

**THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY**

ELECTRONIC COURSE RESERVE

**THE FOLLOWING FILE IS PROTECTED BY
SECTION 17 OF THE
UNITED STATES COPYRIGHT CODE.**

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Linguistics, Nationalism, and Literary Languages: A Balkan Perspective

Victor A. Friedman

Notice: This material may be protected by YF 3910
Copyright Law (Title 17 U.S. Code).

· 1. Introduction c. 1

The processes which led to and continue to affect the formations of the modern literary languages of the Balkan peninsula have their parallels in Western Europe and elsewhere in the world, and yet 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. The relationship of linguistics to the developments in these languages has undergone a number of changes. In this article, I wish to document some of these and comment on their significance.

2. Historical Background

I will begin with a few remarks on the historical background of the linguistic composition of the Balkans. The Albanians speak a language which is often claimed to be descended from Illyrian, which may have been the language spoken on the territory of present-day Albania (and western Yugoslavia) in ancient times. Recent studies of the evidence of toponymy and vocabulary, however, indicate that Albanian may be descended from a Dacian or Thracian dialect which was being spoken in what is now eastern Serbia up to the time the Slavs crossed the Danube and invaded the Balkans (ca. A.D. 550–630). At that time, the linguistic ancestors of the Albanians would have been pushed southwest into present-day Albania (cf., e.g., Fine 1983:10–11).

The Greeks came to the Balkans some time around the second millennium B.C., displacing or absorbing other Indo-European and/or non-Indo-European peoples (cf. Gindin 1967, Neroznak 1978).

From the third or second century B.C. through the first century A.D., the Romans gradually annexed most of what is now the Balkans south of the Danube, and the second century A.D. saw their relatively brief (107–271) occupation of Dacia (roughly, modern Transylvania and western Wallachia). Studies of the language of inscriptions indicate that Roman linguistic influence extended to the so-called Jireček line, running from the coast of central Albania,

across Macedonia south of Skopje to Sofia and across the Balkan mountains in central Bulgaria (cf. Rosetti 1938). South of this line, the dominant language was Greek. Romanian in its various forms (e.g., Daco-Romanian and Aromanian, see below) is descended from the language of Roman colonists and Romanized peoples north of the Jireček line and east of Dalmatia. A hotly contested issue between the Romanians and Hungarians, however, is the question of whether the Romanian of present-day Romania, especially Transylvania, is descended from the language of Romanized Dacians (and hence 'autochthonous'), or whether it is descended from the language of Romans and Romanized peoples living south of the Danube who did not cross over the Danube (or at least into Transylvania) until after the arrival of the Magyars in the late ninth century (cf. Fine 1983:10).

As was mentioned earlier, the Slavs came to the Balkans south of the Danube during the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. They did so in two main groups. One group—the East South Slavs—settled in what is now Bulgaria and Macedonia and penetrated all the way to the tips of the Peloponnesian peninsula. Those Slavs on the territory of modern Greece have been gradually Hellenized, a process which continues into the present day. The second group (leaving to one side the Slovenes) consisted of a single tribe, probably the *Slaveni*, who were divided and ruled by two Iranian military aristocracies, the **Serbs** and the **Croats**, who were Slavicized but whose names have remained as ethnonyms to this day (cf. Fine 1983:53,56–57). These West South Slavs eventually occupied the rest of what is now Yugoslavia (Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro).

The Ottoman Turks spent the second half of the fourteenth century conquering the Balkans, a process which continued into the fifteenth century and reached its peak during the sixteenth.¹ It can be argued that it was the Turkish conquest which created the Balkans as the geopolitical and sociocultural entity we know today. From the Turkish conquest to the nineteenth century, the region was generally known as **Turkey in Europe**. As the Ottoman Empire disintegrated during the nineteenth century, this term became increasingly inapplicable to the area and distasteful for much of the rest of it, and ultimately the term **Balkan**, based on the Turkish name of the mountain chain running through central Bulgaria (Slavic *Stara Planina*, Greek **Haimos**, Latin **Hdemus**) came to replace it.² Nonetheless, it is the common heritage of the so-called 'Turkish Yoke' which gives a background to the various Balkan national consciousness.³

There are many other peoples living in the Balkans, e.g., Armenians, who were first brought there by the Byzantines in the ninth century, Ladino-speaking Jews who fled the Spanish Inquisition for the relative tolerance of the Ottoman Empire in the fifteenth century, Circassians transplanted by the Turks, Hungarians, Saxon Germans, Ruthenians, etc. The literary languages of these groups, however, are based outside of the Balkans, and they have not, for the most part, participated in the intense multilingualism which resulted in the formation of the Balkan *Sprachbund*, i.e., the linguistic league comprising the Albanian, Greek, Balkan Slavic, and Balkan Romance languages, which show

significant structural similarities and lexical borrowings from various sources, as well as a common background of Turkish influence (cf. Sandfeld 1930). These other languages will therefore not be discussed here.⁴ One other ethnic group which is relevant to the present discussion, however, is the Roms (Gypsies), i.e., the Indic speakers who entered the Balkans at the beginning of the second millennium A.D. (Ventcel' and Čerenkov 1976:283). Many Roms have remained in the Balkans to this day, their dialects show significant Balkan features resulting from linguistic contact, and the process of Romani literary linguistic formation—while also taking place elsewhere in Europe—has a very strong center in the Balkans.

3. *Literary Language and Ethnicity*

I will thus be considering six language groups in the Balkans: Greek, Turkic, Romance, Albanian, Slavic, and Indic. Each of these groups is represented by one or more literary languages ranging from well established to nascent. Some of these languages have claims to older written traditions, e.g., that of ancient Greek, Old Church Slavonic, etc., but as the International Commission of Inquiry into the causes of the Balkan Wars wrote (d'Estournelles de Constant et al. 1914:29), “. . . the Turkish conquest came, leveling all the nationalities and preserving them all alike in a condition of torpor, in a manner comparable to the action of a vast refrigerator.” In terms of the study of the formation of literary languages, this leveling resulted in a break of continuous development, so that as the nationalities came out of their ‘torpor’ during the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, they found that their literary languages had likewise been ‘refrigerated.’ It is the process of ‘thawing’ which resulted in the diverse developments I am about to discuss.

