

Official Language, Minority Language, No Language at All: The History of Macedonian in Primary Education in the Balkans*

**by Christina Kramer
University of Toronto**

In countries with linguistically diverse populations the provision of mother-tongue primary education in minority languages has often been the subject of political debate. The author clarifies the history and status of Macedonian in the various areas where it is spoken by providing a summary account of its history as a language of instruction in primary education in the Balkans from the nineteenth century to the present. The use of Macedonian has been closely intertwined with issues of language codification and ethnic identity in the schools in Greece, the former Yugoslavia, the Republic of Macedonia, Bulgaria and Albania. It is the language of government in the Republic of Macedonia and enjoys limited status in Albania, but it is accorded no official recognition in Greece, and in Bulgaria the most recent census does not recognize Macedonian ethnic identity.

In countries with linguistically diverse populations, the provision of mother-tongue primary education in minority languages has often been the subject of political debate. In the Balkans there has been great variation in the language policies of different countries and in the willingness of different governments to provide mother-tongue primary education for minority linguistic groups. The history of the use of Macedonian in former Yugoslavia, Greece and Bulgaria as a minority language in elementary-school instruction during this century from partition in 1913 to the present will be the subject of this study.¹ The focus is on language use in primary education as it relates to the recognition of mother-tongue use in early education as an important indicator of language acceptance. Cooper (1989: 108-109) specifically mentions the import of education in status planning:

Determining media [language] of instruction for school systems is perhaps the status-planning decision most frequently made, the one most commonly subject to strong political pressures, and the one most often considered by educationists

* I wish to thank the anonymous reviewers of this article for their very constructive comments. I also wish to thank Grace Fielder for her editorial help. I owe special thanks to Prof. Victor Friedman for sharing his insights with me, offering me the benefit of his knowledge and experience, and directing me to sources I had missed.

and by students of language planning... The degree to which educational considerations influence the choice of [linguistic] medium varies from case to case, but political considerations always play a role.

It is not my goal to treat theoretical issues of mother-tongue instruction per se, but rather to show how historical events that have helped or hindered the use of Macedonian in the schools relate to broader issues in language planning. Due to the differences in language attitudes in the different countries in which Macedonian is spoken, we can trace the effects of changes in status planning and corpus planning which do not cross international boundaries, cutting off parts of the linguistic community from linguistic change. There have been various models outlining the process of language standardization, codification and acceptance (see, for example Haugen 1966, Fishman 1972a, Radovanović 1979, 1992; see also Friedman 1998 for a comparison of different models and their application to Macedonian). These models elaborate the stages from selection of the norm, the codification of the norm and its expansion and elaboration, through the processes of implementation and cultivation. This paper seeks to explore the external political pressures which inhibit this development within various parts of a speech community and, by implication, the role of early mother-tongue instruction in formulations of international linguistic human rights. Finally, in comparing the results of language policies in the different Balkan countries in which Macedonian is spoken, we will turn to the taxonomy of official attitudes towards minority languages as outlined by Cobarrubias (1983: 71) and by Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (1995: 80-81).

The history of the codification of Macedonian is tied to the historical complexities of the Balkans; only the most salient facts will be treated here. During the centuries of Ottoman rule in the Balkans (from the fourteenth to the nineteenth century) under the *millet* system ethnic identity was subordinate to religious affiliation. The Balkan Slavs belonged to the Greek *millet*, since the majority of Slavs in Bulgaria and Macedonia were Orthodox, and the Orthodox church was controlled by the Greek patriarchate of Constantinople. Since education was controlled by the Church hierarchy, the possibility that a Slavic language might be used as a language of education did not arise. At the close of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, the rise of South Slavic nationalism led to the codification of the modern South Slavic literary languages (see Friedman 1985 for a more detailed discussion). The first half of the nineteenth century saw Macedonian and

Bulgarian Slavs united in a fight against Hellenism and joined in a common cause for a literary language. The proponents of a standard based on Church Slavonic were ultimately defeated by the proponents of a vernacular-based standard. During the latter half of the nineteenth century, debate concerning the development of a Bulgarian standard language based on a vernacular rather than on Church Slavonic centered on which dialect area could serve for a unified Macedo-Bulgarian language. The most frequently cited problem for such a unified language was the great difference between Macedonian and eastern Bulgarian dialects. The newspaper *Pravo* in 1869 (cited in Venediktov 1993) wrote that Macedonian Bulgarians understood Danubian Bulgarians and vice versa less than either understood Church Slavonic; as a result there was no consensus on the choice of dialect base for a joint standard language. It is also worth mentioning that there was no consensus on the name of the language either. Until codification of Macedonian in the 1940s, speakers would not necessarily call the language they spoke 'Macedonian'. As Fishman (1972: 181) has noted, this is not unusual: "It is a fact of primordial ethnicity that not only is there little language consciousness but that the languages employed may have no special designation or no better ones than 'mother tongue', 'our language', 'simple language', 'daily language' etc., i.e. terms with no group or societal name attached to them."² It seems clear that Macedonian and Bulgarian speakers felt the dialects to be sufficiently far apart, regardless of what they might have termed the idiom of their speech community, to argue against a unified language.

