invested with great significance (e.g. "The modern common Serbo-Croatian literary language can be considered to date from the signing of the Književni dogovor in Vienna in March 1850." Naylor 1980:78), then the writer favors a unified Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian literary language. If, however, the significance of the Vienna Literary Agreement is belittled by arguments such as the fact that it was signed by a small number of people (two Serbs [V. Karadžić and Đ. Đamšić], five Croats [I. Kukuljević, I. Mažuranić, D. Demeter, V. Pacel, St. Pejković], and a Slovene [F. Miklošić]), that it was not authorized by any state formation, that it did not have any immediate results (e.g., Vuk’s standard and its orthography was not officially introduced into Serbian schools until 1868), that the unified language was not actually given a name, etc. (e.g. Banac 1984:231, Franolić 1980:31, Katić 1984:289-90), the writer is arguing for a separate Croatian literary language, and moreover is presenting attempts at unitarism as aberrations rather than mainstream developments.34

An irony of the current situation in former Yugoslavia is that the language specified in the Vienna Literary Agreement was being elaborated by a Serb — Vuk Karadžić—and was identified at the time with Serbian rather than Croatian intellectual movements, and yet in the current split it is precisely this language that is more closely identified with Croatian rather than Serbian (cf. Ivčić 1971:184-85). Vuk was born in Tršić in the Stokavian-ijekavian area of Serbia, right on the Bosnian border. However, Vojvodina and Šumadija—whose major population centers, Novi Sad and Belgrade, respectively, had become centers of Serbian culture (especially after 1690) and, in the case of Belgrade, of the nascent Serbian state (beginning with the uprising of 1804)—are both in the heart of Stokavian-ekavian territory, which in any case was overwhelmingly Serbian. This was and remains in contrast to Stokavian-ijekavian territory, which is still religiously and ethnically mixed, and where, together with Stokavian-ekavian territory, almost all Croatian Stokavian speakers were and are to be found. The result was that over time Stokavian-ekavian became identified with Serbian and Stokavian-ijekavian with Croatian.35 Thus jat-reflexes became emblematic of a variety of "ethnic" differences.

At the same time, however, state formations do not correspond to dialectal boundaries. Thus, for example, as can be seen from Map Three, the political boundaries of Croatia, Bosnia-Hercegovina, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) do not correspond in any significant way to the major dialectal divisions.36 As a result, attempts are being made in the countries that have emerged from former Yugoslavia to create identities that will enshrine contrasting dialectal differences. Moreover, there is a lack of correspondence between the original location of the dialectal base (Tršić) and the respective political centers (Zagreb, Sarajevo, and Belgrade—to a lesser extent also Nikšić as a cultural center in Montenegro). The originally Serbian-identified dialect of Tršić has become associated with the center of power in Zagreb, whose native dialect is in an entirely different (Kajkavian) area, while Serbian identity has shifted to the dialect of Belgrade (although this is not an uncontested move; see notes 37 and 38). As a result of the Yugoslav Wars of Succession and the identification of Stokavian-ekavian with Serbian on the one hand and Stokavian-ijekavian with the now broken-away Croatian on the other, Serbs in Stokavian-ijekavian areas, i.e. all of Bosnia-Hercegovina and Montenegro as well as parts of Serbia (and Croatia), have been under official pressure to switch to Stokavian-ekavian.37 This has met with resistance, including attempts to elaborate a separate Montenegrin literary language based on the southern Montenegrin (Zeta-Lovćen) dialects, which, while part of the larger Stokavian-ijekavian area, form a separate group from the Eastern Hercegovinian group to which the dialect of Tršić belongs.38 The tendency to invest regional identities with national significance by raising dialects to the level of separate languages in order to enhance autonomy has also resulted in attempts at separate Dalmatian, Istrian, and Sandžakian languages (and Šopi in Bulgaria).

