ndiana Slavic Studies is an occasional publication of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures of Indiana University. Copyright is vested in Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA. *Indiana Slavic Studies* 1 appeared in 1956, nder the editorship of Michael Ginsburg and Joseph Thomas Shaw; it was subtitled Slavic and East European Series, Volume 2." Subsequent volumes appeared in 1958 *SS* vol. 2; Slavic and East European Series, vol. 13), 1963 (vol. 3; Russian and ast European Series, vol. 28), and 1967 (vol. 4; Russian and East European Series, ol. 36). All volumes were distributed by Indiana University Press.

diana Slavic Studies was revived in 1990 with the publication of volume 5 (Indiana niversity Russian and East European Series, vol. 43). The editor of this issue was nry R. Cooper, Jr.; associate editors were Samuel Fiszman and Felix J. Oinas. ce then *ISS* has appeared on a biennial basis, with volumes published in 1992 l. 6/IU REES vol. 44; a joint issue with *Balkanistica* 8, the journal of the erican Association for Southeast European Studies), 1994 (vol. 7/IU REES 45; cted papers from the Ninth International Conference on Balkan Languages, eratures and Folkore), and 1996 (vol. 8/IU REES 46). A complete list of the lications of the IU Russian and East European Institute and all subsequent issues *SS* is given on the back cover.

iana Slavic Studies is a publication of the Department of Slavic Languages and eratures for the expression of a variety of scholarly viewpoints on issues of Slavic l East European studies. Its Editorial Board comprises faculty members of the pt. of Slavic Languages and Literatures. From time to time individual issues of the rnal will be devoted to the exploration of specific topics in the Slavic and East ropean fields, as determined by the Editorial Board. The views expressed in ticles, reviews and letters contained in *ISS* should not be construed as reflecting the iews of the Dept. of Slavic Languages and Literatures or Indiana University.

rticles are published in *Indiana Slavic Studies* by invitation only. Unsolicited anuscripts will not be returned. Solicited manuscripts should be produced in *both* lectronic format *and* three printed copies, double-spaced, with either endnotes or otnotes. Submissions not in electronic format cannot be considered. For format and yle contributors should follow the *Slavic and East European Journal*. Cyrillic ript must be either in the original or transliterated according to the standard inter-ational system, i.e., with diacritics. All contributions to *Indiana Slavic Studies* are valuated with double anonymity (of both contributor and referee). All editorial cor-spondence may be sent to: Editor, *Indiana Slavic Studies*, Department of Slavic anguages and Literatures, Indiana University, BH 502, Bloomington, IN 47405-103 USA (email iuslavic@indiana.edu; tel. 1-812-855-2608; fax 1-812-855-2107).

rders for current and future issues, as well as back volumes in print, should be sent Slavica Publishers, Indiana University, 2611 E. 10th St., Bloomington, IN 47408-603 USA (email slavica@indiana.edu; tel. 1-812-856-4186 or 1-877-SLAVICA; fax -812-856-4187).

INDIANA SLAVIC STUDIES

Volume 10 (1999)

ISSN 0073-6929

Guard the Word Well Bound

Proceedings of the Third North American-Macedonian Conference on Macedonian Studies

In Honor of Professor Horace Gray Lunt on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday

Edited by

Christina Kramer and Brian Cook

Macedonian Historiography, Language, and Identity, in the Context of the Yugoslav Wars of Succession

Victor A. Friedman

The most significant effect of the Yugoslav wars on the Republic of Macedonia was to bring about the referendum on independence of 8 September 1991, the official adoption and declaration of an independent constitution on 17 and 20 November 1991, respectively, and official requests for international recognition on 2 December 1991. This was followed by a period of extremely high tension during which Greece attempted to prevent international recognition of the new state and imposed more than one unilateral embargo, Bulgaria recognized the state but not the nation and proposed "open borders," the Yugoslav National Army withdrew under extremely tense circumstances—having mined the area around their barracks and taking with them not only all weapons but even the plumbing and wiring from officers' apartments—while the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia continued to insist that their border with the Republic of Macedonia was administrative rather than international (a matter that they have so far [25 May 1998] failed to resolve completely). The FRY also made occasional armed incursions, radical ethnic Albanians in western Macedonia declared an autonomous state of Ilirida (an idea intelligently ignored by the entire international community and eventually dropped by its proponents), and the Albanian state played a game of alternately threatening and supporting the Republic. Throughout this period, Macedonia was referred to as "an oasis of peace", since unlike the other republics that seceded from former Yugoslavia—including Slovenia—it never saw any military deaths on its soil.

These events affected the writing of history in and on Macedonia primarily owing to the fact that, having emerged onto the international scene as a newly independent state and immediately becoming the object of intensified contestation and controversy, Macedonia also became a more interesting subject of study for the international academic community. However, in another sense, the war had nothing to do with Macedonian historiography. The major changes in the writing of history within Macedonia actually took place during the rise of political pluralism between 1988 and 1991 (although these changes continued to affect debate during the post-independence period), while much of the international contestation that has received so much external attention is really just the same old songs that have been played by Macedonia's neighbors and their allies since the nineteenth century. In this article, I shall survey some of the main themes in recent writing on Macedonian

history and identity. Because language has been such a key issue in the formation and contestation of Macedonian identity and hence nationhood, I shall pay particular attention to the linguistic view of these problems.