By the early 1870s, with the establishment of an independent Bulgarian autocephalous church, the victorious Bulgarian movement had fully rejected a linguistic compromise (Rossos 1995: 225) and "publicly adopted the attitude that Macedonian was a degenerate dialect and that Macedonians should learn Bulgarian" (Friedman 1975: 88). The impetus and pressure for the recognition of a separate Macedonian literary language was subsequently vastly increased. Stojan Novaković wrote in 1888 (*Otdžbina*, cited by Koneski 1980): "Finally there is one phenomenon which must not be lost sight of. That is the Macedonians' aspirations to remain themselves... Even among the salaried teachers of the Bulgarian secondary schools in Macedonia there are people in whom these aspirations are being aroused, in the same way in which the Ukrainians react against Russification." By this point at the end of the nineteenth century it is clear that linguistic fission, rather than fusion or incorporation, was progressing (see Haarman 1986 for discussion

of these terms). Novaković proposed that a primer be published for the schools in Macedonia, of which two thirds would be in Macedonian, one third in Serbian. In 1889 seven thousand copies of such a primer were published in Constantinople, but fears of growing Macedonianism led Novaković to abandon this movement. Other Macedonians, such as Kuzman Shapkarev, publicly espoused a linguistic compromise but published textbooks based on purely Macedonian features. The most complete outline of a proposed Macedonian grammar from this period is *Za makedonckite raboti* (On Macedonian Matters) by Krste Misirkov. This work, written in 1903, had as one of its stated goals the standardization of a Macedonian literary language and its introduction into schools. Misirkov's detailed study would have led to an earlier codification of Macedonian had the initial printing not been destroyed by the Bulgarian police at the printing press in Sofia. In the absence of any mother-tongue education at the turn of the century, those who attended schools run by the Serbian, Bulgarian, or Greek Church acquired only a few years of elementary schooling insufficient for mastering any of the languages of instruction, while Macedonian remained the spoken language (see Rossos 1995: 229).

The realization of a codified standard literary Macedonian became more tenuous at the close of the second Balkan war when the Treaty of Bucharest (10 August 1913) partitioned Macedonia among Bulgaria, Greece and Serbia. This treaty thwarted all attempts at Macedonian linguistic and cultural unity. Rossos (1991: 282) has argued that this event resulted in the division of a region which had, since the era of warring dynastic states in the pre-Ottoman medieval Balkans, comprised an economic and ethno-cultural unity. Each of the countries that received a portion of Macedonia imposed its own standard language as the official language to be used in all spheres of public life, including education. The linguistic result was that the Macedonian language developed asymmetrically and suffered different fates in the various regions — namely Vardar Macedonia (now the Republic of Macedonia), Aegean Macedonia (the portion of Macedonia in Greece), Pirin Macedonia (the portion of Macedonia in Bulgaria), and, in addition, the Macedonian villages in Albania.

In Vardar Macedonia, Serbian was the official language in so-called Southern Serbia. Teachers were required to sign a loyalty oath to the regime. Those of Macedonian background had to take a Serbian course in pedagogy or a two- to three-month course to learn Serbian. Documents from the

twenties and thirties show that the local population was dissatisfied with this state of affairs. For example, a letter from the Minister of Internal Affairs to the Ministry of Education dated 19 November 1926 (archive of Yugoslavia 66-21-160, cited in Risteski 1988: 76) describes the situation in schools in the Ohrid district: "former exarchist [Bulgarian] teachers, although they finished education courses in Belgrade for teaching in the Serbian language, are speaking Bulgarian and they are teaching their students that they are Macedonians, not Serbs."

During the twenties and thirties, while Macedonian appeared in print through the publication of folktales, regional literature, and plays, Serbian continued to be used in all official spheres of life. Desire for a standard Macedonian language continued, however: a Macedonian youth revolutionary organization set out an eight-point program which included the recognition of Macedonia as a free nation in Yugoslavia with its own language, schools, administration, civil servants and courts (see Risteski 1988: 76). The Serbian government, in turn, tried to quell the struggle for Macedonian as a language of instruction. A 1939 document written to the Ministry of Education (archive of Macedonia, 346, cited in Risteski 1988: 85-86) cited the "great evil" in the cities: "at every opportunity Macedonian intelligentsia and youth, in their houses, on the street and in public places speak only in [the] Macedonian dialect." As Friedman (1985) and others have pointed out, "[F]orcing Macedonians to attend Serbian schools had the effect of increasing Macedonian self-awareness and unity by bringing together Macedonians from different parts of the country and compelling them to learn a language which was obviously different from their native one."

The standardization of Macedonian was ultimately tied to the shifting policies of the Balkan Communist Federation, as well as to the separate communist parties of individual Balkan states. In the late twenties and early thirties the various Balkan communist parties recognized the separateness of the Macedonians, but it was not until 1934 that the Comintern recognized that the Macedonians had a right to exist as a separate people with a separate language, a position which led ultimately to the recognition of the Macedonian standard language (see Rossos 1995: 238-239 on the shifting policies of the communist party, and Katardžiev 1977). In Vardar Macedonia, Macedonian was ultimately granted status as one of the official languages of Yugoslavia in August 1944, and in the course of the past fifty years Macedonian has been the official language used in all spheres of

public life, including all levels of education.

