

Stanislava-Stasha Tofoska

Ss. Cyril and Methodius University
Skopje

Independent directive (*a*) *da*-constructions with the imperfect tense in the Macedonian language

0. The subjects of interest of this article are independent *da*-constructions with a verb form in the *imperfect tense* which express a non-factive action, are always pronounced with interrogative intonation and in front of which there is nearly always the conjunction/particle *A*¹. They are characteristic of colloquial language and they are usually used in the communication between people who feel close to each other on some level. They may express a request, a demand, a suggestion, a piece of advice, or a reproach, depending on multiple factors, although mostly on the intonation, and these will be reviewed in this article.

Examples:

- (1) *A da se javеше некогаш?*
'How about calling me sometime?'
- (2) *A da ja потскратеше косата?*
'What about having your hair cut?'
- (3) *A da dojdеше со нас?*
'How about coming with us?'

¹ Regarding the 'conjunction' or 'particle' dilemma, read below in the article.

We accept the thesis that *da*-constructions function in the Macedonian language as exponents of subjunctive/conjunctive² (Конески 1986, Минова-Ѓуркова 1994, Тополињска 2008, 2009). The common feature for all functional zones of use of the subjunctive is the expression of an action mainly projected into the future (*desired and possible*), that is to say non-factive, which allows us to accept that *da*-constructions in the Macedonian language function as a subjunctive. Particularly here, we are interested whether this type of *da*-constructions is also used in the functional zones in which the subjunctive is used.

1. Initial theses

In the analysis of the constructions which are subject of our interest, we shall start off from the thesis that the subjunctive is a linking (subordinate) mode, which is expressed using verbal forms (or constructions) that appear mainly in subordinate, and more rarely in main clauses (Karolak 1995: 524). The functional zones in which the subjunctive was used in Latin and Ancient Greek, in main clauses, are hortative, dubitative, optative, prohibitive, jussive and potential (a possible action is expressed, and mainly it serves for less categorical formulation of claims for future actions) (Karolak 1995: 84).

The subjunctive does not have an independent category value, and the principles of its distribution are semantically based. Basically, it is a dependent, subordinate modal construction, functioning as a sentential (propositional) argument of higher-order predicates, whose factiveness and modal-temporal feature is determined by the superordinate predicate (Тополињска 2014: 224).

Givón, in his typological paper on subjunctive, also determines the most frequent superordinate predicates among which the subjunctive appears, sorted according to their semantic values as belong to the deontic zone to or the epistemic zone (see Table 1).

Understanding the subjunctive constructions in the main/independent clauses as dependent on some virtual predicate, we reckon that this also corresponds with their use. More specifically, we are talking about the same superordinate predicates as in the case with subjunctive constructions in the subordinate clauses, but in utterances with independent subjunctive constructions, those predicates are not formalized at the surface of the utterance and are hence called *virtual* (Тополињска 2014: 227).

² I would like to mention that the terms subjunctive and conjunctive are used as relative synonyms, i.e. that subjunctive came about as a subtype of the Latin conjunctive, which is older, and nowadays all meanings covered by these forms are categorized under the former or the latter term (e.g. *subjunctif* in French, *congiuntivo* in Italian, etc.).

Deontic (manipulative) side

	translation in Macedonian
a) 'weak intended manipulation' (<i>tell, ask, suggest</i>)	а) слабо упатување <i>рече, побара, предложи</i>
b) 'preference' (<i>want/wish, prefer, expect</i>)	б) посилно упатување <i>сака, бара, посакува, претпочита, очекува</i>
c) 'epistemic anxiety' (<i>hope, fear</i>)	в) епистемичко сомневање <i>се надева, се плаши</i>
d) 'low epistemic certainty' (<i>not-sure, doubt, suspect, ask if, not know if</i>)	г) слаба епистемичка сигурност <i>не е сигурен, се сомнева, претпоставува, не знае дали, прашува дали</i>

Epistemic side**Table 1.** Givón 1994: 280.

The utterances with subjunctive constructions (*da*-constructions) which are the point of our interest here, can be categorized under the term *directives* (*directive*) since using them the addressee is given directions for some behavior and/or for an action which needs to be performed. Used in such a way, the term *directive* is to be found in Kramer's work: *directive* is "a proposal of a course or pattern of behaviour which should be carried out" (Kramer 1986: 32), as well as (Бужаровска 2000: 219) and Nicolova's work (Ницолова 2008: 409). They correspond with the manipulative speech acts referred to by Givón (1994: 273).