In discussing the relationship of language to the rise of national identity, two models can be invoked, and the choice of model is often motivated by the political intentions of the speaker or writer. One model is exemplified by countries such as Austria and Switzerland, where the formation of a nation-state identity is not connected with a nation-specific national language, the other is exemplified by the Scandinavian countries—particularly Denmark, Norway, and Sweden—where each country has its own primary national language, but the three are mutually intelligible. The importance of the Macedonian literary language (Modern Macedonian) for the formation of Macedonian national identity and the rise of a Macedonian state has long been recognized. The process by which that literary language came into being, however, as well as the relationship of dialect to language, are not well understood in the West, especially by non-linguists, and the result has been some serious misstatements and misrepresentations by individuals claiming authority.

Although a nuanced understanding of the terms of the linguistic debate is essential to an accurate analysis of the past and the present, such an understanding is surprisingly absent from a number of recent works. Thus, for example, Poulton (1995: 116) writes of the period immediately after World War Two: "The new nation needed a written language, and initially the spoken dialect of northern Macedonia was chosen as the basis for the Macedonian language. However, this was deemed too close to Serbian and the dialects of Bitola-Veles became the norm. ... whether it is truly a different language from Bulgarian or merely a dialect of it is a moot point." He even goes so far as to cite a Bulgarian nationalist pamphlet (BAN 1978) as "the most comprehensive refutation" of the distinctness of Macedonian from Bulgarian. Poulton's account is flawed in many respects. The statement that the northern dialect was chosen as the basis of literary Macedonian, which Poulton bases on Barker (1950), is simply inaccurate. As published documentation demonstrates (Risteski 1988), there was never any question of the basis being anything but the West Central dialects, although a specifically northern feature adopted in 1944-45 was replaced by its West Central equivalent in 1948 (Friedman 1985).[1] The Bulgarian "refutation" uncritically cited by Poulton is characterized by Harvard linguist Horace Lunt (1984: 87-88) as "[i]ncompetent in terms of linguistic theory, and resting on a poorly organized series of propositions and claims, many of them dubious, exaggerated or false..." Lunt notes that "[a]side from a

[1] The feature is the productive imperfective derivational suffix: northern *-ue*, west central *-uva*.

dignified answer by Macedonian linguists (Dimitrovski et al. [1978]), this embarrassing aberration from common sense and sound scholarship aroused little response in print." Unfortunately, Poulton (1995) fails to cite that response. Similarly, Glenny (1995: 24) describes Macedonian as "a Bulgarian dialect that is now a separate language" justifying his description by explaining that "...Bulgarian has a definite article and no case declension (unlike all other Slav languages until the Macedonians codified their Bulgarian dialect into a new language)." Aside from the flawed methodology of using two shared grammatical features as a justification for classifying one language as a dialect of another, in addition to which we should note that these two particular features are shared with the southern Serbian dialects, such accounts ignore the fact that Slavic linguists were already treating Macedonian as a separate language prior to World War Two (see below). Describing Macedonian as a Bulgarian dialect is like describing Norwegian as a Danish dialect (see Haugen 1968).

Troebst (1994) represents a modified Bulgarian viewpoint in combination with an anti-establishment Macedonian viewpoint that can be manipulated to support it. The modified Bulgarian viewpoint is that while Macedonian must be recognized today as a separate language, its existence is due entirely to the post-World War Two manipulations of Tito and his communists in their attempt to separate the Macedonians from the Bulgarians.[2] Such an approach must of necessity conceal or discount all evidence that Macedonian national consciousness and strivings for a literary language have their origins in the nineteenth century and continued throughout the twentieth. This is essentially what Troebst does when he dismisses Misirkov (1903)[3] and fails to mention sources such as Pulevski (1875), which contains the earliest published statement of Macedonian national identity to have been discovered so far:

> "Nesme samo mije toku slavjani se, i rusi, i Poljaci i Česi i Srbi i Slovaci i Bugari i Hrvati i od site ovde rečeni, narodi jazikod im je slavjanski [...] Narod se veljid, ljudi koji se od eden rod i koji

[2] A recent Bulgarian variation attempted to credit Venko Markovski and Comintern with the "invention" of the Macedonian language in 1937-38 (*Nova Makedonija* 19.II.1996, p. 3).

[3] Misirkov (1903:132-145) contains the first formulation of the details of a Macedonian literary language. He called for the use of the same west central dialect base that was agreed upon in 1944-45. The fact that later in life, disillusioned by the partition of Macedonia (Treaty of Bucharest 1913, and again after World War One) and other Great Power manipulations, Misirkov published pro-Bulgarian work is irrelevant to the fact that at the beginning of the century he was a strong and articulate advocate of Macedonian linguistic and ethnic identity (see Nihtinen 1995).

> zboruvajed ednakov zbor, [...] Taka i Makedoncive se narod i mestovo njivno je Makedonija." (Pulevski 1875: 48–49)
>
> 'We are not the only Slavs, the Russians, Poles, Czechs, Serbs, Slovaks, Bulgars, and Croats are all also of Slavic language [...] People of one type who speak the same language are called a nation, [...] Thus the Macedonians are a nation and their place is Macedonia.' (The translation is my own, capitalization is as in the original. Pulevksi's language is somewhat convoluted, since he was an autodidact. I have chosen to use 'nation' for *narod* as being closest in modern terms to Pulevski's intent.)

