

SLCCEE

# **Studies on Language and Culture in Central and Eastern Europe**

Edited by  
Christian Voß

**Band 25**

**Three generations, two countries of origin, one speech  
community - Australian-Macedonians and their language(s)**

Jim Hlavac

**SLCCEE**

Biblion Media · 2016

### **Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Bibliothek**

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Informationen sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

### **Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.ddb.de>



© 2016 Biblion Media GmbH  
Geschäftshaus „Grauer Wolf“  
Hainstraße 11  
04109 Leipzig

[info@biblion.de](mailto:info@biblion.de)  
[www.biblion.de](http://www.biblion.de)

in Kooperation mit Kubon & Sagner GmbH  
München – Berlin – Leipzig – Washington/D.C.

[www.kubon-sagner.de](http://www.kubon-sagner.de)

Anschrift des Herausgebers:

Prof. Dr. Christian Voß  
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin  
Institut für Slawistik  
Dorotheenstraße 65  
10117 Berlin

Telefon +49 30 20 93-5185  
[christian.voss@staff.hu-berlin.de](mailto:christian.voss@staff.hu-berlin.de)

Umschlaggestaltung: Christopher Triplett  
Druck und Bindung: Difo Druck, Bamberg  
Printed in Germany

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

ISSN: 1868-2936  
ISBN: 978-3-86688-538-7  
ISBN (eBook): 978-3-86688-539-4

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	7
1. Introduction.....	9
1.1 What is language maintenance? Why is it important? .....	11
1.2 The transposed languages of migrants .....	13
1.3 Linguistic self-identifications .....	16
1.4 Speech community.....	17
1.5 A multi-perspective approach, theoretical frameworks and what this book seeks to achieve .....	20
2. Background theory of concepts .....	27
2.1 Domains and what they cover .....	27
2.1.1 Definitions of bilingualism and self-declared proficiencies .....	28
2.2. Family/Home – Intra-family communication.....	32
2.3 Personal domain.....	34
2.4 Media .....	38
2.5 Education .....	43
2.6 Friendship and social domain.....	47
2.7 Religion.....	49
2.8 Transactional, work/occupational, neighbourhood domains.....	53
2.9 Ethnolinguistic vitality .....	55
2.10 Language attitudes .....	59
2.10.1 Attitudes towards mono-, bi- and multilingualism and language maintenance .....	61
2.10.2 Attitudes towards the value of one’s languages .....	61
2.10.3 Affective responses to languages .....	62
3. Macedonia, the Macedonian language and Macedonian-speakers.....	63
3.1 Macedonia – definition of the area, and the terms Aegean Macedonia (‘Aeg.Mac.’) and Republic of Macedonia (‘Rep.Mac.’).....	63
3.2 Historical, socio-political and linguistic descriptions of Macedonia, Macedonians and the Macedonian language .....	67

3.3	A brief history of the Macedonian language and Macedonian speech communities .....	80
3.4	Speakers of Macedonian and Macedonian-speakers over the last century .....	90
3.5	Language status of Macedonian and Macedonian language maintenance .....	96
3.5.1	Language status of Macedonian in Aegean Macedonia.....	96
3.5.2	Language status of Macedonian in the Republic of Macedonia.....	99
3.5.3	Language status of Macedonian in Bulgaria and elsewhere in south-east Europe.....	100
3.5.4	Minority language maintenance and the Macedonian language in the Macedonian diaspora .....	103
4.	Method and data samples.....	125
4.1	Preparation and compilation of materials for investigation.....	125
4.2	Criteria for choice of potential informants .....	126
4.3	Who are speakers of Macedonian? .....	127
4.4	Access to and establishing contact with informants, distribution of informants .....	132
4.5	Informant Sample 1: Sociolinguistic Questionnaire Participants.....	135
4.5.1	‘Situatedness’ of Sample 1 informants in Melbourne .....	141
4.6	Informant Sample 2: Ethnolinguistic Vitality Questionnaire Participants .....	149
4.7	Informant Sample 3: Recorded Interview Participants.....	150
5.	Language acquisition, reported and self-reported proficiency .....	153
5.1	Pre-emigration features of language acquisition and use .....	153
5.1.1	Language acquisition and use before emigration for first-generation informants .....	155
5.2	Reported and self-reported language proficiency.....	165
5.2.1	Gen.1 speakers from the perspective of Gen.2 informants .....	166
5.2.2	Gen.1 speakers from the perspective of Gen.3 informants .....	175
5.2.3	Gen.2 informants and their self-perceived proficiency in Macedonian .....	177

5.2.4	Gen.2 speakers from the perspective of Gen.3 informants .....	179
5.2.5	Gen.3 informants and their self-perceived proficiency in Macedonian .....	180
6.	Language use across domains.....	183
6.1	Home/Family Domain .....	184
6.1.1	Gen.1A and Gen.1B informants > same-generation interlocutors..	185
6.1.2	First-generation informants < > second-generation interlocutors...	186
6.2	Gen.2 informants .....	197
6.2.1	Gen.2 and their parents.....	197
6.2.2	Gen.2 informants and same-generation interlocutors .....	202
6.2.3	Gen.2 and the next generation .....	215
6.3	Gen.3 informants .....	220
6.3.1	Gen.3 and the preceding generations .....	220
6.3.2	Gen.3 and same-generation interlocutors.....	223
6.4	Conclusion .....	224
6.5	Personal Domain.....	226
6.6	Media .....	231
6.6.1	Music .....	248
6.7	Education Domain .....	250
6.8	Friendship and Social Domain .....	263
6.9	Religion.....	270
6.10	Occupational, transactional and neighbourhood domains.....	279
6.11	Conclusions about language use according to domain.....	288
7.	Ethnolinguistic vitality of a speech community .....	297
7.1	Strength and activeness of groups .....	300
7.2	Demography: birth rates, immigration, endogamy .....	303
7.3	Media representation .....	305
7.4	Friendship and occupational/vocational advancement, inter-group contact .....	307
7.5	Economic power .....	310

7.6 Demography: neighbourhood, wider metropolitan area.....	313
7.7 School / Teaching of languages .....	315
7.8 Cultural / Historical prestige.....	317
7.9 Religion.....	320
7.10 Government services and political power.....	323
7.11 Notions of language as an attribute of ethnicity, language proficiency, status of language.....	326
7.12 Conclusions.....	332
8. Identities, aesthetics and attitudes towards Macedonian and Macedonian language maintenance .....	343
8.1 Attitudes towards language maintenance .....	343
8.2 Macedonian as an endangered language? The legacy of a contested identity and discrimination. ....	347
8.3. Affective attitudes to language .....	350
9. Affective responses to language varieties.....	353
9.1 Affective responses to Dialectal Macedonian .....	355
9.2 Affective responses to Standard Macedonian.....	361
9.3 Affective responses to Australian English.....	365
9.4 Conclusions.....	370
10. Findings.....	377
10.1 Which phenomena are conducive to language maintenance? .....	377
10.2 Which phenomena are unclear or ambiguous for language maintenance? .....	382
10.3 Which phenomena are detrimental to language maintenance? .....	385
10.4 Inter-generational comparisons.....	387
10.5 Comparisons according to homeland: speakers from Aegean Macedonia; speakers from the Republic of Macedonia .....	393
10.5 Multi-faceted descriptions of linguistic minorities – where to from here? .....	398
Summary in English.....	401
Summary in Macedonian / Резиме на македонскиот јазик.....	413



Summary in Greek / Περίληψη στα ελληνικά.....	425
Appendices.....	439
Appendix 1: Transliteration of Cyrillic-script Macedonian into Roman-script letters.....	439
Appendix 2: Sociolinguistic questionnaire for first-generation informants ....	440
Appendix 3: Sociolinguistic questionnaire for second-generation informants	450
Appendix 4: Sociolinguistic questionnaire for third-generation informants...	466
Appendix 5: Ethnolinguistic vitality questions – Macedonian version.....	475
Appendix 6: Ethnolinguistic vitality questions – English version .....	480
Appendix 7: Interview questions for first-generation informants .....	485
Appendix 8: Interview questions for second-generation informants .....	486
Appendix 9: Sample transcript of interview with first-generation speaker (Gen.1A informant) .....	487
Appendix 10: Sample transcript of interview with first-generation speaker (Gen.1B informant).....	490
Appendix 11: Sample transcript of interview with second-generation speaker .....	494
Appendix 12: Details of informants whose interviews were video-taped and URL details of publicly-available recordings on YouTube. ....	497
References.....	501

## 1. Introduction

At my local shopping centre in one of Melbourne's post-industrial inner suburbs, there are groups of old men who gather in local coffee shops. They sit around, talking, arguing, remonstrating, occasionally getting up to greet a friend. They sit there, making a cup of coffee last three hours – their generous, big hands sometimes wrapped around Greek newspapers or horse-racing guides. Their wives are happy as they're out of the house for most of the day, and they are an unremarkable feature of the centre, along with the grungy university students, aged hippies and overworked sales assistants from India or China.

There are two main groups. In one of these groups, all the men speak Greek, a language I don't know. In the other group, the men speak Macedonian. They're Aegean Macedonians and they talk about their latest news, sometimes code-switching to read out headlines from Greek newspapers, the only language in which they have literacy. I'm 30 years younger than these men, and can never be an 'in-group' member in their circle. Nonetheless, I loiter sometimes in their vicinity, eavesdropping on their conversations. I know their faces, and also some of their ailments. Two of the men also occasionally join the Greek-speaking group. This appears unremarkable. To everyone.

In the last 15 years, some other older men have joined the Aegean Macedonian group. They're the same age, but more recently arrived, from the Republic of Macedonia, and some from Serbia and Bosnia. They speak vernaculars appropriate to their origins – but their conversational norms are a bit different. One of them, Stevo, a recently-arrived 70-year old Hercegovinian Serb living in my street, made overtures to join the group. Stevo, an auto-didact in everything, was not received well. I don't know if it was his uncompromising views or his lack of effort to linguistically accommodate to his Macedonian interlocutors that led to his departure from the group. These old men who are more recent migrants are not part of the fold as they don't belong to the same vintage of migrants as the two main groups. They retreat into dyads amongst themselves and tend not to take part in the group narrative that is led, interchangeably by five or six others, in Macedonian.

