DANUTA ROSZKO

Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland
danuta.roszko@ispan.waw.pl

SEMANTIC CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS THEORY AND DIALECTOLOGICAL STUDIES

Abstract

Theoretical contrastive studies (hereinafter referred to as TCS) emerged with a view to compare and contrast natural languages on the basis of a logical interlanguage (Koseska, Penčev (Eds.) 1988–2009). The idea of making the TCS guidelines available to science resulted in discontinuing the division into the original language and the target language when comparing and contrasting two (or more languages), and at the same time, terminating the dependence of the resulting material (i.e. form indexes in the target language) on the formal structures in the original language. The TCS essence is included in the interlanguage, which is used as *tertium comparationis* in the studies. To get more on this topic see Koseska, Korytkowska, R. Roszko (2007). Till now, TCS have not been applied in dialectal studies. There are a lot of reasons for this conjuncture. First of all, dialectal studies usually concentrate on one code (i.e. only a single local dialect is being specified), whilst in TCS, a comparison and contrast between (at least two) languages is provided. Moreover, research on the dialectal differentiation of a specific language (i.e. at least two dialects (/ local dialects) are being specified together) is based on demonstrating the features shared and differentiated on the level of (a) lexis, (b) morphology (most often narrowed to demonstrate differential morphological features) and (c) syntactic (relatively most rarely). Thus, dialectal studies are essentially a description of the formal conjuncture, whereas semantic aspects are out of the area of researchers interest. With this article, I am going to break the current patterns and prove that dialectal studies can be conducted in accordance with the TCS guidelines. The advantage of such dialectal studies is not only a different/new look at a specific local dialect, but also a possibility of an instant comparison and contrast between the local dialect and the standardized language or other local dialects (of one language or another) on the semantic level providing the highest standard of the relevances demonstrated (i.e. similarities and differences).

Keywords: contrastive studies, hypothetical modality, Polish (PL), Lithuanian (LT), local dialect of Puńsk in Poland, corpus of local dialect of Puńsk, parallel corpus of PL and LT.

1. Introduction

1.1. Theoretical contrastive studies

Theoretical contrastive studies brought a new value into the linguistic contrast. Firstly, they limited the amount of research to proceed from the formal grounds of the original language to the semantic grounds of the target language. Secondly, they made the languages compared with each other become equal in the studies and, in consequence — fully comparable. It means that none of the languages contrasted is neither an original language nor a target language in the studies, and the results of the studies are not dependant on the formal structure of any of the languages.

In TCS, the leading task is to define the semantic base for the linguistic contrast. In the TCS terminology, the base is an interlanguage, referred to as an artificial language, which is characterized by simplicity and cohesion. The multi-volume Bulgarian-Polish grammar is an example of the use of TCS (Koseska, Penčev (Eds.) 1988–2009), also its synthesis (Koseska, Korytkowska, R. Roszko 2007) and the studies on the Polish-Lithuanian linguistic contrast (Roszko, R. 1993, Roszko R. 2004, Roszko, D. 2006), and others. More on the TCS topic see Koseska, Korytkowska, R. Roszko (2007, 2009).

1.2. Theoretical contrastive studies and dialectal studies

A question arises whether TCS rule out an analysis of only one natural language. As it is known, TCS were created with a view to a simultaneous contrast between two or more natural languages. However, in my opinion, the description of only one natural language with use of the TCS guidelines is possible, since the condition for the contrast still remains fulfilled: an interlanguage and a natural language are being contrasted then.

Next, there should be careful consideration whether TCS allow an analysis of dialects and local dialects. Also, it should be mentioned that the purpose of contrast between standardized languages, such as Bulgarian, Polish, Serbian and Croatian (Project 1981), was accompanied by the TCS guidelines coming into existence. In order to answer the question raised, the conclusion should be drawn whether the difference between a dialect and a local dialect, on the one hand, and a standardized language, on the other hand, results from the non-congruence of the basic structures of a dialect, a local dialect and a standardized language, or it lies outside the semantic structures of these codes. Well, the semantic structures of a dialect, a local dialect and a standardized language are of an identical character, and the differentiation between dialects, local dialects and standardized languages proceeds on a non-linguistic level. It is right to mention here such factors as the status of a code and its prestige, the degree of independence of a community using a given code, the application of writing, the presence of literature in a given code, and others.