In Bulgaria, use of Macedonian as a language of instruction and its acceptance as a regional standard became a central issue in the forties. After decades of denying the existence of a separate Macedonian language, in December 1943 the Bulgarian Communist Party (BCP) issued a document that seemed to call for a return to the Comintern line of the mid-twenties, i.e. for an independent Macedonia within a Balkan federation. From 1944 through 1946 the governments of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria as well as their respective Communist Parties discussed the possible unification of Macedonian territories. In 1946 the Bulgarian government headed by Georgi Dimitrov recognized Macedonian as a separate ethnicity with a separate language. This recognition is reflected in newspaper articles and scholarly works of the period. With this political shift, more serious steps for the affirmation of the Macedonian literary language in Pirin Macedonia were undertaken. By 1947 the Macedonian language, literature and national history were taught in all elementary schools and *gymnasia* in Pirin. There were approximately 32,000 students enrolled, and teacher and student exchanges were carried out between Pirin and Vardar Macedonia.

By the end of 1947, however, all attempts to solve the Macedonian question through a Yugoslav-Bulgarian federation broke down. Stalin declared that the time was not right to change the status quo. Cultural exchanges and the development of Macedonian as an official language in Pirin Macedonia came to an end with the break between Tito and Stalin in 1948, which led to the deterioration of relations between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. While some recognition of a separate Macedonian ethnicity persisted through 1956, Bulgarian policy reverted to its earlier rejection of Macedonian as a distinct language, and after 1958 Macedonian nationality lost its official status. In Pirin, the Macedonian language was again restricted to use only in the home. Since the late 1950s Bulgarian influence has spread and become, particularly thorough the influence of schools and mass media, a second family language for many Macedonians in Pirin. This does not mean that Macedonian has ceased to be used, however. Kiselinovski (1987: 110), quoting an article in the 10 October 1987 *Rabotničko delo*, notes:

The carriers of the traditional local dialect are the oldest people in the village... School-aged children also switch to the local dialect when speaking among themselves... During breaks between classes, in the same classrooms, in the school yard, in the corridors, conversations begin which are interwoven with

dialect words or are carried on completely in dialect. If socio-linguistic research could be carried out openly on this issue we would be able to determine the dyads connecting family members and the domains of standard language use, ethnic identity and dialect use. While Macedonian in Pirin is most likely restricted to familial and everyday topics, evidence exists that Macedonian continues to play a role in the linguistic choices of these speakers.³

Additional indirect evidence of persistence in the use of Macedonian can be gleaned from the variety of works prepared for teachers of standard Bulgarian to assist them in detecting and correcting non-standard usage among their students. These handbooks, which strive to teach prescriptive norms for standard Bulgarian, provide telling evidence of the types of interference most likely to occur from inter-language contact. It seems likely that speakers of Macedonia in Bulgaria know their native Macedonian as well as standard Bulgarian.

The Bulgarian Communist Party remained in complete control of Bulgarian society until late 1989 when events in the Soviet Union and elsewhere in Eastern Europe swept into Bulgaria. In December 1989 the Mladenov government voted to reverse Todor Zhivkov's policy of assimilation. While some degree of recognition was granted to the Turkish minority, the ongoing political shifts did not change the official government's view that there was no ethnic Macedonian minority. The Zhelev government continued a policy which recognized a politically independent state of Macedonia, but which did not recognize a separate Macedonian language and ethnicity.

To assess the potential demand for Macedonian mother-tongue instruction we need to know the numbers of ethnic Macedonians in Bulgaria (cf. Aggarwal 1992 on language conflict in Manipur). Here it is helpful to look at statistics from several different censuses. In the 1946 census, claimed by some to be the most honest census ever held in Bulgaria, 252,908 people identified themselves as Macedonian. This population lived predominantly in the Pirin region. A document containing a survey of schools, pupils and teachers in Pirin Macedonia from 1946-47 (Korabar and Ivanoski: 1983) also indicates a high number of Macedonian students. For example, the survey finds 32,399 Macedonian students enrolled, 3,074 Bulgarians, 383 Turks, 581 Romanies, 32 Jews, 3,753 Macedonian Mohammedans, and 61 others.

The 1956 census gave Pirin Macedonia 281,015 inhabitants. Of these, 178,862 (63.7%) declared themselves to be of Macedonian nationality. A large minority identifying itself as Macedonian was also reported in Sofia. In the 1965 census, held after the complete suppression of Macedonian identity

in Bulgaria, the number of people declaring themselves to be Macedonian dropped to 8,750, and in the Blagoevgrad district less than 1% claimed to be of Macedonian ethnicity (Poulton 1991).

The Bulgarian census of December 1992 again asked questions concerning ethnicity, for the first time since 1965. Bulgarian nationalists protested that this was divisive and would lead to a splintering of the nation along ethnic lines (Nikolaev 1993). Tellingly, Macedonian was not one of the allowable choices.