The situation with Macedonian and Bulgarian is somewhat different. It is to be remembered that the entire South Slavic area constitutes a continuum (see Map Two). Just as the Croatian area is crossed by a number of isoglosses, so, too, Macedonia is a site of a fanning out of isoglosses that form a more compact bundle along the current Serbo-Bulgarian political border. Nonetheless, just as, for the purposes of literary language formation, the region between isoglosses C and E was sufficiently uniform, despite intervening isoglosses such as 3, 4, and D, to unify around a single (albeit later bifurcated) standard, i.e. Stokavian (with Stokavian-ijekavian and Stokavian-ekavian variants), so, too, the area defined on Map Two roughly by isogloss 939 was sufficiently uniform despite the presence of isoglosses such as 7 and H, and likewise sufficiently differentiated from Eastern Bulgarian, that it served as a center of resistance to the literary norm that emerged in Eastern Bulgaria during the course of the nineteenth century, and it became the basis of the modern Macedonian literary language.

34See Naylor (1990b) for a critical review of another of Franolić’s works. Okuka (1990:84-86) gives a critical comparison of Naylor (1980) and Franolić (1980). He praises Naylor’s work as based on linguistic principles and criticizes the political biases of Franolić’s. He criticizes both authors for giving very little attention to developments in Montenegro and Bosnia-Hercegovina and also makes the point that Naylor (1980) devotes scant attention in the post-War period while Franolić (1980) does essentially the opposite, giving short shrift to everything before World War Two. (See Isakovic 1992:6-7 for a modern Bosnian nationalist account of historical and recent developments; see also Naylor 1992 on the development of so-called republican varieties of Serbo-Croatian in Bosnia-Hercegovina and Montenegro after the promulgation of the 1974 Yugoslav constitution. It was Ken’s intention to conduct an in-depth study of post-World War Two developments, but he died before the project could be realized.)

35Serbian Orthodox Montenegro, however, is entirely Stokavian-ijekavian. Among Serbian intellectuals, three competing approaches to language planning have arisen. One, centered around the University of Novi Sad and the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences (SANU) in Belgrade, supports the status quo ante, equality of Latin and Cyrillic alphabets, the 1960 orthography (Paraginina komisija 1960), and favors ekavian. A second group, centered around the Philosophical Faculties of the Universities of Belgrade and Nikšić (in Montenegro), strongly supports the equality of ijekavian and a return to Vuk’s principle of one letter per sound for the Serbian version of the Latin alphabet (e.g. Ć, ń for current Ćj, nj). Finally, there is the extreme Serbian nationalist position represented by Radoš Milosević, the Milošević-appointed rector of Belgrade University, seeking to promote a single Cyrillic-Orthodox alphabet that eliminates some of Vuk’s reforms while promulgating Vuk’s idea that all Stokavian speakers are Serbs (This account is based on Greenberg 1999b). See also note 37 and 38.

36If we were to add the subdivisions, the lack of correspondence would be even more striking.

37In September 1993, in Republika Srpska, the Serb-controlled region of Bosnia, ekavian was declared the only acceptable variety out of solidarity with Serbia (cf. the adoption of Albanian’s Tosk-based standard by the Geg speakers of Kosovo, Montenegro and Macedonia, discussed below). In November 1994, however, the Bosnian Serb parliament reinstated ijekavian alongside ekavian.

38See Nikšić (1993a, 1993b) and the discussion in Kočev (1995). The proposed Montenegrin orthography differs from standard Serbian in having separate letters for the mellow palatals /š/, /ž/ and the voiced dental affricate /žž/ (de), which represent specifically Montenegrin dialect developments of [šš], [žž], (both as a result of ijekavian pronunciation) and /žž/ before certain consonants (a development that resembles Macedonian and Albanian). The southern Montenegrin accentual pattern also differs from the Eastern Hercegovian. (The former is more archaic.)

39In fact, this isogloss corresponds to a bundle of approximately 30 significant features, see Vidoeski (1998:94-95).
The complexity of the linguistic situation in Macedonia was matched by a complexity of what grew into overlapping territorial claims during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as seen in Map Four:

Despite differences in detail at the edges and the occasional Greek or Serbian attempt to set the northern boundary somewhere in the middle of the region, it is generally agreed that as a geographic area Macedonia is bounded by Mount Olympus, the Pindus range, Mounts Shar and Rila, the western slopes of the Rhodopes, the lower course of the river Mesta, and the Aegean Sea (cf. Wilkinson 1951:1-4).

