

Indiana Slavic Studies is an occasional publication of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at Indiana University. Copyright is vested in Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA. *Indiana Slavic Studies* 1 appeared in 1956, under the editorship of Michael Ginsburg and Joseph Thomas Shaw; it was subtitled "Slavic and East European Series, Volume 2." The second volume of the journal appeared in 1958; it was subtitled "Slavic and East European Series, Volume 13." The third volume, edited by Walter N. Vickery and William B. Edgerton, was released in 1963; its subtitle changed slightly to "Russian and East European Series" and it was numbered Volume 28. The fourth and final volume before the present revival of the journal took place in 1967. The editor was William B. Edgerton; associate editors were Walter N. Vickery and John F. Beebe. This was Volume 36 in the Russian and East European Series. Distribution for all volumes was done by Indiana University Press.

With its revival *Indiana Slavic Studies* 5 (1990) was issued; it was concurrently Volume 43 of the Indiana University Russian and East European Series, the earlier volumes of which are listed on the back cover. The editor was Henry R. Cooper, Jr.; associate editors were Samuel Fiszman and Felix J. Oinas. The present issue, *Indiana Slavic Studies* 6 (1992) is a joint issue with *Balkanistica* 8 (1992), the journal of the American Association for Southeast European Studies; the issue's joint editors are Henry R. Cooper, Jr. and John D. Treadway. This issue is Volume 44 of the Indiana University Russian and East European Series.

Indiana Slavic Studies is designed as an organ of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures for the expression of a variety of scholarly viewpoints on problems of Slavic and East European studies. Its Editorial Board comprises faculty members of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. From time to time individual issues of the journal will be devoted to the exploration of specific topics in the Russian and East European fields, as determined by the Editorial Board. The views expressed in articles, reviews and letters contained in the journal should in no way be construed as reflecting the views of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures or Indiana University.

Articles are published in *Indiana Slavic Studies* by invitation only. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be considered. Solicited manuscripts should be produced in *both* electronic format (the journal is set using *Bene* but other word-processing programs are acceptable) and three printed copies, double-spaced, with either endnotes or footnotes. Submissions not in electronic format cannot be considered. For format and style contributors should follow *The Slavic and East European Journal*. Cyrillic script must appear in the original or transliterated according to the standard international system, i.e., with diacritics. All contributions to *Indiana Slavic Studies* are evaluated with double anonymity (of both contributor and referee). All correspondence relating to the journal may be sent to The Editor, *Indiana Slavic Studies*, c/o Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Indiana University, BH 502, Bloomington, IN 47405-6616. The electronic mail address is COOPER@INDIANA.EDU and the subject line of all communications should refer to *Indiana Slavic Studies*; the telephone number is 812-855-2107; the fax number is 812-855-2107. Additional copies of the current issue and back issues as they are available (vols. 1-4 are currently depleted) may be obtained through the Department.

INDIANA SLAVIC STUDIES

Volume 6 (1992)

ISSN: 0073-6929

Series Editor, Henry R. Cooper, Jr., *Indiana University*

BALKANISTICA

Volume 8 (1992)

