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Chapter 1

Introduction

The modal system of literary Macedonian has not been the subject of any detailed or comprehensive analysis. Handbooks of the language make only superficial reference to modality, while studies on modality have dealt only with the use of individual modal words (e.g. Trifunovski 1974; K. Konstant 1979; G. Gjik 1984; N. Gjik 1973; Nikolaev-Sokolova 1987, etc.). In this work a complete system for the lexico-syntactic classification of the modal particles of modern literary Macedonian will be proposed. These particles will be defined and, using a structural approach, their lexico-syntactic and semantic properties will be described. In this first chapter a basic theory for analyzing Macedonian modality will be given and a brief description of literary Macedonian verbal morphology will be presented.

Henceforth Macedonian will be understood to mean the modern literary language whose definition will be taken from Fredrick (1977:5). Macedonian will be defined as the official language of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia as codified in the grammar of Slaves (1987) and the three-volume dictionary edited by him (1961-63), as published by the SDM since August 2, 1944, or as spoken by people whose mother tongue in Macedonia and who have had at least one year of college education. Since the modal system of Macedonian is in a state of flux, however, discrepancies between prescriptive norms and current colloquial usage will be noted. Certain dialectal forms which have a special
significance for the literary language will also be treated.

Most descriptions of Macedonian and of its closest relative, Bulgarian (Laut 1952; B. Toneks 1957; Butkova 1977; Rupess 1975; Avdjev 1978; Norman 2000, 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 Immanuel 1961; Vinogradov 1947; Djerassi 1956; Lyons 1969).

Aronson (1977:12), citing Vinogradov's original formulation in which he states that mood “reflects the speaker's view of the character of the relation between the action and the actor or goal,” notes that the core 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 time 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 case 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 (1977:12) goes on to note that in analyzing a modality sentence such as We would have won if the editor had 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 nor 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 concern with Aronson, who takes his basic definition of mood from G델 (1966:12): Mood is the grammatical category which expresses the antecedent evaluation of an action denoted by a given verb. Namely modal (i.e. non-indicative) focus are those which denote non-real processes. In Macedonian, the designation of an event as a non-real process is carried by the modal particles which occur with forms of the indicative. It is the interaction of these particles with the verbal categories of the indicative which will constitute the subject of this study.

In his reformulation of Jakobson's (1957) system of verbal categories, Aronson (1977:14-15) has demonstrated that there is a complicated interrelationship between mood and aspect, which he places together in a category which he calls 'mood'; mood qualifies the narrated event and aspect quantifies it. He designates these both as the non-shifter i.e:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-shifter</th>
<th>Qualifier</th>
<th>Mood 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantifier</td>
<td>Aspect i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, for example, in a sentence of the type *we would play golf even if we'd be found in Russia* it is the opposition between *would* and *play* 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 evaluation of manner as aspect or mood depends on other factors in the context. This category of manner will also prove essential to an understanding of the Macedonian modal system.
Before presenting a theoretical framework for the analysis of the Macedonian modal system, however, the other analyses which have been suggested for Macedonian and the closely related Bulgarian will be summarized. Goleš (1964:17) distinguishes four moods, excluding the imperative: the indicative, the potential, the optative-subjunctive, and the conditional. The three currently modal forms, together with the indicative, are treated paradigmatically:

### Indicative
- gledat 'I look'
- gledaš 'you look'
- gleda 'he looks'

### Potential
- bi (past) gledat 'I would look'
- bi (pl) gledat 'you would look'
- bi gledat 'he would look'

### Optative-subjunctive
- da gledat 'I should look'
- da gledaš 'you should look'
- da gleda 'he should look'

### Conditional
- se gledat 'I would have looked'
- se gledaš 'you would have looked'
- se gleda 'he would have looked'

Lunt (1962) distinguishes four under the indicative, the imperative, the subjunctive mood with se, and the potential mood with bi. The indicative and subjunctive mood with se is treated as a subordinating conjunction whose modal meanings are determined by the "context or speech situation" (Lunt 1913:194). Other words such as naš 'let's', što 'whether, if', and dač 'we' are treated as participating in subjunctive constructions.

Ukowa (1971:300-368), under the heading "Modality," cites the indicative, the imperative, the conditional with bi and the conjunctive with se. The particle se is treated as a tense marker and not as a modal marker in both the future and the anterior future. She treats forms of se plus perfective past-tense with the contextual meaning of real condition as homonymous with the temporal future; se plus the perfective imperfect with the contextual meaning of unreal condition is treated as homonymous with the anterior future. Later, under a separate heading, "Modal forms," Ukowa mentions the imperative, do +, and se in its function as a first- and third-person imperative, e.g., do go pogovor 'let's talk'.

Both H. Konstantinov (1971a:1-102) and Kojadinov (1975:112) distinguish three moods: the indicative, the potential, and the imperative. The indicative is treated as a tense marker with modal contextual variants. All other particles, including se, are treated as participating in syntactic constructions.

For Bulgarian, Aronson (1971:25) has demonstrated that modality is inherent in the meaning of the perfective past-tense, i.e., different particles impart various nuances to the perfective past-tense, 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:

1. Сега ще таече, а вие ще бидете готоши.
   — Now suppose you are the ones to come.

2. Няма да таече, вие ще бидете готоши.
   — Nothing will happen, you will be ready.

3. Нищо няма да таече, вие ще бидете готоши.
   — Nothing will happen, you will be ready.

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

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

    Electricity! You push just one little button and there you are!

In Macedonian, the perfective non-past would here be preceded by a modal particle, e.g.:

2. Straša! Nis preetiš anal adem kupa i gonaos! 
    Electricity! If you push just one little button - there you are!

3. Straša! Na preetiš anal adem kupa i gonaos!
    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: analytic (analytic) and morphological (synthetic). In this work we will not treat the one morphological, synthetic modal, the imperative, but will focus on the analytic modals composed of modal particle plus verb.

It should be noted, next, that the number of particles used with the Macedonian perfective non-past is considerably smaller than the number of particles occurring in this environment in Bulgarian. In Bulgarian there is a neutralization of the opposition between future and present after pronoun relatives such as kogodi 'whom, whenever'; kdo 'who, whoever'; dno 'where, wherever' (cf. Aranov 1977:22). This neutralization does not occur with these words in Macedonian, e.g., the Macedonian equivalents koga 'whom', kdo 'who' and dno 'where' must be used with the explicit future marker da when used with a potential or

generic meaning, e.g., Bulgarian:

4. To, kogodi pada (perfective non-past) vs boj na vekoda, 
    toj ne vade.
    To who falls (may fall, will fall) in a struggle for freedom, he does not die

would be in Macedonian:

5. Toj eco na pada...
    he who will fall...

Aranov argues (1977:23) that modal constructions with da, boj and eco 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, a limited set of Macedonian particles distinguished, for the most part, by their ability to co-occur with the perfective non-past can be defined. In addition, these particles should not be treated paradigmatically in Macedonian for the following reasons. First of all da and eco have been formally deparadigmized, i.e., become

invariable. Compare, for example:

Macedonian: pase da offer, 'I would have gone,' 
    Ti da sti, 'You would have gone,'

Bulgarian: As tajne da holu, 'I would have gone,'
    Ti sti da holu, 'You would have gone,'

Macedonian: jas na dobro, 'I would come,'
    Ti na dobro, 'You would come,'

Bulgarian: As sti da dobro, 'I would come,'
    Ti sti da dobro, 'You would come,'

Furthermore, these constructions composed of particle plus vs. 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 auxiliary, e.g.:

6. Ti si mu ja da hilgata.
   You ver-b-copula him (nomin. indirect object enclitic) is (aux. direct object enclitic) gave book-the.
   You gave the book to him.

   Ut ti mu ja da hilgata.
   Ti mu je si da hilgata.
   Ti da si mu ja da hilgata!
   Ti da si me ja da hilgata!
   Ti da si me ja da da hilgata!
   Ti da si mu ja da da hilgata!
   Ti da si me ja da da hilgata!
   Ti da si me ja da da da hilgata!
   Ti da si me ja da da da da hilgata!

Thus, the modal particle, like the verbal copula, is a part of the enclitic chain but must be at the beginning of that chain. Unlike the verbal copula, however, the particles are invariant and therefore cannot 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 the conditional enclitic, for example, can be separated from the verb by a subject, an object, or an adverb, e.g.:

   I do not believe that he went.
   (Peter Cane cited in Mon-va-Gurkha 1967:19)
   If I live through this day, I will be faithful to you my whole life.

8. Ne ne-akor nejti i da doz bai neze, minka se ne mu da.
   (Peter Cane cited in Mon-va-Gurkha 1967:31)

...

If father decided and gave his word without me, let his be on his conscience.

Thus, the syntactic modal constructions can be subdivided into the pseudo-paradigmatic uses Mo, Mo, Mo, and Mo which are closely bound to the verb and are an invariable part of the enclitic chain, and those like Mo and Mo which have a freer syntactic position. Rather than syntactic position, it is the use of the perfective non-part in subordination which unites those particles in a single class of modal particles.

Due to the demonstrated relationship between mood and aspect allied to earlier analytic modality can now be defined in the following manner: particles to which a perfective non-part can be accomplished, and in addition the particle Mo, can be considered modal.

The particle Mo is included despite the fact that its use is limited to the 3-form, for three reasons:

(1) It carries the same type of meanings as other modal particles, for example, compare:

9. Eno bi ja catvore filzbrehta i bi derale plati ne rebecnica, bi male ponza zapa otosbu kena bi robitejme.
   (Rune Mateljic) 22.7.32-3.
   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.

10. Eno bi ja catvore fabriekata... Si smekhe necuno ponza zapa...
    If we were to close the factory... we would have a lower deficit...

(2) It is bound syntactically like Mo, Mo, and Mo.
(3) For historical reasons some particles do not occur with all forms. Mo is not unique among the particles in having certain convergence restrictions index, for example, does not occur with the Mo perfect series.

...
The clear, unambiguous modal particles are these: shó 'if'; le 'would'; de 'time'; dodoc 'to' 'until'; ehe 'now' 'the' 'until'; le 'will, would'; and neko 'last'. There was not full agreement among native speakers on the other particles to be included in the complete list of modal particles, but, on the basis of our definition of modern literary Macedonian, all the particles used by educated speakers and in the Macedonian media will be included. The various opinions of native speakers will be discussed in subsequent chapters. The complete list of particles will also include: detailni 'if, similar as'; and le 'if, whether' in conditional clauses of the type:

11. Pobrat ili, proveri kako može da te papnii!
    If they shoot, the first bullet could hit you.

The morphology of the Macedonian verb has been the subject of numerous studies, e.g., Laš (1952); Uskova (1967); B. Kosmić (1967); Kepeski (1972); Elenska (1977); and Friedman (1977). Since this work is concerned with syntactic relations, the details of Macedonian conjugation are relatively unimportant. Therefore, only a brief outline of Macedonian verbal morphology will be included here and a sample paradigm will be given. The following tables, based on Laš (1952) and Uskova (1967), are taken from Friedman (1977:8):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Impersonal form</th>
<th>Sear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>-me</td>
<td>-me</td>
<td>-me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>-E</td>
<td>-Be</td>
<td>-Be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-Ba</td>
<td>-Ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>-Ee</td>
<td>-Be</td>
<td>-Be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>-ia</td>
<td>-Bi</td>
<td>-Bi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>-at</td>
<td>-Bt</td>
<td>-Bt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the simplex series, the present is formed by adding the endings given in Table 1 to the basic form, which is the third-person singular. The stem vowel truncates before the first person -me, and the stem vowel i and e truncate before the third plural ending -at. In form the imperfect, the endings given in Table 1 are added to the basic form, with the stem vowel i being replaced by e before those endings. Because the aorist is not used in any modal constructions, the details on the formation of the aorist stem, to which the aorist endings are added will be omitted. The two series are composed of the present of the verb in -de plus the imperfect and the aorist 1-form. The l-form is derived by dropping the -e of the first singular of the simplex imperfect and the aorist and adding -t. The -at series is composed of the imperfect and aorist 1-form. The three future forms are constructed with the present, imperfect and the 1-imperfect of the verb in -le to have plus the aorist form of the verbal adjective.

The basic meanings and existential variants of these forms will be important for an understanding of the use of the particles with the four series. Friedman (1977) has defined the grammatical category of the Macedonian indicative forms on the basis of five oppositions.
### Table 2. A Paradigm of the Macedonian Indicative Part "Da"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple Series</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>provar</td>
<td>pravim</td>
<td>pravi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>pravae</td>
<td>pravete</td>
<td>pravie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>pravad</td>
<td>pravade</td>
<td>pravad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>pravam</td>
<td>pravame</td>
<td>pravam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>pravi</td>
<td>pravii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### L-Imperfect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple Series</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>sa pravel</td>
<td>sa pravim</td>
<td>sa pravi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>nie pravale</td>
<td>nie pravate</td>
<td>nie pravate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>pra vale</td>
<td>pra vale</td>
<td>pra vale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>pravale</td>
<td>pravale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### L-Aorist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple Series</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>sa pravile</td>
<td>sa pravile</td>
<td>sa pravile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>nie pravile</td>
<td>nie pravile</td>
<td>nie pravile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>pra vile</td>
<td>pra vile</td>
<td>pra vile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>pravile</td>
<td>pravile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Bade Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple Series</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>be b pravel</td>
<td>be b pravim</td>
<td>be b pravi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>bbe pravale</td>
<td>bbe pravate</td>
<td>bbe pravate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>bbe pravale</td>
<td>bbe pravate</td>
<td>bbe pravate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>bbe pravale</td>
<td>bbe pravale</td>
<td>bbe pravale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impersonal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple Series</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>praveno</td>
<td>praveno</td>
<td>praveno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>rae pravano</td>
<td>rae pravano</td>
<td>rae pravano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>pravano</td>
<td>pravano</td>
<td>pravano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>pravano</td>
<td>pravano</td>
<td>pravano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Past Perfect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple Series</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>sa praveno</td>
<td>sa praveno</td>
<td>sa praveno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>nie pravano</td>
<td>nie pravano</td>
<td>nie pravano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>pravano</td>
<td>pravano</td>
<td>pravano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>pravano</td>
<td>pravano</td>
<td>pravano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- Resultativity, tense/referential, tense, status, and aspect. On the basis of these oppositions, taking the third-person singular of each of the ten tense forms, Friedman explicates the grammatical categories with the marking for each category as shown in the following table and diagram (see following pages).
- There are two types of essential oppositions operating in the Macedonian verbal system: imperfective vs. perfective, and aorist vs. imperfect. While an analysis of the perfective/imperfective opposition is Macedonian must take into account the meaning of these forms in modal constructions, an analysis of the modal particles is not dependent on the specific meaning of the Macedonian perfective/imperfective opposition. Therefore we will accept the standard definition of this opposition in Macedonian given in Friedman (1977a, cf. F. Ketronski (1971:167)). Perfective aspect denotes the accomplishment of an action, or it can denote a series of actions viewed as a whole. The perfective verb directs the listener's attention to the completion of the act.
- Imperfective verbs focus upon the action itself without specifying its completion, and so they may frequently be durative or iterative. Thus, perfective verbs describe the action as a fulfilment (završenost), while imperfective verbs describe it as a process (napočet). Friedman defines the aorist/imperfect opposition as a primitive one in which the imperfect is marked for durativity. HDison (1977:10) notes that while in the North Slavic languages, Slovenian and most Serbo-Croatian dialects, the development of the perfective/imperfective opposition was strengthened at the expense of the aorist/imperfect opposition, the reverse has been true in Bulgarian and Macedonian, where...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Category</th>
<th>Opposition</th>
<th>Tense Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resultivity:</td>
<td>Static</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal reference:</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense:</td>
<td>Anterior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect:</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Simplex Series**
- prs. 1-simp. 1-sor.
- fns. 1-simp. 1-sor.

**Infinitive Series**
- 1-simp. 1-sor.
- 2-simp. 2-sor.

**Present Series**
- 1-simp. 1-sor.
- 2-simp. 2-sor.

**Past Series**
- 1-simp. 1-sor.
- 2-simp. 2-sor.

**Future Series**
- 1-simp. 1-sor.
- 2-simp. 2-sor.

**Perfect Series**
- 1-simp. 1-sor.
- 2-simp. 2-sor.

**Imperfect Series**
- 1-simp. 1-sor.
- 2-simp. 2-sor.

**Perfective Series**
- 1-simp. 1-sor.
- 2-simp. 2-sor.

**Imperfective Series**
- 1-simp. 1-sor.
- 2-simp. 2-sor.
the major aspectual opposition in the indicative is the perfective/imperfective opposition. However, in the modal systems of these languages the perfective/imperfective opposition is the more important since 1) the perfect does not occur in modal constructions, and 2) as noted in Aronson (1977:10), the semantic aspectual opposition perfective/imperfective has displayed a tendency to acquire other, non-aspectual functions, e.g. modal/mero-modal meanings.

We will not concern ourselves here with the debate over whether the perfective/imperfective opposition is grammatical or derivational (see Aronson 1977; Hoppa 1963). Since derived imperfectives and perfectives display no differences in their behavior in modal constructions from that of non-derived verbs marked for the same aspect, this debate is irrelevant in a discussion of Macedonian modality.6

The rules proposed for deriving and recognizing perfective and superlative verbs can be found in Hoppa (1963), Lunt (1952), H. Kavezov (1967), and Eckova (1977).

In the course of subsequent chapters the uses of the same particles which govern modal constructions in Macedonian will be discussed, and the co-occurrence of the pseudo-modal particles Da, Ee, and Di with the other particles will be examined. The chapters on the particles will appear in the following order:

Chapter II  ...Da
Chapter III  ...Ee
Chapter IV  ...Di
Chapter V  ...Abo, Bokolku, Li
Chapter VI  ...Vodna, Bari

A hierarchy of these particles within the Macedonian modal system will be established and the basic meanings of the particles and their contextual variants will be determined taking as a starting point Jakobson (1956:246-246). It will be demonstrated that the hierarchy of modal particles, distinguished on the basis of lexico-syntactic classification is above the hierarchy of verbal categories as defined by Frieda. Discussion will be limited to the interaction of the particles with the simplex series since these forms are far more common statistically, while modal constructions with the use and use series range from the marginal to the dialectal. The use series will be considered with the particle Di because Di is unique in that its use is limited to constructions with the L-form. The use of the other modal particles with the use series resembles the use with the simplex, except in certain limited contexts with use constructions (see Chapter II), and the differences in meaning are probably to be found in categories other than mood. The final chapter presents a detailed summary of the theoretical treatment of analytical modality in Macedonian.
Notes - Chapter I

1. The term *particle* is to be understood as a general term for the conjunctions, adverbs, and particles which may combine with the perfective non-past, and

2. The opposition modal/non-modal is a primitive one in which modal forms are positively marked for non-ontological reality, while the indicative is not so marked. The use of forms of the unwored present indicative in certain modal functions will not be treated, for example in the following sentences:

   a. futurity, e.g.:
      i. V sredse se prinaša "Učilo" (J. Kunsowski 1978:144)
         On Sunday "Učilo" is being shown.
   b. future of intent, e.g.:
      i. "Ko zamanam prodam te iselam idemo zaj tebe!
         Za arno, za loko idemo zaj tebe! (Sedale 1986:248)
         I'll stand before her and I'll tell her: I'm coming to your place. For better or for worse, I'm coming!
   c. pansemantic or semantic meaning, e.g.:
      i. Po celu godinu ne se može i
         jednako život.
         (S. Petrović, cited in E. Kunsowski 1970:141)
         You work all day long, you trouble yourself in your old age and you still have nothing.

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. Japanese (1962:247), in discussing the so-called "future tense" in Bulgarian, treats the future as being marked for presumption, hypotheticality and contingency (*korekurt*). Lyons (1968:100) 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 positive, e.g. "He will eat his ice, in prehodnic use, e.g. "He will sleep on water", etc. Maryanovski (1979:15) states that the future belongs to the modal, not the indicative, place and that it stands in opposition to the "real" plane of the past and present. While not necessarily accepting their specific definitions, we concur with the basic idea that the future should be considered a modal, rather than a temporal category.

4. Macedonian examples with an citation have either been provided by, or checked with, native speakers of Macedonian.

5. Googolworth examples taken from the newspaper Sara Hranitelja will be cited IV followed by the date and page number as follows: day, month, year and page.

6. Googolworth the following abbreviations will be used:
   imperfect, *Ia* - imperfective assist, *Pur* - perfective non-past,
   *Pur* - imperfective non-past.
Chapter II

12a. Sr. Bojke je da i od nase lutke neto.
12b. Mi: Sadaš je da, a mi da nismo nedo.

13a. Sr. Pravito se kao da sam svojku na poslovu.
13b. Mi: Da pravite, samo da ne da se na poslovu.

(Grudin 1992:12)

Be quiet as if he didn’t know me at all.

(Grup 1964:9-10) notes that in Serbo-Croatian there are two homogenous words da:

(1) A declarative conjunction da which corresponds to
Macedonian dáha ‘that’ and Bulgarian dá ‘that’, e.g.:  
14a. Sr. Ja sam uz govesu neznačiti pute, da njezna daa
i sjegrua u nekoj bari.
14b. Mi. Uvijek u nekoj miješne puti, da se neviri daa
i sjegrua u nekoj bari.

(Grup 1964:9)
I told him several times that his children play
in our garden.

(2) A subjective-optimative particle which corresponds to
Macedonian dáha and Bulgarian dá, e.g.:  
15a. Sr. Nisi moja stara majka gojmi, da marti nekoj jutru
ne e vodu.
15b. Mi. Ne posta stara majka mi ne wek da marte nekoj
sahjoze ne vodu.

(Grup 1964:10)
My old mother tells me to get up early every morning
to fetch water.

In the Serbo-Croatian dictionary published by the Nation Sprake
(hereafter referred to as Natica) the meanings of da are divided
between the headings “conjunction” and “particle”. Of the nine
different meanings cited for the conjunction da, only three are
translatable by da in Macedonian. Those three meanings are:

(1) Intention:
14a. Sr. Stojite u hazi do vode.
14b. Mi. To ješto do hazi do vode.
He stayed in the garden to wash.

It should be noted, however, that in order to emphasize the intent
of the action, one would frequently use the compound Macedonian dá,
Dash ‘fre to, for us’ whereas this combination would not be used in
Serbo-Croatian.
(2) Conditional:
A. Irreal, unfalsifiable condition:

17a. S: Da sam govor velika, ne bih ni to sprovala.
   b. M: Da umev aloro, ni to gospodo da go dolosem.
   If I had died yesterday, I would not have experienced this either.

