BALKANISTICA

OCCASIONAL PAPERS IN SOUTHEAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

II

1975

Editor

Kenneth E. Naylor

Assistant Editor

Craig N. Packard

Published for

The American Association for Southeast European Studies

by

Slavica Publishers, Inc.

P.O. Box 312

Cambridge, Mass. 02139

MACEDONIAN LANGUAGE AND NATIONALISM DURING THE NINETEENTH AND EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURIES

Victor A. Friedman

In contradistinction to the development of the other South Slavs, the national awakening of the Macedonians in the nineteenth century was not accompanied by the definitive formation of a literary language. To the contrary, the rise of a Macedonian national consciousness along with attempts to form a Macedonian literary language, or at least a literary language based to a large extent on Macedonian dialects, was discouraged at this time. This paper will investigate not only the phenomenon of language and national identity among the present-day Macedonians but will also demonstrate that a national identity did in fact exist among those people in the nineteenth century. Since the Macedonian literary language did not come to be officially codified and recognized until the time of the Second world War, the "nineteenth century" of Macedonian can in a sense be said to have lasted until that time.

Since the existence of a Macedonian literary language is a sensitive topic in some circles, it is desirable to give some objective definitions. The territorial definition of Macedonia is not disputed by any group: it includes southern Yugoslavia (Vardar Macedonia), much of northern Greece (Aegean Macedonia), and the southwestern corner of Bulgaria (Pirin Macedonia). Any attempts to define the limits of Macedonian on the basis of linguistic boundaries, i.e., isoglosses, however, can be met with accusations of arbitrariness or incompleteness, since there is no definitive bundle of isoglosses- separating Serbo-Croatian, Macedonian, and Bulgarian; rather, the dialects shade very gradually from one into another. The definition of the modern Macedonian literary language presents no problems, as it is firmly based on the west-central Macedonian dialects and has an established grammar, dictionary, and orthography. One has only to compare these works with their Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian counterparts to see the differences. However, because the period discussed in this paper was one during which there were no established norms for Macedonian, and because of the aforementioned problems arising from dependence on isoglosses and from political sensitivity, the most objective definition of Macedonian in the nineteenth-century is a territorial one. 'Thus, for our purposes "Macedonian" will be taken to mean the Slavic dialects

spoken in the region called Macedonia. Since this paper is concerned with the developments connectedwith the formation of the modern Macedonian literary language, those factors which did not directly contribute to these developments, i.e., Bulgarophile and Serbophile activities, will not be considered. Those people whose activity was significant for the development of Macedonian language and nationalism will be treated regardless of the name by which they may have called themselves or their language.

There is not much to be said about pre-nineteenth-century Macedonian nationalism and language. In Macedonia, as in other parts of the Ottoman Empire at that time, the major distinction was in terms of religion rather than language or nationality. Thus the important opposition was Turk/*giaour* rather than national, e.g., Slav/Greek (Arnakis 1963:116). The Slavic literary language of this period was basically Church Slavonic with ever-increasing admixtures of local dialects; texts from Macedonian speech areas show Macedonian linguistic features. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, texts were being written in Church Slavonicized dialects rather than in dialectal Church Slavonic (Koneski 1967b:22-26). (While a number of manuscripts exist in various dialects using both the Cyrillic and Greek alphabets, the discussion in this paper will be restricted to published texts.)

Blaže Koneski (1967b:27) has noted that the earliest published Macedonian text was aimed at the elimination of the language. This was the *Tetraglosson* (*Četirijazičnik*) of the Vlah Hadži Daniil of Moskopole (Albanian *Voskopojë*), first published in Venice in 1794. This quadrilingual word list and didactic conversation manual had as its purpose the Hellenization of Albanians, Aromanians, and Slavs. The Slavic section, called *Bulgarika*, was written in the Ohrid dialect as translated by the priest Stefan of Ohrid (Kepeski 1972:27; Lunt 1953:366). The *Tetraglosson* raises the two major problems of Macedonian language and nationalism during the first half of the nineteenth century: Hellenization and the distinction Bulgarian/Macedonian. As will be seen, the main problem of this period for the Christian South Slavs living in Ottoman territory was the combatting of Hellenization, so such concerns as differentiation among themselves were of secondary importance. The term *Bulgarian* has a long history of being used indiscriminately for the South Slavs living in Turkey, e.g., in the seventeenth century Evlija Celebija wrote of "Bulgarians" in Belgrade and Sarajevo (Koneski 1968:24). During the early nineteenth century, the Bulgarian literary language had not yet developed

its definite eastern character; in fact, the question of a literary language based on the vernacular was not yet considered settled. Church Slavonic (or, in the South, Greek) was still regarded as the language of the high style of writing (Xoneski 1967a:88). Thus the question of whether to call the language of the books of the earliest writers to use Macedonian dialects *Macedonian* or *Bulgarian* is basically immaterial. Wh , is significant is that they tried to use some form of Macedo-Bulgarian vernacular.

