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Abstract
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Doctor of Philosophy 2013
Amanda Carroll Greber
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University of Toronto

This dissertation analyzes how the concept of the ideal citizen is shaped linguistically and visually in Macedonian textbooks and how this concept changes over time and in concert with changes in society. It is focused particularly on the role of primary education in the transmission of language, identity, and culture as part of the nation-building process. It is concerned with how schools construct linguistic norms in association with the construction of citizenship. The linguistic practices represented in textbooks depict “good language” and thus index also “good citizen.” Textbooks function as part of the broader sets of resources and practices with which education sets out to make citizens and thus they have an important role in shaping young people’s knowledge and feelings about the nation and nation-state, as well as language ideologies and practices. By analyzing the “ideal” citizen represented in a textbook we can begin to discern the goals of the government and society. To this end, I conduct a diachronic analysis of the Macedonian language used in elementary readers at several points from 1945 to 2000 using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. I catalogue and chart the frequency of certain linguistic forms and changes in their usage over time and contextualize these choices and changes within the greater changes of the narratives in the books. I conduct a similar analysis of the visual depictions of identity in these textbooks and the content of the textbooks with respect to notions of identity, nationalism, and other cultural factors.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction

In 1946 in Skopje, Macedonia, only one year after the standardization of the Macedonian language, an adult literacy educational booklet was produced – *Bukvar za vozrasni*, “A Reader for Adults.” Macedonia was still rebuilding from World War II and adjusting to the new communist regime. The mostly rural population, many of whom had never left the villages in which they were born, would have to adjust to a new system of society, collectivist and industrial, and would have to learn a new standard language in which they had never been educated. The primary aim of this *Bukvar* was to teach literacy in the new standard language, but its secondary aim was to teach the culture and values of the new state, and it did so both explicitly and implicitly, through various linguistic choices and illustrations, such as scenes of Socialist labor and Yugoslav multiculturalism. A look at this *Bukvar* touches upon many of the issues discussed in this thesis: the shaping of citizenship, standard and non-standard language practice, and visual and linguistic representations of national and civic identity. In the first section of the *Bukvar* the alphabet and basic reading skills are introduced, the second section contains various passages for reading, and the third section teaches basic mathematics. In terms of language, the presentation of a relatively unvarying prescriptive standard in the first section of the book implicitly underscores the ideology of standard language, and the use of specific linguistic forms (and the omission of others) serves to reimagine the boundaries of the language community and seems intended to produce a certain kind of speaker by legitimizing only one way of speaking. The second section, however, exhibited greater language variation, which, while perhaps inadvertent (the passages seem to have been written by different people in

---

1 Research for this paper was supported in part by the Title VIII Southeast European Research Scholar Program, which is funded by the U.S. State Department, Program for Research and Training on Eastern Europe and the Independent States of the former Soviet Union and administered by American Councils for International Education: ACTR/ACCELS, as well as the Fulbright Student Program. The opinions expressed herein are the author's own and do not necessarily express the views of the U.S. Department of State, American Councils, or the Fulbright Program.
different places then compiled and included in the *Bukvar* as they were received) expands the boundaries of Macedonian language to be more inclusive. The passages’ content (excerpts from the Yugoslavian constitution, speeches given by Tito, folk songs and communist hymns, and various other texts) provides a glimpse at the values which were the secondary educational focus. These texts emphasized work and industrialization – values of the socialist Yugoslavian regime of the time – and nationalistic themes alongside the supranational, particularly the values of the “Brotherhood and Unity” policy. One of the texts in the reader was a brief biography of the saints Cyril and Methodius, brothers from Thessaloniki who not only developed a writing system for the Slavic dialects, but who are revered in the Orthodox world for bringing Christianity to the Slavs by translating the Bible into the brothers’ native Slavic dialect. The text here, in keeping with the socialist taboo on religion, downplayed the brothers’ role as missionaries and honored them for their role in uniting all Slavic peoples through language – essentially through a standard written language.

Accompanying images were equally carefully selected, featuring scenes from traditional agrarian life, industrialization, and cooperation among ethnicities. In the images we see a reflection of ideal citizenship as imagined in the *Bukvar*. Each page introduces a letter and has a scene of typical Macedonian life during that period. The clothing worn by the people in the illustrations is most often traditional attire of the various regions and peoples of Macedonia and Yugoslavia, and when appropriate, military uniforms; in a few instances, the characters wear urban, modern-style attire. While the frequent use of traditional clothing may be a result of the fact that the targeted audience was mostly rural, this strategy is useful for underlining the Brotherhood and Unity policy ‘in action,’ so to speak, as one can easily identify Albanians, Macedonians from various regions, and other Yugoslav peoples working together in many
scenes. In addition, the depiction of traditional clothing in some scenes and modern, Western clothing in others also underscores the national narrative, drawing a clear line between modern Macedonia and those traditions that have seemingly always been. Here, as elsewhere, a national consciousness developed first among the educated class, and neither a codified language nor an ethnic identity were of much interest to the average illiterate peasant, the target audience of the primer (cf. Weber’s *Peasants into Frenchmen*). Depicting people in traditional clothing speaking the new standard and proclaiming their Macedonian identity allows the reader to make the association between tradition and the new standard and to associate a sense of history and tradition with the newly recognized Macedonian national identity. In analyzing this reader, we begin to see the many issues involved in the production of textbooks – language ideologies, representation (and non-representation) of various groups, the conceptualization of nation and citizenship, etc. Textbooks and other educational materials encode cultural, linguistic, and national identity and their relation to collective values.

There can be no doubt that schooling has an enormous influence on the production and reproduction of identities. In Macedonia, this is of particular importance because Macedonian identity was and continues to be highly contested by neighboring countries (see Chapter 2). The school is one of the first and most important places where a community can transmit its values, its culture and its linguistic practices. Textbooks are a particularly effective instrument of transmission because they are required reading and students, especially at the primary level, accept and absorb the content of their textbooks as legitimate, impartial and impersonal knowledge (Soysal and Schissler 2004). States and dominant elites are by necessity heavily invested in the production of knowledge and practice, while the nation-state is especially dedicated to historiography and control over the narrative of its creation and evolution. This
process is of prime importance to the nation-state as a way of authenticating and legitimating its existence and boundaries (cf. Anderson 1992, Hobsbawm 1990, Wojtas 2003). Textbooks, then, serve as a link between state-level processes and the classroom and as a concrete product and instrument of the implementation of state ideology and policy. For these reasons, there is often disagreement, if not controversy, about what is taught. Conflict in education surrounds “the kind of knowledge that is and should be taught, … whose knowledge is “official” and … who has the right to decide both what is to be taught and how teaching and learning are to be evaluated,” (Apple 2004, vii). What are at stake are the implicit and explicit messages in textbooks about what makes a good citizen. In this thesis I will discuss how the concept of the ideal citizen is shaped linguistically and visually in Macedonian textbooks and how this concept changes over time. This study will focus particularly on the role of primary education in the transmission of language, identity, and culture as part of the nation-building process. It is concerned with the ways in which linguistic practice changes when the idea of what (and who) makes a “good citizen” changes – how schools construct linguistic norms in association with the construction of citizenship. The linguistic practices represented in textbooks depict “good language” and thus index also “good citizen.” By analyzing the “ideal” citizen represented in a textbook we can begin to discern the goals of the government and society. Language and education are basic to understanding cultural shift. Often, changes in the direction of a nation and the conceptualization of national identity appear in other realms, such as education, before they make political headway. Pavasovic (2006), for example, showed that increased ethnic nationalism in Serbia appeared in textbooks before Slobodan Milosevic’s rise to power, and not as a result of it. By understanding the cultural and linguistic identities and practices, as well as civic values, that are
represented and transmitted in primary education, we can better predict the future direction of a nation.

Macedonia has several features that make it an ideal subject for this study. First, in the 20th century it has undergone a dramatic restructuring of society several times – first at the start of the century with the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire and partition of Macedonia, then again after the Second World War, when the Macedonian nation and language was recognized, and Macedonia became a socialist republic within the Socialist Federated Republic of Yugoslavia, and finally with independence from Yugoslavia and the transition to a capitalist society. These dramatic changes in citizenship and ideology provide a fertile ground for research on identity and its representation(s). The stark contrast between the Marxist ideology of the SFRY years and the new capitalist and more individualistic ideology in the post-Yugoslav years provides a clear distinction in the representation of “good” citizen. In addition, the comparatively recent standardization of Macedonian, which began in 1944 with adjustments continuing until the early 1950s, allows us to better trace language shift and in the educational context.

The issues of language, identity and culture are fraught with tension and emotion in any country. The way in which language is used as a marker of identity and as a vehicle of cultural transmission is vital to understanding many conflicts, notably in the Balkans and post-Soviet countries, but also in many countries across the world. The break-up of the Serbo-Croatian language has shown the importance of language planning – both the regulation of where and when a language can be used, i.e. status planning, and decisions about right and wrong linguistic forms, i.e. corpus planning – in cultivating linguistic identity. In the former Yugoslavia, seemingly small choices about language – what word to use, whether to use the infinitive or a da clause – were not inconsequential, and would become highly salient. The push and pull over
standard Serbo-Croatian ultimately put speakers on high alert as to whose variety was being used and reflected larger grievances over the distribution of power and resources in Yugoslavia. When Yugoslavia broke apart,

“the elimination of ‘foreign’ elements in language [was] seen as a desirable and necessary step in the disentanglement of the ties that bound the former Yugoslavia together. For example, Serbs in Bosnia and Krajina abandoned pronunciations and vocabulary from their native dialects that were viewed as being too similar to Croatian, and Bosnian Muslim leaders early in the war began using a “forced, ‘purified’ and somewhat artificial variant of the language they had previously used, referring to it as the New Bosnian Language … The Christian Science Monitor reported that “Tuđman accidentally used the ‘Serbian’ word for ‘happy’, srećan, instead of the ‘Croatian’ sretan, during a live speech. His error was edited out of later broadcasts on state television, but the opposition press had a field day,” (Langston 180).

These struggles highlight the bond between language and ethnicity and between language and nationalism, particularly in the Balkans, where “[l]anguage, together with religion, is a key feature in the definition of national identity,” (ibid.). Fortunately, issues of language and identity have played out less explosively in Macedonia since independence (and there is more conflict surrounding status planning between Albanian and Macedonian than corpus planning within Macedonian itself) but issues of language use remain a frequent talking point in the Macedonian press.

Textbooks are themselves products of culture. They impart knowledge not only of their stated subjects, but also of the society in which they are produced. Several studies (Francis 1995, Ihm 1996, Lesikin 1998, Yen 2000) have shown that textbooks contain sociocultural representations. What is more, “the school textbook holds a unique and significant social function which is to represent to each generation of students an officially sanctioned, authorized version of human knowledge and culture;” (de Castell, Luke and Luke 1989, vii). A crucial point here is that the knowledge is “officially sanctioned, authorized.” Textbooks have a certain
authority in that students believe them to be impartial. Thus it is not surprising that there is often disagreement, if not controversy, about what is taught. In the United States, the uproar surrounding the Texas Board of Education’s curriculum changes in 2010 provides a clear example of how what is taught is so often political. Texas made national headlines in 2010, when, on the heels of the previous year’s attempt to undermine the teaching of evolution, the Texas Board of Education introduced over 100 amendments to the guidelines for history and economics textbooks which were intended to “put a conservative stamp on history and economics textbooks, stressing the superiority of American capitalism, questioning the Founding Fathers’ commitment to a purely secular government and presenting Republican political philosophies in a more positive light,” (McKinley 2010).² The Board also consistently voted down amendments proposed to include more Latino figures, which angered the Hispanic members of the board and community (ibid.). The board members clearly understood what is at stake and the role of textbooks in society: “As Cynthia Dunbar, another Christian activist on the Texas board, put it, “The philosophy of the classroom in one generation will be the philosophy of the government in the next,’”” (Shorto 2010). In another case, a controversy erupted around the adoption of new history and social studies textbooks in California in 1990 (LaSpina 1998, see Chapter 4 for details).

² Among the changes: “[Board member] McLeroy moved that Margaret Sanger, the birth-control pioneer, be included because she “and her followers promoted eugenics,” that language be inserted about Ronald Reagan’s “leadership in restoring national confidence” following Jimmy Carter’s presidency and that students be instructed to “describe the causes and key organizations and individuals of the conservative resurgence of the 1980s and 1990s, including Phyllis Schlafly, the Contract With America, the Heritage Foundation, the Moral Majority and the National Rifle Association.” The injection of partisan politics into education went so far that at one point another Republican board member burst out in seemingly embarrassed exasperation, “Guys, you’re rewriting history now!” Nevertheless, most of McLeroy’s proposed amendments passed by a show of hands. “Finally, the board considered an amendment to require students to evaluate the contributions of significant Americans. The names proposed included Thurgood Marshall, Billy Graham, Newt Gingrich, William F. Buckley Jr., Hillary Rodham Clinton and Edward Kennedy. All passed muster except Kennedy, who was voted down.”
Textbook content is a result of a “hegemonic selective tradition” of transmission which “provides historical and cultural ratification of the social order,” (Taxel, in de Castell, Luke and Luke 1989, 34). When textbooks portray a group (usually women or minorities) negatively, students are more likely to “develop negative attitudes toward women and these groups,” (ibid.). In addition, underrepresentation or outright exclusion of a group can lead pupils to believe that these groups are not important to society. Chapelle’s (2009) investigation of the underrepresentation of Canada in French textbooks in the U.S. was prompted by the “empty looks of puzzlement that I have received repeatedly when I mention our study abroad program in Québec,” (139). In other words, the implicit messages in textbooks about who is a good citizen and who “counts” matter.

The content of textbooks is significant if we consider how closely curriculum and textbooks are tied together. Studies have shown that textbooks and other instructional materials “structure up to 90% of instructional time,” (Woodward 1987: 511) and that “reading and mathematics teachers design their activities based on suggestions in the teachers’ guide from 85 to 95 percent of the time,” (Yen 2000: 47). Based on his observations in U.S. elementary and junior high schools, Woodward confirmed that many teachers are highly dependent on teachers’ guides and textbooks to organize their instruction. In fact, McCutcheon found that “all twelve teachers used as informants relied on the textbook for all subjects except art,” and that “teachers generally relied on textbooks as the basis for their plans because the texts provided a sense of security about what to teach” (McCutcheon 1981: 57, quoted in Yen 2000: 47).

While teachers around the world often rely upon textbooks for reasons of expediency, in Macedonia, because of changing governments, historically challenged identities, and current inter-ethnic conflicts, their role as officially sanctioned knowledge makes them all the more
influential in the classroom. Teachers will adhere to the information in the textbooks for fear that to do otherwise may entail politically-motivated reprisals. In one classroom incident recounted to me by a colleague, a geography teacher in Skopje asked her class a seemingly simple question: How many countries border Macedonia? This question was complicated, though, by the fact that Kosovo had recently declared its independence from Serbia, bringing the count up to five. The Macedonian government had not yet made clear its official position (they would later recognize Kosovo’s independence). When a student answered, including Kosovo in his list, the teacher pulled back and insisted they stick to the answer in the book, without Kosovo (Elena Petrovska, p.c.).

There has been considerable research on cultural representations in foreign language textbooks, as well. In Chapelle’s study “A Hidden Curriculum in Language Textbooks,” she investigated the representation of Canada in French textbooks for the U.S. using a quantitative analysis of all content in the textbooks and their accompanying workbooks and CD–ROMs. She found that, on average, 15.3% of textbooks, 6.5% of the workbooks, and 29.9% of the CD–ROMs included Canadian content (Chapelle 2009, 141). She concluded that this was insufficient, especially given the close ties and proximity of the U.S. and Canada, and that this small amount of Canadian content “may constitute a hidden curriculum about where French is (and is not) spoken, and even about who “owns” French,” (ibid., 149). Similarly, “Auerbach and Burgess (1985) uncovered a hidden curriculum in survival English as a second language (ESL) materials by demonstrating the messages that these materials contained about who speaks English, where,

---

3 Yugoslavia had a history of concern with its borders: There was a long-running joke that Yugoslavia was surrounded “with troubles,” which in Serbo-Croat is “brigama.” This word is in turn spelled with the first letter of each bordering country: “Jugoslavija je okružena brigama: Bugarska, Rumunija, Italija, Grčka, Albanija, Mađarska, Austrija.” (Bulgaria, Romania, Italy, Greece, Austria, Hungary, Albania). During the existence of the SFRY, all of its bordering states were considered a potential danger at one time or another, and at no point did the SFRY have friendly relations with all of its neighbors at once.
and when, and other research has uncovered messages about national ownership of English through the way the language is portrayed in textbooks (e.g., Matsuda, 2003; Wandel, 2001)” (ibid., 142). Francis (1995) conducted a study on twelve EFL textbooks used in secondary and post-secondary classes in Brazil, examining three dimensions of culture – value orientation, ideology, and hegemonic practices of instructional materials – using content analysis (see Yen 2000: 3). Ihm’s (1996) study of EFL/ESL textbooks in Korea found that racial and gender bias was apparent in textbooks both in the dearth of representation of women and minorities, and sometimes in their stereotypical representations. He concluded that this could limit the students’ perceptions of American culture.

At issue is not only whose knowledge should be taught and how it should be taught, but also in what language. The language of instruction is hotly debated (e.g., votes on bilingual education in California, Arizona, Colorado; French and English in Canada) especially in the case of non-standard language varieties, for example, the case of Ebonics. The Ebonics debates began in 1996 when the Oakland School Board made a proposal that the use of a variety of English spoken predominantly by African-Americans (which the OSB called “Ebonics” and is currently referred to as African American Vernacular English, or AAVE) should be recognized as a separate language and should be supported by the district’s schools (Collins 1999). This language policy was intended to improve the educational performance of its urban students, though critics pointed out that this was “not a question of language” and that economic and social factors were to blame (ibid., 201). There was a public outcry against this proposal, and it was debated in the press, in public forums, and among academics for months. The debates brought up many questions, including the status of Ebonics as a separate language or as “slang,” whether recognizing and promoting minority languages improves student performance or would
“ghettoize” the schools, and also brought up issues of language and nation and symbolic power.\textsuperscript{4} The Linguistics Society of America issued a statement in support of the Oakland School Board’s proposal, saying “[t]here is evidence from Sweden, the US, and other countries that speakers of other varieties can be aided in their learning of the standard variety by pedagogical approaches which recognize the legitimacy of the other varieties of a language. From this perspective, the Oakland School Board’s decision to recognize the vernacular of African American students in teaching them Standard English is linguistically and pedagogically sound.”

While minority language instruction gets more attention in the press and in public debates, equally important are the nuances of the standard language used in schools. Just as the text itself contains implicit and explicit messages, the linguistic choices made by teachers, as well as the authors, editors and publishers of textbooks convey messages about how the ideal citizen speaks. Equally important for conveying messages, both overt and covert, are textbook illustrations. Who is visually depicted, what they are doing, how they are dressed or interacting – all these things are choices made in service of supporting the message in the text and drawing an idealized picture of citizenship and nationalism.

\textbf{Ethnicity and Nationalism}

Our study here must include a framework for understanding how ethnic identity is constructed. Scholarship on ethnicity has moved away from a primordial view, in which it had been argued that ethnic identity derives from primordial attachments, and is thus a stable characteristic of human beings (Geertz 1963, 1973; Isaacs 1975), and towards an instrumentalist or constructivist view of ethnic identity, in which what constitutes a community (or a nation) is not fixed and can be shaped (Barth 1969, 1994; Bates 1973, Hobsbawm 1990, Anderson 1992). The latter two scholars also provide us with a theory of ethnic nationalism linked to linguistic

\textsuperscript{4} For more on the Ebonics debates and the issues of language ideology debates therein, see Collins 1999.
nationalism – Anderson (1992) and Hobsbawm (1990) are among the scholars that focus on the role of language, and particularly the written word, in nation-building.\(^5\) Hobsbawm (1990) in particular dissects European nationalism as developing according to an ideology in which language, nation, and state are intimately and inseparably linked. Here we should also clarify that the term ‘nation,’ is not synonymous with state, though, unfortunately, it is often used in this manner. The nation refers to a community, or a group of people who are tied to one another in some way – primarily through an ethnic bond or a civic bond. In ethnic nationalism, the ties of solidarity and loyalty are founded on cultural affinity, whereas civic nationalism is characterized by instrumental interpersonal bonds and a nation bound by political boundaries, though these lines may blur.

The conceptualization of language = nation = state which seems so natural to many now (cf. the oversimplified view that the French speak French and live in France, the Germans speak German and live in Germany, Canadians live in Canada and speak Canadian(?) etc.) emerged in the 19\(^{th}\) century. The unification of German-speaking principalities throughout the 18\(^{th}\) and 19\(^{th}\) centuries based on shared language and traditions, which culminated in the 1871 unification under Wilhelm of Prussia, offered a challenge to the dynastic, monarchical models of social and political organization which had previously dominated. The French Revolution marks the beginning of this change, as in the aftermath of the fall of the monarchy, a new framework of unification was needed, and nationalism – linguistic, ethnic, civic – grew in that vacuum. As the multi-ethnic and multi-linguistic empires (Austria-Hungary, Prussia, Ottoman) fell in the 19\(^{th}\) and 20\(^{th}\) centuries, linguistic and ethnic nationalism emerged as the dominant model.

