lisations qu'autorisent les conditions particulières de transmission du texte écrit.
Sans doute le problème est-il encore plus complexe qu'il n'a été posé ici et faut-il prendre en compte d'autres facteurs. Il reste que la manière dont nous (tous ceux qui y ont participé) avons abordé le problème de l'écriture des langues mélanesiennes de Nouvelle-Calédonie, en condamnant au lieu de les améliorer les écritures traditionnelles, manquait peut-être encore plus de réflexion et qu'il conviendrait à bien des égards d'en tirer toutes les leçons. ①
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① Ce texte résume l'essentiel des idées avancées dans ma thèse de 3ème cycle (non-publiée) sou- tenue en décembre 1983.
Je n'avais pas eu connaissance à ce moment-là des travaux que le n° 59 de "Langue française" regroupa sous le titre: "Le signifiant graphique".
Quand cette revue parut en septembre 1983, j'étais pris par la rédaction de cette thèse et ce n'est qu'au début de 1984 que j'ai pu me rendre compte que d'autres contestaient une certaine conception de l'écriture.
Si donc, on retrouve dans ce numéro un certain nombre de citations ou d'arguments que j'ai utili- sés, ce n'est que par hasard, ou plutôt phénomène de convergence. On pourra s'y reporter pour une discussion plus approfondie des données historiques et théoriques du problème. On trouvera là, en effet, d'autres arguments et des références bibliographiques qu'à juste titre, on me reprochera d'avoir ignoré.

VICTOR FRIEDMAN

MACEDONIAN: CODIFICATION AND LEXICON*

In order to understand the development of the Literary Macedonian lexicon, it is necessary to understand both the historical processes that led to the codification of the Macedonian literary language and some of the facts of codification at other levels of linguistic structure. In the first four sections of this article, I attempt to give the reader the bare bones of the essential facts. Further details on all these matters can be found in the works referred to in the bibliography.

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1.1. Definition of Macedonia

Macedonia has been used as the name of a Balkan region since ancient times. In the classical period, Macedonia was bounded by Epirus, Thessaly, and Thrace on the southwest, south, and east. In our times, the most convenient geographic definition of modern Macedonia is the region comprised of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia (SRM) in southern Yugoslavia (Vardar Macedonia), the Blagoevgrad District in southwestern Bulgaria (Pirin Macedonia), and the Province of Makedonia in northern Greece (Aegean Macedonia). Two small parts of western Albania — one around Lakes Ohrid and Prespa and the other south of the town of Debar — can also be included in the strictly geographic definition of Macedonia.

1.2. Definition of Macedonian

In ancient times, a (probably) non-Greek, independent Indo-European language, which we can call Ancient Macedonian, was spoken in at least part of geo-

* I wish to thank the American Council for Learned Societies for a grant for East European Studies, financed in part by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Ford Foundation, which enabled me to do some of the research for this paper. I also wish to thank the Committee for Information for the SRM, the Institute for the Macedonian Language, the Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Seminar for the Macedonian Language of the University of Skopje, and the Commission for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries of the SRM for their generous help both when I have been in Macedonia and in sending me many publications essential to my research.
graphic Macedonia (cf. Neroznak 1978: 173). This gave way to Greek, which was in turn supplanted by Slavic when the Slavs invaded and settled in the Balkans in the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. (The question of the extent to which Greek survived in cities such as Salonika and the fact that Macedonia must always have been an area in which many languages were spoken are irrelevant here; cf. Fine 1983). For our purposes, Macedonian can be defined as the Slavic dialects spoken in the territory of geographic Macedonia. Literary Macedonian is the official language of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). Since its official recognition in 1944, it has been codified in dictionaries, grammars, and scholarly publications. It is in use in all spheres of public and private life in the SRM and is guaranteed constitutional equality with Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian for official use at national and international levels in the SFRY. Based on Yugoslav census figures for 1981 (Statistički bilten broj 1295) and other estimates (e.g., Andonovski 1974), the total number of speakers with Macedonian as their first language is probably somewhere between 2,000,000 and 2,500,000 (cf. Friedman 1985).

1.3. Macedonian in the Ottoman Empire

The Ottoman conquest of the Balkan peninsula in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries brought about a disruption of cultural continuity with regard to Slavic literacy in that region. The history of Literary Macedonian can thus be said to begin in the latter part of the eighteenth century with the birth of South Slavic nationalism (cf. Lunt 1953: 364). This early period in the development of what became Literary Macedonian is intimately bound up with developments relating to nationalism, ethnic identity, and the formation of the Balkan states. It is impossible to give a full presentation here of the complicated and controversial history leading up to the official recognition of Literary Macedonian in 1944; for that the reader is referred to works listed in the bibliography (e.g., Apostolski 1969, Friedman 1975, 1985, Lunt 1959, 1984). All that will be attempted here is a brief mention of some of the most important personalities and events that can be said to have contributed directly to the formation of Literary Macedonian.

1.3.1. 1794-1840

This is the period of the first published texts using Macedonian dialects. The first was the “Tetragesison” (“Četirigazičnik”) by Hadiž Danili of Moskopoje (Albanian Voskopoje), which was first published in Venice in 1793 or 1794 (see Kristophson 1974). This was a quadrilingual word list and didactic conversation manual that had as its goal the Hellenization of Slavs, Albanians, and Armenians. The Slavic section, called “Bulgarika”, was written in the Ohrid dialect as translated by the priest Stefan of Ohrid. The two other major figures of this
period were Joakim Krčkovski (d. 1820) and his slightly younger contemporary Kiril Peščanov (c. 1770–1845). These authors published ecclesiastical and didactic works in a language based in many respects on their local dialects, Kratovo-Kriva Palanka and Tetovo, respectively. Their work was intended both to combat the influence of Hellenism and to give the authority of the printed word to the vernacular. The authors of this period in both Macedonia and Bulgaria called their vernacular language Bulgarian. Their concern was with establishing a vernacular-based Slavic literary language in opposition to both the archaising influence of those who would have based the Slavic literary language on Church Slavonic and the Hellenizing attempts of the Greek Orthodox Church, to which the majority of Macedonians and Bulgarians belonged. It should be noted that under the Ottoman millet (“nationality”) system, ethnicity was determined by religion. Thus virtually all Orthodox Christians in the Balkans were considered to be “Greeks” because they belonged to the Greek Orthodox Church (cf. Koneski 1967a, 1986, Friedman 1975, Lunt 1984, but also Braude 1982).

1.3.2. 1840–1870

These dates may be considered approximate. During this period the first secular textbooks and literature based on Macedonian dialects appeared. The struggle against the archaiizers was won, that against the Hellenizers continued, and the struggle over the dialectal base of the emerging vernacular literary language became manifest. Among the chief figures of this period who were significant in the later development of Literary Macedonian were the brothers Dimišar and Konstantin Miladinov (b. Struga 1810, 1832, respectively – d. 1862), Jordan Hadži Konstantinov-Džinot (b. Veles 1820–d. 1882), Partenji Zografski (b. Galicnik 1818–1875), and Kuzman Šapkarev (b. Ohrid 1834–1908). In the course of establishing a vernacular-based Slavic literary language on Macedo-Bulgarian territory, two principal literary centers had arisen: one in the northeast of Bulgaria and the other in the southwest of Macedonia. Intellectuals in Macedonia envisaged a Bulgarian literary language based on Macedonian dialects or a Macedo-Bulgarian dialectal compromise. In Bulgaria, however, all those concerned with the question insisted that their Thraco-Moesian, i.e. eastern, standard be adopted without compromise (see Koneski 1967a, 1986 for a more detailed account of Macedonian activities during this period).