Editor, John D. Treadway, *University of Richmond*

Former Editor, Frederick B. Chary, *Indiana University-Northwest*

Former Editor, Kenneth E. Naylor, *The Ohio State University*

BULGARIA PAST AND PRESENT

Published for the American Association for Southeast European Studies

Editorial and Technical Assistants

R. Carey Goodman, *University of Virginia*

Demitra Pappas, *Columbia University*

Elizabeth Morrow, *University of Kansas*

Robert J. Niedzielski, *American University*

Margaret Anne Gunter, *D.S. Freeman H.S., Richmond VA*

John Cox, Richard Hall, Mark Temple, *Indiana University*

Molly Bell, Cheryl Callahan, Robert Gudmestad, Gladys Llewellyn,

Brian McCormick, Lois Morley, Michael Mortlock, Brantley Scott,

John Smithwick, Stoyan Smoukov, Robert Surine, Sebastian Volcker,

Barbara Weisenberg, Mary Anne Wilbourne, Laurie West, *University of Richmond*

ANALYTIC MODALITY IN BALKAN SLAVIC¹

Christina Kramer

Most descriptions of Macedonian and of its closest relative Bulgarian (Lunt 1952; B. Koneski 1967; Usikova 1977; Kepeski 1975; Andrejčin 1978; Norman 1980, etc.) define modality as a verbal category which reflects the speaker's evaluation of an event. Jakobson (1957), basing his definition on Vinogradov's (1947), gives the following formulation: Mood characterizes the relation between the narrated event and its participants with reference to the participants of the speech event (cf. also Isačenko 1960; Vinogradov 1947; Dzurović 1956; Lyons 1967).

Aronson (1977: 12), citing Vinogradov's original formulation in which he states that mood "reflects the speaker's view of the character of the connection between the action and the actor or goal," notes that the term speaker's view is the same as the speaker's choice between a marked and an unmarked form. Thus, for example, a speaker can choose to "view" the totality (plurality) of lions as singular in an utterance such as *The lion is a member of the cat family* or a speaker can choose to "view" an action completed in the past as non-past, as in the use of the historical present. In other words, the speaker's view is not a definition of modality, but is a characteristic of language per se. Aronson (1977: 13) goes on to note that in analyzing a modal sentence such as, *He would have gone to the meeting had he had the time*, there is no need to refer to the message to define the meanings of the modal forms nor to refer to the speech event or to the participants. He therefore concludes that mood can be regarded as an objective evaluation of the narrated event.

On the basis of this argument, we concur with Aronson, who takes his basic definition of mood from Golab (1964: 1): Mood is the grammatical category which expresses the ontological evaluation of an action denoted by a given verb. Markedly modal (i.e., non-indicative) forms are those which denote non-real processes.² It is these markedly modal forms of Macedonian which will constitute the subject of this paper.

In his reformulation of Jakobson's system of verbal categories (1957), Aronson (1977: 14-15) has demonstrated that there is a complicated inter-relationship between mood and aspect, which he places together in a category which he calls manner; mood qualifies the narrat-

ed event, and aspect quantifies it. He designates them both as the non-shifter E :

Non-Shifter	Qualifier	Mood E
	Quantifier	Aspect E

Thus, for example, in a sentence of the type: He would play golf every day when/if he lived in Chicago, it is the opposition between when and if which allows us to determine whether would play is contextually a qualifier (mood) or a quantifier (aspect) (Aronson 1977: 15). In both sentences the characterization of the narrated event involves neither its participants nor the speech event. The form would play is thus marked for manner, but the realization of manner as aspect or mood depends on other factors in the context. This category of manner will also prove essential to our understanding of the Macedonian modal system.

Before presenting our theoretical framework for the analysis of the Macedonian modal system, however, we will summarize the other analyses which have been suggested for Macedonian. Gołąb (1964:17) distinguishes four moods, excluding the imperative: the indicative, the optative-subjunctive, the potential, and the conditional. The three markedly modal forms, together with the indicative, are treated paradigmatically:

Indicative

gledam "I look"
gledaš "you look"
gleda "he looks"

Potential

bi (sum) gledal "I would look"
bi (si) gledal "you would look"
bi gledal "he would look"

Optative-Subjunctive

da gledam "I should look"
da gledaš "you should look"
da gleda "he should look"

Conditional

ќе gledav "I would have looked"
ќе gledeše "you would have looked"
ќе gledaše "he would have looked"

Lunt (1952) distinguishes four moods: the indicative, the imperative, the projective mood with *ќе*,³ and the potential mood with *bi*. *Da* is treated solely as a subordinating conjunction whose modal nuances are determined by "context or speech situation": (Lunt 1952: 84). Other words such as *neka* (let), *li* (whether), *ako* (if), and *duri ne* (until) are treated as participating in syntactic constructions.

Usikova (1977: 360-368), under the heading "Modality," cites the indicative, the imperative, the conditional with *bi* and the conjunctive with *da*. The particle *ќе* is treated as a tense marker and not as a mood marker in both the future and the so-called future in the past. She treats forms of *ќе* plus perfective non-past with the contextual meaning of real condition as homonymous forms with the temporal future; *ќе* plus the perfective imperfect with the contextual meaning of irreal conditional is treated as homonymous with the temporal future in the past. Later, under a separate heading, "Modal forms," Usikova mentions the imperative, *neka*, and *da* in its function as a first- and third-person hortative, e.g., *Da go čekame*, "Let's wait for him."