In 1999 the Bulgarian government initiated a linguistic compromise: bilateral agreements between Bulgaria and the Republic of Macedonia will be written in both official literary languages, Bulgarian and Macedonian, but in return the Republic of Macedonia has stated that it will not interfere in internal Bulgarian matters. This suggests that no official recognition of Macedonian speakers in Bulgaria will occur in the near future.

The status of Macedonian as a language has been most problematic in Greece. As Cartwright (1990), discussing the complexities of majority and minority languages in the borderlands, argues:

Developments within a borderland that generate harmony and lessen distances between resident groups usually receive only local and regional publicity, but those events that are associated with requests by a minority for cultural sustenance, or are considered a threat to the territorial integrity of the dominant group, will be given national attention that can be distorted, misinterpreted and/or considered only superficially. Indeed, the fate of the Macedonian language in Greece has reflected the policies of the Greek government which has, without exception, followed policies which have sought the elimination of the Macedonian language and the Hellenization of the Slavic minorities. Education has been used as one the main tools of ethnic and linguistic fusion.⁴

In Greece, Macedonian has never been recognized as a minority language, nor, with minor exceptions, has it been granted a place in primary education. In the inter-war years, after the partition of Macedonia following the Balkan wars, there was no clear consensus on the type of Slav-speaking minority present in northern Greece, although clearly a Macedonian identity was present (see Rossos 1995: 230–231). In 1924, Greece signed a treaty with Bulgaria granting linguistic rights to its Slavic “Bulgarian” minority, and in 1926 it recognized the Slav population as a “Serbian” minority (see Schmieger 1998: 129). At the time of partition, in the 1920s, the Macedonian language had not yet been codified and therefore many speakers identified themselves as Bulgarian to distinguish themselves as a Slavic

minority in Greece. The Greek government sought to control the northern province by moving the Macedonian minority out of Greece in accordance with the policy of ‘voluntary resettlement’ defined by the Treaty of Neuilly with Bulgaria (according to data provided by Rossos 1991: 283; see also Kiselivoski 1987: 23). In the period between 1913 and 1928 the Greek government transformed the ethnographic structure of Aegean Macedonia from an area in which Slavs had constituted the majority, into an area in which, according to Rossos (1991: 283), the remaining Macedonian population in Aegean Macedonia found itself a minority in its own land, and an unrecognized and oppressed minority at that. It was overwhelmingly rural and scattered in small, mainly mountainous towns and villages. There was no longer any large Macedonian urban centre there, and, since virtually the entire exarchist educated intelligentsia and most Macedonian activists had been forced to leave and seek refuge in Bulgaria, it lacked an elite of its own. The number of well-educated Macedonians remained small and their education in Greek tended to estrange them from their Slavic roots and cultural traditions.

In 1924, Austin Chamberlain, the British foreign secretary, protested at the League of Nations that Greece was inhibiting minority rights as outlined in the Treaty of Sèvres and sought assurances from the Greek government that the obligations to its minorities would be met (Kuševski 1988: 15). Because of this pressure the first primer intended to be used by Macedonian children in Aegean Macedonia was published in 1925. The primer was printed in the Latin alphabet and based on the Lerin-Bitola dialects. It was sent to the regions of Voden (Edhessa), Kostur (Kastoria) and Lerin (Florina) for the 1925–26 school year, but was never used. Citing political unrest between Greece and Bulgaria, as well as diplomatic pressure from both Serbia and Bulgaria (which did not welcome the possibility of Greek recognition of a separate Macedonian language and ethnicity), the government confiscated the primer and all measures to ensure mother-tongue instruction in Aegean Macedonia were stopped (Apostolski 1972: 328).

During the 1930s, under the dictatorship of General Metaxas, Greek policy toward Macedonian became increasingly hostile. Metaxas sought to hellenize Aegean Macedonia by further limiting the potential domains in which Macedonian could be used. Not only was the language outlawed as a medium of education, but it was no longer allowed in any public discourse at all. People were also forbidden to use it even in the privacy of their own

homes, and the policy of minority assimilation was intensified. Evening classes were established for adults, providing mandatory instruction in Greek.⁵ This prohibition on the use of Macedonian at all levels of discourse was a powerful tool for the stated Greek government goal of hellenization. Language, as Fishman (1996: 48) argues, is a carrier of national character: "we must now acknowledge that it [language] is viewed as cognitively and emotionally formative as well, i.e. as affect expressing, arousing, and deserving, and, in that sense, also as national character related".

The decade of the 1940s in Greece was marked by foreign occupation during the Second World War and by waves of civil war. Beginning in August 1944, preparations for opening Macedonian schools in the districts of Lerin (Florina) and Kostur (Kastoria) were undertaken. In October 1944, the Kostur branch of the Communist party of Greece announced completion of a Macedonian primer and reader. One hundred and fifty copies of the books were printed. The books, however, were never used. In February 1945, with the capitulation of the National Liberation movement and the restoration of the pre-war regime in Greece, Macedonian was no longer permitted.

