



Apprehensive-epistemic *Da*-Constructions in Balkan Slavic

Liljana Mitkovska

FON University
Skopje, Republic of Macedonia

Eleni Bužarovska

University “SS Cyril and Methodius”
Skopje, Republic of Macedonia

Elena Ju. Ivanova

St. Petersburg State University
St. Petersburg, Russia

Апрехенсивно-эпистемические *да*-конструкции в балканославянских языках

Лиляна Митковска

Университет ФОН
Скопье, Республика Македония

Элени Бужаровска

Университет св. Кирилла и Мефодия
в Скопье
Скопье, Республика Македония

Елена Юрьевна Иванова

С.-Петербургский государственный университет
С.-Петербург, Россия

Abstract

The research in this paper is focused on the apprehensive function of the particles *da ne* in Macedonian and *da ne bi* in Bulgarian as part of South Slavic subjunctive *da*-constructions. These clusters of particles are considered to be markers of a wider apprehensive-epistemic category. They are assumed to have undergone grammaticalization due to their morphosyntactic and prosodic unity. Even though there may be some contextual differences, these particles in both Balkan Slavic languages share a common semantic component: an undesirable “fear-causing” possibility of some potential situation. In terms of distribution, they may occur in both dependent and main clauses expressing related, gradient apprehensive-epistemic meanings. The goal of the paper is to categorize the apprehensive-epistemic types, determine their specific structural and functional properties, and establish

the conceptual links between them. The paper takes a functional approach to the analysis of the apprehensive-epistemic semantic category, thus the categorization of its subtypes is determined on the basis of their functions in context. The analysis of the collected examples instantiating these functions testifies to an existing gradience within this category in both dependent and independent use. The conclusions of the paper have typological relevance in view of the fact that they may contribute to a better understanding of this crosslinguistic category from both semantic and grammatical perspective.

Keywords

epistemic meaning, apprehensive, modality, gradience, subjunctive, *da*-construction, Macedonian, Bulgarian

Резюме

Статья посвящена апрехенсивным употреблениям частиц *да не* в македонском и *да не би* в болгарском языках как одной из реализаций южнославянских субъюнктивных *да*-конструкций. Данные частицы рассматриваются как маркеры более широкой категории апрехенсивно-эпистемической модальности. Несмотря на некоторые контекстуальные различия, в обоих балканославянских языках они имеют общее семантическое толкование: беспокойство о возможности наступления нежелательной ситуации. Эти частицы могут употребляться как в зависимых, так и в независимых клаузах, выражая различные варианты градуированного апрехенсивно-эпистемического значения. Целью статьи является классификация апрехенсивно-эпистемических типов конструкций с данными частицами, определяемых на основе их характерных структурных и функциональных свойств, и установление концептуальных связей между ними. В статье применен функциональный подход к анализу апрехенсивно-эпистемической семантической категории, таким образом, категоризация подтипов учитывает функции данных единиц в контексте. Анализ собранных примеров, иллюстрирующих эти функции, свидетельствует о наличии градуированности в данной категории как в зависимом, так и в независимом употреблении. Выводы статьи имеют типологическую значимость, внося вклад в понимание статуса этой кросслингвистической категории как с точки зрения семантики, так и грамматики.

Ключевые слова

эпистемическое значение, апрехенсив, модальность, градуированность, субъюнктив, *да*-конструкция, македонский язык, болгарский язык

1. Introduction

This paper examines the apprehensive function of subjunctive *da*-constructions in standard Macedonian and Bulgarian, two neighboring Balkan Slavic languages. However, the analyzed data shows that this function cannot be examined in isolation, but should be placed within a wider spectrum of epistemic meanings that these constructions display. The epistemic meaning may gradually acquire an apprehensive implicature which becomes conventionalized

in certain contexts, resulting in the existence of several apprehensive-epistemic subtypes that converge into one another. Therefore, to fully understand the apprehensive function of the *da*-constructions, the paper investigates its semantic links with neighboring epistemic meanings, considering the apprehensive as part of an apprehensive-epistemic category.

The term apprehensive¹ covers linguistic means by which the speaker expresses uneasiness and anxiety that an undesirable situation is possible [LICHTENBERG 1995; ПЛУНГЯН 2004: 17; ДОБРУШИНА 2006; ZORIKHINA NILSSON 2012 among others]. D. Angelo and E. Schultze-Berndt provide the following definition:

As a general characterisation, an apprehensive marker conveys the possibility of a state of affairs that is possible, but undesirable and best avoided, often in conjunction with a sentence specifying the action necessary (or to be avoided) to prevent this state of affairs [ANGELO, SCHULTZE-BERNDT 2016: 259].

In Balkan Slavic, apprehensive-epistemic meanings are coded by the particles *da ne* (in Macedonian and Bulgarian) and *da ne bi* (in Bulgarian). But as pointed out above, these particles have not specialized solely for the apprehensive domain. The fused particle *da ne* is used in both languages with similar functions, but in this paper we focus on the Macedonian particle and on the formally different but functionally similar Bulgarian particle *da ne bi*.² These particles appear in both dependent (1–2) and main clauses (3–4) expressing a variety of semantic subtypes, illustrated by the following examples.³

- (1) И стариот [. . .] излезе надвор да заклучи, случајно некој **да не** се накачи по скалите и да влезе кај нив (M/KU) ‘The old man [. . .] went out to lock the door in case someone should climb the stairs and enter their flat.’
- (2) Дори не смеех да влизам в книжарниците, **да не би** да ме разпознаят (B/GD) ‘I even did not dare to go into bookstores, lest I would be recognized.’
- (3) Проклетство! **Да не** е ова крајот? Никако! Никако! (M/KU) ‘Damn it! Could this be the end? No way!’
- (4) **Да не би** да имаш проблеми с дишането? (B/dveri.bg/kd6hq) ‘Do you perhaps have breathing problems?’

¹ Other terms have been used for this category, such as timitive [PALMER 2001: 22], admonitive [e.g. ВУБЕЕ ET AL. 1994], ‘lest’ marker, etc. For more information, see [ДОБРУШИНА 2006; VUILLERMET 2013; ANGELO & SCHULTZE-BERNDT 2016].

² The Bulgarian combination *da ne*, as part of the negative *da*-construction, does not manifest grammaticalization features (prosodic, grammatical, functional) characteristic of the Macedonian *da ne* and the Bulgarian *da ne bi* particles [ИВАНОВА, БУЖАРОВСКА 2016]. The distributional differences between the two Bulgarian constructions are not relevant for the topic discussed in this paper.

³ The symbols in brackets indicate the source of the example: B stands for Bulgarian, M for Macedonian language. After the slash the source for the example follows, unless the example is supplied by the authors.

The speaker expresses a degree of certainty that the event coded in the apprehensive clause is likely to occur and, at the same time, evaluates (or judges) the event as undesirable or harmful for the addressee, for the speaker, or for both. Since the two modal meanings are present simultaneously, LICHTENBERK [1995: 293–294] uses the term ‘mixed modality’, which underscores the complex semantic nature of this category. The apprehensive has two semantic foci: (a) the modal-evaluative, which consists of two components: information about a hypothetical situation and a negative evaluation of the situation (by the speaker) as undesirable [ПЛУНГЯН 2011: 448]; and (b) the emotional apprehension or concern that this situation is likely. The means languages employ to encode apprehensive meanings may not have all these components but they may be derived from the context [LICHTENBERK 1995; ДОБРУШИНА 2006]. Following Lichtenberk’s term ‘apprehensional-epistemic’ [1995: 294] for the forms that have such semantics, Dobrushina [ДОБРУШИНА 2006: 36] calls them “аппре-хенсивный пробабилитив.” She points out that the apprehensive meaning may result from the strengthening of the implicature of fear and undesirability in “probabilistic” utterances.

Crosslinguistically, this meaning is coded by various grammatical and lexical means such as morphological mood markers, particles, bouletic modals, or subordinators (meaning ‘lest’). Specialized apprehension moods and/or markers exist in languages in Austronesia [LICHTENBERK 1995], Australia [VERSTRAETE 2001; DIXON, AIKHENVALD 2009], Australian creole languages [ANGELO, SCHULTZE-BERNDT 2016], Amazon languages [VUILLERMET 2013], and in some languages in Russia [ДОБРУШИНА 2006; ПРОХОРОВ 2009],⁴ among others. It can be argued that in Balkan Slavic, the modal particles *da ne* and *da ne bi* serve as markers of apprehensional-epistemic modality. The components of these indivisible compound forms are recruited from the epistemic-optative domain: the subjunctive particle *da* and the negation particle *ne* produce *da ne* in Macedonian; in Bulgarian, the hypothetical *bi* joins *da ne* forming a particle *da ne bi*. Both combinations function as fixed units characterized by specific structural and functional properties [ИВАНОВА 2014; БУЖАРОВСКА, МИТКОВСКА 2015; ИВАНОВА, БУЖАРОВСКА 2016].