According to Givón, manipulative speech acts are commands, requests, exhortations, which are future projecting, depicting events that have not yet occurred (which fall under the epistemic modality), but also relate to the deontic modality, more specifically the valuative sub-mode of deontic modality. It is exactly that use that the *da*-constructions being analyzed here have.

2. Independent directive *da*-constructions with the imperfect tense

The subject of interest in this paper are particularly the *directive da*-constructions with the imperfect tense used independently and uttered with interrogative (rising) intonation³. It looks as if they, as a form, are typical for the Macedonian

³ Some of the uses of *directive da*-constructions + the imperfect tense in the Macedonian language have been written about by Kramer (1986: 25) – in terms of the use of the *da* + the imperfect

language; they do not have appropriate formal equivalents in the other languages in which the subjunctive functions as a separate form (e.g. in the use of *subjonctif imparfait* in French or in the use of *congiuntivo imperfetto* in Italian) and deserve to be given attention separately. They are polyfunctional and can express a request, a demand, a suggestion, a piece of advice, a reproach, which depends on multiple factors – the role of the participants in the spoken situation, the spoken situation itself, and most of all the intonation with which they are uttered. In that respect, higher-order predicates such as for example *сакам да ...* ‘I would like to ...’, *предлагам да ...* ‘I suggest that ...’, *препорачувам да ...* ‘I recommend that ...’, *те советувам да ...* ‘I advise you ...’, *мислам дека е подобра да ...* ‘I think that it is better ...’ could appear as superordinate predicates of these constructions.

The directive *da*-constructions with the imperfect tense are very often preceded by the conjunction *A*, i.e. the conjunction is found in an initial position of the utterances. *A* in an initial position can be treated as a particle (compare e.g. Бужаровска 2000), but it can also be considered as an adversative conjunctive predicate which is used to refer to a previous event or situation (Тополињска 2001:107). We consider that using the conjunction *A*, as the most typical one for the adversative relation in the Macedonian language, one can express addition, comparison or contrast (Минова-Ѓуркова 1994: 227), and in these constructions it represents an addition and comparison with a previous action. The comparison of the actions using the conjunction *A* can be done on the basis of numerous factors; in situations in which the utterances with *A da + the imperfect tense* are used, that is mainly on the basis of a temporal relation (“досега го правеше/правевме ова-предлагам, барам и сл. сега да правиш/да правиме друго” ‘until now you/we have done this – I suggest, request etc. that you/we do something else now’). The action may be completed (*A да седневме? Се изнастојавме* ‘**What about sitting down?** We’ve been standing for so long’) or it can be about a decision previously reached by the addressee regarding which the speaker has a different or opposing opinion. (*A. Не одам на промоцијата, решив. Б. А да дојдеш? Убава ќе биде* ‘A. I’m not going to the promotion; I’ve decided. B. **How about coming?** It will be great’).

The objective of this analysis is to determine:

- in what types of situations the utterances with these constructions are used;
- if they fall under deontic or epistemic modality and if they are closer to the one or the other side of the zone;

tense in an utterance which represents a polite request/command; Buzharovska (Бужаровска 2000: 223–228) also writes about, but in a wider context of the use of all independent *da*-constructions in the Macedonian language and as compared with the Greek language.

- if there are semantic and pragmatic differences between the same types of utterances expressed with *da* + the imperfect tense as opposed to the utterances with *da* + the present tense;
- what other factors influence the meaning of these utterances.

3. Types of situations (and speech acts) in which the independent directive *da*-constructions are used

Here, we'll illustrate the types of situations in which, according to our analysis, the specific *da*-constructions are used. With each of them, we shall also provide their superordinate (virtual) predicates.

a) Polite request (plea)

superordinate predicate: *сакам да ...*

‘I would like ...’

- e.g. (4) *Да ми донесеше чаша вода?*
‘How about bringing me a glass of water?’
- (5) *Да ми помогнеше малку?*
‘How about lending me a hand?’
- (6) *Да ми ја позајмеше книгата на кратко?*
‘What about lending me the book briefly?’

