

THE MACEDONIAN QUESTION:
Culture, Historiography, Politics

Edited by
Victor Roudometof

SHORT TITLE:

Macedonian Language
and Identity

Replaces: YF 3911

EAST EUROPEAN MONOGRAPHS, BOULDER
DISTRIBUTED BY COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, NEW YORK
2000

**THE MODERN MACEDONIAN STANDARD
LANGUAGE AND ITS RELATION TO
MODERN MACEDONIAN IDENTITY**

Victor A. Friedman
University of Chicago

The course of the nineteenth century saw the rise of a variety of South Slavic (and other) national identities and literary languages, as well as nation-states in which those languages were expected to serve as vehicles of power, although the national boundaries did not correspond to the territorial claims being made by any of the parties involved (see Friedman 1996: 85-86). It is important to recall that all of the modern-day South Slavic (and many other European) literary languages and identities began to achieve their current shape and definition during this period. Examples of the inchoate situation of that time are the Illyrian movement, which sought to unite all the South Slavs with a pan-South Slavic literary language and identity; intellectuals who sought a single literary language uniting Slovenes and Croats; the fact that it was not until 1822 that Vuk Karadžić convinced the eminent Slavist Jozef Dubrovský that Bulgarian was not a dialect of Serbian; and the fact that it was not until 1868 that the Serbian state officially abandoned the macaronic Slavono-Serbian (which was based on Russian Church Slavonic) and adopted a colloquial-based literary language (de Bray 1980: 78, 312; Lunt 1984: 115, Naylor 1980: 80). The processes that led to that standardization of modern Macedonian also have their origins in this period, but unlike the standardization of Bulgarian, Slovenian, and the former Serbo-Croatian,¹ the standardization of Macedonian was prevented by powerful political forces until the middle of the twentieth century. In this paper, I shall trace the developments that led to the standardization of the modern Macedonian literary language and shall comment briefly on the process of standardization itself.

39. Vlado Ivanovski, "Ilinden 1903-1944," (1989, typescript of speech delivered on Meckhkin Kamen, 2 August), p. 13.

40. Vladimir Chupeski, *A Bre, Makedonche: Abecedar i pamfleti za nacibolshevizmot, 1982-1990* (Skopje: Mlad Borec, 1993), pp. 33-36. Although treated as a political intervention, Chupeski's work fits easily into neither of the camps defined here; he is critical of the extremists of both sides. I would thus align it with a new "dissident" strand that has only recently become visible in Macedonia, as these authors can now find publishers. Another in the same school is Slavko Milosavljeski, whose works include *Sociologija na Makedonskata Nacionalna Svest* (Skopje: Kultura, 1992).

41. Gavril Gavril. "Ilinden," *Radosna Vest, Vesnik na Debarsko-Kichevska Eparhija — Ohrid*. 1992, 6 (2 August):1-2.

42. Palmer and King, *Yugoslav Communism*, pp. 63-69.

43. Herbert Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1931).

THE MODERN MACEDONIAN STANDARD LANGUAGE AND ITS RELATION TO MODERN MACEDONIAN IDENTITY

Victor A. Friedman
University of Chicago

The course of the nineteenth century saw the rise of a variety of South Slavic (and other) national identities and literary languages, as well as nation-states in which those languages were expected to serve as vehicles of power, although the national boundaries did not correspond to the territorial claims being made by any of the parties involved (see Friedman 1996: 85-86). It is important to recall that all of the modern-day South Slavic (and many other European) literary languages and identities began to achieve their current shape and definition during this period. Examples of the inchoate situation of that time are the Illyrian movement, which sought to unite all the South Slavs with a pan-South Slavic literary language and identity; intellectuals who sought a single literary language uniting Slovenes and Croats; the fact that it was not until 1822 that Vuk Karadžić convinced the eminent Slavist Jozef Dubrovský that Bulgarian was not a dialect of Serbian; and the fact that it was not until 1868 that the Serbian state officially abandoned the macaronic Slavono-Serbian (which was based on Russian Church Slavonic) and adopted a colloquial-based literary language (de Bray 1980: 78, 312; Lunt 1984: 115, Naylor 1980: 80). The processes that led to that standardization of modern Macedonian also have their origins in this period, but unlike the standardization of Bulgarian, Slovenian, and the former Serbo-Croatian,¹ the standardization of Macedonian was prevented by powerful political forces until the middle of the twentieth century. In this paper, I shall trace the developments that led to the standardization of the modern Macedonian literary language and shall comment briefly on the process of standardization itself.

I. THE DEFINITION OF MACEDONIA AND MACEDONIAN

Wilkinson (1951: 1-3), having claimed that "Macedonia defies definition," and moreover stating that "[o]f all attempts to define Macedonia, that which makes its appeal to physical geography is least profitable, and also the easiest to refute," writes that he uses the name "as a convenient means of referring to the region which lies between the Sar [sic] mountains in the north, the Aegean sea in the south, the lower Mesta river and Rodopi mountains in the east, and the Albanian highlands in the west." This is essentially the same physical definition used from the days of classical geographers, 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 thus defined (Wilkinson 1951: 2, 4). It is the definition that has informed most of the debate since the nineteenth century, and it is the one that I shall utilize here. I shall use the term *Macedonia* or *geographic Macedonia* to refer to this region as defined by physical geography. I shall modify the term *Macedonia* with the adjectives *Vardar*, *Aegean*, and *Pirin*, to refer to the regions that correspond politically to the modern-day Republic of Macedonia, the Greek province of Makedhonia, and the Bulgarian district of Blagoevgrad, respectively.

In terms of language names, I shall follow the standard academic practice in North America and most of Europe of using *Macedonian* to refer to modern Macedonian, which is a South Slavic language most closely related to Bulgarian and the former Serbo-Croatian. Many other languages are also spoken on the territory of geographic Macedonia, including Albanian, Aromanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Judezmo, Romani, Serbian, and Turkish, but these will not be of concern to us here except insofar as they relate to the development and standardization of modern Macedonian.

Turning to Slavic dialect geography, the question of definition is more complex. There is a continuum of South Slavic speech from the Julian Alps in the northwest to the Black Sea in the southeast and south into northern Greece. Along this continuum there are regions of relatively greater uniformity and zones of transition where the shading from one dialect group into another takes place with greater rapidity, but there is no single point through which, on the basis of metrics such as degree of mutual comprehensibility or accumulation of differential

linguistic features (isoglosses), one can draw a clear dialect-based boundary between any two of the modern South Slavic languages. Rather, the dialects in certain regions of relatively greater uniformity have emerged as the bases of standard languages with which speakers of other dialects have come to identify, sometimes on the basis of ethnic feeling. Thus, for example, the dialect of Bosiljgrad (Bulg. Bosiligrad) in southeastern Serbia is officially defined as Bulgarian since the inhabitants identify themselves as ethnic Bulgarians. The nearby dialect of Kriva Feja, however, is considered Serbian, as are its speakers, and although there are features distinguishing the two dialects, they are closer to one another than either of them is to the standard languages with which they are identified and which children learn in school (see Ivić 1956: 118). There are similar zones of transition between Macedonian and Serbian in the north and Macedonian and Bulgarian in the east (likewise between Croatian and Slovenian).

The definition of the modern Macedonian literary language presents no problems, as it is firmly based on the west-central Macedonian dialects and has an established grammar, dictionary, and orthography. One has only to compare these works with their Bulgarian and former Serbo-Croatian (or Serbian) counterparts to see the differences on every level from phonology through lexicon and syntax. However, because there were no officially recognized established norms for Macedonian prior to 1944-45, and because both isoglosses and declared identity present complexities alluded to above and discussed below, the most objective definition of Macedonian in the nineteenth-century is a territorial one. Thus, for our purposes *Macedonian*—as a language name—will be applied to the Slavic dialects spoken in geographic Macedonia, i.e., those dialects that contributed to the formation of modern standard Macedonian. Since our focus here is the process of the formation of the modern Macedonian literary language, those factors that did not directly contribute to these developments, i.e., Bulgarophile and Serbophile (and Hellenophile) activities, will not be considered.² However, people whose activities are relevant to the study of the development of Macedonian language and identity will be discussed regardless of the name by which they may have called themselves or their language.