One day, one of the men is missing from the group. In reference to their missing friend, I overhear one saying slowly, but unsentimentally *A, toj e za rabišo* ("Oh, he's ready for the rubbish [bin]" = 'He's about to die').

One day, their chairs may be filled by Mandarin- and Cantonese-speakers, or Punjabi- and Hindi-speakers, who negotiate their intra- and inter-group linguistic practices in similar ways.

Vignette 1

All groups are worthy of study – a realisation that was already well established before the advent of modern sociology and the emergence of a formal academic discipline that studies how spheres of human activity are affected by the interplay between social structure and individual agency. For all sociolinguists and most linguists, social contact and social categories are axiomatic to the study of language. This is because language developed and continues to develop as verbalised or signed behaviour that is shared within and between groups. Even when one conceives of using language in a private, self-directed way such as thinking to oneself, this use of language is still predicated by structures, forms and functions that are shaped through social interaction and that gain meaning due to shared or negotiated social relations.

This book studies *a* group, here termed a *speech community*, and the language(s) that are the codes of communication employed by its ‘members’. The speech community of this study is, in the first place, characterised by a transposed migrant language whose members regularly have contact with speakers of other languages, invariably the dominant host-society’s language(s), which in Australia is English.

This book also employs categories of social stratification – *generation* and *country of origin* – and examines speakers on the basis of their period of birth and vintage of migration, and between people on the basis of the country that they (or their parents or grandparents) come from where these different countries of origin display different language planning and sociolinguistic features. The term *speech community*, contained in the book’s title, has in recent years been re-evaluated due to concerns that it suggests a presumed linguistic homogeneity amongst members of such a community, when such homogeneity may be hard to actually locate. This term is defined here and its use in this book as a hypernym is explained in section 1.4. The last part of this book’s title is *Australian-Macedonians and their language(s)*, which refers to people residing in Australia who identify as (Australian-) Macedonians and who may use one language, or more than one language, in both intra-group interactions and inter-group interactions.

In Australia, Macedonian is perceived as a transposed immigrant language. But it is not just a language spoken by immigrants, those who left Macedonia and settled in Australia, but also by others born in Australia (the so-called ‘second generation’) and their grandchildren (the ‘third generation’), and also spoken or understood by others who may not self-identify as exclusively Macedonian. What is also known is that the number of speakers of Macedonian is substantial (it is the twelfth most widely spoken language in Australia) and that migrants from Macedonia do not display high levels of language shift to English that other, mainly north-west European migrant communities in Australia display. Australian census data on the language that residents report as

“the language that they use at home” show that Macedonian is one of the best-maintained minority languages in Australia, and the best-maintained European language in Australia. This book is intended as a contribution to the body of research on minority languages and how and why people who have proficiency in a minority language continue using it, long after migration.

Some will also recognise a similarity between the title of this book and the title of Li Wei’s 1994 book, *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*, which was a seminal work in sociolinguistics and code-switching research that examined the social mechanisms of language shift and patterns of language choice in another, diasporic community. The similarity is intentional and this book invokes the role and importance of inter-generational communication that was ably documented by Li Wei.

### **1.1 What is language maintenance? Why is it important?**

Almost all nations in the world are multilingual, i.e. they contain various linguistic groups that are in contact with each other, and not infrequently in competition with each other. Prolonged contact between various linguistic groups usually has three possible outcomes: language maintenance (of each group’s language, sometimes with a diglossic separation of languages on a macro-level with one language functioning as a ‘high-language’ and another as a ‘low-language’); bi- or multilingualism; or language shift<sup>1</sup>. Bi- or multilingualism may also involve the spread of a lingua franca, which is a language of wider communication. Not only in New World countries, but increasingly on a global scale, the chosen lingua franca is usually English.

One of the major points about bi- and multilingualism, even in societies such as Switzerland and Belgium where the use of more than one national language is protected and codified, and even in predominantly bi- and multilingual countries like Kazakhstan or Indonesia, is that maintained group bilingualism (or multilingualism) is dynamic and changeable, and not a static or fixed entity. Socio-political and demographic factors can determine the wax and wane of group bilingualism and multilingualism. In many instances in countries

---

<sup>1</sup> In relation to Macedonians in northern Greece (Aegean Macedonia), it is possible to allocate groups of speakers to each of these three outcome scenarios: 1) older, monolingual Macedonian-speakers who live in isolated rural areas whose language is of low prestige according to the macro-social characteristics of language policy in Greece; 2) middle-aged Macedonian-Greek bilinguals in less remote villages and regional centres; 3) younger people whose parents used mostly or only Greek with them in the family home such that these younger speakers have little or no proficiency in Macedonian and have shifted to Greek (cf. section 3.5.1).

of the Old World<sup>2</sup> (eg. Breton-speakers in France), in post-colonial societies (eg. ethnic Chinese in Indonesia), in asymmetrically multi-ethnic states (eg. Karelian-speakers in the former USSR), in indigenous communities in the New World (eg. Nahuatl-speakers in Mexico), amongst immigrants to countries of the New World (eg. Ukrainians in Canada) it is possible to see how smaller language groups have often abandoned their own language and taken on the language of a larger group. Amongst groups in prolonged contact with each other it is possible to observe that if there is a dominant group whose language is also that of the nation-state, then other groups who do not belong to the nation-state group can be considered 'subordinate'. The identification of this group is important as it has been reported that the "subordinate group... shift[s] to the language of the dominant group, whether over three generations or over several hundred years (Paulston, 1994: 70). For almost all linguists and for anyone who celebrates diversity, the disappearance of various (usually numerically smaller) language communities is regrettable and unwelcome.

Language shift, however, is not an inevitability. Often it does not happen due to lack of incentive (usually economic, cf. speakers of Romany languages across Europe) or a lack of access to the dominant language (eg. Bahasa Indonesia for many residents in isolated areas of Indonesia). Groups can vary in their degree of language maintenance – here understood as their capacity to maintain a language that they view in a cultural-historical sense as their 'own' – and in their rate of shift, of which one major influence is the origin of the contact situation. What is known is that voluntary migration results in much faster shift than does annexation or colonisation (cf. Boeschoten, 1992; Edwards, 1992; Paulson, 1992). It is generally much harder for an immigrant language group to maintain its language than an indigenous minority group continuing to reside in its locality of origin. The rapidness of some immigrant groups' shift to English, particularly in the US, a country largely established and built by voluntary and involuntary immigrants, caught the attention of sociologists and linguists, and North America became the continent in which the earliest modern studies on language maintenance and shift have been conducted.

---

<sup>2</sup> The terms 'Old World' and 'New World' are Eurocentric in their origin. Notwithstanding the cultural bias associated with their etymology, the terms can be understood in a broader sense as those areas of the world from which mass migration over the last 250 years has occurred, and those areas of the world that have been recipient countries of mass migration. In many countries outside Europe, such as many countries in Africa and Asia, the notion of 'Old World' or 'Old Lands' exists as a self-referential term, while people in these countries also view many countries of North and South America, and Australia and New Zealand, as the 'New World' or 'New Lands' to which they may migrate too. The Eurocentricism associated with the terms is therefore relativised and 'Old World' and 'New World' are used in this book as euphemistic hypernyms for 'source countries' and 'recipient countries'.

The importance of the minority language to first-generation migrants is usually obvious: if the migrants are adults, their chronologically first-learned language nearly always remains their functionally dominant language, the language they feel most ‘at home’ in, the language through which they feel they can express themselves with the greatest degree of ease, sophistication, and affect. And in the case of those who do not acquire or who are unable to acquire the language of the new host society, it is the *only* language that they have available to them.

Language as a form of social behaviour is also reflective of social relations and the functions and symbolism that these assume. And apart from the cognitive, cultural, educational and developmental advantages, proficiency in more than one language, something that is usually openly available to many children and grandchildren of migrants, is also a national *resource* of considerable societal and economic value. The absence of national and educational policies that support language maintenance efforts in the US is described by Fishman (2004: 408) as a disastrous waste of national assets:

And yet, the newest linguistic resources (actual and potential) of this country have always been so monstrously squandered and destroyed (at worst) or neglected and ignored (at best) that – except for the very most recent immigrants, some of their atypical children, and some rare and very “exotic” other exceptions – the USA has become an overwhelmingly monolingual English-speaking country.

Notwithstanding this bleak appraisal of the fate of immigrant languages in America, this book attempts to make the link between social-psychological (individual) accounts of language behaviour and sociological (collective) accounts of a group’s conceptualisations towards its own and others’ languages.

## **1.2 The transposed languages of migrants**

Although migration is not a recent phenomenon, until the latter half of the twentieth century the fate of migrants’ languages received little attention as an area of scientific research, and those few accounts that were written were usually restricted to peripheral areas of the disciplines of general philology or history. The ascent of the US in the post-WWII era and continuing immigration to it and other Anglophone countries of the New World led to the presence of sizeable linguistic minorities within these countries. The emergence of the *social group* as a subject of study, the Ethnic Revival in the US, and popularisation of new disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, linguistics perhaps inevitably drew researchers’ interest to the codes of migrants and their children in their own countries. Some early works that concentrate on the *form* of languages spoken

amongst co-resident migrants in the New World were those on Norwegian by Haugen (1953), Yiddish by Weinreich (1953), Swedish by Hasselmo (1961) and German by Kloss (1966).

The sociolinguistic features of the speakers and their communicative networks were generally not closely looked at as speakers were assumed to be part of closely-linked networks (e.g. extended family groups, close-knit social circles) and more distantly-linked networks (e.g. neighbourhood, place of worship, workplace) that together were subsumed under the heading of *speech community*. It was not until the late 1960s and Joshua Fishman's work on linguistic minorities in North America that a comprehensive descriptive model was developed. This model rested on identification of speakers, codes, interlocutors and settings ('*Who speaks which language to whom and where?*') to provide a comprehensive description of the continued use of minority languages. The last feature (i.e. *where?*) relates, broadly speaking to place or setting. The term used in sociolinguistics for this is *domain* ('contexts or spheres of activity'), which is a key metric used in this book that seeks to quantify speakers' language use.