This type of utterances is the most often mentioned in the literature reviewing *da*-constructions in the Macedonian language. They express the desire of the speaker for the addressee to execute some action and it is formulated as a type of polite request, a plea. With the utterances with *da*-constructions with the imperfect tense, one utters a request which is of a greater degree of politeness than the *da*-constructions with the present tense. That has also been noted by Kramer, who emphasizes the role of the tense of the verb related to the degree of politeness in the directive *da*-constructions, where she considers precisely the one with *da* + the imperfect tense as the most polite one (Kramer 1986: 40–41). Buzharovska places these utterances into the deontic-volitional group (Бужаровска 2000: 223).

The utterances of this type belong to the zone of deontic modality. When reporting these utterances, some of the following verbal predicates would be used as the reporting verb: *рече, замоли, побара, (но)сака* ‘say, ask, request, wish’ etc. which means that they are superordinate to this type of *da*-constructions (*Тој ми рече/побара/ме замоли/носака да му донесам чаша вода* ‘He told/requested/asked/wished me to get him a glass of water’). According to Givón (see Table 1),

they belong to the first group of superordinate predicates in the deontic zone of modality which he calls predicates of weak intended manipulation.

The intonation with which these expressions are uttered has a great influence on the way the addressee will understand them, as a polite request or a request with the function to reproach. Just like with any directive utterance with *da* + the imperfect tense in the Macedonian language, the intonation is rising (interrogative), but it can be pleading interrogative or ironic interrogative. (Бужаровска 2000: 223) also emphasizes the great role of intonation in the expression of these requests. According to us, it is exactly the different intonation of the utterances with the same propositional content which is the basis for differentiating 2 meanings and their classification into 2 different situations: plea/request and reproach/request (see under 2).

e.g. (4a) *Да ми помогнеше малку?*

‘How about lending me a hand?’ – with pleading interrogative intonation – request, plea.

(4b) *Да ми помогнеше малку?*

‘How about lending me a hand?’ – with ironic interrogative intonation – request, reproach.

Certainly, apart from the intonation, the situation itself in which the utterance is used can contribute to a different interpretation (*Да ми помогнеше малку?* – *Не можам да ја отворам вратата* ‘How about you helping me a little? – I cannot open the door’ – request, as opposed to *Да ми помогнеше малку?* – *Не гледаш дека се мачам, не можам да ги кренам книгите* ‘How about you helping me a little? – Can’t you see that I’m struggling to lift those books’ – reproach and request).

In the requests expressed in this manner, the *da* + the imperfect tense construction is usually not preceded by the conjunction *A*, since there is no linking with a previous event. The speaker does not refer the addressee to any previous event.

b) Reproach and request

superordinate predicates: *очекував да (требааше да) ... и сакам да ...*

‘I expected you (you were supposed to) ... and I want you to ...’

With these utterances, the speaker expresses a reproach towards the addressee since he/she expected from the addressee to perform the action in question, which the addressee has not performed until the moment of speaking (the present moment).

- e.g. (7) (A) *Да ми помогнеше малку?*
 ‘How about you helping me a little?’
 (8) (A) *Да (ми) се јавеше некогаш?*
 ‘How about calling (me) sometime?’
 (9) (A) *Да дојдеше поблиску?*
 ‘How about you coming closer?’

The interpretation of the superordinate predication of the utterance (7) can be *треба(ше) да ми помогнеш / очекував да ми помогнеш* ‘You should (have) help(ed) me / I expected you to help me’. The reproach at the same time means a request – motivation for action (with added superordinate predicate “I would like for you to help me”), but without great expectations by the speaker that the addressee would respond to the request affirmatively.

The different situation (request or reproach) which in Macedonian is expressed with a different intonation of the utterance (7) can also be seen from the possible variants for translation of this expression into English, where apart from the intonation, different modal verbs (or constructions) are also used: *I wish you help me* – request, as opposed to *I wish you would help me*. *You might help me* (with an accent on *might*) (Thomson, Martinet 1986: 249, 262).

When reporting these utterances, some of the following verbal predicates could be used as the reporting verb: *искритикува, прекори* ‘criticize, reproach’ etc. (which contain *expected to ...*, and if the utterance is also experienced as a request, some of the superordinate predicates from the first group is added: *рече, побара, замоли* ‘say, ask, request ...’ (e.g. *А да (ми) се јавеше некогаш?* – Тој ме *искритикува* што не му се јавувам (никогаш) и ми *рече* да му се јавам (некогаш) ‘How about calling me sometime? – He criticized me for not (ever) calling him and told me to call him (sometime)’).