1.3.3. 1870–1912

The establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870 marked the definitive victory over Hellenism, and an independent Bulgaria was established in 1878 in the northeast of what is now Bulgaria. Macedonia, however, remained part of the Ottoman Empire until 1912. Proponents of the Thraco-Moesian Bulgarian standard now became more vehement in their insistence that no compromise with Macedonian dialects was possible, and that their standard must be adopted by all Macedonians. It is from this period that we have the first published statements insisting on Macedonian as a separate language, although these ideas had been expressed during the preceding period in private correspondence and similar documents (Apostolski 1969, vol. 2: 67, Stamatski 1983). Although many intellectuals of significance to the development of Literary Macedonian were active during this period, it can be argued that the two most important figures were Georgi Pulevski (b. Galicnik 1838–1894) and Krste Misirkov (b. Postol [Greek: Pellia] 1874–1926). Pulevski is the author of the first known published statement of Macedonian national and linguistic separatism, which appeared in his Macedonian-Albanian-Turkish dictionary (Pulevski 1875: 48–49). Misirkov (1903: 131, 145) published the first complete and definitive statement of Macedonian nationalism and linguistic policy in his book on the Macedonian question. He wrote this book in response to the failure of a major armed uprising in Macedonia that began on St. Elijah’s Day (Mac. “Ilinden”), August 2, 1903 and had as its goal Macedonian autonomy. In this he called for the establishment of a Macedonian state, independent from both Bulgaria and Serbia, and for the creation of a Macedonian literary language based on the Prilep-Bitola dialect group, i.e. precisely the dialects which served as the basis of Literary Macedonian. Most copies of Misirkov’s book were confiscated and destroyed in the printing shop in Sofia by the Bulgarian police. It was discovered by the Macedonian writer Kole Nedelkovski during the inter-war period in the Sofia Public Library and was also known to the important poet Kočo Racic, both of whom died during World War Two. Its second edition was not published until 1946, however, and it was unknown to those involved with the earliest stages of the codification of Literary Macedonian in 1944–1945 (Koneski 1967b: 41). Its significance is the fact that it documents a coherent formulation of a Macedonian literary language and nationality from the beginning of this century, thus belying the claim that Literary Macedonian was created ex nihilo by Yugoslav fiat at the end of World War Two (cf. Skendi 1980: 37, 46). For further details on Macedonian literary activity during this period see Polenakovic 1953, Ristovski 1966, 1973, 1974, Sazdov 1975a, 1975b.

1.4. From the Balkan Wars to 1944

October 18, 1912 marks the outbreak of the First Balkan War, in which the Kingdoms of Bulgaria, Greece, and Serbia united to drive Turkey out of Europe. The Treaty of London on May 30, 1913, marked the end of this war and of Turkish rule in Macedonia, but the Second Balkan War broke out on 29 June. This war was ended by the Treaty of Bucharest on 10 August, which, among other things, partitioned Macedonia among Bulgaria, Greece, and Serbia. The borders
of the three divisions of Macedonia are generally the same as those established by this treaty, with the exception of the region around Strumica, which was assigned to Bulgaria but ceded to Yugoslavia at the end of World War One. This marks the end of the development of Literary Macedonian outside the borders of Yugoslavia.

In Greece, the Slavic speaking population has been subjected to unrelenting Hellenization, and Macedonian language and nationality are subjected to constant denial and denigration (see Andriotis 1957, N.M. 27. XII. 81: 11, N.M. 18. X. 86: 2). In Bulgaria the official attitude that Macedonian is merely a Bulgarian dialect has remained constant except for the period 1946–1948. During that brief period, the Macedonians of Pirin Macedonia were recognized as a national minority in Bulgaria with their own schools and publications in Literary Macedonian as it was being codified in the SRM. With the Tito-Stalin break of 1948, Literary Macedonian was denounced by Bulgaria as a Serbo-Croatian plot (cf. Mirčev 1952), and Macedonian publications were (and usually still are) forbidden. Macedonian nationality, however, was still officially recognized. With the 1956 Hungarian revolution and the subsequent worsening of Yugoslav-Soviet relations that lasted until 1958, however, this recognition, too, was abandoned, and Bulgaria reverted completely to its pre-war position (see BAN 1978 for a typical statement of the current Bulgarian position, cf. Dimitrovski et al. 1978 for a response, also Lunt 1984, and N.M. 4. VI. 86: 4).

In interwar Yugoslavia, Macedonian was treated as a dialect of Serbo-Croatian, which was consistent with Serbo-Croatian claims that had been advanced since the nineteenth century (see Belić 1919). Despite intensive efforts at Serbization, however, the Yugoslav government permitted Macedonian literature to develop on a limited basis as a dialectal or folkloristic genre. It was during this interwar period that linguists from outside the Balkans, studying Macedonian dialects, published important studies in which they emphasized the distinctness of Macedonian from both Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian (e.g., Vaillant 1938, Malecki 1938, Bernštejn 1938). During World War Two, Tito's communists won jurisdiction over Macedonia, and on August 2, 1944, Macedonian was formally declared the official language of the SRM.

1.5. After 1944

The standardization of Literary Macedonian proceeded at a remarkably rapid pace after its official recognition. Many people contributed to this process, including writers, journalists, politicians, teachers, members of specific professions such as law and medicine, and individuals in occupations unassociated with language but concerned with the establishment of their native language as a literary norm. During the years after the war, people from all over Macedonia collected lists of dialectal vocabulary to help contribute to the projected diction-
Literary Macedonian, these stylistic judgments indicate spheres of usage considered to be appropriate.

1.5.4. The journal Makedonski jazik

From 1950–1953, this bulletin, which was concerned with the problems of standardization, the establishment of a dictionary, and other language planning issues, was published ten times a year. In 1954 it began to come out semi-annually from the then newly founded Institute for the Macedonian Language, which also took on the responsibility for publishing the Pravopisi, the standard dictionary, and conducting research in dialectology, historical linguistics, and all language-related matters. The degree of standardization already achieved at that time was reflected in the articles in Makedonski jazik, which were more concerned with linguistic research and the finer points of standardization. The journal became an annual in 1958, and articles in it were beginning to examine broader theoretical issues associated with Macedonian linguistics. In 1977 the Institute began to publish an irregular series, “Makedoništika”, which consists entirely of historical and dialectological materials of the type that originally constituted many of the contributions to Makedonski jazik in its early years. This reflects the fact that Makedonski jazik has matured into a journal embracing Slavic and general linguistics as well as Macedonian studies.

1.5.5. Other instruments of standardization

In addition to the Institute for Macedonian Language and the Academy of Arts and Sciences, there are teachers’ and writers’ unions that are concerned with the standardization of Macedonian. Among the important regular publications treating issues of codification are the journals “Literaturen zbor” (“Literary word”), “Prosvetno delo” (“Educational affairs”), as well as Blagoja Korubin’s weekly column “Jazično katče” (“Linguistic corner”, collected in Korubin 1969, 1976, 1980, 1986), which has appeared for decades in the newspaper “Nova Makedonija” (“New Macedonia”), the chief newspaper of the SRM. Nova Makedonija also publishes articles, letters to the editor, serials, etc. relating to language and standardization. During 1984–1985 there was also a column “Jazična kritika” (“Linguistic critique”) which published letters from readers concerned with standardization, and now the new weekly supplement “Lik” (“Image”), which replaces the earlier “Kulturen život” (“Cultural life”) pages of the Sunday edition, addresses issues connected with the literary language as well as other cultural affairs. To this can be added literature, public education, radio, television, and all the means of a modern society used for disseminating information and for communication in general.

2. ORTHOGRAPHY

2.1. The Choice of an Alphabet

The Cyrillic alphabet has been used for the languages of the Orthodox Christian Slavs since the Early Medieval period. The Greek alphabet was occasionally used for writing Macedonian in the pre-1444 period, e.g., the “Tetraglsson” is entirely in Greek orthography, and in fact many Macedonians educated in Greek church schools attempted to write their native language using Greek letters (cf. Tešev 1968). Nonetheless the mainstream of the development of Literary Macedonian has always identified with the use of Cyrillic.

2.2. Choices in the Modification of Cyrillic

The Cyrillic alphabet was originally devised for a language in use a thousand years ago. In the course of the intervening centuries, some of the old phonological distinctions had been lost and new ones had arisen in all the Slavic languages. During the pre-1444 period, those writing in Macedonian attempted a variety of solutions both with regard to letters representing distinctions no longer made and to the representation of new distinctions which had arisen. By 1944, however, the orthographic reforms in Serbo-Croatian and Russian Cyrillic provided Macedonian with two clear models illustrating two different types of solution. Although both orthographies had eliminated letters representing sounds no longer present in either language, e.g. a, k, r, as well as s in final position, they differed with regard to correspondences between letters and sounds.

2.3. Creating a Macedonian Orthography

In the codification of literary Macedonian, the chief orthographic issues were the representations of the sounds [c, j, n, j, dz, dž], vocalic /r/, and schwa. The presidium of the Anti-Fascist Assembly of Macedonia (ASNOM) appointed a special commission that met from November 27 to December 3, 1944, to formulate an alphabet and basic orthographic and grammatical rules. The orthographic section proposed digraphic solutions, e.g., for [c, j], the representations of schwa by a and vocalic /r/ by š, and generally favored the Russian and Bulgarian model. This commission’s five point resolution was rejected in toto and a second commission was formed. This commission’s proposed alphabet was accepted by the government on the day of its submission, May 3, 1945, and was published in the next issue, No. 104, of the newspaper Nova Makedonija (May 5–7, 1945). This alphabet followed the Serbo-Croatian model in its
adoption of the letters ǎ, ř, ř, j for [i, ř, dʒ, j] but also manifested independence in the invention of the letters ķ, ẑ for the dorso-palatal stops [c, j] and in its revival of the Old Church Slavonic letter ş for [dz]. The representation of schwa was conspicuous by its absence. (It does not occur regularly in the West Central dialects, cf. section 3 and Vidoeski 1981–1982.) In the Pravopis published later that year, it was specified that schwa could be represented by an apostrophe in certain contexts when necessary (e.g., the rendering of dialectal forms). This was the last major orthographic modification (cf. Koneski 1950).