Troebst cites sources that claim there was no Macedonian consciousness prior to 1944 (p. 124 n. 64) despite evidence such as that given in Upward (1908):

> "On the second day of my stay in Vodena I made an excursion with Mr. Kalopathakes to two villages [...] Vladova, the first village, was reached after a two-hours' ride. [...] I sent out for a man who seemed to be a leading spirit in the place, and he came into the guard-house and answered my questions freely... I asked what language they spoke and my Greek interpreter carelessly rendered the answer *Bulgare*. The man himself had said Makedonski! I drew attention to this word, and the witness explained that he did not consider the rural dialect used in Macedonia the same as Bulgarian and refused to call it by that name. It was Macedonian, a word to which he gave the Slave [sic!] form *Makedonski*..." (Upward 1908: 202–206)

Troebst also ignores the publication of supradialectal Macedonian literature in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria during the interwar period. Troebst's (1994: 125–26) slightly garbled account of the early years of codification[4] makes use of Risteski (1988) to argue that the standardization "was not the work of the different various expert commissions but of interference by the emerging new political leadership, i.e. the CPM." Troebst fails to grasp the context and significance of Risteski's book. In selectively presenting the documentation of the early years of Macedonian codification, Risteski was attempting to discredit the then-existing Macedonian academic linguistic establishment. However, Risteski's intent is far from claiming that the striving for a Macedonian standard language was an invention of Tito. Rather, he was trying to

[4] The first commission met in late fall, not summer of 1944, schwa is not a "half vowel", elements from the eastern dialects were not excluded from the literary language (see Friedman 1985), and Lunt (1952) is not an English edition of Koneski's grammar (= part 1 of Koneski 1967).

argue that the process of standardization was co-opted by Tito for purely political reasons, which is a very different point, and one that his own documentation actually refutes if read carefully, with a knowledge of linguistics and of what has been omitted. What becomes clear is that in fact the local communists were supporting the better scholars and language activists and were eschewing outside interference (see Friedman 1993 for details).[5] In the end, Troebst (1994) is merely an updated version of Palmer and King (1971).[6]

These authors all privilege a Bulgarian position, assuming that somehow the construction of Bulgarian identity is more legitimate than the construction of Macedonian identity. Poulton (1995: 120) also privileges Greek attempts to delegitimize Macedonian identity. He is apparently incapable of understanding that identity itself is a human artifact and therefore always constructed (cf. Danforth 1995a: 11–27). He is so eager to accept Bulgarian claims that he uncritically reproduces Bulgarian allegations without any indication of their context or veracity (Poulton 1995: 118–19). He even implies that Metodija Andonov-Čento, the first president of the Macedonian republic, was a Bulgarophile rather than a Macedonian nationalist. What Poulton seems to have missed is the fact that those who favored an independent Macedonian state or a united Macedonia (i.e. a Yugoslav republic made up of Aegean, Pirin, and Vardar Macedonia) were accused by Yugoslav communists of being pro-Bulgarian. It is these false accusations that so delight modern Bulgarian nationalist historians. For the facts of Čento's case, see Tanaskova (1990). I am indebted to Andrew Rossos of the History Department of the University of Toronto who shared with me much valuable information about this period in Macedonian history based on his own extraordinary archival research.

A Serbian view is represented by Dragnich (1992: 192): "Macedonia's situation is in some ways even more fraught with dangers. A part of the Serbian nation in the Middle Ages, Macedonia was known as South Serbia. After liberation from the Turks in the Balkan wars, the largest part became part of the Kingdom of Serbia; smaller parts went to Bulgaria and to Greece. After World War II, Tito made Yugoslav Macedonia a republic, and those Serbs who earlier were forced to flee were not allowed to return." Aside from the fact that Greece, not Serbia,

[5] For example, Risteski (1988:409-427) reproduces an anonymous, undated proposal for Literary Macedonian norms which he evaluates as being by a "good philologist" (Risteski 1988:176) despite the fact that the author of the proposal confused letters with sounds and made numerous erroneous and half-true formulations of historical linguistic facts.

[6] For a contemporary critique of Palmer and King (1971) see Lunt (1972). Although Troebst (1994:11) labels Lunt's criticisms "somewhat hysterical", they are actually founded in fact.

received the largest share of geographic Macedonia from the Treaty of Bucharest (1913) and that at least some of the Serbs who had been sent to Macedonia as colonists during the interwar period were in fact allowed to return,[7] Dragnich's use of the contemporary term nation to refer to a medieval empire and subsequent political and cultural influence is at best misleading. With regard to the Yugoslav wars, we can note that during the period leading up to the break-up of Yugoslavia, radical Serbian nationalists such as V. Šešelj occasionally made public statements declaring that Macedonians were really just Serbs, and an early incident in the period leading up to the war was a clash between Macedonians on the one hand and Šešelj's band and Serbian Special Police on the other at the monastery of St. Prohor Pčinjski on 2 August 1990.[8]