B. Real, falsifiable hypothetical condition:

18a. S: Da te nekdo oseba, da bih ti.
   b. M: Da bih ti, bi ti osebe.
   If I had money, I'd give it to you.

Although there is a correspondence to the use of da in the more conditional sentences, Macedonian, unlike Serbo-Croatian, can also use da in a real, falsifiable conditional period, e.g.:

19a. S: Ako profitar kupcu, raznesu se!
   Who profits a shopkeeper, he is worthless!
   b. M: Da ja profitar kupcu, fe se razbere?
      If you read the book you will understand me?

(3) Concessive:

20a. S: Ne prod, da krenu kori, valja za deli.
   b. M: Ne kreni gori, i da krenu kori, trobi da na se ovo.
      One must give unto him who asks, even though he wears a crown.

The other six meanings cited under the conjunction da are transmitted in Macedonian either by deka 'that', deko 'that', which; or a relative pronoun. These meanings include:

(1) Concessive:

21a. S: Vape je kastle da je ujegov osuđivano mjesto
   b. M: Ljudjevade go obrnuto sretovito mokare do go
      Inconvinced him that his satherland could condemn
      it best son to death.

(2) Objective:

(3) Temporal:

22a. S: Sinu momi sediste dolas da ne vreda i mića beba na oz.
   b. M: Tinu momi neku na ozde otrebali te ozdravit te ozdraviti na oz.
      It has only been a few years since they've been returning every year to the lake.

(4) Consequential:

23a. S: Tinu se izbrinuo ozlo da ne ose vsaj ne oz de oz.
   b. M: Tinu izbrinulo ozlo osebe na ozdel oz osebe na oz.
      He laughed so heartily that tears came to his eyes.

(5) Adverbial:

24a. S: Dati da se ozgodi, mora, da ja ne kase da drago.
   b. M: Da se ozgodi, mora, daje da drago.
      She'll marry him, she has to, whom else could she?

(6) Relative:

25a. S: Lea mara u kojima se nekako da je se umrle i polje.
   b. M: Lea mara u kojima se nekako da je se umrle i polje.
      There are nations in which there is not even one person who does not know how to read and write.

There is much greater correspondence between Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian in the so-called particle uses of da. Eleven meanings are cited; three of these relate to the affirmative use of da which should be considered a separate, homogeneous word, and two are idomatic uses which have no correspondence in Macedonian. The other six meanings listed correspond to Macedonian as follows:

(1) Optative (wishes):
(2) First-person hortative:
29a. Si do si čivi i stravi.
29b. Mi do si čivi i stravi.
May you be alive and healthy!

(2) Second-person command:
30a. Si do popijemo kalu vinu.
30b. Mi do spijemo po kalu višu.
Let’s each drink a glass of wine.

(3) Compound forms with da:
Bring them in as soon as they get here.

(4) Surprise:
32a. Si da on ne dojme!
32b. Mi da on ne da.
He didn’t come, did he?

(5) Interrogative:
33a. Si da mi neko fale sami?
33b. Mi da mi ne ko fale sami?
You’re not sick, are you?

(6) Infinitival:
34a. Si da tome je da otkupa.
34b. Mi da pomade da odmo.
He wanted to set off.

In the three-volume Macedonian dictionary (hereafter referred to as Nekši 1973:125), where examples are given in both Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian, there are additional examples of da in Macedonian which either do not translate into da classes in Serbo-Croatian, or in the case of Macedonian compounds of adjective or preposition plus da, e.g. bez da ‘without’, translate as single da classes in Serbo-Croatian. Examples will be cited according to the categories of the Nekši.

Thus, although there is overlap in the semantic functions of da in both Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian, in particular in the so-called particle uses, discussions of Serbo-Croatian da will be excluded from our treatment of Macedonian da on the basis of the following differences: 1) syntactic position, 2) the separate indicative subordinate conjunction da to which is translated into Macedonian by such non-modal words as dačе, da, and relative words such as kamo, 3) the lack of insomption even where meanings seem to overlap,
for example, where Macedonian \( \alpha \) unlike Serbo-Croatian \( \alpha \) can occur within a fulfillable conditional period, 4) while both languages use \( \alpha \) in imperatives, there is no Serbo-Croatian equivalent to the Macedonian polite commands formed with \( \alpha \) plus the imperfect, and finally 5) the numerous uses of \( \alpha \) in combination with various prepositions and adverbs which are not found in Serbo-Croatian, e.g., \( \alpha \). The relationship between Macedonian and Bulgarian \( \alpha \) is much closer. At first glance it appears that there is an isomorphism between the two languages in regard to their uses of \( \alpha \). In both languages \( \alpha \) holds the same syntactic position in relation to the verb, and the two main functions of Serbo-Croatian \( \alpha \) are divided between the modal \( \alpha \) on the one hand, and the indicative-declarative subordinating conjunction on the other, Macedonian \( \alpha \). In addition, similar types of modality are expressed by \( \alpha \) in both languages. However, upon closer examination it becomes evident that here, too, there is no isomorphism and that the Bulgarian literature, while helpful in some respects, does not provide valuable answers to the question of the role of \( \alpha \) within the system of Macedonian modality.

The most significant difference between the semantic value of \( \alpha \) in these two languages may rest on the fact that in Macedonian, where modality is defined by a closed set of modal particles, \( \alpha \) must be analyzed within that set, and its interaction with other particles in that set will establish its hierarchy of meanings. In Bulgarian, where modality cannot be defined by a limited set of modal particles due to the independent use of the perfective non-part \( \alpha \) will have to have

a different place in the entire structure of the Bulgarian modal system. Radev (personal communication) suggests that although Macedonian and Bulgarian \( \alpha \) are extremely similar, they are not identical, and differences may be more syntactic or morphological rather than semantic. The relationships between the modal systems of these two languages, in particular the relationships in the use of \( \alpha \), will have to be the subject of future research.

For the present examples of those areas in which Bulgarian and Macedonian \( \alpha \) do not overlap will be cited. There are some classes of sentences where \( \alpha \) is permissible in Bulgarian but not in Macedonian, where it is replaced by \( \text{well} \) "whether": \( \text{take 'how, so' in the case of Macedonian, which far more often is used as an additive conjunction and conjunction.} \) She assigns a modal meaning of doubt to these \( \alpha \) classes. Macedonian translations of these Bulgarian sentences, taken from Genadieva-Huntsiffer (1979:13), were rejected by Macedonian speakers, e.g.: 40a. \( \text{ni ne vidh} \( \alpha \) vesele dnei} \)

I didn't see that anyone entered, i.e., perhaps someone entered, but I didn't see them.

b. \( \text{ki ne vidh} \( \alpha \) vesele dnei} \)

I didn't see that anyone entered, i.e., someone entered.

41a. \( \text{ni ne vidh} \( \alpha \) vesele dnei} \)

I didn't see that someone entered, i.e., someone entered.

b. \( \text{ki ne vidh} \( \alpha \) vesele dnei} \)

I didn't see that anyone entered, i.e., someone entered.
did enter but I didn’t see them.

42a. B: Случи си ги памето. I hear how the girl is singing.

b. Mi студен биха порането. I hear how the girl is singing.

43a. B: Надготвяме си да идете после. I hope that he has already written to me [doubt].

b. Mi се мечтае да си веднъж си писат. I hope that he has already written to me.

In general informants from eastern Macedonia understood the different nuances expressed, but would not themselves use the construction, while speakers from western Macedonia and Skopje rejected the use of док in these sentences and regularly substituted the factual док, the explicitly declarative док, or the progressive док.

Florezko (1974:46) notes that this construction is rarely found in the written language but he does cite several examples from the spoken language, e.g.:

44. Мисля да се си од Негреви. I think that you are not from Negrven.

45. Стаа да арестуваха волани. I hear that bells ring.

46. Стаа да възбуждат камен. I hear how bells are ringing.

Florezko notes that док in these constructions may alternate with биха бях; биха бях, etc., e.g. биха биха бях биха арестуваха.

In our own search of Macedonian literature and the catalogue of sentences collected from Macedonian literature at the Institute for the Macedonian Language in Skopje, few examples of док after these verbs were found, all from the works of Невески and Петев.

sentences, too, were either rejected or deemed questionable by native speakers.

Another difference between Bulgarian and Macedonian is the co-occurrence of a- with other particles. In both Macedonian and Bulgarian the co-occurrence не da occurs. However, while it is the standard literary form in Bulgarian, it is considered dialectal in Macedonian, e.g.:

46a. B: Не да видя, както си, европейци, по България не си.

46b. Ираклийов 1977:30)

I: Не да видя, както си, европейци, по България не си.

46c. Ираклийов 1967:15)

Let the Europeans see, we told ourselves, that Bulgaria isn’t sleeping.

Finally, differences in Macedonian биха да (as if) and Bulgarian биха да may be noted. First, биха да appears to be more syntactically than its corresponding Bulgarian form, that is, more elements can occur between the two words in Macedonian than in Bulgarian: second, Bulgarian favors the combination биха да in this meaning, while биха да cannot occur in Macedonian, e.g.:

47a. И: Петев не се е демонстративно децата. No one shouted as he passed. (Petev 1994:76)

b. B: И: Петев не се демонстративно децата. No one shouted as he passed. (Petev 1994:76)

On the basis of these differences literature which deals exclusively with Bulgarian де will be excluded.

As has been shown, reference works have generally treated montages
of da as separate, homonymous words, including:

(1) The affirmative da.
(2) A particle da, e.g., in directive (optative) sentences.
(3) A conjunction da, e.g., in subordination to a verb in the same clause.

While we agree that the affirmative da can be considered a separate, homonymous word, and while we agree with Gold (1984:10) that Serbo-Croatian has two subordinating da's as discussed above, we do not see any justification for positing two other separate da's, a particle for independent optative functions and a conjunction for dependent subordinate functions.

In this chapter we will demonstrate the relationship between these two uses of da and we will show that da is the unmarked particle in the Macedonian modal system. We will show that da has no invariant lexical meaning, but has three contextual variant meanings and that the major contextual variant meaning of da is optative (directive).

If the modal system is conceived of as a hierarchy of lexico-syntactic categories, da is the least marked of the modal particles for two reasons:

(1) It is the only particle which occurs in both syntactically dependent and independent functions.

(2) Notably salient it can assume the functions of all the other particles. The use of da in the functions of the different particles will be summarized here:

a. In constructions with any tense, da can replace da in both its future function and in the function as the so-called future in the past. The negative forms with cama will be included.

b. In conditional sentences like da, da, and although can occur in real as well as conditional cases; compare the following:

48a. Potom si povade, da te ubije! (Maletić cited in K. Kanak 1924:48]
48b. Da potonite povade, da te ubijete! If you look further, they'll kill you!

50a. Ali mi se pes, da pes... (Arovski cited in K. Kanak 1924:77)
50d. Da mi se pes, da pes... If he feels like singing, he'll sing...

51a. Dokoliko ne osetite ovaj zvuk, pazite na oze... (Cvetić Nakonjić cited in K. Kanak 1924:79)
51b. Da ne osetite ovaj zvuk, pravka da oze... If these conditions are met, there will be no difficulties.

c. In temporal clauses, da can be used with, or can replace, da, and dejda;

52a. Da dejda toj, da odine. b. Da dejda toj, da odine. When he gets here, we'll go.
53a. da go pridjeva, da dejda toj. b. Da pridjeva, da dejda toj. We'll wait for him until he comes.

d. In hypothetical clauses, da can replace da.

54a. Što kada da ti svare... Vidi da se raste mico, znam da kafe nece. b. Što kada da ti svare... (Mihailović, kariceva?) I'd make you a cup of coffee, he said in order to say something, because there was no coffee.

e. Da can be used in place of nega in first- and third-person substantial
Thus da can be considered unmarked for any specific type of modality. We propose the following hierarchy of contextual variant meanings: The particle da has two modal meanings when it functions independently: directive and conditional. The term direction proposed by Lyons (1977:745-46) will be used in place of the traditional term optative. The term optative applies to a morphological, not a semantic, category and has the limited meaning of wish and does not include all the possible meanings of da as proposed by Lyons (1977:320) notes that the Indo-European optative was probably never restricted to wishes but was the mood of contra-factivity and remote possibility. Neidert (personal communication) notes that Indo-European probably made no distinction between irreal conditions and optatives, i.e. wishes (cf. Genka 1984:47-49). The term directions proposed by Lyons includes utterances which impose or propose some course or pattern of behaviour and which indicate that it should be carried out. This category would include commands, demands, requests, exhortations and imperatives. We will follow Lyons' use of the term imperative to mean only the grammaticalized forms of synthetic second-person appeals, e.g., Macedonian Duai 'Come!' Dependent 'Goa' (second plural). We will speak of requests or exhortations when referring to analytic directives. Within this category of directive we will also include counterfactual wishes, such as if only.

clauses, e.g.:

57. Da ne vidi na manja. If only you had not eaten so much!
58. Du da rokaqo! If only you had told him!
(R. Genika 1984:429)

Dependent da constructions can be defined as those constructions in which da cannot occur in clause initial position, but is dependent on a head verb, adverb, or preposition, e.g.:

59. Dajo da pes.
   Na pada pes.
   He began to sing.

60. Sja da mana.
   Na letama.
   Without my knowing.

In the dependent function da can be said to be marked for the category of mēter since in these constructions da can denote a quantifier or a qualifier depending on the lexical meaning of the governing word (see pp. 55-56).

In Macedonian, then, there is a situation typical in Indo-European languages in which the subjunctive and optative (directive) collapse into one form. In Macedonian, however, the optative-subjunctive marker da has spread to include other types of modality, and has become the unmarked modal particle. The following table illustrates the contextual meaning of da:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the literature to date on qa in Macedonian has focused on the use of qa either in conditional clauses or in its 
subordinating functions. Articles dealing with individual functions of 
qa will be treated later in this chapter when these individual functions 
are discussed. Here those works which treat qa in more than one of 
it functions will be examined, namely the basic grammar of the 
Macedonian language and several articles (Lant 1955; B. Konradi 1967; 
Fekete 1974; Konradi 1975; Velkova 1977).

All of the textbooks make some reference to the use of qa in 
combination with modal verbs, e.g., treka qa 'has to' and 
napravio qa 'has to, will/wont', but there is no consistency in the 
treatment of other uses of qa in these works.

In his grammar of the Macedonian literary language, B. Konradi 
(1967) makes most reference to qa itself. While he treats it as 
non-protasis and not participating in synoptic constructions, there 
is no section devoted specifically to qa, nor is there any 
systematic treatment of these synoptic constructions. B. Konradi 
(1967:143), following the analysis employing two homonymous qa's, 
calls qa a particle only in its independent function as a directive 
particle, e.g. Li baka! 'Let him come!' Elsewhere (515-6) qa 
is treated as a subordinating conjunction. Under the heading 
"Impersonal occur", B. Konradi (1967:262) treats qa and noma as 
forming supplement imperative forms used with the first- and 
third-person, e.g. ćipka qa di slađa. Its conditional 
meaning is mentioned with the form of the imperative (B. Konradi 
1967:356). Thus, there is no compilation of the different meanings of 

As one must look throughout the grammar for references,

Konradi (1975) presents qa in a different manner, i.e., there is 
no section devoted exclusively to qa but instead different syntactic 
and semantic functions of qa are scattered throughout the grammar 
under various headings. First, he treats qa as a particle 
(Konradi 1975:104) in its affirmative function, which is outside the 
realm of modality, and, under the heading "particles with modal 
meanings", qa appears only in its imperative function. It is 
interesting that his only example here is qa in an indirect command:

61. Ne ovosj wogove bodge.
Tell him not to bring a book.

In discussing the use of qa as a subordinating conjunction (Konradi 
1975:150-66), he follows the traditional approach of examining and 
deining the various types of complements used with qa (cf. Lant 1955; 
Cvetkovski 1971; Fekete 1974, etc.), for example:

Resultative:

62. Ne biraq jenem ne rasko bi sa sa ne tapanog. 
Don't throw a stone into this mug, lest you get splattered.

Concessive:

63. Tuj je qe v inemona qa do sa burda visene. 
We don't go to a tavern even if he's free time.

Problems with this type of classification will be discussed later (see 
64.) in the section on the subjunctive, dependent qa.

The conditional meaning of qa is discussed within the context 
of the uses of the imperfect (Konradi 1975:123). Like B. Konradi, after 
discussing the imperfect, Konradi (1975:120) treats the use of qa as a 
but not later.
Dikken (1977:307-48) under various headings treats only the directive and conjunctive uses of *da*.

Lust (1952:84-87) devotes a separate section to the various meanings of *da*. He states that *da* functions simply to show a subordination; the verb accompanying it is viewed as secondary to some other action, expressed or not. The exact nature of this secondary event and of the relation to the primary action is determined by the context of the speech event. This definition is unsatisfactory for two reasons.

First, with the independent use of *da*, for example, we do not see how the verb *fall* in a sentence of the following type can be considered subordinate to some other action, e.g.:

64. Laa da fall, no ka ba na maa.

If you throw a needle, there'd be no place for

it to fall.

(Lust 1952:85)

Second, in its dependent use, *da* does not simply show subordination, but is morpohatically modal, as can be seen when it is compared to other basic subordinating conjunctions, e.g.:

65a. Subordinar da go naparamom tom.

I forgot to do that, i.e., the action *go* is real.

65b. Subordinar da go naprimo tom.

I forget that I did that, i.e., the action *go* is real.

66a. Da go ammid tom, dooma ti w.

If you know that, good for you, i.e., the action *ammi* is real.

66b. Dooma ti w da go ammid tom.

Good for you that you know that, i.e., the action *ammi* is real.

Last does, however, treat the different functions of *da*, e.g., conditional, directive, and dependent, together and attempts to find

some underlying connection between them. Unfortunately, his basic

definition of *da* as merely a subordinator does not capture the fact

that *da* is marked for mental (modality and aspect) and thus

cannot explain the role of *da* in the Mambasa modal system.

Folensan (1974:157-66) divides *da* constructions into what he
calls independent optative-subjunctive and complex, dependent

construction. Like Kendeji, he subdivides the dependent constructions
by type of clause. While the division into dependent and independent
functions is helpful, there are problems here, too. First, within his
category optative-subjunctive each diverse forms as the following are

included:

assertive:

67. Da wina!

Let's go!

optative:

68. Da laa Gooma!

My God grant!

mindative-interrogative:

69. Da doo dago?

He didn't come, did he?

Second, under his heading objective-intentional sentences, clearly modal

and non-modal sentences are grouped together, e.g.:

70. Nima da naa.

He wanted to set off,

non-modal:

71. Nima da naa.

He begins to sing.
It is evident from this summary of the general treatment of da in the literature on Macedonian that there has been no adequate description of all its functions nor is there any unified theory describing its role within the Macedonian modal system. Having proposed a hierarchy of modal functions for da and having demonstrated that it cannot be marked for any specific type of modality and can replace all the other modal particles, we will now turn to the three separate uses of da and establish meanings for them. First the independent functions of da, the directive and the conditional, will be examined.

Both the directive and the conditional functions of da can be divided into two categories: fulfillable and unfulfillable.

Traditional studies of Macedonian have used the terms real and unreal when discussing directives and conditions. Instead we propose the terms fulfillable and unfulfillable because: 1) all modal are by our definition real and 2) hypothetical wishes and conditions, which have traditionally been treated as either unreal or outside the opposition real/unreal, can be treated as ontologically fulfillable.

While past unfulfillable wishes and conditions are marked for pastness in Macedonian, the opposition past/non-past is not the basic distinction since in Macedonian there are present, non-past conditions which are unfulfillable, e.g.:

73. Da sem vo vseh mesto.
It only I were in your place.

In the indicative system it is the present which is the unmarked tense, since it can be used to express events which have occurred before or events which will occur after the speech event, while in the modal system there is a reversal of marking and it is the past which is unmarked since it occurs in place of the present in several modal contexts.

We consider the directive meaning of da to be unmarked since da is not subordinated syntactically and in minimal contexts da will be understood as a directive, e.g.:

73. Da krase!
If only I had答案!

This relationship can be seen in the following diagram:

- Conditional
  - (directive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fulfillable</th>
<th>Unfulfillable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulfillable</td>
<td>Unfulfillable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fulfillable da directive has three functions:
1. Polite commands (requests) used with the second person.
2. First- and third-person narratives and connectives.
3. Enthronements and wishes frequently addressed to some third person, found often in blessings and curses.

When used in its first meaning as a second-person command, da plus the second person is considered a more polite request than the corresponding form of the synthetic imperative (cf. Rowefelder, et al.)
the address is generally not given the linguistic option of refusing to carry out the command unless other factors are present, e.g., a special instrumental pattern, e.g.,

76. Honesty is important.
Bring me the book!

The next level of politeness is the use of do plus a second-person non-past verb form, e.g.,

77. In ni ja damai
donate.
Bring in the book, please.

The most polite form is the use of do with the second-person form of the perfective imperfect, e.g.,

78. Da ni ja donausa
donate.
Bring me the book, would you please?

Thus, there is in the second-person directives the use of a past tense verb with a present meaning for both the least polite form, i.e., do plus an l-form, and the most polite form, i.e., do plus a perfective imperfect.

The second-person forms can also be used in blessings and curses, e.g.,

79. Gai de prayed?
May you grow big [and strong]!

80. Do jukum?
May you burn!

When used with a first-person plural verb do plus non-past expresses an endorsement for the joint completion of an action in which the speaker will also take part. There is no corresponding first-person form with the imperfect for expressing politeness. E. Komori
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(1971:154) states that the appeal is frequently strengthened through the use of expressions such as "adao:"

"Come on!" e.g.:  

01. Ada o, wada do (bokuse).  
   (E. Koseki 1971:154)  
   Come on, let's work together.
also:
02. Ada o, begam!  
   Come on, let's run!
He also notes that the appeal may also be strengthened through the repetition of the command with the imperative of the same verb, e.g.:  

03. Begam ada o, begam.  
   (E. Koseki 1971:155)  
   Begam, let's run!  

The use of ada with a first-person singular verb with the meaning of a command is not very common for the logical reason that one does not ordinarily command oneself to complete some action. E. Koseki (1971:154) cites only one example of ada with a first-person singular verb, which he considers a first-person command or a monologue, e.g.:  

04. Ada, o no danu jikin ko kara da.  
   (E. Koseki 1971:154)  
   Ada, let me find out for you.

E. Koseki does not, however, mention the much more common use of ada with the first-person singular in sentences expressing an appeal "Let Mr. A. do!" e.g.:  

05. Da xi hain,  
   Let us see you.  
06. Da xin da,  
   Let me sit down.

The particle da plus a third-person non-past expresses fulfillable directives of both permission and wish. In the former meaning it is the same type of appeal as those above with ada, e.g.:  

07. Da dojia i tayi.  
   Let this come, too.
Some speakers also accept as theoretically possible a third-person indirect command with an 1-form, e.g.:  

08. Vaisa da, o tayi.  
   May be come immediately.

which would have the same meaning of urgent or emphatic command as when the 1-form is used with the second person (cf. p. 60 above).

