Christina Kramer

Writing Standard: Process of Macedonian Language Standardization

ABSTRACT: This paper focuses on questions of Macedonian standardization at the most micro-level, i.e., within the individual. Through examination of archival materials of Macedonian writers of the early twentieth century, questions of language shift and standardization are addressed. While much research has been conducted on the state processes of language standardizing, on access to the media in newly standardized linguistic codes, and on access to education, this work refocuses discussion of language standards on individual speakers and writers: how and why they shift their language to the emerging norm. Two writers from this period, Anton Kavaev and Radoslav Petkovski, serve as models and provide the first step in a larger study of processes of standardization in the early decades of the twentieth century leading to codification in mid-century. The written works of the authors under study demonstrate that language codification is not an *act*, nor a series of acts, but a *process*, a process that takes place within individual speakers who are committed to the project of language standardization while subject to external political and linguistic pressures.

1. INTRODUCTION

How do writers adapt to changing linguistic circumstances? How did Macedonian writers of the first half of the twentieth century move from writing in the languages of their schooling (Serbian or Bulgarian) or their Macedonian home dialect to become writers of the emerging standard Macedonian?[1] Much research has been conducted that focuses on the state processes of language standardizing, e.g., commissions to codify grammars, publication of new dictionaries and handbooks, access to the media in newly standardized linguistic codes, and access to education. Such works leave unanswered questions: such as why a speaker chooses to write in an emergent language or dialect, particularly if they have been schooled in a dominant language. Dorian writes: "the social standing of a group of people carries over to the language they speak. Social and economic opportunities go mainly to speakers of the state-sponsored language" (26). Yet in the Balkans some writers switched to a lower status variety because of group cohesion and ethno-linguistic identity. Although the lower status language is a reflection of power relations in contexts of developing ethnic and political awareness and newly standardizing languages,[2] some people will opt to

---

[1] I am grateful for the Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences for access to their archives, which helped in locating documents.

[2] See Krejci and Velimsky 1981 for a typology of European languages based on ethnic and political consciousness and other parameters.

shift to this emergent language since, as Dorian states: "If conditions are reasonably favorable, people identify with their own language and do not seek a preferable substitute. In cases in which people have changed to another language and given up their own entirely, it has nearly always been due to a local history of political suppression, social discrimination, or economic deprivation. More often than not, all three have been present" (39). Indeed, in Macedonia all three were present, but in the early twentieth century new circumstances arose that allowed Macedonians to choose Macedonian. How and why individuals make this choice, and how they express themselves in a language they often do not fully control—given that they are usually schooled in the higher status state language and often have few tools such as grammars and dictionaries to aid them—are key underlying questions of processes of standardization.

Much of the scholarship on language standardization is concerned with institutions of social implementation of language shift, language planning, formal declarations of language reform and the legal apparatus that implement language planning.[3] In this paper, however, I focus a discussion of language standards on individual speakers and writers. Scholars such as Danforth who privilege the experience of individuals inform my work:

> Most scholarly work on ethnic nationalism has focused on the construction of national identity as a large-scale collective phenomenon and as a long-term historical process. It has not paid sufficient attention to the construction of national identity as a short-term biographical process that takes place over the course of the lifetime of specific individuals... Many important questions are raised by focusing attention on the construction of national identity at the individual level. (85)

In this study I examine individual speakers: how and why they shift their language to the emerging norm—and, by so doing, help to create it. This change in focus is also informed by Kalogjera (212) who notes that more attention has been given to the *selection* stages of language standardization (cf. Radovanović 1992), but relatively little attention to the *acceptance* stages. I will focus on the linguistic and meta-linguistic factors in language shift and the concomitant identity shift in the generation of writers who, though schooled in Serbian or Bulgarian, chose to write in the nascent Macedonian standard language, even when this led to an inability to publish, social ostracism, personal injury and prison.

This paper is the first step in a broader study of writers in the period 1935–1955. These are writers from the interwar period and writers who published in the first decade after standardization. Particular emphasis is placed on writers who published in the first issues of the literary journal *Nov den,* i.e., authors such as Aco Šopov and Ivan Točko. As a preliminary step toward this broader

---

[3] There is a vast and growing literature on this topic, see for example Cobarrubias 1983, Kirjanovski 1986, Radovanović 1986 and 1992, Bojadžiev 1987, Cooper 1989, Cartwright 1993, Friedman 1998, Greenberg 2004, and others.

study, I discuss here two writers from this period: Anton Kavaev and Radoslav Petkovski. Both writers experienced the transition from dialect to standard in different ways, and their experiences and linguistic autobiographies shed light on the ways in which standardization and identity shift are experienced at this micro-level. While claims have been made that Macedonian was a language constructed by Tito and imposed on the population,[4] archival data show that there were writers committed to Macedonian in the early decades of the twentieth century, developing a meta-dialect that would become the basis of the Macedonian standard.[5] Through the study of their writings, I will explore the responses of these educated individuals to processes of language standardization within changing political boundaries. In this way I will be able to highlight questions of language codification and standardization at the most micro-level, i.e., within the individual.