Unlike the foregoing authors that privilege one or the other of the South Slavic identities that claim primacy over Macedonian, Danforth (1995a), whose work is objective and scholarly, nonetheless frames the debate from a Hellenistic point of view insofar as he concentrates on the Greek contestation of Macedonian identity and operates primarily with émigré communities from what is now Greek territory. From a linguistic point of view, Greek arguments concerning Macedonian are either irrelevant or preposterous, since by no stretch of the imagination can the Slavic dialects spoken on territory ceded to Greece by the treaty of Bucharest be described as Hellenic. Lazarou (1986), however, does attempt to demonstrate that the Aromanian dialects of Greece are not Romance but rather relexified Greek. While this is silly in terms of modern historical linguistic methodology, it is quite practical for the expansion of Hellenism and Greek nation-building mythology. Greeks are thus left claiming that the term "Macedonian" can only be applied to the Greek dialects of Macedonia, that the Slavic dialects of Macedonia do not constitute a language but rather an "idiom" (Andriotes 1957), or, in the Nazi tradition that big lies are more successful than little ones, that there are no minorities in Greece at all aside from Turkish in Western Thrace (cf. Human rights Watch/Helsinki 1994: 2, 11).[9] Glenny (1995: 24) contributes to this latter approach when he describes Greek Macedonia as

[7] This information is based on my own discussions with people who were part of these events.

[8] The monastery of St. Prohor Pčinjski was the site of the declaration of a Macedonian Republic and Macedonian official language on 2 August 1944. Although located in Macedonia at the end of World War Two, the monastery and its territory were ceded to Serbia in 1948 (see Džikov 1990).

[9] The second two claims are demonstrably false. The first claim ignores the well-established fact that ethnonyms can change their referents over time. Thus, for example, the Ancient Bulgars who crossed the Danube in 681 were a Turkic-speaking people, but modern Bulgarian is a Slavic language. Similarly, the medieval Franks were a Germanic-speaking people, but their name is the basis of *Français*, which is a Romance language.

"a substantial chunk of northern Greece whose inhabitants speak Greek" without making any mention of the Macedonian minority that still lives there. There is also a substantial Vlah minority and some Albanians and Roms. The vast majority of Jews were killed during World War Two. Glenny also describes Pirin Macedonia in purely Bulgarian terms with no mention of the self-identified Macedonians that still make up a significant portion of the population despite government denial of their existence and harassment of their organizations. Carefully and objectively documented, Danforth's work frames issues primarily in terms of Hellenic contestation, especially in diaspora. While this is certainly a legitimate topic of study, and one that Danforth handles with intelligence and sensitivity, it is only part of the picture of Macedonian identity.

Connor (1994) provides a striking example of the misuse of extrapolations from secondary sources relating to the Macedonian diaspora. He writes:

> There is little reason to question Belgrade's recent success in encouraging a sense of nationhood among most Macedonians, although the 1981 census data, which indicated a total absence of people within Macedonia who claimed either Bulgar or Greek identity, were unquestionably fraudulent and, in their unrestrained exaggeration, underscore the seriousness with which Belgrade continues to view the self-identity and loyalty of Macedonia's population. (Connor 1994: 215–16)

In a footnote, Connor (1994: 225), admits that the absence is not really total but less than one percent. He then explains that "[b]y contrast, most emigrants from Macedonia now living in the United States (as well as their descendants) describe themselves as of Bulgar descent. And many from that section of Macedonia abutting Greece, declare themselves to be of Greek ancestry. See Stephan Thernstrom, ed., Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups (Cambridge, 1980), 691." Leaving aside the fact that his information is out of date and that most modern immigrants from Macedonia to the U.S. clearly identify themselves as Macedonian, there remains the fact that the predominantly pre-World War Two diaspora to which he does refer reflects precisely those people who did not, could not, or would not stay in what was Turkey, Serbia, Yugoslavia or Greece, depending on when and whence they emigrated. They represent those Macedonians who did not choose or were not able to struggle for a separate Macedonian identity and who did not participate in the consolidation of that identity after World War Two. They thus do not reflect developments in Macedonia itself. In fact, with the post-1991 independence of the Republic of Macedonia and the ferocity of Greek persecution, even Bulgarian-identified émigrés have been redefining their loyalties. The chief Bulgarian-identified Macedonian

Newspaper in the U.S. (*Makedonska Tribuna*) has published pieces in literary Macedonian, and I personally know formerly Bulgarian-identified Macedonians who now declare an unambiguous Macedonian identity. Connor's statement about Greeks in the southern part of the Republic of Macedonia is simply wrong, although it could be charitably described as misleading, but in any case has nothing to do with the current sense of identity among the overwhelming majority of the population.

Skendi (1980), whose studies of Albanian history are authoritative, uncritically uses Bulgarian views on Macedonian language and identity formation: "If I have left out Macedonian Slavic from this linguistic picture of the Balkans, it is because the language is a post-World War II creation. Until then European Slavists considered Macedonian Slavic as composed of dialects transitional between Serbian and Bulgarian [...] first the state was formed and then followed manifestations of national identity" (1980: 37), "More striking is the role of politics in the formation of Macedonian Slavic. Before the end of World War II such a language did not exist." (Skendi 1980: 46). Radical Albanian politicians also take the stance that Macedonians are really Bulgarians, albeit only in private (personal communication from Menduh Thaçi and others, July-August 1994; cf. also Nova Makedonija 14.X.1996, p. 2) In recent years, Albanian-language revisionist historians in Macedonia have written about events in Macedonia from an Albanian point of view. The subtext of these writings is generally to bolster Albanian claims to legitimacy or sovereignty in western Macedonia (e.g. Islami 1994).

