

On Samuil B. Bernštejn's Unpublished
Očerk makedonskogo literaturnogo jazyka
'Outline of the Macedonian Literary Language'¹

Motoki Nomachi
Hokkaido University

1. Introduction: The Fate of Samuil B. Bernštejn's Unpublished Text

Samuil Borisovič Bernštejn (1911-1997), one of the first foreign members of the Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, chosen in 1969, is well-known as an eminent Slavist who made remarkable contributions to various fields in Slavic linguistics. According to Toporov (1998:623), Bernštejn's contributions can be classified into ten areas: I. the comparative-historical grammar of Slavic languages. Slavic languages (general and individual problems); II. Bulgarian studies. Bulgarian dialectology. Bulgarian lexicology and lexicography (dictionaries); III. Slavic dialectology and linguistic geography (atlases); IV. Ethnogenesis and the problem of the Slavicization of the Balkans; V. Slavic languages and their connections with neighboring languages. Balkan studies; VI. Slavic languages and culture; VII. Cyrillo-Methodiana; VIII. History of Slavic studies. Personal details; IX. Overviews, reviews, polemics and discussion; and X. Pedagogical works such as textbooks.

It comes as no surprise that Toporov did not mention "Macedonian studies" as a separate category, because among Bernštejn's numerous contributions to Slavic studies, Macedonian studies occupy a rather peripheral place. According to two *Festschriften* dedicated to Bernštejn (Možaeva 1971, 1991),² he published three scholarly articles (arguably two, as two of them are almost identical),³ one short article for an entry in the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, and two short informational notes on Macedonian studies.⁴ However, it goes without saying that Bernštejn played a key role in the development of Macedonian studies in Russia (Pandev 2013:224), and the role could have been much more visible, because in 1948 (or 1949, as he revised the manuscript later), Bernštejn was about to publish a Macedonian grammar.⁵ Bernštejn finished writing the book on December 1, 1947.⁶ The publication of the book was confirmed on December 28, 1947,⁷ and the text had

been entirely prepared by January 3, 1948.⁸ According to Bernštejn's diary, dated March 23, 1949, he was greatly surprised that information on his book appeared on page 31 of the publishing schedule of *Akademkniga* for 1949; Bernštejn commented that it would take much time for the Macedonian grammar to be published (Bernštejn 2002:136).

However, the conflict between Stalin and Tito, which resulted in the expulsion of Tito's Yugoslavia from Cominform in 1948 (cf. Škarič 2013:105), made his book unpublishable.⁹ His diary does not say exactly when this decision was made.¹⁰ Later, around 1950, Bernštejn apparently stopped studying the Macedonian language.¹¹

Bernštejn's book project is known among historians of Macedonian studies (cf. Risteski 1988; Ristovski 2011, 2013; Usikova 2011). However, the existence of the manuscript itself was not known, as mentioned by Blaže Ristovski (2011:40): "It is regretful that, except for some fragments of this book that appeared in scholarly periodicals, it has remained unknown up to today; it is even unknown whether it is preserved or where it is."¹²

Recently, I was fortunate enough to locate the unpublished monograph in the City Archive of Moscow with the assistance of Irina A. Sedakova and Maxim M. Makartsev of the Institute for Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow. It turns out that three versions of his monograph are preserved: a full manuscript, a full typescript with his corrections, and earlier versions of the Introduction, Chapter 3 and a sample text of the Macedonian literary language. I am preparing a critical edition of this book with commentaries in collaboration with Victor A. Friedman of the University of Chicago, La Trobe University and the Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts.

Bernštejn's unpublished monograph is worthy of attention by Slavic and Macedonian scholars in many respects. It is well-known that the first grammar of the Macedonian language was published by Krume Kepeski in 1946 as *Učebnik vo srednite učilišta* 'A Textbook for Middle Schools,'¹³ while credit for the first scholarly grammar of the Macedonian literary language, according to Pavle Ivić (1953:325), belongs to Horace G. Lunt for his *Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language* (Skopje, 1952), if we do not take into account Reginald de Bray's description of literary Macedonian in his *Guide to the Slavonic Languages* (London-New York, 1951), based on Kepeski's above-mentioned pedagogical grammar.¹⁴ This view is shared among specialists (cf. Gołąb 1956:112, Topolińska 2008b:170).

Considering the scholarly nature of the monograph in question, as will be discussed below, Bernštejn's description of the Macedonian literary language could thus have been the first scholarly grammar. In addition, it includes Bernštejn's concrete views on the Macedonian literary language and his attitude toward the youngest codified Slavic language at that time, which might have taken a different form had Bernštejn participated in codifying it (*cf.* Risteski 1988:136; Risteski 2000:11, 2011).¹⁵

2. Bernštejn's Views on the Macedonian Language and Its Literary Variety: From the Published Works

Bernštejn's position was clear and concrete. In his *Očerk sravnitel'noj grammatiki slavjanskix jazykov* 'Outline of a Comparative Grammar of the Slavic Languages,' published after codification of the Macedonian literary language, which was written naturally from a diachronic perspective, Bernštejn stated that in the past Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects were dialects of the same language, while today the Macedonian language is a member of the Slavic language family enjoying the same status as the other Slavic languages (Bernštejn 1961:38). Also, Bernštejn opined as follows:

“... [a]pppearance of national languages is determined, first of all, by historical conditions, but not by dialectal closeness or distance ... In many respects, the Macedonian dialects are closer to the West Bulgarian dialects than the Rhodope dialects. However, at the present time, the Macedonian dialects belong to the Macedonian national language, while the Rhodope dialects are dialects of the Bulgarian language” (Bernštejn 1961:42).¹⁶

Before the codification of the Macedonian language, he explicitly stated in his 1938 article the distinctive place of Macedonian dialects and their unity in contrast to surrounding dialects/languages as follows:

“In spite of significant dialectal diversity, the Macedonian dialects present a unity and are noticeably different from the vernaculars of Thrace, Rhodope, Moesia, and Balkan” (Bernštejn 1938:743).¹⁷

As pointed out by Božidar Vidoeski (1996[2013]:234), this view was common among Slavic scholars, particularly those outside of Bulgaria and Serbia, such as Mieczysław Małecki (1938) and André Vaillant (1938). This statement might have been linguistically based, but it could be also regarded as a reflection of the attitude of the Comintern, which ruled in favor of the Macedonians' right of existence as a separate people with a language of their own in 1934 (*cf.* Friedman 1993b:164).