Language codification and re-codification in the Balkans from the end of the nineteenth to the beginning of the twenty-first centuries provides a laboratory for examining issues of language, statehood, belonging, and status shifts across national boundaries. Yet, despite the importance language plays in identity, recent studies devoted to Macedonia have either ignored the linguistic dimension of Macedonianness (e.g., Pettifer 2001, and, in some respects, Brown 2003) or accept essentialist identities such as Serbian and Bulgarian, yet treat Macedonian as not imagined but imaginary.[6] Bucholtz's "strategic essentialism"—describing contexts in which "... the group under study is seen by the dominant group as illegitimate or trivial, or when a stigmatized group forms an oppositional identity to counter such negative ideologies" (401)—may be relevant, since for many in the Balkans, and, indeed, for many scholars, Macedonian is an oppositional identity. By examining the speakers themselves who chose Macedonian, I re-center discussion of Macedonians and Macedonian identity on critical linguistic components.

Other scholars have focused on language policy and language codification, yet language standardization in many of these works is expressed as an event or series of events, e.g., a codification congress, followed by attempts to implement its decisions. Greenberg (2004), for example, provides tables of events leading to the demise of Serbo-Croatian and the re-standardization of separate Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian languages. He notes: "The successor languages are still shaping their identities" (162). However, it is, of course, not the languages that

---

[4] See for example BAN 1978, Kofos 1993, Troebst 1994 and discussion in Lunt 1984, Rossos 1991, Kramer 1999, Friedman 2000.

[5] Others have written on Macedonian writers prior to 1945 and on the role of language for nation building—but not with this particular focus. See, for example: V. Čašule 1970, Lunt 1952, 1959, 1984, 1986, Friedman 1975, Rossos 1991, 1995, Szobries 1999, Ristevski 2002, and others.

[6] See Kofos 1993 as well as discussion in Friedman 2000.

shape identities but the people who use them. The written works of the authors under study demonstrate that language codification is not an *act*, nor a series of acts, but a *process*, a process that takes place within individual speakers who are committed to the project of language standardization while subject to external political and linguistic pressures.

Koneski[7] was well aware of the difficulties inherent in developing a new standard, particularly since (in the south Balkan context) Macedonian was a late-codifying language. He wrote in his first published piece, *Macedonian Literature and the Macedonian Literary Language*: "Of course, a language does not form a literary language in a day. Time will have to pass before all the forms of the literary language would be strictly applied" (34). The high school textbook *Odbrani četiva za makedonski jazik vo I, II, i III klas* published in 1946 contains a note on the language used: "In the language of this book there are notable inconsistencies. There are doublets, even triplet forms... These differences are unavoidable, but are even necessary in the phase of the formation, in which our language finds itself" (390). Yet, Lunt notes: "Since the normalizers were starting anew, experiments and controversies were to be expected. What is surprising is the speed with which consensus was achieved" (Lunt 1999: 10).[8] The question then is how writers attained this standard, if at all.

As stated above, writers schooled in Bulgarian or Serbian sought a literary voice in Macedonian, a language that remained uncodified. In comparison to neighbouring languages, Macedonian writers had no institutional support or resources, and were prone to change their stylistic orientation. Only careful study of their writing, untouched by editors, can help us to understand the motivation, the process, and the personal risk they took to write in the Macedonian language.[9]

---

[7] Blaže Koneski was not only a member of the commission which codified the language, but also one of Macedonia's leading poets, linguists, and academicians who was aware of the process of codification in his own writings.

[8] For more details on Koneski see Kramer 2002 as well as references cited there.

[9] Here I would like to draw attention to two additional facts: first, when we talk about writers from Macedonia during the early decades of the twentieth century, we usually do not mention their material circumstances. Looking through the archives, one is struck by the poverty in which these authors lived. Much of their writing is on found paper and written in pencil. These works need to be recorded and saved because they will be completely useless in another decade and this record of the process of pre-codification writing will be lost. Much of the writing is already too faded to read. The famous inter-war playwright Risto Krle, for example, wrote plays on the back of playbills from a Croatian traveling theatre troupe. Other poems are written in school notebooks, on scraps of loose paper, and in pocket notebooks—i.e., paper of poor quality. On the other hand, it is incredible that so much did get published and preserved during periods of war, poverty, imprisonment, earthquakes and continued political upheaval in Macedonia.

