HISTORICAL ROOTS OF THE MACEDONIAN LANGUAGE CODIFICATION
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I

Two thirds would be in Macedonian, one third in Serbian, Stojan Novaković, Serbian scientist and a diplomat, 1888

The historical roots of the Macedonian language codification: The historical roots of the Macedonian language codification date back to the end of the 19 century. Several historical determinisms appeared and operated at the historical field during this period: pro-Bulgarian, pro-Serbian and later on ethnic Macedonian.  

The pro-Bulgarian movement was displayed at a political and culturally educational level. There were two tendencies in Macedonia within the frameworks of the pro-Bulgarian movement Varhovists and Centralists. The difference between these two categories was not of an ethncal, but of a political nature. Both the Varhovists and Centralists were supporting the unity of Macedonia with Bulgaria. The Varhovists supported quick unity through an uprising, even if it meant a war with the neighbours and the Centralists on the other hand, where aspiring to implement the Eastern-Rumelia formula for unity of Macedonia with Bulgaria through autonomy.  

Regarding ethnicity the Varhovists, as well as the Centralists, considered that the Macedonians are Bulgarians and the Macedonian language is a dialect of the Bulgarian literary language. For this reason, the Bulgarian language was used for all the political activity of the pro-Bulgarian movement in Macedonia.  

The Serbian movement, without the presence of the Serbian ethnical element in Macedonia strived to impose Serbian ethno-language characteristics. Stojan Novaković, Serbian

---

1 The Greek and the Romanian factors were also present in Macedonia.
scientist and politician, was a founder of the Serbian political policy towards Macedonia. He believed „... that the easiest way to fulfill this was through the Macedonism“\(^2\) and that only by supporting the ethno-language separatism (the Macedonism), Serbia can reach realistic results in Macedonia\(^3\).

The Serbian scientist paid attention to the role which the Serbian language and punctuation could play within the process of Serbianisation of the Macedonian population. He proposed gradual Serbianisation of the Macedonian language, that is, to decrease „... the difference between the Serbian language and the Macedonian dialect as much as possible“\(^4\). Initially, one primer was to be printed in the Macedonian dialect “...blended and mixed with the Serbian primer, so that two thirds would be in Macedonian and one third in Serbian...”\(^5\). Only in this way, Novaković thought that the Serbian punctuation „... would strike upon the Bulgarian barbaric literacy into its roots”\(^6\).

At the same time, Novaković was comforting the Serbian government not to get upset by the controlled Macedonism because it is not a historical threat for the Serbian activities in Macedonia.

There is no danger, he would write to the Serbian government, from these operations for the Serbian idea because the Macedonism, as such, would not hold on for long, due to the fact that there are no elements for its development and because, by the natural course of things, the same would be subdued to Serbification as soon as it is separated from the Bulgarianism and mixed with it\(^7\).

The postulates of the Serbian policy towards Macedonia (antibulgarism, antiexarchate, gradual serbification of Macedonian language) were promoted by various associations financed by the Serbian government. In that direction, one association particularly stood out which was known as „Serbo-Macedonians“ and which acted in Istanbul (1886). Together with the policy of ethno-language separatism, Serbia started enforcing a policy in order to create a Serbian ethnical community within Macedonia. After the Ilinden Uprising (1903), the Serbian government sent armed forces into Macedonia because of the forcible Serbification of the Slavic Macedonian population and creation of Serbian ethnic minority in Macedonia\(^8\).

The Serbian forces in Macedonia used the local language dialects and phonemes from the Vuk’s\(^9\) alphabet in their written communication.

*Communist movement:* After the decision of the Comintern to establish the existence of Macedonian ethnicity, among the lines of the Macedonian ethnical communist move-

---

\(^3\) Ibidem.
\(^4\) Ibidem, p. 32.
\(^5\) Ibidem, p. 33.
\(^6\) Ibidem, p. 70.
\(^7\) Ibidem.
\(^8\) The pro-Serbian movement in Macedonia was headed by: Jovan Babunski v. Martolci (Velesko), Gligor Sokolov(ic), born in v. Nebregovo (Prilepsko), Jovan Dolgac (Kruševsko), Trenko Rujanov(ic) from v. Krapa, (Poreče), Micko a “duke” from v. Latovo (Poreče) and others.
\(^9\) Vuk Karadžić (1787–1864), a Serbian writer and scholar. His reforms included spelling and the Cyrillic alphabet. He introduced the “Write as you read as it is written” rule in the Serbian language. The spelling principles set by Karadžić apply still today.
ment, in the period between the two world wars, miracle historical happened\textsuperscript{10}. Within the framework of the communist ideology the descendants of the Serbian and Bulgarian movement in Vardar, Macedonia shared the same ideas. Both of them accepted the new ethnical policy of the Comintern for the existence of the Macedonian ethnos, but with them, willy-nilly brought some of the characteristics from their previous movements\textsuperscript{11}. That way, two streams emerged within the framework of the Macedonian ethnical communist left wing: a) the representatives of the Yugoslav (Serbian) Macedonism and b) the opponents of the Yugoslav Macedonism. The representatives of the Yugoslav Macedonism stood for the Macedonian ethnos, but based on the antibulgarism and with serbian ethno-language presence. The opponents of the Yugoslav Macedonism stood for Macedonian ethnos, but without the presence of ethno-language bulgarophobia and ethno-language Serbian influence\textsuperscript{12}.