In 1943, the Anti-Fascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia, better known by its Serbo-Croatian acronym AVNOJ, proclaimed the establishment of the Republic of Macedonia, which was closely connected with the establishment of the new literary language. In this context, Dimitar Vlahov (1878-1953), a politician native to Macedonia who had been living in exile in Moscow since 1935 (Ivanoski 2011, Bernštejn 2002:39), asked Bernštejn, as a distinguished specialist in South Slavic and an authoritative Slavic linguist, to provide his views on and ways of establishing the new literary language for Macedonians (*cf.* Bernštejn 2002:54), and indeed Bernštejn did so on September 11, 1944 (*Ibid.*).¹⁸

In November of 1944, Vlahov returned to Macedonia with Bernštejn's text on the new Macedonian literary language for a meeting of the Anti-Fascist Assembly for the National Liberation of Macedonia, known as ASNOM (*cf.* Jančeva and Mirčevska 2011). In the text, Bernštejn stated two keys to the formation of literary Macedonian (*cf.* Vlahov 1947:215-16, Risteski 1988:223-24, Bernštejn 2002:54):

1. Dialect base: Choose a dialect base and make it clear. More concretely, avoid choosing the Skopje spoken variety as the base (because of Serbian influence); avoid the Eastern dialect as well (because it is close to Bulgarian); the Central dialect (Bitola-Porečje-Prilep) is the only suitable candidate for the base of the literary language; but also it should include elements of the Western dialect, as it is related to the variety of Clement of Ohrid.
2. Orthography: Choose a variety of the Cyrillic script like that of the contemporary Russian or Bulgarian literary language, avoiding the Serbian one; the orthography should be based on a phonetic-morphological principle.¹⁹

In this context, on December 12, 1944, ASNOM decided to invite two experts on South Slavic languages, Bernštejn and Nikolaj Sevast'janovič Deržavin (1877-1953) from Moscow, to serve as consultants to the First Language Commission for codifying the Macedonian literary language (*cf.* Risteski 1988:335, 2000:11, 104; Friedman 1993b:171; Ristovski 2011:40).²⁰ Both scholars confirmed their agreement to collaborate with the members of the Commission. However, the collaboration was never realized and a Second Language Commission was organized instead because Blaže Koneski convinced the politicians that Macedonians should make their own decisions.²¹ Not long after the Second Conference, Koneski wrote:

“The First Language Commission went further, admitting in its explanation to the Agency for National Education dated January 20, 1945, that the First Language Commission would give suggestions not in a definitive form, but that the final solution of our language questions should be made when certain Russian scholars come to help us. Of course, it was totally naïve and a wrong thought. For the solution of our language questions nobody was competent except ourselves” (Koneski 1959:101-02).²²

Even though Bernštejn's role in codifying literary Macedonian was no longer anticipated, he nevertheless composed a grammar of the Macedonian language. In the 1930s, having worked in the early 20th century in Odessa on K. Misirkov's project of codifying the Macedonian literary language as well, Bernštejn clearly prepared his ideas on codifying the new literary language for discussion with the Commission members. Bernštejn's views on various linguistic issues of the Macedonian literary language might have provoked a certain dynamic in the formation of the literary language that ultimately could have been the source of a different form of the literary language that was not realized. In what follows, I will analyze part of Bernštejn's typescript of *Očerk* with some attention to the fragments of the other typescript, entitled *Makedonskij jazyk*.

3. *Overview of the Content of Očerk makedonskogo literaturnogo jazyka*

Bernštejn defines his unpublished monograph as follows:

“Our book is not a textbook of the Macedonian language. We will describe the contemporary Macedonian language by illustrating its rules with examples taken from original works of Macedonian literature. An individual chapter is dedicated to polemics with the codifiers of the literary language on certain disputed questions.” (Bernštejn 1949:4).²³

Thus, it comes as no surprise that in this text, unlike other works with similar titles, Bernštejn’s style is rather polemic. The typescript consists of the following six chapters, plus an Introduction and sample texts.²⁴

- *Vvedenie* ‘Introduction’ ... 1-5
- Chapter 1. *Makedonskij jazyk* ‘The Macedonian Language’ ... 6-11
- Chapter 2. *Grammatičeskij očerk sovremennogo makedonskogo literaturnogo jazyka* ‘Grammatical Outline of the Contemporary Macedonian Literary Language’ ... 12-93
- Chapter 3. *Spornye voprosy sovremennogo makedonskogo literaturnogo jazyka* ‘Disputed Questions of the Contemporary Macedonian Language’ ... 94-108
- Chapter 4. *Jazyk makedonskoj gazety “Vardar”* ‘The Language of the Macedonian Newspaper “Vardar”’ ... 109-16²⁵
- Chapter 5. *Russkaja slavistika i makedonskij jazyk* ‘Russian Slavic Studies and the Macedonian Language’ ... 117-66
- Chapter 6. *Očerednye zadači makedonskogo jazykoznanija* ‘Future Tasks for Macedonian Linguistics’ ... 167-82
- *Teksty* ‘Texts’ ... 183-202

Although Bernštejn proclaimed that the aim of his monograph was to describe the contemporary literary Macedonian language, the content differs somewhat from what we might expect from such a proclamation.

The structure of Bernštejn's monograph was indeed indicated in 1948 in the Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences (Bernštejn 1948b:86). However, his description of *Makedonskij jazyk*, the former title of his planned book, and the content of *Očerk*, the newer title, are not the same. For instance, according to Bernštejn's 1948 text or the overview of his scheduled publication, the first chapter deals with the place of the Macedonian language among the South Slavic languages, but in *Očerk*, such a topic is discussed far less. In addition, according to the author, in Chapter 3, the verbal ending *-t* of the third person singular of the non-past tense form is discussed, while in *Očerk*, the author discusses other topics as well. Thus, it is worth introducing the content of *Očerk* here.

Chapter 1 deals with the socio-political background and history of Macedonian matters and displays Bernštejn's negative attitude toward the Great-Serbian nationalistic tendency among Serbian scholars of Macedonia and the Macedonian dialects.

Chapter 2 is the main part of the monograph and is broader than the title indicates. Indeed, the chapter title might be misleading, as it is not a description of the structure of the Macedonian literary language, but this chapter provides various comparative analyses of Macedonian and Bulgarian (and to a lesser extent, Serbian) on both the synchronic and diachronic levels.

According to the author, this chapter was written by analyzing the following materials (Bernštejn 1949:12-13): 1. Krume Kepeski's *Makedonska gramatika* (1946); 2. *Makedonski pravopis* (1945); 3. Blaže Koneski's *Makedonskata literatura i makedonskiot literaturnen jazik* (1945); 4. *Čitanka za II oddelenie* (1946); 5. *Odbrani četiva za makedonski jazik vo I, II, III klas* (1946); 6. Blaže Koneski's edition of *Zbirka na makedonski narodni pesni* (1945); 7. *Nov den. Spisanie za umetnost, nauka i društveni prašanja* (1945-46); 8. Venko Markovski's *Glamji* (1945); 9. Venko Markovski's *Klime* (1945); 10. Venko Markovski's *Poroi* (1945); 11. Kole Nedelkovski's *Pesni* (1946); 12. Kosta Racin's *Pesni* (1946); 13. Grigor Prličev's *Serdarot* (1946); 14. Aco Šopov's, Blaže Koneski's, Slavko Janevski's, Gogo Ivanovski's and Lazo Kapovski's. *Pesni* (1946); 15. *Istorija na sesožnata komunistička partija (na bolševicite). Kratok kurs*; 16. Some issues of the newspaper *Nova Makedonija*; 17. *Bjuletin' vtorogo kongressa antifašistskoj moloděži Makedonii* (1945).

This chapter includes the orthography, phonetics and phonology, history of the vowel and consonant systems, and nominal and verbal morphology of the language in question. Word formation and syntax are missing entirely. Throughout

this chapter, the author provides diachronic and dialectal accounts of various phenomena in Macedonian, very often in comparison with Bulgarian and Serbian, which would be of interest to scholars. All this was typical for historians and dialectologists of Slavic languages at that time, as neither word formation nor syntax in the scholarly sense of these terms had been elaborated on, Bernštejn might omit them from his book.²⁶

Of particular interest is Chapter 3, as it criticizes certain aspects of the present state of the literary variety established by Macedonians, and Bernštejn suggests his own variety of the Macedonian literary language instead, writing as follows:

“It seems to me that the basic questions have been solved properly. However, there are still things to be done, and in some cases to be remade. In particular, many disputable, sometimes knowingly mistaken things are observed. In this chapter we will dwell on some problems that were resolved mistakenly in our opinion” (Bernštejn 1949:95).²⁷

The details of Chapter 3 will be analyzed in *Section 4* of this article.