Both B. Koneski (1975: 380-502) and Kepeski (1975-113) distinguish three moods: the indicative, the potential with *bi*, and the imperative. *Ќе* is treated as a tense marker with modal contextual variants. All other particles, including *da*, are treated as participating in syntactic constructions.

For Bulgarian Aronson (1977: 25) has demonstrated that modality is inherent in the meaning of the perfective non-past, i.e., different particles impart various nuances to the perfective non-past, which itself is inherently modal. According to Aronson, all of the following sentences can be translated as "Do that and everything will be ready," i.e., all of these sentences are modal:

Napraviš tova, i vsičko šte bade gotovo.
Ako napraviš tova, vsičko šte bade gotovo.
Napraviš li tova, vsičko šte bade gotovo.
Da napraviš tova, vsičko šte bade gotovo.
Ste napraviš tova, i vsičko šte bade gotovo.

In Macedonian, however, unlike Bulgarian, the perfective non-past cannot be used independently but occurs only in subordination to a modal particle or in the imperative.

Thus, for example, while in Bulgarian one can say:

Električestvo! Nastineš samo edno butonče i gotovo!
[Electricity! You push just one little button and there you are!] (Maslov 1956:231 cited in Aronson 1977:24),

in Macedonian, the perfective non-past would have to be preceded by a modal particle,⁴ e.g.,

Struja! Ako pritisneš samo edno kopče—gotovo!
[Electricity! If you push just one little button—there you are!]⁵

Struja! Će pritisneš samo edno kopče i gotovo!
[Electricity! You will push just one little button and there you are!]

On the basis of this fact we can identify two types of modality in Macedonian: syntactic (analytic) and morphological (synthetic). We will not treat here the one morphological, synthetic modal, the imperative, but will focus on the syntactic modals composed of modal particles plus verb.

We should next note that the number of particles used with the Macedonian perfective non-past is considerably smaller than those occurring in this environment in Bulgarian. In Bulgarian there is a neutralization of the opposition between future and present after pronominal relatives such as *kogato* (when, whenever); *kojto* (who, whoever); *deto* (where, wherever) [cf., Aronson 1977: 22]. This neutralization does not occur with these words in Macedonian, e.g., the Macedonian equivalents *koga* (when), *koj* (who), and *kade* (where) must be used with the explicit future marker *ke* when used with a potential or gnomic meaning, e.g., Bulgarian: *Toj, kojto padne* (perfective non-past) *v boj za svoboda*, *toj ne umira*, "He who falls (may fall, will fall) in a struggle for freedom, he does not die" (Maslov 1959: 244-8 cited in Aronson 1977: 22) would be in Macedonian *Toj, koj ke padne...*, "He who will fall..."

Aronson argues (1977: 23) that modal constructions with *da*, *bi*, and *šte* should not be treated paradigmatically in Bulgarian since they modify the inherently modal perfective non-past and should therefore be treated as syntactic constructions together with other modal words such as *ako*. While this argument cannot be applied to Macedonian, we can define a limited set of Macedonian particles distinguished, for the most part, by their ability to co-occur with the perfective non-past. We would argue likewise that in Macedonian these particles should not be treated paradigmatically first of all because *bi* and *ke*, have been formally deparadigmaticized.⁶ Compare, for example:

Macedonian: *jas ke odev* "I would have gone"
ti ke odeše "you would have gone"

Bulgarian: *az štah da hodja* "I would have gone"
ti šteše da hodiš "you would have gone"

Macedonian: *jas bi došol* "I would come"
ti bi došol "you would come"

Bulgarian: *az bih došal* "I would come"
ti bi došal "you would come"

Furthermore, we would argue that these constructions composed of particle plus verb should be considered syntactic due to the strict syntactic rules defining the conditions under which the particles can be separated from the verb. There is a fixed, ordered chain of enclitics in Macedonian and most of the modal particles have a set position in this chain: their position is similar to that of the verbal copula, e.g.:

Ti si mu ja dal knjigata.
[You verb-copula him (masculine indirect object pronominal enclitic) it (feminine direct object enclitic) gave book-the, or, You gave the book to him.]