The clash between these two tendencies within the framework of the Macedonian ethnical communist left wing was inevitable. The clash culminated during the Second World War. When Metodija Šatorov Šarlo\textsuperscript{13} came and stood out in front of the District Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CPY) for Macedonia, the opponents of the Yugoslav Macedonism won within the framework of the Macedonian ethnical communist left wing. Šatorov-Šarlo, apart from other political reforms, formalized the Macedonian vernacular language within the illegal political life and popularized the policy of the party for the Macedonian vernacular language. Koliševski was sent by CPY in Macedonia to defeat the opponents of the Yugoslav Macedonism. and again the Regional committee in Macedonia to subdue him to CPY. Koliševski, as a representative of the Yugoslav Macedonism, conducted the policy of CPY in Macedonia solely in the Serbian language\textsuperscript{14}.

After the attack of USSR by Germany and the intervention of the Comintern, the opponents of the Yugoslav Macedonism were defeated with the help of the Comintern, and the Macedonian communist movement fell into the hands of the representatives of the Yugoslav Macedonism represented by Koliševski.

After the capitulation of Italy (1943), the positions of the Yugoslav Macedonism enforced and the process of materialization of their ethno-language concepts was set off. There was a tendency of introducing the Serbian alphabet within the newly opened Mace-

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{10} A historical wonder.
  \item \textsuperscript{11} From 1919 to 1934, the Comintern thought that in Macedonia live variety of population (mainly Bulgarian, Vlachs, The Serbians, Greeks, Jewish) and within the framework of its anti-Versailles policy, conducted the policy of „United and independent Macedonia”.
  \item \textsuperscript{12} Within the period between 1919 to 1939, CPY did not conduct any kind of Macedonian ethno-language policy. The Serbian language dominated within the illegal political life in Macedonia. At the same time, all printed literary work, among which was the collection of poems Бели Мугри by Kočo Racin too, was published together with the Vuk’s alphabet. The supporters of the Macedonian ethnical autonomous tendency in comparison with CPY wrote their literary work using the Cyrillic alphabet. In 1938, V. Markovski, with the Cyrillic alphabet publishes the first collection of poems in the mother tongue Народни бигори. The same alphabet was used for writing the collection of poems written by Kole Nedelkovski (Мъскавици, Песни по светот).
  \item \textsuperscript{13} Metodi Šatorov Šarlo (1897–1944), member of the Macedonian ethnic communist movement-autonomous tendency in comparison to CPY. He was brought by a family that nurtured the traditional values of the Macedonian exarchate movement. After the recognition of the Macedonian ethnos by the Comintern, as a member of the communist movement, he accepted and conducted the newly established policy of the Comintern in regard to the Macedonian question.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} К. Црвенковски, М. Томовски, Заробена вистина, Скопје 2003.
\end{itemize}
odonian schools\textsuperscript{15}. In Western Macedonia, the teachers used Vuk’s alphabet and Serbian books from the period of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia\textsuperscript{16}. Venko Markovski fought against the appliance of Vuk’s alphabet and the temporary alphabet and also demanded that the same would include the dark vowel (ъ)\textsuperscript{17}. He considered the Macedonian alphabet to be incomplete and that the dark vowel (ъ) is necessary. Due to his persistent efforts to introduce the dark vowel into the alphabet, by the Pro-Yugoslav oriented Macedonian teachers, Venko Markovski was named as the friend „Ер голем”\textsuperscript{18}.

On 2 August 1944 at the First Assembly of the Anti-Fascist Assembly of the National Liberation of Macedonia (ASNOM) (mac. Антифашистичкото собрание на народното ослободување на Македонија), based on the ASNOM ethno-language tie Macedonia = Macedonians and Macedonians = Macedonia, a decision was brought which stated: „In a Macedonian country, the Macedonian vernacular language shall be introduced as an official language”\textsuperscript{19}.

II

Codification of the Macedonian official language

\textit{Koneski came up to me not that much because of philological, but for political reasons, so that there is no disharmony with the policy of the Central Committee,}

Milovan Đilas, a Yugoslav politician and a diplomat, 1990

After the Second World War, the authority in Vardar Macedonia falls into the hands of the pro-Yugoslav ethno-language political establishment. Thus, the period of Yugoslav Macedonism started, that is, the period of Koliševism enters into the Macedonian history\textsuperscript{20}. The period of Koliševism is the period when the ASNOM ethnic tie Macedonia = Macedonians and Macedonians = Macedonia started to be implemented\textsuperscript{21}.

\textsuperscript{15} From the private letter of Panko Brašnarov and Pavle Šatev to CC BCP(b) (Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, Централният комитет на Българската комунистическа партия) from the 1948 the State Archive of the Republic of Macedonia (SARM), f. Georgi Dimitrov No. 1, p. 104.


\textsuperscript{17} The Commission of Education suggested the following temporary alphabet of 25 letters: а, б, в, г, д, е, ж, з, и, ј, к, л, м, н, о, п, р, с, т, у, ф, х, ц, ч, ш.

