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ABSTRACT

This dissertation investigates the theoretical problems and practical considerations inherent in the definition of a dialect and a language in the South Slavic linguistic region. Specifically, it focuses upon the place of the Macedonian language in what is generally recognized as the South Slavic dialect continuum—both from the perspective of the linguist and the perspective of the speaker. A concern of this study is a reconciliation of three apparent paradoxes in previous approaches to defining a language in a continuum situation: 1) from the linguist's perspective, languages exist in a continuum, but an ethnolinguistic group has discrete boundaries from the speaker's perspective; 2) a language is defined either by formal linguistic features or by its perceived sociopolitical status; and 3) linguistic boundaries are posited either on the basis of objective features or subjective features.

In this project, a language is seen to occupy the place at the confluence of culture, politics, power, and identity. Therefore, a sociolinguistic approach facilitates this examination of the interrelationship between a language and ethnonational identity. The notion that perception and self-ascription play a constitutive role in ethnonational identity is explored. It is proposed that a language is the objective link (i.e., as objectified by its speakers) and one of the primary means by which ethnonational identity is understood by speakers of Macedonian. Moreover, a language, especially in its standard codified form, acquires a symbolic function for its speakers; the nature of a language as a symbolic institution has specific linguistic consequences for its speakers.
Data for this study derives from the results of questionnaires and interviews conducted in Macedonia during a ten month period, September 1994-July 1995. The questionnaires and interviews center upon language attitudes toward the neighboring Slavic languages and toward linguistic variation. Two results emerge from the data: 1) Macedonian speakers perceive Serbian to be closer to Macedonian than Bulgarian in spite of the linguistic historical and grammatical-structural affinities between Macedonian and Bulgarian and 2) Macedonian speakers are more likely to accept a phonological, grammatical, syntactical or lexical element which overlaps with Macedonian if it occurs in a Serbian context than a phonological, grammatical, syntactical or lexical element which overlaps with Macedonian if it occurs in a Bulgarian context. These data contribute to several conclusions regarding 1) native speaker perceptions of the place of Macedonian within the South Slavic linguistic continuum; 2) a definition of the Macedonian language for its speakers that encompasses its linguistic, sociohistoric, and symbolic dimensions; 3) and a method for determining speech markers that may characterize a speaker as Macedonian.

This process of recontextualizing the problem of defining a language within a dialect continuum situation gives rise to the concept of an ethnolect. A model of an ethnolect is proposed as a means to bridge the theoretical gaps created by previous approaches to language definitions and provide insight into how linguistic boundaries are constructed for the speaker. An ethnolect, it is argued, is constituted by a set of linguistic and nonlinguistic features; these features are perceived in a hierarchical arrangement which by its nature constructs a boundary. A partial hierarchy of linguistic features, interpreted as speech markers of identity, is proposed for Macedonian based on questionnaire and interview responses to linguistic features such as the place of stress, the use of the reduplicative pronoun with definite articles, and the use of -n/-t
and 1-suffix verbal forms. An ethnolect, then, offers a means of correlating sociolinguistic descriptors—status, prestige, and function—with linguistic descriptors—idiolect, dialect, and grammatical category—in a way that provides a comprehensive objective framework for studying and measuring the subjective dimensions of a language in the context of ethnonational identity.
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A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION AND TRANSLATION

All words transliterated from Cyrillic alphabets are rendered in single-character format, e.g., ș instead of sh; ć instead of ch; c instead of ts; ژ instead of zh; х instead of kh, etc. with the exception of conventional forms for proper names, e.g., Shevchenko, Khazars.

All translations are mine unless otherwise noted.
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BLL: The Bulgarian language, including Bulgarian dialects, standard and literary forms
E: East
ETU: Easiest to understand dialect, Questionnaire 2, Section B
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I: Words treated as numbered items in Questionnaire 2, Section C
LI: Least important dialect, Questionnaire 2, Section B
LL: Least liked dialect, Questionnaire 2, Section B
MI: Most important dialect, Questionnaire 2, Section B
ML: Most liked dialect, Questionnaire 2, Section B
MLL: The Macedonian language, including Macedonian dialects, standard and literary forms
N: North
RLL: The Russian language, including Russian dialects, standard and literary forms
Q1: Questionnaire 1
Q2: Questionnaire 2
S: South
SLL: The Serbian language, including Serbian dialects, standard and literary forms
ULL: The Ukrainian language, including Ukrainian dialects, standard and literary forms
W: West
YL: "your language" as a designation for respondents' choice of items, Questionnaire 2, Section C
ZTV: Zad Tajnata Vrata 'Behind the Secret Door' by Slavko Janevski (1993) and its Bulgarian translation by Boris Misirkov (1994) under the same title.
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The concept of a language is one we take so much for granted that "What is a language?" sounds a very odd question...Leaving aside children, mental defectives and linguistic theorists, what a language is is something already perfectly well understood by anyone who can ask what it is.

--Harris (1980:1)

INTRODUCTION

0.0 Introduction

This study investigates the theoretical problems and practical considerations inherent in the definition of a dialect and a language in the South Slavic linguistic region. It focuses specifically upon the place of Macedonian in what is generally recognized as the South Slavic dialect continuum, yet the implications of such a study go beyond this question. As Friedman (1985:287) notes, "...the Balkans constitute a unique 'living laboratory,' because of both the great diversity of languages and ethnic groups and the fact that these processes are well documented, relatively recent, and ongoing." As such a "laboratory" the South Slavic languages in general, and Macedonian in particular, offer both challenges to the concepts of dialect, language, and ethnonational identity and opportunities to refine the way we describe them.

This project necessarily engages a number of related fields: anthropology and social theory in particular, but the primary lens through which we examine these issues is a sociolinguistic one. The view that linguistics offers, in which language is seen as a system, since at least Saussure, has influenced nearly every discipline in twentieth-century thought including literary criticism, philosophy, political science, psychology,
anthropology, and sociology; it is clear that we have accepted thinking about the world in terms of system and structure.\(^1\)

One of the more influential ideas of the linguistic model is that we have generalized these structures as systems of signs in our cultures.\(^2\) Central to our understanding of human behavior and identity is the idea that people are sign-users; the notion of "text" has broadened, i.e., text is that which has been created and is subjected to reading and interpretation (Geertz 1983:31). And language has come to occupy a privileged place at the center, as mastersign, of all that is associated with culture.\(^3\) Hence, it follows that a language can be understood as both a system of signs \textit{and} as a sign or symbol of something else, e.g., social status, profession, age, gender, geographical origin, etc.\(^4\) In this way language in general, and the way we define a

\(^1\) It should be noted that this view predates Saussure by centuries. Consider Panini (between the 7th and 5th centuries BC) on the nature of Sanskrit (Staal 1972).

\(^2\) The appropriation of many of the insights of linguistics by those disciplines that comprise the Humanities and Social Sciences has significantly shaped their direction, though linguists might justly question the appropriateness of some of these. Central to this influence is Saussure's understanding of the linguistic sign as essentially composed of differential elements "without positive terms." Moreover, his suggestion that a "science of signs, semiotics, has the right to exist" has been followed up in a variety of social science and humanities disciplines. The work of Jakobson and the Russian Formalists has had a decisive impact upon the course of literary theory in this century and helped to inaugurate, along with a direct re-examination of Saussure, the general movement of Structuralism, particularly in France. See Culler (1975); Hawkes (1977); and Jameson (1972). It is interesting to note that this flow of influence did not go in both directions. As a field of study, linguistics remains relatively unaffected by these same disciplines that have appropriated many of its models.

\(^3\) We may follow the impact of the linguistic model in other disciplines to see that this is the case. Levi-Strauss (1963) was among the first to apply structuralist principles to myth and kinship categories and Lacan (1977, 1986) reinterprets Freud in linguistic terms. The various attempts to move beyond structuralism in the work of Foucault (1972) in History, Derrida (1976) in Philosophy, and Bourdieu (1972 (1991a)) in Sociology (to name a few) attest to the continuing influence of the systemic linguistic models developed by Saussure and Jakobson.

\(^4\) Consider Jakobson's (1990:49) notion concerning the dual nature of language as sign and signifier: "As modern structural thought has clearly realized, language is a system of signs, and linguistics is part and parcel of the science of signs or semiotics. The constitutive mark of any sign in particular is its twofold character: every linguistic unit is bipartite and involves both aspects—one sensible (i.e., perceptible) and the other intelligible, or in other words, both the "signifier" and the "signified." These two constituents of a linguistic sign necessarily suppose and require each other." (See also Haarman 1990; Lotman 1990; Portis Winner and Umiker-Sebeok 1979.)
language in particular, holds the key to our individual and collective identities.\(^5\) It is this interrelationship of the linguistic and the nonlinguistic aspects of a language that is explored in this study. These questions necessitate a sociolinguistic approach because it allows us to examine the ways individuals manifest their identity through speech.

Until the 1960s, when sociolinguistics began to develop as a separate field of research, much of linguistics, as a relatively new science, tended to avoid nonlinguistic issues inherent in the study of language use and behavior. Such issues were often said to be mere philosophical speculation somehow disassociated from the study of language as such (Bloomfield 1933:22, Hymes 1974:4-5). This so-called social component was often treated as a subordinate question because it raises issues that seem to defy objective description and rigorous quantifiable scientific methods. Yet, despite important knowledge gained by narrowly defining a language as a purely structural phenomenon, we must also see a language as occupying the place at the confluence of culture, politics, power, and identity.\(^6\) Thus, the problem pursued in this study is not "what is language?", but rather what is meant by "a language." How we answer such a question must include an understanding of native speaker\(^7\)

---

5. As Naylor (1992:83) points out: "In one sense, we must assume that language serves as 'flag' (barjak) by which a group declares its independence, especially in Yugoslavia...a language...serves to identify other groups." With regard to language and identity theory at various levels of group interaction see also Labov (1972); Isaacs (1974); Giles (1972, 1977, and 1979); (Giles, Bourhis, and Taylor 1977); Giles and Coupland (1991); Lam (1979); Gumperz (1982); Fishman (1989); Le Page and Tabourét-Keller (1985); Edwards (1985), to name a few.

6. As has been the case in anthropology. (See for example Hymes 1964 and Kinkade 1975.)

7. For the purpose of this study "Macedonian native speaker" is narrowly defined as those individuals who self-identify as Macedonian and live within the recognized political borders of the Republic of Macedonia (former Yugoslav SR of Macedonia), i.e. Vardar Macedonia. I recognize, however, that there are inherent problems with this designation as well. Macedonia held a referendum concerning its sovereignty and independence on September 9, 1991 and on November 17, 1991 a new Constitution was adopted to that effect. On April 8, 1993 the Republic of Macedonia became a member of the United Nations.

Clearly, there is a need to question the adequacy of our understanding of the ways in which language and identity are interconnected. This also requires us to confront the theoretical considerations inherent in such a project. One problem that requires our attention is the seemingly paradoxical approaches to ways we go about defining and differentiating dialect and language varieties, especially when these varieties are said to exist in a linguistic continuum that stretches across different geographical or political boundaries and contain more than one ethnonational identity. First, in a continuum situation distinct languages are said to have no discernible boundaries while at the same time traditional anthropological notions hold that individuals are organized into ethnic, national or cultural groups as distinct, discrete and discontinuous entities. Second, there is a tendency to define a dialect and a language as either formally linguistic, i.e., as a collection of phonological, morphological, syntactic, and other features, or as nonlinguistic, i.e. as a product of social, historical and political events. And third, there is a propensity toward bracketing off objective linguistic and nonlinguistic realities from subjective ones.

These paradoxical approaches may be attributable to the influence of the systemic-structural linguistic model itself. For instance, structural theories’ reliance upon dualistic or binary oppositions, i.e., between language and speech (langue and parole); code and message; system and process; norm and behavior; competence and

8. This is in no way to imply that there are any simple and/or one-to-one correspondences between language and identity (see for example Eastman 1990).

9. Jespersen (1925:42) is among the first to note that "dialects shade gradually and evenly into one another, and so-called isoglosses cross one another, without any sharp division anywhere." (For a summary of the earlier views that formed the basis of traditional cultural and cognitive anthropology, and sociolinguistics see Honigman 1973). However, more recently researchers have begun to view cultures as unbounded and fluid in nature. See for example Danforth's (1995:35-38) discussion of Drummond's (1980) notion of "cultural continuum."
performance, etc., makes it difficult to reconcile such paradoxes.

Furthermore, to ask about the interrelationship between language, ethnicity, and identity runs the risk of inviting the very problem that the occlusion of the sociopolitical perspective seeks to avoid: bogging down the researcher in ideological controversy. This risk is notorious in the Balkans (see for example Wilkinson 1951). However, our descriptions of the South Slavic dialect continuum as an objective linguistic reality are hardly less controversial to some of the interested parties of the region. Rather, there are other dangers the researcher should be cognizant of. Despite their recognition of objective aspects of ethnonational identity many theorists who emphasize the subjective and contingent nature of identity hazard presenting ethnicity as a mere effect of ideology, a form of false consciousness or delusion.¹⁰

While this project acknowledges the vital role that subjective perception plays in these issues, it maintains that to deny the "reality" of Bulgarian, Serbian, or Macedonian nationality does not follow. I investigate the notion that perception and self-ascription play a constitutive role in ethnonational identity and the idea that language is the objective link (i.e., as it is objectified by speakers and linguists) and one of the means by which ethnic identity is to be understood. By this I mean that language can acquire symbolic dimensions because of its objective features. Further, the nature of language as a symbolic institution has specifically consequences for speech behavior; as speakers ascribe a distinctive group identity to themselves they begin to emphasize aspects of their speech as signs of that identity. Such an investment often alters language perception and behavior. Speakers of a particular language variety are much influenced by the context in which it has been codified, perpetuated and is used. This study works from the assumption that speakers' language behavior can be influenced

by their perceptions of their language as an abstract entity, as a sign of something else that has its own identity. And, in turn, it is admitted that speakers' perceptions and conceptions of their language as an abstract entity must have their own linguistic reality, i.e., that there are speech markers of identity and that markers combine to form categories that convey identity (Gudykunst and Schmidt 1988). Therefore this study focuses on the "living laboratory" that contains the Macedonian language and explores the ways that Macedonian and the theoretical problems of defining a language and identity are themselves interconnected.

0.1 Statement of the Problem

The simplest questions often require the most complex answers. Despite all that is known about language, a fundamental question remains: What is a language? In short, it is still unclear for linguists what constitutes a language for any given group of speakers. This study explores the issues that surround the linguistic data: the definition of a language and the interrelationship of language and identity as viewed from a number of perspectives that deal with language in an effort to develop a synthesized hypothesis of language knowledge and language behavior as it relates to group and ethnonational identity. More importantly, this project focuses on attitudes toward linguistic variation and the description of a language within a linguistic continuum from the point of view of the speaker. Primary emphasis is put on Macedonian and its unique place within the South Slavic literary languages with a brief look at Ukrainian within the East Slavic dialect continuum for contrast and comparison.

The multidimensional nature of the questions concerning language and ethnonational identity likewise calls for a combination of conceptual/epistemological, theoretical, and empirical approaches. Hence, perspectives from across the Human
Sciences are employed to create a comprehensive and synthesized theoretical framework. This project draws on research from Slavic linguistics (Friedman 1975, 1985, 1993 and Lunt 1959, 1984, 1986), general sociolinguistics (Trudgill 1974; Giles, Bourhis and Taylor 1997; Giles and Coupland 1991 and Chambers 1995), semiotics (Lotman 1990; Haarman 1990), social psychology (Giles 1980), anthropology (Barth 1969; Geertz 1983 and Danforth 1995), history, political science and studies of nationalism (Jelavich 1983, Anderson 1991; Adanir 1992). This study seeks an understanding of the elements these varied perspectives share on language and identity in order to reconcile the seemingly paradoxical approaches to defining a language and identity.

An analogy to a web may best express both an understanding of the issues as well as the conceptual theoretical framework employed. A web at once reflects the interconnectedness and interdependence of the problems discussed here. By exploring each strand and examining the connections that hold the strands together we may understand the role each plays in holding the whole together. An important consideration for this study is that language represents the center of the web, the focal point, at which its relationship to culture and identity becomes intelligible.

The aim of this project is threefold: 1) to investigate native speaker perceptions of the place of the Macedonian language in the South Slavic linguistic continuum; 2) to attempt a definition of what constitutes the Macedonian language, historically and symbolically, for its speakers; and 3) to explore the possibility of identifying speech markers that may comprise a category of identity which characterize a speaker as

11. Herson and Bolland (1989:4) express this idea best: "It is the essence of a web that every strand connects with every other strand. Pull or twist even a single strand and all others are affected. At any point in the web, begin to trace any single strand and, sooner or later, the tracing travels across every other strand."
Macedonian. These findings are viewed within the larger sphere of theoretical sociolinguistics in an effort to contribute to an understanding of the definitions of a dialect and a language and their relationship to ethnic or national identity in a geographical linguistic continuum situation. I suggest that these questions be recontextualized by comparing the dialect-language continuum itself as a construct of theoretical linguistics with a speaker's perception of his/her own language and self-ascription to group identity and propose that this perspective gives rise to the concept of imagined (Anderson 1991) speech community with its own ethnolect (Lunt 1984). The concept of ethnolect is introduced as a means to bridge the gaps left by previous binary approaches and as a way of circumventing paradoxical approaches to these issues.

This project further attempts to demonstrate, that for a speaker, an ethnolect encompasses a dialect and/or a language which is marked by a unique combination of specific features (at all levels of linguistic analysis—phonological, morphological, syntactical, lexical, semantic and prosodic) that are perceived to convey information about the speaker's ethnonational identity; as such these features embody an ethnolect—that language which is perceived as being one's own and the language of the ethnonational group to which one belongs. Ethnolectal elements become markers of identity which form a cognitive category that becomes part of the shared grammar of a given language and speech community. In this way the concept of ethnolect provides a means to define a dialect and a language in terms of both its qualitative and empirically observable or quantifiable aspects and provides a way by which speakers distinguish their language from another.

12. See Chambers (1995) for a recent treatment of the theoretical considerations surrounding other linguistic variables such as age, sex, social class, and ethnicity. He contends that such variables yield a continuum of variation in language.
Chapter 1 presents terms and concepts fundamental to this study and discusses the theories surrounding the interrelationship of language to its cultural contexts. Chapter 2 focuses on the emergence of Macedonian national identity and of the Macedonian literary language, its subsequent codification and standardization, and reactions from non-Macedonian and Macedonian scholars to its place and status as a contemporary literary language. Chapter 3 presents data as evidence for the perceived place of Macedonian in the South Slavic linguistic continuum and in support of a theory of ethnolect in the form of self-report measures from language attitude questionnaires. Chapter 4 presents additional data from interviews, observations and a further investigation of the salient linguistic features chosen by the questionnaire respondents by comparing a portion of a novel in its Macedonian original and Bulgarian translation. Chapter 5 summarizes comparative evidence from the history of the standardization of the Ukrainian literary language in light of its relationship to Russian. And Chapter 6 presents a summary discussion of the data findings, a comparison between the concept of a linguistic continuum from a native speaker’s and a linguist’s viewpoint. The concept of ethnolect is presented as a model that reflects a speaker’s mental mapping of his/her language; it is marked and bounded by his or her ethnic or national community as those dynamic reciprocal overlapping sets of hierarchically organized ethnolectal speech markers and corresponding cultural cues. This model of ethnolect is applied to Macedonian as a contribution to the study of dialect and language in connection with ethnonational identity.
Abstract theorizing about the applicability of the terms 'language', 'dialect', and 'idiom' get us nowhere in the face of the assertion of the native that his speech is definitely and decisively different from that of his neighbor.

--Lunt (1959:25)

CHAPTER 1

THEORETICAL APPROACHES AND CONCERNS: THE WEB OF LANGUAGE, CULTURE, AND IDENTITY

1.0 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the problems and paradoxes encountered when we attempt to define the concepts "dialect" and "language" and describe the relationship of a language to its cultural context. In order to establish a theoretical framework for dealing with these issues I draw from several disciplines that regard language as a primary facet of group identity. The theoretical concept of ethnolect is proposed as a means to investigate that area where linguistic and nonlinguistic considerations are equally important elements of what constitutes one's own language. An ethnolect is seen as: 1) as a combination of formal linguistic features; 2) as language behavior; and 3) as an abstract identity-bearing entity. In this study, these three components of ethnolect are shown to exist in a complex reciprocal relationship.
1.1 Terms and Concepts

Because there is a great deal of terminological confusion surrounding discussions of language-related issues it is important to clarify some of the basic terms used throughout this study. The term *linguistic* is taken to mean those ideas, concepts, and elements which are within the scope of the formal structure of a language, e.g., phonology, morphology, syntax, etc. Conversely, *nonlinguistic* is taken to mean those ideas, concepts, and elements which are outside the scope of the formal structure of a language, e.g., social, historical, political, factors, etc. The term *metalinguistic* is used to designate those terms and concepts used for discussing language and linguistics, e.g., lexeme, dialect, linguistic continuum, etc.

The term *language variety* is employed in some cases as a general designation of a dialect and/or a language. It is not intended to convey descriptive nor taxonomic value. Language-related issues are further complicated by discussions involving various points of view. It is useful to make a distinction between the native speaker's point of view and the researcher's point of view. Here the term linguistic does not necessarily refer to the point of view of the linguist or scholar. In such cases the view of the linguist or scholar is indicated as an *academic* viewpoint. There are, of course, instances when speaker and scholar overlap.

Additionally, the use of the terms *perception* and *conception* must be clarified at the outset. Perception is intended to convey the act or process of perceiving and the knowledge gained from the act of perceiving. Conception is understood as the product of perception; that which is conceived of or constructed in the mind.

---

1. These distinctions are made for the purposes of this discussion and I realize that in other studies such lines are drawn differently. Indeed, the linguistic/nonlinguistic opposition can be a difficult one to maintain; I am mindful of Labov's (1972:xiii) comment that he "resisted the term sociolinguistics for many years, since it implies that there can be a successful linguistic theory or practice which is not social."
1.2 Boundaries and Continua

Whenever the South Slavic languages or any dialect continuum (where adjacent language varieties have more similarities than differences) are discussed we confront assumptions about the way we create boundaries; the marking of boundaries, or rather the process involved in marking boundaries, reveals our conceptions of a language itself. The notion of boundary must figure so prominently in this discussion because a boundary, like the linguistic models we employ, implies a binary opposition. Yet, a boundary is also something which has been constructed (politically, culturally, socially, etc.), and more importantly, perceived and internalized by those who seek to uphold it or destroy it (Barth 1969:9-10). Moreover, the idea of a boundary is important because it is something which at the same time divides two entities but is shared by both. In the case of separate languages, a boundary's legitimacy need not be shared by both groups for the boundary to be maintained by one side. Thus, the fact that a boundary is constructed, shared, and a site of conflicting claims suggests that two groups may not merely share the boundary as coequals; rather the existence of an opposition allows us to treat that opposition as a hierarchy (an idea I will return to in Chapter 6). In this way "us" is naturally a privileged concept that excludes "others" even when they claim group membership.

2. Additionally, I employ the term continuum in accordance with Willems and Blister (1989:542-549): "[a] continuum is a metaphor used to symbolize the gradual transition of a set of related varieties. If the varieties in question happen to be linguistic codes, the term language continuum is appropriate and may serve, among other things, to define the function and use of various language varieties...A formal property of a continuum is two poles with gradual transition from one to another." They contend that we almost always tend to envision a continuum as being unidimensional and propose that it is more useful to regard it as pluridimensional. It should be noted that their definition is not restricted to a geographical dialect continuum (for a discussion of both regional and social dialect continuums see Chambers and Trudgill 1980:6-10).

3. See Driessen (1992) for a review of work concerning the symbolic construction of boundaries and ethnicities.
Much social theory posits that the marking of boundaries represents a fundamental and universal human desire to set up differences, to distinguish between "self" and "other." According to Lotman (1990:133-34), for example, this need to delimit our world has its roots in the fact that "the semiotics of right and left are found just as universally in all human cultures as are the oppositions top and bottom" so that the bi-polar structure of some parts of the human body is reflected by the semioticization of our world. In his words, this is "the extension of the metastructural self-description from the center of our culture." Although the delimiting of "us" and "them" may be a universal, the ways in which the boundaries are drawn seem to be largely culture-specific (Lotman 1990:131). Still, almost all cultures have extended this tendency to perceive a dualistic opposition in the physical world to abstract ideas of it. Because human consciousness is formed by semioticized organizational constants--male/female; day/night; living/dead, and so on--Lotman (1990:133) seems to suggest that not only is our world ordered by us to be culturally significant, but the ordering process itself is significant. He has extended this notion to include our perceptions and descriptions of the boundaries that are drawn to distinguish "our" language from "their" language. Specifically, Lotman (1990:134) states that "[i]n the center of the metastructure is 'our' language but on the periphery it is treated as 'someone else's' and as such it is considered unable to adequately reflect the semiotic reality beneath it." In short, our own intuitions yield a similar idea: the more any linguistic element is perceived as being different from the hearer's language, the greater the chance that it

4. What I have in mind here is in keeping with poststructuralist notions that binary terms are really "mini-hierarchies" (see for example Derrida 1981:41). Consider some Bulgarian (BAN 1978; Mladenov 1993; and Ivanov 1994) claims that Macedonian is not a separate language but a western written regional variant of Bulgarian and some Serbian (Belić 1913) claims to the effect that Macedonian is a southern or eastern Serbian dialect. We have witnessed a further politicization of language issues since 1989 in Serbia, Bulgaria and Macedonia (see Friedman 1993a:86).
will be perceived as not being the same language. Part of the problem, of course, may be that all speakers tend to understand themselves as the center and as participating in the "ideal center" (see Haarman 1990; Boon 1982, Portis-Winner and Umiker-Sebeok 1979; in relation to individual linguistic change and variation see also Labov 1972; Householder 1980 and Coulmas 1981).

1.3 Defining a Dialect and a Language

Many of the same concepts employed in the social theory of boundary marking have formed the basis for linguists to divide geographical dialect continuums into separate languages. The principle of mutual intelligibility was long used as a means to differentiate languages (Chambers and Trudgill 1980:3). It has been often proposed by linguists as well as students of nationalism that boundaries are created by those who understand one another (and it is implied: in order to separate them from those whom they do not understand). This notion is as readily applied to a dialect and a language as it is to whole systems of cultural values. For instance, according to Hymes (1974:6-13) shared codes constitute mutual intelligibility in language and cultural behavior. Further, Le Page and Tabourét-Keller (1982:168) contend that "if one sets aside the superstructure imposed on linguistic definition by state and legal and educational requirements the other judgments made by people as to whether they are speaking the same language are often based on mutual intelligibility."

However, mutual intelligibility as a means to delimit linguistic varieties is problematic for a number of reasons. Mutual intelligibility, by its nature, is a relative term and therefore can only be measured by degrees. It is possible for two varieties to be partially intelligible, sharing some grammatical or lexical elements. But as is frequently noted in dialect continua and language contact situations, the level of
intelligibility may not be equal in both directions nor rely purely on linguistic factors. In his extensive questionnaire-based research, Karam (1979:120) observes that in language classification and language distance, lexical similarity is more important than other linguistic similarity. Nevertheless, his study shows that while phonological and grammatical similarity are important to reduce the time needed for related language speakers to achieve mutual intelligibility it is the nonlinguistic or sociocultural factors, i.e. functional, prestige, and political values attached to language varieties are the most important factors in mutual intelligibility (see also Wolff 1959). Mutual intelligibility may also be dependent upon valuing another's language as equal to or greater than one's own. Thus, the argument for separating dialects and languages on the basis of mutual intelligibility does not adequately account for nonlinguistic factors.

A recent relevant example may be found in political events between Macedonia and Bulgaria. In April of 1994, after meetings between the Macedonian and Bulgarian Ministries of Culture and Education, the Bulgarian Minister refused to sign a bilateral protocol which had been written in both Bulgarian and Macedonian. The Minister in

5. The example often cited in this regard is the situation involving the Scandinavian languages—Norwegian, Swedish and Danish—which are considered separate languages. They are also generally considered to be mutually intelligible. Although many native speakers posit that mutual intelligibility is not always "mutual"; in this case most Swedes understand Danish but the opposite does not always hold true (Hanne Clark, personal communication, 1995). It is also the case that within those varieties that are generally considered a single language (rightly or wrongly) such as English, Arabic, German or Chinese there are such great dialectal differences that some varieties are unintelligible to native speakers of other varieties. Moreover, the attitude of a speaker toward a speaker of another variety (though very similar linguistically) may affect intelligibility (Wolff 1959; and see Chapters 3 and 4 with regard to attitudes toward speakers from Strumica and speakers from Kumanovo).

6. Note that the Bulgarian government does not currently recognize the Macedonian language and ethnicity but it did in the past; from 1945-1948 the Bulgarian government recognized the Macedonian language and from 1945-1956 they recognized the Macedonian ethnicity (Kramer 1995:8). Likewise, similar agreements had been regularly concluded between the communist governments of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria (Friedman 1985:48-49). Though the protocols remain unsigned at the time of writing it has been reported that Sofia was ready to sign when the embargo, imposed by Greece (1993-1995), was lifted and fears were raised that Macedonia would lose economic interest in Bulgaria (Kontinent 9/25/95: 2).
his statement: "there is no Macedonian language" (24 Casa 4/27/94:1), reveals the prevailing attitudes upon which governmental policy has been based. Such policy is intended to promote the belief that Macedonian is not a legitimate functionally-valued language (see footnote 4 and Ammon 1989:26) and therefore not appropriate for diplomacy. In addition, many Bulgarian speakers believe Macedonian and Bulgarian are mutually intelligible while Macedonian speakers generally do not. I agree with Romaine (1989:24) when she contends: "it is very important to dispel the widespread belief that mutual intelligibility has some special status as an independent variable, i.e., in isolation from prestige, cultural conditioning, etc." Clearly, the concept of mutual intelligibility is not reflected in social and linguistic reality and is inadequate as a means for defining a dialect and a language.

Trudgill and Chambers (1980:10-14) attempt to reduce the confusion over defining a dialect and a language in a dialect continuum by employing the notions autonomous and heteronomous. Autonomous varieties are independent standardized languages while heteronomous varieties may not be standardized. Therefore heteronomous varieties follow the trends and patterns of the autonomous languages to which the speakers maintain political allegiance. Trudgill (1974:16) suggests that "nonstandard speakers" are oriented toward the standard language that is perceived to be a part of the place where they feel political or national affiliation, not simply the linguistically closest variety. Yet, employing this line of reasoning in

7. This conclusion is the result of several interviews conducted with native speakers from Skopje, Prilep, Ohrid, Sofia and Veliko Tarnovo from September 1994 to July 1996. Several of the Bulgarian speakers who expressed this opinion are also linguists.

8. These kinds of dichotomies have also been explored and conceptualized slightly differently in terms of features that cause perceived similarity and dissimilarity by Kloss (1952) as Abstand and Absbau varieties and by Ammon (1989:38-41) as roof varieties.
drawing distinctions in the linguistic continuum may shift too much attention to nonlinguistic issues (i.e., political legitimization and contestation) and may not accurately account for formal linguistic elements—the linguistic features which have acquired salience by being associated with a particular ethnonational identity.

Given the limitations of the criteria outlined above, scholars have recognized that a combined linguistic and nonlinguistic approach is most useful in defining a dialect and a language (see for example Gumperz 1962; Hudson 1980; Fasold 1984; Romaine 1994). Hymes (1974:47) proposes that the concept of speech community is a valuable one but cautions that the two concepts (speech community and a language) can be mistakenly conflated with very confusing results. According to him, speech community is a redundant concept because it "is inadequate to the bounding of communities, either externally or internally. Externally, the linguistic and communicative boundaries between communities cannot be defined by linguistic features alone. Forms of speech of the same degree of difference may be counted as dialects of the same language in one region and as distinct languages in another, depending on the political not linguistic history of the regions" (Hymes 1974:47).

Despite its shortcomings, the speech community model has been very attractive for Hymes and others such as Labov (1972b), Fishman (1971), Milroy (1982), Gumperz (1982) and Romaine (1989). All who rely on the concept of speech community for defining a language maintain a similar set of assumptions: that speakers who are members of a speech community share a set of nonlinguistic, i.e., social attitudes, norms, and rules as well as linguistic rules for the use of that language. Although it has now become commonplace to explain and define a language in terms of a speech community, which by its nature considers the related sociocultural factors, this
concept does not adequately account for the complex set of issues surrounding cultural and political identity for the speaker.

1.4 Dialect and Language Boundaries/Continua

Often in response to the question "What is a language?," it has been said that "A language is a dialect with an army or a navy."9 Although this answer does little to provide insight into the problems of defining a dialect and a language, it does serve to point out some interesting perceptions about what constitutes a language. Namely, that a language is popularly regarded as either primarily a social, historical, and political phenomenon or—though an obvious and unsatisfactorily response—as a collection of formal linguistic features i.e., isogloss feature bundles at the phonological, morphological, syntactical and lexical levels to which sociopolitical and historical meaning becomes attached at some nonessential level. In this view, linguistic boundaries can really only be established by political means (an idea I return to below).

Linguists and laypeople alike seem to have considerably less difficulty with the concept of a dialect because it is usually understood as a finite entity, as a part of a whole language (whatever that may be). A dialect is frequently considered to be a language variety which differs from other varieties in terms of lexicon, grammar or pronunciation and at the same time it is associated with a particular group of speakers who use it (Crystal 1992:101). For instance, a dialect in nonacademic and academic usage has come to mean a variety which is used by and signals a given geographical region, profession, social or age group. This means of distinguishing a dialect from a language may be problematic in reality because there will always be a certain degree of

9. Pinker (1994:28), though he does not provide a reference for it, attributes this popular maxim to M. Weinreich. Others attribute it to Jespersen. I am unable to find the origin of this statement.
heterogeneity among any given group of speakers. An individual may change the location of his/her residence and/or job, may have been educated in a place different from the place of residence and may be influenced by the dialect differences represented through electronic media. A speaker, in part as a consequence of this heterogeneity, is able to understand and participate in a number dialects which exist in a continuum situation (Chambers and Trudgill 1980:7). This does not, however, imply that a speaker does not perceive different dialects.

Currently many researchers, such as Ammon (1989:29-28), eschew confusion over the terms dialect and language by replacing them with variety, intended to "apply to any particular kind of language which we wish for some purpose, to consider as a single entity." This term, albeit useful as a neutral and inclusive substitute, has no descriptive or taxonomic value. In short, these sorts of definitions do not address the fundamental nature of the question that engages this project; these definitions yield little insight into the ways in which boundaries between a dialect and a language are created and maintained. We can, however, establish that such questions cannot be answered solely by the linguistic factors nor solely by nonlinguistic ones.

Given the limitations imposed by the purely linguistic data, researchers have looked to cultural contexts for answers. In his early studies of a dialect continuum situation, Trudgill (1974:15) observes of the Norfolk and Suffolk dialects that "...linguistic characteristics of [the] dialects change gradually from place to place. There is no clear linguistic break between [them]. It's also not clear where people 'choose' to place dividing lines. If a division is made at a territorial boundary then we accept state/political decisions, the division is political. Hence, it's a social/political definition not a linguistic one." Trudgill's explanation highlights the psychological-perceptual nature of our question, but because politics were not a decisive factor in the
Norfolk-Suffolk situation he has not addressed the problems so prevalent in the dialect continuum in the South Slavic linguistic region: people do not always accept the political boundaries because they rarely 'choose' them (see, for example, Wambaugh 1920). Such boundaries are rarely (if ever) established 'naturally' by those who understand one another (see also Hymes 1974:47 and Preston 1989:121). In the context of exploring models and stereotypes of language and group affiliation, Le Page and Tabourét-Keller (1982:162) comment that "[m]ost people believe there are races, but the races they believe in can't be defined genetically; most people believe there are languages, but the languages they believe in can't be defined linguistically."

With regard to the South Slavic dialect continuum Naylor and Friedman offer similar viewpoints. Naylor (1973a:33-34) observes that:

From a purely synchronic linguistic point of view, it is indisputable that there exists an unbroken continuum of speech for the South Slavic dialect area which begins at the Black Sea and stretches toward the Julian Alps and beyond. Except for the intrusions of alien elements like Hungarian, Albanian, Arumanian and Turkish, which can be explained in non-linguistic, historical terms, we find no sharp breaks in this continuum. We also know that the decision of a people...to assign their speech to the language of one or another of two neighboring nations is dictated not so much by the linguistic characteristics of the idiom as by such non-linguistic criteria as religion, politics or history.

And similarly Friedman (1985:36) notes that "[a]t no place along this continuum, can one point to a given isogloss or bundle of isoglosses which, on the basis of linguistic criteria, defines the boundary between two languages. Again, Friedman (1985:36) concurs that "[t]he decision as to whether a given transitional South Slavic dialect belongs to one or another language is not a linguistic one but a sociopolitical one."

Many researchers have come to agree with Trudgill (1974), Naylor (1973), Friedman (1985) and others (see Lunt 1984) that there is a weakness inherent in a purely formal structural understanding of what a language is; regardless of whether we label the language variety as a dialect or a language, boundary disputes are in fact
settled by nonlinguistic rather than linguistic criteria. But as fruitful and attractive as this argument is, there remains a phenomenon it does not address: namely, that in everyday speech situations speakers may also make judgments about other speakers by privileging linguistic over nonlinguistic criteria. How something is said becomes as important as what is said. It is often the case that linguistic criteria provide the means for deciding the identity of another speaker, in order to associate that speaker with part of some larger group or groups, be it gender, age, geographical area, nation, or state. Likewise, what has not been explicitly addressed in the Slavic linguistic literature is the possibility that these nonlinguistic factors have linguistic expressions. In other words, a speaker perceives linguistic differences that become identified and marked as being outside of his or her own language thereby also serving to identify and mark what is considered "one's own language."¹⁰ This does not mean that such linguistic differences are not intelligible, but that they have acquired additional saliency as a speech marker of identity.

Milroy (1982:208-9), whose work follows the Labovian sociolinguistic tradition, notes that "those elements or structure which are seized on as being beautiful, logical or comprehensible (or the opposite) are only a tiny and insignificant part of the language system," and that the "tendency of speakers to seize upon, and magnify relatively trivial differences to symbolize group distinctiveness is well documented in the sociolinguistic literature."¹¹ Much of this branch of research maintains the same basic set of assumptions: that there are low-level differences in all spheres of linguistic

¹⁰ What is commonly referred to by speakers of Slovenian, Croatian, Serbian, Macedonian and Bulgarian as naš 'our'. See also Neikirk Schuler 1995 for a discussion of a [+ not mine] feature in loanwords and Lozanova (1994) for a description of "alien" vs. "one's own" categories in folk culture in the Balkans.

¹¹ There are, of course, views such as Corder's (1977), which posit that a speech community is self-identified and need not have any other defining attributes.
analysis that correspond to social differences. These differences are used to signal
group membership, and in this way, a language constitutes a marker of that group's
identity.

It would seem that dualistic structuralist approaches to linguistic theory
have failed to capture the complexities involved in defining a dialect and a
language. The conception of what constitutes "our language," for instance, is
reciprocally influenced by the ways in which we communicate; a language must
be seen as the result of the speaker's perception of those similarities and
differences. And it bears repeating that even small differences may take on
significant meanings in order to maintain the boundaries of a given community
(see Barth 1969:10 and Moynihan 1993:15).

1.5 A Language, Culture, and Ethnic or National Identity

Many of the same problems and paradoxes that complicate attempts to define a
dialect and a language also confront those who have tried to define culture in general
and a culture in particular. Though precise definitions of a dialect and a language
remain a difficult matter, there is little disagreement that a language is inextricably
bound up with culture. I need not align myself on any side of the debate over the
epistemological foundations of language in order to recognize the cultural
embeddedness of language on the practical plane. As mentioned above, the most
fundamental approach to the concept of a culture, has been to search for identity by
establishing similarities and differences, i.e., in terms of ours and theirs.

12. Though the argument for linguistic relativism has largely been discredited (Lakoff 1987:304-337),
the idea that language determines reality—as Mead (1936) argued—or that reality is determined by
language—as Whorf (1956) and Sapir (1966) argued—developed the conceptual connections between
language, cognition, and culture (see also Haugen 1971; Lucy 1992).
Above all, we have come to understand culture as the organization of human activity, the totality of a way of life, and the patterns of human behavior including everything produced by people, as a product of materials or the mind. Culture is acquired and has continuity over time. Many definitions of a culture also have, at least, some basis in Barth's (1969:9) assertion that cultural variation is discrete and discontinuous and that "there are aggregates of people who essentially share a common culture, and interconnected differences that distinguish each such discrete culture from all others."13 Although Barth (1969:11) tends to regard "shared common culture" as an implication rather than a primary and definitional characteristic of group organization, he suggests that culture is also, in large part, self-ascribed and a result of the perception of what constitutes community.

For the purposes of this study, I recognize culture in a broad ethnographic sense and employ Herbert's (1991:5) perspective that the important theoretical implications of concept of culture stem from "the presumption that this array of disparate-seeming elements of social life composes a significant whole, each factor of which is in some sense a corollary of, consubstantial with, implied by, immanent in, all the others. Culture as such is not, therefore, a society's beliefs, customs, moral

13. Though lately (as mentioned in the Introduction, note 8), the trend has been to view cultures as a continuum (much like a dialect continuum) based on Drummond's (1980) concept that attempts to provide insight into multiethnic societies. Yet it should be remembered that he does not apply this notion across boundaries to groups that see themselves as belonging to mutually exclusive national communities. Danforth (1995:37) states: "According to the logic of nationalism, because nations are equated with states and because states have unambiguous, clearly defined territorial borders, nations must have such borders as well. Complex cultural realities, however, know no such borders." See also Kavanaugh (1994). Consider also that even a journalist (who knows little of the historical and linguistic past and is somewhat ill-informed about the present situation of the Balkans) like Kaplan (1993:240) can observe that "each time, upon crossing the border into Greece, I became immediately conscious of continuity: mountain ranges, folk costumes, musical rhythms, races and religions, all of which were deeply interwoven into those of the lands I had just come from [Macedonia]. And just as everywhere in the Balkans, where races and cultures collided and where the settlement pattern of national groups did not always conform with national boundaries, this intermingling was hotly denied."
values, and so forth, added together: it is the wholeness that their coexistence somehow creates or makes manifest." Thus, while a language is a constitutive aspect of culture and identity it is also inextricably part of the whole of culture and group identity. And similarly, I take the view that a language is more than a sum of its parts, but it must be considered as a whole in and of itself. From this view it is possible to understand the process of boundary marking and maintenance within a linguistic (or cultural) continuum. In spite of the fact that particular elements of one's own language or culture may coincide with another (and are often the loci of contestation), the conception of one's own language and culture (and the perception of others') as a unique combination or whole constitute a distinct ethnonational identity.