Later studies on the form of migrant languages such as Backus (1996), Kipp, (2002), Gibbons and Ramirez (2004) and Verschik (2008) employ methodologies that record speakers' 'same-language' and 'other-language' contacts as important information that can determine not only *how much* a minority-language-speaker uses his/her language, but *how* s/he uses it, i.e. its form. Continuing use of a language is not only an indicator of language maintenance, but also a likely indicator of speakers' continuing proficiency. To be sure, speakers are known to be able to retain proficiency in a language, even if they do not speak it regularly or even barely at all. (Cf. Schmid, 2002 for L1 attrition.) But in general, speakers' communicative networks and the language choices in those networks are strong determinants for the continued use of a minority language or shift from it. We know at least since Thomason and Kaufman's (1988) seminal work that social changes and migration are catalysts for change and innovation in the form of language. It is not languages that initiate change, but the behaviour of their speakers that brings about transformations.

Initial studies on the state of migrant languages drew on speakers' and 'in-group' researchers' notions of the numbers of minority-language speakers in localities and the features of speakers of these languages (age, birthplace, sex, occupation, social status) to provide descriptive accounts (sometimes with normative exhortations) (Crawford, 1995; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Demographic data have also been drawn upon, such as census figures on the numbers of minority-languages speakers at the national, state/province and local level provide macro-data that give a background context to groups' features.

In relation to individual speakers, and moving from macro-social to micro-level features the following can be distinguished: macro-social level – age, status and gender; situational categories – role, place, setting and context; discourse features – interaction type, footing and conversational loci; means of communication – verbal, signed or written, face-to-face vs. technologically assisted. These are but some of the many features that are examined in qualitative and ethnographic studies of minority language groups.

The second category mentioned above, the situational one, forms the basis of Fishman's (1964, 1965, 1966) domain-based analysis of language groups. The third feature, discourse, is one that was the focus of Gumperz's (1968, 1971) work, and which is now a fully-developed sub-branch of contact linguistics, usually focusing on code-switching (eg. Auer, 1988; Li & Milroy, 1995; Gafaranga, 2007). Many studies of migrant language groups adopt an ethnographic methodology (cf. Lambert, 2008; Schüpbach, 2008) while interlocutor-centred studies are clearly within the field of sociolinguistics.

The term *sociology of language* coined by Fishman has established itself as the hypernym for studies on minority languages based on social categories. The initially descriptive approach adopted by Fishman has been extended to offer a principled approach for language activists who wish to reverse the process of language shift (Fishman, 1991) and to provide predictive models of language viability, eg. the Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) (Fishman, 2001). Complementary to Fishman's domain and societal approach is Giles and Powesland's (1975) initially macro-level approach that looks at the host society and the status and institutional features that the minority language enjoys within it. Giles's approach centred on economic status, social status, socio-historical and language status, demographic aspects and institutional support that sought to offer not only descriptive but also predictive interpretations of minority language groups. Giles' 'Ethno-linguistic Vitality' approach, which initially featured data and discussion from non-protagonists only (i.e. the perspective of 'out-group' members), was then augmented by data supplied by minority speakers themselves about their self-perceptions of their group and others. In more recent work, the effects of globalisation, the mobility of not only well-educated professionals but also uneducated labourers and the educational and occupational aspirations that appear to motivate increased mobility has led to the development of models that foreground these two attributes. In accounting for the linguistic behaviour of young and mobile individuals, and especially those with particular educational and occupational aspirations who may seek to switch (and re-enter abandoned) speech communities, Karan (2011) posits that this can be accounted for by a Perceived Benefit Model of Language Shift. Languages that speakers believe offer them educational and occupational advancement are the languages that Karan's model focuses on most.



### 1.3 Linguistic self-identifications

The above section discussed the role that ‘a common language’ has played as a tool in national projects, where this is or becomes co-terminous with a group’s national designation. While romantic nationalism establishes a narrative for a group that usually advocates the primacy of one (‘the group’s’) language as a single, cohesive force, research on the linguistic practices of groups, even those in which the national project was commenced over two centuries ago, shows us that multilingualism, not monolingualism is the norm, and that linguistic practices bear great variation.

It is therefore important not to equate contact with another interlocutor of a particular ethnic language with presumed use of that particular language. Situational contact with other speakers may vary from dyads to larger groups of interlocutors. This has commensurate effects on language choice as do choice of topic and individual and habitualised varieties of bilingual speech (eg. dense code-switching, frequent alternation). The actual linguistic behaviour of informants may differ markedly from notional suppositions based on the ethnic identity of other interlocutors as, for example, Lanza and Svendsen (2007) contend on the basis of examination of multilingual Filipinos in Norway.

Although self-identification with a language need not be a prominent feature in the formation of a person’s notion of their own ethnic or cultural identity, it remains, as outlined below in section 1.4, a common feature in the formation of the notion of ‘in-group membership’ of a speech community. In the shift away from essentialist interpretations of categories and category characteristics, variationist sociolinguistics acknowledges that the characteristics of speech communities are rarely static and that notions of group membership are fluid. Notions of identity within sociolinguistic research that are based not on formal or essentialist categories have been influenced by theories of symbolic interactionism (Mead, 1956), ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967) and an understanding of socialisation as interactional display of thinking, feeling and acting (Ochs, 1986). Approaches within sociolinguistics which recognise speaker and speech community as non-static entities, include the sociology of language approach (Fishman, 1966), ‘acts of identity’ variation model (LePage & Tabouret-Keller, 1985), accommodation model (Giles, 1980) and rational choice theory (Myers-Scotton, 1993). Language interplays with features (which can also be understood in a non-essentialist sense) such as race, ethnicity, religion, gender, class, socio-economic status, age that are co-indexical of identity (cf. Haeri, 1994; Lane, 2000). In the context of bi- and multilingual individuals and communities, individuals may assume positions anywhere on a continuum where the following terms function as end points to describe their

linguistic practices: mono/ fused/ composite/ multiple; symmetrical/ asymmetrical; constant/ temporary; imposed/ negotiated; static/ dynamic.

What the above section also stresses is the constructed nature of designations, national, ethnic or linguistic and the primacy of the designations used by protagonists themselves. This is reflected in this book with terms used about informants that they themselves use when self-describing.

#### **1.4 Speech community**

Sociology theories from the 1960s and 1970s conceive of identity as an internalised, stable property of both individuals and social groupings, which both determine and reflect psychological and social reality. Individuals are influenced by social structures via socialisation that leads to the internationalisation of social influences. Social organisation and language use are profoundly interwoven. The existence of groups distinguished by ethnic, geographical and sometimes belief structures brings with it the possibility of language being employed as a co-delineating feature. Language can be ‘wrapped up’ within a group, be one of its guiding criteria, and in the ‘hard version’ of ‘admission criteria’, be a pre-condition for entry and membership in the group. This kind of reasoning is based on the notion that groups in some way pre-exist individuals, and that individuals ‘partake of’ groups in a way that may appear static and undynamic, and membership within a group rests on on-going, sometimes ‘timeless’ practices that lend the group a sense of continuity, common history and heritage. This is a more or less textbook or even pre-modern notion of groups, which is basically an essentialist view or explanation of how units of social organisation function and keep on functioning. By extension, where a group is characterised by a particular linguistic behaviour, that behaviour, usually conceived of as a language or dialect, is thought to be ‘that group’s language’. And by extension to this, it is thought, erroneously, that “there is always *only one* (and always the same one) correct variety” that characterises a group (Fishman, 1972: 321. Original punctuation and brackets). Fishman (1964: 68) employed “group” as the term to refer to the clusters of informants that were the focus of his early work. He later started employing the term “speech community” and “speech network” (1972: 244, 245) for communities of speakers of minority transposed languages.

While Fishman never suggested this, in some early discussions in the field, the notion of the ‘speech community’ was conceived of as a discrete, definable entity. In critiquing some of these earlier perceptions, McEntee-Atalianis (2011: 155) reports that some research has been underpinned by the belief that “the relationship between an individual’s/group’s identity... and their language use is seen as causal.” This is criticised by her, and the ‘group  $x$  = language  $x$ ’

supposition is directly problematised by Pavlenko and her associates (eg. Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004), who locate identity performance amongst speakers (eg. indexing of multiple identities in the same exchange) as just one of many examples of more complex and nuanced behaviour occurring within speech communities. There are, of course, in a variety of interactions, many constellations that may have an impact on language use, and group membership (regardless of whether this is subjectively perceived or externally imposed) is but one of many factors that influence behaviour.

In ethnographic studies of small numbers of informants, the notion of ‘speech community’ falls into the background and becomes a type of ontological marker, “a necessary primary term in that it postulates the basis of description as a social, rather than a linguistic entity” (Hymes, 1972: 54). Sociolinguistic research in the Labovian tradition sees the ‘speech community’ not merely as an ontological marker, but as a coherent structure within which there are systematic and ascertainable distributions of features, usually according to macro-social features such as class, gender or age, for example. In Labov’s words (1989:52), “any description of language must take the speech community as its object if it is to do justice to the elegance and regularity of linguistic structure”. Here, Labov’s use of the term shows that he sees it as really a heuristic. This conceptualisation has, as its outcome, “a map of the speech community which can point to its outer boundaries, which claims to be able to identify inauthentic members” (Rampton, 2010: 277). The use of the term ‘map’ is not intended geographically, although in many places of the world, physical locality often plays a key role in the presence of particular features within studied groups.

