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Editor's Preface

The Kenneth E. Naylor Professorship of South Slavic Linguistics was created officially on November 5, 1993 through gifts to The Ohio State University from the estate of my good friend and long-time colleague Ken Naylor, after his tragic death on March 10, 1992. Ken's death brought an untimely end to a productive life, but his scholarly legacy, with its focus on the languages of the Balkans, but especially the South Slavic languages, lives on through this professorship and all activities associated with it. A brief biography of Ken is included on page vi of this publication.

It was my great honor to be named in January 1997 as the first Naylor Professor, and to thus carry on Ken's interest in South Slavic. To that end, one of my first acts was the establishment of an annual lecture series in his memory that would bring a leading scholar in Balkan and South Slavic linguistics to campus each spring for a public lecture and extended visit.

The first Naylor Lecturer was Victor A. Friedman, Professor and Chair of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Chicago, a major figure in the field who has contributed much over the years to our understanding of the Balkan and South Slavic languages on their own and in their relation to one another, and who happens as well to have been a dear friend of Ken's. Some biographical notes on Victor appear on page vii herein. The lecture took place on May 28, 1998, with a substantial audience on hand as he spoke on the subject of "Linguistic Emblems and Emblematic Languages: On Language as Flag in the Balkans", a topic that Ken himself was especially interested in and was working on at the time of his death.

Given the success of the lecture, it seemed reasonable to think in terms of making it public beyond the reaches of the audience on that day, and so the plan emerged to publish the lecture as a booklet. Thus was born the Kenneth E. Naylor Memorial Lecture Series in South Slavic Linguistics, of which the present document constitutes the first number. We anticipate publishing the lectures annually as separate, and every five years or so bringing out a single volume gathering together the individual fascicles that appeared in the preceding years.

The rich scholarship evident in this lecture is a fitting tribute to Ken Naylor's memory, and to the intellectual legacy he left at The Ohio State University. We here, together with others around the country and around the world, miss Ken, but we also take heart in his act of generosity in the name of South Slavic scholarship, and are pleased to be able to honor him through this lecture series.

Columbus, Ohio

March 1999
Kenneth E. Naylor, Jr.

Kenneth E. Naylor, Jr., was born on February 27, 1937 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He received his B.A. in French Linguistics from Cornell University in 1958 and his M.A. in General Linguistics from Indiana University in 1960. At Indiana, he began to study Slavic with Professor Edward Stankiewicz, who became a personal friend and mentor. When Professor Stankiewicz moved to the University of Chicago, Ken went with him. There he received his doctorate in Russian and South Slavic Linguistics in 1966. He was an assistant professor at the University of Pittsburgh from 1964 to 1966, and began teaching Slavic linguistics at The Ohio State University in 1966. At the time of his death in 1992, he was the Acting Director of the Center for Slavic and East European Studies at Ohio State.

Kenneth Naylor was the recipient of numerous awards, grants, and fellowships from many sources, including the American Council of Learned Studies, the Fulbright program, and the countries of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, from which he was awarded medals of honor (the Jubilee Medal and the Order of the Yugoslav Flag with Golden Wreath, respectively). In 1990, he testified before the U.S. House of Representatives, Foreign Affairs Committee, on ethnic rivalry in Yugoslavia and the development of the Serbo-Croatian language.

His research centered on the Serbo-Croatian language and on South Slavic languages in general, but especially in their Balkan context. He served as editor of the journals Balkanistica, Folia Slavica, and The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies. The overwhelming majority of his 100-plus articles, reviews, and edited works focused on Serbo-Croatian and Balkan linguistics. His dedication and many accomplishments live on in his work and in the love of the field he instilled in his students and his colleagues.

Victor A. Friedman

Victor A. Friedman was born in Chicago in 1949 and received his B.A. in Russian Language and Literature from Reed College in 1970. His Ph.D. in both Slavic Languages and Literatures and General Linguistics from the University of Chicago in 1975 was the first dual degree granted in the Divisions at Chicago. His dissertation on the Macedonian verb won the Galler Prize for the Humanities Division.

He taught in the Department of Slavic Languages at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, from 1975 to 1993, when he moved to the University of Chicago. He is currently Professor and Chairman in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures with a joint appointment in Linguistics and an associate appointment in Anthropology.

Victor has over 200 publications and has received more than 40 academic awards and honors. His book, The Grammatical Categories of the Macedonian Indicative, was the first book on Modern Macedonian published in the United States. He is president of the U.S. Committee of the International Association for Southeast European Studies, and vice-president of the U.S. Committee of the International Committee of Slavists.

In 1982, he received the “1300 Years of Bulgaria” jubilee medal for contributions to the field of Bulgarian studies and in 1991 he received the University of Skopje Gold Plaque Award for contributions to the field of Macedonian studies. In 1994, he became the second U.S.-born American citizen elected to the Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences.

He has also worked as a Policy and Political Analyst for the United Nations, advised the Council on Foreign Relations, and lectured at the U.S. Department of State and the National Security Agency. His research centers on grammatical categories, language contact, and sociolinguistics in the Balkans and the Caucasus.
LINGUISTIC EMBLEMS AND EMBLEMATIC LANGUAGES:
On Language as Flag in the Balkans

Victor A. Friedman
University of Chicago

My dear friend the late Kenneth E. Naylor began his scholarly publishing career with the study of grammar and dialects, particularly of Serbo-Croatian (Naylor 1966a, 1966b). Like him, I too began my academic career with the study of the structure of a South Slavic language, and I published an article analyzing the Macedonian preterit in the same journal as one of Ken’s first two refereed articles, but ten years later (Friedman 1976). However, as happens to so many of us for whom the study of language is the study of a vehicle of human communication that is embedded in a cultural matrix, both Ken and I found ourselves broadening our academic horizons beyond questions of prosody and declension, conjugation and morpho-syntax. Ken’s first publication on questions of linguistic history and the relationship of language to identity came out a year before my first such effort (Naylor 1974, Friedman 1975), and mine was actually edited by Ken, since he was the general editor of the journal *Balkanistica* at that time. (It could be argued that Naylor 1973 has definitive sociolinguistic implications; however, in that article Ken was explicitly attempting to frame the question in strictly structural terms.) In fact, it was Ken who was responsible for my first engaging the question of the relationship of Macedonian language to identity. Ken’s life ended too soon (on 10 March 1992), and he died as the Yugoslavia he so loved and that had honored him as he deserved, was also in its death throes. ¹ Ken did not give in to illness but kept on working until shortly before he passed away. (He gave a paper at the 1991 meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages less than three months before his death.) While he never abandoned the pure study of linguistic structure (e.g. Naylor 1994) his last proposed research project, entitled “Language as Flag,” was to be a study of post-War Two developments in language and identity in what was then not yet former Yugoslavia. Ken and I have both published extensively on Southeast European sociolinguistics (e.g., Naylor 1975, 1976, 1978, 1980a, 1980b, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1984-85, 1988, 1990a, 1990b, 1990c, 1991, 1992, 1996; Friedman 1985a, 1985b, 1986, 1989, 1993a, 1993b, 1995a, 1995b, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 1998a, 1998b). And so, in this lecture dedicated to Kenneth E. Naylor’s memory, I shall examine both historical aspects of and current developments in the symbolic function of language in identity formation in Southeastern Europe, with particular emphasis on Albanian, Macedonian, and the former Serbo-Croatian, whose fates provide instructive parallels and contrasts.²

The use of language as a source of identity and identification is attested at least as far back as biblical times. In Judges 12:5-6 (King James version) we read: “And the Gileadites took the fords of the Jordan against the Ephraimites, and it was so, that when any of the fugitives of Ephraim said: ‘Let me go over,’ the men of Gilead said unto him: ‘Art thou an Ephraimite?’ If he said: ‘Nay’; [6] then said they unto him: ‘Say now

¹ Ken was awarded the Orden Jugoslovenske zastave za zlatim vencem ‘Order of the Yugoslav Flag with Golden Wreath’ for distinguished contributions to the study of the Serbo-Croatian language and Yugoslav literatures and the development of cultural ties between Yugoslavia and the United States by the Presidency of the SFR of Yugoslavia on 8 December 1988.