The following quotation from Vaillant (1938), bearing in mind both the date of publication and the fact that Vaillant is the author of some of the most authoritative works in Slavic linguistics, demonstrates the fact that prior to World War Two European Slavists did not view Macedonian as a Bulgarian dialect:[10]

> The concept of "Macedonian Slavic" is only confusing for those who really want it to be. Macedonian Slavic is a reality to such an extent that there existed in the nineteenth century a Macedonian literary language, the language of a very small scholarly literature but of a sizable popular literature. [... T]he centers were Skopje, Tetovo, Ohrid, Bitola (Monastir), Voden, etc. [...] The problem of Macedonian Slavic is that of its place within South Slavic and its relation with the two neighboring linguistic groups of Serbian and Bulgarian and its membership in one of these groups. [...] The question is hotly debated, which demonstrates that it is not obvious to everyone. Some bring up Bulgarian traits of Macedonian, others Serbian ones: They battle fiercely, brandishing the postposed article or the treatment of *ć* delivering blows with jers or the nasal vowels; the battle is confused and unmethodical [...], and it demonstrates that Macedonian furnishes arms to both camps. [...] At the time of the first historical data from the ninth and tenth centuries [...] Macedonian was closely allied with Bulgarian, and its subsequent evolution was parallel to that of Bulgarian; still it was sufficiently independent that it is difficult to make of Macedonian a simple dialect of Bulgarian, and it is more accurate to attribute to it a separate place in a Macedo-Bulgarian group... (Vaillant 1938: 195–96, 197, 208)

[10] The translation is my own. I am citing from Vaillant at such length because it is an eloquent and succinct presentation of an objective historical linguist's view of Macedonian prior to World War Two. Among Vaillant's better known works are Vaillant (1948, 1950-77).

Vaillant argues that the administrative religious, and cultural influence of Serbian on Macedonian from the fourteenth through the seventeenth centuries resulted in fundamental modifications of its linguistic system, and the subsequent spread of the west central Macedonian dialectal koine to other regions such as Ohrid continued that effect even after the waning of direct Serbian influence. Among the relevant events and circumstances were the following: Skopje became the capital of Dušan's Serbian empire in 1346, the territory of the patriarchate of Peć extended as far south as Veles and Štip and east to Samokov, while Ottoman documents show that during the Turkish period Serbian, like Arabic, Greek, and Persian, functioned as a chancery language (Vaillant 1938: 200). In addition to the influence of Serbian, intensive and complex contact with the non-Slavic Balkan languages, especially Vlah, was crucial in giving western Macedonian its distinctive character, making it a center of Balkan linguistic innovation (cf. Gołąb 1959, 1997, Hamp 1977, Friedman 1994). Although, as Vaillant states, Macedonian shares features with both Serbian and Bulgarian, the west central dialects that have historically constituted the core of both the present Macedonian literary language and previous attempts at creating one share among themselves a number of unique characteristics at all grammatical levels, e.g. fixed antepenultimate stress, leveling of morphophonemic alternations in the verbal system, a three-way opposition in the definite article, a new perfect using the auxiliary verb *ima* 'have' with an invariant neuter verbal adjective, sentence initial clitics, and grammaticalized object reduplication.

At the time Vaillant was writing, a vibrant literature in Macedonian was also being published in periodicals in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria (Koneski 1967: 47, Risteski 1988: 80–81, 104–107, Rossos 1995: 245) and performed at the Skopje public theater (Krle 1972: 7). I have had occasion to examine the original manuscript of Krle's drama *"Milion Mučenika"* (now *"Milion Mačenici"*) (1940) as well as the first publication

of Panov's play "*Pečalbari*" (1937–38) in the journal *Luč*, and while the details must remain the topic of a separate study, I can state here that the language of these works is extremely close to that which emerged as the Macedonian standard after 1944. These are not merely dialect works, although they were permitted publication and performance only under that guise. Rather they are conscious attempts to employ a distinctive supradialectal norm.

Many accounts of the formation of literary Macedonian portray the choice of the west central dialects as motivated by the desire to differentiate Macedonian from Bulgarian and Serbian as much as possible in order to enhance the process of nation building. While it is true that the west central dialects provided a linguistic basis for the development of a nation-building ideology, both the linguistic and the documentary evidence indicate that the beginnings of Macedonian separatism had their origins in western Macedonia. It is precisely the west central dialects that are the most compact, uniform, and distinct group of dialects vis-à-vis both Serbian and Bulgarian. In addition they were the basis of a koine that had spread beyond its original boundaries. In other words, it was not the case that Macedonian identity resulted from the imposition of the west central dialects from above to create a sense of difference from Bulgarian and Serbian. Rather, because these dialects were both distinct and relatively uniform, they were in a position to develop into a center of resistance to both the Bulgarian and Serbian literary languages that were emerging in the nineteenth century. As Serbian and Bulgarian nation-building ideologies expanded into Macedonia from the north and east, respectively, resistance was able to crystallize around the fact that the dialects west of the river Vardar (but elsewhere, too) were sufficiently distinct to be perceived by their speakers as belonging to neither of the hegemonizers. It was thus that these dialects ultimately became the basis of a separate literary language (cf. Friedman 1975 and Koneski 1994).