II. DEVELOPMENTS UP TO 1878

There is not much to be said about pre-nineteenth-century Macedonian identity and language. In Macedonia, as in other parts of the Ottoman Empire at that time, ethnicity was determined by *millet*, which in the Ottoman context meant "nationality as determined by a religiously defined community." Under the *millet* system, the word *Turk* usually meant "Muslim" regardless of language.³ The terms translatable as "Greek" (e.g., Turkish *Rum* from "Roman") meant Greek Orthodox Christian, not Hellenophone, although words meaning "Christian," e.g., Macedonian *kaurin* (from Turkish for "infidel"), were also common forms of self-ascription. The term "Bulgarian" was used to refer to speakers of South Slavic dialects from the Black sea to the Adriatic, on occasion as far north as Belgrade and Sarajevo (Koneski 1968: 24; cf. also the use of *bugarin* "Bulgarian" to mean simply "peasant"). Thus the most important opposition in Macedonia (and elsewhere in European Turkey) was Muslim/Christian, rather than, e.g., Slav/Greek. The Slavic literary language of this period was basically Church Slavonic with ever-increasing admixtures of local dialects. Texts from Macedonian speech areas show Macedonian linguistic features. There are a number of manuscripts in Macedonian dialects utilizing Cyrillic or Greek orthography, but we shall focus here only on published materials using Cyrillic except where archival evidence is indispensable.⁴

Koneski (1967b: 27-28) has noted that the earliest published text in a Macedonian dialect was aimed at the elimination of the language. It was part of the so-called *Tetraglosson* (*Četirijazičnik*), a quadrilingual word list and didactic conversation manual by an Aromanian named Hadži Daniil of Moskopole (Albanian Voskopojë), whose purpose was the Hellenization of Albanians, Aromanians, and Slavs. It was first published in Venice, probably in 1794. The Slavic section, entitled *Bulgarika*, was written in the Ohrid dialect as translated by the priest Stefan of Ohrid (Kristophson 1974: 8). The *Tetraglosson* raises the two major issues of Macedonian language and national identity during the first half of the nineteenth century: Hellenization and the Bulgarian-Macedonian distinction. As will be seen, the main problem during the early part of this period for the Christian South Slavs living in the Ottoman Europe was the struggle

with Hellenization, so such concerns as differentiation among themselves were of secondary importance.

As indicated above, the term *Bulgarian* has a long history of use for various South Slavs living in European Turkey. During the early nineteenth century, the Bulgarian literary language had not yet developed its definitively East Bulgarian character; in fact, the question of a literary language based on the vernacular was not yet considered settled. Church Slavonic (or, in the south, Greek) was still regarded as the language of writing (Koneski 1967a: 88), and there were archaizers who attempted to make Church Slavonic the official language of the emerging Bulgarian state. Thus the question of whether to call the language of the books of the earliest writers to use Macedonian dialects *Macedonian* or *Bulgarian* is basically immaterial: The point is that they tried to use some form of East South Slavic vernacular.⁵ The heritage of these early writers is legitimately claimed by both Bulgarians and Macedonians. From the modern Bulgarian point of view, these individuals helped to lay the foundation for an East South Slavic vernacular-based literary language rather than a Church Slavonic one during a period when the dialectal base of literary Bulgarian had not yet been fixed and Hellenization was a threat. They therefore contributed to the process that resulted in the formation of modern Bulgarian. From the modern Macedonian point of view, the fact that these writers used Macedonian East South Slavic makes their work the earliest publications in dialects that later contributed to the creation of literary Macedonian. Their contributions are thus part of the process that resulted in the formation of literary Macedonian.⁶

The first two writers to publish books in a language based on Macedonian dialects were Hadži Joakim Krčovski (d. 1820), whose works used the Kratovo-Kriva Palanka dialects of northeastern Macedonia, and his somewhat younger contemporary Hadži Kiril Pejčinovič (c. 1770-1845), who wrote in the Tetovo dialect, with fewer Church Slavonicisms than Joakim (Lunt 1953: 336).⁷ Both these writers called their language *Bulgarian*, but since their dialects were Macedonian, they can be considered as the first to publish books in some form of Macedonian (Koneski 1967a: 88). As indicated above, their importance to the development of the Macedonian language lies in the fact that their work gave the authority of the

printed word to the vernacular (Koneski 1967b: 31). The long struggle against archaization is illustrated by Hadži Teodosij Sinaitski of Dojran's preface to Kiril Pejčinovič's *Utěšenie Grěšnym* "Consolation for Sinners" (Salonika 1840), in which he likens Church Slavonic to a golden key but defends the vernacular by likening it to a key of iron and steel, which is what is needed to open the heart of the common man (Polenakovič 1973: 244-245). That such a defense should be written in 1840 shows that the concept of using the vernacular in literature had not yet been fully accepted among the Christian South Slavs of the Ottoman Empire. The Macedonian desire for a single Macedo-Bulgarian literary language based on a compromise among various dialects can be said to find its first expression in the works of Joakim and Kiril, but these works were also important because they provided an alternative to Greek.

For much of the period before the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870-1872, most Macedonians and Bulgarians were more or less united in the so-called *Crkvena Borba* "Ecclesiastical Struggle," against the Phanariot Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople (Apostolski 1969a: 63). Serbian influence was strongest in northern and western Macedonia, but it was not of a very extensive nature until later in the century. Thus Greek and the Greek Patriarchate constituted the major threats to Macedonian language and identity into the middle of the nineteenth century, i.e., once a Slavic national consciousness had become sufficiently developed.

According to Stavrianos (1963: 97-98), the Macedonian Slavs escaped Hellenization by remaining illiterate during the long period under the Constantinople Patriarchate, thereby preserving their language and customs, which provided them with the prerequisites for a national awakening in the nineteenth century. Koneski (1967a: 168), however, points out that in the mid-nineteenth century, with the exception of Jordan Hadži Konstantinov-Džinot (b. Veles 1820 – d. 1882), those cultural figures whose work became most significant for the development of Macedonian consciousness were born in and/or educated by people from the Ohrid-Struga area, where Greek influence was stronger and the schools were better. From this it would appear that it was precisely the combination of education and attempted Hellenization that led to resistance (see also Lunt 1984: 101). The first move in the direction of a Macedonian literary

language, in the form of a unified Macedo-Bulgarian language, has its roots in the struggle against the Hellenizing policies of the Phanariot Patriarchate from the 1840s through the 1860s (Lunt 1953: 367).

Examples of the opposition of the Greek Church to any form of education in Slavic in Macedonia can be seen in the treatment of the teachers and cultural activists such as Konstantinov-Džinot and the brothers Dimitar and Konstantin Miladinov (b. Struga 1810 and 1832, respectively – d. 1862). In a letter dated Skopje, 23 April 1856, Jordan complains that in Veles, where he had been teaching, the Greek bishop, Ignatija, summoned the local leading citizens (*čorbadžii*) and demanded that he be stopped, with the following words: "Da go ispudite toj čakān učitel, toj Jordan kopil sefi pušt!" ("Kick that skirt-chasing teacher out, that Jordan bastard pimp faggot!"); Koneski and Jašar-Nasteva 1966: 88-89). At the same time, tensions were also building within the Slavic community. The editor of *Carigradski Vestnik* (No. 55, 6 October 1851 cited in Dimitrovski et al. 1978: 23) attacked Konstantinov-Džinot's language with the following words: "As concerns the language of Mr. Jordan, anyone can see that it is so different from our written and spoken language, so that to a person reading it for the first time it will appear not only incomprehensible but completely different. [...] May the residents of Skopje forgive us, along with those who speak a similar language; since they do not understand our language nor can they speak it."