² The differentiation of Slovenian and Croatian, while part of the overall history of South Slavic literary developments is beyond the scope of our current focus. (See Stankiewicz 1980, Lenček 1982, and Greenberg 1987 for good treatments of this subject.)
shibboleth; and he said ‘Sibboleth’; for he could not frame to pronounce it right; then they laid hold on him and slew him at the fords of the Jordan, and there fell at that time of Ephraim forty and two thousand.” Several millennia later, similar albeit less ferocious scenes were being enacted in Albania during the anarchy of March 1997. The major dialectal (and ethnic) division in Albanian is between Geg of the north and Tosk of the south, and during this period there was a definite sense of the rebellious south against the loyal or at least less rebellious north, despite the insistence of some Albanian commentators that the conflict was political, not ethnic. Thus, for example, there were roadblocks in the south at which armed bands stopped cars and demanded: “孚� шип!” “Speak Albanian!” the implication being that the rebels intended to determine loyalty on the basis of geographic origin, which in turn could be determined from the speaker’s dialect. It is one of the ironies of the Yugoslav Wars of Succession that while dialects of the former Serbo-Croatian are regionally clearly differentiated, they do not follow ethnic lines to any structurally significant degree (Greenberg 1996, 1998a). These are points to which I shall return, but I shall begin my discussion with some accounts of unity rather than diversity, starting — since history is so often invoked in these discussions — with the early middle ages, when the Slavs arrived in the Balkans.

At the time of the Slavic invasions of the Balkan peninsula (ca. 550-ca. 630 CE, cf. Fine 1983:25-73), the various Slavic speaking tribes did not have the type of modern national identities sometimes projected back onto them in modern works (e.g. Franolić 1983, cf. also Banac 1984:189; see Fine 1983:33-37, 45-59 for an objective account), and in fact it is quite clear that during the early middle ages, despite tribal and territorial divisions, they thought of themselves as Slavs and of their language as an entity we can call Slavic (or Slavonic). Thus, for example, in the Vita of Methodius, referring to events in the ninth century (although our manuscript is three or four centuries later), Rostišlav and Svtopluk of Moravia refer to themselves and their people as “my Slovène,” we ‘Slavs’ and the Byzantine Emperor Michael says to Constantin the Philosopher: “...Solunianí visi čisto slovenški besedoufjati.” “...the Thessalonians all speak pure Slavic.” (Kantor and White 1976:74). Indeed, had the Slavs not spoken essentially the same language during this period (although, to be sure, we know that some dialectal differentiation had already taken place), the mission of Constantine (Cyril) and Methodius could hardly have succeeded nor would their language have been accepted throughout the Slavic Balkans (cf. Fine 1983:49-59). But when the Slavs arrived in the Balkans, they did not enter uninhabited territory. On the contrary, they must have been in intimate connect with speakers of many languages, the most significant of which were Greek, Balkan Latin (later Balkan Romance) and pre-Albanian (Golub 1997, Hamp 1994a). Our documentation does not allow us to trace the exact progress of mutual influence, but by the time the peoples of Southeastern Europe attract the attention of Western and their own intellectuals in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, a unique linguistic situation had developed.

Although the situation as it existed at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries was itself the result of earlier events, nonetheless this period can be identified as crucial for subsequent ethnopolitical and sociolinguistic developments and, at the same time, as the beginning of modern historical linguistics as we know it. During the preceding four or five centuries, much of Southeastern Europe had been part of a single state — the Ottoman Empire — and most of the rest was subject to Austria-Hungary in one form or another. As nation-states and national identities emerged in the context of the declining Ottoman Empire and the expanding Austro-Hungarian one, language rose to compete with religion as the determinant of identity.

In his Third Discourse on the Hindus, William Jones (1786) suggested for the first time that the phonological and grammatical similarities between Sanskrit on the one hand and Greek and Latin on the other exhibited such regularities that one might hypothesize their descent from a common ancestor, which perhaps might no longer be spoken. Although it would be a while before scholars realized that there is no such thing as a human language that remains completely unchanged over time, Jones’ idea was the beginning of the search for so-called genetic relationships among languages, demonstrable above all by regularity of sound correspondences in semantically related grammatical and lexical units. It was this search for genetic connections among living and dead languages, i.e. the elaboration of the concept of the linguistic family, that dominated much of linguistics during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Although the Slovene linguist and Imperial Austrian censor J. Kopitar (1829:86) hinted at a different model of linguistic relationships when he wrote that Albanian, Balkan Slavic, and Balkan Romance gave the impression that: ‘‘...nur eine Sprachform herrscht, aber mit dreierlei Sprachmaterie...’’ “only one grammar holds sway, but with three...”

3 Although frequently glossed ‘ear of corn’ (Gen 41:5), the more likely meaning is ‘flood of a stream’ (Ps. 69:3).
4 The traditional dividing line is the rive Shkumbi, which runs through Elbasan in the center of the country, but this division extends beyond the borders of Albania. The dialects of Montenegro, Kosovo, and most of Macedonia (from Struga northward) are Geg (as is the village of Arbanasi, near Zadar in Croatia), whereas those of the southwestern corner of Macedonia, Greece, and enclaves in Italy and from the diaspora of the Ottoman period (villages in Bulgaria, Turkey, Ukraine, etc.) are Tosk. The political history of Albania reflects a kind of Geg-Tosk tug-of-war. The first government of post-World War One Albania was headed by a Geg, Ahmed Zogu, who was ousted by a Tosk, Fan Noli, who in turn was driven from power by Zogu, who became king Zog I in 1928 and remained in power until the Italian invasion of 1939. (There was, however, a rebellion in the south in 1937). During World War Two the communist partisans of Albania were mostly Tosks while the right-wing nationalist Balli Kombetar ‘national front’ was mostly Geg (cf. Blumi 1998:563). Albania’s long-time post-war communist dictator, Enver Hoxha, was from Gjirokaster, southwest of Kërçë in the Labin region of the south, (although his ill-fated successor, Ramiz Alija, was from Shkodër in the north). The first post-communist president, Sali Berisha, is from the north and his successor, Fatos Nano, is a southerner. See Byron (1976b:74) on the origins of Albania’s leaders during the communist period; cf. also Blumi (1998).
6 Larisa N. Kaminetskaja, University of St. Petersburg, personal communication. See also Greenberg (1996) for similar stories about other languages.
icons’, nonetheless, it was not until Trubetzkoy (1923, 1928) that a model different from genetic one was given scientific formulation. Trubetzkoy proposed a model for sifting linguistic relationships that we now call the areal model. It was based not on nmon descent, but rather on the fact that languages in contact with one another can exert tactual influences resulting in similarities due to structural borrowing. He distinguished se two types of relationships as *jazykovoe semessto*, Sprachfamilie ‘language family’ or jazykovoj sojuz, Sprachbund ‘linguistic league, linguistic union’. He took as his prime mple Bulgarian, which by its genetic relationship is a member of the Slavic language ily, but in its radical restructuring of its morphosyntactic system is a member of the lan linguistic league, sharing more with the non-Slavic languages of the Balkans than h the Slavic languages outside the Balkans. Table One (see Friedman 1985c) gives an mple of the type of parallel structures taken as typical of the Balkan linguistic league. of the languages in question are descended from earlier stages with infinitives and other tructions that over time have merged into entirely parallel structures using native modal ticles. This is only one typical instance of types of grammatical convergences—often led Balkanisms—that characterize the Balkan Sprachbund. Just as in Kopitar’s nulation, the grammar (i.e. morphosyntax) in each language is the same, but the lexical erial is not:

| Albanian | të shkojmë | dua | të | shkuarj |
| Greek | ná párne | thélō | ná | gráfō |
| BALKAN SLAVIC | | | | |
| Bulgarian | da trúgnum | iskam | da | piša |
| Macedonian | da odlime | sakam | da | pišuvam |
| Torlak Serbian | da idemo | oču | da | pišem |
| BALKAN ROMANCE | | | | |
| Romanian | să mergem | vreau | să | scriu |
| Aromanian (Kruševo) | s- neddzimă | voi | si | scriu |
| Romani | te dzăs | mangav te | hramonav |
| English | ‘let us go if we go’ | | ‘I want to write’ |

Table One

**Optative-Subjunctive particle replaces infinitival and other structures in the Balkan Languages**

Such, then was the linguistic environment in the Balkans at the beginning of the nineteenth century, i.e. a multilingual setting in which the various peoples could speak one another’s languages and had been doing so for centuries, a result of which was grammatical convergence but the preservation of lexical distinctness (cf. Friedman 1995a, 1997c). At this time, the primary source of identity in the two empires that controlled the Balkan peninsula, i.e. the Habsburg (Austria-Hungary) and the Ottoman (Turkey), was religion. Thus, for example, one’s tax status in Ottoman Turkey was determined by whether one was a Muslim (beraya) or a non-Muslim (re’a). The overwhelming majority of the population in much of Southeastern Europe and European Ottoman Turkey in particular consisted of Eastern Orthodox (which for the most part meant Greek Orthodox) Christians. Moreover, nationality in Ottoman Turkey at this time was defined by millet, which could be glossed either as ‘nation’ or as ‘religiously defined community’. Thus, for example, the label Turk in this context did not necessarily mean ‘speaker of Turkish’ but rather ‘Muslim’, i.e. adherent of the state religion of the Turkish Empire, viz. Islam.