2. ASEN KAVAEV

Asen Kavaev[10] was born on 11 August 1895 in the village of Avlanovo, Bulgaria. He completed his schooling in Gabrovo in 1915. He served in the Bulgarian army from 1915–1918 and later attended university in Sofia where he received his law degree in 1923. Kavaev received official Bulgarian awards for his military service in 1937 and for his editorial work at the *Obštestvena Tribuna* in 1938.[11] Yet, in his writings it is clear that he strongly identifies himself as Macedonian. In his autobiographical sketch, written in the early 1960s, he discussed both his family's emigration to Bulgaria and the reasons why he sought to return to Macedonia. This story of family disruption, violence, shifting identity, and resettlement is not atypical for this period. In order to understand this process, we will first look at elements of his autobiography, then the content of his writing, and finally we will turn to specifics of language use.

Asen Kavaev's father, Hristo Kavaev, was born in Struga in 1865 to Josif Kavaev, a priest in Struga who was, according to Kavaev's account, active in Macedonian nationalist activities. According to Asen's account, his grandfather Josif aided the Macedonian poet Grigor Prličev, arranging a teaching post for him in Struga after he had been removed from his teaching post in Ohrid and was unable to find work. Josif then became a target of attack by the Greeks for his Macedonian works. He was forbidden to conduct services and was restricted in his movements. In February 1903 Father Josif was ambushed and beaten to death while returning from church in Radožda.

Asen's father, Hristo, also took part in Macedonian nationalist affairs and, in 1884 after taking part in an uprising, fled to Bulgaria. He became a teacher in the village of Tărgovište where he married and started a family but, in 1898, died at the age of 33. Asen's mother had relatives in Sofia and with their help Asen was able to pursue his schooling, though not without great hardship and disruptions due to outbreaks of war and years of military service. In Sofia, Asen became involved in the *Makedonski literaturen kružok* (Macedonian literary circle). As he writes: "At this time, 1922, the Macedonian émigré organizations were experiencing great social engagement and turbulent political life. They were divided into two groups, mainly, one tied to the Bulgarian national aspirations, and the other, to a Federated organization, one which promoted the formation of a Macedonian nation, Macedonian literacy, and Macedonian independence in its own country." Kavaev belonged to this latter group.

Kavaev, while training as a lawyer, began writing in various genres, all related to the larger Macedonian question. He was involved in the publication of

---

[10] Information on Kavaev is taken from his autobiographical statement and official personal documents; Kavaev archive, Box 1, folder 1

[11] He was also sent official thanks from the Macedonian government in 1949 for his work building Skopje.

Nezavisima Makedonija (Independent Macedonia) and in the first issues published the poems *Crni Vetr* (Black Wind), *Makedonija*, *Manifest*, and others. When members of the literary circle came under suspicion and threat from the Bulgarian government forces, Kavaev went to Šumen and from there to his home village of Tărgovište.

Kavaev worked as a lawyer in Bulgaria, became a member of the writers' union, and continued writing on Macedonian themes. When the Second World War broke out, he crossed the border and resettled in Ohrid. At the end of the war Kavaev attempted to normalize his citizenship and become a Yugoslav but encountered opposition and his claim of citizenship was at first denied. While in Bulgaria he had been viewed as a Macedonian, now in Macedonia, he was considered Bulgarian. In 1948 he requested a review of his status in the Republic of Macedonia. He based his request on his parental ties to Macedonia, his wife's birthplace, Ohrid, and his sentiments as a Macedonian in Bulgaria, expressed through his publications on Macedonian topics. His language is standard in a number of important respects and the Bulgarisms are somewhat residual, which is even more the case when we consider the norms of 1948. Thus, in his writing, both through the medium and the message, he sought to demonstrate his fitness for recognition as a Macedonian, clearly exemplified in these excerpts:[12]

> Йаз сум македонец и живейам со фамилијата си во Скопје, како бугарски поданин. ..Во Бугарија живеевме во гр. Тарговиште. Тамо живеевме како македонци и се числевме во редовите на македонската емиграција.

> Поради това што сакавме да се вратиме во Македонија, подадовме през 1936 год молба за Југосл. Поданством но дури да се уреди този вопрос дефинитивно—настанаа собитијата од 1941 год.[13]

> Jaz sum makedonec i živeam so familijata si vo Skopje, kako bugarski podanii..Vo Bugarija živeevme vo gr. Tărgovište. Tamo živeevme kako makedonci i se čislevme vo redovite na makedonskata emigracija.

> Poradi tova što sakavme da se vratime vo Makedonija, podadovme prez 1936 god molba za Jgosl. Podanstvom no duri da se uredi tozi vopros definitivno—nastanaa sobitijata od 1941 god.

---

[12] The orthography is typical of many writers during this time because they did not have typewriters with Macedonian characters, including the letter j. Archival materials show they used a broad range of typewriters; people made do with what they had. Some variation, for example, with the dorso-palatals k', g' was due to the fact that the fonts were long unavailable. Early publications, such as the journal *Nov Den* and the newspaper *Nova Makedonija* contained special editorial notes concerning typefaces. See also Friedman 1998: 39.

[13] Kavaev's request sent to Skopje Regional Council, MANU archive, Kavaev fond, box 1, folder 1.

