



Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“ – Штип
С. Македонија

Воронешки државен универзитет
Русија

Универзитет имени Гоце Делчева,
г. Штип, С. Македонија

Воронежский государственный университет
Россия

Goce Delcev University in Stip,
N. Macedonia

Voronezh State University
Russia

Петта меѓународна научна конференција

Пятая международная научная конференция

Fifth International Scientific Conference

ФИЛКО FILKO

ФИЛОЛОГИЈА, КУЛТУРА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

ФИЛОЛОГИЈА, КУЛТУРА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

PHILOLOGY, CULTURE AND EDUCATION

ЗБОРНИК НА ТРУДОВИ
СБОРНИК СТАТЕЙ
CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

8-9 октомври 2020 / 8-9 октябрия 2020 / 8-9 October 2020

Штип

Штип

Stip



Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“ – Штип
С. Македонија
Универзитет имени Гоце Делчева, г. Штип,
С. Македонија
Goce Delcev University in Stip,
N. Macedonia

Воронешки државен универзитет
Русија
Воронежский государственный университет
Россия
Voronezh State University
Russia

Петта меѓународна научна конференција

Пятая международная научная конференция

Fifth International Scientific Conference

**ФИЛКО
FILKO**

ФИЛОЛОГИЈА, КУЛТУРА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

ФИЛОЛОГИЯ, КУЛЬТУРА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

PHILOLOGY, CULTURE AND EDUCATION

**ЗБОРНИК НА ТРУДОВИ
СБОРНИК СТАТЕЙ
CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS**

8-9 октомври 2020 | 8-9 октябрия 2020 | 8-9 October 2020

Штип

Штип

Stip

ЗБОРНИК НА ТРУДОВИ
СБОРНИК СТАТЕЙ
CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

ФИЛКО
FILKO

Јазично уредување

Даница Атанасовска-Гаврилова (македонски јазик)
Марјана Розенфелд (руски јазик)
Билјана Иванова (англиски јазик)
Снежана Кирова (англиски јазик)
Татјана Уланска (англиски јазик)

Техничко уредување

Костадин Голаков
Наташа Сараfoва
Ирина Аржанова
Кире Зафиров

Адреса на организацискиот комитет:

Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“ – Штип

Филолошки факултет

ул. „Крсте Мисирков“ бр. 10-А

Пош. фах 201, Штип - 2000, Р. Македонија

Воронешки државен универзитет

Филолошки факултет

г. Воронеж, пл. Ленина, 10, корпус 2, к. 34, Русија

CIP - Каталогизација во публикација
Национална и универзитетска библиотека “Св. Климент Охридски”, Скопје

316.7(062)

МЕЃУНАРОДНА научна конференција филологија, култура и образование (5 ;
2020 ; Штип)

Зборник на трудови / Петта меѓународна научна конференција ФИЛКО
филологија, култура и образование, 8-9 октомври 2020, Штип = Сборник
статей / Пятая международная научная конференция ФИЛКО филология,
культура и образование, 8-9 октября 2020, Штип = Conference proceedings
/ Fifth International scientific conference FILKO philology, culture and
education, 8-9 October 2020, Stip. - Штип : Универзитет “Гоце Делчев”,
2021. - 465 стр. ; 21 см

Трудови на мак., рус. и англ. јазик. - Библиографија кон трудовите

ISBN 978-608-244-787-2

1. Напор. ств. насл.

а) Културологија -- Собири

COBISS.MK-ID 52932613

ОРГАНИЗАЦИСКИ КОМИТЕТ

Драгана Кузмановска, Филолошки факултет при УГД
Жана Грачева, Филолошки факултет при ВГУ
Весна Коцева, Филолошки факултет при УГД
Татјана А. Тернова, Филолошки факултет при ВГУ
Виолета Димова, Филолошки факултет при УГД
Генадиј Ф. Ковалов, Филолошки факултет при ВГУ
Костадин Голаков, Филолошки факултет при УГД
Лариса В. Рибачева, Филолошки факултет при ВГУ

МЕЃУНАРОДЕН ПРОГРАМСКИ КОМИТЕТ

Виолета Димова (Македонија)
Даниела Коцева (Македонија)
Драгана Кузмановска (Македонија)
Ева Ѓорѓиевска (Македонија)
Марија Кусевска (Македонија)
Силвана Симоска (Македонија)
Татјана Стојановска Иванова (Македонија)
Лариса В. Рибачева (Русија)
Софија Алемпиевиќ (Русија)
Татјана А. Тернова (Русија)
Татјана Атанасоска (Австрија)
Олег Н. Фенчук (Белорусија)
Јулиа Дончева (Бугарија)
Билјана Мариќ (Босна и Херцеговина)
Душко Певуља (Босна и Херцеговина)
Волф Ошлис (Германија)
Волфганг Моч (Германија)
Габриела Б. Клајн (Италија)
Михал Ванке (Полска)
Мајкл Рокланд (САД)
Даниела Костадиновиќ (Србија)
Селена Станковиќ (Србија)
Тамара Валчиќ-Булиќ (Србија)
Ахмед Ѓуншен (Турција)
Неџати Демир (Турција)
Шерифе Сехер Ерол Чалџшкан (Турција)
Карин Руке-Брутен (Франција)
Танван Тонтат (Франција)
Марија Рејес Ферер (Шпанија)
Технички секретар
Нагаша Сарафова
Јована Караниќиќ-Јосимовска
Ирина Аржанова
Главен и одговорен уредник
Драгана Кузмановска

