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Abstract

The implementation of standard Macedonian is examined here as an ongoing process that can be defined in terms of five types of linguistic issues: (1) recurring, (2) remissive, (3) resolved, (4) new, and (5) nonsalient. Orthographic, phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical phenomena are all adduced as examples of these types of issue in the context of four linguistic environments — (1) dialectal, (2) Balkan, (3) Slavic (4) Western) Great Power — and within a three-stage chronological framework — 1945–1950, 1950–1954, and 1954 onward, with subdivisions in the first and third stages (pre/post-1948 and pre/post-1988–1989, respectively). We conclude that, given the relative constancy of certain aspects of both the internal and external Macedonian linguistic environment, it is likely that debates over implementation will continue. What is striking about the Macedonian case is the rapidity with which the basic outlines of the standard were achieved and implemented. Although many issues remain open to contestation and manipulation, the fact remains that the Macedonian standard language has been successfully implemented as the primary means of communication in the Republic of Macedonia.

On August 2, 1944, at the monastery of St. Prohor Pčinjski, the Anti-Fascist Assembly for the National Liberation of Macedonia (ASNOM), which at that time was functioning as a provisional government under conditions of war, declared a Macedonian republic with Macedonian as its official language. Although this moment in time cannot be taken literally as the date of the creation of modern literary Macedonian — on the one hand, efforts toward a Macedonian literary standard had been ongoing since the nineteenth century (see Vaillant 1938), on the other the official work of codification did not begin until after the liberation of Skopje from the Nazis in late 1944 — it nonetheless functions as the symbolic act demarcating the beginning of the period in which efforts...
received the official sanction that enabled standardization to reach the stage of implementation (Friedman 1985, 1993a; Lunt 1984, 1986). In this article, I shall examine the development of the implementation of standard Macedonian as an ongoing process. This process can be defined in terms of five types of linguistic issues: (1) recurring, (2) remissive, (3) resolved, (4) new, and (5) nonsalient. Recurring themes are those that have been raised repeatedly over the past five decades. I use the term remissive to refer to those issues that were the focus of debate at an earlier stage of implementation and subsequently ceased to be the object of dispute only to be raised again in the most recent phase. Resolved questions are those that generated significant discussion at an earlier phase but no longer do so. New issues are those that have only recently acquired salience, while nonsalient topics are linguistic features that could have provided sources for contestation but did not, such as features that are not uniform in the dialects and could thus have been problematized, but that were successfully decided at the level of codification or elaboration and have not been involved in problems of implementation. Nonsalient topics may be the focus of academic linguistic studies, but these are to be differentiated from normative writing that is specifically aimed at implementation. These types of issues can be discussed in the context of four linguistic environments — (1) dialectal, (2) Balkan, (3) Slavic (4) Western) Great Power — and within a three-stage chronological framework: 1945–1950, 1950–1954, and 1954–onward, with subdivisions in the first and third stages. A complete discussion of all the linguistic elements involved would require a monograph, not an article, and so I shall take particularly salient examples as illustrative of each type of linguistic issue in relation to the linguistic environmental context and chronological framework. From this it will emerge that the problems and results of the implementation of the Macedonian standard form a complex network of interacting processes.

In order to frame this discussion, I shall begin with some general remarks on language standardization and language planning that inform the approach taken here. In his classic article, Haugen (1966) identifies four stages in language planning: norm selection, codification, elaboration, and implementation. Fishman (1972: 56) illustrates his reconciliation of Neustupný’s (1970) somewhat different four-stage approach with Haugen’s in Figure 1.

Radovanović (1986, 1992) provides a ten-stage cyclical schema, integrating the stages in such a way that they can overlap or even switch places, as shown in Figure 2 (cf. also Fishman 1974). The last four of Radovanović’s stages concern the fate of that standard once it is in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Stability</th>
<th>Expansion</th>
<th>Differentiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Policy decisions</td>
<td>Codification</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Stages of language planning: Haugen and Neustupný

Starting from the first of the four stages in the Haugen–Neustupný–Fishman framework, we can say that the selection of the dialectal base of the Macedonian standard is remarkable for the fact that it took place more than once, under different circumstances and by different groups or individuals operating independently of one another, but in each case with the same results: the west-central dialects, roughly a rectangle formed by the districts of Makedonski Brod, Kžěvo, Demir Hisar, Bitola, Prilep, and Titov Veles (see Friedman 1993a). The basic policy decision was thus made in an atmosphere of general consensus. The stability of the norm was achieved through codification in approximately five years (from the publication of the alphabet in 1945 to the orthographic handbook of 1950), and the expansion of the norm was elaborated in the subsequent 20 years. I have discussed the details of these processes elsewhere (Friedman 1985). The circumstances under which implementation took place overlapped with the processes of codification and elaboration. The fact that the Macedonian standard was implemented in a context of various types of competition from Serbian and Bulgarian has been stressed on occasion to the exclusion of the other factors involved in this complex process, particularly the factors of dialectal compromise, relationship to the Church Slavonic tradition, and the treatment of Turkish, Russian, and Western elements. In this examination of the implementation of the Macedonian standard I shall first elaborate on these linguistic environments, then outline the chronological framework,
and finally give some examples of five types of salient issues. Because these three categories are not discrete but intersecting, there will be some overlap in the presentation.

The chief problem of implementing the Macedonian standard in its dialectal environment has been twofold, on the one hand, the acceptance of west-central features in the speech and writing of those whose native dialect is outside the area, on the other the acceptance on the part of west-central speakers of the fact that while their dialects form the basis of the literary language, they are not identical with it (Vidoeski 1950b; Ugrinova 1950a). The dialect of Skopje forms a special category in this context. As the dialect of the capital, which is at the same time by far the largest city in the Republic, the Skopje dialect has its own prestige, which in some respects competes with the prestige of the norm. At the same time, for geographic reasons, some of the most salient features of Skopje Macedonian are shared with Serbian, which is an additional complicating factor (cf. Velkovska 1989). During the earliest years of codification, the Pirin dialects, which are spoken for the most part in Bulgaria (but also in the extreme east of the Republic of Macedonia), also competed to some extent with the standard (Koneski 1945a).