---

15In Balkan Turkish, the equivalent expression would be cidem and isteym cidem using the optative. In the second case, the replacement of the Standard Turkish infinitive (gümelek) with an optative clause is a Balkan calque. Like Romani, Balkan Turkish (and Judezmo) have not received adequate attention in Balkan linguistics (see, e.g. Friedman 1982, 1986b, also Joseph 1983:252-53).

16See Verdeny (1983:84-86) on a similar situation in Transylvania where language, class, and religion tended to fragment along the following lines: Hungarian-speaking Catholic and Calvinist landowners, German-speaking Lutheran bourgeoisie, and Romanian-speaking Orthodox peasants.

17Armenian Christians were separate, as were Jews. There were also some Catholics, mostly Slavs and Geg Albanians. Roms (Gypsies) were generally Muslim in Turkey, although some were Eastern Orthodox. They were discriminated against, as attested by Eviya Celebi in the seventeenth century: “The Roman Gypsies celebrated Easter with the Christians, the Festival of Sacrifice with the Muslims, and Passover with the Jews. They did not accept any one religion, and therefore our imams refused to conduct funeral services for them but gave them a special cemetery outside Egri Qapi. It is because they are such renegades that they were ordered to pay an additional xarăc (tax for non-Muslims). That is why a double xarăc is exacted from the Gypsies. In fact, according to Sultan Mehmed’s census stipulation (tabrîl), xarăc is even exacted from the dead souls of the Gypsies, until live ones are found to replace them.” (Friedman and Dankoff 1991:4).

18It should be noted, however, that people were not unaware of the distinction between language and religion. We have records of nineteenth-century jokes whose point is that Slavic-speaking Muslims
Likewise, the label Greek did not necessarily refer to a speaker of Greek but rather to a Greek Orthodox Christian. National labels and the identities associated with them today were not yet established in their current meanings at the beginning of the previous century. The Greek-speakers of this period called themselves romanós ‘Roman’ (in Turkish Rum), since they looked to Byzantium, the heir of the Roman Empire, as their source of cultural and religious identity. They viewed the ancient Hellenes as pagan and something of an embarrassment (Lunt 1984b), an attitude that changed significantly in the nineteenth century (see, e.g., Herzfeld 1987 and Kazazis 1981).

During this same period, the term Illyrians was used to refer to the South Slavs (see Iovine 1987). This was connected with the fact that it was not until the end of the eighteenth century that Western Europe began to view Southeastern Europe in contemporary terms rather than in terms of the classical world (cf. Wilkinson 1951:3-10). This is reflected in Western maps from this period, where classical (Greek and Latin) toponyms for Southeastern Europe persisted into the eighteenth century. It was not until the West began to take an interest in Turkey in Europe (as most of the Balkans was known until the latter part of the nineteenth century, cf. Todorova 1997:27), that maps with toponyms in local languages began to appear. In addition to Christianity and Islam as sources of identity, there was an important differentiation within Christianity, viz., that between Catholic and Orthodox.\(^{20}\) This has different ramifications for Slavs and for Albanians. Among the Southern West South Slavs,\(^{21}\) there was essentially an identity of Serb (Srb) with Orthodox Christianity on the one hand and Croat (Hrvat) with Catholicism on the other, and in some areas the ethnic and religious designations are used interchangeably (Jambrešić 1995), but this is not always the case.\(^{22}\)

called themselves Turks but did not speak Turkish (Cepenkov 1972:132-34). The use of Turk to mean ‘Muslim’ was resurrected during the Yugoslav Wars of Succession for Bosnians. While the derogatory terms for Serbs and Croats were revived from World War Two, viz., četnik for Serb and ustase for Croat (the former referred to anti-Croat royalists, the latter to supporters of the Croatian fascist puppet state set up by the Nazis, and both were used during the post-War period to mean ‘collaborator with the enemy’), the parallel term for Bosnian was Turčin ‘Turk’, a reference to the so-called Turkish Yoke rather than World War Two.

While Illyrian was being used for the Slavic inhabitants of the region known in ancient times as Illyricum (much of which became Yugoslavia), Epître was used for the language of the Albanian-speaking inhabitants of the region that had included ancient Epirus (part of which became Albania). Although Albanian is descended from an ancient Indo-European language of the Balkans, the assumption that it is descended from ancient Illyrian (since ancient Illyricum included part of modern Albania) and even the assumption that the isolated items grouped together as Illyrian come from a single language are problematic due to the paucity of evidence (see Hamp 1994a, 1994b, Mallory and Adams 1978:11, 287-89).

In the Habsburg Empire, Protestantism was also an important factor (see Verder 1982:84-86; cf. also note 16), and Islam itself was by no means unified, the Ottoman Sunni majority being opposed to various Shi’i and other heterodox minorities (cf. Franckel 1993). In the Balkans, Bektashism was especially important, and even entered into Balkan Jewish history (see Schom 1971:150-51). These matters are beyond the scope of this lecture, however, and in any case did not enter into the types of national development on which we are focusing here.

The South Slavic languages are traditionally divided on the basis of the earliest linguistic and historical differentiation into West South Slavic (Slovenian and the former Serbo-Croatian) and East South Slavic (Macedonian and Bulgarian). Within West South Slavic, the linguistic territory of the former Serbo-Croatian can be identified as Southern West South Slavic.

Thus, for example, the Bunjevci of Vojvodina are Catholic but not necessarily identified as Croatian, and in the nineteenth century Catholics in, e.g., Slavonia, did not use the ethnonyms Hrvat and referred to their language as slavonski or slokački. (This latter is now a pejorative term for Croat. On the Bunjevci, cf. OMRI Daily Digest, No. 198, Part II, 11 October 1996; cf. also Ivč 1971:175-76, 183.)

For the Albanians, who were predominantly Muslim by the sixteenth century, Catholicism was associated with the Gegg of northern Albania and Orthodoxy with the Tosks of the south.\(^{23}\) Among the Orthodox Montenegrins, who belonged to the Serbian church, Catholicism was known as arbanaska vjera ‘the Albanian faith’, an indication of the strength of Catholicism among the Gegg-speaking Albanians in the northern mountains. As was the case among the Southern West South Slavs, so, too, among speakers of Albanian, religion played a divisive role (cf. Skendi 1967:12-13, 366-80, Blumenz 1959). While many Muslim Albanian-speakers identified as Turks, many Orthodox Albanian-speakers identified as Greek, and in fact Albanian-speaking Greek Orthodox Christians were among the leading figures in the Greek national movement (e.g., Grillo 1985).\(^{24}\) The Catholics of the north came under the influence of Italy and Austria-Hungary. In fact, the earliest Albanian-language literary activity took place in Italy, whether thousands of Tosk-speaking Christians had fled in the fourteenth century to escape the Ottoman conquest.\(^{25}\)

The difference between Catholicism and Orthodoxy was also significant for the Habsburg Empire to the north. In 1690, when a victorious Habsburg army under general Piccolomini pursued the Ottoman Turks (who had been defeated at Vienna in 1683 and lost Belgrade in 1689) into Southern Serbia, Kosovo, and northern Macedonia, the local Christian population (mostly Orthodox Slavs and Catholic Albanians) was encouraged to rise in rebellion. Piccolomini died of the plague in Prizen, however, and Louis XIV was threatening the western border of the Habsburg Empire. As a result, the Habsburg Emperor Leopold I withdrew his troops from the Balkans (according to other accounts the new Grand Vizier Mustafa Köprüli drove them out), leaving the Christians to be slaughtered by the regrouped Turks. The Albanians changed sides and were spared, although this was the beginning of their forced conversion to Islam. Much of the Serbian population, however, followed the Patriarch of Peć, Arsenije III Crnojević, into what was then Hungary (for the most part, modern day Vojvodina), where they settled with special guarantees that they would be allowed to retain and practice Orthodoxy.\(^{26}\) This in turn translated into linguistic rights, which resulted in the development of Slaveno-Serbian, a literary language based on Russian Church Slavonic with Serbian elements. (The relationship of Church Slavonic to the modern Slavic vernaculars can be compared to that of Medieval Latin to the modern Romance languages.) On that same territory, however, during World War Two and subsequently, Bosniacs were referred to in some Croatian books as ‘Croats of the Muslim faith’ (see Okuška 1990:86 for references). In 1849 Vuk Karadžić advanced the argument that all speakers of Štokavian dialects (see below) were Serbs and therefore one could speak of Catholic Serbs, e.g. in Dubrovnik, and Muslim Serbs in Bosnia-Hercegovina and the Sandžak, etc. (or Srbi rimskoga i turskoga zakona ‘Serbs of the Roman and Turkish custom’). According to this view, only Čakavian (or Čakavčan and Kajkavian) speakers were Croats, a thesis that was quite displeasing to Croatian intellectuals (Karadžić 1849; cf. Ivč 1971:182-83). See Jelavic (1990) on the development of national ideas among Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes via educational systems.