The first two writers to publish books in a language based on Macedonian dialects were Hadži Joakim Krčovski (d. 1820), who used a language based on the Kratovo-Kriva Palanka dialects of northeastern Macedonia, and his somewhat younger contemporary Hadži Kiril Pejčinoviḱ (c. 1770-1845), who wrote in the Tetovo dialect, with fewer Church Slavonicisms than Joakim (Lunt 1953:336)[1] Both these writers called their language *Bulgarian,* but since their dialects **were** Macedonian, they can be considered as the first to publish books in some form of Macedonian (Koneski 1967a:88). Their importance to the development of the Macedonian language lies in the fact that their work gave the authority of the printed word to the colloquial language (Koneski 1967b:31). That a justification of the use of the vernacular in publishing was thought necessary can be seen in Hadži Teodosij Sinaitski of Dojran's preface to Kiril Pejčinoviḱ's *Utješenie Grješnim* 'Consolation for Sinners' (Salonika, 1840), in which he likens Church Slavonic to a golden key but defends the vernacular by saying that it is like a key of iron and steel (*železo i čilik*) and that it is just such a key that is needed to open the heart of the common man (prostiot *čelovek*) (Polenakoviḱ 1973:244-245). That such a defense should be written in 1840 shows that the concept of using the spoken language as the language ofliterarure had not yet been fully accepted among the Christian South Slavs of the Ottoman Empire.. The Macedonians' desire for a single Macedo-Bulgarian literary language based on a compromise between various Macedonian and Bulgarian dialects can be said to find its first expression in the works of Joakim and Kiril, but these works were also important because they provided an alternative to Greek.

Before the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1871-1872, the Macedonians and Bulgarians were more or less united in the so-called *Crkvena Borba,* 'Ecclesiastical Struggle,' against the Phanariot Patriarchate of Constantinople (Apostolski 1969a: 63). Although there was some Serbian influence in northern Macedonia, it was not of a very extensive nature (Clissold 1968:145). Thus Greek and the Greek Patriarchate constituted the major threats to

Macedonian language and nationalism during the middle of the nineteenth century, i.e., once a Slavic national consciousness had become sufficiently developed.

According to Stavrianos (1963:97-98), the Macedonian Slavs escaped Hellenization by remaining illiterate during the long period under the Constantinople Patriarchate, thereby preserving their "Slavic dialects" and customs, which provided them with the prerequisites for a national awakening in the nineteenth century. Koneski (1967a:168), however, points out that with the exception of Konstantinov-Džinot, all of the earliest Macedonian educators and writers were from the Ohrid-Struga area, or at least from the South, where Greek influence was stronger and the schools were better. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the Macedonian national consciousness and the first attempts at a Macedonian literary language, in the form of a unified Macedo-Bulgarian language, have their roots in the struggle against the Hellenizing policies of the Phanariot Patriarchate from the 1840s through the 1860s (Lunt 1953:367).

Examples of the opposition of the Greek Church to any form of education in Slavic in Macedonia can be seen in the treatment of Jordan Hadži Konstantinov-Džinot (b. Veles 1820 - d. 1882) and the brothers Dimitar and Konstantin Miladinov (b. Struga 1810 and 1832, respectively - d. 1862). In a letter dated Skopje, April 23, 1856, Jordan complains that he has been persecuted by bishops and rich citizens for fifteen years. In Veles, where he had been teaching, he writes that the Greek bishop summoned the local leading citizens (*čorbadžii*) and demanded that he be stopped, with the following words: *"Da go ispudite toj čapkăn učitel, toj Jordan kopil sefi pušt*!" ('Kick that skirt-chasing teacher out, that Jordan whoreson pimp faggot!' Koneski and Jašar-Nasteva 1966:88-89). Dimitar Miladinov was one of the first to identify himself as a Macedonian. He advocated the creation of a Macedo-Bulgarian literary language in which Macedonian would play a significant role (Lunt 1953: 367-68). In 1861 Dimitar was jailed in Constantinople at the behest of the Greek bishop of Ohrid. When his younger brother, Konstantin, rushed to Constantinople to help him, he, too, was imprisoned, and they both died in January 1862 (Mitrev 1962:25).

The last ten years of the anti-Phanariot struggle saw the crystallization of Macedonian national and linguistic identity in two forms: Unitarian and separatist. The Unitarians continued the tradition of Dimitar Miladinov, i.e., they advocated a single Macedo-Bulgarian literary language which would be based to a greater or lesser extent on Macedonian dialects. The separatists, or Macedonists, felt that the Bulgarian literary language was too different from

Macedonian to be used by them, and they advocated a distinct Macedonian literary language;-