I use the term Balkan environment here to refer to the non-Slavic languages of the Balkans with which Macedonian has been in intimate contact: Greek, Albanian, Arumanian, and Turkish as well as Romani and Judezmo. While all of these languages have contributed to the Macedonian lexicon, only Turkish occupies a significant position with respect to implementation of the norm. This is because Turkish is in a unique relationship to Macedonian both sociopolitically and linguistically. From the fourteenth century until the beginning of the twentieth, Turkish was the language of administration in Macedonia and also a language of significant cultural and economic prestige. The Greek element in the Macedonian lexicon was the object of academic study (Tahovski 1951; Papazioskeva 1966), but not of debate in language planning. Although Greek was a language of cultural and economic prestige for Christians, especially during the nineteenth century in southern Macedonia, its influence was not sufficient to constitute a problem for differentiation in the implementation of the norm. The other non-Slavic languages of the Balkans, while of linguistic significance, especially locally and historically, particularly taking into account Balkan Latin and proto-Albanian (cf. Goljub 1964: 5–27; Koneski 1967: 182–189; Hamp 1981–1982) also did not figure as elements in the debates over implementation. The Turkish element in the Macedonian lexicon is unique in its quantity as well as due to the fact that it pervades every part of speech, every level of style, and at the same time is perceived as distinct. The manipulation of Turkish lexicon for symbolic purposes has been and remains a vital element in Macedonian (and other Balkan standard languages, cf. Friedman 1996), and thus any implementation of a Macedonian standard language would have to take the position of Turksms into account.
The Slavic environment can be understood as subdivided into three parts: Serbo-Bulgarian, Russian, and Church Slavonic. Serbian and Bulgarian are the two standard languages closest to Macedonian as well as the two ends of that section of the South Slavic dialectal continuum between which the Macedonian dialects are located. At the same time, they are official languages that have served at various times as instruments of cultural and political domination in Macedonia and also at times as the vehicles of the denial of Macedonian identity (see Friedman 1975). Even when they functioned at their most negative, however, Serbian and Bulgarian were the languages of education for most Macedonians who were able to go to school, including those initially responsible for the implementation of the Macedonian standard (cf. Koneski 1950b). Taken in the context of the South Slavic dialectal continuum, the dialects forming the basis of standard Bulgarian are in many respects closer to Macedonian than those forming the basis of standard Serbian, but it was only in the context of Yugoslavia with its Serbo-Croatian lingua communis (cf. Naylor 1992) that the Macedonian standard could be implemented. As the Slavic language with the most geopolitical prestige, and moreover a significant language of culture and education for Macedonians, Russian held a special place as a source of lexis. Similarly, Church Slavonic occupied a special place as the language of the church and as the bearer or inheritor of a tradition that originated in the Slavic dialects of Macedonia. Since Church Slavonic occupies a relationship to modern Macedonian comparable to the relationship of medieval Latin to the modern Romance languages, it was available as a source of vocabulary enrichment.

By Great Power environment I mean both the so-called international (Macedonian megu naroden; essentially Greco-Latinate) vocabulary that serves as the source for a great deal of modern terminology and also the languages of the Western Great Powers that have served as the diffusers of that terminology as well as their own lexicos: basically English, German, and French. The relative importance of these three languages has varied over time (cf. Gacov 1971; Lehitse 1980), but the post-1989 era has seen a virtual explosion of English in Macedonia as elsewhere. The three main chronological stages of the implementation of the Macedonian standard language can be defined as follows: (1) the overlap of implementation and codification/elaboration: 1945–1950, (2) the primary phase of pure implementation (acceptance): 1950–1953, and (3) the phase of established implementation (expansion): 1954 onward. The first and third of these stages can also be subdivided. The first stage has two phases—1945–1947 and 1948–1950—while the third can be divided into three phases: 1954–1970, 1970–1988, and 1988/1989-onward. Each of these stages and phases can be described in terms of specific publications and in some cases also by external political events, which while not always in a causative relationship with implementational phases nonetheless provide contexts in which those phases developed.

During the first stage of implementation, the problems faced were connected with codification and elaboration: the establishment of norms and expansion of vocabulary. The primary vehicle for implementation was the periodical press, particularly the daily newspaper Nova Makedonija and the monthly journal Nov Den (see Ugrinova 1950b). There were also local periodical publications in towns such as Bitola, Tetovo, Prilep, Štip, Vels, Zletovo, Lazaropole (see Videski 1950b), school textbooks (Dimitrovi 1951), and pamphlets (e.g. Koneski 1945a). The first primer (pop Efimov et al. 1945) already showed considerable consistency in implementing the norm that was established that same year, with only occasional inconsistencies, such as e.g. Uvenikot Mista Davidov e presekol (with third person auxiliary e) telefonskata vrka, što ja postavile Germanicie (1945: 90) ‘The pupil M.D. cut the telephone connection that the Germans had set up’; Vo tova vreme vlegoov (instead of vle goov) vo stajata nekoku deca ... (1945: 91), ‘At that moment several children entered the room’; robstvo (instead of rostivo) ‘slavery’ (1945: 91). Other features of the primer, such as the conjugation of derived imperfective verbs using -ue(-) vs. modern -uva(-), plurals for monosyllabic masculine substantives in -oi vs. modern -oi, tova vs. modern toa were in keeping with prescription and variations specified in the 1945 orthographic handbook (Pravopis 1945).