Therefore, whether a dialect or a local dialect, it should be recognized as much a complete and independent system of the same assumed semantic structures as a standardized language. In consequence, the implementation of TCS in the studies on dialects and local dialects is not in contradiction with the studies guidelines, and the TCS theory applies to the object of the studies, i.e. a dialect or a local dialect.

In other words, it is applicable to the analysis of such codes as a dialect and a local dialect.

The implementation of TCS in dialectal studies will contribute to a better and fuller description of local dialects. Being limited to traditional methods in dialectal studies did not let the researchers go beyond the characteristic scope of the tasks: phonetic description (most often contrastive against a standardized language), morphological description (based on the structure of a standardized language), syntactic description (most often appearing when much diverging from the norms of a standardized language), lexical description (with special taking into consideration foreign words) and word formations (when much diverging from the norms of a standardized language). The use of the TCS methods will then make it possible to go beyond the frames determined by the formal aspect of a local dialect. This will make semantic aspects (i.e. universal semantic categories) be in the circle of interest to the researchers of local dialects. It is also worthwhile to emphasize that using the same interlanguage in many, even independently conducted, studies will make it possible to equally compare the results of the studies. It is possible also to assume that such a comparison of results becomes a test of credibility of the studies independently conducted, and a test of cohesion of the linguistic description of specific natural linguistic codes.

1.3. Plan of the description of the object, and the methodology of the studies

The methodology of the studies being conducted is based on the TCS theory (Kosenska, Korytkowska, R. Roszko 2009).

The TCS guidelines are used here in research on the semantic category of hypothetical modality in the Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk. First, the local dialect of Puńsk and a motivated choice of it as the object of the studies will be presented. Next, the interlanguage of the hypothetical semantic category and a motivated choice of this modal category as a scope of the researchers interests will be defined. The interlanguage values favoured in the definition of hypothetical modality will be appropriately reflected in the dialectal material. At every stage of the studies, the Lithuanian and Polish standardized languages will be optionally contrasted (there, among others, will be references to an article by R. Roszko, raising an analogous occurrence in Polish and Lithuanian; the said article is to be found in this volume). The final aspect of the studies will be a summary of conclusions drawn herein and in the parallel article by R. Roszko. It will be a minitest of credibility of TCS.

2. Lithuanians of Puńsk and the Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk

The Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk is spoken by the Lithuanian national minority, densely inhabiting the north-east ends of Poland — in the area of the Suwałki lake district, in the province of Podlasie.

2.1. Lithuanians of Puńsk

In the Middle Ages, the Suwałki lake district constituted the centre of the area occupied by the first historical inhabitants of this land — the Baltic tribe of Yatvingians. In the XIII century, Yatving, weakened in struggles with Poland and Kiev Russia, was easily conquered by the Teutonic Knights. Under the Lithuanian and Teutonic

treaty of Melnensk (in 1422) the area of Yatving was annexed to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. According to Julianna Racis (Racis 1997), the depopulated areas of Puńsk began to get colonized in the XVI century. The Meretch (LT. Merkinė) and Punia Lithuanians were the first new inhabitants. The villages established by them were of the Lithuanian style, which among others is proved by a document of 1597 signed by the Polish king Zygmunt III Waza.

Puńsk and its environs stayed within the borders of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania until 1795, the year of the third partition of the Commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania. In the years 1795–1807, this land was under Prussian rule, next it was under that of Russia (and then also of the Duchy of Warsaw and the Congress Kingdom of Poland established in 1815 at the Congress of Vienna). In the interwar period this land was annexed to Poland.

The Lithuanians of Puńsk are faithful to their national traditions, they stay in the Catholic faith and regard their language with great reverence. Taking into consideration a small number of the Lithuanian community (officially - nearly 6,000 people, unofficially — 10,000–15,000) and the economic-political conditions, the attitude of the Lithuanian national minority to their language deserves appreciation.