РЕДАКЦИОННЫЙ СОВЕТ

Драгана Кузмановска, Филологический факультет при УГД
Жанна Грачева, Филологический факультет при ВГУ
Весна Коцева, Филологический факультет при УГД
Татьяна А. Тернова, Филологический факультет при ВГУ
Виолета Димова, Филологический факультет при УГД
Геннадий Ф. Ковалев, Филологический факультет при ВГУ
Костадин Голаков, Филологический факультет при УГД
Лариса В. Рыбачева, Филологический факультет при ВГУ

МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ

Виолета Димова (Македония)
Даниела Коцева (Македония)
Драгана Кузмановска (Македония)
Ева Ѓергиевска (Македония)
Мария Кусевска (Македония)
Силвана Симоска (Македония)
Татъяна Стояновска-Иванова (Македония)
Лариса В. Рыбачева (Россия)
Софья Алемпиевич (Россия)
Татъяна А. Тернова (Россия)
Татъяна Атанасоска (Австрия)
Олег Н. Фенчук (Беларусь)
Юлиа Дончева (Болгария)
Биляна Марич (Босния и Херцеговина)
Душко Певуля (Босния и Херцеговина)
Вольф Ошлис (Германия)
Волфганг Моч (Германия)
Мария Рейес Феррер (Испания)
Габриелла Б. Клейн (Италия)
Ева Бартос (Польша)
Михал Ванке (Польша)
Майкл Рокланд (США)
Даниела Костадинович (Сербия)
Селена Станкович (Сербия)
Тамара Валчич-Булич (Сербия)
Ахмед Гюншен (Турция)
Неджати Демир (Турция)
Шерифе Сехер Эрол Чалышкан (Турция)
Карин Рукэ-Брутэн (Франция)
Танван Тонтат (Франция)
Ученый секретарь
Нагаша Сарафова
Йована Караникич-Йосимовска
Ирина Аржанова

Главный редактор

Драгана Кузмановска

Языковая редакция

Даница Атанасовска-Гаврилова (македонский язык)

Марьяна Розенфельд (русский язык)

Бильяна Иванова (английский язык)

Снежана Кирова (английский язык)

Татьяна Уланска (английский язык)

Техническое редактирование

Костадин Голаков

Наташа Сарафова

Ирина Аржанова

Кире Зафиров

Адрес организационного комитета

Университет им. Гоце Делчева – Штип

Филологический факультет

ул. „Крсте Мисирков“ д. 10-А

Пош. фах 201, Штип - 2000, Р. Македония

Воронежский государственный университет

Филологический факультет

г. Воронеж, пл. Ленина, 10, корпус 2, к. 34, Россия

Э-почта: filko.conference@gmail.com

Веб-сайт: <http://js.ugd.edu.mk./index.php/fe>

EDITORIAL STAFF

Dragana Kuzmanovska, Faculty of Philology, UGD
Zhana Gracheva, Faculty of Philology, VGU
Svetlana Jakimovska, Faculty of Philology, UGD
Tatyana A. Ternova, Faculty of Philology, VGU
Violeta Dimova, Faculty of Philology, UGD
Genadiy F. Kovalyov, Faculty of Philology, VGU
Kostadin Golakov, Faculty of Philology, UGD
Larisa V. Rybatcheva, Faculty of Philology, VGU

INTERNATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD

Daniela Koceva (Macedonia)
Dragana Kuzmanovska (Macedonia)
Eva Gjorgjievska (Macedonia)
Marija Kusevska (Macedonia)
Silvana Simoska (Macedonia)
Tatjana Stojanovska-Ivanova (Macedonia)
Violeta Dimova (Macedonia)
Larisa V. Rybatcheva (Russia)
Sofya Alempijevic (Russia)
Tatyana A. Ternova (Russia)
Tatjana Atanasoska (Austria)
Oleg N. Fenchuk (Belarus)
Yulia Doncheva (Bulgaria)
Biljana Maric (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
Dushko Pevulja (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
Wolf Ochlies (Germany)
Wolfgang Motch (Germany)
Gabriella B. Klein (Italy)
Ewa Bartos (Poland)
Michal Wanke (Poland)
Danijela Kostadinovic (Serbia)
Selena Stankovic (Serbia)
Tamara Valchic-Bulic (Serbia)
Maria Reyes Ferrer (Spain)
Ahmed Gunshen (Turkey)
Necati Demir (Turkey)
Şerife Seher Erol Çalışkan
Karine Rouquet-Brutin (France)
That Thanh-Vân Ton (France)
Michael Rockland (USA)
Conference secretary
Natasha Sarafova
Jovana Karanikic-Josimovska
Irina Arzhanova
Editor in Chief
Dragana Kuzmanovska

