LANGUAGE POLICY AND LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR IN MACEDONIA:
BACKGROUND AND CURRENT EVENTS

As a major element in ethnic and national identity, language is a key factor in current Balkan political developments. Here I shall examine a variety of issues pertaining to language use and language policy in the Republic of Macedonia. I shall concentrate on the two languages with the largest populations, viz. Macedonian, the language of the majority, and Albanian, spoken by about 20 percent of the inhabitants according to the 1981 census (Friedman 1985). I shall also have occasion to refer to the other major languages of the Republic of Macedonia: Turkish (4.5 percent), Romani (2.3 percent), and Vlah [Aromanian] (0.3 percent) as well as Serbian (2.3 percent).²

Macedonian and Albanian have shared fate and territories for centuries. The regions in which they are spoken were among the last to be relinquished by the Ottoman Empire following the Balkan Wars (1912–1913). In the wake of these wars and World War I both languages were spoken by significant populations in countries where their use was not permitted in any form of public life (schools, publications, etc.) and was sometimes even proscribed in private. This was true for both languages in Yugoslavia (the earlier Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes) and Greece and for Macedonian in Bulgaria.³ The major difference at this point was that Albanian became the official language of an independent Albania while Mace-
donian had no official existence anywhere, including Albania, which had between fifty and seventy-five Macedonian villages in the regions bordering Greek and Yugoslav Macedonia. In order to understand what led to this situation, what has developed out of it, and the role that language has played in the formation of the national identities that serve as the organizing principles of present policies and conflicts, we must begin with the Ottoman Empire of the early nineteenth century and follow each language separately before returning to their current interactions.

At that time the European peoples of the Ottoman Empire were identified by *millet*, which may be glossed as a “religiously defined community.” The majority of Slavs in Macedonia and Bulgaria were Greek Orthodox Christians and were therefore defined as “Greeks.” In the context of the rise of nationalism in the Balkans during this period the Orthodox Slavs in Bulgaria and Macedonia faced two struggles in the creation of any type of modern literary language and the national identity of which it could be a vehicle. One was against the Hellenizers, who wished to impose Greek language and culture on the so-called Slavophone Greeks (i.e. Slavic-speaking Greek Orthodox Christians); the other was against archaizers, who wanted to see some form of Church Slavonic established as the contemporary literary language. Until about 1840 the focus of literary efforts that would ultimately lead to the creation of literary Macedonian was on raising the consciousness of Slavs as different from Greeks and on establishing the legitimacy of a vernacular-based Slavic literary language. By the middle of the century archaization was no longer a serious threat, although the struggle against Hellenism continued. A conflict emerged, however, over the dialect that would serve as the base of the literary language. Two principal literary centers had arisen on Macedo-Bulgarian territory, one in northeastern Bulgaria and the other in southwestern Macedonia. Intellectuals in Macedonia envisioned 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 eastern standard be adopted without compromise. It is here that a brief digression on South Slavic dialects is necessary.

From the point of view of language as a means of communication, the vast majority of South Slavic dialects form a continuum from northern Yugoslavia and adjacent parts of neighboring countries all the way into northern Greece and to the Black Sea coast of Bulgaria in the south and east, respectively. At any given point along this continuum speakers can understand people from contiguous points. As the distance between points increases, however, so do dialectal differences, albeit not at a steady rate. Isoglosses tend to cluster in some regions and fan out in others. Nonetheless, there does not exist a single location where one can draw a line between mutually unintelligible dialects. The definition of language under such circumstances is made on the basis of other criteria, e.g. ethnic or religious self-identification, geographical or political boundaries selected for extralinguistic reasons as definitive. The geographic entity “Macedonia” can be defined in modern political terms as the Republic of Macedonia in what was formerly Yugoslavia (Vardar Macedonia), the Blagoevgrad (БЛАГОЕВГРАД, ГОРА ДЖУМА) district in Bulgaria (Pirin Macedonia), the province of Macedonia in Greece (Aegean Macedonia), and the territory of the above-mentioned villages in eastern Albania. A series of mountains and rivers generally gives geographic definition to these political boundaries. The Slavic language spoken on this territory is then called “Macedonian.”

The establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870 meant the recognition of the Bulgarians as a millet independent from the Greeks and thus marked the definitive victory over Hellenism. By the middle of 1878 Bulgaria was established as an autonomous principedom with boundaries corresponding roughly to the northern half of the modern state. At this stage, Greece, Serbia, and Bulgaria each had an autocephalous church, a literary language, political independence, and claims to additional territory in what was still European Turkey. These territorial claims overlapped precisely in Macedonia, which had been included within the boundaries of the Greek (Byzantine), Serbian, and Bulgarian empires at different times during the
Middle Ages (Fine 1983, 1987). Each of the three countries was therefore actively engaged in propaganda on Macedonian territory, ranging from schools and publications to murder and arson, attempting to convince the Slavic-speaking, Christian population—which constituted the majority of this complex, polyethnic, multicultural region—to accept its church, language, and, ultimately, its sovereignty.

The earliest-known written evidence of organized Macedonian separatism also dates from this period, although these ideas had been expressed previously in private correspondence and similar documentation. Publications, societies, and movements that included among their goals the promotion of the Macedonian language appeared. Krste Misirkov (Мисирков 1903) outlined the principles of a Macedonian literary language based on the Prilep-Bitola dialect group, i.e., precisely the dialects which later served as the basis of literary Macedonian. Most copies of Misirkov’s book were confiscated and destroyed at the printers, but 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 II (King 1973:218; Skendi 1980:37, 46).

On October 18, 1912 the kingdoms of Bulgaria, Greece, and Serbia united against the Ottoman Empire in the First Balkan War. Less than a year later Macedonia was partitioned among these three victorious kingdoms and Albania, essentially marking the end of open efforts at the development of a Macedonian literary language. Each country that received a piece of Macedonia followed a policy of assimilation to the official language. Thus Macedonian had the status of a proscribed language in Kloss’s classification (1968). Officially it was a dialect of Serbian in Yugoslavia and a dialect of Bulgarian in Bulgaria. It was forbidden in Greece and in Albania, too, Macedonian had no official status and efforts were directed at assimilating the population that spoke it.