Sentences of the type "Ada da na oxide?" 'He isn't coming, is he?' and "Da na na oxide!" 'You're not sick, are you?' whose meaning is connected with both interrogation and negation, may still be considered a type of directive (optative). They may be interpreted as an interrogative form of the wish, e.g.: May you not be sick!

Boothman and Gofsh (1964:130) note that in everyday speech da plus a third-person non-past verb is the most common construction for expressing a wish, e.g.:  

09. Da dojia tayi!  
   May be come!  
10. Da da tayi!  
   May be stay!

They note that the use of da plus Ha followed by an 1-form has an emphatic character, e.g.:  

"-12-"
91. Do bi doh! Would that he came!
92. Do bi oustani! Would that he stay!

Both Mraova-Durkova and K. Kowalski (personal communication) now consider the combination da bi archaic or dialectal and not productive in the modern literary language.

The use of da plus the third-person perfective imperfect is also uncommon in the modern language for expressing wishes. Golyp (1964:19) and K. Kowalski (1969:1429) cite the use of this form in the following non-literary example:

93. Da gasiye (Pi) Gospod kefata yah i repe da ti an ostris! May the Lord grant that your arrows be turned to dust and ashes!

Both authors note that the perfective imperfect has a present or future meaning. Several of our informants rejected a future interpretation of this sentence. These same informants were undecided on the grammaticality of wishes formed with the imperfect with a clear future reference:

94. Da daya da tij etire! May be ease tomorrow!

It appears that this construction, like those above with da bi, is no longer productive in the literary language but occurs only in fixed expressions like the curse cited by both Golyp and Kowalski.

Before turning to the unfulfillable directives, the use of fulfillable directives can be summarized. These directives are used with all three persons to express a command or request replacing the
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synthetic imperative when used with a second-person form. When used with a first- or third-person form, the fulfillable directives express an appeal or concession, e.g.:

95. Da ouas. Let me sit down.
96. Da ouas i too. Let me sit down, too.

Finally, the fulfillable directives are used to express a wish which may, however hypothetically, be fulfilled in the future:

1st pers. | 2nd pers. | 3rd pers.
--- | --- | ---
Perfective | Polite command | Command
Form | 1st pl. | 2nd | 3rd

Distinguishable directives express a wish for something either to have occurred at some point in the past, or for something to occur at the moment of speech. When used in this latter context, da can be used with an imperfective non-past, e.g.:

97. Da bi na ose Elenas wata taale! If Elenas were there!
98. Da bi na ose Elenas wata taale! If Elenas were there instead of you!
99. Da bi na ose tu yaraa! (Futurized 1973:115)

In both examples the non-past form can be replaced by an imperfect:
We consider the use of the imperfective non-past to be marked in this context since it is usually the past tense which expresses an action which is unfulfillable.

It is in the use of the unfulfillable directives and unfulfillable conditions that there is overlap in the two independent uses of  şi (cf. Culph 1964:16). It is only through intuition that one can distinguish between an unfulfillable wish and the proscription of an unfulfillable condition:

Directives:

şi za nave!
If only I knew!

Condition:

şi za nave...
If I knew...
(I ought have done something)

In other words, there is no formal distinction between the two unfulfillable meanings and the directive and conditional uses of  şi merge.

The formation and meaning of conditional clauses is one of the most complex problems in the Macedonian modal system. Four of the modal particles are used in the proscription of a conditional period, namely  şi,  şi,  şi, and  díasli. In some instances one can also use  što to express the condition (see chapter V). In the apodosis, two forms are competing: constructions with the particle  şi, and constructions with the particle  şto. In addition, there are various combinations of tense and aspect.

Conditional clauses in Macedonian have been the subject of several shorter works (Golip 1964; Hausmann cited in Golip 1964; Hovanes-Gokovska 1967; Milč 1975; K. Končarski 1977). Here discussion of  şi conditionals will begin with a summary of their treatment in the standard grammars and in the works cited above. Studies of Macedonian conditionals have not treated the modal particles systematically, and, therefore, discussion will be limited to theoretical frameworks and the specific sections pertaining to  şi.

In his grammar of the Macedonian literary language, K. Končarski does not address the problem of the distribution and meaning of particles, but lists  şi,  şi,  şi, and  şi as conditional conjunctions. Neither Lunt (1952) nor Džaks (1977) make special reference to conditionals (see chapter VII). Xepaks (1975:163) states that dependent conditional clauses allow under what circumstances the action in the main clause either did or would take place.

In an earlier grammar (1958 cited in Milč 1975:63), Xepaks defines three types of conditionals:

1. Real conditions in which the condition is necessarily experienced:

98. Ako ću znači da go sveče ovde poslužim. If you study diligently, you will finish school.

2. Potential conditions in which the possibility of the fulfillment of the condition is expressed:

99. Gota ću znači da hoću da go sveče ovde poslužim. If you would study, you would finish school.

3. Irreal conditions in which it is stated that the action was not fulfilled:

100. Da ću znači da hoću da go sveče ovde poslužim. If you had studied diligently, you would have...
finished school.

In her master’s thesis on conditional sentences in Macedonian and English, Milčić (1975) follows Kuno’s division of conditional clauses into the three types listed above: real, irreal, and hypothetical. In her terminology, real conditions (1975:111) express a condition which must be fulfilled in the present or future, while there exists no hindrances for the fulfillment of the condition, the speaker leaves open the possibility that the condition may not be fulfilled. Potential conditions (1975:116) denote the possibility of fulfillment of the non-present condition. Finally, irreal conditions are conditions which were not fulfilled in the past. This type of condition expresses a supposition of what would have occurred had the condition been fulfilled.

I. Kuno gathered over three thousand examples from Macedonian literature in writing his doctoral dissertation on constructions with ἢ. While his dissertation is very rich in data, he does not attempt to define the relationship between various types of conditionals. We will look at his data later after suggesting our own framework for an analysis of conditional clauses; here it will simply be noted that he cites examples of both fulfillable and unfulfillable conditional sentences with ἢ.

Both Golgh (1965:125-30) and Minova-Glizeva (1967:130) also post three types of conditions: real, irreal, and potential. Their works include numerous examples, but these works will be treated in more detail in the chapter on ἢ (chapter IV) and the chapter on ἢ (chapter VII).

Thus, work to date on conditional clauses follows the classical subdivision of conditions into a tripartite system. The tripartite conditional system is not satisfactory because it does not show the relationship between fulfillable conditions on the one hand, and unfulfillable conditions on the other, leaving aside for the moment the degree of possibility that the condition will or can be fulfilled. Nor does it point to the relationship which exist between expectations conditions, i.e., conditions whose fulfillment is or was projected as fulfillable in the past, present, or future in opposition to hypothetical conditions, i.e., conditions which express the speaker’s view that the fulfillment of the action is doubtful, unlikely, uncertain, or conjectural. The opposition expectation/hypothetical will be treated in more detail in chapters V and VI.

In a systematic treatment of conditionals the following system can be proposed:

- Conditional
  - Fulfillable
  - Unfulfillable
    - Expectative
    - Hypothetical
It has been widely accepted in the literature on Macedonian that the particle used in the protasis of real conditions, whereas 'do' is generally used for irreal conditions. MIŠIČ (1975:44) notes that in her corpus eighty percent of real conditions were expressed with 'do', while ten percent of real conditions were expressed with 'pp'. The remaining ten percent were formed with other particles, e.g., 'baa', 'ned'. Sopha (1969:121) and Marava-Gurkova (1969:10-17) have stated that 'pp' expresses a real condition when used with a non-past perfective verb but an irreal condition when used with a non-past imperfective verb. However, it will be seen that 'pp' can be used for all of the four types of conditions shown in the diagram above with verbs of both aspects. Analysis will begin with unfulfillable conditions.

First to be examined will be the unfulfillable expectative, i.e., conditions which could or should have been fulfilled at some point in the past but which were not fulfilled. As mentioned above, the most common type here is the use of a modal particle plus the imperfect in the protasis and 'pp' plus an imperfect in the apodosis. F. Kurekči (1979:51) found sixty-six examples with 'do' and sixty-nine with 'pp'. In addition, F. Kurekči notes that for all conditional sentences the marked, unmarked word order is protasis — apodosis; this is similar to English if — then. He cites examples of both marked and unmarked word order and notes that the marked order is much rarer for conditions with 'pp' than for those with 'do'. It is clear that the marked word order is avoided with 'pp' since 'pp' also occurs in subordination to other verbs in its dependent function and ambiguities might arise when 'pp' is placed directly after the verb in the main clause. Wherever possible examples will be cited with both marked and unmarked word order. The following sentences illustrate unfulfillable, expectative conditions:

1) 'pp' plus 'pp':
   101. Da me vitkam tine, ne pojde.
       (Arenovski, baraterja)
       (If they had invited me, I would have come.
   102. Pojmi da bomo do ustalone sedja.
       (Gregorčevski, baraterji)
       It would have been better if they had stayed abroad.

2) 'pp' plus 'pp':
   103. Da ne osevev, ka je povrili vsak.
       (Parlevinski cited in F. Kurekči 1979:24)
       (If they had left us, I would have slept all night.
   104. E, ki je mirik, ka vse človeke ka je potrjil.
       (Miščič, baraterji)
       Well, how much money would the house have cost us if
       they had stolen it?

3) 'pp' plus 'pp':
   105. A da znate, Če so v cestini manj počas.
       (E, I know, I would have returned much sooner.
   106. A so na drugi, da nase morate priti le do bozbi.
       He wouldn't have come if the people had rifles to defend
       themselves.

All of the above examples with an imperfect of either aspect in the protasis and 'pp' plus an imperfect in the apodosis express an expectative condition.

Unfulfillable, hypothetical conditions are those in which a condition is expressed which cannot be fulfilled at the present. As with the unfulfillable wishes, there is a neutralization of the
opposition past/non-past, and de can occur here with either an imperfective non-past or an imperfect of either aspect. In these hypothetical conditions a bi-clause is most common in the apodosis, but de plus the imperfect is also possible. Problems in the distribution of de and di will be treated in detail in chapters IV and V; here the following examples will be cited:

107. Da maa deka s a yapanta, deka mena si mudda n jomoru, og bi se mudda mick người pred tu tiniduen aindle.
(Upper, Bartokora)

If I knew that everything were in vain, that there is neither sense nor meaning, I would never hide from this real torture.

108. Da maa nokj gun akor, pottis, dek affer ogope.

If he knew some other word, just think, I'd say it.

Both of these sentences could also occur with an imperfective imperfect.

"... afer ogope... dek amon affer ogope..."

Is fulfillable conditions dek is much more common, however, de does occur in both expectative and hypothetical fulfillable conditions. Gottv treated the use of dek as expectative conditions only with a perfective non-past in sentences like the following:

109. Da maa s cala Sabana, da si go dekuk (Fip) mouta de de
(Ed. Koment 1979:260)
The whole Sabana is in me, if they bring me the ox, I would swallow it up.

110. Ah da maa inesab (Fip) poedem pred ofi, de na go
(Ed. Koment 1979:260)
Oh, it that jecum appears before his eyes, he'll pick out what he has heard.

Koment (1979:267) has shown that de can also occur in this type of condition with an imperfective non-past, though he notes that

its use is limited, e.g.:

111. Da dey comwam (1ly) akonu m xir, wite kou a
(Ed. Koment 1979:267)
If you tell someone about them, tomorrow when we go out of here, he won't believe you, we'll think - you're imagining.

Finally, fulfillable hypothetical conditions are those in which the condition is conceivably fulfillable, but which will in all likelihood remain unfulfilled. These conditions usually have a perfective non-past in the protasis and a bi-clause in the apodosis, e.g.:

112. Da dwo dek aro, hi ti dal part.
(Ed. Koment 1979:267)
If you were to come tomorrow (and I don't think you will) I'd give you the money.

The differences in the use of various particles in the apodosis and in the protasis will be discussed in more detail in chapter V and VI.

As seen above, rather than a three-way division of conditionals, we propose a binary opposition between fulfillable and unfulfillable conditions which enables us to show the close relationship between the traditional real and hypothetical conditions to opposition to the so-called irreal conditionals. These two categories may then be subdivided into hypothetical and expectative conditions. This division then unites those conditions which are capable of being fulfilled with those which may be fulfilled, and it unites the hypothetical conditions which are not fulfillable in the present with those which will most likely remain unfulfilled in the future.

There is one more type of sentence with de which may be included in a discussion of conditionals. These are sentences with a nominal predicate such as goma 'shine', goma 'sit' or an
adjectival predicate such as *dojča 'good' or *načo 'important' (see Feletsko 1976:141), e.g.:

113. Sranca e da se kazna.
It is shameful for us to quarrel.

114. Prijmec e da slaviš pesem.
It is pleasant to listen to songs.

These sentences can both be rephrased as follows:

Sranca e da se kazna.
It is shameful for us to quarrel.

Prijmec e da slaviš pesem.
It is pleasant if you listen to songs.

These sentences are here considered to be a type of infallible hypotactic condition, however, they are included between the section on independent and dependent *da, since these sentences can also be interpreted as parenthetic, intercalary clauses, i.e., instead of substituting one of them, in a different context, substitute *kog 'wherever', e.g.:

Sranca e kog se kazna.
It is shameful wherever we quarrel.

Prijmec e kog se slaviš pesem.
It is pleasant wherever you listen to songs.

The dependent function of *da has been the subject of much debate. Since most of this debate has focused on Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian in which, as seen earlier (see pp. 72-73), *da is the dependent function of *da that most differentiates the three languages, only a brief summary of the pertinent aspects of this debate will be given. The discussion centers on whether *da is a preverbal morpheme or an independent modal word. The former view has most recently been supported by Gofta (1954) and Müller (1956); the majority of Bulgarian linguists (e.g., Andreev 1964; Popov 1963; Stoianov 1973; Junakieva 1964; Goevska-Michalska 1962, 1972, 1976) consider *da to be a conjunction in most subordinate clauses.

Works specifically on Macedonian generally treat *da as a conjunction (Lazić 1952; B. Konstantin 1963; Feletsko 1974; Kostanski 1977). Unlike the Bulgarian linguists, who have noted that *da generally carries a modal meaning, Macedonian authors have not attributed the modality to *da, but rather cite individual modal uses, e.g., *da as a suppositional first- and third-person imperative.

Most authors on Macedonian (e.g., B. Konstantin 1963; Červkovski 1972; Feletsko 1974; Kostanski 1977) have distinguished *da clauses on the basis of the type of clause, e.g., intentional, objective, etc. This system is unsatisfactory since it leads to the inclusion of both modal and non-modal clauses within the same category; for example, the Kostanski (1979:125) includes under the heading "objective clauses" the following types of sentences:

1) Modal:

115. Sedeća da namaz.
He wants us to go off.

2) Aspectually inceptive:

He began to sing.

3) Conditional, or iterative:

117. Acro e da mišića.
It is good for you to be quiet.

Armanos (1977) maintained that *da clauses could be either modal or aspectual. He determined that while *da plus an imperfective
non-past covered a range of meanings from the clearly indicative after verbs of 
beginning, fastening, continuing to clearly modal
meaning, when  as was followed by a perfective non-past the action in the subordinate clause was always markedly modal. He did not, however, account for such clearly non-modal uses of  as for 
perfective non-past in subordination to verbs such as  
'succeed' or  'receive', e.g.:

118. Steckerick so pravint isstul uppat da go
pagul (Try 1 version, 
(36 10-11; 12-13)
Steckemki managed to hit the wolf with his first shot.

On the basis of these facts, we will take Aronson's category of manner as our starting point. The dependent use of  can be used to express mood or aspect depending on the lexical meaning of the verb in the main clause. Without knowing the lexical meaning of the head verb, one cannot say whether the subordinate clause is marked modal or aspectual. Therefore, while dependent  can function either as a qualifier or a quantifier, the exact nature of the mood or aspect is dependent solely on the lexical meaning of the verb in the main clause, e.g.:

1) Modal uses:

a. Desire

119. Soka da odi.
He wants to go.

b. Intention

120. Misli da odi.
He's thinking of going.

c. Necessity

121. Mora da odi.
He must go.

d. Indirect command

122. Fall na da odi.
Tell him to go.

2) Aspectual uses:

a. Introductory

123. Pufon da pew.
He began to sing.

b. Durative

124. Probizdo da pew.
He continues to sing.

c. Conclusion

125. Lopet da ipe.
He managed to sing through.

Thus it can be seen that the dependent function of  is based on the lexical meaning of the main verb. Future work on the relationship between the modal and aspectual meanings of  will have to include a dictionary of all the verbs which can govern  after verbs of beginning, fastening, and continuing, and after verbs expressing modalities of desire, e.g.  'wait',  'continue',  'hope'; aspectual, e.g.  'must',  'works',  'goes to', etc.; the particle  is obligatory, i.e. other conjunctions are impossible, e.g.:

*He must that he go.

In other contexts, the substitution of another word changes the
conjugated form the meaning of obligation or duty is strengthened, while
the sense of to have is also present. He cites the following
example:

133. Jaa' fa de ja rellî.

which he translates as 'You should/might to solve it.' or 'You have it
to solve.' B. Karaci (personal communication) rejects the former
interpretation, i.e., that of strengthened obligation, and says the
conjugated form must have an understood object, e.g., Jaa de ofii
'Tea will/must go,' but Jaa de ofii fa ofii. 'You have (a
reason) to go.' Therefore, the conjugated form of Jaa can also be
treated lexically. Because this use of Jaa de ofii fa is closely
interrelated with the use of Jaa, we will return to these
constructions in chapter IV.

When Jaa is used in compound forms with adverbs and prepositions
its meaning is always clearly verbal. The particle de continues with
the prepositions baa 'without', rellî 'before' and fa 'for',
e.g.,

144. Poppo di baa de baa,
(6. Karonki, Karpacz)
I passed without knowing it.

125. Këosu ne sele ëtto de naa ngwë.
(6. Karonki, Karpacz)
We entered the village before the sun show.

136. Zë da ne ngresp le naa ngwë, odo de gi otaawin
(6. Karonki, Karpacz)
In order to find our way when we return, we'll leave
the rings here.
While the elements of these compounds are usually bound, the
preposition can be separated by pronominal forms, e.g.:

137. Đelca pred joj da vidiš v kafi...
(Gunjarević 1975:163)
Already before he entered the house...

The modal meaning of da is especially evident in subordination
to propositions since verb forms are always modal after these compound
prepositions and da cannot be used in constructions with
prepositions that denote fulfillment of an action, e.g., on 'with',
e.g.:

138. *Kogaliv, so da zanu,
or with *posle 'after', e.g.:

139. *Pogledive posle da agire senereo.
The compound banuk da 'as if' unlike the other compounds,
occur with all types of verb forms, including constructions with da,
e.g.:

140. Devinčanka mes teško čevke na Phillip Island sanjade
krstine kruha da otkrijel zlatna rusa.
(Todorov 1975:150)
Truly there is no haggan sam on Phillip Island, he shouted
excitedly as if he had discovered the golden fleece.

141. Me pridelja kroha sovi lebo naskriži, kroha nasnoža da
aje bil azurna rekoj i kroha sebojki da bi obstojal.
(Cabicić 1970:260)
They accepted me as their own in the general silence,
as if I had always been by him, and would always remain.

When da is used with other combining adverbs it has a meaning
of indefiniteness, e.g., bolje da 'however much', bolje da-
šalke i da 'however', e.g.:

102. Čebila i da bilo, even though the inside of the
baker still had flour. (St. Kosmaci, Karlovec)
However it was, this story of his seemed to us as a
consistent whole.

103. *Goga da je videlo, ab je se zareg.  
(Đaković 1978:234)
Wherever I saw him, he stops so.

104. Gogom je v obelo i kroha o mramorni žokn ob vinku
greškeja, en soča da se ne počenijo sestine na zuma
zupci izba. (St. Fener 1970:182)
No matter how good it is, and no matter how indifferent a
man is in such a situation, one cannot help feeling like a
participant in some stupid game.

While da is also used in the compound forms jurči da and
dusči da, these compounds will not be included here since jurči and
dusči occur in modal constructions with similar meanings without da.
These will be discussed in detail in chapter VII.

The following summary of the use of da in Macedonian can now be
given. The particle da is the lowest marked in a hierarchy of modal
particles because it occurs in both independent and dependent
constructions and because it can assume the functions of all the other
Macedonian particles. The independent function is highly marked and
corresponds directly and conditionally. The dependent function of da is
a designator of manner and can, therefore, express either mood or
aspect.
The following abbreviations will be used:

- S - Serbo-Croatian
- M - Macedonian
- B - Bulgarian

In the early issues of the journal *Macedonistika* much attention was given to the syntactic position of particles (see Kureljan 1950a:253-255; Dimitrovska 1952a:40-42, 1952b:87-93). Evidence, for example, suggest an influence of the syntactic position of *da* citing adverbs in the ghas such as the following:

1. Ose pred 25 gollin na se faza na odred ceb fra da za 600 minuti od fivo kroz terenoci. (Kureljan 1950a:225)

Already 25 years ago an owner of a book factory proceeded to producing paper from firewood in 25 minutes.

Instead of the correct Macedonian *da podrobci*.

Although the distinctions used in this dictionary appear to be arbitrary and not based on any consistent semantic criteria, the material will be presented as it occurs since our goal is to demonstrate the differences between Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian and not to formulate an analysis of Serbo-Croatian.

These sentences are the following:

1. Tako li juv lego na most? Vider si trojca da skriva leno od prajsko a prea pristaj. (Sokolik 1950b:94)

If I see people in the night? Did I see a chaser over off to the left of the tracks and not cross them?

2. Igu sema de se se vriat postojano kripo. (Nachbri 1950a:9)

Igu saw how his blood returned little by little.


Momul felt his back pocket again, "If I were like your Boguj a saw you lying in the shade, I'd tie there, too."

4. Sonkula, cellose un vido Mestara Skelovski kako ha raz suda vodn da de se pubi reneko o seluvi kusti... (Poter 1974:137)

Right away the villagers saw Mestra Skelovski so be walked with the officers: they saw his hands were filled with some sort of bales...