Language editor

Danica Atanasovska-Gavrilova (Macedonian)
Maryana Rozenfeld (Russian)
Biljana Ivanova (English)
Snezana Kirova (English)
Tatjana Ulanska (English)

Technical editing

Kostadin Golakov
Natasha Sarafova
Irina Arzhanova
Kire Zafirov

Address of the Organizational Committee

Goce Delcev University - Stip

Faculty of Philology

Krste Misirkov St. 10-A

PO Box 201, Stip - 2000, Republic of Macedonia

Voronezh State University

Faculty of Philology

10 pl. Lenina, Voronezh, 394006, Russia

E-mail: filko.conference@gmail.com

Web-site: <http://js.ugd.edu.mk./index.php/fe>

СОДРЖИНА / СОДЕРЖАНИЕ / CONTENT

1. Suzana R. Bunčić - ANDRIĆ'S EARLY STORIES WITH ELEMENTS OF ALLEGORY AND SATIRE	13
2. Катерина Видова - ГЛАГОЛСКИОТ ПРИЛОГ ВО УЛОГА НА ПРИЛОШКА ОПРЕДЕЛБА ВО МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ЈАЗИК И НЕГОВИТЕ АНГЛИСКИ ПРЕВОДНИ ЕКВИВАЛЕНТИ	19
3. Ана Витанова - Рингачева - СОБИРАЧИТЕ НА МАКЕДОНСКОТО НАРОДНО ТВОРЕШТВО ОД ЦЕПЕНКОВ ДО ДЕНЕС (НА 100-ГОДИШНИНАТА ОД СМРТТА НА МАРКО ЦЕПЕНКОВ)	27
4. Бранка Гривчевска - МОДУЛАЦИЈАТА КАКО ПРЕВЕДУВАЧКА ПОСТАПКА ВО МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ПРЕВОД НА РОМАНОТ „ПАЛОМАР“ ОД ИТАЛО КАЛВИНО	33
5. Сашка Грујовска-Миланова - ИНТЕГРАЦИЈА НА ГЕРМАНИЗМИТЕ ВО МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ЈАЗИК	43
6. Јованка Денкова - СОЦИЈАЛНИТЕ РАСКАЗИ НА АНТОН ПАВЛОВИЧ ЧЕХОВ И БОРИС БОЈАЦИСКИ	49
7. Марија Ѓорѓиева Димова - ИНТЕРДИСКУРСИВНИТЕ ДИЈАЛОЗИ НА ЛИРИКАТА.....	57
8. Ивана Ѓорѓиева, Александар Нацов - ГАСТРОНОМСКИ КАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ НА ИСТОЧНИОТ РЕГИОН НА СЕВЕРНА МАКЕДОНИЈА.....	69
9. Биљана Иванова, Драгана Кузмановска, Снежана Кирова ПРЕДНОСТИ ПРИ УЗУЧУВАЊЕТО НА СТРАНСКИ ЈАЗИК ОД НАЈМАЛА ВОЗРАСТ	75
10. Билјана Ивановска, Марија Кусевска, Цвета Мартиновска Банде ЈАЗИЧЕН КОРПУС НА МАКЕДОНСКИТЕ ИЗУЧУВАЧИ ПО АНГЛИСКИ И ГЕРМАНСКИ КАКО СТРАНСКИ ЈАЗИЦИ	79
11. Лела Ивановска - КРЕАТИВНОСТА ВО НАСТАВАТА ПО АНГЛИСКИ ЈАЗИК КАКО СТРАНСКИ ЈАЗИК	87
12. Natka Jankova Alagjovska - INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION CONGITION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN OUR COUNTRY AND ABROAD	95
13. Сашка Јовановска - УСВОЈУВАЊЕ ВТОР ЈАЗИК- ПЕДАГОШКА ГРАМАТИКА	105
14. Луси Караниколова-Чочоровска - „ПРОСВЕТИТЕЛСТВОТО ВО ЈУЖНОСЛОВЕНСКИТЕ ЛИТЕРАТУРИ“ (ПРЕГЛЕД)	113
15. Карначук Ирина Јурьевна - ПОРЯДОК СЛОВ И ИНВЕРСИЈА КАК СПОСОБИ ВЪРАЖЕНИЯ ЕКСПРЕССИВНОСТИ	119
16. Милена Касапоска-Чадловска - ГРАМАТИКАТА ВО УЧЕБНИЦИТЕ ПО ФРАНЦУСКИ ЈАЗИК ЗА СРЕДНО ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ	123
17. Лидија Ковачева - ДЕМОНОЛОШКИТЕ ПРЕТСТАВИ КАЈ АСИРЦИТЕ И БАБИЛОНЦИТЕ	133
18. Славчо Ковилоски - ПРОТОТИПИ НА ЖЕНСКИ ЛИКОВИ ВО МАКЕДОНСКАТА КНИЖЕВНОСТ И ФОЛКЛОРОТ ОД XIX ВЕК	141
19. Весна Кожинкова - РЕФЕРЕНЦИЈАЛНОСТА ВО РОМАНОТ „МЕМОАРИТЕ НА АЛБЕРТ АЛНШТАН“ ОД КИРЕ ИЛИЕВСКИ.....	149