MAP FOUR
Conflicting Claims to Macedonia, 1912, Prior to the Balkan Wars
(After Clissold 1968:137 and Dako 1919)
(Albania did not declare independence until 28 November 1912)
As noted above, during the nineteenth century the primary source of identity was religion. In the north, among Serbs and Croats, there was a struggle over dialectal base and degree of unity, but the general congruence of religion and identity (which did not correspond to the territorial distribution of dialects) was entirely within a Slavic context (albeit with German and Hungarian pressure on the Croats). In the Macedo-Bulgarian area, however, among the Christian population, there was only one major church — the Greek Orthodox, headed by the Patriarch of Constantinople — and, as noted above, under the millet system, Greek meant Greek Orthodox Christian rather than Greek-speaker. As the nineteenth century progressed, however, there was increasing pressure to create a congruence between language and millet, i.e. there was Greek pressure on Slavs to Hellenize, e.g. by restricting access to education to Greek schools.41 Such pressure was resisted by East South Slav (Macedonian and Bulgarian) intellectuals, who sought to establish a Slavic literary language in opposition to Greek. During this early period, Orthodox Christian writers of this region all referred to that language as Bulgarian.42 This was a different situation from that of West South Slavic territory, where Serbs and Croats (and, to some extent, also Slovenes) of that period were arguing over dialectal base. The same sorts of conflicts, however, soon emerged on East South Slavic territory.

From a dialectological point of view, western Macedonia represents a relatively compact, uniform, and distinct dialect area vis-à-vis the two regions whose dialects served as the bases for literary Bulgarian and literary Serbian, respectively. In terms of language as flag we can observe that the configuration of isoglosses lent itself to the creation of dialectal emblems in the beginning of the nineteenth century saw the emergence of two centers of literacy on East South Slavic territory, one in northeastern Bulgaria and the other in southwestern Macedonia. Although relative to the dialectal diversity of South Slavic linguistic territory as a whole these two regions were not maximally differentiated (they are both East South Slavic), nonetheless they were sufficiently different at every linguistic level from phonology through morphology to lexicon and syntax to occasion the rise of significant competition between the two groups for hegemony in the formation of a common literary language to serve as the vehicle of education, power, etc. (Cf. Friedman 1975, 1985a).

As the nineteenth century progressed and Greek gradually receded as a pervasive threat to Slavic identity (it remained and remains a threat on the local level in the region that became Aegean [Greek] Macedonia), East-South-Slavic-speaking Christian intellectuals came increasingly to quarrel over the dialectal base of the emerging Slavic literary language.43 With the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870-72, Bulgarian

41It can be argued that the Constantinople Patriarch’s abolition of the Slavic metropolitans in Peć and Ohrid during the mid-eighteenth century was already part of a general pressure to Hellenize the non-Greek-speaking Christian population of the south-central Balkans, especially the Slavs, who constituted its majority.

42The majority of the population, having an identity based on religion or locality, referred to their language by terms meaning ‘ours’ or ‘our tongue’.

43Those who sought a colloquial base faced opposition from archaizers who wanted to establish Church Slavonic as the literary language, but by the middle of the nineteenth century it was clear that the archaizers would be defeated. Such was not the case for Modern Greek, however, which ended up with a diglossic split between the colloquial-based Dimotik (Dhimotik) and the archaizing Puristic (Katharevousa), a situation which is beyond the scope of our considerations here (see Friedman 1975, 1986a).