\textsuperscript{18} И. Глигоровски, \textit{Първите учители...}, p. 24.

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{АСНОМ, документи}, том 1, ч.1, ed. А. Христов, М. Тодоровски, Н. Велјановски, Скопје 1984, p. 159.

\textsuperscript{20} Lazar Koliševski (1914–2000), member of the Macedonian ethnic-communist movement pro-Yugoslav oriented. Supporter of the Yugoslav Macedonism. After the Second World War, the first President of the national government of the Republic of Macedonia (1945). Devotee of the centralized Yugoslavia (“Strong Serbia, Strong Yugoslavia”). Consistently conducted the policy of the CC of the CPY in regard with the Macedonian question and the Macedonian a wear the cloak of Đelčev, but we do not follow his footsteps and his work”. Vlado Strugar, an instructor of CPY in Macedonia, to the parties’ political bodies of CPY. М. Миноски, \textit{Авнојска Југославија и македонското национално прашање (1943–1946)}, Скопје 2000, p. 305.

\textsuperscript{21} In order to apply the new ethno-historical tie, on 15 February 1945, the Government of the NR of Macedonia brought about a decision to create a court in charge of dealing with criminal proceedings conducted against the Macedonian national honor.
In order to reach these goals, the Koliševism, in a state of dictatorship, led a fight against two „dangers”: fight against everyone who felt as Bulgarians in Macedonia (labeled as Varhovists), and also against the opponents of the Yugoslav Macedonism (labeled as representatives of the Macedonian extreme nationalism)\(^\text{22}\).

In the style of the Stalinism processes, with or without a court proceeding, the activists of the Macedonian-Bulgarian movement were repressed and killed: Jordan Čkatrov and Dimitar Čkatrov, Dimitar Gjuzelev, Krsto Lazarov-Konjuški, Spiro Kitinčev, Stefan Stefanov, Mirčo Kitikitkov, Nikola Karev’s brother; the mass massacres in Veles, Kumanovo, Priepe, Pavel Šatev, Panko Brašnarov; representatives of the Macedonian ethnic civil movement: Metodija Andonov-Čento and representatives of the post-autonomous ethnic communist movement with comparison with CPY (so-called Šarlovists)\(^\text{23}\). In a similar political surrounding, the process of Macedonian literate language codification was started.

The process of Macedonian language codification did not run smoothly and without any hardships. An evidence of that is the fact that until the final codification of the Macedonian literate language, the issue was overviewed by three language commissions.

**The First Commission for language and punctuation:** In the First philology Commission for language and punctuation\(^\text{24}\) from the very beginning „two clear decisive, uncompromising tendencies appeared, which were at war against each other...”\(^\text{25}\) The **language majority** preceded by Markovski\(^\text{26}\) emerged on the one side, and the **language minority** preceded by Koneski emerged on the other\(^\text{27}\).

The disagreement between the language majority and language minority was essential and the same had reflected upon three crucial questions: a) what kind of alphabet would the future Macedonian literate language have (Macedonian or Serbian-Vuk’s), b) which Macedonian dialects would stand on the grounds of the future Macedonian literate language (central Macedonian (a) dialects or so-called Western Macedonian (a) dialects and v) whether the dark vowel (ь) would be necessary or not for the future literate language.

But what were the views and opinions of the members of the First commission for language and punctuation with regard to these essential issues?

**When it comes to the alphabet:** A lively discussion was developed during the First commission for language and punctuation. The representative of language majority, Markovski,
thought that „when it comes to the Macedonian language, we should have our own, Macedonian alphabet, through which we would be able to express those sounds that are pronounced in our language”\textsuperscript{28}. The representative of language minority, Koneski, was against the creation of a Macedonian alphabet and he was in favor of accepting the Serbian (Vuk’s) alphabet completely. „The vast number of Macedonian population, demonstrating its own attitude through the representative of the language minority, today is literate because of Vuk’s alphabet and if we do not keep these symbols, many of them shall remain illiterate”\textsuperscript{29}.

The members of the First commission for language and punctuation expressed their views on these two different language attitudes. Mirko Pavlov Neproštenski believed that „... the alphabet should have Macedonian characteristics, by which it shall differentiate from the others and which shall give the alphabet a Macedonian character”\textsuperscript{30}, and also proposed an alphabet of 32 letters\textsuperscript{31}. Risto Prodanov, also, was against the acceptance of Vuk’s alphabet. „If we take over the symbols from the Serbian alphabet, Prodanov thought that our students would be able to learn the Serbo-Croatian language... which shall lead to creating a disorder and nonsense when studying the mother tongue language”\textsuperscript{32}. Risto Zografski was also against the Serbian phonemes: „For the Serbian ђ and ъ, he would say, we do not have any feeling and that is why I believe that we do not have a need of these two symbols from the Serbian alphabet”\textsuperscript{33}.

The attitudes of the language minority representative were supported by Milka Balvaliev-Gjorgjević. She was against the creation of separate Macedonian alphabet and she was against any kind of „... introducing of new letters into the alphabet”\textsuperscript{34}. The very time, she explained her attitude, imposes us to take over the letters from the Serbo-Croatian Cyrillic alphabet... „With the Serbo-Croatian Cyrillic alphabet we would have a Yugoslavian alphabet”\textsuperscript{35}.