20. Кристина Костова, Марија Крстева, Наталија Попзариева, Крсте Илиев, Драган Донеv - ДРАМАТА ВО СРЕДЕН ВЕК КАКО ОСНОВА ЗА ОЗНАЧУВАЊЕ НА КУЛТУРНИОТ ИДЕНТИТЕТ ВО АНГЛИЈА	155
21. Мирјана Коцалева, Александра Стојанова, Билјана Златановска, Наташа Стојковиќ - ПРИМЕНА НА РАЗЛИЧНИ МЕТОДИ НА УЧЕЊЕ НА ИНФОРМАТИЧКИТЕ ПРЕДМЕТИ	163
22. Весна Коцева - ГЛАВНИ КАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ НА КОМУНИКАТИВНИОТ ПРИСТАП	169
23. Весна Коцева, Марија Тодорова - ОСНОВНИ НАЧЕЛА НА ПРИРОДНИОТ ПРИСТАП НА КРЕШЕН И ТЕРЕЛ	177
24. Даниела Коцева, Шукрије Барути, Снежана Мирасчиева - ЈАЗИКОТ И ГОВОРОТ ВО ФУНКЦИЈА НА ОПШТЕСТВЕНА И ИНДИВИДУАЛНА АДАПТАЦИЈА	183
25. Даниела Коцева, Снежана Мирасчиева - РЕФЛЕКСИЈАТА НА ОДДЕЛНИ ТЕЛЕВИЗИСКИ СОДРЖИНИ И ПОЈАВАТА НА НАСИЛСТВО КАЈ ДЕЦАТА	191
26. Драгана Кузмановска, Лидија Ристова, Биљана Иванова МОЌТА НА ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЗМИТЕ ВО СВЕТОТ НА РЕКЛАМИТЕ	199
27. Marija Kusevska - WHERE DIRECTNESS AND INDIRECTNESS RESIDE	207
28. Лидија Лумпова - СООТНОШЕНИЕ ГОЛОСА АВТОРА И ГОЛОСОВ ГЕРОЕВ В ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННИХ СИСТЕМАХ ТОЛСТОГО И ДОСТОЕВСКОГО (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ РОМАНА -ЭПОПЕИ Л.Н. ТОЛСТОГО «ВОЙНА И МИР», РОМАНОВ Ф.М. ДОСТОЕВСКОГО «ПРЕСТУПЛЕНИЕ И НАКАЗАНИЕ», «ИДИОТ», «БРАТЪЯ КАРАМАЗОВЫ»)	215
29. Ранко Младеноски - ХИПОТЕКСТОТ ВО ПОЕЗИЈАТА НА БЛАЖЕ КОНЕСКИ	223
30. К.А. Нагина - ТВОРЧЕСТВО Л.Н. ТОЛСТОГО В ПРОСТРАНСТВЕ СОВРЕМЕННОГО ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ	233
31. Георгий Недюрмагомедов - ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ МЕТАПРЕДМЕТНЫХ УМЕНИЙ УЧАЩИХСЯ ОСНОВНОЙ ШКОЛЫ В ПРОЦЕССЕ УЧЕБНОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ	241
32. Першина Татьяна Ивановна - ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ ПРОЕКТНО-ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬСКОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ОБУЧАЮЩИХСЯ ПО ГЕОГРАФИИ	247
33. Мария Попова - РОЛЬ И ФУНКЦИИ МУЗЕЕВ В ФОРМИРОВАНИИ СОВРЕМЕННОГО ГУМАНИТАРИЯ	253
34. Vesna Prodanovska-Poposka - ACQUIRING PROPER PRONUNCIATION: AN OVERVIEW OF A SET OF EXERCISES FOR IMPROVING ENGLISH LONG /i:/ AND /u:/ VOWELS	259
35. Цветанка Ристова Магловска, Младен Мицевски ИСКУСТВЕНО УЧЕЊЕ КАКО АЛАТКА ЗА ИНСПИРИРАЊЕ НА УЧЕНИЦИТЕ ВО УГОСТИТЕЛСКОТО ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ	265
36. Петја Рогич, Драган Донеv - МИНАТИТЕ ВРЕМИЊА ВО БУГАРСКИОТ И МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ПРЕВОД НА „ВУЈКО ВАЊА“ ОД АНТОН ПАВЛОВИЧ ЧЕХОВ ВО ОДНОС НА МИНАТИТЕ ВРЕМИЊА ВО СРПСКИОТ ПРЕВОД	273