The boundaries between groups, then, are maintained by the group membership itself since they persist despite the movement of populations and information across them and "despite inter-ethnic contact and interdependence" (Barth 1969:9-10). This would appear to be born out in our experience of the Balkans as well. And we can also add that boundaries are maintained especially in situations where the proximity or power of one group may threaten the existence of another group. It is interesting to note that individuals generally tend to maintain one primary group loyalty and sense of identity even when they believe their identity to consist of several embedded identities--perhaps as a result of a mixed marriage, change of residence, bilingualism (or

14. Despite the importance of cross-cultural influences and continua, discrete cultural distinctions can nevertheless be identified and (especially at the level of ethnicity and nationality) these distinctions signify individual and group identity. Herbert's (1991) position strengthens my own that if the concept of culture is to have meaning at all, it must by its nature be a bounded entity maintained by its membership. This does not deny that there are similarities and influences across cultures but it does imply that this operation is subjective and serves to guide the way we conceive of the world and behavior in it (and others'), including, of course, the way we conceive of and use language. Therefore this cultural field is necessarily a hierarchical one.

15. See also Lunt's (1984:116) critique of Serbian and Bulgarian linguists' account of Macedonian because they "fail to look at the total systems of the various dialects involved."
multilingualism), etc. The way in which individual-group identity is conceived of or constructed may change over time or as the result of some event, i.e. a particular regional, linguistic, or religious element may be privileged above all others, but an individual still tends to identify at any given point in time as either A or B but rarely both (see Bourhis and Taylor 1977). Hence, the differences by which Slovenian, Bosnian, Macedonian, etc. identity is conceived of by its members hinges upon the perceptions of the relationships of language, society and culture as a whole, distinct from one another (see for example Minnich 1988 and Bringa 1995). Again, this is not to say that there are no elements which overlap with the language, society and culture of others. Thus, the high degree of linguistic similarity and mutual intelligibility between language varieties evident in the South Slavic dialect continuum do not prevent the particular ethnonational communities from establishing, perceiving, and maintaining differences.

The problems outlined above suggest that we must treat the question of defining a dialect and a language as one connected with identity and self-ascription. The link between language and identity, though long-recognized, is one of the most difficult to explain and the most complex to untangle. The nature of the language-culture relationship implicitly requires that investigations which focus upon language-identity questions, whether conducted through anthropology, sociology, psychology or linguistics, make group identity rather than individual identity the focus of discussion. The complexity of this issue is heightened by the lexical confusion that surrounds the ways in which "a group" is defined and labeled, both across various disciplines and within disciplines. Either researchers employ different terms to discuss the same phenomena or the same terms to discuss different phenomena. And the terms are continually being redefined to suit individual instances. The literature of all related
fields, however, has a tendency to treat group identity as "ethnicity" and/or "nationality." And both terms are difficult to comprehend in their own right.

Golab (1992:9) suggests that the etymology of Greek *ethnos* and ethnicity indicates their fundamental meaning was "community of (one's own) affines," i.e., the community of people tied by intermarriages" and that the conditions which enable intermarriage revolve around a common set of cultural and spiritual values and the "ability to communicate in the same language." Many definitions of ethnicity, nevertheless, are grounded in essentialist notions. Horowitz's (1985:113) statement, for example, that "ethnic identity is acquired at birth," sums up the belief for many, that ethnicity and nationality are natural categories which can be objectively designated, as a collection of innate characteristics that naturally define group membership (see also Shils 1957). Yet, a great deal of anthropological and sociological research rejects the essentialist assumption and shows that ethnicity involves belonging to a particular group and is a category that is self-ascribed and self-identified. These researchers recognize the subjective nature of ethnicity (see Barth 1969; Schermerhorn 1974; De Vos and Romanuci-Ross 1975; Anderson 1991 and Danforth 1995). Moreover, much of the work in sociology and, subsequently, in sociolinguistics that focuses on ethnicity is represented by Fishman's (1989:5-6) statement that "ethnicity is a self-and-other aggregative definitional dimension of culture...it is phenomenological, self-perceived or attributed, it exists only as human aggregates utilize it as a basis of aggregation of socio-cultural organization, it exists as it is recognized, interpreted, and experienced."

16. Another argument for those like Shils (1957) who see ethnicity as an essential primordial category concern the acquired vs. ascribed nature of such categories. Traditionally, two views are put forth: 1) the category of language is so integral to identity that the two are considered one and the same category, and 2) that language is but one marker of identity among a multitude of categories that constitute identity.
Additionally, Glazer and Moynihan (1975:3) point out that the term ethnicity has undergone a semantic shift in this century. The 1909 version of the *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* and 1933 edition of *The Oxford Universal Dictionary* define ethnicity as pertaining to "heathen," non-Christian or non-Jewish nations. The 1973 *American Heritage Dictionary* additionally lists pertaining or belonging to a "religious, racial, national, or cultural group," thus reflecting the trend in more recent American and British popular usage where the term has come to signify minority status. In fact, the motivation for Glazer and Moynihan's (1975) collection of essays derived from their belief that ethnicity had become a new social category. They observe that there has been an "increase in tendencies by people in many countries and in many circumstances to insist on the significance of their group distinctiveness and identity and on new rights that derive from this group character" (Glazer and Moynihan 1975:3; see also Smith 1981).

Similarly, researchers have sought to define nations and nationalism on like terms with ethnicity (Danforth 1995:13-14). A nation has come to mean a group whose members feel themselves bound by a common history, culture, language, religion, etc. (Seton-Watson 1977; Smith 1981; Kellas 1983 and Gellner 1983). These

17. Ethnic/ity still has a wider scope in common usage: as an equation with national origin. The key here is that the term is still connotes the sense of "other." And B. Joseph (1996, personal correspondence) has pointed out that terms like "ethnic restaurant," "ethnic neighborhood," "ethnic joke," and "ethnic needs" still bear witness to this usage.

18. Though countless researchers have tried to draw distinctions between ethnic/ity and national/ity in which ethnicity is seen as a part of, condition for, or transition to nationality/ism, (see Seton-Watson 1977; Smith 1986; Sollars 1989; Brueilly 1983; Kellas 1985) it is not useful for this project to create such distinctions. Neither is it my intent to argue that such distinctions should or should not be made, nor that ethnicity and nationalism are inherently negative or positive forces. I simply wish to recognize that they exist and are an integral part of what constitutes identity. (Consider also the concept of dual citizenship where ethnonationalism is opposed to a state political institution; see also Fishman 1974a.) With that in mind I use the terms ethnicity and nationality interchangeably or adopt a conflated the term: ethnonational/ism (GAP 1987).
scholars also tend view nationalism as a modern (dating from the late eighteenth century) phenomenon (Smith 1986). Anderson (1991:6), who espouses the modernist position, defines a nation as "an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign." His definition emphasizes the constructed nature of a nation—as one that is created over time by a complex series of social, cultural, and political processes.

According to Anderson (1991:6-7) national movements can develop if a nation is:

1. *imagined* because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion...

2. *imagined as limited* because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie other nations.

3. *imagined as sovereign* because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm...The gage and emblem of...freedom is the sovereign state.

4. *imagined as a community*, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep horizontal comradeship.

While many of Anderson's insights are central to this project, I also consider that his model evades the issue of the "objective" nature of identity, and the way this objective identity may be experienced by the group itself. Moreover, there is a

---

19. In this regard consider that have new and emerging nation-states not been inclusive, i.e., embracing other larger cultural groupings. Rather they are fragmentary, stressing local difference—the break-up of the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and potentially Spain and China. In fact, the only example of a new multiethnic nation (or tranethnic identity) are nations born out of the Enlightenment: America; or former colonial possessions, e.g., Canada, Singapore, India and some African states. All multiethnic states of the nineteenth century (Ottoman Empire, Austro-Hungarian Empire, etc.) broke apart due to some element of nationalist aspiration. Two examples of supranational creation (Germany and Italy) shared an "imagined" common language; historical legitimacy is bound with common language.
danger inherent in Anderson's terminology; at best it is too easily assumed that for something to be imagined is to deny its constructed nature, or at worst that it is inauthentic, delusional, or simply "false." Yet, such imagined communities, ethnicities, nations, dialects, and languages are indeed perceived as and conceived of as real. In fact, most of what we term culture is, to use Anderson's term, imagined as well; it is an abstraction or a construct. Yet, constructed is real, it is just not essential. And although imagination in these cases is not meant to be associated with fabrication or falsity, there are many who find this term objectionable because of its ambiguous nature; it is too readily imbued with negative and counterproductive connotations.

Mindful of such objections I propose to extend Anderson's conceptual framework to the definition of a language (the "imagined political community," i.e., the idea of nation is akin to that of the imagined speech community), but reject his choice of terminology in favor of a more neutral term: ethnolect. What I have in mind is that an ethnolect is the center of the nexus or web where the complex reciprocal relationship between a language and identity can be theorized. This also encompasses the reciprocal relationship between objective linguistic reality and the subjective aspect of culture and identity. Still, it is a language that remains equally significant for both the objective and subjective; it is the mastersign. Hence, the web is held together by each strand—the social, cultural, and political factors. The perception of these factors construct the imagined speech community and its language for its speakers.

Specifically, this study seeks to explore the perceptions and conceptions that manifest themselves through language attitudes and behavior to create a Macedonian speech community within the Republic of Macedonia. In Anderson's (1991:6-7) terms, it is expected that self-identified speakers of Macedonian, then, should imagine a limited and sovereign speech community. It is imagined because Macedonian speakers
"will never know most of their fellow-members"; it is limited in the sense that Macedonian speakers know their speech community has "finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie in other nations"; and it is sovereign according to the notion Macedonian speakers hold regarding the Republic of Macedonia as "a gage and emblem" of their independence and freedom.

1.6 Language, Ethnonational Identity, and Politics

The concepts and realities of a language, culture, and identity necessitate a consideration of the role of politics and ideology in this complex relationship. A language inasmuch as it functions as symbol of identity—ethnicity, nation and state—often becomes a contested site. Most researchers since Barth (1969) maintain that ethnicity as a category of self-ascription is primarily a political phenomenon (see also Khleif 1979). Fishman (1989:6), though, believes that the language and ethnicity relationship is "not necessarily identical to political identity," yet as something that is "phenomenological, i.e., it is self-perceived or attributed, it exists only as human aggregates utilize it as a basis of aggregation as a basis of socio-cultural organization, it exists as is recognized, interpreted, and experienced...and cosmological: it provides an apparently distinctive way of understanding life, history, the world, universe." Hence, I contend that a language on the one hand (as an abstract entity) has a symbolic function; it represents political reality. On the other hand, a language has communicative function (not only in the conventional sense), but rather, particular linguistic features can convey identity (see also Edwards 1985:17).

Ethnicity and its varied manifestations are often taken as a starting point to explanations of nationalism (Banac 1981; Kellas 1983; Gellner 1983 Smith 1986 and Jelavich 1990). And a great deal of recent research devoted to ethnicity and nationalism
argues from the subjective viewpoint or at least addresses the importance of recognizing both objective and subjective viewpoints. Edwards (1985:8-9) comments that this combined approach may "at first require a paradoxical mingling of mutable and immutable elements" which is rather like "the distinction between group content and group boundaries" itself. Grounded in a social psychological perspective, Giles and Coupland (1991), in fact, offer a useful and comprehensive model of the acquired/ascribed, symbolic/communicative, and objective/subjective dimensions of a language, ethnicity and politics. Their studies, like this one, begin from the assumption that language is one of the most salient components of group identity. Giles and Coupland (1991:96) argue that "language is often a criterial attribute of group membership, an important cue for ethnic categorization, an emotional dimension of identity and a means of facilitating group cohesion." In 1979, Giles introduced a model schematized by two perpendicular axes to explain the dynamic nature of the language-ethnicity relationship. He asserts that ethnic boundaries are maintained because individuals can and do perceive two intersecting continua: linguistic and nonlinguistic. He labels these boundary continua as "hard" and "soft." According to Giles and Coupland (1991:97) "ethnic groups accentuate their ingroup communicative markers" when they perceive both linguistic and nonlinguistic boundaries to be soft, i.e., in some way threatened. He sees this as a desirable process because it fosters differentiation, positive identity and the establishment of norms, thus, maintaining group membership.

In addition, their (1991:97) model "suggests that the most linguistic differentiation occurs, paradoxically enough with the very groups...which have the softest perceived overall ethnic boundaries and hence the greatest similarity with the ethnic outgroup." Linguistic boundaries thus are usually the first to "harden" because
they are a "direct and overt expression of social differentiation in interethnic interaction
(that is, individuals can easily hear and monitor their distinctiveness tactics)" (1991:98).

The present study adopts the basic propositions of the Giles-Coupland model
and introduces the idea that the features which are located within the "hard" quadrant of
the linguistic-nonlinguistic axes are hierarchically organized into different sets specific
to a particular group (ethnic/national group: speakers/linguists). Such a model
conceives of the related linguistic and nonlinguistic components in a web-like fashion; a
hierarchy of components is determined by one's viewpoint of the web.

Mindful that it is always a temptation to reify the ideas associated with language
and to speak of languages as "doing something," it is important to remember that it is
not languages but the speakers (and policy makers) of languages that "do things" (see
B. Joseph 1992). A dialect or a language as it is conceived of as an abstract,
independent, and symbolic reality must be imbued with its symbolic function by its
speakers. And further, in order for a dialect or a language to be perpetuated both as a
means of communication and as a symbol group identity, especially at a national or
state level, it must be normatized. Such a process of normativization, as one requiring
codification and standardization, invariably becomes a political process as well. Thus,
this facet of the language and identity relationship is usually addressed in the literature
concerning language planning and developmental policy (Haugen 1966; Fishman 1966;
Eastman 1983; Romaine 1988). These researchers maintain that a standard is
perpetuated by policy implemented by institutions, education and media, but
conventionalized by its speakers.

A final point relevant for consideration in this study is that a standard language
is often intentionally marked by its differences from others. Therefore linguistic
features which become part of a standard at the exclusion of others can frequently be a matter for contestation because of their connection to nonlinguistic issues.\textsuperscript{20}

1.7 Toward a Theory of Ethnolect

The foregoing discussion should make clear the many complex connections between language and identity—formal linguistic, abstract, symbolic, behavioral, and political. I stress the significance of boundary marking with respect to the definition of a dialect, a language, a culture, and an ethnonational identity, and I attempt to demonstrate that what is at issue is not the boundaries themselves, but what the process of boundary marking itself may reveal.

I contend that the language and identity relationship is a subjectively-defined one, manifested by objective formal linguistic and as well as nonlinguistic realities; termed speech markers of identity and cultural cues, respectively. From this perspective a language can be defined by the perceptions and conceptions of its speakers who recognize and participate in an imagined speech community. Ethnolect, then, is the concept of a language as a combination of formal linguistic features which is seen by a speech community as their own, independent language, symbolic of their ethnonational identity.\textsuperscript{21} I employ the term ethnolect as an alternate descriptor and

\textsuperscript{20} And as is often the case with emerging languages, the quest for linguistic legitimacy (through standardization) is ultimately tied to the quest for national legitimacy.

\textsuperscript{21} The term ethnolect has been used variously by Harrmann (1977); Hill (1977); Danesi (1985) and Tamis (1986) though none use it precisely as it is intended here. Harrmann (1977:19) views it as symbol-laden language variety of an ethnic group, though he is unclear about the relationship of language and ethnicity as co-variables. Danesi (1985) employs the term to refer to a bilingual community's lingua franca and as such, it is a variety which blends native dialectal, standard and borrowed words. Tamis (1986:5) defines it as "a stabilized nonstandard, regional variety with its own features." Hill's (1977) usage of the term which he interchanges with term, "glottolect," is closest to the way in which it employed in this study. He defines ethnolect as a national language including all standard forms and all dialects. Conceptually, I believe ethnolect builds upon earlier work of Eastman and Reese (1981) in which they try to bridge theoretical gaps and see the language-identity link as a combination of factors. Eastman and Reese (1981:109) argue that "[t]he notion of associated language allows us to define language as a factor of ethnicity on its own
model and that may help to reconceptualize the process of boundary marking. A workable theory of the language-identity relationship must mediate between the linguistic/nonlinguistic and the subjective/objective, and as such ethnolect is intended as a way of theorizing that site where the subjective and the objective, linguistic and nonlinguistic approaches to defining a language in a dialect continuum can meet. It seeks to provide ways of describing the reciprocal and dynamic relationship between the speaker's perception and the linguist's conception of a dialect continuum. It is not enough simply to note that a continuum exists and then to conclude that the commitments of speakers to their identities are arbitrarily shaped by national, religious, or historic claims.

Additionally, I explore the idea that as a language variety an ethnolect is a variety or code which is marked by certain features (at all levels of linguistic analysis—phonological, morphological, syntactical, prosodic, and lexical) which convey information about identity. Such speech markers of identity are encoded in the linguistic system as a cognitive category; as part of the shared grammar this category can have aspects which are both qualifiable and quantifiable.

1.8 Summary

I propose that our definitions of a dialect and language are inadequate descriptors in situations where adjacent languages appear to have more similarities than differences yet are felt to be distinct by their speakers. Hence, the concept of a language in a linguistic continuum cannot be thought of in the same way as a nation (or a culture) terms. An associated language is neither langue nor parole nor is it emblem—but, it may be both or each of these forms." They do not posit a cause and effect relationship, yet maintain that it is a "necessary component of identity and they say it does not matter whether we know it or speak it as long as there is a language we associate with our identity; rather they simply recognize that such a relation exists.
because individuals do not recognize a cultural continuum in a quest for legitimization. Political, state, and media institutions are among the entities that provide the legitimization of language and give life to a language as an abstract entity. This concept of a language as an abstract entity in turn influences individual language perception and behavior. The extent to which individual language behavior is measured against this abstract ideal of the standard as a symbolic entity also remains to be investigated. A definition of a language as an ethnolect can be explored through attitudes toward language varieties and specific linguistic features.

Finally, if group (cultural, ethnonational) boundaries exist in the mind of the individual, can a dialect continuum exist in the mind of the speaker as well? If group boundaries are maintained by the group membership itself, language boundaries must also be maintained by the speakers themselves. This premise is investigated through an examination of how the category of naš 'our language' is defined for the Macedonian speaker in the Republic of Macedonia in light of views which hold that there are no distinct linguistic boundaries in the South Slavic dialect continuum.22

22. Naš here is taken from the example, Ađe be zborava š na Makedonski, ta a zn a e naš 'Come on, speak Macedonian, she knows our language' (a colloquial variant of našinski or naški).
It was not at first that these languages made history; it was history that made these languages.

--Deutsch (1942:536-37)

How do you divide up the past? -- You argue over what was in a dead man's mind.

--conversation between Todorovski and Kaplan (Kaplan 1993:58)

CHAPTER 2

LOCATING THE MACEDONIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE IN TIME AND SPACE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the sociohistoric and linguistic emergence and development of the contemporary Macedonian literary language (MLL) in order to provide the background necessary for an understanding of the status and function of Macedonian for its speakers. Of particular interest here are: 1) attempts to differentiate MLL from the Serbo-Croatian literary language (SLL) and the Bulgarian literary language (BLL) and 2) attempts to develop a codified norm separate from SLL and BLL.¹ This discussion is essential to a study of the ways in which Macedonian speakers conceive of MLL as an abstract entity bound up with national identity.

¹ In the interest of simplicity SLL is intended to encompass Croatian and Serbian or the West South Slavic dialects and standard codified forms except where specifically indicated as Croatian (see Chapters 3 and 4); BLL is intended to encompass Bulgarian dialects and the standard codified form for the purposes of this study.
In order to bring into view the nature of MLL's role as constitutive of Macedonian identity, we must turn to historical and political considerations, for if a nation finds its legitimacy in its historical distinctiveness and its territorial separateness, a unique language serves to guarantee authenticity through time and space for its speakers. As such, a language does not merely help to shape a national identity, but in large measure can actually foster that identity. Language emerges as an essential category of identity in the Balkans because it comes to be seen by speakers as powerful "evidence" or "proof" of the discrete existence in time and space of the nation as an almost transcendental entity. A language becomes a powerful symbol in the quest to secure the legitimacy of nationhood. In the case of Macedonian, as elsewhere, questions of nationality and language are closely connected to the practical considerations of codification and the implementation of a standard language. Hence, an understanding of the changing symbolic functions of the vernacular and the historical conditions of the emergence and standardization of MLL are vital to a clear view of the close connection between Macedonian identity and language. Yet, this history is not one of straightforward chronological cause and effect; such an approach runs the risk of a nationalist narrative outlining the rise of a nation as a positive and essential entity. Rather, what must be emphasized is the relational nature of Macedonian identity—and perhaps all ethnolinguistic nationalism—a national consciousness that develops from a relationship to the "other", i.e., from what one is not, before what one is. Thus, this discussion concerning the emergence and standardization of MLL devolves from a thematic rather than a chronological presentation of key issues and events.

2. I wish to note that I am aware of the question this raises concerning the internalization of externally-imposed constructs (see for example Herbert 1991).
2.1 The Argument Over Origins

At present it is over one hundred years since ideas for a separate MLL began to take shape and fifty years since it acquired its status as the official language in the Republic of Macedonia. Macedonian is currently the official and predominant language of government, commerce, media, and education in the Republic of Macedonia. The most recent statistics from the census conducted by the Statistical Office of Macedonia in June 1994 indicate that 1,288,330 citizens declared themselves Macedonian constituting 67% of the entire population. Still, for many Bulgarians (and Greeks) the designation "Macedonian" itself, as well as its historical and current status as a separate literary language, remains a contentious issue.

3. Macedonian was accorded official status at the first session of The Anti-Fascist Assembly of the National Liberation of Macedonia (Antifašistskoto Sobranie za Narodno Osloboduvanje na Makedonija or ASNOM) held August 2, 1944 at the Prohor Pčinski monastery, then in northern Macedonia, now in southern Serbia (Friedman 1993b:164,175).

4. Article 7 of the 1992 constitution mandates Macedonian as the official language of the Republic. Though many languages are used within their own communities and Macedonian Radio and Television stations broadcast several times a week in Albanian, Romani, Vlach and Turkish; newspapers are published daily in Albanian and Turkish (See Friedman 1992:81-83; Lazaroski 1994, 38-9, 234-5.)

5. As of midnight June 20, 1994 the total population was recorded by the Office of Statistics as 1,936,877: 442,914 Albanians; 77,252 Turks; 43,732 Roms; 8,467 Vlachs; 39,269 Serbs. For a point of reference: statistics from the 1981 census of SR Macedonia in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia indicate that there were 1,341,598 native speakers of Macedonian (which is not necessarily the same number as those who declared Macedonian nationality; 6% declared themselves Yugoslav (Friedman 1985, 1995). Note that these numbers are supplied in the interest of information and not to imply that there is any sort of one-to-one correspondence between language and ethnicity or nationality. According to Friedman (1995:4), "multilingual families in Macedonia often made varying decisions about national identity when called upon to declare their nationalities for past censuses. Also, religious identity has often taken precedence over evident linguistic ties, with Muslim Macedonian speakers identifying themselves as Albanian or Turkish, for example, or Christian Albanian speakers calling themselves Macedonian."

6. A consideration of Macedonian-Greek relations is beyond the scope of this study. Suffice it to say that I am aware of the complex issues involved and the impact these have on the Republic of Macedonia and the Macedonian-speaking population in Aegean Macedonia, e.g., the Greek economic embargo (1992-1995) against Macedonia; the ban of Macedonian passport holders by Greece; Greek outrage over the Star of Vergina/Macedonian Sun symbol on the Macedonian flag (which has was changed to a Sun with eight rays late in 1995); and the on-going problem over the name of the Macedonian Republic. Other problems for Macedonian foreign relations include the Bulgarian refusal to recognize the Macedonian language and nation even though they recognize the
Though the name Macedonia has been regarded as a geographical designation at least since the fourth century BC, its history, precise boundaries and ethnographic constitution have been a source of conflict for nearly as long. According to Adanir (1992:183-4) the historiography of the region has been written only to advance the claims of those competing for it (see also Jelavich 1983:89). Likewise, Danforth (1995:56) observes that many of the arguments surrounding the beginnings of a Macedonian identity are fashioned in radical terms. Extremists on one side of the issue claim that Macedonian national identity begins with Alexander the Great in the fourth century BC, while others suggest that Macedonian identity dates from Sts. Cyril and Methodius in the ninth century or from Czar Samuil (976-1014). Still others would have us believe that it was created by decrees from Josip Broz Tito at the end of World War II (see also Friedman 1992:93). Danforth (1995:56), nonetheless, asserts that Macedonian identity "begins in the second half of the nineteenth century with the first expressions of Macedonian ethnic nationalism on the part of a small number of

Republic of Macedonia and the United States' initial reticence to establish full diplomatic relations with Macedonia (the first US. embassy and consulate opened in Skopje March 23, 1996). (See also Kramer 1993:157.)

7. The Greeks, Adanir (1992:183-4) claims, have been able to construct their argument most easily: two circumstances seemed to offer clear proof of the Hellenic character of the Macedonians: the term Macedonian itself which refers to the Hellenistic empire of Alexander and the fact that the Macedonian Slavs were members of the Greek millet during the Ottoman rule on account of their being Greek Orthodox Christians. The Bulgarians on the other hand could emphasize that in the ninth and tenth centuries Macedonia had belonged to the Bulgarian czardom. Finally the Serbs could with the same justification refer to the empire of Stephan Dušan (1335-55), the center of which lay in modern Macedonia. He also adds that "these kinds of historical claims should be regarded as suspiciously as if, for instance, Germany attempted to lay claim to England, or Italy to most of Europe on the basis that these lands were ruled or inhabited by their antecedents" (Danforth 1995:4).

8. Several books have recently been published in Skopje concerning Alexander the Great. See for example, Tupurovski (1994) and Milosevska (1994).
intellectuals in places like Thessaloniki, Belgrade, Sophia, and St. Petersburg. " Similarly, this study suggests that the social and historic circumstances particular to Macedonia in the middle of the last century resulted in a Macedonian identity that was defined in opposition to what it was not. The first manifestations of a Macedonian ethnic consciousness took the form of a Macedonian linguistic consciousness, i.e., attempts to publish in a vernacular.

2.2 An Overview: The Emergence of Language as a Category of National Identity in the Balkans

Considering a language as a marker of identity requires establishing a connection between a linguistic consciousness and an ethnic/national consciousness. And any discussion of the relationship of language and nationalism is contingent upon an understanding of nationalism and nationality as either a product of modernity or as a result of a kind of primordialism (Smith 1986:6-8; see also Kohn 1962; Banac 1981; Kellas 1983; and Anderson 1991). Conceptually, nation and nationality have their roots in the central notions of the late seventeenth century Pietists, e.g., Spener and Boehme, which were later adopted and secularized by German Romantic philosophers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Stoeffler 1965).

Primordialist theorists such as Herder (1772) developed a Romantic position born out of a reaction to what they saw as the overly rationalistic concepts of the Enlightenment: its dedication to instrumental reason, cosmopolitanism, and universalizing speculation. For Herder, this means that society is composed of atomized individuals who define themselves according to rational principles. Against

this position he offers a definition of human community in which language becomes a
direct expression of the authentic nature of a people (Barnard 1965:55-58). The
influence of the German Romantics on the Balkans (and Eastern Europe), namely the
development of nationalism was unlike that in Western Europe; the emerging nations in
the Balkans did not have corresponding historical geographical states and the work of
Herder provided a model for an ethnolinguistic nationalism, which transcended a purely
nation-state-territorial one. Hence, whereas Herder's ideas were experienced in the
West as a legitimization of already existing states on the basis of the nature of a people
(rather than a sovereign), they provided justification for the existence of nations in the
Balkans that were states by 'natural right.'

Fundamental to Herder (1772), and essentialist theories of nationalism that
derive from him, is that a nation exists because of a given groups' attributes such as
physical type, religion, secular and social custom and ritual, and language (see for
example Shils 1957). The connection, then, between a vernacular and a people's
identity comes from the nature of language itself: because it arises through the historical
development of a people and is inextricable from their world view (Barnard 1965:56-
57). In short, inherent in such theories of nationalism is the idea that the world can be
seen as subject to a natural order. The boundaries of states, therefore, are viewed as
"right and natural" if they correspond to the distributions of groups' attributes (Smith
1986:7-10).

Tracing the complex history of social and political events in the Balkans in the
latter part of nineteenth century allows us to understand why language became
privileged over other attributes. As ideas of nation and nationalism began to filter into
the Balkans by turn of the nineteenth century, nationalist movements turned to the
concept of a national language as the source of ideological strength in their struggle
against Hellenization and Ottoman hegemony. Religion, as the determiner of nation, was superseded by language and the states that were competing for population and territory in Macedonia changed their strategy as well; the establishment of schools to teach culture and history in a form of the vernacular served as an extension of the churches.

Insofar as those states competing for population and territory in Macedonia turned to language and cultural propaganda to stake their claim, the ethnographic map emerged as a powerful weapon. Wilkinson (1951:91) observes that after the Treaty of San Stefano (1878) provisions were determined all those involved remained dissatisfied:

...and of all the territories left to the Turk, none was so earnestly desired by so many powers, great and small, as Macedonia. And how might the smaller powers better establish their moral rights than through the medium of the ethnographic map?...nowhere in these areas was the ethnographic issue so much in doubt as in Macedonia, and that it was possible to evolve new ethnographic mosaics by the adoption of fresh criteria.

Language had clearly become recognized as the source and symbol of identity; ethnographic origin could be determined by one's "mother tongue" and all sides raced to publish maps that would reflect their own interests. The writers of the Carnegie Report (1914:27), in fact, note this as a contributing factor to the Balkan Wars and, in addition, they suggest another reason why a language becomes so important in understanding nationalism:11

10. The struggle for independence from the Ottomans gained new impetus from ideas of nationalism: Serbia (1804) staged a revolt that gained them limited autonomy in 1815 and the Greek revolution (1821-1829) drew the attention of the European powers to the Balkans (see C. Jelavich and B. Jelavich 1986).

11. It bears mentioning that the Carnegie Report is a valuable document as a reflection of the European interpretation of the events in the Balkans prior to the Balkan Wars, but should not necessarily be regarded as a primary source.
The new generation in Servia therefore now sought a more reliable and scientific means of determining nationality, and found it in language. Youthful scholars devoted themselves to the study of Macedonian dialects and sought for phonetic and morphological traces of Servian influence which might enable them to classified among Servian dialects. Bulgarian linguists, on their side did the same, and insisted on an essentially Bulgarian basis in the Macedonian dialects.

Thus, if a language can be objectively analyzed as scientific fact, it seems to provide surer footing for what in the Romantic arguments of Herder and his followers remains quasi-mystical. Here the study of language and nationalism can be said to come of age to the extent that they do not solely rely on divinely-granted or innate attributes but begin to investigate the ways in which a language is a constitutive part of identity.

Prior to the turn of this century, language throughout the Balkans was viewed "functionally," i.e., various languages were used for different purposes in different domains (Auty 1979:53). For example, in Macedonia there were many bilingual and multilingual speakers who understood that Greek and Church Slavonic could be used for official, "high style" documents; Turkish could be used for official, military, and governmental purposes, Serbian, Bulgarian and Albanian could be used for commerce and Macedonian would have been spoken at home and in social situations. According to Auty (1979:53), before the 1870s in the Balkans "national consciousness, so far as it existed, did not bear its modern character; and the deliberate cultivation of a vernacular as an expression of national identity or national pride was not found." He argues for the possibility that had the Treaty of San Stefano been implemented creating a Greater Bulgaria, the Bulgarian language would have been accepted by the Macedonians as their literary language (Auty: 1979:73; see also Deutsch 1942:537). However, I contend that this position cannot be substantiated by the social and historical facts: the population in Macedonia—as a small territory within and in between vast multietnic
and multilingual empires—had already begun to understand themselves as culturally and linguistically separate and distinct from those around them.

2.3 Macedonia as a Zone of Transition, Other, and Marginality

In the nineteenth century (and still today), the Balkans and especially the territory that includes the Republic of Macedonia, are thought of as a bridge at the confluence of East and West in terms of religion, culture, and political ideology (Jelavich 1983:91; Walters 1988:17-21; Bakić-Hayden and Hayden 1994: 2; Denitch 1994:23-4). The Slavic language varieties of this region have likewise been described as something that span this bridge both literally and symbolically: one dialect gradually fuses into the other so that indisputable rigid linguistic boundaries cannot be found (Naylor 1973a:33-34; Friedman 1985:36). While the Slovenian and Croatian languages reflect both the Western European cultural influences (and the Roman alphabet), the Serbian, Macedonian, and Bulgarian languages reflect the Eastern Byzantine and later Ottoman cultural influences (and the Cyrillic alphabet).

Specifically with regard to Macedonia, Wilkinson (1951:89) is often quoted: "That 'province' was destined to become a kind of no man's land in both a literal and metaphorical sense." Indeed Bakić-Hayden and Hayden (1994:4) assert that for most of Europe and the West this part of the world has long represented an ideological "other" and as such is at the same time the meeting place for the East and West and a place apart that is neither one nor the other. And at the end of the nineteenth

12. Bakić-Hayden and Hayden (1994:4) also state that: "all these axes of European symbolic geography intersect in Yugoslavia, whose territory has seen the meeting place of empires (Eastern and Western Roman; Ottoman and Hapsburg, scripts (Cyrillic and Latin, and into the twentieth century, Ottoman Turkish), religions (Roman Catholicism, Orthodox Christianity, Protestantism, Islam, Judaism) and cold-war politics and ideologies (between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, communist-run but Orthodox, and non-aligned)." See also the introduction to Longinović (1993) for an interesting discussion of the marginalization of Slavic culture and the notion of 'other' in the poetics of Slavic literature.
century, Macedonia also was at the center of overlapping spheres of interest for three multiethnic empires: Austria-Hungary, Russia, and the Ottoman Empire. (It is interesting to note that the influence of the Ottoman Empire was receding and the others were competing to fill the vacuum.) In this respect, the present day Macedonian nation and state can be seen as a result of two interrelated factors: 1) the multiethnic character of the population and 2) the marginal (geographically and symbolically) place of the Macedonian territory for both the Western European powers and the Eastern Ottoman Empire at the end of the nineteenth century. I submit that these factors and the ensuing struggles between the various Great Powers to lay claim to the territory and population worked together to create a feeling of separateness (i.e., the Macedonians began to see themselves in terms of "what they were not"), and fostered the idea of nation among the population in Macedonia and concomitantly set the stage for the idea of MLL to emerge--to develop forms of the vernacular as a literary language.

According to Friedman (1975:83) "in contradistinction to the development of other South Slavs, the national awakening of the Macedonians in the nineteenth century was not accompanied by the definitive formation of a literary language...Since the Macedonian literary language did not come to be officially codified and recognized until the time of the Second World War, the 'nineteenth century' of Macedonian can in a sense be said to have lasted until that time." Nevertheless, even within this extended nineteenth century, language played a central role in the emergence of Macedonian national consciousness. Since the vernacular began to associated with ethnic consciousness, I argue that the intellectuals and writers of the nineteenth century came to conceive of a Macedonian language as an ethnolect. This nascent conception required various writers, in the absence of a standard, to begin the debate over what
vernacular dialect features were already (and would be) most salient for a Macedonian identity.

2.4 The Emergence of a Macedonian Linguistic and National Identity

The conflicting claims to Macedonian identity, nation, and language are, of course, constituent parts of nationalist movements. And nationalist movements by their nature claim to be grounded in historical continuity (Danforth 1995:15-18). Yet, the complexity of such a project is intensified in Macedonian territory since different nations lay claim to the same history. In this way the eventual emergence and codification of MLL is invariably tied to questions of nationalism and the quest for political legitimacy. And in such a context it is nearly impossible to separate ideas surrounding the emergence and development of MLL from questions surrounding the emergence of Macedonian identity and linguistic identity. Hence, the discussion of the political and social history of the region presented here is intended to serve as a framework in which to understand the status of MLL, not a series of causal explanations.

Macedonia's multiethnic character was one of the reasons that so many states attempted to lay claim to the population in its territory. Though we can be certain that the population in the last century consisted of Christians, Muslims and Jews, among who were speakers of the Slavic, Romance, Greek, Turkish, and Indic languages and

13. There are scores of titles on this topic. See for example: Anastoff (1945); Koneski (1961, 1968a); Andonov-Poljanski (1968); Apolostolski (1970) and; Lunt (1986)

14. For a more in depth account of the history of Macedonia and the Balkans see for example Dvornik (1962); Jelavich (1983); Walters (1988); and Denitch (1994).

15. Jelavich (1983:90) asserts that economic troubles, poverty and land problems provoked social unrest which contributed to the fact that four states--Serbia, Greece, Bulgaria and Romania (Albania also wanted parts of the Kosovo and Bitola vilayets)--advanced claims to Macedonia.
dialects, it is impossible to determine accurate numbers because under Ottoman rule, households rather than individuals were declared and recorded (Kančev 1900; Danforth 1995:77; see also Wilkinson 1951:125-132; Friedman 1986:289-290; Perry 1988:17-19). According to Jelavich (1983:91) "the major problem in drawing national lines was not separating the Albanians, Greeks, and Turks, who could be differentiated by language, but distinguishing among Slavs...The majority of the Christians of Macedonia were indeed South Slavic, but they spoke dialects, and they had customs and traditions drawn from or common to each of their neighbors. The population was largely illiterate, so there was no written language to assist in the determining of nationality."

The fact that under Ottoman rule communities were organized into millets distinguished on the basis of religion further complicated the determination of the actual ethnographic composition of Macedonia (see Wilkinson: 1951:135, 149; Lunt 1984:97; Friedman 1985:33 and 1992:74-75; and Danforth: 79-80). In the words of the writers of the Carnegie Report (1914:22) who investigated the causes and the outcome of the Balkan Wars, "the religion of all the conquered nationalities was the same" to the Ottomans, i.e., the population was treated as non-Muslim by the Ottomans, and treated as "ethnic Greeks who happened to speak some other language" (Friedman 1986:289). Therefore, official Ottoman census documentation does not reflect distinctions drawn on characteristics other than religion.

16. We can never be certain of the actual statistics. Moreover, the issue of multilingualism in this period in the Balkans has largely been ignored. Thus, such statistics do not accurately reflect the reality of the Balkans; there is rarely a one-to-one correspondence between language and ethnicity. According to census data collected after the Congress of Berlin (1878) at least eight different groups lived in Macedonia: Turks, Bulgarians, Greeks, Serbs, Albanians, Vlachs, Jews, and Roms. Jelavich (1983: 89) notes that "undoubtedly some individuals considered themselves primarily Macedonian" referring to Pulevski's (1875) definitive statement on his Macedonian identity.
Statesmen and scholars of the time did not appear to understand that ideas of national consciousness in the Balkans could be made manifest other than through a connection to a sovereign state. The Carnegie Report (1914:21), for instance, notes that even when the territories adjacent to Macedonia were no longer under Ottoman occupation and became part of Greater Bulgaria or Serbia, "these great states did little more than change or shift the political organization which ruled over essentially a multinational population—the idea of nation was not being understood as State." And while this may have been true, the writers of the report do not address the fact that the struggle for the population and territory of Macedonia and Bulgaria had already begun much earlier through the teaching of the vernacular in religious institutions and church schools.

2.4.1 The Role of the Church

The parish educational councils in Macedonia during the first half of the nineteenth century were separate ecclesiastical, educational and social institutions developed within the church for the purpose of performing religious, educational and social activities—marriage, property dispute, inheritance suits. Due to the local nature of the church's involvement, these institutions remained somewhat independent (Trajanovski 1994:353-54). After the abolition of the Archbishopric of Ohrid in 1767 all churches and religious institutions in Balkan Ottoman territory fell to the jurisdiction of the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople who installed their own metropolitans and bishops. Communities were reorganized and run by a wealthy class of Greeks, Vlachs, and Hellenized Macedonians (Trajanovski 1994:354). But at end of the
eighteenth century a new class of Slavophone merchants and tradesmen began to express a desire to free churches and schools of the Greek language and domination. The question of the language of instruction (viz. Slavic vs. Greek) was gradually added to ones concerning religious education. The newly-established Slavophone merchant class claimed control over parish councils, schools, and started building schools for children to be taught in a form of the local vernacular. Given that these local schools used a Slavic vernacular as the medium of instruction they were perceived by the Patriarchate as a means of opposition to and defiance of Hellenization. In the absence of a well-defined nationalist movement this assertion of Slavic linguistic identity was seen by later analysts (e.g. the writers of the Carnegie Report) more as negation of Greek influence rather as a positive statement for a Slavic national unity in Macedonia. In Bulgaria, however, national aspirations had already developed a bit further.

The first Bulgarian school, established specifically for this purpose, was in Tarnovo in 1852. Some argue that this heralded the beginning of a twenty-year period of struggle for Bulgarian religious independence (Perry 1988:14-16). In 1870

17. In addition, Trajanovski (1994:354) claims that these movements were a result of the competition in the market between a Macedonian middle class and Greek and Vlach merchant middle class. Thus, ecclesiastical educational movements acquired a national content as a way to gain independence from the Patriarchate. The new Macedonian middle class of tradesmen came from villages where their traditional views and language was a product of the parish councils. During the 1860s-70s villages refused obedience to the Patriarch, refused to pay taxes and either took control of the parish or created a new community.