In the final period of the Civil War, during the years 1947–48, in the northern areas controlled by the communists, Macedonian once again became a language of education in those compact areas controlled by the Resistance. In 1947 a teacher training school was opened with 257 student-teachers. From October 1947 to March 1948 eighty-seven Macedonian schools were operating with 10,000 pupils. In March 1948 the decision was made to evacuate children to other countries. Approximately 30,000 children, both Greek and Macedonian, were evacuated to Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Albania, East Germany, Romania, and the Soviet Union, where the children were housed in children's homes and given instruction in the native language of the host country as well as in Macedonian and Greek. It is interesting to note that Greek children did not have to learn Macedonian. Instruction in the children's homes was in the standard Macedonian literary language as it was codified in the Republic of Macedonia in 1945 using the first published grammar written by Krume Kepeski. In 1948, with the Tito-Stalin split, the Communist Party of Greece, together with the Macedonian organization Ilinden, began formation of a so-called Macedonian micro-literary language, based on the Lerin dialects, to counter the "Titoist" grammar of Kepeski (Kiselinovski 1987: 99). A reader and grammar based on the Lerin dialect were published. Although these texts

were sent to the children's homes, the books were not adopted. This political attempt at further linguistic fission was rejected and the so-called micro-literary Lerin-based dialect was ultimately abandoned in favour of the literary standard as codified in Vardar Macedonia.

The final defeat of the Communist side during the Greek Civil War in 1949 represented a blow to the recognition of Macedonians as an ethnic minority in Greece. In Aegean Macedonia a policy of one state/one language again ensued and all hope of official recognition of the Macedonian minority disappeared. Even to the present, the Greek government denies the existence of a Macedonian language, but speaks instead of the "Skopian idiom".

It is difficult under present conditions to ascertain how many Macedonians there are in northern Greece. The Greek Monitor of Human and Minority Rights, published in December 1995, gives an estimate of 200,000 based on various studies and surveys.

The Greek foreign ministry has labeled the rise of the standard Macedonian language in the Republic of Macedonia a 'transformation by decree' of west Bulgarian dialects into a literary language. The dialects spoken by so-called Slavophone Greeks are considered to be an unrelated oral idiom with no written form, or grammar.⁶ This is an example of national status planning that denies the speakers of a minority language the benefits of corpus planning, codification and standardization in their language. Cutting off the Macedonian speakers in Greece from the literary tradition of standard Macedonian is a policy that would seem to have as its goal the isolation of Macedonians in Greece. A high-school teacher in northern Greece told the Human Rights mission in 1993 that students may or may not be punished for speaking Macedonian to each other, depending on whether or not individual teachers choose to report the incident. One member of the Macedonian Movement for Balkan Prosperity told the fact-finding mission, "We want all the rights of people who have their own identity and culture.... One of the most important of these is the right to have our children educated in their mother tongue.... Since the government says the Macedonian language doesn't exist, they won't give anyone license to teach it."

Since the Civil War, Greek citizens of so-called Greek genus have been allowed to return to Greece and reclaim family property. This right is not granted, however, to Macedonians. In addition, it has been reported that the Greek government has given generous financial support to Greek-language instruction and cultural centres for these returning Greeks. The Macedonians

of northern Greece have been protesting the resettlement law while at the same time demanding that funds provided by the European community for mother-tongue instruction should be used to fund Macedonian and Vlah language at the primary levels, rather than instruction in Greek dialects offered to returning land claimants.

In Albania, estimates of the Macedonian population range from the official 1989 census figure of 5,000 to the Macedonian estimate of 150,000. In the years immediately following the peace treaties of Bucharest and Versailles, the government of Albania followed a policy of denationalization and assimilation. No instruction was given in Macedonian, though from published sources it appears that the language was permitted both in the home and in public. After the Communists came to power in 1946, a Macedonian minority was recognized in Albania, a primer of Macedonian was published and mother-tongue instruction through grade four was offered in the early primary grades of some villages.

Cobarrubias' taxonomy of official attitudes towards minority languages (1. attempting to kill a language; 2. letting a language die; 3. unsupported coexistence; 4. partial support of specific language function; 5. adoption as an official language) gives a good sense of the range of attitudes towards Macedonian and clearly defines different stages in language policy in the Balkans.⁷

In the Republic of Macedonia, the language continues to serve as an official language. Already recognized within the former Yugoslavia as one of the official state languages and the official language of one region, in independent Macedonia it is the official language of the state. In Bulgaria there have been shifting policies ranging all across Cobarrubias' five attitudes. While Macedonian was given status as a regional official language prior to the Tito-Stalin break, most policies have tended towards a more aggressive position of language assimilation and minority-language suppression. The Greek policy has clearly been directed towards the elimination of Macedonian. The policy has also been extended to deny any connection between the codified standard and the language spoken by the Slavophone minority in Greece. If we accept the notion that language rights (particularly as elaborated by Kloss, Fishman, Cobarrubias, Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson, Schiffman and others) should be extended to captive communities, communities that have historic precedence over the dominant community, then we must accept that the language rights of the Macedonians in Greece and Bulgaria are being denied.