37. Наташа Сарафова - ВЛИЈАНИЕТО НА ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИЈАТА И КУЛТУРНИТЕ ПОЛИТИКИ ВРЗ ВИДЛИВОСТА НА НАЦИОНАЛНИТЕ КНИЖЕВНОСТИ (Пример : Норвешка книжевност)	281
38. Наташа Сарафова, Марица Тасевска - АСПЕКТИ НА КНИЖЕВНИТЕ ИНДУСТРИИ ВО НОРВЕШКА	291
39. Simona Serafimovska - STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS AT THE UNIVERSITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF NORTH MACEDONIA	297
40. Елена Владимировна Сидорова - ЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ОШИБКИ В ПИСЬМЕННЫХ РАБОТАХ УЧАЩИХСЯ	305
41. Александра Стојанова, Мирјана Коцалева, Наташа Стојковиќ, Билјана Златановска - ПРИМЕНА НА VARK МОДЕЛОТ ВО ПРОЦЕСОТ НА УЧЕЊЕ	311
42. Анета Стојановска-Стефанова, Марија Магдинчева-Шопова - ПРЕДИЗВИЦИТЕ ОД ПОЛИТИЧКАТА ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИЈА ЗА ДРЖАВИТЕ	319
43. Aleksandra P. Taneska, Blagojka Zdravkovska-Adamova CREATING SYLLABUS AND DEVELOPING GRADING CRITERIA FOR MACEDONIAN LANGUAGE FOR PROFESSIONAL PURPOSES AT SEEU ACCORDING TO NEEDS BASED ANALYSIS	327
44. Ольга Тихонова - И.В. ГЁТЕ КАК КИНОПЕРСОНАЖ: К ПРОБЛЕМЕ ДИАЛОГА ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ И КИНО	337
45. Марија Тодорова, Весна Продановска-Попоска - ГЛАСОВНИТЕ СИСТЕМИ НА ШПАНСКИОТ И НА АНГЛИСКИОТ ЈАЗИК	345
46. Емилија Тодоровиќ - ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ И ПРАКТИКА: УЧЕЊЕ ПРЕКУ РАБОТА-НОВ КОНЦЕПТ ЗА ПРАКТИЧНА ОБУКА ВО ТЕХНИЧКОТО ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ	351
47. Elena Trajanovska, Maja Gjurovikj, Biljana Ivanova - STANDARDS-BASED EDUCATION IN ACHIEVING LANGUAGE INTEROPERABILITY	357
48. Nina S. Ćeklić - NARRATIVE-STYLISTIC FEATURES IN THE NOVEL LETTERS TO DANILO KIŠ BY FILIP GAJIĆ	365
49. Уљянова Марина Алексеевна - ГЕНДЕРНЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ СЕМАНТИЧЕСКОЙ СТРУКТУРЫ СЛОВА ВЗГЛЯД	373
50. Славица Урумова-Марковска - ПРОСВЕТИТЕЛСКИОТ ЛИК НА СВ. КЛИМЕНТ ОХРИДСКИ ВО ПРЕДАНИЈАТА И ЛЕГЕНДИТЕ	383
51. С.Н. Филошкина, Ж.А. Борискина - АВТОР В ПУБЛИЦИСТИЧЕСКОМ ПРОИЗВЕДЕНИИ (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ КНИГИ Г. ГРИНА “Getting to Know the General. The Story of an Involvement”, 1984.)	391
52. Наталија Хабарова - АНГЛИЙСКИЕ ЗАИМСТВОВАНИЯ В СРЕДСТВАХ МАССОВОЙ ИНФОРМАЦИИ	397
53. Ольга Швецова - ЯЗЫКОВЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ «ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОЙ ПОЭМЫ» А.С. МАКАРЕНКО	407
54. Васко Шутаров - КУЛТУРА И КУЛТУРНА ДИПЛОМАТИЈА ВО ВРЕМЕ НА ПАНДЕМИЈА	415

WHERE DIRECTNESS AND INDIRECTNESS RESIDE

Marija Kusevska

Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“, Штип,
marija.kusevska@ugd.edu.mk**Abstract**

Our primary aim in this paper is to contribute to the understanding of directness and indirectness across cultures. Our secondary aim is to help to improve intercultural communication by focusing on those elements in speech that might lead to misunderstanding. Directness and indirectness seem to be two of the elements which most often lead to breakdown of communication between members of different linguistic or cultural groups, and lead to judgements of people from a particular culture as being rude or distant. In particular, we focus on evidentiality and epistemic modality as sources of (in)directness by discussing the translation of *seem* in the Macedonian translation of the book “Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone”. Being marked for evidentiality and epistemic modality, *seem* functions as a hedge – a pragmatic function of linguistic means that allows the speaker not to express the commitment categorically. Because of its multiple functions, *seem* has different translations in Macedonian. In this paper we focused on the instances with zero correspondences because they most significantly show that Macedonian is less tolerant for vagueness and tentativeness. Epistemic modality expresses the attitude towards the probability of proposition. It allows the speaker to convey that his position is not binding or that to some extent he distances himself from it.

Keywords: evidentiality, epistemic modality, hedging, vagueness, politeness.