Before doing so, however, I should note here that the additional extralinguistic factor of *ethnicity* must be taken into account. According to present-day thinking, language, i.e., mother tongue, is one of the most important determinants of ethnicity. An important factor in the leveling alluded to above, however, was the use of religion as the definer of *millet* ‘nationality’ in the Ottoman Empire. Under this system, all adherents of the Orthodox Christian church headed by the Patriarch of Constantinople (i.e., Greek Orthodox) were ‘Greek,’ while all adherents of the State religion of the Turkish Empire, i.e., Islam, were ‘Turks.’ The Greek Orthodox church gradually took advantage of its privileged position in Constantinople to eliminate the autocephalous Bulgarian and Serbian churches (in 1765 and 1767, respectively). Thus Bulgarians, Serbs, and all other orthodox peoples in European Turkey were treated as ethnic ‘Greeks’ who happened to speak some other language, e.g., Slavophone Greeks, Albanophone Greeks, as opposed to Hellenophone Greeks. Likewise, the Moslem Albanians, Bosnians, Pomaks, Torbeš, etc. were all ‘Turks.’⁵ From this it can be seen that while mother tongue is generally taken as the primary deter-

miner of ethnicity, e.g., in modern multinational states such as Yugoslavia or the USSR, such was not always the case. These facts of the identification of religion and ethnicity bear not only upon the developments of the previous century, but also upon certain current trends and facts.

The definition of the term 'literary language' is complicated by two factors: the meaning of the term 'literary' and that of 'language.' Although both these phenomena are linguistic, their definitions are largely extra-linguistic, i.e., mainly political, e.g., it has been said that a language is a dialect with an army of its own. Thus, for example, the Germanic-speaking peoples of Scandinavia have no less than three mutually comprehensible languages, while people in Italy, China, and the Arab world speak mutually incomprehensible dialects of the same language. In the Balkans, as elsewhere, the situation is further complicated by the fact that linguistic claims and the associated ethnic claims are intimately connected with territorial and other political claims. For the purposes of this chapter, I will accept the definition of literary language as one which is codified and used in all spheres of a given political or ethnic unit's national life (cf. Close 1974:3 1).⁶ I will define the following Balkan languages as literary: Greek, Turkish, Romanian, Albanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Serbo-Croatian. In addition, I will be commenting on Romani, Aromanian, Moldavian, Croatian, and Bosnian, insofar as these languages, dialects, variants, or standards shed valuable light on various processes of development. Since the study of the literary development of any one of these languages—or even one stage of development—has proven sufficient for monographic works, I will attempt here only a survey of the most basic processes and conflicts and enter into greater detail only for selected languages.

4. *The Literary Language in the Balkans*

Beginning with Greek, it can be said that the standardization of modern Greek has suffered considerably at the hands of linguists due to the diglossia which their disagreements encouraged. Greek diglossia goes back to the first centuries before and after the beginning of the Christian era when, in the face of Roman conquest and general decline, teachers and writers began to attempt to imitate the classical Attic of antiquity, thinking of it as the language of a Golden Age. At the same time, they actively discouraged the speaking and writing of the Hellenistic koine, which was the common language of the Greek-speaking world (cf. Browning 1983:44–45). This artificial Atticizing Greek was the ancestor of Byzantine Greek, the official language of the Byzantine Empire, and it began a tendency which culminated in the current diglossia. By the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, as Greek independence became a real possibility, several opposing linguistic camps emerged: one wished to continue the tradition of Byzantine Greek, another wished to return to classical Greek, a third wished to 'purify' the spoken language of its postclassical elements, and a

fourth wished to use the actual spoken language as the basis of the literary language. In the years immediately after independence (1821), the Peloponnesian dialects came to form the basis of a demotic koine (*dhimotikí*). When Athens became the official capital in 1833, the Athenian dialect was overwhelmed by the flood of newcomers, so that at the present time, the demotic standard is based on the speech of the capital, which in its turn has its origins in the Peloponnesian. During the years which followed the establishment of independence, however, a period of political reactionism set in as the old Phanariot nobility from Constantinople moved in and took over. With this political reaction came linguistic reaction: the rise of puristic Greek (*katharévousa*). *Katharévousa* is not the descendant of Byzantine Greek, but is rather Atticized demotic. As such, it is a mishmash of archaic, pseudo-archaic, and contemporary forms. The end of the nineteenth century saw the rise of a new bourgeoisie and the decline of the old Phanariot power, and with this came the rise of literary demotic led by the writer and philologist Jean Psichari. During the twentieth century, the opposition between *katharévousa* and demotic has come to embody the political opposition between the right and the left. Under liberal governments, demotic was used in elementary school instruction and there was hesitation and variation in the use of *katharévousa* elsewhere. Under right-wing governments, such as the military junta which ruled Greece from 1967 to 1974, demotic was banned from all spheres of public life. Since the overthrow of the junta in 1974, demotic has more or less replaced *katharévousa* in both public and private life, although *katharévousa* must still be studied in higher classes because of the literature which has been written in it. The differentiation of *katharévousa* and demotic occurred at all linguistic levels. Thus, for example, in phonology, *katharévousa* has clusters /kt, pt/ where demotic has /xt, ft/; in morphology *katharévousa* uses declined participles where demotic uses gerunds in *-ontas*; in lexicon, *katharévousa* *ixthýs* vs. demotic *psári* 'fish'; ***ophthalmids* vs. *máti*** 'eye,' etc. (cf. Browning 1983: 100–118). The orthography of demotic, however, has remained relatively conservative and is generally perceived as a valuable link with the past. There are those who would reform the spelling to conform with pronunciation, but they can be compared to those who would radically reform English spelling.

The development of literary Turkish provides an interesting contrast with that of Modern Greek. In the course of its use as the official language of the Ottoman Empire and the political center of the Islamic world, Osmanli, i.e., Ottoman Turkish, incorporated so much Arabic and Persian vocabulary, syntax, and even morphology and phonology, that by the nineteenth century this language was incomprehensible to the ordinary speaker of what was called *kubu türkçe* 'vulgar Turkish.' Lewis (1967:xx) provides an excellent example of how Osmanli sounded in comparison to *kaba türkçe*: ". it was as if we said, . . . 'What is the conditio of your progenitor reverendus?' instead of 'How's your father'" In Turkey, as elsewhere, the nineteenth century brought in a period of reform, the Tanzimat of 1839, which stemmed the tide of Arabic and Persian borrowing.