2.4. Implementation of the Orthography

During the first years after World War Two, there was a problem with the availability of typefaces and typewriters. Thus, for example, when Nova Makedonija published the new official alphabet, the newspaper itself had to use digraphs such as ʒi, ʒr for ķ, ẑ in its articles until enough typeface could be made (Stamatovski 1975). Even today an occasional Serbo-Croatian ǰ or ķ will slip into a printed book or article. At present the chief problem with implementation stems from the fact that both the Cyrillic and Latin alphabets are used officially throughout Yugoslavia, and many official documents, signs, and other public notices use the Latin alphabet even when the language is Macedonian. This is due at least in part to the reader availability of Latin typewriters and typefaces in general, but it arouses the ire of many Macedonians, for whom the Macedonian Cyrillic alphabet is an integral part of Macedonian language and national identity (e.g., N. M. 21. VI. 75:7, 22. VIII. 84:9, 17. X. 84:8). In some instances, however, it must be admitted that the problem is one of sheer sloppiness. A case in point is a street sign on a major boulevard reading: ЈУТОСЛАВИЈА (it should read ЈУТОСЛАВИЈА). A photograph of the sign was recently published in Nova Makedonija (N. M. 9. VII. 86:9) along with a couple of paragraphs complaining about the frequency of such orthographic errors. To the credit of those officially responsible for such matters, however, it is entirely likely that by the time this article is published, that particular sign will have been replaced. In such matters in the past, officials have been responsive to public pressure from the press.

2.5. Orthography and Phonology

Macedonian orthography is essentially phonemic. With a few exceptions, each letter corresponds to a single phoneme and words are pronounced as they are spelled, in accordance with the West Central dialectal base (see section 3). The chief exception to the one-to-one correspondence between letters and phonemes is in the lateral liquids, where the letter ŷ represents /ʎ/ before front vowels and /j/ but /y/ elsewhere while ǎ is used for /l/ before back vowels, con-

sonants, and in the final position. The actual pronunciation of -muted is also a problem in current literary speech. The spelling of ķ and ẑ before front vowels and the presence vs. absence of orthographic /h/ in certain contexts, e.g. between e and ǎ, is subject to rules which are not necessarily based on pronunciation (see Pravopis 1970). One other major difference between orthography and pronunciation is the representation of final devoicing and regressive assimilation of voice. Final devoicing of distinctively voiced consonants is automatic in Macedonian but never spelled, while regressive assimilation of voice or voicelessness is spelled to denote certain suffixal and other morphological processes, but not in others. Thus, for example, Загреб — Загреб — in inhabitant of Zagreb, и регион — Регион ‘rare (masc. ~ fem.)’ but город — Град ‘city ~ urban’. In this context we can also note that the first person plural аорист/imperfect marker, which is spelled -ме is pronounced [-me] by analogy with the first singular -у and second plural -паме pronounced [f] and [fте] respectively.

3. THE DIALECTS

3.1. Principal Regions

The Macedonian dialects of the SRM are divided by two important bundles of iso glosses: one runs along the rivers Vardar and Crna and divides the republic into roughly eastern and western halves and the other divides the northernmost dialects ( Tetovo, Kumanovo-Kriva Palanka) from the rest. The western dialect region is characterized by a large, relatively homogeneous central area (Veleški Bitola-Prilep) surrounded by peripheral dialects (from north to south: Tetovo, Gostivar, Debar, Ohrid-Prespa), whereas the east lacks a single large central region (Tikveš-Mariovo and Štip-Strumica in the center, Dojran-Gevgelija to the southeast, Maleshevo on the east, and Kumanovo-Kriva Palanka in the north). The northern dialects are transitional to Serbo-Croatian, whereas the eastern (especially Maleshevo) are transitional to Bulgarian. (For further details see Vidoeski 1960-1961, 1962-1963, and Koneski 1983).

3.2. The Dialectal Basis of Literary Macedonian

Literary Macedonian is based on the dialects of the Western region, but other dialects have contributed to its structure and formation at all levels. The choice of the Western region was already being advocated at the beginning of this century, as evidenced by Misirkov’s book mentioned above. The choice of this dialect region was supported by a variety of factors, among which the most important were the following: 1) it contained the largest number of speakers, 2) owing to its central position, the largest number of speakers from
other areas could adapt their speech with a minimum of adjustments, and 3) in
many respects these dialects are maximally differentiated from both Serbo-
Croatian and Bulgarian. It is important to note here that differentiation from
Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian, while an important motivation, was not an abso-
late principle in codification. Thus, for example, Literary Macedonian regularly
forms verbal nouns from imperfective verbs with the suffix -nie (as in Serbo-
Croatian) and, in some verbs, usually perfective, with -nie (as in Church Slav-
onic, Bulgarian, Russian), rather than using -ne, a suffix characteristic of some
peripheral western dialects (Ohrid-Prespa, Debar).

4. CHOICES IN PHONOLOGY, MORPHOLOGY, AND SYNTAX

4.1. Choices in the Sound System

4.1.1. The problem of stress

The Western dialects are characterized by fixed antepenultimate stress in most
words. Eastern dialects are characterized by varying degrees of mobile
stress, while western dialects outside the SRM tend to fixed penultimate stress.
The West Central antepenultimate stress type has been the prescribed literary
norm since the first resolution of 1944, but the promulgation of the literary
accent has been a major issue, and problems still remain (see Minova-Grkova

4.1.2. Consonants

In general, the consonantism of Literary Macedonian agrees with that of the
majority of the West Central dialects. The most important differences concern
/v/ in intervocalic position and /x/. In the Western dialects, intervocalic /v/ is
generally lost (except in Mala Reka in the Debar region) and older /x/ is entirely
absent (except in the Tetovo region), being either lost or replaced by /v/ or /l/.
The Eastern dialects are characterized by the retention of /x/ (except Tikve-
š-Marino and Kumanovo-Kriva Palanka) and of intervocalic /v/. In these matters
the literary norm has effected a compromise established in the 1950 Pravopis,
e.g., toa (vs. tova) for 'this' but plural marker -ovi (vs. -oli), and specified the prin-
ciples for allowing /x/, viz. foreign words (hotel), toponyms (Ohrid), Church Slav-
onicisms (dah 'spirit'), neologisms (dohod 'income'), and to avoid ambiguity
(ranah 'injury/food').

4.1.3. Vowels

In terms of dialectal classification, as well as native Macedonian perceptions
of their own dialectal differentiation and regional identification, there are five
Common Slavic vowels whose reflexes can be said to be diagnostic: *i, *u, *o
(nasal), *e, *a (both vocalic). The reflexes of these phonemes occur in many com-
mon words of which the five cited below are typical. In order to emphasize the
variations that occur, reflexes from the regions outside the West Central area are
not cited unless they differ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Slavic</th>
<th>*i</th>
<th>*u</th>
<th>*o</th>
<th>*e</th>
<th>*a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>den son pat krk volk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North (Tetovo, Kumanovo-Kriva Palanka)</td>
<td>dan san put - vak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debar region (most common variants)</td>
<td>- - pot korv -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Peripheral (Gostivar, Ohrid-Prespa, Doiran-Gevgelija)</td>
<td>- - pat korv vak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central (Tikveš-Marino, Štip-Strumica, Maleševo)</td>
<td>- - - vak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>day dream road blood wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Northern reflexes of *o and *a, i.e. /u/, are the same as those of Serbo-
Croatian and are found in a number of individual lexical items south of the
northern isogloss bundle due to the influence and prestige of Serbo-Croatian
during earlier centuries. The 1950 Pravopis specified the words Bugarija 'Bul-
garia', čun 'boat', and their derivatives as words where the Literary Macedo-
nian reflex of Common Slavic *a was /u/ rather than /o/, and provided details for /u/ from *o. In some cases both the North and the West Central reflexes are
used for semantic differentiation, e.g., truba 'trumpet' vs. traba 'roll (of cloth)',
ruži 'accuse, sue' vs. ruži 'grieve'.