18. There were earlier expressions of nationalism in connection with the vernacular in Bulgaria. Paisi, a Bulgarian monk at the Hilendar monastery on Mount Athos, encouraged Bulgarians to rediscover their history. He used medieval texts to write *Istorija slavjanob s Ilgarska*, a history of the Bulgarians and, in 1762, appealed to the Bulgarians: "Know your tongue; know it and be not ashamed to write it" (quoted in Pinto 1980:41; see also Daskalov, et al. 1990). The first school in Bulgaria was founded in Gabrovo in 1835. At that time the center of Bulgarian literary activity was established at the Rila Monastery. The first grammar of Bulgarian, *Bolgarska gram matika* (Kraguevac, 1835) was written by Neofit Rilski (1793-1881) from Razlog, the first Bulgarian philologist (Mladenov 1979: 51; see also Lunt 1984:367).
the Bulgarian Exarchate was established, marking a victory over Hellenism and in 1872, the Bulgarians elected their first exarch.19 The Ottoman Empire supported this as a move against Hellenization and the Greek Patriarchate and it is regarded by scholars as "a de facto recognition of the Bulgarians as a millet " (see, for example, Friedman 1993:160). Because Greek had been the language of instruction in schools and the language used in churches, resistance to Hellenization was achieved by favoring the language closer to a Bulgarian form of the local vernacular.20 During the 1870s, the number of schools which taught "Bulgarian" increased significantly (Perry 1988:27-29) in an effort to stake a claim to the territory since the battle against the Patriarchate in Constantinople had essentially been won (Friedman 1985:33; Mitkovska 1993).21 Until that time the Bulgarians had no political claim to territory, and in order to counter the Bulgarian Exarchate, the Greek church excommunicated the new Bulgarian church, which was not deterred from installing their Bishops at Skopje and Ohrid.

At this point, the ethnographic composition of Macedonia became even more confused as it was differentiated by patriarchist and exarchist households and sometimes even divided within households. The Carnegie Report (1914:27) states that "one and the same family would sometimes be divided into 'Bulgarians,' 'Greeks,' 'Wallachians,' and 'Servian,' according to the church attended by this or that member." The establishment of the Exarchate not only weakened the Greek orthodox millet, it also resulted in a rift among the Slavic Macedonian population. Adanir (1992:170-71)

19. A firman issued by Sultan Abdulhamit II in 1870 ended the Greek monopoly over religion in Macedonia (Perry 1988:15).

20. As Friedman (1975: 85) notes: "the question of what that language was called was not as important as the fact that some form of the vernacular was being employed."

21. See footnote 20, this chapter.
notes that Greek meant patriarchist, whereas the Bulgarian meant loyal to the Exarchate. Therefore, "Bulgarian-speaking" had two meanings: a linguistic meaning and a religious meaning. Further, in addition to the fact that there were Slavs among the patriarchist churches who considered themselves Serbs or Greeks, there were some people who did not assign any national designation to themselves (Lunt 1984:97).

It was then, during the latter half of the nineteenth century, that young intellectuals in Serbia, inspired by the Illyrian movement, began to agitate for a South Slavic federation that would include the population of Bulgaria and Macedonia. Consequently, for the first time the territory of Macedonia came into dispute between the emerging Slavic nations in the Balkan Peninsula and the "Macedonian question" entered into the arena of European diplomacy. The Carnegie Report (1914: 24) interpreted this to mean: "while it is true that before 1873 the Greeks had already contended for this region with the Slavs...it had not yet occurred to the Slavs (Servians and Bulgarians) to dispute about it among themselves." Thus, the tendency of educated Macedonians to see themselves as united with Slavs as a whole against the political oppression of the Ottomans, and the cultural and religious intolerance of the Greek church, was severely challenged, bringing their own particular sense of Slavic identity to the fore.

2.4.2 The Role of European Political Intervention and the IMRO

A decisive event for the fate of Macedonia and the Balkans occurred in 1878 when Russia liberated Bulgaria from Ottoman occupation. The treaty of San Stefano, (a

22. This is yet another example of the problem of equating language and ethnicity in the Balkans. See footnote 16, this chapter.

23. Perry (1988:17) notes that "by the turn of the century there were 1,854 churches in the 15 dioceses of Macedonia, 1,232 of which were exarchist. The remainder were chiefly patriarchist."
preliminary treaty to the end of the Russo-Turkish war 1877-78) partitioned Bulgaria into three parts: northern Bulgaria along with Sofia became semi-autonomous; eastern Rumelia remained as a vassal state to the Ottoman regime; and most of Macedonian territory remained under Ottoman control (Klein and Reban 1981:58). Thus by 1878 Bulgaria, Greece, and Serbia each had a state, church and literary language, and each had rival pretensions to the territory that "overlapped precisely in Macedonia" (Friedman 1993:161).

In 1884, the first groups of young intellectuals organized in order to work along with the schools and churches to promote their own territorial aspirations by spreading cultural propaganda (Perry 1988:16). In Bulgaria that year, the Cyril and Methodius Society was founded, and two years later in Belgrade the Society of St. Sava was "dedicated to promoting the growth of Serbian national consciousness among Serbian people" i.e., in Macedonia (Perry 1988:16). Also in 1886, the Secret Macedonian Society was founded in Sofia. Two of its members attempted to publish a Macedonian newspaper in Constantinople and a Macedonian primer in Belgrade, but neither project was realized (Friedman 1993b: 161-162). Soon more militant groups appeared who advocated more direct and violent means to accomplish their goals (Jelavich 1983:93). In 1893, the Macedonian Central Revolutionary Committee was formed in Salonika (Thessaloniki) with the aim of bringing world attention to the Macedonian question: the revolutionary organizations wanted an independent Macedonia; Bulgaria wanted the land "undivided." These revolutionary organizations, such as the Internal

24. Many of the documents that were written by the Secret Committee have been analyzed with regard to their linguistic importance to MLL. See for example Stamatoski (1978).

25. There is some confusion over the name of this organization after its founding. Perry (1988:39-41) maintains that some of the group's members referred to it as the Macedonian Revolutionary Organization in their own correspondence or simply "the organization." In 1896 at another congress it was designated the Bulgarian-Macedonian-Adrianople Revolutionary Organization and in 1902 it was known as the Secret Macedonian Revolutionary Organization. After that its own
Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (IMRO) began to factionalize.²⁶ The sometime rival of the IMRO was the Macedonian External Organization (also called the Supreme Committee) established in 1895 in Sophia. Their goal (when they were not collaborating with IMRO) was to annex Macedonia to Bulgaria, and they had the support of the Bulgarian government and army. Bulgarian politics at that time was largely dominated by policy toward Macedonian territory (Jelavich 1983:94). By 1902, IMRO members were working to keep outside influences from deciding the fate of the Balkans and to prepare for an armed insurrection. Thus, began a particularly difficult and confusing period of revolutionary terrorism and martyrdom.²⁷

The Congress of Berlin had implemented a reduction by half of that which was promised to the Bulgarians by the San Stefano Treaty. Hence, the Bulgarians saw themselves as victims of European treaty-diplomacy and demanded "the return" of land. Moreover, the Berlin Treaty was perceived as an effort by the European powers to curb Russian influence in the Balkans (Adanir 1992:169-170). In 1897, it seemed that the Hapsburg Monarchy was eager to attend to internal problems, so when Russia's attention focused on the Balkans, both Franz Joseph and Nicholas II worked to preserve the status quo of their own spheres of interest (Jelavich 1988:94). The 'status quo' as such was unsatisfactory to the leaders of the IMRO as they prepared for armed

members refer to as the "Internal Organization" because it operated within the borders of the Ottoman Empire. Here it will be referred to as the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (IMRO).

²⁶ According to Jelavich (1983:93), "[a]t first, IMRO supported the formation of a South Slav federation in which Macedonia would have a place. Despite the fact that the motto of the organization was "Macedonia for the Macedonians," at times certain of its members had close connection with Bulgaria."

²⁷ By 1904 there were 100 assassinations a month in Thessaloniki and several plots to kidnap wealthy landowners and political leaders in order to raise money for the organization (Carnegie 1914:31). See also Perry (1988) and Sherman (1980).
insurrection, intent on liberating Macedonia from the Ottoman Empire and provoking foreign powers to intervene. The plans of the leaders of the IMRO were not realized, but resulted in the unsuccessful Ilinden (St. Elijah's day) uprising in August 1903. They managed brief control of the Monastir (Bitola) vilayet, but by October the insurrection was crushed by the Ottoman army (see Perry 1988:136-141). The Great Powers remained reluctant to become involved but, nevertheless, Franz Joseph finally met Nicholas II at Franz Joseph's Mürzsteg hunting lodge in Styria, Austria to implement a reform program for the Macedonian situation (Soward 1989:30). The reforms were entirely ineffectual (see Jelavich 1983:95).

Thus, as tensions in the Balkans continued to mount, Europe had gradually become involved in trying to shape Ottoman policy and have a role in deciding the fate of "Turkey-in-Europe": two rival ideas emerged: the creation of an independent vs. a partitioned Macedonia. Macedonian independence, though, became "a distant goal of diplomatic efforts" (Carnegie Report 1914:34) until the Young Turk rebellion of 1908. After the Turkish rebellion, European diplomats were wary of further involvement and no longer wished to pursue certain foreign policies while the Ottoman empire underwent a transformation to a "modern state."

The Balkan wars of 1912 and 1913 were the culmination of the previous 40 years of conflicting claims to the population and territory by existing Balkan and foreign powers. Relations were strained between Bulgaria and Serbia over the division of territory: Bulgaria favored establishing an independent Macedonia, with the idea that

28. The Carnegie Report (1914:38) offers that "the most natural solution of the Balkan imbroglio appeared to be the creation in Macedonia of a new autonomous or independent entity, side by side with the other unities realized in Bulgaria, Greece, Servia and Montenegro, all of which countries had previously been liberated thanks to Russian or European intervention. But this solution had become impossible, owing first to the incapacity of the Turkish government, and then to the rival pretensions of the three neighboring States to this or that part of Macedonian inheritance."
it would one day become part of their state; Serbia, however, advocated partitioning the territories to curb the power of her neighbors. In March 1912 they came to some agreement in order to quell regional tensions. Jelavich (1983:97) notes:

The treaty signed at this time was on the surface a mutual defense pact; secret clauses, however, provided for a division of the territory in question. It was agreed that the land north of the Sar Mountains would be assigned to Serbia, with the area east of the Struma River and the Rhodope Mountains given to Bulgaria. Much of Macedonia was thus left unassigned.

Three months later, Greece and Bulgaria concluded like treaties but without any mention of land divisions. In October, Montenegro signed similar pacts with Serbia and Bulgaria. The European powers issued cautions, but they came too late and went unheeded: Montenegro launched an attack (with the support of Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia) and defeated an Ottoman army that had been weakened by internal problems (Jelavich 1983:97). The first Balkan War ended when the European powers persuaded both sides to accept the terms of the Treaty of London establishing Ottoman possession of Constantinople and its surroundings; Bulgarian possessions included Adrianople; and Greece was awarded Crete. Yet again, much of Macedonian territory was left out of the treaty provisions (Jelavich 1983:97).

Italy and Austria-Hungary had insisted on an independent Albania as a buffer against the Slavic states' aspiration to an Adriatic port. The "Macedonian question" had now become more than a dispute over ethnography of the region; the balance of power was in question (Sowards 1989:96-97). Thus, Serbia and Greece concluded secret agreements on the division of territory with the aim of thwarting Bulgarian intentions. The Bulgarian government failed to enlist the support of the European powers, and in June 1913, they attempted to establish their own control over the region by attacking Serbia and Greece. In response, Romania, Montenegro and the Ottoman armies engaged and defeated the Bulgarian armies. This second Balkan War was over in a
month, and by August, the armistice was signed. The Treaty of Bucharest divided Macedonia between Serbia and Greece, set up an independent Albania, and ended Ottoman rule in Macedonian territory.29 30

2.4.3 A Category of Macedonian Identity: "What They Are Not"

That the population in Macedonia "felt" different from Serbians, Bulgarians (and Greeks) is evident by fact that not all wanted to adopt Bulgarian or Serbian and hence, Macedonian schools were established to teach in a vernacular form. According to Adanir (1992:170-71), "the formation of the Macedonian Slav school communities resulting from the reorganization of the millet system in turn prepared the ground for the emergence of a specific Macedonian Slav consciousness" (see also Trajanovski 1994). Thus, the process of Macedonian history confirms, as Danforth (1995:74) maintains, "that national identities develop in opposition to categories of "others"; that people know who they are not before they know who they are. "(see also Dogo 1985:7-68). Similarly, Lunt (1984:97) adds that when Bulgarians attempted to document the ethnographic composition of the population at that time, "it was they who determined that the crucial definition should not be elicited with an open question 'Who are you?' but rather by a strictly binary demand, "State whether you are Bulgarian or

29. Hill (1987:55) over generalizes that "the decisive reason why the Albanians succeeded in realizing statehood [in November, 1912] whereas the Macedonians did not was that no one ever doubted that Albanian was an independent language."

30. I omit an account of the of the First World War, but suffice it to say that it signaled the end of Great Power domination in the Balkans and completed the unification of Balkan states. By the time that the Treaty of Versailles ended the war in 1919, the idea of a Macedonian identity and nationality had already strongly taken root among much of the population. They fought to maintain some measure of autonomy in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (and later in the Federation of Yugoslavia). The series of events that led to and battles of First World War have been recounted in-depth, for example, by Lidell Hart (1930); Seton-Watson (1959); Tuchman (1962), and (1966); Palmer (1965); and Craig (1978).
Serbian.' We may speculate that in this situation some individuals objected to the second question and sought a new term to answer the first."

Misirkov, coming of age in this social and political environment, was the first in this century to publish statements regarding the distinctness of the Macedonian linguistic and national identity.31 He (1903:159) suggests that "the people who spoke these dialects had once been called "Slavs" and then either "Serbs" or "Bulgarians" until the rivalry between these names began to alienate the Macedonian Slavs, who started calling themselves after the geographical name of their country. The name Macedonian was first used by Macedonian Slavs as a geographical term to indicate their origin...(trans. McConnell)." Misirkov's work also highlights the fact that a language in the Balkans had unmistakably emerged as a category of identity much before that time.

In sum, the factors outlined here all worked together to create a kind of psychological unity among the population in Macedonia in the latter part of the nineteenth century, allowing a Macedonian linguistic identity to emerge and a national identity to be constructed. These factors are: 1) the multiethnic character of the population; 2) the political claims from surrounding states overlapped in Macedonia; 3) the Macedonian population in the larger cities of Skopje, Monastir (Bitola), Stip and Ohrid was left out of jurisdiction the of Bulgarian Exarchate; 4) much of the population in Macedonia did not feel allegiance to the Ottoman empire nor Greek Patriarchate because cultural and linguistic differences were too great; 5) the surrounding states had begun to acquire a degree of political autonomy after 1878; 6) Macedonian territory

31. Misirkov's (1903) Za Makedonski raboti did not reach the public at that time because it was banned, confiscated, and largely destroyed by the Bulgarian authorities after its printing in Sofia. This act itself is an indication that his ideas had gained enough acceptance to be perceived as a threat to Bulgaria.
remained under Ottoman occupation and did not become part of another (Slavic) suzerainty; 7) the various treaties between Bulgaria and Serbia and Bulgaria and Greece did not include provisions for all of the territories in Macedonia.

2.5 The Emergence of the Macedonian Literary Language (MLL), 1794-1944

Though the period of 1870-1914 is a very important one in the emergence of MLL, the origins of MLL can in fact be found much earlier. Since the start of the first millennium, learning and literacy was centered around the monasteries; monks and priests also took on the role of teacher in their communities. Thus, it is not surprising that the first work to be published containing a text in Macedonian (Ohrid dialect) was written by Priest Stefan of Ohrid for Hadži Danil from Moskopole (Voskopje). The Tetraglosson (Četirijazi čnik) or quadrilingual lexicon and conversation manual was printed in Venice in 1794. The Slavic word list was titled Bulgarika and was intended as an aid in the Hellenization of Albanians, Slavs and Vlachs, i.e., to teach Greek (Friedman 1975:84, 1989:300; Koneski 1967:27; Lunt 1953:366).

The beginning of the nineteenth century brought a growing middle class of educated merchants and trades people in the urban centers in Macedonia which reflected the shift of responsibility for educational and cultural matters away from the church to some extent. The two first writers to respond to a new demand for books written in the vernacular were Hadži Joakim Krčovski (d. 1820) and Kiril Pejčinović (c. 1770-1845). Two books by Pejčinović, A Mirror (Ogledalo 1816, Budapest) and Consolation to Sinners (Utješenje Grješnim, 1840, Salonika), were very popular (Lunt 1984: 366; Friedman 1975:85, 1989:302). Until this time writers had

32. See also Friedman. (1989, 1994) for a five-stage periodization of the history of MLL.
struggled against the archaization (in addition to Hellenization) of the language. And it is interesting to note that the preface to the second book, written by Hadži Teodosij Sinaitski of Dojran, contains a statement justifying the use of the vernacular rather than Church Slavic in a work of literature. He (1840) compared Church Slavic to "a golden key" and the vernacular language to "a key of iron and steel"--and it is the key made from iron and steel rather than the one made of gold which can "open the heart of the common people" (Koneski 1980:55). This statement can be seen as a Romantic legacy of the valorization of the vernacular.

Krčovski wrote in a language based on the northeastern Kratovo and Kriva-Palanka dialects with a good deal of influence from Church Slavic. Pejčinović, on the other hand, wrote in a language based on the northwestern Tetovo with Central Macedonian elements and with much less influence from Church Slavic than Krčovski. Both writers called their language Bolgarski jazik (Dolnaja Mesii) 'Bulgarian language of Lower Moesia'. It should be remembered that this designation was geographical rather than national and was meant to differentiate the Slavic population from the Greek population in that region of the Ottoman Empire. What is more significant than what the language was called is that some form of the Macedonian dialects was used for publication and this fact alone lent the vernacular the authority of the printed word. Moreover, in the struggle against Hellenization, this new language of literature was viewed as the basis for establishing a compromise between Macedonian and Bulgarian dialects which would provide an alternative to Greek (Friedman 1975: 85; Mitkovska 1993).33

33. Similarly, proponents of the Illyrian movement, with the signing of the Književni Dogovor in Vienna in 1850, argued for a Croatian-Serbian literary language, in part, in response to the Germanization and Magyarization they faced being part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Naylor MS; see also Francolic 1980:56). And it should also be remembered that the major publishing centers at that time were: Bucharest, Constantinople (Istanbul), Belgrade, Salonika (Thessaloniki) and Sofia; materials had to be printed in one of these places.
During the 1840s-1860s a Pan-Slavic national consciousness in the Balkan peninsula grew among educated and literate circles as evidenced by the Illyrian movement and the movements for a Macedo-Bulgarian literary language. Two centers of Macedo-Bulgarian literary activity arose: one in northeastern Bulgaria (whose proponents wished to create a literary language to be based on the Thraco-Moesian dialects) and one in southwestern Macedonia (whose advocates envisioned a literary language based on those dialects) (Friedman 1985:33; Mitkovska 1993). One such writer, journalist, and teacher in favor of creating a Macedo-Bulgarian language based on the Macedonian dialects and one of the first to identify himself as a Macedonian was Dimitar Miladinov (b. 1810, Struga). He had been educated in Greek schools and had been to Serbia. He appears to have been greatly inspired by Herder's thesis and by Vuk Karadžić's work, which valued folk poetry and song. Along with his younger brother, Konstantin (b. 1832), he undertook a collection of Macedonian folk songs. The Greek Church, however, took a stand against any form of education in a Slavic language, and the Miladinovs' lives both ended in a Constantinople prison at the behest of the Greek Bishop of Ohrid, due to their involvement in creating a Slavic literary language (Dzambazovski 1984:384). Thus, the Miladinovs are seen as martyrs in the cause for the linguistic independence against the Ottoman effort to suppress Slavic culture and language and their work served as a model for future political and linguistic revolutionaries.

During the 1860s, Macedonian national and linguistic identity became divided by rival views: scholars, like the Miladinovs, took up the unitarian cause—to create a Macedo-Bulgarian language based on the Macedonian dialects, i.e., to "write as they spoke."—or else there were those who felt that the Bulgarian literary language was too
different from their language and espoused a separatist position. Partenij Zografski (b. 1818, Galičnik; d. 1875), a student of D. Miladinov and major figure of the unitarianists, attempted to establish a literary norm based on western Macedonian dialects with an admixture of eastern Bulgarian features— he wrote his first textbooks in 1857 and 1858. He also expressed his ideas in a series of newspaper articles (in Carigradski Vestnik and B ălgarski Knizi) during the same years and was severely criticized by the Bulgarian press, scholars, and the Greek clergy for promoting "Serbianism." They called his language "a mishmash of Bulgarian and Serbian" (Koneski 1967a: 188-190). Yet, Friedman (1975:87) observes that "the very appearance of Macedonian textbooks at that time indicates the development of some form of Macedonian national consciousness and the objections of the Bulgarian press show that they were aware of the possible separatist implications of such manifestations" (see also Koneski 1980: 58-59).

Such strong reactions from the Bulgarians helped to drive the Macedonians away from unitarian ideas. For instance, Kuzman Šapkarev (1834-1908, Ohrid), a student of Zografski, wrote eleven textbooks between 1868 and 1874 (eight of which were published). In the body of his work we witness a shift in his views: in his earlier work he advocated unitarian views and the language he used reflected eastern Bulgarian dialect features, while his later work shows more western Macedonian dialect features (Lunt 1953:368; Friedman 1975: 87-88; Mitkovska 1993). Šapkarev was also criticized by Bulgarian scholars and press. Mitkovska (1993) discusses a 1848 letter from Filipov of Bansko in southeastern Macedonian to a colleague in Bulgaria:

They declared the Macedonian dialects 'degenerate dialects of Bulgarian and set off to impose their language in all Macedonian schools. The Macedonian middle class and the teachers felt cheated and openly

34. According to Vuk Karadžić's principle for standardizing Serbian (see Naylor 1980:72-78).
expressed their discontent...As a reaction the national self awareness of the people grew and the name Macedonian people and Macedonian language was heard more often.

Apostolski (1969:67), similarly, notes in the earliest known document of a separatist character, that "the people in Salonika were saying that they were neither Bulgarian, Greek, nor Aromanian, but 'pure Macedonian.'" People in central and southern Macedonia were happy to replace Greek textbooks with Šapkarev's textbooks (Koneski 1976:204-206; see also Friedman 1975:89). Here again, the choice of terms in these arguments--'purity,' authenticity,' and 'degeneracy'--for all concerned can be seen as reflective of the Romantics' counter-Enlightenment project.

The life and work of Grigor Prličev (b. 1830, Ohrid; d. 1893) exemplifies the nested sense of political, cultural, and linguistic affinities held by many during this time. He was educated in Athens and began to write in Greek. His poems, such as "The Serdar" depicting a Macedonian uprising, won critical acclaim in their day. He then embraced anti-Hellenization and attempted to write in mixed Macedonian and Bulgarian dialects. Toward the end of his life, he wrote his autobiography in BLL.35

The year 1875 is an important one in the history of MLL. The Dictionary of Three Languages (Rečnik od tri jezika) written by another student of Zografski, Gorgi Pulevski (b. 1838 Galičnik; d. 1894) and published in Belgrade, though written in a mixture of Serbian and Macedonian dialects, is an unmistakable call for a Macedonian identity and the desire for a distinct Macedonian literary language. He divides the Slavic languages into five groups: Russian, Croatian, Bosnian, Bulgarian and Macedonian (ruski, hrvatski, bošnjacki, bugarski i makedonski ). To him, a nation (narod ) is defined as a group of the same kind of

35. It was during this time that BLL took on its more eastern character in the work of Xristo Botev, Petko Slavejkov, and Ivan Vazov (Lunt 1953:369).
people (rod), who speak the same language (edinakov zbor), and share the same customs and traditions. In this way, for Pulevski, the Macedonians are a nation that live in Macedonia (Lunt 1984:103).

By 1880, when Pulevski attempted to write a grammar, sixteen textbooks had been published in Macedonian dialects; most were written in language based on the western and Central dialects. Pulevski's Slavjano-naseljenska makedonska slognica rečovska (Grammar of the Language of the Macedonian Slavic Population) however, was unsuccessful in establishing any standards for a literary language because his education was insufficient to the task. Still, the main significance of the textbooks is that they demonstrate that a great deal of the population in Macedonia thought of themselves neither as Serbian nor Bulgarian in spite of the efforts of the those who continued to author histories, geographies or ethnographic maps in agreement with their own political and economic interests. Accordingly in response to the political climate, the next period in the emergence of MLL is marked by a slowdown in the progress for an independent Macedonia, but also by a considerable amount of publishing activity of organizational and revolutionary literature—tracts, manifestoes and journals.

Several literary societies were founded after the Congress of Berlin left Macedonia within Turkey and caused many Macedonian intellectuals to emigrate from the Ottoman Empire to Sofia, Belgrade, and St. Petersburg. In 1888, Pulevski founded the Slavo-Macedonian Literary Society in Sofia, but it was disbanded shortly thereafter by the Bulgarian government. Three years later in Sofia the Young Macedonian Literary Society was founded. They published the journal Loza (The Grapevine) from 1892 until 1894, when it was prohibited. Some of its members founded Vardar, a similar organization in Belgrade in 1893. And, as mentioned
above, it was in that same year that the IMRO was established in Salonika. In 1902, in St. Petersburg, Macedonian émigrés, Cupovski and Misirkov among them, founded the Slavo-Macedonian Scientific-Literary Society. Although their constitution, which was written in Russian, stipulated that discussions, reports, minutes, etc. would be conducted and written in Macedonian, they published a periodical, *Makedonskij Golos* (*The Macedonian Voice*) which was written in Russian (see Ristovski 1978). All of these organizations had, at the heart of their mission, the same agenda: a politically independent Macedonia. Yet, none of them had outlined a clear language policy (Friedman 1975: 90-91; Mitkovska 1993).

As mentioned above, the next significant event in the history of MLL came in 1903 with the publication of *Za Makedonski raboti* (*On Macedonian Matters*) by Misirkov (1874-1926). He had returned to Russia after the unsuccessful Illinden rebellion and gave a series of lectures to the Slavo-Macedonian Society in St. Petersburg on the failure of the rebellion and the Macedonian situation. From there he went to Sofia to seek a publisher for his lectures. *On Macedonian Matters* was written in a language similar to contemporary MLL and printed in December 1903, but was banned by the Bulgarian authorities even before distribution of the volume could take place (see note 31). He was expelled from Bulgaria and went back to Russia (Lunt 1953: 370; 1984:104).

Misirkov devotes one chapter of his monograph to the question of a literary language as a part of a Macedonian national identity. He offers his insights as a linguist and historian in his argument to take the central Macedonian dialects, identified by him as Veles-Prilep-Bitola-Kičevo-Ohrid, as the basis of MLL. His reasoning was based on the fact that these towns constituted the cultural and political centers of
Macedonia. In addition, it is arguable that he understood that the central dialects were spoken by the plurality of the population, could be readily adopted by those speakers outside the central area, and (perhaps most important politically) these dialects were geographically and linguistically equidistant from SLL and BLL which would enable them to develop a distinct character (Misirkov 1974). In spite of the fact that Misirkov's book was not widely read by his contemporaries, it can nevertheless be considered as a culmination of the emergence of a Macedonian national and linguistic identity and indeed one of the first comprehensive attempts to outline a program for standardizing MLL.

2.6 The Standardization of MLL, 1945-1970

Arrested by the social and political events at beginning of this century, MLL could not be developed until 1944. From 1918, the area of Macedonia that was not a part of Bulgaria or Greece came under the authority of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (which became the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in 1929) in which SLL had official status. Since literature in MLL was permitted on a limited basis, a new generation of young Macedonians, such as Vasil Iljoski (1902-1995), Anton Panov (1905-1968), and Risto Krle (1900-1975) began to write dramas and novels in

36. Thus, even though it is geographically and linguistically peripheral, he includes Ohrid because it was the seat of the Macedonian Archbishopric and Slavic literacy.

37. The Treaty of Bucharest ended the Balkan War in 1913 and partitioned Macedonia among Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece. After World War I, Vardar Macedonia was under Serbian rule. Consequently, Macedonian did not have official status anywhere, i.e., Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian and Greek were the languages of education, government and the press in these states, respectively. After 1918, Macedonian was subject to Serbianization policies as a part of Yugoslavia. MLL could only exist on a limited basis in Vardar Macedonia in dialectal, folkloristic literature (see Friedman 1985:34-35 and Kramer 1995).
MLL in the early 1920s (Drugovac 1986). They had also begun to write poetry in the Macedonian dialects under the influence of the earlier models of folk traditions.38

A significant political event in the history of the standardization of MLL is the 1934 declaration by the Comintern regarding the legitimacy of Macedonian national and linguistic aspirations—as a separate people with a separate language (Friedman 1985:35 and 1993b:77; Kramer 1995). This declaration provided a rallying point for separatists, young intellectuals who, thus aligned with the Communist Party, illegally began to publish Party documents and newspapers written in a mixture of western and central dialects (see Lunt 1959; Apostolski 1969:85; Friedman 1993b:77). This underground publishing activity gave new impetus to the young writers. Kosta Racin, for example, published a volume of poetry, Beli Mugri (White Dawns) in 1939 in Zagreb (the first Macedonian volume published in Yugoslavia).39 Their cause was also greatly strengthened ex post facto by the attention focused on Macedonian by European scholars (e.g., Malecld, Vaillant, and Bernštejn) resulting in several studies published in 1938 recognizing Macedonian as separate from SLL and BLL (Peev 12/7/95).

In 1941, Bulgaria was granted authority by Nazi Germany to annex and occupy Macedonia. At that time BLL replaced SLL as the official language. This turn of events further inspired the growing resistance movement for cultural and linguistic

38. Although in the latter part of the nineteenth century several collections of folk songs and folk tales appeared written in Macedonian dialects, they were called Bulgarian. These became an inspiration to later writers and poets. (See for example, Verkovic 1860; Miladinovs 1861).

39. Writers such as Iljoski, who wrote the first Macedonian play, and the poets Kole Nedelkovski (1912-1941, Veles), and Venko Markovski (b.1915, Skopje) were also instrumental in anticipating MLL. According to Lunt (1953:379): "The importance of Racin, Nedelkovski and Markovski is twofold. First, the very existence of verse in Macedonian affirmed the national self-awareness of many young people who did not want to accept the denationalizing designation "South Serbian." Second, and perhaps even more importantly, all three wrote in the central dialects of western Macedonian, thus establishing a foundation for constructing the new literary language."
freedom for Macedonians. Macedonian dialects were used as the language of underground, non-official documents, newsletters, stories and songs. Further, in December 1943, the Bulgarian Communist Party adopted the 1934 position of the Comintern and agitated for an independent Macedonia within a Balkan Federation. So by 1944, when Macedonian was declared the official language of the Macedonian People's Republic of Yugoslavia, the patterns had been sufficiently well established for the standardization of MLL to progress with remarkable rapidity.\textsuperscript{40}

In the course of events of immediately following the liberation of Macedonia in 1944 (November 13) and the creation of a government, ASNOM appointed a commission and a congress was convened in Skopje (November 27-December 4) to settle questions of orthography and grammar in codifying the literary standard (see Friedman 1993b:165-166 and Kiselinovski 1987:78-80). Though its proposals were at first rejected by the government, a second committee was successful in reaching a consensus in May 1945. An outline grammar and orthography appeared in June 1945 (official revisions followed in 1948 and 1950) (Friedman 1993b:166). Another essential question concerned the selection of the dialects that would serve as the basis for MLL. But because the patterns for accepting and using the west-central dialects as the basis for a literary language had long been established, there was not much debate over this issue.\textsuperscript{41} Again, these dialects were considered a logical choice because that area was the most populated, the most important in Macedonian history and frequently

\textsuperscript{40} And as has been suggested elsewhere this was due to the fact that Macedonian had been in the process of being developed as a language of literature for at least one hundred years. "This declaration confirmed what was already de facto practice. It did not create a language out of thin air..." (Friedman 1985:35) Macedonian was "codified after nearly a century of debate and was not, as suggested in Bulgarian scholarship, the result of a language born by proclamation and developed artificially by committee" (Kramer 1995:4).

\textsuperscript{41} It is significant that Misirkov outlined many of the same ideas in 1903, but his work was not available at the time.
most unlike SLL and BLL (Friedman 1985:39-40, 1993b:167). The key to the rapidity of the acceptance and use of MLL by Macedonians is due, in large part, to the fact that the west-central dialects had already been accepted. Moreover, the new government and codifiers of MLL detailed specific plans to ensure its elaboration and implementation.

MLL was implemented immediately as the language of administration, in schools, in the press, radio, theater, and in literature. In 1944, the newspaper, *Nova Makedonija* (*New Macedonia*) and the journal, *Nov Den* (*A New Day*) devoted to the Arts and Sciences first saw publication. The journal's articles, setting the standard for MLL, addressed all aspects of art and literary criticism, history, and science. It also published new poetry and literature. In 1946, the Faculty of Philosophy—along with a separate section for the Macedonian language in the Department of South Slavic Languages—was set up in Skopje and the first high school grammar, written by Krume Kepeski, was published. In addition to questions of general grammar, he outlines nine distinctive characteristics that set MLL apart from other Slavic languages. In 1950, the Faculty launched the first scholarly journal to deal with MLL, *Makedonski jazik* (*Macedonian Language*) and the literary journal, *Literaturen zbor* (*Literary Word*), published since 1954.

42. Palmer and King (1971:154-155) suggest that this last reason was also the most likely consideration for the newly-created government Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia (November 29, 1945) because Macedonian cultural and distinctness furthered their own interests: to diminish Macedonian opposition to Belgrade and to weaken Bulgarian irredentism.

43. These terms, "elaboration" and "implementation," are meant as they used in conventional language planning studies. Elaboration refers to the third stage of language planning (following the selection of a norm and the codification of a norm), whereby the literary language has been developed in such a way as to accommodate a broad range of styles and genres. Implementation refers to the use of the literary language in all facets of public life: mass communication, government and education. See for example Haugen (1966); Fishman (1974b).
In its early stages, MLL borrowed a great deal from SLL, BLL, and Russian, but the codifiers were soon to establish new rules for completely or partially replacing foreign elements with native dialectal ones. The third edition of Makedonska gramatika (Macedonian Grammar), written by Kepeski in 1950 (1st edition 1946) was the first grammar intended for high school use. His grammar appeared to have been adapted from its Bulgarian counterparts (Lunt 1952:v). But by the time the new Makedonski Pravopis (Macedonian Orthography) was printed in 1950, there was already a great deal of uniformity in MLL. With the appearance of this orthography, containing a 6,000-word spelling dictionary, "the new language can be said to have come of age" (Francolic 1980:61). The first scholarly descriptive grammar (employing a synchronic structuralist approach) was written in English by Lunt in 1952 and despite the fact that it could not be used as a handbook in Macedonia, its ideas influenced the codifiers of MLL (Friedman 1989:305). Also in 1952, Koneski published the first part of his normative grammar consisting of a treatise on phonology. This was by far the best study on phonology along with a section he wrote on morphology, it was later incorporated into his two volume Grammar of the Gramatika na makedonskiot jazik (Macedonian Language) in 1965 which became the standard reference grammar of MLL.

The elaboration of MLL was further strengthened by the founding of separate research organizations. The Krste Misirkov Institute of Macedonian Language was established in 1953. A year later the Institute took over the publication of the journal, Makedonski jazik (Macedonian Language), and from 1961-1966 issued the first Macedonian dictionary (Rećnik na makedonskiot jazik) edited by Koneski, et al. in three volumes. In 1967, the Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences' (MANU) Linguistic Department was founded in order to publish and organize scholarly activity.
They have undertaken a great many large-scale projects such as a dialect atlas, a compilation of scientific terminology, and separate dictionaries of surnames and place names of the 12th-16th centuries, Macedonian recension Church Slavic manuscripts. In 1968, the first of the annual summer international Seminars on the Macedonian Language, Literature, and Culture was held in Ohrid. In 1970, Krume Tošev edited the first comprehensive spelling dictionary (Pravopis na makedonskiot literaturn jazik sa pravopisen rečnik). He also edited a Bulgarian-Macedonian dictionary (Bugarsko-makedonski rečnik 1968) based on Mladenov's Bulgarian-Serbo-Croatian dictionary as "čekor napred vo streme žite za poblizko zapoznavanje na dvata jazika 'a step forward towards the aim of a closer understanding of the two languages.'"

The discussion thus far concerning the emergence of the Macedonian national and linguistic idea should make clear that it is impossible to privilege the significance of one factor, event, or figure above another; nor should it be inferred that there is necessarily a causal relationship among such factors. Danforth (1995:28), for example, maintains that nations do not make states and states do not make nations. Rather, the ways in which a national and linguistic community is conceived of is often a self-conscious and deliberate process, in a dialectical relationship. Such conceptions or "imaginings" (in Anderson's (1991) terminology) must embody simultaneous processes: "first they define and reject a national other, then they define and create a national self" (Danforth 1995:28, 88). The process of codifying a national literary language in a dialect continuum situation can be seen in much the same way: the 'linguistic other' is defined and rejected at the same time the 'linguistic self' is established (see Haugen 1966, 1968). And in the case of Macedonia, a linguistic and
national identity had emerged in the nineteenth century before social and political conditions could allow for their development.

It bears repeating that in the span of one generation, MLL was codified, elaborated and implemented in Macedonia. The process of standardization, is to some extent on-going. Nevertheless, the stability of MLL—and hence, its legitimacy as a separate language—during the initial period was challenged by both internal and external factors.

2.7 "Outsider" Views of MLL, Past, and Present

The rise of MLL has been, in large measure, shaped by the process of rejecting a 'linguistic other' and creating a 'linguistic self'. And much of the theory and practice of standardization has been occupied with this process in the context of acceptance and legitimation. Thus, the role of how those outside of the Macedonian "imagined community" view the Macedonian dialects and MLL has been important to its emergence and standardization. Therefore, it is useful to seek clarification of this point from the history of the ways in which "outsiders" have perceived the Macedonian dialects and MLL through ethnographic maps, history and geography textbooks, and dialect studies.

Beginning in the eighteenth century, ethnographic maps and the textbooks they informed were important in both reflecting and fashioning outside (especially Western European, British, and Russian) views concerning Macedonia and, subsequently, the Macedonian dialects. Later these maps and textbooks also both reflected and were employed to legitimate political claims as well. The 1840s mark a pivotal point in the

44. Goldblatt (1984:122) reminds us that "when examining a particular Slavic language question, it is important to remember that we are concerned not with internal linguistic development but rather with the external history of a language, that is, with an aspect of cultural history."
way that Western Europeans viewed the Balkan territories. From 1821-1840 Slavic populations in the Balkan peninsula were divided into Slavs and Illyrians, but according to Wilkinson (1951:85) from 1840-1870, in a climate of Pan-Slavism, these terms were synonymous, and were distinguished not from one another but from Greeks and Turks. In the maps compiled by Western European scholars, Serbs and Bulgarians were thought to be very much linguistically and politically united. Until the 1840s ethnographers and cartographers were more concerned with Macedonia and the Balkans as spheres of Western European influence. Very little was actually known about the Balkans and the criteria for drawing ethnographic boundaries was at first itself as much a matter of uncertainty. During the 1840s, a new series of empirically-based maps emerged that were more focused on the Balkans rather than "Turkey-in-Europe" as their own territorial, cultural and linguistic sphere and language becomes the definitive criterion (see Wilkinson 1951).

The first map of the Balkans prepared by modern methods is, in spite of its many miscalculations, considered to be Safarik's 1842 map on which he recognizes six ethnic groups: Turks, Greeks, Serbo-Croatians, Bulgarians, Romanians, and Albanians (Wilkinson 1951:42-46). Subsequent countless maps published between 1840-1900 recognize these distinct groups in various combinations thereof, but the distribution and measure of these groups developed into the crucial subject for debate at the heart of all scholarly and diplomatic considerations for the period under study. The most hotly contested issue was the distribution and number of the Slavic-speaking population in Macedonia. Boué's 1847 map, for instance, portrayed most of Macedonia as inhabited by Bulgarians and gained influence among supporters of Russia's Pan-Slavism position. Lejean, following Safarik and Boué, presented his map in 1861 which showed that Bulgarians predominated in Macedonia save for a few
small Serbian enclaves near Ohrid. At the Pan-Slav Conference in Moscow 1867, Mirković exhibited his map based on Lejean's which depicted a Bulgarian population even further south and east in the Balkan Peninsula than was previously argued. In 1869, the *Petermann Mitteilungen* published Lejean's map which recognized both a Serbian and a Bulgarian population in Macedonia, but in order to emphasize the Pan-Slav idea they were given the same color (Wilkinson 1951:57). In spite of the myriad of differences concerning the distribution and name of the inhabitants the maps conveyed, the majority of Western European, British, and Russian scholars remained convinced that all Slavic populations were nearly the same until the Seibo-Bulgarian war in 1885 (Wilkinson 1951:57).

Like their Western European counterparts, most Serbian scholars, beginning with Vuk Karadžić, believed that the Macedonian dialects could be classified as Bulgarian until the political issues involving competing territorial claims that arose in the 1870s motivated them to posit their affinity with the Serbian dialects (Lunt 1984:115). Delamarre was the first to argue against the Pan-Slav idea, especially with regard to linguistic criteria, but the first Serb to do so was Milojević. In 1873, he published his map of Macedonia in an effort to prove that the Serbian language and culture extended much farther into the Balkan peninsula than was previously known. Though his arguments were later shown to be erroneous by another Serb, Novaković, his (1873) ideas became the model that shaped nearly all Serbian maps of Macedonia after 1878 (Wilkinson 1951:93). Gopčević's 1889 map, for example was the most widely-known map throughout Europe and Russia at the time. It showed all populations in Macedonia which had previously been regarded as Bulgarian to be Serbian. These maps also reflected the new direction in Serbian-Bulgarian relations and policies concerning the issue of Macedonia.
Maps and the study of geography were central to the textbooks of the time—especially to those written to be used in Serbian and Bulgarian church schools in Macedonia. In 1883 Karić, a Serbian geographer, wrote two very influential textbooks, *Geography for the Lower Grades* and *Serbia--A Description of the Land, People, and State*, in which he defined Serbia as those lands where Serbs have lived since antiquity including Macedonia. He advanced the notion, first promulgated by Vuk Karadžić, that all Slavic tribes were once called Serbs. In addition, he maintained that all peoples who are Orthodox, i.e., celebrate Slava, are Serbian because they share the same national customs. Karić's views laid the foundation for all Serbian textbooks that came after his until 1913 (Jelavich 1990:146-47). Serbian textbooks variously described Macedonia as "the largest Serbian land," the southernmost Serbian land," or "southern Serbia or Macedonia" (Jelavich 1990:157). Similarly, these textbook authors also set out to establish that the populations in these lands spoke Serbian and variously described the language spoken there. Sokolović (1890), for example, writes that Macedonians speak "Serbian as we do." However, Nikolić (1899) writes that "the Macedonian Serbs speak the Eastern dialect, which is a little different from ours" while Mitrović (1902) noted that "they do not speak accurate Serbian, they make mistakes in case and in the accents in the pronunciation of words" (quoted in Jelavich 1990:157-158).