It is worth recalling that it was only in 1822 that Vuk Karadžić finally convinced European Slavists that Bulgarian was not a dialect of Serbian (see de Bray 1980: 78, 312). Ironically, the basis of Vuk's grammatical description that achieved this was the dialect of Razlog, in eastern Pirin Macedonia, which is, however, irrelevant to our basic point here, i.e. the relatively recent nature of the creation of conceptual boundaries within South Slavic linguistic territory. It is also important to note that although there are and have been speakers of dialects classifiable as Macedonian who ascribe to themselves Bulgarian or Serbian (or, for that matter, Greek, Albanian, or Turkish) identity, such instances of self ascription, while perfectly legitimate to those who choose them, do not negate the legitimacy of those who choose a separate Macedonian identity. The situation is analogous to the religious sect

known as Jews for Jesus. Such people have the right to their religious beliefs, but they cannot be construed as representative of, nor do they negate the validity of, mainstream Judaism. Similarly, Bulgarian-identified Macedonians (or any other-identified Macedonians) have every right to their identity, but their existence does not invalidate the legitimacy of Macedonian self-ascription as a separate identity.

Unfortunately, recent historical treatments of the development of Macedonian identity have not made adequate use of pre-World War Two sources. A laudable exception is Rossos (1991, 1994, 1995, 1997), who demonstrates the strength of Macedonian feeling before and during World War Two. The difficulties in attempting to obtain the necessary documentation can be seen from the following passage: "In the second week [of my research in Bulgaria], I discovered that documents that were of greatest interest to me were being removed from the archival files (edinici) that I was requesting. In the third week I was able to look at only four files of the 70 or 80 that had already been set aside for my use. Then, the Assistant Director regretfully informed me that they should not have given me any materials [at all] because the [Main Administration of State Archives] had withdrawn my permission. [Another prominent Bulgarian historian] confided that it was not easy to be a historian in Bulgaria." (Rossos, personal letter, 26 June 1996)[11]

The climate of international contestation presents additional complexities for non-nationalist attempts at reassessing recent Macedonian history such as Donev and Brown's (1993) analysis of the Ilinden uprising of 1903. Cf. also Brown (1995), which is a detailed and sensitive reassessment of the significance of events at the beginning of the twentieth century in the development of Macedonian national identity. The fear in the Republic of Macedonia is that an analysis of the construction of Macedonian identity will be used to delegitimize it vis-à-vis the construction of the other modern Balkan identities (cf. Ristovski 1995). Kofos (1993) is a clear example of the kind of nationalist distortions that, in their attempts to delegitimize Macedonian national identity, create an atmosphere of fear and insecurity in Macedonia itself. In a perverse misreading of Benedict Anderson's (1983) much cited *Imagined Communities*, a work that sets out a theory of how national identities are constructed, Kofos (1993: 330) reinterprets *imagined* to mean 'imaginary', i.e. not real, and applies the term to Macedonian identity in opposition to Greek identity, which he claims is "real." Kofos does not simply miss the point that all national identities—Macedonian and Greek included—are constructed. He actively seeks to enlist the

[11] This passage is condensed from the original. Ellipses have been omitted for greater legibility.

scholarship on the construction of nationalism to serve his specifically nationalist goal (see Danforth 1995b).

Claims to Macedonian autochthony on the basis of a relationship to the Ancient Macedonians put forward by Vlahs, Albanians, and Greeks are all essentially moot in the absence of further documentation and are in any case irrelevant to the existence of the Modern Macedonians (cf. note 9).[12] There are also Modern Macedonians who, believing the Greek propaganda that only the "descendants" of the Ancient Macedonians can call themselves Macedonian, will insist either that Modern Macedonian is not a Slavic language, or that the Ancient Macedonians were Slavic or part Slavic. On the provenience of Ancient Macedonian, see Ilievski (1997). It is possible that some illuminating document or inscription will be discovered someday, but at present that search is just part of the on-going tasks of archaeologists.[13] On the other hand, documents with possible relevance to the rise of Modern Macedonian identity exist but are suppressed. Although Slavic manuscripts reportedly have been dumped in Lake Prespa or otherwise destroyed by both Greek and Albanian authorities at various times, the behavior of Bulgarian archivists and of Hellenist historians such as George Hammond (A. Rossos, personal communication, cf. also Ilievski 1997) leads to the conclusion that significant documentation survives. The destruction of linguistic field materials by Greek police in the course of the past decade suggests that if research could be conducted freely in that country, other documents might still appear.[14] Brown (1996) gives a promising innovative approach in this respect, by utilizing heretofore untapped archival sources outside the Balkans—namely US immigration records from the turn of the century—that attest to both the existence of a separate sense of Macedonian nationality at the beginning of this century and attempts to

[12] Hall (1997:62-64) makes it abundantly clear that regardless of the linguistic relation of Ancient Macedonian to Ancient Greek, the Ancient Greeks did not consider the Ancient Macedonians to be ethnically Greek.

[13] At issue is whether Ancient Macedonian was a Hellenic language, i.e. descended together with other Greek dialects from a common ancestor, or a non-Hellenic language, i.e. descended together with Hellenic from a common Indo-European ancestor, but separated from Hellenic before the distinctively Hellenic developments occurred.