While no Macedonian literary activity was permitted in Greece or Albania, such activity did occur in Yugoslavia and to a more limited degree in Bulgaria, but only as dialect literature and folklore of Serbian and Bulgarian, respectively. It was also during this interwar period that linguists from outside the Balkans published studies in which they emphasized the distinctness of Macedonian from both Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian (e.g., Matecki 1938; Vaillant 1938). In the political arena, the Comintern ruled in April 1934 that the Macedonians had a right to exist as a separate people with a separate language, thus aligning the Communist party with Macedonian separatists (АПОСТОЛСКИ 1969:85, 101, 116; ХРИСТОВ 1970:395–400; КОНЕСКИ 1967:46–48). The Communist party was thereby in a position to attract young Macedonian intellectuals, who were in any case drawn to left-wing social ideas (Lunt 1959:22).

During World War II, Macedonia was partitioned among the Axis powers (see Jelavich 1983:262–277). Macedonian remained proscribed and Macedonian publications were predominantly illegal newspapers and fliers produced by partisans. It was during this period that a koine based on the west-central dialects became established in practice as the language of written communication (Lunt 1959). Though by no means all Macedonians concerned with the improvement of their linguistic situation were communists, the political realities in Macedonia were such that the establishment of a Macedonian literary language was Communist-party policy and also in opposition to all those governments that had ruled in Macedonia.

The establishment of literary Macedonian was also still intimately connected with the idea of establishing Macedonian autonomy either within a Yugoslav or within a pan-Balkan federation.

With the declaration of Macedonia as an independent republic within the federal structure of Yugoslavia and the establishment of Macedonian as the official language of that republic, a new era began for the Macedonian language. Although the standardization of Macedonian has been extremely rapid, the cross-currents in that development have bearing on the current situation and so I shall examine them here in slightly more detail.

Less than three weeks after the liberation of Skopje in November of 1944 a conference for the standardization of Macedonian ortho-
graphy and grammar was held there. Although the participants basically agreed on the dialectal base that practice had already established (known today as the west-central dialects), the nature of the orthography and the details of dialectal compromise had yet to be worked out, and the alphabet ended up being a serious source of contention. The resolution and elaboration composed by members of this first language commission and submitted on December 4, 1944 were not accepted by the Department of Education. A second alphabet proposal submitted in May 1945 was accepted, followed by an orthographic handbook with a grammatical outline in June of that year. Five official modifications were made in 1948 and an expanded handbook with a grammatical outline was published in 1951. Although grammars for primary and secondary school had been in use since 1946, the normative grammar was completed in 1952–1954, the dictionary in 1961–1966, and a definitive orthographic handbook in 1970 (see Friedman 1985). Meanwhile, Macedonian has remained a proscribed language in Greece (cf. НОВА МАКЕДОНИЈА [henceforth NM] 27 April 1991) and Bulgaria and a discouraged one in Albania.13

Unlike Macedonian, Albanian is sharply differentiated from its linguistic neighbors, since it exists as an isolate within Indo-European. Within Albanian, however, there is a major bundle of isoglosses running along the course of the river Shkumbë and the north shore of Lake Ohrid that divides the language into two major dialect groups: Geg in the north and Tosk in the south. In terms of population, Geg represents about two-thirds and Tosk one-third of the total of Albanian speakers. These two dialects are strikingly distinct from one another at all levels: Geg has nasal vowels, distinctive length, and drops unstressed schwa; Tosk has stressed schwa and the rhotacism of intervocalic nasals; Geg has infinitive and future constructions lacking in Tosk, etc. (Byron 1976:41–72; Pipa 1989:8–20). Moreover, Tosk was significantly differentiated into diaspora and nondiaspora dialects, the most important of the former being Arbëresh, the language of Albanians who fled to Italy in the fifteenth century. Another peculiarity of Albanian within the context of Ottoman Europe was that the majority of its speakers (ca. 70 percent) were Muslim, with ca. 20 percent being Orthodox and ca. 10 percent Catholic, in the south and north, respectively (Byron 1985:62). Under the millet system, therefore, most Albanians were "Turks," namely Muslims, while most of the remainder were "Greek," i.e. Orthodox. Orthodox Albanians were under the same Hellenizing, assimilationist pressures as Orthodox Slavs, whereas Muslim Albanians had no chance of developing a separate national consciousness within the millet system, since they were already part of the Muslim "nation" (cf. below).

In terms of literary development, Albanian, unlike Slavic, did not have an archaic tradition to challenge the rise of vernacular literature.14 The hindrance to the development of a unified literary Albanian lay in the fact that each Albanian community developed its own literature independent of the others. Thus Catholics, Muslims, and Orthodox Christians each wrote in their own Gëg or Tosk dialects using the alphabet appropriate to their religion: Arabic for the Muslims, Greek for the Orthodox, and Latin for the Catholics and Arbëresh, who were mostly Uniate and otherwise Catholic. This situation continued until 1878 when the danger of partition provided a threat that was to serve as the impetus for a movement to unify the Albanian people, a task that could only be achieved on the basis of language (Skendi 1967). The Serbs and the Greeks were ready to partition Albania between them; the Greeks and the Turks were propagandizing to absorb the Albanians on the basis of religion. Even after the Slavs were permitted schools in their own languages this privilege was not extended to the Albanians since the majority were Muslim and were thus expected to learn Turkish if they went to school, belonging as they did to the Muslim, i.e. Turkish millet. Although not subjected to competition from powerful linguistic neighbors in the way that Macedonian was caught between the Serbian and the Bulgarian, Albanian national integrity was seriously threatened by its deep religious and dialectal divisions.

The Albanian response to the events of 1878 was the formation of the League of Prizren for the purpose of promoting and protecting Albanian national interests. It rapidly became apparent that without
a unified language there could be no unified Albanian people and without a unified alphabet no progress could be made in unifying the language. Thus, in November 1908, a group of Albanian intellectuals met in Manastir (Bitola in the present-day Republic of Macedonia), for the purpose of deciding on an alphabet. After a great deal of discussion, it was agreed that Albanian would be written in the Latin alphabet, it being more international and less religiously specific than either the Greek or the Arabic and thus representing a victory of linguistic unity over religious division.15

On 28 November 1912 Albania declared its independence. When its final borders were drawn, however, after much fighting with Serbs and Greeks, most areas with mixed Slavic-Albanian populations and even some adjacent areas with predominantly Albanian populations in Montenegro, Kosovo, and western Macedonia were assigned to Yugoslavia.16 As a result, large numbers of Geg speakers found themselves cut off from literary developments and living in a country where their language was proscribed. In Albania, authors continued to write in their own dialects, although attempts were made to produce a unified language. For example, a conference in Shkodër in 1916 drafted a resolution adopting five Tosk features into what was essentially a literary language based on the southern Geg dialect of Elbasan, which is located on the Shkumbi and is thus closest to the dialects that are transitional to Tosk (Xhuvani 1980a; Pipa 1989:2-4).