The Bulgarian scholars of this period responded to the Serbian maps and textbooks by publishing many of their own (see Kănev 1900). To document their position they relied heavily on medieval sources, travel writing of the previous century, and earlier Western European and Serbian sources in which the Bulgarian character of the Macedonian population went unchallenged. Moreover, they believed that the most significant threat, in terms of territorial claims, came from the Greeks rather than from the...
Serbs or the inhabitants of Macedonia themselves. Thus, much of the Bulgarian response was initiated by the Exarchate. In 1901, they produced a map depicting a mixed ethnic population, but the overwhelming majority was shown to be exarchist (Wilkinson 1951:131, 136).

As Western European scholars and diplomats sought explanations for the terrorist acts of IMRO and the Ilinden Uprising of 1903, another series of ethnographic maps appeared. Among them was Peucker's (1903) which attempted to demonstrate that Macedonia was an area constituted by the greatest number of overlapping ethnic groups in Europe and that this in itself was cause to distinguish the Macedonians, called Macedo-Slavs, as a separate group. This idea gained more widespread exposure when it was adopted to the Serbian cause by Cvijić in 1906-7, a student of Karić. In his Remarks on the Ethnography of the Macedo-Slavs, Cvijić argued that the inhabitants of Macedonia shared linguistic and cultural traits with both Serbs and Bulgarians and but had no ethnic identity of their own. Essential to his thesis was that the Macedo-Slavs who called themselves Bulgarians carried no political meaning because their word for themselves, Bugari actually meant peasant (Wilkinson 1951:100). Cvijić's argument has dual significance: all prior ethnographic maps based on the "Bugari" distinction were, according to him, in error and, therefore, Bulgarian claims to the territory could be refuted. Thus, he maintained that the population was mixed and could as easily be assimilated by the Serbian state (Wilkinson 1951:149-150). Cvijić's work had an enormous impact on the policy makers of the time. His 1913 map, in fact, became the basis for future political boundary marking. Wilkinson (1951:172) suggests that "its influence on ideas of Balkan ethnography has been probably greater than that of any other single map."
The Bulgarian response to Cvijić's 1913 map came from Ivanov (1915) and Ishirkov (1917) who presented their maps without reference to either Serbs or Macedo-Slavs. Their arguments were based on Bulgaria's "historical rights" and evidence from dialect studies. Dialect studies were emerging as the single most important determining factor of ethnography and began to play an increasingly important role from the 1890s.

The author of every dialect study involving Macedonia since the pioneering research of Karadžić (1822), Grigorovich (1848), and Oblak (1896) has struggled with the same fundamental problems: the classification of the dialects (Peev 11/21/94; see also Vidoeški 1960-1961:13-17). These early studies set up the questions that divide scholars to the present. The Macedonian dialects are either treated as part of the Bulgarian dialects or separate from them (in some cases this means as part of the Serbian dialects). Further complication arises from the selection of the criteria used for classification. Novaković (1889) and Conev (1901), for instance, were among the first to base classification on the reflexes of *tj and *dj. This produced a three-way distinction in which the Macedonian dialects are: 1) closer to (or belong to) Bulgarian; 2) closer to (or belong to) Serbian and; 3) separate from both. Others like Masing (1891), for example, based their classification on the system of accent. This resulted in a two-way distinction in which the Macedonian dialects are grouped into east and west dependent on whether they have free or fixed stress, respectively. Seliščev (1918) was first to place more value on morphological features such as the definite article and the 3rd person present desinences. However, a different picture may emerge as a result of different criteria. For example, Belić (1919) divided the dialects into two large groups according to the *tj, *dj reflexes: 1) north of Debar, Ohrid, Bitola, Gevelija and west of the Vardar and Struma are the k', g' dialects; 2) others dialects to the south and east of that line are št, šd dialects. Later Belić (1935) and Ružićić (1939) divided the
Macedonian dialect area into three parts: 1) north; 2) central; and 3) south; Ivković (1921) Małewcki (1938) divided it into three parts; Conev (1901) argued for six dialect areas and so forth (see also Vaillant 1938). Later Lunt (1952, 1959) and Ivić (1953) attempted another classification on the basis of the development of the jers and nasals (Peev 11/7/94).

The first wave of interest in Macedonian dialects from Western European and Russian scholars in this century was sparked by the diplomatic attention surrounding the Balkan Wars. Seliščev, who was later often at the center of polemical discussions concerning Macedonian dialectology, spent time in northwest Macedonia in 1914-15. In his outline of Macedonian dialectology (which was to become very influential to a great number of scholars no matter which interpretation they argue for), Seliščev (1918:138) stated that the dorsopalatal reflexes of *t̂j (k) and *d̂j (g) were relatively later developments under the influence of the Serbian phonetic system and placed more classificatory value on morphological features. Though they dealt primarily with southwestern dialects, Vaillant (1938) and Mazon (1938) also sided with Seliščev's position that the Macedonian dialects deserved a separate classification.

Maps and dialect studies received new impetus from the data collected by the 1921 census conducted in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. In this census the primary criterion for distinguishing ethnic group was "mother tongue." The groups that had earlier been considered Macedo-Slav officially became subsumed under the term "Serbo-Croat." This event set the tone for cultural and linguistic policy in Macedonia throughout the interwar years. Jelavich (1983:318) notes that "Belgrade attempted to administer its lands as 'southern Serbia' and to treat the inhabitants as Serbs."
In the interwar years, the Bulgarian reaction to this Serbian viewpoint came from Mladenov (1929), Ivanov and Birkov (1929), and Kuznov and Ivanov (1932) (Peev 11/14/94). Characteristic of their response was that the Macedonian dialects formed a transitional dialect zone to Bulgarian, those dialects in question having more in common with Bulgarian than Serbian, and the political boundaries recognized were those from before the Balkan Wars. After the boundaries created by First World War had been finalized the Bulgarians did not recognize a Macedonian nation nor state, but after 1923 they sought the recognition of a Macedonian state so that it might be incorporated by the Bulgarian state (Kiselinovski 1987:42).

A second wave of interest in the Macedonian dialects came as a result of the 1934 Comintern declaration, anticipating further recognition of the legitimacy of the Macedonian national and linguistic idea at the end of World War Two. In 1935 Belić published a study of the dialects of Galičnik and Lazaropole in which he posited that they could not be part of the Bulgarian dialects based on phonetic evidence. In 1938, the work of scholars from across Western Europe and Russia served to focus attention to the Macedonian western dialects as separate and distinct from SLL and BLL: Malewcki undertook a study of the Suho and Visoko dialects from 1934-38; Bernštejn's article entitled "Macedonian language" was included in the Great Soviet Encyclopedia; and Mazon and Vaillant again published articles on the Macedonian dialects advocating an approach to treat them as separate and distinct from Serbian and Bulgarian.

The Bulgarian response to these views was much the same as it had been before 1938. They relied on the maps and studies from a much earlier period and did not waver from their contention that the Macedonian dialects were part of the Bulgarian dialect area. Armed with this linguistic evidence, they modified their political policy to
advance diplomatic relations toward incorporating Macedonian territory into Bulgaria under the auspices of a Balkan Federation. During the 1941-1944 Bulgarian occupation of Macedonia when BLL was the official language Bulgarian scholars continued to strive the recognition of Macedonian dialects as Bulgarian.

After 1944, the existence of a Macedonian nationality and MLL was no longer a question for debate in Yugoslavia and there were, of course, no official Serbian statements or scholarly work that the Macedonian dialects and MLL were not separate and distinct from Serbian and Bulgarian. During the Yugoslav years Belgrade considered MLL as a triumph of language planning and it was in their interest to encourage MLL and Macedonian culture (Palmer and King 1971:158-59; Bugarski 1992:19). And in essence, the 1944 declaration making MLL the official language of the SR of Macedonia reversed the Bulgarian position for a while; and from 1945-1948, Bulgarian scholars recognized the existence of MLL.

This stance regarding MLL has remained fairly constant over the last 50 years. The governmental policy toward MLL, however, has shifted once since 1944 (Kramer 1995:2-4). With the exception of 1944-1946 immediately following the war when the Yugoslav government suggested that Bulgaria could be part of the federation. This suggestion never bore fruit for a number of reasons, but Sofia agreed to closer cultural ties between the Macedonian populations on both sides of the border. For nearly a two-year period after the Second World War the Yugoslav government sent teachers to Pirin Macedonia in western Bulgaria to teach MLL and Macedonian culture. The

45. Yet, there was always some amount of residual feeling so that SLL could at times be perceived of as part of the internal linguistic landscape, but more often it was considered as external to or 'other' to MLL (see below and Lunt 1984).
cultural programs ended when Bulgaria signed a friendship pact with Greece at the outbreak of the Greek Civil War in 1947 (see Jelavich 1983:320-21).

The official Bulgarian policy toward MLL that resumed in 1948 is still presently in effect.46 As mentioned in Chapter 1, a recent example of Bulgaria's policy concerning the Macedonian language are evidenced by events surrounding a series of bilateral protocols. These protocols were drafted in April 1994 in order to promote cooperation between the Macedonian and Bulgarian Ministries of Education; they remain unsigned. There was a greater degree of cooperation in the signing of bilateral agreements before Macedonia's declaration of independence than after (Friedman 1985). The dispute that developed over the April protocols was represented by the Bulgarian press as "simply a visit of the Bulgarian Education and Science Minister, Marko Todorov to Macedonia which ended in fiasco"(24 C̆asa, 4/27/94). The Macedonian papers, however, reported that the incident was due to efforts by Sofia to avoid mentioning, let alone recognizing MLL. The Bulgarian government released a statement to the effect the documents will be signed in "the official languages of both countries"(Nova Makedonija 4/28/94). Two weeks after this incident Macedonian President, Kiro Gligorov went to Sofia and both he and Bulgarian President, Zhelu Zhelev tried to circumvent the problem of signing the protocols. But Zhelev had angered the Macedonian delegation by asking translators to stop translating from Macedonian. According to newspapers, "Gligorov refused to sign anything that called into question the language of our people" (Nova Makedonija 4/28/94). In September 1995, the Bulgarian Parliament publicly stated that the reason these documents are still unsigned is that Macedonia insists that it be officially noted that the

46. At first the policy of the Bulgarian government was to reject the existence of a separate Macedonian language, but not ethnicity. Then, in 1956, the Bulgarian government also rejected the existence of a separate Macedonian ethnicity.
documents be signed in both languages. Sofia saw this stance as a holdover from former Yugoslav practices: "the attitude of Skopje recalls the Macedonian behavior under Belgrade's domination." In the Bulgarian press any mention of Macedonian language is rendered in quotation marks (24 Casa, 4/27/94).

While it would be inaccurate to suggest that all Bulgarian scholars rejected the existence of MLL (see for example Stojkov 1962), such was the viewpoint which received the most attention from scholars since 1948 (either to support this position or refute it). The prevailing Bulgarian position is exemplified by the 1978 Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (BAN) publication, *Edinstvoto na B əlgarskija ezik v minaloto i dnes (The Unity of the Bulgarian Language in the Past and Present)*. Though the author(s) was not named, it has been attributed to Georgiev, the then-editor of the BAN journal, *B əlgarsko ezikoznanie* (*Bulgarian linguistics*) (Lunt 1984:87). This view can be sketched out as follows: 1) the Macedonian language in SR Macedonia is a regional literary dialectal variant (*pismenoregionalna forma*) developed on the basis of southwestern Bulgarian a-dialects, e.g., CS > x, a and z: a, pat 'road, path'; 2) This new written form was created and implemented as a result of Tito's 1944 decree (BAN 1978:6-7); 3) Krčhovski and Pejcinovik were not Macedonian, but rather scholars of the Bulgarian National Revival period; and 4) the Macedonians do not have their

47. A second shift in official Bulgarian policy toward MLL may be on-going as the result of economic interests. Recently, there has been a public willingness toward signing the protocols because the Greek Embargo against Macedonia has been lifted. Bulgarian journalists report that Sofia's readiness to sign 23 documents with Skopje in both Macedonian and Bulgarian is "belated but necessary" and according to Kontinent "they should have taken this step earlier before the Greek embargo ended since now Macedonia's economic interests are free to turn away from Sofia." (9/25/95) Duma (9/26/95) reported the language dispute made the meetings "seem trivial"; Kontinent (9/25/95) emphasized the conviction of both presidents that the language dispute will not be an obstacle to normal Macedonian-Bulgarian relations.
own body of scholarship on MLL but have copied and plagiarized the work of Bulgarian scholars on BLL (for example, Koneski is accused of putting his name on Mirčev's (1934) work, Istori ėska gramatika na b ělgarskiija ezik (Historical Grammar of Bulgarian) and changing the title to Istorija na Makedonskiot jazik (History of the Macedonian Language) and Vidoeski is accused of reissuing Stojkov's (1937) Pokazalec na obnarodvanite materiali po b ělgarskiija dialektologija (Index of Published Material on Bulgarian Dialectology) as his under the 1953 title Prilog kon bibliografijata na makedonskiot jazik (Supplement to the Bibliography of the Macedonian Language) (1978:8)); 5) this new written norm, with the exception of the foreign Serbian words, has no specific character of its own through which it can be distinguished from BLL as a whole; and 6) because MLL is based on the features of part of the western Bulgarian dialects where differences from dialect to dialect are minimal and inconsequential (1978:43-44).

That this view was not held by all Bulgarian linguists is illustrated by Stojkov (1962).48 Even after Macedonia declared its independence many Bulgarian policy makers and scholars have not recognized the existence of a Macedonian nation or language. A recent resurgence of the BAN position is witnessed by a reissuing of Stojkov's (1962) B ělgarska Dialektologija with a 17-page section on Macedonian dialects that did not appear in the original. Mladenov (1994:170) explains this addition as "an answer to the

48. Ivan Lekov published a study in Sofia in 1968 which describes the Macedonian dialects as having the same status as the Bulgarian dialects. The book was removed from the bookstores by the Bulgarian authorities within a few days of its appearance. (I was unable to locate a reference to it, let alone a copy in our state library system.)
needs of the university education and aims to give a more complete historical picture to students of the Bulgarian language territory." Further Mladenov (1994: 18-19) states that:

Prof St. Stojkov razgleda da dialektnoto členie samo v granicite na segaš nata българска държава. Tova se objasjjava s vremeto, kogato toj e pisal svoja trud. Po tozi način sa bili sestaveni i publikubanite karti. Na redica mesta ohaše se səzirat drugi vəzgledi, kojto za səzalenie sa ostanali nerazkriti pəlno v izsledvaneto mu. Taka naprimer toj jasno i kategorично izrazjava ne samo svojite pozicii, e "v granicite na българския език влизаат makedonskite govori, kojto spodeljat vsицки xarakterni čerti na българска езикова sistema. Българските и makedonskite govori ca ednakvi po glavnite osobenosti na gramatičija si stroeci na osnovnia si rečnikov fond. Te obrazuvat edna ezikova cjajost, kojato се стеснено seotlicava ot сръбско сръбската езикова sistema. Blizostta на българските и makedonskite govori ne e slučajna. Tja e posledica ot obštija im proizvod i ot ednakvija im razvoj v prod-ezenie na povече ot 12 veka na Balkanskija poluostrrov v ramkite на българската narodnost и българската nacija."

'Prof. St. Stojkov looked at dialects only within the borders of the present day Bulgarian state. This can be explained by the time in which he was writing his work. In this way they composed and published maps. In a number of places however, other approaches were noted which unfortunately are still not fully investigated. Thus, for example, he clearly and categorically expressed not only his position that "within the borders of Bulgaria there are Macedonian dialects which share all the characteristic features of the Bulgarian language system. The Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects are primarily the same in grammatical structure and lexicon. They form one language whole which is essentially distinguished from the SerboCroatian language system. The closeness of the Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects is not accidental. It is a result of the same development which continued from the 12th century in the Balkan Peninsula in the context of the Bulgarian nationality and nation.'

But Mladenov has not included the entire paragraph of the original in which Stojkov (1962:49) also notes that "this circumstance, however, does not deny the right of the Macedonians to separate as an independent nation and to create their own separate national language."
The discussion thus far illustrates the manifold and complex social issues, political ideologies, and historical events which form the context for the emergence of MLL. Above all, MLL has a distinct and unique place at the center of overlapping political, historical, and linguistic claims for and against its existence. And at this point in the discussion it is beneficial to shift the perceptual focus from "outsider" views to "insider" views of MLL.49

2.8 Macedonian Views of MLL

The ways in which Macedonians perceive MLL within the South Slavic continuum can be traced through responses to earlier Serbian and on-going Bulgarian contestation of the status of MLL. The opinion that MLL was created in 1944 is, of course, patently rejected by Macedonians. MLL is rightly viewed as the "youngest" Slavic literary language, and its path of development is much the same as the other Slavic literary languages which were codified in the nineteenth century, i.e. on a dialectal basis. As Koneski (1968:10) notes: "Thus with Serbo-Croatian the basis was provided by the Herzegovinian dialect, with Bulgarian the eastern dialect, with Slovak the Mid-Slovak dialect, and with Macedonian the Central dialects." Further, Koneski (1968:10-11) states that Macedonian and "these languages are notable for a greater closeness to the contemporary vernacular speech than is the case with languages which carry on in some way a longer written tradition" (e.g., Russian, Czech and Polish). Koneski (1968:11) argues that the underlying reason for this is the relationship between a language and its nation, "the building up of a feeling for a supradialectal language connection in the national community."

49. It should be noted that by "outsider" here I do not include the views of Western European scholars and journalists whose views essentially echo the Bulgarian or Macedonian position.
The Macedonian response to the BAN/ Dimitrovski, et al. (1978:6) position, which regards MLL as a literary regional variant of BLL, is that it is "remarkable for its theoretical novelty." And the authors (1978:8) point out the inconsistencies of this position and leave no room for any interpretation other than that MLL "functions in every way as a contemporary standard language. The Macedonian language is a language of an independent Macedonian nation in the same way that Bulgarian is a literary language of an independent Bulgarian nation."

The role of SLL in Macedonian is different and in some ways problematic for Macedonians because it was, and to some degree still can be, considered at once both part of the internal and external landscape of Macedonia. Thus, the process of defining the 'linguistic other' takes on interesting dimensions in Macedonia's case. That SLL is an external challenge to MLL is self-evident even after 1944. The fact that SLL was the established and privileged language of administration and mass communication from a much earlier period also plays a part in the struggle for the acceptance of MLL norms. The codifiers of MLL and those writers, journalists, and teachers involved in the day-to-day task of implementing the norm, often faced internal, practical challenges such as the availability of typewriters with the proper Cyrillic typefaces and the availability of Macedonian textbooks in secondary and university education. Thus, generations of Macedonians were bilingual, raised and educated in SLL. The availability of literature, textbooks and printed material was severely limited in MLL and SLL was used instead. Yet, as Korubin (1986:33-34) points out it is also internal precisely because it was the language of federal administration, mass communication and education: "bases for today's language situation are distinguished by the importance and effect of two factors: the dialects with their specific features and the Serbo-Croatian language with its culturo-historic features and its functional prestige in Yugoslavia, at least in relation to the
Macedonian language." In addition, the dialect of Skopje which contains a great deal of northern isogloss features that also overlap with SLL (see Chapter 4) i.e., "Skopski" has been imitated and accepted by many, especially younger speakers, as a prestige dialect (see Mišeska Tomić 1992:124). And since the late 1980s, the role and influence of SLL has again been politicized in issues of linguistic purism (Friedman 1987:158-67).

Hence, issues like linguistic purism (I will return to this issue in Chapter 4) demonstrate that standardization and implementation processes were shaped, in part, by a response to those who would deny the existence of MLL (see Vidoski 1995). Thus, a positive definition of MLL was created in opposition to what was considered not part of nas' jazik; choices were made to establish norms that emphasize the differences between SLL, BLL and MLL. Moreover, recognition and legitimation from European and American scholars took on an important role as well. Vidoski (1971), for example, summarizes the first 25 years in MLL's codification by way of enumerating the research institutes which helped to foster many studies in Macedonian dialectology in addition to work concerning Macedonian written by Western European and American scholars, and a list of places where MLL is taught abroad. Thus, the need for extra-regional legitimation and the need to develop academic institutions capable of self-sufficiently defending language and culture are in some tension.

This becomes apparent in consideration of Macedonian academic and official views of MLL. Above all, Koneski (1986:130-131) stresses that the standardization of MLL marked the end of a process rather than a beginning. Further, when the standardization process was undertaken in 1944, Macedonian scholars felt it should be accomplished without foreign assistance (or that decisions could be made after experts arrived from Russia) since they had a "well-established [tradition of] literacy and an
intelligentsia that could carry out the task with sufficient expertise" (Koneski 1986: 130). In support of this statement he quotes from a speech given at that time:

We are now conquering our own culture. The future is ours. This means that the past, which has been so falsified, belongs to us too, and we shall illuminate it, because it is as clear as daylight to us that our whole development, including our past literature, is a necessary step-by-step process to the present, when the Macedonian people have created their national culture for the first time in freedom.

Hence, the promotion of independent academic institutions is seen as central to national life and national identity.

Academics, scholars and writers occupy a special and privileged place in Macedonian society because of their historical role as shapers of a revolutionary national consciousness and their current role as defenders of national culture. Even 75 years ago, Misirkov (3/12/25 Mir ) observed that "nie, makedonskata intelegencija, nesomneno ja nosime najgolemata odgovornost za položbata vo koja denes se najoža našata tatovina 'we, the Macedonian intelligentsia, undoubtedly shoulder the biggest responsibility for the situation in which our fatherland finds itself."\(^50\) Government policy, public opinion and Macedonian scholars themselves recognize the Academy as guardians of national language and culture.\(^51\) The traditions that they represent are in contradistinction to European and American society because Macedonians perceive themselves to be in an embattled position where any threat to the Macedonian language represents a threat to Macedonian identity.

As a result, the place of language issues in popular culture and consciousness is heightened. In an interview (6/3-4/95 Ve čer ) with Vasil Iljoski, shortly before his

---

\(^{50}\) Translated from Bulgarian and reprinted in Korubin (1994:33).

\(^{51}\) This relationship between the Academy, the government, and political parties in Macedonia is, actually, much more complex than could be explained here and beyond the scope of this study.
death in 1995, the ninety-five year old author of the play, in 1928 titled, Begalka (The Fugitive) (later called Lenče Kumanovče (Lenče from Kumanovo)) stated that:

_Imav srȩka da bidam prv makedonski avtor koj nešto napisal na makedonski jazik, zašto kumanovskiot govor, neli, e dialekt na makedonskiot jazik. Srbiite go narekuvaat srpski, Bugariite b'lgarski ezik, a toj si beše i si e eden od makedonskite govari. Vsusnost, tokmu jazikot iegovata posebnost bea i najsilnito oruž je so koe upornite assimilatorski nastojuvanja. A gledame deka i denes, ne pomalku uporno, se nastojuva da se negira našata samobitnost, pred se'jazikot. Od sobstvenoto iskustvo i od političkite kazni i progonshta koi gi dozivuvav, znam kolku toj jazik im be 'trn vo okoto' na onie što i natamu, no sega ušte epoperfidno, se obiduvaat da mu ja grabnat ne samo teritorijata tuku i dušata na ovoj narod._

'I was lucky to be the first Macedonian author who wrote in the Macedonian language, because the Kumanovo dialect is a dialect of the Macedonian language, isn't it? The Serbians called it Serbian, the Bulgarians called it Bulgarian, but it was and is one of the Macedonian dialects. Actually, this language and its uniqueness was the strongest weapon with which a person from this region could resist the relentless assaults of assimilation. And even today we can see that, in this no less persistent struggle to negate our independence, language is above all the most targeted. From our own art and from political castigation and persecution which I've survived, I know how much that language was a 'thorn in the side' to them, to those who now not only more perfidiously try to steal our territory, but the soul of this nation.'

This interview was published in _Večer_, a popular daily newspaper suggesting the extent to which the language issue is a central public concern. Indeed, articles and information about the connection between MLL and Macedonian frequently appear in the Macedonian press and on radio and television. Ilija Milčin, for example, writes a weekly column, "Od jazi čen agol 'From the Language Corner,'" for _Večer_ in which he points out inconsistencies in language use and behavior and admonishes his readers and the media to pay more attention to prescribed MLL usage. Milčin (_Večer_ 4/29-30/95) cautions that even minor inconsistencies are:

_samo ušte eden od sekojdnevnite insulti, nagrizuvanje na jazikot, što go kodificiraa Blaže Koneski, Krum Tošev,_
Mixail Petruševski, a go zapisa vo Rečnikot od Krum Toshev, Mixail Petruševski, Todor Dimitrovski, Blagoja Korubin, Trajko Stamatovski, i na koi e sozdadena prekrasna literatura. Toj jazik denes e napadnat i zagrozen bukvalno od site strani za da se odrеće, na praktika...A Blaže Koneski ni ostavi zavet: "Jazikot e naša edinstvena takovina". Denes e najprva zadа and dolg na sekoj obrazovan Makedonec da napravi se' što može da ne go zaborava toj zavet, da ja brani posebnost i čistotata na toj naš jazik vo čisto temeli e vgrađeno celokupnoto bleskovо tvoreš tvo na Koneski i gramadniot lingvišticki pridonе na Toshev i Petruševski. Za zal, mnozina od naš zaboravame deka, ako go zagubime jazikot, e e zagubime se'.

'only one more of the daily insults, the erosion of the language codified by Blaže Koneski, Krum Toshev, Mixail Petruševski, and written in the dictionary that was by Todor Dimitrovski, Blagoja Korubin, Trajko Stamatovski, and of which beautiful literature was created. Today that language is under attack and literally threatened from all sides to deny its unique quality in practice...Blaže Koneski left us an pledge: 'Language is our only homeland.' Today the first task and duty of every educated Macedonian is to do everything they can in order not to forget that oath, to defend the uniqueness and purity of language on which the foundations of the entire brilliant work of Koneski and the massive linguistic contribution of Toshev and Petruševski is built. Unfortunately, the majority of us forget that if we lose the language, we will lose everything.'

This sort of highly-charged rhetoric of patriotism and nationalism bears witness to the close connection in the Macedonian conception between language, nation and the state. Korubin (1984; reprinted 1994:85) points out that MLL has

*poopštì karakteristiki na sovozememiot literaturen jazik, koj se javuva kako nacionalna pa vo opredeleni okolnosti i etnička norma, a vo vrska so negovoto nastanuvanje so negovat uloga i funkcija kako faktor vo formiraneto na nacijata i vo razvojot na nacionalnata i na etnička kultura,* 'the general characteristics of a contemporary literary language which arises as a national and ethnic norm in certain circumstances related to its emergence, to its role and function as a factor in the formation of the nation and in the development of nationality and an ethnic culture.'

Such complex and reciprocal connections between linguistic and national identity, i.e., language and culture as a national culture, nation and state, as seen from the
Macedonian perspective bring us closer to an understanding of the concept of a Macedonian ethnolect.

2.9 Summary

Koneski (1986:129) maintains that "it is not always the case nor true of every nation that language plays such an important role in the process of their national emancipation." But for Koneski and his colleagues, historical experience and circumstance mandated that this must be the case for Macedonia; a Macedonian linguistic identity is fundamental to Macedonian national identity. The fact that both aspects of Macedonian identity had for so long been contested contributes to the status of MLL: a language endowed with powerful symbolic properties for its speakers.

The complex combination of circumstances that gave rise to a Macedonian national consciousness in the nineteenth century is inextricably bound to the question of language in the region. The above discussion has focused on an understanding of the concepts essential to interpreting the historical context in which MLL emerged. I have emphasized the notion that language took on an increasingly central role superseding other criteria as a marker of identity.

Language also has played, and continues to play, a central and formative role in what is termed legitimation in the broadest sense: the process of envisioning, constructing, marking, and thus guaranteeing the authenticity of nationhood both for members within and neighbors beyond the boundaries that nation is meant to secure. This seemly circular nature of legitimation is indeed its primary characteristic; identity is "legitimate" when it succeeds in the construction and maintenance of notions of self and other, and these notions are utterly dependent upon one another. Much like the concept of a linguistic sign--where there are only differential relations between signifier
and signified—we may think of linguistic and national identity in Macedonian's case as a kind of differential negativity (with self and other as its formal constitutive opposition). Admittedly, the content of this opposition (who is a "self" and who is an "other") shifts according to where one stands, but the essential feature is that to be "legitimate," those on both sides of such a constructed boundary must recognize that it has a right to exist. Failing in this means a nascent nationhood and literary language alike struggle to achieve this reciprocity. Events current and past remind us what can happen when only one side asserts the authenticity of such an identity. Hence, the aim of this chapter has been to consider not only the view that the Macedonians have of themselves and MLL, but the attitudes of the "other," particularly those attitudes of the others in the South Slavic dialect continuum.

The struggle for legitimacy has, as was discussed, taken place in a number of stages in the case of Macedonia. Under the Ottomans, this struggle predominantly arose from the most basic self/other distinction in the empire: religion. In this stage, religion continues to be a decisive issue for identity, but in a way that stresses the emergent forces of nationalism as the Greek Church attempts to enforce Hellenization and the Ottoman regime counters by establishing the precedent of autocephalous Slavic churches in the Balkans—moves that favor further demands for religious autonomy among various ethno-linguistic groups. A third stage may be characterized by the influence of increasing secularization as rising merchant classes in the Slavic towns assert more control over such matters and do so in support of the cause of the vernacular. At the same time, the rise of nationalism in Europe as a whole lends theoretical support to increasingly politicized intellectuals in the Balkans, which leads to not only the formation of revolutionary programs, but also a new focus upon language as an "objective" criterion for the determination of national legitimacy.
The reasons for the continuing importance of a language in the development and maintenance of Macedonian identity clearly follow from the above. Yet, in order for a language to play its role in the construction of identity (for speakers) and legitimacy (for speakers and hearers), it must have a codified, standardized form. Such a standard functions as a symbol of that identity.

Finally, the above discussion has focused on the historical context of the rise of MLL to show how the quest for a literary standard is guided by the twin concepts of identity and legitimacy, the interrelationship of which constitutes that which is conceived of and perceived as one's own language, i.e., ethnolect. And it is this notion of the subjective (conception/perception of a language) interrelationship with the objective (the language as reality) that leads us to shift the perceptual focus in the following discussion on self-report data concerning language attitudes.
Dialectologists, sociolinguists, and students of the social psychology of language have not focused on the ordinary speaker's overt percept of language variation. Perception, of course, may be understood in 2 ways. First, microlinguistically--i.e., how are linguistic categories (at any level) which demonstrate considerable variation processed at all?... Second, macrolinguistically (ethnographically--i.e., what are the ordinary speaker's understandings of language variation?). This aspect of the perception of variety raises questions about the ordinary speaker's taxonomy of language variation categories...

--Preston (1989:2)

CHAPTER 3

SPEAKER PERCEPTION IN THE DYNAMICS OF BOUNDARY MARKING: SELF-REPORT MEASURES

3.0 Introduction

This chapter examines self-report data in support of a theory of ethnolect in the South Slavic dialect continuum as exemplified by Macedonian. The methods, procedures and results of two questionnaires are presented individually and then interpreted as a whole within the general framework outlined in Chapter 1. This framework bridges linguistic with sociohistoric and subjective with objective approaches to definitions of a dialect and a language through the study of attitudes toward language varieties and toward linguistic features with the aim of determining possible speech markers of ethnolinguistic identity. Specific models for the study of language attitudes and ethnolinguistic speech markers are derived from earlier work.
concerning interlinguistic and intralinguistic phenomena. To this end, the questionnaire data consist of quantitative analyses of subjective speaker perceptions of dialect variation within Macedonia and across state borders. Language attitudes as evaluative responses are targeted in an effort to determine how speakers perceive Macedonian within the South Slavic dialect continuum. It is not the intent to establish an exact indexical relationship between a national and linguistic identity, but rather to explore the symbolic nature and function of a language for its speakers. Further, those linguistic features which MLL shares with SLL or BLL are investigated as a means to identify how the category of naš jazik 'our language' is constituted.

3.1 Bridging Theoretical Approaches

A theory of ethnolect attempts to describe the dynamic interaction among those variables which create and constitute the sense of a distinct language for its speakers. A description of these variables must include the nonlinguistic factors which endow linguistic elements with value and legitimacy and those linguistic elements which are thought to possess value and legitimacy for speakers. Both these variables—the nonlinguistic and the linguistic factors—can be schematized and clarified by analogy to a web. Following the analogy of a web, these variables are related to one another by a series of connections that conjoin concentric circles; this implies a hierarchical ordering in which the elements have a reciprocal or dialectical relationship. However, it must also be remembered that the way in which the component variables affect one another is also dependent on the vantage point being offered—how and by whom they are perceived. It is expected that the definition and description of a language by its speakers does not always coincide with the definition and description of a language by
linguists. The data presented here provide a starting-point to consider where and how these viewpoints differ.

The acquisition and interpretation of the data undertaken here relies both on the earlier discussions concerning the paradoxical nature of defining a dialect and a language in a linguistic continuum (Chapter 1) and the social and linguistic history specific to Macedonian (Chapter 2). Therefore, not only is it useful to bear in mind that the data can serve as a bridge between viewpoints—namely, 1) the concepts of a linguistic continuum vs. a bounded ethnonational identity and 2) subjective perception vs. objective language reality—but also that subjective perception of language realities (speech markers) from the speakers' point of view influence the way they conceive of their language (language attitudes) and, in turn, how they use it. This dynamic and reciprocal relationship between the perceptions of one's own language and identity and the conceptions of one's own language and identity can also motivate language policy and affect spoken as well as written norms.

The perceptions of native speakers regarding a language are, then, of great importance. However, the nature of a dialect continuum also suggests that it is a construct speakers and scholars within a speech community are not always aware of in the same ways. For instance, it is possible to identify viewpoints in addition to and beyond "speaker" (these are by no means mutually exclusive and may include): group spokesperson, academic (linguist) and official policy maker (Edwards 1985:140-145). In addition, as has been the case with Macedonian, non-native scholars can exert significant influence as well, e.g., Lunt (1952). Examining the language perceptions from each of these groups can help bring together the various theoretical approaches.

1. Edwards (1985:140-145) outlines five groups: the four above plus a "mainstream population" which does not apply to the Macedonian situation in this case.
As stated in Chapters 1 and 2, language has long been documented as emblematic and symbolic of group identity. It has a unifying as well as separatist function. Identity, likewise, is based on similarity as well as difference; as a self-ascribed category identity is constructed both in terms of what is held in common by the group and what separates it as distinct from others. In the broadest terms, the salient features of a language which can be called speech markers are one way that group identity is established and maintained. Such functionally differentiated speech markers can have important implications for social organization and behavior (Giles, Taylor and Scherer 1979:351). Speech markers are associated with a particular social category. Yet while the phenomenon itself is universal, the association of a particular speech marker with a particular social category is speech-community-specific. And under study here is a method for determining linguistic features which are considered (Vardar) Macedonian speech markers for its speakers.

A speaker is aware of a linguistic continuum to the extent that s/he is aware of variation. In this sense, variation is continuous while perception is dichotomous (Laver and Trudgill 1979:23-25), i.e., a speaker must be cognizant of variation to make a judgment about it. According to Coulmas (1981:17), a speaker reacts to variation in two ways: either the speaker "shares certain grammatical rules with some members of his speech community" and can communicate and comprehend "or does not share certain grammatical rules with others and thereby s/he experiences variation in the acceptability/grammaticality" of utterances perhaps to the point of incomprehensibility or communication breakdown. In either case the speaker makes judgments based on those elements which differ from his/her conception of their own language. To make judgments about linguistic elements, in essence, to draw boundaries, reveals how one's language (nas' jazik) parameters are established. This said, reasons for a speaker's
perception/reaction to variation, however, may not always be purely linguistic. For example, many social and political reasons can motivate and shape attitudes toward a particular form of variation. We may not even be able to point to a specific reason, but many times when we do not value, like, or believe other speakers we simply do not (or will not) understand them, and attach social significance to particular forms of variation. Hence, targeting language attitudes provides useful insight to understanding which speech markers have acquired salience—both positive and negative valuations—for a given speech community.

3.2 Speech Markers and Language Attitudes

Labov (1972:142) distinguishes between indicators, markers, and stereotypes. An indicator is a linguistic variable to which very little or no social significance is attached. A marker, however, does carry social significance. In Labov's words, speech markers are "potent carriers of social information. People are aware of markers and their distribution of markers is clearly related to social groupings..." Stereotypes are a "popular and therefore conscious characterization of the speech of a particular group...often stigmatized and need not conform to reality." Therefore, studies of linguistic variation most often focus on linguistic variables which are markers rather than indicators or stereotypes. Stereotypes, though, remain important indices for categorization. The reason that a linguistic variable becomes/is a marker rather than an indicator is that it is value-laden, tied to prestige or positive identity in comparison to others variables that are not (Chambers and Trudgill 1980: 83-84). It bears reiterating that the salience of a speech marker can be measured by the attitude toward it.

Most scholars like Fasold (1984:147) believe there are two competing theories of the nature of attitudes: 1) the mentalist theory, in which attitudes are a state of
readiness, an intervening variable between stimulus and response or 2) the behaviorist theory, in which attitudes are inherent in responses to social situations. Both theories of language attitudes derive from social-psychological models. Baker (1992:11) for example, states that "attitudes are a convenient and efficient way of explaining consistent patterns in behavior. Attitudes often manage to summarize, explain, and predict behavior." An attitude can be defined as "a disposition to respond favorably or unfavorably to an object, person, institution or event" and they "locate objects of thought on dimensions of judgment" (Ajzen 1984:4).

Very few studies to date deal precisely with a situation similar to the Macedonian one, i.e., a linguistic continuum which cuts across political borders and where the division of that continuum into standard languages is arguable (see Haugen 1966; Kremer and Niebaum 1990). Thus, much of the work relating speech markers and language attitudes is based on interlinguistic and intralinguistic studies of language attitudes and variation (see for example Grootaers 1959; Weijnen 1968; Giles, Scherer and Taylor 1977; Giles 1979; Chambers and Trudgill 1980; Rickford 1983; Deprez 1984; Preston 1989; Giles and Coupland 1991 and Chambers 1995).

3.3 General Procedural Concerns

Methods for investigating language attitudes can involve both direct and indirect means. Direct questionnaires or interviews ask opinions about another dialect, language or language variety. The indirect method is designed to keep a subject from knowing that attitudes are under investigation. Questionnaires and interviews can be open or closed. Open questions give a subject maximum freedom for the expression of views but are difficult to score and measure. A closed format consisting of yes/no, multiple choice or a scaling/ranking system is easier for the subject to deal with and
easier to score. Both open and closed methods have weaknesses: with open questions
subjects may not give the response under investigation while closed questions may
encourage a response that is not in the subject's own terms (Fasold 1984:150-152). In
addition, questionnaires and interviews—regardless of whether they are open or closed-
invariably create what Labov (1972: 209) terms the "observer's paradox": when
speakers are aware that they are being observed this potentially influences their
response and behavior, yet only by observation is data obtained.

3.4 The Data

In this study the target population is younger native speakers (under age 35;
who received their elementary education in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s) of
Macedonian who self-identify as Macedonian and were educated in MLL.2 The total
sampled population represents 250 individuals, of whom 198 completed questionnaires
suitable for analysis. A high percentage are high school and college students from a
variety of humanities, social science, and science disciplines. All respondents were
educated in MLL. The statistical tests for frequency distributions, central tendencies,
variabilities, and factor analyses were run on a Statistical Analysis System (SAS) on a
mainframe computer. All statistics are rounded to the nearest whole number.

3.4.1 Questionnaire 1 (Q1): Method

Q1 examines speaker perceptions concerning the relationship of Macedonian to
other languages. (See Appendix A.) In other words, how speakers view Macedonian
with regard to its place in the South Slavic dialect continuum is of particular concern.

2. The age group of the sample was limited in keeping with the goals of this study: to understand the
place, status and function of MLL as seen by the current generation coming of age 50 years after
MLL acquired official status and 5 years after Macedonia's independence.
Under the title "Stavovi kon izu čuvanje to na stranskite jazici (Opinions Concerning the Study of Foreign Languages), " Q1 combines different degrees of directness and indirectness. Subjects are aware that attitudes toward languages and their study are in question, but they are not necessarily aware that the questionnaire is meant to focus on specifically on Serbian, Croatian, and Bulgarian. All instructions were provided in MLL.

Section I asks for 1) biographical data: age, sex, place of birth, occupation, place of elementary school, place of secondary school and 2) opinions concerning foreign language study and knowledge: university attendance, course of study, native language, native language of parents, foreign languages studied, where and why studied, knowledge of language(s) studied (rated on a 1-5 scale in reading, writing, listening, and speaking).

Section II presents 19 passages of text taken from recent newspapers in various languages and one passage taken from a 1913 newspaper. Though numbered, the passages were arranged in a random order on the page. They are: Romanian, Russian, French, German, Polish, Italian, Serbian, Swedish, Albanian, English, pre-revolutionary Russian, Bulgarian, Korean, Contemporary Bulgarian in pre-1944 orthography, Turkish, Croatian, Slovenian, Greek, Hebrew, and Czech. Written text passages were chosen over spoken recorded passages to minimize respondents' reaction to a speaker of a language variety vs. the language itself.

Under each passage respondents were asked to answer four questions, one open and three closed: (a) the correct identification of the language in that text; (b) the percentage understood of that text; (c) the degree of difficulty or ease to learn that language (on a 1-5 scale: 1=difficult, 5=easy) and (d) the degree of difference or similarity of MLL with that language (on a 1-5 scale: 1=completely different, 5=very
similar. All of these questions are designed in keeping with my interest in speaker perception of "What is a language?", a subjective viewpoint. Therefore there was no attempt made to ask respondents for some sort of objective measurement such as the extent of their comprehension of a given text.