5. Vro Parenko, Zaif Igorski te svidel vu Bitola, da si joj rat... (Poter 1974:228)

Hey Parenko, Zaif Igorski saw you smoking tobacco in Bitola...

6. The term katroki "title" will be used to designate examples which were taken from the files of the Institute for the Macedonian Language in Skopje.

It is interesting to note that while this distinction is mentioned by both B. Kureljan (1967:122) and Kepovski (1973:123) it is ignored by B. Kureljan in his analysis of the use of the imperative in Macedonian in which he treats *da* constructions only in the first- and third-person, as appropriate imperative forms. He takes no mention of the use of *da* for second-person requests. It should also be noted that B. Kureljan (1967:1416) also cites the use of an imperfect form for requests relating to the past, e.g. *Da ju sa sreška* (translit. da me sâska) "If only you had told him [you had told you should have told him]". This latter type of sentence will be...
considered as one belonging not to requests, but to unaffordable directives since, as Lyons (1979:746) notes, one cannot rationally command or request someone to carry out some course of action in the past.

While reasons for rejecting this theoretical framework will be discussed later, here we will point to some problems in Milčić’s treatment of her data. First, she relies too heavily on the works of Marko Cepenek, a nineteenth-century folklorist. The use of nineteenth-century sources is a persistent problem throughout the work done by Macedonian scholars. It is as if someone wished to illustrate contemporary English usage by citing examples from Shakespeare. The changes which have occurred in Macedonian over the last century are as great in magnitude as the changes in English over the last three centuries. There has been great activity among Macedonian authors in the post-war years and Macedonian scholars should look to these modern authors rather than to the works of Marko Cepenek and Kosta Mustac.

Second, Milčić does not distinguish different types of conditional clauses and different verbal categories systematically; for example, her first sub-category of real conditions is defined as follows: Both clauses have a present tense, but the verb in the second is always joined by a modal verb, most often dok. First, we do not see how a verb subordinated to dok can be considered present, and second, it is clear that dok is not a modal verb, but a particle.  

* For more detail on this debate, see Gundel-Heine-Schreuder 1976, and Rubin 1982.

Chapter III

The particle neska 'last' has received little attention in studies of Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Serbo-Croatian. Due to the paucity of literature on neska, just a brief summary of the areas of intersection and divergence in the use of the particle in these three languages will be given here.

The Serbo-Croatian particle neska is fewer syntactically than its counterpart in Macedonian, where it is closely bound to the verb and can be separated from the verb only by the negative particle se, the exclamative discourse, and, rarely, the particle dok, e.g.:

145. Mi
Hoka me se trafi mogu na bronasti!  (Petkovic 1975:66)
Hoka rejka na bronasti se trafi!
Let her not spend a lot of money!

146. Hoke se kafe zao Ako je jest?
(Vlahini 1969:129)
Let him say it himself, if he's a here.

147. Sj
Hoka u korina u kafe se na ustrenje doju.
(J. Kovan in cited in Stovangor 1974:70)
Let them come as wedding guests to our village during Lent.

While more handbooks and dictionaries of Serbo-Croatian (e.g., Stovangor 1975:135; Benson 1971:336; Pelletier 1992:170; Runza 1972:103) note only those uses of neska which have parallels in Macedonian, viz.: wish, consent, and blessing in constructions with a third-person verb form, e.g.:
a first-person only is the schematic one cited above from the Natica; elsewhere it is used with the first-person. Thus, Serbo-Croatian has no first-person directive with only parallel to Macedonian Neka

Janjov daj... 'Let us say that...'

While Bulgarian and Macedonian neka are more similar, here, too, there are several differences. In Chapter II (p. 28) differences were cited in the co-occurrence of neka and da in these two languages, namely, while neka da is standard in Bulgarian, our informants considered its use in Macedonian typical of eastern dialects, e.g.: 

40a. Si: Neka da vidiš kajleme ml. evangelistina, ka
Bulgariju ne ugri. (Kostantinovska 1973:90)
Mi kog vilam evangelistina, na velmen, da da Bugarska
ne ugri. (Kostantinovska 1973:25)

Let the Europeans see, we told ourselves, that Bulgarians isn't sleeping.

The Bulgarian particle is also free syntactically than the particle in Macedonian, though placement directly in front is preferred, e.g.: 

125. Ako da da da na lista kome na nego - nane najinte naka da da da

Si: (cited in Efrosina 1978:12)

If I allow him to be hurt - let the whole village judge me.

Many works on Serbo-Croatian (e.g. Stuparović 1973; Tanen 1971; Novak 1973; Hana 1973) only cite the use of naka with a third-person non-past verb form. Golub (1984:xii) states that the particle may be used with either a first-or third-person verb form. Our informants for Serbo-Croatian would accept the use of naka with: 

(1) In conditional clauses in place of ali 'if' or ako 'even
though, even if':

151. Neka nam se povoljno ne poveže, nali je nezno.
If it gets up and takes two steps, it's soaked in sweat.

(2) In concessive clauses replacing neka, John 'even

152. Da...ona ne može...ona poveže...mali 'Iza na
ta le potječe, ja nek se smiru.'
Don't ever do anything...she blushed...she thanks, 'I know
that without you, even if I am poor':

(3) Polite refusal:

153. Djeve, ja...leži ti samo.
Don't, I'll do it...just lie down.

154. Delal rođe mi. - Neka, bvala...! sit nan.
Come on, have soon, he said to me. - Oh, thanks! I'm full.

Many works on Serbo-Croatian (e.g. Stuparović 1973; Tanen 1971; Novak 1973; Hana 1973) only cite the use of naka with a third-person non-past verb form. Golub (1984:xii) states that the particle may be used with either a first-or third-person verb form. Our informants for Serbo-Croatian would accept the use of naka with:
or where the corresponding forms of the present and that the particle *mek* is rarely used with other than the third-person.

Kupat (1975:119) does mention that *mek* or *dv* may be used with a first- or third-person plural verb form, however, he cites examples only with the third-person. Gikova (1977:367) states that the first- and third-person analytic imperative is formed as follows: *mek* + (2h) + present, e.g., *mek* (2h) *kame*! 'Let him speak!'. She cites no examples with a first-person, nor does she make explicit that focus with *dv* are not the standard literary form. Lunt (1952:16) creates *mek* as a subheading under the entry *dv*, stating that *mek* may be used with the third-person to express meanings of exhortation or wish. Since these meanings are not explicit in the particle *dv*, Lunt considers the use of *mek*, which has no other meaning, stronger.

While it is clear that *mek* to, in some contexts, parallel to the imperative in that it expresses the speaker's request for some third party to carry out the stated request, e.g.,

159. No prints ton ofoulitema ti ocharaketa ti eugenou ti epistikes
-ti metaxi tis oto ti an se of to *mek* *dv* *kame*
meta apo praktika.
-Edikthe *dv* to *mek* ton for in to *mek* *kame* kai *dv* *kame*.
(On 31-Jr-3-19)
On the first day of school, the teacher explains to the little pupil:
-If any of you has to go to the bathroom, let him raise two fingers quickly.
-Do you think that will help? asks little Vidos.

In other examples it is evident that something other than a command is expressed, e.g.,

-We found other examples in Bulgarian literature, and:

157. A meka me mavrijez in iia, ti psalitelijet vagrom - opored
brevni ti grall iugor - me meka ciklami geemacka.
(Trench 1977:16)
But let us not forget, above, that the last question — according to the ancient rule of the gno — was not a real ciddle.

Thus, Bulgarian shows the use of *mek* as an alternative form of *dv* plus non-past in first-person narratives. No examples of *mek* with a past tense verb form were found in Bulgarian nor would our
Bulgarian informant accept a Bulgarian sentence which parallels this use in Macedonian, e.g.:
In chapter II (p. 50) the use of Lomé's term *díre jò* was proposed for that category which includes commands, decrees, requests, entreaties and imperatives. In the discussion of the directive function of the particle *díre*, it was stated there was both a fulfillable and unfulfillable directive. The fulfillable directive *díre* could be used to express the following:

1. Polite commands (requests) used with the second person, e.g.:
   77. [word not legible]
   78. [word not legible]

2. First- and third-person imperative and concessives, e.g.:
   85. Rise, now do whatever.
   Come on, let's work together.

3. Subordinations and wishes in the blessings and curses, e.g.:
   89. [word not legible]

The unfulfillable directive (chap. II, p. 50) could be used to express a wish for something either to have occurred at some point in the past, or for something to occur at the moment of speech, e.g.:

73. Rise now!
   If only I had known!

In the course of this chapter we will demonstrate that *díre* is most often used as a fulfillable directive which may be used in place of do in first- and third-person exclamatory, imperative, and appeal. Due to its lexical meaning, i.e., *díre* and its main use as a fulfillable directive, *díre* is usually restricted to constructions with a main verb since, as Jerome (1965:264) noted, a request necessarily has relation to future time. The particle *díre* does, however, function marginally as an unfulfillable directive.

The term *díre* as a particle used to express a wish, command, request, or approval. This meaning is similar to that of *díre* which is defined in the American Heritage Dictionary (1976:270) as: (1) as auxiliary verb used to (a) express permission or allow; (2) an aux. verb in the imperative used to (a) convey a command, request, or proposal: Let's finish the job! (b) a warning or threat: Start to do it now; (c) to convey an assertion or hypothesis: Let's equal L.; (d) to convey acceptance or resignation to the inevitable: Let's the future come! One of the synonyms of *díre* is *díre* where meanings include: to allow to; consent to; tolerate; to afford opportunity to (American Heritage 1976:275). Taking this definition as our starting point, we will give the following as the basic meaning of the particle *díre*; the directive particle *díre* expresses the speaker's willingness or consent for the action to be done to be fulfilled, or his desire that the action be done to be fulfilled, i.e., the speaker may permit the action, e.g.:

101. Don't do it, obey me.
   Let him go, it's all the same to me.
   or the speaker may request that the action be permitted, e.g.:
When *nek* is used with a third-person verb, it is always an appeal, and expresses various nuances, e.g.:  

1. A third-person imperative:  
   
   106. Neka mu kađe sam ovo burla!  
   "Neka kao otro mene ne osuđite!"  
   (Slavko 1995:119)  
   Let him not go, what's to you?  
   Let him not tell the Germans and not to you!  

2. Resignation, acceptance, or exhortation, e.g.:  
   
   102. Sosa uskati se veru se veću wakup pes za benčast.  
   (M. Bosnaci, kartoteka)  
   Now leave him here, let him die like a dog  
   on a garbage heap.  

106. Kako neka bude!  
   (Slavko 1997:214)  
   So be it!  

3. Expresses a lack of, destroys a major reason.  
   (Adapted from "My the Down Staircase" shown on  
   RTV Slovenska 20:1-6:21)  
   May I be lucky, today is my birthday.  

When the particle *nek* is used with a first-person singular  
form, it expresses the speaker's desire that permission be granted to  
fulfill some action (cf. *da* plus first sg. chapter II, p.42), e.g.:  

106. ...a čim volim, onda izdržava kupa sveti doveru  
   nekog od kuća, ove izdružene mlade  
   dvojice albiha, onda nekome od  
   svogu sela da u ponedjeljak vijeti,  
   kada neka izdava...  
   (G. Barić, kartoteka)  
   And since already surrender opens before me like holy  
   doors, doors which will again lead me back to my  
   soul to the Macedonian truth, then let me give myself up...  

The particle *nek* may also be used with a first-person plural  
form. In this context it is parallel to the use of *da* plus the  

The particle *nek* occurs very rarely with a past tense verb  
form. Its mention of *nek* plus past tense was found in any grammar,  
and in a survey of Macedonian literature only the following examples  
were found, both from future:  

150. Sada ma odbala za sekundu dugo,  
   nake me se stajali  
   nekoga uzet na pokolu.  
   So that modest girl didn't want to,  
   let her not have  
   waited long at night with the young villagers to the  
   barracks.  

151. ...snežke da im steku,  
   ili nekada popolna nila  
   da da sniža trejto  
   pokoje neka ometa  
   terapo u sile.  
   (Frusa 1974:220)  
   Be wanted to have one hundred, one thousand times more  
   strength in order to level the hay,  
   and then let him be  
   set up without a drop of strength.  

These examples imply that if some action is currently rejected,  
the agent should or should not have completed some action in the past.  
This use can be considered an unsatisfactory directive, i.e. as an appeal  
that some past action should not have taken place. The following is an  
additional example discussed with members of the Institute for the  
Macedonian language:  

(To friends go off to the notice without waiting for a  
third friend who has not arrived at the appointed time.  
The next day they learn that this friend is angry that  
they left without him, upon which the two friends respond)
The use of the particle *mon* may now be summarized. The particle *mon* is used mainly to denote a fulfillable directive in constructions with a third-person non-past verb. In this context the *mon* construction expresses permission, tolerance, concession, or request. The particle is used more rarely with a first-person plural non-past, *da* being more common. When used with a first-person plural, the *mon* construction expresses an exhortation for the joint completion of an action in which the speaker will participate. In first-person singular directives, i.e., appeals, *da* is more common.

Finally, in limited contexts *mon* may be used with a past tense form to denote an unfulfillable directive, i.e., an appeal that some action should not have taken place in the past. We consider *mon* marked for appeal, thus separating it from the other modal particles. The particle *mon* may only be used with first- and third-person forms and is, therefore, the most restricted of the modal particles.

1. B. Ennekai considered the use of a *da* perfect theoretically possible, but rejected the use of an *tan* perfect in this context.
Chapter IV

The particle 'ke' is another of the pseudo-paradigmatic particles closely bound to the verb; it can be separated from the verb only by the active and accumulative personal and reflexive pronouns, the clitic form of the -imam, and, in suppositional clauses, by the particle do, e.g.:

171. Ke mu ja daošam kisamet.
I'll give him the book.

172. Doktori mi rečel: Enam sam rodilu, kaj če sem nisem umrl, vodila bi sem pestirina.
(T. Maleški cited in K. Konečni 1970:131)

Doctor told me: If I had given birth, who knows whether I would have stayed alive.

(Maleški, Karotki)
He must have been some eighteen years old.

In Macedonian, unlike both Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian, the future particle derived from the verb gledaš 'to watch' has been formally deparadigmatised. While in both Bulgarian and Macedonian there is an invariant particle used with a non-past verb, differences are apparent in the particle used with other so-called future tense forms, e.g.:

1. Mi gredeš 'I will look' 
Ke gredeš 'He will look'
Be gredeš 'We will look'

2. Sin gredeš 'You will look'
Sle gredeš 'You will look'

Mi gredeš 'I would have looked'

In Serbo-Croatian the future is formed with a fully paradigmatic auxiliary derived from the verb hadî 'to want' followed by an infinitive. The auxiliary can occur as the second element in the clause, or it can be postponed and attached to the verb, e.g.:

Ja će gledati; ja će do gledati; gledat Â 'I will look' 
Ti će gledati; ti će do gledati; gledat Â 'You will look'
On će gledati; on će do gledati; gledat Â 'He will look'.

Aside from these formal differences, while the future is used in many similar contexts in these three languages, there are significant formal and semantic differences. In Serbo-Croatian the future auxiliary may be separated from the verb, e.g.:

174a. Mi daš ukriv križ.
b. Mi daš ukriv, karvari ukriv.
We will spend the night there.

In Serbo-Croatian there is no construction using a past form of do (an imperfect) corresponding to the Macedonian and Bulgarian future in the past; constructions with do are used to express (1) unfulfilled conditions, and (2) past intensive habitual actions, e.g.:

175a. Si da nevim da sem usmeren, dokler bi...
175b. Mi da ne bave miseto, da bi...
If I had not been there, I would have come.

176a. Si samo o venem na veceg gubac bi
evzelo gubac dole.
176b. Mi ovsene osebe na veceg gubac bi
evzelo gubac dole.
Only when time to time a rifle would fire down below.
Another difference is the absence of de after temporal adverbs in Serbo-Croatian where de must be used in Macedonian, e.g.:

177a. St. Hedi dvadset, jutro se.
177b. Mi Hedi de dvadset, jutro se.
When you arrive, call.

The relationship between the Bulgarian and Macedonian future is much closer, but here, too, there are important differences. Examples were cited above (p.7) in which there is a neutralization of the opposition between future and present after pronouns relatives in Bulgarian, while this neutralization does not occur in Macedonian, e.g.:

178a. Bo Tovi, hajde pade v buj na sobaka, tuj se undo.
178b. Mi Tovi de pade...
He who (will) die in a battle for freedom.

The most significant difference between Macedonian and Bulgarian is in the use of the so-called anterior future as an iterative/habitual.

The purely temporal meaning of such constructions is not present in literary Bulgarian and its use is considered dialectal (Brenman 1977:25; Golev 1964:22). In Macedonian such constructions are characteristic of the literary language. Golev (1964a:95), summarizing differences between Bulgarian and Macedonian, concludes that Bulgarian, in preserving conjugated forms of the future particle, represents a more conservative usage in the development of the future. He cites differences not only in the use of the past iterative/habitual, but also in the type of conditions expressed by the so-called future in the past; namely, in Bulgarian the form de would have come when occurring together with a preposition de a imperfect may express a potential, rather than an iterational condition, i.e., "I would come..."
more traditional approaches to it will be presented.

8. Kosinski (1967:174-79) includes the future, i.e., €€ plus
non-past, the future in the past, i.e., €€ plus imperfect, and the
future perfect, i.e., €€ plus the same series among the
indicative verbal tenses. For the future, B. Kosinski (1967:146-79)
gives the following uses:

(1) An action which will occur after the speech event
(Absolute time), e.g.:
178. Ðecesta sẽ ăn trưa; sẽ ponduu daircuit.
The children will get up and will want to eat.

(2) In subordinate clauses, an action which will occur after the
occurrence designated in the main clause (Relative time), e.g.:
179. Ðe puesto, puesto no nego, trénda postará,
se dasbawá (U) jaula ákoro da e dólá (Hyn)
€€ at (€€) tó covidu (Hyr) akan yodo oku pata.
At first, angry with him, Brenda secretly hoped
that soon he would come [lit. will come] and that he
would know [lit. will know] one evening at the door.

(3) Supposition, e.g.:
How old will he be? He, surely he’ll be around forty.

(4) Iterative-habitual actions, e.g.:
181. ë sa ñawolé sa ñawolé, tó ci en báku ko báku, ë sa
nda refl: ë sa ñawolé ko teko, ë sa ñawolé
will return in the evening, she waits for me
at the corner, she will take me by the hand, and
we’ll return together.

(5) Conditional, i.e., in the apodosis of conditional periods,
e.g.:
182. Ñe ñu sá ñawolé ko teko, ë en ñawolé sá ñawolé
you will come to get me, if you come to get me
pón using ko ñawolé ko ená ko báku.
if you come to get me, you will marry, if
you now come, terrible cold will mean, or you’ll have
a huge quarrel or quarrel with people.

The future is the past in used to express a past action which is
viewed as future from the point of view of some other past moment (B.
Kosinski 1967:140-1). The meanings cited for this tense parallel those of
the future:

(1) An action occurring after some event in the past, e.g.:
183. Ñe ñáa, ñe ñáa ko báku.
They assembled and would go to town.

(2) Supposition, e.g.:
184. Ñe da ñawolé ñu ñáa ko báku.
We must have been gone eighteen years now.

(3) Iterative-habitual, e.g.:
185. Ñe ñu ñawolé ko tó ñáa ko teko.
Some of the women will come and bring some food,
pod saída.
Only from time to time a rifle would fire down below
the village.

(4) Condition, e.g.:
186. Ñe ñu ñáa ko báku ko ñu ñawolé ko báku ko teko.
If he had come, he’d have done so when she
would return in the evening, she waits for me
at the corner.

Finally, B. Kosinski includes a third future paradigm, the future
reported, composed of €€ plus the same series. Again the uses of
this tense parallel those of the other tenses:

(1) An action occurring after some other action, e.g.:
187. Ñe ñawolé ko báku ko ñu ñawolé ko báku
the day arrived when they would have a wedding.

(2) Iterative-habitual, e.g.:
188. Ñe ñawolé ko ðe ñawolé ko ñu ñawolé ko ðe
some day he would come and they would say to him: let
Mr. Burchi, give me cotton, cheaper goats.
(6) Conditional

Esperanto gives three same meanings for the \textit{ki} plus \textit{am} series, but also claims that they have additional marking for reportiveness.

The most extensive treatment of \textit{ki} constructions in the doctoral dissertation of H. Koneski. H. Koneski (1979:11-15) also concludes that \textit{ki} constructions belong to the temporal, not the modal, system of Macedonian. Following the traditional approach of H. Koneski and Kopyski, he assigns essentially the same meanings to the three \textit{ki} temporal forms.

Dzhusova (1979:162) treats none uses of the future, future in the past, and future reported as indicative. In a separate article, (1979:209) she also includes a future recitative, i.e., \textit{ki} plus the \textit{am} perfect (cf., Luci 1982:799, Tomas 1975:90), e.g.:

192. \textit{ki} am iuppifu, \\
I will have written.

Unknown defines the future tense as the form used to express an action which must occur after some other past, present, or future event, i.e., the future expresses both absolute and relative time. Defining mood as the speaker's relation to the narrated event, she attributes various modal meanings to the future: necessity, intent or awareness that the action has to have been, or will be completed. Dzhusova (1979:162) states that on the basis of its modal meanings, forms of the future and the future in the past are frequently used in conditional periods.

With separate heading - conditional past - Dzhusova (1979:306) treats those conditional \textit{ki} constructions as modal forms synonymous
with the indicative, temporal forms. Real conditions (fulfillable) are
homogeneous with the future tense, while unreal conditions
( unfufifiable) are homogeneous with the future in the past.

There are several problems with the treatment of $€$ in these
works. First, merely listing contextual variant meanings does not lead
to discovering a basic meaning which unites all the contextual variant
meanings of the so-called future (cf. King 1963:3-4). Second, on the
basis of the definition of modals taken from Golz (1964b), we disagree
with the traditional view that $€$ as a tense marker, nor do we think
it necessary to posit homonymous forms. Finally, since $€$ is
invariant, it cannot be said to define a paradigm; the meanings cited
for the future, the future in the past, and the future reported are
inherent in the particle itself. The use of different tense forms in
subordination to the particle add nothing for temporal reference or for
status.

In order to determine a basic meaning for the particle $€$, we
will take as our starting point the works of Lust (1912), Golz (1964a,
1964b) and Topolánka (1974). All three of these authors have pointed
to an underlying invariant modal interpretation of $€$ constructions.