World War II interrupted the development of a Geg-based standard. The ruling communist elite that emerged in Albania after the war was Tosk and the 1948 Tito-Stalin break that gave Albania a pretext for aligning itself with the USSR against Yugoslavia—thereby preventing Tito's planned partition or absorption of Albania—once again separated the Geg speakers of Yugoslavia from linguistic events in Albania. The 1950s and 1960s saw the codification of a standard in Albania based on Tosk that incorporated Geg elements, whereas Albanians in Yugoslavia continued to work on the codification of a standard based on Geg.17 The Yugoslav government attempted to encourage a sense of separate ethnic identity among the Albanians living on its territories by insisting that there were two nationalities and languages: "Албанец/Албански" (albanac/albanski) for Albania and "Шпирар/Шпирарски" (Siptar/Siptarski) for Yugoslavia.18 Albanians were also living under unsatisfactory social and economic conditions, cut off from developments in Albania and under pressure from Serbo-Croatian as the official language of the federal state and also of the Republic of Serbia, within which Kosovo was an autonomous region, (and in Macedonia under dual pressure from Macedonian as the republic language and Serbo-Croatian as the dominant federal language; cf. Flaka e Vëllazëritit [henceforth FeV] 14 December 1986). This situation came to a head in 1968 when Albanians in Kosovo demanded republic status, which they were not granted, although other concessions were made (e.g., the establishment of various educational institutions, the substitution of the term "nationality" for the phrase "nationality/national minority" in the Yugoslav constitution by Amendment 19, etc.). That same year a linguistic conference was held in Pristina at which Albanian intellectuals resolved to adopt the standard as it was developing in Albania (see Raka 1988). This move was clearly prompted by fears of Slavic assimilation and by a desire to place ethnic unity above regional interests. In November 1972 an orthography conference in Tirana fixed the conventions of what was known as gjyha unifikuara, "the unified language" (Byron 1979). Important standardizing works appeared in 1976 (Domi et al.; Kostallari et al.) and 1980 (Kostallari et al.).

Since World War II relations between Macedonian and the other languages of Macedonia have been regulated by the republic's constitution. The first Macedonian constitution (1946) guaranteed freedom of language use, which was already in practice de facto in terms of elementary schools in Macedonian, Turkish, and Albanian. The second (1963) extended the use of minority languages (Albanian and Turkish) in schools, while the third constitution (1974) replaced the term "national minority" (национално малцинство) with "nationality" (народност) and established Albanians and Turks as constituent nationalities of Macedonia together with the Macedonian people/nation (народ, plural народи).19 Vlachs and Roms (Gypsies) were each
designated an “ethnic group” (етничка група), meaning groups that did not have national states outside Yugoslavia or codified literary languages (cf. Sejfula 1964, Tsatsa 1974, Jonić 1982). After 1981, however, Article 1 of the constitution was changed such that Albanians and Turks were defined as citizens of Macedonia without the rights of national collectives (FeV 23 November 1990). In some cases, issues surrounding differences in language use among the three chief groups have been more of degree than kind. Schooling has been available in minority languages; the question has been how many classes and to what level. Skopje has regular newspapers in Macedonian, Albanian, and Turkish, but only the Macedonian papers are daily whereas the Albanian and Turkish newspapers are each tri-weeklies. There have also been fluctuations in the amount of time devoted to non-Macedonian-language radio and television programming. As will be seen below, however, other instances such as keeping school records, toponyms, and anthroonyms have involved the legal prohibition of the official use of any language other than Macedonian.

In the spring of 1981 what began as a student demonstration against the poor quality of food in the University of Prishtina’s dining hall rapidly mushroomed into widespread riots and renewed demands for republic status for Kosovo. For the first time since World War II martial law was invoked in Yugoslavia. Sympathetic demonstrations also took place in Macedonia and Montenegro. Relations with Albania were essentially cut off, although they have since been reestablished. Nonetheless, the past decade has seen the rise of unrelenting tension between the Albanian- and Slavic-speaking populations in southern Yugoslavia, with other linguistic minorities often caught up on various sides of the crossfire. A major source of conflict between Albanians and Macedonians has been the Albanian insistence on the linguistic equality guaranteed by the 1974 constitution and the Macedonian response of reducing those rights already in place.

One example is the controversy surrounding toponyms. Toponyms in the Balkans often occur in each of the languages of the peoples who have occasion to refer to them. In some cases the differences are rooted in the phonological history and structure of the respective languages, for example Macedonian Скопје (Skopje), Serbian Скопље (Skopje), Albanian Shkup, Turkish Üsküp, Aromanian Skopia, all from Latin Scupi. In other cases the name is quite different due to translation or calquing as in the case of Slavic Црна Гора (Crna Gora, “Black Mountain”; English Montenegro)—Albanian Mal i Zi, Turkish Karadagi; similarly Macedonian Битола (Bitola, from the Slavic Обиталий, “monastery”) but Turkish and Albanian Manastır, from Greek Μοναστήριον. Sometimes toponyms have separate histories as Тетово (Tetovo) in Macedonian and Tetovë in Albanian, but Turkish Kalkandelen. In the belief that choices of toponyms are connected with claims of sovereignty and suffering from a sense of territorial insecurity, since 1982 Macedonian authorities have attempted to require the use of Slavic toponyms in non-Slavic language textbooks and sometimes in other print media as well (cf. FeV 14 April 1991, 16 September 1990, 14 June 1989). They have even forbidden the use of certain Albanian anthroonyms (e.g. Ilir, Teutë, Flamur), claiming they are irredentist or promote interethnic disharmony. Albanians object to this as linguistic oppression and attempted Slavicization (Berani 1983; Ismajli 1988:17; FeV 26 October 1990;HM 4–10 June 1991) and a conference was held at the Institute for Albanian Studies in Prishtina in March 1978 in defense of Albanian onomastics (cf. Gjuha shqipe 1 [1987]). At the same time some Macedonians are calling for all Serbian toponyms to be translated into Macedonian, not just Београд for Београд as is standard but also Лесковци for Лесковци, and so forth.