Thus, for example, there were attempts to teach a simplified or purified Osmanli (*en sude osmanlica*), writers experimented with Western influences, especially French, and in 1918 Enver Paşa proposed an orthographic reform whereby the Arabic letters would be written separately and with vowel signs. Atatürk's comment on this last idea, however, sums up the early attempts at reform: *İyi bir niyet, fakat yarmı iş; hem de zamunszz* 'A good intention, but it only goes halfway, and it is not timely,' i.e., too little, too soon (cf. Korkmaz 1973:43–50). In 1923, Turkey became a republic headed by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. In 1928, Atatürk caused the entire country to switch to the Latin alphabet—an orthography which he devised in consultation with linguists—virtually overnight. The change of alphabet greatly facilitated the process of eliminating or naturalizing Arabic and Persian vocabulary, not only by cutting off the link with those languages but also by rendering phonological irregularities predictable from the Arabic orthography opaque (cf. Perry 1982:16). In 1932, Atatürk founded the Turkish Language Society (originally the Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti, later the Türk Dil Kurumu) and held the first Turkish Language Conference. Atatürk's intention was to create a literary Turkish based on the common spoken language and purged of that part of its Arabic and Persian component—lexical, syntactic, morphological, and phonological—which had not entered common usage. The Turkish Language Society was charged with creating new vocabulary based on dialect words, borrowing from other Turkic languages, and—most important—new derivations based on roots already present in the language. The extremist purism of the Turkish Language Society during the thirties, however, gave rise to one of the most bizarre linguistic theories ever to emerge from a standardization movement, viz., the so-called Sun Language Theory (*Güneş Dil Teorisi*). According to this theory, all human language originated from man's utterance of the primal syllable **A(g)**, and all words of all languages can be derived by a series of formulae from this primal syllable. An additional feature of this theory was that it claimed that Turkish was the mother of all languages (cf. Tankut 1936). While this theory rendered most Turkish theoretical linguistic work of the period invalid, it did have the positive effect of tempering radical purism, for if Turkish was the mother language, then the Arabic and Persian words in it were, ultimately, of Turkish origin and could thus be claimed as native Turkish. In a period when radical purism threatened to create a new kind of diglossia, this admittedly ludicrous theory did serve a useful function. It is even suspected that Atatürk himself launched this theory for the purpose of controlling the radical purists (Heyd 1954:34). It is in the role of purism that Greek and Turkish provide an instructive contrast. The purism of Greek is archaizing and politically conservative, that of Turkish is innovating and politically liberal or radical. During the most recent period of military rule in Turkey, when public discussion of politics was forbidden, right-wing and left-wing papers began to editorialize on linguistic usage. The former, led by *Terciman*, attacked the Turkish Language Society as too radical, the latter, led by *Cumhuri-*

yet, defended it. Both sides did so in the name of Atatürk—the former claiming that the Turkish Language Society had gone too far, the latter claiming that it was carrying on his mission.

The case of Romanian is considerably different from both Greek and Turkish. Although there is no question regarding Romanian's ancestry, there is considerable debate over its provenance, as was mentioned earlier. Be that as it may, by the fourteenth century, Church Slavonic was the official language of the Romanian kingdom(s) whose dominant religion was Orthodox Christianity; the earliest document is from 1352 (Rosetti 1966:187). The earliest document in Romanian is a letter from 1521. With the Turkish conquest, Greek gradually became the dominant language in Wallachia and Moldavia because of the *millet* system and the power of the Phanariot nobility. The situation in Transylvania was considerably more complicated. After the reformation, Transylvania had four official religions: Catholicism, Calvinism, Lutheranism, and Unitarianism. The ruling classes had two languages: Hungarian and German. The majority of the population consisted of disenfranchised Romanian-speaking Eastern Orthodox serfs. As education was tied to class and religion, there were no Romanian schools. During the eighteenth century, the Hapsburgs introduced the Uniate church into Transylvania, which they had acquired from Turkey at the end of the preceding century, in an attempt to Catholicize the Romanian-speaking majority and thus promote centralization and the integration of Transylvania into their empire. The result was that Romanians were exposed to education, learned that their language was descended from Latin—the language of the 'noble Romans' who had ruled a vast empire—and thus acquired a new sense of dignity before their Magyar and German masters. The resultant movement, called 'Latinism,' served as the basis of Romanian nationalism and the development of the Romanian literary language (cf. Verdery 1983:84–121). The movement spread from Transylvania to Wallachia and Moldavia, where it took hold.

The subsequent rise of literary activity was particularly concerned with lexicographic considerations and the relationship of Romanian to Latin and the living Romance languages that already had literary traditions, especially French and to a lesser extent Italian, in the coining of neologisms and devising an orthography. The former was more important for the lexicon, the latter for orthography. The dialectal base of the literary language which emerged was that of Wallachia, particularly Bucharest.⁷ In 1859 Moldavia and Wallachia were, for all practical purposes, united into an independent country, and the Cyrillic alphabet which had been used for Romanian since the sixteenth century was officially replaced by a Latin orthography. Transylvania became part of Romania between 1918 and 1920.

Unlike Greek and Turkish, where divisions have been language-internal, the divisions affecting Romanian have been external, viz., Moldavian on the one hand and Aromanian on the other. As a result of the annexation of Bessarabia by the Russian Empire in 1812, the principality of Moldavia was divided in half.

The half that remained dependent on Turkey—Moldavia proper—formed part of the independent Romanian state in 1859. Bessarabia became part of Romania in 1919 and was re-annexed by Russia in 1940. During the interwar period, Russian claims to Bessarabia were historico-political: the ‘people’ of Bessarabia wanted to live in a communist state. After World War II, however, the Russians could no longer use this argument, since Romania was also a socialist country, and so the concept of a separate Moldavian nationality with its own Moldavian literary language was pursued in earnest (cf. King 1973:100–105). Although it would appear that Moldavian is a Russified dialect of Romanian which differs from literary Romanian primarily in its use of Cyrillic orthography, the differences are difficult to determine from secondary sources, because the Romanians cannot include Soviet Moldavian in their dialect studies (although, interestingly enough, they do include the Istro-Romanian, Aromanian, and Meglenoromanian dialects of Yugoslavia, Albania, and Greece), while Soviet linguists devote most of their efforts to demonstrating Moldavian’s links with East Slavic. Neither Balkanists nor Romance linguists treat Moldavian as a language coming into their purview.

Aromanian—the Romance language of scattered groups living in Albania, Greece, and Macedonia—had separated from Daco-Romanian (the language of Romania proper) by the tenth century. While it could not be integrated with literary Daco-Romanian for a variety of reasons (see Close 1974:67), the fact that it does *not* constitute a separate Balkan literary language is worthy of comment in the context of the pluralistic policies of Yugoslavia, particularly Macedonia. It would appear that religion is still an important defining ethnic factor insofar as all the non-Slavic Moslem minorities of Macedonia have or are obtaining a certain degree of legal linguistic autonomy, whereas the Aromanians, who constitute the most significant non-Slavic (Orthodox) Christian minority (5% of the population) do not have such rights.

