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In a discussion of modality in Macedonian, we will take our basic definition of mood from Gołęb, namely: Mood is the grammatical category which expresses the ontological evaluation of an action denoted by a given verb. Markedly modal, i.e. non-indicative forms, are those which denote non-real processes.

Aronson (1977:14-15) in his the narrated event, aspect quantifies it. He designates them both as the non-shifter $E^\circ$.

The realization of manner as aspect or mood depends on other factors in the context. Thus, for example, in a sentence grammatical category which expresses the ontological evaluation of an action denoted by a given verb. Markedly modal, i.e. non-indicative forms, are those which denote non-real processes.

Aronson (1977:14-15) in his the type: He would play golf every day if when he lived in Chicago it is the opposition between when and if which allows us to determine whether would play is contextually a qualifier (mood) or a quantifier (aspect).

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

Napraviš tova i všecko šte bude gotovo.
Ako napraviš tova, vsšeko šte bude gotovo.
Napraviš li tova...
Da napraviš tova...
Šte napraviš tova...

In Macedonian, however, unlike Bulgarian, the perfective non-past cannot be used independently, except in the imperative, but occurs only in subordination to a modal particle. Therefore, the designation of an action as a non-real process is carried by a set of modal particles¹ which occur with forms of the indicative. Thus, for example, while in Bulgarian one can say:

Elektrîçtsto! Nastinšel samo edno buttonče i gotovo!
Electricity! You push just one little button and there you are!

In Macedonian the use of a modal particle before the perfective non-past is mandatory, e.g.:

Struja! Ako/Ke pritisneš samo edno kopće — gotovo!
Electricity! If you press you will press one little button and there you are.

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

In Macedonian, due to the demonstrated relationship between mood and aspect alluded to earlier, we can define a limited set of particles distinguished for the most part by their ability to co-occur with forms of the perfective non-past. The particle bi 'would' must be included among the modal particles despite the fact that its use is limited to the I-form for three reasons:

1. It carries the same types of meanings as other modal particles, cf.:

   Koga bi ja zavorele fabrikata i bi davale plati na rabotnici. bi imaše pomala zaguba otkolu koga bi rabotele. (NM 24-V-82-8)

   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.

   Koga bi ja zavorele . . . ke imame. ke imamne pomala zaguba . . .

   If we were to close it . . . we will/would have a lower deficit . . .

2. Syntactically it functions like ke, da and li.

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

The unambiguous set of modal particles includes ako 'if', bi 'would', da 'that', dodeka 'until', duri (ne) 'until', ke 'will, would' and neka 'let'. There was not full agreement among native speakers on the acceptability of other particles since the status of these particles is in a state of flux. We will include all the particles currently used by educated speakers and in the Macedonian media. The complete list of particles will also include, then, dokolku 'if, insofar as' in sentences of the type:

Cenata za ovoj izlet iznesuva 180 dinari, no dokolku se prijava v bogol broj zaimisirani, cenata može da bide i pomala.
The cost of the outing is 180 dinars, but if there is a greater number of interested parties, the price may be lower.

and li 'if, whether' in conditional clauses of the type:
Vo tekot na godinava supersilite ke trošat na vooružovanje po milion dolari sekoja minuta. (NM 5-X-82-4)
During the course of this year the super powers will spend on armaments more than a million dollars every minute.

Toj bi dokol.
He would come.

Sega ostavi go ovde, neka umre sam kako pes na bunište.
(B. Koneski, kartoteka³)
Now leave him here, let him die alone like a dog on a garbage heap.

the remaining particles, dodeka, duri, ako, dokolku and li occur only in subordination to a higher clause.

We will begin our discussion with the subordinate particles since they, unlike the independent particles, have only one invariant modal meaning, and no contextual variant meanings.

These particles may be differentiated first by marking for condition. Although other particles, namely the independent particles da, ke and bi have contextual meanings of condition, the three conditional particles have no other modal meaning.