2.2. The Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk

The area occupied by the Lithuanian population is a meeting point of many ethnic and linguistic borders. Just here runs the internal border between the Balts and the Slavs, and also the internal border between the Eastern and Western groups of Slavs. Moreover, a small Lithuanian-language area in Poland is dialectally diversified. The northernmost point of the area is taken by the West-Aukstaitian dialect, also called the Kapsian dialect (LT. kapsų tarmė), whereas in the south the South-Aukstaitian dialect, also known as the Dzukian dialect (LT. dzūkų tarmė) is used. The area taken by the South-Aukstaitian dialect is definitely larger than that taken by the West-Aukstaitian dialect. Two local dialects have been distinguished within the South-Aukstaitian dialect: that of Puńsk (being the subject of the research) and that of Sejny (LT. Seinai).

2.3. Motivation to choose the local dialect of Puńsk

The choice of the local dialect of Puńsk as the object of the studies results from a few factors:

1. an affiliation of the local dialect to a different family than that of the Slavic language,
2. an efficient functioning of the local dialect in the ethnic areas (the Polish-speaking population are immigrants),
3. a high degree of embracing the local dialect,
4. a relatively short period of bilingualism of the Lithuanians of Puńsk (a lot of years after the world war two the Lithuanians of Puńsk still exclusively used a local dialect),

5. a relatively late acquaintance with the standardized Lithuanian language. Until the second half of the 1980s the contact of the Polish Lithuanians with their motherland was rare (the border of Poland and the former USSR closely guarded). A certain spur to learn the standardized form of the Lithuanian language is due to starting a grammar school in Puńsk in 1956, with Lithuanian as a language of instruction.

3. Hypothetical modality

Hypothetical modality is a modal category. According to the TCS guidelines, it is also a sentence and semantic category. It expresses the subjective attitude of a speaker/sender to the contents/opinions being spoken by himself. This fact is reflected with appearance of a possibility functor /it is possible that/ in the semantic structure of a hypothetical sentence.

Moreover, as for the semantic category of hypothetical modality, one's own authorship of opinions being spoken is acceptable, whereas the opinions being regiven by a speaker/ sender go beyond the frames of hypothetical meanings, and so they constitute the content of another modal category called a semantic category of imperceptivity. It is worth mentioning that the semantic character of the category is reflected on different formal levels of languages, i.e. lexical, morphological and syntactic.

The content of the semantic category of hypothetical modality adopted here refers to a definition included in a monograph by Vjara Maldjieva (Maldžieva 2003). Maldjieva favours comparability of hypothetical meanings. A graphical interpretation of comparability of these meanings can be illustrated in the form of a probability parameter axis, on which, between extreme values of false and true, intermediate values of probability are being contrasted. Originally, in my own studies I applied a five-degree scale, with the help of which I clearly marked extreme points of false (value 0) and true (value 1), median point (value 1/2), and intermediate ones between the aforementioned values 0 and 1/2, and between 1/2 and 1 (Roszko, D. 2006), see Scheme 1.

Scheme 1.

- - - 0 (false) ————— 0 ————— 1/2 ————— 0 ————— 1 (true) - - -

The reason for adopting the intermediate value 1/2 was an analysis of the dialectal functioning of perfectum, which used in a hypothetical meaning stands for the probability value $P(x)$ of a sentence being equivalent for the negation $\sim P(x)$ of the sentence. In other words, using the dialectal form of perfectum for expressing hypothetical meanings means that the speaker/ sender is not able to give a definite degree of probability relevant to the contents/opinions spoken by himself. He just passes to the addressee the information that the contents/opinions announced in the sentence are equally as much possible as impossible.

The aforementioned author does not adopt the probability value 1/2 and applies a six-degree scale of probability (Maldžieva 2003). On account of the fact that the author's approach has already been implemented in the Bulgarian-Polish

contrastive studies and the fact that the Lithuanian-Polish contrastive studies presented in this volume proceed on the basis of the six-degree scale of probability (Roszko R, in this volume), for the need of this article I will accept this very scale, and basing on it I will present the corresponding exponents of the Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk. Adopting the five-degree scale would make it impossible to compare my own results with those included in the aforesaid article by R. Roszko (in this volume).