Another example is that in 1983 it became obligatory for non-Macedonian schools to keep all records, public notices, etc. in Macedonian as well as any other language and in 1989 a law was passed permitting only Macedonian in school records (HM 29 April 1991). This law has been constantly broken in Albanian-language schools where teachers insist on continuing to use Albanian for such records (HM 20 March 1991, 26 March 1991, 3 April 1991, 24 April 1991). There is also a movement to make Macedonian the republic’s “offi-

Other measures enacted since 1982 have been the elimination or reduction of the number of Albanian- and Turkish-language classes in elementary and high schools, changing Albanian names of public places such as schools and streets to Slavic, using Cyrillic for Albanian signs, etc. (Ismajli 1988:17, FeV 26 September 1989 on street names in PeCe/Pejë/Ipek; Birlık, [henceforth B ] 15 June 1991). High-school classes are mostly ethnically "mixed" and therefore the instruction takes place in Macedonian even when 90 percent of the students are Albanian, as in Tetovo (FeV 23 September 1980). At the Zef Lush Marku High School in Skopje instruction was in Albanian from 1950–1982. Beginning with the 1982–1983 school year there were proportional numbers of Albanian and Macedonian tracks. For the 1991–1992 school year there was pressure to eliminate the Albanian tracks (HM 9 July 1991). Most students finishing elementary school in many predominantly Albanian school districts are no longer registering for high school due to the unavailability of Albanian-language tracks (FeV 14 July 1991). In 1985, 2,000 of the University of Skopje’s 40,000 students were Albanian (FeV 30 October 1985), but in 1988 only 175 Albanian students registered (HM 27 February 1988). The Macedonians claim that this was because Albanians were not learning enough Macedonian in school to pass the university’s entrance examination, that their teachers were telling them that the University of Pristina was the only place to go, and that Pristina’s standards were lower for Albanians from Macedonia. The Albanian side is that they are being discriminated against. Recent years have seen the reintroduction of the use of shqiptar and nacionašno mënbëshëm in public media (see notes 17 and 18).

The Turks have also been affected by these events. Thus, for example Birlık (25 October 1986) published an article complaining that Skopje had only three Turkish-language elementary schools and that in many towns Turkish students must travel from one end of town to the other. The six-year school Tefeyyüz (“Progress,” begun in December 1944) had 905 pupils, of whom 760 were Turkish, 91 Albanian, and 54 Macedonian. The Albanian and Macedonian students were those going to their closest neighborhood school in grades one through four. The article complained that while in accordance with the constitution a first-grade class was opened for nine Macedonian students at that school, a Turkish-language third-grade class with the same number of pupils at the Josip Broz Tito school in the center of town was closed. Other towns have grades containing seven to nine students as in the case of Tefeyyüz. A week later another article in Birlık (B 1 November 1986) claimed that thirty-five Macedonian students had been allowed to register for first grade at the Josip Broz Tito school after the deadline for registration had passed and that as a result a Turkish-language class would be closed in order to open a Macedonian-language class for the Macedonian students. At present many Turkish children quit school after four years because of the inadequate number of higher level classes in Turkish; the Democratic League of Turks is seeking the reopening of the Turkish-language section of classes at Josip Broz Tito high school (HM 11 June 1991). The title of a recent article in Birlık lamenting the elimination of Turkish-language tracks at the high-school level sums up one feeling: “Biz Türkler sabir taşi değiliz,” (We Turks are not the Patience Stone)26 (B 15 June 1991).

In 1989 the number of hours of instruction in Macedonian in non-Macedonian-language schools was increased from two to three hours per week in all grades in Albanian and Turkish schools and in grades five through eight of Serbian schools (there not being enough resources to fund Macedonian instruction in the first four years of Serbian schools; HM 29 September 1989). Non-Macedonians feel themselves to be under a particularly onerous burden in Macedonia because they are required to be trilingual—their native language, Macedonian, and Serbo-Croatian—before they can begin to study a so-called world language such as English or French, whereas Macedonians have only one extra language in their way and Serbo-Croatian speakers have none at all (cf. Friedman 1985). According to Ismajli (1988:18), for Albanians learning Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian is more like dealing with diglossia rather than with two
languages (the opposition is Albanian/non-Albanian, or better yet, Albanian/Slavic) since Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian are so close for an Albanian speaker, especially one from Kosovo or northwestern Macedonia, where the respective local dialects of Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian are transitional to one another. In fact, even Albanians working in Sweden object to being required to learn Swedish, which they perceive as assimulatory and limiting, rather than English, which they perceive as international and the key to betterment.

This brings us to the rise of political pluralism in 1989–1990. Although the new political scene in Macedonia resulted in a plethora of political parties, most of which had the word “democratic” somewhere in their name, three major types of political parties have emerged on the Macedonian scene: (1) reformed communist/socialist, which are dominated by Macedonians but still include members of other nationalities; (2) Macedonian nationalist; and (3) other (non-Macedonian) nationalist or at least ethnically identified.27 For all parties language has become the symbol through which a variety of conflicts are played out. Thus, during 1990, for example, the two Macedonian—or Macedonian-dominated—groups were bitterly divided by questions concerning literary Macedonian, among other things. The nationalists accused the (communist-identified) intellectual establishment of Serbianizing Macedonian, the establishment responded by pointing out that this has been the standard Bulgarian line all along and accused the nationalists of Bulgarophilism and Serbophobia (cf. HM 6 June 1990, 19 January 1991).