> I am a Macedonian and I live with my family in Skopje as a Bulgarian citizen. In Bulgaria we lived in the village of Tărgovište. There we lived as Macedonians and considered ourselves among the ranks of the Macedonian émigré community.

> Because we wanted to return to Macedonia, we submitted a request to the Yugoslav embassy during 1936 but before the question could be settled definitively, the events of 1941 took place.

In his 1948 request for a review of his citizenship application, he included not only the fact that he had already been working as a lawyer in Skopje since 1947, but also a list of his writings, writings which, he pointed out, were all on Macedonian themes. These included, among other works, a long poem entitled *Biljana*, a play devoted to national liberation, a one-act play entitled *Mavrovo*, a three-act play *Pesnata na Vardarot* [Song of the Vardar], a poem entitled "Longing for Struga" written in honour of Konstantin Milidanov.[14] He cites these writings as foundational to his claims of Macedonian and Yugoslav loyalty and citizenship because, as he writes:

> Од ова печатена мойа творба, Вие исто така можете да заклйучите, дека йаз можам и сакам да бидам еден од най добрите и лойални граѓани на Македонийа и Йугославийа.[15]

> Od ova pečatena moja tvorba, Vie isto taka možete da zaključite, deka jaz možam i sakam da bidam eden od naj dobrite i lojalni gragjani na Makedonija i Jugoslavija.

> From this published work of mine, you can also conclude that I can and wish to be one of the best and most loyal citizens of Macedonia and Yugoslavia.

Kavaev felt he had long been a foreigner, i.e., a Macedonian in Bulgaria. He now wished to be a Macedonian at home in Macedonia. At the close of his request he writes:

> ...йаз сакам да не живейам веке како "туѓинец." Сакам да живейам како овдешен. Целийот свой живот сум го провел во бугарийа,—како македонец,— тежнейки за овде. Там бевме туѓинци, кои растиеа, чекайки еден ден да се вратат овде. И сега, кога се вратив—сакам да бидам примен како син на земйата, кой йа лйуби и кой сака да и биди полезен.

> ...jaz sakam da ne živejam veke kako "tuginec." Sakam da živejam kako ovdešen. Celijot svoj život sum go provel vo bugarija, kako makedonec, težnejki za ovde. Tam bevme tuginci, koi rastiea, čekajki eden den da se vratat ovde. I sega, koga se vrativ sakam da bidem primen kako sin na zemjata, koj ja ljubi i koj saka da i bidi polezen.

---

[14] Kavaev produced two versions of this poem. A comparison of their linguistic features will be the subject of future research.

[15] Kavaev's request sent to Skopje Regional Council, MANU archive, Kavaev fond, box 1, folder 1.

I do not wish to live any longer as a 'foreigner'. I want to live as one who belongs here. I have lived my whole life in Bulgaria—as a Macedonian—longing for here. There we were foreigners, who grew up waiting for the day to return here. And now, when I have returned, I want to be accepted as a son of the country, one who loves her and who wishes to be useful for her.

Kavaev provides an interesting example of the difficulties encountered by writers of this period. He wrote on Macedonian matters, though not in standard Macedonian. For a long time he was claimed neither by Bulgaria nor Macedonia. His personal writings from his twenty years in Macedonia are not written in Bulgarian, but he also never fully acquired standard Macedonian, a fact he highlights in his autobiographical sketch,[16] written in 1961. Here he makes his most explicit remarks on his linguistic code:

> Од тогава до сега пишам непрекинато, иако не познавам добро македонскиот јазик. На македонски јазик не можам да напишам нито едно стихотворение но сум написал и публиковал много разскаи во в. Нова македонија, во Разгледи, во Бирлик...

> Od togava do sega pisam neprekinato, iako ne poznavam dobro makedonskiot jazik. Na makedonski jazik ne možam da napišam nito edno stixotvorenie, no sum napisal i publikoval mnogo raskazi vo v. Nova Makedonija, vo Razgledi, vo Birlik...

> From that time to the present I have been writing without break, although I do not know the Macedonian language well. In Macedonian I cannot write a single poem, but I have written and published many stories in the newspaper *Nova Makedonija*, in *Razgledi*, in *Birlik*...[17]

Perhaps it is not surprising that Kavaev's last years were spent in Paris, where he died far from the Balkans in August 1967.

3. RADOSLAV PETKOVSKI

Let us now look at one other writer from this period, Radoslav Petkovski. Petkovski is one of the most significant literary figures in inter-war Macedonia. He has a much less complex history than Kavaev, yet he too experienced difficulties in developing a Macedonian literary style and in getting his works published in Macedonian.[18] He was born on August 13, 1916 in Resen, though, he notes, he is an Ohrid resident by background. He completed some of his schooling in Ohrid, then continued studies for four years in Bitola. He took up law in Belgrade, but, due to financial difficulties, returned to Ohrid where he became active in the cultural life of that city. According to his autobiographical

---

[16] Biographical notes, written by Kavaev; MANU, Kavaev fond, Box 1, folder 2

[17] *Nova makedonija* is a leading daily newspaper, *Razgledi*, a literary journal, *Birlik* a Turkish language newspaper.