Partenij Zografski (b. Galičnik 1818 - d. 1875) was the earliest-leading figure of the Macedonian Unitarians. He wrote the first Macedonian (or Macedo-Bulgarian) textbooks (Apostolski 1969a:67) and was the first to espouse the cause of a Macedo-Bulgarian compromise literary language in print, in an article in *Carigradski Vestnik* of February 9, 1857, No. 315. Books had been printed in Macedonian before, but Partenij's were the first to attempt to establish a literary norm. His two textbooks were printed in Constantinople in 1857 and 1858. The second book was to have been printed in Salonika, but the Greeks would not allow it (Roneski 1967a:177-78, 181-82). The significance of Partenij's textbooks for the development of Macedonian language and nationalism can be seen in the reaction of Bulgarians to his language and ideas. In various articles which appeared in 1857 and 1858, Partenij was said to be advocating Serbism, his language was called 'a mishmash of Bulgarian and Serbian' *(edna razmesa od Bălgarski i Srăbski)*, and he was referred to as an Arnaut attempting to compose a Bulgarian grammar (Koneski 1967a: 188-90). Partenij envisioned a Macedo-Bulgarian compromise based on West Macedonian, which he used in his textbooks and which he described in some detail in articles appearing in *Carigradski Vestnik* in 1857 and *Bălgarski Knižici* in 1858.[2] The Bulgarians, however, envisioned a Macedo-Bulgarian compromise as consisting of the adoption of Thraco-Moesian Bulgarian by the Macedonians (Koneski 1967a:190). The very appearance of Macedonian textbooks at that time indicates the development of some form of Macedonian national consciousness and the objections of the Bulgarian press show that they were aware of the possible separatist nationalist implications of such manifestations.

Between 1867 and 1868 Dimitar V. Makedonski (b. Embore, Kajlarsko [Greek *Ptolemaïs*] - d. 1898) published three textbooks. His language was close to the West Macedonian of Partenij, but he also included features from his own Aegean dialect, e.g., the reduction of unstressed vowels (/e/>/i/, /o/>/u/) (Koneski 1967a:202-203). Thus his name must be included among the list of those who contributed to Macedonian nationalism by publishing textbooks which attempted to synthesize Macedonian dialects into a literary language. Partenij's most active pupil, Kuzman Šapkarev (b. Ohrid 1834 - d. 1908), published eight textbooks beween 1868 and 1874; he also wrote three other textbooks which were not published. Although he began as a Unitarian and the language of his earliest textbooks contained more East Bulgarian elements than Partenij's,

with each book his language became more West Macedonian, and he eventually became a "flaming Macedonist" in practice if not in print (Koneski 1967a:199-200, 209-10).[3]

The years 1870-1872 witnessed the end of the anti-Phanariot struggle and the Bulgarian rejection of a Macedo-Bulgarian linguistic compromise. In answer to an article written by Šapkarev, published in the periodical *Makedonija* on June 15 and July 3, 1870; Marin Drinov, in the name of the Brăila Literary Society, stated in an article appearing in the July 31, 1870 issue of the same periodical that the new Bulgarian literary language could not accept any Macedonian compromise, i.e., it would remain Thraco-Moesian. Later in the same year, Šapkarev convinced the citizens of Resen to return the Bulgarian textbooks ordered for their school and use his Macedonian ones instead. This can be said to have made him a Macedonist, although he still advocated compromise in his journal articles (Koneski 1967a:223-25, 228-31). One result of this act was an anonymous letter to the November 30, 1870 issue of the Constantinople periodical *Pravo,* in which the language of Šapkarev's textbook is called a pure Ohrid dialect which stinks of Arnautisms and Hellenisms. Šapkarev was also accused of saying *Edvam se oslobodixme od* G&cite, *sega pak Šopie li da staneme?* 'We've barely freed ourselves from the Greeks--are we to become Bulgars now?' (Sazdov 1975a:22). It soon became clear that the writer of the anonymous letter was the owner of the bookstore in Veles which had to take back the Bulgarian textbooks returned by the citizens of Resen.

In the following year, 1871, the newly formed Bulgarian Exarchate excluded the Macedonian representatives from its first council, calling them *Cincari.*[4] In 1872, after the establishment of the Exarchate, the Bulgarians publicly adopted the attitude that Macedonian was a degenerate dialect and that Macedonians should learn Bulgarian (Lunt 1953:369-70; Koneski 1967a:251). The nature of the policy developed by the Exarchate toward Macedonia can be seen in the fact that in 1872 the eparchate of Veles, in Macedonia, was expected to pay the Exarchate 45,000 groša for 6,500 weddings, while the eparchates of Samokov and Kjustendil, in Bulgaria, were each taxed the same amount as Veles, i.e., 45,000 groša, although they had 30,000 weddings apiece (Koneski 1967a:197-98). In that same year, Venijamin Mačukovski solicited subscriptions for the printing of his Macedonian grammar, but the reaction of the Constantinople Bulgarian press prevented its publication (Koneski 1967b:34; Lunt 1953:369).

