

nationality. The complex problems of language standardization, brought into focus by the contemporary language crisis in Yugoslavia, have challenged Brozović to restate his observations in a more theoretical framework involving other Slavic languages and other Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages as well. A collection of his contributions appeared in 1970 in a volume entitled *Standard Language*. In the introductory chapter to his book, Brozović points out that linguists have often neglected the intricate relationship between the natural processes of linguistic systems and the role of normativization intentionally imposed by the language planners.

According to Brozović, the normative processes of standardization deserve a special approach which should not confuse linguistic factors with the sociocultural products. He shows that such a distinction is particularly needed in the areas where language communication is shaped in connection with the needs of tribal and ethnic distinctiveness of developing nations. In this framework the present Serbo-Croatian language conflict is seen as a sociolinguistic case comparable to similar cases in Africa, South America, Asia, and so forth, where the languages have a sensitive relationship to the growing nationalism in its transitional stages of clan and tribal identification. Thus Serbo-Croatian, which has attracted linguistic investigation for decades because of the unique preservation of its ancient Indo-European heritage, becomes in its present political crisis the subject of a new science to which Brozović has provided a substantial epistemological groundwork. In fact, his *Standard Language* is the most civilized and learned contribution to the present language conflict in Yugoslavia, a conflict which otherwise has displayed many personal and local aspects obscuring rather than elucidating the painful growth of a cultural language in the Balkans.

LADISLAV MATEJKA
University of Michigan

ISTORIJA NA MAKEDONSKIOT NAROD. 3 vols. Edited by *Mihailo Apostolski* et al. Skopje: "Nova Makedonija," 1969.

ISTORIJA MAKEDONSKOG NARODA. 3 vols. Edited by *Mihailo Apostolski* et al. Belgrade: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika Socijalističke Republike Srbije, 1970. Vol. 1: OD PRAISTORIJE DO KRAJA XVIII VEKA. 321 pp. 100 new dinars. Vol. 2: OD POČETKA XIX VEKA DO KRAJA PRVOG SVETSKOG RATA. 414 pp. 110 new dinars. Vol. 3: PERIOD IZMEĐU DVA SVETSKA RATA I NARODNA REVOLUCIJA (1918–1945). 449 pp. 120 new dinars.

Yugoslav historians have had difficulty solving the problems of writing a unified synthesis of the history of their several peoples. Vladimir Ćorović's *Istorija Jugoslavije* (Belgrade, 1933), published before the Second World War, was a bold attempt to produce such a history, but it fell short of its goal. It did not provide good coverage of many basic historical problems and was written with patriotic fervor.

The resurgent nationalisms and efforts to fit the history of the Yugoslav peoples into a Marxian scheme of periodization stand as barriers to objective inquiry. The irreconcilability of ethnic and Marxian interpretations was amply manifested during the long discussions preparatory to the writing of the "History

of the Peoples of Yugoslavia." The positions taken by the historians on many vital issues reflected their ethnic bias. Those who cited Marx as their authority, as well as those who did not, often disagreed on the interpretation of many important questions. Nearly every Yugoslav historian endeavored to present his own people's past in the most favorable light and to spell it out in as detailed a fashion as possible. After much wrangling, compromises were reached on the interpretation of sensitive questions and in regard to the allocation of space to the individual nations in a "History of the Yugoslav Peoples." The result was the first volume of the *Istorija naroda Jugoslavije*, which has been sharply criticized by Yugoslav historians who did not participate in the venture. The fact that the first volume was published in 1953, the second not until 1960, and the third has not yet appeared is a consequence of the difficulty in reconciling various ethnic and ideological points of view.