Another linguistic effect of political pluralism has been the rise of dialectal forms and Turkisms in public contexts. Thus, for example the Turkish тајфа has become the normal colloquial word for “group” whereas the term група (a so-called internationalism) has taken on the negative connotations of “faction.” This, too, could be associated with earlier debates concerning the position of Turkisms in literary normativization. Although there was a current of thought that favored the retention of Turkisms in the literary language, both as a distinctive feature of Macedonian and as a characteristic of colloquial speech, other scholars opposed the incorporation of most Turkisms on the grounds that their stylistic nuances were unsuitably ironic, dialectal, or old-fashioned (e.g. Koneski 1945). The trend to avoid Turkisms succeeded so well that by 1981 some establishment scholars were finding it necessary to warn against the artificial
avoidance of Turkisms in works and translations dealing with the Ottoman period (Корунин 1981). Modern folklore collections must now contain extensive glossaries of Turkisms along with regional expressions and the obsolescence of some Turkisms has progressed to the point that even graduate students in Slavic philology do not know words like үтиja, “clothes iron” (literary Macedonian now uses пега, from the German bügel[eisen]), which were still in common use two or three decades ago. Turkisms have always been more common in informal styles as opposed to formal speech or writing and the apparent rise in Turkisms may also be connected with a tendency to colloquialize the literary language in opposition to establishment norms. Moreover, in the context of antagonistic relations between Macedonians and Albanians, the Turks have become objects of affection and nostalgia by comparison. It is claimed that in urban areas the local Turks were always bilingual with Macedonian, as were the Macedonians with Turkish. This certainly seems to have been the case in towns such as Skopje and Ohrid. It thus seems that a combination of anti-establishment linguistic politics and ethnic tensions with Albanians have contributed to a shift in usage and attitude concerning Turkisms at least among some speakers.28

The old millet system of determining nationality on the basis of religion has also continued to operate. The linguistic competition between Macedonian and Albanian that has escalated since 1981 is not a new phenomenon. This is demonstrated by orders from the Macedonian Commission of Education, dated 8 March 1945, which stated that only Macedonian was to be taught in villages where the population was Macedonian speaking, regardless of religious affiliation. The orders go on that “certain fascist elements, taking advantage of the ignorance of some villagers in Torbeč [Macedonian Muslim] villages,” were encouraging local inhabitants to demand schooling in Albanian or Turkish and that such agitation was to be stopped by taking “all possible legal measures” (Ристевски 1988:430–31).

Nonetheless, between 1952 and 1964, and even into the 1970s, large numbers of Macedonian Muslims emigrated to Turkey as "Turks," i.e., as Muslims (HM 7 January 1984). In fact it was not until 1979 that Macedonian Muslims were encouraged to identify as Macedonians through special cultural organizations, events, etc. (cf. ФeV 13 March 1985). In recent years many formerly Macedonian Muslim villages have become Albanian-speaking as Albanian Muslims fleeing violence and oppression in Kosovo have settled in villages vacated by Macedonian Muslims who emigrated to Turkey and as Macedonian-speaking Muslims have shifted to Albanian when the religious factor dominates the linguistic factor in ethnic identity. A striking example is Горно Врановци (Gorno Vranovci), which was a Macedonian Muslim village when Нова Македонија was first published there in 1944, but which is now Albanian (HM 5 January 1985, 3 May 1991).

In areas that are still predominantly Macedonian Muslim there is considerable dispute over national identification. Thus, for example, in the Reka (Река) region (near Debar [Дебар]) some Macedonian-speaking Muslims have claimed that their nationality is муслиман whereas their religion is исламство and, moreover, that the expression Македонци муслиман is a contradiction in terms (HM 28 March 1991). The Reka region has been noted for voting for the PDP (see note 26). Among the reasons given by the Macedonian press, besides the traditional нажат (“spiteful stubbornness”) of the Rekans, is the fact that the region is poor, with high unemployment, and therefore has sought to draw attention to itself. It has also been claimed that PDP “agitators” have attempted to convince the Slavic Muslims that they are Muslim by nationality rather than Macedonian, thereby reducing the number of Macedonians in the census figures and using the Muslim religion as a tool for assimilation to Albanian language.29 It is pointed out that Albanians register as Albanians, not as Muslims (HM 5 May 1991, FeV 15 July 1990, 24 August 1990, 8 October 1990).30 On the other hand Albanians claim that many Christian Albanians assimilated to Macedonian or Vlah identity on the basis of religion (FeV 14 April 1991).31

There is also a dispute over the Slavic-speaking Muslims living in the Gora (Гора) region, a district of twenty-eight villages on the
Albanian and Serbian sides of the mountains that form the Republic of Macedonia's northwestern border. Macedonian linguists classify their dialects as Macedonian (Debar group, see ВИДЕОСКИ 1986), but in Serbia their language is considered Serbian, they must go to Serbian schools, and there are no Macedonian schools (FeV 113 March 1985). Macedonian–Serbian relations are also subject to other strains. On the one hand we have Macedonian objections to the Serbianization of Macedonians settled in Vojvodina who must go to Serbian-language schools (HM 19 August 1989), tensions erupting between Macedonians and Serbs in villages north of Skopje near the Serbian border (ibid.), a controversy over the Macedonian-Serbian border (Шибаев 1990), and the above-mentioned accusations of the Serbianization of literary Macedonian. In contrast, Macedonians contributed to the building of a Serbian-language school in the village of Ajanovce in Kosovo—in the spirit of “brotherhood and unity”—to help stop the flood of emigration of Serbs and Montenegrins from Kosovo (B 2 July 1989).

It was the Macedonian–Albanian conflict that led to the present political makeup of the Macedonian Parliament. In late September of 1990 polls indicated that the reformed communist-socialist parties had between one-third and half the votes, the Macedonian nationalist parties having between 5 and 10 percent, other parties (most importantly the PDP) with less than 7 percent, and one-third or more of the electorate undecided (cf. HM 29 September 1990). After the first round of elections, however, during which the Albanian-identified PDP won majorities in predominantly Albanian regions in western Macedonia, amid accusations of election fraud and intimidation, the Macedonian nationalists won a plurality in the Parliament during the second and third rounds as a reaction (cf. HM 20 November 1990).32

When the current situation is viewed from an historical perspective, it can be said that Albanians have had to rely on language to overcome internal barriers of religion and to unify divergent dialects while Macedonians have had to use language to differentiate themselves from closely related neighbors (Serbs and Bulgarians) or from coreligionists (Greeks). The Albanians seem to have achieved a significant measure of success, which may be due at least in part to the Slavic threat to their integrity. This has militated towards unity among Gegs and Tosks. Had Kosovo been part of Albania and had Stalinism not triumphed there, the dialectal gap might have taken on more significance—it still could (cf. Пипа 1989:224–28)—but given the current political situation in Yugoslavia, chances are that it will not. As for the Macedonians, it appears that after fifty years of relative autonomy in Yugoslavia they are still suffering from the partition of 1912. This is exacerbated by changing demographics and language behavior in the western countryside. Some Macedonians fear that, if current trends continue, their language and sense of ethnic separateness that goes with it will only survive in diaspora in places like Australia, Canada, and the United States.