The Republic of Macedonia, now an independent nation, is in the process of sorting out minority rights and mother-tongue instruction. While there is a history of providing elementary language instruction for speakers of minority languages, e.g. Turkish and Albanian, there are pressures for increased language rights in education. We can only hope that those in power will keep in mind the fundamental linguistic rights of minorities. Those demanding ever-increasing linguistic rights and educational opportunities, however, should not lose sight of the incredible odds Macedonian has had to overcome to achieve its current status in the Republic of Macedonia (a right denied Macedonians in neighboring countries), and all citizens of Macedonia should respect this history.

Christina Kramer holds a doctorate in Slavic linguistics from the University of North Carolina and is currently associate professor of Slavic and Balkan linguistics at the University of Toronto. Her publications include work on verbal categories and comparative Balkan linguistics, the Macedonian language, and language policy in the Balkans.

Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A1 — ce.kramer@utoronto.ca

RÉSUMÉ

Langue officielle, langue minoritaire, pas de langue du tout: L'histoire du macédonien dans l'enseignement primaire dans les États Balkaniques

Dans les pays avec des populations diverses, la disposition d'enseignement primaire de langue maternelle dans les langues minoritaires a souvent été le sujet de débats politiques. L'auteur éclaircit l'histoire et l'état du macédonien dans les régions différentes où on le parle en fournissant un compte rendu abrégé de son histoire comme langue d'instruction primaire dans les États Balkaniques du dix-neuvième siècle jusqu'à présent. L'usage du macédonien a été relié de près avec les questions de la codification de langue et de l'identité ethnique dans les écoles en Grèce, en ancienne Yougoslavie, dans la République macédoine et jouit d'un statut limité en Albanie mais on ne lui accorde pas de reconnaissance officielle en Grèce. En Bulgarie le recensement le plus récent ne reconnaît pas l'identité ethnique macédonienne.

RESUMO

Oficiala lingvo, minoritata lingvo, nenia lingvo: La historio de la makedona en elementa edukado en la balkana regiono

En landoj kun lingve diversaj loĝantaroj, la liverado de elementa denaska-lingva edukado en minoritataj lingvoj ofte fariĝas temo de politika debato. La aŭtoro klarigas la historion kaj situacion de la makedona en la diversaj teritorioj, kie oni parolas ĝin, resumante ĝian historion kiel lingvo de elementa edukado en la balkana regiono de la deknaŭa jarcento ĝis hodiaŭ. Utiligo de la makedona intime ligiĝis kun demandoj de lingva normigo kaj etna identeco en la lernejoj de Grekio, la antaŭa Jugoslavio, la Respubliko de Makedonio, Bulgario kaj Albanio. Ĝi estas la registara lingvo en la Respubliko de Makedonio kaj ĝuas limigitan statuson en Albanio, sed oni cedas al ĝi neniun oficialan rekonon en Grekio, kaj en Bulgario la plej lasta popolnombro ne rekonis makedonan etnan identecon.

NOTES

1. I will also briefly discuss the use of Macedonian in primary education in Albania where, since the close of World War II, Macedonian has been used in schools up through grade four in the Macedonian areas of Prespa, but not in Golobrd or Gora.
2. Fishman's use of 'primordial' is better understood as 'nascent' and is not intended to essentialize ethnicity.
3. Fishman also discusses differences in multilingual production and multilingual comprehension. In Toronto, where many young speakers do not speak fluent Macedonian, they will attempt to speak Macedonian to their grandparents. In many cases, the children are quite fluent in their comprehension levels even when production is almost nonexistent. It is probable that a similar situation prevails in Pirin.
4. For a recent account on the sociolinguistics of Macedonian in Greece, see Schmieger (1998).
5. As one informant in Toronto told me, "They [the Greeks] used every occasion, every means to ban Macedonian. My mother and father at that time were illiterate: they couldn't write Greek or Macedonian. When the Greek regime came, they formed evening schools, even for older people. So they took the old people when they were coming home from work to teach them the Greek language and, of course, Greek writing. Many of them went for no reason except fear. If they didn't go to the school and learn the Greek language and writing they would be fined. Many times they were mistreated, they were beaten... they would say to them, "I am not given the opportunity to learn Macedonian and I don't want to go and become Greek" (see Kramer 1993 and Human Rights Watch 1994 for additional interviews with Macedonians from Aegean Macedonia on this subject).

6. This is a familiar claim when discussing the "legitimacy" of various languages — that the language in question doesn't have a grammar, etc. The same has been said about sign languages, Black English etc., and in every case is both wrong and silly. (I am grateful to a reviewer of this article for this observation.)
7. There have been other taxonomies proposed. Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (1995: 80) offer the following grid of language attitudes:

Assimilation-oriented	Maintenance-Oriented
	Overt
Prohibition ——— Toleration ——— Non-discrimination ——— Permission ——— Promotion	prescription
	Covert

It is difficult to plot diachronic processes on a grid, but we can see that in Greece and Bulgaria language policies have been far to the left on this grid, with intermittent attempts through education policy to shift support of minority language to the right.