**Si ti mu ja dal knjigata.*
**Ti mu si ja dal knjigata.*
**Ti mu ja si dal knjigata.*

Ti da si mu ja dal knjigata!
[You that verb-copula him it gave book-the!
If only you had given him the book.]

*Da ti si mu ja dal knjigata!

*Ti si da mu ja dal knjigata!

*Ti si mu ja da dal knjigata!

Thus, the modal particle, like the verbal copula, is a part of the enclitic chain but must be at the end of that chain. Unlike the verbal copula, however, the particles are invariant and therefore can not be said to define a paradigm. The particles are closely bound to the verb and so the modal constructions in Macedonian can be treated as non-paradigmatic syntactic constructions composed of particle plus verb.

Not all of the particles are as closely bound syntactically as *da*. The conditional *ako*, for example, can be separated from the verb by a subject, an object, or an adverb, e.g.:

Ako ovoj den go preživeam, *ke* ti bidam verna celiot život.

[If this day it I live through, I to you will be faithful all-the life.]

[If I live through this day, I will be faithful to you my whole life.] (Živko Čingo cited in Minova-Ćurkova 1967:18)

Ako tatko storil niet i dal zbor bez mene, neka me ima on na duša.

[If father made intention and gave word without me, let me have-he on soul.]

[If father decided and gave his word without me, let him have me on his conscience.] (Slave Popov cited in Minova-Ćurkova 1967:131)

Thus, we can subdivide the syntactic modal constructions into the pseudo-paradigmatic ones *da*, *bi*, *ke*, and *li* which are closely bound to the verb and are an immovable part of the enclitic chain, and those like *ako* and *dokolku* which have a freer syntactic position. Rather than syntactic position, it is the use of the perfective non-past in subordination which unites the particles in a single class of modal particles.

Due to the demonstrated relationship between mood and aspect alluded to earlier, we can now define syntactic modality in the following manner: particles to which a perfective non-past can be subordinated, and in addition the particle *bi*, can be considered modal. The particle *bi* is included despite the fact that its use is limited to the 1-form, for three

reasons:

1. It carries the same types of meanings as other modal particles, for example, compare:

Koga bi ja zatvorile fabrikata i bi davale plati na rabotnicite, bi imale pomala zaguba otkolku koga bi rabotele.

[If we were to close the factory and if we were to give the money to the workers, we would have a lower deficit than if we were to work.] (Nova Makedonija, 24 May 1982:8)

Koga bi ja zatvorile fabrikata...*ke* imame/*ke* imavme pomala zaguba...

[If we were to close the factory...we will/would have a lower deficit...]

2. It is bound syntactically like *ke*, *da*, and *li*.

3. For historical reasons some particles do not occur with all verbal forms. *Bi* is not unique among the particles in having certain co-occurrence restrictions; *neka*, for example, does not occur with the *ima* perfect series.

The clear, unambiguous modal particles are these: *ako* (if), *bi*, (would), *da* (that), *dodeka* (*ne*) (until), *duri* (*ne*) (until), *ke* (will, would), and *neka* (let). There was not full agreement among native speakers on the other particles to be included in the complete list of modal particles, but this list will also include *dokolku* (if, in so far as); *li* (if, whether) in conditional clauses of the type: *Puknat li, prvot kuršum može da te pogodi*, "If they shoot, the first bullet could hit you," and *štom* (as soon as), e.g., *Štom dojde profesorot, ke odime*, "As soon as the professor gets here we'll go." These three particles, while rejected by some speakers in constructions with the perfective non-past, are used by many educated native speakers and occur in the Macedonian media.

Future work will have to establish a hierarchy of these ten particles within the Macedonian modal system, and to determine the basic meanings of the particles and their contextual variants.