With regard to what I have termed the Balkan environment, it was during this period that Koneski (1945b) wrote an article that defined the direction of the position of Turkisms in the implementation of the Macedonian standard. He argued there against the use of Turkisms in formal contexts. Thus in Macedonian, as in the other Balkan languages (Kazazis 1972) and even in Turkish itself (Friedman 1996), Ottoman elements were relegated to the archaic, colloquial, and ironic layers of vocabulary. Although there had been a current of thought in favor of using Turkisms as a means of distinguishing Macedonian from neighboring Slavic languages, Koneski argued effectively and successfully against this trend and in favor of Slavic elements from Macedonian dialects or adaptations of cognate forms. Thus, for example, instead of komitski drzavi ‘neighboring states’ (Macedonian komija ‘neighbor’ <Turkish kompa ‘neighbor’) he recommended sosedi drzavi citing the Galicnik dialectal form so'sed ‘neighbor’. The following year, Koneski (1946) addressed the issue of the Slavic context, which was an important one from the earliest codification conferences (see Friedman 1993a). Here,
too, he recommended yo prv red do maksimum da se iskoristat elemenite što vek se dodeni vo narodnot govor ‘in the first rank let elements that occur in folk speech be used to the maximum’. One of his examples is nastan ‘event’, which occurs in Macedonian folk poetry collected by the Miladinov brothers in the nineteenth century, as opposed to the Serbism događaj or the Bulgarism sobitie. This did not exclude borrowing from Serbian, Bulgarian, and Russian but rather made a principle of seeking native material first. Koneski made a particular point in this article of pointing out that the Pirin Macedonian dialects of Bulgaria are peripheral with respect to the central dialects, and that therefore just as literary Serbian and Bulgarian are based on specific dialectal areas to which others are peripheral, so, too, Macedonian should stick to its central dialectal base. His goal here was combating a current of thought that sought to bring literary Macedonian closer to Bulgarian.

On 28 June 1948, Yugoslavia was expelled from Cominform, thus definitively marking the break between Tito and Stalin (see Jelavich 1983: 321–329). The effect of this event on the implementation of the Macedonian standard was the expulsion of Macedonian teachers from Bulgaria and Albania, thus limiting further activity to the Macedonian Republic. It also marked the beginning of Bulgarian claims that the Macedonian standard was a Serbianizing plot (see Koneski 1948). Entirely independent of these developments, however, were modifications in the 1945 Pravopis, two of which were particularly salient: in a number of lexical items with an etymological back nasal (*ь) the northern, that is, Skopje, Macedonian (and also Serbian, Russian, and Russian Church Slavonic) reflex /у/ was prescribed rather than the central reflex /а/, as in oраlje ‘arms’ rather than orалje, because these particular lexical items were already in wide use in these forms in the spoken language before codification. In the early years of implementation, hypercorrection (spelling with <а> instead of <у>) was sometimes a problem. Similarly, a decision was made to change the conjugation of derived imperfectives from -сеф(-) to -ув(-), as in касуе ‘says’ to касува, the former being the Skopje (and also Serbian) realization, the latter being used in the majority of west-central dialects (see Friedman 1985; Risteski 1988: 464–465). These changes were submitted on 20 November 1947 (Risteski 1988: 461) and were thus independent of the Tito–Stalin break, but as soon as the break occurred, Bulgarian linguists attacked the new norm as an attempt to Serbianize the Macedonian people (see Koneski 1948, 1952a; Mirkčev 1952). It was not until 1956, however, that these same linguists—together with politicos—reverted to the earlier position that Macedonians were really Bulgarians and therefore their dialects were Bulgarian, a position the postcommunist period of political pluralization has done nothing to change (cf. Veličkova 1991). It is interesting to note that in the earliest Bulgarian claims that the Macedonian standard was an attempt at Serbianization, the codifiers’ decision to use the Skopje conjugation of derived imperfectives (-сеф(-)) was highlighted as an example, but already before this claim appeared the decision had been made to use the west-central form (-ув(-)) instead.

With regard to the orthography, the chief problem during the first stage of implementation was the availability of typefaces and typewriters. Thus, for example, when the official Macedonian alphabet was first published in Nova Makedonija, the newspaper itself had to use a number of diacraphs (š, ć, ĭ, ĕ, ćĕ, ćě) for š, č, ĭ, ĭ, ě until enough typefaces could be made (Stamatoski 1975: 8). After 1948, Bulgarian linguists also claimed that the Macedonian orthography was an attempt at Serbianization, since like Serbian Cyrillic the principle of one letter per sound was chosen rather than the more archaic Bulgarian-East Slavic Cyrillic, which contained letters representing more than one sound and more than one representation for the same sound (e.g. Serbian and Macedonian ja, ja vs. Bulgarian and Russian во, for the sequences /ja/, ja/, Macedonian and Serbian у vs. Bulgarian and Russian ў for the phonemes /у/, Serbian and Macedonian ј vs. Bulgarian and Russian ј, etc. for the phonemes /j/, /и/). As we shall see, the claim resurfaced in Macedonia itself during the post-1988/1989 period.

Thus, the initial stage of the implementation of the Macedonian standard, overlapping as it did with codification and elaboration, was involved in three types of problems. The first were the same problems as those faced in the tasks of codification and elaboration, viz. selection of grammatical features and vocabulary building. The implementation of these selections marks the beginning of the differentiation of issues into the five linguistic types adduced at the beginning of this article. The second sort of problem was strictly technical: availability of typefaces, etc. The third characterized the second phase of the first stage, viz. attempts on the international scene to negotiate the implementation of the standard on the part of Bulgarian linguists as well as the exclusion of the standard from Albania. 11

The second stage in the implementation of the Macedonian standard can be defined in terms of the journal Makedonski jazik, which began publication in 1950 as the bulletin of the Department of South Slavic Languages of the University of Skopje and appeared in ten numbers a year. This situation lasted until 1954, when Makedonski jazik began to be published as the journal of the newly founded institute for the Macedonian Language. 12 In terms of codification and elaboration, 1950 was the publication date of the first Macedonian orthographic dictionary.
(Pravopis 1950), which marked the definitive culmination of the essentials of that process. Progress was such that Koneski (1950a) could write of the standardization of Macedonian: “Na bitino e tokomu toa Sto deneska se roboti za podrobnosti, ... The essential point is that today it is a matter of details ...” (emphasis in the original). Many of the articles that appeared in the 35 issues of Makedonski jazik during its first four years of publication (six issues were double numbers), were concerned with implementation of that standard language. Among the chief problems were interference from local dialects, Serbian, and Bulgarian (cf. Vidoeski 1950b). The range of phenomena affected all linguistic levels, but they were, as Koneski stated, details.