Group-defining features are supposedly distinct, uniform and unique, but in reality this is rarely the case. It may be a large number of characteristics or it may only be a handful of features that distinguish a linguistic group, but regardless of this, close examination of these often reveal that they are unevenly displayed by group members and often shared by surrounding groups. In studies of language groups proximate to each other, different variables may have different social distributions, with people in different areas or situations sharing some linguistic features but not others. The linguistic ‘map’ for a group can therefore expand and contract greatly and it is sometimes arbitrary to draw lines between groups – certainly in Europe, the lines drawn between language groups are almost always arbitrary and in reality, the features of speakers living on linguistic peripheries often overlap to some extent with those ‘on the other side of the arbitrarily-drawn fence’. These brief points discussed here only portray the *linguistic* picture. Linguistic isoglosses can capture features within a group or area, but that is not the only component to constitute a ‘speech community’. There is a social component, which includes nomothetic views held amongst speakers that are to a great extent common and shared, and which touch on

language but also non-linguistic features. Views relating to language may include the following: the belief that the group has a common language or vernacular that is in some way ‘theirs’ and usually also distinct from that of other groups, and that this language or vernacular usually has a designation that is agreed upon and reflective of the group. (It may be but need not be co-terminous with other designations that a group may employ for other things such as ethnicity, religion or locality of habitation.) Further, communicative interactions with other members of the speech community can be and are performed in this language or vernacular, even if it is not the only or exclusive code that is used in ‘in-group communication’. In addition to the functions performed by way of this language or vernacular (regardless of how many functions there are), speakers are able to systematically associate social meaning to forms and features, and in turn, map social meaning from the speech or linguistic forms of other speakers, identifying them as ‘local-intimate’, ‘in-group’, ‘borderline’ or ‘not one of us’.

It is this kind of amalgam of linguistic features, together with a coalescence of social group features that describe what I refer to as ‘speech community’ in this book. Speech community is used by me here as a hypernym, understood not as an essentialist entity, but as a cover term to refer to a collectivity of various speakers whose ‘in-group’ communication can occur in a language that they, and outsiders, recognise as in some way distinct, and theirs. For speech communities that are minority groups, these kinds of features can become ‘compelling’ where they perceive their position to be marginalised or even endangered. Speech communities are not discrete entities<sup>3</sup>. Instead, they are to some degree heterogeneous and porous. Members can join and leave, and then re-enter again if they want. Linguistic proficiency is also not an absolute criterion of membership – in diaspora settings many see themselves as members of a speech community, even though they may have only passive command of the language, or even no command at all. The important feature is that they see themselves as ‘speaking with members of their community’, which gains them membership into the speech community. It is interesting to note that full-speakers of the language are usually unlikely to dispute the membership of ‘semi-speakers’ or ‘non-speakers’.

A socially constructed attribute, ethnicity, can also be selectively applied to the speech community. While the stereotypical view is that members of the same speech community share a common ethnicity, this need not be the case.

---

<sup>3</sup> The concept of a speech community is close to the notion of entitativity, which is the “extent to which a group is perceived as being a coherent unit in which the members of the group are bounded together in some fashion” (Lickel, Hamilton & Sherman, 2001: 130).

Exogamy and the inclusion of non co-national spouses and partners<sup>4</sup> is a feature of many speech communities. Those who belong to a different ethnicity but who speak the same language are also part of the speech community – their ethnicity may be expressed, downplayed or re-presented in a way that enables communication via the group’s code. There are others, whose code may be different, but which is sufficiently close to be comprehensible to most members of the speech community. Where their interactional networks may include other members of the speech community, their status in the speech community may be akin to that of an ‘insider’, even if they themselves and others do not readily see them as such. Membership is therefore dynamic, with shifting communicative networks and language varieties that range greatly.

The bottom line definition used here in this study of Macedonian-Australians is that their speech community, in a quantitative sense, refers to the total number of speakers or users of Macedonian who are resident in Australia, and with whom an interaction can include some use of Macedonian.

### **1.5 A multi-perspective approach, theoretical frameworks and what this book seeks to achieve**

As stated, generational membership and country of origin are categories that are applied as variables to distinguish sub-groups of speakers or informants. Generational affiliation is a common category in the study of speakers of minority languages and an axiomatic one for speakers of transposed migrant languages. Generational affiliation is important as a category for the chronological measurement of the transmission (or interruption) of a minority language to the following generation.

Country of origin is a category that requires more explanation. A ‘textbook’ description of a transposed speech community is that of, for example, Finnish-speakers, who emigrate from Finland to Australia speaking a variety of Finnish more or less congruent to standard Finnish, with literacy in the standard Finnish. There is only one country in the world where Finnish is the native language, Finland, and there is therefore a common and reasonably uniform experience that speakers of Finnish have in regard to the acquisition and use of their native language in Finland, before emigration. Thus, when talking about the ‘country of origin’ of Finnish-speakers in Australia, one needs to look at one country only, Finland, and at the sociolinguistic situation of that country only if one wishes to examine pre-emigration sociolinguistic features of Finnish-speakers in Australia.

---

<sup>4</sup> For the sake of brevity, the term ‘spouse’ will be used as a hypernym referring to married wife or husband, partner or ‘significant other’. The informants were free to interpret the words ‘spouse’ and ‘partner’ in their own way and no definitions of these two terms were supplied.

More often than not, speakers of transposed migrant languages, particularly the bigger ones, come from not only one 'source country', but from multiple countries. Spanish-speakers in the US may have their origins in Argentina, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Spain or a number of other countries. While they are grouped together as 'Spanish-speakers' in the US, their pre-emigration sociolinguistic profiles may differ greatly, and there may be marked differences in the use and role of language in a variety of functions in the source countries. These differences are likely to result in differences in language use after migration as well, so that linguistic features that pertain to the country of origin are also pertinent in accounting for language use amongst Spanish-speakers in the US. The same applies to other groups as well: Hakka-speakers in Australia from Malaysia, Indonesia and mainland China; Arabic-speakers in France from Algeria, Morocco, Lebanon, Egypt and Iraq; Portuguese-speakers in Germany from Angola, Brazil, Mozambique and Portugal; Bengali/ Bangla-speakers in the United Arab Emirates from India and Bangladesh; German-speakers in New Zealand from Austria, Germany and Switzerland; Punjabi-speakers in the UK from Pakistan and India.

The different circumstances that speakers have encountered in their source countries have been identified as having an effect on different rates of language maintenance amongst diaspora German-speakers, for example (cf. Kloss, 1966). A large-scale project was undertaken that examined such differences amongst other groups in Australia. Clyne and Kipp (1999) examined Arabic-speakers (comparing those from Egypt to those from Lebanon), Chinese-speakers (comparing Cantonese- and Mandarin-speakers, and both sets of speakers from both mainland China and Hong Kong) and Spanish-speakers (comparing those from Chile to those from Spain) and identified substantial differences in language use, rates of transmission to children and attitudinal responses. Different sociolinguistic features in source countries can but need not have resultant different effects on speakers in the diaspora – there can be common or coincidentally similar circumstances that lead to congruent patterns of language maintenance. This study focuses on speakers of the same language from two different countries – northern Greece (Aegean Macedonia) and the Republic of Macedonia. The sociolinguistic features of both source countries vis-à-vis Macedonian vary greatly: in the first country, Macedonian is not recognised as a minority language and public and even private use of it is strongly discouraged, even prohibited. In the Republic of Macedonia, Macedonian is the official language and there are no restrictions on the use of this language in the public

domain, as the language of instruction, in state-owned and private media, as well as in private interactions<sup>5</sup>.

Therefore, there is a very stark contrast between the status of the same language in both countries, and to the sociolinguistic features that speakers of the same language encounter in either country. These differences are greater than the differences that exist between speakers of a language who in one country form the largest or constitutive nation of the country and in another are a local or regional majority, such as is the case with Hungarian-speakers in Hungary and Hungarian-speakers in Romania, or Somali-speakers in Somalia and Somali-speakers in Ethiopia. There are considerable numbers of Macedonian-speakers living outside the Republic of Macedonia. However, the two neighbouring countries with the largest Macedonian-speaking minorities, Greece and Bulgaria, explicitly refute the existence of a Macedonian-speaking minority within their borders, and also the existence of other attributes of ‘Macedonianness’, namely of Macedonian nationality or of the legitimacy of the Macedonian Orthodox Church. With such differences in the sociolinguistic and socio-political features of these countries that condition the acquisition and use of Macedonian, this book applies the variable of country of origin to the speech community to examine the influence of such features after migration to and settlement in Australia.

This book thus offers perspectives on different groups, stratified according to generation and country of origin. This book also offers a multi-perspective approach. This refers to the same group (or sub-groups of the same group) being studied with the help of different methodological tools. The first tool is a sociolinguistics-focussed survey that elicits information on language use in nine domains across the three generations. This survey also elicits personal demographic, acquisitional and self-diagnostic data, as well as a range of other social and individual responses on speakers’ reported behaviour. The responses gathered from this survey are largely statistical, i.e. Likert-scale numeric responses, selection of available options, and answers to yes/no questions or to short-answer questions. In places, the surveys also welcomed longer, free-responses from informants, and many informants provided such responses. The responses, mostly statistical, are all *qualitative* in nature, as the information gathered, in a sociological sense, relates to complex and detailed phenomena, and to categorical variables, not only numeric ones. This survey tool enables the collection of a wide and varied amount of data from a large number of informants. This survey tool provides for a uniformity and comparability of

---

<sup>5</sup> Other languages such as Albanian, Turkish, Romany and Serbian also enjoy official status as co-national or regional languages in the Republic of Macedonia, and language planning regulations there reflect not only a recognition of ethnic minority rights, but a policy of inclusiveness and pluralism amongst Macedonia’s citizenry (cf. Vasilev, 2013). In contrast to Greece, the languages of minorities in the Republic of Macedonia are granted official status.

questions. Sociolinguistic questionnaires are also a standard tool in studies on language maintenance and shift. They function as an amenable data-gathering tool in many studies, not only statistically-focussed ones. They may accompany or follow ethnographic research on minority-language speakers. This first perspective grounds this study by providing a broad and detailed picture of the speech community's reported *language use*.

The second perspective that this book provides is one that is socio-political, with subjective responses from a sample of informants, a sub-group of those surveyed by the first tool. This perspective is provided through responses to an ethnolinguistic vitality questionnaire that contained questions about informants' views of Macedonian-Australians and of other groups, and questions about informants' perceptions of how others perceive Macedonian-Australians. Informants' views on Macedonians, Macedonian-speakers and other groups are elicited in relation to three main categories with the following sub-categories: status (economic, social, socio-historical, language); demography (national, territory/state level, concentration, proportion, absolute number, birth rate, exogamy/endogamy, im-/e-migration) and institutional support (mass media, education, government services, industry, religion, culture). This second perspective, with nomothetic and ideographic viewpoints, provides a full picture of the speech community's views on their *own group* and their *own language vis-à-vis* other groups and languages.