The *da*-construction represents one of the major syntactic idiosyncrasies of modern South Slavic languages. Known as a subjunctive construction (*da*+*praesentis*) in Bulgarian and Macedonian, this nonfactual structure consists of the mood particle *da* and an untensed verb marked for person and number. The modal *da* signals the syntactic and prosodic dependency of the untensed verb:⁵ no lexical items can intervene between them (except pronominal clitics)

⁴ Such as Evenki, Yakut, Mordvin, etc [ДОБРУШИНА 2006] and Kalmyk [ПРОХОРОВ 2009].

⁵ The verb forms (in present perfective) are dependent and cannot be used without the morpheme *da*.

and it forms a phonological unit with the verb [JOSEPH 1983]. The construction is characterized by a high degree of polysemy which reflects its historical development [АСЕНОВА 2002]. Originally used with goal adjuncts, *da* spread into nonfactual complements, becoming a subjunctive marker in Balkan Slavic [ГРКОВИЋ-МЕЏОП 2004: 200].⁶ In these languages with the broadest nonfactual functional scope of *da*-constructions, *da* may have different functions: a morpheme governing the subjunctive form of the verb, a modal particle in optative-directive utterances [AMMANN, AUWERA 2004], and a sentential operator introducing a subordinate clause.

The particle *bi* is the potential mood marker originating from the old subjunctive forms of the verb **byti* ‘to be’, used as a fully inflected unstressed particle in Bulgarian and an uninflected one in Macedonian. It combines with the verb forms in *-l*, which historically go back to the past participle active, to code various nonfactual functions.⁷ Yet in Bulgarian, the petrified particle *bi* is not inflected only in this combination, i.e., the particle *da ne bi*; it also occurs with the *da*-construction in curses and proverbs [ИВАНОВА 2014].⁸

Our main hypothesis is that both languages have developed apprehensional-epistemic markers via grammaticalization of the modal particle *da*, the negative *ne*, and the potential *bi*, but used different combinations. In Bulgarian *da ne bi*, all three fused into a single particle that precedes the *da*-construction. In Macedonian the modal morpheme *da* coalesced with *ne*, thus severing the dependency relation between *da* and the verb. The resultant fixed particles—*da ne bi* and *da ne*—do not have a compositional meaning of their parts but acquired a contextually dependent epistemic meaning. They cover a number of related functions that are usually characterized as apprehensional modality [ЛИХТЕНБЕРГ 1995; ДОБРУШИНА 2006; DIXON, АΙΚΗΝΕΥΑΛΔ 2009; PALMER 2001; ПЛУНГЯН 2004].

In view of these assumptions, this article aims to contribute to the growing discussion on the linguistic means for expressing apprehensive semantics from a typological point of view. Our main goal is to give a full account of the constructions in which the described markers occur. To this end, we categorize the related apprehensional types in Balkan Slavic, determine their specific structural and functional properties, and establish the conceptual links between these types.

The analysis is conducted on examples collected from literary prose, internet forums, and the Bulgarian National Corpus (BNC), as well as examples attested in conversation. The paper takes a functional approach to the analysis

⁶ Grickat [ГРИЦКАТ 1975: 174] notes that *da* additionally assumed a paratactic function in Serbian, Croatian, and Slovenian.

⁷ It usually combines with full verb forms in *-l* to code conditional and other types of modal functions, more often used in Bulgarian than in Macedonian.

⁸ *Да би пукнал!* ‘May you burst!’ or *Да би мирно седяло, не би чудо видяло* (lit.) ‘If you sat still, you wouldn’t see the wonder.’

of the apprehensive-epistemic because the existing gradience within the semantic subtypes and between the apprehensive and other neighboring categories is determined on the basis of their functions in context. Moreover, given that one of the functions of modality is to denote speech acts [NORDSTROM 2010: 49], we believe that the apprehensive-epistemic functions of the analyzed combinations of the subjunctive particles with the negation marker cannot properly be understood without invoking the speech act theory.

The paper is structured as follows: *Section 2* provides the theoretical basis of the research; *Section 3* presents a functional classification of the apprehensive-epistemic constructions; *Section 4* discusses the semantic and syntactic properties of these constructions accounting for the conceptual links between them; and the last section summarizes the conclusions.

2. Theoretical Considerations

This section lays the ground for further discussion: we briefly explain the concepts related to the categorization of the apprehensive-epistemic meanings as a semantic category. First, the distinction between the two apprehensive-epistemic markers is provided on the basis of their syntactic status. Within the dependent and independent syntactic context, several semantically-related apprehensive functions are distinguished. The occurrence of apprehensive markers in dependent and independent clauses is typologically common. In dependent use, the same clausal connectors are used in complements of fear predicates and negative purpose adjuncts. Thus, verbs of fearing in Greek and Latin were followed by the negative subjunctive forms which are “the arguably ‘irrealis’ forms used for negative purpose” [PALMER 2001: 133]. They are also characteristic of other European languages, for instance, Spanish. In Slavic languages, negative purpose clauses and fear complements (realized as negative nonfactual clauses in potential mood) are introduced by a modal connector, such as *chtoby* (Russian), *żeby* (Polish), and *aby* (Czech).

As for apprehensive markers in independent clauses, they were attested as far ago as antiquity: in classical Greek “an expression of fear can be indicated without a verb of fearing, simply by the subjunctive preceded by the negative *mē* [. . .] Often, however, this expresses more than an unwelcome possibility” [PALMER 2001: 133].⁹ Similar polysemy of apprehensive markers in independent clauses has been noted in contemporary languages (see [LICHTENBERK 1995; ДОБРУШИНА 2006], among others). Depending on the speech act in which they occur, they perform an array of apprehension-related functions ranging from an attempt to prevent an unwanted situation to its epistemic evaluation.

These functions in independent apprehensive clauses in Balkan Slavic are performed by the apprehension-epistemic modal markers *da ne* and *da ne bi*.

⁹ It also has an epistemic meaning of ‘perhaps’.

This is not inconsistent with other uses of the *da* particle. Both positive and negative *da*-clauses are used in unactualized, unreal contexts to express interrogative, optative, and imperative (directive) speech acts.¹⁰ Traditionally, these moods are covered by the umbrella term subjunctive mood, although subjunctive implies subordination [PALMER 2001: 5]. It would be more accurate to affiliate these moods with another functional category of modality—speech act modality [SWEETSER 1991; PORTNER 2009], along with propositional and event modality [NORDSTROM 2010].¹¹

Speech act modality comprises both deontic and epistemic utterances with an illocutionary force that distinguishes them from each other in everyday communication. It should be pointed out that the subordinate uses of apprehensive markers do not belong to speech acts, since complement clauses are void of illocutionary force: they are not independent utterances and their interpretation depends on the main clause (see, for instance, [CRISTOFARO 2003]). In the same vein, Nordstrom argues that embedded polar questions (in Germanic languages) are not performative but “reproduce the propositional content of the questions. . .” [NORDSTROM 2010: 227]. This entails that, in the absence of the illocutionary force, *da* marks the nonfactual status of the embedded proposition, i.e., propositional modality.

3. Apprehensional-epistemic Subcategories in Balkan Slavic

In this section, we proceed to the description of the functional subtypes of the apprehensive-epistemic category coded by the analyzed Balkan Slavic particles. Both the Bulgarian *da ne bi* and the Macedonian *da ne* can express most of the modal meanings that are usually ascribed to the apprehensive markers in typological studies [LICHTENBERG 1995; ДОБРУШИНА 2006], both in dependent and in independent clauses. The morphological, syntactic, and prosodic properties of the markers vary, being less prototypical in some peripheral uses, which will be pointed out in the discussion. Even though there are some differences as to the particular distribution or pragmatic nuances, the two particles convey basically the same overall meanings: the possibility of an event to occur, the undesirability of that event, and anxiety at the possibility that this event may occur. Therefore, we consider the two markers together, and point out the differences where appropriate.

¹⁰ Here are some Macedonian examples: *Да не одиш таму!* ‘Don’t go there!’ (prohibition); *Ти да не одиш таму?!* ‘How could you not go there?! (surprise); *Да не отиде таму?* ‘Did you perhaps go there?’ (assumptive question); *Бел ден да не видиш!* ‘May you not see the light of the day! (curse). For more, see [БУЖАРОВСКА, МИТКОВСКА 2015; КРАМЕР 1986; ТОПОЛИЊСКА 2008, 2015].