A memorial plaque located at the hydroelectric plant in the Matka Gorge outside of Skopje, apparently set up some time after 1947, illustrates all the basic types of problems from the early years of implementation. Since some of these are orthographic, I cite it here in the original Cyrillic with transcription and transliteration:

(1) Na padali bociri od I bataljona XII makedonska brigada koj vodela borba protiv fashističke zavojevaci i balistički bandi za oслободuvanje na el. Centralna Matka
Od Okoliski odbor sojuz na borcita od N.O.B
G. Petrov.
Na padali bociri od I bataljona XII makedonska brigada koj vodela borba protiv fashističke zavojevaci i balistički bandi za oслободuvanje na el. Centralna Matka
Od Okoliski odbor sojuz na borcita od N.O.B
G. Petrov.
'To the fallen fighters of the 1st battalion 12th Macedonian brigade who fought against the fascist occupiers and the Ballist ganges for the liberation of the electric power plant Matka
'The Regional Council of the Union of Fighters of the N[ational] L[iberation] S[truggle]
'G. Petrov.'

The use of the I-form (old resultative participle) padali instead of the verbal adjective padan is a grammatical Bulgarian, the spelling of 'bata-lion' with i instead of j is an orthographic Serbian, and the form zavojevač instead of zavojuvač is a lexical Serbism. The spelling of the relativizer 'who' as koi instead of koi is an orthographic dialectism reflecting the pronunciation of /j/ as Ј in final position after a vowel in colloquial speech. The lack of periods after the capital O and B and the lack of an acute over the Г. are mistakes in punctuation and accentuation. To modern Macedonians, the language of this plaque represents an interesting remnant of the days before the standard had been effectively implemented.

In 1954 Makedonski jazik became the journal of the Institute for the Macedonian Language and ceased to be concerned directly with problems of implementation of the norm, a task that was taken over by Literaturni zbor 'Literary word', a new journal that was started that year. That same year the second part (morphology) of Koneski's two-part university-level grammar was published (Koneski 1952b, 1954). It is from this point onward that I date the third stage in the implementation of the Macedonian norm, which had become the kind of process comparable with similar processes in most other countries with standard languages based on the speech of the majority of the population. Taking into account Radovanović's more nuanced schema of the process of standardization, this was the period in Macedonia during which the full circle had been completed in many respects and there was an interaction between the various stages. Major events connected with codification and elaboration also occurred during this period, such as the publication of the three-volume standard dictionary (Koneski 1961, 1965, 1966 — the hiatus being due to the terrible Skopje earthquake of 26 July 1963) and the publication of the 1970 orthographic dictionary (Pravopis 1970), but these were more marks of maturity in the process of standardization. This last event marks the end of the first phase of the third stage of implementation.

Throughout this period, implementation of the norm was advocated not only through Literaturni zbor but through writers' unions, teachers' unions, and mass media publications as well. The daily newspaper Nova Makedonija was a major disseminator of work aimed at implementation of the norms, which it achieved under four different rubrics: (1) feature articles and serialized pamphlets devoted to linguistic questions, (2) the regular feature of letters to the editor, which often contained letters raising linguistic issues (during 1984—1985 such letters received their own rubric, Jazična kritika ‘linguistic critique’), (3) the literary supplement Kulturen život ‘Cultural life’, which in 1986 began publication as a separate periodical and was replaced by a weekly supplement named Lik ‘image’, and (4) the weekly feature Jazično kafe ‘linguistic corner’, edited for decades by Blagoja Korubin, a member of the Institute for the Macedonian Language. Many of Korubin's columns were collected in the four volumes of his Jazikot naš deneteli (Korubin 1969, 1976, 1980, 1986) and serve as a good barometer of the problems that were faced in the course of implementing the standard. Oral media such as theater, film, television, and radio also serve as means of implementation both by their use of language and occasionally by means of special programs...
focusing on linguistic questions. Thus, for example, Friedman (1985) was translated into Macedonian and broadcast as a two-part special radio program in 1987. From time to time articles have appeared criticizing the quality of the language of television and radio announcers, which is itself an indication of the importance attached to the media.

The decade of the 1980s saw the first events that would lead to the breakup of Yugoslavia. At the same time, the multiplicity of voices raised in linguistic discussions increased and became more diverse. From a strictly linguistic academic point of view, this increased pluralism did not always mean an increase in quality, but certainly in variety. An interview with Trajko Stamatoski (director of the Institute for the Macedonian Language) in the 8 June 1988 edition of Ljubljana touched off a vociferous debate over the status of Macedonian and especially its relationship to Serbo-Croatian and the relationship of the standard to the dialects. Parts of the debate were reprinted or published for the first time in Kostinski (1989). Among other things, there was a call for the formation of a separate normative body to attempt to dictate or influence public opinion concerning linguistic usage, and criticisms of the orthography were again raised. I date the third phase in the third stage of implementation from this period.

In addition to the mass media that had been engaged in the implementation of the standard, new independent media and publishing houses began to contribute their own voices. Some of these, especially organs of opposition political parties, such as Demokratija and Delo, concerned themselves particularly with the remissive issues discussed below. During this period a new rubric began appearing irregularly in Ljubljana, Od zbor k zbor ‘From word to word’, with debates over issues of implementation of the standard. Ilija Milčin, who also has a linguistic column in the daily (except Sunday) tabloid Večer called Od zaštita agol ‘From the linguistic corner’, is a frequent contributor, but linguists from the Department of Macedonian Language such as Liljana Minova-Gurkova have also contributed. During the pre-1988/1989 period, syntax did not figure in monographic normative works, although there were some scholarly treatments intended for the academic community, such as Topolinska (1974). The post-1988/1989 period has seen an increase in academic monographs treating syntax, such as Čušule (1989), K. Koneski (1990), and Korubin et al. (1992), as well as the first normative monographic treatment of the subject, viz. Minova-Gurkova (1994). Another important effect of political events in this last period has been the increase in Macedonian-language radio and television broadcasting and film dubbing and subtitling. Whereas prior to Macedonian independence in 1991 much of this mass-media material was taken from Belgrade and other Serbo-Croatian-speaking areas and was thus in Serbo-Croatian, the combination of political independence and the war and sanctions in former Yugoslavia caused Macedonians to invest significantly more effort in their own mass-media programming. A somewhat ironic result of this has been that while complaints of Serbiaization continue to be directed at Macedonian language usage in the media, there is far less Serbian actually being heard.