The emergence of a Macedonian nation was also linked to this model of ethnic-linguistic nationalism, in which a common language is linked to a nation, which in turn is linked to a

nation-state. Lunt and Friedman have demonstrated that the Macedonian national and linguistic identities developed simultaneously and were intertwined, in ways similar to the other nations of the Balkans that became independent states during the course of the 19th and 20th centuries (cf. Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, Albania, etc.). Language became a marker of Macedonian identity (as it has been and continues to be for South Slavic peoples) “establishing them as a separate people and… acknowledging the legitimacy of Macedonian nationality.”

Let us also dwell for a moment on what we mean when we say “the French speak French.” This idea of the connection between national identity and language is part of a language ideology, “a set of beliefs about the structure of language and/or the functional uses to which language is put which is shared by a community …beliefs [which] have been part of the community for so long that the origins are obscured or forgotten – they are thus socioculturally reproduced as constituting a set of “true” precepts,” (Watts 68, cf. also Milroy & Milroy 1985). Furthermore, we should note that “ideologies of language are not about language alone. Rather, they envision and enact ties of language to identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology. Through such linkages, they underpin not only linguistic form and use but also the very notion of the person and the social group, as well as such fundamental social institutions as religious ritual, child socialization, gender relations, the nation-state, schooling, and law” (Schieffelin, et al. 1998, 18). The belief that a common language is a key part of national identity is pervasive throughout Europe and the West and has contributed to the great political symbolism of language. It is also concomitant with the ideology of standard, that is, that there should be one standardized, written form of the language that all the members of the nation should learn and be unified by. We should note, however, that the idea of a standard (standardized) language which

---

7 Naylor, in Bugarski and Hawkesworth 1992, p. 82
all French-speakers use is a recent phenomenon, historically speaking. At the time of the French revolution, “most Frenchmen could not speak French, much less read it,” (Higonnet 41). In 1793, the National Assembly was still handing its decrees over to “a ‘bureau of translators’ so that they might be translated into the ‘differens idiômes encore usités en France,’” (ibidem).

On the other hand, we recognize different standard forms of the same language. What does it mean to say “Canadians live in Canada and speak Canadian?” We recognize that Canadian French and European French are different, and that they are also part of the same language. Canadian English also has its own standard form, which differs from American English, British English, Australian English and other varieties. English, French, German and many other world languages are pluricentric, that is, “languages with several interacting centres, each providing a national variety with at least some of its own (codified) norms,” (Clyne 1). In fact, there is no one way to think about language. Some languages and language varieties are valued and accepted while others are devalued and rejected. Which outcome a language variety achieves depends on many interacting socio-cultural and economic variables. In the Balkan context, Macedonian has been a stigmatized language (both before and after its standardization), a circumstance which has had an impact on both corpus and status planning.

A modern manifestation of linguistic nationalism can also be seen in language purism. Post-Yugoslav language planning in Croatia is an excellent example of the way language can be used as an icon of nationalism. Langston (1999) describes the language planning processes in Croatia and proves that “many of the current attempts to promote linguistic purism are clearly motivated by a desire to further differentiate Croatian from Serbian in order to establish more firmly Croatian’s independent linguistic status and, consequently, Croatia’s status as an independent nation,” (185). In one example, “Stanka Pavuna in the preface to her language
handbook *Do we speak Croatian correctly?* states that she compiled this work to assist Croats who “are striving to speak good Croatian and in everyday life to demonstrate their national consciousness also by means of language,”” (Pavuna i-ii, quoted in Langston, 180). Langston notes that Croatia is not alone however, pointing out that “[l]anguage purism is the prototypical reflection of nationalism on the linguistic level, and similar campaigns have taken place in languages such as French, Finnish, Turkish and Hindi, to name only a few examples,” (180).8

The successor languages to Serbo-Croatian also serve as an example of *Ausbau* languages within Kloss’s typology. According to Kloss (1993), languages in an *Ausbau* relationship are split because of separate standardizations and created through language planning, whereas those in an *Abstand* relationship to each other have grown apart naturally.

**Language Planning**

The issues raised above about language standards and standardization bring us to the topic of language planning. How is it that a language comes to be standardized? When we think of language planning, the first thought is of the processes of language standardization and corpus planning. It is best to consider language standardization as a process rather than an achievement. In fact, as Milroy and Milroy (1985) are right to point out, absolute standardization of a language is never fully achieved, as language is constantly changing. The standard language exists “as an idea in the mind rather than a reality” and it is therefore more appropriate to consider standardization as an ideology (Milroy and Milroy 23). The ideology of a standard language is often seen as a given – the disputes over so-called Ebonics show how much we in North America take for granted the ideology of language standard, standard linguistic practice, and how rigid we can be with regards to language variation in our schools. These and other public debates over language – ever-present even in the most stable times – reveal that language is not just a means

---

8 For more on language purism, see Thomas 1991 and Jernudd and Shapiro 1989.
of communication but a marker of identity. Indeed, it seems to have a “special ability to serve as an object for debating broader issues of identity and state building,” or, to use Cooper’s *bon mot*, “to plan language is to plan society,” (Gorham, 4; Cooper, 182).

There is a growing body of research on the processes and methods of language planning which includes a multiplicity of definitions of language planning. Haugen (1959) defined language planning as “the activity of preparing a normative orthography, grammar and dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogeneous speech community,” (quoted in Cooper, 8). He later came to view these activities as outcomes of language planning and in 1969 defined language planning to include “the normative work of language academies and committees, … and all proposals for language reform or standardization,” (*ibid.*, 29-30).

According to Rubin and Jernudd 1971, “language planning is deliberate language change; that is, changes in the systems of language code or speaking or both that are planned by organizations that are established for such purposes or given a mandate to fulfill such purposes. As such, language planning is focused on problem-solving and is characterized by the formulation and evaluation of alternatives for solving language problems to find the best (or optimal, most efficient) decision,” while Fishman 1974 says simply “the term language planning refers to the organized pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at the national level,” (*ibid.* 30).

Language planning is most often divided into the sub-categories of corpus planning and status planning. We can think of these two categories as form vs. function, that is, corpus:form||status:function. *Status planning* refers to the allocation of languages or language

---

9 Race and language continue to be an issue in American public discourse. *The New York Times* published an article on President Obama’s use of language, particularly his “style-shifting” and “linguistic flexibility,” (Alim and Smitherman 2012). The authors also highlight the ways race and language are inseparable to many people, for instance Sen. Harry Reid’s statement that Obama spoke “with no Negro dialect, unless he wanted to have one,” (*ibid.*).

10 See Fishman, Haugen, Milroy & Milroy, Rubin & Jernudd, Rubin et al, Woods, inter alia; see also Cooper p. 30-31 for an excellent summary of some of the most prominent definitions.
varieties to given functions (e.g., official language, medium of instruction, language of mass communication, etc.). *Corpus planning* refers to the planning within a language, including the coining of new terms, reforming spelling, or adopting a new script; more broadly, it includes language cultivation, reform, and standardization. To these two, Cooper adds a third sub-category – that of acquisition planning. Acquisition planning is directed towards means and methods of teaching the language and increasing the number of users. As Cooper explains, “status planning is an effort to regulate the demand for given verbal resources whereas acquisition planning is an effort to regulate the distribution of those resources,” *(ibid.*, 120). The means of acquisition planning include those designed to create or improve the opportunity to learn (such as school instruction, creation of media in the language), those which create or improve the incentive to learn (including status planning decisions), and those that do both.

Prator joins Cooper as one of the few scholars who regard language teaching as an object of language planning:

“Language policy is the body of decisions made by interested authorities concerning the desirable form and use of languages by a speech group. It also involves consequent decisions made by educators, media directors, etc., regarding the possible implementation of prior basic decisions. According to this definition, the decision to emphasize in a language class specific skills or linguistic forms – even the choice of a textbook – could become a part of language policy. The latter should thus be one of the primary concerns of language teachers. The entire process of formulating and implementing language policy is best regarded as a spiral process, beginning at the highest level of authority and, ideally, descending in widening circles through the ranks of practitioners who can support or resist putting their policy into effect.”¹¹

Language planning is about much more than transmission of ‘correct’ language. It is perhaps driven to a greater extent by nonlinguistic factors and is directed toward nonlinguistic ends: national integration, mobilization of national movements, political control, creation or

¹¹ quoted in Cooper: 160
maintenance of elites, etc. In the 19th century, industrialization, the spread of literacy and the rise of nationalist movements combined to form national standard languages in Europe. The creation of a joint Serbian-Croatian literary language (with the Vienna Literary Agreement in 1850) was related to these movements, as having a national language would help the cause of gaining independence of the Serbs (from the Ottoman empire) and Croats (from the Austro-Hungarian empire). In another example of language planning being driven by nonlinguistic factors, in the wake of the French revolution, the bourgeoisie used language planning to deny the sans-culottes access to resources. Through the use of corpus planning, the new elites were able to exclude the sans-culottes and legitimate and maintain inequality (Higonnet 1980). As Berger and Berger (1976) point out, “[t]hat language planning should serve so many covert goals is not surprising. Language is the fundamental institution of society, not only because it is the first institution experienced by the individual but also because all other institutions are built upon its regulatory patterns,” (Berger and Berger 1976, quoted in Cooper: 182). Gorham recognizes this as well: “Discussions about the representations of language, therefore – particularly in times of radical social and political change – frequently reflect broader attempts to articulate visions of state authority and national identity,” (Gorham 6).12 Taking this idea further, Fishman states that “a great deal of successively contradictory language planning (as was not uncommon under the Soviets) is always indicative of contradictory and repetitive political changes (or approaches to changes) in the culture as a whole,” (Fishman 2006: 5).13 This was certainly true for Macedonia in the 20th century, as we can trace, to a large extent, political changes through language planning changes. The language of government changed from Turkish (Ottoman Empire) to Serbian

12 For more on standardization see Rubin et al. 1977, Ricento 2006, inter alia
13 This was also true for Greece, as the push and pull between the high variety katharevousa and the vernacular dhimotiki varied predictably based on whether a right or leftist government was in power until 1976 when diglossia was abolished (Kazazis 1993).
(Kingdom of Yugoslavia) to Bulgarian (occupation during WWII) to Macedonian (under socialist Yugoslavia) over the course of 50 years.

Controversies over language planning have been particularly intense in the Balkans and can be studied as a model for smaller scale language fights elsewhere in the world. Friedman’s work on language in the Balkans (1999, 2003) has shown that language is used as a flag, to use Naylor’s expression, essentially conflating linguistic and national identities. Greenberg’s *Language and Identity in the Balkans* (2004) has shown how linguistic identities can be formed and language practice changed to reflect national identity (more on this in Chapter 2). Language planners in Croatia in particular have worked actively to move the Croatian standard further away from Bosnian and Serbian standards, (Langston 1999). Because Macedonia is located on the South Slavic dialect continuum transitional to Serbian and Bulgarian, both of which standardized their languages earlier than Macedonian and who blocked Macedonian’s attempts to standardize at various points in the 19th and early 20th centuries, the standard language carried heavy ideological weight. Since both language and liberation from the Ottoman Empire were delayed, the standard language was highly important to the recently recognized nation, and corpus planning was thus especially important (I discuss these issues further in Chapter 2).

In the Socialist Federal Republic of Macedonia, status planning targets were clear: with the 1944 declaration, Macedonian was recognized as the official language within the republic.\(^\text{14}\) Following Cooper’s typology, we can make three distinctions under official status: statutory, working and symbolic. Macedonian’s status as a statutory language was codified in the constitution. It also fulfills the symbolic designation, being used by the government as a symbol of the state. As most government officials had been educated in another language, usually Serbo-

\(^{14}\) Some critics have taken this to mean that a Macedonian language was created *ex nihilo* by this 1944 declaration. This claim has been disproven (and refuted several additional times) by Lunt, Friedman and others through examination of written records dating from at least the mid-19th century.
Croatian (during the Kingdom of Yugoslavia) but also Bulgarian and other languages, the status planning target of using the new standard in day to day government activities and as the working language would take time to be fully implemented. Officials could now replace the lingua franca of Serbo-Croatian with Macedonian (at least for republic matters; at the federal level Serbo-Croatian was still mandatory), i.e., the new prescriptive standard which they were learning for the first time.

Another status planning target of particular interest to this thesis is that of educational medium. “Determining media of instruction for school systems is perhaps the status planning decision most frequently made, the one most commonly subject to strong political pressures,” according to Cooper (109). Prior to 1945 and as early as the late 19th century, educators were often forced to sneak Macedonian textbooks into the classroom to challenge the hegemony of Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian education (cf. Kramer 2008a, see Chapter 2 for more). Now, with recognition as the official language of Macedonia, all new textbooks were to be prepared in the newly codified standard.

Even when a standard language for instructional medium has been set, issues of language in education remain. Bourdieu (1970, 1977a, 1982) argues that the school reproduces the domination of the upper classes and perpetuates the existing distribution of social class through the use of scholarly language. He explains the processes of reproduction through “symbolic domination,” the ability of those in power to maintain control by establishing their world view and their cultural and linguistic practices as the only acceptable ones. To understand the success

---

15 While students in Macedonian primary and secondary schools were educated in the official Serbo-Croatian in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, during Bulgarian occupation in WWII many were forced to attend school where Bulgarian was the language of instruction. In addition, those who pursued post-secondary education often had to study ‘abroad’ (that is, outside Macedonia) in Serbia, Bulgaria, the Soviet Union, Western Europe, etc. as there were few local opportunities for higher education, and certainly none in Macedonian – instruction at the Filozofski Fakultet in Skopje was in Serbo-Croatian.
of symbolic domination we must also understand the concepts of habitus and cultural and linguistic capital. The habitus comprises the values, conduct, language, manners and mores which are inculcated by everyday experiences, by previous pedagogic work and, first and foremost, by the family. Bourdieu emphasizes that habitus cannot be learned or taught, only acquired through experience. The habitus of some students will more closely correspond to the values that the school transmits (both consciously and unconsciously) and legitimates. Those students will have inherited their habitus ultimately from families and peer groups, who, in Bourdieu’s example of the French educational system, are likely to come from the upper classes and thus be closer to the scholarly language, manners and values. Bourdieu (1977b) also links the idea of reproduction to economic theory by referring to cultural and linguistic “capital” and “markets.” Habitus then becomes a form of cultural capital to be used or sought by actors in the market, and the ability to function fluently in one or more language varieties (standard and non-standard) is linguistic capital. The dominant elites use the institutions at their disposal to elevate their linguistic capital as the most valuable. Heller observes that “language is central to institutional processes of symbolic domination, since conventional language practices serve to establish the normality, the everydayness of institutional processes … examining language practices can therefore reveal the micro-processes of symbolic domination – including the identification of interactional zones where individuals use language choices to exert, aggravate, or mitigate their power, to collude with or resist that exercise, and to exploit or minimize the effects of paradoxes produced by the overlapping or crosscutting of social and institutional constraints,” (Heller 1995: 373-374). Even if you speak the language of the nation properly, “you still need to constantly prove yourself against the measures developed by the dominant group, who use the agencies of the state (schools, bureaucracies, language academies, the media) to
describe what counts as linguistic competence and the means to identify it,” (Heller and Duchêne 2012: 5). In Macedonia, influence is exerted on the standard not only by intellectual political elites, but also by the Skopje dialect, which is outside the western dialect zone that formed the basis of the standard, but retains influence due to its status as the language of the capital city. Those speaking other regional varieties are subject to the symbolic domination of the elites in the capital.\(^\text{16}\)

Apple argues that “there is a very real set of relationships among those who have economic, political and cultural power in society on the one hand and the ways in which education is thought about, organized, and evaluated on the other,” (Apple 2004, vii). This idea, which relies on Gramsci’s concept of hegemony and on Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic domination, is central to a discussion of the messages in the curriculum.\(^\text{17}\) While the work of those mentioned above relies considerably on the idea of linguistic and cultural “capital,” I will explore the concept of linguistic capital in socialist societies, in which the idea of “capital” as such is anathema. Despite the rejection of capital(ism) espoused by socialism, it is clear that linguistic capital was still extremely important. In the USSR, command of the new Soviet speech was certainly important for upward mobility within the communist party. Along with the new communist ideology came a way of speaking and writing that was just as new for most citizens. The array of neologisms, acronyms, stump compounds, foreign borrowings, and new stylistic discourse was astounding. Not only were adults expected to learn these new forms, the educational establishment incorporated the new Bolshevik language into its textbooks very early

\(^{16}\) However, see Friedman 2012 on the “parachuting” of features and the “covert prestige” of Ohrid as Macedonia’s premiere tourist destination.

\(^{17}\) Strinati describes Gramsci’s concept of hegemony as “a cultural and ideological means whereby the dominant groups in society, including fundamentally but not exclusively the ruling class, maintain their dominance by securing the ‘spontaneous consent’ of subordinate groups, including the working class, through the negotiated construction of a political and ideological consensus which incorporates both dominant and dominated groups,” (165).
on. “The question of how a student was to speak and write became integrally linked to the more general task of shaping young Soviet citizens,” (Gorham 16).18

Soviet language policy and educational policy formed the basis of Yugoslav language policy, and retained influence even after Tito’s break with Stalin in 1948.19 In the USSR, communist ideology dictated that all languages were equal and, accordingly, there was no official state language, in the statutory sense. Instead, there was the policy of korenizaciia, ‘nativization’, “which was intended to educate the indigenous peoples and move them into the workforce. It called for full recognition of the national languages on a par with Russian… but it was more than just a political strategy. The nativization policy was a clear attempt to create, with the utmost speed, a larger and better educated labor force so as to rapidly industrialize the country,” (Grenoble 44). In the early years of the Soviet Union, instruction was in the mother tongue, to the extent possible (as not all languages of the USSR had been codified), with a second language introduced in the third grade (usually Russian, but not always), and a third language in the fifth. In 1938, Russian language instruction became compulsory for all. The impetus for this change was “the need for a common, inter-ethnic language for future economic and cultural development,” (Grenoble 60). After World War II, socialist Yugoslavia adopted a similar language education policy: All citizens had the right to acquire education in their mother tongue, and primary education was compulsory from ages 7 to 15 (Jemuović 1964).20 Serbo-Croatian was dominant at the federal level, however, and served as a lingua franca among the nationalities, so students for whom it was not the mother tongue were obliged to learn Serbo-Croatian as well. Another force for the spread of Serbo-Croatian was military service, which was

---

18 There are a number of studies which explore the intersection of language and power in the Soviet Union (see Gorham 184-5 for an extensive, though not exhaustive, list).
19 For more on Soviet language policy, see Grenoble (2003).
20 The 1974 constitution recognized and reaffirmed the rights of the nations and national minorities of Yugoslavia to have and use their own languages (Greenberg 1999: 145).
compulsory for males, as the language of the army was Serbo-Croatian, and servicemen were often sent to serve in other parts of Yugoslavia where Serbo-Croatian was the official language.

In the years just following World War II, “education was homogenous and controlled, relying on the dominance of the communist party to unify the system and subsequently the country,” (Soljaga 1998: 15). However, in 1948, Tito and Stalin had a falling out and Yugoslavia was expelled from the Cominform. Yugoslavia was then forced to find a “new way” of socialism, “a new ideological position within the Communist framework … there was some administrative decentralization, less arbitrary activity by the secret police, and some public diminution of the more obvious party privileges,” (Wilson 1978: 78). This decentralization was developed further, and in 1950, the self-management (B/C/S: samoupravljanje Mk: samoupravuvanje) policy was announced. Originally intended for industry, by 1963 self-management had extended to other areas, including education (Soljaga 1998: 15). Thus, communities had more control over education (which was particularly important for education in the minority languages) but were still constrained by other factors, including textbooks.

In post-Yugoslav Macedonia, as was the case under SFRY, minorities have the right to primary education in their native language. There are numerous Albanian- and Turkish-language schools, and many choose to study at them rather than at Macedonian schools. Their curriculum is determined by the Ministry of Education just as it is for the Macedonian schools, and an official curriculum is produced in those languages as well. Control over the Ministry of Education changes with the political party in power: under the SFRY there was one-party rule, and since independence the hand-over of power after an election is often accompanied by a purge of the civil service.

21 “What prompted this cataclysm in the communist world was a dispute over foreign policy, in particular Yugoslavia’s support for the communist insurgents in Greece. As Banac notes, the spark which ignited the affair was Tito’s decision in January 1948 to station Yugoslav troops on Albanian territory,” (Perović 32).
Textbook Production in Macedonia

Textbook production was tightly controlled by the state. In Yugoslavia (as in the USSR), there was only one state-issued textbook for each subject and year. In addition, an official curriculum (*nastaven plan i programa*) was produced each year by the Council for Education, Science and Culture of the People's Republic of Macedonia which outlined which subjects should be taught, for how many hours, and what each subject should include. In the first several years after WWII, the need for new textbooks was pressing, and textbooks were often translated directly from Serbian or Russian textbooks; this was especially true of the sciences. The readers, however, were produced new. Once a textbook was chosen, it was often used for 10 or more years, with only small changes and/or additions from year to year. In the case of one author, Čorģi Delčev, his obituaries mentioned that his primers educated 37 generations of students.