Before comparing the three conditional particles, ako, dokolku and li, we will give a brief summary of various types of conditional periods. The formation and meaning of conditional clauses is one of the most complex problems in the Macedonian modal system. Four of the particles are used in the protasis of a conditional period, namely da, ako, li and dokolku. In some instances koga bi may be used. In the apodosis, two forms are competing: constructions with the particle ke and constructions with the particle bi. Work to date on Macedonian conditionals has followed the classical subdivision of conditions into a tripartite system: real, irreal, and hypothetical conditions. Rather than the terms real and irreal we propose the terms fulfillable and unfulfillable for two reasons: one, all modals are by our definition irreal and two, hypothetical conditions, which have traditionally been treated as either irreal or as outside the opposition real/irreal, can be treated as ontologically fulfillable. We find the tripartite conditional system unsatisfactory 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 this system point to the relationships which exist between expectative conditions, i.e. conditions whose fulfillment is or was projected as fulfillable either 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. We propose the following system for conditional periods:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
\text{Conditional} & \text{Unfulfillable} & \text{Fulfillable} \\
\hline
\text{Expectative} & \text{Hypothetical} & \text{Expectative} & \text{Hypothetical}
\end{array}
\]

Returning to the three conditional particles we find that *dokolku* and *li* are separated from *ako* because, unlike the unmarked conditional particle, their use is restricted to unfulfillable conditions. The choice of conditional particle is, however, in a state of flux. The use of the particle *li* in conditional periods is limited in the standard language and informants generally considered its use dialectal or archaic. While the particle *li* has a basic meaning of interrogation, within the modal system it belongs functionally with *ako* and *dokolku* as a conditional particle.

While the role of *li* is becoming more limited and marginal in the literary language in conditional periods, the use of the particle *dokolku* is becoming ever more frequent. Many informants rejected the use of *dokolku*, considering it to be journalistic jargon and would not condone its use in sentences such as:

Britanskiot minister za nadvorenštini raboti Frensis Pim izjavi deka Velika Britanija ke prodolzi da se zalaga za mirolubivo rešenje na folklandska kriza, no, *dokolku* propadat site diplomatski napori, verojatno ke se obide osbro vite da gi vrate so sila. (Večer Nedela 3-V-82-10)

The British Minister of foreign affairs, Francis Pym, announced that Great Britain would continue to strive for a peaceful solution to the Falkland crisis, but if all diplomatic attempts fail, it will probably attempt to take back the islands by force.

While many informants would not condone the use of *dokolku* in unfulfillable conditions, they rejected its use in unfulfillable, regularly substituting *ako* or *da*. Examples of this type do, however, occur in the press, e.g.

Dokolku ne bevme xendikepirani... veruvam deka dosega “keramika” ke se natpresvaruvalje vo pavisok rang. (NM cited in K. Koneski 1979:235) If we hadn’t been handicapped... I’m sure that (the team) keramika would have competed at a higher level before now.

The current use of *dokolku* can be compared to the situation in English in which speakers would not accept the use of the verbs to impact or to interface, though they occur frequently in the press.

The opposition between the conditional particles is one of style: *li* is considered stylistically marked or unacceptable in conditional, while *dokolku*, though not acceptable in unfulfillable conditions, is becoming widespread in fulfillable conditions.

The conditional particle *ako* is unmarked with respect to *dokolku* and *li* since it occurs freely in both fulfillable and unfulfillable conditions, e.g.:

Unfulfillable:
Ako prodolže taka za desetina godina, Dobridol ke broše peistotini kuki. (Fotev, cited in K. Koneski 1979:230)
Had it continued like that for ten years, Dobridol would have numbered five hundred houses.

Fulfillable:
Ako dojde toj, nema da odam.
If he comes, I’m not going.

The other two subordinated particles, *duri* and *dodeka*, can be said to be modally marked as +relational. They express a temporal relationship between the main and subordinate clauses. With these two relational particles we see a close relationship between mood and aspect since these two particles denote non-ontologically real events only when used with a perfective non-past; compare, for example, the following:

1. Duri + perfective non-past:
   Ke go čekame duri da dojde.
   We’ll wait for him until he comes.

2. Duri + imperfective non-past:
   Ako ne se vratis, duri sum živa gologlava kletvi ke ti prakam.
   If you don’t return, as long as I am alive and unmarried I will send you curses.

   (Maleski, kartoteka)

3. Dodeka + perfective non-past:
   Nešto što e ponataka ke bide taka sè dodeka ti dukanot ne go zatvoris tamu, i se preseli ovde.
   (Krle, kartoteka)
   What’s more, it will be like that until you sell your store there and move here.