There was a reaction by the representative of the language majority towards the attitude of Milka Balvaliev-Gjorgjević. „To talk about so-called Yugoslavian alphabet it’s so unrealistic, said Markovski... Our aim is not to merge our people with the Yugoslavian people, but to keep our national identity”\textsuperscript{36}. The attitudes of Markovski were supported by Georgi Kiselinov too. It (referring to the Yugoslav alphabet m. b.), said Kiselinov, „... would never exist. We as Macedonians...do not want to give up from ourselves and from what’s ours ... History has never heard of a nation to give up from its own language”\textsuperscript{37}.

After long discussions with regard to the alphabet (Macedonian or Serbian), the question was put to the vote. Nine members were in favour of the Markovski’s attitude for creating a separate Macedonian alphabet, and two of them voted against it\textsuperscript{38}.

\textsuperscript{28} С. Ристески, cited literary work, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibidem, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibidem. p. 51.
\textsuperscript{31} Mirko Pavlov Neproštenski proposed the following alphabet: а, б, в, г, ѓ, д, е, ж, з, и, j, к, ќ, л, љ, м, н, њ, о, п, р, с, т, у, ф, х, ц, ч, џ, ш, s, ъ.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibidem, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibidem, p. 55.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibidem, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibidem, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibidem.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibidem, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{38} Banvaliev-Gjorgjević and Tošev voted against. The representative of language minority, Koneski, withdrew his work from the First commission for language and punctuation and did not participate in the voting.
**The dialects:** Similar irreconcilable views appeared even in respect with what dialects should be taken as the ground of the prospective Macedonian literate language. The representative of the language majority, Markovski, considered that the future Macedonian literate language should be founded upon the central Macedonian dialect „...,spoken in Veles, Prilep, Bitola, Ohrid, and already penetrated into the Macedonian literate language as a foundation. The representative of the language minority, Koneski, thought that the central Macedonian dialect „..., I would name it as a Western dialect... bordering with Skopje, Tetovo, Ohrid...” He supported his view by stating that other linguists realized the same. „In the studies of Oblak, Miletić and Belić, explained the representative of the language minority, the very word was used: and as for dialects, Western-Macedonian dialects. I believe that that term is more appropriate.” Markovski reacted for the so-called Western-Macedonian dialect.

We, stated Markovski, should be aware that the scholars also have political aspirations and that every participation in arguments has been made under the influence of those political aspirations...Belić considers Macedonia to be Serbian and that is why he divides the dialects not only to Western but Southern as well. Miletić, when he wants to think straight and righteous, calls that dialect a central dialect, and when he is under political influence, he names it a Western dialect.

The members of the First commission for language and punctuation supported the views of Markovski. Kiselinov believed that „among the Macedonian dialects, the most beautiful one is the central dialect... That dialect is heard in Veles, Prilep, Bitola... It is fairly outspread and very nice.” Dr. Georgi Šoptrajanov stood for „... taking the central Macedonian dialect as a basis for the Macedonian literate language.” Džambaz, also, supported the views of Markovski. The central Macedonian dialects, he believed, „... should serve as foundation of our literate language... Within that dialect we can find elements of all Macedonian dialects and so to say, that unites all the other Macedonian dialects.” The views of the majority were supported by Krum Tošev. „I don’t know, said Tošev, Belić named it in one way and Miletić in another. Let them call it however they want to, but we shall name it Central Macedonian dialect.”

The dark vowel: Irreconcilable arguments were conducted with regard to the dark vowel as well (ъ). The representative of the language majority, Markovski, thought that „..., the phoneme ъ is also present in our speech and we shall have to accept it... With these symbols our alphabet shall be complete and each sound that is heard in our language because of the non-acceptance of his language views. His withdrawal, by advice, was an expression of dissatisfac-tion of the CC of CPM because of the ways the things with regard to the language issues developed during the First language commission.

---

39 С. Ристески, cited literary work, p. 42.
40 Ibidem, p. 36.
41 Vatroslav Oblak (1864–1896), Slovenian linguist.
42 Alexander Belić (1876–1960), Serbian linguist.
43 С. Ристески, cited literary work, p. 39.
46 Ibidem, p. 36.
47 Ibidem, p. 45.
48 Ibidem, p. 43.
would be able to be pronounced”⁴⁹. The representative of language minority, B. Koneski, considered that „... he personally does not feel the pronunciation of that ъ” ... „and I stand for keeping ћ and ќ in our language whereas ъ should not be written”⁵⁰.