In Macedonia since independence, textbooks are solicited by the Ministry of Education (usually through advertisements in trade publications) and submissions are refereed by a three-person committee formed specifically for the task, which must include at least one professor in the subject matter and one professional educator at the grade level in question. The authors of the textbooks which get adopted were and still are closely associated with the governmental organizations that solicited and published them.\(^{22}\)

Textbooks and Identity Formation

There have been numerous studies on the importance of education, and particularly textbooks, in identity formation. Wojtas (2003), for example, examines the role of schools in

\(^{22}\) The associations of a few selected authors of the textbooks listed in Appendix 1 are as follows: Spase Čučuk was the Director of the textbook department of the Council of Education. Krum Tošev was a member of the Commission for the Codification of the Macedonian literary language and the first editorial advisor of the newly-founded state publishing house of Macedonia, and the first director of the Institute for Macedonian Language “Krste Misirkov.” Mane Manevski appears to be a pseudonym. Čorģi Delčev was a professor at the University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius, in the pedagogical department.
Polish nation-building. She interprets representations of Polish identity disseminated by schools “as a form of a narrative that embraced the goal of “retrospective mythology” and allowed the nation-builders to mold the collective memory of the citizenry,” (Wojtas 1). Lee uses discourse analysis to examine how Taiwanese identity was constructed in seventh grade Chinese textbooks used in Taiwan, and how these textbooks reflected the historical and sociopolitical contexts of Taiwan from the 1970s to 2004. These studies and others like them draw upon the notion that students generally accept textbook content as “objective, encyclopedic-nature, impersonal” and socially legitimate knowledge. The influence of textbooks or use of textbooks as a tool becomes even more important in socialist and transitioning societies where the state controls education and the curriculum to an unusually high degree, as noted above in the example of Macedonia’s borders. In Yugoslavia, there was only one state-issued textbook for each subject and year, which meant that there was little variation in what was taught. This facilitated the efforts of the governing authorities to shape identity as they wished by controlling what to include and exclude from the curriculum. In addition, there were often no alternative sources available, and no possibility for public debate about the factuality of the information presented, making it all the more likely that the average student would accept what was presented in the textbook (including the unintended or non-explicit negative “messages”, resulting from the underrepresentation of linguistic and ethnic minorities).

A majority of studies on education in former communist societies focus on the policy level. There have also been a number of studies on Yugoslavia and the former Yugoslav states,

---

23 Soysal and Schissler 2004, p. 1; see also Brophy and Sledright 1997, Olson 1989
24 Each republic had the authority of its own textbooks, so Macedonia’s textbooks were locally written and produced. The textbooks for the minority languages (Albanian and Turkish, who had their own schools) were translated from the Macedonian textbook.
in particular Bosnia, Serbia and Croatia, which explore ethnic identity and the representation of the other in textbooks, particularly history textbooks.\textsuperscript{26} Many of these studies of education in the former Yugoslavia focus on Serbian and Croatian conceptualization of the other and nationalism, often with the intention of explaining the upsurge in nationalism and violence and ethnic hatred. Baranović explains the particular focus on history and social studies textbooks thus:

“Since it is precisely in these subject areas that the state (politics) attempts to convey to the young what the “desired” social and political values are, it is here where the school systems of three communities differ from each other most. In their efforts to promote a desired ethnic identity and national awareness, the so-called group of national subjects became critical. History, literature and geography acquired a significant political importance and were subjected to significant changes. This especially applies to the history curriculum, which now must reinforce the notion that one’s specific ethnic group has a long history and a claim to sovereignty over a certain geographic area. Therefore, history itself becomes an essential constituent of ethnic identity. For this very reason, it acquires a special importance when the development or redefinition of nations or ethnic groups takes place.” (Baranović 16)

Baranović (2001) looks closely at various history textbooks in use in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the late 1990s, finding that each of the three ethnicities (Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian) uses its own, ethnically oriented textbooks, a situation which came about through an educational policy in which each community creates its own textbooks. This contributes “more to the creation of a closed, ethnocentric identity than to an identity open to diversity … [and] serve[s] more as a disintegrative than integrative factor in the post-war reconstruction period,” (Baranović 13). In Macedonia, the different ethnic communities also have their own schools and textbooks, resulting in the same ethnocentrism and lack of inclusive diversity (see Chapter 3). In the volume Warfare, Patriotism, Patriarchy, Plut, Rosandić, Pešić, and Stojanović (1994) explore various aspects of identity and ethnicity representations through narratives of war in elementary and secondary school textbooks. Plut explores the “rules” of society that are implicit


27
in the elementary school textbooks. Her concern is those messages which the community intended to confer, hence those which the community considered important. Rosandić discusses the forms and changing definitions of patriotism expressed in textbooks from the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and the SFRJ, and Pešić discusses messages of war and peace in elementary school textbooks. Höpken examines history textbooks from all the Yugoslav republics from the 1970s through dissolution in the 1990s, evaluating how much of the text was devoted to national history vs. Yugoslav history, and also how the history was portrayed. He concludes, like Baranović (2001), that history is not presented as open, and that, in the texts, “historical identity is not based on discourse, but on ready solutions.” In his analysis, the textbooks’ “main intention obviously is not to develop a “civic identity,” … but to supply political elites with legitimacy and preparing students for the elites’ current politics,” (Höpken 119-20). This analysis has been confirmed by others as well (Dimić and Olimpić (1996), Plut (1994), Ronsandić (1994), Pavasovic (2006)). Pavasovic (2006) studied the same time period as Höpken, but focuses only on Serbia so as to more systematically plot changes in the textbooks over time. She finds the sharpest change after 1988, when the socialist, “brotherhood and unity” messages were replaced by sharp nationalistic themes. She also finds that the ethno-nationalism increases beginning in 1982, and precedes political changes, such as the rise of Milosevic and the dissolution of Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, it is not only the textbooks themselves which have an ideological slant. Some of the scholarship on textbooks, particularly on Macedonia, is marred by the scholars’ own ideologies of ethnicity and nationalism (in particular work by Vouri on Macedonian and Bulgarian textbooks, as well as Kofos on Macedonia).27

27 See Vouri 1996 and Kofos, 1994. Kofos is one of the most vociferous detractors of Macedonian identity in Greece, who continues to deny the legitimacy of a Macedonian national identity. His and Vouri’s work suffers from these ultra-nationalist prejudices against Macedonia.
These studies of textbooks vary in their methods of analysis. Approaches vary from entirely quantitative methods, typically coding positive or negative messages or associations (e.g. Rosandić (1994), Vouri (1996), Pešić (1994)), to entirely qualitative, where the scholar chooses the most relevant textbook passages for the point at hand (e.g. Dimić and Olimpić (1996), in Öl ins Feuer), and various combinations of the two approaches. For example, Plut (1994) conducts a content analysis of the text according to a specific model: a unit of analysis is the message of the textbook – in the text itself she counts instances of a particular message, groups them according to “area,” then divides areas into points and ranks points according to frequency. She takes these points and considers them to be “rules” for the pupil. Unfortunately, the multiplicity of approaches makes it difficult to build upon previous research in a systematic way. I follow Pavrasovic (2006) and Baranović (2001) in employing a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. Pavrasović first examines the texts and determines key themes and ideologically loaded phrases. She then counts the number of times each appears in a particular book and codes these to compare the frequency of terms across the timeline.

Methodology

What is missing in the above-mentioned research on textbooks is a focus on the medium of language itself, in addition to the messages conveyed. There have been few studies of this kind on Macedonia or the other former Yugoslav republics, Slovenia and Montenegro.28 I seek to fill this gap in the literature on Macedonia with a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the language and images used in primary education materials in Macedonia from its first years as a republic immediately after World War II through the early years of independence in the 1990s.

28 The lack of scholarship on language textbooks in Montenegro can be explained by the lack of an official designation of Montenegrin as a nationality (narod) in Yugoslavia, and its later move toward independence. I suspect that many studies on Montenegro (and Montenegrin language) will soon be added alongside the other successors to Serbo-Croatian linguistic identity.
and 2000s. I will examine textbooks from 1945 through the early 1950s, the years of the implementation of the standard language and the first years of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. My analysis will combine qualitative and quantitative methods. I track changes particularly in those early years, since during that time several specific changes were made to the standard language (e.g., verbs ending in –ue changed to –uva) and Tito broke with Stalin (1948), which led to changes in the Yugoslavian socialist ideology. Finally, I analyze textbooks from 1970s and the period of the decline and dissolution of Yugoslavia and creation of an independent Macedonian state, from 1985 through 2000. I focus particularly on readers, which are intended for language arts instruction and include a variety of different texts and illustrations, the choice and content of which we can analyze in terms representation of correct grammar and correct citizen. I also chose readers because they are explicitly intended to confer values: According to the 1952 official curriculum, readers should “develop in students love and devotion to their homeland and its peoples, a sense of brotherhood and unity and enthusiasm for socialist construction of our country,” and the readers for 1
st to 3
rd grades should also acquaint students with important historical events and people, since history is not taught as a separate subject in those grades.

As will be explicated, the messages of “good” citizen are often explicit in books from the earlier periods, both in written texts and visual representations. In a Macedonian adult literacy textbook from 1946, the pupil is encouraged to continue reading with this post-script: “We are all obliged to expand our knowledge. He who reads more will do his work better and thus will be more useful to his people.” In modern Macedonian textbooks, we must look deeper to find the

29 „задача на наставата по македонски јазик во основните училишта: д) да развие кај учениците љубов и преданост кон татковината и нејзините народи, чувство за братство и единство и одушевување за социјалистичка изградба на нашата земја“(Nastaven plan i programa 1952: 5)
30 учениците ќе се запознаат ... со најважните настани и факти од историјата на нажите народи (Nastaven plan i programa 1952: 21)
encoded messages of identity, society and nationalism, not only because of the ideological premise of an accepted literary standard but also owing to images of an idyllic child’s world, rather than a reflection of an adult world we find in earlier textbooks. In addition, new textbooks in Macedonia have adopted Western ideologies of childhood in education, in which the child inhabits a liminal space, relatively free from responsibility, and is no longer simply a “small comrade,” as Kirschenbaum refers to the child in Soviet ideology. Kirschenbaum’s study of Soviet preschools and Rodden’s on East German education before and after reunification shed light on the top-down process of reshaping education based on ideology. I show how this is achieved on the ground level through the specific use of ideologically loaded linguistic forms, language practices, and illustrations. I also investigate how educators wrote the values of the new society into textbooks whose primary aim was to teach basic skills, impart civic values, and model civic behavior, and how this process differed in the socialist and post-socialist periods.

This thesis is situated at the intersection of linguistic and cultural knowledge. While there have been numerous studies on nationalism and ideology, and others on ideology and language planning, I combine these two areas, examining how these interrelated ideologies function in practice. Another gap in the scholarship this study fills is that of analyzing the process of linguistic and ethnic/national identity formation. That schooling has an impact on childhood socialization and ethnic identity has been confirmed in study after study. What is lacking, however, especially in the areas of post-communist Europe, is a sense of how identity is (re)constructed and what role education plays in this process. Ultimately, this study sheds light on discursive shifts in societies transitional to and from communism and on the role of education in nation-building at the ground level, not the policy level, using the textbook as a material trace of historical processes, and as a concrete product linking state-level processes to the classroom.
This thesis is structured as follows: In Chapter 2 I discuss the history of Macedonian language and its standardization, the controversies and debates surrounding Macedonian language, as well as the sociopolitical changes in Macedonia during the period under study, to contextualize the analysis in Chapters 3 and 4. In Chapter 3 I examine the language in the textbooks and discuss how the ideal citizen is being constructed linguistically at different points in time. I analyze patterns of language usage in the textbooks from a sociolinguistic point of view and carefully consider what, if anything, these patterns index. My quantitative analysis includes cataloguing the frequency of certain terms and themes; I also tag and catalogue texts for certain linguistic features, e.g., -uva vs. -ue verbal suffixes, dropping vs. non-dropping of intervocalic -v-; lexical items as archaic, ideological, dialectical, etc. This allows me to quantify particular aspects for each text and thus show and quantify movement. I put changes of language into context with changes within the state and the ongoing processes of standardization. I also contextualize the language choices and changes within the greater changes of the narratives in the books. In Chapter 4 I analyze the illustrations in the textbooks and a look at how the ideal citizen is constructed visually. I examine the content of the textbooks with respect to notions of identity, citizenship, nationalism, and culture using a quantitative analysis and then explore individual illustrations with qualitative analyses. Chapter 5 concludes and brings the analyses together into a combined view of the changing representations over time.
Chapter 2 – Macedonian Language and Standardization

As we have seen, Macedonian language is highly contested and has undergone a recent and well-documented process of codification. In this chapter I will give a brief outline of the Macedonian language, then discuss the Macedonian language’s path to standardization, problems and debates during codification and implementation, and lay out the arguments used to contest Macedonian’s legitimacy so that we may have a clearer picture of the issues of Macedonian and of the context in which Macedonian textbooks are produced.

While Macedonia’s codification process is recent and a comparatively well-organized, purposeful endeavor, this is certainly no reason to claim (as some have, see below) that Macedonian is an invented language. Nearly all written languages are subject to language planning processes, at differing degrees. Dictionaries and grammars are the tools of corpus planning, and a language does not have to have an academy (like Italy’s Accademia della Crusca or France’s Académie française) to be subject to language planning. Reagan (2004) argues that all languages are historical inventions and that language boundaries are socially constructed. Reagan asserts that a named language (a French, English, Farsi, Hmong) cannot exist, since “language—any language—is constantly changing, and in flux, and thus any effort to demarcate the boundaries of a particular language are inevitably at best able to provide a snapshot of the language at a particular time and place,” (44) and further, that because language varies across speakers and in terms of gender, class, region and other factors, a language is “ultimately a collection of idiolects which have been determined to belong together for what are ultimately non- and extra-linguistic reasons,” (Reagan 46). Makoni and Pennycook (2005) further argue that “languages – and the metalanguages used to describe them – are inventions,” and that alongside them “an ideology of languages as separate and enumerable categories was also
created,” (138). Ultimately “these inventions have had very real and material effects, determining how languages have been understood, how language policies have been constructed, how education has been pursued, how people have come to identify with particular linguistic labels,” (ibid.). The language ideologies which these authors seek to dismantle have indeed affected the development, description and teaching of a standard Macedonian language and, as we shall see, detractors used this metadiscourse to deny the existence of Macedonian. The arguments of Reagan (2004) and Makoni and Pennycook (2005) go hand in hand with the commonplace of anthropologists that “social categories – including nations, ethnic groups, races, genders, classes – are in part constructed and reproduced through symbolic devices and everyday practices that create boundaries between them,” (Gal and Irvine 1995) though the detractors of Macedonian do not acknowledge this fact.

It is also important to note that language planning does not only occur in or pertain to the initial processes of standardization. While “corpus planning is crucially important to “developing languages” that are also attempting to interact (i.e., to encourage interaction on the part of their speakers and writers) with the modern world, whether for commercial, touristic, political, and/or educational purposes… we mustn’t think that developing languages are the only ones that need to or that seek to “tamper” with their language,” (Fishman 2006: 3). Language planning, and corpus planning in particular, “corresponds to two widespread convictions: that language usage helps bring about social change, on one hand and that language usage helps reinforce or stabilize social change, on the other hand,” (Fishman 2006: 4) This sentiment has led to recent language change in English, for example, gender-neutral terms such as congressperson (instead of congressman), fire fighter and police officer (replacing fireman and policeman), and the marital-status-neutral title of Ms. “Language policy is invariably based on linguistic ideologies, on
images of “socially desirable” forms of language usage and of the “ideal” linguistic landscape of society, in turn often derived from larger sociopolitical ideologies,” (Blommaert 2006: 244).

Issues in language variation can revolve around class differences and fights over distribution of resources (see Bourdieu 1977, Higonnet 1980, Heller 2003, inter alia), gender differences (see Lakoff 1975, Cameron 1995, 2007, Ochs 1992, Tannen 1996, inter alia), regional differences (e.g., regional variants in Serbo-Croatian, see Greenberg 1999, 2004, Kalogjera 1985) and many other dimensions. The Macedonian case is interesting in that there is not a significant class dimension in variation. When the language was first standardized, it was not based on an upper class dialect; rather, there were political issues which were more important – the practical need for a dialect based on a large proportion of people’s speech and maximal distance from Serbian and Bulgarian. Notably, the dialect of the capital is outside the dialect zone on which the standard language is based (see map in Appendix 1). In addition, the political environment in which official standardization processes began brought to bear a powerful anti-class-stratification, anti-elite ideology to the project – namely, socialism. Regional dialect variation has more significance for Macedonian than any class distinction. The Skopje dialect, as the dialect of the capital, has its own prestige, “which in some respects competes with the prestige of the norm,” (this is perhaps what motivated the inclusion of –ue in the original standard, see below) (Friedman 1998), and most speakers are now bi-dialectal, speaking their home dialect as well as standard, owing to strong feelings of regional attachment and pride.

**Macedonian Language**

Macedonian is part of the South Slavic language group which also includes Slovenian, the successor languages of Serbo-Croatian, and Bulgarian. The South Slavic languages form a continuum from Slovenian to Bulgarian, separated by a series of isoglosses, some of which occur
together as bundles. As one moves across the territory of South Slavic, one crosses these isoglosses and moves from one dialect to the next. Contiguous dialects are mutually intelligible, the degree of which depends on the number and nature of intervening isoglosses. (It should be noted that here, as elsewhere (cf. German, Italian, Chinese, Scandinavia) whether a dialect is considered part of one language or another is determined by sociopolitical factors, not linguistic ones.) The bundle of isoglosses separating Serbian from Bulgarian fans out across Macedonia, making the transition from Serbian to Macedonian to Bulgarian more gradual (cf. the languages of the Iberian peninsula, where isoglosses fan out).

Macedonian can be divided on the basis of these isogloss bundles into three main dialect areas: Eastern, Western, and Northern (see map). The Western dialects can be further subdivided into west-central (Veles-Prilep-Bitola-Kičevo) and peripheral (Upper and Lower Polog, Debar, and Ohrid-Prespa). In the Eastern zone are the Tikveš-Mariovo dialect, which is transitional to the Western area, then Štip-Strumica, Gevgelija-Dojran, and Maleševo-Pirin. The Eastern zone also includes the dialects of Aegean Macedonia, that is, northern Greece, but we are not concerned with those dialects here. The Northern area includes the Skopje-Kumanovo-Kratovo-Kriva Palanka dialects. See Appendix 1 for a map of the dialect areas. Below I discuss the major differences between the regions which are relevant to Macedonian standardization and the textbook issues at hand.

In terms of phonology, the Western dialects are distinguished from the other areas by fixed antepenultimate stress, the loss of the phoneme /x/ and loss of intervocalic /v/. The three groups are further distinguished according to reflexes of the following Common Slavic

---

31 For a comprehensive look at Macedonian dialectology, see Vidoeski 1998 and 2005.
32 Because of the political situation and relations among the countries, Aegean Macedonian dialects were not taken into account during the standardization process.
33 Vidoeski includes Skopje in the West-Central area, though it is more correctly part of the Northern zone. My overview closely follows Friedman (1985).
phonemes: the jers, the back nasal vowel /ɔ/ and the vocalic sonorants (CrC and ClC) (see chart in Friedman 1985a: 38). In the North, the jers fell together (son, don, cf. elsewhere son, den), and the reflex of both vocalic l and the back nasal is /u/ (vuk, cf. West volk, East vɔlk, vɔk; put, cf. West pat, East pət). The Eastern dialects are distinguished by the back nasal reflex of schwa and schwa in the vocalic r reflex (kərv, cf. elsewhere krv).

In terms of morphology and syntax, we will restrict the discussion to several relevant features. Most of these isoglosses separate the Eastern and Western areas; the Northern areas will be mentioned if they fall entirely on one side.

1. The deictic definite articles in –v- and –n- (detevo ‘this child here’, deteno ‘that child there’) in the West, which are absent in the East.
2. The plural desinence for monosyllabic masculine nouns: –oi (-ovi) in the West, and –ove in the East (–ovi is characteristic of the Tikveš-Mariovo dialects and transitional between western –oi and eastern –ove).
3. Pronouns
   a. West: 3^{rd} sg masc nom. toj ; East and North: on
   b. West: 3^{rd} sg fem acc / dat je ; East: acc ja dat i
   c. West: 3rd pl acc i East: gi
4. West and North: Oblique forms for proper names and other animate nouns na Boreta, na deda, na Vasila ; East: na Bore, na dedo, na Vasil
5. West: Sentence initial clitics (Go vidov ‘I saw him’), East: not possible: (Vidov go)

The western features above were all adopted in the standard language with the following exceptions: 1) The plural desinence originally allowed for variation between -oi and -ovi, which was changed to just –ovi in 1950. 2) The pronouns were a mix of West and East: both toj and on were allowed, though toj was preferred and has dominated; the fem acc ja and dative i were adopted, with pl acc gi. 3) The derived imperfective suffix –ue was adopted in 1945, but changed to –uva in 1948.
We now turn to an overview of the standardization of Macedonian, efforts at which had been ongoing since the 19th century. This point must be stressed because there were (and still are) critics who charged that the Macedonian language was created *ex nihilo* in 1944 and that it was a Titoist plot to Serbianize the supposedly Bulgarian people living in Yugoslav Macedonia (Dučevska 1995: 20). As has been demonstrated elsewhere (Friedman 1985a, Lunt 1984), and as we shall see below, these claims are untrue.