The earliest known document of a separatist character is a letter written by the teacher Nikola

Filipov of Bansko in southeastern Macedonia to the Bulgarian philologist Najden Gerov in 1848. In the letter, Filipov expresses his dissatisfaction with the use of the eastern dialect of Bulgarian in literature and textbooks (Apostolski 1969a:67). In the 1860s, people in Salonika were saying they were neither Bulgarian, Greek, nor Aromanian, but "pure Macedonian." Šapkarev's textbooks were enthusiastically received and replaced Greek ones in central and southern Macedonia. Parents preferred them-to Bulgarian books because they could understand Sapkarev's textbooks when their children read aloud (Koneski 1967a:204-206). But it was not until 1875 that a Macedonist expressed his ideas openly in print. This was the self-educated mason Ǵorǵi Pulevski (b. Galičnik 1838 - d. 1894). Between 1873 and 1880 he published three textbooks. Proof of Pulevski's acquaintance with earlier works is seen in the fact that in the first ninety pages of his *Rečnik od tri* jezika ('Dictionary of three languages,' Belgrade, 1875) he incorporates the content of Sapkarev's *pъrvonačjalny poznanija za malečki dětca* ('Elementary knowledge for small children,' Constantinople, 1868) (Koneski 1967a: 255). Unlike Šapkarev, however, Pulevski made no attempt to write in a Macedo-Bulgarian compromise (Lunt 1953:368; Koneski 1967a:257).[5] In his *Rečnik od tri jezika*, Pulevski stated that the Macedonians constituted a separate nationality and advocated a Macedonian literary language and a free Macedonia (Lunt 1953: 368; Koneski 1974:58). Pulevski himself attempted to write a Macedonian grammar, and it was published in Sofia in 1880 under the title *Slavjano-naseljenski makedonska slognica rečovska* ('Grammar of the language of the Macedonian Slavic population'). Since Pulevski was not sufficiently educated for the task, his grammar remains only an expression of the striving for a Macedonian literary language (Koneski 1967a: 257, 260).

In 1953, Blaže Koneski published a brief article in *Makedonski jazik* announcing that he had discovered a reference to Pulevski's *Slognica rečovska* in an old periodical. He went on to say that this would make Pulevski the author of the first Macedonian grammar and to express the hope that a copy of it might still be found in Macedonia (Koneski 1953:45). In a later number of the journal that same year, Haralampie Polenakovik announced that he had just found a copy of Pulevski's grammar in Ohrid, and he published the title page with the announcement (Polenakovik 1953: 188). This indicates the extent to which evidence of Macedonian nationalism was lost in later years, a point which will be returned to later.

One other textbook which should be mentioned was published in 1889 in Constantinople by Stojan

Novaković, who had 7,000 copies printed. Two-thirds of it was written in Macedonian and one-third in Serbo-Croatian. His intention was to combat Bulgarian propaganda and to promote Serbian interests, but he soon abandoned the whole idea for fear of arousing Macedonian nationalism (Koneski 1959:15).

If Novaković's textbook is excluded, it is possible to speak of sixteen textbooks published between 1857 and 1880 by Partenij, Makedonski, Šapkarev, and Pulevski. These textbooks were important in the development of Macedonian national unity. They were directly connected with Macedonian separatism by teaching children that they were not Bulgarian. They show that Macedonians did not all think of themselves as Bulgarians, and they demonstrate that the "Macedonian Question" was not only an issue at the Berlin Congress of 1878 but a problem which had developed at least twenty years before the Congress (Apostolski 1969a:67-69). The next period in the development of Macedonian language and nationalism was one of periodicals, organizations, inflammatory literature, and insurrections, rather than textbooks and compromises.

When Bulgaria gained its independence in 1878, after the Russo-Turkish War, a large number of Macedonians emigrated there from the Ottoman Empire, where they attempted to found literary societies. For example, in Sofia in 1888 Ǧorǧi Pulevski founded the Slavo-Macedonian Literary Society, but it was dispersed by the authorities and some of its members were imprisoned. Of the many societies formed by Macedonian immigrants at this time, one of the most important was the Young Macedonian Literary Society (*Mladata Makedonska Kniževna Družina*), which published the journal *Loza* 'The Vine' in Sofia from 1892 to 1894. Although the group tried to give the impression of being Unitarians of Partenij's type, i.e., desirous of the participation of Macedonian in a common Macedo-Bulgarian language, they were in fact separatists, as can be seen from the fact that they had a public constitution published in Sofia, and a secret one printed in Romania. The Society, despite its shortexistence, was not without effect. The year 1893 saw the founding of the student society *Vardar* in Belgrade and the *Vnatrešna Makedonska Revolucionerna Organizacija* 'Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization' (VMRO) in Salonika. *Vardar* was a direct response to *Loza* and included as members Krste P. Misirkov and Dimitrija D. Čupovski, who first began to develop their Macedonian nationalist ideas at that time, while the VMRO was founded by members of *Loza* and similar groups, e.g., Petar Pop Arsov (Ristovski 1973:143-48).