In this type of utterances, the conjunction *A* almost always appears preceding the construction *da* + the imperfect tense, since the speaker relates, i.e. refers to a previous situation which is a direct reason for the expression of the reproach (e.g. *А да ми помогнеше малку?* – *Цел ден само лежиш пред телевизорот; А да дојдеше поблиску?* – *Што си седнал толку далеку, за да викам?* ‘How about lending me a hand?’ or ‘You’ve been lying in front of the TV the whole day’ or ‘You might help me! Instead of lying in front of the TV’; ‘How about coming closer?’ – ‘Why have you sat so far away; so I would shout?’ etc.).

c) Advice with weak reproach

superordinate predicates: *очекував да ... (трябаше да) ... мислам дека за тебе е добро да ...*

‘I expected you to (you were supposed to) ...
I think that it would be good for you ...’

With these utterances, the speaker expresses a stimulus for performing/completing some action which he/she considers that the addressee should perform/complete. At the same time, the speaker also expresses weak reproach towards the addressee because he/she expected the addressee to have already *started performing/performed* the action in question, which the addressee has not performed until the moment of speaking (the present moment). The speaker reckons that it would be good for the addressee to perform the suggested action, and in that respect, these utterances are considered to be pieces of advice, and not merely a suggestion.

- (10) *A да поучеше малку? Имаш тест утре.*
‘How about studying a little? You have a test tomorrow’
- (11) *A да ја потсредеше собата? Лом ти е.*
‘How about tidying your room? It’s a mess’
- (12) *A да ја скратеше косата? Нон-стоп ти е в очи.*
‘How about having your hair cut? It’s in your eyes all the time’
- (13) *A да ги пиеште апчињата поредовно? Нема толку често да те боли главата.*
‘How about taking the pills more regularly? You won’t be having a headache so often’

These utterances are used in the communication with people who are close to us, whom we love and to whom we wish well. So, e.g. 10 and 11 can be used in parent-child communication, e.g. 12 as well, but also between friends, e.g. 13 is between friends, but also between a child and a parent (if the sufficiently grown-up son or daughter, caring for the health of their mother/father advise them what he/she should do, while reproaching him/her mildly) etc.

In some situations, the action being suggested (which the speaker considers to be good for their addressee) is contrasted with the previous one which the addressee had been doing until the moment of speaking (which the speaker sees as not good) or with the situation in which the addressee had been until that moment. In those cases, the reproach is stronger, but is nevertheless uttered out of care for the addressee.

- (14) *A да поучеше малку? Цел ден си на компјутер.*
‘How about studying a little? You’ve been in front of the computer the whole day’
- (15) *A да легнеше порано? Многу си уморна. Ќе се разболиш.*
‘How about going to bed earlier? You are very tired. You’ll get sick’

With this type of utterances – for expression of advice, due to the character of the advice as a speech act, there are often examples with a negation (explicit or implicit), and their interpretation is (I think that **you should not** ... / it is not good for you to perform the action which you have performed until now, you should stop doing it ... in order for you to be well). The action can be some habit, a characteristic of the addressee (smoking, speaking, eating), which the speaker sees as harmful for the addressee and advises them to stop doing it or decreasing its intensity.

- (16) *A да не зборуваше толку многу? Затоа не те сакаат.*
‘How about not talking so much? That’s the reason why they don’t like you’
- (17) *A да не јадеше навечер? Вака, никогаш нема да ослабнеш.*
‘How about not eating during the evening? That way you will never lose weight’
- (18) *A да престанеше да пушиш? Знаеш колку е штетно.*
‘How about quitting smoking? You know how harmful it is’

This type of utterances, just like the ones from the previous type, have two superordinate predications: *очекував да ...* and *треба да / подобро е да ...* ‘I expected that ... and you should / you had better ...’ and according to the superordinate predicates, they belong to the second group of predicates from the deontic zone of modality (predicates of preference), according to Givón (see Table 1). When reporting these utterances, the verbal predicate *те советувам да ...* ‘I would advise you to ...’ (which involves the predication ‘I think that it would be good for you to ...’) would be used as a reporting verb, which is an indication for their character – advice.