became a millet on a level with Greek.44 The basis of the definition, however, was still religious, not linguistic. Thus travelers accounts from the period refer to Bulgarian Greeks, by which they mean Slavic-speakers loyal to the Greek Orthodox church headed by the Patriarch of Constantinople, as opposed to Exarchists, generally Slavic-speakers loyal to the Exarchate. Then in 1878 roughly the northern half of what is today modern Bulgaria became an autonomous principedom and de facto independent of the Ottoman Empire, i.e. an independent Bulgarian state was formed. By this time, the remaining territory, and the Christian population living on it, had become the object for conflicting claims among the Greek, Serbian, and Bulgarian states and the churches that supported the state’s political authority with ecclesiastical authority.45 Education was also essentially an ecclesiastical institution at this time, i.e. schools were religiously sponsored institutions, and so ecclesiastical jurisdiction determined education, which in turn taught literacy, language, and identity.46 The quarrel over the base of literary Bulgarian began in the mid-nineteenth century, when intellectuals in Macedonia expressed concern that their dialects were being excluded. The dispute intensified in the 1850’s and 1860’s, as can be seen from attacks in the Bulgarian-language press on attempts at publishing textbooks based on Macedonian dialects.47 The establishment of the Exarchate marked the definitive rejection on the part of Bulgarian intellectuals of any sort of compromise with Macedonians who wanted a unified Macedo-Bulgarian literary language. The former insisted that Macedonians adopt their eastern-based standard without compromise. This in turn strengthened the resolve of the

44The Porte issued a firman in 1870 establishing an autonomous Bulgarian Exarchate, but the Exarch (a rank in the Orthodox Church between a metropolitan and a patriarch) was to be chosen by the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Patriarchate and the Porte took turns stalling until 1872, when the Bulgars received permission from the Porte to elect an Exarch. The Patriarch refused to recognize the elected Exarch, the Exarch declared the Bulgarian Church independent of the Patriarch, and the Patriarch declared the Bulgarian Church schismatic. The Greek Patriarch did not annul the declaration of schism until 1943. The first council of the Bulgarian Exarchate (1871) tried to exclude the Macedonian representatives saying that they would try to move the Exarchate to Ohrid, or that they would attempt to create a separate hierarchy, or that they were not Bulgarians but Aromanians (Apostolski 1969:64-65, MacDermott 1962:161-67).

45It is sometimes argued that it was the drawing of boundaries for a greater Bulgaria at the Treaty of San Stefano in March 1878 and the subsequent scaling back at the Treaty of Berlin that June that brought about Serbian interest in the region (e.g. Wilkinson 1951:91).

46There are numerous anecdotes about schools that attempted to attract pupils by providing incentives such as free notebooks or pencils. In the context of rural poverty in which these schools were operating, it is understandable that parents would be swayed by such considerations. While Western observers sneered at these circumstances, such behavior did not reflect lack of principles but rather a combination of economic necessity with the fact that identity formation was not yet firmly established along western models (cf. Braifus 1906:102-103).

47In an article in BULGARSKI KNITSICI (1 January 1858), Partenij Zografski listed twelve Macedonian characteristics that he considered basic to the literary language he was advocating. This can be taken as the mold for the palatalization formulation relating to the creation of literary Macedonian and provoked bitter Bulgarian attacks. His twelve points were the following: 1) stress tends to fall at the beginning of the word; 2) Common Slavic *zj, *dj give k, g; 3) unstressed a, e, o are reduced; 4) different reflexes of vocalic r / i, 5) Common Slavic i (a)utum gives e; 6) / becomes /, / or v, 7) definite articles of the type -ov, -on, in addition to -or; 8) more remnants of nominal declension; 9) neuter nouns in -e have plurals in -jna; 10) third sg. pres. ending in -t; 11) presence of a verbal adverb; 12) Common Slavic back nasal *q gives a or o (Koneski 1967a:182-184). Partenij’s twelve points substantiate Lunt’s statement (and my own field experience) that while Slavic linguistic frontiers are relative in the Balkans, natives pick on certain linguistic traits as distinguishing their speech from that of their neighbors (Lunt 1953:364, 371). Cf. the Vienna Literary Agreement discussed above.
Macedonists, i.e. those who were working for a Macedonian literary language separate from the Bulgarian literary norm as it emerged during the course of the nineteenth century. By the time an autonomous Bulgarian state was established in 1878, the sense of a distinct Macedonian national identity had already advanced to the stage that it had been expressed in print (Pulevski 1875:49). By 1903, we have an explicit formulation of a distinct Macedonian literary language (Misirkov 1903).