3.5.2 Q1 Results

Q1 was completed by 115 individuals. All but three are native speakers of Macedonian who self-identify as Macedonian (two are also Albanian speakers who are pursuing degrees in Macedonian philology and one Turkish speaker who self-identifies as Macedonian). The respondents range in age from 15-30. Thus, over half of the respondents have studied SLL in high school. The largest number are 19 years old (56 or 49%) followed by 10 (9%) 20-year olds. Ninety (79%) are female and 25 (21%) are male. The sampled population represents regions from across Macedonia. The largest number 59 (51%) were born and raised in Skopje. Eight (7%) were born in Tetovo, 7 (6%) in Gostivar and Prilep, 6 (5%) in Stip, 5 (4%) in Ohrid, 3 (2%) from each of the following towns: Delčevo, Kavadarcu, Kumanovo, and Strumica and 1 (.9%) from each of the following towns: Berovo, Bitola, Debar, Kočani, Negotino, Kriva Palanka, Radoviš, and Struga.

In Q1 Section II (b), where respondents were asked to identify text passages and judge their comprehension of the texts, respondents in aggregate claimed to understand a mean of approximately 92% of the Serbian text passage, 84% of the Croatian passage, and 55% of the Bulgarian passage.3 (See Table 3.2.) In other terms:

3. For additional information concerning the identification of the text passages in Q1 see Table 3.1. Though information was gathered those answers concerning the languages in the South Slavic continuum which are relevant to this study are presented here. Overall, the least often correctly identified passage was Korean and the most often correctly identified passage was English. It is
• For Serbian the largest number of respondents (68 or 59%) claim 100% comprehension. The second largest number (14 or 12%) claim 90% comprehension.
• All together those who indicate a 90% or higher comprehension rate are 99 (86%). Three (3%) respondents claim zero comprehension.
• For Croatian the largest number of respondents 42 (37%) claim 100% comprehension and 27 (24%) claim 90% comprehension. Those who indicate a 90% or higher comprehension rate are 83 (72%). Five (4%) respondents claim zero comprehension.
• For Bulgarian the largest number of respondents 18 (16%) claim 50% comprehension, followed by 15 (13%) with 90% comprehension. Those who indicate a 90% or higher comprehension rate are 21 (18%). Thirteen (11%) claim zero comprehension. Three (3%) respondents claim 100% comprehension. (See Table 3.1.) Overall, 83% identified the Contemporary Standard Bulgarian text correctly and 17% did not answer or identified it incorrectly.

interesting to note the diversity of answers in the identification of the Bulgarian B passage: (located under Table 3.2) answers represent all Slavic language groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Serbian</th>
<th>Croatian</th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Bulgarian B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Q1 II (b) Identification and Claimed Comprehension Rates
Table 3.1 (con't)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 91.54

* identified correctly but no percentage given
† identified as SerboCroatian
‡‡ identified as Serbian
§ identified as Croatian
Δ not identified
(a) identified as Czech
(b) identified as Russian
(c) identified as Old Church Slavonic
(d) identified as Old Macedonian
(e) identified as Ukrainian
(f) identified as Some Slavic Language
(g) identified as Polish
(h) identified as Montenegrin
(i) identified as Bosnian
(j) identified as Belorussian
(k) identified as a Central Macedonian dialect
(l) identified as the language of Krste Mirskov
Figure 3.1: Claimed Comprehension Rates, Q1 II (b)
The Bulgarian B (Contemporary Bulgarian written in pre-1944 orthography) passage was identified correctly by 38% of the respondents. This was the passage that was most often incorrectly identified of the South Slavic ones. (See Table 3.2)

There is a great deal of individual consistency among respondents' answers. For Q1 II (b) there appears to be no discernible pattern by sex or place of birth group, but there are some differences with regard to age. Those under the age of 16-17 least often correctly identified the Bulgarian and Bulgarian B passages and claimed lower rates of comprehension.

In Q1 Section II (c), the perceived difficulty or ease to learn the language of the text passage:
• For Serbian 4 (4%) respondents did not answer, 11 (10%) respondents answered with 1, 3 (3%) answered with 2, no one answered with 3, 15 (13%) answered with 4 and 82 (71%) answered with 5.
• For Croatian 6 (5%) answered with 0, 7 (6%) answered with 1, 6 (5%) answered with 2, 7 (6%) answered with 3, 27 (24%) answered with 4 and 62 (54%) answered with 5.
• For Bulgarian 15 (13%) answered with 0, 7 (6%) answered with 1, 6 (5%) answered with 2, 21 (18%) answered with 3, 34 (29%) answered with 4, and 32 (28%) answered with 5. (See Table 3.2 and Figure 3.2.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY DIFFICULT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>NEITHER</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT EASY</th>
<th>VERY EASY</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERBIAN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROATIAN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULGARIAN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Percentage of Respondents and Perceived Difficulty--Ease to Learn
Figure 3.2: Perceived Difficulty--Ease, Q1 II (c)
For Q1 II (c) there appears to be no discernible pattern by age, sex, or place of birth groups.

In Q1 Section II (d), the perceived difference or similarity between Macedonian and the language of the text passage:

- For Serbian 4 (3%) respondents answered with 0, 5 (4%) answered with 1, 3 (4%) answered with 2, 6 (5%) answered with 3, 38 (33%) answered with 4 and 59 (51%) answered with 5.
- For Croatian 5 (4%) answered with 0, 6 (5%) answered with 1, 7 (6%) answered with 2, 23 (20%) answered with 3, 40 (35%) answered with 4 and 34 (30%) answered with 5.
- For Bulgarian 13 (11%) answered with 0, 7 (6%) answered with 1, 4 (4%) answered with 2, 23 (20%) answered with 3, 42 (37%) answered with 4 and 26 (23%) answered with 5. (See Table 3.3 and Figure 3.3.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY DIFFERENT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DIFFERENT</th>
<th>NEITHER</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT SIMILAR</th>
<th>VERY SIMILAR</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERBIAN</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CROATIAN</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BULGARIAN</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Perceived Difference—Similarity
Figure 3.3: Perceived Difference--Similarity, Q1 II (d)
For Q1 (d), there appears to be no discernible pattern by age, sex, or place of birth groups. Although responses vary from respondent to respondent, there is a high degree of individual consistency in general among the respondents. Therefore it is possible to discuss this sample of respondents as a unified group of native speakers, sharing the same set of linguistic perceptions.

3.4.3 Q1 Findings

Q1 II (b) shows a difference of 7% between overall comprehension of Serbian vs. Croatian, 30% between Croatian vs. Bulgarian, and 37% between Serbian vs. Bulgarian. This suggests that respondents do make a distinction between Croatian and Serbian regardless of their linguistic closeness. This is interesting because the former Yugoslav governments stressed the similarities rather than the differences between the regional and literary standards as reflected in the name (Serbo-Croatian or Croato-Serbian). But more importantly, the lowest level of understanding claimed is that of the Bulgarian text passage rather than the Serbian.

It is worth noting that the statistics also show an inverted relationship between Serbian and Bulgarian for those who claim a zero vs. 100% comprehension rate: for Serbian 3% of the respondents claim zero and for Bulgarian 3% claim 100%.

In the 90% (or greater) claimed comprehension range, Serbian and Croatian follow a similar pattern as is expected based on the linguistic closeness of Serbian and Croatian. The differences in the results between Serbian and Croatian may simply be a matter of orthographic—Latin vs. Cyrillic alphabet—difference. In fact, though we have no concrete proof, it is likely that the orthography of a given text was a key factor in
respondents answers. Compare, for example the disparity in responses for Bulgarian and for Bulgarian B. Nevertheless, there is a marked decrease in the 90% (or greater) comprehension range for Bulgarian. There is also an 9% increase in the zero comprehension rate between Serbian to Bulgarian demonstrating that a greater number of respondents claim not to understand any Bulgarian than those who claim not to understand any Serbian. (See Figure 3.1.)

Q1 II (c) shows a difference of 17% between the degree of ease-difficulty to learn Serbian vs. Croatian, 26% between Croatian vs. Bulgarian, and 44% between Serbian vs. Bulgarian. It is significant to note that all three languages follow roughly the same pattern in the lower to middle response range (1-3), but in the higher response range (4-5) the results for each language diverge and follow the same pattern noted in Q1 II (b). According to these statistics we may infer that the respondents believe Serbian to be almost 44% easier to learn than Bulgarian. (See Figure 3.2.)

Q1 II (d) shows a difference of 22% between the degree of similarity-difference of Macedonian to Serbian vs. Croatian, 7% between Croatian vs. Bulgarian, and 29% between Serbian vs. Bulgarian. Again, it is significant to note that all three languages follow roughly the same pattern in the lower to middle response range (1-3), but in the higher response range (4-5) the results for each language diverge and follow the same pattern noted in Q1 II (b) and Q1 II (c). According to these statistics we may infer that the respondents consider Serbian to share almost 29% greater similarity with Macedonian than with Bulgarian. (See Figure 3.3.)

Interpreted as a whole, Q1 suggests that the majority of Macedonian speakers surveyed regard Serbian as closer to Macedonian than Bulgarian in spite of the fact that 4. Less than 3% of the respondents correctly identified Turkish and Albanian; most probably as a result of orthographic similarities, many respondents identified Swedish as Albanian (see Chapter 4).
there is greater linguistic grammatical-structural affinity with Bulgarian. And in spite of the fact that the linguistic and geographic distance is greater for Croatian, the Macedonian speakers surveyed still believe it to be closer to Macedonian than Bulgarian ("closer" is taken to mean more times correctly identified, a greater percentage understood, easier to learn, and more similarities with Macedonian). The same pattern appears in each part of Q1 indicating a clear and consistent perception of the other languages within the South Slavic language continuum by Macedonian speakers. Hence, the speaker's perception of the relationship of Macedonian to other languages, specifically with regard to locating MLL within the South Slavic continuum, does not appear to be influenced as much by linguistic facts as by the nonlinguistic ones. By this I mean that the particular social, historical and political factors of the Macedonian case (e.g., Macedonia's status as a republic in the former Yugoslavia, Serbo-Croatian as the official language of the Federation, the availability and precedence of print and electronic media in Serbo-Croatian and the status of foreign relations between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria after 1948) have played a significant role in creating this perception. Further, Q1 suggests that Macedonian speakers have a markedly different perception of the relationship of Macedonian to Serbian and Bulgarian than linguists might expect. Indeed, I expected a greater familiarity with and acceptance of Serbian,

5. See Veljanovska (1995) for a similar conclusion. The results from a survey "Anketka za makedonskiot jazik vo javnata komunikatsija vo republika Makedonija vo 1994" (Survey Concerning the Macedonian Language in Mass Communication in the Republic of Macedonia, 1994) 659 native Macedonian speakers from every part of the country were asked for their opinions regarding the languages of the neighboring nations; "Which (of Serbian, Bulgarian, Albanian, and Greek) is "closest, nicest, best, most comprehensible and which would/do you/your children study?" Serbian elicited the most (322) positive response, cited for its "good, pretty, melodic, poetical, expressive, and rich" qualities. 510 subjects regarded Serbian to be "most understandable." Only 169 expressed positive opinions toward Bulgarian and 25 believe it is "closest." 152 subjects noted that Bulgarian has "non-melodic, ordinary, rude/coarse" qualities, or "sounds funny." The underlying assumptions that form these responses also reinforce attitudes and stereotypes.
but I could not have predicted such a distancing of Bulgarian given their historical and structural affinities.

3.5 Questionnaire 2 (Q2): Method

Q2 examines speaker's knowledge of and attitudes toward variation in the form of: 1) specific lexical dialectal variants; 2) specific dialects of the South Slavic continuum; and 3) standard Serbian and standard Bulgarian. (See Appendix A.) Specifically, speaker categorization of the dialect continuum viz. positive/negative valuations of linguistic variants and dialects is under investigation. Under the title "Stavovi kon dijalektite na makedonskite jazici (Attitudes Toward the Macedonian Dialects)," Q2 consists of four sections. A preliminary section asks for biographical data: age, sex, place of birth, place secondary education completed, and occupation. All instructions were provided in MLL.

Section A asks respondents to provide a place of origin (a general region such as North (N), South (S), East (E), West (W) and so forth or the specific name of a city, town or village) for each of 24 lexical dialectal variants corresponding to seven lexical items in MLL. All lexical items are attested in Vidoeski's (1982) preliminary studies toward dialect atlas of Macedonia. They are as follows: zamb, zub, z'b, zup (MLL: zab) 'tooth'; izik, ezik, jezik, inzik (MLL: jazik) 'language'; čašule, čevče, čašča, Češe (MLL: čaška) 'glass'; trpeza, astal, sofra (MLL: masa) 'table'; vuk, v'lk, vlk (MLL: volk) 'wolf'; vilica, vilička, bunela (MLL: viluška) 'fork'; and duma, laf, reč (MLL: zbor) 'word'.

Section B asks respondents to provide a general region such as N, S, E or W or the name of a city, town or village in answer to each of the following six questions: "Which dialect is easiest to understand? (ETU); Which dialect is most difficult to
understand? (HTU); Which dialect do you like most? (ML); Which dialect do you like least? (LL); Which dialect is most important? (MI); and Which dialect is least important? (LI)."

Section C asks respondents to indicate within a passage of text where "your language" (YL) begins and ends. This text is intended as a means to elicit information about the perceived boundaries of Macedonian on two levels, simultaneously addressing attitudes toward: 1) the place of Macedonian in the South Slavic dialect continuum and 2) the perceptions of specific linguistic features which may mark the boundaries between languages for them.

The passage was adapted from Zad Tajnata Vrata 'Behind the Secret Door' (Macedonian, 1993:113-114; Bulgarian, 1994: 98-99) written by contemporary Macedonian novelist Slavko Janevski (b. 1920, Skopje). It is the only Macedonian novel to date that has been translated into Bulgarian (trans., Boris Misirkov). The passage contains 397 lexical items and is modified gradually from beginning to end—grammatically, syntactically, lexically, orthographically, and with variations on stress—so that the text begins in a standard Serbian translation, then shifts to a mix of Serbian and Macedonian, shifts to a standard Macedonian (Skopje) variant, then shifts to a mix of Macedonian and Bulgarian and then ends in the Bulgarian translation, i.e., this constructed text is meant to represent, on some level, a model of dialect continuum. (See Figure 3.4.) Each word in the text is treated as an item (I) and tabulated as a nominal variable. A written text passage was chosen over a spoken recorded passage to minimize respondents' reaction to a speaker of the language variety vs. a language variety itself. In addition, responding to variation in textual/written rather than aural/oral form may encourage an individual to make a somewhat more conscious and reasoned decision about which items to accept and which items to reject.
Čovek je stajao sa lopatom iznad grumke, rovite zemlje u svojoj basti. Vredao je krta. Kada se mala grda na humusu malo pokrenula na površini, му se da krt provladi svoju njušku kroz isto rastresenost zemlje. Ravita se zemlja poravnala od udarca, medzutim krt nema, iako je na metalnom delu lopate čovek vide krv.


Može se no ne go ubiti krtot tuku skamenet i go glede so začudenost krtot so odi ponekogas zakopani dluboko pod koren na staro judino drvo, znadi ne slep, molbeno gleda vo nadmosnoto sušt. Od levoto mu oko pag'aa skameneti sulzi, v desnoto krie svoi molitvi. Čovek zaxvrli lopata i gi otkoma krilca.

Spored tvrdenieto na devetija raskazvad, ot toj vek, dovekot lesno zakadil krilcata na ramo. Pri opita mu da poleti, se sluci ne sto drugo. Mesto da se vivne kon bjalo oblace na glavata padnal i zapocna da ja rie zemja. Skoro se izgubil. Čovekot zaxvri lopata i gi otkoma  lopata stanal krt.

I krtot, sega bez strax, če nekoj što se ubije, si promeni oblika. Stana čovek, istina malke poveče vlaknest i, s čoveški, no vsepak čovek. Naram, kako podolikuva na dobar stopanin, trgn i kon  gradinata.

Spored versijata na desetija razkazvać ot toj rod, 115

Figure 3.4: Q2C Text

115
Figure 3.4 (con't)

verojatno posleden slučka prodolžila.

Poznato je, ce njakoj denovi cutrinite skimtjat kato na nastinali kućenca, dokato privečerite xapjat u Site na golglavite minuvadi. Za smetka na toa pladneto m efcd tu takava sutrin i takava veder e mirno i prilida na voda, kojato ne preminava vjatar. Dojde takov edin den. Čovekot, predi tova, stoeše s lopata nad kupcinka roxkava zemja si gradinata. Kogato površnostta nakucnkata se porazmrda, na nego mu se stori krtot, predi tova dovek, podava demata s mucunka ot saSto tolikova demata razpovena zemja. Zamaxna lopata. Roxavata zemja se spleska ot udara, obade karta, preditova dovek, go njamaše, makar če po metalnata čas na lopata sevižaši kart. Ubeden, če e svetil masloto na zivotnoto, čovekat, predi tova kart, razkopa zemjata na tova mjesto. Ostana iznenadan. Sledovla tova istorijata se povtori. Kartat čovek se ot novo stana čovek, a če čovekat kart se zavama svojata tannina.

* in the original text: underlined characters represent digraphs љ в, њ в в в в в in the original

I 1 - I 55 mostly Serbian features with Serbian orthography
I 56 - I 86 mixed Serbian and Macedonian features
I 87 - I 139 mostly Macedonian features
I 140 - I 174 mixed Macedonian and Bulgarian features
I 175 - I 330 mostly Bulgarian features written in Macedonian orthography
I 331 - I 397 mostly Bulgarian features written in Bulgarian orthography
3.5.1 Q2 Results

Q2 was completed by 83 individuals. All are native speakers of Macedonian who self-identify as Macedonian. The respondents range in age from 15-50. The mean age is 28 years old (8 or 10%) with 45 (58%) below that age and 34 (33%) above age. Forty (48%) are female and 43 (52%) are male. Respondents represent regions across the Republic of Macedonia. The largest number 42 (48%) of respondents were born in Skopje. Six (7%) were born in Štip, 4 (5%) from Prilep and Struga, 3 (3%) from Berovo, 3 from Bitola, and 3 from Kumanovo, 2 (2%) are from Ohrid, 2 from Strumica and 2 from Tashkent and Titov Veles 1 (1%) each are from the following towns: Gevelija, Kavadarci, Kočani, Kriva Palanka, Kratovo, Kruševo, Sveti Nikole, Pehčevo, and Tetovo.6

In Q2 A, there are no statistically significant results for zup, inzik and def de. (For glosses see page 113.) These items were, therefore, excluded from statistical tests. It should also be noted that no lexical item was answered by all respondents and no single respondent provided an answer for all lexical items. The fewest number of those missing in the frequency distribution are 2 for zub, 11 for jezik, 14 for re c and 15 for vuk. This also accounts for the wide range in percentages of total answers given.

The generally expected answers for the lexical variants are as follows: zub, jezik , vuk , astal , cе sе , trpeza and re с occur in the N; z'b , ezik , laf , v'lk , vilica , sofра and duma occur in the E; bunela , zamb and cаv се occur in the W; izik and cаsule occur in the S. Since respondents could answer

6. There are a number of Macedonians, many from Agean Macedonia, who were resettled by the Communist Party after the Second World War in Warsaw and Tashkent and then later were able to emigrate to the Republic of Macedonia.
with either the general region or specific place name, all specific place names were re-coded as general region for the purpose of one analysis: 7

- For zam the largest number of respondents 20 (63%) assigned it to W, followed by 8 (25%) with S and 4 (13%) with E.
- For zub the largest number of respondents 73 (36%) assigned it to N, followed by 4 (5%) with North-East (NE) and 3 (4%) with North-Central (NC).
- For z'b the largest number of respondents 16 (36%) assigned it to S, followed by 14 (31%) with E.
- For izik the largest number of respondents 9 (36%) assigned it to both S and W, followed by 5 (18%) with E.
- For jezik the largest number of respondents 62 (86%) assigned it to N, followed by 5 (7%) with NE.
- For ezik the largest number of respondents 30 (51%) assigned it to E, followed by 10 (17%) with NE.
- For cašule the largest number of respondents 12 (55%) assigned it to W, followed by 4 (18%) with both N and S.
- For cače the largest number of respondents 7 (44%) assigned it to W, followed by 3 (19%) with N.
- For češče the greatest number of respondents 9 (86%) assigned it to N, followed by 5 (7%) with NE.
- For trpeza the largest number of respondents 10 (32%) assigned it to both N and S, followed by 6 (19.4%) with E.

7. Here "general region" refers to the speaker's conception of what constitutes general region taken from pilot studies and interviews. These do not necessarily correspond to the dialect classifications of dialectologists and academics (see Vidoeski 1960). Place names correspond to general region as: Tetovo=N; Kumanovo=N; Skopje=NC; Titov Veles=C; Kavadarci=C; Prilep=C; Kriva Palanka=E; Struga=SW; Bitola=SW; Ohrid=SW; Strumica=SE and Gevelija=SE.
• For *astal* the largest number of respondents 13 (50%) assigned it to N, followed by 4 (15%) with both S and N.

• For *sofra* the largest number of respondents 7 (30%) assigned it to both S and W, followed by 5 (22%) with E.

• For *vlk* the largest number of respondents 10 (32%) assigned it to E, followed by 9 (29%) with S.

• For *vuk* the largest number of respondents 58 (85%) assigned it to N, followed by 4 (6%) with E.

• For *v'lk* the largest number of respondents 18 (49%) assigned it to E, followed by 15 (41%) with S.

• For *vilica* the largest number of respondents 6 (32%) assigned it to N, followed by 4 (21%) with both E and W.

• For *vili čka* the largest number of respondents 5 (36%) assigned it to W, followed by 4 (29%) with E.

• For *bunela* the largest number of respondents 23 (58%) assigned it to S, followed by 10 (25%) with E.

• For *laf* the largest number of respondents 16 (41%) assigned it to W, followed by 15 (39%) with S.

• For *re č* the largest number of respondents 62 (89.8%) assigned it to N, followed by 8 (12%) with NE.

• For *duma* the largest number of respondents 41 (66%) assigned it to E, followed by 12 (19%) with W. (See Figure 3.5.)
For Q2 A, there appears to be no discernible pattern among the responses for sex, or age, but a pattern emerges when responses are arranged by place of birth. As is expected, respondents from the E--Berovo, Kočani, Kriva Palanka, Stip, Sveti
Nikole, and Titov Veles—identify *ezik, v'lk, and duma* on average 73% more times correctly than respondents from the NC, C, S, and SE—Bitola, Gevelija, Prilep, Skopje, Struga and Strumica, i.e., they are more likely to come into contact with these lexical variants.

For Q2 B, respondents could answer with either the general region or specific place name. The missing frequencies are as follows: for "easiest to understand" (ETU) 0; for "hardest to understand" (HTU) 6; for "most liked" (ML) 9; for "least liked" (LL) 17; for "most important" (MI) 8; for "least important" (LI) 18:

- For ETU, 28 respondents (34%) answered with SK, followed by 19 (23%) with C, 9 (11%) with NC, 7 (8.4) with both N and NE, 2 (2%) with both W and Bitola, and 1 (1%) with E, S, SW, Kavadarci, Strumica, and Titov Veles.
- For HTU, 19 respondents (25%) answered with SE, followed by 16 (21%) with S, 13 (17%) with Kumanovo, 12 (16) with Strumica, 5 (7%) with NE, 3 (4%) with E, 2 (3%) with Kriva Palanka, and 1 (1%) with West-Central (WC), C, Prilep, Skopje, and Tetovo.
- For ML, 22 respondents (30%) answered with Skopje, followed by 21 (29%) with C, 6 (8%) with Bitola and N, 5 (8%) with NC and Titov Veles, 2 (3%) with Struga and Prilep, and 1 (1%) with W, Kumanovo, and Ohrid.
- For LL, 16 respondents (24%) answered with Strumica, followed by 14 (21%) with S, 11 (17%) with E, 10 (15%) with SE, 7 (11%) with Kumanovo, 3 (5%) with NE, 2 (3%) with Bitola, and 1 (2%) with Skopje, Ohrid, and Gevelija.
- For MI, 39 respondents (52%) answered with Skopje, followed by 28 (37%) with C, 4 (5%) with NC, 2 (3%) with Titov Veles and 1 (1%) with Kavadarci and Kumanovo.
Figure 3.6: Lexical Variants by Specific Place Names, Q2 B
• For LI, 34 respondents (52%) answered with E, followed by 9 (14%) with SE and Strumica, 7 (11%) with S, and 1 (2%) with C, Gevelija, Kumanovo, and Skopje. (See Figure 3.6)

Due to the fact that respondents could answer with either the general region or specific place name in Q2 B, all specific place names were recoded as general region (see note 5) for a second frequency distribution analysis:
• For ETU, 37 respondents answered with NC, followed by 23 with C, 7 with NE, 3 with S, 2 with SE and W and 1 with SW.
• For HTU, 27 respondents answered with SE, followed by 17 with S, 15 with N, 5 with NE and E, 2 with C and 1 with WC and W.
• For ML, 26 respondents answered with NC, followed by 12 with N, 7 with S, 4 with C, 2 with NE and SE and 1 with W.
• For LL, 26 respondents answered with SE, followed by 15 with S, 11 with E, 7 with N, 3 with NE, and 1 with NC.
• For MI, 43 respondents answered with NC, followed by 31 with C and 1 with N.
• For LI, 35 respondents answered with E, followed by 19 with SE, 7 with S, and 1 with N, NC, and C. (See Figure 3.7.)

For Q2 B, there appears to be no discernible pattern by sex, or age, but a pattern emerges when responses are arranged by place of birth. As might be expected there is and inverse relationship for the negative valuations between those from the N/NE and those from S/SE; respondents from Stip and Skopje are most likely to respond to HTU and LL with Strumica or SE while respondents from Struga, Ohrid, Strumica, and Gevelija, are more likely to respond to HTU and LL with E or Kumanovo.
Figure 3.7: Dialect Attitudes by General Region, Q2 B
For Q2 C, more than one half of the respondents indicated items [I 89-149] as "your language" (YL). (See Figure 3.8.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>YL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.8: Items Indicated as YL

Within the set of items chosen to reflect YL (I 89-149), there are differences in the frequency which with the items were designated as YL. The items which were designated as YL by 90-98% of the respondents are indicated by a double underline in Figure 3.8. The items which were designated as YL by 80-90% of the respondents are indicated by a dotted underline in Figure 3.8. The items which were designated as YL by 70-80% of the respondents are indicated by a single underline in Figure 3.8. The items which were designated as YL by 60-70% of the respondents are indicated by shadowing in Figure 3.8. The items which were designated as YL by 50-60% of the respondents are indicated by ...
respondents are indicated by bolding in Figure 3.8. The descending order of frequency for designating [I 89-149] as YL, according to a mean response test is as follows:

- 98% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 105-111].
- 97% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 93-99, 102-103].
- 96% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 100, 104].
- 95% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 101].
- 92% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 123, 125-126].
- 91% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 119-122, 124].
- 87% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 113-116, 118].
- 86% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 117, 127-131].
- 85% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 132].
- 84% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 134-138].
- 81% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 139].
- 80% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 141-145, 147-149].
- 79% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 146].
- 67% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 140].
- 65% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 112].
- 63% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 133].
- 55% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 89-90].
- 54% of the respondents indicated YL as [I 91-92].

The highest statistical confidence for Q2 C lies between [I 55-175]. In other words, these items were chosen most often as YL, but it is clear from the above tabulation of frequencies that the highest concentration of items chosen as YL is between [I 89-149]. Thus, the areas of the text which display mixed features can be statistically defined as the items between [I 55-88] and [I 150-175]. The items which
motivated the greatest fluctuations in frequency occurred within these mixed-feature areas; they are: [I 67] prag 'doorstep', [I 78] če 'will', [I 112] dluboko 'deep', [I 133] sulzi 'tears', [I 139] zaxvrli 'threw', [I 41] lopatata 'the shovel', [I 146] krilca 'wings', [I 148] svoj 'one's own', [I 153] devetja 'ninth', [I 160] zakacil 'hung, attached', [I 183] padnal 'fell', [I 196] imal 'had' and [I 200] stanal 'became'.

For Q2 C there appears to be no discernible pattern by sex, or age, but as might be expected, a pattern emerges when responses are arranged by place of birth. Those respondents who extend the boundaries of YL within the text, i.e., further from I 150 are, correspondingly, from North-Eastern, South-Eastern, and Eastern places, i.e., further from Skopje. (See Figure 3.9.)

Thus far, the results have been calculated as the sums of the means and averages of the number of times each item was chosen as YL. This kind of statistical test treats each item independently and allows us to see overall patterns in the choice of the item among the group of respondents. A factor analysis, however, is designed to reveal a pattern of interrelationship between the nominal variables (lexical items) themselves, i.e., factors delineate statistically dependent variation. Hence, this type of analysis allows us to see patterns in the text, i.e., which items were chosen or rejected with the same frequency. According to a factor analysis, 23 factors emerge for the 397-item corpus, of which 8 show statistical significance. And from these eight factors:

8. For further explanation see Rummel (1970). There are many types of statistically-determined non-orthogonal factor rotations possible. The SAS system ran several randomly-chosen different rotations; presented here is a Harris-Keiser rotation which yielded the most effective analysis.

9. In order of statistical confidence (not in order of frequency) all eight factors are as follows:
   - Factor 1 comprises [I 74-77].
   - Factor 2 comprises [I 105-111, 238-241, 180-185, 255, 306, 376, 380-381].
   - Factor 3 comprises [I 100-104].
   - Factor 4 comprises [I 71-73].
   - Factor 5 comprises [I 41-42, 44-45, 48-51].
factors, we can determine which items are chosen as sets comprising nominal or verbal phrases in the mixed-feature areas of the text and which items are rejected with the same frequency in the portion of the text containing mostly MLL features.

In the SLL and MLL mixed-feature area, the first phrase factor is [I 63-67], go najde krtot na prag 'he found the mole on the doorstep'. The second phrase factor is [I 71-73], mu bea slomeni 'his [legs] were broken'. The last phrase factor before [I 89] is [I 74-77], Koga misleš da povtorno 'when he thought to [strike] again'.

Within the area of the text that contains mostly MLL features, three features occur as factors related to one another: [I 112], duboko 'deep', [I 133], sulzi 'tears', and [I 140], zavrli 'threw down'. And corroborating the frequency analysis, [I 100-104], stoje skamenet i go gledeš 'he stood petrified and stared at it' and [I 105-111], so začudenost. Krtot so oči ponekogas zakopani 'with wonder. The mole with his eyes sometimes buried' occurs together as a phrasal unit and one factor.

In the BLL and MLL mixed-feature area, the following phrases occur as factors: [I 169-172], se sluči nešto drugo 'something else happened', [I 203-207], I krtot, sega bez strax, 'And the mole, now without fear', [I 187-190], zapo čna da ja rie zemja 'started to root in the earth' and [I 197-207], imal gradina i lopata stanal krt 'had a garden and a shovel became a mole.

• Factor 6 comprises [I 169-172, 187-190, 197-207, 216-224].
• Factor 7 comprises [I 63-67].
• Factor 8 comprises [I 112, 133].
Figure 3.9: Respondents Arranged by Place of Birth:
Distribution of Item Choice for YL
3.5.2 Q2 Findings

First, it should be noted that the overall high missing frequencies in the questionnaire responses for Q2 A and B are not reflective of individual consistency; in fact, individual responses form quite consistent patterns. In Q2 A, the group of lexical variants with the highest missing frequencies, and most often incorrectly identified, are those variants that neither coincide with SLL nor with BLL. Conversely, the lexical variants with the lowest range of missing frequencies, i.e., the most answers given, and most often correctly identified variants, are those which coincide with SLL: zub 'tooth', jezik 'language, tongue', vuk 'wolf' and re č 'speech, word'. The second lowest range of missing frequencies belong to those lexical variants which coincide with BLL: z'b 'tooth', ezik, 'language, tongue', v'lk 'wolf', and dumа 'word'. The overall high missing frequencies, i.e., few answers given, in Q2 A, thus, suggest that the respondents are generally unable to correctly identify (and are uncomfortable guessing) the origin of the lexical variants given. As is expected, the statistics suggest that respondents from places closer to the northern border more often correctly identified variants that coincide with SLL and respondents from places closer to the eastern border more often correctly identified variants that coincide with BLL.

Moreover, the statistics also suggest that speakers do not possess the same knowledge of and perception of each variant and, hence, are unable to provide an opinion for all variants. (See Figure 3.6.) Rather, only those variants which pattern together as a group are generally correctly identified. Thus, I suggest that these groups of lexical variants have salience for the respondents; this salience underlies the reason such variants are most often identified. From the linguist's perspective, this salience may result from the fact that the lexical variants as a group reflect the same patterns of
historical phonological (and morphological) development, e.g., group 1) zub 'tooth'; CS q > u, jezik 'language, tongue'; je > je, vuk 'wolf'; ol, lo > u; and re č 'word, speech'; ĉ > e; and group 2) z' b 'tooth'; CS q > a, ezik, 'language, tongue'; e > e, v'lk 'wolf'; ul, lu > al, and duma 'word'; (lexical difference). Yet, it is not likely that such similar historical phonological developments serve as a possible explanation for why these groups of words pattern together in the respondents' answers; the majority of speakers are unaware of such historical developments. Rather, I suggest that such a group of lexical items may acquire saliency by being additionally marked as overlapping with another language. Such a finding corroborates the patterns that emerge in the Q1 results; it appears that the greater familiarity with SLL is as dependent on nonlinguistic as much as linguistic factors.

Though the patterns that emerge according to the general region and specific place name statistics in Q2 B are the same, the number of respondents who answered with specific place names is greater than those who answered with general region. It appears that respondents are more likely to categorize constitutive linguistic elements and to associate positive, and especially negative, characteristics with specific places. (See Figures 3.5 and 3.6.) Missing frequencies were overall quite low. In fact, every respondent had an answer for ETU. The most positive characteristics--ETU, ML, and MI--are assigned to NC and Skopje dialects. In general the most negative characteristics are assigned by all respondents to E, SE and Strumica dialects. As is expected, there is also a tendency for the association of positive and negative characteristics to be dependent upon respondents' place of birth. But it is interesting to note that respondents from the SE region most often associate Kumanovo dialects with negative characteristics while respondents from non-SE (mainly NE) regions associate Strumica with negative characteristics. Thus, Q2 B suggests that speakers generally
consistently perceive the N/NC dialects as "better" than the S, SE dialects. Since the S, and particularly SE, dialects are farthest away—both geographically and conceptually—from Skopje, it stands to reason that speakers perceive the greatest differences in those dialects farther away from the geographical and conceptual norm. And while the same may be said of the SW dialects, I propose that the SE dialects are associated with negative characteristics not because they are farther away from Skopje, but because they are closer to Sofia, i.e., the linguistic border with Aegean Macedonia and Greece is not contested in the same way as is the border with Pirin Macedonia and Bulgaria.

In Q2 B, respondents are asked to cite specific dialects that correspond to their general evaluative perceptions. Q2 C, on the other hand, requires the respondent both to make judgments concerning specific linguistic elements, in addition to eliciting underlying language attitudes toward SLL and BLL. The only question provided asks the respondent to judge whether a linguistic element (word, phrase or sentence) can be labeled "your language." This question was deliberately open-ended in order to determine if any pattern might emerge.

If we anticipate that respondents would choose as "your language" (YL) all items in the text that exist in MLL—whether in the grammatically correct form for a given construction or not --YL [ISet 1] (Criterion 1) would contain the underlined items in Figure 3.10.


If we anticipate that respondents would choose as YL only the longer phrases that exist within MLL (excluding prepositions, reflexive particles, pronouns and/or isolated lexemes that coincide with SLL or BLL), it could be expected that \[\text{ISet 2}\] (Criterion 2) could optimally contain the underlined items in Figure 3.11:
... od udarca, medzutim krt nema, iako je na metalnom delu lopate. Čovek vide krv.


Može ne go ubi tuku stoš skameni. Človek zaxvrli lopatat i ga otkoma krilca.

Spored tvrdenieto na devetija raskazva ot toj vek. Čovek lesno zakuči kricata i trcit na staro drvo. Mesto se vijne kon bjalo oblače na glavata mu, padna po započna da ja rie zemja. Skoro se izgubil. Čovek koji imal lopata.

I krot sega bez strax, če nekoš ste togo ubie, si promeni oblika. Stana čovek, istina malko poveče vla księ. i, se nekoš bjaxa čoveški, no vsepak čovek. Narami i, kako podolikuva na dobar stopin, trga kon gradinata.

Spored versijata desetijska razkazva ot toj rod, verojatno posleden slučkata prodolžila.

Poznato, če jakos denovi skimjat kato nastalni kucenca. Dokato priveče, xapjat ušite na gologlavite.

Figure 3.11: ISet2–ML Criterion 2
According to the respondents of a follow up questionnaire using the same text, no separate languages could satisfactorily be identified. The linguists surveyed tended to find that the Q2 C text consists of either: 1) only a mix of transitional dialects; or 2) separate elements as in [ISet 2] that are labeled as belonging to one or more languages.

The Q2 C results from the Macedonian speakers, however, show a different pattern than those anticipated as a result of the first criterion--YL [ISet 1], or those anticipated as a result of the second criterion--[ISet 2], or the academic viewpoint above. Rather, Q2 C shows that speaker perception of YL is [ISet 3] (See Figure 3.12.). The respondents' answers are limited to the third paragraph; over half of the respondents restricted their choice of YL to [I 89-149]. I suggest that, here, mean response item frequencies can be interpreted as a rate of acceptability for speakers; those items which fall into a higher acceptance rate group (50% and above) establish the typical Macedonian YL as [ISet 3] ([I 89-149]) for the majority of respondents.

10. This questionnaire was distributed to linguists and students of the South Slavic languages at the Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures at the Ohio State University in January, 1996. They were asked to indicate where the boundaries of SLL, MLL, and BLL would be in the text.
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Moreover, upon closer examination of [ISet 3], some interesting points can be noted. For instance, there exists a hierarchy of acceptability both within the parameters of [ISet 3] and in the mixed-feature areas [I 55-86] and [I 150-175]. By this I mean that those items within [ISet 3] that coincide with the northern Macedonian isoglosses and SLL, e.g., *dluboko* [I 112] for MLL *dlaboko* 'deep', *sulzi* [I 133] for MLL *solzi* 'tear', SLL *zaxvrlj* [I 140] for MLL *frli* 'throw, cast'], though lower on the scale of acceptability are nonetheless included. Further, the phrase *mu bea slomeni* [I 71-73] for *mu bea skrsen* 'his were broken' is accepted more often than MLL/BLL *se sluči ne sto drugo* [I 169-171] 'something else happened', in spite of the fact that both phrases are considered acceptable phrases which exist in MLL and the Skopje dialect. I argue it is the preceding context which "cues" the reader and shapes their attitude or inclination toward acceptability.

In addition, in spite of the fact that there are almost three times as many items that overlap with MLL in the fourth paragraph to the end of the text than there are in the first and second paragraphs of the text, there were fewer items designated as YL after [ISet 3]. In other words, the rate of acceptability is higher for those items which overlap with MLL that are found in the SLL (or mixed SLL and MLL) context and, conversely, the rate of acceptability is lower for those items which overlap with MLL that are found in the BLL (or mixed MLL and BLL) context. Overall, this seems to suggest that lexical differences (mutually intelligible or not), in and of themselves, are not as salient for speakers as we (as linguists) might think. Rather, it is the context that determines the acceptability of a particular lexical item. Such a sensitivity to context, i.e., SLL and BLL, may reveal as much about attitudes toward the neighboring languages as it does about particular linguistic features.
The rate of acceptability of items within the mixed-feature areas—statistically
corraborated as [I 55-86] and [I 150-175]—of the text can provide information about
which particular linguistic features may signal a boundary between YL and "non-YL."
In these areas, the factor analysis shows that certain items were accepted and rejected as
nominal or verbal phrases. By comparing that information with the mean frequencies,
which exhibit the greatest increases or decreases in acceptability, three linguistic
features emerge as "boundary markers," e.g., the use and realization of the definite
article after a preposition; the position of the reduplicative pronoun and the use of the
-n/-t and 1-suffix verbal forms (these features are discussed further in Chapter 4).

3.7 Preliminary Conclusions

Q1 shows that Macedonian speakers perceive Serbian to be closer to
Macedonian than Bulgarian and Q2 shows that Macedonian speakers have greater
knowledge of, and are more accepting of lexical variants and phrases which coincide
with SLL than those lexical variants and phrases which coincide with Bulgarian even
when such variants are defined as belonging to one's own language (as MLL). Results
from both self-report questionnaires corroborate the fact that Serbian is perceived as
easier to understand, easier to learn, and, in general, as being more like Macedonian.
This is not what we might expect given the formal linguistic relationships between
Croatian, Serbian, Macedonian, and Bulgarian. Such a finding brings us back to the
central question of this study: What does this tell us about the ways we approach
defining a language within a dialect continuum?

In general, the results of Q1 and Q2 reinforce the notion that, in practice,
nonlinguistic factors largely determine how the boundaries of a language are established
and maintained. Yet, this subjectively-experienced perspective of MLL, in particular,
does not follow our models of a dialect continuum. For the speaker, MLL is a bounded
entity—both as an abstract concept, i.e., speakers "imagine" there is a Macedonian
language (whether as a standard or simply as "one's own") and as combination of
objective, formal linguistic features. Speakers can and do make judgments as to
whether linguistic elements belong to the category of their own language. Therefore, a
language cannot be purely the result of a set of features—regardless of whether they are,
in this case, unique to MLL or shared with SLL or BLL—unless we know which
elements are marked by speakers as belonging to the category of their own language.
The self-report data suggest that this category is not seen as only those features which
are unique to one's own language. Yet, and conversely, the coincidence of lexical or
phrase units with other languages does not mean they are not seen as part of one's own
language. In a dialect continuum it is, in fact, the features which are shared with
another language that may acquire saliency by being additionally marked (and perhaps,
contested) as such. In addition, the data suggest that speakers' judgments of particular
overlapping features are based on 1) the perception of which language they overlap
with and the particular valuations of that language and 2) the context and concentration
with which they occur, creating a unique set of hierarchically-organized linguistic features. Finally, one's vantage point (e.g., speaker, linguist, etc.) in the dynamic and reciprocal connections of nonlinguistic variables determines one's perception of a linguistic hierarchy. Thus, the hierarchy is determined by the point of view from which they are perceived; perception is shaped by historical, political and social factors.