4.2. Morphology and Syntax

The morphology and syntax of Literary Macedonian is predominantly West
Central, but by no means uniformly so. Many specific features such as the shape
of the definite article, certain clitic pronouns, etc., are Eastern rather than West-
er (see, e.g., Vidoeski 1950a, 1965, Friedman 1985). Due to the complexities
of dialectal developments in Macedonian verbal morphology, some important fea-
tures of Literary Macedonian conjugation cannot be classified as simply West
Central vs. non-West Central. One of these is of significance for the expansion of
the lexicon, viz. the shape of the suffix used for deriving imperfective verbs from
perfectives. Until 1948, the prescribed suffix for derived imperfectives was -ae.
E.g., zbone 'speaks' (3 sg. pres.), characteristic of the North, Gostivar, Kičevo
and part of the Veles region. One of the changes specified in the 1948 revisions
was the change to the suffix -uva, e.g., zboruva, which is characteristic of Prilep, other parts of Veles, Debar, and Mariovo. Other dialects have other suffixes, e.g., zborivit, zboroa, zboruve, etc. This was a case where the political prestige of the dialect of the capital, Skopje, which is located approximately at the intersection of the major north-south and east-west isogloss bundles, gave way to the literary prestige of Prilep, which is in the heart of the West Central region.

4.3. Morphology, Syntax, and the Lexicon

Except for the grammatical suffix used to derive imperfectives mentioned in 4.2, the explicit statement of codifying rules concerning morphology were limited to paradigm and inflection. A few features of Macedonian syntax, e.g., the place of pronominal clitics in verb phrases, were specified in the early codifying documents. Other features have been discussed in articles in Makedonski jazik and elsewhere, but a unified study has yet to be published (see K. Koneski and Džukeski 1986). Although the lexicon has also been the subject of normativization, its codification was more complicated than that of phonology or morphology. We shall now turn our attention to the lexical corpus of Literary Macedonian.

5. SOURCES OF THE LEXICON

5.1. General Comments on Slavic Sources

5.1.1. Living South Slavic languages

Macedonian together with its two closest relatives, Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian, and the more distantly related Slovenian constitute the living languages in the South Slavic group of the Slavic family. From a dialectological standpoint, the bulk of the dialects of these languages form a single continuum extending from northern Yugoslavia south and then east across Bulgaria to the Black Sea. Although the dialects change with greater or lesser rapidity along this continuum, and although the speech forms at its two ends are not mutually intelligible, there is no single linguistic feature or group of features that can be said to mark the boundary between any two of these languages. At any two contiguous points along the continuum the dialects will be mutually intelligible. The transition from Serbo-Croatian to Bulgarian at the Serbian-Bulgarian political border is relatively rapid due to the clustering of isoglosses in that region. The transition from Serbo-Croatian to Macedonian and thence to Bulgarian, however, is quite gradual, since these isoglosses fan out through Macedonian territory. Thus, while native Macedonian dialectal forms have developed many of their own peculiarities, they also share elements with Serbo-Croatian and with Bulgarian that these two do not share with one another. To this must be added the fact that until 1944 Macedonians were educated in either Serbo-Croatian or Bulgarian if they stayed in the Balkans and did not go to Greek church schools. As closely related literary languages that were already officially established and had served as vehicles of education, Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian exerted significant influence on the formation of Literary Macedonian vocabulary.

5.1.2. Church Slavonic

Old Church Slavonic is the name given to the literary language found in the oldest Slavic manuscripts, about fifteen texts from the tenth and early eleventh centuries. These texts are copies of originals or other copies going back to the mission of Saints Cyril and Methodius to the Moravians in 863 in what is now Czechoslovakia. The language of these texts is very close to Common Slavic and was probably understood all over the Slavic-speaking world, but it contains certain features that mark it as specifically East South Slavic, i.e., Macedo-Bulgarian. Methodius and Constantine who became the monk Cyril on his deathbed were from Saloniki in Macedonia. After their deaths their disciples were driven from Moravia and settled in Macedonia and Bulgaria, especially Ohrid in southwestern Macedonia and Preslav in northeastern Bulgaria. The language of later documents is known as Church Slavonic. Church Slavonic functioned as a literary and ecclesiastical language for centuries in the Orthodox Slavic world, taking on the dialectal peculiarities of the regions where it was used. For Literary Macedonian, Church Slavonic has the prestige of being the literary language whose tradition it can claim as ancestral.

5.1.3. Russian

Russian is an East Slavic language. The conversion of Prince Vladimir of Kiev in 988 resulted in the establishment of Christianity as the state religion in Russia and in a South Slavic influence on the written language due to the influx of clergy from Macedo-Bulgarian territory. A second major influx of South Slavic clergy and linguistic influence came in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, with the Ottoman conquest of the Balkans, which left Russia as the only (Slavic) Orthodox Christian State. The Church Slavonic which developed in Russia significantly influenced the formation of the modern Russian literary language which began in the eighteenth century. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Russian has had great prestige in the Orthodox Slavic Balkans, and many Macedonians and other Balkan Slavs went to Russia for advanced education and were thus influenced by the Russian literary language. The influence of Russian, and through it Church Slavonic, on Bulgarian has been far greater than
its influence on Serbo-Croatian. In this, as in other things, Literary Macedonian is somewhere between Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian.

5.2. General Comments on Non-Slavic Sources

5.2.1. The Balkan languages

The Slavic languages of the Balkans (except Slovenian) together with Greek, Albanian, and Balkan Romance (Rumanian, Aromanian, etc.) form the Balkan linguistic league or “Sprachbund” (cf. Sandfeld 1930). These languages share a wide range of features at all linguistic levels due to centuries of mutual multilingual contact. To this must be added their shared exposure to Turkish as part of the Ottoman Empire for five centuries. Due to its central position in the Balkans, vocabulary elements from all these languages are present in Macedonian to varying degrees.

5.2.2. The Western languages

Modern Western influences in Macedonian are of three types. The first is that of French and German (and to a lesser extent Italian) which began during the Ottoman period and continues to this day. The second is the influence of so-called international words, i.e., words of predominantly Greco-Latin origin that have been coined or spread since the Middle Ages through recent times and are used by a wide range of languages, often to describe modern or Western things and ideas, e.g., words for television, electricity, nation, university, etc. The third is the influence of English, which has come about as a result of the post-war power of the U.S. and Great Britain, not only in politics and economics, but also in mass entertainment and other fields. To these factors must be added the fact that many Macedonians have emigrated to the U.S., Canada, and Australia or go there to work, returning to Macedonia to live or visit.

6. CODIFICATION AND PRE-OTTOMAN CONTACT LANGUAGES

6.1. Albanian and Aromanian

Under this rubric we include not only these languages but also their ancestors and predecessors. We are thinking here of Balkan Latin and the so-called Balkan substrate languages. The former was the dominant language in the northern half of geographic Macedonia when the Slavs arrived and was the ancestor of the modern Balkan Romance languages including Aromanian. The latter includes Illyrian and Daco-Thracian, one of which must have been the direct ancestor of Albanian and both of which left traces in this language and in Balkan Romance (see Hamp 1966 on the problems of these relationships). We can also mention here the pre-Indo-European (sometimes called Mediterranean) languages which are thought to account for such items as wine, hemp (Macedonian vino, konop), etc. A number of individual lexical items were borrowed from these languages at various stages in the history of Macedonian, and some of these items were accepted into Literary Macedonian without qualification while others were excluded or labelled “dialectal”, “archaic”, etc. Thus, for example, substrate items such as magare ‘donkey’, guša ‘throat’ are unmarked standard, while cap ‘billy goat’ is listed in Koneski (1986) as “dialectal”. While cap does have literary equivalents of Slavic origin, viz. jarec, pric, so does guša, viz. gljoci. There are a number of Balkan Latin loanwords in the literary language, e.g., banja ‘bath’, kambana ‘church bell’, kum ‘godfather, compadre’, kosula ‘shirt’, etc. Aromanian and Albanian loanwords, however, are extremely rare in Literary Macedonian. Aromanian sugare ‘late-born lamb’ is standard, but Albanian čupa ‘girl’ is dialectal and besa ‘faith, oath’ is labelled “archaic”. On the other hand, Aromanian has had a significant influence on the grammatical and lexical structure of Macedonian, especially the western dialects, in terms of calquing and lexical convergence (cf. Golj 1959, 1970, 1981–1982), while Albanian and Aromanian have both made significant contributions to the so-called secret languages, i.e. trade jargons etc. (see Jašar-Nasteva 1953, 1974). These elements have not entered Literary Macedonian, however.