On St. Elijah's Day (*Ilinden*), August 2, (N.S.), 1903, the VMRO attempted an insurrection to free

Macedonia, but the rebellion was repressed. One of the problems which the VMRO failed to solve was the clarification of its policy on nationalism and language. The members of the VMRO wanted political freedom from Turkey and the Exarchate and thought that cultural policies could be worked out later (Stavrianos 1958:519-20). However, owing to its lack of a specific national policy, the VMRO came under considerable Bulgarian influence during the *Ilinden* uprising (Koneski 1967b:41). Krste Misirkov (b. Postol [Greek *Pélla*] 1874 – d. 1926), who had returned to Macedonia from St. Petersburg to participate in the insurrection, went back to Russia immediately after the failure of the *Ilinden* rebellion and delivered a series of lectures to the various literary societies there to inform them of the events taking place in Macedonia. That November he went to Sofia to arrange for the printing of a book based on his lectures, *Za makedonckite raboti* 'On Macedonian matters.' The book appeared in Sofia in December 1903 but was confiscated by the Bulgarian police in the printing shop before it could be distributed (Lunt 1953:370). Misirkov himself was expelled from Bulgaria, and returned to Russia (Misirkov 1974:19-20; Lunt 1953:370). *Za makedonckite raboti* was written by Misirkov in response to the failure of *Ilinden* (Koneski 1967b:41) and constitutes the ideological culmination of the development of nineteenth-century Macedonian nationalism, particularly from the linguistic point of view. As an illustration of this, the final paragraph of the book will be cited here:

> 1, Prilepcko-Bitolckoto narečije za literaturen jazik, kao jednakvo daleko i ot srbckijot i bugarckijot jazici, i centralno vo Makedonija. 2, fonetičnijot praopis . . . so mali otstapki na etimologijata i 3, rečničnijot materijal da jet sobrajn'e ot site makedoncki narečija.
>
> (Misirkov 1903:145)

> '[The following should be adopted:] 1. The Prilep-Bitola dialect as the basis of the literary language, since it is equally distant from Serbian and Bulgarian, and central in Macedonia, 2. A phonetic orthography . . . with minor concessions to etymology and 3. The collecting of dictionary material from all Macedonian dialects.'

Misirkov concluded his book by calling for the establishment of a Macedonian literary language using virtually the same principles which were ultimately arrived at in 1944 in ignorance of his work.[6] Because all but a few copies were destroyed, *Za makedonckite raboti* was prevented from having much influence in Macedonia between the two world wars: the second

edition did not come out until 1946. No copies of the first edition survived in Macedonia: the writer Kole Nedelkovski found a copy of it in the Sofia public library (Koneski 1967b:44).

During the years between *Ilinden* and the Balkan Wars, living conditions in Macedonia were difficult. Most intellectual activity was carried on outside the country, largely in St. Petersburg, where Misirkov and Dimitrija Dimov Pavle-Čupovski (b. Papradište 1878 - d. 1940) were active in forming literary societies and publishing periodicals, e.g., the political journal Vardar (Ristovski 1966) and *Makedonski Golos* 'Macedonian Voice' (Sazdov 1975b). As has been indicated by the fate of Pulevski's and Misirkov's books, knowledge of nineteenth-century Macedonian nationalistic and linguistic activity was lost, at least in part, as a result of the policies of various opposing parties. Ristovski (1973:142) complains that many of the details of nineteenth-century Macedonian intellectual development remain carefully guarded in the state archives in Sofia. Nevertheless, those periodicals and memoirs which have survived indicate that the Macedonian intelligentsia were active in the search for their identity.

Outside of Macedonia, scholars began to concern themselves with the "Macedonian Question." In 1890, Komarov's ethnographic map, published in St. Petersburg, became the first to recognize the Macedonians by giving them a separate color (Ristovski 1973:140). Lamouche (1899:23-24) wrote that the Macedonians were neither Serbs nor Bulgarians, but he concluded, on the assumption that language was the only indisputable indicator of nationality, that Macedonians were Serbs if they spoke Serbian and Bulgarians if they spoke Bulgarian. Even in Serbia, there was some recognition of the independence of Macedonian. In an article in *Brankovo Kolo* in 1904, Andra Gavrilović wrote *a* review of Vojdan Černodrinski's troupe's visit to Belgrade, in which he said that the language of the troupe's plays marked the de-but of a fourth South Slavic literary language, not just a jargon (Koneski 1959:16).

The partition of Macedonia in 1913, after the Second Balkan War, had the ruinous effect on Macedonian nationalism that Misirkov predicted (Koneski 1967b:44), e.g., in Greece, under Metaxas, the Macedonian language became illegal (Apostolski, 1969b: 271-72). The greater part of Macedonia went to Serbia, where Macedonian was treated as a South Serbian dialect, in contrast to the situation in Bulgaria, where it was treated as West Bulgarian, or Greece, where it was treated as nonexistent.

Throughout the interwar period, scholars in the Balkans and elsewhere carried on a polemic over the

nationality and language of the Macedonians. In America, Dominian's (1916:440-43) ethnographic map colored Macedonia "Bulgarian," except for the northwest, which was colored "Albanian." Dominian also wrote that Macedonian was closer to Bulgarian, but transitional to Serbian.

In a book called *0 Makedoniji i Makedoncima* 'About Macedonia and the Macedonians' (1918), the scholars Wendl, Rizov and Tomić argue over the nature of Macedonia, its people, and their language. Rizov claims that the people are Bulgarian and that the land belongs to Bulgaria (Wendl, Rizov, and Tomić 1918:31 and *passim*). Wendl, along with Fischer and Cvijić, holds that the Macedonians could become either Serbs or Bulgarians (Wendl, Rizov, and Tomić 1917:109), while Tomić says that the Macedonians are really Serbs who have been subjected to more Turkish influence than other Serbs and have recently been Bulgarized by the Exarchate (Wendl, Rizov, and Tomić 1918:108-109).