Chapter 4 is dedicated to an analysis of the letters, phonetics and morphology of Macedonian in K. Misirkov’s journal “Vardar” published in Odessa from December 9, 1904 to September 30, 1905. Bernštejn conducted his research at the Odessa Historical Archive in 1934, and this chapter is a result of that research (Bernštejn 1958: 178). The author does not explain why he has included this chapter in the book. One might, however, speculate that he included it because his model of the literary variety of Macedonian came into being by analyzing Misirkov’s idiolect. The two articles on the Macedonian language of K. Misirkov’s “Vardar” published in 1958 and 1960 are in many respects identical to this chapter, which shows that Bernštejn had practically ceased his work on Macedonian studies by 1950, as mentioned in the Introduction to this article.

Chapter 5 is somewhat unusual for this kind of publication as a separate chapter, rather than as an appendix to the book. This chapter discusses the history of Macedonian studies in Russia. Here one can see another side of Bernštejn, namely, a historian of Slavic studies. Basically, this chapter discusses Slavists of the 19th and the early 20th centuries such as V.I. Grigorovič, P.A. Lavrov, V.N. Ščepkin, N.S. Deržavin, S.M. Kul’bakin and A.M. Seliščev. Among these scholars, more than 40 pages (the chapter has 49 pages) are devoted to Seliščev’s contributions to

Macedonian studies, including Bernštejn's interpretation, evaluation or review of Seliščev's works. Some parts of this chapter were published in his article entitled "Iz istorii izučenija južnyx slavjanskix jazykov v Rossii i v SSSR" (1957). It is worth noting that some of the descriptions of Grigorovič's and Seliščev's contribution to Macedonian studies are identical.

Chapter 6 deals with the strategy for the development of the young literary language. According to Bernštejn, one of the most important tasks for Macedonian linguistics is to publish a serious scientific grammar of the Macedonian literary language (Bernštejn 1949:170). Bernštejn opines that without such a scholarly elaborated grammar, it is impossible to write a school grammar. In this context, Bernštejn pointed out various problems in the first school grammar written by Kepeski (1946), who did not have access to a scholarly grammar. In addition, Bernštejn writes that Macedonian linguistics needs analyses of historical documents, dialectological research, including the creation of a linguistic atlas, and research on toponyms.

4. A Few Words on Chapter 3. Spornye voprosy sovremennogo makedonskogo literaturnogo jazyka 'Disputed Questions of the Contemporary Macedonian Language'

In this chapter, Bernštejn polemically criticizes the state of the Macedonian literary language and suggests his own way of solving the problems he saw in it. He gives six such problems. In what follows, I will introduce the problems and Bernštejn's solutions. After that I will discuss the appropriateness of his ideas after 70 years.

4.1. Introduction of the Letter j

According to Bernštejn (1949:94-95), the introduction of the letter *j* following the Serbian Cyrillic script and discarding the traditional Cyrillic *ѣ*, *я*, *ю* cannot be justified for literary Macedonian. This opinion had indeed already been mentioned by the author elsewhere, but in this section he justifies his view as follows:

“It has been rightly pointed out many times that the introduction of *jot* into the Slavic graphic system destroys the internal unity of the Slavic alphabet and produces polygraphic difficulties, and in general there is no sense to it, because unlike in the Latin alphabet, the Slavic one does not need this letter. However, in Serbian, this innovation of Vuk’s is settled and it would already be difficult and perhaps irrational to introduce the letters *я, ю* now. But now, for what purpose should the same unsuccessful introduction be repeated in the Macedonian literary language, for which there has been no tradition, and for which a new alphabet could be consistent at the greatest degree? It seems to us that in this case Macedonian writers should have followed the Russian and Bulgarian alphabets” (Bernštejn 1949:95-96).²⁸

Discussion: In Serbian, the introduction of the letter *j*, taken from the Latin alphabet, was often discussed in the context of anti-Orthodox sentiment, which was triggered by Jernej Kopitar, Vuk Karadžić’s adviser in establishing a literary language based on the vernacular (*cf.* Neweklowsky 2010:162). As shown by Aleksandar Mladenović (1963) and Miodrag Popović (1983), contrary to general belief, the letter *j* was used before Vuk in handwritten Serbian texts in the 18th century, and even in Russian as well, with which Vuk was most probably familiar (see also Dmitriev and Safronov 1975:44).

According to Jan N.I. Baudouin de Courtenay (1871:174): “Only Vuk Stefanovič Karadžić, a talented man with a subtle feel for the phonetic aspect of his mother language and, on the other hand, having a strictly consistent intellect, preserving the alphabet that had been used until his time, applied entirely consistently the literal (phonetic) graphic principle, and in this respect he rendered a very important service to Serbian literature and Serbian intellectuals. One may say that Karadžić’s graphic system shows a pattern of excellence, at least in respect of its principle” (cited in Gudkov 2014:72).²⁹

It may be also worth noting that, according to Bilodid (1965:36), the attempt to introduce a new alphabet with *jot* in the Vukovian spirit for Ukrainian was made by M.P. Drahomanov. However, it was not successful because, according to Bilodid, the traditional Cyrillic letters that were familiar to the people were deeply rooted, which thus does not mean that the Vukovian system destroyed the unity of the Cyrillic alphabet.

In addition, according to Stamatovski (1986:52, 54; 1998:89), the letter *j* was also used by Macedonian authors such as Gjeorgji Pulevski, Kiril Pejčinovikj and Konstantin Petkovikj in the 19th century. We might note that Misirkov also used *i* in his Cyrillic. Stamatovski regards the introduction of the letter *j* as meaning a great deal to modernization of the orthographic system of Macedonian (1998:159), which Mareš (2008:151) evaluates as follows: “The Macedonian daughter of the Vukovian Cyrillic letters represents one of the most perfect graphic systems in terms of the phonology.”²⁹

From a practical point of view, Koneski regarded the Vukovian Cyrillic alphabet as more practical and simpler than the Bulgarian one and as easier for children to master (Risteski 2000:118).³¹

One should also note that the letter serves a symbolic function. In the case of Macedonian, it is in the very use of *j* that one could distinguish Macedonian visually from Bulgarian, the closest language to Macedonian.³²

4.2. *Inconsistency of the Phonetic Principle*

Bernštejn criticizes the principle of the Macedonian writing system as follows:

“Having established a phonetic orthography following the Serbian language, the codifiers of the new literary language did not take clearly enough into account the differences between the Serbian and Macedonian phonetic systems. The Serbian way of writing *zub* ‘tooth,’ *dub* ‘oak,’ *grob* ‘grave’ and so on is phonetic writing. The Macedonian case is totally different. In this language, as in Bulgarian, final voiced consonants are realized as the corresponding devoiced ones. Therefore, one would have to write *dap*, *zap*, and *grop*, just as one writes *jas* ‘I’ [not *jaz*, M.N.]” (Bernštejn 1949:96).³³

Discussion: One might on the one hand agree with Bernštejn, as there is indeed inconsistency in this respect (see also Usikova 2003:28-30). On the other hand, one might justify it because there is a difference between nouns and pronouns in the sense that the former may take post-posed definite articles, in which case one should know the correct underlying form: *leb* ‘bread’– *lebot* ‘the bread,’ but not *lepot*.