¹¹ They correspond to propositional and event modality in PALMER [2001] and epistemic and deontic modality in LYONS [1977]. Deontic modality includes obligation, ability, and volition, while epistemic modality expresses the speaker’s commitment to the truth of the proposition.

3.1. *Da Ne Bi* and *Da Ne* in Dependent Clauses

The particles *da ne bi* (Bulgarian) and *da ne* (Macedonian) are used to introduce dependent clauses of negative purpose (5–6), complement clauses with predicates expressing fear (7–8), and utterance and propositional-attitude predicates (9–10).¹²

- (5) Ова морам тивко да ти го кажам, **да не** чуе некој (M/VD) ‘I must tell you this quietly, so that nobody hears.’
- (6) . . . тутакси угаси фенера **да не би** някой от реката да го забележи (B/PB) ‘He immediately turned the flashlight off so that no one could notice him from the river.’
- (7) Најмногу се плашев **да не** ја разочарам (M/VD) ‘Most of all I was afraid not to let her down.’
- (8) Уплашили се **да не би** да разсърдят Бог и той да им отнеме дарбата. . . (B/BNC) ‘They feared that they might anger the Lord and he would take away their gift. . .’
- (9) Мислев **да не** реновирате па да преспиеш кај мене ако сакаш (M/twitter.com) ‘I thought you might be remodeling the house, so you can sleep over at my place if you want.’
- (10) Аз сега щях да Ви питам **да не би** нешто да се е променило в тези месеци? (B/dariknews.bg) ‘I just wanted to ask you, has something maybe changed during those months?’

Purpose clauses express an unrealized event which is intended as a volitional consequence of the event expressed in the main clause [DIXON 2009: 17]. For that reason they are often marked with subjunctive or irrealis markers [PALMER 2001: 129]. In Balkan Slavic the use of the subjunctive *da*-construction in purpose clauses is considered to be one of the first functions in which it started replacing the inherited Slavic infinitive [ИЛИЕВСКИ 1988: 196]. It is often preceded by the grammaticalized allative preposition *za* ‘for,’ which reinforces the purpose semantics, as in the following examples.

- (11) Стана од трosedот, (за) да ја затвори вратата (M) ‘He got up from the sofa to close the door.’
- (12) Той се пресегна над главата ми, (за) да затвори вратата (B) ‘He reached over me to close the door.’

Negation in the purpose clause is imparted by the negative particle *ne* before the verb (13 and 14), but in Bulgarian, a special complex connector *da ne bi* also carries the negative meaning, illustrated in (6).¹³ However, the particle *ne*

¹² This type of complex sentence does not constitute a separate semantic class, and therefore will not be discussed further. We consider them as indirect and/or reported utterances.

¹³ There is some difference in distribution between the (*za*) *da ne* and *da ne bi* marking of the negative purpose clause in Bulgarian, but this is beyond the scope of this paper.

functions as a negation marker here and is prosodically distinguished from the subjunctive particle, so we cannot consider these elements as fully fused markers. The negative purpose clause has a complex modal semantics: it points out that there is a possibility of an undesirable (and potentially dangerous) event to occur unless the situation in the main clause is realized. Thus, apart from the epistemic modality usually present in purpose clauses, the negative marker adds a negative attitude toward the designated situation.¹⁴

- (13) Не се оглежда, **за да не би** някой да я извика. . . (B/BNC) ‘She doesn’t look around, so that no one could call her.’
- (14) Не брзам **за да не** се уморам (M/VD) ‘I don’t hurry so that I don’t get tired.’

The relation between the two events in the negative purpose clause can be of two types, which may sometimes lead to potential ambiguity. This has been noted by LICHTENBERG [1995: 298], who names the two types ‘avertive’ and ‘in case’. The former is restricted to negative purposive function which establishes a causal link between the ‘apprehension-causing situation’ in the dependent clause (Y) and the ‘precautionary situation’ in the main clause (X). “If no precaution is taken, the apprehension-causing situation will take place: if not X, then Y” [IBID.]. This interpretation is possible only if the protagonist of the main clause is viewed as having control over the foreseen undesirable event, illustrated in (1–2) and (13–14).

The ‘in case’ type has a more general interpretation, the causal link between the two events is weakened, and the subject of the main clause has no control over the apprehension-causing situation, as in *Take your umbrella in case it rains*¹⁵/**so that it does not rain* [ANGELO, SCHULTZE-BERNDT 2016: 4]. In such situations the focus in the clause introduced by *da ne* and *da ne bi* falls on the epistemic character of the expressed situation, which is often supported by the nonvolitional adverb *случајно/случайно* ‘accidentally, by any chance’ in (15) and (16).

- (15) Го исклучи телефонот [. . .], **за** случајно **да не** ѝ се јават од ординацијата и да ја прашаат зошто доцни (M/RB).
‘She turned off the mobile, in case they called her from the office and asked her why she was late.’ (*so that they didn’t call her)
- (16) Любопитните винаги обичат да държат главите си над другите глави, **да не би** случайно нешто от погледа им да убегне (B/JR) ‘Curious people always like to hold their heads above the others’ lest something escape their attention.’

¹⁴ That is why it is not uncommon crosslinguistically for languages to employ a different marker for the negative purpose clause [PALMER 2001: 128; THOMPSON ET AL. 2007: 253].

¹⁵ *Земи го чадорот, да не заврне* (M). *Взemi чадџра да не би да завали* (B).

In many cases when we have controllable events in the purpose clause, both interpretations are possible, as LICHTENBERK [1995: 299] notes. The context-dependent semantic difference in speech is signaled by intonation, but in such cases it usually does not cause a crucial misunderstanding as there is only a difference in emphasis. The dependent clauses in the sentences in (17) and (18) can be interpreted as expressing both purpose and apprehension of a possible undesirable event ('in case') exemplifying a transitional semantic "knot" between the two subtypes.

- (17) Дувај мило, **да не** се попариш (M/DM).
'Blow dear, so as not to be scalded/or you might get scalded.'
- (18) Тук по многу причини спестихме страшните подробности — **да не би** някој малолетен да отвори вестника (B/segabg.com/article) 'Here for many reasons we omitted the horrible details, lest some underage kid read the paper.'

Apprehension-causing situations over which the speaker has a relatively low degree of control do not directly invoke a purpose relation, but the juxtaposition of an undesirable situation may invite a precaution implicature: that some measure should be taken against an undesirable potential consequence of a future or an ongoing event. A clause encoding an unfavorable event combines with a main clause that expresses some precautionary measure to prevent or alleviate the possible harmful consequences of this event (19). The term precautionary or admonitive apprehensive has been suggested for this category. A special subtype is represented by main clauses that function as an alert or direct or indirect appeal. However, it is the main clause, and not the apprehensive one, that functions as a directive speech act, ranging from attention alerts and warnings (19–20) to commands and threats (21–22), whereas the apprehensive clause remains in the realm of propositional modality [AIKHENVALD 2010: 278].

- (19) Почнаа да се качуваат внимателно обзирајќи се **да не** ги следи љубопитниот поглед на некоја сосетка (M/KU) 'They started climbing (the stairs) looking around carefully lest some neighbor's curious look should follow them.'
- (20) Само внимавај **да не** отвориш раната по време на бягството (B/A) 'Only take care not to open the wound while running away.'
- (21) Симни се доброволно **да не** биде како минатиот пат! (M/SN) 'Get yourself down so that it won't be like the last time!'
- (22) Предупреждавам ви, **да не би** случайно да се разминете! (B/PV) 'I warn you, lest you accidentally miss each other!'

LICHTENBERK [1995: 299] poses the question whether the two possible interpretations (depending on the presence of control) should be defined as a case of fuzzy monosemy or polysemy. Invoking the concept of 'pragmatic ambiguity' he seems to favor the polysemy approach. We also claim that this function

(precautionary or admonitive) of the apprehensive markers in Balkan Slavic represents a separate subcategory of the apprehensive. Functionally, it differs from the negative purpose category in that it displays increased subjectivity in the epistemic evaluation of a possible, even accidental, situation and emotional involvement. The particle *ne* does not impart negation because it is an integral part of the single morphosyntactic unit marking epistemic uncertainty. *Da ne* and *da ne bi* constitute prosodic units under a single coherent intonation contour, a fact that triggered their grammaticalization.¹⁶ At least two distinctive syntactic properties provide evidence for the noncompositionality of the units *da ne* in Macedonian and *da ne bi* in Bulgarian: the need for an additional *ne* to negate the dependent clause (23) and the use of past tense in dependent clauses introduced by these particles (24).