Dimitar Miladinov was one of the first to insist explicitly on the right of Macedonians to participate in the creation of a common Macedo-Bulgarian literary language (Lunt 1953: 367-68). He and his brother were active as teachers, writers, and collectors of folklore, by which activities they combated the influence of Hellenism. In 1861 Dimitar was jailed in Constantinople at the behest of the Greek bishop of Ohrid. When his younger brother, Konstantin, rushed to Constantinople to help him, he, too, was imprisoned, and they both died in prison in January 1862 (Mitrev 1962: 25).

The last ten years of the anti-Phanariot struggle saw the crystallization of Macedonian national and linguistic identity in two forms: unitarian and separatist (Macedonist). The unitarians continued the tradition of Dimitar Miladinov, i.e., they advocated a single Macedo-Bulgarian literary language called *Bulgarian* but based to a greater or lesser extent on Macedonian dialects. The Macedonists felt that the

Bulgarian literary language as it was emerging was already too different from Macedonian to be used by them, and they advocated a distinct Macedonian literary language.

Partenij Zografski (b. Galičnik 1818 – d. 1875) was the earliest leading figure of the Macedonian unitarians. He wrote the first Macedonian (or Macedo-Bulgarian) textbooks (Apostolski 1969a: 67) and was the first to espouse the cause of a Macedo-Bulgarian compromise literary language in print, in an article in *Carigradski Vestnik* (No. 315, 9 February 1857). Books had been printed in Macedonian before, but Partenij's were the first to attempt to establish a literary norm. His two textbooks were printed in Constantinople in 1857 and 1858. The second book was to have been reprinted in Salonika, but the Greeks would not allow it (Koneski 1967a: 177-78, 181-82). The significance of Partenij's textbooks for the development of Macedonian language and identity can be seen in the reaction of Bulgarians to his language and ideas. In various articles which appeared in 1857 and 1858, Partenij was said to be advocating Serbism, his language was called "a mishmash of Bulgarian and Serbian" (*edna razmesa od Bălgarski i Srăbski*), and he was referred to as an *Arnaut* (Albanian) attempting to compose a Bulgarian grammar (Koneski 1967a: 188-90). Partenij envisioned a Macedo-Bulgarian compromise based on West Macedonian, which he used in his textbooks and which he described in some detail in articles appearing in *Carigradski Vestnik* in 1857 and *Bălgarski Knižici* in 1858.⁸ The Bulgarians, however, envisioned a Macedo-Bulgarian compromise as consisting of the adoption of Thracio-Moesian (Eastern) Bulgarian by the Macedonians (Koneski 1967a: 190). The very appearance of Macedonian textbooks at that time indicates the development of some form of Macedonian consciousness as different from Bulgarian and the objections and denunciations published in the Bulgarian press show that the Bulgarians were well aware of the separatist implications of such manifestations (Lunt 1972: 133; 1984: 102).

Between 1867 and 1868 Dimitar V. Makedonski (b. Embore, Kajlarsko [Greek Ptolemaïs] 18??–d. 1898) published three textbooks. His language was close to the West Macedonian of Partenij, but he also included features from his own (eastern) Aegean Macedonian dialect, e.g., the reduction of unstressed vowels (*/e/* > */i/*, */o/* > */u/*) (Koneski 1967a: 202-203). Thus his name must be included among

the list of those who contributed to Macedonian identity by publishing textbooks which attempted to synthesize Macedonian dialects into a literary language.⁹ Partenij's most active pupil, Kuzman Šapkarev (b. Ohrid 1834–d. 1908), published eight textbooks between 1868 and 1874; he also wrote three other textbooks that were not published. Although he began as a unitarian and the language of his earliest textbooks contained more East Bulgarian elements than Partenij's, with each book his language became more West Macedonian (Koneski 1967a: 199-200, 209-210).¹⁰

Šapkarev attempted to avoid antagonizing both unitarians and separatists, and he explicitly distanced himself from separatists in published statements. In practice, however, his language use and publishing activities became separatist, and he was denounced as such in the Bulgarian press after the declaration of the Exarchate, which signaled the definitive Bulgarian rejection of a Macedo-Bulgarian linguistic compromise. Thus, for example, in answer to an article written by Šapkarev (*Makedonija* 15 June and 3 July 1870), Marin Drinov (*Makedonija* 31 July 1870), in the name of the Brăila Literary Society, stated that the new Bulgarian literary language could not accept any Macedonian compromise, i.e., it would remain Thracio-Moesian. Later in the same year, Šapkarev convinced the citizens of Resen to return the Bulgarian textbooks ordered for their school and use his Macedonian ones instead. One result of this act was an anonymous letter to the Constantinople periodical *Pravo* (30 November 1870) in which the language of Šapkarev's textbook was attacked as "un-Bulgarian, or at least not sufficiently Bulgarian, a pure Ohrid dialect that stinks of Albanianism and Hellenism." The author went on to accuse Šapkarev of saying: "*Edvam se oslobodihme od Gărcite, sega pak Šopie li da staneme?*" "We've barely freed ourselves from the Greeks—are we to become Šops now?" (Sazdov 1975a: 22).¹¹ Apparently the writer of the anonymous letter was the owner of the bookstore in Veles that had to take back the Bulgarian textbooks returned by the citizens of Resen. This can be said to have defined Šapkarev as a Macedonist, although he still advocated compromise in his journal articles (Koneski 1967a: 223-25, 228-31; Sazdov 1975a: 22-23). Šapkarev's textbooks were enthusiastically received and replaced Greek ones in central and southern Macedonia. Parents preferred them to Bulgarian books because they could understand

Šapkarev's textbooks when their children read aloud (Koneski 1967a: 204).

In 1871 the first council of the Bulgarian Exarchate 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 (*Cincari*).¹² In 1872, after the establishment of the Exarchate, the Bulgarians publicly adopted the attitude that Macedonian was a degenerate dialect and that Macedonians should learn Bulgarian (Lunt 1953: 369-70; Koneski 1967a: 251). The following year, Venijamin Mačukovski solicited subscriptions for the printing of his Macedonian grammar, but the reaction of the Constantinople Bulgarian press prevented its publication (Koneski 1967b: 34; Lunt 1953: 369).

The earliest known document of an explicitly separatist character is a letter written by the teacher Nikola Filipov of Bansko in Pirin Macedonia to the Bulgarian philologist Najden Gerov in 1848. In the letter, Filipov expresses his dissatisfaction with the use of the eastern dialect of Bulgarian in literature and textbooks (Apostolski 1969a: 67). Stefan K. Salgandžiev, in his memoirs cited in Koneski (1967a: 205-206), describes the situation in the late 1860's in Salonika, when he was sent there to edit the newspaper *Seljanik*:

V tova vreme be zavejal onja vjatar, na otdavna zamislenijat plan ot njakoi učiteli iz zapadna Makdeonija, spored koito Makedonskata mladež da se ogranici da se uči i razviva izključitelno na Makedonskoto narečie i za taja cel bjaxa započnali da iz davat i izdadoxa njakolko učebnici na tova narečie... (Koneski 1967a: 205).

At that time there was blowing that wind of the plan thought up long ago by some teachers from western Macedonia, according to which Macedonian youth should be limited to studying and being educated exclusively in the Macedonian dialect, and for this goal they had begun to publish and had published several textbooks in this dialect....

He goes on to quote one of the teachers as saying: "*Ja ni sum ni bugarin, ni grk, ni cincarin; ja sum čisto Makedonik [sic]...*" "I am not a Bulgarian, nor a Greek, nor an Aromanian, I am purely a Macedonian...."