4.3. *Secondarily Derived j before n in the Central Dialect*

Bernštejn points out that Macedonian writers have been trying to express the secondarily derived *j* as in *kamejnata* ‘the stones,’ *prigotovejneto* ‘the preparation,’ *barajne* ‘request,’ *izgradvejne* ‘constructing,’ *poginvejne* ‘death’ and so on in their works (Bernštejn 1949:96). This form also appeared in K. Misirkov’s “Vardar.” But in the contemporary language – as per Bernštejn’s criticism – this feature was not included in the new literary language, and the inclusion/exclusion of this feature could be decided only after a dialectal survey.

Discussion: One might agree with Bernštejn in this respect. Friedman (2015:263) has also pointed out that these forms are unique in light of Old Church Slavonic and Russian *-nie* on the one hand and Serbo-Croatian *-nje* on the other, and the feature would have added to the *distinctiveness* of the literary Macedonian language. It may be worth noticing that, according to Koneski (1983:93), this pattern is found in the Western dialect (Prilep, Bitola, Prespa and Ohrid regions) and Lower Vardar region and is particularly to be found among speakers of the younger generation, which means that there are also socio-dialectal differences in the same geographical dialect. According to Marjan Markovikj (personal communication), in most Central, Western peripheral and Eastern dialects the verbal nouns have the ending *-nje*, but not *-jne*. This tells us that, at least retrospectively speaking, there is also a convincing reason not to include this feature in the literary language.

4.4. *Coexistence of Forms of the Third-Person Singular Personal Pronoun*

Bernštejn criticizes the coexistence of *on/ona/ono* and *toj/taa/toa* ‘he/she/it’ in the new literary language (Bernštejn 1949:96). According to him:

“Coexistence of these different forms in the system of one literary language cannot be justified. It is necessary to make a choice. I think that it is not difficult at all to do so” (Bernštejn 1949:96).³⁴

In short, according to Bernštejn, *toj/taa/toa* should be chosen as the norm because this pattern is more widespread in Macedonia and the replacement of *on/ona/ono* with *toj/taa/toa* can be observed in various areas in Macedonia.

Discussion: Bernštejn's suggestion seems to be correct, while this selection might have been made to differentiate Macedonian from Serbo-Croatian, which has *on/ona/ono*, and which is also a feature of the speech of Skopje (cf. Selišček 1986:174). According to Friedman (2015:195), *on/ona/ono* is a feature of the Northern and Eastern dialects of Macedonian and is still officially permitted.³⁵ In this respect, Lunt's explanation is unclear: "the forms *toj/taa/toa* are used by some speakers, and *on/ona/ono* by others" (1952:37). Koneski (1967:331) pointed out that *on/ona/ono* is rather limited and found only in poems, while Markovikj (2014:444) regards this form as more colloquial. Although *on/ona/ono* has not been totally lost from the pronominal system, Bernštejn's view was *de facto* realized in the course of development of literary Macedonian.³⁶

4.5. The Threefold Article System

Bernštejn regards the threefold article system in Macedonian dialects as unique and as something that should be reflected in the new literary language (Bernštejn 1949:97). He continues:

"However, it is not difficult to notice that the forms *ov, va, vo, on, na, no* are clearly avoided. Unlike in the folk language, in which they are found very often, in the literary variety they are rarely used and basically they appear in texts with elements of the folk language ... there is no doubt that all this is bringing the language to unification, with the loss of important nuances and tints ... This feature of the folk language should be preserved in the literary language as well" (Bernštejn 1949:97).³⁷

Discussion: The frequency of the three articles does indeed seem to be significantly different in the two varieties, but all these forms have been preserved in the literary variety of Macedonian since that time (cf. Markovikj 2013:444, Minova-Gjurkova 2003:224). According to Minova-Gjurkova (1998:115), in the contemporary Macedonian language *-ot* has the broadest sphere of usage (deictic, generic and other referential functions), while *-on* has the smallest sphere of usage and *-ov* is somewhere in between. According to Topolińska (2008a:185), the terminology is rather inadequate and only *-ot* functions as a genuine definite article, while *-on* and *-ov* are clitic (non-accentual) forms of the demonstrative pronouns. In addition,

although Bernštejn did not mention this at that time, in the various registers of the literary language today, the double usage of the article and the pronoun (such as *taa ženata* [literally] ‘that lady-the,’ *ovaa poslednava ulica* [literally] ‘this last-this street,’ etc.) seems also to be widespread, which means that the demonstrative pronouns are not mutually exclusive with the *-on* and *-ov* forms.³⁸

4.6. Verbal Form of the Third-Person Singular of the Present Tense

According to Bernštejn, this topic is the most problematic. Indeed, in the earlier version of Chapter 3 in his *Makedonskij jazyk*, only this topic was discussed. This version is very similar to, indeed in many cases almost identical with, his article published in 1948 under the title “K voprosu o forme 3-go. L. ED. Č. nastojaščego vremeni v makedonskom literaturnom jazyka” (‘On the Question of the Form of the Third-Person Singular of the Present Tense in the Macedonian Literary Language’). The revised version in *Očerk* is also identical with a few small differences.³⁹

Bernštejn’s main arguments are two: First, the ending *-t* should be preserved in the 3sg.prs. as in *begat* ‘he/she/it runs,’ *nosit* ‘he/she/it carries,’ *trait* ‘he/she/it continues’ and *piet* ‘he/she/it drinks,’ in light of the history of the Macedonian language and the wide presence of the form in question in the contemporary dialects. In addition, Bernštejn thought that it is this form that differentiates Macedonian from neighboring Serbian and Bulgarian:

“As is well-known, most of the contemporary Macedonian dialects have the ending *-t* for the third-person singular of the present tense, which sharply distinguishes the Macedonian dialects from all other South Slavic languages” (Bernštejn 1949:99).⁴⁰

Second, in Bernštejn’s opinion, the feature is correlated with the form of the post-posed definite article: a dialect that has the ending *-t* in the 3sg.prs. tends to have a post-posed definite article with *-t* for the masculine singular. Since the codifiers of the Macedonian literary language included this form of the definite article, the asymmetric norm of the new literary language cannot be natural, being unnecessarily mixed in terms of its dialectal bases, unless it includes the ending *-t* in the 3sg.prs., about which he said:

“Keeping *-t* in the article form on the one hand and discarding it in the 3sg.prs. on the other, the codifiers of the new literary language violated a very important pattern of the Macedonian dialects and set up an artificial correlation of these two forms. This can never be justified” (Bernštejn 1949:105).⁴¹

In the end, Bernštejn suggests the following verbal paradigms in *Table 1* (Bernštejn 1949:109):

1.	begam	begame	vikam	vikame
	begaš	begate	vikaš	vikate
	begat	begaat	vikat	vikaat
2.	nosam	nosime	stoam	stoime
	nosiš	nosite	stoiš	stoite
	nosit	nosat	stoit	stoat
3.	traam	traime	padnam	padnime
	traiš	traite	padniš	padnite
	trait	traat	padnit	padnat
4.	pijam	pieme	bijam	bieme
	pieš	piete	bieš	biete
	piet	pijat	biet	bijat

Table 1:
The “Correct” Verbal Paradigms of Literary
Macedonian, according to Bernštejn

Discussion: Judging from the data taken from previous studies (such as Seliščev, Oblak, Vaillant/Mazon, Belić and others), Bernštejn’s view might seem to be correct. However, retrospectively speaking, Bernštejn missed the tendency of the evolution of these forms in Macedonian in general, as a more thorough dialect survey had yet to be conducted in his time. As has been pointed out, this feature is basically attested in the Western dialects, but not all Western dialects possess this form (Koneski 1967:161), and in particular $-\emptyset$ is the ending in the Central subdialects of the Western dialect group (Tošev 1979:62), which is the main dialect base of the literary language. In addition, in some other dialects the *-t* in the 3sg.prs. tends to be

lost. For instance, the Veles dialect has lost this feature entirely (Koneski 1967:161),⁴¹ while retaining the *-t* form of the post-posed definite article: *toj kupuje-Ø*, but *na carot čerki* (taken from Reiter 1967:117, 127). Thus, the correlation of the two forms is not as universal a feature as Bernštejn claimed in his time.