- (23) а) Ќе му се јавам на Марко **да не не** знае за состанокот (М).
 б) Ще се обади на Марко, **да не би да не** знае за среќата (В) ‘I’ll call Marko, in case he doesn’t know about the meeting.’
- (24) а) Провери во сандачето, **да не дошол** поштарот порано (М).
 б) Провери пощенската кутија **да не би да е идвал** пошталњот по-рано (В).
 ‘Check the postbox, in case the postman has come earlier.’

When *da ne* and *da ne bi* introduce complement clauses with fear predicates the emotional component seems to dominate. The overtly expressed fear in the main predicate has an understandable semantic effect on the connector. The undesirable and hence feared situation is not temporally restricted; though typically posterior (25), its time frame can be anterior (27) and even simultaneous (26). The presence of a negation marker in (25) and (27) testifies to the grammaticalized status of both complex connectors (*da ne* and *da ne bi*) in this function.

- (25) Се плашам **да не не** стигне на време (М) ‘I am afraid that he wouldn’t arrive on time.’
- (26) Тина молчеше, исплашена **да не** има и таа таков вирус (М/РВ) ‘Tina kept quiet, fearing that she might have the same virus.’
- (27) Страх ме е **да не би да не** е дошла (В) ‘I fear that she might not have come.’

3.2. *Da Ne Bi* and *Da Ne* in Independent Clauses

In independent clauses *da ne bi* and *da ne* function as apprehensional-epistemic markers that express a wide array of modal meanings in various types of speech acts. They appear in declarative and interrogative clauses, though the

¹⁶ The typological features of interrogation and negation have been noted by THOMPSON [1998], who points out the importance of a prosodic unit as a natural locus for the grammaticalization of interrogation [IBID.: 317].

latter seem to be much more widespread. Ivanova and Bužarovska point out that the interrogative form is mostly used for expressive purposes: “вопросительная форма выступает во многих случаях лишь как оболочка, в которую облечены «пристрастные» констатирующие высказывания” (In many cases, the interrogative form serves as a cover under which biased constative utterances are used) [ИВАНОВА, БУЖАРОВСКА 2016: 153]. The illocutionary force of a particular speech act relies strongly on contextual support—the lexico-grammatical properties of the clause in the surrounding discourse, as well as the discourse-pragmatic and social conventions established in a given speech community. The role of the immediate context in the interpretation of the speech acts expressed by apprehensional markers has been noted in many accounts of such structures, e.g., [LICHTENBERG 1995; ДОБРУШИНА 2006; AIKHENVALD 2010: 278; ИВАНОВА 2014; ANGELO, SCHULTZE-BERNDT 2016]. Out of context, the utterance in (28) can be interpreted in a number of ways: fear, worry, indirect request to close the door, reproach for leaving the door open, criticism, irony, etc.

(28) **Да не** избега мачката!? (M) ‘Has maybe the cat run out?’

Below, we look at declarative and interrogative main clauses with the apprehensive markers in Balkan Slavic.

3.2.1. Declarative main clauses with the apprehensive-epistemic particles express anxiety over a possible occurrence of a negatively assessed situation, but unlike in dependent clauses, the emotion is not overtly expressed. However, the linguistic and extralinguistic contextual factors conspire to create a particular implicature signaled by the prosody in speech. In (29) the appeal to the beloved to end the date and the mention of the father imply anxiety; in (30) and (31) the choice of vocabulary indicates fear. We call this type ‘apprehensive proper’.

(29) Ај доста, Бошко, **да не** ме побара татко. . . (M/VI) ‘Boško, I must go, lest my father call for me.’

(30) Свети му вода, Божано! **Да не** згрешил пред господа. Знаеш. . . младо, лудо. . . (M/AP) ‘Pray for him, Božana! In case he has sinned against the Lord. You know how the young are.’

(31) Имаш и вила—още една тревога: **да не би** да я ограбят (B/dveri.bg/kd6hq) ‘If you have a summer house you have one more worry: lest it not be broken into.’

3.2.2. Questions with the particles *da ne bi* and *da ne* are overwhelmingly used in both Macedonian and Bulgarian for a plethora of functions (see [ИВАНОВА 2014; МИТКОВСКА ET AL. 2015; ИВАНОВА, БУЖАРОВСКА 2016] for a detailed overview). These particles are grammaticalized markers with inner cohesion,

and they are characterized by pronounced mixed modality: both deontic and epistemic. As questions, they always presuppose a response required by the addressee (except in cases of rhetorical questions),¹⁷ hence automatically flag a manipulative speech act [GIVÓN 2001: 311].¹⁸ The constant epistemic component is the relative uncertainty. These polar questions do not question the truth of the proposition but the assumption about its truth. Similarly to biased questions [DUKOVA-ZHELEVA 2010], the communicative goal is to obtain the addressee's confirmation of the speaker's assumption that the proposition is true (or not true). That is why we call them 'assumptive questions'. If this presupposition is regarded as undesirable by the speaker an apprehensive implicature is generated.

We can distinguish two main types of speech acts:

(a) The first type comprises functions close to the core apprehensive-epistemic meanings, used for expressing anxiety, uneasiness, worry, or disappointment on the part of the speaker. We can call this type 'proper apprehensive questions'. The speaker judges from the situation that his/her assumption is correct and therefore usually expects a positive answer which, on the other hand, is considered undesirable so s/he hopes to get a negative answer. Depending on the context the opposite is also possible. Thus in *Да не го покани и Милан?* (M) 'Have you perhaps invited Milan?' the speaker assumes that the proposition is not true but fears that it might be the case. The degree of undesirability is responsible for the rise of the apprehension implicature. This can be illustrated by the difference between examples (32–33) and (34–35), the latter displaying a more pronounced apprehensive meaning.

- (32) *Да не си одиш?* – натажено праша малиот (M/KU) 'Are you perhaps leaving? – the child asked sadly.'
- (33) *Ти да не би да се сърдиш?* (B/BNC) 'Are you perhaps angry with me?'
- (34) *Да не ме забораџија, Господи?!* – мислеше скупчен на терасата (M/HR) 'Lord, could it be that they have forgotten me? – he thought, crouching on the veranda.'
- (35) *Да не би да хвџрлят бомба вџрху нас?* (B/BNC) 'What if they dropped a bomb on us?'

(b) The second type includes questions which emphasize the epistemic component but (almost) lack the emotional component in their semantic structure.

¹⁷ Usually they express criticism and irony: *Да не си паднал од Марс?!* (M), *Да не би да си паднал од Марс?* (B) 'Have you fallen from Mars?!'

¹⁸ Manipulative speech acts are verbal acts through which the speaker attempts to manipulate the behavior of the hearer, with the goal being that of eliciting action rather than information. One can therefore subsume, at least trivially, the interrogative under the manipulative speech act, with the added provision that the second aims to elicit verbal acts of information, i.e., declarative speech acts [GIVÓN 2001].

Whether the speaker expects a negative or a positive answer can usually be inferred from the context and/or the situation. In nonapprehensive assumptive questions in Macedonian, *da ne* functions as ‘epistemic downtoner’ [ЛИЧТЕНБЕРК 1995: 298], exploiting their intrinsic uncertainty as a face-saving strategy (36–37).

- (36) **Да не** имате свежи печурки? (М) ‘Do you perhaps have fresh mushrooms?’
 (37) А: Целиот лук да го ставам? В: **Да не** е многу?! (М) ‘Should I put all the garlic?—Isn’t it too much?’

The Bulgarian *da ne bi* is considerably restricted in this function. It is not employed in requests as they make use of *da*-constructions: *Да имаш случайно тази книга?* ‘Do you perhaps have this book?’ [НИЦОЛОВА 2008: 424]. It seems that *da ne bi* occurs in assumptive questions when they are emotionally colored and more biased towards the negative answer (38). More neutral contexts prefer *da ne*; thus, the Bulgarian counterpart of (37) is *Да не е много?*¹⁹

- (38) Икономическата криза сега **да не би** да е предизвикана с извънземно участие? (В/ВНС) ‘Is maybe the economic crisis caused by extraterrestrials?’

4. Semantic Gradience of the Apprehensional-epistemic Subcategories

The Balkan Slavic apprehension markers (*da ne* and *da ne bi*) are characterized by polysemy in both dependent and independent syntactic environments. However, the meanings (discussed in the previous section) occupy the same irrealis space of apprehensional-epistemic modality. They are united by a common semantic denominator of undesirable possibility, a blend of epistemic (possibility) and deontic (undesirability) meaning, but the prevalence of one component over the other results in a gradual semantic shift. The pragmatics of the speech situation, the context, and the illocutionary force of the apprehensive expression influence the degree of foregrounding of the epistemic meaning (possibility) over the emotional component (fear), or vice versa. *Tables 1* and *2* show the shared semantic properties of the subcategories in dependent and independent clauses, respectively. The shaded areas indicate the features that are especially focused in each subcategory.