Finally, further research may show that it is possible to establish hierarchies of acceptability—broadly for grammatical categories and, specifically, for linguistic features—which reflect the ways in which a speaker and communities of speakers perceive of linguistic variation and construct linguistic boundaries. The results from Q1 and Q2 suggest that Macedonian speakers place syntactical, and morphological adherence to the codified norm higher in a hierarchy of acceptability than phonological and lexical adherence to the codified norm.

This idea is investigated in Chapter 4, as I shift the perceptual focus from the speaker's point of view of MLL to a study of speakers' language behavior, and to a look at MLL from the linguist's point of view and return to a discussion of the features which emerge as markers.
Basically the essential difference between prestige, function and status is the difference between past, present and future. The prestige of a language depends on its record, or what people think its record to have been. The function of a language is what people actually do with it. The status of a language depends on what people can do with it, its potential.

--Mackey (1989:4)

CHAPTER 4

THE STATUS, FUNCTION AND PRESTIGE OF MLL: LANGUAGE ATTITUDES AND SPEECH BEHAVIOR AS BEYOND SYMBOLIC PRACTICES

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents additional evidence in support of a theory of ethnolect, specifically 1) the findings of interviews with younger Macedonian speakers; 2) observations regarding language attitudes and speech behavior and 3) a further investigation of the specific features accorded salience by questionnaire respondents through a description of MLL and BLL from a portion of a novel in its Macedonian original and its Bulgarian translation. The qualitative approach undertaken in this chapter is intended to augment the quantitative approach to the self-report questionnaire data presented in Chapter 3. These data concerning language attitudes, which have been acquired through interview and observations, are interpreted within the general theoretical framework of Chapter 1. In this section of the study the perceptual focus is shifted from a speakers' self-report perspective to an observer's point of view.
Again, it is not the aim of this project to establish an absolute indexical relationship between a national and linguistic identity, but rather to determine what language attitudes, rooted in popular culture and consciousness, reveal about the symbolic nature and function of a language as it is connected to national identity for its speakers. The symbolic level of language attitudes is taken to be reflective of social and political realities as well as linguistic realities and understood as evidence of how self/other, us/them boundaries are constructed (see Gal 1987:637). In other words, of interest here is both the function of MLL as a standard literary language, as it is conceived of as a sign (i.e., signifier) and as it is perceived as an object (i.e., signified) in maintaining Macedonian national and linguistic boundaries.

4.1 Interviews: Procedure

Interviews provide a method to gather naturalistic data concerning language-related issues. The purpose here is to investigate the attitudes of younger speakers toward MLL and their ideas about its status and function in Macedonia and within the South Slavic dialect continuum. With younger people, I conducted interviews in a group discussion format because the informants were able to define it as something other than a formal interview situation and were able to talk with one another and with me. Additionally, the groups' dynamics are more conducive to observing spontaneous language behavior (see Milroy 1987:63). Moreover, group interviews provide an opportunity to observe both attitudes and speech behavior which some scholars interpret as equivocal (see Fasold 1984: 152).

The interviews were conducted during the course of my fieldwork in Macedonia and Bulgaria over a ten-month period, September 1994-July 1995. All interviews were conducted in an informal, unstructured manner. A number of interviews were held on
an individual, one-to-one basis, but the majority of them were group interviews. Most interviews were conducted in an informal setting, i.e., in homes, cafes, and at social events. But some of the interviews were conducted in elementary school, high school, language school and university classrooms. Eighty-five individuals, age 12-24, in Skopje, Prilep, Struga and Ohrid participated in more than one interview session and approximately 45 participated only once. All of the participants are students. (See Table 4.1.) The duration of the interviews ranged from 15 minutes to 3 hours in length. Although each individual and group of participants were asked the same sorts of language-related questions, no two interview sessions progressed in exactly the same manner. Therefore no two individuals or groups were asked the same questions in the same order. This was done in order to elicit responses that were less likely to be self-censored by those who were very aware that they were being questioned by a foreign researcher. For the most part, questions were posed as direct or open-ended inquiries and participants understood that I was interested in their opinions about foreign language learning, in general, and toward Macedonian, Serbian and Bulgarian in particular. Discussions were conducted in Macedonian and in English or a combination thereof.

4.1.1 Interview Questions

After some initial general conversation about family, social life, and school, a typical interview session might proceed from the following questions:

1) Do you study Macedonian as a separate subject in school?
2) Can you tell me about the history of the Macedonian language?
3) Do you study any foreign languages?
4) Which ones do you study?; Why?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Place of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, private school for English, Singelič</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, private school for English, Singelič</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, private school for English, Singelič</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, private school for English, Singelič</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tetovo</td>
<td>Skopje, private school for English, Singelič</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kratovo</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Katlanovo</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Resen</td>
<td>Ohrid, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ohrid</td>
<td>Ohrid, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ohrid</td>
<td>Ohrid, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Struga</td>
<td>Ohrid, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Struga</td>
<td>Ohrid, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Struga</td>
<td>Ohrid, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ohrid</td>
<td>Ohrid, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bukovo</td>
<td>Ohrid, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Prilep</td>
<td>Prilep, home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Prilep</td>
<td>Prilep, home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Prilep</td>
<td>Prilep, home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Titov Veles</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, Center for Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Prilep</td>
<td>Skopje, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Negotino</td>
<td>Skopje, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, Soros International House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje, Soros International House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Radoviš</td>
<td>Skopje, Soros International House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Informants by Age and Place of Interview
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Table 4.1 (con't)

| 17 | M | Štip | Skopje, Soros International House |
| 17 | M | Skopje | Skopje, Soros International House |
| 17 | F | Struga | Struga, hotel |
| 18 | F | Struga | Struga, hotel |
| 18 | F | Ohrid | Struga, hotel |
| 18 | M | Struga | Struga, hotel |
| 18 | M | Skopje | Struga, hotel |
| 18 | M | Skopje | Struga, hotel |
| 18 | M | Skopje | Skopje, University |
| 19 | F | Skopje | Skopje, University |
| 19 | F | Kumanovo | Skopje, University |
| 19 | F | Skopje | Skopje, University |
| 19 | F | Gevelija | Skopje, University |
| 19 | F | Gostivar | Skopje, University |
| 19 | F | Titov Veles | Skopje, University |
| 19 | F | Skopje | Skopje, University |
| 19 | F | Skopje | Skopje, University |
| 19 | F | Teto | Skopje, University |
| 19 | F | Ohrid | Ohrid, cafe |
| 19 | F | Ohrid | Ohrid, cafe |
| 19 | F | Ohrid | Ohrid, cafe |
| 19 | F | Ohrid | Ohrid, cafe |
| 19 | M | Ohrid | Ohrid, cafe |
| 19 | M | Ohrid | Ohrid, cafe |
| 19 | M | Skopje | Skopje, home |
| 19 | M | Skopje | Skopje, home |
| 20 | F | Skopje | Skopje, home |
| 20 | F | Skopje | Skopje, home |
| 20 | F | Skopje | Skopje, home |
| 20 | F | Skopje | Skopje, University |
| 20 | F | Skopje | Skopje, University |
| 20 | F | Skopje | Skopje, University |
| 20 | F | Skopje | Skopje, University |
| 20 | F | Skopje | Skopje, University |
| 20 | F | Skopje | Skopje, University |
| 20 | M | Skopje | Skopje, cafe |
| 21 | F | Skopje | Skopje, cafe |
| 21 | F | Sv. Nikole | Struga, hotel |
| 21 | F | Titov Veles | Struga, hotel |
| 22 | M | Kumanovo | Struga, hotel |
| 23 | M | Bitola | Struga, hotel |
| 23 | M | Struga | Struga, hotel |
| 24 | F | Kičevo | Struga, hotel |
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5) Which foreign language is it most important to study? (Which language is most important/best?)

6) Do you think Macedonian is easy/hard for a foreigner to learn?

7) Have you ever studied Serbian or Bulgarian? Why or Why not?

8) Have you ever been to Belgrade? to Sofia? What language did you speak there? Could they understand you? Could you understand them?

9) Where do Macedonians speak the best/most correct Macedonian?

10) Where do they speak the worst/least correct Macedonian?

4.1.2 Interview Findings: The Study of MLL

Language issues, in general, and the normative use of Macedonian, in particular, are very much a part of the Macedonian popular culture and public consciousness. As expected, MLL is a compulsory subject at the elementary and high school levels. At the University of Sts. Cyril and Methodius in Skopje, the largest enrollments are in the faculty of arts and sciences in the department of Macedonian Philology. Overall, the students I spoke with have a highly developed metalinguistic awareness; in discussions of the rules of grammar, nearly all possess a good command of linguistic terminology and by age 15 or 16 have an extensive knowledge of the history of MLL and Macedonian literature.¹

One group of high school students, who had recently completed the Macedonian language portion of the university entrance exam, told me that the most important things to know about Macedonian in addition to points of grammar are: 1) the first Slavic literary language was Macedonian since Cyril and Methodius were from a

1. I use as a point of comparison here the students I have taught at The Ohio State University, who as sophomores and juniors rarely know the terms and definitions for nouns and verbs and in general have a very limited knowledge of literature in the Anglo-American tradition.
Macedonian-speaking region; 2) in the struggle for the right to use Macedonian they had to fight against the use of Turkish, Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian and; 3) MLL became an official language in 1944 but had already been a literary language. With regard to grammar, the students stressed the importance of knowing the rules for 1) the correct usage of accent, especially exceptions such as gerunds, e.g., *imájki* 'having', *pokazuvájki* 'showing' where the stress does not fall on the antepenult syllable; 2) the formation of and usage of definite articles in constructions that require the expression of definiteness and; 3) the correct usage of reduplicative pronouns.2

These kinds of statements demonstrate how the students comprehend their identity and position in the history of the region. Hence, they seem to have absorbed the dominant ideological positions concerning MLL: establishing the historical continuity of Macedonian as a literary language and upholding those norms of MLL which are most different from the neighboring languages of the South Slavic continuum.

4.1.3 Attitudes Toward Learning Serbian and Bulgarian

Nearly everyone I interviewed studies a foreign language either as a part of their regular school curriculum and/or (if parents can afford it) attend evening classes at private language schools. The overwhelming majority study English; of those who study another language—usually in addition to, rather than instead of English—the

---

2. In literary Macedonian accent is fixed on the antepenult syllable, definiteness is marked by the definite article and there is a tripartite spatial distinction, and the short forms of the 3rd person pronouns are obligatory in a construction with a definite direct or indirect object. In a book designed to prepare students of the eighth form for a high school entrance exam, questions concerning these points are given primary emphasis (see Miskoski and Veljanoski 1994).
choice is usually Italian or German. Only a small number of university students, usually those pursuing a degree in Slavic philology study other Slavic languages, primarily Polish and Russian.

With respect to Serbian, those students whom I interviewed who study it as a foreign language, all indicated that they did so out of respect for family members or for the sake of communicating with relatives, usually grandparents who speak Serbian. Older high school and university students say they have little to no problems understanding spoken Serbian and frequently read books and magazines, watch television and films and listen to music in Serbian. But some add that they would be hesitant to write in Serbian or speak Serbian beyond a general conversational level. Elementary students, however, said they frequently do not understand everything in Serbian television shows, films, and music.

Skopje is located in the northern dialect area which shares many salient features with southern Serbian isoglosses. I was particularly interested in how younger speakers perceive these features—for instance, if they perceive them as marked to any degree as Serbian or as neutral. When I questioned the frequent use of "Serbian" words and phrases in the high school students' speech, e.g. u 'in, at', kao 'how, like', ali 'but', ufura u ćema 'get with the program', etc. and many emphatic and expletive phrases, they responded: "Ama toa ne e Srpski, a baš Skopski 'That's not Serbian, it's just really Skopian;' Osven toa, Makedonci sme

3. This information was obtained from a section of Questionnaire 1, other sections of which are presented in Chapter 3. A decade ago French was chosen more often to study as a "world language" (Friedman 1985:52).

4. This is probably as much a result of the fact that Professors Z. Topolinska and R. Usikova offer instruction in their native languages, Polish and Russian, respectively and there are opportunities to participate in exchange programs with Poland and Russia.
"Besides, we are Macedonian." This overt attitude was, however, complicated by further observation (see below).

Their use of northern isogloss features which coincide with Serbian does seem to fulfill a prestige function. And although many older students indicate that they have varying degrees of competence in SLL, the speech behavior of Macedonian speakers in Skopje cannot be accurately described in terms of code-switching. Although the majority of students would not claim to be bilingual, they do claim to speak a dialect, Skopski, that happens to have some elements which overlap with Serbian. Moreover, I suggest that for younger speakers, their linguistic repertoires, which include these features, function as a prestige form of an urban sociolect. As a rule, the students do not use this repertoire in formal contexts or domains but primarily when speaking with one another in informal situations. In addition, they frequently mix the two referential and semantic codes in the same stretch of speech to signal this sociolectal use, e.g. [Serbian/Macedonian]: molim/molam 'please', pita/prafa 's/he asks', kao/kako 'like, how', razumem/razbiram 'I understand.'

Only two university students expressed an interest in studying Bulgarian at a summer seminar in Sofia. These particular students have an interest in Slavic philology and believe it would not take them long to become conversant in spoken Bulgarian, but that it would be very difficult for them to ever become "really fluent." This attitude, however, was not a typical one with regard to Bulgarian; none of the elementary or

5. This term is difficult to define accurately in any circumstances, let alone in those as complicated as these. For instance, I was unable to determine whether a given word or phrase was perceived as belonging to one's own native linguistic repertoire or is perceived as [+ foreign] (or simply [+ not mine] see Neikirk Schuler 1996). In addition this perception is likely to vary from speaker to speaker. See, for example, Romaine's (1989:131-147) discussion concerning distinction between borrowing and code-switching.
high school students I spoke could think of a reason to study Bulgarian and had never considered it before.

Quite a few students had been to Belgrade and other parts of Serbia and reported they had had no trouble communicating but that they could not say with any certainty what language they spoke while there; some of both, they speculated. As a result of the embargo and border closing by Greece (1992-1995), many people made 1-2 day shopping excursions to Sofia. Several of the older students, who had recently gone for a weekend trip, described feeling afraid to speak Macedonian in the stores and restaurants because they had heard rumors of crimes being committed against Macedonian tourists. But most reported that they did not want to speak Macedonian because they thought they would be charged higher prices. For the most part, they said they had trouble understanding the Bulgarian spoken in Sofia and that it had "sounded funny and rude" to them (see Veljanovska 1995).

In general, then, younger Macedonian speakers see no need to formally study Serbian or Bulgarian, but for different reasons. By the time they reach 13-14 years of age, they have been routinely and consistently exposed to the arts and mass media in Serbian and consider their mastery of it sufficient to their needs. For them, Serbian functions as a language of entertainment and general information. They do not see any social or economic motivation to study it as a foreign language. Bulgarian, by comparison, does not have any social or economic function for them and is very rarely ever considered a language for study.

4.1.4 Attitudes Toward Other Foreign Languages: Function and Prestige

I was impressed on several occasions by the near-native fluency, on the part of students, achieved in English, especially in American accent and idiom, from school
instruction coupled with watching American television shows and films and listening to
music. The single most often-cited reason for studying English is that it is a *svetski
jazik*, 'a world language', and second that it is important for *biznes* 'deals'.

It is worth noting that no one indicated an interest in learning Albanian or
Turkish and, in fact, nearly everyone admitted they could not tell the two languages
apart in print or had to rely on additional cultural cues, e.g., appearance, to distinguish
between spoken Albanian and Turkish.6 This observation presents a clear picture of
language attitudes regarding prestige valuations; students demonstrate an excellent
command of a language they can be in contact with only "virtually," i.e. through
television and film, and have no interest in learning a language they come into "real"
contact with on a daily basis (Herson Finn 1995). For them, a knowledge of English is
closely tied to their ideas of economic and social mobility in a way that Albanian and
Turkish could never be. In contrast with their parents' generation, English is now
more available to them and has overtaken Serbian in its function as a prestige language.

4.1.5 MLL: Function and Prestige

The question of whether the students believe Macedonian is a difficult language
for a foreigner to learn was invariably met with surprise and incredulity. Yet, this
reaction was not due to the degree of linguistic difficulty but an inability to understand
why anyone who does not have to, e.g., does not have a Macedonian relative, would
wish to study Macedonian. I encountered a number of variations on this attitude which
I have interpreted as a "small language" attitude.7 One informant provided an extreme

6. This information was gained from a section of Questionnaire 1, other sections of which are
presented in Chapter 3.

7. See also Magocsi's (1993) discussion of Rusyn.
example to justify this position by citing the average number of dictionary entries for English, French, German, Italian and Spanish and the number of speakers for each of these languages. He reasons that as a result of the relatively low number of Macedonian speakers and of words in the Macedonian dictionaries, MLL is insufficient to the task of expressing what can be articulated in other languages.

The awareness of differences in language status and function seems to carry over to dialect differences as well. Everyone I interviewed indicated awareness that regional and social variation exists in Macedonian. High school students in Ohrid, for example, imitate the speech of the students from Skopje who visit on weekends and in the summer. They consider the raised and fronted /e/, e.g. [sme:tka] 'bill', in the speech of young people, especially young women from Skopje, to be "very silly."8 The students from Skopje, for their part, do the same: imitating the speech of the students from Ohrid by substituting the 3rd SG regional variant -t for an entire verbal paradigm and emphasizing the pronunciation of /i/ in medial- and word-final position in verb forms, e.g. Jas prasət (standard: Jas prasəm) 'I ask' (cf. Ohrid Taaprafat (standard: Ta aprasa) 'she asks/is asking'; nie beff-me ' (standard nie befme) we were'.

In the course of the discussions with students, a tension emerged between issues of purism and prestige. The students whom I interviewed had two decidedly different answers regarding the questions of where the most "correct" Macedonian is spoken and what is meant by "best." The students interpreted "best" as either closest to the prescriptive norms or the most socially prestigious (a few students offered that the "best" Macedonian is spoken "on television"). The "worst" or "least correct"

8. Friedman (1994:252) notes that "[t]he higher variants are particularly characteristic of the western dialects and also of modern educated Skopje speech, especially among women of the younger generation."
Macedonian for them is associated with Strumica and Kumanovo dialects. Still, it does not seem to be the case that these dialects are stigmatized in terms of social or economic prestige since there is general recognition that an urban and/or educated variety of Macedonian is more highly-valued than a non-urban variety (see Q2 B results, section 3.6.2). Furthermore, a single regional dialect may not have emerged as "best" over another since MLL is based on the features of the central dialects rather than on one dialect.

The attitudes held by a group of Skopje high school students who write and edit their own magazine for teenagers further accent this tension between purism and prestige. "Best" may be interpreted as either the dialect most highly valued for economic and social mobility or the dialect closest to the prescriptive norms of MLL: traditionally, the urban Skopje dialect and the Prilep-Bitola dialect, respectively. The articles in their magazine are peppered with English words and phrases printed in the Latin alphabet without quotation marks, while any "Skopski-isms" are printed inside of quotation marks. According to the editors, this is done "because everyone will understand the English; it is a more appropriate expression and better to say it that way but it's important that people know we write correct Macedonian." Hence, while the "small language" attitude persists, they wanted to inform me that knowing how to speak and write Macedonian is also of equal (or greater) importance.

9. The most likely explanation for this is that these dialects are perceived as furthest from the norm. There is still a great deal of work to be done, however, in explaining the role of the historical and present political situation and attitudes toward the specific linguistic features of these dialects.

10. There is, in fact, a kind of covert prestige among speakers of the Kumanovo and Strumica dialects. Here, I adapt Trudgill's (1972:88) notion of covert prestige as "the unconscious attitude by a minority group to a variety that is stigmatized by a majority group, i.e. valued by a minority group and maintained as separate."
4.2 Preliminary Conclusions of Interview Findings

The results of the interviews are much the same as those of the self-report questionnaires: Serbian is regarded as being closer to Macedonian than Bulgarian in spite of the greater overall linguistic affinities of the latter with Macedonian. Yet, the interviews provide a more complete picture of the nonlinguistic factors motivating this belief. Macedonian speakers' ideas about the function and prestige of the languages in the immediate South Slavic continuum are important in the formulation of this attitude. For instance, very few younger speakers indicated that they are bilingual in Serbian, but Q1 (a) results show that 86% of the respondents claimed that they could understand over 90% of the Serbian passage. These results are not incongruous when we consider that passive skills such as reading are more easily mastered, but more than this, the results can be interpreted as evidence of the role that nonlinguistic factors play in collective self-understanding; to admit to speaking Serbian may be seen as being "less" Macedonian (see Minnich 1988).

Further, language planning policies of Yugoslavia have had an impact on current language attitudes in Macedonia. There is a greater tolerance for Serbo-Croatian than for the other official language (at the federal level) of the former Yugoslavia, Slovene (see Brozović 1970). It should also be mentioned that other factors contribute to this tolerance: there were greater social and economic motivations for learning and speaking Serbo-Croatian in addition to greater exposure to Serbo-Croatian, and the northern Macedonian isogloss features and the Skopje dialect features acquired a prestige value. Additionally, but for a brief period from 1945-1948, political, cultural and social cooperation between the SR Republic of Macedonia and Bulgaria were on a limited basis.
Finally, younger Macedonian speakers are presently of two minds in their attitudes toward MLL: on one hand, it is a "small language," and therefore "not worthy" of study by "outsiders," and, on the other hand, the ability to speak and write it correctly is highly valued as a mark of an educated urban dweller and as an expression of ethnonational identity.

4.3 A Few Observations on Language Attitudes and Behavior

The messages concerning language attitudes conveyed in popular culture also reflect the competing concerns of purism and prestige that emerged as a result of the interviews. There is, in fact, a great deal of time and attention devoted to language issues in the press and electronic media on a daily basis. Much of this attention takes the form of highly polemical debate, especially with regard to Bulgarian views of MLL. As noted in Chapter 2, the highly-charged rhetoric of language issues is often cast in patriotic and sometimes nationalistic frames.

4.3.1 The Press

The two daily newspapers in Macedonia reserve at least one weekly feature and column for issues and events that pertain to language and culture. In the main daily, *Nova Makedonija*, a separate section, *Lik*, appears each Wednesday featuring recently published fiction and poetry, research relating to language and literature, and interviews with scholars and academics. The other newspaper, *Večer*, which presents a more sensationalized version of news and events of interest, runs a weekly column, "*Od jaziden agol' 'From the Language Corner*" (as noted in Chapter 2) devoted primarily to issues of language purism. This column is of particular interest.
to an observer as a barometer of what is perceived as a threat to MLL’s integrity and purity.

In the last year, the author of this column, Ilija Milčin, has written most often about the presence of English in written form, e.g. commercial marketing, street signage and television commercials, and magazines for youth and the prevalence of non-standard variants in spoken form, e.g. stress placement.

It is true that the overwhelming majority of newly-established private enterprises in Macedonia have signs in English and their advertisements contain many unadapted English words and borrowed words in various states of adaptation that are not included in any normative dictionaries or grammars (see figure 4.1). In addition, code-switching and code-mixing between Macedonian and English is especially prevalent in the press marketed to youth, e.g. Taa (She), Mis (Miss), Blef (Bluff) and Show (see figure 4.2). There does not seem to be any linguistic reason motivating the choice for which words are left in the English original and which words are borrowed and adapted (when equivalent native words exist). Still, in general, the perceived threat from English is not viewed in the same critical light as the perceived threat from Serbian. Milčin’s (Večer, 2/4-5/95) tone, for example, is not as strident in discussions of English interference in rock music: "toj jazik e samo mesanica na uvozeni slengovi. A mladite us te ednašt treba da gi posetime deka slengot može i mora da se rodi vo jazinata pazuva na soodvetniot narod, a ne da se vnesuva tug" 'that language is only a mixture of imported slang. But we ought to remind young people again that slang can and must be born in the bosom of the language situation of a given people and not imported from

11. At least some of these are not included presumably because such dictionaries and grammars have not yet been recently updated and published. It will be very interesting to see which foreign words will be included.
Alarm systems cars and things
Systems for card-activated limited access
Surveillance, listening and recording devices
Portable bar-code readers
Industrial hardware and software
Working hours registration

Japanese air conditioners--split system models: wall, ceiling, under the sill
channel, inverter with built in ionizer
technical consulting, installation and service
Office for energy machinery

Figure 4.1: Examples of English in Advertisements
Cindy on Film
Cindy Super model, Cindy fitness-girl, Cindy MTV host.
Now the curvy mega-beauty is on the movie roster in ’95. She who has everything will play in the thriller "Fair Game" with Billy Baldwin. Move over Sharon Stone & Co.!!

(Taa 4/95)

After a seventeen-year venture as a DJ with his partner, rapper Rakim, Eric B. finally got in front of a microphone, rapping about friendship. Under the simple title, "The Album," among the others he created and covered, "Maze," "Before I Let Go" and Zappa’s classic "Computer Love," and he uses samples from the Steam classic "Nah, Nah, Hey, Hey (Kiss Him Good-bye)" in an impressive way in the song, "Good-bye."

(SHOW 6/96)

Figure 4.2: Examples of English in the Youth Press
abroad." He criticizes younger speakers for thinking that Macedonian does not have the same prestige function as English in certain contexts and that Macedonians can still participate in European and American youth culture but should invent their own slang.

The second focus of Milcin's (Ve čer, 3/25-26/95) attention is "akcentska bolest 'accent disease,'" which is spread by television and radio announcers. Milčin asks: "Dali navistina nema nikakov način da si izvojuvaaat pravo onie, koi govorat pred mikrofon kako profesionalci da gi šlusat nivnite jazi čini soveti? 'Is there really no way for those who speak into the microphone to win the right for others to listen to their advice on language?'" because "ne treba da se potoruva notornata vistina deka spikerite se prvite i najvlijatelni u čiteli za ubav jazik na mladite pokolenija. 'the well-known truth that announcers are the first and most influential teachers of good language for the younger generation does not need to be repeated.'" Further, he asserts (Ve čer, 4/15-16/95) that this "accent disease" must not be tolerated because "akcenskiot sistem e eden od bele žite na posebnosta na nasiot jazik 'the accentual system is one of the distinguishing traits of the uniqueness of our language.'"

Articles concerning all aspects MLL history and status frequently run not only in daily newspapers but in magazines directed at all elements of the population. Such articles are even published in a monthly women's magazine normally given to discussions of fashion and health. For example, in the September 1995 issue of Zena 'Woman', published in Skopje, the editors printed an article entitled, "Kako da se spasi jazikot 'How to Save the Language,'" an appeal to take issues of language purism in MLL seriously. Eftim Kletnikov, the author, draws an analogy to the situation in France, citing a recently written book, Parlez-vous Franglais? 'Do you speak Franglish?' which, according to him, should be written in Macedonian
under the title, *Zboruvate li Maksrpski? 'Do you speak Macserbian?'

Kletnikov (1995:16) invites the reader: "*Poglednete go našiot pečat, šlusajte vesti na radioto ili na televizijata, pa Ėe vidite kako lo so zvuči makedonskiot i na sintaksi Ėki i na leksički plan. 'Look at our daily press, listen to the news on the radio or television, you will see how awful Macedonian sounds on both the syntactic and lexical levels.'" His concern is that if steps are not taken (i.e. legislation) to preserve MLL from outside influence—especially Serbo-Croatian and English—then the Macedonians will "disappear like the Khazars": "*No Xazarska sudbina Ėe uštė ne ni bega dokolku prodoł žime so takva nebre žnost da se odnesuvame kon ona što e naš identitet 'But we will not escape the fate of the Khazars as long as we continue to treat that which is our identity with such negligence'" (1995:17) Moreover, he asserts that the Macedonians would never be able to defend themselves against military aggression of the neighboring countries, therefore "*Ona so što nie možeme da se branime, toa ima kako dar našeto bitie 'That with which we can defend ourselves [language and culture] is like a gift to our existence.'"

4.3.2 Television, Film, and Radio

Television programming offers the viewer in Macedonia the most accessible and widest exposure to foreign languages. In addition to the state-run channels (Macedonian Television or MTV) there are a few private channels which daily broadcast a tremendous amount of American and British television shows and films and direct satellite feed from British and European telecommunications networks. Aside from the television news segments anchored by native speakers of the five official minority languages, any program in a foreign language that is not directly from a satellite feed is
subtitled in Macedonian. During the course of my ten-month stay in Macedonia (September 1994-July 1996), English (American and British) and Serbian programs air on a daily basis, Italian, French, German programs and films are frequently broadcast, Albanian and Turkish programs appear occasionally, but never once was a Bulgarian program aired.

Programs which follow a talk show or interview format and have non-Macedonian speakers as guests always provide a translator. Native speakers of English and of Serbian frequently appear as talk show guests. More often than not, in a conversation between a Macedonian and Serbian speaker on a talk show, both speakers would begin by conducting the discussion through the translator, but 10-15 minutes into the conversation, the speakers would begin to speak directly to one another and the translator would be ignored. On occasion, when a Bulgarian speaker appeared as a guest, the interviewer would speak to him/her through a translator for the duration of the show.

The films shown in Skopje’s six non-X-rated movie theaters are, for the most part, American films released to Belgrade. Hence, all the related promotional material is in Serbian and the subtitles (since 1991) are in Macedonian.

Due to a general lack of legal regulations for television and radio broadcasting in Macedonia since the break up of Yugoslavia, the number of radio stations in Skopje has increased tremendously. The largest growth has been in stations geared to younger listeners which cover a broad range of musical styles: "Euro-pop," American Rock, and

12. The five languages which have state-granted status as an official minority language in Macedonia are Albanian, Turkish, Vlach, Serbian, and Romani.

13. By programs, here I mean shows other than news broadcasts. On the three state-run Macedonian Television stations, one-half hour news programs are broadcast at least once daily with announcers who are native speakers in Serbian, Albanian, and Turkish, respectively.
British-American alternative music. Nearly every song played on the radio stations has English lyrics and the disk jockeys and announcers mix English words and phrases in their speech as well. There is an especially widespread and growing use of English emphatic expressions, both in speech and writing, e.g., *jes! 'yes!*, *uaul!, 'wow!*, and *ekselent 'excellent*.

Serbian, Albanian, and Turkish music still accounts for a part of the pop and rock music played on youth-oriented radio stations and sold in record stores. But a great deal of popular folk and traditional music that is played, and is available, is Serbian. Bulgarian music of any genre, on the other hand, is rarely heard on radio or television broadcasts. The use of the Bulgarian language and music on Macedonian radio and television is limited to specific contexts, particularly comedy and humor.

### 4.3.3 Language Choice and Accommodation

A changing political and economic situation, in recent years, has added new contours to the linguistic landscape among Macedonian speakers; many times it is difficult to distinguish whether the linguistic processes at work can best be described as code-switching, code-mixing or intra-language (especially sociolectal) variation. These processes, however, become clearer in certain moments when speakers confront variation and choose to change their own speech or switch to another language to accommodate another speaker and/or the context. And in these moments, language attitudes concerning these choices are revealed.

Many times in the earlier part of my fieldwork in Skopje, my failed attempts to communicate in Macedonian were met with kindness and patience. Invariably my interlocutor tried to compensate for my inability by using a number of synonyms, simplifying his/her speech or switching languages entirely. The age of the speaker
appears to provide the greatest predicative clue to whether s/he would switch to Serbian or English; those speakers over 50-55 switch to Serbian, those under 45-50 to English. This kind of automatic code-switching reinforces a phenomenon mentioned above. Namely, my inability to communicate immediately categorizes me as a foreigner and speakers automatically attempt the first foreign language they are most comfortable with. Individuals over 40-45 did not have English available to them. This age-related orientation to Serbian and English was encountered again when I had the opportunity to interview two entrepreneurs who deal primarily with businesses in Belgrade. The first business person, a man in his middle forties, had worked in a large state-run textile industrial complex for over twenty years. All of his meetings with colleagues from Belgrade were conducted in Serbian, regardless of whether they were held in Skopje or Belgrade. However, an electrical engineer, a woman in her twenties who had recently established a private firm reported, that when she spoke on the phone or met with her clients in Serbia they spoke Serbian, but when her Serbian colleagues come to Skopje they each used their native language or English.¹⁴

During the latter part of my stay in Macedonia, after some improvement in my language capacity, I became aware of another aspect of prestige-purism tension. Many of my younger colleagues and friends spoke "very Skopski," i.e., with a great deal of Northern isogloss/Serbian words and phrases mixed into Macedonian in colloquial speech. However, in contrast to overt attitudes toward these features mentioned above, whenever I used any "Skopski" word or phrase (though I was careful not to use slang), e.g. u instead of v 'in', ali instead of ama 'but', etc., I was almost always admonished to "speak Macedonian not Serbian."

¹⁴. They used English when discussing technical materials or documents printed in English.
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4.4 Preliminary Conclusions of Observation Findings

Overall, it is fair to say that foreign—namely English and Serbian—language use by Macedonian speakers is context- and domain-dependent because each is perceived to fulfill a different function. The most important language in terms of its perceived social and economic prestige function is English. In his observations of MLL and its speakers, Lunt (1983:114) stated that:

the average Macedonian has no personal memory of any struggle for the right to use his or her native tongue. In 1951, the young people who were building the new culture were often very diffident about their own use of the language, somehow apologetic that it might somehow be inferior to another language. This attitude had disappeared by 1960. The generations of Macedonians who had been made to feel inferior by the Turks, Greeks, Serbs, and Bulgars are gone; today's Macedonia has no doubts about the dignity and validity of the Macedonian language and Macedonian nationhood.

This statement certainly holds true for the present situation with the exception of the role of English in creating the "small language" attitude in some younger Macedonian speakers. Friedman (1985:53) too notes that there is a:

source of tension among Macedonians with regard to the literary language, viz. the linguistic generation gap. This gap resulted from the fact that there is now an entire generation of speakers educated in literary Macedonian and an older generation that received its education in another language and still remembers the struggles for codification. The former is far less tolerant than the latter of deviations from the norm.

The influence of English may have widened this generation gap in recent years.

Due to the change in the political situation, SLL has lost its perceived social and economic prestige for most younger speakers. They do not have the same attitudes toward SLL as their parents, and certainly as their grandparents, some of whom were educated in SLL. For younger speakers now, SLL functions as a language for entertainment—in books, music, television and film. And though the northern Macedonian dialect features which coincide with SLL appear to have lost their association with SLL in the Skopje dialect, they were always called "Serbian" when I
attempted to use them, revealing the importance of a distinct and "pure" Macedonian for its speakers.

The function of Bulgarian for Macedonian speakers, by comparison to SLL, is non-existent. Lunt (1984:113) made an effort to investigate Macedonians' knowledge of and attitude toward Bulgarian. He reports that "as a rule, the knowledge is virtually zero, and the attitude varies from sharply negative among older people to indifferent among younger Macedonians." Without a doubt, this statement characterizes Macedonians' attitudes toward Bulgarian today as well.

The status of a language (one's own and others) is affected by practical and symbolic functions it fulfills (see Ryan/Giles/Sebastian 1982:5). Thus, the heightened linguistic awareness among younger Macedonians--an awareness that is greatly reflected in and reinforced by print journalism, television, and popular culture generally--is, in part, a consequence of the South Slavic continuum itself. Linguistic identity is defined by "the language one does not speak" as much by the language one does speak. However, it is important to state that the symbolic function of a language as it is perceived by its speakers should not be interpreted as merely an "effect" of ideology.\textsuperscript{15} Rather, while MLL no doubt functions as a powerful political symbol for its speakers, it is able to fulfill this function because of the linguistic features which serve as objective evidence of their distinct linguistic, cultural and national identity. Thus, the immense public interest in issues of linguistic purism and prestige is not limited only to those who hold strong positions in nationalist politics, but also extends

\textsuperscript{15} By effect here I mean, either as a form of false consciousness or as a category the seeks to explain all phenomena under the political or economic spheres (see Volosinov 1973). This caution is analogous to the one offered in the discussion of Anderson's (1991) term "imagined community" in which a nation is seen as a construct that has real but not essential dimensions.
to younger educated sections of the population, as well as academics and writers who still act in the traditional role of "guardians" of the national culture (see section 2.8).

4.5 A Comparison of Three Linguistic Features in MLL and BLL:
Standard Languages as More than Symbols of National Identity

J. Joseph (1987:72) asserts that a standard language transcends its practical function and serves as an ultimate extension of the ideology of any "unit of loyalty, but particularly [to] the nation." Moreover, he notes that "when a relatively uniform linguistic community is split politically—as in the case of the Czechs and the Slovaks, the Serbians and the Croatians, the Macedonians and the Bulgarians—those responsible for standardization often ideologize whatever minor differences do separate them, so as to create the illusion of a greater Abstand" (1987:72).16 This statement is problematic, yet allows us to understand the nature of much previous work concerning standard languages and the standardization process. First, it is unclear what is meant by a "relatively uniform linguistic community." Second, he seems to imply a chronology which cannot be proved and herein lies another problem with this sort of reasoning. Joseph argues that salience is somehow assigned to linguistic differences by linguists and policy makers. I, however, argue that national differences can be fostered on the basis of linguistic differences—because they are felt to different by speakers, regardless of whether there is a standardized language or a legitimate sovereign state. Thus, Joseph's point is to be taken with some caution since the moment when linguistic and ethnonational categories are seen as inextricably connected to one another by the speakers themselves, differences acquire salience which in turn may be politicized if

16. Kloss (1967) distinguishes two criteria for language status: abstand (distance) from ausbau (cultivation). See also Tomík (1992) for an application of this concept to the Macedonian language.
historical and political circumstances permit or require. Yet, a standard language is more than a national symbol in that it is perceived as an objective measure of difference and a way of maintaining linguistic and national boundaries.

The question of which came first—linguistic difference or salience, i.e., a critical or associative value attached to a linguistic feature—is particularly interesting in languages that are closely historically, genetically and geographically related since this question lies at the heart of issues concerning the contestation of the status of MLL. Contemporary standard Macedonian and Bulgarian share many of the same linguistic features and grammatical categories, yet the specific usage and the realization of some of these categories differ in each language. Moreover, it is fair to say that not every Macedonian linguistic feature which differs from Bulgarian becomes a marker of MLL for its speakers.

The aim of the comparison between the Macedonian and Bulgarian standard languages presented in this section is to further investigate findings of Q1 and Q2, namely, that speakers felt SLL to be more like MLL than BLL, which shares a greater grammatical-structural closeness to MLL. While there are some grammatical-structural features of SLL and MLL that pattern together, e.g., a tripartite distinction in distance marking in deictic adverbs and pronouns (see example 1) and variable clitic placement (see example 2), there are more features that pattern together in BLL and MLL which also distinguish them from other Slavic languages, i.e., those features which characterize the Balkan Sprachbund (see Tomič 1992:447). 17

17. Among those features which are traditionally considered Balkanisms are: 1) loss of case; 2) grammaticalization of the category of definiteness expressed by means of definite articles; 3) periphrastic expression of the future tense; 4) loss of infinitive; 5) pronominal reduplication of the object; and 6) a high central vowel phoneme (schwa), which exists in MLL only in dialect and expressive forms (see Demiraj 1994).
1) a) MLL: ovoj/toj/onoj SLL: ovaj/taj/onaj BLL: tozi/onzi
   'this/that (proximate)/that (distal)'
b) MLL: vaka/taka/onaka SLL: ovako/tako/onako BLL: taka/onaka
   'this way/that way/that (another) way'

   'Peter knows him.' 'He knows him.'

In the text constructed as an experiment for Q2 C (see Chapter 3), the respondents' answers to "where does your language (YL) begin and end?" suggest that variation in the usage and realization of three grammatical features signaled a boundary between YL and "non-YL" for them. These features are: 1) the presence/absence of the definite article with ; 2) the presence/absence of the reduplicative clitic pronoun and 3) the choice of -n/-t or the l-suffix verbal form. In order to further explore these three features that speakers have focused on, I describe the differences, pertaining to these features, found in a portion of a novel in its Macedonian original and its Bulgarian translation. It is necessary to examine the grammatical categories that each language have in common, but it is more important in this context to determine if variation in the expression of these categories in the standard languages helps to account for respondents' choices in Q2 C and thus, if such features may constitute speech markers of identity for Macedonian speakers.

The novel, Zad Tajnata Vrata 'Behind the Secret Door' (1993) (ZTV), by Slavko Janevski and its Bulgarian translation by Boris Misirkov (1994) was selected since it is the only novel to date translated from Macedonian into Bulgarian. Janevski
(b. 1920, Skopje) is among the first postwar generation of writers in Macedonia. He has published numerous novels, children's books, countless articles for journals and newspapers, and several film screenplays. This novel is part of a cycle of mystical stories about Kukulino, a mountain village north of Skopje.

4.5.1 The Definite Article

Both MLL and BLL express definiteness which is formally marked by a definite article, postposed to the first available nominal constituent in a definite noun phrase. The definite article marks the noun or noun phrase as a referent that is known to the speaker (or reader) (see Mayer 1988; Scatton 1994; Friedman 1994). Briefly, the general rules for determining the form of the singular definite article in both languages are the same: for a substantive they are governed by the morphological shape of the noun, i.e., the word-final consonant or vowel, 1) -C + -ot/at (-a); 2) -a + -ta; 3) -o/e + -to; 4) -i + -te, with gender as a factor for those substantives which end in a consonant or high vowel in the SG (see examples 3-11).

MLL/ BLL

3) jazikot/ ezikat 'the language, tongue' (M SG DEF)
4) mojot jazik/ mojot ezik 'my language (M SG DEF)
5) ženata/ ženata 'the woman, wife' (F SG DEF)
6) visokata žena/ visokata žena 'the tall woman' (F SG DEF)
7) drvoto/ drvoto 'the tree, wood' (N SG DEF)
8) zelenoto drvo/ zelenoto drvo 'the green wood' (N SG DEF)
9) liceto/liceto 'the face, person' (N SG DEF)
10) taksito/taksito 'the taxi' (N SG DEF)
11) nokta/ noštta 'the night' (F SG DEF)
There is a difference between MLL and BLL, however, in the formation of the definite article of plural substantives. Plural substantives ending in -i in MLL and BLL take an article in -te. But for plural substantives in -e in MLL, the article is -to regardless of number and in BLL plural substantives ending in -e take -te (Naylor 1986) (see example 12).