The third perspective is an attitudinal one in which informants provide general responses to questions about language maintenance and the place and value of language as a tangible entity in speakers' lives. Following this, informants' affective responses to adjective pairs are presented, that show their responses in regard to five thematic areas: practicalness, aesthetics, regularity, intimacy and contemporaneousness. This third perspective enables a comprehensive description of the group's *language attitudes*.

This multi-perspective account of groups of informants belonging to the same speech community allows the same reported data and responses to be examined and interpreted from three different perspectives. This is a stated aim of this book, which seeks to advance research on the continued use and maintenance of minority languages with an application of *multiple* perspectives. In addition, this book is punctuated by select excerpts taken from a further sample featuring the same informants. This further sample is not systematically examined and presented here (cf. Section 4.7) and the inclusion of these excerpts as well as the vignettes serves the purpose of introducing informants' voices, at various intervals. These excerpts and vignettes are included due to their thematic closeness to various sections of this book and make no claim to be representative of the other samples.



There are several theoretical postulates that this book is based on. The first is a macro-societal perspective which conceives of individual speakers' behaviour being conditioned by social and situational context. A description of the social and situational context that speakers had in the country of origin, and that which pertains in the recipient country is instructive to an analysis of language use. Sections of chapter three provide a description of the demographic, historical, social, socio-political and sociolinguistic conditions that pertained to Macedonian-speakers before emigration and after this with their arrival in Australia. The importance of the pre-migration situation of speakers, particularly where there are sharp differences in the situations (countries) that speakers come from, is recognised in the title of this book: 'two countries of origin'. The variable of country of origin is consistently applied in this book.

A macro-societal analysis is able to provide a 'global' or 'bird's eye' view of a group, but the use of two or more languages, usually in a way that suggests that there is often a regularity of the one language in one place and another language in another, calls for an analysis that recognises that the distribution of language use can be complementary. Using a bottom-up approach, a 'unit' of social relations, namely 'domain' has become a term with which groupings of situations with common features can be looked at, where it appears that these strongly co-occur with patterns of language use. A definition of 'domain' is provided by Li (1994: 8) who describes it as the "clustering of characteristic situations around a prototypical theme which structures speakers' perception of the situation and their social behaviour, including language choice". A domain is a clustering of situations, usually with some constant features, but there is no set number of domains that need apply to a group of speakers, and the choice of number and type of domains is, as Fishman (1972: 441) strongly suggests, dependent on empirical data rather than a fixed theoretical taxonomy.

Originally, the notion of domains relied on a congruence of two sets of features: that in the domain there was congruence between interlocutor, topic and setting; that within a single domain there is usually one language that is used. Both of these original premises of what a domain is have been relativised. Sociolinguistic studies that employ domain as a unit of analysis now distinguish between differences in interlocutor, topic and setting. To do this, fine-grained data collection methods are used that can elicit differences within the same domain for these features. Further, one single domain is now not conceived of as being synonymous with one single language. Variations of language use from the monolingual use of either language to the use of two or more languages, equally or unequally are now also regularly elicited. This study does this too by providing informants with fine-grained response choices that record variation and an unequal distribution of language choice within the same domain, and with the same interlocutor and on the same topic. From the macro-societal level that

was outlined at the start of this section, we have now arrived at a micro-level of social features.

These ‘macro to micro’ and ‘back to macro’ questions are summarised below as the main questions that this book addresses:

– Macedonian is a very well maintained language – the ‘best-maintained European language in Australia’. This book elicits data from three generations to identify a very large number of the communicative settings, topics and interlocutors that informants engage with to see where Macedonian is used. This is instructive and suggestive of use of language that goes beyond what is known on language use in Australia, i.e. widespread use amongst first-generation speakers, with use restricted to the home/family and religion domains for second- and third-generation members.

– Different countries of origin. What is the legacy and possible continuing influence of the sociolinguistic and language planning features in the country of origin after emigration and settlement in Melbourne?

– What are levels and practices of continuing use of a migrant, transposed language across generations? This question is asked particularly in reference to the ‘pivotal’ role of second-generation speakers. They are themselves protagonists of a bilingual and bicultural childhood and for the maintenance of their minority language in an English-speaking environment, they take on the key role as models and examples of ‘living in two languages’ in 21<sup>st</sup> century Australia. Amongst the gamut of communicative events that they share with their own children, do these include the use of either or both languages?

– With a view to third-generation speakers, most of whom have never been to the country of birth of their grandparents, which communicative events, including but going beyond those shared with their own parents, show use English, Macedonian or both languages?

– Does a multi-perspective approach that seeks to document use and attitudes of the same minority language point to congruent or different phenomena? Do data on reported language use, affective responses to language varieties, and perceptions of the vitality of the minority language group together allow a coherent and consistent characterisation of a group of minority-language users?

These questions underlie the presentation and analysis of data in chapters 5 to 9 and are revisited in the conclusion, chapter 10.

## **Summary in English**

### **Three generations, two countries of origin, one speech community: Australian-Macedonians and their language(s)**

This book examines groups of Macedonian-speakers in Melbourne across three generations and from two countries of origin: northern Greece (Aegean Macedonia) and the Republic of Macedonia.

In Australia, Macedonian is perceived as a transposed immigrant language. But it is not just a language spoken by immigrants, those who left Macedonia and settled in Australia, but also by others born in Australia (the so-called 'second generation') and their grandchildren (the 'third generation'), and also spoken or understood by others who may not self-identify as exclusively Macedonian. What is also known is that the number of speakers of Macedonian is substantial (it is the twelfth most widely spoken language in Australia) and that migrants from Macedonia do not display high levels of language shift to English that other, mainly north-west European migrant communities in Australia display. Australian census data on the language that residents report as "the language that they use at home" show that Macedonian is one of the best-maintained minority languages in Australia, and the best-maintained European language in Australia. This study is based on empirical data gained from questionnaires and recorded interviews with a large sample of participants: 50 first-generation speakers (adult migrants); 10 first-generation speakers (child migrants); 38 second-generation speakers; and 10 third-generation speakers. Immigrants and their children from both source countries are represented amongst the first- and second-generation speakers.

This book, a sociolinguistic study of Australian-Macedonians, features three approaches: a sociology of language approach with a domain-based analysis of contexts, settings and groups of interlocutors; an application of (subjective) ethnolinguistic vitality of and about the Australian-Macedonian speech community; a language attitude approach with affective responses to language varieties that are part of the speech community's repertoire. Data presented and examined are foregrounded by a brief history of the Macedonian language and of Macedonian speech communities in south-east Europe, which includes a description of language planning issues. The current status of Macedonian varies greatly between the source countries of the participants: in northern Greece, Macedonian remains an officially unrecognised and strongly discouraged language; in the Republic of Macedonia, it is the official national language across the country, alongside other languages with official status such as Albanian, Romani or Turkish. The contrasting sociolinguistic status of

Macedonian in the two countries of origin is a variable that is applied to participants' responses throughout this study, along with the variable of generation. Information is given on the total number of Macedonian-speakers in Melbourne and in Australia, together with a contextualisation of the speech community and communicative networks of Macedonian-speakers in Melbourne.

This book is intended as a contribution to the body of research on minority languages and how and why people who have proficiency in a minority language continue using it, long after migration. In addition to the variable of country of origin (northern Greece / Aegean Macedonia and the Republic of Macedonia) as stated, the variable 'generation' is one that is applied to all data and the following three generations are distinguished: Generation 1A (Gen.1A) informants who migrated from Macedonia as adults; Generation 1B (Gen. 1B) informants who migrated as children; Generation 2 (Gen.2) informants who are Australian-born to adult migrants from Macedonia; Generation 3 (Gen.3) informants are Australian-born whose grandparents are Macedonian-born migrants to. The first approach adopted, a domain-based analysis of settings, focuses on the following domains: family/home; personal domain (dreaming, thinking, counting, swearing, language with animals); media; friendship and social domain; transactional, work/occupational and neighbourhood domains; education; religion. Fine-grained descriptions of the type of language use are provided, with range from 'monolingual Macedonian' to 'monolingual English' with informants able to select points between these to reflect the representation of forms from both languages. Data were elicited on the use of other languages in which many, usually Generation 1A and 1B informants, have proficiency, eg. Greek and Serbian.

In the family/home domain, reported use of language amongst and between first-generation informants (eg. spouse, siblings) is almost exclusively Macedonian, and 'monolingual Macedonian' is the most common variety that first-generation parents use with their children. Further, contact with grandchildren is also characterised by a high use of Macedonian: eg. over half of the Gen.1A informants report speaking 'Macedonian' or 'Macedonian with some English' to them. Amongst Gen.1B informants there is an even distribution of Macedonian and English with their children, while with grandchildren only half use Macedonian to some degree. Gen.2 informants report similar linguistic choices with their parents' generation: Macedonian is the dominant code, but there can be substantial variation in the language choice according to the theme or context of interactions with parents. With siblings, Gen.2 informants predominantly use English, but around 40% claim to use Macedonian to some degree, sometimes even more than English. Generation 2 informants report no significant difference in language choices with older siblings compared to

younger ones. Over half of the Gen.2 informants are in endogamous relationships, and while English is the most popularly used code, nearly 40% state that they use both languages equally. Half of the Gen.2 informants use both Macedonian and English with their children, and 40% report that their children use both languages with them. Of the Gen.2 informants without children, an overwhelming number state that they would speak both languages to their future children. Amongst Gen.3 informants, there are differences in their exposure to Macedonian according to generation. From their parents (Gen.2 members) they report that English is the dominant language used, but with frequent examples of code-switching according to topic-specific contexts, eg. jokes, food, family matters and even work/school matters. English is *not* the dominant language with the Generation 3 informants' grandparents – the most frequent response is that *both* languages are used in communication across three generations. Further, Generation 3 informants report that they *hear* Macedonian not only from grandparents, but from others in the immediately preceding generation, i.e. aunts, uncles and other relatives. Twenty percent of Gen.3 informants are in endogamous relationships.