Like Romanian, Albanian did not have an ancient continuous literary tradition. The earliest document is a baptismal formula embedded in a Latin text from 1462. While Albania was under Ottoman rule, an Albanian literature did develop among the Albanians who had fled to Italy, the Arbëresh, but they did not have much effect upon events in Albania. The Albanians were divided among three religions: Catholic in the north (10%), Orthodox in the south (20%), and Moslem all over (70%) (Byron 1979a:17). The Ottoman *millet* system worked especially to the disadvantage of the Albanians. The Orthodox were subject to hellenization, the Moslems were considered ‘Turks’ and were therefore denied linguistic rights even after various Christian peoples had begun to gain theirs, while the Catholics were few in number and largely isolated in the mountains of the north (although there was a significant community in the city of Shkodër [Scutari]) (see Skendi 1980:187–204). The *millet* system also put the Albanians in danger of being completely partitioned by their Greek and Slavic Christian neighbors as the Ottoman Empire was disintegrating, and so in 1878, in the wake of the Congress of Berlin, a group of Albanians formed the League of Prizren to promote Alba-

nian nationalism and to defend Albanian territorial integrity. An important part of the League's program was the promotion of the Albanian language, since this was the one national characteristic which cut across religious boundaries. A key issue at the time was the choice of an alphabet. Each of the possibilities had religious implications: Arabic implied Moslem, Greek implied Orthodox, and Latin implied Catholic.⁸ In the case of the Latin alphabet, the choice of symbols and digraphs was of interest to the European powers, because they were sponsoring schools and seeking to extend their influence in the area. Thus, for example, Austria-Hungary and Italy, which were publishing textbooks and supporting schools especially in the Catholic north, purposefully supported different orthographies (Skendi 1980:218–220). In 1908, the Young Turks came to power, and the Albanians were briefly permitted linguistic freedom. That same year an Albanian Alphabet Congress was held in Bitola (Monastir), and it was a key step leading ultimately to the current Latin orthography. Realizing the implications of an Albanian literary language, viz., an independent Albanian state, the Young Turks quickly suppressed the Latin alphabet, but their efforts were in vain. Independence was declared in 1912, and from then until World War II the main focus of linguistic efforts was the dialect question. Albanian has two very different dialect groups: Geg (north) and Tosk (south), e.g., Geg has phonemic length and nasality, Tosk does not; Geg preserves intervocalic /n/ and drops /a/, Tosk rhotacizes the /n/ and keeps the /ə/ (e.g., the name of Albania: Geg = *Shqipnia*, Tosk - *Shqipëria*); Geg has an infinitive and shortened participle lacking in Tosk; there are also many lexical differences. In the early years people wrote more or less in their own dialects and attempts at dialect integration were threatened by a high degree of artificiality, e.g., Faik Konitza's suggestion that the Geg indefinite article *nji* and the Tosk indefinite article *një* both be used in literary Albanian, but that the former be used for feminine nouns and the latter for masculine (Byron 1976:50)—whereas in fact no Albanian dialect ever makes a gender distinction in the indefinite article. Under King Zog (1925–1939), efforts were made to base a literary standard on the southern Geg dialect of Elbasan, but serious standardization did not progress until after World War II.

At this point it should be noted that for a variety of historical and political reasons the region of Kosovo, which is predominantly Albanian, was awarded to the kingdom of Serbia in 1913 and subsequently became part of Yugoslavia. In Albania, the number of Gegs is only slightly greater than the number of Tosks, but Gegs are the only Albanian group in Kosovo and they are the overwhelming majority in Macedonia, in which the Albanians constitute 13% of the population. After World War II, the Tosk dialect of Korçë gradually emerged as the basis of the standard of Albania, while Albanians in Yugoslavia continued to pursue standard Geg. The Yugoslav government tried to encourage the idea of two separate nationalities and languages, *Albatzski* for Albania vs. *Šiptarski* (from Albanian *Shqiptar* 'Albanian') for Yugoslavia, but this failed. In 1968 the Albanians of Kosovo officially accepted the Tosk-based literary standard of Albania,

thus producing *gjuha unifikuar* 'the unified language' (see Byron 1979b). Kosovo intellectuals keep length and nasality, and efforts have been made to integrate certain Geg features, e.g., the reflexive possessive pronoun *i vetë* (Tosk dialects lack such a pronoun altogether), but the standard is still Tosk in the vast majority of its features.

Unlike the other language groups considered thus far, the South Slavs have been considerably more fragmented. The territory of modern-day Yugoslavia was divided between Austria-Hungary and Turkey at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Autonomy, independence, and unification were achieved in bits and pieces during the course of the next hundred years, so that by the end of World War I the boundaries of Yugoslavia were more or less what they are today. Of concern to us here are the West South Slavs other than the Slovenians (cf. note 4), i.e., the Serbs and Croats (and to a lesser extent the Bosnian Moslems).

During the nineteenth century, the literary languages of the West South Slavs were characterized by a tendency toward increasing unity while those of the East South Slavs were characterized by a tendency toward division. The differences among the West South Slavs are considerable. Serbs are Orthodox and use Cyrillic; Croats are Catholic and use the Latin alphabet. Croatian dialects are much more divergent from one another than Serbian.⁹ Croatian tends to borrow from Latin and German and tends to create neologisms whereas Serbian is more likely to borrow from Greek and Turkish and accept loanwords from other Slavic languages, e.g., Croatian *kolodvor* Serbian *stanica* 'station.' A major dialectal division cutting across these lines is the reflex of Common Slavic *ĕ (æ, orthographic ě, Cyrillic ѣ, named *jat*); there are three main possibilities: /i/, /e/, and /je/~/ije/ (the last choice being dependent on length). The reflex /e/ occurs in Serbia and adjacent parts of Croatia, /i/ occurs along the coast and /je/~/ije/ elsewhere. In 1850, Serbian and Croatian linguists and intellectuals signed the *književni dogovor* in Vienna, agreeing to adopt a Hercegovina-based /ije/što (ijekavian-štokavian) standard developed by the Serb Vuk Karadžić as a common literary language. This was a compromise for both sides brought about by the political necessity of the need for a common language. Croatian was too fragmented dialectally, e.g., the cultural center, Zagreb, was in the middle of the Kajkavian area, the medieval-renaissance Croatian literary tradition was in Čakavian, and Štokavian speakers constituted the numerical majority. Vuk's language met stiff resistance in Serbia, where it was not officially adopted until 1868. The Serbs had been using a form of Church Slavonic called *Slavenoserbian*, which had an established literary tradition and orthography, albeit no connection with the spoken language. Vuk not only rejected the grammar and vocabulary of this language, advocating instead use of the vernacular, but he also reformed its Cyrillic orthography, eliminating obsolete letters ⟨ѣ, њ, ѣ, ѧ, ѣ, ѧ⟩ and, following the principle of one letter per sound he introduced the grapheme ⟨j⟩ from the Latin alphabet and thus rewrote ⟨я⟩ as ⟨ja⟩, ⟨ю⟩ as ⟨jy⟩, and ⟨й⟩ as ⟨j⟩. This last