In this type of utterances, the conjunction **A** almost always appears preceding the construction *da* + the imperfect tense, since the speaker relates, i.e. refers to a previous situation which is a direct reason for the expression of the reproach and the suggestion for another action.

d) Suggestion (proposal)

superordinate predicate: *мислам дека треба да ... / е подобро да ...*
‘I think that you should ... / You had better’

With these utterances, the speaker, with a good intention, thinking that it would be better for the addressee, expresses a different opinion about the action which

the addressee has performed with a specific aim and motivates him/her to perform a different or opposite action.

- (19) *A да ги облече тие црните кондури? Поубаво ќе ти одат со оваа комбинација.*
 ‘How about putting those black shoes on? They will look better with this outfit’
- (20) *A да се дотераше малку? Сепак е прослава.*
 ‘How about dressing up a little? It is a celebration, after all’

The motivation for a different or opposite action can only also refer to a previously reached (and announced) decision about performing the action.

- (21) *A да дојдеш со нас, сепак? Размисли! Убаво ќе биде.*
 ‘How about coming with us anyway? Think about it! It will be great’
- (22) *A да му кажеш? Може ќе те разбере, ќе ти дозволи.*
 ‘What about telling him? Maybe he’ll understand you, he’ll allow you’

The utterances of this type are pronounced with an intonation expressing empathy, and with it the suggestion is weakened. At the same time, the interrogative intonation here refers to whether the addressee would agree with the opinion of the speaker. The interpretation of the utterance may be as follows: ‘I think that it is better for you to ... What do you think – would it be better to ...?’

When reporting these utterances, some of the following verbal predicates would be used as the reporting verb: *предложи, сугерира* ... ‘propose, suggest ...’ etc., which classifies them into the first group of superordinate predicates in the deontic zone of modality (predicates of weak intended manipulation), according to Givón (see Table 1).

e) Suggestion and motivation for joint action

superordinate predicate: *мислам дека (ние) треба да ... / е подобро да ... и/или сакам (ние) да ...*
 ‘I think that (we) should ... / we had better ... and/or I would like (us) ...’

These utterances are differentiated from the previous ones only by their hortative character. Uttered in the 1st person plural, they express the speaker’s desire for an action which also involves the addressee (or even the other participants in the spoken situation) and motivates them for joint action. Uttered in this form (*da* + the imperfect tense), the motivation is a type of suggestion (proposal) which is rendered milder. Again, the utterance is based on the previous situation, which

is significantly opposed to the proposed one. One can say that the speaker may feel fed up with the previously performed action and considers that it has been performed long enough or too long and that it would be good if something else should be done. At the same time, the speaker also requests the addressee to agree with the suggestion, to accept it.

- (23) *A da седневме на кафе? Се изнастојавме цел саат.*
 ‘How about we sat for a cup of coffee? We’ve been standing for a full hour’
- (24) *A да си одевме дома? Може домаќините сакаат да си легнат.*
 ‘How about we went home? Our hosts may want to go to bed’
- (25) *A да се чуевме на телефон, да не се договараме вака со СМС?*
 ‘How about we spoke on the phone, to avoid making agreements through text messages?’
- (26) *A да подизлеземе на воздух, цел ден го преседовме внатре, а види колку е убаво.*
 ‘How about we went out to catch some air – we’ve spent the whole day sitting inside, and look how nice [the weather] is’

When reporting these utterances, some of the following verbal predicates would be used as the reporting verb: *предложи, сугерира* ... ‘propose, suggest ...’ etc., which indicates that they belong to the first group of superordinate predicates in the deontic zone of modality (predicates of weak intended manipulation), according to Givón (see Table 1).

In this type of utterances, the conjunction *A* almost always appears in the initial position, since the speaker relates to a previous situation and suggests another action.

f) expression of dissatisfaction with a situation and desire for change

superordinate predicate: *очекував да ... (требаше да) и мислам дека тие треба да ...*

‘I expected that ... (they were supposed) and I think that they should ...’