5. Conclusion

There is no “do-over” in history, and the case of the Macedonian literary language is not an exception. Thus, Bernštejn’s views of the Macedonian literary language did not have any effect on the formation of the norms of the literary Macedonian language in reality, since he could not act as one of the codifiers and was unable to publish his completed book. However, although in this limited time and space I could not go into more detail, even today one cannot deny that there is a variety of interesting ideas in his unpublished book. As can be seen in the example of the pronominal form, history proves that some of his observations were borne out with the passage of time. In any case, the publication of Bernštejn’s typescript and manuscript will be a meaningful contribution to the historical study of the Macedonian literary language and the discussions that took place in the early years of its codification.

Notes

1. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Christina Kramer for her useful and insightful comments on my presentation at the international conference entitled *Makedonistički denovi vo MANU* (May 17, 2018). In addition, I would like to thank Prof. Victor A. Friedman, Prof. Zuanna Topolińska, Prof. Svetlana Mihajlovna Tolstaja, Prof. Predrag Piper, Prof. Jouko Lindstedt and Prof. Marjan Markovikj all of whom read an earlier version of this manuscript and gave me their personal material related to the topic.

2. *Issledovanija po slavjanskomu jazykoznaniju: Sbornik v čest’ šestidesjatiletija profesora S.B. Bernštejna* (Moscow, 1971) and *Studia Slavica: k 80-letiju Samuila Borisoviča Bernštejna* (Moscow, 1991)

3. It was not his intentional double submission. On September 21, 1960, Bernštejn wrote that he sent his manuscript entitled “‘Vardar’ K.P. Misirkova” for the special issue of the Slovenian Slavic journal *Slavistična revija* dedicated to Rajko Nahtigal, but it turned out that the editor had not received the manuscript. Thus, Bernštejn decided to publish it in the Soviet Union and it was

indeed published. However, later, the manuscript that he had sent earlier arrived in Slovenia and it was also published in the next issue of *Slavistična revija*. See Bernštejn (2002:264).

4. These publications are as follows: *Makedonskij jazyk* (*Bol'shaja sovetskaja ènciklopedia*, 1938), *Iz podgotovljaemyx rabot "Makedonskij jazyk"* (*Bjulleten' akademii nauk*, No. 4, 1948), *K voprosu o forme 3-go lica edinstvennogo čisla nastojaščego vremeni v makedonskom jazyke* (*Vestnik MGU*, vyp. 2, 1948), *Izučenie makedonskogo jazyka v Narodnoj Republike Makedonii* (*Voprosy jazykoznanija*, No. 2, 1956), "Vardar" K.P. Misirkova (*Slavistična revija* XI, 3-4, 1958), *Iz istorii makedonskogo literaturnogo jazyka. "Vardar" K.P. Misirkova* (*Slavjanskaja filologija*, vyp. 3, 1960). It may be worth noting that in his inaugural lecture on Slavic morphophonemics for his membership in the Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Bernštejn devoted not a single word to the Macedonian language.

5. There are two versions of the title pages preserved. One is entitled *Makedonskij jazyk* with 1948 as the year of publication. The other is entitled *Očerk makedonskogo literaturnogo jazyka* with 1949 as the year of publication.

According to Usikova (2011:18), Bernštejn was the first person to have written a grammar of the Macedonian literary language, entitled *Očerk po makedonskomu jazyku*, in 1945. This is doubtful because in an entry in his diary dated November 2, 1945, Bernštejn wrote as follows: "Posle zaveršenija dissertacii, načnu novuju, očen' važnuju rabotu, napisat' kotoruju ja obeščal Vлахovu. Reč idët o grammatike makedonskogo jazyka ('after finishing my doctoral dissertation, I shall start a new, very important work which I promised Vlahov [Dimitar Vlahov, M.N.] to write up. I am talking about the grammar of the Macedonian language'). See Bernštejn (2002:73).

6. See Bernštejn (2002:115).

7. See Bernštejn (2002:115).

8. This date can be found in the Introduction to his manuscript.

9. According to Škarič (2013:105), the so-called "Macedonian" question was the most disputatious issue between the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

10. Writing about the death of V.P. Kolarov in his diary dated January 30, 1950, Bernštejn returns to the discussion with D. Vlahov of the problems of the Macedonian literary language. This might suggest that by this time the book project had already been abandoned. See Bernštejn (2002:147).

11. It seems that this was at least partially due to the conflict between the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1950s with regard to various Macedonian issues. As pointed out by Valeva and Isaeva (2013:144), it was almost a taboo to work on Macedonian studies at the Institute for Slavic and Balkan Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. However, some of Bernštejn's direct pupils, such as N.I. Tolstoj and V.M. Illič-Svityč, studied various aspects of the Macedonian language under Bernštejn's guidance.

According to Nikita Tolstoj's wife, Svetlana Mixajlovna Tolstaja (personal communication), Bernštejn gave Tolstoj such topics as a linguistic analysis of the language of R.K. Žinzifov (for a class assignment) and the preposition *od* in the Macedonian language (for an MA degree thesis). It is worth remembering that under Tolstoj's guidance, Illič-Svityč and D. Tolovski compiled the first completed bilingual dictionary of the literary Macedonian language (Moscow, 1963). Also, R.P. Usikova, who was also Bernštejn's pupil, has published numerous articles, books and dictionaries on the Macedonian language, including various grammars such as *Makedonskij jazyk* 'Macedonian Language' (Skopje, 2000), *Grammatika makedonskogo literaturnogo jazyka* 'Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language' (Moscow, 2003) and a three-volume Macedonian-Russian dictionary, *Makedonsko-ruski rečnik/Makedonsko-russkij slovar*' (Skopje, 1997), *Makedonsko-russkij slovar'/Makedonsko-ruski rečnik* (Moscow, 2003).

12. "Za žal, osven nekoj fragmenti od ova kniga što se pojavija vo naučnata periodika, do deneska taa ostana nepoznata, duri ne se znae ni dali e začuvana i kade se naogja."

13. The second edition was published in 1947, and in 1950 a new edition was published. Bernštejn consulted the first edition of his grammar (Bernštejn 1949:12).

14. Right after the publication of Lunt's grammar, the first part of Blaže Koneski's *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturni jazik* 'Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language' came out.

15. In fact, Koneski objected to the desire of people at the First Codification Conference to bring in Bernštejn to tell them what to do. Koneski felt strongly that standard Macedonian should be codified by native speakers, not foreigners. This was one of the reasons the First Conference failed and a second one was held (Blaže Koneski, personal communication with Victor A. Friedman in 1991). For details, see *Section 2* of this article.