6.2. Greek

At the time of the Slavic invasions, Greek was the dominant language in the southern half of geographic Macedonia, as well as the language from which the first Slavic texts were translated. Both before and during the Ottoman period, Greek was the dominant language of Christian culture in Macedonia, as well as a major contact language on the everyday level. In Literary Macedonian, most of the ecclesiastical vocabulary as well as some ordinary words have been retained, e.g., angel ‘angel’, ikona ‘icon’, keramida ‘tile’, oti ‘that’ (rel. conj.). Many other words of Greek origin, however, have been relegated to the colloquial or dialectal levels of the literary language, e.g. daskal ‘teacher’ is labelled “colloquial” for the literary nastavnik or učitel, kokal ‘bone’ and aresa ‘to like’ are labelled “dialectal” in opposition to the literary koska and dopaža se, or sviša se or the colloquial bendisa. In every case except bendisa, which is a Turkism, the preferred form is Slavic. This last example points to an important difference between Greek and Turkish loanwords in Macedonian. Turkish influence was spread more or less uniformly all over Macedonia whereas Greek influence decreased as one moved from south to north. The relatively local character of many Hellenisms led to their exclusion from consideration, as can be seen by
7. CODIFICATION AND TURKISH

7.1. The Sources of Turkish Vocabulary

For our purposes, all those words that entered Macedonian via Turkish are Turkisms. Thus, for example, although Turkish *efendi* 'sir' (archaic) is itself from the Greek *ατρέφω*, its presence in Macedonian is counted as a Turkism and not as a Hellenism, since Turkish was the immediate source. There are also ambiguous cases where it is difficult to determine whether or not a word entered Macedonian via a Turkish intermediary. In general, however, these are popularly felt to be Turkisms or at least words associated with the Ottoman period, and this is how they function for purposes of the discussion of codification.

7.2. General Comments on Turkish Influence

For over five hundred years (1389–1912), Turkish was the official language all over geographic Macedonia. It was the language of administration, of the market place, and was spoken in villages as well as towns. Virtually all men knew at least some Turkish, and in the towns almost everyone was at least bilingual. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that Turkish influenced Macedonian at all linguistic levels. In phonology, Turkish was a contributing factor to the phonemicization of /l/ /l/ and /y/ and a major source of the phonemicization of /dʒ/ and the preservation of the opposition /l/ vs. /l/ (see Koneski 1983). The influence of Turkish on inflectional morphology and on syntax is moot at best (see Friedman 1978, 1986), but the influence on derivational morphology and semantics has been significant and has lasted into the modern period.

7.3. The Semantics of Turkisms

Turkish lexical items entered all levels of Macedonian vocabulary. From the grammatical point of view, there are Turkisms in virtually all the traditional parts of speech: nouns (*đezb* 'pocket*'), verbs (*kurtuli* 'save*'), adjectives (*azac* 'fresh*'), adverbs (*badjla* 'for nothing*'), conjunctions (*ama* 'but*'), prepositions (*karši* 'opposite*'), pronouns (*iče* 'nothing*'), exclamations (*siker* 'scram!*'), particles (*keški* 'if only*'). The only Macedonian traditional part of speech lacking Turkisms is the numeral, although there are Turkisms in numerical expressions, e.g., *čerek* 'quarter*, and Turkish numerals in other parts of speech, e.g., *kelilik* '5 "pence" silver coin*'. In terms of semantic fields, Turkisms are found in every area: *urban/rural* (*dukan* 'shop*, *sokak* 'street, alley*, *ambar* 'barn*, *endek* 'furrow*, *dilch*), *artificial/natural* (*avan* 'ceiling*, *işle* 'bottle*, *zumbul* 'hyacinth*, *taftabita* 'bedbug*), *intimate/abstract* (*đežer* 'liver, lungs*, *badžanak* 'brother-in-law* [wife's sister's husband*], *muabet* 'conversation*, *zulum* 'violation*), etc. (cf. Jašar-Nasteva 1963, 1974, 1981, Kazazis 1972, Kramer 1979). In addition to obvious lexical borrowings, there are numerous lexical and phraseological calques, e.g., the use of *jade* 'eat' to mean 'undergo something unpleasant' (colloquial) as in *jade kotek* (Turkish *kösek yemek* 'to eat a blow') 'to get a beating' and also *jade doži* (Slavic *dož* 'rain') 'to get soaked*, *jade gomno* (Slavic *gomno* 'foces') 'to say something stupid/embarrassing*.

7.4. Turkisms in the Nineteenth Century

The degree of the penetration of Turkisms into Macedonian reached its height during the nineteenth century. According to Koneski (1965: 188–189), this was due to the migration of Macedonians to the cities, where Turkish was the language of the market place. It is noteworthy that Turkish even penetrated the realm of Christian religious terminology, which, given the identification of Turkish with Islam, should have been the most impervious to such influence. Thus we find in nineteenth century texts *kurban* 'eucharist* (Turk. *kurban* 'sacrifice*), *kurtulija* 'the Savior* (Turk. *kurtul* 'save*), *sajbiha* 'the Lord* (Turk. *sahib* 'master*); cf. Gołb 1960, Jašar-Nasteva 1970, Miocović 1980. It was also during the nineteenth century, however, that intellectuals made the first efforts to halt the influx of Turkisms by revising and introducing Slavic words in their colloquial-based writings, i.e. in the works whose language represents the precursor of Modern Literary Macedonian. This was especially true with abstract nouns, e.g., Krčovski felt the need to gloss *gorodost* 'pride* with the Turkish *fodullenik*. Even *narod* in the meaning of 'nation* (for which the internationalism nacija can now also be used) was glossed with the Turkish *millet*.

7.5. Turkisms from 1912–1944

The interwar period saw the obsolescence of some Turkisms for strictly practical reasons. In Vardar Macedonia, Serbo-Croatian was now the official language, and since Turkish was no longer the language of the state, many administrative terms, e.g. *vilajet* 'province*, *kajmakam* 'governor* etc. became obsolete. In everyday Macedonian speech, however, large numbers of Turkisms were still in regular use.

7.6. Turkisms after 1944

The position of Turkisms was an issue from the very beginning of codification. There was one current of thought among some Macedonian intellectuals
who maintained that Turkisms should be encouraged and preserved because they were characteristic of folk speech and also emphasized Macedonian’s differentiation from the other Slavic languages. The predominant current, however, continued the nineteenth century tradition of encouraging Slavic replacements for Turkisms. Thus, for example, in 1945 Blaže Koneski wrote a review of a translation of Molière’s “Le Tartuffe” in which he criticized the use of Turkisms as lowering the beauty of Molière’s language to the level of street market chit-chat (reprinted in Koneski 1967a; cf. also Ežov 1952, Gošb 1960, Markov 1955). The process of replacing Turkisms involved three types of words: 1) Slavic, e.g., običaj for adet ‘custom’, znaki for demek ‘it means’, no (borrowed from Russian) for ama ‘but’; 2) Western, e.g., from German pegla (from the first half of Bügeleisen) for utjela ‘iron’, pasuva for yjds ‘fit’; 3) so-called internationalisms, e.g., informacija for aber ‘information’, nacija for millet ‘nation’. In some cases, the replacement has resulted in a differentiation of written and spoken language. Thus, no educated Macedonian would use ama or demek in formal writing, but even academicians and professors use them routinely in speaking. In other cases, the Turkism has remained standard for the concrete meaning while its replacement will be used for abstractions, thus, for example Turkish tavsan is the standard word for ‘ceiling’, but when talking about a price ceiling, the French plafond is used (cf. Korubin 1986). In some cases, the Turkism was replaced by extending the use of a Slavic word, e.g., the use of narod ‘people’ to mean ‘nation’ in place of Turkish millet as well as the international nacija.