move outraged many Serbs because of its Roman Catholic implications. The majority of Serbs never accepted the ijekavian pronunciation, however, and, ironically enough, Vuk's ijekavian standard came to be identified as Croatian while Serbian has remained ekavian. In 1954 a new agreement was signed in Novi Sad in which the various Serbo-Croatian-speaking peoples of Yugoslavia reaffirmed their commitment to a unified literary language. In March 1967, however, a group of Croatian intellectuals issued a manifesto proclaiming Croatian as a separate language, and the problems continue to this day. In recent years, the Serbo-Croatian-speaking Moslems who constitute the majority in Bosnia-Herzegovina and are recognized as a separate ethnic group, viz., *muslimani*, have also been agitating for a separate codified standard distinct from both Serbian and Croatian. Further conflict is created by the competition between the prestige dialects of the Serbian and Croatian capitals (Belgrade and Zagreb) which both differ from Vuk's standard, among other things, in their loss of phonemic tone (see Magner 1981). Thus, the centripetal forces of the nineteenth century have been replaced by centrifugal ones in the twentieth (see Naylor 1980).

The situation of the East South Slavs, i.e., the Bulgarians and Macedonians, has been quite different. As a group, they were severely threatened by hellenization during the first half of the nineteenth century due to the *millet* system, but with the establishment of an independent Bulgarian church (the Exarchate), different tensions began to manifest themselves. Two centers of Slavic literacy had arisen on East South Slavic territory during this period: one in southwestern Macedonia and one in northeastern Bulgaria. The people of the southwest had a distinct regional identification as Macedonians, and with the uncompromising attitude of the users of the northeast Bulgarian standard—especially after the establishment of the Exarchate—came the development of a separate ethnic and linguistic consciousness among many Macedonians. In dialectal terms, there is a relatively thick bundle of isoglosses coinciding roughly with the Serbian-Bulgarian political border which fans out when it reaches Macedonia, so that the dialects of Macedonia are transitional between Serbian and Bulgarian. Serbia and Bulgaria also had conflicting territorial claims to Macedonia (as did Greece), and in part they tried to support these claims by linguistic arguments (as well as force of arms, e.g., the Second Balkan War of 1912). Thus, for example, the Serbian linguist Aleksandar Belić claimed that the northern and central Macedonian dialects were Serbian on the basis of a single isogloss, viz., the reflex of common Slavic */tj, dj/ as dorso-palatal stops /k, ġ/, like the Serbian palatal stops /č, ž/, vs. the Bulgarian reflexes /št, žd/ (Belić 1919:250, but see Vaillant 1938:119). The official Bulgarian attitude to this day is that Macedonian is a 'regional variant' of Bulgarian, based on other isoglosses (see B.A.N. 1978).

A comparison is sometimes made between Macedonian and Moldavian (e.g., King 1973:100–102). The claim is that just as the Russians have fostered a Moldavian language in order to justify the annexation of Bessarabia from Ro-

mania, so the Yugoslavs have created a Macedonian language to justify their territorial claims against Bulgaria. There are, however, considerable differences between the two situations. Macedonian linguistic separatism is attested in print since 1875, and the first definitive outline of the bases for a Macedonian literary language date from 1903, i.e., while Macedonia was still a part of Turkey (see Friedman 1975). Thus, while the official recognition of a separate Macedonian language and nationality may well be in Yugoslav interests, the fact remains that this language and ethnic identification arose among Macedonians themselves as a result of historical and linguistic circumstances quite independent of Yugoslav interests and before such interests even existed. The same cannot be said of Moldavian, since Bessarabia was already annexed to Russia in 1812.

After the Second Balkan War, Macedonia was divided among Serbia (later, Yugoslavia), Greece, and Bulgaria. In Greece, Macedonians have been subject to gradual but unrelenting hellenization. In Bulgaria, only the Bulgarian language has been permitted, except during the period from 1946 to 1948 (i.e., from the end of World War II up to the Tito–Stalin break), when Macedonian was officially recognized in Bulgaria as a minority language. In Yugoslavia, Macedonian was treated as a Serbian dialect between the two world wars, but literature was published and plays were performed as ‘dialect’ literature. On August 2, 1944—in keeping with Tito’s pluralist nationalist policy—Macedonian was officially recognized as a separate literary language in Yugoslavia. The basis was the West Central dialect region (bounded roughly by the towns of Titov Veles, Kičevo, Bitola, and Prilep), and a generation of *young* linguists set about establishing norms. There was a brief period when some people proposed waiting until a team of Russian experts could be brought in, but their proposal was not accepted (see Friedman 1985:40). The orthography follows the principles of Serbian as opposed to Bulgarian, e.g., in its use of ⟨j⟩ and the single graphemes ⟨љ, њ⟩ for /l, ñ/ as opposed to Bulgarian Cyrillic, which is like Russian. Macedonian presents one of the few examples where linguists participated in a more rational arrangement of dictionary entries. Following the classical tradition, the codifiers of the literary language at first listed verbs by the first singular (present). In literary Macedonian and the West Central dialects on which it is based, a verb can have one of three stem-vowels in the present tense: /a/, /e/, /i/, e.g., **3 sg** *gleda* ‘look,’ *piše* ‘write,’ *nosi* ‘carry.’ Whereas the third singular constitutes the bare present stem, however, the first singular ending, /-am/, completely neutralizes the opposition, e.g., **1 sg** *gledam*, *pišam*, *nosam*. An American linguist, Horace Lunt, convinced the codifiers of the literary language to use the third singular rather than the first as the standard citation form (see Lunt 1951). This not only gave the dictionary entry more predictive power but also helped spread the standard use of stem vowels, as this is an area of considerable dialectal variation (see Friedman 1985:38–40). At present, a major problem for literary Macedonian is the fact that Skopje—the capital and principal cultural and population center—is outside the West Central dialect area and is subject to

considerable Serbo-Croatian influence. Nonetheless, an entire generation of speakers educated in the literary language has grown up, and they can and do use it consistently.