REFERENCES

- Aggarwal, K. 1992. To Include or Not to Include: An Attempt to Study the Language Conflict in Manipur. *LPLP* 16: 21–37.
- Andonovski, Hristo. 1974. Macedonian National Minorities in Greece, Bulgaria, and Albania. In M. Apostolski and H. Polenakovik (eds.), *The Socialist Republic of Macedonia*. Skopje: Macedonian Review, 188–204.
- Apostolski, Mihajlo. 1972. *Istorija na makedonskiot narod*. Skopje: Prosvetno Delo.
- BAN (Bulgarska akademija na naukite). 1978. Edinstvo na bulgarskija ezik v minaloto i dnes. *Bulgarski ezik* 28: 3–43 [published in English as *The Unity of the Bulgarian Language in the Past and Today*, Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1980].
- Bojadžiev, Todor. 1987. *Meždu dialektoto i knževnoto*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Čašule, Vanga. 1970. *Od priznavanje do negiranje*. Skopje: Kultura.
- Cartwright, Don. 1993. Sociolinguistic Events in an International Borderland. In Ernst Håkon Jahr (ed.), *Language Conflict and Language Planning*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cobarrubias, Juan . 1983. Ethical Issues in Status Planning. In Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (eds.), *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton, 41–85.
- Cooper, Robert L. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crvenkovski, Dušan and Branko Pendovski (eds.). 1983. *The Historical Truth*. Skopje: Kultura.
- Cvetkovski, Victor. 1990. Meg' u Makedoncite vo Pirin, series in *Nova Makedonija*, Skopje.

- Dimitrovski, Todor, Blaže Koneski and Trajko Stamatovski (eds.). 1978. *About the Macedonian Language*. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik (Institute of the Macedonian Language).
- Edwards, John. 1985. *Language, Society and Identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Eminov, Ali, and Catherine Rudin. 1993. Bulgarian Nationalism and Turkish Language in Bulgaria. In Eran Fraenkel and Christina Kramer (eds.), *Language Contact — Language Conflict*. New York: Peter Lang, 43–71.
- Fine, John. 1983. *The Early Medieval Balkans*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1972a. *Language in Sociocultural Change. Essays by Joshua A. Fishman*, ed. Anwar S. Dil. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . 1972b. *Language and Nationalism: Two Integrative Essays*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- . 1996. *In Praise of the Beloved Language: A Comparative View of Positive Ethnolinguistic Consciousness*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Friedman Victor. 1975. Macedonian Language and Nationalism During the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries. *Balkanistica* 2: 83–98.
- . 1985. The Socio-Linguistics of Literary Macedonian. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 52: 31–57.
- . 1989. Macedonian: Codification and Lexicon. In Istvan Fodor and Claude Hagège (eds.), *Language Reform: History and Future*. Vol. 4. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- . 1993. Language Policy and Language Behaviour in Macedonia: Background and Current Events. In Eran Fraenkel and Christina Kramer (eds.), *Language Contact — Language Conflict*. New York: Peter Lang, 73–105.
- . 1998. Implementation of Standard Macedonian. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 131: 31–57.
- Greek Monitor of Human and Minority Rights*. 1995.
- Haarman, Harald. 1986. *Language in Ethnicity: A View of Basic Ecological Relations*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Haugen, Einar. 1966. *Language Conflict and Language Planning. The Case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kabasonov, Staiko. 1966. *Za obučenieto na literaturnen bŭlgarski ezik v dialektna sreda*. Sofia: Narodna prosveta.
- Katardžiev, Ivan. 1977. *Vreme na zreenje: makedonskoto nacionalno prašanje megŭ dve svetski vojni, 1919–1930*. Skopje: Kultura.
- Kirjanovski, Risto. 1986. The Struggle of the Macedonians from Aegean Macedonia for Use of the Macedonian Literary Language. *Glasnik* 30/1: 161–181.
- Kiselinovski, Stojan. 1987. *Statusot na makedonskiot jazik vo Makedonija (1913–1987)*. Skopje: Misla.
- Kloss, Heinz. 1968. Notes Concerning a Language-Nation Typology. In Joshua A. Fishman, Charles A. Ferguson and Jyotirinda Das Gupta (eds.), *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley.
- Koneski, Blaže. 1980. Macedonia. In Alexander Schenker and Edward Stankiewicz (eds.), *The Slavic Literary Languages: Formation and Development*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Korobar, Pero and Orde Ivanoski (eds.). 1983. *The Historical Truth: The Progressive Social Circles in Bulgaria and Pirin Macedonia on the Macedonian National Question 1896–1956*. Skopje: Kultura.
- Kramer, Christina E. 1996. Macedonian and Bulgarian Language Contact. *HSK (Kontaktlingvistik 2)* 65: 1–6.
- . 1993. Language in Exile: The Macedonians of Toronto. In Eran Fraenkel and Christina Kramer (eds.), *Language Contact — Language Conflict*. New York: Peter Lang, 157–183.
- Kuŭevski, Voislav. 1985. Foreword. Abecedar (1925–1985). In *Abecedarjubilejno izdanie*. Skopje: Macedonian Review.
- Lunt, Horace. 1952. *A Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language*. Skopje.
- . 1959. The Creation of Standard Macedonian: Some Facts and Attitudes. *Anthropological Linguistics* 1/5: 19–26.
- . 1984. Some Socio-Linguistic Aspects of Macedonian and Bulgarian. *Language and Literary Theory in Honor of Ladislav Matejka. Papers in Slavic Philology* 5: 83–132.
- . 1986. On Macedonian Nationality. *Slavic Review*, 729–734.
- Macedonians of Greece*. 1994. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Misirkov, Krste P. 1903. *Za makedonickite raboti*. Sofia: Liberalni klub. Reprint Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik. 1974.
- Mladenov, Maxim. 1992. Language and the National Problem. In *National Problems in the Balkans: History and Contemporary Developments*. Sofia: Argos Publishers.
- Nikolaev, Rada. 1993. Bulgaria's 1992 Census: Results, Problems, and Implications. *RFE/RL Research Report* 2/6: 5.
- Poulton, Hugh. 1991. *The Balkans*. London: Minority Rights Publications.
- Radovanović, Milorad. 1979. Sociolingvistika. Beograd: Beogradski izdavacko graficki zavod.
- . 1992. Standard Serbo-Croatian and the Theory of Language Planning. In Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth (eds.), *Language Planning in Yugoslavia*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, 93–100.
- Risteski, Stojan. 1988. *Sozdavanjeto na sovrmeniot makedonski literaturnen jazik*. Skopje: Studenski zbor.
- Ristovski, Blaže. 1989. *Portreti i profili*. 3 vols. Skopje: Kultura.
- Rossos, Andrew. 1991. The Macedonians of Aegean Macedonia: A British Officer's Report, 1944. *Slavonic and East European Review* 69: 282–309.
- . 1995. Macedonianism and Macedonian Nationalism on the Left. In Ivo Banac and Katherine Verdery (eds.), *National Character and National Ideology in Interwar Eastern Europe*. New Haven: Yale Center for International and Area Studies.
- Schiffman, Harold F. 1996. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. London: Routledge.