The majority from the members of the First commission for language and punctuation again supported the views of Markovski. Mirko Pavlov Neprostenski believed that „... for our dialects, I can say that, that symbol is necessary, because there is hesitation, where the strong half-phoneme is present”⁵¹. Risto Prodanov voted in favor of accepting the dark vowel into our alphabet. „In favor of ъ, also was R. Prodanov too, there is nothing to discuss about any further, that is our symbol and we shall accept it as it is”⁵². Risto Zografski, also, considered that „we need the letter ъ, so that the phoneme is present in our language”⁵³. Džambaz made a statement that the dark vowel „... is heard in the Macedonian language, and also it can be seen in the following inscriptions: the collection of poems by Šapkarev, in the poems of Miladinov, we will find a record of it everywhere. Verković also tracks a record of this vowel”⁵⁴. Krum Tošev was in favour of the dark vowel as well. „...I agree to take ъ, that from the examples given from Venko and the other friends I believe that this sound is present within the dialects of our language”⁵⁵. Vasil Iliev thought that „... it is not necessary to take the ъ”⁵⁶. The same attitude for the non-acceptance of the dark vowel was occupied by Milka Balvanlieva-Gjorgjević⁵⁷. After the completion of the discussions whether the dark vowel (ъ) is necessary in the Macedonian alphabet or not, a ballot was performed. Nine members from the First commission for language and punctuation voted in favor of accepting the dark vowel, and two of them voted against it⁵⁸.

Blaže Koneski, aspiring to impose his own language views, had warned the members of the First commission for language and punctuation, that these issues cannot be solved by themselves. „With regard to this matter, he said, there is a vast number of people interested in this issue. And I believe that, there are many among them that would disagree with the current opinion”⁵⁹. The first one who understood the message by the representative of the language minority was Tošev. „Before Blaže [Koneski – S. K.] stood up, said Tošev, it seemed so easy to us, but now we grasped that it is not by far that easy”⁶⁰ and he also concluded that he agrees and accepts all the arguments remarked by his friend (Koneski m.b.)”⁶¹. „...I, myself, am petrified of making a mistake”⁶² and, in order to avoid any

---

⁴⁹ Ibidem, p. 51.
⁵⁰ The same, p. 59. Koneski’s special effort with regard to the utilization of the Serbian alphabet was immortalized by Vasilie Popovic-Cico in his caricature.
⁵¹ Ibidem, p. 52–53.
⁵² Ibidem, p. 54.
⁵³ Ibidem, p. 55.
⁵⁴ Ibidem, p. 68.
⁵⁵ Ibidem, p. 70.
⁵⁶ Ibidem, p. 61.
⁵⁷ Ibidem, p. 72.
⁵⁸ Tošev and Balvanlieva-Gjorgjević were against it. Tošev during the discussion with regard to the dark vowel advocated for its acceptance, but after the warning by Koneski, voted against its acceptance.
⁵⁹ С. Ристески, cited literary work, p. 55.
⁶⁰ Ibidem, p. 61.
⁶¹ Ibidem, p. 59.
⁶² Ibidem, p. 61. The same feeling of anxiety was expressed by Risto Prodanov. „According to me, he said, it is better to make a grammar mistake, rather than a political mistake”.

inconveniences with the Yugoslav federation, you should, as quickly as possible, suggest ... „that Serbian letters, rather than Bulgarian letters, be accepted”63. Aspiring to get closer the views of Markovski and Koneski, Tošev proposed a solution settled by mutual concession. „It would be nice, he suggested, if we could settle our dispute, and come to an agreement, perhaps not very scientific, but still moderate and practical ... That is why we should find the middle, Blaže and Venko, both would give in to a certain point, and that way we shall reach a compromise”64. Tošev, aware of the presence of one foreign political will-power during the codification of the Macedonian literate language, he concluded that, „...in the long run, the alphabet shall be tried out, we would see how practical it is, then others would come in and make corrections. I believe in evolution... people shall arrive to change what is wrong”65.

After extensive and polemic discussions, the language majority, through a ballot, defeated the language minority and proposed an alphabet of 32 letters66. „The alphabet is ready, said President Prodanov in his closing speech, and let it be honorable and long-lived”67. Unfortunately, the alphabet was neither long-lived nor eternal. With the help of the Yugoslav and Macedonian pro-Yugoslavian political nomenclature, the language minority, soon turned into a language majority.

The defeat of the language minority68, that is, the defeat of the Yugoslav language policy in Macedonia, seriously upset the Yugoslav as well as the Macedonian pro-Yugoslav- 
ian political nomenclature (Džilas69, Koliševski, Gigov70, Smilevski-Bato and others)71. The new Macedonian alphabet ... with the dark vowel (ъ) was thrown away by the CC of CPY, by Belić and Džilas72. The party decided to impose Vuk’s alphabet by force in Macedonia. The party-language scenario begins at the 14 session of the Presidium of ASNOM that was held on 7 December 1944. When the adoption of the Resolution for