With these utterances, one expresses strong dissatisfaction with some situation which is current at the moment of speaking and a desire for changing the situation projected in the future. The use of the *da*-construction with the imperfect tense in these utterances indicates that the speaker has expected the action to have been completed until the moment of speaking and expresses great dissatisfaction, sometimes even irritation due to the fact that it has not happened. Of course, it is also accompanied by an appropriate, ironic intonation, so these utterances are

experienced as ironic comments. However, the predication that the speaker wants that action to happen is also expressed in them.

Interesting for this type of utterances is that a 3rd person (singular or plural) appears in them, which the speaker considers as the one/ones who should have performed the action, so with the utterance, the speaker does not ask from the addressee to take any action. In that respect, these utterances cannot really be considered as directive – they rather express the speaker's attitude regarding some situation. Nevertheless, directed towards the addressee as a form of a question, they ask for confirmation from him/her that the attitude, opinion which the speaker has is true, correct, right.

- (27) *A да го смене менито некојпат? Со години им е исто.*
 'Isn't it about time they changed the menu? It's been the same for years'
 (28) *A да ни платееа? До кога треба да чекаме.*
 'How about they paid us? Until when should we wait?'

The interpretation of the utterance *A да ни платееа?* 'How about they paid us?' can be: I expected that by now they should have paid us; I think that it is bad that they haven't paid us yet; they should (have to) pay us; I want them to pay us.

The utterances with the 3rd person (singular or plural) can also represent an ironic comment to an utterance previously uttered by the addressee which refers to some 3rd person in a way that the 3rd person should perform some action which the addressee has suggested to the speaker. Using this construction, the speaker (with irony and sarcasm) expresses dissatisfaction with the suggestion of the addressee, considering that it is the 3rd person who should perform the action, since it is an action which he/she usually does not do (the accent is placed on the 3rd person pronoun).

- (29) *A тој мене да ме побараише? Само јас го барам.*
 'How about he called me? I am always the one who calls him'
 (30) *A маа да му ги купеише? Сеè ти му купуваиш.*
 'How about she bought him those? It is always you buying him stuff'

The situation with the utterance (29) can be interpreted in the following manner (A. *Побарај го X!* or *Зошто не го побараиш X?* 'A. Call X!' or 'Why don't you call X?' which is followed by B. *A тој мене да ме побараише? Само јас го барам* 'B. How about he called me? I am always the one who calls him').

In this type of utterances, the conjunction *A* almost always appears in the initial position, since the speaker, expressing a desire to change the situation, automatically refers to a previous one which he/she criticizes.

4. Comparison in the use of utterances with directive *da*-constructions + the present tense as opposed to directive *da*-constructions + the imperfect tense

If we compare the directive (A) *da*-constructions + the present tense with the directive (A) *da*-constructions + the imperfect tense, we can conclude that in all the cases all the directive utterances with *da*-constructions + the imperfect tense have a stronger emotional charge than their “equivalents” with *da* + the present tense. Whether the emotions are positive or negative mainly depends on the intonation and the type of situation, but with a *da*-construction + the imperfect tense they are reinforced.

So, the utterance with *da* + the present tense is experienced as a “simple” suggestion (only a suggestion), without emotions, while expressed with *da* + the imperfect tense, it becomes more intimate, more pleading, it shows greater interest for the well-being of the addressee on the part of the speaker, i.e. (types 3 and 4):

<p>e.g. <i>A da dojdeš</i> <i>so nas?</i> ‘You could come with us’</p>	<p><i>A da dojdeše</i> <i>so nas?</i> ‘How about coming with us?’</p>
--	---

or it “is transformed” into an unobtrusive piece of advice (such as the third and fourth types of situations).

<p>e.g. <i>A da gi oblečeš</i> <i>crnite konduri?</i> ‘You could put on the black shoes’</p>	<p><i>A da gi oblečeše</i> <i>crnite konduri?</i> ‘How about putting on the black shoes?’</p>
--	---

In the utterances expressing negative emotions, serving as criticism or reproach, the utterances with *da* + *the imperfect tense* are harsher, more ironic, sarcastic.