16. "... voznikovenie nacional'nyx jazykov opredeljaetsja prežde vsego istoričeskimi uslovijami, a ne blizost'ju ili otdalēnost'ju dialektov ...Vo mnogix otnošenijax makedonskie govory bliže k zapadnym bolgarskim, neželi rodopskie. I tem ne menee, makedonskie govory v nastojašee vremja odnosjatsja k makedonskomu nacional'nomu jazyku, a rodopskie govory javljajutsja govorami bolgarskogo jazyka."

17. "Nesmotorja na značitel'noe dialektnoe raznoobrazie, makedonskie govory predstavljajut soboj edinstvo i zametno otičajutsja ot narodnyx govorov Frakii, Rodop, Mizii i Balkan."

18. In his diary, Bernštejn wrote that he passed the text to Vlahov on September 11, while in Risteski's document and Vlahov's speech the date given is September 12. See Risteski (1988:222) and Vlahov (1947:214), respectively.

19. These two points clearly reflect anti-Serbian sentiment, which may be seen elsewhere in Bernštejn's works on Macedonian. Indeed, in his diary, Bernštejn wrote: "Nel'zja dopustit', čtoby makedonskij literaturnyj jazyk stal poluserbskim ('one cannot permit the Macedonian literary

language to be half-Serbian’) (Bernštejn 2002:56). On the other hand, it is also important to note that Vlahov’s concern was: “... odnako mne izvestno, što v nastojaščee vremja v Makedonii silna grupa, kotoraja orientiruetsja na skopskij dialekt i na serbskij literaturnyj jazyk (‘however, I know that now in Macedonia there is a strong group that is oriented to the Skopje dialect and to the Serbian literary language’). See Bernštejn (2002:54).

20. Deržavin’s linguistic views of Macedonian can be characterized as pro-Bulgarian, *i.e.*, the Macedonian dialects belong to Bulgarian (Deržavin 1914:54-111).

21. See also *Note 13* in this article.

22. “Prvata jazična komisija otide i podaleku, iznesuvajkji vo svoeto obrazoloženie do Poverenstvoto za narodnata prosveta, od 20 januari 1945 godina, deka taa go dava predlogot ne vo definitivna forma, ami krajno rešenje za našite jazični prašanja treba da se zeme duri koga kje dojdele da ni pomožat nekoj ruski naučnici. Se razbira deka ova beše sosem naivno i pogrešno misleno. Za rešavanieto na našeto jazično prašanje ne možeše da bide kompetenten nikoj drug osven nie samite.”

23. “Naša kniga – ne učebnik makedonskogo jazyka. My daëm opisanie sovremennogo literaturnogo jazyka, illjustiruja ego pravila primerami iz original’nyx proizvedenij makedonskoj literatury. Otdel’naja glava posvjaščena polemike s sozdateljami literaturnogo jazyka po nekotorym spornym vorposom.”

24. Although the Index is indicated in the Table of Contents, it is not attached to this typescript.

25. On page 109 of the typescript, Bernštejn changed the title of this chapter to “Iz istorii makedonskoj žurnalistiki” (see also Ristovski 2013: 565).

26. Lunt’s *Grammar* does not include word formation or syntax. Koneski’s grammar, however, does treat word formation and syntax.

27. “Mne predstavljaetsja, što osnovnye voprosy rešeny verno. No koe-čto eščo nužno sdelat’, v nekotoryx slučajax peredelat’. V časnostjax nabljudajetsja mnogo spornogo, a poroju i zavedomo ošibočnogo. V dannoj glave my ostanovimsja na nekotoryx problemax, rešennyx, kak nam predstavljaetja, nepravil’no.”

28. “Uže mnogo raz spravedljivo ukazyvali, što vvedenie jota v slavjanskuju grafiku narušaet vnutrennee edinstvo slavjanskogo alfavita, sozdaet poligrafičeskie trudnosti i voobščee ne imeet smisla, tak kak v otličie ot latinskogo alfavita slavjanskij ne nuždaetsja v etoj bukve. Odnako v serbskom jazyke eto novovvedenie Vuka privilos’ i teper’ bylo by uže trudno i možet byt’ neracional’no vvodit’ bukvy я, ю. No začem povtorjat’ neudačnie novovvedenija teper’ v makedonskom literaturnom jazyke, kogda eščo net nikakix tradicii, kogda novyj alfavit v naibol’shej stepeni mog by byt’ posledovatel’nym. Nam kažetsja, što makedonskim literatoram sledovalo by v dannom slučae pojti po puti russkogo i bolgarskogo alfavitov.”

29. “Tol’ko Vuk Stefanovič Karadžič, odarennyj tonkim čut’ëm k zvukovoj storone otečestvennogo jazyka i, s drugoj storony, obladašij strogo posledovatel’nym umom, soxraniv upotrebljavšijsja do nego alfavit, primenil k nemu vpolne posledovatel’no bukval’nyj (zvukovoj) grafičeskij princip i etim okazal nemalovažnuju uslugu serbskoj literature i serbskim umam. Grafika Karadžiča predstavljajet, možno skazat’, po svoemu, po krajnej mere, principu obrazec soveršenstva.”

30. “I makedonskata kjerka na Vukovata kirilica pretstavuva eden od fonološki najsovršenite grafiski sistemi.”

31. Koneski opines as follows: “Uvodejkji go toj znak (jot, M.N.), nie veće možeme da go obeležime so nego zvukot *j* sekad kaj što se sluša, i izbegnueme nacrti: *я, ю, ѱ*. Jasno je kolku se uprošue so toa rabotata: eden zvuk mesto tri” (‘By introducing this sign, now we can mark the sound with the letter *j* whenever the sound is heard, and we can avoid writing *я, ю, ѱ*. It is clear by that how much the thing is simplified: one sound instead of three’).

32. In this context it is important to note Georgi Madenov’s rather positive view on an influence of the Serbian language on Macedonian dated October 31, 1946 (Čašule 1970:97): “Vrz makedonskiot jazik besporno, kje ukažat vlijanie i sosednite jazici, kje ukaže i srpskiot jazik, zašto makedonskiot narod e vo ekonomska, kulturna i politička zaednica so jugoslovenskite narodi” (‘Needless to say, neighboring languages will have an influence on the Macedonian language. The Serbian language will also have an influence on it as well, because the Macedonian nation is in an economic, cultural and politic community with the Yugoslavian nations’).

33. “Ustanoviv vsled za serbskim jazykom fonetičeskuju orfografiju, sozdateli novogo literaturnogo jazyka ne dostatočno jasno predstavili sebe različija serbskoj i makedonskoj fonetičeskix system. Delo v tom, što serbskie napisanija *zub, dub, grob* i pr. javljajutsja fonetičeskimi napisanijami. Sovsem inače delo obstoit v makedonskom jazyke. V něm, kak i v bolgarskom jazyke, konečnye zvonkie perexodjat v sootvetstvujuščie gluxie. Poetomu sledovalo by pisat’ *dap, zap, grop*, tak že kak pišetsja *jas*.”

34. “Sосушествование èтих различных форм в системе единого литературного языка недопустимо. Необходимо сделать выбор. Думаю, что сделать это совсем не трудно.”