- Schmieger, Roland. 1998. The Situation of the Macedonian Language in Greece: Sociolinguistic Analysis. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 131: 125–155.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, and Robert Phillipson (eds.). 1995. *Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stavrianos, L. S. 1958. *The Balkans Since 1453*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Stojkov, Stojan. 1971. *Upatvane za proučvane leksikata na mesten govor*. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.
- Stojkov, Stojan, and S. R. Bernstejn. 1964. *Bŭlgarski dialekten atlas*. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.
- Strasimov, Dimitrov. 1992. Ethnoreligious and Ethnocultural Aspects of the National Problem in the Balkans. In *National Problems in the Balkans History and Contemporary Developments*. Sofia: Argos.
- Tintoski, Stevan. 1987. *Makedoncite vo Bugarija*. Skopje: Studentski Zbor.
- Venediktov, G. K. 1990. *Bogarskij literaturnij jazik epoxi vozroždenija*. Moskva: Nauka.

Grassroots English in a Communication Paradigm*

by Lachman M. Khubchandani and Priya Hosali
Centre for Communication Studies / Central Institute of English
and Foreign Languages

The paper focuses on the communicative approach in plurilingual settings and analyzes data from Indian English in the light of the speaker/listener, the task, the context, and other negotiating factors which regulate speech in everyday life. In the post-colonial period there has been a noticeable growth in the use of grassroots English among those who spontaneously acquire certain rudimentary characteristics of the language in an urban plurilingual milieu. By and large, such use of language is not formally learnt by education. This situation reveals the processes of adaptation to the context-and-task-specific reality. Instead of deliberating over the normative characteristics of Indian English on the global pluricentric cline of native and non-native Englishes, this study concerns itself with identifying the *complementarity* of grassroots English with other Indian languages, and its emergence as one of the vital *contact* languages in plural India.

Introduction

In the past few decades various aspects of non-native varieties of English have been explored in South Asia and in neighbouring countries like Singapore, Hong Kong and the Philippines (cf. Nihalani, Tongue and Hosali 1979; Platt and Weber 1980; Smith 1981; Kachru 1986, 1989; Görlach 1991; Khubchandani 1991; Leitner 1991; Cheshire 1992; Sridhar 1992; Dasgupta 1993). Most of these studies are concerned with determining representative normative varieties of English prevalent in specific regions. The South Asian English version (SAE) has been postulated on the basis of the “imperial” role of English as a carrier of elitism and refined education, as manifested among the Brownsahebs aspiring to a maximum proximity with British English (à la Nirad Chaudhary).

But the pursuits of this enquiry appear to have somewhat neglected the other end of the spectrum, i.e. the zero-level grasp of English in everyday-life communication. The post-colonial proliferation of English in the Indian subcontinent has virtually sealed the monopoly of the English “go-between”, acquired when the British empire was at its zenith, as there is a noticeable

* The paper was first presented at the South Asian Languages Association Round Table Conference, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, January 1997. We are grateful to Professor Görlach for his comments and suggestions. We also deeply appreciate the help rendered by Professor Mohale, Cyrus Taraporvala, and David Cook in data collection.