These data of language use in family/home settings are generally reflective and typical of a 'well-maintained' language in a diaspora setting, i.e. first-generation speakers predominantly use the minority language and the close and multiplex relationships that pertain to younger generations mean that this language remains a widely-used variety. The use of Macedonian here is co-indexical of family integrity and it is a marker and code in which 'things can get done' that themselves are important for family members.

In the personal domain, most Gen.1A informants report use of only Macedonian for the personal activities of dreaming, thinking, counting quickly, swearing and speaking to pets. For Gen.1B informants, both languages are employed to do these things. For Gen.2 informants it is mostly English for dreaming, thinking and mental arithmetic, but usually both languages for swearing and talking to animals. Gen.3 informants do most things in English, but swearing can be performed in either language. The personal domain (with the exception of mental arithmetic) is one largely, but not exclusively derived from home and family experiences. There is an interplay of the communicative interactions from the family domain with one's personal-intimate realm, and these are likely to mutually support continuing use of Macedonian.

In the media domain, informants were asked about the medium of information-reception or entertainment that they used: radio, television, newspapers, DVDs and the internet. Gen.1A informants listen to radio more often in Macedonian, watch television more often in English, while newspapers are consumed equally highly in Macedonian as in English. Macedonian DVDs are more widely watched than English-languages ones, while the computer is

used by a smaller number of informants, and language use is evenly split. Gen.1B informants consume all kinds of media more often in English, but over half claim to watch TV programs, read newspapers and watch DVDs in Macedonian. Gen.2 informants rely overwhelmingly on English-language media. There are moderate levels of use of Macedonian, however for all forms of media, except for radio. Gen. 3 informants also are English-dominant media-consumers. Macedonian is consumed by some, usually in an audio/visual format that allows visual content to complement or augment aurally-received text that may not be readily understandable to some.

In regard to minority-language schooling in Macedonian, Few Gen.1A and no Gen.1B informants sent their children to Macedonian school. Only 18% of Gen.2 informants and 10% of Gen.3 informants went to Macedonian school. These rates of attendance at Macedonian school are lower than those that currently pertain to for Australian-Macedonians of school-age living in the Melbourne area, of whom around one third attend formal instruction in Macedonian. But amongst the informants of this sample, formal instruction in the minority language is not a domain that can account for the mid-high self-reported ratings of aural/oral skill proficiency in Macedonian that, for example, Gen.2 informants claim, and the mid-low ratings that Gen.3 informants claim.

What the education domain does provide to these informants is the knowledge that recognition and status is granted to Macedonian by the Victorian educational authorities. This occurs through immersion programs in mainstream primary schools, inclusion as a standard school subject at primary and secondary schools, and the teaching of it at five state-supported Saturday morning schools. This does not go unnoticed, even if these opportunities for formal instruction are largely unused by these informants.

The friendship and social network domain shows that amongst Gen.1A informants friends are mostly of Macedonian background and Macedonian only is the most commonly used code. The same applies also to Gen.1B informants. Gen.1B informants differ little from Gen.1A informants in this respect. Amongst Gen.2 and Gen.3 informants, the vast majority of the informants report that their friends are a mix of 'some Macedonian, some non-Macedonian' friends. With Macedonian-background friends, 85% of Gen.2 informants report using both languages, while 30% of Gen.3 informants report doing the same with co-national friends. These are unexpected findings. I posit that there are complex and dense ties within extended families, employment (and educationally-based) networks, neighbourhood and shared leisure activities that may not themselves be 'ethnically-specific'. This points to a critical mass of 'known others' – friends, acquaintances and contacts, who are of a similar background, and where co-national friends are from a mix of ethnic-specific, family- or locality-based networks and also from a wider mix of social contacts, some of whom are

coincidentally also Macedonian. Macedonian is likely to have a complementary function in Gen. 2 and Gen.3 informants' social circles: as a code in which speech with ethnic-specific referential content is related; as a code from which emblematic badges are accessed; as an exclusionary or secret language for private dyads.

For the religious domain, speech communities that are predominantly Orthodox Christian are known to have strong symbolic and organisational support from their church in the use and cultivation of the speech community's own language (or at least a high-register version thereof used in the liturgy). Gen.1A and Gen.1B informants claim high levels of attendance at Macedonian-language (i.e. Macedonian Orthodox) religious services. Of those who pray, most do so in Macedonian. Amongst Gen.2 and Gen.3 informants, there are lower levels of attendance at religious services. Around half of Gen.2 attend religious services to some extent, but less than 30% pray – usually in English or both languages. No Gen.3 informants attend religious services and none pray. The religious domain is better characterised not so much as a setting for the observance of religious practices, but as one for intra-ethnic social, educational and leisure activities. The large number of Macedonian Orthodox churches (8) and monasteries (3) in the Melbourne area are evidence of an ethno-religious infrastructure that serves not only regular church attenders, but also 'occasional' visitors to church-held events. These interactions, around and beyond the observance of religious practices, are conducive to Macedonian language use. Even 'non-attenders' are likely from time to time to attend these interactions. But low or zero attendance is evidence that the religious domain is peripheral or irrelevant to many (younger) informants' lives, and this then removes the religious domain as an institution that may be conducive to language maintenance, although irregular attendance at church-held events is likely for many.

The workplace domain is one that figures very highly in the use of the minority language. Amongst Gen.1A and Gen.1B informant, two-thirds of the former and a half of the latter group claim to use or to have used Macedonian at the workplace, usually with fellow workmates. This is matched by 55% of Gen.2 who claim to also use Macedonian to some extent at work, again usually with workmates. Sixty percent of Gen.3 informants claim to use it. This points to the existence of businesses/workplaces that service Macedonian-speakers, as consumers and service-users. Further it suggests the existence of businesses/workplaces in which, through personal, family or other contacts, groups of Macedonian-speakers happen to gain employment and in which communication can happen with co-national Macedonian-speakers, as well as with others.

The transactional domain, which refers to speakers' use of services or purchase of products as consumers also reveals data that informants visit shops or use service-providers known to them, where the motivation to choose a particular retailer or service provider is not primarily because they are Macedonian-speaking, but because they are familiar. Language use is a consequence of this motivation, not a motivation itself. In regard to the neighbourhood domain, 40% of informants report having neighbours with whom Macedonian is used. However, the geographical location of most informants in areas with low numbers of Macedonian-speakers suggests that local social networks, rather than local density of Macedonian-speakers account for minority language use in this domain.

The second approach that is applied in this book is that of ethnolinguistic vitality, an approach that measures, through Likert-scale responses, Australian-Macedonians' perceptions of their strength as a group in relation to their status, demography and institutional support in Australia. By using questions that relate to group members' self-perceptions of not only their own group, but of other groups in Australia, a comparative picture emerges of how Australian-Macedonians see themselves. Findings from the ethnolinguistic vitality elicitation about themselves as a group reveal very low ratings are recorded for the following: immigration of Macedonians to Melbourne; representation in local business institutions; population density in own local area; political power; perceptions of themselves as a group that wields prestige at a local and international level. Low ratings are recorded for: local birth rates; availability of media; language as a tool for vocational advancement; control over local economic and business matters; provision of Macedonian-language instruction in schools; use in government services. Mid-level responses are recorded for numerical strength of Macedonians in Melbourne in a general sense; levels of endogamy; language as an enabler of friendships; perceptions of wealth; representation in local cultural life; Macedonian Orthodoxy and language proficiency as pre-requisites for 'Macedonianness'; frequency of visiting places of worship. High vitality recordings are provided for the following: population density of Macedonians in general across Melbourne; normative opinions on how 'well' Macedonian is spoken in Melbourne; historical-linguistic prestige wielded by Macedonian. Informants recorded very high ratings for pride in cultural history and achievements.

In tracking the responses from the ethnolinguistic vitality questions, there are areas that are congruent to the responses from the domain-based sample and areas that differ. In general, the level of ethnolinguistic vitality reported by Macedonians about their own group is lower than the level that the actual sociolinguistic data, through domain analysis, show. In other words, informants



do not perceive many attributes of their own ethnolinguistic group as being as robust as the sociolinguistic data on their language use actually show.

Looking at the two samples, there is a lower level of congruence between the two in the reported rates of endogamy in the ethnolinguistic vitality while the actual levels of endogamy in the sociolinguistic sample suggest a higher level. Similarly, the ethnolinguistic sample understates somewhat the presence of Macedonian as a language used in places of worship for Macedonians. Concentration of Macedonians is higher in some areas of Melbourne than others, but the ethnolinguistic data suggest that informants feel that there are fewer Macedonians in the area that they live in, than the sociolinguistic data suggest. Similarly, there are low levels of ethnolinguistic responses in relation to the provision of teaching Macedonian in schools, when, in fact, Macedonian is reasonably well-served by both Saturday morning and public mainstream schools, at least in the suburbs where there is the highest concentration of Macedonians in Melbourne. Part of this may be due to the lower number of Gen.1A informants who sent their children to Macedonian school, and the low number of Gen.2 informants who went to Macedonian school.

Proficiency in the Macedonian language has a mid-level rating in the ethnolinguistic responses, while in the sociolinguistic data, informants' use of Macedonian is evident across a large number of domains and in a large number of settings. Low ethnolinguistic ratings are given for control over business and economic matters. This average response is not divergent with sociolinguistic data that focus not on economic control, but on the use of Macedonian at the workplace, where it was recorded that with workmates and clients/customers, Macedonian is a frequently used code. Lastly, there are low responses for the perceived presence of Macedonian in media available to Australian-Macedonians. This contrasts with the active and dynamic provision of Macedonian-language media in Australia over the last 50 years that now features both locally (and professionally) produced audio and audio-visual media, as well as the availability of these types of media from Macedonia too. In general, there are few significant differences in the ethnolinguistic responses given by Aegean-Macedonians compared to those from the Republic of Macedonia. However, there are some differences between the two generational groups: first-generation informants vis-à-vis second-generation ones. First-generation informants are more likely to provide higher ratings in regard to the vitality of Macedonian media in Australia, the Macedonian language as an enabler for both friendship and vocational advancement, perceptions of wealth and economic strength, and the use of Macedonian in educational and governmental settings. Where there are sizeable differences between first- and second-generation informants in the responses to the ethnolinguistic sample, it is the first-generation informants who record higher ratings of their own speech community.