Literary Bulgarian, like Serbo-Croatian and Greek, had to face threats from archaizers who wanted Church Slavonic to become the official language of the emerging Bulgarian state. Having overcome these (although the Bulgarian orthography was not completely modernized until 1944) as well as the hellenizers, the creators of literary Bulgarian were faced with the task of integrating a number of divergent dialects. Among the many issues which had to be resolved were the pronunciation of *jat* (Cyrillic (ѣ)) and the form of the masculine definite article. A major isogloss, the so-called *jat*-line, separates the eastern two-thirds of Bulgaria from the western third. West of the line *jat* is consistently pronounced /e/, east of the line the rules are more complicated. During the early years of the formation of literary Bulgarian, the political and cultural center was Tŭrnovo in the northeast, but later it shifted to Sofia in the west. The ultimate result was an attempt to blend the two sets of systems. Thus, e.g., the literary language has a basically eastern vocalism, including the pronunciation of the masculine definite article, but the consonantism is that of the west. Similarly, in the case of the masculine definite article, the Bulgarian dialects have two forms: **f** - **a f** and /-ət/. The language planners (arbitrarily) assigned the value 'oblique' to the form /-ə/ and 'nominative' to the form /-ət/, e.g., *ezikŭt* 'the language' **na** *ezikŭ* 'of/in/to the language.' A similar type of solution was reached for the presence vs. the absence of the auxiliary in the third person of the past indefinite (see Friedman 1982). At the present time, the fact that Sofia is the major population and cultural center of Bulgaria is having a significant impact on the literary language, e.g., the consistent use of /e/ for etymological **jat** is becoming increasingly acceptable. On the whole, however, having experienced increasing centrifugal tendencies in the nineteenth century and definitive split in the twentieth, the two East South Slavic literary languages are currently characterized by tendencies to unify around their respective standards as opposed to the increasing fragmentation in West South Slavic.

This brings us to Romani. Although literary activity in Romani dates only from the early years of this century, a number of attempts have been made to use it in at least some of the functions of a literary language, e.g., in literature, education, etc., in the USSR, Scandinavia, France, England, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere. The past decade or so has seen a significant upsurge in Romani nationalism, e.g., the formation of the World Romani Congress, and concomitant with these activities there have been renewed attempts to create a Romani literary language. Activities outside the Balkans are beyond the scope of this paper, and activities outside of southern Yugoslavia, which has the largest settled Romani population in the world, are not taking place on such a large and public scale. I will comment here on a specific event which may prove to be of considerable significance, viz., the publication of a bilingual Romani grammar

(Romani and Macedonian) in Skopje in 1980 (Jusuf and Kepeski 1980). This grammar is a significant signal of the efforts to create a Romani literary language for use in the schools, and can be compared with certain Macedonian works by Ćorġi Pulevski from the end of the nineteenth century (see Friedman 1975). Both reflect the rising national consciousness of their respective peoples, both are polyglot as a reflection of the linguistic situations of their respective users, and both reflect that lack of consistency and standardization characteristic of the pre-codified stage of a nascent literary language. In the case of Macedonian, Pulevski's work, like other manifestations of Macedonian nationalism at that time, was lost or suppressed, although the results achieved after 1944 were consistent with the beginnings signaled by it. In the case of Romani, Jusuf and Kepeski's grammar may be able to serve as the starting point for a Romani literary standard, at least in Macedonia and adjacent parts of Serbia and Kosovo.

The chief problems facing all attempts at a Romani literary standard are the integration of or selection among divergent dialects and the expansion of vocabulary. Jusuf and Kepeski's grammar draws on the three main dialects of Skopje: Arlija, Džambaz, and Burgudži. The Arlija dialect is Jusuf's native one and is also the oldest one in Skopje. It is thus the basic dialect used in the grammar, but the authors' main approach to dialect selection is to avoid selection, i.e., they randomly use different dialect forms throughout the text, including some of the paradigms. For the expansion of vocabulary, Jusuf and Kepeski have followed the practice endorsed by the World Romani Congress of borrowing words from Hindi. Unfortunately, they have not adapted these borrowings to Romani phonology, e.g., they spell words with voiced aspirates, which are utterly foreign to the Romani sound system, e.g., *bhavi* 'consciousness.' The situation is reminiscent of the problems faced by Romanian in the last century, when it turned to other Romance languages with which it had had no contact for centuries. In the field of orthography, Jusuf and Kepeski have chosen the Latin alphabet, although they supply a conversion table for a Macedonian-based Cyrillic and use it when citing Romani forms in their Macedonian text. The bialphabetical linguistic practice which is already well established in Yugoslavia made this obviously internationally aimed option easier.¹⁰

We should also mention here a more recent work by Marcel Cortiade (1984) in which he proposes to overcome certain dialect differences by means of the use of morphophonemic symbols in the spelling system, e.g., orthographic ⟨Romeça⟩ for phonetic [romesa]/[romeja]/[romeħa]/[romea] 'Rom' (instrumental case), where the various realizations of what was originally intervocalic [s] are readily predictable. In other environments, however, there is considerable variation in the treatment of [s], and so, ultimately, a choice will have to be made. Cortiade has argued that one of the more conservative Balkan dialects should serve as the basis of literary Romani, since various innovations are predictable in terms of the original base, but not vice versa. When we look at the factors that have led to the selection of dialect bases for the various Balkan literary languages, we see a

combination of political, cultural, and numerical considerations. Thus, for example, in the case of literary Macedonian, the choice of the West Central dialect base was motivated by three major factors: it was the most distinct from both Bulgarian and Serbian, it was the single largest relatively homogeneous regional dialect, and it was most readily comprehensible by the largest number of speakers from other regions. In the case of Serbo-Croatian, Vuk Karadžić chose his native dialect. The victory of literary Tosk over literary Geg as the basis of the Albanian standard is due at least in part to the fact that the majority of the leaders of postwar Albania are Tosks, which in its turn resulted from various historical and cultural factors (see Byron 1979a). In Bulgaria and Greece, the dialect in the first area to become independent of Turkish domination ended up as the basis of literary language, although other factors (shift of the capital in Bulgaria, diglossia in Greece) have significantly complicated the picture. Similarly, in Turkey and Romania, it is the dialects of the capitals which have had the prestige to serve as the basis of the literary languages, although in the case of Romania, the original impetus came from outside the literary region. In this context, it can be said that the considerable Romani literary activity outside of the Balkans will also have to be taken into account, but the precise outcome of interaction and integration remains to be seen.