In the meantime groups of historians have embarked on schemes to produce multivolume histories of individual Yugoslav peoples. The Montenegrin historians were the first to launch such a project (*Istorija Crne Gore*). Two volumes have been published so far—the first in 1967 and the second, in two parts, in 1970. Together they cover the history of Montenegro to the end of the fifteenth century. A comprehensive history of Bosnia and Hercegovina is being written, and the publishing house Srpska Književna Zadruga has recently completed an agreement with a group of Serbian historians to do a multivolume history of Serbia. Preparatory steps are being taken to produce equally ambitious histories of Croatia and Slovenia. The Croatian historians have already published two important surveys, one on the early medieval history of Croatia (Nada Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata*, Zagreb, 1971, 593 pp.) and the other on Croatian history from 1860 to 1914 (Jaroslav Šidak et al., *Povijest hrvatskoga naroda g. 1860–1914*, Zagreb, 1968, 352 pp.). Both of these works should be translated into English.

The Macedonian historians, in collaboration with a number of other Yugoslav historians, are the first among the Yugoslavs to complete a comprehensive three-volume history of their people. This reflects a greater urgency for the Macedonians to produce a survey of national history than for other Yugoslav nationalities who already have a rich historiography. The *History of the Macedonian People* emphasizes the period from the beginning of the nineteenth century to the present. Two volumes are allocated to this period and one to the entire earlier history of Macedonia.

The first volume covers the history of Macedonia from the primitive-communal period to the end of the eighteenth century. Fifty-seven pages are devoted to Macedonia prior to the coming of the Slavs to the Balkans. The authors discuss the ancient Macedonian state and society, Roman rule in Macedonia, the slaveholding order, feudalism, the colonization of the Slavs and their Christianization, the so-called Bogumil heresy, Samuel's empire, the Byzantine and the Serbian sway over Macedonia, and the Ottoman conquest and rule in Macedonia.

The second volume covers the period from the beginning of the nineteenth century to the end of the First World War, and treats such fundamental problems as the disintegration of Ottoman feudalism, the beginnings of capitalism in Macedonia, the first Macedonian national stirrings, the inception and development of the Macedonian national revolutionary movement, the Young Turk movement, the Balkan Wars (1912–13), and the First World War (1914–18). The greatest attention is given to the Macedonian revolutionary movement. The authors describe

the division of Macedonia among the Balkan Allies in 1912–13 and conclude that although the victory of the Balkan states over the Ottoman Empire resulted in the destruction of Ottoman feudalism and a more rapid development of capitalism, it did not secure economic, political, and national liberation for the Macedonians. Finally, the authors discuss Macedonian participation in the First World War and the Macedonian contribution to the Allied victory.

More than half of the third volume is on Macedonia in the interwar period. The most space is given to Vardar Macedonia (Macedonia in Yugoslavia), much less to Pirin Macedonia (Macedonia in Bulgaria), and the least space is given to Aegean Macedonia (Macedonia in Greece). In the remainder of the volume the authors discuss the period of the Second World War, the Axis occupation, and the national liberation war. The treatment of the period of the Second World War represents a summation of what is well known; it is probably more important for what it does not include in the discussion (the Yugoslav-Bulgarian Communist rivalry, the Comintern involvement, the question of Macedonia in the high Yugoslav Communist Party councils) than for what it does.

Unlike those nations whose identity and ethnic distinction are not questioned, the Macedonians feel compelled to prove that their separate nationality has its own ethnic, linguistic, and historical specifics. The fact that the Yugoslav government recognizes the Macedonians as a nation with its own national culture and that the Macedonians have within the Yugoslav federation their own socialist republic—their own political and ecclesiastical organization—is challenged by neighboring Bulgaria and Greece and by some Macedonians themselves.