The last sample consists of affective responses to three language varieties: dialectal Macedonian, standard Macedonian and Australian English. Informants were given adjectival pairs in the following thematic areas: practicalness; aesthetics; regularity; and intimacy. Comparison between these varieties reveals that Gen.1A informants rate in general terms their home dialect in the most positive terms, followed by Standard Macedonian, and then Australian English. Gen.1B informants tend to rate their home dialect in the most positive terms, closely followed by Australian English, with Standard Macedonian in third place. Gen.1A and Gen.1B informants ascribe positive appeal, seemliness and sophistication to their dialects, and they see them as very much part of their life here and now. Amongst Gen.2 informants, there is a mix of responses. Surprisingly, their parents' home dialect also attracts the most positive reactions (eg. 'warm', 'familiar', 'beautiful'), apart from ratings of it as the most 'old-fashioned', while Australian English and Standard Macedonian are positioned behind this, with the former being 'uglier' and 'clearer', and more 'modern' as well as 'younger'. Standard Macedonian is more 'sophisticated', but also more 'impersonal', and also the least 'pleasant' of all of them. Amongst the Gen.3 informants, there are mixed responses and, overall, a very differentiated view of the place of each of the languages: Macedonian is more 'practical' but more 'old-fashioned, more 'familiar' but also more 'artificial'. Australian English is more 'ugly' but more 'modern', more 'inexact' but more 'young'. Both languages are equally 'important' and 'personal'. In the younger generations, Gen.2 and Gen.3, we see attitudinal responses to Macedonian that affirm its place in informants' lives not as a 'kindly', or 'nostalgic' code that they once heard, but rarely now use, but as a code that evokes attitudinal responses to do not only with 'intimacy' and 'aesthetics', but also 'practicalness' and 'regularity', and even in some cases 'contemporaneity'. These are unexpected findings for a minor transposed language in a New World, largely Anglophone, society, but not unexpected considering the findings from other sections of this book that record robust levels of language maintenance amongst all generations. The positive responses reported here for Macedonian are important precursors of language maintenance, learning and revitalisation, although not guarantors of the continuing use of the language, which is determined not only by attitude, but by a combination of factors.

The factors responsible for the continuing use of Macedonian as a transposed, 'immigrant' language, even amongst third-generation speakers, are the following. For informants of all generations, Macedonian still occupies the role of a language that is a functional code in which 'things can be done' and in which 'things are done'. The first evidence for this claim is the gamut of inter-generational interactions (eg. first to second, second to third) and cross-generational interactions (eg. first to third) that occur within family, home and

social settings in which, for many speakers, the unmarked code is Macedonian. For ‘things to get done amongst family members’ this is usually best achieved in Macedonian. Macedonian is not an emblematic or primarily symbolic code (although the symbolism of any language choice in any interaction is rarely completely absent) but a functioning vernacular, that first- and second-generation speakers have active command in, while third-generation speakers’ display variation from active command in all macro-skills to aural proficiency only. The self-diagnosed assessments of informants are in line with this description. The functional role that Macedonian occupies extends beyond the family/home domain, and the religious domain, the two domains that are traditionally the ones in which minority language use is maintained the longest, to other domains such as the friendship and social domain and the occupational, transactional and neighbourhood domains. In relation to the friendship and social domain, the influence of family-related contacts can be considerable due to the often dual or multiplex relationships that pertain between interlocutors. Further, there is also a high concentration of Macedonian-speakers in some areas of Melbourne, and in many settings there is a ‘critical mass’ of co-nationals, so that use of Macedonian is an available code in an unmarked way, or in an emblematic ‘marked’ way. The least expected finding from informants from all three generations is that at the workplace, Macedonian has been a very commonly used code, usually with workmates, but also with clients, customers, employers and others. This is typical for a situation in which a speech community has a ‘critical mass’ of speakers who are known but also unforeseen interlocutors in many communicative situations. Data on language use, again even amongst younger generation speakers for the transactional and neighbourhood domains, back this contention up.

The ethnolinguistic vitality data provide responses that indicate that Macedonian is a less well maintained language. Ethnolinguistic responses, as subjectively elicited ones, are reflective of perceptions of behaviour, rather than empirically collected *examples* of behaviour. The main finding from the ethnolinguistic vitality sample is that this sample of Australian-Macedonians perceive themselves, or their speech community, as less robust than the sociolinguistic data suggest. There are features that pertain to the local situation of Macedonian-speakers in Australia, and in Victoria, from the period in the 1990s when there were particular national and state policies in relation to designations of Macedonian ethnicity and to the Macedonian language. The designations were opposed by the very group to which they referred – namely Macedonians – and they led to a justified feeling of grievance amongst Australian-Macedonians that others could apply labels to them with apparent impunity. Despite the apparent numerical strength of the Australian-Macedonian community, the consequence of these policies that were later withdrawn was that

many Macedonians felt that their influence, standing and level of prestige as a group in Australia was, in some respects, subordinate to that of others. The speech community, at least initially, did not have the power to prevent the imposition of these policies, although it was successful in campaigning for their eventual withdrawal. This was a catalyst for intra-group activities, with linguistic consequences as well.

The functional, as well as symbolic and aesthetic features of Macedonian (both dialectal/home vernacular and standard varieties) are underlined through the affective responses that record informants' attitudes towards language varieties, including also Australian English in a comparative way. The responses underline not only the notion of intimacy and aesthetics but the functional (practical and instrumental) attributes of Macedonian, even for younger, i.e. second- and third-generation speakers. These are clearly congruent to the recorded function that Macedonian performs in the lives of the younger informants. This also applies to Gen.1A and Gen.1B informants, who record even higher ratings for dialectal Macedonian, ahead of standard Macedonian.

Lastly, and to refer briefly to examples of narratives that are presented in this book in a less systematic way, there are some comments that can be made about *how* speakers use the minority language. Macedonian-speakers in intra-family situations, but also in other settings such as with friends, workmates, clients and even with other lesser known acquaintances interact in ways that include the desire to relate referential content *and* the desire to perform verbally (not in an ethno-stereotypical way) that includes social, discourse-pragmatic and phatic functions. The ability to relate referential content matter with relative ease in Macedonian is something that all first-generation informants and most second-generation speakers (in this sample) have. For third-generation speakers there are gaps in their command of different registers and in their command of some active skills, usually only those requiring literacy. But there are few restrictions to their communicative fluency and they are relatively unrestricted in using Macedonian to convey referential content. When interacting with others, many social, discourse-rhetorical and phatic functions, and not only these kinds of functions, may be performed in Macedonian. Performance of these things amongst third-generation speakers is not primarily *emblematic* (although it can be) but reflective of the discourse, setting and fellow interlocutors with whom communication is taking place. While a receding code for these younger speakers, we can still conceptualise Macedonian as being a language that is being maintained.

This brings us back to a central question that this book has sought to address: what are the attributes of speakers and what are the sociolinguistic profiles of speakers of a speech community whose language is known to be very well maintained? A multiple perspective analysis of the same speakers allows a

fine-grained and nuanced picture of a (diaspora) speech community that documents for us not only the incidence of minority language maintenance, but how and why this can occur.

## Summary in Macedonian / Резиме на македонскиот јазик

### Три генерации, две земји на потекло, една јазична заедница: австралиските Македонци и нивниот јазик

Во оваа книга се анализираат групите говорители на македонскиот јазик во Мелбурн кои припаѓаат на три генерации и потекнуваат од две земји: северна Грција (Егејска Македонија) и Република Македонија.

Во Австралија, на македонскиот јазик се гледа како на преселен иселенички јазик. Но не се работи само за јазик кој го говорат иселениците што заминале од Македонија и се населиле во Австралија, туку и за јазик кој го говорат оние што се родени во Австралија (таканаречената втора генерација) и внуците на иселениците (третата генерација), а го зборуваат и разбираат и оние кои можеби не се идентификуваат само како Македонци. Се знае и дека бројот на македонски говорители е значителен (тој е дванаесеттиот најзборуван јазик во Австралија) и дека кај иселениците од Македонија не се забележува висок степен на менување на јазикот за разлика од други заедници на иселеници во Австралија, посебно оние од северозападна Европа. Податоците од австралискиот попис во врска со „јазикот што населението го зборува во домот“ покажува дека македонскиот јазик е еден од најзачуваните малцински јазици во Австралија, како и најзачуваниот европски јазик во Австралија. Ова истражување се основа на емпириски податоци добиени по пат на прашалници и снимени интервјуа со голем примерок на испитаници: 50 говорители од првата генерација (возрасни иселеници); 10 говорители од првата генерација (деца иселеници); 38 говорители од втората генерација, како и 10 говорители од третата генерација. Иселениците и нивните деца од двете земји на потекло се претставени преку говорителите од првата и втората генерација.

Оваа книга, која претставува социолингвистичка студија за австралиските Македонци, се заснова на три пристапи: социолингвистички пристап со анализа на домени поврзани со контекстот, ситуациите и групите соговорници; (субјективен) пристап за испитување на етнолингвистичката виталност на австралиско-македонската јазична заедница; пристап за испитување на односот кон јазикот преку емоционалните реакции кон јазичните варијанти што се дел од репертоарот на таа јазична заедница. На прикажаните и анализирани податоци им претходи кратка историја на македонскиот јазик и македонските јазични заедници во југоисточна Европа, вклучително и претставување на прашањата поврзани со проблемите на јазичното планирање. Кога ќе се

имаат предвид земјите на потекло на испитаниците забележливи се значителни разлики во сегашниот статус на македонскиот јазик: во северна Грција, македонскиот јазик сè уште официјално не се признава и не се поддржува; македонскиот е официјален и државен јазик во Република Македонија, заедно со другите јазици кои имаат официјален статус, како на пример албанскиот, ромскиот и турскиот. Со ова различниот социолингвистички статус на македонскиот во двете земји на потекло е една од варијаблите во одговорите на испитаниците од оваа студија, заедно со варијаблата „генерација“. Наведени се информации во врска со севкупниот број македонски говорители во Мелбурн и во Австралија, заедно со контекстуализација на јазичната заедница и комуникациската вмреженост на македонските говорители во Мелбурн.