University of Toronto

NOTES

1. This article is based on an earlier paper presented at the Bulgarian-American Studies Conference in Boston in 1982. For a more detailed treatment of this subject, consult Kramer: 1986, *Analytic Modality in Macedonian*. Kubon and Sagner: Munich.
2. We note that the opposition modal/non-modal is a privative one in which modal forms are positively marked for non-ontological reality, while the indicative is not so marked. We will not treat here the forms of the unmarked present indicative when it is used in certain modal functions as in the following:
 - a. Futurity, e.g.,
V nedela se prikažuva "Otelo"
[On Sunday "Othello" is being shown.]
(B. Koneski, 1976: 414)
 - b. Future of intent, e.g.,
Ke zastanam pred nea i ke rečam: idam kaj tebe!
Za arno, za lošo idam kaj tebe!
[I'll stand before her and I'll tell her: I'm
coming to your place! For good or for bad, I'm
coming!] (Čašule, 1980:268)
 - c. Panchronic or gnomic meaning, e.g.,
Po celi dni rabotiš, na stari godini se mačiš i
pak ništo nema.
[You work every day, you torture yourself in your
old age and you still have nothing.] (R. Petkovski
cited in B. Koneski, 1976: 413)
3. It has often been argued that the future is a modal rather than a temporal category since it does not refer to an ontologically real event. Janakiev (1962: 427), in discussing the so-called "future tense" in Bulgarian, treats the future as being marked for presumption, hypotheticality and categoriality (*kategoričnost*). Lyons (1968: 310) argues that the future intersects the categories of both mood and tense since it can be used in contexts where it does not refer to events which will occur after the speech event, for example in the putative, e.g., "He will be such a big boy now," in panchronic uses, e.g., "Oil will float on water," etc., Kurylowicz (1956: 26) says that the future belongs to the modal, not the indicative, plane and that it stands in opposition to the "real" plane of the past and present. While not necessarily agreeing with their specific definitions, we concur with the notion that the future should be considered a modal, rather than a temporal category since it does not express ontological reality.
4. The term particle is to be understood as a general term for the conjunctions, adverbs and particles which, having little or no inherent lexical meaning, are modal markers in Macedonian.

5. Macedonian examples with no citation have either been provided by, or checked with, native speakers of Macedonian.
6. The purely lexical negated forms *nejkum*, "I won't, I don't want to"; *nejkeš*, "you won't, you don't want to," are lexical and therefore do not constitute a paradigm.

REFERENCES

- Andrejčin, Ljubomir, 1978. *Osnova bālgarska gramatika*. Sofia: Nauka i kultura; reprint of 1944 edition.
- Aronson, Howard I., 1977. "Interrelationships between Aspect and Mood in Bulgarian." *Folia Slavica* 1,1:9-32.
- Gołąb, Zbigniew, 1964. "The Problem of Verbal Moods in Slavic Languages." *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 8:1-36.
- Isačenko, A. V., 1960. *Grammatičeskij stroj russkovo jazyka vsopostavlenii slovačkim*. Bratislava: Slovenjekse Akademie Vied.
- Jakobson, Roman, 1957. *Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb*. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Janakiev, Miroslav, 1962. "Za gramemite naričani v bālgarska gramatika 'segašno vreme' i 'bādešte vreme.'" *Izvestija na Instituta za bālgarski ezik* 8: 410-432.
- Kepeski, Krume, 1975. *Grammatika na makedonskiot literaturnen jazyk za učilištata za sredno obrazovanie*. Skopje: Prosvetno delo.
- Koneski, Blaže, 1967. *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturnen jazyk*. Skopje: Kultura.
- Lunt, Horace, 1952. *A Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language*. Skopje: Državno Knigizdatelstvo.
- Lyons, John, 1969. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Minova-Ćurkova, Liljana, 1967. "Svrznikot ako vo makedonskiot jazyk." *Makedonski Jazyk* 18:111-140.
- Norman, B. Ju., 1980. *Bolgarskij jazyk*. Minsk: Belorusskij gosudarstvennyj universitet.

Usikova R., 1977. "Makedonskij jazyk." *Slavjanske jazyki*. Moscow: Moskovskij gosudarstvennyj universitet.