Having outlined the basic chronological stages and phases of implementation as well as the linguistic environments to which they relate, we shall now turn to the five types of issues involved in implementing the Macedonian standard: recursive, remissive, resolved, new, and nonsalient. We shall examine some typical examples of each.

Fixed antepenultimate stress is one of the most distinctive phonological characteristics of the western Macedonian dialects. It was a feature that was agreed upon without dispute at the first codification conference (Risteski 1988: 316), and yet it has been the focus of continuous attempts at implementation. In 1959, Koneski (1950b) wrote the following lines:

'Ve are taking as the object of these remarks certain intellectuals from Western Macedonia, people who, one might say, along with their mother's milk also acquired the rule of antepenultimate accentuation that has also been taken into the literary language from the western dialects. One might say that even if they wanted to they would not be able to make mistakes in accentuation. And yet the matter is not so: it is simply incredible how much our intellectuals err in this regard and the kinds of deviations from the structure of the Macedonian accentual system that come out of their mouths.'

In Koneski's article the emphasis is more on the influence of Bulgarian, whereas in later phases, the problem has been perceived more as one of Serbian or local dialects. Koneski (1950b) states that under the influence of Serbian and Bulgarian there was a tendency among intellectuals to keep the stress on the same syllable rather than shifting to the antepenultimate when morphology required; for example, široki 'wide' should have a definite form širokite 'the wide' but instead one heard širokite narodni masi 'the broad masses' rather than širokite. Koneski makes the point that these same people would never say širokite beži 'the broad breeches' but only širokite beži. His point here is that there were two styles of
accentuation among these intellectuals; in their informal style they would automatically use their native — and the normatively correct — accentuation, but in formal ("high") style, they tended to adopt an artificial accentuation that was contrary to the norm but in keeping with the languages in which they had received their education — Bulgarian or Serbian. In each of his four collections of normative articles, Korubin (1969: 114–120, 1976: 145–160, 1980: 215–227, 1986: 186–188) devotes attention to problems of accentuation. Among the problems he addresses are the overgeneralization of antepenultimate stress to cases that constitute exceptions, such as verbal adverbs (which bear penultimate stress, e.g. gledajki ‘looking’ not gledaji) and various recent foreign borrowings. Accental units, that is, phrases that bear penultimate stress as unit, such as interrogatives like Kolka pari ‘How much money’, constitute another class of difficulties. Although such units are characteristic of the west-central dialects and prescribed as part of the norm, most of them are not used outside their native region (see Friedman 1993b for details). Educated speakers from outside the west-central area — including speakers in Skopje — view most accentual units as regionalisms. In recent years, the influence of Serbian and Skopje dialect is frequently cited as responsible for difficulties in the implementation of the accentual standard (see Trenevski 1995; Herson-Finn 1996: 159). Thus, implementation of accentual norms constitutes a recurring problem in Macedonian, although the specific manifestations have varied over time and the environmental emphasis has shifted from Bulgarian and the eastern dialects to Serbian and the Skopje dialect.

The place and representation of lateral sonorants in the literary Macedonian system has been another recurring theme. It was the subject of considerable debate at the 1944 codification conference (Risteski 1988: 293–299). Although not as constant a topic of discussion as the place of stress in subsequent years, it has been a recurring theme at least since the early 1970s, hence my decision to treat it as recurring rather than remissive (see Korubin 1976: 106–112, 1980: 157–166, 1986: 173–174; Tomovski 1972). According to the literary norm, there are two laterals in Macedonian — dark (velarized) /l/ and clear /ɾ/, and the opposition is neutralized before front vowels and ej, where only clear /ɾ/ occurs. In the orthography, distinctive clear /ɾ/ is represented by the grapheme ḳ, whereas elsewhere ḳ is written. Under the influence of Serbian and the Skopje dialect, however, there has been a tendency to pronounce both the grapheme ḳ and the sequence ej as a palatal /ɾ/ as in Serbian. In some dialects, such as Prilep, there is also a tendency among the younger generation to pronounce ḳ as velar /ɾ/ before /e/ and /i/. This has resulted in orthographic confusion so that, for example, the proper name ḳiljana, which should be written ḳiljana, is misspelled ḳiljana, which is also how it would be spelled in Serbian (cf. also the example of 'battalion' cited above). In the post-1988/1989 period, this problem has been taken as emblematic of excessive Serbian influence and has been cited in calls for orthographic reform, for example in Velkovska (1989), Ristovski (1994). The use of Latin orthography is another recurring problem of implementation, although its symbolism has changed over time. In the earliest stages, the problem was essentially one of availability of typewriters and typefaces. Throughout the pre-1988/1989 period, the use of Latin orthography or the mistaken use of a Latin letter in a Cyrillic sign would arouse critical commentary (cf. e.g. N.M. 21. VI. 75: 7). In more recent years, however, the use of Latin orthography in public has taken on political overtones. Thus, for example the 28 July 1994 Nova Makedonija reported that The Republic Market Inspection Commission had given the owner of stores in Skopje with signs in Latin eight days to replace them with Cyrillic or obtain special permission to use Latin. In focus were Macedonian-owned stores with western signs (e.g. "boutique DALLAS"). The article criticized the commission for not informing shopkeepers in time. However, this move could also be seen as the type of symbolic oppression of nationalities whose languages use the Latin alphabet, especially Albanians and Turks. Article 7 of the Macedonian Constitution (which specifies Macedonian as the official language and Cyrillic as the official alphabet in the Republic) was cited as the Commission's justification. However, that same Article allows for other languages in localities with a "majority of significant number" of other nationalities, and Article 48 protects the language rights of minorities.

On the levels of morphology and syntax, some typical western features such as the three-way deictic opposition in the definite article (the east has only one type of definite article) and the use of oblique forms for masculine proper names and some other animate nouns (lacking in the east) have received repeated attention (Korubin 1986: 67–93, 202–204). Problems resulting from excessively literal translations from Serbian such as the separation of clitics from verbs, permissible in Serbian, which follows Wackernagel's law, but not in Macedonian where verbal clitics are strictly bound to the verb, have also been recurring themes (Kepeski 1950; Dimitrovski 1951; Korubin 1986: 41).