According to Aleksandar Stojimirov, Professor of Geography at the University of Skopje (personal communication 1994), the villages of Brven and Brodec in the Gostivar region of northwestern Macedonia are (Geg) Albanian-speaking but Macedonian Orthodox in religion. These villagers consider themselves ethnic Macedonians. This is another instance of religion taking precedence over language in national identity.

We are leaving to one side the differences between the Tosk dialects of modern Albania and contiguous regions and those of Italy (Aberish) and of central and southern Greece (Arvanitika). Although separated from the main bulk of Albanian dialects for six to eight centuries and thus linguistically quite divergent, they are close enough for some degree of intercommunication.

In Italy, these Orthodox Christians accepted Uniatism.

\(^{23}\) See von Kohl and Libal (1997:14-19) for a balanced overview of the demography of Kosovo from the late middle ages to the beginning of the twentieth century.
Southern West South Slavic-speaking Catholics (i.e., Croats), did not have the same language rights. Meanwhile, Hungary itself was in a subordinate position vis-à-vis Austria, so that Croatian was under pressure from Hungarian, which in turn was under pressure from German (and, until 1848 Latin). Thus, in Austria-Hungary there were privileged Serbs and disadvantaged Croats, while in Ottoman Turkey there were Serbs, Croats, and Slavic-speaking Muslims (mostly in Bosnia-Hercegovina and the Sandžak of Novi Pazar [a district now divided between Montenegro and Serbia]), who, like other Muslims were called Turks, all speaking various Southern West South Slavic dialects.

The course of the nineteenth century saw the creation of new independent nation-states on former Ottoman territory. The rise of the new nation-states was accompanied by the development of literary languages to serve as vehicles of power and hegemony in the new states. In the case of the Serbs and the Croats, there were individual strivings, especially on the part of Croatian intellectuals, to create a modern-day literary language. Serbian intellectuals tended to be dominated by the Slaveno-Serbian tradition that had developed in Vojvodina, but it was the Ottoman-born Serb Vuk Karadžić who, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, conceived the (for that time and place) revolutionary idea of a literary language based on the vernacular. It is important to realize that although South Slavic linguistic territory consists of a continuum along which any given dialect is mutually intelligible with contiguous dialects, there are regions on this territory where salient isoglosses (boundaries indicating the territory of individual linguistic features, e.g., the presence of a definite article or the merger of the two Common Slavic short high vowels in to a single, lower vowel) occur with greater or lesser frequency, thus increasing or decreasing the rapidity with which mutual intelligibility becomes more difficult. Map Two, based on Ivić (1958:31-32) with some additions of my own, illustrates some of the most salient phonological and morphological isoglosses on South Slavic territory.

27The majority of Slovenes lived in Austrian territory, while Slavonia and Croatia proper (the region between Slavonia and Dalmatia) were part of Hungarian Crown Lands (see Jelavich 1983:314).
29Montenegro (1799), Serbia (1804-29), Greece (1821-32), Romania (1829-58), Bulgaria (1878-85). The territories of all these states was considerably smaller than today. Bessarabia was detached from Moldavia and ceded to Turkey in 1812. Albania declared independence in 1912.
30There were, of course, earlier literary traditions, such as those of Medieval Serbia or Renaissance Dubrovnik, but political and cultural subjugation and division — among the South Slavs as among many other peoples of both Eastern and Western Europe — did not allow for the direct continuity of such traditions into vernacular-based modern standard languages.

MAP TWO
A Selection of Salient Phonological and Morphological Isoglosses on South Slavic Territory
All features are found north or west of the isogloss. The territory outlined is that of former Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, although South Slavic dialects extend beyond these political frontiers.

Phonological Features
1. *zq* > z (or č)
2. *d>d* > š (or ě)
3. *sk*, *st* do not merge with š or ř
4. še > e in present of 'can' (more)
5. vocalic quantity is preserved
6. jers (Common Slavic short high vowels) fall together
7. *i* does not merge with *sk*, *st*
8. reflex of é is not broader than e
9. stress is not fixed

Morphological Features
A. Dual preserved
B. Use of interrogative kaj
C. The extension -ov- does not spread to most masculine monosyllables
D. The 1 pl. 2pl. pronominal clitics mi, vi (or ne, ve) are lacking
E. Synthetic declension
F. Absence of postposed definite article
G. 1 pl. pres. -mo (not -me, -m)
H. 1 pl. nom. pronoun mi, mie (not nie, etc.)
I. 3 pl. possessive pronoun based on njih- (not tēha-)
As can be seen from Map Two, Slovenia and Eastern Bulgaria represent relatively uniform areas in terms of the features in question. Southern West South Slavic territory is divided by only a few major isoglosses. The two regions where there is significant bundling are Croatia proper (the region between Dalmatia and Slavonia) and Šopluk (the region around the modern Serbo-Bulgarian political border and adjacent northeastern Macedonia). Zagreb, the center of Croatian intellectual activity, is in one of the areas of significant dialectal diversity. Southern West South Slavic territory can be divided in three major dialectal areas, named for the respective words meaning ‘what’: Štokavian, Kajkavian, and Čakavian. Within each of these regions, there are various subdivisions, but the most salient is the division of Štokavian into three areas based on the reflex of Common Slavic Chiến (ča), viz. ekavian, ikavian, and (i)jekavian, as illustrated by the following phrase meaning ‘beautiful summer’: lepo leto, lipo lito, ljepo ljeto. The majority of Croats, and all Serbs (and Southern West South Slavic-speaking Muslims) spoke Štokavian dialects, whereas Kajkavian and Čakavian dialects were spoken only by Croats. These divisions are represented very schematically in Map Three.

31 According to the last outline of Serbo-Croatian dialectology (Brozović and Ivić 1988:70-71), Čakavian and Kajkavian each have six major divisions and Štokavian has twelve. Salient classificatory criteria include prosodic features such as tone, length, and stress (both presence/absence and places of occurrence) and other phonological and morphological developments. Although the terms jekavian and ijekavian can be used to refer to dialects with slightly different developments (e.g., bjela bjelina vs bijela bjelina ‘white bleached linen’), these are subtypes and need not be distinguished here.

MAP THREE
Schematic Map of the distribution of Principal Slavic Languages and Dialects in Former Yugoslavia.

1. Minor islands and subdivisions based on accentual and other features are not indicated.
2. Republic boundaries are also shown. In most cases they do not coincide with dialectal divisions.
3. Subdivisions of officially recognized provinces and entities are not shown.
4. Slovenian and Macedonian are languages associated with republics that became independent countries. Čakavian and Kajkavian are Croatian Dialects.
5. The Štokavian-iękan dialects are the basis of Neo-Croatian, Bosnian, the Croatian-Serbian (or Western) variant of the former Serbo-Croatian, and the Serbian standard of Montenegro and Republika Srpska (one of the two entities of the Bosnian federation). The Štokavian-Ękan dialects are the basis of the Serbian standard of Serbia and the Serbo-Croatian (or Eastern) variant of the former Serbo-Croatian.
5. [Provisions for a common Serbo-Croatian dictionary, initiated by Matica Srpska and joined by Matica Hrvatska.]  
6. [Provisions for creating common technical terminology.]  
7. A common language should also have a common orthography. [Provisions for creating a common orthography.]  
8. It is necessary to put a stop to the placing of artificial impediments to the natural and normal development of the Croato-Serbian literary language. It is necessary to prevent the damaging phenomenon of arbitrary “translations” of texts and to honor the original text of the writer.  
9. A commission for orthography and terminology is to be arranged by our three universities (in Belgrade, Zagreb, Sarajevo), two academies (in Zagreb and Belgrade), and Matica Srpska in Novi Sad and Matica Hrvatska in Zagreb. [Other appropriate experts are also to be consulted.]  
10. Matica Srpska will deliver these resolutions to the Federal Executive Council, the executive councils of PR Serbia, PR Croatia, PR Bosnia and Hercegovina, and PR Montenegro, the Universities of Belgrade, Zagreb, and Sarajevo, the Academies in Zagreb and Belgrade and Matica Hrvatska in Zagreb, and will publish them in daily newspapers and journals.  

The common orthography of point seven was published by the Matica Srpska and Matica Hrvatska in 1960.  