The earliest published expression of separate Macedonian identity that we know of, however, dates from 1875. The writer was

the autodidact stone mason Ćorgi Pulevski (b. Galičnik 1838–d. 1894). Between 1873 and 1880 he published three textbooks, and he made no attempt to write in a Macedo-Bulgarian compromise (Lunt 1953: 368; Koneski 1967a: 257).¹³ Pulevski's explicitly separatist statements deserve citing here:

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 zboruvajed ednakov zbor, i koji, živuvajed i drugarad eden, so, drugi, i koji, imajed, jednakvi, običaji i pesni i veselja, tije ljudite ji vikajed narod a mesto, vo koje živuvad narod, se veljid otečestvo, od toi, narod. Taka i Makedoncive se narod i mestovo njivno je Makedonija (Pulevski 1875: 48-49).¹⁴

We are not the only Slavs; the Russians, Poles, Czechs, Serbs, Slovaks, Bulgars, and Croats are all also of Slavic language [...] Nation is said [of] people who are of one kind (*rod*), and who speak the same speech, and who live and associate with one another, and who have the same customs and songs and festivals, those people are called a nation and the place (land) in which the nation lives is called [the] fatherland (homeland) of that nation. Thus, the Macedonians, too, are a people and their place (land) is Macedonia.¹⁵

Pulevski himself attempted to write a Macedonian grammar, the first of its kind, *Slavjano-naseljenski makedonska slognica rečovska* ("Grammar of the language of the Macedonian Slavic population," Sofia, 1880). Since Pulevski was not sufficiently educated for the task, his grammar remains only an expression of the striving for a Macedonian literary language (Koneski 1967a: 257, 260).

One other textbook that should be mentioned was published in 1889 in Constantinople by Stojan Novaković, who had 7,000 copies printed. Two-thirds of it was written in Macedonian and one-third in Serbo-Croatian. His intention was to combat Bulgarian propaganda and to promote Serbian interests, but he soon abandoned the whole idea for fear of arousing Macedonian national separatism (Koneski 1959: 15).

If Novaković's textbook is excluded, it is possible to identify sixteen textbooks published between 1857 and 1880 by Partenij, Makedonski, Šapkarev, and Pulevski. Other works could be cited and activists named, e.g., Rajko Žinzifov and Grigor Prličev (see Koneski

1967a: 168), but the textbooks discussed here were especially important in the development of Macedonian identity. They were directly connected with Macedonian separatism by teaching children in a language closer to that of their parents and different from that of the emerging Bulgarian norm. They show that Macedonians did not all think of themselves as Bulgarians, and they demonstrate that the "Macedonian Question" was an issue that had developed decades before the Berlin Congress (Apostolski 1969a: 67-69).¹⁶ The next period in the development of Macedonian language and nationalism was one of periodicals, organizations, inflammatory literature, and insurrections, rather than textbooks and compromises.

III. From 1878 to 1944

With the establishment of Bulgaria as an autonomous principedom at the end of the Russo-Turkish War in 1878, the situation was created in which Greece, Serbia, and Bulgaria each had an autocephalous church, a literary language, political independence, and claims to additional territory in what was still European Turkey.¹⁷ These territorial claims overlapped precisely in Macedonia, which had been included within the boundaries of Greek (Byzantine), Serbian, and Bulgarian empires at different times during the Middle Ages. Each of the three countries was therefore actively engaged in propaganda on Macedonian territory, ranging from schools and publications to murder and arson, attempting to convince the Slavic-speaking Christian population, which constituted the majority in most of this complex, polyethnic, multicultural region, to accept its church, language, and—ultimately—sovereignty.¹⁸

At this time, large numbers of Macedonians emigrated from the Ottoman Empire to newly independent Bulgaria, where they attempted to found literary societies. For example, in Sofia in 1888 Ćorĝi Pulevski founded the Slavo-Macedonian Literary Society, but it was dispersed by the authorities and some of its members were imprisoned. During the second half of 1891 in Sofia the Young Macedonian Literary Society was founded by a group of intellectuals that included the future leaders of later Macedonian revolutionary movements, e.g., Konstantin (Kosta) Shahov (president), Petar Pop-Arsov, Naum Tjufekĉiev, Andrej Ljapĉev, Toma Karajovov, and at

least a dozen others (Ristovski 1973: 143). The Society published its journal *Loza* "Grapevine" in 1892, was broken up by the Bulgarian minister president Stambolov himself, and formed again in 1894 after Stambolov's fall but did not last (cf. Perry 1988: 35-36). Although Misirkov (1903: 71) writes that the purpose of the organization was "to separate the interests of the Macedonians from the Bulgarian [interests] by raising one of the Macedonian dialects to the level of a literary language for all Macedonians," only the first of *Loza*'s total of six numbers was linguistically distinct from Bulgarian,¹⁹ and the viewpoint espoused in it was one of Macedo-Bulgarian dialectal compromise (Koneski 1967b: 38-39; Ristovski 1966b: 12). The fact that the society had a public constitution published in Sofia and a secret one printed in Romania, however, suggests that their language use was intended to give the impression of being unitarians, when they were actually separatists. The journal was severely attacked in the Bulgarian press as "separatist", and it appears that political rather than linguistic considerations were the group's primary focus (cf. Ristovski 1973; Perry 1988: 35-36). The Society was not without effect. The year 1893 saw the founding of the student society *Vardar* in Belgrade and the Macedonian Central Revolutionary Committee (later called the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization [IMRO]) in Salonika.²⁰ *Vardar* was a direct response to *Loza* and included as members Krste P. Misirkov (b. Postol [Greek *Pélla*] 1874 – d. 1926) and Dimitrija Ćupovski (b. Papradište 1878 – d. 1940), who first began to develop their Macedonist ideas at that time (Ristovski 1973: 143-48).

Macedonists were also pursuing linguistically relevant activities elsewhere. In 1886 four members of the Secret Macedonian Committee (founded that year in Sofia)—Temko Popov, Naum Evro, Kosta Grupĉe and Vasil Karajovov—conducted talks with the Serbian government in Belgrade during which they proposed that that government fund the printing of materials in Macedonian and the sending of teachers to Macedonia.²¹ In 1887 Grupĉe and Evro attempted to print a Macedonian newspaper in Constantinople, and in 1888 they prepared the text of a primer and sent it to Belgrade, but these projects were stopped before publication. A similar fate had befallen an attempt at a Macedonian primer by Despot Badĝoviĉ in 1879, although the periodicals *Vardar Kalendar* (Vienna 1879) and

Golub Kalendar (Constantinople 1889) were published in a type of Macedonian in order to spread Serbian propaganda (Ristovski 1966a: 12, 1973; Stamatovski 1986: 94-96).

On 22 August 1892, the Kostur (Greek Kastoria) parish school council adopted the proposal of a group of six teachers who had met previously in secret, and agreed to eliminate both Bulgarian and Greek and introduce Macedonian as the language of instruction in the town school for the 1892/93 school year. Three teachers were asked to compose a grammar and dictionary, tasks that were apparently already under way. By 18 September, however, the Greek bishop had succeeded in convincing the Turkish governor of Kostur to close both the school and the one church in town that was using the Slavonic liturgy. A Bulgarian representative from Plovdiv (Atanas Šopov) convinced the parish council to adopt literary Bulgarian lest they lose both their church and their school to the Greeks. The only documentation we have of the incident is contained in the telegrams to the Serbian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Belgrade from the Serbian Consul in Bitola (Monastir), who had attempted to turn the movement to Serbian advantage without success (Andonovski 1985a).

On 28 October 1902 Dimitrija Čupovski, Krste Misirkov, and 17 other students and intellectuals signed a document founding the Slavo-Macedonian Scientific-Literary Society in St. Petersburg. Article 12 of the Society's constitution, which was written in Russian, states: "Conversation in the Society will be conducted in the Macedonian language (Slavo-Macedonian); reports and protocols will also be written in the same language" (Lape 1965: 200). After the failure of the Ilinden Uprising of August 1903, Misirkov, who had returned to Macedonia from St. Petersburg to participate in the insurrection, went immediately back to Russia and delivered a series of three lectures to the Society on the events in Macedonia, on the need for Macedonian independence, and on the separateness of Macedonians from Serbs, Bulgars, and Greeks. That November he went to Sofia to arrange for the printing of a book based on these lectures and two others: *Za makedonckite raboti* "On Macedonian matters." The book appeared in Sofia in December 1903 but was destroyed in the printing shop before it could be distributed, and only a few copies were preserved.²² Misirkov himself was expelled from Bulgaria, and returned to Russia (Lunt 1953: 370). *Za makedonckite*

raboti was Misirkov's response to the failure of the Ilinden Uprising (Koneski 1967b: 41) and constitutes the ideological culmination of the development of nineteenth-century Macedonian national and linguistic identity. As an illustration of this, here is the final paragraph of the book:

1, Prilepko-Bitolckoto narečije za literaturnen jazik, kao jednakvo daleko i ot srbckijot i bugarcijot jazici, i centralno vo Makedonija.
2, fonetinčnijot pravopis...so mali otstupki na etimologijata i
3, rečničnijot materijal da jet sobrajn'e ot site makedoncki narečija (Misirkov 1903: 145).