5. *Linguistics and Nationalism*

As can be seen from the foregoing, the use of linguistics in the formation of literary languages and the affirmation of nationalism has had a wide variety of effects. Historical linguistics has been used by archaizers and purifiers especially in the cases of Greek and Turkish. On the other hand, dialectology has been the key to efforts of separatism and unity among the Slavic, Romance, and Albanian languages. To these latter can now be added Romani. In the fixing of orthographies, phonology has played a role in all but Greek, which has retained its historical spelling. All of the other languages claim 'phonetic' spelling, although in fact **phonemic** would generally be a better term. Of these languages, Romanian has the least consistent orthographic system, i.e., most influenced by historical spelling, e.g., two signs for [i], viz., ⟨â⟩ and ⟨î⟩. Of the Slavic languages, Bulgarian is distinguished from Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian by a greater tendency toward morphophonemic spelling, e.g., prefixes ending in underlying voiced consonants are subject to regressive assimilation of voicing when added to stems beginning with voiceless consonants. This change is indicated in Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian spelling but not in Bulgarian, e.g., **raspraviti (SC)**, **raspravi (M)**, **razpravja (B)** 'tell, relate;' **Razoružiti (SC)**, **razoruži (M)**, **razoruža (B)** 'disarm.' As a result of the 1944 spelling reform, Bulgarian also has a few morphologically conditioned pronunciation rules of a type not found in Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian.¹¹ Another example of a phonological phenomenon affected by standardization is the automatic devoicing of underlying voiced consonants in final position. This phenomenon is absent in Greek, Roma-

nian, and Serbo-Croatian; it is uniformly present in Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Turkish; and it also occurs in some dialects of Romani and Albanian.¹² The approach in the Slavic languages has been to portray the underlying phoneme orthographically, e.g., *nurod-nurodi* [narot-narodi] 'people-peoples.' In Turkish, after considerable vacillation, the current orthographic practice favors phonetic representation, e.g., *kitap-kitabım* 'book-my book.' In the case of Albanian, the central dialects are characterized by final devoicing, while this feature is absent further north and further south. In this instance, after some vacillation, language planners have opted definitively for spelling final voiced consonants, e.g., *zog-zogu* 'bird-the-bird,' despite the fact that this does not represent the pronunciation of the Tosk region whose dialects form the basis of the standard language. The spelling of final voiced consonants is helping to spread the literary pronunciation to areas where it is not native. In the Romani of Jusuf and Kepeski, as elsewhere, alternatives are used but not selected, e.g., the spellings ⟨dad⟩ and ⟨dat⟩ 'father.' The situation and potential are the same as in Albanian but the result remains to be seen. It is worthy of note that Cortiade (1984) has suggested a morphophonemic orthography for Romani which could significantly minimize problems created by the representation of dialectal differentiation.

In the realm of morphology, we have seen how the alternatives offered by different dialect forms can be used to enrich the literary language, as in the standard Albanian use of the Geg reflexive pronoun *i vetë*; or they can be used to create artificial distinctions as in the case of the two Bulgarian definite articles. In the case of syntax and lexicon, the dialects can be used to enrich the literary language and earlier stages of the language can likewise be drawn upon, but a key issue which is less significant for phonology and morphology is the extent and source of foreign borrowing (lexical) and imitation of foreign models (syntactic). This latter has been an especially important issue for Macedonian, where the tremendous influence of Serbo-Croatian during the years immediately after World War II threatened to alter its syntactic patterns significantly. Concerted efforts on the parts of both codifiers and users of the literary language have succeeded in reversing this trend, however.

This brings us to a consideration of the sources of authority in language codification in modern times. Each of the socialist countries, viz., Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, and Yugoslavia, has an Academy of Sciences and an Institute of Language, either as a branch of the Academy or as a separate institution closely associated with it.¹³ These institutes are responsible not only for linguistic research but also for developing and defining literary norms and publishing grammars, dictionaries, and other authoritative works. Each institute has its journal in which both theoretical and practical linguistic questions are addressed. The institutes are not the only sources of normativization, however. There are also teachers' unions and other language organizations which publish linguistic or language journals on a more popular level and which are more devoted to practical considerations of usage and codification. Similar linguistic topics are

also discussed in the daily press, and there are many popular books on 'language culture,' i.e., normative usage. As a result, the codification of the literary languages has developed in part through dialogue between codifiers and users. In Greece and Turkey, language codification has been more closely tied to political parties, as has been seen, and linguistic tendencies are associated with political tendencies. Although the Turkish Language Society functions in a manner similar to an institute of language, neither Greece nor Turkey has quite the same type of institution, because of differences in sociopolitical structure, and the Ministry of Education frequently plays a more active role in decision making.

In future language planning and language standardization in the Balkans, linguistics can be used to advance compromise solutions to specific problems—choices or interpretations—or it can be used to justify divisive tendencies which are always present in potential. In Greek and Turkish, special problems are created by the strength of archaizing or puristic tendencies, while the Slavic and Albanian literary languages' main source of difficulty is that their cultural and political capitals are not identical with the sources of the literary language. Linguistics has the greatest potential in aiding rational solutions to problems such as dialectal compromise and enrichment of vocabulary in the case of **Romani**, where these processes are still in their early stages.

NOTES

1. The Ottomans first entered Europe in 1345. They first settled there, in Gallipoli, in 1354. The battles of Maritsa (1371) and Kosovo (1389) were decisive in their conquest of Slavic territory. Constantinople fell in 1453, and the Albanian hero Skanderbeg died in 1467, signaling the final conquest of Albania. The first siege of Vienna was 1529; the second, in 1683, marked the beginning of Ottoman territorial losses in Europe.
2. In recent years, the term **Southeastern Europe** has become increasingly common. This is due in part to pejorative connotations which have become attached to the term **Balkan** and in part due to arguments over whether **Balkan** can include Hungary, on the one hand, or exclude Romania, Greece, and/or European Turkey, on the other. In this chapter, I take the most widely accepted definition of the term, viz., the peninsula comprising the modern nations of Yugoslavia, Romania, Albania, Greece, Bulgaria, as well as European Turkey (Turkish Thrace).
3. It is an interesting but little-known fact that while popular belief in the Balkans attributes many social ills to the Turkish occupation, popular belief in Turkey attributes these same ills in Turkey to Turkey's having spent so much time ruling the Balkans.
4. I will be including Turkish because of its influence on all the members of the Balkan *Sprachbund*, but I will exclude Slovenian because, despite the fact that its literary form is based in a Balkan country (Yugoslavia), it is not a Balkan language, i.e., it is not a member of the linguistic league.
5. The Catholics of Northern Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, etc. were not subject to the same denationalizing pressures through the *millet* system. but various

sovereign Catholic states, e.g., Austria-Hungary and Italy, exerted similar denationalizing pressures when they had the opportunity.