This agreement, however, was repudiated by a group of Croatian intellectuals beginning with a resolution of the Zagreb Linguistic Circle in 1966 concerning the independent development of Croato-Serbian (Pavletić 1969:195-96), followed by the March 1967 “Declaration of the Name of the Croatian Literary Language” explicitly rejecting both the Vienna and Novi Sad agreements (cf. Naylor 1980:83), the collapse in 1969 of the joint dictionary project specified in point five of the Novi Sad Agreement, and culminating with the publication in 1971 of a Croatian Orthography that was banned the year it appeared (see Franolić 1980:119).  

The Vienna Literary Agreement remains a kind of touchstone among Serbian and Croation intellectuals concerning attitudes towards the elaboration of Serbian, Croatian, or Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian. Thus, for example, if the Vienna Literary Agreement is  

---

32 Matica is a kind of patriotic-intellectual organization.  
33 See Greenberg (1996:402-404) for additional details. Matica Srpska and Matica Hrvatska collaborated on the joint dictionary (Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika and Rečnik hrvatskopoljskog književnog jezika, respectively) to the letter O, but only the first two volumes, to the letter K, were eventually published by both organizations, each in its respective home city (Novi Sad and Zagreb, 1967). This publication provoked immediate criticism from Croatian intellectuals (see Babić, S., R. Katić, and T. Ladan 1969 for references). The third volume was published in 1969 by Matica Srpska (Novi Sad) with the imprint of both Matica Srpska and Matica Hrvatska, but Matica Hrvatska never published its corresponding third volume. That same year, two special issues of the Zagreb journal Kritika (Pavletić 1969, Brozović 1969) were devoted entirely to criticizing the first two volumes of the Matica Hrvatska edition of the joint dictionary and essentially repudiating the Novi Sad agreement. Croatian intellectuals argued that their language had been subordinated and marginalized by the Serbs, that many distinct Croatian words had simply been left out, etc. It is significant that immediately after the tide page, Pavletić (1969) reproceses the Decision concerning the publication of decisions and proclamations of the Anti-Fascist Assembly for the Liberation of Yugoslavia (AVNOJ: 15 January 1944) and the Decision concerning the Official Register of the Democratic Federalist Republic of Yugoslavia (1 February 1945), both of which specify that the languages used are to be “the Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, and Macedonian languages.”
invested with great significance (e.g. “The modern common Serbo-Croatian literary language can be considered to date from the signing of the Književni dogovor in Vienna in March 1850.” Naylor 1980:78), then the writer favors a unified Serbo-Croatian/Croatoserbian literary language. If, however, the significance of the Vienna Literary Agreement is belittled by arguments such as the fact that it was signed by a small number of people (two Serbs [V. Karadžić and D. Damšić], five Croats [I. Kukuljević, I. Mažuranić, D. Demeter, V. Pacel, S. Pejković], and a Slovene [F. Miklošić]), that it was not authorized by any state formation, that it did not have any immediate results (e.g., Vuk’s standard and its orthography was not officially introduced into Serbian schools until 1868), that the unified language was not actually given a name, etc. (e.g. Banac 1984:231, Franolić 1980:31, Katić 1984:289-90), the writer is arguing for a separate Croatian literary language, and moreover is presenting attempts at unitarism as aberrations rather than mainstream developments.34

An irony of the current situation in former Yugoslavia is that the language specified in the Vienna Literary Agreement was being elaborated by a Serb — Vuk Karadžić — and was identified at the time with Serbian rather than Croatian intellectual movements, and yet in the current split it is precisely this language that is more closely identified with Croatian rather than Serbian (cf. Ivić 1971:184-85). Vuk was born in Tršić in the Štokavian-ijekavian area of Serbia, right on the Bosnian border. However, Vojvodina and Samobor — whose major population centers, Novi Sad and Belgrade, respectively, had become centers of Serbian culture (especially after 1690) and, in the case of Belgrade, of the nascent Serbian state (beginning with the uprising of 1804) — are both in the heart of Štokavian-ekavian territory, which in any case was overwhelmingly Serbian. This was and remains in contrast to Štokavian-ijekavian territory, which is still religiously and ethnically mixed, and where, together with Štokavian-ekavian territory, almost all Croatian Štokavian speakers were and are to be found. The result was that over time Štokavian-ekavian became identified with Serbian and Štokavian-ijekavian with Croatian.35 Thus jat-reflexes became emblematic of a variety of “ethnic” differences.

At the same time, however, state formations do not correspond to dialectal boundaries. Thus, for example, as can be seen from Map Three, the political boundaries of Croatia, Bosnia-Hercegovina, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) do not correspond in any significant way to the major dialectal divisions.36 As a result, attempts are being made in the countries that have emerged from former Yugoslavia to create identities that will enshrine contrasting dialectal differences. Moreover, there is a lack of correspondence between the original location of the dialectal base (Tršić) and the respective political centers (Zagreb, Sarajevo, and Belgrade — to a lesser extent also Nikšić as a cultural center in Montenegro). The originally Serbian-identified dialect of Tršić has become associated with the center of power in Zagreb, whose native dialect is in an entirely different (Kajkavian) area, while Serbian identity has shifted to the dialect of Belgrade (although this is not an uncontested move; see notes 37 and 38). As a result of the Yugoslav Wars of Succession and the identification of Štokavian-ekavian with Serbian on the one hand and Štokavian-ijekavian with the now broken-away Croatian on the other, Serbs in Štokavian-ijekavian areas, i.e. all of Bosnia-Hercegovina and Montenegro as well as parts of Serbia (and Croatia), have been under official pressure to switch to Štokavian-ekavian.37 This has met with resistance, including attempts to elaborate a separate Montenegrin literary language based on the southern Montenegrin (Zeta-Lovćen) dialects, which, while part of the larger Štokavian-ijekavian area, form a separate group from the Eastern Herzegovinian group to which the dialect of Tršić belongs.38 The tendency to invest regional identities with national significance by raising dialects to the level of separate languages in order to enhance autonomy has also resulted in attempts at separate Dalmatian, Istrian, and Sandžakian languages (and Ópi in Bulgaria).

The situation with Macedonian and Bulgarian is somewhat different. It is to be remembered that the entire South Slavic area constitutes a continuum (see Map Two). Just as the Croatian area is crossed by a number of isoglosses, so, too, Macedonia is a site of a fanning out of isoglosses that form a more compact bundle along the current Serbo-Bulgarian political border. Nonetheless, just as, for the purposes of literary language formation, the region between isoglosses C and E was sufficiently uniform, despite intervening isoglosses such as 3, 4, and D, to unify around a single (albeit later bifurcated) standard, i.e. Štokavian (with Štokavian-ijekavian and Štokavian-ekavian variants), so, too, the area defined on Map Two roughly by isogloss 39 was sufficiently uniform despite the presence of isoglosses such as 7 and H, and likewise sufficiently differentiated from Eastern Bulgarian, that it served as a center of resistance to the literary norm that emerged in eastern Bulgaria during the course of the nineteenth century, and it became the basis of the modern Macedonian literary language.

34 See Naylor (1990b) for a critical review of another of Franolić’s works. Okuka (1990:84-86) gives a critical comparison of Naylor (1980) and Franolić (1980). He praises Naylor’s work as based on linguistic principles and criticizes the political biases of Franolić’s. He criticizes both authors for giving very little attention to developments in Montenegro and Bosnia-Hercegovina and also makes the point that Naylor (1980) devotes scant attention to the post-War period while Franolić (1980) does essentially the opposite, giving short shrift to everything before World War Two. (See Isaković 1992:6-7 for a modern Bosnian nationalist account of historical and recent developments; see also Naylor 1992 on the development of so-called republican varieties of Serbo-Croatian in Bosnia-Hercegovina and Montenegro after the promulgation of the 1974 Yugoslav constitution. It was Ken’s intention to conduct an in-depth study of post-World War Two developments, but he died before the project could be realized.)

35 Serbian Orthodox Montenegro, however, is entirely Štokavian-ijekavian. Among Serbian intellectualas, three contesting approaches to language planning have arisen. One, centered around the University of Novi Sad and the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences (SANU) in Belgrade, supports the status quo ante, equality of Latin and Cyrillic alphabets, the 1960 orthography (Pravopisna komisija 1960), and favors Štokavian. A second group, centered around the Philosophical Faculties of the Universities of Belgrade and Nikšić (in Montenegro), strongly supports the equality of ijekavian and a return to Vuk’s principle of one letter per sound for the Serbian version of the Latin alphabet (e.g. Ć, Ž for current Žj, nj). Finally, there is the extreme Serbian nationalist position represented by Radmil Đorđević, the Milošević-appointed rector of Belgrade University, seeking to promote a single Cyrillic-Orthodox alphabet that eliminates some of Vuk’s reforms while promulgating Vuk’s idea that all Štokavian speakers are Serbs (This account is based on Greenberg 1993b). See also notes 37 and 38.