Topolánka (1974:275) states that $€$ plus non-past cannot be
considered a future tense in some contexts because these
constructions constitute the expression of actions based on fact,
but on the inner psychological reality of the speaker. She compares sentences such as:

Zasa baše lođe baše veđenja. I know that lođe came yesterday.

with sentences such as:

Zasa baše lođe $€$e veđenja. I know that lođe will come tonight.

She treats the former sentence as subordinate to a higher clause.

In this same article (1974:275) she states that $€$ plus
non-past cannot be defined as a future tense which expresses an action
which will occur after the speech event because $€$ plus non-past is
frequently used to denote a past action in relative time, i.e., $€$
refers to a past sequence of events, rather than an absolute future
time. Topolánka’s treatment is a useful starting point, but she does
not propose an invariant meaning for all the $€$ constructions.

In his extensive treatment of constructions formed with $€$ plus
the imperfect, Golz (1964a:46), noting the parallel functions of $€$
plus non-past and $€$ plus imperfect, cites the following contextual
meanings: actions which will occur after the speech event, or after some
other action in the past; conditional actions - irreal in the past and
potential in the present and future; and iterative-habitual actions in
the past and non-past.

Unlike the former studies, Golz (1964a:43) attributes these
meanings to the modal particle $€$. He notes that it is the verb
form in subordination to this particle which temporarily modifies the
modal particle $€$ itself. In his work on verbal mood (1964b) he
does not include the future among the modal categories of the Slavic
languages; however, he does note that actions to occur after the speech
event are not ontologically real, and are thus differentiated from those
model-expected because future habitual actions do not denote real processes, e.g.:

193. Toj kő dojul, de rosar, i légg rölli abban szöveget szózzak. He usually comes [lit. will come], sits [lit. will sit] and solves [lit. will solve] some problems.
(Laut 1932:101)

Laut notes of this sentence that the end result is expected to be achieved on many occasions. This habitual action is here considered no more real than an action expected to occur only once in the future. Here will be included protomorpho, general truths of the type all will float on water, which may be interpreted: whatever will not fall into water.

At times, while an expected result is expressed, the action denoted is not at present catalogically real.

In the expectational-expected meaning of őr, the non-past may occur, however, in the so-called historical present; őr plus non-past can be used in place of an imperfect, e.g.:

Sono recalled his uncle’s case, short visits at that time. He would [lit. will] come, would [lit. will] sit, and would [lit. will] be silent.

195. A hős, a néző és a még a végút i od poszájhat.
A hős, a néző és a még a végút i od poszájhat.

The hero, the spectator and even the end of the path.

The use of őr plus the imperfect to denote expectational
iterativity is very common in the literary language. E. Konkoly, in collecting data for his dissertation, found three thousand five hundred
examples of खे plus imperfect, of these two thousand were
iterative-habitual. In these constructions खे is usually followed
by a perfective-imperfect; in R. Eason’s examples only one hundred and
seven contained खे plus an imperfective imperfect.

It is evident that the past iterative-habitual events
ontologically real events when we consider the following:

185. Сомо од врного осмове खे пакао  во аким пулу
дело пе делио.

*All crime proceeds खे пакао пулу, and so пакао.
From that to time a rifle would fire, but it didn’t fire.

These constructions also retain an expectative nuance, however (cf.
Aramon 1977:265): the action, though real, is still predictive, e.g.:

196. Ток седмо ден खे 32 семуме кнага, а 35 реабане редо;
50 не ден 35 не дуфо.

Every day he would take the book and would solve some
problems, but on that day he didn’t look.

All the other meanings of खे belong to the modal-expectative.

These meanings may be divided into the suppositional and the
non-suppositional. The definition of suppositional will be taken from
Higginbotham (1982:26) that sentences of the type That’ll be John at
the door and the class will be over by one are parallel to the use of
the present tense for future actions, e.g.: The train leaves at seven
a.m.

In the latter instance a future prediction is presented as
present fact, while in the former, a present action is reversed from the
present factual perspective, and is presented as future prediction. The
term suppositional refers, then, to actions which are temporally
present, but which are expressed as future expectations. Thus
non-modal use of the future particle to express a suppositional then
extends to the past tense, where it does not present an action received
from the present, but merely expresses a supposition of the type 32 must
have arrived yesterday. When used to denote a supposition, 32 may
occur with 32, e.g.:

197. 3а 32 граоло 32 да а.
(Rufinov, 3М 32-32-7)
It must be like that.

198. 32 3а домен гоходи.
32 да 3а фраане гоцо.
He’ll be about twelve years old.

It is only in this suppositional meaning that 32 may be followed by
32, e.g.:

199. 32 3а преоди кнага траа.
32 да 3а преоди кнага траа.

Within the non-suppositional uses of खे, the two most important
uses are the conditional and the temporal. The use of खे in
conditional periods is as closely connected to the use of खे and the
conditional particle ом, 35, deodah and protective 32
which will be treated in chapters 7 and 17, that throughout this chapter
conditional forms will merely be cited, while specific contexts in which
32 can be used will be treated in more detail in the later chapters.

The major contextual variant meaning of constructions with 32
plus imperfect has been the subject of some debate. R. Eason (1979),
D. Johnson (1967) and Rufinov (1977) have treated the temporal reference
meaning of 32 plus the imperfect as primary, e.g.:

200. 32 пакао  во куме на лаход оо 32 в пеогрее 32 фраа 32.
(Tamazov, cited in D. Johnson 32-32:212)
A young traveler with a small letter suitcase climbed on board the passenger ship "Fittim", which was set off towards Istanbul in an hour.

Göböl (1964) has demonstrated, however, that from a synchronic point of view it is the conditional meaning which must be considered primary since, outside of a wider context, a sentence such as  الماضي الزمن will be interpreted as the conditional They would have gone to town rather than as the temporal They will have gone to town.

In addition, it can be noted that constructions with الماضي plus the imperfect, when used in the apodosis of a conditional, are not temporally marked, i.e., they may replace الماضي plus non-past.

201. On the baked-tanor zabaveni prvo dočekati od sačeta selo ne se dočeku ve gradinama.

(Chart cited in K. Kononi 1971:252)

If there were [lit. is] any kind of entertainment, the youth of our village wouldn't have gone to the cities.

This use of الماضي plus imperfect will be treated again in chapters V and VI, here it may be stated in agreement with Göböl, that the conditional meaning of الماضي plus imperfect is unmarked with respect to the temporal meaning since it can replace the non-past in this context, and since, in similarly marked contexts, the construction الماضي plus imperfect will be understood as an unfulfilled condition.

Constructions formed with الماضي plus the non-past reverse the marking: the future meaning is unmarked with respect to the conditional.

The mental particle الماضي can combine with non-past verbs of either aspect. In its non-synoptic meaning, الماضي plus non-past is a simple declarative sentence always referring to an action which will take place after the speech event, i.e., absolute time, e.g.:

202. Ći vi rastečak (ifp) za divariste Spone Lake x Yala Alikul. Vi vi rastečak (ifp) za minata divarica Elma Gafajkina, i za minat čim će se divarica tam ne dođe do slave.

(Kononi 1971:267)

I'll tell you about the last day Spone Lake and Yala Alikul, and I'll tell you about the episode Elma Gafajkina, and about everything that happened that night with the devil.

203. Ći te kupanin (ifp) za oruž. tajni garedni izvori.

(Kononi cited in K. Kononi 1971:25)

I'll tell you about the three big meetings with the girls.

204. Vi težak na ponedjeljak supercilijite čakat (ifp) na uvjetovanje je milion dolari ukojaća minuta.

(Jurčić 1971:294)

During the course of this year the superpowers will spend one million dollars every minute for arms.

In complex sentences, however, الماضي does not denote absolute time, but denotes an action posterior to the action in the main clause (cf. B. Kononi, K. Kononi, Topoliška 1971:276), on the basis of this tensive relationship between the two clauses, concludes that الماضي plus non-past is, in her terms, not asked for absolute time, while الماضي plus imperfect, when used to denote temporal reference, is so marked. Shown below are examples demonstrating the temporal relationship between the main clause and the subordinate clause containing الماضي plus non-past, e.g.:

a. The main clause verb is present:

205. Šta go optisan naslov ime i sifra. Budući su višeg év de kogom, o ne su sigurni o čega se vuču.

(Besalija 1974:249)

I'm leaving you our estate and our honor. Because I am sure that I will go, but I'm not certain that I will return.
b. The main clause verb is imperfective.

206. Sigurno se znašemo da... (Claus 1976:18)
Surely we didn’t know that they would... (lit. will) give us warm coffee with jam and a place of bread...

c. The main clause verb is perfective.

207. Tovd dan bila da nimam samopaznata za trgovska razmene ogledu cenja... (SM, cited in K. Konecki 1969:58)
He added that he would [lit. will] sign a trade agreement with the two countries.

d. The main clause verb is without.

208. Trajala osudene izpomlčene dekla ko se žaliti na nezakonitos ne... (SM, cited in K. Konecki 1969:90)
The three defendants announced that they would [lit. will] appeal to a higher court.

e. The main clause verb is also future.

209. Se razbiro, kakor komunist, ti nema du primarno deka Stalinska ko pozn... (K. Konecki 1974:14)
Of course, as a communist, you will not admit that Stalin’s will fail.

Although Konecki and B. Konecki separate the imperative meaning of će plus non-past from the temporal meaning, it will be included here since, as stated above (p. 71) a command or request logically refers to a moment posterior to the speech event. We agree with Konecki (1982:101) that the use of a future form as an imperative is frequently more categorical than the imperative mood itself, cf. English Close the door and You will close the door, though Macedonian is not an categorical as English, e.g.
apologies of a conditional period usually denote an unfulfilled expectative condition, outside a conditional period, in temporal contexts, it denotes a fulfillable expectative action, cf:

216. Se abomin, se oda v gruz.  
They’re gathering, and they’ll go to town (it is likely they will go).

217. Da se zbrisut, se oda v gruz.  
If they gather, they’ll go to town (and if they gather it is likely they will go).

218. Se abomin, se oda v gruz.  
They gathered, and would go to town  
(and they might have gone).

219. Da se zbrisut, se oda v gruz.  
If they had gathered, they would have gone to town  
(but they didn’t).

The conditional use of se will be treated in greater detail in chapters VI and VII, here it simply may be noted that se plus non-part denotes a fulfillable condition.

Earlier (p. 90 it was noted that se constructions have parallel forms composed of the invariant form se plus se. The standard handbooks (e.g. B. Konstel 1961; Engelski 1975; Uniksen 1977) merely cite these forms but do not attempt to define the differences between these. Lunt (1952:62) states that the construction se se plus non-part denotes a future action, containing a greater or lesser degree of the ordinary significance of se, i.e., ‘there is’, ‘one should’, e.g., Jan dva sa rafom: may mean ‘we shall solve it’; ‘It’s here for us to solve’ or ‘We should solve it’. I. Konstel (1979:162) states that forms with se se are axiologically neutral, expressing a greater degree of definitiveness, preparatory, or awareness of the speaker towards the completion of the action.
These forms will be considered the marked future; they denote necessity combined with future intent, i.e., *tana te* carries the meaning of both *tana te + te* necessary and *te* The construction *tana te* is rejected by most speakers where either of these two meanings is contradicted. In a survey of students in the Macedonian language department in Skopje, only ten percent accepted sentence a below, while only seventeen percent accepted sentence b:

220a. *Tana te odam, te odam ne te odam.*
I want / will go, but I’m not going.

b. *Tana te odam, iako me treba, I must / will go, even though I don’t have to.
I want / will go.

Sentence b was accepted only with the meaning ‘I must go even if I know it isn’t really necessary.’ Most of the students who rejected these sentences regularly substituted *treba* for *tana te* in sentence a., but replaced *tana te* by *ne te* in the sentence b. We agree, therefore, with K. Konzaki, who concludes (1976:162) that constructions with *tana te*, though still in use, have a limited use and are always stylistically marked.

It has frequently been stated (Last 1952; K. Konzaki 1967; Zajkavić 1975; Belchev 1974, 1977) that while the positive future is usually formed with *te*, the negative future is usually formed with *nena te*. K. Konzaki, however, cited three thousand and negative future sentences, of which 56.6 percent (1,700) were with *te*, while 43.4 percent (1,300) were with *nena te*. It is evident that *tana te* like *tana te* retain some of its original lexical meaning when one looks at examples containing verbs expressing capability, e.g. *nena te* ‘can’ and necessity, e.g. *nena te* ‘must’. It is in

constructions with these verbs that *nena te* is much more prevalent.

In K. Konzaki’s examples of this type four hundred and eighty occurred with *te*, compared with only fifty-four with *nena te*.

Mimulka-Molea (personal communication) feels that there is no difference between *tana te* and *te*, however, while she would generally use *nena te*, she rejected sentences containing *tana te* plus treba or need.

221. *Nena te moram, te do treba.*
I want / will go.

222. *Nena te od treba.*
I must / will go.

It may be concluded, then, that *tana te* and *te* occur in free variation except in contexts expressing modalities of necessity and capability. K. Konzaki (1975:166) states that *nena te* may express the assumption of the speaker that the action will not be completed, while *te* does not express this assumption. Among our informants, however, there was a general tendency to prefer *tana te* even when the future outcome was in doubt.

The following survey of the meanings of the *te* constructions may now be given. The particle *te* belongs to the category of manner and has the basic invariant meaning of experientiation, i.e., constructions with *te* denote an action which was or is to occur after some other action, or is projected to occur after some point of time, either the speech event, or some moment in the past. This experientive particle may be a quantifier, denoting experient iterativity, or a qualifier, denoting a supposition or a future action. In its experient meaning *te*
is limited to past reference. The modal-expectative meaning is not limited to past actions, and outside of a wider context, verbs subordinated to the article .nano will be understood as denoting projected, non-habitual actions. The following diagram outlines the contextual meanings of .nano:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{+ expectative} \\
\text{+ quantifier} \\
\text{+ supposition} \\
\text{+ condition (future)} \\
\end{array}
\]

In the next two chapters the relationship between  nano and  na.na will be discussed. It will be demonstrated that the difference between the particles is a status opposition in which  nano is the marked member of the opposition.

Notes - Chapter IV

1 In Bulgarian there is a fully paradigmatic verb  nano "to want":

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{на} & \quad \text{не} \\
\text{на} & \quad \text{немо} \\
\text{на} & \quad \text{не} \\
\end{align*}
\]

E.g., на не 'I don't want to', няма да си купят седалка

'As you like' (Bulgarian-Russian reference 1972:1013-24).

2 In Serbian dialects, particularly in the south and west,  nano does occur in the expression of an unfulfillable condition (see Belić 1995:103; Gotz 1964:96-110; Boljarski-Frank 1982, 1985). Gotz (1964:97) notes that there are two types of constructions:  nano plus infinitive or  nano plus de plus present, the latter type typical of south-eastern dialects, e.g.:

i. To on ploče glave me pogođio, tri umrli brata graditi fakel pa i Smeda vigor hit o čak i
   rakole bde nakon četiri druga.
   (Gotz 1964:97)
   If I had not died, he would have caused three hundred scandals even Istanbul would not have been safe if he had spread his wings.

ii. Tamo je če da gozima veca, ali evo ti posme u plat.
   (Gotz 1964:97)
   The sun was just about to set, when there appeared a golden vessel.

According to the research of Boljarski-Frank (1982) these forms are
most frequent in Montenegro; in the northern Torlak dialects they occur
in colloquial speech, while in southern Balkan and Bosnian-Hercegovina
the forms were common only up to the turn of the century.

This is the only example cited by B. Kostki and, therefore, it is
included even though it could be interpreted as an absolute future.
Although not cited by R. Komniki, the 1-locus may occur with a suppositional meaning. In its suppositional meaning, the 1-locus usually expresses a prediction that something occurred in the past. As with the other suppositional constructions, 1-locus is more usually followed by 1.

7. Ne tušitelj poslušao o dovezi golini. (Bosnian)
He wouldn’t have been more than twelve years old.

44. Ne ću. Bojan je ću sa jašam morao se kupiti, ten n... Tij. nesel naes takz žabiti, stari, a uzeo je do nesel. (Bosnian, cited in R. Komniki 1981:4)
Absolutely not! Bojan must have had something up his sleeve, that’s it... He was carrying something secret, he must have been carrying arms.

Friedman (1977:78) has shown that the so-called declarative use of the non-series is actually better described as derivative, retrospective, stereotyped, or ironic since it is almost always used as a sarcastic repetition of a preceding statement, and thus confirms the basic meaning of suppositional, e.g.:

4. (Javan) Taj provode od veka sve sa sukobom.
(Dusan) Taj provode sambu.
(Javan) He knows more about botany than you do.
(Dusan) He knows more indeed.
(Friedman 1977:78)

This marked use of the non-series also occurs in subordination to the particle 1-locus with added working for favority. It occurs most frequently with a negated verb and expresses disbelief at what has been said together with a sarcastic or sarcastic denial. The examples we found, along with those cited by R. Komniki, all contained the interrogative kamo 'how', e.g.:

1. Kamo dojme, kamo ne ćemo doći?
(Makeski, Karanjak)
(We’ll come, how could we possibly not come!!)

ii. Ti vidiš li, ne ću, ne ću li?
Ti gde dojme, kamo ne ćemo doći?
(Friedman, cited R. Komniki 1979:135)
I told you to wait for him, didn’t you hear me?
I’ll wait for him, how could I possibly not wait for him.

We’ll divide the child! - unexpectedly said Nadele with raised voice. How could we divide my Georgie! screamed Nadele.

5. R. Komniki (1967:200), Last (1952:99-100) and others (e.g.,
Dakeva 1971; Točić 1971) include temporal uses of 1-locus not only with the imperfect and the non-series, but also with the non perfect.

They state that these constructions have a meaning of future resultativity. This meaning is clearly stated in the example cited by Last (1952:99):

1. Dari ti ćemo doći, tej ćemo i to i rođenu toga robota.
Then you get here, he will have solved the matter.

Friedman (1977:94-95) questioned speakers from northeastern Macedonia where the forms are not common, and he obtained the following example of 1-locus plus 1-locus perfect:

ii. Vidiš li, ja sam robota! Vido i Goko li ja sam robota.
Do you see this business? Vido and Goko must have done it.

This sentence does not express any sort of temporal relation to the moment of speech, nor to any past moment, but is marked for suppositional and should be included under the suppositional contextual variant meaning of 1-locus. The two other examples cited by Friedman
contains the perfect in the apodosis of a conditional

period:

115. (A) bēna ti nohu stah...tōmu ti no su hán sēnhio
metau pritadān.
(B) bēna ti no su hān sāh...tōmu ti no su hān sēnhio...
metau pritadān.
(C, cited in Friedel 1977:193)
And if you were some handsome fellow — they would have
bitten you up with some cute little cookie by now!

116. (A) bēna su no cu hān sāh...ti no hān sēnhio
metau pritadān.
(B) bēna su no cu hān sāh...ti no hān sēnhio
metau pritadān.
(C, cited in Friedel 1977:190)
If I weren't here, and these children, you would
have squeezed it by now.

We found no additional examples of the perfect plus the

periphrasis, nor did E. Kawai cite any such examples in his dissertation.

It may be concluded, then, that these constructions are marginal in the

literary language.

7 Although the use of a perfective non-past after these temporal

adverbs is considered typical of eastern dialects, examples were found

with other forms of non-past form outside the

prescribed eastern dialect areas. The following examples with other

forms of non-past were written by someone from Frippa:

1. A ti no hān sēnhio se maipjā se was...
(Akashi-Kisshū 1972:169)
And then, when I have eaten and drank with you...

Informants consistently inserted the after other forms.

considered the absence of the non-standard.

The status of the perfective non-past is somewhat

different; its use is more widespread, particularly in colloquial

language. Examples were found not only in the media, but also in

literature, and in conversations with people from western dialect areas.

11. [The following is the caption of a political cartoon

which depicts British troops dressed in penguin costumes

on board the ship bound for the Falkland Islands

Stop massacre, demand an end to nuclear tests!

ON T.V. Show (17-8-90)
As soon as we arrive, mingle with the local population!

11. They will eat, they will drink.

(Sketch of the movie "The Devil Bird of Hollywood"

shown on TV Showie 14-4-90.
As soon as it gets dark, you should run away from here.

111. From devotees, an aide.

(Conversation with Y. Cottovas, Prof. of English from Bithna)
As soon as the professor arrives, we'll go.

11. From passports, an aide.

(Turkey, author from Cottovas, cited in E. Enami 1979:74)
As soon as we are off, we'll grab them.

11. From passports, an aide.

(Turkey, author from Cottovas, cited in E. Enami 1979:74)
As soon as you are alone with him, ask him

about his sister.

(Conset 1971:10)

It appears that while the literary norm still demands the after

these temporal adverbs, the use of a perfective non-past without the

particularly after from, is spreading beyond its original dialect

area.
Chapter V

The particle ʊ, like ʊ and ʊ, closely bound to
the verb and can be separated from the verb only by the pronominal
anaphoric and, in some instances, by the subject form of the verb (cf.

223. Dolgo gledam taka maz vo čelostu nejedal se
kdo se ne pytalo o gléda.
(B. Konečni 1917:79)
For a long while Sokol looks like that and it seems
to him that he would never tire of looking.

224. ʊ mi reči!
(šent 1012:701)
You should have decided!

The particle ʊ is the most paradigmatic of the particles
since, unlike the other particles which may occur with different verb
forms, the particle ʊ occurs in constructions only with the
1-participles. In chapter I (p.4) ʊ was included among the modal
particles despite this morpho-syntactic restriction since it behaves
syntactically like the other pseudo-paradigmatic particles, it is not
the only particle which has certain co-occurrence restrictions (cf.
šent, chapter III, p.74) and finally, it carries the same types of
meanings as other modal particles. In this chapter it will be shown
that the basic meaning of ʊ is hypothetical.

Before presenting an analysis of Macedonian ʊ, a brief

comparison of the uses of ʊ in Macedonian, Bulgarian and
Serbo-Croatian will be given. Particular emphasis will be given to the
use of ʊ in Serbo-Croatian, because it is precisely in the use of
ʊ that the Macedonian modal system is most in a state of flux due, to a
great extent, to Serbo-Croatian influence.