3.1. Motivation to choose the semantic category of hypothetical modality

The choice of the semantic category of hypothetical modality is motivated by the undermentioned facts:

1. a hypothetical occurrence is familiar to every code being under consideration (the local dialect of Puńsk, the Polish language, the Lithuanian language),
2. a high degree of internal division/fragmentation of meanings (see the probability scale),
3. a great diversity of forms to express hypothetical meanings (lexical, morphological, syntactic and mixed),
4. formal disproportions between the system of the Polish language, on the one hand, and the systems of the Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk and the Lithuanian language, on the other hand, in applying the corresponding exponents (morphological exponents of hypothetical modality are not familiar to the Polish language),
5. the morphological exponents of hypothetical modality in the Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk are different from those in the Lithuanian language.

4. Exponents of hypothetical modality in the Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk

The semantic and sentence character of the category of hypothetical modality allows all forms: lexical, morphological and syntactic in the function of an exponent of hypothetical meanings. The Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk comprises all the forms. The Polish language lacks only morphological exponents. As far as the two language codes, a combination of exponents belonging to different levels of a language is possible, e.g. morphological and lexical in the Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk or including the lexical exponents into the compound syntactical structures typical of the local dialect of Puńsk as well as the Polish language. The lexical exponents of hypothetical modality will be described in detail in section 5, whilst here a detailed attention will be paid to other morphological and syntactic exponents.

4.1. Lexical exponents (see section 5)

4.2. Morphological exponents

The morphological exponents of hypothetical modality in the local dialect of Puńsk

take the perfectum form, e.g. *dzirbis* ‘perhaps he worked’. In example 1, there is to be noticed a cooperation of the dialectal exponents: lexical (*kiba*) and morphological (*atjojis*). In example 2 (continuation of example 1), there can be independently observed the use of the morphological forms of the dialectal perfectum (*pamatis*, *insimylėjis*) to express hypothetical meanings.

[1] *Kiba atjojis* tas ponas su sūnum.¹

[2] Tas *pamatis* here mergu ir *insimylėjis*.

The paraphrases of sentences 1 and 2 are as follows:

‘The speaker supposes it is possible that this man together with his son arrived on horseback.’

‘The speaker supposes it is possible that this son saw this girl’, and

‘The speaker supposes it is possible that this son fell in love with her.’

In examples 1 and 2, the dialectal form *kiba* ‘perhaps’ is a lexical exponent of hypothetical modality coming under the fourth group (section 5, item 4). The forms *atjojis*, *pamatis*, and *insimylėjis* are dialectal perfectum forms used without a copula to express hypothetical meanings.

It is worthwhile to give here a due Polish equivalent for dialectal examples 1 and 2:

[1-PL] *Chyba* przyjechał ten pan z synem.

[2-PL] Ten (zaś) zobaczył tę dziewczynę i zakochał się.

The singularity of using an exponent of hypothetical modality, here of the lexeme *chyba*, is remarkable in Polish. Theoretically, the lexical exponent could be repeated in sentence 2-PL, but the custom of the Polish language limits any combinations of this type. In consequence, linguistic understatement takes place. In practice, linguistic understatement (here by lack of an unambiguous

means to expressing hypothetical meanings) is deducted from a context and/or a consituation. However, it is not so much obvious. The addressee of a Polish sentence will usually have difficulty in unambiguous bordering between a text fragments modally marked and those not modally marked. In the local dialect of Puńsk, (also in the Lithuanian language) the morphological exponents allow a simpler bordering between the modally marked and unmarked fragments. Repeating the morphological exponents of hypothetical meanings does not disturb the syntax of a dialectal text.

An analysis of dialectal texts proves that using a morphological exponent of hypothetical modality is characterized by:

- neutral level (of value 1/2) of modal marking if lack of co-operation with other non-morphological exponents of hypothetical modality,

¹The dialectal examples come from the experimental corpus of the Lithuanian dialect of Puńsk.

- applicable level of an initially applied lexical exponent of hypothetical modality (see sentences 1 and 2).