36 If we were to add the subdivisions, the lack of correspondence would be even more striking.

37 In September 1993, in Republika Srpska, the Serb-controlled region of Bosnia, ekavian was declared the only acceptable variety out of solidarity with Serbia (cf. the adoption of Albania’s Tosk-based standard by the Geg speakers of Kosovo, Montenegro and Macedonia, discussed below). In November 1994, however, the Bosnian Serb parliament reinstated ijekavian alongside ekavian.

38 See Nihatatar (1993a, 1993b) and the discussion in Kocan (1995). The proposed Montenegrin orthography differs from standard Serbian in having separate letters for the mellow palatals ř, ž/ and the voiced dental affricate /dj/ (de), which represent specifically Montenegrin dialect developments of [j], žj, (both as a result of ijekavian pronunciation) and /dj/ before certain consonants (a development that resembles Macedonian and Albanian). The southern Montenegrin accentual pattern also differs from the Eastern Herzegovinian. (The former is more archaic.)

39 In fact, this isogloss corresponds to a bundle of approximately 30 significant features, see Vodeški (1992:94-95).
The complexity of the linguistic situation in Macedonia was matched by a complexity of what grew into overlapping territorial claims during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as seen in Map Four.

Despite differences in detail at the edges and the occasional Greek or Serbian attempt to set the northern boundary somewhere in the middle of the region, it is generally agreed that as a geographic area Macedonia is bounded by Mount Olympus, the Pindus range, Mounts Shar and Rila, the western slopes of the Rhodopes, the lower course of the river Mesta, and the Aegean Sea (cf. Wilkinson 1951:1-4).

MAP FOUR
Conflicting Claims to Macedonia, 1912, Prior to the Balkan Wars
(After Clissold 1968:137 and Dako 1919)
(Albania did not declare independence until 28 November 1912)
As noted above, during the nineteenth century the primary source of identity was religion. In the north, among Serbs and Croats, there was a struggle over dialectal base and degree of unity, but the general congruence of religion and identity (which did not correspond to the territorial distribution of dialects) was entirely within a Slavic context (albeit with German and Hungarian pressure on the Croats). In the Macedo-Bulgarian area, however, among the Christian population, there was only one major church — the Greek Orthodox, headed by the Patriarch of Constantinople — and, as noted above, under the _millet system_, Greek meant Greek Orthodox Christian rather than Greek-speaker. As the nineteenth century progressed, however, there was increasing pressure to create a congruence between language and _millet_. i.e. there was Greek pressure on Slavs to Hellenize, e.g. by restricting access to education to Greek schools.41 Such pressure was resisted by East South Slav (Macedonian and Bulgarian) intellectuals, who sought to establish a Slavic literary language in opposition to Greek. During this early period, Orthodox Christian writers of this region all referred to that language as _Bulgarian_.42 This was a different situation from that of West South Slavic territory, where Serbs and Croats (and, to some extent, also Slovenes) of that period were arguing over dialectal base. The same sorts of conflicts, however, soon emerged on East South Slavic territory.

From a dialectological point of view, western Macedonia represents a relatively compact, uniform, and distinct dialect area vis-à-vis the two regions whose dialects served as the bases for literary Bulgarian and literary Serbian, respectively. In terms of _language as flag_ we can observe that the configuration of isoglosses lent itself to the creation of dialectal emblematicism. The beginning of the nineteenth century saw the emergence of two centers of literacy on East South Slavic territory, one in northeastern Bulgaria and the other in southwestern Macedonia. Although relative to the dialectal diversity of South Slavic linguistic territory as a whole these two regions were not maximally differentiated (they are both East South Slavic), nonetheless they were sufficiently different at every linguistic level from phonology through morphology to lexicon and syntax to occasion the rise of significant competition between the two groups for hegemony in the formation of a common literary language to serve as the vehicle of education, power, etc. (cf. Friedman 1975, 1985a).

As the nineteenth century progressed and Greek gradually receded as a pervasive threat to Slavic identity (it remained and remains a threat on the local level in the region that became Aegean [Greek] Macedonia), East-South-Slavic-speaking Christian intellectuals came increasingly to quarrel over the dialectal base of the emerging Slavic literary language.43 With the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870-72, _Bulgarian_ became a _millet_ on a level with Greek.44 The basis of the definition, however, was still religious, not linguistic. Thus travelers accounts from the period refer to Bulgarian Greeks, by which they mean Slavic-speaking loyal to the Greek Orthodox church headed by the Patriarch of Constantinople, as opposed to Exarchatic, or generally Slavic-speakers loyal to the Exarchate. Then in 1878 roughly the northern half of what is today modern Bulgaria became an autonomous principedom and _de facto_ independent of the Ottoman Empire, i.e. an independent Bulgarian state was formed. By this time, the remaining territory, and the Christian population living on it, had become the object for conflicting claims among the Greek, Serbian, and Bulgarian states and the churches that supported the state’s political authority with ecclesiastical authority.45 Education was also essentially an ecclesiastical institution at this time, i.e. schools were religiously sponsored institutions, and so ecclesiastical jurisdiction determined education, which in turn taught literacy, language and identity.46

The quarrel over the base of literary Bulgarian began in the mid-nineteenth century, when intellectuals in Macedonia expressed concern that their dialects were being excluded. The dispute intensified in the 1850’s and 1860’s, as can be seen from attacks in the Bulgarian-language press on attempts at publishing textbooks based on Macedonian dialects.47 The establishment of the Exarchate marked the definitive rejection on the part of Bulgarian intellectuals of any sort of compromise with Macedonians who wanted a unified Macedo-Bulgarian literary language. The former insisted that Macedonians adopt their eastern-based standard without compromise. This in turn strengthened the resolve of the

---

41It can be argued that the Constantinople Patriarch’s abolition of the Slavic metropolitanates in Peć and Ohrid during the mid-eighteenth century was already part of a general pressure to Hellenize the non-Greek-speaking Christian population of the south-central Balkans, especially the Slavs, who constituted its majority.

42The majority of the population, having an identity based on religion or locality, referred to their language by terms meaning ‘ours’ or ‘our tongue’.

43Those who sought a colloquial base faced opposition from archaizers who wanted to establish Church Slavonic as the literary language, but by the middle of the nineteenth century it was clear that the archaizers would be defeated. Such was not the case for Modern Greek, however, which ended up with a diglossic split between the colloquial-based _Dhimotiki_ and the archaizing _Puristic Rukharetovska_, a situation which is beyond the scope of our considerations here (see Friedman 1975, 1986a).

44The Porte issued a _firman_ in 1870 establishing an autonomous Bulgarian Exarchate, but the Exarch (a rank in the Orthodox Church between a metropolitan and a patriarch) was to be chosen by the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Patriarchate and the Porte took turns stalling until 1872, when the Bulgars received permission from the Porte to elect an Exarch. The Patriarch refused to recognize the elected Exarch, the Exarch declared the Bulgarian Church independent of the Patriarch, and the Patriarch declared the Bulgarian Church schismatic. The Greek Patriarch did not annul the declaration of schism until 1943. The first council of the Bulgarian Exarchate (1871) tried to exclude the Macedonian representatives saying that they would try to move the Exarchate to Ohrid, or that they would attempt to create a separate hierarchy, or that they were not Bulgarians but Aromanians (Apostolki 1969:64-65, MacDermott 1962:161-67).

45It is sometimes argued that it was the drawing of boundaries for a greater Bulgaria at the Treaty of San Stefano in March 1878 and the subsequent scaling back at the Treaty of Berlin that June that brought about Serb interest in the region (e.g. Wilkinson 1951:91).

46There are numerous anecdotes about schools that attempted to attract pupils by providing incentives such as free notebooks or pencils. In the context of rural poverty in which these schools were operating, it is understandable that parents would be swayed by such considerations. While Western observers sneered at these circumstances, such behavior did not reflect lack of principles but rather a combination of economic necessity with the fact that identity formation was not yet firmly established along western models (cf. Braifslod 1906:102-103).