7.7. Turkisms Today

The campaign to limit the use of Turkisms has been successful; their advance has been more or less halted. Whereas a century ago it was necessary for writers to gloss Slavic words with Turkish ones, today it is necessary for folklorists to include glossaries of Turkisms in their collections of folktales. Forty years ago writers criticized translators for using Turkisms when Slavic words were available. Today the tables are turned and authorities are criticizing translations, e.g., from Serbo-Croatian, that use Slavic expressions where the original uses Turkisms, also known in Macedonian, for specific effect (Korubin 1986). The use of Turkisms in Macedonian today is similar to that in the other Balkan literary languages (cf. Kazazis 1972). There are many items that are thoroughly established and irreplaceable, e.g., dzeb ‘pocket’, jorgovan ‘lilac’. Included in this class are toponyms, names of businesses, etc., e.g., Čair ‘meadow’ a district in Skopje, Merkez ‘center’ name of a coffee-house in Skopje, etc. Many other words are standard colloquialisms that are avoided in formal writing, e.g., ama and demek cited above. Certain types of specialized terminology also rely on words of Turkish origin; in dove breeding Turkish names are used for different types of birds, e.g., ak kuruk ‘white tail’, kara kuruk ‘black tail’, bez ‘[pure] white’, sija ‘[pure] black’ (I am indebted to Dr. Vlado Cvetkovski for this information). A large number of Turkisms have been retained for specific stylistic nuances. There are three types of context in which such Turkisms will be used in any type of speech or writing for effect: 1) historical/epic/archaic, 2) local color/dialectal, 3) ironic/pejorative. Thus, for example, one finds Turkisms such as zul ‘violence’, emiš ‘fruit’, išer ‘sign’, verest ‘credit’ rather than the Slavic or “international” equivalents naslishto, ovoče, znak, kredit, respectively, in newspaper articles describing the bad old days under the Turks, or the life of successful traditional villagers, or ridiculing unsavory practices. It is interesting to note that in serious articles about Turkey or the Turkish minority in Macedonia, Turkisms are scrupulously avoided. Thus, for example, in an article about the Turkish film director Yılmaz Güney (N.M. 7. IX. 82:5) not a single word of Turkish origin was used, despite the fact that the discussion of prisons, witnesses, etc. offered ample opportunity.

8. CODIFICATION AND WESTERN LANGUAGES

8.1. Continental European

By the time the Slavs arrived in the Balkans, the division between the Eastern and Western Roman Empires had already taken place. For our purposes, Western languages are those from territories that were part of or affected by the Western Roman Empire. Macedonian’s first Western contact language was Italian, particularly the Venetian dialect. The earliest contacts came through the crusades and later through Ottoman conflict with Venice. It is from this period that words such as namsla ‘food, dish’, damadulama ‘demijohn’, etc., entered Macedonian. These Italianisms are common to all the Balkan languages and probably did not enter Macedonian directly. They are in effect Balkanisms. During the nineteenth century, a large number of French and German words entered Macedonian. As Gacov (1971) points out, the chief buyers at the trade fairs in Bitola, Ohrid, and Prilep came from Vienna, Budapest, Leipzig, and Berlin (cf. also Lehiste 1980). To this we can add that at that time French held the position of international and diplomatic language occupied by English today. German vocabulary is especially evident in vocabulary relating to technology introduced into Macedonia before the end of World War Two. Examples are šteker ‘electric plug’, šlep ‘transport truck’, sah ‘postbox’, šalter ‘counter window’. In many cases westernisms and Turkisms will be opposed in what they imply. Thus, for example, a sign using the ‘Turkism kujundžija ‘goldsmith’ will signal a dealer in traditional jewelry while one that uses the Gallicism bijutelija ‘jewelry’ implies modern, western-style items. Many of these pre-war westernisms have been
8.2. International Words

The concept of internationalisms has been very important to the codification of Modern Literary Macedonian. Etymologically, there is no such thing as a true internationalism, since every such word has a concrete source, generally Greek and/or Latin. Such words usually entered Macedonian via French or Russian but also came through Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian and German. Conceptually, however, such words are seen as shared with the broader community of "modern" (i.e. "Euro-American") nations. And in fact, allowing for minor adjustments in spelling and suffixes, words like administracija, etnologija, informacija, homoseksual, infrastruktura, intervencija, problem, sistem, socijalizam, telefon, telegraf, temperatura need no translation in a large number of European languages. Macedonian intellectuals such as Misirkov were already using so-called international words in the nineteenth century (Dimitrovska 1967). Since 1944, internationalisms have been seen in all areas with technical vocabularies. Latinate terminology is especially strong in medicine and law, but virtually any type of technical writing will contain numerous international terms. Such terminology is also frequent in the popular press. It should be noted that this usage is occasionally the subject of jibes in humor columns and complaints in letters to the editor; in both cases the point is that many Macedonians are unfamiliar with these terms and feel that authors should be using either familiar words with extended meanings or inventing transparent terms on the basis of native roots and morphology.

8.3. English

In recent decades, the number of English loanwords has increased both in the colloquial language and the popular press. Many of these words have shifted semantically from their English sources, e.g., šoping 'going abroad to shop for consumer goods', biznes 'deal', šou 'TV show', barel 'measure of petroleum', sef 'safe deposit box', lider 'world leader', imidž 'public image', flei 'news flash', star 'movie/TV star' (see also Cvetković 1966). Others have expanded their use, e.g., startva 'to kick off', which was originally limited to sports terminology, is now used to describe beginnings in general. Some items denote imported con-
cepts without a semantic shift, e.g., panter 'punt', stagflation 'stagflation'. In other cases, however, there is no difference, e.g., between televisor vo boja and televisor vo kolor 'color TV'. Stylistically, Anglicisms are often used with irony in the popular press, or are associated with student slang, but many expressions such as super 'terrific' and okej 'OK' have entered general colloquial use (cf. N.M. 10. IX. 85:16). A telling comment on the use of westernisms in Macedonian can be seen in Darko Markovski's comic strip "Pecko", a kind of Macedonian Donnesbury whose eponymous hero is a worker with wife and family. In a recent strip, Pecko's son enters the room saying: "Džast moment, papa, dač transfuzija, pak sum švoric!" 'Hey, Pop, gimme some bread, I'm out again'. Pecko gives him some money and his son says: "Okej! Super! Cao!" 'Great! Terrific! Bye!'. Pecko comments to a friend: "Mnogu go pročistiti jazikot, povëke ne upotrebuva turcizmi!" 'He's purified his language a lot. He doesn't use Turkish anymore.' (N.M. 17-III. 85:16). In Pecko's son's speech, only the words dać 'give', pak 'again' and sum 'I am' were native. Many of these English words do not officially belong to Literary Macedonian. The standard dictionary (Koneski 1986) was completed in 1966, and a revision has yet to be made. In the intervening two decades changes in politics and mass communications have brought Macedonian into intimate contact with English, not just through the institution of going abroad to work (pečalba) but also through movies, television, and records. Shows such as "Dynasty" and "Peyton Place" have enjoyed enormous popularity, and other series from American and British television such as "The Cisko Kid", "Columbo", "Man about the House", etc., are shown undubbed, with Macedonian or Serbo-Croatian subtitles. Record stores carry the latest releases of the Talking Heads, Rolling Stones, etc., and many if not most of the films being shown in the main population centers are in English with subtitles. English is overwhelmingly the most popular foreign language in schools, far outdistancing second-place French. From the point of view of codification, however, the Anglicisms have not been the subject of much official attention.

9. CODIFICATION AND THE OTHER SLAVIC LANGUAGES

The relationship of Literary Macedonian to the related languages discussed in section 5.1., as well as to its own dialects and neologisms, is intimately bound up with the derivational processes that will be discussed in the following section. Here we will discuss general lexical features. In Modern Literary Macedonian there is an explicit hierarchy of Slavic sources (Koneski 1967b: 81–83). The Macedonian dialects, and after them devices such as semantic extension, calquing, neologisms, etc. are highest. Church Slavonicisms should be made to conform phonologically with Macedonian developments. More or less equal hierarchically are Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian, and Russian is at the bottom.
This is in explicit opposition to that intellectual current in Macedonian thought that favored the adoption of Russian terminology. This current was evident in the writing of some intellectuals in the nineteenth century (cf. Dimitrovski 1967) and reached its height at the beginning of the period of codification when the first codifying proposals of 1944 went so far as to suggest that they should be considered as tentative until Russian experts could arrive to help with the final decisions (Koneski 1950). Even before the Tito-Stalin break of 1948, this linguistic policy was successfully opposed by those who had the most influence on the subsequent codification of Literary Macedonian. Koneski (1967b) even went so far as to write that Russian loans should be adopted via Bulgarian or Serbo-Croatian since these latter were the original sources of Russianisms in the nineteenth century and are South Slavic and thus more closely related to Macedonian. Although we can say that Bulgarian and Russian influence was stronger before 1912 and that Serbo-Croatian influence has been stronger since 1944, the Literary Macedonian lexicon has borrowed from all these languages. Thus, for example, veska ‘connection’ is from the Bulgarian veska (vs. Russian sv’az’ and Serbo-Croatian vez) while utas ‘constitution’ is from the Serbo-Croatian (Russian and Bulgarian konstitucija) and no ‘but’ is from the Russian. Macedonian has borrowed not only Slavic words but also so-called international words through the intermediary of these related languages. However, diverse correspondences can be seen from the following list of internationalisms and neologisms in which the forms corresponding to Macedonian are highlighted (cf. Dimitrovski 1967):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Macedonian</th>
<th>Serbo-Croatian</th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hero</td>
<td>heroj</td>
<td>hero</td>
<td>geroj</td>
<td>geroj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journal</td>
<td>spisanie</td>
<td>žasopis</td>
<td>spisanie</td>
<td>žurnal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class</td>
<td>klasa</td>
<td>klas</td>
<td>klas</td>
<td>klas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomy</td>
<td>avtonomija</td>
<td>autonomija</td>
<td>avtonomija</td>
<td>avtonomija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aristocracy</td>
<td>aristocratija</td>
<td>-tiša/-ciša</td>
<td>-ciša</td>
<td>-tiša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guarantee</td>
<td>garancija</td>
<td>-ciša/-tiša</td>
<td>-ciša</td>
<td>-tiša</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the relative numbers of these different correspondences vary considerably (Modern Literary Macedonian shows a preponderance of the type illustrated by ‘hero’, whereas some of the writing in the nineteenth century was even closer to Russian than is Modern Literary Bulgarian), this table gives an accurate depiction of the range of occurring possibilities (cf. Ugrinova 1968, Veličkova 1980, Polenakovik 1967).