In the first half of the 19th century, Macedonians and Bulgarians struggled together against the Hellenizing influences of the Greek Orthodox Church, under whose jurisdiction they existed in the Ottoman Empire. Many Macedonians and Bulgarians were united behind their goal for codification of a Macedo-Bulgarian South Slavic literary language. It was in the 1840s that the debates over the choice of a dialect base and features to include in a new standard language caused a rift between east and west. The Macedonians sought a compromise between eastern and western features and supported the creation of a joint language, but following the formation of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church in 1870, the Bulgarians rejected the compromise and codified their language on the basis of the Eastern Bulgarian Stara Planina dialects (Friedman 1985a), thus making the need for a purely Macedonian language more pressing. By the late 19th century, Macedonian elites understood the significance of having their language recognized as separate, since the consensus of 19th century Western European intellectuals was that:

“identifying languages was the same as identifying nations... Moreover, the equation of one language with one culture was endowed with political significance: a linguistically united community (“nation”), when tied to a territory, could claim to deserve a state of its own. In effect, exactly because linguistic differences were seen to be independent of human social intention, they could serve as an apparently neutral warrant for political claims to territory and sovereignty,” (Gal and Irvine 1995, 967).
One of the first publications containing vernacular Macedonian is Hadži Daniil’s *Tetraglosson*, published in the 1790s.\(^{34}\) It was a quadralingual dictionary and conversation manual, and the Slavic section, called *Bulgarika*, was written in Ohrid dialect. Among the first to write in vernacular Macedo-Bulgarian vernacular were Hadži Joakim Krčovski (d. 1820), who wrote in northeastern Macedonian Kratovo-Kriva Palanka dialects, and Kiril Pejčinovik (1770-1845), who used the north-western Macedonian Tetovo dialect, though both these writers used the term Bulgarian for their language, which reflects common 19\(^{\text{th}}\) century terminology (Friedman 1975: 85). These works were important for legitimizing the usage of the vernacular and providing an alternative to Greek. Partenij Zografski (1818-1875) was the earliest public proponent of a Macedo-Bulgarian compromise language. He published the first Macedo-Bulgarian textbook and in 1857 published an article in the *Carigradski Vestnik* supporting a new standard language. Although he publicly supported compromise, he nonetheless wrote in his own peripheral south-western Macedonian Galičnik dialect. The negative reactions of Bulgarians to his article hint at the threat of separatist Macedonian identity (Friedman 1975: 87). The *Carigradski Vestnik* published other articles as well in which Bulgarian writers rejected the language used by western Macedonian writers. These rejections “helped lead to the formation of a separate Macedonian linguistic and ethnic consciousness,” (Friedman 2003: 262). As part of the greater movement of establishing Macedonian as a written language, there were many attempts to introduce Macedonian-language pedagogical materials in the latter half of the 19\(^{\text{th}}\) century. Among these attempts was that of Zografski, who wrote textbooks in his own Galičnik

---

\(^{34}\) The Konikovo Gospel, a late 18\(^{\text{th}}\)-early 19\(^{\text{th}}\) century Greek-Macedonian bilingual manuscript, “is in fact “the oldest known text of greater scope that directly reflects the living Slavic dialects of what is today Greek Macedonia” (Introduction, p. 9) and also the oldest known Gospel translation in what we would today term Modern Macedonian,” (Schallert 2011: 131). The Macedonian translation is written in “a local Macedonian idiom of the Lower Vardar region (spoken to the northwest of Solun/Thessaloniki),” in Greek script (*ibid.*, 132). Portions of the Macedonian text were published in Solun/Thessaloniki in 1852.
dialect, Kuzman Šapkarev (1834-1909), from Ohrid, who wrote eight textbooks using both eastern and western features which he felt would be easiest for both Macedonians and Bulgarians to adapt to. While he continued to publicly support a compromise, his later textbooks included more and more western features. “Šapkarev’s textbooks were enthusiastically received and replaced Greek ones in central and southern Macedonia. Parents preferred them to Bulgarian books because they could understand Šapkarev’s textbooks when their children read aloud (Koneski 1967a: 204-206),” (Friedman 1975: 285). Gjorgji Pulevski (1838-94), also from Galičnik, published a trilingual dictionary in 1875, and between 1873 and 1880 published three textbooks in his own dialect. 35 He not only called his language Macedonian, but stated that Macedonians were a separate nationality and that they should have their own language, which was the first published statement in support of Macedonian ethnic and linguistic nationalism.

In 1903, Krste Misirkov published On Macedonian Matters, in which he describes a Macedonian standard language, based on the west-central dialects, the area of most compact isoglosses. These dialects eventually became the basis for the standard language:

“1. Prilepko'Bitolckoto narečije za literaturen jazik, kao jednakvo daleko i ot srbeckijot i bugarckijot jazici, i centralno vo Makedonija. 2, fonetičnijot praopis... so mali ostapki na etimologijata i 3, rečničnijot materi’al da jet sobran’e ot site makedoncki narečja. (Misirkov 1903: 145)

[The following should be adopted:] 1. The Prilep-Bitola dialect as the basis of the literary language, since it is equally distant from Serbian and Bulgarian, and central in Macedonia. 2. A phonetic orthography ... with minor concessions to etymology and 3. The collecting of dictionary material from all Macedonian dialects,” (Friedman 1975: 287).

This was the most complete proposal for a separate standard Macedonian language to that date.

Unfortunately, most copies were destroyed by the Bulgarian police at the printing press in Sofia (Friedman 1985a, Kramer 1999). That the Bulgarians sought to destroy this book indicates that

they saw an independent Macedonian language and nation not only as a real possibility, but also as a threat to their territorial desires.

After the Balkan wars of 1912-1913, Macedonia was partitioned among Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria, according to the borders created by the Treaty of Bucharest. The territory awarded to Serbia by the treaty (often called Vardar Macedonia) eventually became the current Republic of Macedonia, and we shall discuss the development of the Macedonian language in that region only. Under Serbian rule (first in the Kingdom of Serbia, then the Kingdom of Yugoslavia) Macedonia was treated as part of Serbia – Macedonians were considered to be South Serbians and Macedonian was considered a southern Serbian dialect. It was claimed that Macedonians in the 19th century had claimed Bulgarian identity, not Serbian, due to Turkish pressure: “That the people in Macedonia and Old Serbia now call themselves Bulgars is entirely due to the enforced desire of the Turks, who more readily hear the name of the peaceful and submissive Bulgar than that of the ever rebellious Serb,” (Slijepčević 1958, 87). While Serbo-Croatian was the official language and all schooling was in Standard Serbo-Croatian, the publication of literature in Macedonian dialects (officially “South Serbian dialects”) was permitted as folk literature. The attempted Serbianization of the population was ineffective, however. A monthly report by a government official from 1939 complained of a “great evil” (golemo zlo): that “the Macedonian intelligentsia and youth, in their homes, on the street and in public places, at every opportunity, speak only in Macedonian dialect,” (“македонската интелигенција и сета младина, а особено училишната, во своите домови, на улица и на јавните места во секоја прилика зборуваат само на „маќеонскиот дијалект,”) (Risteski 1988: 86).

The Comintern ruled that Macedonian was a separate language in 1934 and began to circulate illegal Communist Party newspapers in Macedonian (Apostoloski 1969, quoted in

---

36 For information about the fate of Macedonian language in the other regions, see Kramer 1999.
Friedman 1985a: 35). After the war, Macedonian gained formal recognition as a literary language. At the first session of the Anti-Fascist Assembly of Macedonia (ASNOM), held in the Prohor Pčinjski Monastery on August 2, 1944, the anniversary of the Ilinden Uprising, Macedonian was established as the official language of the Republic of Macedonia and a commission established to draw up a literary standard.\(^{37}\)

The commission based the literary language on the West-Central dialects but also incorporated many features of the Skopje dialect (Friedman 1985a: 40). It also proposed an alphabet including the letter ъ for schwa, and ър for vocalic /r/, and suggested that terminology should be borrowed from Russian (ibid.). Ultimately, the commission’s resolution and alphabet were rejected and a new commission was formed. In May of 1945, the new commission in charge of standardization submitted a Cyrillic alphabet based on Vuk Karadžić’s phonetic principles and the idea of ‘one letter per sound’, thus rejecting digraphs (i.e., using the letters к, ѝ, л, н, с, ц, ј as opposed to кь, гь, ль, нь, дз, дж, й, ю, я, etc.) and creating an alphabet that more closely resembled Serbian than Bulgarian. In June the commission submitted the first Pravopis (orthography), a 20-page handbook of spelling, punctuation and morphology. The new standard would be based on the West-Central dialects, with some elements of other dialects (e.g., the clitics were a mix of Eastern and Western forms, the 3\(^{rd}\) sg verbal desinence was a zero ending, not the Western –t). Friedman (1985) notes that this area was “the largest in both area and population” and that it was maximally simple for speakers from outside this area to adjust their speech to match (1985: 40). In addition, these dialects presented the greatest differentiation

---

\(^{37}\) On the night of August 2, 1903, VMRO (the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization, whose goal it was to liberate Macedonia from the brutal Ottoman reign) began its planned uprising in towns around Bitola, in the southern region of Macedonia. The rebels captured Krušev, where they set up a provisional government, the Krušev Republic, lead by Nikola Karev. Ottoman forces tried unsuccessfully on August 4\(^{th}\) and 5\(^{th}\) to retake Krušev, but returned with more forces on August 12\(^{th}\), when they recaptured and burned the village. The 10-day Krušev Republic is considered the first Macedonian state.
from both Bulgarian and the southern Serbian dialects. One notable exception was the derived imperfectives in –ue, which as noted above is a Northern feature. In 1948, this was changed to the West-Central –uva, and five other modifications were made. These modifications were printed in the April 1948 edition of the journal *Nova Makedonija*:

1. Change in the conjugation of derived imperfectives from –ue to –uva,
2. The reinstating of the /u/ reflex of back nasal /ŋ/ for some lexical items (e.g., oružje, not oružje ‘weapon’),
3. A grave accent for acc 1 pl nè to distinguish it from the negative particle ne,
4. The writing of j between i and a in all cases,
5. The use of /a/ for secondary jer before r,
6. The use of ќ, ѓ for the reflexes of Common Slavic *tj/dj*  

(Kramer 2008b)

After the modifications of 1948, a new and much more complete grammar was composed by Blaže Koneski and Krum Tošev. Published in 1950, this work also contained a 6000-word orthographic dictionary (Friedman 1985a: 41). The most complete description was published in 1952/1954 in Koneski’s grammar of the Macedonian language.  

**Contestation of Macedonian Language and Identity**

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Macedonia was still a part of the Ottoman Empire, but independent Bulgarian, Greek, and Serbian states were already in existence. The people in Macedonia were and remain a highly diverse group, consisting of Slavs, Greeks, Vlachs, Albanians, Turks, and Roma, among others. These groups did not adhere to the Western European ideology of the time, which links language, national identity and territory. Travelers in Macedonia in the early 19th century noted (with consternation) that ethnicity and language often

---

38 Horace Lunt’s 1952 grammar, while certainly influential on Koneski’s grammar (notably in the listing of verbs by their 3 sg forms and not their 1 sg forms, which was the norm for other Balkan languages without infinitives, but would obscure important verbal classifications in Macedonian), was written in English and therefore not accessible to most Macedonians at that time.

39 Serbia achieved autonomy in 1817; Greece became independent in 1830. Bulgaria attained autonomy in 1870 with the establishment of the Exarchate and, along with Serbia, won full independence in 1878 with the Treaty of Berlin. For more, see Okey 1982.
failed to coincide in the way they (supposedly) did in Western Europe (Gal and Irvine 2000). Lucy Garnett noted “A Greek-speaking community may prove to be Wallachian, Albanian or even Bulgarian, and the inhabitants of a Slav-speaking village may claim to be of Greek origin,” (1904: 234, quoted in Gal and Irvine 2000: 64). Furthermore, “families often sent each son to a different school – Bulgarian, Greek, Rumanian, Serbian – whose language and nationality the child would then adopt,” (Gal and Irvine 2000: 64, see Brailsford 1906). This European confusion was largely the result of the fact that the Ottoman Empire’s *millet* system, in which people were grouped together according to their religious affiliation, not ethnic identification, differed greatly from the ethnic-linguistic nationalism of Western Europe. Under the millet system, Muslims of any ethnicity belonged to the Muslim millet, with the Sultan as Caliph, and no matter what their language or ethnicity, were considered Turks. All Orthodox Christians were governed by the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which was the largest millet after the Muslim one, and held, correspondingly, considerable political influence and power. Other millets included the Jewish millet and the Armenian Patriarchate. Each millet governed its own people, and was responsible for collecting and rendering taxes and keeping their people on good behavior. Thus, according to this system, the most important opposition was not Turk/Greek/Bulgarian/ Macedonian/Albanian/etc., but rather Turk/giaour, often glossed as ‘infidel,’ i.e., non-Muslim. Identification according to religion was the condition throughout the Balkans in Medieval times, in the Roman (Byzantine) period, early Orthodox Balkan states and the Hungarian Empire (Fine 1983, 17).

---

40 Gal and Irvine (1995) also note that “Even so influential a student of ethnicity and nationalism as Benedict Anderson (1983) seems to assume that “communities” will be linguistically homogeneous and easily linked to named languages. He laments the “fatality” of monolingualism, which supposedly provides the fertile ground for linguistic nationalism. But he thereby ignores the variety of culturally and, often, politically significant linguistic differentiation present in the repertoires of speakers before print capitalism, and within contemporary states which are only legally or nominally “monolingual,”” (1002).

41 For more on the millet system, see Abu Jaber 1967.
In the 19th and 20th century the Greeks, Serbs and Bulgarians all laid claim at various times to Macedonian territory and the illiterate peasants who lived there and spoke a Slavic idiom later to be recognized as Macedonian. On the Greek side, claims to the land came from as far back as ancient Macedonia under Alexander the Great; the Bulgarians claimed the land from the time of Tsar Samuel in the 11th century, when the seat of the kingdom was in Ohrid, in western Macedonia; and the Serbs claimed lands held by them in the 14th century. The claims to the identity of the Macedonian people were also part of these countries’ political power plays, and inextricably related to territorial desires. Each country “‘imagined’ the territory and inhabitants of Macedonia as part of its own emerging ‘community’… advocates of Serbian, Bulgarian, and Greek expansion, as well as those calling for Macedonian autonomy, appealed to linguistic descriptions to prove the existence of social boundaries that would authorize their claims to popular loyalty,” (Irvine and Gal 2000: 67). The Greeks claimed that these people were Greek and had adopted the vernacular of their Bulgarian neighbors (Kofos 1964: 13), while the Bulgarians claimed that they were Bulgarians who, because of the effective Hellenization at the hand of the powerful Greek Church, claimed Greek identity in the hopes of upward mobility (Bourchier 51). The Bulgarians and Serbs reimagined linguistic variation in an attempt to prove that the language spoken by the Macedonians was a dialect of their own. Since a large bundle of isoglosses separating the Serbian and Bulgarian languages fans out across Macedonian territory, this was just a matter of choosing which isoglosses to declare salient and nonsalient. In fact, “that linguistic boundaries had not yet been conceptualized in modern terms can be seen in the fact that as late as 1822, Vuk [Karadžić, one of the codifiers of Serbo-Croatian] found it necessary to argue that Bulgarian was not a dialect of Serbian (de Bray 1980, 78, 312; Lunt 1984, 115),” (Friedman 2003, 261). Individual words could even become salient linguistic
markers: Slijepčević brought forth various claims that Macedonians are Serbs because they use the term ‘Bugarin’ (using the Serbian reflex of the ТьлТ group) rather than “Bûlgarin,” as the Bulgarians do (Slijepčević 88-91). (The central Macedonian reflex of the ТьлТ group is TolT, which would give *Bolgarin; ‘Bugarin’ is the reflex of the Northern and Skopje dialects.) The symbolism of having such a linguistic litmus test in the very ethnonym of those who compete for the allegiance of the Macedonians was of great significance to Slijepčević and those who would agree with him. The Serbian arguments that the Macedonians were in fact Serbs used the lack of sharp linguistic frontiers to their advantage. While one of the more salient features separating the East South Slavic dialects from the West South Slavic ones was the loss of cases in the east, some South Serbian dialects lost, or were in the process of losing, cases (these are often referred to as the Prizren-Timok dialects or Torlak dialects), and this was also used as evidence that the case-less Macedonian dialects also belonged to the Serbian system.

The argument that Macedonia was part of Serbia was revived by the ultra-nationalist Vojislav Šešelj, head of the Serbian Radical Party, in the early 1990s. Šešelj declared on multiple occasions that Macedonia is part of Serbia. In one such incidence, he declared, “Macedonia, that is Southern Serbia, was part of Serbia before the creation of Yugoslavia and will remain a part of Serbia even after Yugoslavia's existence ceases,” (Oberschall 26). On Ilinden (August 2) 1990, Šešelj, along with other Serbian Radicals, also destroyed a plaque commemorating the ASNOM meeting in the Prohor Pčinjski Monastery. He then said of the incident, “a 46-person delegation of the Serbian Chetnik Movement was at the famous Serbian monastery of Prohor Pčinjski yesterday. There we tore down what represented a great heresy, we tore down the pagan plaques that were attached to the walls of the temple and that were witness to an alleged formation of the first parliament of that artificial Macedonian state and an artificial Macedonian nation,” (ibid.
Šešelj has made similar claims about Montenegrins and Croats, and is currently on trial for crimes against humanity and violations of the laws or customs of war by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

The Bulgarian claim that Macedonians and Macedonian language are Bulgarian begins with the fact that no distinction between Macedonians and Bulgarians was made until the early-to mid-19th century, due to the Ottoman millet system, and with their shared history dating back to the 11th century and the time of Tsar Simeon. The indiscriminate use of the term “Bulgarian,” by foreigners even into the 20th century further muddies the waters. Nonetheless, among the (native) intelligentsia, there was no public discussion of a distinction between Macedonians and Bulgarians until the mid-19th century, when disputes about language led to the eastern Bulgarians and western Macedonians each publishing their own separate textbooks (see above).

When the Bulgarians achieved autonomy in 1870, they “publicly and uncompromisingly adopted the attitude that Macedonian was a degenerate dialect and that Macedonians should learn literary Bulgarian,” (Friedman 1985a: 34). With the exception of the period of 1946-1948, Bulgaria has since insisted that Macedonian is not a separate language but a dialect of Bulgarian, and accordingly, the Macedonian people are really Bulgarians, part of the Bulgarian nation. The Institute for Bulgarian Language published The Unity of the Bulgarian Language in the Past and Today to argue this point. The authors also declare that the Macedonian language only appeared in 1944 in association with the Socialist Republic of Macedonia (under Yugoslavia), and that it is in reality a “second Bulgarian literary language,” (Institute for Bulgarian Language 7). This is an

---

42 Due to a dispute between the Serbian and Macedonian Orthodox Churches, Macedonian delegations were denied access to the Prohor Pčinjski Monastery to commemorate the ASNOM meeting for five years, but were allowed in again in 2009 (Macedonian Information Center).
43 It should be noted, however, that there was linguistic divergence from the earliest written records of the two literary centers, one around Ohrid in western Macedonia, the other around Veliko Tūrnovo, in northeastern Bulgaria (Lunt 1984).
44 i.e., prior to Tito’s split from Stalin
oft repeated claim on the Bulgarian side, despite the fact that Bulgaria officially recognized the
Macedonian language until the Tito-Stalin break of June 1948. The Bulgarian arguments center
on the elements which the two languages have in common (e.g., the loss of cases and rise of an
analytic system, the post-posed definite article, the loss of infinitive) and ignores or downplays
those elements that differ (e.g., Macedonian’s deictic definite articles, fixed anteponultimate
stress, different rules governing the usage and placement of clitics, etc.). The authors of *The
Unity of the Bulgarian Language in the Past and Today* focus particularly on the reflexes of
various Common Slavic phonemes (the jers, the nasal vowels, tj and *dj) in particular
Macedonian dialects where those reflexes fall together with Bulgarian (e.g., those eastern
dialects which share the reflex of schwa for the back nasal vowel and vocalic /r/), while ignoring
the fact that those reflexes differ in Standard Bulgarian and Standard Macedonian (e.g., the back
*jer, Mk son, Bg sân, the back nasal vowel /q/, Mk maž, Bg măž, and the vocalic sonorants, Mk
krv, volk, Bg krăv, vălk). In addition, the authors of *Unity* see “nothing startling… in the fact that
the regions [with similar reflexes] mentioned are hundreds of miles apart, or that the given
features play an entirely different role in the phonological systems of the dialects involved,”
(Dimitrovski, Koneski, and Stamatoski:12). That Macedonian was sufficiently different from
Bulgarian was clear as early as 1851, when the editor of the *Carigradski Vestnik* wrote of the
language of the Veles-born educator Jordan Hadži Konstantinov-Džinot:

“As concerns the language of Mr. Jordan, anyone can see that it is so different
from our [Bulgarian] written and spoken language, so that to a person reading it
for the first time it will appear not only incomprehensible but completely
different. And in truth his language, even though it appears to be Bulgarian, and
its material, like that of our language, is also taken from the Church Slavic literary
language, has in its form, nevertheless, that is in the pronunciation of the words
and in writing, so many properties and peculiarities that it can more easily be
learned and spoken correctly by a foreigner, and not by a native Bulgarian May
the residents of Skopje forgive us, along with those who speak a similar language:
since they also do not understand our language, nor can they speak it.”

All of these arguments involve socially constructed boundaries of language through the processes described by Gal and Irvine (1995, 2000), particularly iconization and erasure.

“Iconization involves a transformation of the sign relationship between linguistic features (or varieties) and the social images with which they are linked. Linguistic practices that index social groups or activities appear to be iconic representations of them, as if a linguistic feature somehow depicted or displayed a social group's inherent nature or essence … By picking out qualities supposedly shared by the social image and the linguistic image, the ideological representation (itself a sign) binds them together in a linkage that appears to be inherent,” (Irvine and Gall 2000: 37).