[18] For more on Petkovskij, see Ristovski 1980 185–211.

notes,[19] he began writing poetry as a young student and published his first work while in a gymnasium in Bitola. His poem *Ribarče* [The Young Fisherman] was his first published work in Macedonian.[20]

Petkovski comments that he was unable to publish much of his work from the thirties due to censorship, adding that some of his work was even banned by the office of the public prosecutor. Smilevski (2000) comments that since it was not legally possible for a Macedonian paper to appear, Macedonians employed various strategies to publish newspapers and journals in other languages, i.e., Serbian or Bulgarian, and then inserted some Macedonian works in the hopes of getting them past the censors.

The materials in the Petkovski archive allow us to see the processes of standardization in detail. It is important to recall that writers were developing both language and new genres. Other writers experienced difficulties as well due to the lack of resources and an inability to get their Macedonian works published. Such a situation is described by the inter-war playwright Anton Panov in his autobiographical notes,[21] when he remarked on the difficulties of writing in any type of standard when there were no grammars, no dictionaries, and the threat of prison for writing in Macedonian. Petkovski also writes of his personal difficulties caused by virtue of his Macedonian writings, as seen, for example, in his autobiographical notes of 1946:[22]

> Нарочно тешко ми беше кога завршив матура. Немав возможност да се издржавам на студи и стипендија не ми се даде макар да бев одличен ученик и завршив матура одлично. Стипендија не ми се даде бидејки уште како ученик се запишав со песни и уште во гимназија и како студент пишев на македонски јазик..

> Naročno teško mi beše koga završiv matura. Nemav vozmožnost da se izdržavam na studi i stipendija ne mi se dade makar da bev odličen učenik i završiv matura odlično. Stipendija ne mi se dade bidejki ušte kako učenik se zapišav so pesni i ušte vo gimnazija i kako student pišev na makedonski jazik.

> It was especially difficult for me when I finished high school. I didn't have the opportunity to remain at my studies and I didn't receive a scholarship even though I was an excellent student and I completed high school with excellent marks.[23] I was

---

[19] Biographical notes, written by Petkovski; MANU, Petkovski fond, folder 1, doc. 16.

[20] *Novi sjaj*, II, 16–19, Bitola, Aug–Nov. 1935, 4. Cited in Ristovski 1980:202.

[21] MANU archive, Panov fond, box 1, folder 1.

[22] MANU archive, Petkovski fond, box 1, doc. 16.

[23] In fact his high school records for the years 1931–1934 do show that he received excellent marks (5s) in all courses ranging from languages (Serbo-Croatian, Latin, German, and French), science (Natural sciences, chemistry, physics), Religion, and Philosophy. The only exceptions: in 1931 he received a very good (4) in nature study, and drawing, and a good (3) in physical education, and in 1932 very good (4s) in

not given a stipend because I had already as a schoolboy begun to write poems and as a high school student I wrote in the Macedonian language.

In the Petkovski archives are multiple versions of several poems: the original versions from the 1930s written in school notebooks, the self-published edition of 1941, as well as this latter version with the author's hand-written editorial changes. Here we see an individual who was born and educated in Macedonia, who self-identified as Macedonian, who published in Macedonian, and who was committed to moving his language to the emerging standard. In the introduction to the 1941 edition, he wrote:

> Овие песми се написани во времето од 1936/1938 год. Требаше да бидет штампани тога во една збирка со други песми написани на српски йазик, ама поради политички причини не бейа штампани.[24]

> Сметам оти денеска тие све пак кйе имат ако некойа нарочна книжевна вредност, она историско политичка—да видит оти тога преди войната се пишело во македонийа на народниот македонски йазик.[24]

> Ovie pesmi se napisani vo vremeto od 1936/1938 god. Trebaše da bidet štampani toga vo edna zbirka so drugi pesmi napisani na srpski jazik, ama poradi politički pričini ne beja štampani.

> Smetam oti deneska tie sve pak kje imat ako nekoja naročna kniževna vrednost, ona istorisko politička—da vidit oti toga predi vojnata se pišelo vo makedonija na narodniot makedonski jazik.

> The poems were written in the period between 1936 and 1938. They should have been published then in a collection of other poems written in Serbian, but due to political reasons they were not published.

> All the same, I consider that today they will have some sort of literary value, an historical political one—to demonstrate that the Macedonian folk language was written in Macedonia before the war.

In addition to the importance of this statement for historical, political reasons, it is also interesting to note how close it conforms to the standards of the codified Macedonian language. That is not to say that there are not obvious dialectisms, even here (in a 'public' genre). Most notably we see the presence of the Ohrid dialect form: –t in the third singular of the verb *bide* 'be'.