47In an article in _Bulgarski knizici_ (1 January 1858), Partenij Zografski listed twelve Macedonian characteristics that he considered basic to the literary language he was advocating. This can be taken as the prototypical formulation relating to the creation of literary Macedonian and provoked bitter Bulgarian attacks. His twelve points were the following: 1) stress tends to fall at the beginning of the word; 2) Common Slavic *dj* give *k*; *g*; 3) unstressed *a*; *e*; *o* are reduced; 4) different reflexes of vocalic *l*; 5) Common Slavic *l* (now always gives *r*); 6) *n* becomes *θ*; *f*; *v*; 7) definite articles of the type *-om, on*, in addition to *or*; 8) more remnants of nominal declension; 9) neuter nouns in *-e* have plurals in *-p*; 10) 3rd sg. pres. ending in -*ē*; 11) presence of a verbal adverb; 12) Common Slavic back nasal *n* gives *a* or *o* (Koneski 1967a:182-184). Partenij’s twelve points substantially limit his (and my own field experience) that while Slavic linguistic frontiers are relative in the Balkans, natives pick on certain linguistic traits as distinguishing their speech from that of their neighbors (Lunt 1953:364, 371). Cf. the Vienna Literary Agreement discussed above.
Macedonists, i.e. those who were working for a Macedonian literary language separate from the Bulgarian literary norm as it emerged during the course of the nineteenth century. By the time an autonomous Bulgarian state was established in 1878, the sense of a distinct Macedonian national identity had already advanced to the stage that it had been expressed in print (Pulevski 1875:49). By 1903, we have an explicit formulation of a distinct Macedonian literary language (Misirkov 1903). Map Five illustrates how linguistic features become “flags” that are manipulated to represent territorial claims. Lines one and two correspond to isoglosses 7 and F, respectively, on Map Two. They also correspond, roughly, to the territorial claims advanced by Serbia and Bulgaria, respectively, as illustrated in Map Four. At the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries (and even today, see, e.g. Glenny 1995), linguists were putting their knowledge at the service of politicians by choosing one or another isogloss as the definitive justification for the ethnic identity — and therefore nationality — of the Slavic speakers on Macedonian and adjacent territory. The claims about nationality were then translated into claims for the territory to be included in the nation-state.

48See Friedman (1975, 1985a, 1993b) for details. Limitations of space preclude entering into the complexities of these developments, especially the question of identity formation among Macedonian-speaking Muslims and speakers of Macedonian dialects who chose (or choose) Greek, Serbian, or Bulgarian identity (see also Danforth 1995). I am concerned here with outlining the developments that led specifically to the establishment of Macedonian and Bulgarian as distinct languages and am therefore concentrating on facts and events relevant to those developments.

49The main points were summarized as follows (my translation): “1. The Prilep-Bitola dialect as the basis of the literary language, since it is equally distant from Serbian and Bulgarian, and central in Macedonia; 2. A phonetic orthography […] with minor concessions to etymology; 3. The collecting of dictionary material from all Macedonian dialects.” (Misirkov 1903:145).

MAP FIVE
Map showing approximate locations of isoglosses [1] and [2]
These representations are highly schematic.
The precise distribution of features is complex but irrelevant to the basic point. See Ivić (1958:25-49).
Key to Map Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>pleči</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>plev'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>plešti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differing isoglosses used to support conflicting territorial claims:
[1] the reflex of Common Slavic *tj, [2] the presence of a definite article
The forms cited in the table are those used in the modern standard languages.
These claims were also bolstered by census figures. Table Two reproduces claims made for the population of Macedonia from four different sources, each with a specific national interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>Serbian %</th>
<th>Greek %</th>
<th>Turkish %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ethnic group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarians</td>
<td>57,600</td>
<td>332,162</td>
<td>896,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbs</td>
<td>201,140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>2,648,330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanians</td>
<td>652,795</td>
<td>37,85</td>
<td>307,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks</td>
<td>219,571</td>
<td>1,508,507</td>
<td>99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2,911,004</td>
<td>1,724,818</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,870,620</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Vlachs, Roms (Gypsies), Jews, Circassians, etc.

Table Two

Conflicting Census Figures for Macedonia: 1889-1905

Sources: d'Estourneles de Constant (1914:28-30) and Saral (1975:75)

These discrepancies are not entirely arbitrary. Rather, at least to some extent, different authors have selected criteria that would support their point of view. Thus the Greek and Turkish figures use religion as the criterion of ascension. The result is the complete elimination of the Albanians, who are counted as Turk if Muslim, Greek if Orthodox, or Other if Catholic. The Serbs were likewise eliminated from Greek figures because the Greek definition of Macedonian territory stopped short of the northern districts included in the jurisdiction of the Serbian church. Bulgarian and Serbian figures use language, but choose different isoglosses as illustrated in Map Five to justify the claims for the territorial extent of Bulgarian or Serbian. (Serbs also based their claims on the practice of a folk custom, the Slava, celebrating a family's patron saint.)

At the end of the Second Balkan War in 1913, Macedonia was partitioned among Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Albania. Greece received most of what it claimed (about 50% of Macedonia), Serbia received most of that part of its claim that did not overlap with Greece (about 40% of Macedonia), Bulgaria received a small eastern corner and Albania received a string of villages on the western slopes and shores of the borderland mountains and lakes. With the exception of minor modifications after World War One and a major re-partitioning during World War Two (see Jelavich 1983: 262-277), the 1913 borders have remained in place. The partition of 1913 marked the end of any chance for an officially recognized Macedonian literary language, since Macedonian was treated as a dialect of Bulgarian in Bulgaria and of Serbian in Serbia. Publications and public performances in Macedonian were permitted in the guise of dialectal literature, however, and thus progress toward a codifiable standard continued to be made, albeit in an underground fashion. In Greece, Macedonian was proscribed, and in the thirties the speaking of Macedonian was even criminalized (see Apostolski, 1969: 271-72, see also Risteski 1988:97-102). In Albania, the existence of Slavic-speaking minorities was simply ignored.

On 2 August 1944 the part of Macedonia that had been part of Serbia prior to the outbreak of World War Two was declared the People's Republic of Macedonia with Macedonian as its official language. Progress toward standardization on the basis of the west central dialects was rapid, and today Macedonian is a fully functional standard language (Friedman 1985a, 1988a), although the existence of a Macedonian minority in Greece continues to be denied by official Greek sources (e.g. in a press conference given in Skopje by Theodoros Pangalos, Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs, on 22 December 1998), while official Bulgaria remains incapable of recognizing the simple reality that Macedonian is not a dialect of Bulgarian (Velev 1998 is typical in this respect) just as Norwegian is not a dialect of Swedish, nor Dutch a dialect of German. Albanian officially recognizes the presence of a Macedonian minority on its territory, although the numbers are disputed, support for Macedonian-language education is limited to the first four years of elementary school and only among Macedonian-speaking Christians of the Prespa region in southern Albania (the Macedonian-speaking Muslims in the villages further north receive only Albanian-language education), and Albanian officials have occasionally made public statements in tacit support of Bulgarian claims that the Macedonians of Albania are really Bulgarians (MIC 6 March 1995).

The Albanian territorial claims illustrated in Map Four appear to have been made by connecting the most outlying Albanian-speaking villages in the territory adjacent to more or less compact Albanian settlements. The title of Dako (1919) — Albania: Master Key to the Near East — illustrates how the concept of 'Near East' has been constructed by the West to supply the Other against which it can define itself as the West (or Europe). At the turn of the century, the Balkans were at the edge of that Other (cf. Bakić-Hayden 1995, Todorova 1994, 1997). The Albanian situation in certain respects was the converse of that of the South Slavs. South Slavic linguistic history has been one of progressive centrifugal forces. The nineteenth century saw the division of Slovenian from Croatian and Macedonian from Bulgarian (albeit this latter was not officially recognized until 1944), while the centripetal forces that led to the formation of Serbo-Croatian have now yielded to the break-up of Yugoslavia and the creation of at least three standards: Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian. At the same time, Albanians have been working very hard to create a unity out of a major dialect division (Geg vs Tosk; i.e. North vs South; see note 4) as well as the three-way religious split alluded to above (see Skendi 1967:366-404 for details).

The differences between Geg and Tosk can be minimized or maximized, depending on the intent of the writer, much as is the case, e.g., with Serbian and Croatian. Consider the following examples based on Pippa (1989:16, 202):

Geg: Nuk kam me mëjtë me ardhë në Shqipni.

Tosk: Nuk do të mund të vij në Shqipëri.

'I will not be able to come to Albania. Not all the needles were washed and cleaned.'

In the case of the first sentence, Geg could choose the same type of construction as Tosk, but it also has at its disposal an infinitival construction lacking in Tosk. The form meaning 'be able' (mjujtëmund) illustrates Geg nasal vowels, lacking in Tosk, and the form meaning 'Albania' illustrates both Tosk rhotacism (the historical change of intervocalic /h/ to /r/) and the Geg elimination of unstressed schwa. The second sentence was constructed to illustrate the pervasive nature of Tosk rhotacism and certain vocalic developments, which can be compared in this respect to the salience of the jat reflexes of the Stokavian dialects of the former Serbo-Croatian. Although Pippa represents an approach that would sanction both Geg and Tosk variants of literary Albanian (cf. the Western and Eastern or "republican" variants of the former Serbo-Croatian or the current situation in Serbian), most of the history of the standardization of Albanian has been in the direction of greater unity, i.e. centripetal forces reducing sanctioned differences.