"[The following should be adopted:] 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 and 3. The collecting of dictionary material from all Macedonian dialects."

Misirkov concluded his book by calling for the establishment of a Macedonian literary language using virtually the same principles which were ultimately arrived at in 1944 without explicit reference to his work.²³ Because all but a few copies were destroyed, *Za makedonckite raboti* was prevented from having much influence in Macedonia between the two world wars: the second edition did not come out until 1946. No known copies of the first edition survived in Macedonia, but the writer Kole Nedelkovski found a copy of it in the Sofia public library (Koneski 1967b: 44).

During the years between Ilinden and the end of World War One, living conditions in Macedonia ranged from difficult to nightmarish. Most intellectual activity was carried on outside the country, largely in St. Petersburg, e.g., the political journal *Vardar*, which, like *Za makedonckite raboti*, was published in a Macedonian very close to the modern literary norm (Ristovski 1966a, 1996: 71; Nihtinen 1992), and *Makedonski Golos* "Macedonian Voice" (Sazdov 1975b), which was published in Russian. Knowledge of nineteenth-century Macedonian national and linguistic activity was suppressed, at least in part, as a result of policies attempting to eliminate awareness of its existence. Ristovski (1973: 142) complains that many of the details of nineteenth-century Macedonian intellectual development remain carefully guarded in the state archives in Sofia, and this continues to be the case to this day.²⁴ Nevertheless, those periodicals and memoirs

that have survived indicate that the Macedonian intelligentsia were active in the search for their identity, and, as we shall see below, this identity appears to have spread much further than is generally acknowledged.²⁵

Turning from the Macedonians themselves to the West Europeans, who were to figure so prominently in deciding their fate and representation, we find that the latter began to become aware of the ethnolinguistic diversity of Southeastern Europe at about the same time as the people living there began to shift their identities from religion to language, i.e., the early nineteenth century (cf. Wilkinson 1951: 10-11). By the middle of the nineteenth century, Europeans were producing ethnographic maps of the Balkans based on the understandings of linguistic classification of that period. Wilkinson claims that the creation of the Exarchate provoked the beginning of Serbian claims on northern Macedonia, and he writes that "the Serbo-Bulgarian ethnographic quarrel" had not yet begun as late as the Conference of Constantinople in 1876 (Wilkinson 1951: 61-63). Based on Gopčević's map of 1885, he writes that: "Nobody before 1885, except for a few discredited Serbian chauvinists, such as M.S. Milivojević, had believed that the Serbs were really an important minority south of the Sar [sic] mountains." (Wilkinson 1951: 102). An investigation of sources other than ethnographic maps, however, shows that Serbian interest in Macedonia predates the formation of the Exarchate.²⁶

According to Wilkinson (1951: 105), the second edition of N.S. Zaryanko's map published by V.V. Komarov in St. Petersburg (1890)—which Ristovski (1973: 140) describes as the first to recognize the separateness of the Macedonians by giving them a color separate from both Serbs and Bulgarians—left the Macedonians without a specific color, i.e., neither Serb nor Bulgarian, as a result of the claims of Serbian ethnographers. Lamouche (1899: 23-24) wrote that the Macedonians were neither Serbs nor Bulgarians, but he concluded, on the assumption that language was the only indisputable indicator of nationality, that Macedonians were Serbs if they spoke Serbian and Bulgarians if they spoke Bulgarian. Gavrilović (1904: 516), in reviewing productions written and staged in Serbia by Vojdan Černodrinski (Crnodrimski), however, described the plays as "Macedonian dramas in the Macedonian language" and continued,

"we have before us the beginnings of a new, fourth, literature in the Slavic South." (cited in Dimitrovski 1978: 29).

Wilkinson (1951: 151) credits the Serbian geographer Jovan Cvijić with having "seized upon the idea of the 'Macedonians' and [having given] to what had originally been a political tag, an ethnic significance." Apparently Wilkinson knew something of Misirkov (1903), which he cites on the same page as an "article" by one "Missinko" under the title *Des Affaires Macédoniennes* [sic]. Wilkinson somehow missed the clearly ethnic character of Misirkov's statements, assuming that he read the work at all. What is striking about this and many other accounts of the early years of Macedonian identity formation is the absence of the voices of Macedonians themselves, which, if they are heard at all, are garbled or dismissed. Brown (1996) has discovered U.S. Immigration Service records that attest to the fact that between 1900 and 1906 immigrants arriving from Macedonia, then still in Ottoman Turkey, called themselves Macedonians and their language Macedonian. It was only at the intervention of American "experts" that the classification *Macedonian* was eliminated from immigration documents, and self-declared Macedonians were recorded as Bulgars, Serbs, or Greeks.

There are indications from other travelers of the same period that a distinct Macedonian identity had already spread to rural populations and was not limited to a negligible handful of intellectuals (pace Troebst 1994: 104, 124). Consider the following passage from Upward:

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 in the presence of the Turkish captain. [...] 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: 202-204).

The partition of Macedonia by the Treaty of Bucharest at the end of the Second Balkan War in 1913, which was reaffirmed with minor adjustments in favor of Serbia in 1919 at the end of World War One (Treaty of Neuilly), was a tremendous setback for the development of Macedonian language and identity (Koneski 1967b: 44-45). Conditions were unquestionably the worst in Greece, where children were sometimes tortured by their teachers if they spoke Macedonian in school (e.g., their tongues were rubbed with hot pepper or stuck with needles; Risteski 1988: 102). There was no publishing in Macedonian,²⁷ and in 1938 even the speaking of Macedonian in private was declared a criminal act (Apostolski, 1969b: 271-72; Risteski 1988: 97-102). In both Serbia and Bulgaria, a limited amount of publishing in Macedonian (as Serbian or Bulgarian dialect literature, respectively) was permitted, and while children were subjected to "ordinary" corporal punishment for speaking "dialect" in school (according to my friends, teachers would hit them), such treatment only helped confirm the popular sentiment that Macedonian was a separate language.

Throughout the interwar period, a polemic was waged in the Balkans and elsewhere over the nationality and language of the Macedonians. Linguists had already begun studying the Macedonian dialects in the nineteenth century, but the debate over their classification intensified after World War One.

Weigand (1924: 67-76), cited approvingly by Wilkinson (1951: 331), represents the Bulgarian point of view, which had the military support of Germany during World War One (Wilkinson 1951: 327). Weigand argues on the basis of morphological innovations and some phonological features that "*das Makedonische nur als ein bulgarischer Dialekt aufgefasst werden kann.*" (Weigand 1924: 75-76). Belić (1919: 250) represents the Serbian viewpoint, claiming that the north and central Macedonian dialects are basically Serbian while the south is basically Bulgarian. He bases this argument almost entirely on the reflexes of Common Slavic */tj/, */dj/ in Macedonia, i.e., north and central /k/, /g/, south /šč/, /žj/. Meillet (1918: 168) writes that the Macedonian dialects "*ne sont ni vraiment serbes ni vraiment bulgares.*" He goes on to write: "In reality they do not really belong to either of the two groups disputing them. It is politics that will decide the linguistic future of Macedonia" (my translation).