While recursive themes have been more or less constant, remissive themes are distinguished by the fact that they were at issue in the earliest stages of codification and did not arise again or did so only sporadically until the post-1988/1989 period. An example is the treatment of schwa. Although distinctive schwa occurs in a majority of the Macedonian
dialects, it is absent from the core of west-central dialects that served as the basis of codification. Moreover, schwa is of different origins in different dialects (in the north it is from Common Slavic *u and *i, in the east-central dialects from vocalic ʰε, in parts of the south and elsewhere on the periphery from nasal ʰe, etc.) and thus it occurs in different words in different dialects (cf. Vidoševski and Pečev 1981). In the west-central core, schwa is allophonic before vocalic ʰe in initial position and after another vowel. The representation of schwa was the subject of heated debate at the first and second codification conferences. At the first, Cyrillic ђ as in Bulgarian was proposed. At the second, it was decided that schwa would be represented with an apostrophe and only used before initial vocalic ʰe and in dialectal forms and Turkisms when used for poetic or artistic purposes. Interestingly enough, during the 1950–1954 period, when lexical material from the dialects was being collected as part of the process of elaborating the lexicon, readers were instructed to use ă when sending in their material, in keeping with “običnata naučna transkripcija, što se upotrebljava nasekade među slavistite” (Koneski 1950c) “the usual scholarly transcription used everywhere among Slavists”. When the 1970 orthographic dictionary (Pravopis 1970) was published, there was some discussion of eliminating the apostrophe as unnecessary, while others supported its retention as potentially distinctive, as in po’rtn (= p’ttn) ‘begin to germinate’ vs. p’rtn ‘gates’ (see Jankuloski 1972). Throughout this period, however, there was no question of establishing ђ as part of the orthography.

The post-1988/1989 period, however, saw the resuscitation of this debate (e.g. Nedelkoski 1989). It so happens that, like the core west-central Macedonian dialects, Standard Serbo-Croatian and the dialects on which it is based have no schwa, while Standard Bulgarian and its dialects do. This fact became a politicized issue in the rivalry between Macedonian politicians and politically oriented academies (one of the parties in the 1990 elections was founded by a professor of Macedonian literature) on the one hand, and the political and linguistic establishment on the other. The decision to exclude schwa from the Literary Macedonian inventory was portrayed by nonestablishment Macedonian nationalists as an example of Serbianization, while their opponents viewed the attempt to reintroduce the grapheme ђ as an example of Bulgargophilia. Throughout the 1990s this issue was discussed in both government-sponsored and independent mass media. This challenge to the standard was reflected not only in polemics around the letter ђ but also in the use of the orthographically sanctioned apostrophe in contexts other than the belteristic ones originally prescribed, such as an individual writing to the letters-to-the-editor section of Nova Makedonija who signed his name B’xc (N.M. 8. IX 90: 12). Since the 1990 elections, however, this issue has essentially disappeared from public discourse.

Related to the question of schwa is the entire question of phonemic versus historical orthography. As was mentioned above, during the first stage of implementation, there were polemics that portrayed the Macedonian phonemic orthography as Serbianization, since it followed Vuk Karadžić’s linguistically sound principle of one letter per phoneme. In the post-1988/1989 polemics over the relationship of Macedonian to Serbian, not only the issue of schwa but the question of the orthography as a whole was occasionally raised. Nedelkoski’s (1989: 133) challenge to the orthography and accusation of Serbianization provides a fairly typical example of the type of rhetoric that was used:

‘...we are historically and naturally the heirs to Cyrillic methodian literacy... but we use the misbegotten Vukkaradžićan alphabet: the groups ђ, ъ, и are replaced with the soft consonants г, л, and к...’

Aside from the fact that Vuk’s innovations were actually quite in the spirit of Cyril and Methodius’s original alphabet (Glagolitic, which was phonemic, not Cyrillic, which is derived from Greek uncial), we can note here that clear or palatal /l/ and palatal /h/ have nothing to do with the dorso-palatal stops, and moreover the dorso-palatal stops represent the reflexes of Common Slavic *tj, *dj in most Macedonian dialects, including the west-central ones. The reflexes /tjo, djo/ for Common Slavic *tj, *dj are for the most part typically Bulgarian. The polemic is thus concerned not merely with orthographic reform, but with a tug-of-war between those who would draw Macedonian closer to Bulgarian by accusing the current establishment of Serbophila and those who would continue the principles established during the first phase of implementation.

Another remissive complaint relating to Serbian influence is the tendency to use /l/ in places where the literary norm has prescribed the voiced dental affricate /Ѓ/ (Cyrillic Ћ versus Ђ). The voiced dental affricate is relatively rare in Macedonian, and the letter representing it is unique to Macedonian and therefore not available in other typefaces. Moreover, it corresponds to /l/ in Serbian and elsewhere in Slavic. The substitution was a problem in the earliest days of implementation, when it was decreed as disrespectful toward the literary norm (Šopov 1950). The issue was raised again in the post-1988/1989 phase as part of the complaint against Serbianization (Velkovska 1989). During the intervening years, the treat-
ment of the use of this sound and the letter representing it were limited to questions where different dialects were in competition, as in literary 

noze 'legs' versus dialectal nose (Korubin 1976: 115-117).

