic types and the modal meanings expressed and b) the lexical, grammatical and stylistic restrictions of the use of the constructions.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Batistić T. (1983). O nekim pitanjima u vezi sa analizom glagola 'morati' i 'moći'. *Južnoslovenski Filolog*, 39: 99-111
- Benešová E. (1971). Syntax slovesné modality. Klasifikace sémantických jednotek slovesné modality. In: Panevová I., Benešová E. & Sgall P. (eds.). *Čas a modalita v češtině*. Praha. 97-143.
- Besters-Dilger J. & Drobňaković A. & Hansen B. (in prep.). Modals in the Slavonic languages. In: Hansen B. & de Haan F. (eds.): *Modals in the Languages of Europe*. (Eurotyp). Berlin.
- Бондарко А. В. (ред.) (1990). *Теория функциональной грамматики. Темпоральность. Модальность*. Ленинград.
- Bybee J. & Perkins R. & Pagliuca W. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago.
- Drobňaković A. in prep. *The grammaticalization of TAM-verbs in Serbian*. PhD Dissertation. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.
- Djordjević M. (1983). *Verbalphrase und Verbvalenz. Untersuchungen zur deutsch-serbokroatischen kontrastiven Grammatik*. Heidelberg.
- Букановић В. (1992). Глаголи *требати* и *ваљати* и њихова инфинитивно-презентска допуна. *Научни Састанак Слависта у Вукове дане*. 22/2: 119-126.
- Engel U. & Mrazović P. et alii (1986). *Kontrastive Grammatik deutsch-serbokroatisch 1/2*. München – Novi Sad.
- Frawley W. (ed.) (2006). *The Expression of Modality*. Berlin.
- Hansen B. (1998). Modalauxiliare in den slavischen Sprachen. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*. 43/3: 249-272.
- Hansen B. (2001). *Das Modalauxiliar im Slavischen. Grammatikalisierung und Semantik im Russischen, Polnischen, Serbischen/Kroatischen und Altkirchenslavischen*. (Slavo-linguistica 2). München.

- Hansen B. (2004). The boundaries of grammaticalization. The case of modals in Russian, Polish and Serbian/Croatian. In: Bisang W. & Himmelmann N.P. & Wiemer B. (eds.) *What makes grammaticalization? A look from its fringes and its components*. (Current trends in linguistics Studies and Monographs 158). Berlin. 245-271.
- Hansen B. (2006) На полпути от словаря к грамматике: модальные вспомогательные слова в славянских языках. В: *Вопросы языкознания*. 2006/2: 68-84.
- Hansen B. & de Haan F. (in prep.) (eds.). *Modals in the Languages of Europe*. (Eurotyp). Berlin.
- Hansen B. & Karlik P. (eds.) (2005). *Modality in Slavonic Languages. New perspectives*. (Slavo-linguistica 6). München.
- Heine B. (1993). *Auxiliaries. Cognitive forces and grammaticalization*. New York.
- Hinrichs U. & Hinrichs L. (1995). *Serbische Umgangssprache*. Wiesbaden.
- Ivić, M. (1970). О употреби глаголских времена у зависној реченици: презент у реченици с везником *да*. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku*. 13/1: 43-55.
- Ivić M. (1972). Problematika srpskohrvatskog infinitiva. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku*. 15/2: 117-138.
- Ivić M. (1973). Problematika modalnih rečenica. In: *Otázky slovanské syntaxe III*. Brno. 85-91.
- Ivić M. (1999). Iz problematike modalnih rečenicih značenja. Ivić M. *Red reči: lingvistički ogledi 4*. Beograd. 68-75.
- Kalogjera D. (1982). *The English Modals and their equivalents in Serbo-Croatian*. Zagreb.
- Kordić S. (1997). Употреба глагола *треба*. *Научни Састанак Слависта у Вукове дане*. 26/2: 71-81.
- Mrazović P. & Vukadinović Z. (1990). *Gramatika srpskohrvatskog jezika za strance*. Novi Sad.
- Noonan M. 1985 Complementation. In: T. Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description, Volume 2: Complex constructions*. Cambridge. 42-140.
- Palmer F. R. (2001). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge.
- Пипер П. (2005а). Модалност. In: Ивић М. (ред.) *Синтакса савременог српског језика*. Београд. 636-649.
- Пипер П. (2005б). Предикат. In: Ивић М. (ред.) *Синтакса савременог српског језика*. Београд. 301-345
- Plank F. (1981). Modalitätsausdruck zwischen Autonomie und Auxiliarität. In: Rosengren I. (ed.). *Sprache und Pragmatik*. Lund. 57-71.
- Ramat P. & Ricca D. (1998). Sentence adverbs in the languages of Europe. In: van der Auwera J. (ed.). *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin. 187-277.
- Roeder C. & Hansen B. (2006). Modals in contemporary Slovene. In: *Wiener slawistisches Jahrbuch*. 52: 153-170.
- Ружић В. (2005). Проста реченица као синтаксичка целина. In: Ивић М. (ред.) *Синтакса савременог српског језика*. Београд. 477-568.
- Станојчић Ж. & Поповић, Љ. (1995).<sup>4</sup> *Грамматика српског језика. Уџбеник за I, II, III и IV разред средње школе*. Београд.
- Стевановић М. (1953). Напоредна употреба инфинитива и презента са везицом *да*. *Науи језик*. V/3-4: 85-102.
- Танасић С. (1995/96). О употреби глагола *треба*. *Науи језик*. 1-5: 44-52.
- van der Auwera, J. & Plungian V. A. (1998). Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 1/2: 79-124.

Бјорн Хансен

МОРФОСИНТАКСИЧКА ТИПОЛОГИЈА КОНСТРУКЦИЈА  
СА МОДАЛНИМ ГЛАГОЛИМА У СРПСКОМ ЈЕЗИКУ

Резиме

Рад се бави морфосинтаксом конструкција с модалним глаголима у српском језику. Показује се да се модални глаголи разликују од лексичких израза модалности и у семантичком и у морфосинтаксичком погледу. Модални глаголи у српском су хетерогени и образују различите типове морфосинтаксичких конструкција. Модалне конструкције варирају у погледу синтаксичког енкодирања привилегованог синтаксичког аргумента, приписивања маркера конгруенције модалном глаголу и/или главном глаголу и означавања времена и начина било модалног или главног глагола