50 Although the 1989 Albanian census registered only 5,000 Macedonians, the Macedonian organization in Albania, Bracno, claimed 40,000 members in 1993 (MIC 30 November 1993).
During the first half of this century, there was no official attempt at legislating a unified Albanian literary language, although seven years before Albania's declared independence, one of Albania's greatest linguists, Aleksander Xhelalani (1980/1905) published — albeit under a pseudonym — a concrete proposal for the principles of a unified literary language similar to those employed after World War Two. Although a Literary Committee met in Shkodër in 1916 and agreed to elaborate a standard based on Elbasan Gëg with some concessions to Tosk, in practice both literary Gëg and literary Tosk continued to be elaborated in Albania until after World War Two (Pipa 1989:3-4), when the communist regime succeeded in imposing a Tosk-based unified standard on all of Albania, taking the dialect of Korçë as the basis.

While the Tosk-based standard eliminated literary Gëg in Albania, Albanians in Yugoslavia continued to write in Gëg. From 1945 (and even before that) until the 1974 constitution, the Yugoslav government attempted to encourage a separate identity among Yugoslav Albanians, using the term Shqiptar (from Albanian Sipër) for the Albanians of Yugoslavia and Albanac for those of Albania (Ismajli 1998:64-72). The plan failed, however, and in 1968, after a series of events that culminated in a failed demand for republican status for Kosovo, Albanian intellectuals in Yugoslavia voted to adopt the Tosk-based standard of Albania as a nation of national unity. This was affirmed by delegates from Albania and Yugoslavia (Macedonia and Kosovo) on 25 November 1972 at an orthography congress held in Tirana. The situation is thus comparable to that of Serbs and Croats in 1850 (and the opposite of the situation in 1967 or 1991) insofar as, like the Croats, the Kosovars (and Albanians of Montenegro, Macedonia, and Serbia) were adopting a standard promulgated from the outside in order to resist other pressures. The crucial difference is that while most Croats (albeit not those who signed it) were speakers of the standard promulgated by the Vienna Literary Agreement, Kosovars and most other Albanians in former Yugoslavia are Gëg and therefore the adoption of the unified literary language involved an entirely exoglossic situation.

Thus during the social upheavals of 1967-68 in Yugoslavia, both centripetal and centrifugal linguistic forces operated as forms of resistance. For the Croats, the declaration of difference from Serbian and the repudiation of Serbo-Croatian/Creto-Serbian constituted a centrifugal resistance against what was perceived as Serbian centralism, while for the Albanians that same perception of Serbian centralism led to an abandonment of their distinct literary dialect and a centripetal unification with the standard of Albania. With the so-called fall of communism and the upheavals of the past decade, Croatian has made a definitive split from Serbian, and the purposefully deepened lexical divide may never be bridged. Meanwhile, in Albania the question of reintroducing literary Gëg as a co-equal variant with the current Tosk-based standard was raised at a conference in the fall of 1992 and has remained a burning issue ever since. At a conference I attended in Tirana in the summer of 1995, a single paper devoted to this topic provoked more than four hours of heated discussion. At both conferences, the Gëgs of Shkodër, the town in northwest Albania with an old, independent literary tradition as well as a university, proposed the reintroduction of literary Gëg, and the Tirana establishment and Tosks of the south opposed it. The Kosovars present at the conferences argued for a single standard but declined to define how that standard should be determined. They did not want to support a diglossic situation from their perceived need for (trans-)national unity, but neither did they wish to abandon the possibility that their dialectal base (which is northeastern Gëg and thus significantly different from the northwestern Gëg of Shkodër) could be more represented.

A final example of the emblematization of language is illustrated in Table Three, which utilizes the six languages of the Republic of Macedonia used in the 1994 census (Friedman 1996a) and quantities degrees of non-correspondence between declared nationality and declared mother tongue in the 1953 and 1994 censuses in that republic. In each of the two charts, the top figure is the total of those whose declared nationality differed from the corresponding declared mother tongue, followed by a figure indicating the percentage of the total of those declaring the mother tongue in question. The lower figure gives the numerical total of those declaring the relevant mother tongue. In each chart an overall total is given below the language-by-language totals. While it is clear from these figures that declared nationality does not always correspond to declared mother tongue, it is equally clear that in all cases except the former Serbo-Croatian there has been an increasing tendency toward such congruence, in many cases a dramatic one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1993</th>
<th>Declared Mother Tongue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declared Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Corresp</td>
<td>14210 = 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1889651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative stability of the former Serbo-Croatian in this respect is related to various political and demographic factors beyond the scope of this lecture.
TABLE THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declared Nationality</th>
<th>Macedonian</th>
<th>Albanian</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Serbo-Croat</th>
<th>Romani</th>
<th>Vlah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Corresp.</td>
<td>43115 = 3.2</td>
<td>4945 = 1.1</td>
<td>1939 = 2.9</td>
<td>7222 = 20.6</td>
<td>165 = 0.5</td>
<td>289 = 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132293</td>
<td>431363</td>
<td>64665</td>
<td>35905</td>
<td>35120</td>
<td>7036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Co</td>
<td>57937 = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total**</td>
<td>1907710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference between declared nationality and declared mother tongue for the six main languages of the Republic of Macedonia: 1953 and 1994


*This figure represents Serbian and Croatian which were listed as separate languages in the 1994 census.
**This figure is slightly smaller than the total population (1945932) because there was a partial boycott of the census in the municipality of Debar. Elsewhere the non-enumerated Albanian and Turkish population was estimated, but in this table only the enumerated population was included. Moreover, this table does not include languages other than the six official languages of the census.

We can conclude by observing that the situation in Southeastern Europe is by no means unique, and in fact there are homologues in the West for any of the situations we have analyzed here. One can mention the Quebeccois of Canada, the Flemings of Belgium (who at one point declared that Flemish was Dutch but have since returned to the position that it is not), the struggle between Bokmål and Landsmål in Norway, the Italian questione della lingua, the Occitans of France, the Frisians of Holland and Germany, the movement to eliminate the compulsory study of Swedish from Finnish schools, etc. (cf. also Posner 1996:189-96). It is the politicization of linguistic drift (the natural tendency of languages to differentiate over time) that has had particularly dramatic effects in Southeastern Europe, where language has become a vehicle of conflicting centrifugal and centripetal forces. Thus, for example, the Croat separatist declaration of 1967 and the Albanian unitarist decision of 1968 set vectors in a direction which, while deflected by the Yugoslav federal constitution of 1974, were headed back in the direction of dissolution by the Kosovar uprising of 1981 and the economic crisis of the 1980s (cf. Woodward 1995).

I shall close with a quotation from a Serbian dialectologist that Ken found in 1983 and brought to my attention. The quotation is sadly prescient in its warning:

"ni smo u kruh i hleb povoljne nacionalne barjace, a zaboravili na prostu činjenicu da nam i jedan i drugi mogu, bilo na vatri bilo na ognju, jednako izgoreti i da pravi problemi počnu tek onda kad v Goror Komoru, Bukovica, Zmijanje i Paštrovićima nestane kruh, kada na Kosovo ostane samo buke i kada po istočnoj Srbiji i Zagorju počnu da gore (h)ijež. (Petrović 1982: 53)"

...we have conceived of kruh and hleb as national banners, and forgotten the simple fact that we can make one or the other, either on the vatra or on the oaganj burn just the same, and real problems begin, only when in Gorski Kotar, Bukovica, Zmijanje and Paštrovićki kruh disappears, when in Kosovo there is only buke and when in Eastern Serbia and Zagorje the (h)ijež begin to burn. 56

56 The words kruh, hleb, and buke all mean 'bread'. The first is associated with Croatian (although some Serbs in Croatia use the same word), the second with Serbian Stokavian (the ekavian reflex marks it as such; Serbs, Croats, and Muslims in Bosnia-Hercegovina, Montenegro, and also southwestern Serbia, including the Sandžak, would all say hleb), but it is also the Kajkavian form, while the third is Albanian. The words varata and oaganj both mean 'fire', but varata is specifically domesticated, controlled

It is inevitable that languages will change and that the resulting differences will be either ignored or enshrined, transcending or establishing boundaries, depending -- among other things -- on political circumstances. Kenneth E. Naylor dedicated his scholarship to furthering the knowledge of both the grammar and the social history and function of the languages of Southeastern Europe. And it is only by understanding that we can hope to deploy our information wisely.
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