The Serbian linguist Aleksandar Belie (1919:250) quotes Meillet in saying that the Macedonian dialects are neither Serbian nor Bulgarian and that politics will determine the linguistic fate of Macedonia. Belić then goes on to claim that the north and central Macedonian dialects are basically Serbian while the south is basically Bulgarian. He bases this argument almost entirely on the reflexes of Common Slavic */tj/, */dj/ in Macedonia, i.e., north and central /ǩ/, /ĝ/, south /šč/,/žǰ/. He rejects Oblak's suggestion that the reflexes /ǩ/, /ĝ/ are the result of Serbian-influenced substitution. He also ridicules Bulgarian scholars by suggesting that his opinion coincides with that of impartial European scholarship, viz., his interpretation of Meillet, because Serbia had contact with the West while Bulgaria slept deeply under the Turkish yoke, and that the resulting difference in intellectual development could not easily be overcome (Belie 1919:253-56, 264).

Vaillant (1938:119) writes that Belie's argument is based essentially on one phonetic trait and that most Slavists agree that Macedonian is actually a part of a Macedo-Bulgarian group which has been subjected to the prolonged influence of Serbian. He lists numerous phonological traits which link Macedonian with Bulgarian rather than Serbian, e.g., the fate of the jers and juses, /vъ/, and /l̥/, and goes on to note that vestiges of /št/ in the /ǩ/ area show that the latter reflex is the result of substitution, e.g., in Galičnik *gaki'* 'underpants' but *gašnik* (cf. Bulgarian *gaštnik*) 'a belt for holding up *gaki'*. Vaillant concludes his remarks by saying that Macedonian is not a dialect of Bulgarian and deserves a separate place in a Macedo-Bulgarian group (1938:204-08).

In Vardar Macedonia, as opposed to Aegean or Pirin Macedonia, Macedonian nationalism was kept alive long enough to find its ultimate expression in a literary language and separate republic in Yugoslavia after World War Two. While Metaxas was imprisoning Macedonians in Greece for speaking their native language, the Serbs were permitting the publication of folkloristic literature in Macedonian, e.g., Vasil Iljoski's play *Lenče Kumanovče* 'Lenče from Kumanovo,'[7] first performed in Skopje in 1928, and the collection of poems *Oginot* 'The Fire' (1938) by Venko Markovski (Koneski 1967b:47). In addition to this permissiveness, attempts at Serbianization, e.g., forcing Macedonians to attend Serbian schools, only served to increase Macedonian self-awareness by bringing together Macedonians from different parts of the country and attempting to force them to learn a language which was not their native one (Koneski 1967a:96; Lunt 1959:21).

In 1934, the Comintern ruled that the Macedonians had a right to exist as a separate people with a separate language, and illegal Communist Party newspapers and leaflets began to be published and circulated (Apostolski 1969b:85,101,116; Hristov 1970:395-400; Koneski 1967b:46-48). During world War Two, the Yugoslav partisans won jurisdiction over Macedonia and followed Tito's policy of cultural autonomy by issuing leaflets and news bulletins in Macedonian (Lunt 1959:23). The development of literature and propaganda in Macedonian before the War were crucial factors in the rapid crystallization of the literary language after 1944 (Lunt 1953:373; Koneski 1967b:48). While doing research in Skopje during 1973-1974, I had occasion to compare the original manuscripts of plays written by Risto Krle and Dimitar Kočov in the late 1930s with the versions published in the 1960s, well after the establishment of the literary language. The only major difference was that these writers tended to use the third person singular present desinence *-t* in their manuscripts, while this feature was not adopted as part of the literary language (cf. footnote 6). Thus, as Lunt (1959:23) suggests, the formal proclamation of Macedonian as a literary language on August 2, 1944 was merely official recognition of the status quo.

The development of Macedonian language and nationalism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries can be roughly divided into four periods. (It has not been possible to mention all those who played a part in this development: attention has been focused on the people of greatest significance for Macedonian linguistic history, and this in turn reflects the history of Macedonian nationalism.) The periods themselves are not inviolable sections of time, but

merely indications of the approximate time during which certain tendencies were stronger or more important than others. The following table summarizes the periodization suggested by this paper:

I. 1794-1840: The period of the first published texts employing Macedonian dialects. Main figures: Hadži Daniil of Moskopole, Hadži Joakim Krčovski, and Hadži Kiril Pejčinović. Main event: the awakening of a Slavic national consciousness. The opposition Turk/*giaour* is superceded by Greek/Slav, and Slavs struggle for a literary language of their own.

II. 1840-1870: The period of the first textbooks. Main figures: Dimitar and Konstantin Miladinov, Jordan Hadži Konstantinov-Dkinot, Kuzman Šapkarev. Main event: the anti-Phanariot struggle. Most intellectuals favor a common Macedo-Bulgarian literary language based to a large extent on Macedonian.