“Erasure is the process in which ideology, in simplifying the field of linguistic practices, renders some persons or activities or sociolinguistic phenomena invisible. Facts that are inconsistent with the ideological scheme may go unnoticed or get explained away. So, for example, a social group, or a language, may be imagined as homogeneous, its internal variation disregarded. Because a linguistic ideology is a totalizing vision, elements that do not fit its interpretive structure--that cannot be seen to fit--must either be ignored or be transformed. Erasure in ideological representation does not necessarily mean, however, actual eradication of the awkward element, whose very existence may be unobserved or unattended. It is probably only when the "problematic" element is seen as fitting some alternative, threatening picture that the semiotic process involved in erasure might translate into some kind of practical action to remove the threat,” (Gal and Irvine 1995).

By claiming that Macedonian dialects are either Serbian or Bulgarian, they erase Macedonian entirely. Meanwhile, “[s]ocial relations of “closeness” and “distance” were projected iconically from presumed or claimed “closeness” of linguistic relations,” in other words, shared linguistic features (analytic morphology, salient phonological features and lexemes), which were then used “to justify political unity,” (Irvine and Gal 2000: 68-69, Gal and Irvine 1995).

**Issues and Debates over Macedonian language**
As we can see, Macedonia was codifying its language against the backdrop of considerable controversy and disputation. Thus the usual language debates were even more significant, as each decision had the possibility of inflaming arguments about the Bulgarianness or Serbianness of the linguistic forms.

The alphabet was the first site of serious debate. There were many who argued for the inclusion of ъ for schwa (which is also an issue of phonology), as well as digraphs for ќ, џ, љ, њ, etc. As we have seen, the initial commission was in favor of these proposals, while the second commission aimed for a more simplified system, which also had the result of putting Macedonian orthography more in line with Serbian than Bulgarian. This was one of the many elements that prompted accusations of the Serbianization of Macedonian. Scholars in Bulgaria were quick to seize upon this point. Kiril Mirchev, a professor at St. Kliment University in Sofia, wrote an article in the journal Otechestven Front in April 1952 entitled “How the Skopian Titoists Serbianized the Macedonian Orthography,” (Dučevska 20). In it, he took issue with the alphabet, particularly the letters ќ, џ, љ, and њ, as well as the use of vocalized /tʃ/ without a schwa (срб, not сърб) as Serbian influences. Blaže Koneski responded in June 1952 in Makedonski Jazik defending these choices and pointing out that Mirchev misrepresented the dialects in Macedonian as not having vocalized /tʃ/ when in fact this is attested in the West-central dialects on which the standard was based.

The journal Makedonski Jazik (Macedonian Language) was created in 1950 in order to provide a place for the discussion of the issues of standardization. In the inaugural issue, they state their goal: “Our newsletter appears precisely in order to contribute to the organization of a regular review of the issues of our linguistic practice,” (нашов билен сè јавува токму со цел на
pridonese za organiziranjeto na edno redovno razgleduvanje prašanjata od našata jazična praktika) and define the most pressing tasks as the following:

1. To prepare, as soon as possible, a solid scientific grammar of our literary language (da se izr Robit vo što poskoro vreme solidna naučna gramatika na našiot literatun jazik)
2. To compile a dictionary of the Macedonian language and in this sense to work for the creation of established terminology in all areas (da se sostavi rečnik na makedonskiot jazik i vo taa smisla da se raboti za sozdavanjeto na ustanovena terminologija vo site oblasti)
3. To wage a constant battle for the purity of our language in literatu, the press, radio theater, etc., – and especially in our schools, in terms of proper placement of the Macedonian language as a subject of study, the method of its instruction, and the preparation of textbooks in this subject. (da se vodi postojana borba za čistotata na našiot jazik vo literaturata, pečatot, radioto, teatarot i dr., – i osobeno vo našite učilišta, vo vska so što da se polaga griža za pravilnoto postavuvanje na makedonskiot jazik kako predmet vo niv, za načinot na negovoto predavanje, za izr Robotuvanje učebnici po toj predmet) (M.J. 1.1.50: 1).

While the first two points are typical concerns about codification, the third point stresses both linguistic purism and the teaching of Macedonian language in schools. Another article in the inaugural issues directly addresses the language used in schools. While the author is pleased with the progress of students in learning standard Macedonian, she is concerned that they have not completely removed localisms from their speech, and then details specific problems in the schools. In the east, students have trouble with the antepenultimate accent; use the auxiliary verb in the 3rd person sg. and pl. l-forms, whereas the auxiliary verb is dropped in the standard language; use incorrect word order, especially in regards to the clitics; fail to use the deictic definite articles; and often do not double the dative and accusative direct objects. These so-called mistakes are consistent with features of the eastern dialects. In Bitola and Ohrid, the deviations from standard often involve verbs in –uvam (e.g., kažvame instead of kažuvame, vlegva instead of vleguva); the use of the 3rd sg. masc. dative clitic mu in place of the 3rd sg. fem. and 3rd pl.
(e.g., *Artem mu veli na majka si*); lenition of intervocalic consonants (e.g., *se snajt, ne mojše*); and localisms such as *raka* instead of *raka*, *pat* instead of *pat*, *nimi* instead of *nim*. In Skopje schools the mistakes cited are: verbs in *-ue* instead of *–uva*; 3rd person plural aorist and imperfects in *–eva, –ava, –ova*; *put* instead of *pat*, *vuk* instead of *volk*. (Ugrinova 1950: 8-10).

These mistakes are all commensurate with the dialects of the regions and their differences from the standard.

In the early years the lexicon was strongly influenced by Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian, as all educated Macedonians at that time had received their schooling in one of these languages. “Naturally the spoken language of a population which was overwhelmingly peasant and agricultural did not contain the terminology to deal with the complex civilization and culture of a modern state. It was necessary to find or create” all this new terminology. “At first, the tendency was to borrow outright from Russian, Bulgarian and Serbian,” (Lunt 1952: 6). The pages of *Makedonski Jazik* and other publications at the time were filled with letters and articles complaining about Serbisms and Bulgarisms seen in the press. Soon, however, these words were replaced by words of native origin or from native roots. Also related to this struggle between Serbian and Bulgarian was the verbal suffix *–ue /–uva* for derived imperfectives. The former, which was included in the 1945 standard, is the reflex for the northern dialects but also for Serbian, and was thus used as evidence for the Serbianization of Macedonian. Interestingly, it was brought up in evidence even after the standard had been changed to use *–uva*.

“The Turkish element in the Macedonian lexicon is unique in its quantity as well as due to the fact that it pervades every part of speech, every level of style, and at the same time is perceived as distinct,” (Friedman 1998: 35). Turkisms were addressed by Koneski in a 1945 article in *Nov Den*, who argued that Turkisms should be avoided, especially in formal contexts.
and for abstract concepts. In their place, Slavic elements from dialects or cognates should be used. This argument proved convincing, and Turkisms were relegated to a colloquial status in the literary language.

The relegation of Turkisms to colloquial status is part of a process of language purification. Language purism is most often seen as the excising of foreign elements from the language, but can also encompass dialectisms and jargon. This activity is generally associated with language academies, (e.g., l’Académie française and its insistence on the native-based ‘courriel’ instead of the borrowing ‘email’) and indeed some such bodies have been set up specifically for the task of retaining the ‘purity’ of a language, but academies are not the only means through which language purism manifests itself. Language purism movements are not isolated from the culture in which they appear, and are best understood as linguistic manifestations of the general socio-political atmosphere of the time. For example, the founding of the Allgemeine Deutsche Sprachverein, in 1885, “coincides with the intense nationalism of Wilhelmine Germany,” (Thomas 13). In fact, while purism movements have developed in many different socio-political contexts, their influences “pale into insignificance beside nationalism as a determinant of puristic attitudes,” (Thomas 135). Nationalism and purism have enough in common that “their closeness prompts the question whether purism is not simply an epiphenomenon of nationalism inasmuch as the desire to rid a language of unwanted foreign elements forms part of a more general wish to divest a culture of alien associations,” (ibid., 136). Indeed, this instance of linguistic purism co-occurs with the recognition of Macedonian nationalism, and the political and historical situation of Macedonia, as we have seen, certainly gives rise to a desire to remove foreign elements from the Macedonian language. (Similarly, it is easy to see why, in the wake of the Yugoslav war in the 1990s, Croatia would engage in a
campaign to rid the language of foreign elements, especially if by doing so it creates more distance from Serbian, see Chapter 1.) Purism movements are also likely to arise in times of cultural and political change, as opposing groups seek dominance; they can be seen in the political context of the “power and authority-related process of the interplay of identity and difference, which creates solidarity within certain groups and differences between those groups and others,” (Shapiro 23). In addition, purification as an idea is closely tied to morality, and “attempts to “purify” a language implicitly promote those who can most closely identify themselves as belonging to the language base toward which the change is aimed to a position of moral superiority. And because purification implies getting rid of stain and thus evil, purification movements imply at some level that the impure language elements belong to impure persons,” (Shapiro 22-23). Other social factors associated with linguistic purism include elitism and populism, particularly populist nationalism which has “nostalgia and idealization for the countryside and folk virtues,” (Smith 1971: 63).

Another issue in the lexicon was the use of nonliterary dialectal forms, which continues to be a problem. As noted by Friedman (1985), letters to the editor in Nova Makedonija frequently complained of nonstandard language: “one writer complains that while literary Macedonian is used in the schools, it is not used at home or work (N.M. 31.X.79: 9),” while others complain about the use of nonstandard language in the media (Friedman 1985a: 47). This problem has not gone away, as new polemics against nonstandard language appear in the press every day. On September 30, 2012, on the website of Macedonia Radio and Television, appeared an article entitled “Do we have a verbal language culture?” (Imame li verbalna jazična kultura?). In it, the author writes:

---

45 For more on linguistic purism, see Thomas 1991 and Jernudd and Shapiro 1989.
“The Macedonian language is not poor at all. On the contrary, it abounds with all the wealth of dialects, words and jargon. Let us not dirty it with Serbisms, Turkisms and slang. The world is unthinkable and powerless without language. It creates enemies and friends more than procedures/behavior/acts. Therefore politicians, journalists, musicians and everyone else should aspire to a higher and more sophisticated verbal linguistic culture,” (Pereveska 2012).

Another frequent point of debate is the choice of the preposition used to indicate possession – East na and West od / na are both included in the standard, though na is preferred.

Finally, the influence of languages of mass media is an area of consistent debate. Serbo-Croatian was the main outside influence throughout the time of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia due to the large number of radio and television shows broadcast from Belgrade, and the majority of foreign movies and television were dubbed or subtitled in Serbo-Croatian. Since the 1980s, English-language, and particularly American, movies, television, and music have an increasing presence in Macedonia, and a vast amount of lexical influence, in the form of calques and borrowing, has come from English.

Considering that linguistic forms can act as indexes of social groups, the linguistic features noted above are of particular significance and many have become shibboleths. As Gal and Irvine explain,

“as part of everyday behavior, the use of a linguistic form can become a pointer to (index of) speakers' social identities, as well as of the typical activities of those speakers. But speakers (and hearers) often notice, rationalize, and justify such linguistic indices, thereby creating linguistic ideologies that purport to explain the source and meaning of the linguistic differences. To put this another way, linguistic features are seen as reflecting and expressing broader cultural images of people and activities. Participants' ideologies about language locate linguistic phenomena as part of, and as evidence for, what they believe to be systematic
behavioral, aesthetic, affective, and moral contrasts among the social groups indexed. That is, speakers have, and act in relation to, ideologically-constructed representations of linguistic practices,” (1995).

As we have seen, the following are, or have been at one point, areas of contention and debate and we shall see their treatment and usage in textbooks in the next chapter: issues of orthography, morphology (-uel-uva, -oj-ovi), lexicon (the pronouns on/toj, prepositions na/od), dialectisms, and borrowings, including Serbisms, Bulgarisms, Turkisms, and recently Anglicisms.
Chapter 3 – Textbook Language

As we have discussed, textbooks play an important role in shaping young people’s knowledge, feelings about the nation and nation-state, and language ideologies and practices. They do not function in isolation, but rather as part of the broader sets of resources and practices with which education sets out to make citizens – citizens not just as subjects of the State, but as good and moral people. Education, and those in power who control it, is in the business of forming good citizens. Wojtas has noted that “curricula represented not only a tool in the hands of a teacher, but also a means used by the authorities to exert control over learning. School programs thus predetermined the scope of knowledge available to students and influenced its interpretation. In the long run, curricula established a standard of education for a given community and promoted a uniform set of values among its members. Furthermore, the bureaucrats often identified instruction in the native tongue, or national history, as the core subjects responsible for the process of identity formation,” (Wojtas 106). Wojtas further points to language attitudes represented in the curricula: “…children were expected to define their national identity through a common tongue, “a language which would allow them to communicate with fellow compatriots”” (ibid. 113). This idea of the connection between national identity and language is part of a language ideology, defined by Watts as “a set of beliefs about the structure of language and/or the functional uses to which language is put which is shared by a community …beliefs [which] have been part of the community for so long that the origins are obscured or forgotten – they are thus socioculturally reproduced as constituting a set of “true” precepts,” (68) or more simply by Irvine (1989) as “the cultural (or subcultural) system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests,” (255; see also Milroy & Milroy 1985). The Herderian ideology which links language and nation is
omnipresent in Europe and the West and is often concomitant with the ideology of standard, that is, that there should be one standardized, written form of the language that all the members of the nation should learn and be unified by. One counterpart to the ideology of standard is the ideology of dialect, exemplified by Swiss German. “Ideology of dialect” is “any set of beliefs about language in which, in a scenario in which a standardized written language coexists with a number of non-standard oral dialect varieties, the symbolic value of the dialects in the majority of linguistic marketplaces in which they are in competition with the standard is not only believed to be much higher than that of the standard but is also deliberately promoted as having a higher value… In the German-speaking part of Switzerland this is effectively the dominant scenario,” (Watts 69). Another counterpart is the concept of ‘polynomie,’ first coined by the French sociolinguist Marcellesi, which refers to “a pluralist ideology of language that locates language identity in collective recognition of unity in diversity (1989, p. 170)” (Jaffe 230). While the Macedonian authorities clearly adhere to the ideology of standard, we shall see that in recent textbooks there is some moving away, towards a language ideology closer to polynomie.

As Auerbach and Burgess (1985) demonstrated, textbooks contain implicit messages about whose language does or does not “count” through controlling who speaks English, where, and when. In addition, “other research has uncovered messages about national ownership of English through the way the language is portrayed in textbooks (e.g., Matsuda, 2003; Wandel, 2001)” (Chapelle 142). For Macedonian students, seeing their dialect included in a textbook may give them the feeling of being important and valued in the society, whereas seeing their language or dialect excluded has the opposite effect – the feeling of being devalued. The consequences of the valuing of one language variety over another can also be seen in terms of success and symbolic domination. Bourdieu (1970, 1977) examined processes of selection and reproduction
in terms of their relation to the concept of cultural and linguistic capital and argued that the educational system reproduces the domination of the classes in power and perpetuates the existing distribution of power relations through the use of language, particularly scholarly language. As Heller explains, “language is central to institutional processes of symbolic domination, since conventional language practices serve to establish the normality, the everydayness of institutional processes. Language norms are a key aspect of institutional norms, and reveal ideologies, which legitimate (or contest) institutional relations of power,” (1995: 373).

In the French context, it is the upper classes and urban populations who dominate and continue to succeed in education, while the lower classes and rural students are subject to a higher degree of selection. By determining whose language is being represented in the Macedonian context, we can determine whose linguistic capital is more valued and determine selection processes in Macedonia.

In terms of selection processes, the more pressing area of concern is the situation of the other ethnicities in Macedonia. Macedonia has a large minority of Albanians, approaching 25% of the population, and smaller but significant minorities of Roma and Turks. These groups have the right to education in their native languages, (and there are numerous Albanian and Turkish schools), and they produce their own native-language textbooks (during the SFRY period, the Albanian and Turkish textbooks were translated from the official Macedonian textbooks, and in some cases still are, for reasons of expediency). Though they are often educated separately, minorities’ inclusion or exclusion from representation in Macedonian textbooks sends a message about who is included and valued in Macedonian society. The minorities are required to learn

---

47 This number is contested; Macedonians claim that Albanians number fewer than 20%, while Albanians argue that they are at least 25% of the population, see Friedman 1996.
48 There are several reasons why the Roma did not have their own textbooks or schools until recently, including social and linguistic reasons. They have only recently codified a written language; see Friedman (1985b, 1995) for more on the Roma.
Macedonian as a second language in primary and secondary education and often attend Macedonian universities.

In this chapter I conduct a diachronic analysis of the language in Macedonian elementary textbooks at several points from 1945 to 2000. I look at issues at the levels of morphology (nominal and verbal inflection and derivation), syntax (clitic placement), lexicon, and discourse. I also contextualize these choices and changes within the greater changes of the narratives in the books, discussing the content of the textbooks with respect to notions of identity, nationalism, and other cultural factors. I have chosen readers from the 1st grade (Читанка за I одделение), and will look at several exemplars, though I will also discuss a few significant textbooks from other grades and subjects. I will present books from several periods: 1) The early period of SFРY, just after the official standardization of Macedonian (1945-55); 2) The relatively stable middle years of SFРY (1970s); 3) The dissolution of SFРY and creation of the independent Republic of Macedonia (mid 1980s to mid 1990s); and 4) The current period (late 1990s to present). I investigate the representation of the ethnic minorities in Macedonian textbooks as well in this chapter. In the previous chapter I discussed Macedonian dialects and the process of, and issues surrounding, its standardization. Here I will briefly review the particular issues which are relevant to the linguistic context of the textbooks and the analysis presented here.

Macedonian can be divided into three main dialect areas: Eastern, Western, and Northern. The Western dialects can be further subdivided into west-central (Veles-Prilep-Bitola-Kičevo, the dialects on which standard Macedonian is based) and peripheral (Upper and Lower Polog, Debar, and Ohrid-Prespa). In the Eastern zone is the transitional Tikveš-Mariovo dialect, Štip-Strumica, Gevgelija-Dojran, and Maleševo-Pirin. The Northern area includes the Skopje-
Kumanovo-Kratovo-Kriva Palanka dialects. The major phonological, morphological and syntactic features which distinguish these areas were discussed in chapter two. In this chapter I will focus on the following salient features:

1. The plural desinence for monosyllabic masculine nouns: –oi (–ovi) in the West, and –ove in the East (–ovi is characteristic of the Tikveš-Mariovo dialects and transitional between western –oi and eastern –ove).
3. Oblique forms for proper names and other animate nouns (Western and Northern feature) na Boreta, na deda, na Vasila; Eastern: na Bore, na dedo, na Vasil
4. Clitic placement: West: Sentence initial clitics (Go vidov ‘I saw him’), East: sentence initial is not possible, clitics are in second position: (Vidov go)

I focus on these features because they were all in flux over the time period studied, and because, in the case of the first two, they are significant shibboleths. The plural desinence originally allowed both –oi and –ovi (with –oj accepted for use in poetry) which was changed to –ovi in 1950. The use of –oi is seen as a distinctly western pronunciation. The derived imperfective suffix –ue was adopted in 1945, but changed to –uva in 1948. The 1945 standard –ue is the reflex for the northern dialects and also for Serbian, and was thus used by detractors as evidence for the Serbianization of Macedonian even, as noted earlier, after the standard had been changed to use –uva.) The placement of clitics does not always conform to the standard in the earliest textbooks, and the use of oblique forms was erratic in the textbooks analyzed.

The earliest textbooks do exhibit have a high degree of consistency in their language use considering the newness of the standard, though it is not without deviations. Indeed the textbook authors were clearly aware of this problem, as the high school textbook Odbrana četiva za makedonski jazik vo I, II, i III klas from 1946 contains a note on the language: “In the language of this book there are notable inconsistencies. There are doublets, even triplet forms… These

49 Vidoeski includes Skopje in the West-Central area, though it is more correctly part of the Northern zone. My overview closely follows Friedman (1985).
differences are unavoidable, but are even necessary in the phase of the formation, in which our language finds itself,” (390, quoted in Kramer 2008a: 40). The 1945 primer (Bukvar) was the first primer published in the newly codified standard. We can look at several examples of the inconsistencies of this book to see where some problems lay. On one page in the 1945 Bukvar, we have three realizations of the adverbs of time: никогда, секогаш and тогај (standard никогаш ‘never’, секогаш ‘always’, тогај ‘then, at that time’). On another page we see: “Ученикот Миша Давидов е пресекол телефонската врска, што ја поставиле Германците” / Učenikot Miša Davidov e presekol telefonskata vrska, što ja postavile Germancite / The pupil Misha Davidov cut the telephone connection that the Germans had set up (1945: 90). (In Standard Macedonian this sentence would be: Миша Давидов ја пресекол телефонската врска / Učenikot Miša Davidov ja presekol telefonskata vrska). The use of e here is nonstandard, and there are two possibilities for its form and inclusion. The first is that it is a dialectal reflex, as elje is the 3rd person singular feminine direct object clitic for dialects in the western region around Debar. The second possible explanation is that e is the 3rd person singular present tense of the auxiliary verb sum. In this case, we would have both the deviation of using the auxiliary verb sum with the l-form past tense in 3rd person, which is an Eastern feature and non-standard, and the deviation of a missing direct object clitic in the first clause. This may be due to influence from an Eastern Macedonian dialect, or possibly Bulgarian influence, as the doubling of object clitics is optional in Standard Bulgarian and many leading Macedonian intellectuals, including Blaže Koneski, had been educated in Sofia and Belgrade. Another interesting feature of this sentence is the use of the l-form perfect tense; this is also an Eastern feature, though included in the standard language. Western dialect speakers are more likely to use a perfect with ima and the verbal adjective (e.g., ima dadeno / sum dal) (see Kramer and Mitkovska 2011).\(^{50}\)

\(^{50}\) The complex perfects may be a subject for future research, as their distribution is not clear-cut.
It is clear that the earliest textbooks have significantly more linguistic variation than the later ones. In 1953, a text contained the phrase “pod nimi,” using a Western peripheral dialect for the 3rd person plural oblique pronoun (cf. standard Macedonian “pod niv”) (Čitanka za prvo oddelenie 1953: 10). There are variations that indicate outside influence as well, including some instances of syntax which would be more natural in Serbian than in Macedonian, for example:

Ти не‘, Тито, напред водиш / Ti ne’, Tito, napred vodiš / You, Tito lead us forward

Ти, Тито, напред не’ водиш / Ti, Tito, napred ne’ vodiš (Standard Macedonian)

Macedonian is innovative with respect to clitic placement, and does not follow Wackernagel’s Law, according to which the clitic must be in second position, as does Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian. In fact, in Macedonian clitics can occur sentence-initially, which separates it from both Serbian and Bulgarian. This clitic in second position in the above example could be due to influence from Serbian as well. In another example, from the 1946 textbook, we note the following:

Не се плаши Весо! / Ne se plaši Veso! [sic] (Don’t be afraid, Vesa!).  