<p>e.g. <i>A da mi se javiš</i> (<i>nekođau</i>)? ‘It would be nice for you to call me sometime’</p>	<p><i>A da mi se javiše</i> (<i>nekođau</i>)? ‘How about calling me sometime?’</p>
<p>e.g. <i>A da ni plataš</i>? ‘It would be nice if they paid us’</p>	<p><i>A da ni plateaš</i>? ‘How about they paid us?’</p>

If we compare the expression of different communicative functions with this type of subjunctive constructions in expressions with interrogative form in the other South Slavic languages (Serbian, Croatian, Bulgarian), we shall see that there is only use of those with the present tense, while the subjunctive constructions with the imperfect tense are not present. That, in the Serbian/Croatian language can be due to the lack of use of the imperfect tense in general, but it is interesting

that such use does not exist in the Bulgarian language either, although there the imperfect tense (of perfective verbs) is used to express other meanings.

A direct parallel of the use of this type of constructions exists in the Albanian language⁴, where both constructions with present subjunctive and imperfect subjunctive are used, often accompanied by the interrogative particle *A* or *Sikur* (Newmark et al. 1982), using which requests become milder, suggestions and offers more polite and less obtrusive, while reproaches become more ironic.

- (7) (A) *Да ми помогнеше малку?*
 (A) *Të më ndihmoje pak?*
 ‘How about lending me a hand?’
- (14) *A да поучеше малку? Цел ден си на компјутер.*
A të mësoje pak? Tërë ditën në kompjuter je.
 ‘How about studying a little? You’ve been in front of the computer the whole day’
- (25) *A да се чуевме на телефон, да не се договараме вака со СМС?*
A të dëgjohemi në telefon, të mos merremi vesh me SMS?
 ‘How about we spoke on the phone, to avoid making agreements through text messages?’

5. Conclusions

The independently used *da*-constructions with the imperfect tense in the Macedonian language are used with a directive meaning in order to express a plea, a request, a desire, a suggestion, dissatisfaction, reproach.

They are always pronounced with a general interrogative (rising) intonation which is in different situations additionally modified depending on what the speaker wants to express. They are almost always used with the conjunction *A* used in the initial position, which signalizes the linking of the spoken situation with a previous (spoken or unspoken) situation and their comparison or contrasting.

They are used in colloquial language, in informal communication, among people who feel close to one another (close friends, friends, spouses, immediate family).

Regarding their correlates with *da* + the present tense, they are characterized by stronger emotional charge (independent of whether the emotions are negative or positive), and are distinct from them by the fact that they relate the action which they express with a previous situation (even without using the conjunction *A*).

⁴ I am grateful to professor Victor Firedman who pointed out this similarity between Macedonian and Albanian.

According to the functional zones in which they appear and the meanings which they express, the independently used *da*-constructions with the imperfect tense correspond with some of the meanings of subjunctive. The specificity of the utterances with this type of subjunctive constructions resides with the fact that semantic values from both the deontic and the epistemic modality intertwine in them. The superordinate virtual predicates of the *da*-constructions in these utterances are predicates of the deontic zone of modality (from the first and the second group – *said, suggests, wants, wishes, expects* etc. (see Table 1 on p. 4), and on the other hand, the manner of their expression in the form of a question carries the epistemic meaning of uncertainty, indecision (predicates from the first group of the epistemic side of modality from the type *не знам дали е добро ...? не сум сигурен ...* ‘I don’t know if it is good ...? I am not sure ...’. According to Givón, this type of utterances are indirect manipulative speech acts, since by asking the epistemic question (in English with *What about ...? How about ...?* or other), the speech act acquired a meaning of weak manipulation (a weaker directive) (Givón 1994: 276).

Literature

- Givón T., 1994, *Irrealis and the subjunctive*, „Studies in Language”, Vol. 18, № 2, pp. 265–337.
- Karolak S., 1995, *Subiunctivus*, [In:] *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*, red. S. Karolak, Wrocław : Warszawa : Kraków: Ossolineum.
- Kramer C., 1986, *Analytic Modality in Macedonian*, München: Verlag Otto Sagner.
- Newmark L., Hubbard P., Prifti P., 1982, *Standard Albanian*, Stanford: Stanford University.
- Thomson A.J., Martinet A.V., 1986, *A Practical English Grammar*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Бужаровска Е., 2000, *Независните да-конструкции во македонскиот јазик и нивните корелати во грчкиот јазик*, „Македонски јазик”, г. 48–50 (1997–1999), Скопје: Институт за македонски јазик „Крсте Мисирков”, стр. 217–236.
- Конески Бл., 1986, *Историја на македонскиот јазик*, Скопје: Култура.
- Минова-Ѓуркова Л., 1994, *Синтакса на македонскиот стандарден јазик*, Скопје: Радинг.
- Ницолова Р., 2008, *Българска граматика. Морфологија*, София: Универзитетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски”.
- Тополињска З., 2000, *Полски ~ македонски: Граматичка конфронтација*, 3: *Студии од морфосинтаксата*, Скопје: МАНУ.
- Тополињска З., 2001, *Полски ~ македонски: Граматичка конфронтација*, 5: *Zdanie w zdaniu. Реченица во реченица*, Скопје: МАНУ.