The period since the so-called fall of communism has seen increased rights for the smaller minority languages, Romani and Vlah, but in the context of competition between Macedonian and the largest minority language—Albanian—which has lost legal but not demographic ground since the events of 1981. Turkish, as the second-largest minority language, shared postwar advances with Albanian and has subsequently suffered setbacks which can be evaluated as relatively more severe since the Turks constitute, in a sense, a minority within a minority. By this I mean that within the context of Islam in Macedonia, Albanians are the majority. This situation (perhaps combined with the spread of literacy among Albanians33 and the unification of the literary language) has also resulted in a reversal in power and status between Albanian and Turkish. Until World War II (and even for some time thereafter) Turkish retained among Muslims the cultural if not the official prestige it had enjoyed when Macedonia was part of the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, the pan-nationalist identity of religion with ethnicity and consequent lability in language loyalty is still operative in Macedonia, resulting in shifts to Albanian among non-Albanian Muslims as well as shifts to Macedonian among non-Macedonian Christians. And over all hangs the threat of a third Balkan war—Милошевић is reported to have said...
that if Macedonia tries to secede from Yugoslavia, Greece and Serbia will share a common border again (HM 15 September 1991). As these lines are being written one can only hope that the peoples of Macedonia manage to live together, even if that togetherness is deemed, in the words of one politician in Macedonia, a "necessary evil," as he interprets the Latin *conditio sine qua non* ([sic] FeV 7 July 1991).34

NOTES

1. I should like to take this opportunity to thank the Ministry of Information of the Republic of Macedonia, the Institute for the Macedonian Language, the University of Skopje, and the Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences, which have generously supplied me with many of the publications essential to this research.


3. There were small populations of Albanian speakers on Bulgarian territory as well, of which at present only a single village remains (Mandrica, near the Greek-Turkish borders). In terms of relative numbers, however, they did not represent sizable minorities. (See Friedman [in press-a] on the Albanian diaspora in Thrace and elsewhere in the eastern Balkans.)

4. Braude (1982) provides important information regarding the origins of this system. Its relative lack of antiquity, however, does not change the fact that it was serving as an organizing principle by the time we are considering here.

5. Slavic-speaking Moslems were thus "Turks," although they were also distinguished by specific ethnonyms such as Torbeš and Pomak, which, however, are sometimes considered pejorative.

6. For the purposes of this article Church Slavonic can be identified as an ecclesiastical language that bears a relationship to the Slavic vernaculars similar to that existing between Medieval Latin and the Romance vernaculars.

7. Greek and Serbian territorial claims also extended into Albania, but here the two powers agreed to partition the country between them, leaving a small central section for an Italian puppet state.

8. Romania was also promoting its interests in Macedonia on the basis of the Aromanian population, who were recognized as a millet in 1905 (*NOVA Makedonija* [HM] 23 July 1991). The Albanians, who unlike the Macedonians emerged from the Balkan Wars with their own state, likewise had territorial claims extending into Macedonia. Despite his obvious flaws, Miller (1898:385-89), gives some useful facts. Neither of these two sets of claims, however, attempted to define the nationality of the Slavic-speaking population.

9. ПУПЕВСКИ (1875:48-49) contains the first-known public statement that the Macedonians were a separate people different from Bulgars, Serbs, and other Slavs. In 1880 he published the first attempt at a Macedonian grammar (ПУПЕВСКИЙ 1953) and in 1888 he founded the Slavo-Macedonian Literary Society in Sofia, which was quickly dissolved by the Bulgarian authorities (РИСТОВСКИ 1973). In 1892 a group of teachers and elders in Kostur (Greek, Kastoria) attempted to introduce Macedonian (as opposed to Bulgarian, Greek, or Serbian) into the parish school. The Greek bishop persuaded the Turkish governor to threaten to close the church and a Bulgarian activist persuaded the Macedonians to accept Bulgarian lest they lose a Slavic church and school altogether (АДИНОВСКИ 1965a).

10. In accordance with Article 9 of the Treaty of Sèvres (August 10, 1920) concerning minority-population language rights in Greece, a commission of three men (probably from Bitola and of Aromanian origin; cf. АДИНОВСКИ 1985b:xiii) composed a Macedonian primer, entitled *Abeedar*, and printed it in Athens in 1925 using a Latin orthography and based on dialects spoken between Bitola and Lerin (Greek, Florina), but the book was never used and most copies were destroyed (cf. АПОСТОЛСКИ 1969:250-53).

11. It has been (and sometimes still is) argued that the encouragement of Macedonian has been a Serbian (or Titoist, or Yugoslav, or Yugoslav communist) plot whose purpose is the separation of Macedonian from Bulgarian and/or the territorial absorption of Pirin and Aegean Macedonia (cf. King 1973, ANDRIOTES 1957, МИРЕВ 1952). The publication of *Abeedar* in Greece was likewise seen by Bulgaria and Yugoslavia as an attempt by the Greek government to threaten their territorial integrity. It is certainly true that there were policymakers in both Greek and Serbian government circles who saw the encouragement of Macedonian separatism as a means to eventual assimilation, but their ultimate goal was not the improvement of the status of Macedonian. As Apostolaki (HM 27 April 1991) points out, Greek, Bulgarian, and Serbian chauvinists have all attributed Macedonian separatism to their respective rivals rather than acknowledging that the inhabitants of Macedonia might have any concept of and right to a separate identity.

12. Henceforth Macedonia will mean the Republic of Macedonia, i.e., Vardar Macedonia, unless otherwise specified.
13. In Firin Macedonia, in Bulgaria, Macedonian was officially recognized and taught 1946–1948, but as soon as Tito broke with Stalin the language was labeled a Serbian plot and proscribed. In 1956 the ethnic category was dropped from census classifications and also proscribed. In Greece there were attempts to establish Macedonian norms among Macedonian partisans in 1944, but these were squelched even then by Greek communists (see Пиера 1988:158-67). In Albania too, Macedonian was taught before the Tito–Stalin break (cf. HM 29 October 1990). After the break, Nikola Berovski, a native of Bitola who had been among the cadre of teachers sent to Albania in 1944, stayed in Albania. He apparently composed readers in a Macedonian strongly influenced by his native Bitola–Prespa dialect in 1956 using Bulgarian–Russian Cyrillic (cf. Fiedler 1972), but in 1983–1984 he was permitted to publish primers, readers, and a Macedonian–Albanian dictionary in literary Macedonian, which is taught in first through fourth grades. Aside from these limited uses, however, Macedonian had no place or support in Albanian public life until 1991. According to the 1989 Albanian census there were 5,000 Macedonians in Albania, but Macedonian sources insist that there are really ten to twenty times that number (FeV 25 August 1989, HM 3 February 1990). One of the results of the recent sociopolitical upheavals in Albania has been more freedom of movement and open recognition for the Macedonian minority in Albania, however. The legal registration of the Macedonian cultural organization, Prespa, founded by Macedonians living in Albania (HM 30 April 1991), the announcement of the beginning of a Macedonian-language program by Radio Korçë in Albania (HM 8 March 1991), and the legal registration of the Macedonian organization Bratstvo (Brotherhood) in Tirana (HM 9 November 1991) are indications of this.