35. According to Friedman (2001:265), the use of *on/ona/ono* seems to be increasing in Skopje. This observation is just the opposite of what was pointed out by Bernštejn (1949:96). However, the concrete dynamics of these two sets of pronouns are unknown.

36. For instance, Mareš (1994:43), Topolińska (1995:24) and Usikova (2003:160) have already excluded *on/ona/ono* from the paradigms of the personal pronouns. Mišeska Tomić (2012:165-66) includes only *toj/taa/toa* while indicating that *on/ona/ono* is found in the northern dialects, which means that she treats the latter variety as a dialectal feature.

37. “Odnako ne trudno zameťit’, čto formy *ov, va, vo, on, na, no* očevidno izbegajutsja. V otličie ot narodnogo jazyka, gde eti formy vstrečajutsja očen’ často, v literaturnom jazyke oni upotrebljajutsja redko i glavnym obrazom v tekstax s elementami narodnogo jazyka ... Net nikakogo somnenija v tom, čto eto privodit k objedineniju jazyka, k utrate važnyx njuansov i ottentkov ... Èta čerta narodnoj reči dolžna byt’ soxranena i v literaturnom jazyke.”

Examples are taken from Minova-Gjurkova (2000:131). According to Ugrinova-Skalovska (1962:105:11), this feature is found particularly in a colloquial variety. For a detailed analysis, see Friedman (2016:285-94) and Rudin (2018:263-86).

39. First, Bernštejn added these words: “Naibol’šee vozraženie vyzyvaet forma 3 l. ed. glagolov nastojaščego vremeni (‘the verbal form of the third-person singular of the present tense provokes the strongest objection’) (Bernštejn 1949:98). Second, to make his argument more convincing, Bernštejn added concrete examples taken from R. Žinzifov between the paragraphs starting from “Ètoj že osobennosti ...” and “Vyše ja upominal ...” in his 1948 article.

40. “Kak xorošo izvestno, bol’šaja čast’ sovremennyx makedonskix govorov v 3 l. ed. imeet okončanie *-t*, čto rezko ix vydeljaet sredi vsex govorov južnoslavjanskix jazykov.”

41. “Soxranjaja *-t* v člennoj forme i opuskaja ego v 3 l. ed. č. nastojaščego vremeni, sozdateli novogo literaturnogo jazyka narušili očen’ važnuju v makedonskix govorax zakonornost’ i ustanovili iskusstvennoe sootnošenje etix dvux form. Èto nikak nel’zja opravdat.”

42. According to Marjan Markovikj (personal communication), today the feature can be found in a very limited area in the Western peripheral dialects only. Thus, it cannot be a feature to be included in the literary language, even though it indeed is a very archaic and unique feature of the Macedonian language.

References

- Baudouin de Courtenay, J.N.I. 1871. “Neskol’ko slov po povodu Obščeslavjanskoj azbuki,” *Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveščeniija* 5, pp. 145-95.
- Bernštejn, S.B. 1938. “Makedonskij jazyk,” *Bol’šaja sovetskaja ènciklopedija*, Šmidt, O.Ju. (ed.). Moscow: Gosudarstvennyj institut “Sovetskaja enciklopedija,” p. 743.
- _____. 1948b. “Makedonskij jazyk,” *Bjulleten’ akademii nauk* 4, pp. 85-86.
- _____. 1949. “Očerok makedonskogo literaturnogo jazyka,” Unpublished ms., Akademija nauk SSSR.
- _____. 1957. “Iz istorii izučeniija južnyx slavjanskix jazykov v Rossii i v SSSR,” *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznaniija* 2, pp. 123-52.

- Bernštejn, S.B. 1958. "‘Vardar’ K.P. ‘Misirkova,'" *Slavistična revija* 9, pp. 3-4.
- _____. 1961. *Očerk sravnitel'noj grammatiki slavjanskix jazykov*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
- _____. 2002. *Zigzagi pamjati: Vospominanija. Dnevnikovye zapisi*. Moscow: Institut slavianovedenija RAN.
- Bilodid, I.K. 1965. *Vuk Karadžič v istorii ukraïns'ko-serbs'kyx naukovyx zv'jazkiv*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Deržavin, N.S. 1914. *Bolgarsko-serbskija vzaimootnošenija i makedonski vopros*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija "A. Smolinskij."
- Dmitriev, P.A., i G.I. Safronov. 1975. *Iz istorii rusko-jugoslavjanskix literaturnyx i naučnyx svjazej*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo leningradskogo universiteta.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1993b. "The First Philological Conference for the Establishment of the Macedonian Alphabet and the Macedonian Literary Language: Its Precedents and Consequences," *The Earliest Stage of Language Planning: The "First Congress" Phenomenon*, Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 159-80.
- _____. 2011. *Makedonistički studii*. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite.
- _____. 2015. *Macedonian Studies 2*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- _____. 2016. "Edna stilska osobenost vo makedonskiot govoren jazik vo XXI vek: Dvojno opredeluvanje vo takanarečenite 'Bombi' od 2015 g.," *Zbornik vo čest na prof. d-r Radmila Ugrinova-Skalovska po povod devedesetgodišninata od ragjanjeto*, Crvenkovska, Emilija (ed.). Skopje: Univerzitet "Sv. Kiril i Metodij," pp. 285-94.
- Gołąb, Zbigniew. 1956. "Review of Horace Lunt's 'A Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language,'" *Rocznik slawistyczny* 18, pp. 111-19.
- Gudkov, V.P. 2014. *Vuk Karadžič: 1787-1864: Dan' pamjati: Sbornik statej*. Moscow: MAKS Press.
- Ivanoski, Vlado. 2011. "Aktivnost na Dimitar Vlahov vo sovetskiot sojuz (1941-1944)," *Makedonija i Rusija/SSSR (Istorija – Politika – Kultura) od Prvata svetska vojna do formiranjeto na sovremenata makedonska državnost (1914-1944)*, Ristovski, Blaže (ed.). Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite, pp. 295-305.

- Ivić, Pavle. 1953. "On the Present State of the Study of Standard Macedonian," *Slavic Word* 2, pp. 325-38.
- Jančeva, Ljubica, and Katerina Mirčevska. 2011. "Vlijanieto na sovetските slavisti vrz rabotata na komisiite za kodifikacija na sovremeniot makedonski literaturen jazik i pravopis (1944-1945)," *Makedonija i Rusija/SSSR (Istorija – Politika – Kultura) od Prvata svetska vojna do formiranjeto na sovremenata makedonska državnost (1914-1944)*, Ristovski, Blaže (ed.). Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite, pp. 307-15.
- Kepeski, Krume. 1946. *Makedonska gramatika*. Skopje: Državno knigoizdatelstvo na Makedonija.
- Koneski, Blaže. 1952. *Za makedonskiot literaturen jazik*. Skopje: Kočo Racin.
- _____. 1959. "Za donesuvanjeto na makedonskata azbuka i pravopis," *Makedonski jazik* 5, pp. 99-104.
- _____. 1967. *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturen jazik del I i II*. Skopje: Kultura.
- _____. 1983. *A Historical Phonology of the Macedonian Language*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Lunt, Horace G. 1952. *A Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language*. Skopje: Državno Knigoizdatelstvo na NR Makedonija.
- Mareš, František Václav. 1994. *Makedonská gramatika*. Skopje: Makedonská akademie věd a umění.
- _____. 2008. *Komparativna fonologija i morfolologija na makedonskiot jazik. Sinhronija i dijahronija*. Skopje: Univerzitet "Sv. Kiril i Metodij."
- Markovikj, Marjan. 2013. "The Macedonian Language: Overview of the Contemporary Situation," *Macedonia: Land, Region, Borderland*, Sujecka, Jolanta (ed.). Warsaw: Faculty of "Artes Liberales," University of Warsaw and Wydawnictwo DiG, pp. 433-51.
- Minova-Gjurkova, Liljana. 1998. "Sostojbi i promeni vo makedonskiot jazik od 1945 godina. Morfolologija," *Makedonski jazik*, Minova-Gjurkova, Liljana (ed.). Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski – Instytut Filologii Polskiej, pp. 108-19.
- _____. 2000. *Sintaksa na makedonskiot standarden jazik*. Skopje: Magor.
- _____. 2003. *Stilistika na sovremeniot makedonski jazik*. Skopje: Magor.
- Mišeska-Tomić, Olga. 2012. *A Grammar of Macedonian*. Bloomington, Indiana: Slavica.