6. I should note here that I will be using **literary** as a cover term for 'literary,' 'standard,' and 'national.' These admittedly important distinctions do not affect the considerations of this article and will therefore not be discussed, for the sake of greater conciseness.
7. There were early attempts to create a literary **Romanian** which combined **Daco-Romanian** and Aromanian dialects, but these were abandoned as impractical (Close 1974:67). Within Daco-Romanian, dialectal differentiation is not as great as, for example, in other Romance languages (Du Nay 1977:111).
8. Cyrillic was also used to write Albanian, especially in Macedonia, but it was never a serious contender as a possible national alphabet.
9. The names of the principal Croatian dialects are based on their words for 'what,' viz., *ča*, *kaj*, and *što*. The Serbian dialects are virtually all *što* dialects.
10. The Soviet Union provides an instructive contrast. There, **Romani**, like all other national or literary languages except Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Georgian, Armenian, and Yiddish, must use a Russian-based Cyrillic alphabet.
11. For example, the graphemes (a) and (a) will be pronounced [a], [jə], even under stress, in certain word-final endings.
12. The details for Turkish are actually more complicated, but they need not concern us here.
13. In Yugoslavia, each republic and the autonomous region of Kosovo has its own academy.

REFERENCES

- B.A.N. 1978. "Edinstvoto na bŭlgarskija ezik v minaloto i dnes" ["The Unity of the Bulgarian Language in the Past and Today"]. *Bŭlgarski ezik [Bulgarian Language]* 28:1, pp. 3-43.
- Belić, Aleksandar 1919. *La Macédoine*. Paris: Bloud and Gay.
- Browning, Robert 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byron, Janet L. 1976. "Faik Konitza dhe gjuha letrare shqipe" ["Faik Konitza and the Albanian Literary Language"]. In: Edward Licho (ed.), *Faik Konitza 1876-1976*. New York: Vatra, pp. 49-51.
- Byron, Janet L. 1979a. *Selection Among Alternates in Language Standardization: The Case of Albanian*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Byron, Janet L. 1979b. "Language planning in Albania and in Albanian-speaking Yugoslavia." *Word* 30:1-2, pp. 15-44.
- Close, Elizabeth 1974. *The Development of Modern Rumanian*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cortiade, Marcel 1984. *Romuni fonetika thaj lekhipa [Romani Phonetics and Spelling]*. Place of publication given as Filân Than 'some place or other': no publisher.
- Du Nay, André 1977. *The Early History of the Rumanian Language*. Lake Bluff, IL: Jupiter Press.
- d'Estoumelles de Constant, Baron, et al. 1914. *Report of the International Commission to Inquire into the Causes and Conduct of the Balkan Wars*. Division of Intercourse and Education, Publication No. 4. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Fine, John V. A. 1983. *The Early Medieval Balkans*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1975. "Macedonian language and nationalism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries." *Balkanistica* 2, pp. 83-98.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1982. "Reportedness in Bulgarian: Category or stylistic variant?" *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 25-26, pp. 149-63.

- Friedman, Victor A. 1985. "The sociolinguistics of literary Macedonian." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 52, pp. 31–57.
- Gindin, L. A. 1967. *Jazyk drevnejšego naselenija juga balkanskogo poluostrva [The Language of the Earliest Population of the South of the Southern Balkan Peninsula]*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Heyd, Uriel 1954. *Language Reform in Modern Turkey*. Jerusalem: Israel Oriental Society.
- Jusuf, Šaip, and Krume Kepeski. 1980. *Romuni grumarika-Romska gramatika [Romuni Grammar]*. Skopje, Yugoslavia: Naša Kniga.
- King, Robert R. 1973. *Minorities Under Communism: Nationalities as a Source of Tension Among Balkan Communist States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep 1973. *Cumhuriyet döneminde türk dili [The Turkish Language in the Republican Period]*. Ankara: Ankara University Press.
- Lewis, G. L. 1967. *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lunt, Horace 1951. "Morfologijata na makedonskiot glagol" ["Morphology of the Macedonian Verb"]. *Makedonski jazik [Macedonian Language]* 2:6, pp. 123-31.
- Magner, Thomas F. 1981. "The Emperor's new clothes or a modest peek at the Serbo-Croatian accentual system." *General Linguistics* 21:4, pp. 248-58.
- Naylor, Kenneth E. 1980. "Serbo-Croatian." In: A. M. Schenker and E. Stankiewicz (eds.), *The Slavic Literary Languages*. New Haven, CT: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies, pp. 65-83.
- Neroznak, V. P. 1978. *Paleobalkunskie jazyki [The Ancient Balkan Languages]*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Perry, John R. 1982. "Language Reform in Turkey and Iran." Paper presented at the Atatürk Centennial Symposium, University of Chicago. To be published by Arizona University Press.
- Rosetti, Al. 1938. *Istoria limbii române II. Limbilebalkanice [History of the Romanian Language II. The Balkan Languages]*. Bucharest: Fundatia Pentru Literatură și Arta "Regele Carol II."
- Rosetti, Al. 1966. *Istoria limbii române, IV, V, VI [History of the Romanian Language IV, V, VI]*.
- Sandfeld, Kr. 1930. *Linguistique balkanique*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Skendi, Stavro 1980. *Balkan Cultural Studies*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, No. 72.
- Tankut, H. R. 1936. *Güneş-Dil Teorisine göre Dil Terkikleri [Linguistic Investigations According to the Sun-Language Theory]*. Istanbul: State Publishing House.
- Vaillant, A. 1938. "Le problème du slave macedonien." *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 39:2:116, pp. 194–210.
- Ventcel', T. V., and L. N. Cerenkov 1976. "Dialekty cyganskogo jazyka" ["The Dialects of the Gypsy Language"]. In: *Jazyki Azii i Afriki*, Vol. 1. *Indoeuropejskie jazyki (Languages of Asia and Africa: Indo-European Languages)*. pp. 283-339. Moscow: Nauka.
- Verdery, Katherine 1983. *Transylvanian Villagers: Three Centuries of Political, Economic, and Ethnic Change*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.