There are syntactic, morphological, and semantic differences in the
use of Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian ʊ. While in Macedonian ʊ has
become fully depersonalized, ʊ is conjugated in Serbo-Croatian,

: ʊ je bi doželi 'I would come'
: bi doželi 'You would come'
: bi doželi 'He would come'
: bi doželi 'She would come'
: bi doželi 'We would come'
: bi doželi 'You would come'
: bi doželi 'They would come'

: je bi doželi 'I would come'
: bi doželi 'You would come'
: bi doželi 'He would come'
: bi doželi 'She would come'
: bi doželi 'We would come'
: bi doželi 'You would come'
: bi doželi 'They would come'

Steiner (1970:713) (also Delić 1995:469) notes, however, that there
is a tendency to generalize the form ʊ in the first and second


225. Hvali ʊ de rečen.
We would like to know.

226. Bi ti vi ili a namei?
Would you come with me?

rejection ʊne bi bilo de rečen and ʊta ili a namei? Topolov
(personal communication) also notes this tendency to use ʊ with
the first singular in colloquial speech.

The syntactic position is fixed in both languages, but they are
governed by different syntactic rules (cf. the rules for ʊ in chapter
II, p.10). Whereas Macedonian ʊ can be separated from the verb only,
by the exclamatory pronoun and the clitic form of goo, Serbo-Croatian bi may be separated from the verb by a whole clause, but the particle must be the second element in its clause, e.g.:  

227. Bi mi na spremi de ne sada ona srečka, jer je značio da bi mi tore začela napraviti nekaj rade. (N. Jevšek, cited in Stavrović 1979:715)  
He was in his usual wont to come across an obstacle, since he knew that in that case his recall would be too slow.  

228. U svim bi se ova složenina isprobala okliza potencija magičnosti manifestacije je da je geverska loca, odnosno subjekt veruje u ono što se kao potencijalizaciju. (Stavrović 1979:715)  
In all these instances before the form of the potentiality, the statement can be added that the speaker or the subject is sure of him that is expressed by the potential.  

Also, in Serbo-Croatian, unlike Macedonian, bi cannot occur in clause initial position, while in Macedonian, the particle must occur before the verb, cf.:  

229. Mi bi zaklali,  
S巴拉ki bi.  
Bi mi,  
I would like.  

Macedonian bi, like Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian bi, may be used to express potentiality, wish, intent, politeness, etc. There are, however, three uses of Serbo-Croatian bi which are, to varying degrees, unacceptable in Macedonian, namely:  

1. iterative-habitual actions,  
2. the object of periphrastic clauses,  
3. unrealizable expectative conditions.  

In the last chapter (p. 73) it was noted that Serbo-Croatian uses bi to express past iterative-habitual actions where Macedonian uses  

plus perfective imperfect, e.g.:  

M. Še ne da bi im poslovio bi sada.  
S. Še bi im poslovio, je bi sada.  

With regard to the use of bi in Macedonian, it was stated earlier that in this context the verb subordinate to bi denotes an ontologically real event. Stavrović (1979:717) says of bi in contexts denoting habitual actions, that it is not modal nor does it contain any conditional nuance, but rather describes an action which has occurred repeatedly in the past. This, then, is a crucial difference between the Serbo-Croatian bi and the Macedonian bi which, as will be seen, cannot denote ontologically real events in the past.  

The use of bi in periphrastic clauses is not typical of literary Macedonian, while in Serbo-Croatian it is common, e.g.:  

230a. S. Tako bi mi kogome da bi mi ta noge prežitati.  
230b. S. Da bi mi ta noge prežitati.  

Finally, Serbo-Croatian uses bi in the epoche of unfalsifiable expectative conditions where Macedonian has historically used bi plus perfective imperfect, e.g.:  

231a. S. Da bi mi kuca koja da bi mi kuca koja.  
231b. S. Da bi mi kuca koja da bi mi kuca koja.  

The use of bi in these conditions will be treated in more detail later in this chapter (see p. 73) since the current literary language does employ bi in this context.  

Bulgarian bi is more closely related to Macedonian bi; however, there are several differences. First, in Bulgarian, as in
Serbo-Croatian, the particle \( \text{hi} \) is still fully paradigmatic, e.g.:

Je bih došao; "I would come"  Mi bih došao; "We would come"
Ti bi došao; "You would come"  Vi bi došao; "You would come"
Da bih došao; "I would come"  Oni bih došao; "They would come"

Second, the Bulgarian particle is free syntactically to

Macedonian \( \text{bi} \). Its usual position is the same as in Macedonian, i.e., it is normally closely bound to the verb and is separated only by the pronominal clitic forms. It may, however, also be separated from the main verb by the interrogative particle \( \text{bi} \) and, more rarely, when occurring in word-initial position, the word order may be reversed (Stojanov 1971:392), e.g.:

230. Bi li mi dal pari?
Would he give me money?

231. Eksel mi bih/exsel bih mi.
I would tell him.

234. Eksel mi go bih/exseli bih mi go.
(Stojanov 1971:392)
I would leave it to him.

In Bulgarian, like Macedonian, \( \text{bi} \) is more typical of the written literary language, while \( \text{bi} \) (Macedonian \( \text{bi} \)) plus imperfect is more typical in colloquial or dialectal speech (Stojanov 1971:393). The particle \( \text{bi} \) is used to express similar modalities in the two languages and the differences may lie in the frequency in the use of \( \text{bi} \) in certain contexts. In Macedonian, as shall be seen below, \( \text{bi} \) is becoming more common in the expression of an unfulfillable, expectative condition, while \( \text{bi} \) is considered rarer in this context in Bulgarian, e.g.:

235. Also in the example of \( \text{bibi doša} \).
(Ankita Larina)
If there were a place, I would (have) come.

The \( \text{bi} \) construction here would normally be replaced by \text{biq} \( \text{biq} \) plus imperfect.

Elsewhere \( \text{bi} \) may be used in contexts similar to those in which \( \text{bi} \) is found in Macedonian.2

Very little research has been devoted to the use of the \( \text{bi} \) constructions in Macedonian. The important works of Hausmann 3 and Golub will be treated in detail later in this chapter; first, however, the material provided in the basic handbooks will be summarized.

B. Konsterski attributes three meanings to the \( \text{bi} \) constructions:

- wish, condition, and potentiality. He notes (1987:499) that the use of \( \text{bi} \) in the potential meaning is rare in colloquial language, e.g.:

236. Ovde moram poseti, bi li mi dal samoljepo.
In this place I ought to visit, I would give away a daughter to you,
but I'm not the greatest in the world.

It occurs more frequently in colloquial language in expressions such as curses and blessings, e.g.:

237. Do bi biskam te uraditi!
'That a bullet strike you!' (B. Konsterski 1987:500).

In the literary language, however, B. Konsterski cites the spread of the \( \text{bi} \) constructions with a potential meaning due to the influence of other Slavic languages at the expense of \( \text{biq} \), as its conditional meaning,

which is more usual in the colloquial language. The \( \text{bi} \) constructions in their potential meaning are said to denote actions whose completion is viewed as possible. These constructions are not marked for tense but: 

2.
constantly they may refer to the past, present, or future, e.g.:  

239. Past:  
Misa, sa predla, evrski, je ne znaš.  
(B. Komski 1967:150)  
The thought consumed me, I would have broken the railings with my hand.  

239. Present:  
Sto, saheli, mene klinu bi saheli, da ne v viklju.  
(B. Komski 1967:201)  
I would like, you know how much I would like, for it not to be the truth.  

240. Future:  
Bi lahko da se obna, pomakal tejo.  
(B. Komski 1967:150)  
She could jabber, he thought.  

3. Komski cites examples of ḫi in both the protasis and apodosis of conditional periods, e.g.:  

241. Stoj, bile bi h bi do slo Iskra, da si izmre sao zareja, so ena do h škra.  
(B. Komski 1967:150)  
Stoj, how beautiful life would be if we had our own land, to work for ourselves.  

241. Koga bi se prejave da se razpravi po tebe,  
bi bi zvečel.  
(B. Komski 1967:201)  
If they want to leave me to quarrel with you,  
I would quickly settle it.  

Komski (1967:150) states that when ḫi occurs outside of a conditional period, the possibility of the action is expressed without explicit reference to the condition on which the completion of the action depends.  

He also notes that constructions with the verbal copula usually express a command, i.e., some action should have been, but was not, fulfilled, e.g.:  

242. Bi si go Čunela!  
(Teleb) da go Čunela, koji ti o lega krivi?  
(You should have watched him!  
(You needed to watch him, now whose fault is it?)  
244. Bi ste m go Čunela!  
(Po tojih izkoda se go kacel?)  
(You should have told him!  
(Do then why didn’t you?)  

Also included in an example is which the verbal copula is used but this manner is absent:  

245. Bi sam dobiš, ako je to premo,  
I would care if the weather were (lit. is) good.  

Informants accepted the use of the verbal copula in this sentence only if it were needed to disambiguate the subject of the sentence;  
elsewhere they considered the use of the am form appropriate only if the former context.  

In concluding his section on ḫi constructions, B. Komski, alluding to Serbo-Croatian influence, cautions against the use of ḫi in purpose clauses, e.g.:  

Ta doge ve Stoj (me) do da vidi do mene.  
(B. Komski 1967:150)  
He came to Stoj (in order) to see me.  

Lepski (1972:120) also defines ḫi constructions as those constructions which denote an action which may potentially be fulfilled.  
In citing examples of ḫi in conditional periods he, like B. Komski, does not attempt to differentiate the contexts in which ḫi is, or in not, in free variation with other particles.  In an earlier grammar,  
Lepski (1950:94) defines ḫi constructions as denoting an action which will be completed upon the fulfillment of some condition. One  

interesting feature of this early work is that all of the conditional
sentences cited are those in which Disposed is used in the apodosis of an unfulfillable expectative condition. e.g.

245. Ti bi deh to wene, de suunke dekta tunde saka.
(Lumusa 1952:109)
You would have come yesterday if you had known that we had work.

In the earlier work Lumusa (1952:109) cites the following use of Disposed outside of the conditional:

Optative, e.g.:

246. Bi bi me kade?
If only he wouldn’t come!

Consequential, e.g.:

248. Bi potoh akwa, dza de so kade je kade.
I would burst from pain upon climbing the stairs.

Future hypothetical, e.g.:

250. Jana bi reba, dza ti de go gwi a.
I would say that you’re not doing this sincerely.

In the later work he cites meanings of wish and intent, e.g.:

Wish:

251. Mangi bi jama a de kade.
I would like very much to see you.

Intent:

252. Jana nga bi deka dza a kadi.
I would now go even to Tundu.

It may be noted that here the meaning of wish is lexical, and not due to the use of Disposed.

Kubwayo (1974:109; 1977:367) calls Disposed constructions the conditional/potential which express past possibility (conditionum?),

probability (conditionum?) and desirability of the action (facilum/mand"

( Conditum) denoting actions which would occur dependent on conditions which are not temporally marked. The potential conditional is in opposition to irreal conditions which are marked for past time and real conditions which are marked for present or future time.

Lumusa (1952:109) gives the following as the basic meaning of Disposed which he calls the potential mood; the act is viewed as possible or desirable, but has not yet been achieved. So, too, cite examples of Disposed in both its dependent conditional use and in the independent use. He includes examples of Disposed in unfulfillable hypothetical conditions, e.g.:

253. De mule hera to gwere, bi ti reba...
(Lumusa 1952:109)
If the baby could talk, he’d say to you...

and also in unfulfillable expectative conditions, e.g.:

254. Bi mule, bi a a re ba.
(Lumusa 1952:109)
If I had been able, I would have asked it.

He states (1952:109) that in these contrary-to-fact conditions the form of the verbal copula is used. As noted above, however, the copula would not be used in such conditions except where the subject of the sentence would be unattainable without the explicit person marker.

Lumusa does not include examples of Disposed in the apodosis of unfulfillable hypothetical conditions; he does, however, cite its use in so-called adversative clauses, i.e., clauses in which the protasis is stated as a negation, e.g:

255. Tjo bi rafuli/reiała, wa ne zanu kade.
(Lumusa 1952:109)
So would decide, but he doesn’t know how.
Cf.: Koa mme baka, toj bi rešifin.  
If he knew how, he would decide.

In this context Lunt attributes a source of nilé velition or moral necessity.

Finally, bi includes hi in optative sentences, stating that with the use of see the moral necessity is strengthened, e.g.: 

295. Bi ni rešif!  
You should have decided!

The three meanings generally assigned to hi may be summarized as follows:

1. Hypothetical conditions, e.g.:  
On bole bawo da poko karu, hi ni remo...

2. Hypothetical future actions outside of a conditional period, e.g.:  
Toj hi azho.

3. Directive (optative), e.g.:  
Bi ni rešif!

Before beginning a more detailed discussion of hi, it must be noted that there was no agreement among informants on the acceptability of certain constructions. Consequently, those constructions which have become archaic, or which have yet to become standard in the literary language must be excluded before a hierarchy of meanings for the particle hi is established. These three meanings are:

1. Directive, e.g.:  
295. Bi ni rešif!

2. Iterative-optative, e.g.:  
297. Dedan ba an inager me ba naka, a ova mbafla baka mba niki, bawo loo be bi pende ro mpó re bá a modú dekaj bi ne vili bi mae ba bi embalje na.
The following hierarchy for the hypothetical particle $h$ may be given:

- $h$ is hypothetical
  - conditional
    - fulfill
      - (expect.) hypoth. fulfillable
      - fulfillable

It will be seen that in its part meaning the hypothetical particle $h$ is in free variation with the conditional particle $c$ in its fulfillable expectation meaning and that it is in the non-part
meanings that $h$ is most clearly differentiated from $c$.

Discussion here will begin with the independet function of $h$.

In this context $h$ constructions denote actions which may occur, whose fulfillable depends on the fulfillment of an unstated condition, or an action whose fulfillment is unlikely, e.g.:

256. Ne, bog da ja blagoslovit te troje majke, što vi
ravni toliko učinili i ubili, te da gasti i da sijadi
na tebe najveće dobro, zašto si stvori te bosku i
posti $h$ bi bila bez me ove život.

257. God blize your mother who bore you so extraordinary
and beautiful, so that my soul would burn and suffer
because of you, since the pain is sweet and my life
would be empty without it.

259. Anachronistic voda će izvesti ljubavna deca ovanim ne
suntka rođena intervenicju vo Polska $h$ donosa
"bugsledivši teški ponosniču za unutrate
među teški i zapad."

260. I would like a cup of coffee.

Although the actual process is real, which is evident in comparing the following:

261. Taj $h$ doček, sam se doček.
He would come, but he isn’t coming, i.e., although he would
hypothetically come, for some reason he isn’t coming.

262. Jaz $h$ vikla doček, sam se zanem.
I would like a cup of coffee, but I don’t want it.

263. U e poništi da mi objasnite.
I would ask you to explain [it] to me.

264. Ne može da mi objasnite.
I beg you to explain [it] to me.
265. Ke ve colla da...
I will request you to...

There are contexts in the literary language where a free exchange
is possible between ke and ni, where both ke plus imperfect
and ni modify the request, e.g.:

266. Ni telah/ke trebahe da biotee portarinsela.
(Chowman, cited in Gofgh 1964a:18)
You should/I will have to be more careful.
Gofgh (1964a:72) also points out the interchange of ke and ni
is unfulfillable, hypothetical actions, e.g.:

267. Sreeta ke go daa/ke go dai.
I would give my heart.

Among informants, the construction with ke was preferred in
this context.

The most important function of non-conditional ke remains,
however, to express a future action whose fulfillment is presented as
only hypothetically possible. While both ke and ni can express
an action which will occur after the speech event, and therefore an
tonologically future event, the use of ni expresses the speaker’s
view that the action involved is less definite than a corresponding
construction with ke, cf.:

268. Marim daa ke daepe.
I think that he will come. (expected, unfulfillable)

269. Marim laa ke loojeel.
(Chowman, cited in Gofgh 1964a:18)
I think that he would come. (hypothetical, fulfillable)

It is in this context that the particles cannot be exchanged
without changing the modal stance from hypotheticalness to expectation.

Turning to the conditional function of ke the following diagram
illustrates the relationship between conditions with ke and those
with ni:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unfulfillable</th>
<th>Fulfillable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>expect.</td>
<td>hypothetical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni</td>
<td>ke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the remainder of this chapter the difference between these types
of conditions will be further explicated and it will be seen that the
crucial distinction between conditions with ni and ke is in the
expression of a fulfillable condition.

Unfulfillable expectative conditions are those conditions which
could have been, but which were not fulfilled in the past. In
unfulfillable conditions the degree of possibility is not expressed and
there is a neutralization between an expected and a hypothetical
condition, for example:

A. If you call me, I’ll come.
B. If you called me, I would come.
C. If you had called me, I would have come.

In the past tense the degree of possibility becomes irrelevant and in
the past both of these sentences are expressed as actions whose
fulfillment was possible and expected in the past, i.e., sentence C. is
the past for both sentence A. and B.

The same situation prevails in Macedonian. While the degree of
expectation is expressed in the future, this opposition is neutralized
in the past, i.e.:  

A. Ako mi se javite, se doživam.  
B. Ako mi se javite, se doživlji.  
C. Ako mi se javite, se doživaj.

Göpf (1964:11) notes that the use of *d* plus imperfect in the apodosis of unfulfillable expectative conditions is more typical of Bosnian. B. Kudrać (personal communication) notes that in this context it is rare in colloquial or dialectal speech. It has become more common in the literary language at the expense of the conditional use of *d*. Göpf (1964:19) concludes that *d* represents a more formal, literary style. The use of *d* is also becoming more prevalent in journalistic style, e.g.:  

270. ... pokrenuto bi ispalu mnogo pomenu 
πi je prijavljeno na lokalnu policiju uspjesno 
10-30-17*.*  

*d* would have had many fewer victims if the suspect of the local police had succeeded in catching him.

In the diagram of conditions with *d* and *bi* parentheses mark the contexts in which the two particles are expressing one another, with certain stylistic differences maintained between them. In unfulfillable expectative conditions *bi* is expressing *d* while in unfulfillable hypothetical conditions, *d* is expressing *bi*.  

The oscillation between the use of *bi* and *d* in current speech is evident from the fact that of one hundred Bosnian students surveyed, three-quarters accepted the use of *bi* in the following example, while one-quarter changed *bi* to *d* in the apodosis, e.g.:  

271a. *Ega nacionalno kruna bi imala pravljivu svetinju s neobiljajnim djetinjama, a jednom vježba* bi *kao* Republike.  

Or our national anthem had a different content and melody, we would already have been a republic for a long time.

b. *Ega nacionalna kruna bi imala pravljivu svetinju s neobiljajnim djetinjima, a jednom vježba* bi *kao* Republike.

In chapter II (p. 4) unfulfillable hypothetical conditions were defined as those conditions which express an action which cannot be fulfilled in the present, e.g.:  

272. *Mi bi da, da me nanesu, bi...*  

I would give everything to worsen...degenerate.

207. Da smo daše o se popustu, da se sami da sanjali bi sreće.  

If I knew that everything was in vain, that there is neither sense nor meaning, I would never hide from that real torture.

In chapter II (p. 5) it was noted that a potential is more common in the apodosis of such a condition, but that *d* is also possible, e.g.:  

---
sentences दा and दिं are in variation, with certain stylistic differences. In unfilling expectative conditions दा still predominates in colloquial and dialectal language, while among educated speakers, and in more formal contexts, दिं is becoming more prevalent. In unfilling hypothetical conditions both दा and दिं may be used, though दिं is preferred. This follows the conclusions of both Hausmann and Golgh, who have stressed that the particle दा cannot itself express past unfilled possibility, but can only be contextually marked as unfilled.

Turning to fulfillable conditions, there is a clear opposition between expectative conditions with दा and hypothetical conditions with दिं: it is in the fulfillable conditions where the exchange of दा and दिं is not possible (except as noted below where दा occurs in the present) without changing the modal meaning.

The following examples of types of fulfillable hypothetical conditions are based on those cited by Golgh (1966a:21)

1. खा + दि — दि
2. खा + दि — दि
3. खा + दि — दि

As he notes, this sentence does not mean if I had been a bird, I would have flown in the morning, but rather if I were a bird I would fly... i.e., an unfilling hypothetical condition. He concludes that the particle दां is not used in the present to provide the context in which the potential दि can be construed as unfilling, rather than as fulfillable. In the next chapter the problem of particle choice in the present of conditional periods will be examined in more detail.

It has been demonstrated above that in unfilling conditional
The construction not cited by Golgh, but which may be included here is the following:

4. *ana + mi — mi*

299. [cartoon which depicts two men working under the street looking up through the manhole and peeling under women's skirts;]

*Mano, kadi ti robotim v kanalima, zan bi moćel da go viši čas?* (SN 30-1-31-20)

Well, young man. If you were to work in an office, would you be able to see this?

Golgh (1964b:20) notes that there is free exchange between *ana* and *mi* in the expression of a hypothetical condition if the protasis contains *mi* since the hypotheticalness has, then, already been expressed, e.g.:


Just these few moments. It seems, are important for her, and if she were to let them go, the evil which must be overcome would come.

It should be noted that informants considered the use of *ana* plus *mi* to be an expressive form, and not usual in everyday speech.

The difference between the hypothetical and expectative particles in conditional sentences is the degree of expectation that the action will be fulfilled. This difference is evident if the following are again compared:

- "Aho mi po javite, uč dojlan. If you call me, I'll call you.
- "Aho mi po javite, baš dojlan."

While the former contains an expectation that the action will be fulfilled, the latter merely presents a hypothesis that if the action as the protasis were to be fulfilled, then the action denoted by the *ana* construction would be fulfilled. The use of *ana* may be summarized as follows: In Macedonian the particle *mi* is most typically used to express an action which is viewed as hypothetically possible, but whose fulfillment is in doubt, or whose fulfillment is expressed as a hypothetical future action with no explicit expectation that the action will occur. Here *mi* cannot be exchanged with *ana* without changing the modal meaning. It has been shown that while *ana* is not marked for unfulfillability, it can be used in the protasis of an unfulfillable condition where the meaning is modified by the broader context.

While *ana* is typically used in both independent and dependent contexts to express an action, it has been shown that the position of *ana* within the Macedonian modal system is in a state of flux. The following areas of change may be cited: first, the directional use of *ana* is no longer current in the literary language; second, *ana* has begun to appear in contexts in which it carries a meaning of iterative habitual action, replacing the more usual *ana* construction. However, this is typical of Serbo-Croatian *ana*, and is still rejected by most Macedonian speakers. Finally, *ana* is becoming much more prevalent in the literary language in the expression of an unfulfillable expectation.
condition, again, bringing the use of Macedonian āi closer to the
use of āi in Serbo-Croatian. On the basis of these trends, the
opposition between āi, in its conditional meaning, and āi will
merge except when used to express a future action where the opposition
is maintained between a hypothetical action expressed with āi, and
an expected action expressed with āi.