When we take a closer look at one poem, we can follow the transition from dialect to standard more clearly. In the following table Column One represents the poem in its handwritten version of 1938.[25] The second column presents the self-published text of 1941.[26] The third has been modified to include the changes

---

chemistry and hygiene.

[24] Archive of MANU, fond Radoslav Petkovski, Box 1, document 99.

[25] MANU archive, Petkovski fond, box 1, doc. 84.

[26] MANU archive, Petkovski fond, box 1, doc. 99.

which Petkovski later wrote in hand onto the text. Underlining shows changes from 1938 to 1941, bold-face shows later changes to the 1941 edition.

I.	II.	III.	IV.
И ниje бефме деца... Растефме, во куќите наши стари, сред карајнците од таткојни и мајкини.	И ние бефме деца... Растефме, во куќите наши стари, меѓу карајнците од таткой ни и майки ни.	И ние бевме деца. Растевме, во куќите наши стари, меѓу **карајците** од таткой ни и майки ни.	We were also children...[27] We grew up, In the houses of our elders, among the quarrels of our fathers and mothers.
Растефме, без мрачки и шекерчина, во немашчини и мки!	Растефме без мрачки и шекерчина, во немашчини и маки!	Растевме без мрачки и шекерчиња во немаштини и маки!	We grew up Without whining and candies In poverty and torments!
Растефме играфме! по патишча полни со праф, по патишча полни со кал,	Растефме и играфме! По патишча полни со праф, по патишча полни со кал,	Растевме и игравме! По патишта полни со прав, по патишта полни со кал,	We grew and we played! Along the streets filled with dust, Along the streets filled with mud,
играфме по цели дни, ашици и бајами, котка и бинек, и фудбал со лопки од крпи! И ни беше мка!	играфме по цели дни, ашици и бајами, котка и бинек, и фудбал со лопки од крпи! Ни беше мака!	игравме по цели дни, ашици и бајами, котка и бинек, и фудбал со лопки од крпи! Ни беше мака!	all day we played, knucklebones and almonds, cat and saddle-horse,[28] And soccer with balls of rags! It was torment for us!

---

[27] The ellipses here represent the punctuation of the first two versions. This was changed to a period in the final version.

[28] This may not be the most felicitous translation. Clearly this is a game whose name includes two animals, i.e., cat and mouse.

Table continues from p. 47:

I.	II.	III.	IV.
И опитвефме невино ко деца: Зашчо тије да имат све, а није не?	И опитвефме невино ко деца: Зашчо немаме и ние, Све то шо имает тие?	И прашавме невино ко деца: Зошчо немаме и ние, Се то шо имаат тие?	And we asked Naively like children: Why/why don't we also have[29] Should they have everything and we no[thing]?/ everything that they have?

Here we see changes in orthography, phonology, morphology, and lexicon. Again, we note that some problems in orthography are mechanical in nature. Petkovski consistently writes the letter –j- but in the later versions we see ñ, an artifact of the Cyrillic machine he was using. We will disregard this fact here. We will also need to disregard the spelling of ќ. We see two different solutions to this font problem represented here: куките, куќиите,[30] i.e., either ignore the diacritic or insert –j-. In the later versions we see also the same digraph solution to solve for the lack of ѓ: рй.

Changes between 1938 and 1945 include:

- Loss of intervocalic [j] in the first person pronoun: nije → nie.[31]
- In the first version Petkovski spells mki 'torments' with a zero vowel, representing phonemic schwa. Later versions modify to the standard reflex of –a-. mki → maki.
- We should also note here the spelling of noun plus possessive pronoun as an accentual unit in the first version, but separated as two separate lexical items in the second two: таткојни tatkojni vs таткој ни tatkoj ni.[32]
- We note the lexical changes, as well: e.g., sred to megju 'among, between'.

---

[29] The first version differs from the later two. The variation in translation here and in the line below is separated by a slash (/).

[30] In fact, in the southwest dialects k' occurs less frequently (see Vidoeski 2000:27), but we cannot determine the cause of its absence because of the font issues mentioned above.

[31] Note this was a standard orthographic issue. Cf. the rules in the Pravopis

[32] At the University of Toronto many heritage speakers from southeast dialect areas, where accentual units are particularly strong, consistently write the possessive pronoun and noun as a single unit, even when other areas of their spelling conform to norms. For information on accentual units in these dialects see Vidoeski 2000:25.