Map Five illustrates how linguistic features become "flags" that are manipulated to represent territorial claims. Lines one and two correspond to isoglosses 7 and F, respectively, on Map Two. They also correspond, roughly, to the territorial claims advanced by Serbia and Bulgaria, respectively, as illustrated in Map Four. At the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries (and even today, see, e.g. Glenny 1996), linguists were putting their knowledge at the service of politicians by choosing one or another isogloss as the definitive justification for the ethnic identity — and therefore nationality — of the Slavic speakers on Macedonian and adjacent territory. The claims about nationality were then translated into claims for the territory to be included in the nation-state.

---

48See Friedman (1975, 1985a, 1993b) for details. Limitations of space preclude entering into the complexities of these developments, especially the question of identity formation among Macedonian-speaking Muslims and speakers of Macedonian dialects who chose (or choose) Greek, Serbian, or Bulgarian identity (see also Danforth 1995). I am concerned here with outlining the developments that led specifically to the establishment of Macedonian and Bulgarian as distinct languages and am therefore concentrating on facts and events relevant to those developments.

49The main points were summarized as follows (my translation): 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; 3. The collecting of dictionary material from all Macedonian dialects. (Misirkov 1903:145).

---

**MAP FIVE**

*Map showing approximate locations of isoglosses [1] and [2]*

These representations are highly schematic.

The precise distribution of features is complex but irrelevant to the basic point. See Ivčić (1958:25-49).

**Key to Map Five**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[1]</th>
<th>[2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shoulders</td>
<td>woman/the woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>pleći</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>plek'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>plešti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differing isoglosses used to support conflicting territorial claims:**

- [1] the reflex of Common Slavic *tj*, [2] the presence of a definite article

The forms cited in the table are those used in the modern standard languages.
These claims were also bolstered by census figures. Table Two reproduces claims made for the population of Macedonia from four different sources, each with a specific national interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>ethnic group</th>
<th>Serbian %</th>
<th>Greek %</th>
<th>Turkish %</th>
<th>Bulgarian %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgarians</td>
<td>57,600</td>
<td>332,162</td>
<td>896,497</td>
<td>1,181,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serbians</td>
<td>201,140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>307,000</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>652,795</td>
<td>37.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albanians</td>
<td>634,017</td>
<td>36.76</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>128,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turks</td>
<td>195,644</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>105,844</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>219,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,252,224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,911,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Vlachs, Roms (Gypsies), Jews, Circassians, etc.

Table Two: Conflicting Census Figures for Macedonia: 1889-1905
Sources: d’Estournelles de Constant (1914:28-30) and Saral (1975:75)

These discrepancies are not entirely arbitrary. Rather, at least to some extent, different authors have selected criteria that would support their point of view. Thus the Greek and Turkish figures use religion as the criterion of ascertainment. The result is the complete elimination of the Albanians, who are counted as Turk if Muslim, Greek if Orthodox, or Other if Catholic. The Serbs were likewise eliminated from Greek figures because the Greek definition of Macedonian territory stopped short of the northern districts included in the jurisdiction of the Serbian church. Bulgarian and Serbian figures use language, but choose different isoglosses as illustrated in Map Five to justify the claims for the territorial extent of Bulgarian or Serbian. (Serbs also based their claims on the practice of a folk custom, the Slava, celebrating a family’s patron saint.)

At the end of the Balkan War in 1913, Macedonia was partitioned among Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Albania. Greece received most of what it claimed (about 50% of Macedonia), Serbia received most of that part of its claim that did not overlap with Greece (about 40% of Macedonia), Bulgaria received a small eastern corner and Albania received a string of villages on the western slopes and shores of the borderland mountains and lakes. With the exception of minor modifications after World War One and a major re-partitioning during World War Two (see Jelavich 1983: 262-277), the 1913 borders have remained in place. The partition of 1913 marked the end of any chance for an officially recognized Macedonian literary language, since Macedonian was treated as a dialect of Bulgarian in Bulgaria and of Serbian in Serbia. Publications and public performances in Macedonian were permitted in the guise of dialectal literature, however, and thus progress toward a codifable standard continued to be made, albeit in an underground fashion. In Greece, Macedonian was proscribed, and in the thirties the speaking of Macedonian was even criminalized (see Apostolski, 1969: 271-72, see also Risteski 1988:97-102). In Albania, the existence of Slavic-speaking minorities was simply ignored.