Before beginning a discussion of the conditional and coordinative
particles in the next chapters, it is now possible to present a partial
distinctive feature matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>NEA</th>
<th>āi</th>
<th>ūi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes - Chapter 5

1 We are indebted to Dr. Catherine Odin for this data from
Alexa
Lazareva who taught a course in contemporary Bulgarian at the summer
seminar in Sofia in 1962.

2 As will be seen later in this chapter, these contexts include:

1. In the apodosis of hypothetical conditions, e.g.:
   i. Je mi lič Dragosimo, neku bi napravil ti... lezta sti, 
   aha tej bi namalil da večne čudavinu sa terenima. 
   (Trifunov, cited in Gajić 1964a:19)
   Tell Drago, what would you do with your brother if he were to plot to bring about disaster to the kingdom.

2. To express a polite request, e.g.:
   ii. Da meni, kih lokal da čuo neki male ferevo vin.
   (Tešković 1970:165)
   Of course, I would like to bring me a little red wine.

3. To express a potential action outside of a conditional
   period, e.g.:
   iii. Ko bi mogal da napravi tolo!
   Who would be able to do that?

3 The author was unable to obtain a copy of Remana’s unpublished
   dissertation Der Potential im Macedonischen: Dissertation zur Eiludung
   der Pestzeichen der philologischen Fakultät der Goethe-Universität
   Göttingen 1956, and has had to rely exclusively
   on Goedhe’s references to it.

4 The use of āi outside of the potential is here considered to
   be archaic or lexical in expressions such a da on āi, e.g.:

   1. Onj e nošen da on kvarče eda mol, ho gud nikaj bolvedalac, 
   on mo āi ne možem do ovo jutrelja. — inquilinaj 
   on levo je desno, mo bi voli poti 
   restavare ili kuhar.
Although B. Konesti, Sopran, Gogb, and Haunmann note the prevalence of this use of $b_{1}$ in colloquial or dialectal language, we agree with Gogb (1964:16) who states that in literary Macedonian $b_{1}$ is not used in optative clauses.

The use of $b_{1}$ to express an iterative-habitual action will also be included. While examples of this type exist in the literature, and while they may eventually become more widespread in Macedonian, they are now considered hesitams and are rejected by most speakers.

Gogb (1964:36) notes that the use of $b_{1}$ to express a past potential action is rare (cf. Trifonov 1921:1) and that only one of the fifteen examples of $b_{1}$ cited by Konesti (1967:501) refers unambiguously to the past, namely:

Mislata ne gorede, refaktite ne rase $b_{1}$ gi iskridj.

Gogb (1964:36) concludes that this use of $b_{1}$ overlaps that of $b_{2}$ and that there is no difference in meaning, e.g.:

Mislata ne gorede, refaktite ne rase $b_{2}$ gi iskridj.

There was no agreement among native speakers on the acceptability of these constructions; hence, therefore, they are considered marginal in the literary language.
Chapter VI

AND, \( \ldots \), and \( \ldots \)

The particles which will be treated in this chapter and in the
following chapter are differentiated from the four preceding particles
on the basis of their syntactic position. These five particles are
marked as subordinate since they cannot occur except in subordination to
a non-subordinate clause.

The particles \( \ldots \) and \( \ldots \) are distinguished from the other subordinate particles in that they are
positively marked for conditionalities; i.e., they occur in the
protasis of a conditional period, and denote some action upon whose
fulfillment depends the fulfillment of some other action.

It has been noted elsewhere (Lyons 1977:764; Aronson 1977:104) that
there is a close relationship between interrogation and mood.
Interrogation seems like a type of modality since it does not express
ontological reality. While the category of mood affirms the
non-ontological reality of a given process, the category of
interrogation is the non-affirmation of ontological reality. The
category of interrogation will not be treated in any detail here since
it is considered outside the scope of the Macedonian modal system.
However, the interrogative particle \( \ldots \) must be integrated into the
modal system since, although this particle can be defined as having the
basic meaning of interrogation, it also has an affirmative modal

contextual meaning which, though still marked for interrogation,
functionally belongs with \( \ldots \) and \( \ldots \).

It must be understood that \( \ldots \), in its conditional meaning, is
being transformed from the primary system to which it belongs. When \( \ldots \) occurs in the protasis of a conditional period, it is clear that an
\( \ldots \) clause has been deleted and the interrogative has assumed its
function, e.g.:

261. \( \ldots \) ogojte \( \ldots \) ? \( \ldots \) odojte. \( \ldots \) odojte. \( \ldots \) odojte?
Are you coming? If you come, we'll go.

becomes:

262. \( \ldots \) ogojte \( \ldots \) ? \( \ldots \) odojte. \( \ldots \) odojte. \( \ldots \) odojte?
If you come, we'll go.

The particle \( \ldots \), then, is positively marked for condition
within the modal system, but has a basic meaning of interrogation,
separating it from \( \ldots \) and \( \ldots \).

While other particles are used in the protasis of a conditional
period, namely \( \ldots \) and \( \ldots \) (see chapters II, V), the three marked
conditional particles have no other modal function. In the course of
this chapter the differences among these three conditional particles
will be examined, and their contextual variant meanings will be
discussed.

Before beginning an analysis of the three conditional particles in
Macedonian, a few differences among Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian, and
Bulgarian may be cited. Differences in conditional sentences in these
three languages are due not only to the choice of particle in the
protasis, but also in the choice of particle in the apodosis and the
interrelationships between particle and verb form. A detailed
composition of conditional sentences demands a separate study; therefore, discussions here will be limited to general remarks on the use of ako, ja, and the Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian equivalents of Macedonian štoki.

In Serbo-Croatian, unlike Macedonian and Bulgarian, the choice of conditional particle in the protasis is more clearly dictated by the type of condition, i.e., ako is limited to fulfillable conditions, whereas ja is used only in unfulfillable conditions, e.g.:  

203. Da vam on radio muziku, mora bit ovo polako.  
(Decima 1971:165)  
"Ja vam on radio muziku,...  
If I were in your place, I would take this room.

204. Ako se ući u bačku, da podjeće ne vama, vi prečete ranu ujetu.  
(Stetzerova 1979:32)  
"Ja se ući u bačku...  
If you decide to come with us, get up early in the morning.

As shall be demonstrated later (see p. 44), a distinction between ako and ja is made in Macedonian only when the conditional particle is followed by an imperative non-past. In other contexts the choice of particle is based on stylistic considerations.

One other distinction which should be made here is in the use of the future auxiliary after ako. In Serbo-Croatian, particularly in Croatian, ako may be followed by the future (Gulam 1964:146; Gubler, et al. 1965:252; Stetzerova 1979:90). Bračec (1964:252) cites examples in which the future expresses both futurity and wish, e.g.:  

205. Ako ćete se godišnjoj, to da ne željite  
If you will listen to me, you won't do that.

Here the auxiliary could be replaced by bićete 'you want'. In addition, he cites examples of ako plus a future in which ako has a concessive meaning, e.g.:  

206. Magarac je negdje, ako ne imaš i platiš pokrovac,  
A donkey is in a donkey even if it has [lit. will have] a golden blanket.

In Macedonian the conjunction ja or samo ako 'even though' would be used in this context.

The interrogative particle li is used in Serbo-Croatian in fulfillable conditions, e.g.:  

207. Daje li, da goji polje?
(Decima 1971:261)  
If you come, I'll show it to you.

Gulam (1964:146) notes that li in Serbo-Croatian is used in constructions only with a present or future. In Macedonian, as in Bulgarian, li may also be used with an imperfect in non-factive and iterative conditions.

The Macedonian conditional štoki is like the Serbian ecke, and therefore, there are no differences in meaning and usage.

There are fewer differences between Bulgarian and Macedonian in the choice of conditional particle, differences being based mainly on the relationship between the protasis and apodosis. Several differences may be noted. While ako may not occur with li in Macedonian, it has been demonstrated that there are contexts in which this co-occurrence is possible in Bulgarian (Walter 1971:65-67; Makura-Elemenka 1972:234-239), e.g.:  

208. Ako te čekam, napalim lampu.  
(Chukurova-Elemenka 1974:225)  
If you're going to read, turn on the light.

The future will be used in this context if the person to whom the
speaker addresses this remark has not yet begun to read, but he surely shows his intent to carry out this action (Montova-Ellias 1972:235).

In Macedonian this would have to be expressed metaphorically, e.g.:

289. Nako sam manje do štaja, zapeli je izvoda.
     If you intend to read, turn on the light.

The use of да in Bulgarian parallels the use of да in Macedonian. It may be used in the presence of real conditions with a
perfective non-past, or with a perfective-imperfect in non-pastive and
iterative conditions (Georgiev 1978:a:23). While да is now considered
dialectal or archaic in Macedonian, some of the grammars of Bulgarian
note that да is stylistically marked.

The Bulgarian equivalents of доколку, докато, докато are not used in conditional sentences, but are used only to express
degree, e.g.:

290. Sorim se, da nadežden bude.
     (Bulgarians: viknov noviz 1973:84)
     We struggle as much as we can.

Turning to a comparison of the three conditional particles within the
Macedonian modal system, it must be noted that little attention has
been paid to these three particles in the standard handbooks of
Macedonian. The particle доколку, in its conditional meaning, is a
new phenomenon in the literary language and to, therefore, not mentioned
in older works (Gant 1952; Golap 1962:a, b; R. Konuk 1967;
dоколку in the supplement to the third volume; no examples are given,
just the German translation, доколю. The only references to this
particle in the literature are contained in R. Konuk’s dissertation

Korošić is mainly concerned with the form of доколку as opposed
to non-standard на колку, and his examples treat доколку in
constructions with да колку such as the following:

291. Da kaška topljeta e pogojena, da toliko isparjava na
     vedeta e pogojena.
     (Korošić 1969:82)
     Insolal oc the temperature of the water is greater,
     the greater is the evaporation of the water.

L. Konuki (1979:125) notes that while the particle is becoming
more widespread, it is most typical in journalistic prose. Mišić
(1971:30) cites only two examples, noting that she found few examples
due to its new appearance as a conditional in the literary language.

The particles да and да are mentioned in the grammars of
both R. Konuki (1967:529) and Korošić (1975:163) under the heading
conditional conjunctions. R. Konuki cites one example each with the
two particles in fulfillable conditions:

292. Xe toj rafča drau e toa valkina, meta odoi, a odo ar,
     hele ar rextauri, deleq bora da se probavi
     da nisim.
     (Javor, cited in R. Konuki 1967:529)
     If I were that that is true, let them scatter, but if not,
     let them scatter, so at least the children
     won’t make fun of them.

293. Mine da, gori mečka.
     (Javor, cited in R. Konuki 1967:530)
     If I jasan, the earth burns.

Korošić (1975:163) also includes an example of да in an
unfulfillable condition:

294. Perico se te vilqen se pere sirajle polevam,
     Perico would not have seen you if you had hidden
Both authors include ako also under a separate heading
concessive conjunctions, though neither grammar includes examples.
B. Fasski (1967:359) emphasizes that the particle ako occurs less
frequently with a concessive meaning, being replaced by nan 'even if,
although' in the literary language.
Laut (1952:85) does not devote a separate section to conditionals.
He does, however, include both ako and ak among the verbs which
can be used with a perfective non-past. He includes the following
eamples (1952:85) of fulfillable conditions with the two particles:

295. Ako mi ga reihe van neka, ke ti bidaa bingadareni.
     If you solve this problem for me, I will be
     grateful to you.

296. He aloga li, ke ti vihoom.
     If you don't come, I'll call you.

He notes that in the latter example ako would be more common, i.e.,
ako na 3086. Other examples with ako occur throughout the
grammar but only in reference to other grammatical parts; it is not
itself the subject of attention.

Usikwe (1977:361) includes ako among the particles used with
the perfective non-past. Her brief survey of Haremoso includes no
examples with ako, and ako occurs only incidently, in the
protests of both a fulfillable and an unfulfillable condition.

Works which treat conditional sentences in more detail (Gofcha
1964a; Minowa-Gurkova 1967, 1968; Mlilo 1977; K. Fasski 1979) will be
discussed in the sections devoted to the use of the individual
particles.

Discussion will begin with the least marked conditional particle ako.
The conditional particle ako is marked for conditionality
within the modal system, but it is unmarked in relation to dokula and
ak because it may occur in the protests of both fulfillable and
unfulfillable conditionals. Furthermore, while ak is stylistically
marked as archaic or dialectal in its conditional use, and dokula is
stylistically marked as jargonnese, ako is stylistically unmarked.

Minowa-Gurkova (1967:154, 1969:14) has found in her research on
conditionals in Shona that ako is the most frequently used
conditional conjunction in both the standard literary and in colloquial
language.

Earlier it was noted (see p. 8) that ako is not closely bound
to the verb. While its usual position is in clause initial position,
separated from the verb only by the enclitic pronouns and the negative
particle, it frequently is separated from the verb for stylistic
reasons, e.g.:

7. Ako avu yevi ko vehuru, ke ti bidaa vetsa
     rika avonshe.
     (Gofcha, cited in Minowa-Gurkova 1967:125)
     If I live through this day, I shall be faithful to you
     all my life.

The Referski (vol. I 1979:2-3) cites examples of ako in both
fulfillable and unfulfillable conditions, and in concessive clauses,
e.g.:

Fulfillable:

297. Msiwa vem ka ak se ako bidaa siyedakhom.
     Come to our place tomorrow if you're free.

Unfulfillable:
In fillable hypothetical conditions, i.e., conditions which express a situation whose fulfillment is possible, but not anticipated, ako may co-occur with би in the protasis, or би may appear only in the apodosis (see chapter 5, p.129 [cf. Collip 1964a:70, 125]; Minova-Гуркова 1967:131), e.g.:  

303. Ако би станале мъжка, ще би много дълга време  
      добивам детето.  
      (Cited in Minova-Гуркова 1967:132)  
   If it were to become necessary, I would be able to  
   give birth both now and later.  

304. Ако не бяха те таки ги лъвове би били такива  
      преданини предатели.  
      (Cited in Minova-Гуркова 1967:133)  
   If I could somehow get that done, I wouldn’t  
   feel sorry for myself.  

Informants considered the use of ako би to be an emphatic, and  
Minova-Гуркова (1967:133) concludes from her large corpus of examples  
that examples with би in both the protasis and the apodosis  
are rare.  

The particle ako is frequently used in non-factive, i.e.,  
conditions whose result is unknown, and iterative conditions. A  
comitite of the type:  

If he went to Paris, he visited Montmartre.  

may be interpreted as iterational: Whenever he went to Paris, or, as a  
non-factive, that is, the speaker cannot vocalize the truth or falsity of  

In the literature on Macedonian conditions, this type of  
condition has been treated as real (Collip 1964a; Minova-Гуркова 1967,  
1969; Млади 1977). Examples of this type will be considered fillable  
since, like other fillable conditions, the fulfillment of the
condition is still considered possible at the moment of speech. In
conditions that should have been fulfilled in the past, non-factive
fulfillable conditions are most often differentiated from unfillable
expectative conditions in that there is no modal particle in the
apodosis (but see below). cf:

Fulfillable:

305. *Ake bebe topo vresede, ogaja na bebe nitar.
(Potier, cited in Minna-Gurkova 1967:122)
If the weather was warm, his mother was calm.
In this example, either the condition was fulfilled repeatedly in the
past, i.e., *whenever the weather was warm... or, at the moment of speech
the speaker does not know whether the condition was fulfilled;

Unfulfillable:

306. *Ake bebe topo vresede, ogaja na kere bebe nitar.
If the weather had been warm, his mother would have been calm.
Here, the speaker states that the condition was not fulfilled, but had it been, the action in the apodosis would have followed.

Minna-Gurkova has demonstrated that in some contexts *na may acquire an iterative-habitual meaning even when it occurs in the
apodosis, e.g.:

307. *Na aminu na bebo gi na a ba aminu san ka na bebo.
(Potier, cited in Minna-Gurkova 1967:132)
I would arrive in some city and if I arrived during the
day, I would immediately leave my suitcase in the hotel
and I would go for a stroll outdoors.

As she notes, *na acquires this meaning contextually from the
iterative-habitual meaning of the first *na clause.

The particle *na frequently occurs in the protasis of
unfulfillable expectative conditions, e.g.:

308. I na yorunlu toko na dete min, Dobridal
Na brewe prazan suh .
(Potier, cited in K. Landau 1979:220)
And if it had continued like that for two years, Dobridal
would have numbered five hundred houes.

In this environment *na may also occur (see chapter II, p. 50). It is in
unfulfillable expectative conditions that *na and *na are
differentiated. In chapter V (p.128) the following example from Colpa
(1966a:31) was cited:

275. Ake buy jin ci, bi jiyari yam na unuwa bile.
Minna-Gurkova noted that this sentence does not mean 'If I had been a bird I
would have flown early into the morning white' but rather 'If I were a
bird. I would...'. Here the imperfect may is used in place of a present
tense verb to express a present, unfulfillable condition (see chapter
II, p. 50). Minna-Gurkova (1966a:31) states that *na is more
appropriate in this context since *na does not in itself carry a
meaning of unfulfilability, and *na usually denotes a fulfillable
condition.

Minna-Gurkova (1966a:16-17) draws a clear distinction between *na and
*na when they occur with an imperfective non-past in the protasis.
She concludes that in this environment the unfulfillable meaning of
conditional *na is preserved. When *na is replaced by *na in this
context the condition changes from a fulfillable one to an unfulfillable
one, e.g.:

309. *Na toms pari, hu ti mi.
If I have money, [and I might] I'll give it to you.

If I have money, and I might I'll give it to you.
The non-modal character of the conjunctive derives from its interpretation as an already fulfilled condition. In this context ako may be replaced by other conjunctives which have no modal meaning, e.g., "ako ako" (even though""). Furthermore, the non-modal character is evident in the fact that a conjunctive meaning is incompatible with a future meaning, e.g.,

*Močerši štu dojč, nemo da deo.

The first sentence can be translated 'If he is coming, I won't go' or, when ako is stressed: 'Even if he is coming, I won't go'. Here the action is projected, which is evident when the conjunctive ako is substituted: here he must be used: "ako ako be deo, nemo da deo 'Even if he is coming, I won't go'.

The independent use of ako in sentences such as:

3.15. Ako, dajme tebi ti troba.
Even if it is so, that's what you need.

are here considered to be a type of conjunctive, i.e., "ako ako."

In Macedonian, the particle "ako" is the unmarked interrogative particle, as compared with other, more stylistically marked particles such as ali or an.

3.16. It is used in direct questions, e.g.,

3.17. Močerši štu dojč, nemo da deo da deo?

(English 1977:60)

Could I, too, study a little with you?

The sentence above with ako can be negated, e.g.,

Ako reo, duše... se se sinter, ne niko ne reo.
If I said it, a hole didn't open up, but I didn't say it.
*Reo reo... niko ne reo.

"ako reo, duše... se se sinter, ne niko ne reo.
If I said it, a hole didn't open up, but I didn't say it.
*Reo reo... niko ne reo.

*Reo... se se sinter, niko ne reo.

The basic modality of ako, in contrast to the examples above with ako and ako, no, is evident since only the sentence with ako can be negated, e.g.,

3.18. *Reo reo, duše... se se sinter, niko ne reo.
If I said it, a hole didn't open up, but I didn't say it.
*Reo reo... niko ne reo.

*Reo... se se sinter, niko ne reo.
and in indirect questions, e.g.:  

319. Dikli se man go home li.  
(Malekski 1956:118)  
I still don’t know whether I’m looking for him.

The particle li is closely bound to the verb but, unlike the other closely bound particles which precede the verb, li in the protasis of a conditional period occurs in post-position. 4 Its use as a conditional particle is limited to the standard language and informants generally consider it dialectal or archaic. Minova-Gjorcheva (1969:136; and personal communication) does not consider it typical in conditional periods, nor does she accept its independent use with a perfective non-past. E. Konesti (personal communication) would not use li in conditional clauses except in poetry. A further restriction on the particle is that it occurs only in fulfilled conditions (Minova-Gjorcheva 1969:17; E. Konesti 1979:150), e.g.:  

(Malekski 1956:119)  
If they shout, the first bullet could strike you.

320. Ne le malo li nivasto, te nego ce ga prenesti.  
(E. Konesti, cited in E. Konesti 1979:88)  
If you don’t give them victory, they’ll take it themselves.

The particle li occurs more frequently in conditional clauses together with od, e.g.:  

321. Badis li se treba, a selo od li sebe, kogadan se nam, se izdate li, gospod nam ti daru uze toba.  
(Darvishi, Korfondia)  
I don’t need a trip, but if you give something I’ll be grateful, if not, may God grant you as much.

E. Konesti cites examples of li only with a non-past, however, li may also occur more rarely in non-factive and iterative conditions, e.g.:  

322. Reže li ka Mimarka, pravljivosti uradna sa posmatra sa veoma senteran potegom.  
(Darvishi, Korfondia)  
If he was at Mimarka’s, he asked the old woman when the railroad worker would return from town.

Thus, while the basic meaning of li in interrogations, within the modal system the particle may occur in the protasis of a fulfilled or expectative condition. This use is considered by most informants to be archaic or dialectal and, therefore, the conditional contextual meaning of li is marginal in the current literary language.

While the use of li is disappearing in conditional periods, the use of the particle dadekli is becoming ever more frequent. Before beginning a discussion of this particle it must be noted that many informants reject its use. They consider dadekli, used as a conditional particle, to be journalistic jargon and would not consider the use. A similar situation in English would be the acceptance or rejection of the verb to want or to interfere, i.e., while they occur frequently in the prose, many speakers do not consider them acceptable.

Both E. Konesti (1979:89-90) and Maksic (1977:201) cite examples of dadekli in fulfilled conditions. Numerous examples can be found in the prose, e.g.:  

323. Britanski ministar za vanjske poslove Francis Pia je objavio da bi se probala da se zaliga za aričljivo rešenje sa Iokoškakske krize, no, problema ipak stari diplomatski napore, razumije se, ne bih očekivao da bi zvati sa nile.  
(Forer Hoblin 1975-02-16)  
The British minister of foreign affairs, Francis Pia announced that Great Britain would continue to strive
Neither E. Enoski nor Milic has noted that *dokuku* may also occur in fulfillable hypothetical conditions with *bi* in the apodosis, e.g.:  

---  

225. Arumaisan pru rafi da levu fikin dalet ad Spitsberge da Soviyan polit. na *dokuku* ko; le da awonilu apapo, toogb *bi* aorganizationi transarctic flight ko.  