Тополињска З., 2008, *Полски ~ македонски. Граматичка конфронтација*, 8: *Развиток на граматичките категории*, Скопје: МАНУ.

Тополињска З., 2014, *Организација на не-фактивната зона на вербалниот систем во македонскиот и во полскиот систем*, [во:] *Субјунктив со посебен осврт на македонските да-конструкции*, уред. З. Тополињска, [= Морфосинтактички студии, 3], Скопје: МАНУ : Истражувачки центар за ареална лингвистика, стр. 218–229 [<http://ical.manu.edu.mk/books/ZbornikSubjunktivICAL2014.pdf>].

Резиме

Директивни самостојни (а) да-конструкции со имперфект во македонскиот јазик

Предмет на интерес на оваа статија се самостојните да-конструкции со глаголска форма во *имперфект* во македонскиот јазик, кои изразуваат не-фактивно дејство, секогаш се изговараат со прашална интонација и пред кои речиси секогаш стои сврзникот/партикулата А.

Примери:

1. *А да ми се јавеше некогаш?* (‘јави се некогаш, не си ми се јавил одамна/никогаш’)
2. *А да ја потскратеше косата?*
3. *А да дојдеше со нас?*
4. *А да седневме на кафе?*

Карактеристични се за разговорниот јазик, и обично се употребуваат во комуникација меѓу луѓе кои по некоја основа се чувствуваат блиски. Тие се употребуваат со директивно значење и тоа за да изразат молба, барање, желба, предлог, незадоволство, прекор и сл. што зависи од повеќе фактори, иако најмногу од интонацијата, и тоа ќе биде разгледано во оваа статија.

Тргуваме од поставката дека да-конструкциите во македонскиот јазик функционираат како експонент на субјунктивот (Конески 1986, Минова-Гуркова 1994, Тополињска 2008, 2009), сфаќајќи го субјунктивот како несамостојна, подредена модална конструкција, во функција на реченичен (пропозиционален) аргумент на предикати од повисок ред, чија фактивност и модално-темпорална карактеристика ја одредува надредениот предикат (сп. Karolak 1995). Исказите со самостојно употребените да-конструкции со имперфект, според функционалните зони во кои се јавуваат и значењата кои ги изразуваат соодветствуваат на некои од значењата на субјунктивот. Специфичноста на исказите со овој тип субјунктивни конструкции е во тоа

што во нив се испреплетуваат семантички вредности и од деонтичката од епистемичката модалност.

Исказите со *да*-конструкциите кои овде нè интересираат ги нарекуваме директиви (директивни) затоа што со нив на соговорникот му се дава насока, (дирекција) за некакво однесување и/или за дејство што треба да се изврши (сп. Kramer 1986, Бужаровска 2000, Ницолова 2008). Тие соодветствуваат на манипулативните говорни чинови (manipulative speech acts) кај Гивон (Givón 1994: 273), а тоа се наредбите, молбите/барањата, поттикнувањата/наговарањата, кои искажуваат настани проицирани во иднина и ја засегаат деонтичката модалност. А токму таква употреба имаат и *да*-конструкциите кои ги анализираме.

Целта на оваа анализа е да утврди: во какви типови на ситуации се употребуваат исказите со овие конструкции; дали спаѓаат во деонтичката или епистемичката модалност и дали се поблиску до едната или другата страна на зоната; дали има и какви се семантичките и прагматичките разлики меѓу истите типови на искази изразени со конструкциите со *да* + имперфект наспрема исказите со *да*+презент; кои други фактори влијаат на значаењето на овие искази.

Клучни зборови: субјунктив, модалност, македонски јазик, *да*-конструкција, имперфект.