1. Defining directness and indirectness

Directness and indirectness are terms that often appear in research in the field of pragmatics and intercultural communication. Direct speech acts are associated by Austin (1962) and Searle (1979) with the literal meaning of utterances. On the other hand, their indirect illocutionary meaning refers to the other illocutions that a statement could express. The direct locution of the statement *I’m very busy* (*Имама многу работа*) is a declarative sentence, an assertion. But it can also be a request, an apology, or a refusal.

According to Searle (1979), there are two types of indirect speech acts: 1. those that can be derived by inference; and 2. those that can be derived by conventional expressions. Sperber & Wilson (1986) state that indirectness can be determined by the cognitive effort that the interlocutor makes to understand the message. They propose that there are two models of communication: “According to the code model, communication is achieved by encoding and decoding of messages. According to the inferential model, communication is achieved by the communicator providing evidence for her intentions, and the audience inferring her intentions from the evidence” (Sperber & Wilson 1986, p. 24). The second group of indirect speech acts are characterized

by their form, their conventionality. Searle takes the request as an example. Referring to them, the questions *Could you help me?*, *Do you mind passing this message to David?* (*Можеш ли да ми помогнеш?*, *Ke сакаш ли да му пренесеш нешто на Давид?*) are indirect because their literal meaning is different from the speech act they typically represent (question: asking). Indirectness, therefore, means deriving meaning by inference or by conventional expressions.

2. Indirectness and politeness

Directness and indirectness are often related to politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987). According to Brown and Levinson, speech acts can be realized indirectly, in the form of allusions or hints, and directly, with or without mitigation. Mitigation means modification of utterances by using language means that give face to the interlocutor. When someone says *Excuse me, is this seat taken?* the request is conventionally direct and clear, but it is mitigated by the speech act of apology and the question form. The more linguistic means the speaker uses to mitigate his/her utterance, the politer the utterance is considered.

The role of mitigation has received most attention by Brown and Levinson (1987) who suggest that a central concept in interaction is the concept of face. In their view, everyone has both positive face, the desire for approval, and negative face, the desire not to be impeded. Based on the assessment of social distance, relative power and degree of imposition, people choose how to formulate their speech. Mitigation is seen as a form of politeness conceptualized as conflict avoidance. By showing hesitation and uncertainty, the speaker leaves space for a different opinion and gives options to the interlocutor.

Brown and Levinson (1987) present a lot of linguistic means used in support of the positive or the negative face of the interlocutors. The positive face is reinforced by showing interest and attraction to the speaker, avoiding disagreement, use of endearment terms and terms of solidarity, jokes, etc. The negative face is supported by the use of linguistic expressions by which the speaker shows that he does not want to impose himself on the interlocutor and that he gives him the freedom to act as he pleases. This is achieved by the use of questions, hedges, downtoners, apologies, hypothetical statements, modal verbs, etc.

In this paper, we discuss the role of hedges and epistemic modality as sources of (in)directness. In particular, we focus on the verb *seem* and its translation into Macedonian in the book “Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone” by J. K. Rowling.

3. Hedging and epistemic modality

Propositions expressed through utterances and sentences are considered true (Frajzyngier, 1985). And so it is with speakers of all languages. However, our knowledge is very limited and very often we cannot be absolutely sure of the truth of the proposition we are talking about. Our evaluation of the situation can range from great certainty to great uncertainty, even to the conclusion that something is amazing or impossible. Hence the large number of expressions to express different degrees of evaluation of the probability of the proposition. This function is primarily carried out by hedges and epistemic modal expressions.

The notion of hedging is used in linguistics to describe words “whose job is to make things more or less fuzzy”. It has been applied to linguistic devices used to qualify a speaker’s confidence in the truth of a proposition, such as *I think*, *perhaps*,

might and *may*(*be*) which speakers use to avoid commitment to categorical assertions. Hedges therefore express tentativeness and possibility in communication, and their appropriate use in scientific discourse is critical (Hyland, 1998, p. 1).

We do not doubt that speakers of all languages evaluate the proposition and formulate their statements in relation to a certain proposition, in fact, they express their evaluation of it. However, in English, the use of these language means is particularly extensive, so a speaker from another language community may remain confused and insecure. This group includes expressions such as *I expect, I believe, I suppose, I assume, I imagine, I gather, I presume, I guess, I suspect, I take it, I understand, I trust, I wonder, I feel*, which may be additionally modified as in *I should think, I should've thought, I'm inclined to think, I tend to think, I don't think, I don't suppose, I would guess, I would argue, I would suggest*. These imprecise expressions have a purpose and represent a special communication strategy related to politeness. The use of these means in communication is not stylistic, but is essential and is used for certain communication purposes.

The use of such linguistic means shows the culture's tolerance for inaccuracy. In the Macedonian language, for example, the frequent use of these language means sounds unacceptable and unclear.

The expression of tentativeness and personal attitudes as well as of commitment and detachment, traditionally falls within the semantic domain of modality. Some linguists propose that hedging is one aspect of epistemic modality as well. Modality is essentially concerned with a speaker's standpoint, judging the truth of a statement in terms of possibility, probability or certainty. It includes lexical verbs (*think, believe, doubt, assume, suppose presume*), modal verbs (*can, could, may, might, will, would*), epistemic adjectives (*certain, probable, definite*) and epistemic adverbs (*certainly, probably, maybe, definitely*).