- Mladenović, Aleksandar. 1963. "Znak *j* u perspektivi predvukovskog ćirilčkog pravopisa," *Godišnjak filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 7, pp. 1-8.
- Možaeva, I.E. 1971. "Bibliografija trudov prof. S.B. Bernštejna (1935-1970)," *Issledovanija po slavjanskomu jazykoznaniju. Sbornik v čest' šestidesjatiletija profesora S.B. Bernštejna*, Dëmina, E.I., E.I. Zelenina, N.I. Tolstoj and E.V. Češko (eds). Moscow: Nauka, pp. 5-17.
- _____. 1991. "Bibliografija trudov prof. S.B. Bernštejna (1970-1990)," *STUDIA SLAVICA. K 80-letiju Samuila Borisoviča Bernštejna*, Bulatova, R.V., V.A. D'jakov, V.N. Toporov and V.A. Xorev (eds). Moscow: Akademija nauk SSSR, pp. 5-15.
- Neweklowsky, Gerhard. 2010. *Die südslawischen Standardsprachen*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Pandev, Dimitar. 2013. "Makedonskij jazyk v sovetskoj lingvistike (1945-1991)," *Rossija (SSSR) i Makedonija: istorija, politika, kul'tura 1944-1991 gg.*, Nikiforov, K.V., et al. (eds). Moscow: Rosijskaja akademija nauka, cc. 223-30.
- Popović, Miodrag. 1981. *Jota*. Beograd: "Rad."
- Reiter, Norbert. 1967. *Der Dialekt von Titov-Veles*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz.
- Risteski, Stojan. 1988. *Sozdavanjeto na sovremeniot makedonski literaturen jazik*. Skopje: Studentski zbor.
- _____. 2000. *Stenografski beleški od prvata jazična komisja*. Faksimil. Skopje: Menora.
- Ristovski, Blaže. 2011. "Nikolaj Deržavin, Samuil Bernštejn i Dimitar Vlahov za sovremeniot makedonski literaturen jazik i pravopis (Kon istorijana na makedonskana kodifikacija)," *Prilozi XXXVI* (1-2). pp. 17-42.
- _____. 2013. "Rol' rosijskoj slavistiki v kodifikaciji sovremennogo makedonskogo literaturnogo jazyka i orfografii (po powodu 100-letija so ddnja roždenija prof. S.B. Bernštejna)," *Rossija (SSSR) i Makedonija: istorija, politika, kul'tura 1944-1991 gg.*, Nikiforov, K.V., et al. (eds). Moscow: Rosijskaja akademija nauka, pp. 199-212.
- _____. 2013. *Makedonski raboti: Jazik-Literatura-Istorija-Nacija-Država*. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite.
- Rudin, Catherine. 2018. "Multiple Determination in Bulgarian and Macedonian: An Exploration of Structure, Usage, and Meaning," *V zeleni drželi zeleni breg. Studies in Honor of Marc L. Greenberg*, Stephen M. Dickey and Mark Richard Lauersdorf (eds). Bloomington, Indiana: Slavica.

- Seliščev, A.M. 1986. *Prinosi v bŕlgarskata dialektologija i etnografija*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo nauka i izkustvo.
- Stamatoski, Trajko. 1986. *Borba za makedonski literaturni jazik*. Skopje: Misla.
- _____. 1998. *Kontinuitetot na makedonskiot literaturni jazik*. Skopje: Prosvetno delo.
- Škarič, Svetomir. 2013. "Političeskaja sistema Makedonii v 1945-1953 gg. (Vzgljad iz XXI veka)," *Rossija (SSSR) i Makedonija: istorija, politika, kul'tura 1944-1991 gg.*, Nikiforov, K.V., et al. (eds). Moscow: Rosijskaja akademija nauka, pp. 91-112.
- Topolinjska, Zuzanna. 1995. *Zarys gramatyki języka macedońskiego*. Kraków: Nakładem uniwersytetu jagiellońskiego.
- _____. 2008a. *Polski-makedonski: Gramatička konfrontačija 8. Razvitok na gramatičkite kategorii*. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite.
- _____. 2008b. "Advantage and Disadvantage of Late Standardization," *Language Typology and Universals* 61(2), pp. 170-75.
- Toporov, V.N. 1998. "Samuil Borisovič Bernštejn," *Balto-slavjanske issledovanija* 1997, pp. 619-23.
- Tošev, Krum. 1979. *Struškiot govor (spored nekoj materijali od XIX vek)*. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik "Krstev Misirkov."
- Ugrinova-Skalovska, Rada. 1962. "Dve stilski osobenosti vo našiot govoren jazik," *Makedonski jazik* 11-12, pp. 105-11.
- Usikova, R.P. 2003. *Grammatika makedonskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moscow: Muravej.
- _____. 2011. "O razvitii makedonistiki v Rossii," *Sovremennaja slavistika i naučnoe nasledie S.B. Bernštejna*, Žuravrev, A.F., and N.E. Anan'eva (eds). Moscow: Institut slavjanovedenija RAN, pp. 17-19.
- Valeva, E.L., and O.N. Isaeva. 2013. "Makedonistika v SSSR: k istorii po političeskix tabu," *Rossija (SSSR) i Makedonija: istorija, politika, kul'tura 1944-1991 gg.*, Nikiforov, K.V., et al. (eds). Moscow: Rosijskaja akademija nauka, pp. 141-58.
- Viodeski, Božidar. 2013. *Prilozi za razvojot na makedonističkata lingvistika*. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite.
- Vlahov, Dimitar. 1947. *Govori i statii 1945-1947*. Skopje: Državno knigoizdatelstvo na Makedonija.
- Čašule, Vangja. 1970. *Od priznavanje do negiranje (bugarski stavovi za makedonskoto prašanje) – statii, govori, dokumenty* –. Skopje: Kultura.

Other Sources Consulted

- Bernštejn, S.B. 1948a. "Makedonskij jazyk," Unpublished ms., Akademija nauk SSSR.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1993a. "Macedonian," *The Slavonic Languages*, Comrie, Bernard, and Greville G. Corbett (eds). London and New York: Routledge, pp. 249-305.
- Lunt, Horace G. 1984. "Some Sociolinguistic Aspects of Macedonian and Bulgarian," *Language and Literary Theory. In Honor of Ladislav Matejka*, Stoltz, Benjamin A., I.R. Titunik and Lubomír Doležel (eds). Ann Arbor, Michigan: Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, pp. 83-132.