¹⁹ The difference is explained in [ГСБКЕ 1983: 56]: „Въпросителните изречения с *да не би да* се отличават от близките по значение до тях въпросителни изречения с *да не* именно по подчертаването, че става дума за нежелана възможност.“ It is noteworthy that Nicolova [НИЦОЛОВА 2008: 425, 428] traces optative nuances in *da ne bi*-questions.

Table 1. Semantic Properties of the Apprehensive-epistemic Subcategories in Dependent Clauses

semantic features	negative purpose	precautionary	fear clausal complements
purpose	+	+/-	-
possibility	+	+	+
undesirability	+	+	+
fear	-	+/-	+

Table 2. Semantic Properties of the Apprehensive-epistemic Subcategories in Independent Clauses

semantic features	declarative	interrogative— assumptive questions	epistemic downtoners
	apprehensive proper	apprehensive questions	
purpose	-	-	-
possibility	+	+	+
undesirability	+	+	-
fear	+	+/-	-

On the basis of the observed links, we propose that the identified functional types represent gradient, hence fuzzy, semantic subcategories of the apprehensional-epistemic modality. As in any type of epistemic modality, it is prone to subjectivity [LYONS 1977; VERSTRAETE 2001].²⁰ We use the term ‘gradience’ to refer to the way language categories are organized internally and the nature of boundaries between them [TRAUGOTT, TROUSDALE 2010: 20]. Gradience between two categories obtains when “they gradually converge on one another by virtue of the fact that there exist elements which display properties of both categories” [AARTS 2004: 6]. This is related to the prototype organization of the categories, which comprise more or less central representatives, the latter converging to the conceptually close categories.

4.1. Semantic Gradience

All presented subcategories expressed by the apprehensional particles in Balkan Slavic express the epistemic feature of possibility, which is accompanied by an emotional component of undesirability. So it seems that the speaker’s stance of epistemic uncertainty is inseparable from the emotions of worry

²⁰ LYONS [1977: 739] explains subjectivity “as devices whereby the speaker, in making an utterance, simultaneously comments upon that utterance and expresses his attitude to what he is saying.”

and/or fear, thus justifying Lichtenberk's term apprehensional-epistemic modality [LICHTENBERK 1995: 293–294].²¹ In the epistemic downtoners, the negative emotional component is absent, thus this function seems rather remote from the basic apprehensional semantics. However, they are cognitively linked to 'apprehensive questions' by pairing the uncertainty component with pragmatic strategies of politeness (see examples 36–37 above and the discussion).

In dependent clauses, the association of negative purpose meaning to fear is established through cautioning of possible negative consequences (expressed in the main clause). It has been shown that crosslinguistically, the same apprehensive marker often covers the two functions, e.g., [LICHTENBERK 1995; ДОБРУШИНА 2006; ДИХОН 2009], which bears evidence for a cognitive link. The Balkan Slavic situation is entirely compatible with this assumption. It was shown in 3.1 that some situations allow double interpretation (see examples 17 and 18) and that the focus can easily shift from negative purpose (an intention not to achieve a possible state of affairs) to warning (an appeal not to allow a possible state of affairs). This involves a strengthening of the undesirability component as well as a structural difference: the subjunctive marker *da* forms a unit with the negative particle *ne*, expressing epistemic uncertainty, not negation.

The speaker's negative mental attitude²² to some potential situation is triggered by his/her ability to establish a causal link between an apprehension-causing situation and its expected "fear-inspiring" consequences. While in the precautionary, the emotion of fear is contextually implied, in the 'fear clausal complements' the emotion is overtly expressed. The following examples illustrate the semantic overlapping between the two subcategories: in (39) fear is strongly implied in the warning, whereas in (40) the fear predicate indicates caution.

- (39) a. Внимавај **да не** те забележат, опасни се овие кучиња (M/HR) 'Be careful so that they do not notice you, these dogs are dangerous.'
- b. Внимавайте **да не би** вашите съквартиранти да не се възползват от добротата ви (B/dama.bg/article/kakav-sakvartirant) 'Be careful so that your roommates may not abuse your kindness.'
- (40) a. Се смрзнав во место, исплашен **да не** скршам нешто (M/RB) 'I froze on the spot, afraid not to break something.'

²¹ Dobrushina [ДОБРУШИНА 2006: 34] argues that the former is basic because: "Семантичешким компонентом, обшим для эпистемического наклонения и apprehensiva и мотивирующим это направление эволюции значений, является оценка некоторой ситуации как возможной." This is also supported by the fact that the apprehensive meaning is often coded by epistemic moods [IBID.: 34].

²² The link between emotions and propositional attitudes is noted by Palmer. In his view, "fears and wishes indicate attitudes to propositions rather than unrealized events" [PALMER 2001:134]. This may explain why *I am afraid* in English has become a verb of propositional attitude and a downtoner as "I think."

- b. Само се пазеше да не се спъне — [. . .] от страх **да не би** да привлече върху себе си нечие внимание. . . (B/DT) ‘He only worried lest he stumble, fearing that he may attract someone’s attention.’

Though the independent clauses with apprehensive markers are structurally and functionally different from the dependent clauses, the cognitive links are quite obvious. The declarative apprehensive proper clauses have the same focus as the complements of fear predicates. There are examples, as in the sentences in (39–40) above, where contextual elements support the implicature. But fear can be expressed in the immediate context, as in the idiomatic expression in (41) below or with similar signals, such as emotional particles or exclamations (42).

- (41) Пред секој преглед мене **паника ме фаќа** [. . .], леле **да не** најдат нешто страшно (M/tvoebebe.com/forum) ‘I panic before any medical exam [. . .] God forbid they might find something wrong.’
- (42) a. **Леле да не** дознае мама! (M/facebook.com/Vicovi) ‘God forbid, lest my mom find out!’
- b. **Леле, да не би** да Ви настъпих по мазола? (B/kaldata.com/forums/topic) ‘Oh, dear, have I maybe stepped on your bunion?’

The declarative apprehensive and the apprehensive questions at the apprehensive end almost blend together when it comes to expressing fear (compare example 40 above with 43 below). The difference is pragmatic, pertaining to the illocutionary force and the expected perlocutionary effect. GIVÓN [2001: 318–320] has shown that declarative, interrogative, and imperative speech acts are not “absolute and discrete functional entities” [IBID., 318], but that there is a graded continuum between them.²³

- (43) Ѐ се потсекоа колената. **Да не** ја отвориле вратата? (M/KU)
‘She went weak at the knees. Have they perhaps opened the door?’

Nevertheless, assumptive questions comprise various subtypes with a wide range of functions, from those prominently featuring the fear component to those in which it is rather weak, fading into worry (44) and concern (45), or entirely absent. The latter involve other types of emotion and attitudes: indignation (46), irony (47). Given their ability to perform specific pragmatic functions, interrogative apprehensive-epistemic speech acts with no undesirability

²³ “There are strong grounds for suspecting that the three or four major well-coded speech-acts are just the most common, conventionalized (‘grammaticalized’) prototypes. These prototypes distribute along a multi-dimensional continuum space organized along a number of social-psychological dimensions” [GIVÓN 2001: 318]. For more on prototype organization in grammar, see CROFT [2003].

component represent a link to the epistemic-downtoning function (48). Since the fear implicature is canceled, the epistemic evaluation comes to the fore, often shaped by speaker subjectivity.

- (44) a. Мори Васо, ќерка ти многу гола излезе за на работа. **Да не** настине? (М/ВТ) ‘Hey Vaso, your daughter went out to work barely dressed. She could catch a cold, couldn’t she?’
 b. Какво ли пак е станало?, питаше се Капка, **да не би** пак катастрофа? (В/ВНС) ‘What’s the matter now, wondered Капка, could it be a disaster again?’
- (45) a. Кети, мила моја, **да не** сакаш да го откажеме нашето попладне? Ми изгледаш бледо (М/ВР) ‘Kathy, dear, do you want perhaps to cancel our afternoon together? You look pale.’
 b. **Да не би** да ми се сърдиш за нешто? (В/ВНС) ‘What is it, are you perhaps angry with me?’
- (46) a. Па што мислат тие? **Да не** сме случајно утки подсечански, паднати од гранка?! (М/ВР) ‘Well, what do they think? Are we maybe some owls fallen from a tree?’
 b. На мен някой **да не би** да ми плаќа за тоа че гледам реклами?’ (В/ВНС) ‘Do they pay me to watch commercials maybe?’
- (47) a. Ама каде си го повлекла ова дете? И него **да не** го свршуваш? Ха-ха-ха. . . ! (М/ВС) ‘And where are you taking this young lad? Do you perhaps want to get him married, too?’
 b. **Да не би** пак да са повишили цената на бензина? — запитвам, додето се промъкваме в навалицата (В/ВР) ‘Have they maybe again raised the price of gas? — I ask, while pushing my way through the crowd.’
- (48) А ние, почитуван господине, **да не** се познаваме од некаде? (М/ВТ) ‘And what about you, sir, have we maybe previously met?’