Both hedges and expressions of modality have a great role as mitigating devices. Their role has been addressed not only by Brown and Levinson (1987) but by other linguists as well (Caffi, 2007; Fraser, 2010; Hyland, 1998; Zhang, 2011; Cornillie, 2009; Lampert & Lambert, 2010; Wiemer, 2018).

4. The Macedonian translation of *seem* and what it indicates

We discuss the mitigation in English and Macedonian by analyzing examples of *seem* extracted from the book "Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone" by J. K. Rowling and its Macedonian translation. What has aroused our interest in the verb *seem*, however, is the observation that Macedonian learners of English rarely use it although they are aware of it. Similarly, translators often drop it because examples with *seem* are rather awkward to translate in a way that they would sound natural in Macedonian. This has been noticed in other languages as well (Johansson, 2007; Aijmer, 2009; Usonienė and Šinkūnienė, 2013). Table 1 presents the linguistic means used to translate *seem* in Macedonian:

Table 1 Macedonian correspondences of *seem* in “Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone”

<i>Seem</i> correspondences	Frequency	<i>Seem</i> correspondences	Frequency
omitted	39.6% (38)	како да-clause	7.3% (7)
се чини дека/како/ AdjP/Ø	29.2% (28)	мисли	1% (1)
изгледа дека/како/ AdjP/Ø	16.7% (16)	навидум	1% (1)
личи	5.2% (5)		

The table shows that sometimes *seem* is not translated at all. In the Macedonian translation of the first Harry Potter book, there were 38 examples when *seem* was omitted, which mounts up to 39.6%. Consider the examples below.

(1) This seemed to cheer Ron up. Ова го орасположи Рон.

(2) Malfoy, it seemed, had sneaked up behind Neville and grabbed him as a joke. Малфој му се прикрал на Невил од зад грб и на шега го зграпчил.

Johansson (2007) notes that “the general background for the occurrence of zero correspondences is the weakened meaning of *seem*”. This may apply to cases when *seem* is followed by another copula verb (*to be, to become*) and the translator decides to drop *seem*.

(3) It seemed to be a handsome, leather-covered book. Тоа беше убава книга со кожени корици.

Also, the translator may regard *seem* redundant because there are other mental or perception verbs around it. (Johansson, 2007)

(4) ... they seemed to think he might get dangerous ideas. ... тие сметаа дека тој би можел да добие опасни идеи.

(5) ... the Dursleys were his only family. Yet sometimes he thought (or maybe hoped) that strangers in the street seemed to know him. Дарслиеви беа неговата единствена фамилија. Сепак, понекогаш имаше впечаток (или можеби, се надеваше) дека непознатите луѓе на улица го знаат.

(6) No one seemed to have noticed that Harry’s broom was behaving strangely. Никој не ни забележа дека метлата на Хари се однесува чудно.

However, this explanation does not account for the examples below, in which there are no other mental or perception verbs. There is no uncertainty either and the speakers do not express any reservations or doubts about the truth of the assertion. On the contrary, both sentences refer to something that is certain or usual.

(7) The afternoon’s events certainly seemed to have changed her mind about Snape. Настаните од тоа попладне очигледно го сменија нејзиниот став кон Снејп.

Seem may be lost in translation if the translator thinks that it is redundant because of the presence of many *seems* and other hedges in the book. We may agree with Usonienė and Šinkūnienė (2013: 307) that “[t]he given cases of translation differences perhaps could be attributed to a culture-specific alternative conceptualization of *seem* or culture-specific understanding and realization of certain pragmatic functions, for instance, hedging”. This is especially true for Macedonian speakers when referring to something that we consider a fact and the translator may feel that *seem* twists reality.

This may be the reason why Macedonian speakers are often confused by the use of *seem* in certain collocations:

(8) I can't seem to find them in the telephone book.

I can't seem to think straight.

I can't seem to stay awake.

What seems to be the matter?

Why would an English speaker prefer *What seems to be the matter?* to *What is the matter?* There is clearly a difference in impact between the first and the second question. The form without *seem* is direct and asks for the identification of a particular problem with no hesitation. The question with *seem*, on the other hand, is politer and gives the addressee more options in answering; it does not presuppose that there really is a problem. But Macedonian speakers would certainly get rid of *seem* in it. To them, the question requires a factual answer and when we talk about facts they are not to be hedged.

The omission of *seem* in translation casts light on some differences between Macedonian and English. This could be indicative of both meaning bleaching of *seem* and of the overuse (redundancy) of evidential-epistemic markers in English. (Usonienė and Šinkūnienė, 2013)

According to Frajzyngier (1985:247) indicative sentences express what the speaker wants to convey as the truth. If they have any doubts about the truth, they may use hedging devices such as *sort of*, or constructions “with such verbs as *seem*, *appear*, sentential adverbs *apparently*, *presumably*, etc.”. Therefore, by using *seem* speakers express some doubt in the truth of the sentence indicating that it does not reflect their belief. While “it appears that in English there are no limitations in expressing doubt” even about one’s own speech (Frajzyngier, 1985: 247), in Macedonian, this “hedging” of the truth may work somewhat differently. Native speakers of Macedonian feel that it is not possible to express doubts about the truth if you have actually seen or experienced something. You don’t say *I can't seem to stay awake* when you really feel like going to bed or *I can't seem to find my glasses* when you clearly can’t find them. The translator has dropped *seem* in (9) because the use of *изгледа*, *се чини*, or any other of the mentioned correspondences would negate the personal experience of the noticing.