III. 1870-1913: The period of the first grammars and nationalist publications. Main figures: Ǵorǵi Pulevski, Krste P. Misirkov, Dimitrija Dimov Pavle-Čupovski, Petar Pop Arsov, and other members of the VMRO. Main events: the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, the *Ilinden* rebellion, and the partition of Macedonia. Macedonian nationalism is opposed to Bulgarian and Serbian interests.

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

In conclusion I would like to emphasize the fact that in the nineteenth century, Macedonian was already in the process of developing into a literary language much like the contemporary one. The process was cut short by the partition of 1913, and yet it began anew and resumed the same direction of development in Yugoslavia during the interwar period, so that the language officially proclaimed in 1944 was essentially the same one which had developed during the course of the preceding century.

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

FOOTNOTES

[1]An example of the more colloquial character of Kiril Pečinovik's language is his consistent use of parataxis to "translate" Church Slavonic hypotaxis (Koneski 1967a:126).

[2]Partenij listed twelve Macedonian characteristics which he felt were basic to the literary language he was advocating: 1) Macedonian stress tends toward the beginning of the word, like Serbian, rather than toward the end like Bulgarian. 2) */tj/ */dj/ give /ḱ/ /ǵ/ rather than /št/ /žd/ as in the word *meǵu vs. meždu* 'between.' 3) Unstressed a, e, and 0 are not reduced in Macedonian. (Koneski points out that they are reduced in the Southeast.) 4) Macedonian and Bulgarian have different reflexes of vocalic */ŗ/ and */ļ/. 5) In Macedonian, /ě/>/e/ vs. Bulgarian /ja/. 6) In Macedonian, x becomes ø, *f*, or *v*. 7) Macedonian has definite articles of the type *-ov* and *-on*, in addition to - ot. 8) Macedonian, according to Partenij, has more remnants of the nominal declension. 9) Macedonian neuter nouns in -e have a plural in *-inja*. 10) The third singular present tense ending is *-t*. (The third plural varies.) 11) Macedonian has a verbal adverb. (12) */ǫ/ gives /a/ or /o/, e.g., pat or pot vs. Bulgarian *păt*. (Koneski 1967a:182-184) Partenij is against the use of *ѫ*, and a feminine accusative -&in the orthography, because they have no basis in the living language. In his first book, Partenij used such Galičnicisms as o for the reflex of */ǫ/, 3rd pl. aor. *-e*, 1st pl. pronoun *mie*, and 3rd sg. neut. pronoun *tea*. In his second book, he tried using more forms from other Macedonian dialects and avoiding Galičnicisms (Koneski 1967a:179-180,185). Partenij's twelve points, which he published in an article which appeared in the Constantinople Bulgarian periodical *Bălgarski knižici* of January 1, 1858, substantiate Lunt's statement, that while Slavic linguistic frontiers are relative in the Balkans, natives pick on certain linguistic traits, e.g., reflexes of jers and juses, stress, and vowel reduction, as distinguishing their speech from that of their neighbors (Lunt 1953:364,371).

[3]Some characteristics of Šapkarev's language are the following: 1) Use of the Ohrid reflex of */ǫ/ (=a), because it is like Bulgarian. 2) Use of 1st sg. pres. *-m* only with the *a*-group (*begam* 'I run' *vs. kaža* 'I say'). 3) Use of Ohrid verb groups, i.e., absence of an i-group. 4) Ohrid verbal adverbs (in *-štem*). 5) Bulgarian orthography and relative pronouns. 6) Misuse of *ě* but correct use of x. 7) Many Russisms and Church Slavonicisms, like Partenij, but with interesting "glosses," e.g., *polza* 'fajda' *('use')*, *dlăžnost* 'borč' ('debt'), *văzduh* 'hava' ('air'), *narodi* 'mileti' ('peoples'). (Koneski1967a:210-12)

[4]On the other hand, some Macedonists claimed that they were pure Slavs and that the Bulgarians were 'Tatars' (Koneski 1967a:237). This notion is also commonly found among Turks, e.g., *Bulgarlar Türktür, bunları Islāv yapan dildir* 'The Bulgarians are Turkish, it is their language which makes them Slav' (Lewis 1953:81).

[5]Pulevski attempted to use a supradialectal language, but as he was not well educated his language suffered from inconsistencies. He used such Galičnicisms as /o/ from */ǫ/ 3rd pl. aor. -(j)e, and the future particle ќa. He had verbal adverbs in -eќi, -ješti, and -ješči. In his grammar (1880), he opposed Macedonian, which he called *našinski or slavjano-makedonski,* to Bulgarian and Serbian on phonological and lexical bases. By this time he was also able to differentiate between the Galičnik reflex of */ǫ/ and the more common Macedonian reflex a (Koneski 1967a:258-60).