14. The oldest unambiguous Albanian document is a baptismal formula from 1452 (cf. Elsie 1986). The oldest texts of significant length, however, date from the sixteenth century.

15. The final decision of the Alphabet Congress was a compromise, leaving two official alphabets—the “Istanbul,” with one character per sound (e.g., ă for the voiced interdental fricative), and the “bashkimi” (“unity”), which used digraphs and was close to the orthography that ultimately prevailed (e.g., dh for the voiced interdental fricative). The significance of the congress was its endorsement of Latin characters over Greek or Arabic. The final fixing of the orthography came during the decade after Albanian independence was declared (cf. Xhuvani 1980b).

16. Mixed territories in Southern Epirus and Aegean Macedonia were assigned to Greece. It should be noted, however, that there were also sizable Greek and Slavic minorities on the territory that became Albania. Moreover, there were other significant ethnic groups in this entire region, including Turks, Aromanians (Vlachs), Roms (Gypsies), Jews, and others.

17. In 1952 Tosk became the official standard in Albania, although Geg was still permitted in bellestristic literature; however, it quickly went out of use altogether except in specifically dialectal contexts. That same year at an Albanological congress in Pristënine, Albanian intellectuals in Yugoslavia enunciated their commitment to the development of a literary language based on Geg (Pipa 1989:4, Byron 1985:71).

18. The form šiptar is based on the Albanians’ own ethnonym shqiptar, but in South Slavic it has become a term of abuse (cf. polack or yid in English) (cf. Skendi [1980:52 cited in Byron 1985:67], FeV 9 May 1990, 2 March 1991).

19. Macedonian narod can be translated as “people,” “nation,” or “folk,” depending on the context. Macedonian also has the word nacija, “nation.” The Macedonians, together with Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Montenegrins, and [Slavic-speaking] Moslems (mostly in Bosnia and Herzegovina, see note 29) constitute the six narodë of Yugoslavia, i.e., those populations that constitute the majorities in their own republics. A major problem is the position of Albanians in Kosovo, where they constitute a majority. Because Kosovo is administratively part of Serbia, Albanians are a minority in Serbia as a whole, but there are more Albanians in Yugoslavia than Macedonians or Montenegrins, hence their demands for the status of narod and republic status for Kosovo. On the other hand, unlike any of the Slavic narodë of Yugoslavia, Albanians have an independent state, viz. Albania. Moreover, Albanians and Slavs have fought over borders and hegemony more than once in this century. To be sure, there has also been cooperation and peaceful coexistence between Albanians and Slavs. The entire history of claims and counterclaims is obviously beyond the scope of this article. Suffice it to say that the situation is complex and fraught with difficulties and mistrust, especially during the course of the past decade.

20. On July 7, 1991, the First Party Congress of the Party for the Complete Emancipation of the Roms (FCER) declared that Roms should be a narodnost, “nationality” in Macedonia (FeV 7 July 1991; HM 7 August 1991). Romani has been in the process of modern codification since the First World Romani Congress in 1972. We should also note that efforts at codifying a literary Romani for Roms in the USSR were made in the 1920s. In the case of the Vlachs, a number of cultural organizations have been recently incorporated, e.g. Brothers Manaki in Bitola, Pitu Gulli in Skopje, Nikolae Batsaria in Kruševo, similar organizations in Štip, Struga, and elsewhere. This process culminated in the formation of the League of Vlachs in Macedonia constituted in Bitola on 12 September 1990. Niko Popnikola (president of Brothers Manaki) complained about Vlachs being left out of the public media (HM 6 February 1991) and his
pamphlet on the history of the Vlahs was serialized in HOBAJA MAKEDONIJA shortly thereafter (April 16–25). Several Vlah publications began appearing in 1990 (Feniks in Skopje, Lulensesfire in Kruševo). Demands for television and schools in Vlah (FeV 15 June 1990, HM 20 April 1991) have been met in part (see note 21).

21. Among Albanian political demands in Macedonia has been the increase of the tri-weekly to a daily.

22. In 1989 only Turkish and Albanian were represented on television: Each had twenty minutes of news Monday through Friday and a half-hour children’s program on Saturday. In 1991 television programming in Romani and Vlah was begun: fifteen minutes of news on Tuesday and Wednesday, respectively. Also during 1991 Turkish and Albanian news was increased to twenty-five minutes, with additional half hours of programming in Albanian or Turkish on Tuesdays. It should also be noted that Macedonian television programming has not been very extensive. Much air time was devoted to foreign (especially U.S. and British) films and series and to programs from Belgrade and other cities in Yugoslavia. More recently there has been considerable pressure to increase Macedonian-language programming as well. The name-change from TVS (Television Skopje) to MTV (Macedonian Television) in early 1991 was considered symbolic of Macedonian nationalist feeling and was the topic of substantial debate.

23. The situation in Kosovo can be described as a combination of Serbian exodus and Serbian repression, e.g., the shutting down of Rilindja, the chief Albanian-language paper of Kosovo on August 8, 1990 (see FeV 10 August 1990), along with problems for the non-Slavic minorities, for example complaints in the Turkish-language press that Turks are treated as third-class citizens not only because there is much less Turkish-language broadcasting than either Albanian or Serbo-Croatian, but most of it is on the third channel, which broadcasts at only one kilowatt and cannot be heard beyond Pristina. This is as opposed to the first channel broadcasting in Albanian at 1000 kw or the second, in Serbo-Croatian at 80 kw (8 24 August 1989). The Albanian and Slavic language media frequently report charges and countercharges of intimidation, discrimination, violence, poisoning, involuntary sterilization, etc. There are also mutual accusations of the “Kosovization” of western Macedonia. (In Slavic terms, this means Albanians driving out Slavs, in Albanian terms it means Slavs oppressing Albanians.) Another example of conflicting tensions was the appeal to Roms to register in the 1991 census as Romans and not as Albanians or Turks or “something else” out of fear or due to pressure (HM 28 March 1991). To the extent that the Macedonian government is seeking to reduce Albanian influence, this has led to increased recognition for Roms and Macedonian Muslims (cf. note 28).