The patriotic Macedonian historians are duty-bound to produce a history that will serve to instill in the younger generation pride in their nation and its history. They have to provide a model for teachers and writers of history, a model that contains acceptable interpretations of historical events and men. Their aim is to show that the Macedonians have a continuous history which is uniquely their own. To establish the identity of their people, the Macedonian historians seek to show that from the time their ancestors settled in the Balkans the Macedonian Slavs were a distinct group, that they crossed into the Balkans at a particular point and time, and that the original home of the Macedonian Slavs was not located in the same geographic area as that of the Bulgarians and the Serbs. The contemporary Macedonians are seen as the cultural heirs of ancient peoples who preceded them on the Macedonian territory. The writing of history with special national and ideological objectives has necessitated circumvention of delicate and insoluble questions and the molding of historical developments to fit preconceived notions. Imbued with national spirit, the Macedonian historians, like some Croatian and Serbian national historians, are driven to project the modern concept of nationalism into the past.

The problem of disentangling the history of the Macedonians from that of other Balkan peoples, especially the Bulgarians and the Serbs, is virtually impossible. The three kindred peoples mixed on meeting, as mutually soluble liquids do, and their histories in certain periods are inextricably entwined. Nationalism was late in coming to the Macedonians. In fact the Macedonians did not become nationally conscious until modern times.

The *History of the Macedonian People* is written simply and addressed to a broad reading public. Although it has no index, which is a great pity, each volume includes an excellent bibliography. Macedonia is a young and still developing

nation. When it achieves its full consolidation, its historians will no longer find it necessary to write history with such passion and purpose. And when that time comes, much of the *History of the Macedonian People* will be revised. But for the time being, despite the defects to which we have alluded, these volumes represent a step forward in the rapidly expanding Macedonian historiography.

WAYNE S. VUCINICH
Stanford University

BITOLSKI NADPIS NA IVAN VLADISLAV SAMODŪRZHETS BŪLGARSKI: STAROBŪLGARSKI PAMETNIK OT 1015–1016 GODINA.

By *Jordan Zaimov* and *Vasilka Zaimova*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiia na naukite, 1970. 160 pp. + 11 plates.

In 1956 a marble block serving as part of the threshold of a sixteenth-century mosque in Bitola was discovered to contain a badly worn Slavonic inscription. The text clearly must have spilled over to a lost block on the left, and to one or more blocks at the top. Yet the twelve preserved lines refer to "John, autocrat of the Bulgars" and, later, "son of Aron." The historian and paleographer Vladimir Mošin published the text (in *Makedonski jazik*, 1966), with a bold series of conjectures and emendations arguing that the inscription included reference to Samuel's defeat in 1014 and had been set up by Ivan Vladislav, Samuel's nephew (ruled 1015–18). The Zaimovs confidently "restore" most of the text, including dates, and proceed to take their wish-thoughts as incontrovertible proof of a number of historical events otherwise unknown.

Unfortunately there is no even remotely reliable set of criteria for dating early South Slavic Cyrillic, and epigraphic material is sparse and extremely controversial. I must respectfully disagree with Mošin's estimate that this text fits in the early eleventh century. Zaimov's paleographic and linguistic arguments are inaccurate and naïve.

One basic point: Mošin clearly records the fact that the date he confidently reconstructs as 6522 (1014) has been worn away ("datata e izližana"; p. 39 in *Slovenska pisemnost*, ed. P. Ilievski, Ohrid, 1966). Indeed it does not show up in any published photographs (note that the Zaimovs' plate 2 has been doctored in an unspecified manner, and plate 3 is frankly a drawing), nor is it found in a latex mold made by Professor Ihor Ševčenko of Dumbarton Oaks. Assuming that this spot does contain a date, one can grant the 6 and the final 2, and a vertical line with a partial crosspiece that could be Φ (500) but looks much more like Ψ (700), and is followed by a space wide enough even for M (40). If one then conjectures the numbers as 6742, the date would be 1234. This fits beautifully with the orthography and language, and it identifies Ivan as Asen II, who gained power over Macedonia in 1230. Yet it also demolishes the intricate historical explanations elaborated by the Zaimovs and generally diminishes the light that this inscription allegedly throws on an obscure period of Macedonian and Bulgarian history. The crucial questions remain open.

HORACE G. LUNT
Harvard University