12) stolove (M PL INDEF) / stolovete (M PL DEF) 'the chairs'

Another more striking difference between the expression of definiteness in MLL and BLL is seen in the form of the article used for M SG direct or indirect objects. The long form occurs when it is used with the subject, as predicate complement, and as a phrase that modifies the subject. MLL uses this form for all conditions, but BLL uses a short form of the article for M SG substantives and adjectives that are direct or indirect objects. Examples 13-17 illustrate this pattern:

13) MLL: Ponekogas vo kamenot otkrivame oblici. (ZTV, 24)
    BLL: Ponjakoga v kamaka otkrivame oblici. (ZTV, 25)

'Sometimes we discovered figures in the stone.'

14) MLL: So godini ragase negovi glavur desi goltari, poznavaci na jazikot na pcelite. (ZTV, 15)
    BLL: Ot godini mu raždaše glavesti golišarčeta, poznačaći na ezika na pčelite. (ZTV, 15)

'The years bore him big-headed featherless birds, experts on the language of the bees.'

15) MLL: Javačot na životinskiot grb se pregruva so nea. (ZTV, 30)
    BLL: Ezdačat na životinskaija grb se pregrasta s neja. (ZTV, 27)

'The rider on the animal's back embraced her.'

16) MLL: Od čeloto mu raste se obviva okošlu edniot rog. (ZTV, 30)
    BLL: Ot čeloto mu raste povet, uviva se okošlo edinija mu rog. (ZTV, 27)

'A clematis vine grew from his forehead, coiling around his horn.'

17) MLL: Se najdoa domak'ini, maž i žena so kup deca pod pokriv od skameneta slama, i mu otstapija odaja na čiji dzid bezimen zograf go naslikal so boja
They found the owners of the house, a man and a woman with a lot of kids under a covering of petrified straw and they withdrew to his chamber, on the walls of which an unknown icon painter, an original witness from the 8th century with the given name Kerubin, had drawn with paint or animal blood.

Thus, the category of definiteness is formally realized differently in each language and may be interpreted differently as well. The following examples show variation from the pattern above in the way the category of definiteness expressed in MLL and BLL. In example 18, the MLL example does not express definiteness through formal means but the BLL example does. In example 19, the first noun, obrac 'ring', is articulated as expected for the object of a preposition, with long and short forms, respectively. There are a number of possible explanations for this variation: 1) it is a mistake; 2) the choice reflects the translator's preference; 3) a definite article would be redundant or is not required in the context; or 4) the category of definiteness is not perceived in the same way in both languages. 18 The fact that there...
are a number of instances in the text probably rules out the first explanation, we have no way of confirming the second explanation, and a reading of the context itself rules out the third explanation.

18) MLL: I pod sneg, mestoto na kladata beše prepoznatlivno. (ZTV, 11)
BLL: I pod snega, mjastoto na kladata si ličiše. (ZTV, 11)

"The place of the log under the snow was obvious.'

19) MLL: Vo obracot na rebrata oltar od koj ke se moli negovata senka, poslednoto što ke ostana od nego. (ZTV, 15)
BLL: V obraca na rebrata--oltarat, ot kojto řte se moli negovata sjanka, poslednoto, koeto řte ostane ot nego. (ZTV, 15)

'His ribcage was like an altar, from which his shadow would pray, the last that was left of him.'

In the majority of instances the formation and usage of the F and N SG definite article coincide in both languages: note the underlined forms in examples 12, 15, 18 and 19. There are a reasonable number of occurrences, however, that exhibit the opposite of this expected pattern (see examples 20-22). Lunt's (1952:55) observation that after prepositions "the omission of [a definite article] is not felt as a statement of indefiniteness...In Macedonian, the definite article is a marked signal, but its absence is only a negative signal: it does not specify indefiniteness" may give weight to the explanation proposed above that, perhaps, these instances can be considered as evidence for a difference in the way the category of definiteness is interpreted by speakers of MLL and BLL. See also examples 17, 20 and 21. Example 22 is particularly interesting since it does not consistently follow the same pattern (e.g. duša and glina are not articulated and glina is the object of a preposition), and suggests that there are other factors at work.

MLL: Naludnicav vetar gi raznese na site strani iskrite od kladata. (ZTV, 11); BLL: Poludjal vjatar raznese na vsički strani iskrite od kladata. (ZTV, 11)

'A mad wind carried the sparks from the fire off in various directions'
4.5.2 The Reduplicative Pronoun

Both languages have object reduplication, but there is a difference in their usage. Object reduplication refers to the a clitic pronoun which occurs in the verb phrase that agrees in gender, number, and case or case-function with a direct or indirect object. In MLL, object reduplication is obligatory with direct and indirect objects and connected to the expression of definiteness (Lunt 1952:38; Friedman 1994b: 102). In BLL, however, reduplicative clitic pronouns occur in both direct and indirect object cases but they are almost always optional and restricted mainly to colloquial contexts. The occurrence of the "doubled" pronoun in BLL is accounted for by discourse factors, especially topicalization, i.e., the speakers calls attention to the object usually (but not always) accorded to the subject (see Leafgren 1992; Friedman 1994b). This emphasis normally occurs with (but is not necessarily dictated by) the expression of definiteness and the need for word-order clarification. Thus, the occurrence of the reduplicative pronoun is a grammaticalized morphosyntactic feature of the nominal system resulting
from the topicalization of the object. Examples 23-25 exhibit the expected patterns of the respective literary languages.

23) **MLL**: So toa ja iskaža ljubovta. (ZTV, 15)  
**BLL**: Taka izravi ljubovta si. (ZTV, 15)  
'She expressed her love this way.'

24) **MLL**: Od toj dopir prsnal iskri i g i usvetija oblačite. (ZTV, 25)  
**BLL**: Ot tozi dopir se razprasna iskri i ozarixa oblačite. (ZTV, 24)  
'The sparks scattered from that touch and lit up the clouds.'

25) **MLL**: Svetot gi znaše nekošanite monasi Anatolij i Kiril po toa što na manastirskite slavi i panaguri se borea kako divi petli. (ZTV, 27)  
**BLL**: Vsifiki poznavaxa njakogaSnite monasi Anatolij i Kiril, zašto po manastirskite praznici i panairste te se borexa kao divi petli. (ZTV, 25)  
'Everyone knew the monks Anatoli and Cyrill of those days from the way that they would fight like wild cocks at the monastery celebrations and fairs.'

In the portion of ZTV that was examined, there are, in fact few instances where reduplicative object clitic pronoun usage coincides since in BLL the doubled pronoun is optional. The use of the doubled pronoun in BLL in example 26 shows an emphasis on new information in the context of the narrative.

26) **MLL**: Ovoj podatok nekoj go zapišal so kozja krv na istrugan pergament, iako vo minatoto lugeto od toj kraj pismenosta ja izrazuvale so slikanje. (ZTV, 17)  
**BLL**: Tova svedenie njakoj go e zapisal s kozja krav na pergament, ot kojto bili izčegartani bukvite, makar ce po onova vreme tušanite xora izrazjavali pismenostta si s ricunki. (ZTV, 17)  
'Someone wrote this information on parchment with goat blood, though in the past people expressed their literacy with drawings.'

4.5.3 \(-n/-t\) and \(l\)-suffix Verbal Forms

Both MLL and BLL have \(-n/-t\) and \(l\)-suffix verbal forms, but the same forms do not share the equivalent grammatical conventions nor express equivalent meaning in
each language. In MLL the -n/-t form is a verbal adjective that is formed from
transitive, intransitive, reflexive, perfective and imperfective verbs. The -n/-t form
represents durative or completed action and functions syntactically as a verbal adjective.
In MLL, the l-suffix verbal form conveys passive voice and a past temporal, non-
confirmative meaning. In BLL, as opposed to MLL, the -n/-t form is a genuine past
passive participle and can only be formed from transitive verbs. The l-suffix verbal
form remains a resultative participle and, in addition, can function attributively.
Examples 27-32 illustrate this opposition between MLL and BLL.

27) MLL: "Ednaš, večer ne znam koga, se upokoj znam koga, se upokoiv zamrznat na volča vrvice", toj
       reče. (ZTV, 18)
       BLL: "Lednaš, večer ne znam koga, se spominx, premrzan na edna volna
              pšetka—reče toj.(ZTV, 18)
       'Once, I don’t know when anymore, I remembered I was (had) frozen
       on a wolf track, he said.'

28) MLL: Golite noze mu se spoeni so petic v jazilesta alka. (ZTV, 30)
       BLL: Bosite mu craka sa se vpleli s petite v jak a xalka. (ZTV, 28)
       'His bare feet were joined at the heels with a heavy iron ring.'

Another difference in the usage of the l-suffix verbal form in MLL and BLL is
an opposition between past pluperfect vs. nonpluperfect. Consider the following
examples 29-31:

29) MLL. Potomcita na onie što tancuvaa ednas okolu žrtvenata klada izvekao od
       zaednički son svoe božestvo. (ZTV, 11)
       BLL. Potomcita na onezi, kojto bjaja tancuvali okolo žrtvenata klada,
              izvijaoka ot vseobštija si san svoe božestvo.(ZTV, 11)
       'The descendants of those who (had) once danced around the sacrificial
       pyre communicated their divinity in a collective dream.'

30) MLL. Mnogugodišnje želbi go sozdadoa ognot. (ZTV, 37)
       BLL. Delgogodišnje kopneži bjaja sozdali ogan. (ZTV, 35)
       'The long years of longing (had) created fire.'
31) MLL. Mladite se iselija na nepoznat ostrov. (ZTV, 23)
BLL. Mladite bjaxa se izselili na neznaen ostrov. (ZTV, 21)

'The young people (had) settled on an uncharted island.'

4.6 Preliminary Conclusions of a Comparison of MLL and BLL

Based on the salient differences noted between the ZTV texts, I return to the features in the Q2 C experimental text that signaled the boundaries of "your language" (YL) for the respondents. The most significant increases or decreases in the rates of frequency, i.e., acceptability, for the respondents of Q2 C were noted for the three features discussed above. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the mixed portions of the Q2 C text (between SLL and MLL; between MLL and BLL) were most indicative of which grammatical features seemed to mark boundaries for speakers. The following examples are sentences from the Q2 C text compared with their equivalents from ZTV. The bolded items are those which most affected acceptability rates. In examples 32-34, respondents focused on 1) the presence of the short form definite article instead of the expected long form of the definite article when it follows a reduplicative pronoun or preposition and 2) the absence of a reduplicative pronoun when its presence is indicated by the following definite article. In example 32 the reduplicative pronoun is optional in the BLL translation.

35) MLL: Čovekot ja ffli lopatata i i' gi otkoma krilcata na svojata zrtva. (ZTV, 113)
BLL: Čovekat zaxvarli lopatata i otskubna na krilcata fcertvata si. (ZTV, 98)
Q2 C: Čovekot (#) zaxvrl lopatata i i'gi otkorna krilc na svoj zertva.

'The man threw the shovel and tore out the wings of his victim'

36) MLL: Spored tvrdenjeto na devetiot raskaiuvac od ovoj vek, čovekot lesno si gi zakadi krilcata na ramo. (ZTV, 113)
BLL: Spored tvrdenieto na deveti razkazvad ot tozi vek, covekat lesno zakačl krilcata na ramnete si. (ZTV, 98)
Q2 C: Spored tvrdenieto na devetiča raskazvač od toj vek, čovek lesno zakačl krilcata na ramo.
'According to the opinion of the ninth storyteller from that era, the man easily attached the wing to his shoulders.'

37) MLL: Mesto da se vivne kon prebeloto oblače nad sebe, padna ničkum i započna da ja rie zemjata. (ZTV, 113)
BLL: Vmesto da se izvisi kam bjaloto oblače nad glavata mu, padnal po oči i vzela da rie zemjata. (ZTV, 98)
Q2 C: Mesto sa se vivne kon bjalo oblače na glavata mu, padna po oči i započna da ja rie zemja.

'Instead of moving up toward the little pale cloud above his head, he fell on his face and started to root around in the earth.'

It is also interesting to note that respondents indicated higher rates of acceptability for the phrase go najde krtot na prag 'he found the mole on the doorstep' (in the mixed SLL and MLL part of the text closest to the SLL part of the text) than might be expected despite the fact many of these same respondents also indicated that prag should occur with an article. Note that example 35 shows that in the MLL original, prag 'the doorstep' occurs without an article even though the context should require an article.'

35) MLL: Po malku vreme, pri vraćanje kon svojata kuća go najde krtot na prag. (ZTV, 113)
BLL: Sled malko, kogato se pribiraše v kaštata si, nameri karta na praga. (ZTV, 98)
Q2 C: Uskoro, pri vračanje kući, go najde krt na prag.

'Soon after returning to his house, he found the mole on the doorstep.'

Two of the same sentences in the examples above also serve to illustrate the differences in the use of the l-suffix verbal form which motivated decreased acceptability rates (examples 36-38).

36) MLL: Spored tvrdjenjeto na devetiot raskazuvač od ovoj vek, čovekot lesno si go zakačil kricata na ramo. (ZTV, 113)
BLL: Spored tvrdienieto na devetija raskazvač od tozi vek, čovekst lesno zakačil kricata na ramnete si. (ZTV, 98)
Q2 C: Spored tvrdieneto na devetija raskazvač od toj vek, čovek lesno zakačil kricata na ramo.

'According to the opinion of the ninth storyteller from that era, the man easily
attached the wing to his shoulders.'

37) MLL: Mesto da se vivne kon prebeloto oblače nad sebe, padna ničkum i započna da ja rie zemjata. (ZTV, 113)
BLL: Vmesto da se izvisi kom bjaloto oblaće nad glavata mu, padnal po oči i vzel da rie zemjata. (ZTV, 98)
Q2 C: Mesto sa se vivne kom bjalo oblače na glavata, padnal po oči i započna da ja rie zemja.

'Instead of moving up toward the little pale cloud above his head, he fell on his face and started to root around in the earth.'

38) MLL: Čovekot što imaše gradina i lopata stana krt. (ZTV, 113)
BLL: Čovekat, koeto imal gradina i lopata stanal krt. (ZTV, 98)
Q2 C: Čovekot koito imal gradina i lopata stanal krt.

'The man, who had a garden and a shovel became a mole.'

Thus, the three features (the definite article, object reduplication, and the l-suffix verbal form) which most affected increased or decreased acceptability rates for respondents in Q2 C reflect the differences in the respective literary languages. While all three features occur both in MLL and BLL, their usage is different in each language. For example, in BLL object reduplication is discourse-bound, subject to pragmatic speaker-dependent considerations, whereas in MLL object reduplication has been grammaticalized to mark definite direct and indirect objects (Friedman 1994b:105).

Hence, I argue that there is a reciprocal relationship between the way the geographic and conceptual norms of the codified literary language are conceived (formed by attitudes) and which features acquire salience (perceived linguistic variation). Further, the above discussion corroborates the questionnaire data which suggest that the adherence to these norms is stronger for morphosyntactic variation than to phonological or lexical variation: constructing a hierarchy of acceptability (see Chapter 3). In addition, the findings of the interviews and observations suggest that the placement of stress is positioned very high in a hierarchy of acceptability for Macedonian speakers.
Friedman (1995b:300) suggests that innovations, such as the grammaticalization of object reduplication, arose out of the need for more effective communication among speakers in areas of complex linguistic contact. Moreover, this interaction between grammaticalization and pragmatics was important in advancing the differentiation between MLL and BLL. Here, I would add that part of such pragmatic considerations may also have been the wish (or need) to "communicate" one's sense of ethnic identity. I reiterate the basic tenets of the Giles-Coupland model (1991) presented in Chapter 1: linguistic boundaries are "hardened" because they are the most "direct and overt expression of social differentiation in interethnic interaction" (Giles/Coupland 1991:98). Most important is the notion that "most linguistic differentiation occurs, paradoxically enough with the very groups...which have the softest perceived overall ethnic boundaries and hence greatest similarity with the ethnic outgroup" (Giles/Coupland 1991:97). Such an explanation works well in accommodating the diachronic and synchronic factors which construct and constitute a Macedonian ethnolect.

4.7 Summary

This chapter has further examined Macedonian speakers' attitudes toward MLL, paying particular attention to ideas concerning its prestige, function, and status: three concepts that Mackey (1989:4) suggests are analogous to past, present, and future. It must be understood that just as any assessment of the present, for example, necessarily involves an interpretation of past and future, any consideration of prestige, function, and status must recognize their interdependence. Nevertheless, since this project seeks insight into how MLL functions in the fostering and maintenance of ethnonational identity, questions of prestige and status must be related to the present. Viewed from
this perspective, MLL becomes subject to sociolinguistic investigation because of its intricate involvement in the symbolic practices of national life.

I have shown that MLL operates as a "sign" in which, what I have termed "symbolic load" is attributed to certain salient features of MLL that in turn signify "Macedonianess," as it were, and are seen as markers of ethnonational identity, e.g. especially fixed antepenult accent and the usage of reduplicative clitic pronouns specific to MLL. Moreover, the salience of these particular features is connected to the geographical and conceptual norms of the literary languages; this point was reinforced by the description of the differences between the two ZTV texts. I pose that MLL becomes objectified for Macedonians as an abstract symbolic institution that helps to underwrite nationhood and state legitimacy. This objectification explains why language issues are so prominent not only in language attitudes of the general population, but also in those more visible institutions of education and popular culture.

I have suggested something of the conflicting trends within popular culture (radio, television, film, and the press) between their role in establishing a kind of "virtual" language-contact situation (i.e., English is available mainly through electronic and print media) and their persistent attempts to foster a kind of linguistic purism. Many of the same newspapers and magazines which feature articles on language issues and interviews with leading scholars on the need to defend MLL's integrity also contain a tremendous amount of recently-borrowed foreign words and English printed with Latin characters. Clearly, for younger speakers of Macedonian, English is not perceived as a threat to the maintenance of national and linguistic boundaries. Still, such articles demonstrate the centrality of language within ethnonational identity. As might be expected, such attitudes are more common among the older generation, who feel that their duty to pass on their language and culture is subverted by the
proliferation of slang and foreign borrowings among younger speakers. Nevertheless, as the interview data suggest, younger people recognize the need to become literate in MLL and to defend its integrity despite their feelings that it is a "small language." For many Skopje high school students, borrowed words, especially from English, are seen as part of a generalized Euro-American youth culture and hence non-threatening to MLL; but prescriptivism prevails in matters that challenge the symbolic value of MLL and, thus, its constitutive value in Macedonian identity.
The question, "When did the Ukrainian language arise?" is often asked and often answered with great self-assurance. It is, however, both unanswerable and unscholarly, for it ignores the difficulty of historically defining the term "Ukrainian language."

--Shevelov (1980:143)

CHAPTER 5

THE UKRAINIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE:
A CASE FOR COMPARISON

5.0 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to determine the extent to which the ideas presented in this study may be applicable to other situations where definitions of a dialect and a language, and the existence of a distinct ethnonational identity, have been contested. The status and development of the Ukrainian literary language (ULL) and Ukrainian identity provides a useful case in point. Many aspects of the history of ULL and its current status bear a similarity to that of MLL. There are several parallels that may be drawn: 1) ULL has a long historical continuity from Common Slavic; 2) the territory where ULL is spoken has been under the rule of more than one multinational empire and divided among several states at various times in its history; 3) ULL shares its early literary history with Russian and Belarusian; 4) the Ukrainian dialects are said to exist in a continuum with Polish, Rusyn, Belarusian, and Russian dialects at its
boundaries; 5) ULL has been at the center of arguments concerning its status as a
dialect of Russian (RLL) or as a separate language; 6) ULL has been codified on a
dialectal basis; 7) ULL acquired official status as the language of a sovereign state from
1917-1920 and again since 1989 (in the interim it was the official language of the
republic); and 8) ULL is considered to be integral to Ukrainian identify by a growing
number of Ukrainians and language issues are central to Ukraine's nation-building
process.

5.1 The Current Status of ULL

The second most widely-spoken language of the Slavic languages, in general,
and of the East Slavic languages, in particular, Ukrainian is spoken in Ukraine, parts of
eastern Poland, the Slovak Republic, Hungary, southern Belarus and western Russia.
Among Ukraine's population of 52 million, 73% are identified as ethnically Ukrainian
and 22% are identified as ethnically Russian (Motyl 1993:6). 1 ULL occupies a central
position in the East-West dialect continuum; it is bordered on the West by Slovak and
Polish; on the North and East by Russian; on the North by Belarusian. ULL is, since
1989, the only official language of Ukraine used for educational, mass communication,
and governmental purposes. The fact that the standard is based primarily on the
Poltava-Kiev dialects in the Southeast, but has many features from the Southwest as
well causes some scholars to treat it as a bidialectal standard (see Shevelov 1993:947).
In addition, ULL was patterned on rural rather than urban forms of the vernacular.

1. These figures are derived from Soviet passport designations and therefore may not be entirely
accurate because they cannot necessarily be interpreted as numbers of Ukrainian and Russian
speakers. Motyl (1993:7) reports that 88% of passport holders in Ukraine have identified their
native language as Ukrainian. Most of these speakers, especially in the urban areas of the central,
eastern and southern regions, speak Russian at work and send their children to schools where the
language of instruction is Russian.
Scholars generally agree that Ukrainian dialects have a tripartite division (Shevelov 1993: 993). The northern dialects extend across a line located approximately from Luc'k-Kiev-Sumy. The southern dialects extend to the South of this line and divide into West and East at Xvastiv-Balta.

ULL has a several diachronic and synchronic phonetic and morphophonemic features which set it apart from neighboring Slavic languages, e.g., the alternation of o and e with i; the reflex of jat' as i; the coalescence of y and i in a mid-high, mid-front vowel; partial preservation of palatalization of c'. ULL also shares many features with Belarusian, e.g., the preservation of word-final voiced consonants; -ry-, -ly-interconsonantally from weak jers; the affricates dz and dż; the glottal fricative h; the bilabial [w] written v replaces l in C-BIC forms; and alternation of u > v in some positions. Only the last two of these features are found in all Ukrainian dialects. There are others features, of course, found in all the Ukrainian dialects; however, these features are common with one or more neighboring Slavic language, e.g., h (shared with Belarusian); the same reflexes for front and back jer (shared with Belarusian and Slovak); pleophony (shared with Russian and Belarusian).

The unity of ULL is "secured by the fact that each dialect shares many developments (and consequently many features) with other dialects, in various degrees with each other, and all of them adhere to the same standard which speakers accept as superior without necessitating an actual switch of every speaker to that ideal standard" (Shevelov 1979:29). Thus, Shevelov stresses the importance of speaker perception and the role that nonlinguistic factors play in establishing and maintaining the boundaries of ULL: "the unity of Ukrainian as a language is partly material (the common substance of the language), and partly ideal (volitional), as molded historically" (Shevelov 1979:29).
5.2 An Historical Overview of ULL

The name, the character, and the boundaries of ULL have undergone many changes in the course of its historical development, subject to alternating cycles of reform and repression under Czarist and Soviet rule. Scholars of Ukrainian, (see for example Shevelov 1979, 1980, 1989) posit a long continuity with Common Slavic, and Church Slavic for ULL. Thus, ULL, developed through its use in literature, and is dated from the tenth century. ULL evolved, though with many interruptions, over three periods: Kievan (10th-13th centuries), middle (14th-18th centuries), and modern (19th-20th centuries). Until the beginning of this century, the differences between spoken and written forms of Ukrainian were great. The geographical territory where Ukrainian is spoken and the continuity of its phonological development, however, have been its most stable features over centuries. Yet, the issue of the emergence of ULL must be addressed within its political and social context because its principle developments were conditioned by sociopolitical phenomena. Further, in answer to the question of when did ULL arise, (Shevelov 1979:30) asserts "a definitive solution lies in the presence of the spiritual (volitional) factor in the apprehension of a language as a unity. That factor cannot, however, be discovered directly, at least not in the historical phonology: what a scholar sees are only material aspects of the development in all their multiformity."

5.2.1 The Kievan Period, 10th-13th Centuries

The emergence of a literary language in Ukraine is seen by may to be the same as a Ukrainian literary language (see, for example, Shevelov 1979, 1980). For him, 

2. The dates employed here for periodization here are approximate. See Shevelov (1980:154) for a more precise periodization.
ULL can be dated with Vladimir's adoption of Christianity. The Ukrainian language of this period is attested by extant Church and government texts such as the Primary Chronicle (988), the Kiev Charter (1130) and Galician charters of the mid-fourteenth century. The language of these texts is Church Slavic with varying degrees of local vernacular features.

The new supralanguage imported from Ohrid and Tarnovo to Kiev did not differ significantly from the language used in the texts in Ohrid and Tarnovo. The church acted as a codifier of norms in maintaining the unity of its literary language, Church Slavic. The changes that were incorporated into the texts from Kiev as a result of the mixing of vernacular elements were not done as intentionally, but were attempts to cope with the bewildering complexity of the new language (Shevelov 1980:144).

The contact between the Church and literary schools in Ohrid and Tarnovo and those in Kiev was dissolved after the Bulgarian and Macedonian states fell (972 and 1018, respectively). During this period, Kievan scribes attempted to systematize their own understanding of Church Slavic and in the process ever more vernacular features found their way into the texts in Kiev. The development of ULL from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries was characterized by its incorporation of local vernacular forms. Shevelov (1980:145) notes that "by the end of the fourteenth century, the unity of Church Slavonic was more in the idea behind it than in actual usage."

Moreover, the political and social changes that took place within Kievan Rus' created a divergence in the literary languages of the Church and of the government. The fall of Kievan Rus' (1240) and the subsequent annexation of the Galicia-Volhynia principality and a great deal of Ukrainian territory by the Grand Duchy of Lithuania are evidenced by a growing use of the vernacular in the administrative languages at the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth centuries. Further, the absorption of
Ukrainian territories into Poland created a situation for two variants of this
administrative language to develop: a Galician variant and a Volhynian-Polisian variant.

According to Shevelov (1993:8):

The Galician variant which reflected the phonetics and morphology of
the southwestern dialects and contained more Polonisms, became
obsolete when the government adopted Latin or Polish (1433). The
Volhysian-Polisian variant, with its center in Lutske, reflected the
phonetics and morphology of the northern dialects and, after becoming
the basis of the official language of the Lithuanian-Ruthenian state,
absorbed more and more Belorussian features, especially those shared
by the northern Ukrainian and southern Belorussian dialects, e.g.,
distinctions between e and ê under stress, hardened r, ž, č, š. It became
a distinctive koiné which was used occasionally in East Europe as a
language of diplomacy.

5.2.2 Mid-Ukrainian, 14th-18th Centuries

The mid-Ukrainian period was characterized by a generally diglossic (and at
times triglossic) situation. A new trend in the literary language of the Church reversed
the earlier trend of incorporating vernacular elements and, along with the increased need
for an administrative literary language, led to a diglossic situation in the late fourteenth
and beginning of the fifteenth centuries. This trend the so-called "Second South
Slavonic Influence," or "Euthymian Recension" was a result of language reforms
implemented by Patriarch Euthymius of Tarnovo. These reforms were characterized by
a strong influence from Greek, in syntax and lexis, and a return to a greater measure of
artificiality and archaization. The reforms were seen to reinforce the symbolic nature of
the language of the Church and to be a reflection of the "ultimate religious truth".
"Consequently, this 'new' Church Slavonic could not admit elements of the vernacular,
and the vernacular could not absorb its esoteric rules" (Shevelov 1980:146).

Thus, the language of the Church became further distanced from the chancery-
and vernacular-influenced administrative languages. The Peresopnytsia Gospel (1551-
61) and the Krehiv Apostol (1563-72) represent attempts to translate the Bible into a language more closely resembling the vernacular. But this movement toward the vernacular was again hindered by three concurrent developments: the decline of Ukrainian towns, the Polonization of Ukrainian nobility and the so-called "Third Slavonic Influence." The Union of Lublin (1569) marked the beginning of the Polish expansion on cultural and linguistic as well as territorial and political fronts. Most of the Ukrainian gentry and towns were subsumed by Polish administrative units. Polish and Latin were used in all public spheres of life and there was little need for a Ukrainian vernacular-based language to develop. There were a few official protests by the Ukrainian nobility to which the government responded by issuing a series of guarantees from 1569-1681, but these were not enforced. After 1628, Polish was the only language used as the language of government, Latin was used in some legal documents, and the vernacular-based language, called prostaja mova, at that time was used in private letters, memoirs, and a small amount of prose fiction.

The Church, then, assumed ideological and intellectual leadership and became the only champion of a Ukrainian literary language. Thus began a revival of an eclectic, multi-layered Church Slavic in the 1580s, along with a renewed interest in the publication of normative dictionaries and grammars. However, these attempts to codify the language had the reverse effect of what had been intended: "by severing the literary language from the vernacular and blocking the secularization of the literary language, the church in fact facilitated the Polonization process" (Shevelov 1993:8).

The diglossic situation was further reinforced after the revolution of the Cossacks resulted in an autonomous state within the Russian Empire. In this Hetman state, a standardized prostaja mova assumed the status of the language of administration and developed the potential to become a national literary language. After
the decline of the Hetman state brought about by the Russian victory at Poltava (1709), the *prostaja mova* lost its stronghold as an administrative koiné and Church Slavic was in more and more cases being replaced by Russian.

5.2.3 The Emergence of Modern Ukrainian, 1800-

The development of modern Ukrainian was characterized by: 1) the influence of the German Romantics and; 2) shifts in the geographical and cultural center resulting in the emergence of two variants. Attitudes toward the prestige function of the vernacular played a significant role in the development of a standardized norm.

The decline of the Hetman state, and further czarist control in Ukrainian territories brought about censorship and a ban on the use of the vernacular language in favor of Russian in education and administration. A series of ukases issued by the czarist government (1721-1772) gradually prohibited the use of Ukrainian in more and more contexts: in the publication of official documents, in theatrical performances, in public readings, as the language of instruction in schools; for translations of literature from other languages. Though the vernacular could be used in some instances of fiction and poetry, it was generally reserved for satirical or humorous writings, or personal correspondence. These restrictions on the use of the vernacular were, in part, a result of legal prescription and, in part, as a result of the prescriptivism of classicist literary theory exemplified by Lomonosov's distinctions among low, middle and high styles; the vernacular was permitted for low style genres.

The influence of Herder in the late eighteenth century, and Romanticism in general, changed many intellectuals' attitude toward the vernacular; this development determined the nature of Standard Ukrainian. The view of the Romantics inspired

writers to blend the styles of the "low" vernacular-based language and the "high" Church Slavic. The resulting literary language was both purged of "vulgar" elements and full of Church Slavonisms. Ukrainian intelligentsia attempted to establish a "populist" language to unite the elite, clergy and the masses in order to lay the foundation for shared Ukrainian identity. Subtelny (1994:229) notes that:

Compared to prestigious and cultivated languages such as French, German, and, increasingly, Russian, the spoken language of the untutored Ukrainian peasant appeared crude and of limited application...Among the educated, the view prevailed that as peasants had little to say and as their way of saying it was crude, anyway, it was pointless to raise peasant speech to the level of a literary language. Moreover, because Ukrainian was closely related to Russian, many members of the intelligentsia argued that Ukrainian was not a distinct language but merely a dialect of Russian.

Nevertheless, some writers like Ivan Kotlarevsky attempted to refine the vernacular for use as a medium of literature in spite of the fact that he was ambivalent to using Ukrainian for literary purposes. His Eneida (1798), a burlesque poem based on Virgil's Aeneid, depicts the survivors of Troy and the founders of Rome as Cossacks. As the first literary work written in Ukrainian, it marked a turning point in the development of Modern ULL (Chirovsky 1986:71).

Taras Shevchenko is generally credited with having the most profound impact on the development of ULL and Ukrainian literature. The language of his work combined elements from several Ukrainian dialects, peasant colloquialisms, and Church Slavonicisms; he was thus able to synthesize the historical and geographical elements, making a literary language that was accessible to the greatest number of people. It was also so imbued with the Romantic spirit as to serve as a call for a distinct Ukrainian ethnonational identity. As Subtelny (1994:233) notes: "that a poet should have attained such preeminence in a developing nation of 19th-century Eastern
Europe is not unusual...it is often difficult to find another example of an individual whose poetry and personality so completely embodied a national ethos as did Shevchenko for the Ukrainians."

The Ukrainian intellectuals of the 1840s-1860s attempted to reach a broader audience by publishing in the Russian journals in St. Petersburg and Moscow. Though their literary works appealed to a readership eager for the folkloristic, exotic stories and regarded Ukraine as a "wild frontier," they nonetheless saw Ukraine as a part of Russia and, therefore, regarded Ukrainian literature as a regional Russian literature (Subtelny 1994:232).

The new ULL, as established by Shevchenko, and built upon by Panteleimon Kulish, Mykola Shaskevych, Aleksander Metlynsky, and Mykola Kostomarov, began to be used in scholarly and journalistic works by the early 1860s. The further development of ULL, however, was interrupted by a czarist decree prohibiting the printing in languages other than Russian in the Russian Empire. This decree resulted in an eventual shift of Ukrainian language publishing to Austro-Hungarian -ruled Galicia, and subsequently gave rise to a ULL strongly influenced by the western dialects. In 1881, this governmental decree was relaxed, and several normative dictionaries saw publication. Hence, by the 1905 revolution, two variants of ULL were well developed: one based on western dialectal norms, and the other on eastern ones. After 1905, the ban on non-Russian publications was removed and censorship restrictions were reduced. Nevertheless, both variants of ULL continued to be used until Ukraine's partition among Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania in 1920.

The use of ULL expanded into all public domains and literary genres in the independent Ukrainian state (1917-1920). This development necessitated its codification and implementation in Soviet Ukraine. In the 1920s two rival ideas arose
concerning the normitivization of ULL at that time: proponents of a "purist," ethnographic approach supported a literary language based strictly on popular and rural vernacular forms and archaisms, while others argued for the incorporation of more urban speech forms and internationalisms (Wexler 1974:158). In the 1930s, the latter approach won out, and principles of prescriptivism sought to establish similarity with Russian in matters of orthography, orthoepy, morphology and syntax.⁴

Stalin's consolidation of power brought the Russification of all non-Russian peoples and an end to the further elaboration and implementation of standard ULL. Under Krushchev's authority (1953-1964) restrictions on the use of ULL were relaxed until Brezhnev (1964-1982) consolidated his power and reversed Khrushchev's policies. The use of ULL was again restricted to private domains until Ukrainian independence in 1989. In spite of the tremendous influence from Russian, the general character of ULL has remained largely unchanged from the form established by Shevchenko and Kulish in the 1860s and 1870s and later codified in the 1920s and 1930s (Shevelov 1993:9).

5.3 The Emergence of Ukrainian National Identity

It has been argued that the emergence of Ukrainian identity began with Kievan Rus' in the 10th century (Hustystyi 1971), or that it began with the Cossack Hetman state (1648-1782) (see Farmer 1980:93-94). And while it is certainly true that both these periods figure prominently in Ukrainian national culture, it is more accurate to date the development of a modern Ukrainian national consciousness from the 1820s. Closely linked to the Romantic movement emanating from Herder and German

4. For a discussion concerning the "well-planned artificially imposed process of Russification," see Perfecky (1987).
intellectuals in the late eighteenth century, Ukrainian nationalism was, in part, defined by its relationship to Ukrainian culture and language. Subtelny (1994:225) states that "[t]he road to national consciousness was paved with books...Furthermore, in the process of writing these books, the intelligentsia developed and refined the Ukrainian language, the one element that was most effective in creating a feeling of fraternity among all Ukrainians."

Between the generations of the 1820s and the generation of the 1840s, a shift occurred in the ideological basis of Ukrainian identity. In the 1820s the intelligentsia was oriented toward political activism, but was not committed to the idea of a national culture; there was not necessarily a link between the two. In fact, proponents of a national culture were most often apolitical, or conservative czarists. It was the ideas of the intelligentsia of the 1840s that created a watershed in the development of Ukrainian national consciousness; national culture and political ideology were seen as two sides of the same coin for the first time in Ukrainian history (Subtelny 1994:233).

The first political organization to establish a connection between cultural and political stages of national development was the Brotherhood of Sts. Cyril and Metodius, founded by several professors, teachers and writers associated with Kiev University in 1847.5 The primary concerns centered on the abolition of serfdom, and restructuring society with the aim of granting "justice, equality, freedom to all men" and education for the masses. Nationality was also a major focus of the organization's writings; contextualized broadly as a Pan-Slavic federation, they believed all Slavic peoples should develop their cultures in a democratically founded union, with Kiev at its head. The members of the Brotherhood were arrested 14 months after the organization's inception, but the group's long-term significance lies in the way it

marked the beginning of a cycle of activism and repression. The Russian government became aware of the threat of Ukrainian nationalism and reacted with Anti-Ukrainian and Russification policies which set the tone for the next century of tension between Moscow and Kiev (Subtelny 1994:237).

These Russification policies were, in the end, counter-productive for Russian aims. During Ukraine's struggle for independence after the 1917 revolution, "many Russified Ukrainians "became aware that they were not Russians and the existence of a nation-state, albeit brief, consolidated Ukrainian national identity, and forced the Bolsheviks to create the Ukrainian SSR and even to accede to the policy of Ukrainization in Soviet Ukrainian society through most of the 1920s" (Struk 1993:10).

5.4 Czarist and Soviet Language Policy

Prior to 1989, and but for a brief period of independence (1917-1920), the status of ULL has been delimited by foreign powers. For most of its history, ULL has been recognized as a "regional language" or as a dialect of Russian (Markus 1993:45). During the reign of the Russian Empire, Russian was the only official language tolerated; a few minority languages were granted the right to exist on a limited basis. However, ULL had no such rights, and, in fact, was prohibited in 1876 (as mentioned above) by order of the Ems Ukase. Thus, the Czarist government did little to contribute to the development of ULL; in fact, its designation "Little Russian" as a dialect of Russian (and "Little Russia" in opposition to "Great Russian") was intended to diminish any separatist linguistic or cultural aspirations (Comrie 1981:145).

For the Ukrainians in the Austro-Hungarian Empire in the first half of the nineteenth century, language status was not well defined. Ukrainian had been recognized as a regional language in 1786, but German and Polish remained the
languages of the government, courts and schools. The Austrian Constitution of 1867
recognized the rights of "all peoples to preserve and cultivate their national traditions
and language, but this recognition was not followed up with practical legislation"
(Markus 1993:44-45). In Galicia, Polish had the status of official language and in
Bukovyna, German was recognized as the official language at that time. In practice,
communities could choose which language was to be used for official purposes, and
Ukrainian communities normally chose ULL (Shevelov 1989:5-7; Markus 1993:45).

Immediately after the 1905 revolution, much of the rigid censorship imposed by
the imperial government was not enforced and, for a time, ULL was used in many
government publications and works of literature. The foundering Czarist regime
reacted anew in 1909 with restrictions to control the Ukrainian press, and the use of
Russian was again enforced in all spheres of public life. The situation changed again
after the 1917 revolution. ULL was granted official and legal status in the Soviet
Ukrainian Republic under national autonomy laws.

The interwar period, however, did not have a beneficial impact on the further
elaboration and implementation of ULL; each part of Ukraine operated under a different
set of language laws because each was governed by a separate state: Poland, Romania,
Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. Although almost all government publications
were written both in ULL and RLL in Soviet Ukraine, ULL gained broader
implementation in education only in the western regions. Despite the fact that Lenin's
nationality policy advocated the free development of national languages, there was a
great deal of inconsistency in the Party's enforcement of this policy.

All three non-Soviet states were under the agreement of separate international
treaties to uphold the rights of ULL use. The most liberal language policy toward ULL
existed in Czechoslovakia. In 1920, ULL was granted the same rights and privileges
as other minority languages and in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, ULL was the second official language. Government documents were written both in Czech and ULL. In Poland, the language of education was governed by a separate statute (Lex Grabski), which stipulated that schools could be conducted in ULL if the community consisted of at least 25% Ukrainians (Markus 1993:145). The written language of municipal government, however, was strictly Polish; ULL was permitted in verbal and written agreements of more rural areas. Romania enforced the most prohibitive laws toward ULL of all three states; ULL was banned from use in the government, legal system and the Orthodox Church. Ukrainians were not granted the status of a minority group and were officially treated as Romanians "who had forgotten their native tongue" (Markus 1993:145-146).

1923 marked another reversal in Soviet language policy: the Ukrainization policy. At the prodding of a intelligentsia groups in Ukraine, the Party initiated a series of steps to introduce ULL into government, public life, the arts and education. As a result of ULL widespread use, between 1923 and 1933, the most development occurred in the standardization of ULL. Stalin's consolidation and centralization of power by 1933, reintroduced intensive Russification policies in all the republics. ULL was deemed inferior to RLL; RLL was promoted "as the language of higher culture, of the October Revolution, of Lenin and Stalin...the 'second native' language of all non-Russians in the USSR" (Markus 1993:47). Russian bureaucrats were dispatched to the Ukrainian SSR by the thousands to enforce Russification, collectivization and centralization policies. The Party prosecuted Ukrainian linguists as nationalist saboteurs, accused of separating ULL from RLL. The official Soviet policy which was one of convergence—all aspects of ULL, e.g., orthography, lexis, and syntax were
made to resemble RLL and to be used in all spheres of public life—remained more or less in effect until 1989.

Motivated by Gorbachev's perestroika reforms in the late 1980s, Ukrainian intellectuals called for a revision of language policies. In October 1989, ULL was granted official status as the language of the Ukrainian SSR by its own Supreme Soviet which proposed a gradual re-Ukrainization; thwarted by political indecision and upheaval, this policy could not be fully implemented until 1991. As a result of the previous sixty years' language policies, nearly three-fourths of the urban schools and universities everywhere in Ukraine (except in the western regions) use Russian as the language of instruction (Motyl 1993:12). Russian is used in much of the press, theater, radio and television as well. Motyl (1993:13) maintains that at present:

Ukrainian elites are surely not being extreme in requesting that passport Russians and passport Ukrainians learn and, perhaps, even use Ukrainian in public activities and at the work place—all the more so since these two Eastern Slavic tongues are sufficiently similar as to make each comprehensible to speakers of the other...And just as linguistic similarity encouraged the Russification of Ukrainians, it must surely facilitate the use of Ukrainian by Russians.