On 2 August 1944 the part of Macedonia that had been part of Serbia prior to the outbreak of World War Two was declared the People’s Republic of Macedonia with Macedonian as its official language. Progress toward standardization on the basis of the west central dialects was rapid, and today Macedonian is a fully functional standard language (Friedman 1985a, 1987a), although the existence of a Macedonian minority in Greece continues to be denied by official Greek sources (e.g. in a press conference given in Skopje by Theodoros Pangalos, Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs, on 22 December 1998), while official Bulgaria remains incapable of recognizing the simple reality that Macedonian is not a dialect of Bulgarian (Velev 1998 is typical in this respect) just as Norwegian is not a dialect of Swedish, nor Dutch a dialect of German. Albania officially recognizes the presence of a Macedonian minority on its territory, although the numbers are disputed, support for Macedonian-language education is limited to the first four years of elementary school and only among Macedonian-speaking Christians of the Prespa region in southern Albania (the Macedonian-speaking Muslims in the villages further north receive only Albanian-language education), and Albanian officials have occasionally made public statements in tacit support of Bulgarian claims that the Macedonians of Albania are really Bulgarians (MIC 6 March 1995).

The Albanian territorial claims illustrated in Map Four appear to have been made by connecting the most outlying Albanian-speaking villages in the territory adjacent to more or less compact Albanian settlements. The title of Dako (1919) — Albania: Master Key to the Near East — illustrates how the concept of ‘Near East’ has been constructed by the West to supply the other against which it can define itself as the West (or Europe). At the turn of the century, the Balkans were at the edge of that Other (cf. Bakić-Hayden 1995, Todorova 1994, 1997). The Albanian situation in certain respects was the converse of that of the South Slavs. South Slavic linguistic history has been one of progressive centrifugal forces. The nineteenth century saw the division of Slovenian from Croatian and Macedonian from Bulgarian (albeit this latter was not officially recognized until 1944), while the centripetal forces that led to the formation of Serbo-Croatian have now yielded to the break-up of Yugoslavia and the creation of at least three standards: Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian. At the same time, Albanians have been working very hard to create a unity out of a major dialect division (Geg vs Tosk, i.e. North vs South, see note 4) as well as the three-way religious split alluded to above (see Skendi 1967:366-404 for details).

The differences between Geg and Tosk can be minimized or maximized, depending on the intent of the writer, much as is the case, e.g., with Serbian and Croatian. Consider the following examples based on Pipa (1989:16, 202):

Geg: Nuk kam me mëjtë me ardë në Shqipn. Jo të tâna gjyqënuar ishin të lume e të pastrueme.
Tosk: Nuk do të mund të vij në Shqipëri. Jo të tëra gjilpërri ishin të lara e të pastruara.
'I will not be able to come to Albania. Not all the needles were washed and cleaned.'

In the case of the first sentence, Geg could choose the same type of construction as Tosk, but it also has at its disposal an infinitival construction lacking in Tosk. The form meaning ‘be able’ (mëjtë/mund) illustrates Geg nasal vowels, lacking in Tosk, and the form meaning ‘Albania’ illustrates both Tosk rootacism (the historical change of intervocalic /h/ to /f/ and the Geg elimination of unstressed schw. The second sentence was constructed to illustrate the pervasive nature of Tosk rootacism and certain vocalic developments, which can be compared in this respect to the salience of the jot reflexes of the Stokavian dialects of the former Serbo-Croatian. Although Pipa represents an approach that would sanction both Geg and Tosk variants of literary Albanian (cf. the Western and Eastern or “republican” variants of the former Serbo-Croatian or the current situation in Serbian), most of the history of the standardization of Albanian has been in the direction of greater unity, i.e. centripetal forces reducing sanctioned differences.