(9) As he sat in the usual morning traffic jam, he couldn't help noticing that there seemed to be a lot of strangely dressed people about. Додека се пробиваше низ вообичаениот утрински сообраќаен метеж, не можеше да не забележи дека по улиците се моткаат многу чудно облечени луѓе.

Similarly, the situation in (10) would seem absurd if any doubt was expressed that people vanished the second Harry tried to get a closer look.

(10) The weirdest thing about all these people was the way they seemed to vanish the second Harry tried to get a closer look. Најчудно во целата таа работа беше тоа што во моментот кога Хари ќе се обидеше да ги погледне одблиску, луѓето исчезнуваа.

These sentences are given in isolation here. But in the book they are usually elaborated and there is enough evidence of what happened or how it happened. Such situations are understood as facts and we do not speculate about facts. The use of *seem* would deteriorate the truth and resort to speculation. For Macedonian speakers, the insecurity and doubt that *seem* conveys in these instances is in contradiction with factive data.

Another motivation for the translator to drop *seem* may be the abundant use of evidential-epistemic markers. For instance, *think* and *might* were used in (4) and *thought*, *maybe* and *hoped* in (5).

Our research of the English interlanguage of Macedonian learners of English also showed poor mitigation even at higher levels. We searched the conversations in the Macedonian Corpus of Learner Language (MACOR) and were able to find only 10 examples with *seem*. Three of them were used with the meaning of the copula verb *look* and were not appropriate in the given context:

- (11) It makes them seem irresponsible maybe.
- (12) if I have a piercing I'm don't seem like a serious person.
- (13) It definitely would make the city seem cleaner and everything

In this corpus of conversations which mount to 591.35 minutes (9.9 hours), with the total number of 66,696 words, there were only seven instances in which *seem* was used appropriately.

- (14) they seem like they don't care
- (15) it's the authorities who don't seem to care about it enough?
- (16) they don't seem like they care about the street dogs

5. Conclusion

One of the fields that has often been marked as a stark difference between English and Macedonian is directness and indirectness. Macedonian speakers sound more direct in comparison with English speakers. This analysis has successfully proven that some of the sources of this may be the different attitude of Macedonian speakers towards firsthand experience and the much smaller amount of epistemic markers and hedges in their speech.

Because of its multiple functions, *seem* has different translations in Macedonian. The roots of zero correspondences may be the abundant use of hedging words in English and their different use in Macedonian. But the cultural aspect of hedging may also account for the omissions. The wide range of correspondences gives evidence of the translators' struggle to find ways of expressing the different meanings of *seem* in another language.

References

6. Aijmer, K. (2009). *Seem* and evidentiality. *Functions of Language* 16 (1), 63-88.
7. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. ([1978] 1987). *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Caffi, C. (2007). *Mitigation*. New York: Elsevier.
10. Caffi, C. (2007). *Mitigation*. New York: ELSEVIER.
11. Cornillie, B. (2009). Evidentiality and epistemic modality: On the close relationship between two different categories. *Functions of Language* 16 (1), 44-62.
12. Frajzyngier, Z. (1985). Truth and the indicative sentence. *Studies in Language* 9 (2), 243-254.
13. Fraser, B. (2010). Pragmatic competence: The case of hedging. In G. Kaltenböck,

- W. Mihatsch, & S. Schneider, *New Approaches to Hedging* (pp. 15-34). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
14. Grainger, K., & Mills, S. (2016). *Directness and indirectness across cultures*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
 15. Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in Scientific Research Articles*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
 16. Johansson, S. (2007). *Seeing through multilingual corpora: On the case of corpora in contrastive studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
 17. Lampert, G., & Lampert, M. (2010). Where does evidentiality reside? Notes on (alleged) limiting cases: *seem* and *be like*. *Language typology and universals (STUF) 63-4 (special issue Database on evidentiality markers in European languages ed. by Björn Wiemer and Katerina Stathi)*, 308-321.
 18. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 19. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance. Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
 20. Usonienė, A., & Šinkūnienė, J. (2013). A cross-linguistic look at the multifunctionality of the English verb *seem*. In J. I. Marín-Arrese, M. Carretero, J. Arús Hita, & J. van der Auwera, *English modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality* (pp. 281–316). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter .
 21. Wiemer, B. (2018). Evidentials and Epistemic Modality. In A. Y. Aikhenvald, *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality* (pp. 85-108). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 22. Zhang, G. (2011). Elasticity of vague language. *Intercultural Pragmatics 8 (4)*, 571–599.