It can be concluded from the above discussion that the different interpretations of the constructions with the markers *da ne* and *da ne bi* exemplify context-dependent variation. The semantic components of epistemic uncertainty and undesirability encoded by these particles remain constant in all examined subtypes, but the “division of labor” between them varies with respect to the modality status reflected in their syntactic function. In dependent use, where these particles function as modal connectors of propositional modality, the undesirability component prevails, whereas in independent use, they function as modal particles indicating the illocutionary force of a nonfactual utterance. The ratio between uncertainty and undesirability in the semantic structure of *da ne* and *da ne bi* is determined by the illocutionary force of the utterance (type of speech act) and the context.

4.2. Grammaticalization—Possible Directions

By explaining the relations and overlapping areas between the segments of the polysemous semantic category marked by the particles *da ne* and *da ne bi* in Balkan Slavic, we have added a dynamic dimension to our synchronic description. For a polysemous category that displays family resemblance structure, HEINE [1992] uses the term ‘grammaticalization chain’²⁴ in order to highlight the link between its constituent parts. Such categories are usually considered a result of context-induced reinterpretation and various semantic and pragmatic processes. The relationship is explained as follows:

The linear ordering²⁵ has both diachronic and synchronic dimension: diachronic in that a given stage can be assumed to be historically prior to any other stage to its left, that is, ordering reflects a diachronic process. At the same time it is also synchronic, since a given stage is more grammaticalized than any other stage to its left, where “more grammaticalized” in this case means either more abstract in semantic content, more decategorized in its morphological behavior, more restricted in its syntagmatic variability, more reduced in its phonological substance, or any combination thereof. . . [HEINE 1992: 343].

What does the synchronic gradience indicate in relation to the diachronic rise of the apprehensive-epistemic markers in Balkan Slavic? According to the semantic and syntactic criteria outlined by Heine and other scholars advocating the grammaticalization theory, in the absence of historical evidence, we can put forward two hypotheses.

In line with the principle of ‘subjectification’ outlined by TRAUGOTT [1986; 1988], according to which “meanings tend to come to refer less to objective situations and more to subjective ones (including speaker point of view), less to the described situation and more to the discourse situation” [TRAUGOTT 1986: 540], the first hypothesis assumes that the development of the apprehensive-epistemic markers in Balkan Slavic proceeded from ‘negative purpose’ to ‘epistemic downtoners’ (Figure 1). In the former, there is no apprehensional semantics, though they imply the possibility of an undesirable event to occur, which results from the combination of the subjunctive marker and the negating particle. Here, the purpose component is the most prominent and the subjunctive *da* + verb are syntactically strongly bound, while *ne* negates the verb. In the precautionary subcategory, the emotional inference is stronger as the bond between the verb and *da* weakens, *ne* loses the negating function and links to *da/da* and *bi* intensifying the possibility component. From here on, the meaning gets more subjective, and in the last two subcategories it assumes pragmatic functions.

²⁴ HOPPER AND TRAUGOTT [1993: 6] propose the term ‘cline’.

²⁵ Heine refers here to the submeanings of a particular form which are “placed” on a grammaticalization cline to show their conceptual relations and the subsequent stages in the semantic change.

Figure 1. Possible Developmental Path of the Apprehensive-epistemic Markers in Balkan Slavic

negative purpose → precautionary → fear clausal complements →
apprehensive proper → apprehensive questions → epistemic downtoners

However, the hypothesis that the grammaticalization proceeded from dependent to independent clauses is contrary to the unidirectional development in clausal combination. The prevalent direction has proven to be “from more to less paratactic clause combination” [HOPPER, TRAUGOTT 1993: 184]. It has been attested in Old Slavic that the development of complex sentences was a long process that started from juxtaposition and resulted in dependency via syncretism of connectors [ГРКОВИЋ-МЕЈЏОР 2004: 187].²⁶ Yet LICHTENBERK [1995: 306], who advocates a reverse path for the apprehension marker *ada* in Ta’ba’ica, accounts for the development of independent apprehensional-epistemic clauses from the dependent complements of fear predicates via metonymy: as the marker *ada* became strongly associated with the apprehensive meaning, it did not need the lexical support of the fear predicate in independent uses.

The second hypothesis offers another possible development of these structures. It could be assumed that the independent and dependent constructions developed through separate paths. The dependent apprehensive constructions could be linked to negative purpose. We can observe a gradual loss of objectivity from precautionary to fear clausal complements. It is also possible that the independent declarative clauses (apprehensive proper) are a metonymic output in that line.

On the other hand, the assumptive questions might have developed from independent optative-subjunctive constructions: the Macedonian *da ne* originated from the optative (speech act) function, which is semantically close to directive (49).²⁷

(49) Да **не** одиш! ‘Don’t go!’ (M)

The shift from directive to interrogative can be explained by the underspecified meaning of the modal particle *da*, which allowed the *da*-construction to be used in a variety of speech acts. This is in line with the crosslinguistic tendency of IE subjunctive mood (imperative, hortative, jussive, and optative) to have speech-act functions [NORDSTROM 2010: 125]. As argued above, in independent use, the subjunctive *da* indicates the illocutionary force of a

²⁶ Grković-Major [ГРКОВИЋ-МЕЈЏОР 2004: 191], following VEČERKA [1996] argues that it is difficult to pinpoint the meaning of the adjunctive *da* between two clauses as it assumes the contextual meaning (of coordination, conclusivity, contrast).

²⁷ However, as previously stated, in such deontic speech acts, the juxtaposed *da ne* in Macedonian does not represent a single grammaticalized particle because it is not under the same intonation contour: *da* is part of the analytic imperative construction, and the negative marker *ne* bears the stress.

speech act, which entails that mood marking is sensitive to the illocutionary force. In questions, the prosodic unit *da ne* functions as an apprehensive-epistemic marker. Context-induced inferences and pragmatic factors contributed to the scalar character of this semantic category.

Bulgarian *da ne bi* may have also originated from an optative source via the combination of the inherited subjunctive *bi* and the Balkan subjunctive *da*. However, this hypothesis requires historical evidence, which we lack. Like other Slavic languages,²⁸ Balkan Slavic makes use of the same apprehensive-epistemic markers in both syntactic domains. In the analytic constructions that replaced the infinitive, the subjunctive morpheme coalesced with the negation marker. Typological comparison between dependent and independent apprehensive-epistemic constructions in non-Slavic Balkan languages shows that Romance languages have markers structurally similar to Macedonian *da ne*. They are also recruited from the constituents of the negative subjunctive construction: the subjunctive and the negation marker *să nu* in Romanian (*s-nu* in Aromanian). However, Albanian and Greek have specialized apprehensive-epistemic particles: *mos* (Albanian) and *mipos* (Greek), both of which are employed in all the functions described in the present paper. The latter historically derives from the fusion of the nondeclarative negative marker *mi(n)* (*mēn* in classical Greek) and the connector *pos*. This suggests a common developmental pattern involving a semantic attraction between the subjunctive morpheme and the negator. The question whether this attraction between adjacent modal particles had syntactic consequences, i.e., was grammaticalized in other Balkan languages, needs further research.

5. Concluding Remarks

In this paper we investigate the apprehensive function of the two fused grammaticalized particles *da ne* and *da ne bi* in standard Macedonian and Bulgarian. Acting as morphosyntactic and prosodic units under a single intonation contour, they have undergone grammaticalization resulting in their semantic and syntactic fusion.

Semantically, these polysemous particles contain an epistemic and a volitive component, which triggers the inference of fear. Their property to operate in the domain of propositional and speech act modality is reflected in the form: those used in the former domain are realized as subordinate clausal constituents, while those in the latter represent independent subjunctive clauses. The split dependent vs. independent use is a typologically common phenomenon. In both uses they are treated as markers of an apprehensive-epistemic category characterized by a prototype organization of its core and peripheral members.

²⁸ For instance, the Russian particle ‘*kak by* + negative infinitive’ is used in both dependent and independent clauses [ДОБРУШИНА 2006].