The use of Turkisms can also be classed as a remissive issue. As indicated earlier, the trend to exclude such words from formal discourse was set in 1945. Three and a half decades later, Korubin (1981) found it necessary to admonish translators not to become so carried away by purism that they translate Serbo-Croatian Turkisms such as 

Buğrum efendi 'At your command, sir' with the native but here inappropriate Povestne gospodine. 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 

uti, 'clothes iron' (literary Macedonian now uses pegla, from the German bügel(eisen)), which were still in common use two or three decades ago. Another linguistic effect of political pluralism of the post-1988/1989 period, however, has been the rise of Turkisms in public contexts. This, too, could be associated with earlier debates concerning the position of Turkisms in literary nor- 
mativization. Turkisms have always been more common in informal styles as opposed to formal speech or writing and the apparent rise in 

Turkisms also appears to be connected with a tendency to collo quo- 

lize the literary language in opposition to establishment norms. The post-1988/1989 period has seen a significant increase in the use of Turkisms in formal contexts where they would previously have been eschewed, for example in the press, and a tremendous increase in their use in informal contexts. This is a result, in part, of the perceived democratization of Macedonian by opposing earlier policies.15

Among the resolved issues, that is, those that were problematic during the early years of implementation and that have not recurred, we can cite the position of the phoneme /x/, the morphological classification of verbs according to stem class, the consistent omission of the auxiliary in the third person of the past indefinite, the shape of relativizers, and the place of Russian and Church Slavonic lexical items, all of which received attention in early implementational works (e.g. Vidoesi 1950a, 1950b; Ugrinova 1950a, 1950b).

The strikingly nonsalient issues, that is, areas of the grammar that could have been singled out for implementational debate but were not, include morphosyntactic features of the literary language specific to the western dialects such as the perfect with the auxiliary ima 'have' plus the verbal neuter adjective as well as eastern features adopted into the literary language such as the shape of clitic pronouns and the neutral definite article (ot versus western -o), which have not figured in discussion centered on the implementation of the norm, although the use of the ima perfect is still more likely in speakers from regions where it is native. Colloquial features such as double determination (e.g. ovie decuva 'these here children') have figured only in technical linguistic discussions. A new issue in the implementation of the Macedonian standard is the relationship of Macedonian to the Great Power linguistic environment, especially to the influence of English as seen in the influx of lexical items in the speech of the younger generation, in popular media, and in the press. Youth-oriented radio uses a large number of English expressions, and in the daily newspapers one commonly sees advertisements mixing alphabets and using loanwords where native forms exist. This is especially the case with computer-related equipment, as in the following example cited in Cyrillic as well as transcription for orthographic reasons. In the transcription, words originally in the Latin alphabet are italicized while technical loanwords are underlined:

Online дневността Компьюръръ обяви дека пушта във работата нов сервис кой 

им овозможи на корисниците на Mobile Comm, Page Mart, како и на Page 

Net да я приема своите поща преку алфавитерски пейджери.

Online dežvajata Kompirer objavi deka pulta vo robota nov servis koi im ovozmozi na korisnici na Mobile Comm, Page Mart, kako i na Page Net da ja prima svojata poista preku alfamerikaliski pejdjeri.

The online division of Compuserve has announced that it is setting up a new service which enables users of Mobile Comm, Page Mart, as well as Page Net to receive their mail via alphanumerical pagers’ (N.M. 22.V.96: 17).

The flood of new English words and expressions has aroused the ire and concern of puristically oriented linguists and writers, who have objected to the influx of English terms in much the same way as the French (see Venovska-Antevska 1995. Herson-Finn 1966: 159). The explosion of English in the Macedonian vocabulary is in part a reflection of the political and technological situation since 1989, but it is especially preva lent among the youngest generation and thus also seems to be an emblem of youth culture. In much the same way, Skopje features such as the form of derived imperfectives in -set() as opposed to the literary -uvat(), seem at least to some extent to function as markers of hip, urban, slangy expression.16

In conclusion we can say that the implementation of the Macedonian norm is the source of ongoing debate in which complex grammatical and linguistic-environmental factors have interacted in a definable chronol ogy. Certain themes in this debate have been recurring, others have receded only to be resuscitated, still others have been resolved while new
problems have arisen. Finally, there are parts of the norm that while not universally shared by all the dialects have nevertheless not constituted the focus of any particular problematization. Moreover, the same issue can take on different implications at different times. In the pre-1947 and post-1988/1989 periods, the relation of the standard to Bulgarian informed many of the debates over implementation, whereas the relationship to Serbian has been a constant theme ebbing and flowing in importance. Similarly, the competition between Skopje and the west-central dialects was an important issue prior to 1948 and again after 1988/1989. While the Russian question was important during the first stage, it has not resurfaced, but the symbolic significance of Turkism as distinctive has come back as a kind of lexical democratization. The association of nationalist politics with Serbophobic linguistic policies that end up appearing Bulgarophilic is a particularly ironic effect of the most recent phase of the implementation debates.

Given the relative consistency of certain aspects of both the internal and external Macedonian linguistic environment, it is likely that these debates will continue. The use of the standard language as a resource for power and prestige ensures this. What is striking about the Macedonian case is the rapidity with which the basic outlines of the standard were achieved and implemented. In terms of everyday use and general control of the norm, the implementation of the Macedonian standard in Macedonia has been basically successful, although many issues remain open to contestation and manipulation. The period of independence has seen a rise in the use of Macedonian as the primary means of communication, and recently more attention is again being paid to language issues. In the 50 years of standardization some prescriptions have changed, some have been dropped, some have become facilitative, and the facts of implementation have influenced all this. For all the problems that have been discussed and continue to be discussed, however, the fact remains that the Macedonian standard language has been successfully implemented as the primary means of communication in the Republic of Macedonia.
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Notes

1. Misirkov (1903) and the stenographic notes from the 1944 codification conference (Risteski 1988: 231–257) are two examples. Moreover, during fieldwork in Macedonia in 1973–1974 I had occasion to examine the 1940 manuscript of Risto Kče’s play Milion mačenika, which was written in ignorance of Misirkov (1903), and found that its language was very close to the principles advocated in both the aforementioned documents.

2. This rectangle surrounds the district of Krusevo. Metropolitan Skopje straddles the main bundles of isoglosses (see Ugrinov 1951 for details). While internal administrative data do not necessarily correspond exactly to these defined by isoglosses, they nonetheless serve as a convenient orientation. On 14 September 1996, after this article was written, the number of administrative units (optima ‘commune’ or ‘municipality’) was changed from 14 to 123. For an accessible survey of the phonology of Macedonian dialects, see Vidoški (1983).