[14] Among those of my colleagues who have personally had their linguistic recordings confiscated and destroyed by Greek police are Roland Schmieger (Ph.D., University of Vienna), Alexander Sobolev (professor, University of St. Petersburg), and Erik Thau-Knudsen (graduate student, University of Copenhagen). I have spoken with Macedonians in Florina (Macedonian *Lerin*) who expressed their fear of speaking their native language to strangers due to harassment from Greek authorities. Greeks even bring these attitudes with them when they emigrate. In 1976 I was denied service and told to leave a Greek restaurant in Portland, Oregon, because I spoke Macedonian while in the establishment.

dismiss it. Lunt (1972) points out that Bulgarian denunciations of Macedonian separatism beginning in the mid-nineteenth century assure us of evidence that a sense of Macedonian difference among at least part of the Macedonian population dates from not later than that period. Despite both ill-intentioned and naïve attempts to erase this evidence, young scholars like Brown and Donev assure us that in the post-1991 period of Macedonian independence we have a chance to come closer to a more accurate reconstruction of the emergence of Modern Macedonian identity.

References

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Andriotes, N.P. 1957. *The Confederate State of Skopje and Its Language*. Athens: Argonaut.

BAN [Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite] (ed.) (1978). Edinstvo na bŭlgarskija ezik v minaloto i dnes. reprinted in *Bŭlgarski ezik* 28(1), 3–43.

Barker, Elizabeth. 1950. *Macedonia: Its Place in Balkan Power Politics*. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs.

Brown, Keith. 1995. *Of Meanings and Memories: The National Imagination in Macedonia*. Ph. D. dissertation. University of Chicago.

———. 1996. "Friction in the Archives: Nations and Negotiations on Ellis Island, 1904." Paper presented at the Tenth International Conference of Europeanists. Chicago, March 1996.

Connor, Walker. 1994. *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding*. Princeton: Princeton University.

Danforth, Loring M. 1995a. *The Macedonian Conflict: Ethnic Nationalism in a Transnational World*. Princeton: Princeton University.

———. 1995b. "Review of Kofos (1993)." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 13,2. 362–64.

de Bray, R.G.A. 1980. *Guide to the Slavonic Languages: Part 1, South Slavonic Languages*. Columbus: Slavica.

Dimitrovski, Todor et al. 1978. *Za makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik.

Donev, Jovan and Keith Brown. 1993. *Mečkina usluga na Mečkin kamen*. Puls 20.VIII.1993: 21–22.

Dragnich, Alex N. 1992. *Serbs And Croats: The Struggle In Yugoslavia*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace.

Džikov, Stavre 1990. *Vistinata za Prohor Pčinski*. Skopje: Nova Makedonija.

Friedman, Victor A. 1975. *Macedonian Language and Nationalism During the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*. Balkanistica 2.83–98.
———. 1985. "The Sociolinguistics of Literary Macedonian." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 52.31–57.
———. 1993. "The First Philological Conference for the Establishment of the Macedonian Alphabet and the Macedonian Literary Language: Its Precedents and Consequences." *The Earliest Stage of Language Planning: The "First Congress" Phenomenon*. Ed. by Joshua Fishman, 159–80. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
———. 1994. "Variation and Grammaticalization in the Development of Balkanisms." *CLS 30: Papers from the 30th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Volume 2: The Parasession on Variation in Linguistic Theory*, 101–115. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
Glenny, Misha. 1995. "The Birth of a Nation." (review of Poulton 1995). *The New York Review* 16 November.24–28.
Gołąb, Zbigniew. 1959. "Some Arumanian-Macedonian Isogrammatisms and the Social Background of Their Development." *Word* 15,3.415–35.
———. 1997. "The Ethnic Background and Internal Linguistic Mechanism of the So-Called Balkanization of Macedonian." *Balkanistica* 10.13–18.
Hall, Jonathan M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
Hamp, Eric. 1977. "On some Questions of Areal Linguistics." *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* 3.279–82.
Haugen, Einar. 1968. "The Scandinavian Languages as Cultural Artifacts." *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. Ed. by Joshua Fishman, Charles Ferguson and J. Das Gupta, 267–84. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
Human rights Watch/Helsinki. 1994. *The Macedonians of Greece*. New York: Human rights Watch.
Ilievski, Petar. 1997. "The Position of the Ancient Macedonian Language and the Modern Name Makedonski." *Balkanistika* 10.227–240.
Islami, Hivzi. 1994. *Rrjedha demografike shqiptare*. Pejë: Dukagjini.
Kofos, Evangelos. 1993. *Nationalism and Communism in Macedonia: Civil Conflict, Politics of Mutation, National Identity*. New Rochelle, NY: Caratzas.
Koneski, Blaže. 1967. *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturen jazik*. Skopje: Kultura.
———. 1994. "A Situation and a Personal Viewpoint." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 108.216–18.
Krle, Risto. 1940. *Milion mučenika*. MS.
———. 1972. *Izbor*. Skopje: Makedonska Kniga.
Lazarou, A. G. 1986. *L'Aroumain et ses rapports avec le grec*. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies.