[6]In fact, Misirkov's language has fewer traits in common with literary Serbian or Bulgarian than does the modern Macedonian literary language, as can be seen in the following list of traits of Misirkov's language: 1) */tj/ gives šč vs. literary *k.* 2) Intervocalic V is lost everywhere, even in neologisms, e.g., *osnoač* vs. literary *osnovač* 'founder'. 3) jnj vs. literary nj, e.g., in verbal nouns in *-nje.* 4) 3rd sg. pres. *-t* vs. literary *-ø.* 5) *Numerous* neologisms (Koneski 1967b:43). Misirkov's orthography was essentially the same as the modern one, except that he had an additional letter? for etymological */ǫ/ (Ristovski 1966:56). (This was the concession to etymology referred to in point two of the closing paragraph of *Za makedoncskite raboti.*)

[7]The play was published in Iljoski's *Izbor* 'Selected works' (1966, Skopje) under the name *Begalka* 'The run-away bride'.

REFERENCES

Apostolski, Mihailo et al. 1969a. *Istorija na makedonskiot* narod, vol. 2. Skopje: Institut za Narodna Istorija.

_____. 1969b. *Istorija na makedonskiot narod,* vol. 3. Skopje: Institut za Narodna Istorija.

Arnakis, G. 1963. "The role of religion in the development of Balkan nationalism." *The Balkans in* Transition, ed. by Charles and Barbara Jelavich. Berkeley: University of California Press, 115-144.

Belić, Aleksandar. 1919. *La Macédoine.* Paris: Bloud & Gay.

Clissold, Stephen et al. 1968. *A short history of Yugoslavia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Dominian, Leon. 1916. "Linguistic areas in Europe: Their boundaries and political significance." *Annual report* of the *Board* of *Regents* of *the* Smithsonian Institution *1915,* 409-443. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Hristov, Aleksandar. 1970. *Zbornik na dokumenti za sozduvanje na makedonskata državnost (1893-1944).* Skopje: Univerzitet "Kiril i Metodij."

Kepeski, Krume. 1972. *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturen jazik za učilišta od II stepen.* Skopje: Prosvetno Delo.

Koneski, Blaže. 1953. "Gramatikata na G. Pulevski." *Makedonski jazik* 4.45-47.

_____. 1959. "La question de la langue littéraire au XIX et au début du XX siècle." *Langue littéraire macédonienne,* 10-17. Belgrade: Jugoslavija.

Koneski, Blake and Olivera Jašar-Nasteva. 1966. *Makedonski tekstovi 20-20 vek.* Skopje: Sojuzot na društvata za makedonski jazik i literatura.

Koneski, Blaže. 1967a. *Za makedonskiot Ziteraturen jazik.* Skopje: Kultura.

_____. 1967b. *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturen jazik.* Skopje: Kultura.

_____. 1968. *Makedonskiot jazik vo razvojot* na *slovenskite literaturni jazici.* Skopje: Kultura.

_____. 1974. "The image of Gjorgji Pulevski," translated by Victor A. Friedman. *Macedonian Review 4.57-59.*

Korubin, Blagoja. 197.2. "Jazičnoto prašanje vo makedonija vo vtorata polovina na 19 vek." *Predavanja na V Seminar za Makedonski jazik, Ziteratura i kultura, 29-37.* Skopje: Univerzitet "Kiril i Metodij" Seminar za Makedonski Jazik, Literature i Kultura.

Lamouche, Léon. 1899. *La péninsule balkanique.* Paris: Paul Ollendorf.

Lewis, Geoffrey L. *1953. Teach yourself Turkish.* London: English Universities Press, Ltd.

Lunt, Horace. 1953. "A survey of Macedonian literature." *Harvard Slavic Studies* 1.363-396.

_____. 1959. "The creation of standard Macedonian: Some facts and attitudes." *Anthropological Linguistics* 1,5. 19-26.

Misirkov, Krste P. 1903. *Za makedonckite raboti.* [Reprinted 19741. Skopje: Institut za Makedonski jazik.

_____. 1974. *On Macedonian matters,* translated by Alan McConnell. Skopje: Macedonian Review.

Mitrev, Dimitar. 1962. "Po tragite od podvigot na Miladinovci." *Miladinovci--Zbornik--1861-1961.* Skopje: Kočo Racin.

Polenakovik, Haralampie. 1953. "Za gramatikata na Pulevski." *Makedonski jazik 4.188-189.*

_____. 1973. *Nikulcite na novata makedonska književnost.* Skopje: Misla.

Ristovski, Blake. 1966. *"Vardar": Naučno-literaturno i opštestveno-političko spisanie na* K. *P. Misirkov.* Skopje: Institut za Makedonski jazik.

_____. 1973. "The Macedonian literary society *Loza.*" *Macedonian Review 2.139-148.*

Sazdov, Tome. 1975a. *Životot i deloto na K. A. Šapkarev.* Skopje: Sovremenost.

_____. 1975b. "The role of the periodic@ *Macedonian Voice* (1913/14)." *Macedonian Review 5.44-51.*

Stavrianos, L. S. 1958. *The Balkans since 2493.* New York: Rinehart & Co.

_____. 1963. *The Balkans: 1815-1914.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston,

Vaillant, A. 1938. "Le problème du slave macédonien." *Bulletin de la Société Linquistique de Paris 39* fasc. 2 no. 116.194-210.

Wendl, Herman, D. Rizov and Svet. Tomić. 1918. *0 Makedoniji i Makedoncima.* Belgrade(?): Državna Štamparija Kraljevine Srbije.