4.3. Syntactic exponents

Syntactic exponents of hypothetical meanings are known in the three codes studied. Sometimes, lexical and morphological elements are incorporated into their structure (which is quite common in a dialect). Below, there are introduced the syntactic exponents of hypothetical modality in the local dialect of Puńsk. Their sequence reflects a growing degree of probability:

nemislinu, kad ... ‘ I don’t think that ... ’
maža nodzieja, kad ... ‘ there is little hope that ... ’
man neatrodo, kad ... ‘ it does not seem to me that ... ’
galimas dalykas, kad ... ‘ it is possible that ... ’
man atrodo, kad ... ‘ it seems to me that ... ’
vierinu, kad ... ‘ I believe that ... ’
jaucu, kad ... ‘ I feel that ... / I have a feeling that ... ’
atrodo, kad ... ‘ it seems that ... ’
usinėša an ... ‘ is looks like ... / is looks as if/though ... ’
Aš² skaitau, kad ... ‘ I think that ... ’ (the determiner *aš* ‘I’ being emphasized)
Aš vierinu, kad ... ‘ I am convinced that ... ’ (the determiner *aš* ‘I’ being emphasized)
Aš cikiu, kad ... ‘ I am sure that ... ’ (the determiner *aš* ‘I’ being emphasized)

An example of using a syntactic construction in a sentence:

[3] Vytuk, *nemislinu*, kad jisai Kauni gyvena. Varšuvoj dzirba.

Witek, I don’t think that he lives in Kovno. He works in Warsaw.

4.4. Other meanings connected with use of the dialectal perfectum form

The dialectal perfectum is not an unambiguous means³ to express hypothetical meanings. It can be applied in other modal functions, i.e. imperceptive and conclusive functions. Moreover, the dialectal perfectum is to express aspectual-temporal contents. The differentiation between the meanings resulting from using the dialectal perfectum is also connected with (a) use or lack of use of a copula, (b) if using a copula — a copula’s form created from either the verb *būc* ‘to be’, or *tūréc* ‘to have’ (see Roszko, D. 2006).

²This is to emphasize the emotional accent in a sentence.

³An unambiguous means is an exponent that irrespective of a context has only one meaning interpretation.

5. Lexical exponents of hypothetical modality in the Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk

The number of lexical exponents in the local dialect of Puńsk is relatively large. However, in comparison with standardized languages, such as Polish and Lithuanian, it is rather modest. Also, the exponents are not that much differential. In many cases they are modifications of lexical phrases constructed on the basis of generally two exponents: *gal'* and *mažum/mažam*, e.g. *o gal'*, *mažum ir*. The modest number of the lexical exponents of hypothetical modality in the Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk can be caused by a high frequency of using the perfectum form in this meaning. In the standardized Lithuanian language, the morphological exponents of hypothetical modality (here the *modus relativus* forms) are relatively more rarely applied. Moreover, the lexis of the standardized Lithuanian language was formed on the basis of lexical resources going beyond one local dialect, which can result in a higher diversity of lexemes and lexical expressions in the standardized Lithuanian language.

The lexical exponents of hypothetical modality presented below (items 5.1.–5.6.) are grouped according to the guidelines of the description adopted by Maldjieva (Maldžieva 2003) and R. Roszko (in this volume).

5.1. Lexical exponents — the first group

Expressing the hypothetical meanings of a low degree of probability is reserved for the following compound lexical phrases: *gal' ir*, *mažum ir*, *mažam ir*. The component element *ir* 'and' used in a modifying-moderating function is a characteristic feature of the expressions. The element being modified can be one of the two most common lexical exponents of hypothetical modality in the local dialect of Puńsk — a lexeme of the fourth group: *gal'* or *mažum/mažam*. Sometimes, the form *ir* 'and' comes before the modified lexeme, e.g. *ir gal'*, *ir mažum*, *ir mažam* — these are rare cases of the initial use of the exponent in a text. Below there are some examples in sentences:

- [4] *Gal' ir* buvo atėjis, nežinau. Dartės jo nėra.

He may have come, I don't know. He is now not in.

/Perhaps he had come, I don't know. He is now not in./

- [5] *Mažum ir* buvo išėjį in laukus, tep kap sakė, namie nieko nebuvo.

They may have been in the field, as they said. There was nobody at home.