3. Thus, for example, the eastern shape of the neutral definite article (or vs. western -o) and third person clitic pronouns (fem. acc. ja, fem. dat. i, acc. pl. gi vs. westers je-je-i), were chosen, despite the fact that these choices were the same as literary Bulgarian, individual lexical items with the northern reflex u ~ 'u were prescribed despite the fact that these were the same as in literary Serbo-Croatian (e.g. bugarski ‘Bulgarian’, guska ‘goose’), and the productive suffixes for verbal nouns were prescribed as -nie (as in Church Slavonic and Russian) and -nie (as in literary Serbo-Croatian), despite the fact that there existed western forms in -ne that were unique and would have added to the differentiation of literary Macedonian. To this can be added the fact that, as we shall see, the treatment of Turkisms was the same as in the other Balkan languages. In all of these cases, choices were made on the basis of factors other than the desire to make literary Macedonian as different as possible from neighboring languages. Other considerations such as the fact that a given choice was more widespread or that it had an older literary tradition were also important. It is thus a mistake to claim that differentiation was the only factor motivating the decisions made in the codification and elaboration of literary Macedonian (pace Trobest 1994: 126).

4. According to the preliminary results of the 1994 census, the population of the Skopje metropolitan area was 541,280 of a total in the Republic of Macedonia of 1,936,877. Of these, the numbers declaring Macedonian nationality were 354,377 and 1,288,330, respectively. The second largest municipality, Tetovo, had a total population of 174,748. The second largest concentration of declared Macedonians was in Bitola, with 96,358 out of a total of 166,012 (Statistical Office of Macedonia 1994). While the correspondence of declared nationality and mother tongue is by no means one-to-one, these raw figures nonetheless convey some sense of the proportions involved.

5. Albanian and Arvanitian contributions have been limited in the standard language but are quite significant in local dialects, e.g. the towns of Debar and Bitola (Konskii 1967: 148; Jalas-Nasteva et al. 1990; cf. also Milanski et al. 1954; Vidoški 1968: 81). Romani has been limited primarily to the informal and marginal layers (e.g. secret languages, cf. Jalas-Nasteva 1951), while Greek has had more of an impact in the south than in the north. See Friedman (1989) for details. There has been very little study of Judaeo elements in Macedonian dialects, but in the standard language they seem to be limited to terminology relating to Jewish culture (see also Jalas-Nasteva 1988: 154; Cvetkovski 1988: 190; Kolonomos 1995). Most of the Jewish community of Macedonia was destroyed by the Nazis during World War Two, particularly on 11 March 1943, when the majority were brought to Skopje and shortly thereafter deported to the death camp at Treblinka. Approximately 200 Macedonian Jews survived the War, but most left after the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 (Kolonomos and Sudarikov 1995: 83). In addition to lexical influences, the Balkan languages have all had significant effects on the grammatical structure of Macedonian (see: Friedman 1978, 1994 and Konskii 1967: 143–73 for examples; see also Demiraj 1994 for a recent general treatment). However, from the point of view of the implement-
tation of the Macedonian standard, the Balkan origin of relevant grammatical features has not been an issue. These features are treated rather as integral parts of the dialects in which they occur (see Veljkovska 1989; Mišenka-Tomšić 1992).

6. Turkish has retained its cultural prestige among Muslims, and to a certain extent among non-Muslim urbanites, especially the older generation.

7. Had the Macedonian dialects of Aargan Macedonia or the districts of Lower Prespa, Golo Brdo, and Kukbi been in a position to participate actively in the implementation of the Macedonian norm, then it is conceivable that Greek or Albanian lexical elements, which are more significant in those dialects, might have played a more significant role if only as objects of purism. Since contact with the Macedonians of Albania was effectively cut off between 1948 and 1989, however, and since Greek government policies have never permitted free communication in Macedonian on Greek territory, the Greek and Albanian languages have remained uncontroversial and irrelevant as sources of lexicon. To this can be added the fact that the Macedonian dialects in closest contact with these languages are peripheral and were therefore marginalized in codification and elaboration as well.

8. The question of the relation of Serbian to Serbo-Croat/Croat-Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian (as well as Montenegrin, Sandžakian, and Dalmatiniški), while of great current sociolinguistic and sociopolitical interest, is irrelevant to the questions addressed in this article. The West South Slavic dialects adjacent to Macedonian are all Serbian, and the variant of the former Serbo-Croatian standard of the former Yugoslavia that had the most influence in Macedonia was the Serbian variant. Thus, in this article I use the term Serbian, depending on the context, to refer to the Serbian variant of the former Serbo-Croatian, the current standard of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, or to the Serbian dialects. Occasionally the term Serbo-Croatian is used to refer to the standard language of former Yugoslavia as such.

9. Greek was also a language of instruction in southern Macedonia, and some Macedonians studied at Russian universities.

10. The recension of Church Slavonic used in Macedonia is in fact the Russian one. Old Church Slavonic can be defined as the language reconstructed on the basis of a small corpus of undated manuscripts (and one inscription set up in 993 CE) that are of non-East Slavic origin prior to about 1100 CE (see Lant 1974). This basically South Slavic language, which is in many respects quite close to our reconstruction of Common Slavic, was continued in later recensions as Church Slavonic. Church Slavonic had tremendous impact on the formation of the Russian literary language and survived in Russia after the fall of the Balkan Slavic states to the Ottoman Empire. The Russian recension thus became the one used on the Slavic Orthodox Churches.

11. Greek linguists and politicians have been basically consistent in their negation of the Macedonian norm (see Andrionis 1957 for a typical example). Brief attempts at teaching Macedonian in Greece in the late 1940s were quashed. See Riatiski (1988: 88-102) and Kiselinovski (1988: 112-119) for details. Although both these books’ treatment of Macedonian within the Republic of Macedonia must be used with considerable caution due to the personal and political agendas of their authors, they nevertheless gather together a considerable quantity of useful data (see Friedman 1993a, note 2).


13. The 1981 uprising in Kosovo, which resulted in the first use of martial law in Yugoslavia since World War Two, was arguably the beginning of the end. Of the plethora of books that have sprung from this tragedy, Woodward (1995) gives a particularly clear analysis of the role of international involvement (see also Hayden
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