There is a cognitive link between these members and a graded semantic shift along the semantic continuum they form. The shift is presumably triggered by the speaker's increased subjectivity and emotional involvement in the epistemic evaluation of a possible undesirable situation. Accordingly, we tentatively suggest two developmental paths, each consisting of three converging subtypes. Each subtype foregrounds two of the four common semantic components: purpose, possibility, undesirability, and fear. In dependent use, the peripheral negative purpose subtype becomes contextually apprehensive in the second precautionary subtype and explicitly apprehensive in the fear subtype. In indirect use the declarative apprehensive subtype merges with the interrogative. The third peripheral subtype of the apprehensive-epistemic category—downtoning questions—lacks the apprehensive meaning. The two paths can be thought of as parts of a single cline separated in two by the opposition: propositional modality vs. speech act modality. The cline is flanked on both ends by the peripheral subtypes, negative-purpose and downtoning questions, leaving three types as central members (fear, apprehensive statements, and apprehensive questions) and one (precaution) closer to the prototype. Other Balkan non-Slavic languages (Greek, Romanian, Aromanian, Albanian) also demonstrate this two-pronged affinity: with purpose negative clauses on the one hand, and biased questions on the other. The fact that these languages are characterized by isofunctional and isomorphic means for expressing apprehensional meanings suggests that this category may have acquired areal typological features.

Bibliography

Sources

Bulgarian Sources

BNC = Bulgarian National Corpus

A = Avaiyata

BR = Б. Райнов

DT = Д. Талев

GD = Г. Данаилов

JR = Й. Радичков

PB = П. Бобев

PV = П. Вежинов

Macedonian Sources

AP = Антон Панов

BT = Братислав Ташковски

DM = Димитар Молеров

HR = Христо Крстевски

KU = Кочо Урдин
RB = Румена Бужаровска
SN = Сашко Насев
VC = Војдан Чернодрински
VD = Владо Димовски
VI = Васил Иљоски

Literature

АСЕНОВА 2002

АСЕНОВА П., *Балканско езиковознание: Основни проблеми на балканскиот езиков сџюз*, Велико Търново, 2002.

БУЖАРОВСКА, МИТКОВСКА 2015

БУЖАРОВСКА Е., МИТКОВСКА Л., “Негираните независни *да*-конструкции”, in: З. Тополинска, ред., *Субјунктив со посебен осврт на македонските да-конструкции*, Скопје, 2015, 23–46.

ГРИЦКАТ 1975

ГРИЦКАТ И., *Студије из историје српскохрватског језика*, Београд, 1975.

ГРКОВИЌ-МЕЈЏОР 2004

ГРКОВИЌ-МЕЈЏОР Ј., “Развој хипотактичког *да* у старосрпском језику”, *Зборник Матице српске за филологију и лингвистику*, 47/1–2, 2004, 185–203.

ГСБКЕ 1983

Грамматика на сџвременниот бџлгарски книжовен език, 3: *Синтаксис*, Софија, 1983.

ДОБРУШИНА 2006

ДОБРУШИНА Н. Р., “Грамматическиет формит и конструкции со значениет опасения и предостережения”, *Вопросы языковознания*, 2, 2006, 28–67.

ИВАНОВА 2014

ИВАНОВА Е. Ю., “Апребенсив в русском и болгарском языках”, *Studi Slavistici*, 11, 2014, 143–168.

ИВАНОВА, БУЖАРОВСКА 2016

ИВАНОВА Е. Ю., БУЖАРОВСКА Э., “Эпистемическит вопросительные частицы *да не* в македонском и *да не би* в болгарском языках”, in: М. Б. Коношенко, Е. А. Лютикова, А. В. Циммерлинг, ред., *Типология морфосинтаксических параметров*, 3, Москва, 2016, 140–158.

ИЛИЕВСКИ 1988

ИЛИЕВСКИ П. Х., *Балканолошки лингвистички студии*, Скопје, 1988.

НИЦОЛОВА 2008

НИЦОЛОВА Р., *Бџлгарска грамматика. Морфология*, Софија, 2008.

ПЛУНГЈАН 2004

ПЛУНГЈАН В. А., “Предисловие”, in: *Исследования по теории грамматики*, 3: *Ирреалис и ирреальность*, Москва, 2004, 9–25.

——— 2011

ПЛУНГЈАН В. А., *Введение в грамматическую семантику: грамматические значения и грамматические системы языков мира*, Москва, 2011.

ПРОХОРОВ 2009

ПРОХОРОВ К. Н., “Калмыцкиет формит косвенных наклонений: семантика, морфология, синтаксис”, in: *Исследования по грамматике калмыцкого языка* (= Acta Linguistica Petropolitana, 5/2), С.-Петербург, 2009, 160–224.

ТОПОЛИЊСКА 2008

ТОПОЛИЊСКА З., *Полски – македонски. Граматичка конфронтација, 8: Развој на граматичките категории*, Скопје, 2008.

——— 2015

ТОПОЛИЊСКА З., ред., *Субјунктив со посебен осврт на македонските да-конструкции*, Скопје, 2015.

AARTS 2004

AARTS B., “Modelling Linguistic Gradience,” *Studies in Language*, 28/1, 2004, 1–49.

AIKHENVALD 2010

AIKHENVALD A. Y., *Imperatives and Commands*, Oxford, 2010.

AMMANN, AUWERA 2004

AMMANN A., AUWERA J., “Complementizer-headed Main Clauses for Volitional Mood in the Languages of South-Eastern Europe—A Balkanism?” in: O. MIŠESKA TOMIĆ, eds., *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, Amsterdam, 2004, 293–314.

ANGELO, SCHULTZE-BERNDT 2016

ANGELO D., SCHULTZE-BERNDT E., “Beware Bambai—Lest It Be Apprehensive,” in: F. MEAKINS, C. O’SHANNESY, eds., *Loss and Renewal: Australian Languages since Contact*, Berlin, 2016, 255–296.

BYBEE ET AL. 1994

BYBEE J., PERKINS R., PAGLIUCA W., *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago, 1994.

CRISTOFARO 2003

CRISTOFARO S., *Subordination*, Oxford, 2003.

CROFT 2003

CROFT W., *Typology and Universals*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 2003.

DIXON 2009

DIXON R. M. W., “The Semantics of Clause Linking in Typological Perspective,” in: R. M. W. DIXON, A. Y. AIKHENVALD, eds., *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-linguistic Typology*, Oxford, 2009, 1–56.

DIXON, AIKHENVALD 2009

DIXON R. M. W., AIKHENVALD A. Y., *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-linguistic Typology*, Oxford, 2009.

DUKOVA-ZHELEVA 2010

DUKOVA-ZHELEVA G., “Questions and Focus in Bulgarian” (Doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa, Department of Linguistics Faculty of Arts, Ottawa, Canada, 2010).

GIVÓN 2001

GIVÓN T., *Syntax*, 2, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 2001.

HEINE 1992

HEINE B., “Grammaticalization Chains,” *Studies in Language*, 16/2, 1992, 335–368.

HOPPER, TRAUGOTT 1993

HOPPER P., TRAUGOTT E. C., *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, 1993.

JOSEPH 1983

JOSEPH B. D., *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics*, Cambridge, 1983.

KRAMER 1986

KRAMER C. E., *Analytic Modality in Macedonian*, Munich, 1986.