/Perhaps they had been in the field, as they said. There was nobody at home./

- [6] *Mažam ir* buvo nuvėjis, nematiau.

He may have gone. I didn't see.

/Perhaps he had gone. I didn't see him./

5.1.1. The dialectal exponents belonging to this group correspond with the Polish *może* and the Lithuanian *gal ir*. The dialectal structure of a compound phrase is

compatible with Polish and Lithuanian structures. The dialectal expression *gal' ir* is fully compatible with the literary form⁴ *mažum ir*, *mažam ir* contain the modified element *mažum/mažam* which might have been borrowed from Polish, see *može* → *maž-um/-am*.

5.2. Lexical exponents — the second group

Expressing the hypothetical meanings of a little higher degree of probability is reserved for the following dialectal compound lexical phrases: *o gal' ir*, *o mažum ir*, *o mažam ir*. In comparison with the first group, the added modifying element *o* is a distinctive feature, see the following examples:

- [7] Sakė, kad gerai jam ainasi, tai ir toliau dzibrs, *o gal' ir* išvažuos, kas žino.

He said (that) he was doing well, so he will still be working, and perhaps he will leave, who knows.

- [8] *O mažum ir* nieko negavo, nieko nesakė.

And perhaps he got nothing, he said nothing.

- [9] *O mažam ir* atvažuos kap atšils, sako gerai laikosi.

And perhaps he will arrive if it gets warm, they say (that) he is doing well.

5.2.1. The dialectal exponents of this group correspond with the Polish phrases *a może* and *może zresztą* and the Lithuanian *o gal ir*. As in item 5.1, also here can be made an analogy between the structure of a compound phrase in the local dialect and that in the Lithuanian language, see *o gal' ir* : *o gal ir*. When a dialectal phrase using the lexeme *mažum/mažam* as a clause being modified, then it is a potential borrowing from the Polish language. Also a certain formal similarity is noticeable between the Polish *može zresztą* and the dialectal *gal' visciok* (literally: perhaps without a difference / perhaps it makes no difference). However, the dialectal phrase comes under the fourth group.

5.3. Lexical exponents — the third group

The next group of the dialectal lexical exponents of hypothetical modality comprises the following compound phrases: *o gal'*, *o mažum*, *o mažam*. As in the aforementioned groups, the element being modified is one of the two most common dialectal exponents — *gal'* or *mažum/mažam*, whereas the form *o* is a modifying element. It is easy to notice that in this and the preceding groups, the element being modified are the same lexemes: *gal'* or *mažum/mažam*, whereas a modifying element is different. In the first group the lexeme *ir* is in the postposition. In the second group the lexeme *ir* is still in the postposition and the lexeme *o* appears in the preposition and increases a probability degree. The lexeme *ir* disappears in this group, only the lexeme *o* appears. The modifications presented here can be substantiated with the following pattern: *gal' ir* → *o gal' ir* → *o gal'*. Below, an example of the application of the exponents of this group:

⁴Phonetic features are not taken into consideration.. However, the other two exponents

[10] Vakar niekur negalėjo rasti knygos. *O mažam* jos visai neturėjo?

Yesterday, she couldn't find the book anywhere. And perhaps, she didn't have it at all?

5.3.1. Also in this group, a comparison and contrast between the local dialect of Puńsk and the languages: Polish and Lithuanian leads to the conclusions analogous to those presented in item 5.2.1. The formal structures of the exponents in the three compared codes are identical, see the dialectal *o gal'*, the Polish *a może* and the Lithuanian *o gal*. Similarly, as stated earlier there is to be found a perfect correspondence of the dialectal *o gal'* with the Lithuanian *o gal*. However, as for the two other dialectal exponents: *o mažum* and *o mažam*, they might have been borrowed from Polish.

5.4. Lexical exponents — the fourth group

This group of the dialectal lexical exponents belongs to most numerous. Basing on the data of the experimental corpus of the Lithuanian local dialect Puńsk, it is easy to conclude that a comparatively high frequency is characteristic of these exponents. This group comprises: *kiba*, *gal'*, *mažum*, *mažam*, *gal' visciuk*, *mažum cikrai*, *gal' kiba*, see:

[11] *Kiba* čia nieko nėra, kad atšaukt nemožna?