(NM 27-6-02-12)  

Arumaisan first decided to complete a flight (flight) from Spitsbergen to the North Pole, and if that flight were completed successfully, then he would organize a transarctic crossing.  

While informants would not consider the use of *dokuku* in fulfillable conditions, they rejected its use in unfulfillable, regularly substituting *sho* or *kpa*. Examples of this type are, however, occur in the press, e.g.:  

---  

218. Bajum na ase se ko ase ko anfaksu sinu *dokuku* bi, irade pole.  

(NM cited in K. Fonseka 1979:255)  

Who knows what would have happened last night if E. had played better.  

219. Dokuku na lemu beninukami...verran deko ditsa *teramuk* ko se intarese sonu ko pori aak.  

(NM cited in K. Fonseka 1979:225)  

If we hadn’t been handicapped...I’m sure that [the team] *teramuk* would have competed at a higher...
The following diagram illustrates the relationship of the three conditional particles:

```
+ Condition
  + fulfillable
    - fulfillable
      - interrogative
        - interrogative

Although it has been shown there are no strict rules governing the use of one particle over another, having examined all of the particles which may be used in the pronaxis and the apodosis of conditional periods in Macedonian, the following diagram may be drawn illustrating the most usual relationships between choice of particle and type of condition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pr</th>
<th>Pa</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Pr</th>
<th>Pr</th>
<th>Pa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfill</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULSI</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOXIL</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFUL</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| + designates normal use
| ++ designates contexts which are marked, but which do occur
| * designates contexts which do not occur
```

Notes - Chapter VI

1 The orthographic dictionary of Macedonian (Pravopis 1978:27(292)), the Refisk (vol. III 1979:598), and Koršin (1969:82) cite the form do dohokoe and dohokule. The form dohokile will be used since it occurs more frequently.
2 For a more detailed comparison, see Godić 1964:135-39.
4 The particle dohokoi may also be used as an intensifier (England 1977:139).

In this meaning dohokoi is not postposed to the verb, but occurs after the word which is stressed, e.g.:

i. I love you, da, ljubov tebeja. Ich liebe dich, koho dohokoi te di te koj teho teke.
(Trochowici 1966:135)
I love you...now else must I tell you that I love you?

The particle dohokoi may co-occur with aho. In this context dohokoi gives aho an emphatic nuance. In this context, too, dohokoi is not postposed to the verb, e.g.:

ii. Gejoped, aho ponjaše, abe te dohokoi, dohokoi te koj teho teke.
(Osama-Gejoša 1967:137)
If the Lord helps, everything will be done, if not, nothing can be done.

The co-occurrence of these two particles is rare. Minow-Corbière found only two such examples in her entire corpus, both taken from folk proverb. Informants accepted such examples but stressed their
Chapter VII

MODES AND Moods

The particles _dveča_ 'until, while' and _duri_ 'until, while' have not been treated in any detail in the grammar of Macedonian. The only reference to these two particles in the grammar of 3. Konesti (1907:538) and Čepenički (1975:106) is their inclusion in a list of temporal conjunctions. There is no discussion of possible contextual variant meanings, nor are any examples given with a non-past verb. Last (1952:61) includes _duri_ on among the words which can be used with a perfective non-past, stating that _duri_ sets the term for the completion of the action, which will then be followed by another action.

329. Duri se nadin našlo na nom, se ko pojden.
(Last 1952:61)
Until I find something for her, I won't go.

So mention is made of _dveča_, though in included in Last's dictionary, Bulkova (1977) makes no mention of either _dveča_ or _duri_.

The Indiš translates both _dveča_ and _duri_ (in its use as a conjunction) by English _till until_. No examples are given with _dveča_; the following example is cited for _duri_ plus _je_ a perfective non-past:

(Indiš vol. 1 1979:29)
According to the definition of modal particles as that set of particles which may, in the literary language, govern forms of the perfective non-past, the status of dodena and duri is tenuous. Both duri and dodena are frequently used with do and pre,
in fact, it will be seen that duri, in its modal use, must be used with one of these two particles. A number of informants from western Macedonia did not consider dodena native in their speech. These two particles may be included, however, for the following reasons:

1. Dodena occurs, and is accepted, in the literary language with a perfective non-past verb, e.g.:

331. Tuka e dalok o celot svet. I od najmladist pot teren do ce domini mnogo kilometri dodena po shezo do seloto.
(Kaptsi 1979b,229)
It's so far from the whole world. Even from the nearest road, many kilometers must be covered until one reaches the village.

2. Duri ne/dur in synonymous with dodena, e.g.:

332. Dodena/duri do pojdena l vreme da bide ne adezja.
By the time we finish eating it will be time to go.

3. While duri ne can be used with a perfective non-past,

329. Duri ne mozam nesko na nes, ne bi pojnam.
the negative particle cannot be used independently with a perfective non-past", e.g.:

*X'mozam nesko na nes...

Syntactically, the two particles are, like the conditional particles, not closely bound, but may be separated from the verb, e.g.:

333. Dodena sto e ponakno da bide takie da dodena do duhovat se go ezerishe tne, i ne prestarit seh.
(Stiev, karotetski)
What's more, it will be like that until you sell your store there and move here.

In the course of this chapter the use of dodena and duri with other particles will be discussed and contexts in which the verb subordinated to these particles in modal will be compared with those contexts in which the verb is aspectual. It will be shown that the basic meaning of both manner particles is relational, i.e., they express a temporal relationship between the main and subordinate clauses, and that duri and dodena are, like conditional particles, syntactically dependent.

Discussion will begin with the aspectual meanings of these two particles. When followed by any verb other than a perfective non-past, the verb subordinated to the relational particles is clearly marked aspectually. When the verb subordinated to the particle is an imperfect or an imperfective non-past, the particles denote a contemporaneous relationship between the main and subordinate clauses. In this context the two particles occur independently, i.e., without do or ne

1. Duri/Dodena + Ipi

334. Dodena duri e sela, e besprek. (Petrovici, karotetski)
As long as a child is small, he is innocent.

335. Ako ne go vriko, duri sam ciro golenlava kljebi se ov prpak.
(Toljani, karotetski)
If you don't return, as long as I'm unmarried I will
 send you curses.

335. Seta sa nevme do na drme, saznic i jex treba već daj sa
trumpa, dogde ias vreme.
(F. Cev. 1976:166)
We can leave now, because I, too, must set off
immediately, while there's still time.

(2) Dodaka + ile + 1pl

337. A paisu, dodaka zahatni do stana pod vrnit, se cican
amamno i fe pemo prasti do foco i slavo.
(Serovkšt, cit. in E. Koseki 1976:136)
And later, while the vegetable pie rises [lit. will rise]
in the pan, we'll chew mint and sing songs about
love and joy.

(3) Dodaka + ili

338. Dodaka oboe gostric, pod milišičo treplancje as
napeljastu svečko, je pristavka relatiča i vsečnica,
taj razvojilo mlede čina vse tosa s tama abal...
(Mošar, 1976:120)
While both sisters, under the twinkling flicker of the
burning candle, prepared meal and the dinner, he thought
contentedly that all this was so beautiful...

56. (1976:146) has pointed out that in this coordinating
function, the use of a perfective verb is insinuatable in the
subordinate clause. He further notes (1976:149) that if the action is
the main clause continues as long as the action in the subordinate
clause, both clauses will contain an imperfect or an imperfective
non-past, e.g.:

339. Dodaka studimoc na vičetom na fersko i otok bolje.
(Coetsen, cit. in F. Cev. 1976:149)
As long as the student got along with her daughter,
things were fine.

When izet and dodaka occur with an agent they must often
occur as compounds with iz or iz, but they may occur
independently. With an agent, rather than coordinating two
contemporaneous actions, they denote the point up to which the action in

The main clause continued, e.g.:

340. Skrata je rasteta, se račeta do košmare,
se predvija ten konob negori povrat, ispis novca
se zmanjka te osmo pred crkveto, dežemo turtati,
va orti na masala tliekete i se
vratila je na kordinje do grijeta.
(Mošar, 1976:123)
They strolled among the stalls, they walked to the
chestnut trees, they set up with some of his acquaintances,
they danced in the field together with the villagers;
in front of the church, they marched as countless
parties until their eyelids grew heavy and they
returned to the porch to sleep.

341. Za dodaka se omar do ne razvita, bes aruvita.
Uzi i bel to dekli, I was happy.
(DN 1-126-66-4)

The non-modal usages of dodaka and izet may be summarized
as follows: when used in combination with an imperfective non-past, or
with an imperfect, the action subordinated to these two particles
occurred simultaneously with the action in the main clause, i.e., the
particles denote aspetual durativity; when used in combination with an
agent, the action subordinated to these particles is the terminus at
which the action in the main clause ended, i.e., the action is
effectively marked as terminative.

It is the role of dodaka and izet within the modal system.
However, which is of greater interest here. With the relational
particles there is a close relationship between mood and the perfective
non-past since these two particles denote aspetually real events
only when used with a perfective non-past. We agree with Drumm
(1976:24) who attributes their modality in constructions with a
perfective non-past to a meaning of certainty.

The meaning of the particles with a perfective non-past paralleled
the past meaning with an aorist. Namely, the action subordinated to these particles denotes the projected point at which the action in the axis clause will end, e.g.:

342. Zasna, zna ao u vezen rezi i se negre vo ziskada dodika me ga
upotrebe perna na Belomest ci voda.
[Croat, karstenska] I know, I know that still another century will pass in
etern until we understand the voice of the Great water.

326. Dari se najeb noelce za na, ne se pojedua. Until I find something for her, I won't go.
There is a great degree of variation in the form of the particle
when used with the perfective non-past. The following variations were
all accepted by some informants:

(1) Dodika + Prije:  
343. Jon visue dodaka njike.
[overheard in the student buffet of the language department
of the University of Split and Neretva, Skopje] There's time before he gets here.

344. Ajde nie dodaka dishat da porazijame i pongrešame.
[ko, karstenska] Come on, let's clean and straighten up a little until
they come.

(2) Dodaka + da + Prije:  
345. Dodaka se samo na spotrle, da ga spotrebjuv dodaka
da je ga predala na obične pokolenja.
[Croat, karstenska] It was given to him only on loan. To me until he passed
it along to the future generation.

346. Dodaka da porazije tvarne, Gripeja noj i se go vesi.
[Makreski, karstenska] Let after season until I return.

(3) Dodaka + se + Prije:  
347. Sostojite se vostrakom ali nemo da se povleču od
ubrza iz i pokraj rezidnica in OB i overmane negdaj,
se dodaka spagotiamenata a nejda na druge
dovolita siks da ga se spustivkan su.

The use of dodaka with the causative particle $+$ is not
considered standard by most speakers; this problem will be discussed
later (see p. 159).

(2) Dari + se + Prije:  
349. Zama (Saliana) se gi polni raguina i se gi prazni, polna-
prazni se envi, se dari se go poprav i pozidolci pocelj.
[Makreski, karstenska] There (Salina) will fill the jugs and empty them, she will
keep filling and emptying them until she has sent off
the very last traveler.

(6) Dari + da + Prije:  
350. Majda da ja razeli dari da se vritis.
[Makreski, karstenska] Look after season until I return.

351. Staraca bebe rečen da se upa uveć malka, dari da djevo
krajat sa 17 godina, ja podr na ne vod od koja
to dole i, sa ne veči kako sico voda.
[Br. košenski, karstenska] The old man had decided to be patient a little longer
until the end of the school year comes, and thus set
them return whereas they came, and everything would turn
out as it should.

While most temporal adverbs are used with $+$ (see chapter IV,
p. 133), the use of $+$ with the relational particles is considered...
sub-standard. (Milanović, personal communication; I. Enserski
1979:175). I. Enserski states (1979:174) that while kapa, vapa and
atako occur with a perfective non-past in some dialects, the current
tendency and the literary norm is to use \( \text{k} \) when these temporal
adverbs occur with a perfective non-past; by analogy, some speakers
may use \( \text{k} \) with dojke and doj. Here it may be added that since dojke
is not native to speakers from western dialect areas (see p. 217),
informants from that area rationalize the use of \( \text{k} \) with dojke and
doj. I. Enserski (personal communication) stated that he would be
uncertain in the use of dojke with a perfective non-past.

The choice of \( \text{ak} \) or \( \text{ak} \) is, in part, dependent on the
presence of a negative particle in the main clause. When the verb in
the main clause is negated, doj and dojke must be followed by
\( \text{ak} \). 46:

352. Dodeka se ne vrati broj mi Parancii od Amerike, nama se ne
odolje na se dojeni. (Kovac, kartoteka)

Until my brother Parancii returns from America, we won't
separate from my father.

353. Ne sume da ti kapa brada dojke se \( \text{ak} \) izgledam dolgovito! - \( \text{ak} \) ti povode \( \text{ak} \) manje pjesijnerite sebelum one.
(M 20-IV-21)

I can't buy you a fur until I pay my bills.

Of course, you love your creditors more than me?

Ne sume da ti kapa...dojke se...

When the verb in the main clause is not negated, either \( \text{ak} \) or
\( \text{ak} \) can be used, e.g.:

354. Duri deju \( \text{ak} \) \( \text{ak} \) vrap, toj \( \text{ak} \) se go tau pravljano vewust.

By the time you arrive, he will have read the newspaper.

The tendency is to avoid the negative particle if both clauses contain a
perfective verb. Some informants rejected the use of \( \text{ak} \) in a
sentence such as:

355. Duri de stanaa, \( \text{ak} \) se fasti nok.

"Duri de stanaa, he is fasti nok.

By the time I arrive, might will overtake me.

There are examples with \( \text{ak} \), however, in which both clauses are
perfective, e.g.:

356. Se gi onone ti veste na popravek i da odj nakon
vremena, ili da prodaju vasa dojke \( \text{ak} \) vaste dojke. (Kovac: 1979:16)

Should be bring the shoes for repair and go around
hereafter for a while, or should I continue like this
until he wears them out.

Felsenzki (1976:146) differentiates the use of \( \text{ak} \) and \( \text{ak} \) on
the basis of the fulfillment of the action in the main clause as
follows: if the action in the main clause occurred in the past, or
occurs recursively and if the result is known to the speaker, the
particle occurs with \( \text{ak} \), e.g.:

357. Tako ti deju \( \text{ak} \) se \( \text{ak} \) njud \( \text{ak} \) vreme.

(Felsenzki 1976:147)

That's how it was until she fell in love one day.

358. \( \text{ak} \) dojke se \( \text{ak} \) veste na soljaci pot. Južno mladež.

(Felsenzki 1976:147)

Until they set off on the village road, Dusko was silent.

If the action in the main clause is still unfilled, however, or if it
took place in the past but the speaker does not wish to inform his
listener of the result, then \( \text{ak} \) and \( \text{ak} \) are conjuncted with
\( \text{ak} \), e.g.:

359. Babeta salaža \( \text{ak} \) de se \( \text{ak} \) veste je.

(Felsenzki 1976:149)
Grandmother waited until he lay down.

There are counterexamples and, therefore, this does not serve as a satisfactory solution. For example, the above rules cannot explain the choice of the negative particle in sentences such as:

354. Da gi odeva li čevel o pravdvo....ili da prodal Mi vaše  
đođeše me gi išalao.

360. Mutak je potrebit, dobilo se ne dobro kroz.  
Mix the bitter, until it turns to cream.

It may be concluded that the negative particle is used if the main clause is negative, but may also be used in some instances if the clause is positive. The use of *da* is limited to a clause not subordinated to a negative main clause. It is used more often than *ne* in sentences which contain a perfective verb in both clauses. It must be emphasized that these are only tendencies since there was no agreement among informants on the use of *da* or *ne* with *dori* and *dodoka* and further research is needed on the co-occurrence of these particles.

Turning to the difference between *dori* and *dodoka*, it appears that the original difference between these two forms was dialectal. This distinction is not mentioned as a dialect feature in the general studies of Macedonian dialectology (Vilimski 1960, 1962). Informants from south and west central Macedonia did not consider *dodoka* native to their dialects but use it now due to its frequent use in the literary language. Dialect descriptions from that area mention only *dori* (see Grozdanov 1971:204-205; Hendriks 1979b:256; Damaskovski 1967:215) while studies of northern dialects mention both *dodoka* and *dori* (Vilimski 1950:25). Informants from eastern Macedonia regularly use *dodoka*. It appears, then, that *dodoka* was used originally in the east and

north, while *dori* was used in the west and north. The current opposition between the particles is stylistic; *dodenka* has become more widespread and occurs more frequently in journalistic and formal prose, while *dori* is more colloquial (Mihajlovski, personal communication).

The particles *dori* and *dodenka* denote a temporal relationship between two clauses and, therefore, carry the basic meaning relational. These two particles, together with the conditional particles, may be separated from the pseudo-paradigmatic particles in that they are positively marked for subordination, i.e., these two particles are syntactically bound to a higher clause. The modality of *dori* and *dodenka* is closely connected to finiteness and the two particles are moodily marked only when they occur with a perfective non-past. In other contexts they are quantifiers, and modally uncategorically real, indicative particles.

The particle *dori* is marked in relation to *dodenka* both stylistically, since it is considered more colloquial, and grammatically since it, unlike *dodenka*, cannot occur independently with a perfective non-past.

It will now be possible to give a complete distinctive feature matrix for the semantic categories of particles used in analytic model constructions in Macedonian. This matrix will be presented in the concluding chapter where an explanation of the completed matrix will be given.
The emphatic particle \textit{dakil} 'even' is considered homonymous with the relational particle and will not be included here. Unlike the relational particle which is syntactically subordinated, and which may only modify a verb, the emphatic particle is syntactically independent and can modify any element in the sentence, e.g.: 

1. 'Dakil i jas e zoav sa teza. 
Even I don't know about that.
2. 'Dakil i e razgo sa teza.
I don't even know about that.
3. 'Dakil e teva, buri ri na teza.
I don't know about even that.

Further evidence for the existence of two homonymous particles is the fact that they are translated by different words in the English: the emphatic \textit{dakil} is translated by Serbian \textit{duk} 'even', while the relational particle \textit{dakil} is translated by Serbian \textit{duk} 'until'.

So far has been devoted exclusively to the relational particles in Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Serbo-Croatian, but it appears that differences are mainly syntactic. Serbo-Croatian \textit{dakil} 'while, until' and Macedonian \textit{dakil} 'while, until' have essentially the same meaning as Macedonian \textit{duk} and Serbo-Croatian \textit{duk}.

Bulgarian \textit{duk}, which historically is the same as Macedonian \textit{dakil}, cannot be used literally. One other difference which may be noted is that in Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian there are no collocations equivalent to Macedonian \textit{koka} up, \textit{kura} up.

There is no context in which a perfective non-past may occur with the negative particle \textit{not}, newly in colloquial speech in questions such as the following:

1. \textit{Jas ne stanem?} 
   Would you like to sit down?
2. \textit{Jas ne stane?} 
   Would you like to sit down?
3. \textit{Jas ne stane?} 
   Would you like to sit down?
4. \textit{Jas ne stane?} 
   Would you like to sit down?

This type of example will be excluded since it is colloquial and the use of the perfective non-past is connected here with both negation and with interrogation. One could not say, for example:

\textit{\ldots ete stane.}
particles, distinguished on the basis of their ability to occur with forms of the perfective non-past, occur in syntactic constructions with indicative verb forms and carry modal meanings.

In the preceding chapters contents have been shown in which the particles may act as qualifiers and contents in which they may act as quantifiers. Future studies will be needed to integrate the modals and non-modal meanings of these particles. Yet, this work, however, has been to outline the system of syntactic modality by plotting a lexico-syntactic distinctive feature matrix, and establishing its hierarchical relationship to the particles. Thus, discussion will be limited to those contents in which the particles function modally.

The completed distinctive feature matrix of the lexico-syntactic classification of the modal particles can now be drawn. In the diagram of the hierarchy, all of the modal invariant meanings of the particles have been included (see Tables on the following pages).

As can be seen from these tables, subordinate, conditional and states are the most important classifications for the modal system. The conditional particles ви, нами, and ли and the relational particles даде and да си are separated from the non-subordinate, pseudo-paradigmatic particles да, да ли, and ли on the basis of their subordinate syntactic position. Unlike the pseudo-paradigmatic particles, the subordinate particles can only occur in subordination to a non-subordinate clause.

The subordinate particles are then differentiated by meaning for condition. It was stated earlier that ли which has a basic meaning of interjection, belongs functionally with ви and нами.
within the modal system. Although other particles, namely the proto-paradigmatic particles de, tu, and li have contextual variant meanings of condition, the three conditional particles have no other modal meaning.

The particles dehui and li are separated from the others because, unlike the unusual conditional particle, their use is restricted to fulfillable conditions. As noted earlier, however, the system is in a state of flux and dehui is spreading to unfulfillable conditions. The two fulfillable conditional particles are distinguished on the basis of style.

While dehui is still considered by some speakers to be limited to journalistic style, its use is becoming more usual in the literary language, while li is becoming more rare, and is considered stylistically marked as archaic or dialectal.

The relational particles daxi and duwul are unmarked for condition. The two particles have only one modal meaning: futurity. As demonstrated earlier, what was originally a dialectal opposition — daxi used in the west and north, and duwul used in the north and east — has become a stylistic difference in which daxi is stylistically marked as more colloquial.

Whereas the subordinate particles have only one invariant modal meaning and no contextual variant meanings, the non-subordinate particles, with the exception of dehui, have multiple contextual variant meanings. The contextual variant meanings of the non-subordinate particles may overlap with the basic meaning of the subordinate particles, which is drawn schematically in Figure 3.
The particle  lượt is the unmarked particle in the modal system since, as has been demonstrated in chapter II, it has no single basic, invariant meaning and, in certain contexts, it may replace all of the other modal particles. Thus, the original optative and subjunctive particle merged and has spread to include other modal meanings.

The term stann is adopted to designate the opposition between  lượt and  trái. The term is used here in the narrow sense of designating the speaker's view. Within this classification,  trái is marked since it denotes the speaker's view that the action is hypothetical, i.e., the action is doubtful, unlikely, uncertain, or conjectural.

The particle stán in the most restricted particle since it may occur only with the first and third person. While it generally denotes a fulfillable directive, in rare instances when used with a past tense, it may denote an unfulfillable directive.

The modal system has been treated as a consistent whole, but those areas in the system which are in the process of change have also been examined. Areas have been cited in which the modal systems of Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian differ from that of Macedonian; while there are many similarities among them, the modal systems are not isomorphic. There is much work which can be done in comparing the modal systems of the Balkan languages.