Lunt, Horace. 1952. *A Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language*. Skopje: Državno knigoizdatelstvo.
———. 1972. "Review of Palmer and King (1971)." *Slavic and East European Journal* 16.132–33.
———. 1984. "Some Socio-Linguistic Aspects of Macedonian and Bulgarian." *Language and Literary Theory: In Honor of Ladislav Matejka*. (Papers in Slavic Philology 5.) Ed. by B. Stolz, I. Titunik, and L. Doležel, 83–132. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
Misirkov, Krste P. 1903. *Za makedonickite raboti*. Sofia: Liberalni klub. (Reprinted 1974, Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik, Posebni izdanija 8.)
Nihtinen, Atina. 1995. "Comments on Contradictions in the Life and Work of Kr. P. Misirkov." *Studia slavica Finlandensia* 12.96–103.
Palmer, S. and R. King. 1971. *Yugoslav Communism and the Macedonian Question*. Hamden: Archon.
Panov(ić), Anton. 1937–38. "Pečalbari." *Luč* 1.4:136–43, 1.5:198–204, 1.6–7:273–79, 2.3:102–106, 2.4:148–53.
Poulton, Hugh. 1995. *Who Are the Macedonians?* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Pulevski, Ǵorǵi. 1875. *Rečnik od tri jezika*. Belgrade: Državna štamparija. (Slavic section republished in Blaže Ristovski (ed.), 1974, Ǵorǵija M. Pulevski: Odbrani stranici, Skopje: Makedonska kniga.)
Risteski, Stojan 1988. *Sozdavanjeto na sovremeniot makedonski literaturen jazik*. Skopje: Studentski zbor.
Ristovski, Blaže. 1995. "Dezinformaciite na vlaškite lideri." *Nova Makedonija* 11.XI.1995, p. 14.
Rossos, Andrew. 1991. "The Macedonians of Aegean Macedonia: A British Officer's Report, 1944." *Slavic and East European Review* 69,2.282–309.
———. 1994. "The British Foreign Office and Macedonian National Identity 1918–41." *Slavic Review* 53.369–94
———. 1995. "Macedonianism and Macedonian Nationalism on the Left." *National Character and National Ideology in Interwar Eastern Europe*. Ed. by Ivo Banac and Katherine Verdery, pp. 219–254. New Haven: Yale Center for International and Area Studies.
———. 1997. "Incompatible Allies: Greek Communism and Macedonian Nationalism in the Civil War in Greece, 1943–49." *Journal of Modern History* 69.42–76
Skendi, Stavro 1980. *Balkan Cultural Studies*. (East European Monographs No. 72.) Boulder, CO.: East European Monographs.
Tanaskova, Fidanka. 1990. *Metodija Andonov Čento*. Skopje: Nova Makedonija.

Troebst, Stefan. 1994. "Yugoslav Macedonia, 1944–53: Building the Party, the State and the Nation." *Berliner Jahrbuch für osteuropäische Geschichte* 1994/2.103–39.
Upward, Allen. 1908. *The East End of Europe*. London: John Murray.
Vaillant, André 1938. "Le problème du slave macédonien." *Bulletin de la Société Linquistique de Paris* 39 fasc. 2 no. 116.194–210.
———. 1948. *Manuel de vieux slave*. Paris: Institut des Études Slaves.
———. 1950–77. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Paris: Langues du monde (vols. 1–2) Klincksieck (vols. 3–5).

Slavic Department
University of Chicago
1130 E. 59th St.
Chicago, IL 60637

Vfriedm@midway.uchicago.edu

Macedonian Evidence for Synchronic and Diachronic Parallelism in the Development of One Balkanism: The general relativizer *što*

Kim Gareiss

An Introduction to the Problem: Incongruous Linguistic Representations

The purpose of this paper is to discuss three sets of somewhat incongruous representations of linguistic reality in terms of each other in order to facilitate a more complete articulation of the sources of these incongruities. All three sets of apparently incongruous representations will be related to the distribution of relativizers in the non-prepositional restrictive relative (NRR) environment. The representations that will be presented reflect synchronic distribution, diachronic development and the definition of areal features.

Macedonian relativizers and their environments

What follows is a brief summary of the distribution of relativizers in Macedonian restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses.[1]

In a restrictive prepositional environment, *koj* is used.

(1) Toa e prvoto prašanje na koe može da se odgovori i so da i so ne, dolgo da se razmisluva vrz nego, da se osuduva i da se potkrepuva. (Popovski: 7)

'This is the first question that can be answered both with yes and no, pondered for a long time, judged and to substantiated.'

[1] In this paper, I follow James McCawley's guidelines (McCawley: 1988, 367-445) for defining restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses. Clauses referred to as restrictive correspond to Liljana Minova-Ǵurkova's individualizing and qualifying restrictive categories. Some clauses that I refer to as restrictive may fall into Minova-Ǵurkova's category of nonrestrictive. For example, the following sentence, which is labelled nonrestrictive by Minova-Ǵurkova, will be labelled as restrictive for the purposes of this paper.

Baram interesna i dobra kniga, koja ḱe odgovara za vozrasta na moeto dete.
'I aḿ looking for an interesting and good book, which will suit my child's age.' (Minova-Ǵurkova 1997:318)

The implications of this classification may indicate that remnants of the association of *koj* with indefinite antecedents in the NRR environment persist even in the West Central dialects, upon which the standard language is