Later changes include:

- In the final column we see orthographically correct –v- in the first-person plural past tense ending, earlier written phonetically as –f, e.g., befme → bevme.
- The cluster шч šč, typical for Ohrid reflex of *tj (see Vidoeski 2000:27) becomes standard шт št: немашчини → немаштини.
- The metathesis and diphthongization typical of Ohrid dialect seen in the noun карајнци karajnci (<karainci < karanici, cf. Vidoeski 2000:25) is absent in the final version: каранците. ʹ
- In the neuter plural, the –n- is softened: шекерчина→ шекерчињa šekerčina →šekerčinja.
- The third-plural verb ending, which earlier appeared in the southeast dialect form imaet (cf. Vidoeski 2000:27) regularizes for the –a class to –at: imaat.
- Several lexical changes including све sve to ce se 'everything', and опитвефме opitvefme 'we asked' becomes прашавме prašavme.

Despite these changes, other examples of Ohrid dialect remain. Of course, some of these may have been preserved for artistic reasons, e.g., zoščho and lopki, to keep a dialect flavour in the poem. Other non-standard features present in the poem are due, in part, to the fact that the standard was not yet fully codified in the early 1940s, e.g., -oj remained an acceptable variant for -ovi until 1950.

4. CONCLUSION

The work of the two writers discussed above, Kavaev and Petkovski, serve as example of the difficulties faced by many writers in Macedonia in the first decades of the twentieth century. As the language was codified, these writers were ready to contribute works to the emerging literary journals. There are archives filled with documents, personal writings, poems, plays, official letters, all written before 1945, which give evidence of this literary activity and the desire of individuals to contribute to a Macedonian linguistic and literary identity. This current paper is a first examination of these processes of standardization within individual writers based on archival documents. In contrast to other works that focus on stages of development and an examination of features present at one moment, I propose a diachronic analysis of the linguistic changes within individuals. In future work I will develop a data base in which specific linguistic features will be tagged as dialect, meta-dialect, or standard. These features will then be examined along several parameters: (1) a temporal parameter: how does writing evolve as individual writers develop from pre-standardization in the 1920s and 1930s to post-1945 standardization; (2) a genre parameter: can we detect differences in dialect vs. standard, depending on type of writing, e.g., personal diaries and private letters, poetry, prose, official

documents.[33] Finally, (3) a content parameter: documents will be weighted for Macedonian content, i.e., is the writer claiming Macedonian identity explicitly. This latter parameter will be an important feature of this research because, for example, there are writers, such as Kavaev, who sought recognition as Macedonians, whose work is on Macedonian subjects, yet who wrote in dialect or meta-dialect but not in standard Macedonian.

It is both well known, and well studied, that national identity in the Balkans is closely tied to national language. Because emerging statehood has been tied to a program of language standardization, Friedman (1999), echoing Naylor, writes of "language as flag." Yet surprisingly little research has focused explicitly on the impact of these changing standards on individual speakers, how standardization processes are lived. While many studies privilege the spoken language, standardization happens in written code perhaps more obviously than in spoken and, in the case of Macedonian, we have access to this written record.

REFERENCES

BAN. 1978. Bălgarska akademija na naukite. Edinstvo na bălgarskija ezik v minaloto i dnes. Bălgarski ezik 28: 3–43. [Published in English: *The Unity of the Bulgarian Language in the Past and Today*].

Bojadžiev, Todor. 1987. *Meždu dialektnoto i kniževnoto*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.

Brown, Keith. 2003. *The Past in Question:Modern Macedonia and the Uncertainties of Nation*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2003. "Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity." Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.

Bugarski, Ranko. 1993. "The Language Situation and Language Education in Yugoslavia" in *Language Education for Intercultural Communication*. Ed. Dennis Ager, et al. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cartwright, Don. 1993. "Sociolinguistic Events in an international Borderland" in *Language Conflict and Language Planning*, ed. Ernst Håkon Jahr. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Čašule, Vanga. 1970. *Od priznavanje do negiranje*. Skopje: Kultura.

Cobarrubias, Juan. 1983. "Ethical Issues in Status Planning" in *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*, eds. Juan Cobarrubias, Joshua A. Fishman. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Cooper, Robert L. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Danforth, Loring M. 2000. "How Can a Woman Give Birth to One Greek and One Macedonian? The Construction of National Identity among Immigrants to Australia From Northern Greece," in Jane K. Cowan (ed), *Macedonia: The Politics of Identity and Difference*. London: Pluto Press. 85-103.

---

[33] Here Gal's (2005) "public/private" distinction will be valuable.

Dorian, Nancy. 1999. "Linguistic and Ethnographic Fieldwork," in *Handbook of Language and Ethnicity*, ed. Joshua Fishman. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 25-41.

Friedman, Victor. 1975. "Macedonian Language and Nationalism During the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries." *Balkanistica* 2: 3-98. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Slavica.

_____. 1985. "The Socio-linguistics of Literary Macedonian." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 52: 31–57. Amsterdam: Mouton.

_____. 1989. "Macedonian: Codification and Lexicon" in *Language Reform History and Future*, ed. Istvan Fodor, Claude Hagege. IV. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

_____. 1993. "Language Policy and Language Behaviour in Macedonia: Background and Current Events" in *Language Contact-Language Conflict*, eds. Eran Frankael and Christina Kramer. New York: Peter Lang.