In 1938, three articles by three prominent Slavic linguists in three different countries appeared, all arguing for an independent status for Macedonian vis-à-vis both Serbian and Bulgarian (pace Skendi 1980: 37). Given the nature of publishing in the former Soviet Union, Bernštejn (1938) reflects official Russian and Soviet recognition of Macedonian as a language separate from both Bulgarian and Serbian. Maļeckī (1938: 142-43, cited in Lunt 1984: 93 and Dimitrovski 1978: 33), who conducted extensive fieldwork in Macedonia, wrote that the Macedonian dialects "are neither exclusively Serbian nor Bulgarian; rather the majority of them comprises an individual dialect type (which may be called the Macedonian language), bound by powerful ties of kinship to both languages mentioned. Macedonian is a link between Serbian and Bulgarian, and to connect it to only one of these languages is, from the linguistic viewpoint, unfounded." Vaillant (1938: 119) writes that most Slavists agree that Macedonian is part of a Macedo-Bulgarian group which has been subjected to the prolonged influence of Serbian. He lists numerous phonological traits which link Macedonian with Bulgarian rather than Serbian, e.g., the fate of the jers and juses, the sequence /v/+back jer, and vocalic /j/, and goes on to note that vestiges of /š/ in the /k/ area show that the latter reflex is the result of substitution, e.g., in Galičnik *gaki* "britches" but *gašnik* (cf. Bulgarian *gaštnik*) "a belt for holding up *gaki*." However, Vaillant (1938: 204-08), the author of some of the most authoritative works in Slavic linguistics, concludes his remarks by saying that Macedonian is not a dialect of Bulgarian and deserves a separate place in the Macedo-Bulgarian group:

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).²⁸

Vaillant argues that in addition to the influence of Serbian, intensive and complex contact with the non-Slavic Balkan languages, especially Vlach, was crucial in giving western Macedonian its distinctive character, making it a center of Balkan linguistic innovation. 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 the 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 and performed at the Skopje public theater (Koneski 1967b: 47; Risteski 1988: 80-81, 104-107; Rossos 1995: 245). At a time when Greece prohibited the speaking of Macedonian even in private, Serbia permitted the publication of folkloristic literature in Macedonian, e.g., Vasil Iljoski's play *Lenče Kumanovče* "Lenče from Kumanovo,"²⁹ first performed in Skopje in 1928, and the collection of poems *Oginot* "The Fire" (1938) by Venko Markovski (Koneski 1967b: 47). I have had occasion to examine the original manuscript of Risto Krle's drama *Milion Mučenika* (now *Milion Mačenici*) (1940), works by Dimitar Kočov, as well as the first publication of Anton Panov's play *Pečalbari* (1937-38) in the journal *Luč*, and while the details must remain the topic of a separate study (see Kramer 1998), it is clear that the language of these works is close to that which emerged as the Macedonian standard after 1944.³⁰ 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 (see Rossos 1995: 244-45).³¹

In 1934, the Comintern ruled that the Macedonians had a right to exist as a separate people with a separate language, and illegal Communist Party newspapers and leaflets began to be published and circulated (Apostolski 1969b: 85, 101, 116; Hristov 1970: 395-400; Koneski 1967b: 46-48).³² During World War Two, the Yugoslav partisans won jurisdiction over Macedonia and followed Tito's policy of cultural autonomy by issuing leaflets and news bulletins in Macedonian (Lunt 1959: 23). The development of literature and propaganda in Macedonian before the War were crucial factors in the rapid crystallization of the literary language after 1944 (Lunt 1953: 373; Koneski 1967b: 48). Thus, as Lunt (1959: 23) suggests, the formal proclamation of Macedonian as a literary language on 2 August 1944 was an official recognition of the status quo.

IV. PERIODIZATIONS, PERSPECTIVES, AND POST-WAR DEVELOPMENTS

The development of Macedonian language and national identity in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries can be roughly divided into four periods that are not inviolable sections of time, but merely indications of approximately when certain tendencies were stronger:

- I. 1794-c.1840: The period of the first published texts employing Macedonian dialects. Main figures: Hadži Daniil of Moskopole, Hadži Joakim Krčovski, and Hadži Kiril Pejčinovič. Main trend: The awakening of a Slavic national consciousness. The basis for identity shifts from the opposition Muslim/Christian to Greek/Slav, and the Slavs struggle for a literary language of their own.
- II. c.1840-1870: The period of the first textbooks. Main figures: Dimitar and Konstantin Miladinov, Jordan Hadži Konstantinov-Džinot, Kuzman Šapkarev. Main trend: The anti-Phanariot struggle. Many intellectuals favor a common Macedo-Bulgarian literary language based to a large extent on Macedonian.

III. 1870-1913: The period of the first grammars and nationalist publications. Main figures: Ćorgi Pulevski, Krste P. Misirkov, Dimitrija Ćupovski, Petar Pop-Arsov, and other members of the IMRO. Main events: The establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, the Ilinden rebellion, and the partition of Macedonia. Macedonian national identity is opposed to Bulgarian and Serbian (and other) interests.

IV. 1913-1944: The development of Macedonian literature in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria leading to the crystallization and ultimate establishment of the Macedonian literary language.³³

From the foregoing exposition, it should be clear that the developments of the modern Macedonian identity and the literary language have their origins in the nineteenth century. The process was hindered by the formation of the surrounding nation-states and interrupted by the Balkan Wars and subsequent events, and yet it resumed in the same direction of development in Yugoslavia (and to a lesser extent in Bulgaria) during the interwar period, so that the norm that developed after the official recognition of 1944 was essentially a continuation of the course of events in the preceding century. Thus, it is not the case that "first the state was formed and then followed the manifestations of national identity" (Skendi 1980: 37) nor was the "propagation of Macedonianism" simply "[Tito's] solution to the Macedonian problem" (Troebst 1994: 139). While it is indeed the case that modern standard Macedonian was not free to develop along normal language planning lines until after the founding of the Macedonian republic, and while it is also true that Tito and various communist parties supported (to a certain extent) Macedonian efforts at self-determination, it is prevarication to contend that the concepts of a separate Macedonian language and identity were created *ex nihilo* by Yugoslav fiat (see Friedman 1985: 34).³⁴

This account is a revised update of Friedman (1975), which ends here. Since then, I have published a number of studies of the standardization of modern Macedonian (e.g., Friedman 1985, 1993, 1998). The break-up of former Yugoslavia and the independence of the Republic of Macedonia have resulted in the focus of much more Great Power scholarly and popular attention on this region than in the days when I was a graduate student investigating the grammatical categories of a small and relatively little-studied Slavic language (Friedman 1977). Leaving to one side publications with obvious national agendas, some writers have misrepresented or misunderstood

not only the process of Macedonian identity formation but also the early days of codification. I will therefore close this account with a brief epilogue outlining the most salient features in the standardization of Macedonian during the first years of official standardization and address some misconceptions that have seen print.

Although Macedonian was declared the official language of the Macedonian Republic on 2 August 1944, owing to wartime conditions it was not until 27 November – 4 December of that same year that the first Language Commission met to discuss concrete language planning issues.³⁵ On 3 May 1945 a proposed alphabet was submitted to and accepted by the Ministry of Education, followed by a brief handbook of orthographic and morphological rules, submitted on 2 June and accepted by the Ministry of Education on 7 June that same year. On 15 April 1948 a list of six official modifications to the 1945 rules was published in the daily newspaper *Nova Makedonija*. On 11 November 1950, the orthographic handbook by Blaže Koneski and Krum Tošev' was approved and printed in March 1951. Whereas the 1945 document was a 20-page booklet outlining the basic principles of spelling, punctuation, and morphology, this second one contained a 75-page rule section followed by a 6,000-word orthographic dictionary. From the point of view of normative stabilization, 1950 represents the year in which the most basic documents were in place and the language planning process moved from codification into the phase of elaboration (v. Friedman 1985, 1993 for further discussion).