- LICHTENBERK 1995
LICHTENBERK F., "Apprehensional Epistemics," in: J. BYBEE, S. FLEISCHMAN, eds., *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1995, 293–327.
- LYONS 1977
LYONS J., *Semantics*, 2, Cambridge, 1977.
- MITKOVSKA ET AL. 2015
MITKOVSKA L., BUŽAROVSKA E., KUSEVSKA M., "Macedonian 'Da Ne' Constructions as Distance Markers," in: B. SONNENHAUSER, A. MEERMANN, eds., *Distance in Language, Language of Distance*, Cambridge, 2015, 243–262.
- NORDSTROM 2010
NORDSTROM J., *Modality and Subordinators*, Amsterdam, 2010.
- PALMER 2001
PALMER F., *Mood and Modality*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 2001.
- PORTNER 2009
PORTNER P., *Modality*, Oxford, 2009.
- SWEETSER 1991
SWEETSER E. E., *From Etymology to Pragmatics*, Cambridge, 1991.
- THOMPSON 1998
THOMPSON S. A., "A Discourse Explanation for the Cross-linguistic Differences in the Grammar of Interrogation and Negation," in: A. SIEWIERSKA, JAE JUNG SONG, eds., *Case, Typology, and Grammar: In Honor of Barry Blake*, Amsterdam, 1998, 307–340.
- THOMPSON ET AL. 2007
THOMPSON S. A., LONGACRE R., SHIN JA HWANG, "A Typology of Adverbial Clauses," in: T. SHOPEN, ed., *Language Typology and Linguistic Description*, Cambridge, 2007, 237–300.
- TRAUGOTT 1986
TRAUGOTT E. C., "From Polysemy to Internal Semantic Reconstruction," in: *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 12, 1986, 539–550.
- 1988
TRAUGOTT E. C., "Pragmatic Strengthening and Grammaticalization," in: *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 14, 1988, 406–416.
- TRAUGOTT, TROUSDALE 2010
TRAUGOTT E. C., TROUSDALE G., "Gradience, Gradualness, and Grammaticalization: How Do They Intersect?" in: E. C. TRAUGOTT, G. TROUSDALE, eds., *Gradience, Gradualness, and Grammaticalization* (= *Typological Studies in Language*, 90), Amsterdam, 2010, 19–44.
- VEČERKA 1996
VEČERKA R., *Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax, 3: Die Satztypen: Der einfache Satz*, Freiburg, 1996.
- VERSTRAETE 2001
VERSTRAETE J. C., "Subjective and Objective Modality: Interpersonal and Ideational Functions in the English Modal Auxiliary System," *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 2001, 1505–1528.
- VUILLERMET 2017
VUILLERMET M., "The Grammar of Fear in Ese'eja. Paper Presented at the Syntax Circle, University of California, Berkeley, 2013" (https://www.academia.edu/5185472/The_grammar_of_fear_in_Eseeja; last accessed: 01.12.2017).
- ZORIKHINA-NILSSON 2012
ZORIKHINA-NILSSON N., "Peculiarities in Expressing the Apprehensive in Russian," in: *Oslo Studies in Language*, 4/1 (= *The Russian Verb*), 2012, 53–70.

References

- Aarts B., "Modelling Linguistic Gradience," *Studies in Language*, 28/1, 2004, 1–49.
- Aikhenvald A. Y., *Imperatives and Commands*, Oxford, 2010.
- Ammann A., Auwera J., "Complementizer-headed Main Clauses for Volitional Mood in the Languages of South-Eastern Europe—A Balkanism?" in: O. Mišeska Tomić, eds., *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, Amsterdam, 2004, 293–314.
- Angelo D., Schultze-Berndt E., "Beware Bambai—Lest It Be Apprehensive," in: F. Meakins, C. O'Shannessy, eds., *Loss and Renewal: Australian Languages since Contact*, Berlin, 2016, 255–296.
- Asenova P., *Balkansko ezikoznanie: Osnovni problemi na balkanskiia ezikov süiuz*, Veliko Tarnovo, 2002.
- Bužarovska E., Mitkovska L., "Negated Independent *Da*-constructions", in: Z. Topolinjska, ed., *Subjunctive: With Special Reference to the Macedonian *Da*-constructions*, Skopje, 2015, 23–46.
- Bybee J., Perkins R., Pagliuca W., *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago, 1994.
- Cristofaro S., *Subordination*, Oxford, 2003.
- Croft W., *Typology and Universals*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 2003.
- Dixon R. M. W., "The Semantics of Clause Linking in Typological Perspective," in: R. M. W. Dixon, A. Y. Aikhenvald, eds., *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-linguistic Typology*, Oxford, 2009, 1–56.
- Dixon R. M. W., Aikhenvald A. Y., *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-linguistic Typology*, Oxford, 2009.
- Dobrushina N. R., "Grammatical Forms and Constructions with the Meaning of Fear and Caution," *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, 2, 2006, 28–67.
- Givón T., *Syntax*, 2, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 2001.
- Grickat I., *Studije iz istorije srpskohrvatskog jezika*, Belgrade, 1975.
- Grković-Major J., "The Development of the Hypotactic '*Da*' in Old Serbian," *Matica serbica. Classis litterarum. Archivum philologicum et linguisticum*, 47/1–2, 2004, 185–203.
- Heine B., "Grammaticalization Chains," *Studies in Language*, 16/2, 1992, 335–368.
- Hopper P., Traugott E. C., *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, 1993.
- Ilievski P. H., *Balkanološki lingvistički studii*, Skopje, 1988.
- Ivanova E. Ju., "The Apprehensive in Russian and Bulgarian," *Studi Slavistici*, 11, 2014, 143–168.
- Ivanova E. Ju., Bužarovska E., "Epistemicheskie voprositel'nye chastitsy *da ne* v makedonskom i *da ne bi* v bolgarskom iazykakh," in: M. B. Konoshenko, E. A. Lyutikova, A. V. Zimmerling, eds., *Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters*, 3, Moscow, 2016, 140–158.
- Joseph B. D., *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics*, Cambridge, 1983.
- Kramer C. E., *Analytic Modality in Macedonian*, Munich, 1986.
- Lichtenberk F., "Apprehensional Epistemics," in: J. Bybee, S. Fleischman, eds., *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1995, 293–327.
- Lyons J., *Semantics*, 2, Cambridge, 1977.
- Mitkovska L., Bužarovska E., Kusevska M., "Macedonian '*Da Ne*' Constructions as Distance Markers," in: B. Sonnenhauser, A. Meermann, eds., *Distance in Language, Language of Distance*, Cambridge, 2015, 243–262.
- Nordstrom J., *Modality and Subordinators*, Amsterdam, 2010.
- Palmer F., *Mood and Modality*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 2001.
- Plungian V. A., "Predislovie," in: *Issledovaniia po teorii grammatiki*, 3: *Irrealis i irreal'nost'*, Moscow, 2004, 9–25.
- Plungian V. A., *Vvedenie v grammaticheskuiu semantiku: grammaticheskie znacheniiia i grammaticheskie sistemy iazykov mira*, Moscow, 2011.
- Portner P., *Modality*, Oxford, 2009.
- Prokhorov K. N., "Oblique Moods in Kalmyk: Semantics, Morphology, Syntax," in: *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*, 5/2, St. Petersburg, 2009, 160–224.
- Sweetser E. E., *From Etymology to Pragmatics*, Cambridge, 1991.
- Thompson S. A., "A Discourse Explanation for the Cross-linguistic Differences in the Grammar of Interrogation and Negation," in: A. Siewierska, Jae Jung Song, eds., *Case, Typology, and Grammar: In Honor of Barry Blake*, Amsterdam, 1998, 307–340.
- Thompson S. A., Longacre R., Shin Ja Hwang, "A Typology of Adverbial Clauses," in: T. Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and Linguistic Description*, Cambridge, 2007, 237–300.
- Topolinjska Z., *Polski – makedonski. Gramatička konfrontacija*, 8: *Razvitok na gramatičkite kategorii*, Skopje, 2008.
- Topolinjska Z., ed., *Subjunctive with Special Reference to the Macedonian *Da*-constructions*, Skopje, 2015.
- Traugott E. C., "From Polysemy to Internal Semantic Reconstruction," in: *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 12, 1986, 539–550.

Traugott E. C., "Pragmatic Strengthening and Grammaticalization," in: *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 14, 1988, 406–416.

Traugott E. C., Trousdale G., "Gradience, Gradualness, and Grammaticalization: How Do They Intersect?" in: E. C. Traugott, G. Trousdale, eds., *Gradience, Gradualness, and Grammaticalization* (= Typological Studies in Language, 90), Amsterdam, 2010, 19–44.

Večerka R., *Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax*, 3: *Die Satztypen: Der einfache Satz*, Freiburg, 1996.

Verstraete J. C., "Subjective and Objective Modality: Interpersonal and Ideational Functions in the English Modal Auxiliary System," *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 2001, 1505–1528.

Zorikhina-Nilsson N., "Peculiarities in Expressing the Apprehensive in Russian," in: *Oslo Studies in Language*, 4/1 (= The Russian Verb), 2012, 53–70.

проф. **Лилјана Митковска**, доктор по филолошки науки
Универзитет ФОН, Факултет за странски јазици, редовен професор
бул. Киро Глигоров бр. 5, 1000 Скопје
Република Македонија / Republic of Macedonia
liljana.mitkovska@fon.edu.mk

проф. **Елени Бужаровска**, доктор по филолошки науки
Универзитет „Св Кирил и Методиј“, Филолошки факултет, редовен професор
бул. Гоце Делчев бр. 9, 1000 Скопје
Република Македонија / Republic of Macedonia
elenibuzarovska@t.mk

проф. **Елена Јурьевна Иванова**, д. филол. наук
С.-Петербургский государственный университет, филологический факультет,
профессор кафедры славянской филологии
199034 С.-Петербург, Университетская набережная, д. 7/9
Россия/Russia
e.y.ivanova@spbu.ru

Received March 17, 2017