50Although the 1989 Albanian census registered only 5,000 Macedonians, the Macedonian organization in Albania, Bratesco, claimed 40,000 members in 1993 (MIC 30 November 1993).
During the first half of this century, there was no official attempt at legislating a unified Albanian literary language, although seven years before Albania’s declared independence, one of Albania’s greatest linguists, Aleksandër Xhvacë (1890/1905) published — albeit under a pseudonym — a concrete proposal for the principles of a unified literary language similar to those employed after World War Two. Although a Literary Committee met in Shkodër in 1916 and agreed to elaborate a standard based on Elbasan Gëg with some concessions to Tosk, in practice both literary Gëg and literary Tosk continued to be elaborated in Albania until after World War Two (Pipa 1989:3-4), when the communist regime succeeded in imposing a Tosk-based unified standard on all of Albania, taking the dialect of Korçë as the basis.

While the Tosk-based standard eliminated literary Gëg in Albania, Albanians in Yugoslavia continued to write in Gëg. From 1945 (and even before that) until the 1974 constitution, the Yugoslav government attempted to encourage a separate identity among Yugoslav Albanians, using the term Sipin (from Albanian Shqiptar) for the Albanians of Yugoslavia and Albanac for those of Albania (Ismajli 1998:64-72). The plan failed, however, and in 1968, after a series of events that culminated in a failed demand for republic status for Kosovo, Albanian intellectuals in Yugoslavia voted to adopt the Tosk-based standard of Albania as a nation of national unity. This was affirmed by delegates from Albania and Yugoslavia (Macedonia and Kosovo) on 25 November 1972 at an orthography congress held in Tirana. The situation is thus comparable to that of Serbs and Croats in 1850 (and the opposite of the situation in 1967 or 1991) insofar as, like the Serbs and Croats, the Kosovars (and Albanians of Montenegro, Macedonia, and Serbia) were adopting a standard promulgated from the outside in order to resist other pressures. The crucial difference is that while most Croats (albeit not those who signed it) were speakers of the standard promulgated by the Vienna Literary Agreement, Kosovars and most other Albanians in former Yugoslavia are Gëg and therefore the adoption of the unified literary language involved an entirely exoglossic situation.

Thus during the social upheavals of 1967-68 in Yugoslavia, both centrifugal and centripetal linguistic forces operated as forms of resistance. For the Croats, the declaration of difference from Serbian and the repudiation of Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian constituted a centrifugal resistance against what was perceived as Serbian centralism, while for the Albanians that same perception of Serbian centralism led to an abandonment of their distinct literary dialect and a centripetal unification with the standard of Albanian. With the so-called fall of communism and the upheavals of the past decade, Croatian has made a definitive split from Serbian, and the purposefully deepened lexical divide may never be bridged. Meanwhile, in Albania the question of reintroducing literary Gëg as a co-equal variant with the current Tosk-based standard was raised at a conference in the fall of 1992 and has remained a burning issue ever since. At a conference I attended in Tirana in the summer of 1995, a single paper devoted to this topic provoked more than four hours of heated discussion. At both conferences, the Gëgs of Shkodër, the town in northwest Albania with an old, independent literary tradition as well as a university, proposed the reintroduction of literary Gëg, and the Tirana establishment and Tosks of the south opposed it. The Kosovars present at the conferences argued for a single standard but declined to define how that standard should be determined. They did not want to support a diglossic situation from their perceived need for (trans-)national unity, but neither did they wish to abandon the possibility that their dialectal base (which is northeastern Gëg and thus significantly different from the northwestern Gëg of Shkodër) could be more represented.