One of the earliest misunderstandings or misrepresentations of this crucial earliest period was published by Barker (1950: 104-105): "The written language which had now been established in the Macedonian People's Republic had originally been based on the spoken tongue of northern Macedonia, and so had contained some "Serbisms" (although the Macedonian leaders later decided that the dialects of the Bitolj-Veles area were a better basis, so that their literary language became more akin to Bulgarian)." Poulton (1995: 116) cites Barker without page references, but renders the information thus: "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. These dialects were closer to the literary language of Bulgaria but because the latter was based on the eastern Bulgarian dialects, it allowed enough differentiation for the Yugoslavs to claim it as a language distinct from Bulgarian—a point which Bulgaria has bitterly contested ever since." Note that Barker's "Macedonian leaders" are transformed into Poulton's "Yugoslavs," a subtle shift that emphasizes the Bulgarian

claim that Macedonian identity was invented by Yugoslav communists.

Although Barker is usually meticulous in her documentation, she gives no source for the above cited statement, and the data in the archives flatly contradict it (Friedman 1993: 167). Jovan Kostovski's stenographic notes from the meeting of the first Commission make it clear that there was complete consensus from the very beginning that the west central dialects would serve as the basis of literary Macedonian.³⁶ The earliest publications likewise attest to this fact. It is true that a salient feature shared by the northern Macedonian dialects and Serbian was adopted in 1944-45 (the productive imperfective derivational suffix: northern *-ue*, west central *-uva*), and it was replaced by its west central equivalent in 1948 (Friedman 1985: 42). This might have been the source of Barker's misunderstanding.

Troebst (1994: 126) likewise misrepresents the codification process when he describes it as including a "decision to exclude the eastern and northern dialects." As I have shown (Friedman 1985: 39), the fact that the west central dialects were taken as the base of the literary language did not mean that the new norm was identical with those dialects. On the contrary, a number of significant eastern and northern features were included, and early codifiers were explicit in their efforts to inform the public that the literary language was not identical to its dialectal base (Friedman 1985: 47).³⁷

One final example of misrepresentation in the discussion of the codification of modern Macedonian shows how local concerns can intersect with western academic agendas to produce unexpected (for the locals) results. Troebst (1994: 126) uses Risteski (1988) to argue that the standardization of Macedonian "was not the work of the different various expert commissions but of interference by the emerging new political leadership, i.e., the CPM," which he then uses to support the position that modern Macedonian language and identity were essentially a Yugoslav communist invention. Troebst was apparently unaware of 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 as part of a larger polemic that had begun that year over the relationship of Serbo-Croatian to Macedonian within the Yugoslav federation.³⁸ However, as is clear from the first hundred pages of his book, 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 argue that the process of standardization was co-opted by the communist leadership for purely political reasons. This is a

very different point and one that Risteski's own documentation actually refutes, if read carefully and with a knowledge of linguistics and of the documents that have been omitted. What becomes clear is that in fact—whether by intent or coincidence is irrelevant—the local communists were supporting the better scholars and language activists and were eschewing outside interference (see Friedman 1993 for details).³⁹

The emergence of Macedonian identity and language are summarized eloquently by Blaže Koneski (b. Nebregovo 1921)—the leading figure in the codification of modern Macedonian and a leading writer and cultural figure—in a kind of literary testament he wrote in 1993, the year he died. Like identity itself, the statement is subjective, and yet, also like identity, it has its bases in historical events. I shall offer two brief quotations here by way of a conclusion.⁴⁰ "But in the nineteenth century this region [Macedonia] became peripheral in relation to the centers of national differentiation in the Balkans. Not one of these centers was sufficiently developed in a cultural or economic sense to attract our lands into its sphere and to modernize life in them. We could not wait for them to mature. Independent national action began among us. Thus, historical circumstances dictated our becoming a small, negated people." At the end he writes: "At the same time, we must not forget that the component we choose to call local tradition is not limited only to a particular ethnic group and its language, but represents a complex structure, created in a much wider cultural sphere, which for centuries incorporated that people and its language. That process and those results have not been impeded to date by the Balkan cynics and planners of genocide. It is precisely the achievements of Macedonian literature over the past 50 years in various genres that show best that we had no reason to wait. Now at least they have the chance to destroy something worthy."

NOTES

1. At present, separate Croatian, Bosnian, and Serbian standards are being developed.

2. 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, Aromanian, Turkish, or Romani) 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.

3. But we have nineteenth-century jokes whose point is that Slavic-speaking Muslims call themselves *Turks* but do not speak Turkish (Cepenkov 1972: 132-34).

4. See Koneski (1993: 12) on publishing activity in Aegean Macedonia using the Greek alphabet.

5. South Slavic languages are traditionally divided on the basis of early linguistic differentiation into West South Slavic (Slovenian, Serbo-Croatian) and East South Slavic (Macedonian, Bulgarian).

6. In 1997 the Russian Academy of Sciences published a history of West and South Slavic literatures in which nineteenth century writers using Macedonian dialects were all assigned to Bulgarian literature, the argument being that a separate Macedonian national consciousness had not yet developed (*Nova Makedonija*, 22.X.97: 1,11-12). But these writers were seminal in the development of that consciousness, since their dialects were rejected by the framers of literary Bulgarian (Lunt 1953: 367).

7. An example of the more colloquial character of Kiril Pejčinović's language is his consistent use of parataxis to replace Church Slavonic hypotaxis (Koneski 1967a: 126).

8. In *Balgarski knjižici* (1 January 1858), Partenij listed twelve Macedonian characteristics as basic to the literary language he was advocating: 1) stress tends to the beginning of the word; 2) */tj/ */dj/ > /k/ /g/; 3) unstressed *a*, *e*, *o* are not reduced; 4) different reflexes of vocalic */j/, */j/; 5) Common Slavic /ē/ (jat) > /e/ always; 6) /x/ becomes Ø, /f/, or /v/; 7) definite articles of the type *-ov*, *-on*, in addition to *-ot*; 8) more remnants of nominal declension; 9) neuter nouns in *-e* have plurals in *-inja*; 10) 3rd sg. pres. ending in *-i*; 11) presence of a verbal adverb; 12) Common Slavic back nasal */q/ > /a/ or /o/ (Koneski 1967a: 182-184). Partenij also favored a more phonemic Cyrillic orthography. In his first book, he used such Galičnicisms as /o/ for the reflex of */q/, 3rd pl. aor. *-e*, 1st pl. pronoun *mie*, and 3rd sg. neut. pronoun *tea*. In his second book, he tried to use more forms from other Macedonian dialects and to avoid Galičnicisms (Koneski 1967a: 179-180, 185). Partenij's twelve points substantiate Lunt's (1953: 364, 371) statement (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.

9. In his *Kratka svjaštena istorija za učilištata po Makedonija (na makedonsko narečie)* "Short ecclesiastical history for schools in Macedonia (in the Macedonian dialect)" (Constantinople, 1867), Makedonski identifies the modern Macedonians with the ancient Macedonians and distinguishes them from the Bulgarians, a folk belief that also occurs in Pulevski (Koneski 1986: 206-207). While the substance of the belief does not accord with historical reality, its sentiment attests to a sense of being something other than Bulgarian among Macedonians by the middle of the nineteenth century (Lunt 1984: 109).

10. Some features of Šapkarev's language are the following: 1) the Ohrid reflex of */q/ (schwa), because it is like Bulgarian; 2) 1st sg. pres. *-m* only with the *a*-group (*begam* "I run" vs. *kaža* "I say"); 3) Ohrid verb groups, i.e., absence of an *i*-group; 4) Ohrid verbal adverbs in *-stem*; 5) Bulgarian orthography and relative pronouns; 6) misuse of *š* but correct use of *x*; 7) many Russisms and Church Slavonicisms, like Partenij, but often with Turkisms as glosses, e.g., *vāzduh* "hava" ("air") (Koneski 1967a: 210-12).

11. Ethnographically, the term Šop refers either to Bulgarians in the villages immediately around Sofia or, alternatively, to Slavs in a region defined roughly by Sofia, Niš, Radoviš, and Blagoevgrad (Gorna Džumaja). The word has a secondary derogatory

meaning of "simple peasant." Here it is being used to derogate the East Bulgarian standard from a West Macedonian viewpoint.

12. *Cincar* varies in its connotation from neutral to pejorative. It often referred to urban Aromanians, many of whom were Greek-identified. The denial of Macedonian identity by claiming that they are "really" Aromanians continues to this day. In 1997 I was informed by a diplomatic source that Albanian officials had told him that there were no Macedonians in Albania, that they were "really" Aromanians.