Perhaps there is nobody here, if it is impossible to catch anybody's attention?

[12] *Mažum cikrai*, tep kaip sako, atšyla, šandie jau mažasnis šalcis buvo.

Perhaps it is indeed as they say — it is getting warm, today frost was not that much severe.

It is worthwhile to pay attention to the hybrid phrase *gal' kiba*, where takes place a combination of two lexemes of identical expressiveness of hypothetical meanings, but of different origin: *gal'* — a vernacular lexeme and *kiba* — a borrowed lexeme (slavism).

5.4.1. When the local dialect contrasted with the standardized Lithuanian language, some counterparts can be observed: the dialectal *gal'* — the Lithuanian *gal*, the dialectal *gal' visciuk* — the Lithuanian *gal vis tiek*. More formal similarities are to be observed when the local dialect contrasted with the Polish language. First, a possible borrowing from Polish should be mentioned again, see the dialectal *mažum/mažam* — the Polish *może*. Next, the use of the given lexeme *mažum* in the compound structure *mažum cikrai*, which corresponds with the Polish *może rzeczywiście*. In the standardized Lithuanian language a similar structure (*gal tikrai*) functions, however in the dialectal version there can be noticed the use of the form *mažum*, which possibly comes from the Polish *można*. This is another similarity. So, the dialectal lexeme *kiba* is also a possible borrowing from Polish, see the Polish *chyba*.

It should be emphasized that the number and formal diversity of the Polish and Lithuanian exponents of this group is higher than that of the dialectal (see Roszko, R. in this volume).

5.5. Lexical exponents — the fifth group

The fifth group of the dialectal lexical exponents of hypothetical modality is characterized by a significantly high degree of expressing the probability. Here the following exponents can be mentioned: *(nu,) gali būc, atrodo, tep mislinu, pagal' mani*, e.g.

- [13] *Jau parašus, tep mislinu. Vakar sakė, kad rašė.*

She has already written, I think so. Yesterday he said that he was writing.

- [14] *Pagal' mani, raikėjo ansciau atsikelc ir visur būtų speta nuveic.*

In my opinion, you should have got up earlier and we would have managed to reach everywhere.

5.5.1. As described in item 5.4.1, also in this group there can be observed a lower number and diversity of dialectal exponents in comparison with the standardized Lithuanian language and also the Polish language (see Roszko, R. in this volume). There can be emphasized such counterparts of the local dialect and the Lithuanian language as the dialectal *atrodo* — the Lithuanian *atrodo*, the dialectal *gali būc* — the Lithuanian *galbūt* (a contracted form), the dialectal *pagal' mani* — the Lithuanian *pagal mane*, the dialectal *tep mislinu* — the Lithuanian *taip manau*. In the last example, it is possible to observe a possible borrowing from the Polish language, here the flexem *mislinu* ‘I think’, see the Polish *myśle* ‘I think’ / *myśleć* ‘to think’. The dialectal verb *mislyc* ‘to think’ is in common use. In the standardized Lithuanian language, the verb *manyti* ‘to think’ is used in this meaning.

5.6. Lexical exponents — the sixth group

The last group of the dialectal exponents of hypothetical modality comprises the forms: *cikrausia* and *kap MAN*⁵ *atrodo*, see:

- [15] *Cikrausia jau bus numezgus. Jau seniai buvau jei davus siūlus.*

Undoubtedly she has already knitted something. It is already a long time since I gave her wool.

The exponents are characterized by the highest degree of probability.

5.6.1. Also in this group, the number of both Polish and Lithuanian exponents expressing the top degree of probability is definitely higher (see Roszko, R. in this volume). The dialectal equivalents correspond with the literary ones, see the dialectal *cikrausia* — the Lithuanian *tikriausia*, the dialectal *kap MAN atrodo* — the Lithuanian *kaip MAN atrodo*. Special attention should be given to the emphasis of the determiner *man* ‘me’ in the two codes.

⁵This is to emphasize the emotional accent in a sentence.