5.5 The Re-emergence of Ukrainian Language and Identity

Although all physical traces of Communism are gone from Ukraine since their independence in 1991, the Communist presence is still an obstacle to attempts at redefining a Ukrainian national identity. Ukrainian political and intellectual elites have the opportunity to forge a new Ukrainian identity separate from Russian and Soviet identity. Yet, the myths, symbols, heroic and historic figures of Ukraine's past are also shared and claimed by Russia. Ukraine, as a new state, is in the process of reconstituting and "re-imagining" its historical memory in order to assert its national authenticity. There are new claims staked to the "rights" of cultural artifacts such as
Kievan Rus', Gogol, Potebna, and Malevich. In spite of the fact that two-thirds of the Ukrainian population is urbanized, they are also attempting to establish their connection to the agricultural peasantry and the land, the "freedom-loving" Cossack culture, and Ukrainian literature and folklore; and the Ukrainian language is, understandably, at the center of this emergent national identity (Ilnytskyj 1992:445-447).

In the wake of the collapse of Communist ideology and the abandonment of Soviet political discourse, the Ukrainian elites are turning to alternate discourses to fill the conceptual vacuum: namely, the language and discourse of religion and ethnonationalism. This development has divided the Ukrainian population, to some extent, over the proposed plans to Ukrainianize the language of government, education and mass media which is, for the overwhelming majority, RLL. There is a split over this issue between the ethnic Russian and Ukrainian population in Ukraine. Thus far, there are no government plans for mandatory ULL implementation. For both sides, language is a source of legitimacy. Most ethnic Ukrainians, particularly in Galicia, resent Kiev's evenhandedness and the widespread use of RLL (Motyl 1993:79-83). Thus, competing claims to Ukraine's history, population, and language have caused some leaders of the Ukrainian elite to reject a national culture which includes the Russian population, culture, and language. For them, Ukrainian ethnonational identity is, first and foremost, constituted by ULL.

5.6 Belarusian and Rusyn

If it can be said that ULL developed in the shadow of RLL, then Belarusian and Rusyn, by comparison developed in the dark. Both languages deserve mention here as the "youngest" East Slavic codified (and in the case of Rusyn, still in the process of
being codified) literary languages, which for most of their history were at various times regarded as dialects of Russian or Ukrainian.

Belarusian developed along similar lines as Ukrainian, a product of its sociohistorical circumstances: under rule by the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and subject to cycles of reform and repression of the Czarist and Soviet empires. Thus, as McMillian (1980:112) notes "there could be no hope of standardizing, much less codifying, the modern literary language until after the 1905 Revolution."

The earliest stage of Belarusian's codification, both linguistic and cultural, took place during 1906-1915, with the publication of the newspaper, *Naša Niva* (*Our Field*). This newspaper served as a forum for national issues, e.g., politics, history, literature, and most of all, language, and served as a means to establish linguistic norms. In 1918, Branislau Taraškevič published *Belaruskaja hramatika dlja škol* (*Belarusian Grammar for Schools*) which was immediately adopted as the standard for orthography and grammar. Taraškevič's grammar inspired Belarusian linguists to begin work on the first dictionaries in addition to normative grammars (see McMillian 1980; Mayo 1994). This period of linguistic development was brought to an end by Stalin's 1933 Russification policies. Hence, further steps taken to codify and develop Belarusian in the 1960s and 1970s have been carried ultimately out under Moscow's political direction and in a context of Russian linguistic and cultural dominance.

In the late 1980s, Gorbachev's perestroika reforms were seen as an opportunity by Belarus' intellectuals for a chance to reassert their national culture. A turning-point in the re-emergence of Belarusian ethnonationalism took the form of a letter to Gorbachev, written by a group of 28 academics and artists (hence, known as the "Letter of the Twenty-Eight"), which petitioned to grant Belarusian official status as
The language of Belarus and implement it in all aspects of public life in order that they might avert what they termed the "spiritual extinction" of the Belarusian people (Zaprudnik 1993:126). The highly-charged language of the Letter (translated by and quoted in Zaprudnik 1993:125) champions a language as:

the soul of a nation, the supreme manifestation of its cultural identity, the foundation of its spiritual life. A nation lives and flourishes in history while its language lives. With the decline of the language, culture withers and atrophies, the nation ceases to exist as a historical organism; it is no longer an invaluable component of civilization on Earth.

Moscow, however, in spite of the prevailing spirit of glasnost, was not sympathetic and all 28 intellectuals who signed the petition were threatened with dire consequences if they did not recant; none did and the Belarusian Communist Party head made good on his threats. These series of actions had the opposite effect of what Moscow intended and galvanized and politicized the emerging and growing Belarusian ethnonational movements into action around the language issue. This growing protest against the neglect of Belarusian culminated in a number of rallies out of which the Belarusian Popular Front (BPF) emerged as the largest and most influential group. The BPF succeeded in electing their own candidates to government posts and in 1990, the government approved "The National Program on the Development of the Belarusian Language and the Languages of the Other Nationalities of the Belarusian SSR" (Zaprudnik 1993:139). In 1991, two more laws were passed regulating the use of Belarusian as the language of instruction in all educational institutions in Belarus. Although the passing of these laws is considered a major accomplishment by the BPF in securing Belarusian national culture, it is not yet clear how it will be implemented in reality, when RLL is still used as the primary language of public life.

Rusyn, by contrast to Belarusian, is still in its embryonic stage as a codified literary language. Rusyn, spoken in the area of Subcarpathian Rus', has been called 200
various names, each of which, according to Fishman (1993:119) reflect the "variation in attitudes toward the ethnic identity of its speakers, and the sociopolitical arrangements with respect to the future of the language and its speakers": Ruthenian, Carpatho-Russian, Carpatho-Ukrainian, Rusniak, and Subcarpathian Rusyn. Rusyn has been banned in all Eastern European countries where it is spoken since World War II except former Yugoslavia. Currently, in a new political atmosphere, steps are being taken to establish a literary basis for Rusyn.

The first scholarly seminar on the codification of the Rusyn language was held in November of 1992 in Bardjeovske Kupele in northeastern Slovakia. This seminar is unofficially considered the first language planning congress of the Rusyn Language. In spite of the fact that there are no generally accepted literary norms, several books have been published in Rusyn and newspapers and journals have been founded in Poland, Slovakia and Ukraine since 1989. And beginning in 1990, there is a professional Rusyn-language theater and radio and television broadcasts in Slovakia, and several schools where a Lemko variant of Rusyn is taught in Poland (Magocsi 1993:120). The participants of the "First Congress" drew up several resolutions with an aim to codify Rusyn on the basis of the spoken vernacular in each of its dialectal areas: Subcarpathia, Lemko, Prešov and Vojvodina. In addition, the participants found it of great necessity to write a historical grammar, to develop literary works that implement the new norms, to implement the new norms in educational institutions and to found a language institute that will work in cooperation with Slavic scholarly institutes in all countries.

5.7 Summary

Considered as a whole, the East Slavic dialect continuum comprised by Ukrainian, Belarusian, and Rusyn exhibit some important differences—especially
political, economic and demographic—from the South Slavic dialect continuum.

Politically, the situation in the East Slavic region differs from that in Yugoslavia in that Communist ideology was much more central to Soviet identity than it was to Yugoslav identity. In addition, a nation like Ukraine played a much larger role in the economic infrastructure of the Soviet Union than Macedonia did to Yugoslavia.

Demographically, Ukraine has a more homogeneous Slavic population, i.e. the largest minority is Russian-speaking, for so long the only language of prestige and power. For these reasons, the nations that have emerged as states from the former Soviet Union have found it difficult to implement exclusionary language policies. For instance, in Ukraine, despite more vocal movements in Galicia, most schools in Ukraine still maintain RLL as the language of instruction. And in Belarus, the new language laws make provision for the minority language, i.e., Russian. Furthermore, the Ukrainian population is a large portion of the Europe's population with 52 million. I would speculate that Ukrainian speakers, in all likelihood, do not experience the sense of vulnerability manifest in what I have termed a "small language" attitude in the way that speakers of Belarusian and Rusyn do (see Magocsi 1993).

Nevertheless, these East Slavic languages do possess important similarities with the South Slavic ones beyond the most obvious ones, e.g., both groups of languages share an historical continuity with Common Slavic and a literary history rooted in Church Slavic, a history of foreign domination, and the contestation of the languages as dialects of another language at certain points in their history. Both groups also developed their concept of national identity under the influence of Herder and the German Romantics. As a result, codification of the literary language was based on vernacular forms and a reclamation of cultural symbols, myths, and an effort to interpret history as a source of national legitimacy; a standardized language has been
central as a symbol of national identity. Though Ukrainian, Belarusian and Rusyn are at different stages in their process of self-definition, they exhibit the same processes I have suggested are at work in Macedonia. Thus, I argue that this suggests that what I have termed ethnolect describes the way in which linguistic and nonlinguistic factors interact, and are seen to construct boundaries and categories of identity in the East Slavic dialect continuum as well.
CHAPTER 6

THE RECIPROCAL RELATIONSHIP OF LANGUAGE AND
IDENTITY: CONCLUSIONS REGARDING
A THEORY OF ETHNOLECT

6.0 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the theoretical foundations of this study and its
empirical findings, with an aim to elaborate a theory of ethnolect as applied to MLL in
the South Slavic dialect continuum. In previous chapters, I have developed an
argument that attempts to explain the nature of the relationship between language and ethnonational identity in what is generally recognized as a dialect continuum. In such a situation, distinct languages are said to be either a product of historical and political events or collection of formal linguistic features; in either case, delimiting rigid boundaries eludes us. I have suggested that this approach to defining and classifying dialects and languages leaves out a crucial element in determining what is meant by "a language": the speaker's attitudes.

To this end, I have focused on the emergence of the Macedonian language and identity, and by examining younger Macedonian speakers' attitudes toward language varieties and toward particular linguistic features I have illustrated the complex, dynamic, and reciprocal relationship between an ethnonational identity, a language, and its speakers in order to gain further insight into how speakers construct the boundaries of their language within the dialect continuum. Yet, putting the speaker back into our understanding of what constitutes a language seemingly creates a gap between the point of view of the linguist and that of the speaker. If this gap is part of the problem in defining the nature of a language, then a sociolinguistic perspective, in accounting for the way that boundaries are constructed within a continuum, offers a model that bridges both points of view. Since social realities affect the language behavior of speakers it follows that this behavior impacts the linguist's object of study.

6.1 Boundaries and Continua:
The Perspective of The Linguist and the Speaker

The overarching concern of this project has been to reconcile the seemingly paradoxical approaches to the way we define a dialect and a language. As noted in Chapter 1, arguments like Lunt's (1959:25) that rigid notions of dialect and language
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"get us nowhere in the face of the assertion of the native that his speech is definitely and decisively different from that of his neighbor," are taken as the starting point of this project. Lunt's perspective suggests the problem of point-of-view in any definition of a language, and by extension of an ethnonational identity. While this problem underlies a series of related paradoxes, it can also help us to bridge them.

6.1.1 Linguistic Continuum vs. Ethnonational Group

The first paradox is that a language, from a linguist's perspective, exists in a continuum, but an ethnonational group, from the speaker's perspective, has discrete boundaries. The division of speech into dialects and languages are constructs for linguists; but dialects and languages are "real" for speakers. At the outset of this study, I posed the question: "Does the dialect continuum exist in the mind of the speaker?" This study shows that the answer is necessarily yes and no, because, in order for the salience of specific features to emerge, there is most often something shared, and many times also, "at stake."

The results of both questionnaires (in Chapter 3) illustrate at once both the point-of-view problem and reciprocal influence between nonlinguistic and linguistic factors. Furthermore, these results demonstrate a speaker's strong sense of salience of the features which differentiate the codified literary norms of MLL and BLL. For example, despite the fact that BLL is grammatically and structurally the closest to MLL than to any other South Slavic language, the results of Q1 demonstrate that Macedonians perceive SLL as closer to MLL than BLL. Similarly, the results of Q2 interpreted as a whole show that Macedonian speakers are more accepting of phonological and lexical variants which coincide with SLL than BLL, e.g. dluboko (MLL:dlaboko) 'deep', sulzi (MLL:solzi) 'tears', but not bjal (MLL:bel) 'white'.

206
Clearly, these results are explained, in part, by the sociohistorical and political context of the region; the political and cultural dominance of SerboCroatian in the former Yugoslavia had an impact on the status and prestige functions of SLL, BLL, and MLL for Macedonians (see Chapter 4). Such nonlinguistic factors have also greatly influenced the codifiers of MLL and shaped the linguistic behavior of speakers in such matters as language accommodation and purism.

Moreover, when asked to draw the boundaries of "their language" within a text modified to exhibit features of SLL, MLL and BLL, respondents consistently reacted to certain types of variation within the mixed-feature portions of the text; the features which seem to trigger the biggest increase or decrease in rates of acceptability and, thus, signal the boundaries of "your language," are morphosyntactic ones (e.g. object reduplication) rather than phonological and lexical ones. It is important to note that this particular morphosyntactic feature is shared by MLL and BLL (though not realized in the same way in both languages), and is not shared with SLL. Still, speakers' perceptions of BLL and SLL are not reflective of this fact. In the Giles-Coupland (1991) model such shared features are said to fall within areas perceived as "soft," i.e., have the greatest similarity with another ethnolinguistic group, and hence, where ethnonational identity may be at stake; such "soft" areas are often places where speakers want to "harden" boundaries. Thus, speakers are only aware of the dialect continuum to the extent that they perceive variation and that variation is markedly "not mine" because it is perceived as the language of another ethnolinguistic group.

I might have expected that lexical differences (e.g. SLL: tražiti; MLL: bara; BLL iska 'want, require, demand') and phonological differences in lexical items (e.g. SLL: jezik, MLL: jazik, BLL: ezik 'language, tongue') are, in general, the most obvious and, one could argue, most salient for speakers. Yet, the data presented here
suggest that in a dialect continuum situation lexical differences may not be as marked for speakers as I have assumed. Speakers are aware of differing synchronic realizations of historical processes (e.g., PSI $b_l > SLL sulza$, MLL $solza$, BLL $slza$ 'tear') only to the extent that they are aware that such variation is associated with a particular group of speakers, from a particular place. And I argue that delimiting linguistic boundaries in a dialect continuum must devolve upon speakers attitudes and perceptions toward maintaining ethnonational boundaries.

6.1.2 Linguistic vs. Nonlinguistic Factors

The second paradox that I have examined centers upon the definition of a language as an either-or proposition: either it is defined by formal linguistic features or by its perceived sociopolitical status. Yet, as I have argued (in Chapters 2 and 4), the linguistic and the nonlinguistic factors interact to create and maintain the perceived boundaries of a language for its speakers. MLL functions for its speakers as a "sign" in maintaining Macedonian ethnonational and linguistic identity, i.e., both as a "signifier," as it is conceived as an abstract entity, and a "signified," as it perceived of as a collection of objectified linguistic features. Such features carry a symbolic load and distinguish MLL from BLL for its speakers, e.g. antepenult stress placement (vs. free, mobile stress placement in BLL), grammaticalized object reduplication (vs. object replication determined by colloquial discourse factors in BLL), the long form of the definite article (vs. the use of a short form definite article as the object of a preposition in BLL) and the -n/-t verbal adjective (vs. its past passive participle function in BLL).

As frequent articles in the press, such as Kletnikov's "Kako da se spasi jazikot, 'How to Save the Language" and Milčin's dire warnings about the fate of the Khazars make clear, they perceive a climate of crisis surrounding language issues—
climate that demonstrates the centrality of language within ethnonational identity. In such a climate, questions of linguistic purism come to the fore; for those like Kletnikov and Milčin, Macedonian identity is, to some degree, seen as "enshrined" in MLL maintaining the integrity of its features, i.e., maintaining linguistic boundaries is tantamount to maintaining ethnic and national boundaries. Likewise, the attitudes of younger speakers, such as the Skopje high school students, who edit their own newspaper, print native non-standard words in quotation marks, and leave English words unmarked, suggests a distinction in which foreign borrowings, especially from English, are seen as non-threatening to the integrity of MLL; but in matters that are seen to challenge the symbolic value of MLL, e.g. Milčin's akcentska bolest 'accent disease', prescriptivism prevails.

6.1.3 Boundaries vs. Hierarchies

The third paradox that I have investigated, a consequence of bracketing off objective from subjective realities, is the point-of-view problem in the first two paradoxes. On the one hand, from the perspective of linguistics, isogloss and dialect features define a language. But in a dialect continuum the features themselves do not constitute clear language boundaries. On the other hand, speakers themselves insist that "they know who they are and what they speak." Generally speaking, from the linguist's perspective, objective features can be shown to exist but their salience cannot necessarily be predicted, i.e., the status of a particular feature as an indicator, marker or stereotype (see Chapter 3). This salience can only be made manifest from the speaker's perspective. In the linguist's perspective the decision is to argue for a continuum and to leave the other decisions to social and political realms. But from the speaker's perspective the salience of any given feature, I contend, is the result of its
place in a hierarchy of acceptability (see Chapters 3 and 4). This hierarchy of acceptability, often geographically-dependent, is most strongly a conceptual center/periphery structure after codification. For instance, the results of Q2 (in Chapter 3) and the interviews and observations (in Chapter 4) suggest that a student from Strumica who is educated in MLL perceives Skopje as a conceptual center. And a student from Skopje, though he perceives the Strumica dialect as "less important," "hardest to understand," and "least liked," nonetheless treats it as Macedonian. The boundary between one language and another occurs at the point in which the hierarchy of acceptability breaks down. Again, this breakdown is not necessarily dependent solely on linguistic factors.

Those features (or isoglosses, dialects, and language varieties) which are included within a hierarchy of acceptability on either side of the boundary, in essence, not only construct the boundary, but also give a sense of positive identity for those on either side. At the same time, this identity is always at stake because the boundaries in a continuum situation, and especially where there is not necessarily a one-to-one correspondence between language and ethnonational identity, are elastic. The hierarchy of acceptability can be represented as follows:

```
L1
O -3- -2- -1- \rightarrow 0 \leftarrow -1- -2- -3- - O
```

Figure 6.1: Model of an Ethnolect
In this schematized diagram, L1 and L2 represent an idealized center (or codified standard) of two languages in a continuum relationship. The numbered positions represent features or groups of features within a hierarchy of acceptability, from the ideal center or standard to the zero position, which represents the point where features are most shared, and hence most contested. Though this hierarchy is geographical in part, it is primarily a conceptual hierarchy that describes the way speakers position language varieties against a conceptual linguistic norm. Although such a hierarchy is likely to vary slightly at the idiolectal level, there must necessarily be enough of a consensus among speakers of a given linguistic community to construct and maintain its boundaries. We can infer from the questionnaire results that for Macedonian speakers, the acceptance or rejection of certain variant morphosyntactic features (e.g., stress placement and morphosyntactic features such as the definite article and object reduplication) is more important in establishing the hierarchy than the acceptance or rejection of certain variant phonological and lexical variants.

This schema helps us to understand the results of the questionnaires and subsequent interviews more clearly. As we have seen (in Chapter 3), the results from Q1 provide the foundation for understanding the difference in the perceptual foci of the linguist and the speaker. The speakers' attitudes that underlie the hierarchy of acceptability are made clear: SLL is perceived to be closer to MLL than BLL. And this distancing of BLL by speakers of MLL would appear to be contrary to what the linguist may think.

Figure 6.1 is intended to emphasize the boundary that is created among overlapping, shared features and the salience that is accorded to such features when attitudes shape them. For example, Q2 A demonstrates that respondents are able to identify more readily dialectal lexical variants that overlap with neighboring languages.
but not those that do not overlap with another language. Further, the results of Q2 B help to reinforce the results of Q1 by showing the low position of eastern and southeastern dialects in the hierarchy of acceptability and the high position of northern and north-central dialects in the hierarchy of acceptability. Most importantly, in terms of the model presented above, Q2 C shows that the text passage is perceived to be heading toward BLL by the respondents, and given the fact that BLL is viewed as being further from MLL, they begin to reject phrases that are unambiguously standard MLL, e.g. *se sluči ne što drugo* 'something else happened' (1-179-172). Moreover, this phrase is rejected more times than *mu bea slomeni* 'his were broken' which has an SLL lexical component, but is within the SLL context. The mixed-feature areas of the text are those that constitute the "zero" position in the model above. They show the places where features may overlap and hence, are potentially contested. What enables respondents to accept or reject features is largely dependent on the context in which features occur: the phases surrounding the above exemplar contain features which were consistently noted as a boundary of "your language," e.g., *na devetija raskazvačić ot* 'the ninth storyteller from' (I 151-155). As a whole, the results of both questionnaires demonstrate not only the importance of subjective perception in the construction in the hierarchy of acceptability, but also the fact that in a continuum situation speakers construct a hierarchy of acceptability based upon context and the attitudes they hold toward a given language variety. Together, the results of the questionnaires frame the definition of a language in a dialect continuum as an ethnolect: a set of hierarchical parameters which devolve upon the notion of boundary construction.
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6.2 A Model of a Theory of Ethnolect

A workable theory of the relationship between language and identity in a dialect continuum, then, must account for the point of view of the speaker and the linguist, the subjective and objective view, and integrate linguistic and nonlinguistic factors. Variation is present and continuous at all levels of language, from the objective point of view. But the speaker's perception is subjective, based on judgments. These judgments are based on linguistic as well as nonlinguistic criteria. These nonlinguistic criteria manifest themselves in the attitude that speakers have toward a given language variety or particular linguistic feature; therefore, speaker judgments are made in accordance with the attitudes they hold toward a given language variety or particular linguistic feature and as such become markers, i.e., convey social significance. And these markers constitute parameters for what I term ethnolect. Finally, from the linguist's perspective, markers suggest the existence of categories; and if speakers can differentiate language varieties, then there must be categories that allow them to do so.

An ethnolect, then, is constituted by a set of hierarchically-perceived linguistic and nonlinguistic features. Just as a dialect is a collection of linguistic features particular to a geographical region, and a sociolect is a collection of linguistic elements particular to a social group, an ethnolect is a collection of features identified by speakers as belonging to a discrete ethnonational identity. As such ethnolect contains, but is not contained by, the codified standard. Though speakers may value standard norms in terms of "purism," they may also value other forms based on their prestige function. Hence, in the context of establishing and maintaining ethnonational identity, ethnolect provides a more accurate definition of a language.
6.3 What is *Naš*?: a Revised Definition of a Language

A language, this project argues, is best defined as a subjective attitude held toward a system of objective features. Yet, for speakers, this is not a merely a collection of features added together, but a greater "whole" that expresses a deep sense of identity. Whether or not we view this idea in terms of a Herderian sense of identity or in terms of Anderson's (1991) sense of imagined community, what is important is the legitimacy that speakers invest in their identity. In the case of Slavic ethnonational identities in general and Macedonian identity in particular, the term *naš* "our(s) embodie this concept; a Macedonian ethnolect is self-ascribed and is not subject to opposition from "outsiders." In a non-continuum situation, a language may be defined differently, but here one's point of view in the region, i.e., one's ethnonational identity, determines the construction of a hierarchy of acceptability. For instance, based on the most recent Bulgarian studies of the region's dialectology, I speculate that some Bulgarians may construct a hierarchy of acceptability that establishes the "zero" position at Albania (see Chapter 2). Nevertheless, once the legitimacy of a language is based upon the concept of ethnolect such issues of contestation are moot. Central to this concept of imagined community is, in fact, that it describes the relationship that members of a group perceive themselves to have to one another. Koneski exemplifies the concept that Anderson theorizes when he writes: "With imaginary boundaries/I have outlined my Fatherland..." The poem emphasizes the social nature of this vision. As the poet asks in the poem's final line: "What would you reduce it to in your minds?" he expresses the nature of Macedonian identity in terms of the poet's relationship with his readers. In giving voice to his understanding of his native country, Koneski invites his readers to participate in the creation of a
shared vision—a vision of naš. By analogy, an ethnolect can be seen as an imagined speech community.

6.3.1 Speech Markers of Identity: Some Preliminary Conclusions

The role of speech markers, in constructing and maintaining social categories, has been an important focus of sociolinguistic research (see Chapter 3). Yet, discussions of indicators, markers, and stereotypes normally take place within the context of intralinguistic studies (see Labov 1972; Scherer and Giles 1979; Chambers 1995). They frequently take social categories such as gender, economic class, minority ethnicity, education, etc., as the parameters with which to measure speech cues that mark social identity. By extension, these intralanguage markers—ones that are essentially prestige forms representing social categories—can be applied to interlanguage questions, especially in dialect continuum situations. Since intralinguistic markers represent social groupings that express and maintain their identity, the same can be said of interlanguage situations by transferring group identity to the national level, where norms of the codified standard are even more established by which one measures language use, one's own and other's.

Labov’s (1972) classification of social factors in linguistic change—indicators, markers, and stereotypes—can be recast on the interlanguage level. Indicators, for Labov, are those features that are embedded in the social matrix and, while showing differentiation, have no significant pattern for speakers. On the level of a national language, indicators would be those features whose variance from the standard does not challenge their status as still being that language (e.g., the dialect features of Skopje such as u (vo) ‘in, at’, kao (kako) ‘how, as’, ali (ama), ‘but’, etc. which overlap with SLL or features of the eastern and southeastern dialects which overlap with BLL).
In Labov’s terms, they "have little evaluative force" (1972:314). Markers, in Labov’s framework, are those features that do bear social information, and they elicit evaluations on subjective reaction tests; however, these reactions are based upon a largely nonconscious social background, or general context. Interpreted on the interlanguage level, markers create the necessary precondition for the strong evaluation that a particular feature does or does not belong to "my" language. In a weak evaluation, a given feature is seen as "my language" or an acceptable dialectal variant; in a strong one, it is "not my language," e.g. unacceptable variation in the placement of stress, in definite articles, and in object reduplication (see Chapters 3 and 4). In short, these strong evaluations have the potential to be transformed into "stereotypes."

Stereotypes, Labov's final class, are evaluated by speakers as signs of group membership (ethnicity, social class, education, occupation, etc.); on one hand, they mark, reinforce, and maintain a sense of membership for speakers who exhibit them, and as such, they come to represent an individual's sense of inclusiveness in the group; on the other hand, they provide a means of identifying, stereotyping, other speakers as belonging to particular groups.

On the interlanguage level, I have argued that the concept of markers plays a decisive role in differentiating the speech of the Other from one's own, especially in a linguistic continuum. This is so because it is at the level of the marker that speakers make judgments as to whether a given feature lies within the hierarchy of acceptability (i.e., is seen as tending toward being simply a weak marker or merely an indicator, in which case it becomes a positive stereotype of "my language"), or as falling outside acceptability (in which case it is seen as "not mine" and subsequently is labeled, stereotyped, as a different identity). This cognitive process of stereotyping transforms what are, from an objective view, merely differential, and hence, negative, relations...
between terms into positive categories of identity from the subjective view of speakers. And it is these features, arranged in a systematic hierarchy of acceptability that signify a positive identity, that constitute an ethnolect. Here, I recall the analogy to a web whereby concentric figures representing different sets of linguistic and nonlinguistic features are reciprocally connected by linguistic and nonlinguistic factors.

6.3.2 A Category of Identity

Implicit in this study has been the notion that there exist for speakers a category of identity, i.e., linguistic features, which convey information about the ethnonational identity of the speaker. Categories by their nature have an inherent internal structure, and structure potentially implies a hierarchy. A category is founded upon the perceived hierarchy of acceptability of the members of the category and the assumption that members have particular affinities. Thus, categories are delimited by both by the attributes of their members and the perceived status of their attributes.

As stated above, for the speaker and for the linguist, languages can be seen as overlapping sets of hierarchically perceived/arranged features embedded in their own socio/culturohistorical context. The differences that these features mark are, in turn, objectified into positive categories of identity by speakers. For this reason, ethnonationalism and ethnolinguistic identity are inexorably linked because the objective status of these features allows speakers to objectify the concept of a national essence. (We can have little to say on the question of whether such national essences are "real" or not; an evaluation of such transcendental claims, at any rate, is best left other disciplines.) However, we can demonstrate that, in matters of language, such perceived differences and identities are based on objective features which have acquired salience for speakers. Furthermore, this salience cannot necessarily be predicted purely
from objective criteria alone. Rather, further research into this problem must proceed along sociolinguistic lines in a manner that elucidates the connection between objective features and attitudes toward them that in turn influence speech behavior.

6.4 The Interrelationship Between a Language and Ethnonational Identity

In presenting the concept of ethnolect, this study addresses the interrelationship between a language and ethnonational identity. Understanding this interrelationship presents unique challenges for the linguistic researcher, especially when studying a language within a dialect continuum. Foremost among these is the problem of developing a framework that can account for the way in which definitions of a language, and a language itself, in such a continuum, are necessarily the product of both objective linguistic factors and subjective speech attitudes and behaviors of speakers themselves.

The difficulty of defining a language in a continuum situation suggests that relying upon objective linguistic features—as represented by a codified standard and traditional dialect studies—alone are inadequate. Generally, a codified standard functions more as an idealized center than as a lingua communis for its speakers, who readily make judgments about others based upon, among other criteria, their proximity to or distance from the standard. But in a linguistic continuum, this project maintains, speakers rely upon a hierarchy of acceptability to make judgments about whether or not others use "their" language. These are judgments about linguistic, and hence ethnonational, identity; and this definition of a language, the one perceived by speakers, is not always discernible from objective linguistic criteria alone. Within the reality of this complex and reciprocal relationship, I admit that the opposition between
nonlinguistic and linguistic factors can be a difficult one to maintain. The concept of an ethnolect, I argue, provides an inclusive framework.

An ethnolect, as this project has defined it, is constituted by speakers' attitudes toward objective linguistic features, and as such, it allows us to coordinate the traditional dialect map with the mental map of the speaker. Hence, it helps us account for both linguistic realities for speakers and the impact of nonlinguistic factors on their linguistic attitudes/perceptions that make objectified linguistic features salient. Clearly, speakers do not always agree on salience; nevertheless, the results of this project have suggested a large area of agreement upon what constitutes a hierarchy of acceptability, and thus what constitutes *nas* 'our language,' among Macedonians; for this reason, this study has focused upon the attitudes of Macedonians toward the language of their neighbors.

An ethnolect, then, offers a means of correlating sociolinguistic descriptors—status, prestige, and function—with linguistic descriptors—idiolect, dialect, and grammatical category—in way that provides a comprehensive objective framework for studying and measuring the subjective dimensions of language in the context of ethnonational identity.
APPENDIX A

Questionnaire 1 as it was presented to respondents:

ИСТРУЖУВАНЕ
СТАВОВИ КОН ИЗУЧУВАЊЕТО НА СТРАНСКИТЕ ЈАЗИЦИ

АНКЕТАТА Е АНОНИМНА

1. Општи информации (исключиво за статистички цели)

1) Возраст: __________
2) Пол: __________
3) Место на ражање: __________
4) Занимание: __________
5) Во кое место завршилте основно училиште? __________
6) Во кое место завршилте средно училиште? __________
7) Дали сте студирале факултет и во која област?: __________
8) Кој е вашиот мајчин јазик? __________
9) Кој е мајчинот јазик на вашите родители? __________
10) Кои страниjni јазици ги знаете: __________
11) Каде и зошто сте ги изучувале? __________
12) Како би го оценилее вашето знаење на овие јазици на скала од 1 до 5 (5-одлично, 1-слабо)

Јазик: ______________________
Читање: ______________________
Пишуване: ______________________
Слушање: ______________________
Говорење: ______________________
13) Според вас, кои страниjni јазици се најважни и зошто?

II. ПРЕПОЗНАВАЊЕ НА ТЕКСТОВИ НА РАЗЛИЧНИ ЈАЗИЦИ

13) Одредете ги јазиците на кои се напишани следните текстови:

Под секој пасус внесете ги следните податоци:

а) За кој јазик се работи?

б) Приближно, колкав процент од овие јазици можете да разберете?

в) На скала од 1 до 5 (5-лесно, 1-тешко), колкава тешкотија би претставувало изучувањето на овој јазик (до степен на способност за читање и говор)?

1. The actual questionnaires, as they were presented to respondents, was 27% larger. Also, the Hebrew passage in Q1 was mistakenly inverted on the page. I do not believe this affected the results in any way.
2. Daniel Fargeat, presidente de l'agence, assi-
specialissu a nanga ja tl. In a p llc a re a Legl fo n ctar.
le s c u  s i V i r u  "dl. s l . d - n a  R l d a s a n u . d in ias i,
( i ) n p o i ic iiT  un p a a lin p n i h c :_____________
a ) ja -iiiK
i a no su l In ca re  a  a ju n s  ta r a .
ed e t rm ln a t s i  p a r e u r g p i n i  la  c a p i t  a c e t' (ext. e h la r d a e a
d e t )  cniiMiitiCT Him p m m iK .i c o  n n iiin n r  jn n iK :
puUce d e 's t i n g a . e e e a  ce  n u  B .Im p le d lc i s£-l c o n s id e r s
se m n caza .P o m d n il a n o lm r. S erlo z lta tea anailzel p e  ca re
y x a s a  u a  c o c r  au i<  o M o c k u q
[potuCAiuuc
s iiA c itra  0  S o p k S c  c  mum. O cc
U pOAOAM OAilCb OMCTpCAM II
[ en o a u o a i o r .  k c t a t i i .  iim c iiiu i
*ax.
ooAACT oA acrnM ,
R
ecran. D'ici a ce qu'il. se prenne la grosse
diurnazione, d'une parfaite collabora-
tion. de ses fans,' autrement dit, du petit
gent pas, pour l'instant, de le retirer à l'af-
tion de ses fans,' autrement dit, du petit
craci, du fils-tireur et de la passion, de
a ) ja n iiK
= la spaccia ture e la passione, di un fragile
d&apos;origine, du petit
c' est un pro et qu'il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c'est un pro et qu'il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c' est un pro et qu'il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c’ est un pro et qu’il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c’ est un pro et qu’il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c’ est un pro et qu’il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c’ est un pro et qu’il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit

3. Daniel Fargeat, presidente de l'agence, as-
sure que l'animal (on ose à peine l'appeler
come pa) a fait montre, durant les quatre
jours du tournage, d'une parfaite collabora-
tion. Attenfl aux remarques, d'une extrême
tagance et d'une grande bonne volonté, il
s'est plie sans problème aux nécessités de la
réalisation. Rex porte un nom célebre et on
affirme, dans les milieux bien informés, que
C'est un pro et qu'il s'occupe d'ores et déjà sous
de norme, la cérémonie de l'animal, des manu-

a ) ja n iiK
= la spaccia ture e la passione, di un fragile

c' est un pro et qu'il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c' est un pro et qu'il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c' est un pro et qu'il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c' est un pro et qu'il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c' est un pro et qu'il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c' est un pro et qu'il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit

4. Doch das Projekt dringt in die Wirklichkeit:
Bei Wismar überspannt die erste Brücke eine
Wiese; auf die Bauarbeiten wurde sogar schon ein
Anschlag verübt. Und in den bunten Broschüren
des Bundesverkehrsministers, in den Altpalmen
der Ökologen hat die A 20 längst ihren Platz. Und
nachlich in den Prognosen der Verkehrs- und
Wirtschaftswissenschaftler, dieser höchst gegen-
wärtigen Wunderwelt aus Kurven, Tabellen und
Säkendigrammen, in denen die Vergangenheit
sich in die Zukunft verlängert.
a) ja n iiK
= la spaccia ture e la passione, di un fragile

c' est un pro et qu'il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c’ est un pro et qu’il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c’ est un pro et qu’il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit

5. Zanalizujmy moment przekształania
svabi przed pięciu lat, stara się dla
najlepiej, wolniej fundamentalnej
przyjazdy w zakresie sportsim, w komitet obozu,
który pokreślił się w przeciwnie zbioro-
wej wychowaniu. Jest w linii przewo-
dującej się z romantycznej tradycji.
Tyle że jest oto dzisiejszy program,
które to przegranie jest niespodziewanym
elementem skądowym tejże romantyczno-tradycyjnej
tradycji.
a) ja n iiK
= la spaccia ture e la passione, di un fragile

c' est un pro et qu'il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c’ est un pro et qu’il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit

6. Questa diminuzione degli "aficiona-
dos" tv, accompagnata dal fenomeno
degli stadi semi-vuoti, è un connubio
preoccupante soprattutto perché a spegnere il vedo o a non rinnovare
l’abbonamento sembra essere lo spec-
tatore più importante per l'industria
calcio: il tifoso "medio" che segue
del calcio: il tifoso "medio" che segue
del calcio: il tifoso "medio" che segue
del calcio: il tifoso "medio" che segue
del calcio: il tifoso "medio" che segue

a) ja n iiK
= la spaccia ture e la passione, di un fragile

c' est un pro et qu'il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c’ est un pro et qu’il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c’ est un pro et qu’il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c’ est un pro et qu’il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
c’ est un pro et qu’il cloue d’ores et déjà sous
fiche, du petit
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 Nedjelju ujutro je održana Tamšinjk
6) ponosnija i napredna

Dužino/inno h t*kthm ho. Tf. c a  /totffm

9. To ouyKcnpioivo ycyovdc rd-

10. K o h to  me 3AccnwTT» c/tyttctfitOTo. 4

inceleyen prolesor Lin, bu loprak malzeme-

Jenja ubrana, da vzpostavlja kiasiCno harmonijo

Predvsem pa je ta knjiga, tzdana v podastitev

zlasti manj znane ati jirii javnosti aploh neznane

mostnutnega "livotopisa".

ZaZelio svima dabrodoZUcu u St.

Inačina, vseskozi odkritosrtnega upesnje*

Jung je v pesmih dosli tudi takih seatavin.

Guzerjeve poerije samogovor, osebna izpoved,

Predvsem pa je ta knjiga, tzdana v podastitev

valca svojega lasinega >iivotopisa«.

Inačina, vseskozi odkritosrtnega upesnje*

Jung je v pesmih dosli tudi takih seatavin.

Guzerjeve poerije samogovor, osebna izpoved,

Predvsem pa je ta knjiga, tzdana v podastitev

valca svojega lasinega >iivotopisa«.

Inačina, vseskozi odkritosrtnega upesnje*

Jung je v pesmih dosli tudi takih seatavin.

Guzerjeve poerije samogovor, osebna izpoved,

Predvsem pa je ta knjiga, tzdana v podastitev

valca svojega lasinega >iivotopisa«.

Inačina, vseskozi odkritosrtnega upesnje*

Jung je v pesmih dosli tudi takih seatavin.
Questionnaire 2 as it was presented to respondents:

Анкета
Ставови кон дијалектите на македонски јазик

Ова анкета не е како испит. Нема неточен одговор.
Анкетата е анонимна – Општи информации (исклучиво за статистички цели)

1) Возраст: __________
2) Пол: __________
3) Место на рагање: __________
4) Во кое место сте завршиле училишето: ______________
5) Занимање: ______________

I. Препознавање на зборови на различни дијалекти.
Одредете ги од кое Место (или Област: северна, источна, јужна, западна) се напишани следниве зборови:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>зеб</th>
<th>јазик</th>
<th>чаша</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>замб</td>
<td>изик</td>
<td>чашуле</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>зуб</td>
<td>език</td>
<td>чефче</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>з’б</td>
<td>језик</td>
<td>чавче</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>зуп</td>
<td>инзик</td>
<td>чеше</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Маса</th>
<th>волк</th>
<th>вилица</th>
<th>зобр</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>трпеза</td>
<td>вук</td>
<td>вилица</td>
<td>дума</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>астал</td>
<td>в’лк</td>
<td>виличка</td>
<td>лаф</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>софра</td>
<td>влк</td>
<td>бунела</td>
<td>реч</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Според вас:
Кој дијалект (од кое место или област) е најлесно да разбирате?
____________________

Кој дијалект е најтешко да разбирате? ____________________

Кој дијалект најмногу ви се доаѓа? ____________________

Кој дијалект најмалку ви се доаѓа? ____________________

Кој дијалект е најважен? ____________________

Кој дијалект е најмалку важен? ____________________
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III. Прочитайте го пасусот и ставајте X каде, според вашите мислење, почнува и завршува вашот јазик.

Човек је стајао са лопатом изнад гръчке, ровите земље у својој башти. Вредао је крта. Када се је мала грда на хумусу мало покренула на површини, му се да крт проблаци своју црну њушку кржисто тако црну растресеност земље. Ровита се земља поравнала од ударца, месути крта не мааше, како је на металном делу лопате човекот виде крв.

Ускоро, при вркање кучи, го најде крот на праг. Обе преди ноге му беа спомени. Кога мислење да повторно че замина, се поднаредна и биде нешто што најмаше го очекуваше. Кротот имаше две крлица.

Ножеше но го уби кротот туку стоеше скаменет и го гледеше со зачуценост кротот со очи понекогаш закопани глубоко под корен на стаоро јудино дрво, значи не слеп, моблено гледаше во надмоцното суштество. Од леово му око пага скаменети супли, во десното криеше свои молитви. Човекот захврли лопатата и ги откорна крлица на свој жерева.

Според тврдението на деветија расказвач, од тој век, човекот лиесно заакачил крилата на рано. При оптна му да полети, се служи нешто друго. Место да се вивне ком бјало облаче на главата му, паднал по очи и започна да ја рие земја. Скоро се изгубил. Човекот, којто имал градина и лопата стаанал крт.

И крот, сега без страх, че некој ште го уби, си промени облика. Стаана човек, истина макко повече владинест и с очи, кое то не биаха човешки, но всепак човек. Нараами и, както подоликував прз добар стопанин, тргна кон градината.

Според верситета на десетија разсказвач от тој род, веројатно последен слуčката продолжила.

Познато е, че нјаки денови сутрините скимтјат како настинали кученца, докато привечерите хапјат њувите на голглашните минувачи. За сметка на тоа плодното между такава сутрин и такава вечер е
мирно и прилича на вода, над което не преминава вятар. Дојдете такъв едън ден. Човекот, преди това кръг, стоише с лопата над купчинка розкава земя в градината си. Когато повърхността на купчинката се поразмрда, на него му се стъри, че кръгот, преди това човек, подава черната си мушунка от също тоъкова черната разпъвена земя. Замахва със лопата. Розкавата земя се сплетска от удара, обаче кръг, преди това човек, го нямаше, макар че по металната част на лопатата се виждаше кръг, разкопа земята на това място. Остана изненадан. След това историята се повтаря. Кръгът човек отново стана човек, а човекът кръг се завърна в своите тъмнина.


Ви благодаряме за соработката.
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