63 С. Ристески, cited literary work, p. 60.
64 Ibidem, p. 61.
65 Ibidem, p. 61.
66 The First commission for language and punctuation suggested the following alphabet: а, б, в, г, д, го, ж, к, к, л, лв, м, н, нг, о, п, р, с, т, у, ф, х, ц, ч, џ, ш, ъ.
68 Koneski informed Koliševski for the condition with regard to the Macedonian alphabet and once more repeated his views with regard to the alphabet (the acceptance of Vuk’s alphabet, the acceptance of the so-called Western-Macedonian dialects as foundation of the prospective Macedonian literate language and exclusion of the dark vowel). The representative of the language minority at the same time informed Koliševski that there are different views with regard to Macedonian alphabet and that those views were often defended with fierceness and the language features of the majority were characterized as language opposition. Koneski, for the alphabet, Државен Архив на Република Македонија – State Archive of the Republic of Macedonia (ДАРМ), фонд: Лазар Колишевски, Просвета, п. бр. 31.
69 Milovan Džilas (1911–1995), Yugoslav revolutionary and a diplomat. After the war, besides Tito, Ranković and Kardelj, one of the most influential persons in post-war Yugoslavia. From a zealous communist radical during the Second World War he turned into one of the most famous Yugoslav dissident. Supporter of utilizing Vuk’s alphabet in Macedonia.
70 Strahil Gigov (1909–1999), member of the Macedonian ethnic communist movement– pro-Yugoslavian oriented. Supporter of Yugoslav Macedonianism who advocated for Vuk’s alphabet utilization within Macedonia.
72 В. Марковски, cited literary work, p. 255.
the Macedonian alphabet proposed by the First commission for language and punctuation, was introduced, Gigov, suggested to postpone the acceptance of the Resolution with regard to the Macedonian alphabet. „The comrade, as was written down in the minutes, believes that the resolution should not be applied and issued with decision of the Presidium, so as to avoid broad discussion into the public, which at the moment can harm our young country. In order to give larger scientific authority into the whole matter, he suggests to delay the publishing of the resolution for the time being, and to summon two secular experienced representatives of the Slavonic philology from Moscow, who are the best linguists of the Balkan’s languages, that is Bernstein and Derzhavin. The proposal was accepted“73.

At the same time, Koliševski, on 8 December 1944, on the behalf of the CC of the CPM, sends a personal letter, in the Serbian language, to the CC of the CPY, informing them about the developed circumstances and conditions with regard to the Macedonian language codification. „We have, Koliševski informed the CC of the CPY, big difficulties in regard with the Macedonian alphabet and language... In the Presidium of ASNOM, a serious discussion developed with regard to our alphabet and as a result different directions emerged which can have a negative impact upon the political life of our people. Different elements, which were still not ripened in Federative Yugoslavia, would misuse and try to turn the issue about our alphabet into their advantage so as to divide our people and to distance us from Federative Yugoslavia. We have managed to throw away that threat for the time being... We believe that you shall understand our position and that you will help us in no time. It wouldn’t be a bad idea if you could send us a good linguist from Belgrade, who will be working with ours for a certain period of time“74.

In that period, to meet Džilas and Radovan Zogovic in Belgrade was sent off Koneski. „Koneski came to me, said Džilas, not so much from philological reasons, as from political so as to avoid any kind of disharmony with the politics of the CC“75. The party disbanded the First commission for language and punctuation, and created a new second one76.

The Second commission for language and punctuation: In the Second commission for language and punctuation, the main role was played by Koneski, and the very commission overviewed the language issue for the second time: the type of alphabet (Macedonian or Vuk’s), which dialects shall be used as the foundation of the future Macedonian literate

73 C. Ристески, cited work, p. 104. Brašnarov and Šatev have described the proposal of Gigov as „... thoughtlessness by the side of the CC of the KPM... That proposal was given by the CC of the CPM in order to buy time to get rid off the large number of Macedonian activists and representatives who were considered to be “nationalists”, because they had their opinion, and sheltered people from the “agitprop” who completely obeyed to the CC of the CPM”. From the personal letters of Brašnarov and Šatev addressed to the CC of the BCP (b), cited. The names of Sergei Natanović Bernstein and Nicolay Derzhavin were used by the Macedonian pro-Yugoslavian political nomenclature solely to postpone and not to accept the proposed alphabet by the First commission for language and punctuation. Bernstein and Derzhavin were never invited to Macedonia.

74 Ibidem, p.106. With the invitation sent to the CC of the CPY, the Macedonian political pro-Yugoslavian nomenclature has formally involved the external (Serbian) factor that was deeply interested in the form and shape of the future Macedonian official language.

75 М. Гилас, Нема да формирам своја партија, „21“, 2.3.1990, p. 31–33.

76 Second party commission for language and punctuation was formed of 15.2.1945. Members of the party’s commission were: Koneski, (lecturer Macedonian), Liljana Čalovksa (non-philologist), Veselinka Malinska (non-philologist), Vasilij Burzev (non-philologist), Kiro Hadživasilev (non-philologist), Lazar Mojsov (non-philologist), Dimče Mirevski (archaeologist), Džambaz (pharmacist), Markovski (poet).
language (central or so-called western-Macedonian) and whether the dark vowel (ъ) needs to be present in the prospective Macedonian alphabet.

As far as the alphabet, Koneski suggested again,... to completely accept Vuk’s alphabet... it has deeply enrooted within Macedonia... The majority of our people have become literate with this alphabet and have gotten used to it...’’77.

As far the dialects, Koneski again advocated for the acceptance of the so-called Western Macedonian dialects „It is a historical fact, Koneski had been convince the members of the language conference, that the central Macedonian dialects, and in broader sense referring to the Western Macedonian ones, gave the foundation to our official literate language”78.