4. Dodeka + imperfect:
   Dodeka obete sestri ja prigotovuva sajata i večerata, toj zadovolno mielede deka seto toa e taka ubava.
   (Martinovski 1979:120)
   While both sisters prepared the salad and the dinner, he thought contentedly that all this was so beautiful.
We agree with Aronson (1977:24), who attributes their modality in constructions with a perfective non-past to a meaning of futurity. Both *dodeka* and *duri* occur with *da* and *ne*; in fact, *duri*, in its modal function in constructions with a perfective non-past must be used with one of these. We may include *duri* as a separate modal particle for the following reasons:

1. *Duri ne/da* is synonymous with *dodeka*, e.g.:
   Dodeka/duri da pojadedi i vremeto ke bide za odenje.
   By the time we finish eating, it will be time to go.

2. While *duri ne* can be used with a perfective non-past, e.g.:
   Duri ne najdam nešto za nea, ne ke pojdam.
   Until I find something for her I won't go.

   the negative particle cannot be used independently with a perfective
   non-past, e.g. *Ne najdam nešto za nea...

Although the choice between *duri* and *dodeka* is not mentioned as a dialect feature in the general studies on Macedonian dialectology (v. Vidoeski 1960, 1962) we conclude from the works on specific dialects (Groen 1977:204-205; Hendriks 1976:256; Stamatoski 1957:115) that the original difference between these forms was dialectal, *dodeka* being used in the east and north, and *duri* in the west and north. The current opposition between the particles is stylistic, *dodeka* has become more widespread and occurs more frequently in journalistic and formal prose, while *duri*, in this modal meaning, is considered more dialectal.

We may now turn to the independent particles. The particle *neka* is the most restricted of the particles since it may be used only with first- and third-person non-past verb forms. Unlike the other independent particles which may carry different types of modal meanings, *neka* is only used to express appeal. It is used most often with third-person non-past verbs where it expresses permission, tolerance, or concession, e.g.:

Neka odi, mi e se edno.
Let him go, it's all the same to me.

Neka odi, što ti e guje.
Let him go, what's it to you.

While the particle *da* is more common with first-person verb forms, *neka* occurs in first-person hortatives, e.g.:

Neka ja zadušuvame zasega makata i neka veruvmave vo ona za koe zboruvavme vo one zimski večeri vo tvojata soba. (Ivanovski, kartoteka)
For now, let us forget the trouble, and let us believe in what we spoke about those winter evenings in your room.

and in first-person singular appeals, e.g.:

Neka izdadam. (Čašule, kartoteka)
Let me give myself up.

The particle *da* is the unmarked particle in the modal system since, *mutatis mutandis* it may carry the modal meanings of all the other particles, e.g.:

1. In constructions with *ima/nema*, *da* can replace *ke* in both its future function and in its function as the so-called future in the past. We will include here the negative forms with *nema* since they are the unmarked forms of the negated 'future':
   *ke odi* 'he'll go'
   *ima da odi* 'he has to go; will go'
   *ne ke odi* 'he won't go'
   *nema da odi* 'he won't go'
   *ne ke odeče* 'he wouldn't have gone'
   *nemaše da odi* 'he wouldn't have gone'

2. In conditional sentences *da* can replace *li, ako* and *dokoliko*. Compare, for example, the following real, fulfillable conditions:

Pobaras li poveke, ke te ubijat! (Maleski cited in K. Koneski 1979:88)
Da pobaras poveke, ke te ubijat!
If you keep looking, they'll kill you!

Ako mu se pee, ke pee . . .
(Arsovske cited in K. Koneski 1979:77)
Da mu se pee, ke pee.
If he wants to sing, he'll sing.

Dokoliku se obezbedaat ovie uslovi, prečki ke nema.
(Nova Macedonija cited in K. Koneski 1979:89)
Da se obezbedaat ovie uslovi, prečki ke nema.
If these conditions are met, there will not be difficulties.

3. In relational clauses, *da* can be used with or replace *dodeka* and *duri*, e.g.:

Duri/dodeka da dojde toj, ke odime.
Da dojde toj, ke odime.
When he gets here, we'll go.

4. In certain hypothetical clauses *da* can replace *bi*, e.g.:

Edno kafe da ti svaray — reči za da reči nešto, zašto kafe nemaše.
(Maleski, kartoteka)
Edno kafe bi ti svaral . . .
I'd make you a cup of coffee, he said in order to say something, since there was no coffee.
5. Da can be used in place of neka in first- and third-person appeals, e.g.:

Da gledame/Neka gledame
Let's look.