6. Conclusions

Taking into consideration the method of theoretical contrastive studies allows to favour semantic categories which are not involved in the issues typical of the formal grounds of a language. Each semantic category has its interlanguage which is both a basis for the studies and a benchmark for each stage of the studies. Taking into account the fact that linguistic analysis is based on constant comparison with the interlanguage, regardless the research object being a local dialect, or a literary language, or a couple of different natural codes, the studies can be conducted independently, and the results obtained are cohesive and comparable. The applying of the linguistic corpora significantly improves the accuracy of the results obtained. In the analysis of the dialectal aspects of the semantic category of hypothetical modality, the experimental corpus of the local dialect of Puńsk has been a useful source.

Hypothetical modality — as a semantic category — has lexical, morphological and syntactic exponents. In the Lithuanian local dialect of Puńsk, as well as in the standardized Lithuanian language, all the given linguistic levels are present. In Polish, hypothetical modality exponents do not have their representative only on the morphological level.

The analysis of the dialectal lexical exponents proves the internal division of exponents into subgroups (here 6), being characterized by a different degree of probability — beginning with the lowest and finishing with the highest. In comparison with Polish and Lithuanian, the number of the lexical exponents of hypothetical modality is low. A particularly high contrast is noticeable in two-three of the groups of the highest degree of probability. Some of the dialectal lexical exponents correspond with their Lithuanian counterparts on the formal grounds. Whereas some of them demonstrate possible connections with the Polish language — in a wider context they can be referred to as slavisms. Such forms as *mażum*, *mażam*, *mislinu*, *kiba* are obviously slavisms.

References

- Koseska, Korytkowska, R. Roszko 2007:** V. Koseska, M. Korytkowska, R. Roszko, *Polsko-bułgarska gramatyka konfrontatywna*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Dialog”: 531.
- Koseska, Korytkowska, R. Roszko 2009:** V. Koseska, M. Korytkowska, R. Roszko, Contrastive Studies and Semantic Interlanguage, *Cognitive Studies / Études Cognitives* 9: 33–52.
- LKŽ 2008:** *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, electronic version, first issue (2005), last update (2008): <http://www.lkz.lt>
- Maldžieva 2003:** V. Maldžieva, *Modalność: hipotetyczność, irrealność, optatywność i imperatywność, warunkowość*, *Gramatyka konfrontatywna bułgarsko-polska*, vol. 6, p. 3, SOW. Warszawa.
- Project 1981:** *Projekt gramatyki konfrontatywnej bułgarsko-polskiej i serbsko-chorwacko-polskiej*, Wstęp, [In:] *Studia polsko-południowosłowiańskie*, Wrocław.
- Racis 1997:** J. Racis, *Dzieje osadnictwa w parafii Puńsk od roku 1597 do końca XVIII wieku*. Puńsk: Auśra.
- Roszko, D. 2006:** D. Roszko, *Funkcjonalne odpowiedniki litewskiego perfectum w litewskiej gwarze puńskiej i w języku polskim*, SOW Publishing House, Warszawa.

- Roszko, Roszko 2009:** D. Roszko, R. Roszko, Morphosyntactic Specifications for Polish and Lithuanian. [Description of Morphosyntactic Markers for Polish and Lithuanian Nouns within MULTTEXT-East Morphosyntactic Specifications (Version 3.0 May 10th, 2004)] — *Representing Semantics in Digital Lexicography Innovative Solutions for Lexical Entry Content in Slavic Lexicography, MONDILEX Fourth Open Workshop Warsaw, Poland, 29 June – 1 July, 2009*, SOW Publishing House, Warsaw.
- Roszko, R. 1993:** R. Roszko, *Wykładowiki modalności imperceptywnej w języku polskim i litewskim*, SOW Publishing House, Warszawa: 130.
- Roszko, R. 2004:** R. Roszko, *Semantyczna kategoria określoności/nieokreśloności w języku litewskim (w zestawieniu z językiem polskim)*, SOW Publishing House, Warszawa: 371.
- Roszko, R. in this volume:** R. Roszko, Lexical exponents of hypothetical modality in Polish and Lithuanian.
- Satoła-Staškowiak, J. 2010:** *Polsko-bułgarskie odpowiedniości przekładowe czasów przeszłych*, Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy, Warszawa 2010: 144.