_____. 1998. "Implementation of standard Macedonian." *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 131: 31–57.

_____. 1998. "Language Reform." IV, ed. by I. Fodor and C. Hagège. Hamburg: Helmut Buske. 299–334.

_____. 1999. "Linguistic Emblems and Emblematic language: On Language as Flag." Kenneth E. Naylor Memorial Lecture Series in South Slavic Linguistics, No. 1. Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures, The Ohio State University.

_____. 2000. "The Emergence of the Modern Macedonian Standard Language and its Relation to Modern Macedonian Identity" in *The Macedonian Question: Culture, Historiography, Politics*, ed. Victor Roudometoff. Boulder, CO: E. European Monographs. 173–206.

Gal, Susan. 2005. "Language Ideologies Compared: Metaphors of Public/Private." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15.1: 23–37.

Greek Monitor of Human and Minority Rights. 1995.

Greenberg, Robert D. 2000. "Language Politics in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia: The Crisis over the Future of Serbian." *Slavic Review* 59.3: 625–640.

Iljoski, Vasil, Krume Tošev, and Xristo Zografov, eds. 1946. *Odbrani četiva za makedonski jazik vo I, II, i III klas*. Skopje: Državno knigoizdatelstvo na Makedonija.

Kalogjera, Demir. In Bugarski, R., Hawkesworth, C. *Language Planning in Yugoslavia*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavic Publishers.

Krejci, Jaroslav and Vitezslav Velimsky. 1981. *Ethnic and Political Nations in Europe*. London: Croom Helm.

Kofos, Evangelos. 1993. *Nationalism and Communism in Macedonia: Civil Conflict, Politics of Mutation, National Identity*. New Rochelle, NY: Caratzas.

Koneski, Blaže. 1945. *Makedonskata literatura i makedonskiot literaturen jazik*. Skopje: Kultura.

Kramer, Christina E. 1999. "Official Language, Minority Language, No Language at All: Macedonian in Primary Education in the Balkans" in *Language Problems and Language Planning* 23.3 (Fall): 233–250.

———. 2002. *Blaže Koneski's 1945 Lecture* "Makedonskata literatura i makedonskiot literaturen jazik" in *Deloto na Blaže Koneski: ostvaruvanja i perspektiva*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences. 435–446.

Lunt, Horace G. 1952. *A Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language*. Skopje: Državno knigoizdatelstvo.

———. 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" in *Language and Literary Theory in Honor of Ladislav Matejka*. Ann Arbor: Papers in Slavic Philology 5. 83–132.

———. 1986. "On Macedonian Nationality." *Slavic Review* 45.4: 729–734.

Lunt, Horace G. 1999. "Time and the Macedonian Language," in *Guard the Word Well Bound: Proceedings of the third North American-Macedonian Conference on Macedonian Studies, Indian Slavic Studies*, ed. Christina E. Kramer and Brian Cook, vol. 10. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Poulton, Hough. 1995. *Who are the Macedonians?* London: Hurst and Company.

Pettifer, James. 1999. *The New Macedonian Question*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Radovanović, Milorad. 1986. *Sociolingvistika*. Novi Sad: Književna zajednica Novog Sada.

———. 1992. "Standard Serbo-Croatian and the theory of language planning" in *Language Planning in Yugoslavia*, Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth (eds.) 93–100. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Risteski, Stojan. 1988. *Sozdavanjeto na sovrmeniot makedonski literaturen jazik*. Skopje: Studenski zbor.

Ristovski, Blaže. 1980. *Makedonskiot stix 1900–1944: Istražuvaja i materijali*. Skopje: Misla.

Rossos, Andrew. 1991. "The Macedonians of Aegean Macedonia: A British Officer's Report, 1944." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 69.2: 282–309.

———. 1995. "Macedonianism and Macedonian Nationalism on the Left" in *National Character and National Ideology in Interwar Eastern Europe*, eds. Ivo Banac and Katherine Verdery. New Haven: Yale Center for International and Area Studies.

Smilevski, Vele. 2000. *Literaturni studii*. Skopje: Institut za makedonska literatura.

Stamatoski, Trajko. 1995. "Naučnata dejnost na Blaže Koneski vo vremeto od 1944–1946," in *Makedonskiot Jazik od 1945 do 1955 godina*. Skopje: Misla 27–38.

Szobries, Torsten. 1999. *Sprachliche Aspekte des nation-building in Mazedonien*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Troebst, Stefan. 1994. "Yugoslav Macedonia, 1944–1953: Building the Party, the State and the Nation." *Berliner Jahrbuch für osteuropäische Geschichte 1994/2* 1.1: 103–139.

Vidoeski, Božo. 2000. *Tekstovi od dijalektite na makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Krste Misirkov.