A final example of the emblematization of language is illustrated in Table Three, which utilizes the six languages of the Republic of Macedonia used in the 1994 census (Friedman 1996a) and quantities degrees of non-correspondence between declared nationality and declared mother tongue in the 1953 and 1994 censuses in that republic. In each of the two charts, the top figure is the total of those whose declared nationality differed from the corresponding declared mother tongue, followed by a figure indicating the percentage of the total of those declaring the mother tongue in question. The lower figure gives the numerical total of those declaring the relevant mother tongue. In each chart an overall total is given below the language-by-language totals. While it is clear from these figures that declared nationality does not always correspond to declared mother tongue, it is equally clear that in all cases except for the former Serbo-Croatian there has been an increasing tendency toward such congruence, in many cases a dramatic one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1953</th>
<th>Declared Mother Tongue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declared Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Corresp.</td>
<td>42140 = 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1838905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Co.</td>
<td>92751 = 7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative stability of the former Serbo-Croatian in this respect is related to various political and demographic factors beyond the scope of this lecture.
TABLE THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declaration of Mother Tongue</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Albanian</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Serbo-Croat</th>
<th>Roman</th>
<th>Vlah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Corresp.</td>
<td>431154</td>
<td>2.1931</td>
<td>2.0170</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>431736</td>
<td>431836</td>
<td>35095</td>
<td>35120</td>
<td>7036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This figure represents Serb and Croats which were listed as separate languages in the 1994 census.**

**Non-Corresp.**

**This figure is slightly smaller than the total population (19650572) because there was a partial boycott of the census in the municipality of Debar. Elsewhere the non-enumerated Albanian and Turkish population was estimated, but in this table only the enumerated population was included. Moreover, this table does not include other than the six official languages of the census.

We can conclude by observing that the situation in Southeastern Europe is by no means unique, and in fact there are homologues in the West for any of the situations we have analyzed here. One can mention the Quebecois of Canada, the Flemings of Belgium (who at one point declared that Flemish was Dutch but have since returned to the position that it is not), the struggle between Bokmål and Landsmål in Norway, the Italian question della lingua, the Occitans of France, the Frisians of Holland and Germany, the movement to eliminate the compulsory study of Swedish from Finnish schools, etc. (cf. also Posner 1996:189-96). It is the politicization of linguistic drift (the natural tendency of languages to differentiate over time) that has had particularly dramatic effects in Southeastern Europe, where language has become a vehicle of conflicting centripetal and centrifugal forces. Thus, for example, the Croat separatist declaration of 1967 and the Albanian unitarian decision of 1968 set vectors in a direction which, while reflected by the Yugoslav federal constitution of 1974, were headed back in the direction of dissolution by the Kosovar uprising of 1981 and the economic crisis of the 1980s (cf. Woodward 1995).

I shall close with a quotation from a Serbian dialectologist that Ken found in 1983 and brought to my attention. The quotation is sadly prescient in its warning:

...mi smo u kruh i klob povoljne nacionalne barjake, a zaboravili na prosu činjenicu da nam i jedan i drugi mogu, bilo na vatri bilo na ognju, jednako izgore i da pravi problemi počinju tek onda kad u Gorskem Kotaru, Bukovici, Zminjanju i Paštrovičima nestane kruh, kada na Kosovo ostane samo bukë i kada po istočnoj Srbiji i Zagorju počnu da gore (h)že. (Petrović 1982: 53)

... we have conceived of kruh and klob as national banners, and forgotten the simple fact that we can make one or the other, either on the vatra or on the oaganj burn just the same, and real problems begin, only when in Gorski Kotar, Bukovica, Zminjanje and Paštrovički kruh disappears, when in Kosovo there is only bukë and when in Eastern Serbia and Zagorje the (h)že begin to burn.56

56The words kruh, klob, and bukë all mean 'bread'. The first is associated with Croatian (although some Serbs in Croatia use the same word), the second with Serbian Stokavian (the ekavian reflex marks it as such; Serbs, Croats, and Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, and also southwestern Serbia, including the Sandžak, would all say hjeb), but it is also the Kajkavian, while the third is Albanian. The words vatra and oaganj both mean 'fire', but vatra is specifically domesticated, controlled

It is inevitable that languages will change and that the resulting differences will be either ignored or enshrined, transcending or establishing boundaries, depending -- among other things -- on political circumstances. Kenneth E. Naylor dedicated his scholarship to furthering the knowledge of both the grammar and the social history and function of the languages of Southeastern Europe. And it is only by understanding that we can hope to deploy our information wisely.
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