Thus, da can be considered unmarked for any specific type of modality.

The modal uses of da may be divided into syntactically independent and dependent functions. The particle da has two independent modal meanings: directive and conditional. The term directive proposed by Lyons (1977:816) includes commands, demands, exhortations, and requests. There are both fulfillable and unfulfillable da directives. The fulfillable da directive has three functions:

1. Polite commands used with a second-person verb form, e.g.:
   Da mi ja doneses knjigu.
   Please bring me the book.

2. First- and third-person hortatives and concessives, e.g.:
   Ajde, zaedno da rabotim.
   Come on, let's work together.
   Da dojde i toj.
   Let him come too.

3. Exhortations and wishes, used often in blessings and curses, e.g.:
   Da pijet!
   May you burst!
   Golem da porasnes!
   May you grow big and strong!

Unfulfillable 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; in this latter context da can be used with either an imperfect or an imperfective non-past, e.g.:

Da mi e/bele sega Elena mesto tebe. (B. Koneski, kartoteka)
If only it were Elena now instead of you.

In conditional periods da occurs in all four types of conditions outlined above, though the most frequent use of da is in unfulfillable, expectative conditions of the type:

Da znae, ke se vratev mnogo pobru.
If I had known, I would have returned much faster.

The dependent da can be used to express mood or aspect depending on the lexical meaning of the verb in the main clause. While da can here function as a quantifier or a qualifier, the exact nature of the mood or aspect is dependent solely on the lexical meaning of the head verb, cf.:

He wanted to sing. He began to sing. He managed to sing through.

We have adopted the term status to designate the opposition between ke and bi. We use the term here in the narrow sense of designating speaker's view. Within this classification, bi 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 bi is used to denote actions which were, or are, possible or desirable, but which were not, or have not been fulfilled. Unlike actions subordinated to the particle ke which are presented as expected, projected events, the choice of the particle bi indicates the speaker's view that the action, while possible, is less likely to occur than a corresponding ke construction.

The particle bi may occur independently. Here the particle is used to express a hypothetical action. In this context bi constructions denote actions which may occur, whose fulfillment depends on the fulfillment of an unstated condition, or an action whose fulfillment is unlikely, e.g.

Amerikanska vlada ja izvesti Moskva deka eventualno sovetska voena intervencija vo Polska bi donela "nesoglediv teški poslednici za odnosite mejš istok i zapad." (NM 13-II-82-2)
The American government informed Moscow that possible Soviet military intervention in Poland would lead to "unforeseeable grave consequences in east-west relations."

While both bi and ke can express an action which will occur after the speech event, the use of bi expresses the speaker's view that the action is less definite than a corresponding construction with ke, cf.:

Mislam deka ke dojde.
I think that he will come.

Mislam deka bi došol.
I think that he would come.

If we compare the conditional uses of ke and bi, we may draw the following diagram to demonstrate the relationship between conditions with ke and those with bi:

```
Unfulfillable
expectative         hypothetical
Ke     (Bi)          (Ke)       Bi

Fulfillable
expectative         hypothetical
Ke     Bi
```
Gołęb (1964a:31) notes that the use of *ke* plus imperfective in the apodosis of unfulfillable expectative conditions is more typical of Macedonian. Hausmann (cited in Gołęb 1964a:31) states that while the use of *bi* in this context is rare in colloquial or dialectal speech, it has become more common in the literary language at the expense of the conditional use of *ke*. Currently in the literary language, our informants note a tendency to use constructions with *bi* in more formal language, while the use of *ke* plus imperfective is developing a colloquial nuance. We have marked in parentheses in the preceding table those contexts in which the use of *ke* and *bi* is in a state of flux. We may conclude that while *ke* is still more common in the apodosis of unfulfillable, expectative conditions, a situation is developing in which both particles are permissible, but stylistically differentiated.

In unfulfillable, hypothetical conditions both *ke* and *bi* may be used; compare, for example:

Sè bi im dal na ženite . . . kurvite, orospite, glavata bi ja dal i kušata bi ja rasturil da ne sum jas.

(Stamatoski, kartoteka)

I would give everything to women . . . whores, degenerates, I would give my head and destroy my home if only I weren’t myself.