Не плаши се Весо! / Ne plaši se Veso! (Standard Macedonian)

In standard Macedonian, the clitic follows the verb in the imperative mood, whereas in indicative mood it precedes the verb (Kramer and Mitkovska). The clitic in second position in the above example could be due to influence from Serbian (though this would not be the correct placement in Serbian, so would in fact be a hyper-correction). It could also be due to the pull of the negative particle ne. This nonstandard clitic placement occurs in both the 1949 and 1950 textbooks, and the 1951 text is changed so that it does not include an imperative. Another example of nonstandard clitic placement appears in 1949:

---

51 In BCS, second position clitic placement can alternate between second syntactic constituent and second phonological word.  
52 Čitanka za prvo oddelenie 1949: 39
The most notable example of nonstandard use of clitics came from the 1945 and 1946 textbooks:

Ѓурѓа му ѓумот подаде / Gjurgja mu gjumot podade (Gjurgja gave him the canister).\textsuperscript{53}

Ѓурѓа му го подаде ѓумот / Gjurgja mu go podade gjumot (Standard Macedonian) or

Ѓурѓа ѓумот му го подаде / Gjurgja gjumot mu go podade

Here we not only have the indirect object clitic \textit{mu} in second position, we are missing the reduplicated direct object clitic, which is required in standard Macedonian (it is optional in Bulgarian and not possible in Serbian).

In addition, we find several examples of forms from different dialects. In 1951, we can find not only standard \textit{pomoš} ‘help’, but also the Northern form \textit{pomok} and the Eastern \textit{pomošt}.\textsuperscript{54}

In 1945 we see several examples of the usage of \textit{ja} instead of \textit{jas} for the first person pronoun (nominative), typical of the northern dialects, including Skopje. Other forms found in the textbooks further indicate language contact phenomena arising from the fact that the authors had received their education in Serbian and Bulgarian. In 1951 we have the phrase \textit{Sretna nova godina}, using the Croatian form of the adjective ‘happy’ (Serbian: \textit{srećna}, Macedonian: \textit{srekna}).

There are many more instances of colloquial speech in the early textbooks, as well. There is the use of \textit{oti} ‘that’ (conj.) (in place of \textit{deka}), several instances of lenition, for instance, \textit{ojme / ojte} (in place of \textit{odime / odite} ‘we-go’ / ‘you-pl-go’), \textit{dajme} (\textit{dademe} ‘we-give’), \textit{pojke} (\textit{poveke} ‘more’) and others. Finally, in the early textbooks there is greater variation in interjections and exclamations. The exclamations \textit{ela, elate} (from Greek \textit{έλα}, ‘come’, used colloquially) appear frequently from 1945 to 1951, then disappear. There is one instance of \textit{elate}, however, in the

\textsuperscript{53} Читанка за Ј одделение 1945, 53 and 1946, 59

\textsuperscript{54} ‘Pomoš’ itself is a truncated form of ‘pomošt’.
1995 textbook. There is also the use of the emotive interjection *dejdi* (from the Turkish *dey gidi* — an exclamation) in 1949 and 1950. The text references the folk song *Dejdi Jano, dejdi mila čerko*, which changed to *Lele Jano, lele mila čerko* in the 1951 book.

Orthography remains an area of variation in the newest textbooks. The distinction between the lateral sonorants has been the subject of debate since codification (see Risteski 1988: 293-299 on the debates at the 1944 conference on codification) and Friedman 1998 treats the problem as recurring. According to the literary norm, л is pronounces as ‘dark’ (velarized) /ʎ/ before back vowels and as clear /l/ before front vowels, while both љ and лј are pronounced as clear /l/ in all instances. However, due to the influence of Serbian and the Skopje dialects, there is a tendency to pronounce both љ and лј as a palatal /ʎ/, and in other dialects, such as that of Prilep, there is a tendency to pronounce л as dark even before front vowels. This has caused orthographic confusion and some have called for orthographic reform (see Friedman 1998: 44-45). The distinction between џ and џ in their usage before front vowels /є, и/ also remains an issue. In a second grade textbook from 2008 we see *ќилим* where standard is *килим* ‘rug’, (the non-standard *ќилим* was also used repeatedly in the 1953 textbook) and *ќибрит* instead of *кибрит* ‘match’.

We shall track a few elements and chart the change in their use over time. First is the switch from –*ue* to –*uva* in the conjugation of derived imperfectives. The former, as mentioned above, is the realization for the northern dialects, specifically Skopje (as well as the realization in Serbian), and the latter the west-central realization. The other is the switch from –*oi* to –*ovi* (– *evi*) for the plural desinence for monosyllabic masculine nouns. The –*oi* realization is the colloquial pronunciation and characteristic of the western dialects, and–*ovi* is characteristic of the Tikveš-Mariovo dialects and transitional to eastern –*ove*. It should be noted that, in the
official orthography, what is NOT acceptable is often mentioned as well. We can take this as an
example of something that people were in fact using, otherwise there would be no need to point
it out or try to prohibit it. Interestingly, in the 1950 orthography, the desinence for the plural of
monosyllabic nouns is given as –ovi and –evi, with –ove explicitly marked as incorrect. There is
no mention of –oi, though the ending –oj is allowed for poetic usage only.

The change from –ue to –uva in the Pravopis occurs in 1948, and we see a clear
compliance with this change in Chart 1 below. It seems that –uva may have been preferred
despite the prescription of –ue, as we see the usage of –uva increase even before it was officially
changed. In the case of the plural morpheme for monosyllabic masculine nouns, both –oi and –
ovi are given as acceptable in the 1945 Pravopis, though as we can see from the chart, the form
without the intervocalic /v/ is preferred. In 1950 the standard changes, allowing only –ovi, with –
oj accepted only for poetic usage. Despite the previous preference for –oi, this change is quickly
adopted as well.

**Graph 1**
Also of interest is the use of an oblique desinence form for names and certain animate objects (e.g., *Go vide Marka*, cf. *Go vide Marko*). This is a distinctly Western and Northern feature, and was not explicitly mentioned in any of the Pravopis documents until Koneski’s 1952 grammar, where it was considered part of the standard (Friedman 1985a: 43). As we can see in Chart 3 below, usage of oblique forms varies far more widely than the previous two features. The lack of certainty about whether the oblique form was included in the standard may account for its high variation during the early years of implementation. By 1998 this feature was no longer attested in the dialect of the younger generation in Skopje (Petroska 66). Its usage, or lack thereof, in recent textbooks certainly reflects its loss in Skopje speech, and may be a reflection of its falling out of use across Macedonia.
One more major difference between the early books and the more recent ones is the use of Turkisms. They were prevalent in the textbooks up through 1950, but beginning with 1951, they taper off, though with a slight uptick again in 1999. See the above-mentioned *dejdi*, *sofra* ‘table’ (as opposed to *masa*), etc. They are largely replaced with Anglicisms (or foreign borrowings in general) in the newer books. For example, the following text from 1999:

Дедо ми е дžентлмен
Има чешел, има фен
гледа парламент
очекува комплимент

Dedo mi e džentlmen
Ima češel, ima fen
gleda parlament
očekuva kompliment

My grandfather is a gentleman
He has a comb, has a hair dryer
He watches parliament
He expects a compliment

According to Stefanova and Kasapova (2010), current textbooks are not fully in line with prescriptive language use. Stefanova and Kasapova analyzed new textbooks which were available on the Ministry of Education website and found that they contained a large number of errors. Some of these errors are obvious typographical errors, and many are not, linguistically speaking, errors, but rather non-standard usage of Macedonian. They found several examples of what they consider Serbisms and Bulgarisms:
They flow mostly into open marine basins and fall into 4 catchment areas.

These trees are used in shipbuilding, chemical, and furniture industries.

… [he/she] also has the power of veto to the extent that these decisions are harmful to the citizens and state

… led by Bajo Topuli, who was a teacher in the Turkish high school. 55

In the above examples, predimno, and prepodavatel are considered Bulgarisms and nameštaj and vo kolku are considered Serbisms. However, it is not clear that predimno, prepodavatel and vo kolku are outside influences. Prepodavatel and predimno are listed in Koneski’s three-volume dictionary (1951, 1955, 1956). While vo kolku is not correct usage here, it may not in fact be a direct influence from Serbian (a calque of ukoliko), though nameštaj is the Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian word for furniture (Macedonian uses the internationalism mebel).

The authors also pointed out many errors in the use of prepositions. Looking at their examples, it sometimes seems that the authors of the textbooks are being purposefully inclusive of variants. Here we have two separate examples where two different prepositions are used in the same function almost right next to one another:

- title: Population in Europe; subtitle: Characteristics of the population of Europe
- … books by Joakim Krčovski and by Kiril Pejčinovik’ 56
While the choice between vo and na in the first example is neutral (‘in Europe’ or ‘of Europe’) the second example shows dialectal variation. The usage of od to indicate possession is a clearly Western feature, whereas na is used elsewhere.\(^{57}\) The usage of these two prepositions in such close proximity would suggest that it is a purposeful usage to highlight linguistic diversity – or at least express the richness of the Macedonian language.

While it is unclear if the variation exhibited in the earlier books was purposeful inclusion or simply confusion about the standard, what is more interesting is the turn towards acceptance of dialect speech that has occurred in the post-Yugoslav period. This turn mirrors that of other Western countries, for example in Britain, where Received Pronunciation is no longer the only acceptable speech for broadcasting. In Macedonia, a first grade textbook from 1999 challenges students to consider variation within the language. The text has two tomatoes talking at the market. In Macedonian there are two words for tomato: патлиџан / patlidžan and домат / domat. The latter is the literary word, and the former a Turkism and the more widely used lexeme. The ‘domat’ mocks the ‘patlidžan,’ in a little poem:

```
Тебе никој не сака     No one wants you
патлиџан се викаш.  [since] you’re named ‘patlidžan’
Нема никој да те купи No one will buy you
можеш да се сликаш! you can just shove off!
Јас зеленчук сум културен I am a cultured vegetable
и збор литературен, and a literary word
домат секој бара everyone’s looking for a ‘domat’
никој не ме кара! no one scolds me!
```

(Adamcheska 97)

It seems at first that the text is strongly in favor of the literary word and attempting to stamp out the use of the colloquial (Turkish) variant. However, the ‘domat’ gets his comeuppance in the last stanza, which states that both tomatoes remain in the box, unsold at the

---

\(^{57}\) Blaž Koneski had suggested in an article in Makedonski Jazik that one should use od to break up a series of na or to avoid overuse of na.
end of the day. The discussion questions which follow further indicate that the aim is for acceptance of variation. The text asks, “Is there really a difference between a ‘patlidžan’ and a ‘domat’?” It further states that there are many objects with different names, and suggests that the pupil ask their parents about such objects which they use different words for, and to then compare this with the lists their classmates receive from their parents. “Thus you will learn how rich our language is,” (Taka ke naučiš kolku e bogat našiot jazik) (ibid.).

This is not an isolated case. A textbook from 2000 for 4th graders has a page in which the pupil is told he overhears three old men talking in a park. Each old man then tells a story in a dialect of Macedonian. One is from Valandovo (southeast, Štip-Strumica dialect), one is from Negotino (east-central, Tikveš-Mariovo), and one from the north (no city is specified). The textbook adds that the pensioners spoke in their naroden jazik, or dialect, very beautifully and
vividly: “penzionerite raskažuvaa na naroden jazik mnogu ubavo i živo.” (Sinadinovska 36). The students are then asked to retell what they could understand from the story, find the dialect words and define them, and compare the naroden jazik from the stories with both the dialect of their region and the literary standard. Then they are to write a story in their dialect, write it again using standard Macedonian, and explain where and when dialect and literary language should be used.58

This is a surprising step forward, for this is not just an acknowledgement that the literary standard is not used at home for many students. This exercise also sends the message that dialect speech is important, worthy of consideration and study, and has its place of use. We can compare this with the situation in Germany, where the standard High German (Hochdeutsch) is used for education and professional situations, and dialects in informal situations. This is also taking place in an era, beginning in the 1960s, of loosening language standards elsewhere, cf. the decline of Received Pronunciation in Britain, especially in broadcasting, (Mugglestone 2003: 273), and the increasing acceptance of Australian vernacular in Australia (Jernudd 1989: 14).

It is perhaps more instructive to look at this change through the concept of ‘polynomie.’ Over 50 years after standardization, Macedonian has achieved a state of heteroglossia in which educated speakers speak both their home dialect and the standard language, and the acknowledgement of this in official textbooks seems to situate Macedonian on a plane in which users not only tolerate variation but view this diversity as a form of richness. We can also view this change as an indication that the implementation of standard Macedonian has been fully successful in the eyes of the authorities. In the earliest textbooks such an inclusion of dialects

58 It is interesting to note that the dialects are not referred to as such, but rather that the contrast is “naroden jazik” vs. “literaturen jazik,” essentially ‘folk language’ or ‘national language’ vs. ‘literary language’; it is also often referred to possessively, as ‘our language’ and ‘your language’ “naroden jazik od vašiot kraj” in the 4th grade textbook and “našiot jazik” in the 1st grade textbook.
was not desirable, since the new standard was being implemented and authorities’ first goal was for the population to learn the new, standard Macedonian. Through this new standard language students would learn national consciousness, and the content of the textbooks would further reinforce a national identity based on a national language. This was similar to the educational policies of other European countries. Wojtas demonstrated this in the Polish inter-war educational system:

“Although deemed part of the Polish heritage, dialects “[were] not to be used in the classroom.” This need to replace local speech with a standardized version of the native tongue represented the true mission of Polish language instruction. Clearly the Ministry of Education perceived the homogenization of ‘means of communication’ as the effective path to national unity. In this respect, the Polish case did not differ from nation-oriented educational policies undertaken in other European countries … the concept of awaking national consciousness through the use of standardized language is supported in other works,” (for example, Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen* and Green, *Education and State Formation*) (Wojtas 114).

The representation of dialects comes less than ten years after the dissolution of Yugoslavia and establishment of an independent Macedonia, and over 50 years after the first attempts to implement standard Macedonian and the recognition of a Macedonian nation. There are several possible reasons for the openness to dialect representation. It could be related to a general loosening of controls on society, as Macedonia has moved from a controlled dictatorship in Yugoslavia to an open, democratic society. It also seems that there is a greater sense of confidence that the idea of cultural unity in a common (standard, written) language has taken hold and the authorities are comfortable expanding the boundaries of Macedonian language and moving closer to the idea of unity in diversity. This would be consistent with changes worldwide, as there is greater acceptance of dialect in countries around the world, for instance, the abovementioned relaxing of requirements for Received Pronunciation in broadcasting in
England, and a similar trend in America. There is also the possibility that this is related to a change in the center-periphery relationship after the fall of Yugoslavia. While under the SFRY Macedonia was on the periphery and in a complex relationship with Serbo-Croatian at the center, now the standard language is the center, leaving more space in a periphery relationship with its own non-standard varieties.

In addition to the symbolic representation of Macedonian speech as inclusive or exclusive, we must consider the inclusion and exclusion of the other ethnicities of Macedonia, namely Albanians, Turks and Roma. Their representation can easily be signaled through the use of names in texts. They were reasonably well-represented in the early Yugoslav textbooks, reaching a high of 17% in the 1949 textbook (this was lower than their actual percentage of the population, which was approximately 33%, but still considerable; see Friedman 1996 for population statistics). We can see an example of this in the textbook page below:

```
Primer for first grade (Bukvar za prvo oddelenie) 1951
```
Dž

Džafer, Merdžan and Džemal

Džafer, Merdžan and Džemal are good children. All three go to school. Džafer goes to a Turkish school. Merdžan goes to a Macedonian school. Džemal goes to an Albanian school. They are all good students. They listen to their teachers and parents. Often, they go to the mountains together. They gather flowers and take caterpillars off of trees.

The three children have traditional Muslim names, and are explicitly marked as members of different ethnic communities by which school they attend. (They are also marked as belonging to their respective ethnic groups with their clothing – Džafer is wearing a fez, Džemal is wearing the typical Albanian qeleshe hat and traditional Albanian pants, and Merdžan is wearing a Macedonian woven belt and bag; more on costumes and images in Chapter 4). While Merdžan is a typically Muslim name (Mercan in Turkish, from the Persian marjân, meaning 'coral'), the Macedonian child is likely not meant to be marked as Muslim, but rather has the name Merdžan as a reference to a famous Macedonian hero from World War II, Todor “Merdžan” Cipovski.59

The text also highlights interethnic relations, as the children are noted to be friends who spend time together even though they attend different schools.

59 Cipovski was born in Tetovo in 1920 and died in battle in 1944. He was a leader in the Regional Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia in Tetovo and a delegate at the first session of ASNOM.
However, this inclusion quickly dropped off, as we can see in the chart below, and in the post-Yugoslav textbooks there are no non-Macedonian names represented. The only possible upside here is that the total number of names included overall dropped dramatically. This is due to a greater reliance on impersonal forms of address such as “the boy” “the child” or “the sister” and also a greater number of stories featuring animal characters. In this sense, a child can graft his or her self-identity onto the unnamed characters or animals.

![Diversity of Names by percent](image-url)
The representation of minorities in textbooks has increased somewhat in the most recent (2008 and later) textbooks, according to a report on multiculturalism by UNICEF, though they note that non-Macedonian names occur only rarely. According to the report, “no textbook contains more than six such names. The total number of Turkish, Albanian and Roma names in grammatical examples and short texts for class instruction is less than ten,” (UNICEF, 35). The UNICEF study further found that the textbooks were ethnocentric, “contribute only to the development of separate ethnic identities” and even when the books “do acknowledge the existence of ‘others’, they fail to mention or promote interaction between the members of different ethnic communities” (ibid, 49).

In terms of in-group, or Macedonian representation, the textbooks both in the 1940s – 50s and in the most recent years exhibit a high level of inclusiveness of variation. In the early textbooks this inclusiveness may have been inadvertent, as the standards were being implemented and the authors were not always sure of the standards or accustomed to using them, but nonetheless was still a factor. In the most recent books, inclusiveness is purposefully
included for didactic purposes, and the uniformity of the other texts highlights the move towards acceptance of a heteroglossia. The textbooks in the middle era, between 1955 and 1999, do not display either form of inclusivity. In terms of the out-group, the pattern trends toward a decrease in inclusiveness. The other ethnicities of Macedonia are rarely included in the earliest texts, as Yugoslavia promoted its ideal of Brotherhood and Unity among the peoples (narodi) of Yugoslavia (e.g., Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, etc.) and less so among the minorities (narodnosti) (e.g., Turks, Albanians, Hungarians, etc.). Even this representation decreases towards the later years of Yugoslavia, however, and by the years of independence, the ethnicities barely mention each other in their textbooks; even if they do, they fail to promote interethnic interaction.

Summary

In the first decade of Macedonian-language education, there was some flux in language use as the population was adapting to the new standards, and as the standards were changing and adapting during the process of implementation. The result is that the textbooks present a more linguistically inclusive picture of whose speech is considered Macedonian. This soon gives way to a long period in which prescriptive standard is enforced, narrowing that picture. After Macedonian independence, we see an intentional inclusion of non-standard speech accompanied by specific metalanguage directed at valuing such speech as a rich part of the multi-layered complexity of the Macedonian language and, by extension, Macedonian identity. This inclusiveness is contrasted with the increasing exclusion of the other ethnic minorities in Macedonia, limiting their representation in Macedonian society.
Chapter 4 – Textbook Images

In preceding chapters we have focused on representations in the text and language of textbooks. Another important element of elementary textbooks is the illustrations contained within them. Who is visually depicted, what they are doing, what they are saying, how they are dressed or interacting – all these things come together to shape a message. The illustrations may support the message in the text or not; they may draw an idealized picture of citizenship and nationalism, or they may reveal a more realistic picture.

In this chapter I conduct a diachronic analysis of the illustrations in elementary readers at several points from 1945 to 2000. I also contextualize these choices and changes within the greater changes of the narratives in the books, using an analysis of the content of the textbooks with respect to notions of identity, nationalism, and other cultural factors. I will use a combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis, cataloguing the frequency of certain symbols and themes in addition to a deeper discussion of the selected images within a semiotic framework. I have chosen the Reader for 4th grade (Čitanka za IV oddelenie), and will look at 5 exemplars. I have collected images from the books published in 1946, 1949, 1957, 1996 (the 12th edition of the same book, so this book represents the 1980s and 1990s), and 2000 (this book has been reissued for over ten years, and the 2011 version is identical, save for the inclusion of two new illustrations to accompany already-existing stories). I consider the lack of overt symbols of nationalism and ethnicity in the post-socialist books as well, as silence or covert messages are as telling as an openly stated position.