13. Pulevski attempted to use a supradialectal language, but as he was an autodidact his language suffered from inconsistencies, e.g. verbal adverbs in *-eki*, *-ješti*, and *-ješč'i*. He used such Galičnicisms as /o/ for the reflex of */q/, 3rd pl. aor. *-(j)e*, and the future particle *ka*. In his 1880 grammar, he opposed Macedonian, which he called *našinski* or *slavjano-makedonski*, to Bulgarian and Serbian on phonological and lexical bases. By this time he was also able to differentiate between the Galičnik reflex of */q/ and the more common Macedonian reflex /a/ (Koneski 1967a: 258-60).

14. This section is followed by a discussion of national self-determination. Pulevski declares loyalty to the Sultan in his preface, but the juxtaposition here can be taken as a call for Macedonian independence.

15. I have chosen to use "nation" for *narod* as being closest in modern terms to Pulevski's intent.

16. Barker (1950: 7) writes: "The Macedonian question came into being when in 1870 Russia successfully pressed Turkey to allow the formation of a separate Bulgarian Orthodox Church, or Exarchate, with authority extending over parts of the Turkish province of Macedonia." Such an approach ignores prior developments among the Macedonians themselves.

17. Most of Macedonia and Thrace were ceded to Bulgaria by Turkey in 1878 under the treaty of San Stefano (Turk. Yeşil Köy) in March, and then given back to Turkey under the Treaty of Berlin in June. It is sometimes argued that had Macedonia remained under Bulgaria, Macedonian separatism would never have developed, but Macedonian separatism began well before 1870.

18. Romania also promoted its interests in Macedonia among the Aromanian population, and the Albanians likewise had territorial claims extending into Macedonia (Dako 1919: frontispiece). Neither of these two sets of claims, however, attempted to define the nationality of the Slavic-speaking population.

19. Among the distinctive traits were the use of the Macedonian definite article *-ot*, Macedonian lexical items, and phonemic Cyrillic orthography. (Bulgarian, like Russian, has a morphophonemic orthography.)

20. *Internal* referred to inside the Ottoman Empire. See Perry (1988: 40-41, 221) for details on the name.

21. A Serbian strategy against Bulgarian propaganda was support for Macedonian separatism. Since it could not control this movement, however, Serbia reverted to claiming the Macedonians as Southern Serbs just as the Bulgarians claimed them as Western Bulgarians and the Greeks (on the basis of religion and territory) claimed them as Greeks.

22. According to Džambaz (1946: v), the pro-Bulgarian Supreme Macedonian Committee (Vrhovists) led by Boris Sarafov were the destroyers, according to Lunt (1953: 370), the Bulgarian police did it.

23. Mziirkov's language has fewer traits in common with literary Serbian or Bulgarian than does the modern Macedonian literary language, which belies the claim

that the codifiers of modern Macedonian were guided only by principles of maximal differentiation (e.g., Skendi 1980: 53). The following traits of Misirkov's language are illustrative in this regard: 1) /šč/ as the reflex of */tj/ vs. literary /k/; 2) intervocalic /v/ is lost everywhere, e.g., *osnoač* vs. literary *osnovač* "founder"; 3) /nj/ vs. literary /nj/, e.g., in verbal nouns in *-nje*; 4) 3rd sg. pres. *-t* vs. literary *-Ø*; 5) numerous neologisms (Koneski 1967b: 43). Misirkov's orthography was essentially the same as the modern one, except for the letter *а* for etymological */q/ (Ristovski 1966a: 56). (This was the concession to etymology in point two of the quoted paragraph.)

24. Andrew Rossos, University of Toronto: personal communication based on experience.

25. The fact that later in life, disillusioned by the partition of Macedonia and the situation in Vardar Macedonia under Serbia, 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) and Lunt (1984: 107-108) for a balanced assessment.

26. Stefan Verkovič was sent by the Serbian government to Macedonia in 1862. His primary purpose was the raising of a Slavic consciousness among the Slavic speaking peasantry of Macedonia to combat Hellenization. The question of whether they would declare themselves as Serbs or Bulgarians was to be left until after their liberation (Verkovič 1985: 334-36), which means that it was regarded as a question.

27. In accordance with article 9 of the Treaty of Sèvres (10 August 1920) concerning minority population language rights in Greece, a commission of three men composed a Macedonian primer, entitled *Abecedar*, printed in Athens in 1925 using a Latin orthography and based on dialects spoken between Bitola and Lerin (Greek Florina), but the book was never used, and most copies were destroyed (Andonovski 1985b: XIII; Apostolski 1969b: 250-53).

28. The translation is my own. Despite this clear formulation, western journalists continue to fall for the Bulgarian line in the battle alluded to by Vaillant, citing features that are shared not only by Macedonian and Bulgarian, but by the adjacent Serbian dialects as well, as "proof" that Macedonian is a Bulgarian dialect (Glenny 1995: 24). Poulton (1995: 116) likewise privileges Bulgarian attitudes. See Lunt (1984: 87-88) for a comprehensive treatment of Poulton's Bulgarian sources.

29. Published under the name *Begalka* "The run-away bride" in Iljoski's *Izbor* (Skopje, 1966).

30. The only major difference in Krle's work was the tendency to use the third person singular present desinence *-t*, a western feature that was not adopted as part of the literary language.

31. Troebst's (1994: 124) characterization of Macedonian at the end of World War Two as "a spoken idiom used in writing only by the partisans" is clearly belied by these pre-War publications.

32. The association of Macedonian with communism is a complex one. In Greece, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, Greek, Bulgarian, and Yugoslav communists worked together with Macedonists for their "liberation," but inevitably there were conflicts. Although occasionally supportive of Macedonian affirmation, the Greek communists were still basically Hellenizers (Rossos 1997, Risteski 1988: 161). After a brief period of acknowledgment (1946-48), Bulgarian communists repudiated first the Macedonian language and then Macedonian nationality (Koneski 1948, Čašule 1972, Lunt 1984: 101-102; these stances have remained basically unchanged), while in Yugoslavia Macedonian

nationalists that were too independent of Tito were accused of Bulgarophilia and eliminated from public life (Andrew Rossos, University of Toronto: oral communication based on archival research).

33. Koneski (1975: 81) has three periods: pre-1913, 1913-44, and 1944-present, i.e. the rise of national and linguistic consciousness, the struggle for establishment, and the achievement of establishment. Ristovski (1983: 145-46) sets the beginning at 1814, the date of Krčovski's first book *Slovo iskazanoe zaradi Umiranje* "Sermon on Dying," arguing that the purpose of Daniil's text disqualifies it. He then distinguishes 1814-70, 1870-1903, and 1903-44, i.e. up to the Exarchate, from the Exarchate to *Za makedonckite raboti*, and from that to the Republic.

34. Unfortunately, the line that Macedonian separatism was invented by Tito and his communists (promulgated by Bulgarian officialdom when it is not claiming that Macedonian is and always has been Bulgarian) is sometimes uncritically accepted in the West, e.g. Palmer and King (1971). Although Troebst (1994: 111) terms Lunt's (1972) criticism of that book "somewhat hysterical," Lunt's respect for subjective judgment in identity formation and his attention to nineteenth century historical sources are quite rational.

35. Pace Troebst (1994: 125), the Commission was not appointed until shortly before the meeting.

36. Document #167, Jovan Kostovski file, Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences. A flawed but usable version was published by Risteski (1988: 228-317).

37. Among the most salient non-western features are the preservation of intervocalic /v/, the presence of a phonemic velar fricative, the presence of final *-t* in the nonproximate/nondistal definite article and its absence from the 3 singular present marker, oblique pronominal forms and usage as in the east rather than the west, and the acceptance of quantitative plurals and imperfective aorists.

38. At that time, such polemics had distinctly separatist implications. See Koteski (1990).

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

40. See Koneski (1994) for the complete text. The quotations are from pages 217 and 218.