As far as the dark vowel (ъ), Koneski proposed that the same shouldn’t be introduced into the new alphabet. „Do not enter ъ again into our alphabet, explained Koneski, just because of several Turkish words, as for example kismet (fortune, fate) because it does not make any sense”79. The members of the party (anti-philological-agitprop) commission approved the proposals brought by Koneski for acceptance of the Serbian (Vuk’s) alphabet and its utilization within Macedonia. The Second commission for language and punctuation, after a short discussion, proposed an alphabet consisting of 31 letters80.

The representative of the language majority from the First philological language and punctuation commission, Markovski, vigorously fought against the resolutions of the Second party commission for language and punctuation. He spoke out against the acceptance of Vuk’s alphabet and its utilization in Macedonia. At the same time, Markovski asked for his opinion to be taken out from the resolutions of the Second (party) commission for language and punctuation81. He categorically refused „... to defend the views and resolutions of the party group ... because of the fact that that opinion is not scientific, but from some reasons it has been a hidden pro-directed chauvinism”82. Then Čalovska, Koliševski’s wife in that period, „... fiercely and undoubtedly threatened to Venko, that he should by any means guard Vuk’s back, because he is a party member and also he is supposed to obey discipline”83.

The party commission, after the acceptance of B. Koneski’s language views, proposed their adoption in front of the so-called language conference. In the end, the language conference decided to adopt „... Vuk’s alphabet entirely”, by adding the old-Slavonic letter s and brought a decision that the dark vowel (ъ) was not a trait for the Macedonian literate

---

77 С. Ристески, cited literary work, p. 121. Vuk’s alphabet didn’t have a historical tradition within Macedonia. It was imposed in Macedonia within the period of Serbian occupation (1913–1941) and the majority from the Macedonian population was illiterate (75%). Vuk’s alphabet was accepted only among the pro-Serbian oriented Macedonian population.

78 Ibidem, p. 120.

79 Ibidem, p. 123. Koneski’s views were supported by the Serbian linguist Radovan Zogovic, personally sent in Macedonia by Đilas in order to resolve the Macedonian language issue in a proper manner. „He, as Gustav Vlahov recalls, managed to impose in everything because Koneski has been scientifically proving the advantage of Vuk’s alphabet”. С. Ристески, cited literary work, p. 14.

80 The second, party commission for language and punctuation proposed the following alphabet: а, б, в, г, д, ж, е, ё, з, и, й, к, л, в, м, н, й, о, п, р, с, т, у, ф, х, ч, ш, щ only adding the letter s.

81 С. Ристески, cited literary work, 113–114.

82 Ibidem, p. 114.

83 Ibidem.
language and that it should not be introduced into the new alphabet. Koneski specifically advocated not to include the dark vowel (ъ) into the Macedonian alphabet. The reason for this was simple: Vuk’s victory would have been considered as a Pyrrhic victory within Macedonia, if the dark vowel was introduced into the Macedonian alphabet. It would have smelled of Bulgarian.

The acceptance of the Serbian (Vuk’s) alphabet got upset a large number from the political and intellectual public and, .... it created a big mess. Apart from the fact that the Serbian Cyrillic was accepted and amended with the letter y, wrote Koliševski, that sort of decision was not accepted by many intellectuals and leaders in Macedonia. The political nomenclature, anxious, intervened fast and quietly in order to resolve this issue. Malinska, Koneski and Markovski were urgently summoned to Belgrade by Džilas, .... so as to definitely solve the issue with regard to the Macedonian alphabet. In the headquarters of the CC of the CPY, discussions were led among the representatives from Macedonia (Markovski, Koneski) Džilas and the Serbian linguists with regard to the issue of the Macedonian alphabet. Fierce arguments about the Macedonian language were led among Markovski and Džilas, .... in his cabinet and the cabinet of Madera in the home of the CC of the CPY regarding the punctuation of the Macedonian alphabet. Džilas, in the presence of Belić, persistently, .... was convincing Venko to give up his proposals regarding the alphabet and to agree with Koneski’s views. Venko refused that.

The third commission for language and punctuation: After the consultations in Belgrade, the Third commission for language and punctuation was formed. On 3 May 1945, the third commission for language brought its final (settled by mutual concession) resolution.

---

84 Ibidem, p. 121–123 Members of the Second language and punctuation commission were: Blaže Koneski, Venko Markovski, Dare Džambaz, Veselinka Malinska, Liljana Čalovska, Vlado Maleski, Vančo Burzev Kiro Hadživasilev, Lazar Mojsov, Dimitar Vlahov, Dimče Mireski, Boro Miljoski, Ivan Mazov, Lazar V. Kostov, Voislav Ilic (Ilievski) and Doctor Georgi Šoptrajanov. Due to the disagreements caused by the Vuk’s alphabet acceptance, Šoptrajanov withdrew from the work of the language conference.

85 As a result, the dark vowel (ъ), which was present as a token within the oral and written tradition in Macedonia more than thousands of years, became unacceptable, hatred and banished in Macedonia. Apart from the unacceptable [something is missing] of the dark vowel, the phoneme “v” became partially unwanted and that was especially noticed with the surnames (Ivanov – Ivanoski, Popov – Poposki and etc.).