Children’s books “always express both a society’s image of children and its value system, in their texts as well as in their pictures. With varying degrees of artistic freedom, both reflect – or at least address – the social norms communicated to children,” (Lötscher 18). As such, a
certain amount of cultural information will be included in the texts and illustrations. This cultural content is usually implicit, and hard to see when looking at books from our own culture. It is only when we see those from a different culture that we become aware of these implicit messages, and are led to think about such messages in our own products. This fact is, of course, not limited to messages in the text, but is true of pictures as well. Lötscher wonders if there is even such a thing as a “universal language of pictures,” (ibid.). Problems with the translation of children’s books have shown that many illustrations can be culturally incompatible, and are more likely to be so the more humans they involve, and the more “ordinary, everyday” topics covered. In fact, animals are the most translatable. She explains: “Ever since Aesop, stories with animals have been understood as polyvalent models for developmental tasks and conflicts, while telling the same stories with human characters tends to demand a more concrete, culturally specific setting and is only partially viable across cultural divides. So cultural transfer stands or falls with reduction: that is, with the lacunae in a book. The more of your own culture you can read into the pictures, the more compatible the book will be,” (ibid.).

There has been considerable research on cultural representations in foreign language, as well (see chapter 1). Francis (1995) conducted a study on twelve EFL textbooks used in secondary and post-secondary classes in Brazil, examining three dimensions of culture – value orientation, ideology, and hegemonic practices of instructional materials – using content analysis (see Yen 2000, 3). Ihm’s (1996) study of EFL/ESL textbooks in Korea found that racial and gender bias was apparent in textbooks both in the dearth of representation of women and minorities, and sometimes in their stereotypical representations. He concluded that this could limit the students' perceptions of American culture.
Illustrated texts have a long history, going back at least to illuminated manuscripts of the 5th century A.D. Illustrations in textbooks are now so commonplace that we consider them obligatory, especially at the elementary level. Thomas (1976) “traces the use of pictures in instructional materials back to Canisius, in the 16th century, who illustrated a child's catechism with marginal pictures and woodcuts. In North America, pictures were used in 1729 in the New England Primer,” (O’Donnell 1983, 462). O’Donnell also points out that illustrations “have been used in textbooks for so long, we take them for granted, without giving thought to why or how they are used,” (ibid.). While O’Donnell asks this question in regard to their effectiveness as a learning tool, in this study we are concerned with their messages. Why are these particular images selected, and what message do they send?

Even when serious attention is given to creating an illustration, potentially controversial factors can be overlooked. In focusing on the informational aspect, we can fail to see what the images say about culture. In “The Visual Turn,” LaSpina focuses on the particular illustrations in textbooks up for adoption in 1990 which raised objections from minorities about their representation. In many cases, the illustrators and publishers had overlooked the viewing perspective of the audience. The viewer brings his/her own “culture, morality and imagination” to the image, according to Roland Barthes (1977), and the image is “burdened” with these factors as well. In one instance, LaSpina discusses the image below:
From the standpoint of an historian, there was nothing objectionable about the image of the escaping slave. LaSpina asks, “While it may be historically accurate to depict a slave poised at the moment of his liberation, why did its African American critics not find it empowering?” (172). Several details, such as depicting the slave barefoot and referencing his back, scarred from whipping, in the “callouts,” or captions within the picture, led many to feel that this image was demeaning, likening African Americans to animals. He explains: “in each of these visual artifacts, the symbolic dynamics at work destabilized the image such that the denoted or intended meaning became suspect, thus allowing multiple readings on the part of the viewer. Thus, the
image reveals connotative symbolic layers not apparent to the artist. These counter-meanings in some instances reflect ideologies of racial and ethnic stereotyping and cannot be understood in terms of the real/unreal criteria of accuracy and objectivity held as guidelines for the [textbook] series,” (ibid., 178). How did the individuals involved in creating these images miss the other possible connotations of these images? LaSpina sees this problem as a result of the hegemony of the image-saturated society:

“Our visual culture has so thoroughly colonized our society, our collective mental and physical space, that oftentimes we do not see … images as constructed, but simply as part of the natural order of public perception and common knowledge. Because this mediated social reality is so naturalized we often do not see it as part of a larger network and system which disseminates information as a commodity and not out of any fundamental social obligation to the viewer,” (LaSpina 1998, 177).

How then, can we analyze and parse out cultural factors in images? The analysis of illustrations certainly has its base in art history. There is a strong tradition of illustration analysis which mixed art history with semiotics. Erwin Panofsky’s lecture *Perspective as Symbolic Form* (1927) was highly influential and groundbreaking in that it was the first attempt to explain changes in the representation of perspective in terms of changing world views. It was an important break from the idea that the use of perspective in art creates a factually accurate representation of the objects depicted. As W.J. T. Mitchell (1986) pointed out, “it opposes the notion that knowledge is a copy or image of reality imprinted on the mind. It seems clear that knowledge is better understood as a matter of social practices, disputes, and agreements, and not as the property of some particular mode of natural or unmediated representation,” (30). Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) addressed this idea as well, stating that “visual structures point to particular interpretations of experience and forms of social interaction,” (3). In Panofsky’s theory of analysis, “these four terms – form, motif, image, symbol – are overlapped to construct a three-dimensional model of interpretation that moves from “pre-iconographical description” of
“primary or natural subject matter” to “iconographical analysis” of “secondary or conventional subject matter” to “iconographical interpretation” of the “intrinsic meaning or content” to the (iconological) world of “symbolic values,”” (Panofsky 14; quoted in Mitchell 1994, 26).

Another influential contributor to this approach was Nelson Goodman, who “explore[d] the conventions and codes that underlie non-linguistic symbol systems,” particularly in his book “Languages of Art” (Mitchell 1994, 15). Mitchell (1980) considers a theory of analysis moving from form as object, to object as image, and images as symbols. His far-reaching consideration of the reconciliation of language and images is well beyond the scope of this thesis, but his thoughts regarding images as a language, namely the semantic, syntactic, and communicative power of images to encode messages, have been influential (Mitchell 1980, 3).

In this chapter I rely on the theoretical framework of semiotics. While the study of signs can be traced back as far as Plato and Aristotle, modern semiotics is largely based on the work and ideas of Ferdinand de Saussure and Charles Sanders Peirce. In the 20th century, we can point to “three schools of semiotics [which] applied ideas from the domain of linguistics to non-linguistic modes of communication”: the Prague School of the 1930s and 1940s, which drew from the work of Russian Formalists, the Paris School of the 1960s and 1970s, which developed the work of de Saussure and Peirce, and a new school, beginning in the 1970s and 1980s, which came out of the ideas of Michael Halliday (Kress and van Leeuwen 2006, 6).

Saussure introduced the concepts of langue and parole, in which langue, meaning language, is an abstract system of signs through which meaning is created, and parole, or speech, refers to individual utterances. Saussure also introduced the concepts of signifier and signified. Saussure posited that a word, in and of itself, has no inherent meaning. The word is a signifier, representing a thing or concept, which combines with the signified, the thing itself, thus
forming a sign. It is only through this process that we assign meaning to words and language. Peirce drew a three-way relationship between the signifier, the signified, and the interpretant, and the categories of denotation and connotation. In Peirce’s view, as in Saussure’s, the signifier is the physical form of the image, while the signified is the associated concept or object in external reality. The interpretant is the viewer, who imbues the image with a particular meaning. Peirce also discusses the icon/index/symbol triad. An icon resembles its object in some way. In an index there is a direct link between the signifier and signified, for example, smoke is an index of fire. With symbol there is no direct connection, though there is a generally agreed upon connection, for example, the hammer and sickle as a symbol of communism. I will rely on these concepts in my analysis of particular images.

As an example, let us look at the following illustration and the poem it accompanies, from the first grade reader from 1948.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reader for first grade (Čitanka za prvo oddelenie) 1948</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Image of illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROTHERHOOD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Macedonian, Turk, Vlach, and Albanian – brother beside brother set off for a new life – Tito showed them the way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All together at work At school the same, in unity, dear brothers, love will preserve home’s threshold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here we see four children, described as a Macedonian, Turk, Vlach (Aromanian) and Albanian, dancing side by side. Even without the description, their inclusion in these ethnic groups would be clear from their dress, as their traditional clothing contains elements from their respective cultures and thus indexes the group affiliation of each boy. Such overt stereotyping is intentional, so that we see the ethnic groups living in harmony. The dancing together also symbolizes working together, underscoring the Brotherhood and Unity policy of Yugoslavia. The children are *icons*, physical depictions of children; the clothing is an *index*, as it is associated with the respective ethnic groups, and their positioning, arm in arm, is a *symbol* of working together in Yugoslavia and of Brotherhood and Unity.

Before we return to semiotic analyses of individual images, let us consider the greater themes which appear throughout the texts and illustrations, and their trends over time. Francis (1996) developed seven subcategories for classifying cultural content: natural phenomena and living surroundings; products; people; discovery and independence; engineering accomplishments; events; and archaeology/ancient sayings. Yen (2000) based his analysis of cultural content in ESL/EFL textbooks on Francis’s, developing six subcategories: natural phenomena and living surroundings; products; people, national identity, and ethnicity; discoveries, events and engineering accomplishments; language, literacy, proverbs and sayings; and other (e.g., values, beliefs, customs, manners).

While in this study I use a content analysis which is strongly influenced by Francis’s and Yen’s systems, I added additional relevant categories. The content of the books will be tagged according to the following categories:

- **Supranational** (includes references to Brotherhood and Unity, as well as content about the other nations in Yugoslavia, or pan-Slavic themes)
- **National** (national identity and ethnicity)
- **Environment** (includes natural phenomena and living surroundings)
War (scenes of war, soldiers, weapons)
Events (historical events)
Literacy (language, literature, proverbs)
Overt Ideology (individualistic / collectivist)
Habitus/Children’s knowledge (values, beliefs, customs, manners, behaviour)
Technology & Skills (industrialization, engineering, discoveries, how-to)

Yen (2000) developed a chart of ideological statements of individualism and collectivism, based on research by Samovar and Porter (1982) (Yen 79). I use this system as a diagnostic for determining texts and illustrations which have an overtly ideological theme, and for determining whether the overt ideology is collectivist (communist) or individualistic (capitalist).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Collectivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America, Northern, Western Europe</td>
<td>Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>Extended family, work group, tribe, caste, country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Goals</td>
<td>In-group goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-independent (I)</td>
<td>Group-dependent (we)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiocentric</td>
<td>Allocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive towards horizontal relationships</td>
<td>Positive towards vertical relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value freedom, honesty, comfort, equity</td>
<td>Value harmony, face-saving, equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation is acceptable</td>
<td>Confrontation is taboo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer superficial and short-term relationships</td>
<td>Prefer close and long-term relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status is defined by achievement</td>
<td>Status is defined by ascription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust strangers and outsiders</td>
<td>More associative within their in-groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-attachment</td>
<td>Family-attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger needs for autonomy</td>
<td>Stronger needs for affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer consultations</td>
<td>Frequent consultation with others, particularly in vertical relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below we can see how the frequency of these themes changed over time, both in the texts and the images. As many of the texts contain more than one theme, the numbers here will add up to over 100%.

**Table 1: Percentage of Texts Containing the Following Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supranational</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitus/Children’s themes</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt Ideology</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology &amp; Skills</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 1: Themes in Texts 1946-2000**

**Table 2: Percentage of Illustrations Containing the Following Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supranational</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>(66%)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(As there were only three illustrations in the textbook from 1946, I did not consider that a representative sample; thus the percentages from that year are marked with parentheses.)

**Graph 2: Themes in Illustrations 1946-2000**

From 1946 to 1949, we see a slight increase of supranational, war and ideology in the texts. The number of illustrations has greatly increased, up to 18. There are several pictures of notable cities, lakes and other places in Yugoslavia, which leads to an increase in the number of images with environmental themes. Of the 28% of images containing some sort of overt ideology in 1949 (the year with the highest amount), 39% are individualistic and 61% collective, showing a strong communist bent. While the supranational texts are mostly related to the other nations of Yugoslavia, in the books from 1946 and 1949 we see several examples of a pan-Slavic ideology. There are translations of Ukrainian and Belorussian folktales (noted as such in captions), texts
about Stalin, Lenin, Stalingrad and Leningrad. While there is a greater number of such texts in 1946, it is interesting that they had not been scrubbed from the 1949 version following the expulsion of Yugoslavia from the Cominform.

From 1949 to 1957, the images have a marked increase in industrial themes – there are scenes showing a hydroelectric dam, peasants gathered around to see a harvester, farmers using a sprinkler for irrigation, and finally, a page showing scenes of the evolution of man, from hunter-gatherers through pre-industrial man, and finally to the factory worker and laboratory workers.

From 1949 to 1957, there is a significant drop in the representation of national and supranational themes in the images, particularly supranational, which sees almost a 50% reduction. However, in the texts we see only a slight decline, and as pertains to language as a medium, there is ample representation. In the book from 1957, there are a full ten texts in Serbo-Croatian, which are mostly untranslated (two are followed by a Macedonian version), and one text in Slovenian, which has a small glossary (but would still be difficult for a Macedonian unfamiliar with Slovenian to read), also followed by a Macedonian translation. There are, however, no texts written in or translated from the major minority languages of Macedonia, Albanian and Turkish. Interestingly, there are also twenty-eight texts in Macedonian which are written in the Latin alphabet (for comparison, there were none in 1946 or 1949, only one Macedonian text in Latin letters in 1996, and six in 2000). While officially, Macedonian is only written in Cyrillic, it is clear that the authors felt it necessary for students to be able to read the Latin alphabet, which is an official alphabet for Serbo-Croatian. It is also the alphabet used by Turkish and Albanian, but exclusion of these languages from the texts would indicate that they had no influence. There are other linguistic changes associated with these changing ideas of nationalism – the decrease of Turkisms and other dialect features over time, though in the 2000
It should be noted that the supranational images are not equally or proportionally representative of the various peoples of Yugoslavia, or even Macedonia. Before we see who is represented, it will be useful to discuss the categorization. The various groups in Yugoslavia fell into three official categories: first were the narodi, ‘nations,’ which included those groups whose national home was Yugoslavia. The narodi were Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians, Montenegrins and Muslims, a category distinct from the religious denomination and used to refer to people of Islamic faith in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Bugarski 1993: 169). The second were called narodnosti, ‘nationalities,’ which referred to groups whose national home was a nation-state outside Yugoslavia. The narodnosti, listed in decreasing order by population according to the 1981 census, were: Albanians, Hungarians, Turks, Slovaks, Romanians, Bulgarians, Czechs, Italians, and Ukrainians (Bugarski 1993). The final category, officially recognized in 1974 with the new constitution, was that of the ethnic groups designating those peoples who had no national home (nation-state) (Friedman 1999). Before the new 1974 constitution, these were considered national minorities. The ethnic groups were the Roma (also called Romanies or Gypsies) and Vlachs. Ruthenians, though they did not have a national home, were given the status of narodnost (Friedman 1999). There was also a significant minority of people who identified as ‘Yugoslavs,’ preferring a national identification to an ethnic one.\(^60\) Each category

\(^60\) It should be noted that individuals declared their own nationality, which accounts for certain changes in the numbers of populations recorded (Yugoslavs, Roma, Turks) as people changed their declared affiliations. This is especially true for the Roma, who, due to their low status in Yugoslavia (and elsewhere) often did not declare a nationality, or declared a different one. Bugarski notes that the declared number of Roma in the 1981 census (168,000) “falls far short of ethnic reality” and that “estimates put their actual number at some 600,000,” making them the 8th largest group, more numerous than one of the narodi, the Montenegrins (Bugarski 1993, 170-1).
came with different linguistic (and other) rights, which were moderated by the size and
distribution of the group. The languages of the nations were official at the federal level
(Albanian and Hungarian also had semi-federal status); those of the nationalities had official
status at the republic or provincial level or communal level; while those of the ethnic groups had
no guarantee of official support (Friedman 1999). While naturally Macedonians are the group
most often represented, the second group in terms of frequency is the nations. The main nations
of Yugoslavia are often seen hand in hand, without the nationalities or ethnic groups. While two
nationalities, namely Albanians and Turks are the second and third largest ethnic groups in
Macedonia, they are seen rarely – once or twice in any given book for the Albanians, three to
time for the Turks, and then usually as Ottomans. Even in texts about Albanian-majority
cities (e.g., Struga, Tetovo, Gostivar) there is no mention of Albanians. A text about Metohija
(the southwestern part of Kosovo) mentions Albanians and then describes the architecture of
their “simple” houses, but in the next paragraph references the Serbian population there and their
“beautiful” houses. Clearly, Albanians are not seen positively, when they are seen at all. In
addition, the Turks are painted negatively in the texts, as almost all references to them are within
the context of the Ottoman Empire. They are only seen in a negative light, as oppressors. The
ethnic groups, which in Macedonia are Roma and Vlachs, are seen only once in any of the books
under investigation (the Vlach in the first grade reader mentioned above, and a Rom in the 1996
book, who plays the violin). This lack of representation makes it seem as if these groups are not
important members of the society and undermines the official position of equality for all.

In the 1980s, the books underwent a significant change. At first glance, they were
“modernized,” with children who looked indistinct from any western European or North
American images. The overall look of the books became less sparse – they were full of color,
had a great deal more illustrations, and became more child-centric, with more texts featuring animals. It should be noted that childhood is primarily a social and cultural category: “Childhood is to be understood as a social construct, it makes reference to a social status delineated by boundaries that vary through time and from society to society … Childhood then always related to a particular cultural setting” (Jenks, quoted in Erdei 157). In the earlier Yugoslav textbooks, the child was seen as a small adult. The school-age child “was also reaching the first stage of social maturity, where he or she was expected to start fulfilling obligations of society. In that way, the state in socialist Yugoslavia took an active part in molding childhood, separately from the family’s natural responsibility for early socialization,” (Erdei 155). It is clear from the textbooks from the 1980s on that the conceptualization of childhood had changed, and that children were thought to inhabit a liminal space, without the adult social obligations of the early years.

While the textbooks of the 1980s do retain some local markers, they are more subtle in these stylized illustrations and we are seeing a trend away from the strongly ethnonational images. In fact, the only non-Macedonian in the book is a black child (the image accompanies a text about friends in Mississippi – obviously meant to be Huckleberry Finn), indicating a globalized idea of diversity rather than a local one. The textbook from 1996 is the twelfth edition: it was first produced in 1984. The supranational images have not only fallen drastically in number, they have changed qualitatively. They are global images rather than Yugoslav-specific. While national images have not dropped as drastically in number, they have changed qualitatively, as well. The external markers are more muted – a character will wear one or two elements of folk dress, rather than an entire outfit. In 1957, modern and traditional dress were represented almost equally. In 1984, modern dress outnumbered traditional almost three to one,
reflecting changes in the society. The muted traditional dress is likely a reflection of that as well, because otherwise the characters might seem to be in costume, rather than naturally wearing the national dress. Historical events depicted have also fallen, as has technology and ideology. What is more, scenes of technology are less about industry, and more about space travel. Two categories, on the other hand, have markedly increased: that of habitus and children’s themes, and environment. The vast majority, 81%, of images consist of scenes in the outdoors, often in a forest, or on a hill, and usually with various animals present as well. All animals, and the sun as well, are anthropomorphized. In one scene, the sun cries, witnessing a touching scene of an old man and his dog. This increase in the outdoors can be seen as a return to the pastoral, and the “nostalgia and idealization for the countryside and folk virtues,” (Smith 1971: 63).\footnote{For more on the urban/countryside dichotomy, see Williams 1975.} Most importantly, the themes of ideology have changed in quality. Whereas before there were scenes of community and working together, now more characters are portrayed alone (often with animals around), with depictions of nuclear families replacing depictions of communities. All this seems to point to a move away from the collectivist sensibility and towards an individualistic one.

In the late 1990s and 2000s, the textbook content changed once again, becoming even more global in image. This could potentially be read as a desire for a place in a globalizing world. The drastic drop in the national images as well seems to be a way of distancing themselves from the local, especially since the supranational images are now exclusively global. However, it could equally be argued that this is a case of western cultural imperialism – the local, Balkan culture was marked and marginalized, and the key was to westernize. While Macedonia escaped relatively unscathed by the wars that engulfed the other republics in the 1990s, the Balkans were marked by the ethnic conflicts, and the move away from overt
nationalist images may be a reaction to that. Macedonia was also hoping (and still hopes) to join the European Union, which was an additional motivation to represent Macedonia as western and modern, rather than Balkan and ‘backwards’.