10. DERIVATIONAL PROCESSES

10.1. Types of Processes

In the development of the Literary Macedonian lexicon, codifiers have relied heavily on those processes which have been present in Slavic since (and presumably before) the time of the first recorded texts, processes which have remained alive in the dialects over the centuries, viz. suffixation and compounding, and to a limited extent prefixation. In the discussion that follows, we will examine suffixation and compounding in separate sections, but not prefixation. The chief reason for this, aside from the relative limitation and marginality of prefixation as a derivational process in Macedonian, is that whereas the border between suffixation and compounding is very clear — suffixes do not possess independent lexical meaning and never stand alone — the border between prefixation and compounding is hazy. Many items that could be said to function prefixally also function as independent words, e.g., samo- ‘self-’ as in samopridones ‘voluntary contribution’, samoupravovanje ‘self-management’, samokritika ‘self-criticism’, cf. sam-a-a-o-i ‘oneself, etc.’. Other prefixal items are capable of standing alone although they do not usually do so, e.g., the prefix anti- ‘anti’ can be used predicatively to mean ‘against’ or ‘opposed’. Prefixes such as pra- ‘proto-, etc.’ are capable of being repeated, e.g., pradeo ‘great-grandfather’, prapradeo ‘great-great-grandfather’, etc. Even preverbs, which are transparently and historically derived from prepositions, and which at times are devoid of lexical content when performing the grammatical function of deriving a perfective verb from an imperfective, are still capable of carrying lexical meaning. Prefixation in Macedonian is thus not a clearly defined morphological process like suffixation or compounding and so will not be treated in a separate section. Rather, it will be referred to when relevant in our discussion of the other two processes.

10.2. Suffixation

10.2.1. Nominal/Slavic

The creation of new nominal forms was a key issue in the process of codification. The chief question was one about which suffixes were to be used and with which meanings. An early article by Korubin (1950) focuses on one of the most important of these issues. In the article, Korubin discusses different possibilities for the word meaning ‘self-determination’. The key issue is the shape of the verbal noun corresponding to our ‘determination’. The main title of the article consists of four possible forms: samoopredelenie, samoopredelenje, samoopredelavanje, samoopredelnja. The first two are based on the perfective stem of the verb
meaning 'define, determine' (itself consisting of the root del- and the prefixes o- and pre-). The first uses the Church Slavonic (and Russian) suffix for forming deverbal nouns, -nie, while the second uses a native Macedonian development -nje. The third form is based on the imperfective stem (derived by the suffix -unu) and the native -nje, while the fourth uses the perfective stem and a different suffix, -ba, which is attested in Old Church Slavonic and is not limited to verbs (e.g., OCS zulo 'malice' from zulo 'evil' as well as moliba 'petition' from moliti 'to pray'). These last two processes are both productive in Macedonian dialects. In his article, Korubin alludes to the decision at the Second Conference of the Commission on the Macedonian Language that the suffix -nje should be used for the regular derivation of verbal nouns from imperfective stems and that -nie should be used with those perfective stems that also supply verbal nouns. He then points out that many people engaged in the public use of language, e.g., newspaper editors, are rejecting derived nouns in -nie as archaic and favoring imperfective-based nouns in -nje in all contexts. Korubin objects to this practice on the grounds that the imperfective base is intended to denote a concrete action while the perfective base is for abstractions; cf. the English His deciding (Mac. rešavanje) to go and His decision (Mac. rešenje) to go. Korubin proposes the use of -ba to derive nouns from perfective bases, hence samoopredelba, and gives three justifications which are paradigmatic for the codification of the Macedonian lexicon: 1) neologisms of this type are already in use, e.g., sosilija 'state, situation', istotba 'exhibition', 2) usage of this type occurs in nineteenth century authors, e.g., Rajko Žinžilov has proseba 'walk, stroll' (modern prošetka), 3) the suffix is productive in the dialects, e.g., suredbba 'furniture' (literary namešta). Koneski (1965: 181) also cites the productivity of -ba in earlier texts, e.g., krađa 'theft' from the sixteenth century.

Korubin's solution was accepted for samoopredelba, which was listed in the standard dictionary as standard while samoopredelenja was labelled "archaic" (Koneski 1986). In general, however, verbal nouns based on perfective stems are individual lexical items, and the choice of, e.g., -ba vs. -nie is sometimes difficult to predict, while the tendency to use imperfective-based nouns in -nje is stronger. Even in the earliest days of codification the dialectal verbal noun prašanje 'asking' from the bispecular verb praša 'to ask' was the standard word for 'question' in all senses (e.g., makedonskoto prazanje (the Macedonian question), and today it is common practice to use somnevanje instead of somnenje for 'doubt, suspicion' (there is also nedoverba 'doubt, distrust'), nepoznavanje for 'ignorance', etc. On the other hand, Church Slavonicisms such as rešenje 'decision, resolution, permit' are well established.

As Koneski (1967b: 83) points out, the codifiers of Macedonian have not indulged in "čistunstvo" (radical purism). In addition to agitative suffixes such as -ač, which is popular in Macedonian dialects, Modern Literary Macedonian freely uses suffixes such as -tel, and -ec for this purpose. Interestingly enough, during the Middle Ages, the tendency to use deverbal -(n)ie and agentive -(tel) was characteristic of the Ohrd school, e.g., in the writings of St. Clement, while the use of -a and -(i)cu (modern -a, -ec) in these functions was stronger in Preslav, e.g., in the writing of John the Exarch. The Ohrd school, however, was more influential in Russian Church Slavonic and subsequently in Modern Literary Russian, whence its usages became dominant in Bulgarian. In many cases, Modern Literary Macedonian favors -o over -nie, e.g., odojov vs. odojšenje 'relation' tek vs. teče-je 'course, flow', etc.; cf. also the neologism dohod 'income'. All the Slavic languages make use of the suffixes which in Macedonian have the shapes -oas and -o sto for abstract nouns, but sometimes in different words. Thus, e.g., while Serbo-Croatian has nastilje and Bulgarian has nastilie for 'violence' Macedonian uses nastilство. Although the suffix -ač was recommended by codifiers over -(tel) in Literary Macedonian, actual usage varies. Thus, for example, television viewers are dragi gledali 'dear viewers' but radio listeners are dragi slušateli 'dear listeners'. The word slušat is also used in Literary Macedonian, but for the inanimate object as well as animate, i.e., a listening device as well as listener. There is also slušalika which means 'stethoscope' or 'telephone receiver'. As can be seen from this exposition, there is a great deal of room for variation and productivity. The complete system of adjectival and nominal derivation is too rich and complex to be discussed in greater detail here (see Koneski 1967b). There are a few derivational affixes of recent foreign origin, e.g., -ist'-ist', but there is one group of nominal affixes which deserves separate treatment in the following section.