86 Statement of Filimena Markovska, Venko Markovski’s wife, given to the author on 24 April 2010.

87 Д. Клјакић, Времето на Колишевски, Скопје 1994, p. 292. The leaders in Macedonia who did not accept the utilization of Vuk’s alphabet were: Metodi Andonov-Čento, Pavle Šatev, Panko Brašnarov and etc.

88 С. Ристески, Статистически белејци, cited literary work, p. 123.

89 Participants within the discussion were Mihajlo Stefanović, Radovan Lalić, Radovan Bošković and Radomir Aleksić, all Serbians from Montenegro. The language views of Koneski overlapped with the language views of the Serbian linguists. In Belgrade, the Macedonian language positions were protected solely by Markovski.

90 V. Markovski, cited literary work, p. 128–129. When Filimena Markovska agreed to publish V. Markovski’s book Goli Otok, Ostrovot na smrta, (The Barren Island, The island of Death) in Macedonia, she passed on one pledge to her husband: „To publish the book, if it is possible, without any Serbian influence“. F. Markovska, cited.

91 F. Markovska, cited.

tion regarding the Macedonian alphabet\(^{93}\). That is how one incomplete alphabet of 31 letter (with the absence of the dark vowel-ъ) was created and by that the phonemic principle was not consistently respected\(^{94}\).

The inconsistent respect of the accepted phonetic principle (the replacement of one phoneme (ъ) consisting an apostrophe, with the phonemes a, o or the so-called vocalized r) shall contribute for the appearance of one rare language curiosity: instead of the alphabet to adapt the language, the language adapts to the alphabet\(^{95}\). The language minority, with the help of the Macedonian and Yugoslavian Nomenclature, had defeated the language majority. The Macedonian literate language was codified upon the grounds of the so-called Western-Macedonian dialects, which led to the creation of one settled to reach compromise incomplete alphabet and also the dark vowel was extracted from the Macedonian alphabet.

With the victory of the language minority the doors of the Serbian language influence upon the Macedonian language were wide opened.

On 5 May 1945 in the daily newspaper „Nova Makedonija“, the alphabet was published, and on 7 June the same year, the punctuation of the Macedonian official language was also published. The establishment of the alphabet, as it was written in the daily newspaper „Nova Makedonija“, the Minister of Education at the time Nikola Minčev, wrote in his appendix: „Our alphabet“, represents a notable entity of the entire history of our people... „Therewith we receive one more confirmation for the authenticity of the Macedonian people“\(^{96}\).
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93 The third commission for language and punctuation, instead of the Serbian phonemes ђ and Ђ, accepted the phonemes ќ and ѓ and threw away the dark vowel. The Commission proposed the following alphabet: А, Б, В, Г, Д, Ѓ, Е, Ж, З, И, Ј, К, Ќ, Л, Љ, М, Н, Њ, О, П, Р, С, Т, У, Ф, Х, Ц, Ч, Џ, Ш. The Third language commission, in fact, accepted the proposed alphabet by Mirko Pavlov Neproštenski suggested duthe work of the First commission, with the exception of the dark vowel and with a different position of the letter y. During the work of the Third commission for language and punctuation, discussions were led with regard to the need of the dark vowel. 5 out of 10 members of the commission voted in favor for accepting the dark vowel in the alphabet: (Venko Markovski, Ilija Topalovski, Dare Džambaz, Gustav Vlahov and Vlado Maleski) and the other five members voted against (Blaže Koneski, Vasil Iljoski, Krum Tošev, Ivan Mazov and Kiro Hadživasilev). С. Ристески, Прилози за историјата на македонскиот јазик, Охрид 2000, p. 181.

94 Thus, for instance, we say Džindžić, but write Gjingjic, Džukanović – Gjukanovic, Džordžević – Gjorgevic, Džilas – Gjilas, Ćirić – Kiric, Ćosić – Kosic, Srečko – Sreko. Peč (Pek), Ičiči (Ikiki), Bihać (Bihak), st. Bihačka (Bihakka), Nikšić (Nikši), Nikšići (Nikški) and etc.

95 The absence of the dark vowel into the alphabet, its replacement with an apostrophe or with the phonemes (a, o) or with the so-called vocalized r, in the Macedonian language, has contributed to the lexis to change its language appearance and to adapt to the newly adopted alphabet. Thus, for instance, the village Б’мбоки was renamed Bonboki or Bamboki, Д’мбени into Đambeni or Dombeni, V’мбело into Vambel, R’би into Robi or Rabí, С’ботско into Sobotsko and etc. There are toponyms, where if the dark vowel is not pronounced, we won’t be able to read them as (village Б’с, Вак’в, Д’лга, Т’лменци, К’скане, Р’цачно, Р’званово, Р’нковце). Also, we won’t be able to read some of the surnames as well (Kal’čev, Krmzov and other).

96 Daily Newspaper „Nova Македонија“, 5, 6, 7, May 1945.
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Historical Roots of the Macedonian Language Codification

Summary

Within the period of Macedonian language codification two tendencies emerged: one language majority headed by Venko Markovski and another one preceded by Blaže Koneski. The language differences among the language majority and minority were a matter of crucial fact. The language minority, with the help of the Macedonian and Yugoslav political nomenclature defeated the language majority and imposed their own language views.