Another ethnic group that has achieved greater recognition from the current situation are the Gjupci or Egipkani. Like the English term Gypsy, these ethnonyms derive from Egyptian. Members of this group, who are concentrated in southwestern Macedonia, especially Ohrid and Struga (but who also live elsewhere in Macedonia and Kosovo), speak Albanian and are nominally Muslim but religiously syncretistic (cf. SoS 18 November 1990:34–35). They attempted to be recognized as a separate ethnic group in the 1981 census but were listed as “other” (HM [Cazora] 3 June 1982). In 1990, however, they formed a union headed by Nazmi Arifi and were accorded separate status in the 1991 census. Although based on their ethnonym and other features they have been considered Albanian-speaking Roms by outsiders, Arifi insists that they are descended from Egyptians and that they are not connected to the Roms. Although not all members of this ethnic group have shared the same certainty regarding their descent, they do consider themselves distinct from Roms.

24. This same type of insecurity occurs elsewhere in the Balkans. Thus, for example, Greek nationalists will become terribly upset on hearing the Slavic names Lerin and Kostur used for the towns known in Greek as Florina and Kastoria, which are in Greek Macedonia but which were predominantly Slavic until their Hellenization during the course of this century (a process that is not yet complete). There was also an incident recently when the Turkish Consul in Komotini, the capital of Greek Thrace, used its Turkish name, Gümlüce, in a document (Diakoma June [1991]:4).

25. Cf. also the concern with Slavic influence expressed in an article on syntactic errors in the Albanian-language press due to the influence of disa gjithe fajntje, “some neighboring languages” (FeV 14 December 1986).

26. The reference is to a Turkish folk tale in which the heroine undergoes tremendous injustice and tells her story to a stone that bursts because it cannot bear such woe. (I should note that the tale ends happily; would that the same could be written for Macedonia.)

27. Thus, for example, the PCER (see note 19) immediately upon formation allied itself with Macedonian reformist parties in order to distance itself from parties such as the Party for Democratic Prosperity (PDP), which is perceived by most Macedonians as an essentially Albanian nationalist party (HM 24 September 1990). Among the demands of the PDP that engender this perception are the following: republic status for Kosovo; complete equality of languages; permission to return for noncriminals who emigrated to Turkey; restoration of various language rights, especially in education, as guaranteed by the 1974 Constitution. However, the PDP also has the support of some Turks, whose language rights have been similarly curtailed, and of some Macedonian Muslims (see below). These supporters see in the PDP’s demand the defense of their own interests (8 15 June 1991).
28. To this can be added the fact that recent events such as the persecution of Turks in Bulgaria and Greece combined with unending Greek and Bulgarian propaganda attempting to deny the legitimacy of Macedonian language and identity have led to increased closeness and cooperation between Macedonia and Turkey as exemplified by events such as diplomatic visits (HM 9 September 1991), cooperation at human rights conferences (HM 17 June 1990), and the Symposium on Turkish–Macedonian Cultural Relations sponsored by the University of Skopje (October 23–25, 1991). On the other hand, in some respects the Turks have also had cause to complain about language policies, as indicated above.

29. Another striking example of religion determining language shift was reported from the village of Bačište, seventeen kilometers from Kicevo in the heart of west-central Macedonia. Although the village is entirely Muslim Macedonian, parents are now refusing to send their children to the Macedonian-language village school and insisting on schooling in Albanian for their children. The villagers are now claiming to be Macedonianized Albanians. The Kicevo branch of the PDP has been blamed for these developments, but it is noted that all the nearby villages are Albanian Muslim, and like other Macedonian Muslims the residents of Bačište were not the subject of much economic and developmental attention (HM 13 September 1991). The Democratic Union of Turks has also been accused by Macedonian nationalists of putting assimilationist pressure on Macedonian Muslims, an accusation they bitterly resent (B 2 February 1991).

30. Actually, in the boycott of the 1991 census many Albanians did not register at all in protest of what they were convinced would be a biased census (cf. HM 26 March 1991, 2 June 1991). The declaration of Muslim as a nationality is a phenomenon characteristic of Bosnia and Hercegovina, where 43.7 percent of the population declared Muslim as their nationality in the 1991 census (HM 4 May 1991). In this part of Yugoslavia, Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism are inextricably linked with Serbian and Croatian national identity, respectively, and hence Serbo-Croatian-speaking Muslims do not chose either. The term Bosnian is ambiguous since it can refer to any inhabitant of the geographical region. In Macedonia a similar identification of Macedonian nationality and Orthodox Christianity took place and the events and articles surrounding the dedication of the main cathedral of the autocephalous Macedonian Orthodox Church in Skopje on August 12, 1990, had many references and statements equating Macedonian nationality and the Macedonian Orthodox Church.

31. Throughout the centuries shifting language, religion, and/or ethnicity have played important parts in social mobility in Macedonia, and status has played an important role in multilingualism. Thus, people lower on the social scale had to know more languages. Roms have had to be the most multilingual. Until World War II many Albanians (and Macedonians) in Macedonia knew Turkish. Now many Turks know Albanian owing to the pressure and prestige of numbers while Albanians no longer learn Turkish.

32. Although the head of the PCER, Faik Abdı, did win a seat, no Turk was elected to the Parliament or appointed to the government, apparently due to lack of sufficient organization along national lines at the time of the elections (HM 11 June 1991).

33. In Yugoslavia in 1948, 73.7 percent of the Albanian population was illiterate as opposed to 63.9 percent of the Turkish and 22.7 percent of the Macedonian. In 1971 the illiteracy rate for Albanians was 34.9 percent, that for Turks 31 percent (Jončić 1987:87).

34. The original interview with Faik Abdı has the following sentence: “Patjetër duhet të jetojmë bashkarisht, ndërkaq kjo bashkarisht sipas një mendimi të urtë latinvështë: ‘Conditio sive qua non’. Çka do të thotë ‘e keqe pa të cilën s’mundemi.’”
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