Let us take a closer look at each category to see whether the text and images align.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Texts and Illustrations Containing Themes of Nationalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supranational (text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supranational (image)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National (text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National (image)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage and change for supranational themes in the texts and illustrations do correlate. For both, there is a sharp decline in representation over the years, culminating in 3% of images in 2000 (and, as mentioned, those images are international, rather than Yugoslav or pan-Slavic in nature). This general trend is reflective of the socio-political changes Macedonia experienced – first, the break from the Soviet bloc precipitated a decrease in pan-Slavic images, then the dissolution of Yugoslavia and establishment of an independent Macedonia led to the purging of the other Yugoslav nations from Macedonian textbooks. In terms of national themes, the appearance in images fluctuates to a higher degree, and drops off significantly between 1996 and 2000, whereas it remains steadier in the texts, with a dip only in 1996. The drop-off in nationalistic images in 2000 is a result of the turn towards globalization, where the people depicted look generically western and only rarely are marked in some way as specifically Macedonian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Texts and Illustrations Containing Environmental Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Environment (text) | 16% | 23% | 33% | 36% | 34% |
| Environment (image) | (33%) | 56% | 47% | 81% | 45% |

With the exception of the previously-mentioned spike in environment-related illustrations in 1996, the depiction of environment in images is on a slowly decreasing trajectory, while it increases, then plateaus for the texts.

| Percentage of Texts and Illustrations Containing Themes of War |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
|                   | 1946 | 1949 | 1957 | 1996 | 2000 |
| War (text)        | 22%  | 32%  | 15%  | 13%  | 5%   |
| War (image)       | 0    | 11%  | 21%  | 28%  | 5%   |

Texts referencing warfare are highest in 1946 and 1949, as WWII was still fresh in everyone’s minds and Macedonia was still rebuilding, but decline sharply by 1957 and continue to do so, to a low of 5% in 2000. In images, we see an increase from 1949 to 1957 and a peak of 28% in 1996, followed by a drop-off to 5% in 2000. While there were more war-themed images in 1957, a larger portion of them are related to battles from the middle ages and the Ottoman Empire (King Marko, who ruled in Macedonia (Prilep region) from 1371 to 1395 and fought against the invading Ottomans; and Matija Gubec, leader of the Croatian-Slovenian peasant revolt of 1573) than to WWII as in the 1940s. The increase in war images in 1957, and the increase in the breadth of wars depicted, could be a reflection of the existential threat of a Soviet invasion following the Tito-Stalin split. Following Yugoslavia’s expulsion from the Cominform, the Soviet Bloc countries began, at the USSR’s behest, to increase their troop and weapons levels, particularly those countries bordering Yugoslavia (Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Hungary) (M. Kramer 2010, 83-92).

| Percentage of Texts and Illustrations Containing Habitus or Children’s Themes |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
|                   | 1946 | 1949 | 1957 | 1996 | 2000 |
There is a strong and constant increase in texts featuring habitus and children’s themes, whereas the images remain constant. This may be related to the child-centric world of the newest textbooks, and also reflects the greater number of morality tales. The most recent textbooks assume a greater role in shaping the morality of students (stories with morals, about sharing, telling the truth, etc.).

Themes of overt ideology are strongest during the nation-building years, as the new communist system was being implemented, and then taper off. In addition, the ideologies depicted change in character, becoming more individualist and less collectivist after the dissolution of the SFRY.

Though it’s never particularly high in the texts, industry as a theme peaks in 1957, when 15% of texts and 32% of images have industrial themes. While Yugoslavia had, by this time, abandoned its original plans to collectivize farms, “and the ‘private’ status of peasant farmers
was tolerated,” the impetus to industrialize was still strong, and had had the beginnings of success in Macedonia (Wilson 1978: 78).

We shall now turn to a more detailed analysis of certain images from the textbooks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reader for 4th Grade (Čitanka za IV oddelenie) 1949</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://example.com/image1.png" alt="Image 1" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these illustrations, from 1949, we see the mix of the modern and the traditional. In the first image, the child on the left wears modern, western clothing, while the other two wear traditional clothing. The children dancing in the background also appear to be in traditional Macedonian dress. Once again, all the children are working together, indexing collectivism. We can also note that the only female we have seen depicted so far is in a nurturing role. A full discussion of the gendering of the images is beyond the scope of this study, but is worthy of a future, separate study.
The men in the image on the right are also working together, either at the factory in the background or the farm in the foreground. When we look closer, there are several other elements which index or symbolize important elements of the new society. The man on the right appears to be wearing a hard hat, an index for factory work (in other contexts it could index construction work, but combined with the factory in the background, here it is likely meant to mark this man as a factory worker). Before the industrialization in the SFRY, Macedonia was largely an agricultural society, with a poor, rural population, many of whom were subsistence farmers. Through the socialist industrial reforms implemented by Tito, Macedonia was slowly becoming more industrialized, and this picture is also a reflection of that reality – the factory worker on the right, and the man on the left, who is in more simple dress and is likely meant to be the farmer, are working together. This was also a reference to the collectivization of agriculture, a campaign which in Yugoslavia began in 1949 (Swain 642). The factory and field are also standing in for the hammer and sickle, the symbol of communism, in a rather circular symbolic relationship, as the hammer and sickle are symbolic of the industrial proletariat and the peasantry, respectively, and as a unit are the emblem of the communist party. Finally, the men are reading, indexing literacy and education which the government was actively promoting (see Chapter 1 on the adult reader).

Image 3: Reader for 4th Grade (Čitanka za IV oddelenie) 1957
While far more characters in the 1957 text are shown wearing modern, western clothing than in traditional clothing, in the image above, the first in the book after Tito’s portrait (which appears before the title page in every textbook), once again we see the traditional brought out to index the nation to which it belongs. While the placement of each man (and again, they are all men) on the map of Yugoslavia is enough to index his ethnicity, the dress is used as well to indicate that, in the absence of geographical markers, it will serve this symbolic function. The rope appears here as both icon and index, or arguably symbol, “tying” the peoples together in their country and their work.
In Image 4, as the children play, the soldier guards over the country, keeping them safe. The soldier in this illustration is an icon, but also a symbol of the state and its safeguarding of its people. The soldier (the state) is guarding the newly free socialist (industrial) state from outside enemies. His protection allows children to play freely. There is a general absence of cultural markers, as well. There is no red star on the soldier’s uniform; the children could be from any European country. By 1957, with the nation secure, there seems to be less need for cultural markers, which is reflected in the percentage of national and supranational themes. Clearly there is the possibility of adding cultural signs to the scene, but that option was forgone by the illustrators. The images, and also the text, though to a lesser extent, have begun to lose many of their overt markers of culture.
Image 5 is typical of the images in the 1996 book. The boys wear modern clothing, are in a forest, and there is an anthropomorphized bear behind them. The image is devoid of specific cultural markers of Macedonia – Macedonian, Albanian, Turk, Rom, etc. This image could be taken from any European or North American textbook. These scenes, like most others, also depict the children outdoors, with anthropomorphized animals; the sun appears frequently as well, and is also anthropomorphized. In Image 6, we see the only picture of ethnic diversity in the book. The boy does not belong to one of the ethnic minorities of Macedonia, however, but is black, embodying a stereotypical western, globalized idea of ethnic diversity. The patch on his pants is a symbol indicating his poverty, indexing rural poverty in particular. In fact, this image accompanies a text about two boys in Mississippi, and the black boy is poor, lives in the woods with his dog, and as we discover, has not eaten in three days. His white friend then gives him all the food in his house. This narrative is a troubling stereotype of race and class in America.

Yugoslavia fares no better, however. The other ethnicities who appear in the texts (though not the images) are not the nations, like in previous books, but two Albanians and a Roma. All three
are depicted as poor, and the Roma is, stereotypically, a violinist. Despite their inclusion in the
text, the minorities are still not shown in a positive light.

Images 7 and 8 are examples of those texts which do have some nationalist markers. In
Image 7, fighters in early 20th century dress are celebrating a victory. They serve as a symbol for
Macedonian freedom, and the strong association with images of such clothing with VMRO
suggests the celebration of victory over the Turks, as well. In addition, the church in the
background indexes Macedonian, as the majority of Macedonians are Christian Orthodox. This
image also explicitly excludes the largely Muslim Turkish and Albanian minorities in the
country, and could be problematic for that reason. The houses in Image 8 are also a national
index. That architecture is typical of Macedonian houses. As in 1957, we have a soldier watching
over the boy, keeping him safe from unknown enemies. There is a larger presence of soldiers in
the images in 1996 (originally 1984) textbook, which is an ominous sign about the coming dissolution of Yugoslavia.

Now we move to the most recent book, from 2000. It is clear already from the cover of the textbook that this is a child-centric world, full of play and animals, free from responsibility. The children on the cover are modern and western, in look and dress, as are those on the first page, heading to a modern-looking school. In addition, many of the illustrations are cartoonish, (note, for instance, the degree of rotation of the clown’s head, a disconcerting image seen in several other illustrations in this book) reflecting the non-reality of the children’s world.
The trend toward globalization is clearly evident in these images. In Images 11 and 12, we have a young boy touring the world. He is seen in Africa, China, India, and Siberia, and on the right he explores the west, in Paris and New York. The locations are indexed by their great landmarks and architecture (The Statue of Liberty, Taj Mahal, Eiffel Tower, a pagoda), flora and fauna (zebra and giraffe on a grassland for Africa, fir trees and snow for Siberia) and clothing (the dǒuli, a conical straw hat, and silk robe for China, the ushanka, a fur hat with ear flaps, for Siberia). It is worth noting that the West is on one page, and the rest of the world on another.

There are few pictures of diversity in this textbook, as most of the characters have a generalized western appearance (the culturally-insensitive mimicry of Asians in the above image notwithstanding). The only ethnic minorities are seen in historical images, such as Image 14 below. Here, Turks are stereotypically indexed by a fez, vest, sash and moustache. The other
man in the illustration is revealed by the text to be Itar Pejo, a Macedonian folk hero and antagonist of the authority figures of the Ottoman Empire. One of the few national, Macedonian indexes is seen in Image 13. The shepherd is depicted in Macedonian traditional clothing, but a simplified version, playing a pan flute on Šar Mountain. It is of note, in a book with no explicitly Albanian characters, that Šar Mountain is in the Albanian-majority western part of Macedonia. As in the above-mentioned text from 1957, even in Albanian-majority territory, Albanians are ignored. Also relevant is that in 2000 images of war or soldiers were at their lowest point from any time in the studied period. We know, however, that there was tension building between the majority Macedonian and minority Albanians, which would result the next year in a minor armed conflict. That this aspect of the changing society was not reflected is intriguing. Since the Albanians were already excluded from the textbook, it may simply be that tensions with Albanians were ignored as well. This may also be a result of the separate children’s world depicted in the books. Whereas in Yugoslavia, the issues of the country were the responsibility of all people, in 2000 these issues were for adults only.
Children’s books depict a society’s image of children and itself, its value system and its norms. The view of children in the early textbooks is that of future workers, with more adult themes and texts centered around workers or production. It seems to reflect the Soviet view of children as “small comrades,” to use Kirschenbaum’s term. The newer textbooks, however, have adopted Western ideologies of childhood in education, in which the child inhabits a liminal space, relatively free from responsibility. There is also a turn towards representing a more urbanized, bourgeois life in the newest books, reflecting the turn towards the acceptance of class differentiation. This urban life is then juxtaposed with images of the romantic pastoral, such as that in Image 13 above (for more on the urban/pastoral dynamic, see Williams 1973).

As Macedonia moved from nation-building to stability, back to instability and nation rebuilding, the textbooks and their images changed alongside. Images of war started high after
WWII, then waned, and waxed again in the 1980s after the death of Marshal Tito and coming instability of Yugoslavia. This societal change ceased to be reflected in the textbook from 2000, however, despite the fact that the next year tensions would rise to the point that an armed conflict took place. During the period of most intense nation-building, when the SFRY and Macedonia were new, the highest level of national and supranational (Yugoslavian) imagery was recorded, as would be expected. It then steadily declined, and the Yugoslavian imagery was replaced by a western, globalization-infused imagery beginning in the 1980s. The supranational images in the final two books were in fact international.

The textbooks studied are a reflection of the values and ideas of the Macedonian society at the times of their production. They create an image of who is a good citizen and legitimize the state – the depictions, visual and textual, of space serve to create a nation-state around space and subtly express the ideas about space. The descriptions and pictures of various natural wonders of Yugoslavia (the Plitva lakes, Postojna caves, Dalmatian coast, Lake Ohrid) from the early books imply that the riches of Yugoslavia are for all citizens to enjoy. In a similar fashion, the Macedonian boy on Šar Mountain creates Macedonian ownership of all land in Macedonia.

A good citizen in the pre-1980 books is Macedonian, a worker and useful to the state, and embraces all Slavic peoples as brothers. In the post-1980 books, a good citizen is modern (and urban), global-thinking and European-looking, but with a Macedonian identity. In this way, the books represent both a realistic and an idealistic view of the state and the world.
Chapter 5 – Conclusion

Textbooks both reveal and shape attitudes. The school is one of the first places in which the state can transmit its values to a new generation. Through textbooks, the state (or those who control education) can spread its ideology, language, identity and culture. States are by necessity invested in creating citizens – good, moral people as well as loyal citizens who are committed to the state’s ideology, be it communist, capitalist, monarchic or democratic. During times of nation-building or government transitions, encouraging nationalism and loyalty to the state are of special importance. It is clear that “in addition to transmitting knowledge, textbooks also seek to anchor the political and social norms of a society. Textbooks convey a global understanding of history and of the rules of society as well as norms of living with other people,” (Schissler 1989: 81). By depicting certain people, behaviors, linguistic practices, and so on, textbooks demarcate the borders of society – who is within these social boundaries and who is excluded. What are at stake are the implicit and explicit messages in textbooks about what and who makes a good citizen, and there is necessarily conflict in any society over who gets to determine these boundaries. Textbooks are a product of and instrument for the implementation of the ideology and policy of states and/or dominant elites.

As we have seen, “textbooks are one of the most important educational inputs: texts reflect basic ideas about a national culture, and … are often a flashpoint of cultural struggle and controversy,” (Altbach 257). We have also seen how language is often a flashpoint for controversy, both in terms of struggles between languages for legitimacy and language rights (Catalan in Spain, French and English in Canada, Ebonics in the USA, etc.), that is, status planning, and in terms of struggles within language, corpus planning. In Macedonia, we see these
struggles over language standardization and implementation playing out in the textbooks of the 1940s and 1950s.

Macedonia has experienced several transformations of society during the 20th century, as they have gone from an Ottoman territory, to Serbian, to communist Yugoslav, to capitalist and independent Macedonia, changing language and education policies with each transition. The most important transformation for Macedonia was the official recognition of the Macedonian nation and language after World War II. The Macedonian language was implemented in a particular context – its legitimacy, and as a corollary, Macedonian identity itself, was highly contested by the nations around it. The ideology of ethno-linguistic nationalism contributed to the shaping of the Macedonian language, in terms of the choice of dialect base and features to include, as well as the fate of Turkisms and other elements. Macedonia has, in the span of just 60 years, codified a standard language and adjusted to a new heteroglossia, with local dialect, standard Macedonian language, and Serbo-Croatian each having their social context of usage; adjusted to state language policies for the nationalities living in the SR Macedonia; reevaluated the Macedonian identity as an independent nation outside of the Yugoslav context; and come to terms with the situation of the Macedonian language decades after the standardization in a state of seemingly-stable diglossia (local dialect and standard language). We have traced the changes in the textbooks through all of these societal changes.

In the early years of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, both the linguistic and visual representation of Macedonians was inclusive. There was fluctuation in the language of the textbooks as the population was adapting to the new standards and issues of codification were still being resolved. As a result, the textbooks present a more linguistically inclusive picture of whose speech is considered Macedonian, including a greater inclusion of dialect forms (e.g.,
fluctuation in the usage of verbal suffixes –ue/–uva and plural desinences –oil–ovi, the
prepositions od and na for indicating possession) and vocabulary. In addition, along with the
Brotherhood and Unity ideal, the various nationalities and ethnic groups of Macedonia and
Yugoslavia were represented in texts and illustrations. There was a greater emphasis on being
Yugoslavian than being Macedonian in the texts and images – supranational (Yugoslav) themes
outnumbered national (Macedonian) by as much as 2:1 in the early textbooks. The Macedonian
citizen in the 1940s and 1950s is also collectivist above individualist, an industrious worker, and
students are first and foremost citizens and comrades whose highest goal is being useful to their
community. This is in stark contrast to the depiction of the student in textbooks from the 1980s
and later, where students are conceived first and foremost as children and individuals. These
depictions of the good citizen are not only overt, but covert, especially in the newest textbooks.

Let us return to two illustrations, one from 1949 and one from 2000: both feature children
in front of the school, but their depictions and activities are diametrically opposed. In 1949, the
children are all depicted in groups, engaging in group activities – dancing together in the
background, and studying together in the foreground. The fact that all the children are engaged in
activities subtly indexes the communist command to be useful to society, and indicates that
communist children, like adults, must not be idle. In addition, the female character is shown in a
nurturing role, underscoring the gender roles expected of citizens. In contrast, the children of the
2000 textbook are depicted individually, not actively engaged with one another. They file into
the school; only the two boys in the foreground are greeting each other. None are actively
engaged in any activity, as working is no longer emphasized as strongly for children in 2000, and
the female and male characters are equally unengaged. The genders are depicted as equals,
though the males are still foregrounded.
The changes in representation seen in these textbooks are not only representative of the periods in which they were produced, but also indicative of the kind of citizen the state aims to produce. The interethnic cooperation displayed in the earlier books is representative of the good citizen, and the lack of inclusion in the more recent textbooks would seem to indicate that interethnic cooperation is no longer an important goal.

From the mid-1950s to the early 1980s we see a decline in inclusiveness. The linguistic variation exhibited by earlier textbooks has given way to a consistent prescriptive standard, inclusion of the minorities of Macedonia (Turks, Albanians, Roma) has declined, and supranational themes in the texts and illustrations have declined. The Brotherhood and Unity
themes have not disappeared entirely, however, and working together remains a major theme until the late 1980s. Working in general is a significant theme during this time, as industry, farming and the military see an increase in representation, reflecting the changes in society due to industrialization, and also echoing the fears of society, in terms of fear of a new war with the Soviet Bloc countries.

The specter of war still hovers in the 1980s, with the rise of nationalism in Yugoslavia presaging its breakup, an anxiety which is reflected in the illustrations of the textbooks of the 1980s and 1990s. It is also at this point when the supranational imagery shifts from Yugoslav brotherhood to worldwide global. At the turn of this century, though the representation of ethnic minorities is at a low point, the linguistic inclusiveness is on the rise. There is a concerted effort in the most recent textbooks to reevaluate the attitudes toward dialects, aiming for greater acceptance of the place of such speech in society, and for an appreciation of the dialect diversity in Macedonia as cultural richness. This discourse of ‘richness’ of language may also fit into various discourses of the commodification of language.

There is also an element of rural authenticity, related to the construction of Romantic nationalism, which we see in the scenes of rural life and national dress in the earliest books, and which declines in the middle period with its emphasis on industry and urbanization. There is a return to the pastoral beginning in the textbooks of the 1980s, (see the uptick in environmental themes, as well as the scene of the Macedonian boy playing a flute on Šar Mountain in chapter 4). The valuation of the dialects in the newest textbooks is also related to this trope of locating authenticity in the countryside, which exists within a greater effort at locating authentic Macedonian identity in the past (and even the very distant past, with the current Gruevski government’s attempts to draw a parallel to Alexander the Great).
The textbooks also reflect shifting conceptualizations of the Macedonian nation. In the Yugoslav period, Macedonian identity was seen in the context of being equal with the other Yugoslav peoples – a Slavic people with its own territory, language, and history, united and equal under communist ideology. After independence, Macedonian identity must locate itself outside of Yugoslavia. Due to the contested nature of Macedonian identity, especially from its neighbors, Macedonian identity is linked more closely with the ideology of authenticity, reaching back to the 19th century (and in some cases even further back, reflecting the hypernationalistic and sometimes irredentist rhetoric of the nationalist party VMRO-DPMNE). We can look back to Images 7, 13, and 14 from Chapter 4 and see a scene from the 1903 Ilinden Uprising, the boy on Šar mountain in traditional (read: authentic) national dress, and a depiction of Ottoman-era folk hero Itar Pejo for examples of this idea of authenticity in Macedonian identity. The inclusion of “naroden jazik” in the newest textbooks also reflects this search for folk authenticity – locating the language in the countryside, the people, and tradition. This may also be an attempt to distance Macedonian from the accusations that it is an “invented” language.

Ultimately, a good citizen in the pre-1980 books is Macedonian, but can be a member of other ethnic groups as well, an industrious co-worker and useful to the state and community, and embraces all of the Yugoslav peoples as brothers. In the post-1980 books, a good citizen is modern, global-thinking and European-looking, but with an ethnic Macedonian identity. The exclusion of other ethnicities from the post-1980 books implies that Macedonian identity is what “counts” and has value. These trends reveal a push-and-pull between ethnic and civic nationalism: while ethnic nationalism has long been part of the Macedonian identity, and is represented in all the textbooks studied, the concept of civic nationalism is much stronger during
the Yugoslav period. The textbooks produced after independence reflect almost exclusively an ethnic Macedonian nationalism.

Areas for Future Study

Future avenues for research include a similar linguistic analysis on the textbooks of other Yugoslav republics, particularly a comparison of the successor languages of Serbo-Croatian. A comparative analysis of the Soviet Union – both Russia and the other republics – and the other Warsaw Pact countries would shed light on the implementation, at the textbook level, of the differences in Yugoslav and Soviet communist ideology. Also of interest would be a study using the methodology developed in this thesis of other identity-forming subjects, particularly history and civics textbooks. Finally, several studies could shed light on issues of equality in the Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav periods: as mentioned in Chapter 4, there is the potential for an analysis of the gender dynamics in the textbooks, and also of great interest are the textbooks for the minority communities of Macedonia, namely Albanian and Turkish.
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