### 10.2.2. Nominal/Turkish

One of the most visible influences of Turkish on the Macedonian lexicon has been the loan of four highly productive derivational suffixes: -džija used to denote types of people, -lak used mainly for abstract nouns, -ana used for buildings, and -lija used to form adjectives. These suffixes are used in common words of Turkish origin, e.g., jabandžija 'foreigner', javušak 'slowness' (pejorative), meana 'tavern' (archaic), meraklija 'pleasure-loving, fond'. They have also been used productively with Slavic roots, e.g., lovžija 'hunter', stroganak 'matchmaking', pilan 'chicken coop', vošija 'lousy'. These suffixes remain productive in recent loanwords, although they frequently have a pejorative or ironic overtone, e.g., fužbadžija 'inexp soccer player', motoržija 'obnoxious' motorcyclist, asistentžija 'assistantship' (ironic), hidroelektrarna 'hydroelectric power station' (colloquial but neutral), pubertžija 'teenager' (ironic). The fate of these suffixes reflects the fate of Turkisms in general. They remain vital and productive but colloquial and in many cases stylistically shifted downward to the informal or the ironic. The codifiers have attempted to limit their productivity (e.g., Markov 1955), and they have been successful to a large extent in formal
writing (cf. Friedman 1986), but Turkisms remain distinctive and productive elements in both the written and spoken language.

10.2.3. Verbal

Macedonian has had three productive suffixes for forming verbs, and they reflect the three important elements in the Macedonian lexicon: Slavic, Balkan, and Western European. These three are the native *-uva*, the Greek *-sa* (Turkish *-disa*), and the Western European (Latin > French > German > Slavic) *-ira*. All three remain productive to this day. Verbs in *-uva* are imperfective, e.g., *zbot ‘word’ > zboruva ‘speak’ > prozboruva (impf.), prozbori (perf.) ‘utter’. But perfectivization can also be achieved by means of prefixation, e.g., *interesuva/zainteresuva ‘be interested’. Verbs in *-ira* are biaxial, but show a tendency to be treated as imperfective, with perfectives being derived by means of prefixation, e.g., *kontrolira/prokontrolira ‘check, examine’, interesira/zainteresira ‘be interested’. Verbs in *-sa* are often perfective and form perfectives by means of *-uva*, e.g., *bendisabendissuva ‘like’ (< Turkish), but prefixation also occurs, e.g., *mirisa/namirisava ‘smell’ (< Greek), *elektirsina/elektirisa ‘electrify’ (< international).

In some cases, the suffixes serve the purpose of semantic differentiation, e.g., *kritikuva ‘to criticize’, kriticira ‘to give a critique’. In other cases differentiation is purely aspectual, e.g., *degenerira ‘to degenerate’ (biaxial) but *degenerisal degenerisuva (impf./perf.). Some new loans permit formation freely with more than one of these suffixes, others do not. Thus, for example there is no particular difference between *falsificira and falsifikuva ‘falsify’ but *flet ‘fright’ permits the formation of the verb *fletuva but not fletira. (See Minova-Gurkova 1966).

10.3. Compounding

Compounding was a productive form of derivation in Indo-European; it remained so in Slavic, where it was reinforced by contact with Greek and then, in the Balkans, with Turkish. In Modern Macedonian, compounding with the linking vowel *-o*, which is inherited from Indo-European, is still productive, e.g., *rabotodavač ‘employer’, rabotospoben ‘employable, able-bodied’, zemjotes ‘earthquake’, zemjotedec ‘farmer’, maloten ‘minor, underaged’, etc. In the early stages of codification, there was some competition between the use of *-o* and *-u* as linking vowel, e.g., *malubroen vs. malubroen ‘few in number’, but *-o* has won the definitive victory in this. The Turkish type of compound lacks a linking vowel, e.g., *tutunkese ‘tobacco pouch’, but there are also native formations without linking vowels, although these generally use disparate parts of speech, e.g., *adverb + substantive domazet ‘son-in-law who lives with his wife’s parents’, adjective + substantive liinden ‘St. Elijah’s day’, imperative + substantive zajdisone ‘sunset’, etc. (see Vidoeski 1951).

10.4. Other processes

With the exception of sound symbolism, which has not, to the best of my knowledge, been affected by the processes of standardization nor participated in it, all the processes mentioned by Fodor (LR III: 439-454) find expression in the codification of Literary Macedonian. Processes such as calquing, e.g., *sceu udar ‘heart attack’ and artificial means such as the use of abbreviations, e.g., *SAD*, pronounced [sat], *< Soedineite Amerikanski Drzavi ‘United States of America, U.S.A.’ also occur, but are not nearly as important as the various processes already discussed thus far.

11. EVALUATION OF THE REFORM

11.1. Statistics

It is difficult to supply much statistical data concerning the codification of Literary Macedonian because the necessary resources such as an etymological dictionary, etc. are not yet written. As was mentioned above, the 1970 Pravopis contains 30,000 items. The standard dictionary (Koneski 1986) contains 64,522 main entries, but even in 1966 when the last volume was completed, the dictionary did not include all the words of the literary language, and in the intervening decades, a large number of new words has been added. There is an enormous lexical card file at the Institute for Macedonian Language, but concrete plans for a new dictionary have not been made. According to Koneski (1965: 183), there are about 2,000 words of Greek origin in the folk dialects, and the number of Turkisms is estimated as between 4,000 and 5,000 (Schmaus 1970). Ugrinova (1968) lists over 1,000 Bulgarians. Gacov (1971) and Lehište (1980) combined, supply over 100 Germanisms. Tomik (1977) supplies a statistical analysis of the language in Blaže Koneski’s literary works, but he does not give information on word formation.

11.2. Problems

During the earliest years of codification, there was a potential threat of excessive Russian influence. This was averted. Since 1948 Literary Macedonian has been plagued by unceasing attempts by both Greek and Bulgarian governments and scholars to deny its independence, legitimacy, and even existence. While this has had negative effects outside the SRM, it has not hindered the process of standardization. During the early years of codification, a problem in the West Central region was the assumption on the part of many speakers and writers, including journalists and educators, that since their dialects formed the basis of
the literary language, their dialects were the literary language. These people thus used non-literary dialect forms that were West Central but not literary. The local press in Prilep was especially bad in this regard. (For examples of such forms, see section 4). Another problem which has remained to this day is the influence of Serbo-Croatian. From the earliest years of Makedonski jazik to recent articles in Lik (e.g., Minova-Grkova 1987), linguists and anyone else concerned with language have been writing about this problem. As the chief language of Yugoslavia, the official language of the military, the dominant language in the mass media, and the language whose southern dialects are directly transitional to the local dialect of Skopje, the capital of the SRM, the influence of Serbo-Croatian on Macedonian remains very strong in all areas from phonology to syntax and the lexicon.

11.3. Successes

Macedonian began its literary development, like Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian, in the nineteenth century, but with the partition of Macedonia in 1912 this natural development was broken for an entire generation. When it resumed in 1944, however, the intellectual, social, and political mechanisms for rapid standardization were in place, aided by previous support. While there were certainly differences of opinion on sources of borrowing, the status of Turkisms, the nature of the orthography, the use of relative pronouns, etc., the basic premise that Macedonian should develop a literary standard with the participation of all its speakers was accepted by everyone in the SRM. Less than half a century later, Macedonian is a fully functional standard language used in all spheres both public and private. Thus, for example a recent series of articles in Nova Makedonija (19/22. VIII. 86:9) denounces the rise of Macedonian bureaucratese in terms which show it to be a completely mature, modern, literary language. There is now an adult generation born and educated in a society where Literary Macedonian has been the established norm throughout their entire lives. These speakers vary in their degree of mastery of the norm, as is the case in any society, and the language is in a natural state of flux, as are all languages. With the exception of the influence of a dominant foreign language, viz. Serbo-Croatian, however, the problems faced by Macedonian are not qualitatively different from those faced by American English. Anyone who has read writing by first-year American college students is aware of the degree of variation among individuals in the mastery of the literary norm. Taken as a whole, Modern Literary Macedonian represents a remarkable achievement in recent language standardization.
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Les langues berbères

1. Géographie et statut du berbère

Il suffit d’observer une carte du domaine berbère pour pressentir les difficultés qu’y présente une "réforme des langues". Il s’être, en lambeaux discontinus et inégaux, de Siwa l’égyptienne à la côte atlantique du Maroc1, de la Méditerranée au fleuve Sénégal et jusque dans la boucle du Niger. L’expansion de l’arabe a

1 Remplacée par l’espagnol, l’ancienne langue des îles Canaries n’est plus parée depuis plusieurs siècles. Il n’en reste que des toponymes, ainsi que des mots et des phrases recueillis à temps par divers visiteurs (Wölfel 1965). Des rapprochements avec le berbère sont vraisemblables. Par ailleurs les îles comportent de nombreuses inscriptions de type libyco-berbère. Mais l’idée de redonner vie à ces disjecta membra, très incomplets et souvent énigmatiques, ne peut être qu’un thème politique. Elle impliquerait du reste une création plutôt qu’une réforme.