Da znam nekoj drug zbor, pomisli, ke go rečev nego.

If I knew some other word, just think, I would say it.

When we turn to fulfillable conditions we see a clear opposition between expectative conditions with *ke* and hypothetical conditions with *bi*. The difference between the potential and the projective particles in fulfillable conditions is the degree of expectation that the action will be fulfilled, e.g.:

Ako mi se javite, Ke dojdam.

If you call me, I’ll come.

Ako mi si javite, bi došol.

If you call me, I would come.

We may conclude that in its conditional meaning, the opposition between *bi* and *ke* is stylistic except when used to express a future action where the opposition is maintained between hypothetical actions with *bi* and expected actions with *ke*.

The particle *ke* has several modal, contextual variant meanings. Lunt (1952:101) defines *ke* as the projective mood to which he attributes the general meaning of an action “viewed as manifest, that is as real or highly probable, but not immediately present.”

In a modification of Lunt, we assign the basic meaning of expectative to the particle *ke*. We also note that the particle *ke* is not a marker solely of mood since, as we have seen above, there are contexts in which the verb subordinated to *ke* is aspectually iterative.

The particle *ke* carries contextual modal meanings of futurity, condition, and supposition.

We agree with the argument proposed by Janakiev (1962:427), Lyons (1969:310), Kurzyłowicz (1956:26) and others that the so-called future tense is a modal rather than a temporal category, since actions which are to occur after the speech event cannot be said to refer to ontological reality because the completion of these actions is based not on fact, but on prediction.

We have already shown those contexts in which *ke* occurs in the apodosis of a conditional period. Here we will note only that the major contextual variant meaning of *ke* plus an imperfect has been the subject of much debate. Macedonian linguists have treated the temporal future-in-the-past meaning as primary, for example in sentences such as:

Mlad patnik so kožen mal kofer se kačil na patniškot brod “Viktorija,” koj po eden čas ke fataše pravec za Istanbul.

(Abadžiev, cited in K. Koneski 1979:222)

A young passenger with a small leather suitcase boarded the passenger ship “Victoria,” which in an hour would set off in the direction of Istanbul.

We agree with Gołęb who 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 *ke* odea vo grad will be interpreted as the conditional ‘They would have gone to town’ rather than the temporal ‘They will have gone to town.’

We will take our definition of *supposition* from King, who notes (1983:116) that sentences of the type *That’ll be John at the door* and *The class will be over by now* are parallel to the use of the present tense for future actions, e.g. *The train leaves at noon*. In the latter instance a future prediction is presented as present fact, while in the former, a present action is removed from the present factual perspective, and is presented as future prediction. Our term *suppositional* refers, then, to actions which are temporally present, but which are expressed by a future expectative, e.g. *Ke ima dvanaeset godini ‘He’ll be twenty years old’*.

The modal system of Macedonian is currently in a state of flux. As we have shown, the use of the particles is changing due to the influence of the literary language and journalistic style, as well as pressure from Serbo-Croatian. We have concentrated here on those contexts in which the particles carry modal meaning, i.e. we have shown their use in contexts which are markedly modal. While we have outlined the system of analytic modality and have plotted a lexico-syntactic distinctive feature matrix, future
studies will have to integrate both the modal and non-modal meanings of
the particles.

Murray State University

NOTES

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 bi.
2. Examples taken from the newspaper Nova Makedonija will be cited NM followed by
the date and page number as follows: day, month, year and page.
3. We will use the term kartoteka 'file' to designate examples taken from the files of
the Institute for the Macedonian Language in Skopje, Yugoslavia.
4. Minova-Gurkova (personal communication) does not consider it typical in conditional
periods, nor does she accept its independent use with a perfective non-past. B. Koneski (per-
sonal communication) would not use it in a conditional period except in poetry.
5. Further research is needed to determine the choice of da or ne with the relational par-
ticles; the choice appears to be dependent in part on the aspect of the verbs in the two clauses
and the presence of a negated verb in the main clause.
6. In limited contexts neka may be used with a past tense form to denote an unfilled
able appeal, e.g.
   Ako ne sakala taa neskromna devojka, neka ne se vlečese noče so mladite selani vo
   štabot.
   (Fotev, kartoteka)
   If that immodest girl didn’t want to, let her not have tagged along at night with the
   young villagers to the headquarters.
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