Оваа книга има цел да придонесе кон бројот на истражувања на малцинските јазици, односно зошто и како луѓето кои добро владеат малцински јазик продолжуваат да го употребуваат долго по иселувањето. Покрај варијаблата „земја на потекло“ (северна Грција / Егејска Македонија и Република Македонија), како што веќе беше споменато, кај варијаблата „генерација“ во базата на податоците се издвоија следните три категории: испитаници од Генерација 1А (Ген. 1А) кои се иселиле од Македонија како возрасни; испитаници од Генерација 1Б (Ген. 1Б) кои се иселиле како деца; испитаници од Генерација 2 (Ген. 2), родени во Австралија како деца на возрасни иселеници од Македонија; испитаници од Генерација 3 (Ген. 3) кои се родени во Австралија, но чиишто баби и дедовци се иселеници од Македонија. Според првиот пристап, анализа заснована на домени на опкружувањето, се фокусиравме на следните домени: семејство/дом, личен домен (сонување, размислување, броење, пцуење, обраќање кон животни); медиуми; социјален домен и пријателства; трансакциски, работа/занимање и соседството; образование; религија. Обезбедивме прецизни дескрипции на типот јазик што се користи, во опсегот од „монолингвален македонски“ до „монолингвален англиски“, при што испитаниците можеа да изберат која било точка во рамките на овој опсег поради претставување на структурата на двата јазика. Добиени се и податоци во однос на другите јазици што ги владеат испитаниците, посебно оние од Генерација 1А и 1Б, како на пример грчки и српски.

Кај доменот семејство/дом се покажа дека јазикот што се користи меѓу испитаниците од првата генерација (на пр. сопружници, браќа или сестри) е речиси исклучиво македонски, а и дека „монолингвалниот македонски“ е најчестата варијанта што ја користат родителите од првата генерација со нивните деца. Понатаму, контактот со внуците исто така се карактеризира со голема употреба на македонскиот: на пример, повеќе од

половина од испитаниците од Ген.1А велат дека зборуваат „македонски“ или „македонски со примеси на англиски“ со внуците. Меѓу испитаниците од Ген.1Б се забележува еднаква распределба на македонски и англиски со децата, додека само половината со внуците користат македонски до одреден степен. Кај испитаниците од Ген.2 се забележува сличен јазичен избор како кај генерацијата на нивните родители: македонскиот е доминантен код, но има значителни варијации во изборот на јазикот во однос на темата или контекстот на интеракцијата со родителите. Кога се во прашање браќата и сестрите, испитаниците од Ген.2 најчесто користат англиски, но околу 40% тврдат дека до одреден степен користат македонски, некогаш дури повеќе од англиски. Кај испитаниците од Генерација 2 не се забележува голема разлика во јазичниот избор со постарите браќа или сестри наспрема помладите. Повеќе од половина од испитаниците од Ген.2 се во ендогамни врски, и додека англискиот е најпопуларниот код, околу 40% тврдат дека еднакво ги користат и двата јазика. Половина од испитаниците од Ген.2 користат и македонски и англиски со своите деца, додека 40% велат дека нивните деца ги користат двата јазика со нив. Најголемиот број испитаници од Ген.2 што немаат деца тврдат дека би ги зборувале двата јазика со нивните идни деца. Меѓу испитаниците од Ген.3 се забележуваат разлики во однос на нивната изложеност на македонскиот јазик кон различните генерации. Во односот кон нивните родители (припадници на Ген.2), тие тврдат дека англискиот е доминантен јазик, но со чести примери на префрлување на кодот во зависност од тематскиот контекст, како на пример шеги, храна, семејни прашања, па дури и прашања поврзани со работата или училиштето. Англискиот *не* е доминантен јазик со бабите и дедовците на испитаниците од Генерација 3 – најчестиот одговор е дека *двата* јазика се користат во комуникацијата меѓу овие две генерации. Понатаму, испитаниците од Генерација 3 тврдат дека го *слушаат* македонскиот не само од нивните баби и дедовци, туку и од другите генерации по нив, како на пример тетки, чичковци и други роднини. Дваесет проценти од испитаниците од Ген.3 се во ендогамни врски.

Овие податоци за користењето на јазикот во семејство/дом средината генерално го отсликуваат и се типични за „добро зачуваниот“ јазик во дијаспорското опкружување, т.е. говорителите од првата генерација доминантно го користат малцинскиот јазик, а блиските и многуслојните односи кои се однесуваат на помладите генерации покажуваат дека овој јазик сè уште често се користи. Тука употребата на македонскиот јазик е показател за интегралноста на семејството и е маркер и код преку кој работите кои се битни за членовите на семејството „може да се завршат“.



Во личниот домен, повеќето испитаници од Ген.1А изнесуваат дека користат само македонски во личните активности како што се сонувањето, мислењето, брзото пресметување, пцуењето и зборувањето со миленичиња. За испитаниците од Ген.1Б, и двата јазика се користат за овие цели. Кај испитаниците од Ген.2 англискиот најчесто се јавува кај сонувањето, мислењето и менталната аритметика, но обично се употребуваат двата јазика за пцуење и зборување со животни. Испитаниците од Ген.3 повеќето работи ги прават на англиски, но пцуењето може да се јави и на едниот, и на другиот јазик. Личниот домен (со исклучок на менталната аритметика) е најчесто, но не исклучиво, одреден од домашните и семејните искуства. Постои заемодејство во комуникативните интеракции од семејниот домен со лично-интимните области, и тие најверојатно заемно го поддржуваат континуираното користење на македонскиот.

Во доменот на медиумите, испитаниците беа запрашани за медиумот за информирање или забава што го користат: радиото, телевизијата, весниците, ДВД-јата и интернетот. Испитаниците од Ген.1А повеќе слушаат радио на македонски, почесто гледаат телевизија на англиски, додека еднакво читаат весници на англиски и македонски. Македонските ДВД-ја се почесто гледани од англиските, додека компјутер користат помал број испитаници, а јазикот што се користи е еднакво распределен. Испитаниците од Ген.1Б почесто ги користат различни типови на медиуми на англиски, но повеќе од половина тврдат дека гледаат телевизиски програми, читаат весници и гледаат ДВД-ја на македонски. Испитаниците од Ген.2 во најголема мера користат медиуми на англиски јазик. Се јавува и умерено користење на македонскиот јазик за сите медиуми освен за радиото. Испитаниците од Ген.3 исто така доминатно користат медиуми на англиски јазик. Некои испитаници користат медиуми на македонски јазик најчесто во аудио-видео формати кои овозможуваат визуелната содржина да поддржува или засилува аудитивно примен текст, кој некои испитаници не можат веднаш да го разберат.

Во однос на школување на малцински јазик како што е македонскиот, малкумина од испитаниците од Ген.1А ги пратиле децата во македонско училиште, додека тоа не го сторил никој од испитаниците од Ген.1Б. Само 18% од испитаниците од Ген.2 и 10% од испитаниците од Ген.3 посетувале македонско училиште. Овие проценти се помали од тие што моментално важат за австралиско-македонските ученици што живеат во Мелбурн и неговата околина, од кои една третина посетуваат формална настава на македонски. Но кај испитаниците од овој примерок, формалната настава на македонски јазик не е причина за средно-високите оценки кои, на пример, си ги одредуваат испитаниците од Ген.2 во однос на нивните

говорни/слушни способности кај македонскиот јазик, како и средно-ниските оценки кои си ги одредуваат испитаниците од Ген.3.

Но тоа што образовниот домен сепак им го нуди на испитаниците е сознанието дека македонскиот јазик има официјален статус и е признат од образовната администрација на државата Викторија. Ова се случува во програмите во државните основни и средни училишта во кој македонскиот јазик не е школски предмет туку јазик на кој се одвива наставата, како и во предавањето македонски во пет државни саботни утрински училишта. И покрај тоа што испитаниците главно не ги користат ваквите можности за формална настава, оваа пракса не поминува незабележана.

Доменот на пријателствата и социјалните мрежи покажува дека меѓу испитаниците од Ген.1А пријателите на испитаниците главно имаат македонско потекло и македонскиот јазик е најчесто користениот код. Истото се однесува и на испитаниците од Ген.1Б. Во овој поглед, овие испитаници малку се разликуваат од испитаниците од Ген.1А. Меѓу испитаниците, пак од Ген.2 и Ген.3 мнозинството изјавува дека нивните пријатели се некоја мешавина од 'некои Македонци и некои не-Македонци'. Кај пријателите со македонски корени, 85% од испитаниците на Ген.2 ги користат и двата јазика, додека 30% од испитаниците од Ген.3 велат дека го прават истото со пријателите од иста националност. Овие резултати се неочекувани. Мојата теза е дека во поширокиот круг на семејството владеат комплексни и густы врски, мрежи поврзани со вработувањето (или основани на образованието), соседски и други заеднички активности за разонода кои сами по себе не се етнички определени. Ова упатува на една критична маса на „други познати“ – пријатели, познаници и контакти кои имаат слично потекло, и каде што пријателите од иста националност доаѓаат од мешавина од специфично етнички, семејно или локално фомирани мрежи, или пак од поширок спектар на социјални контакти, од кои некои се случајно Македонци. Македонскиот најверојатно има комплементарна функција кај општествените кругови на испитаниците од Ген.2 и Ген.3; како код во кој се изнесува говор со етнички определена референтна содржина; како код преку кој се пристапува на амблематски ознаки; како посебен или таен јазик за приватни разговори меѓу двајца соговорници.

Што се однесува до религиозниот домен, кај јазичните заедници што се главно православни христијани е познато дека имаат силна духовна и организациска поддршка од црквата кога е во прашање употребата и негувањето на јазикот на таа одредена јазична заедница (или, во најмала рака, неговата верзија која се користи во литургиите). Испитаниците од Ген.1А и Ген.1Б го потврдуваат високото ниво на присутност на македонскиот јазик во богослужбата. Од тие што се молат, повеќето се

молат на македонски јазик. Кај испитаниците од Ген.2 и Ген.3 се забележува помало присуство на богослужбите. Повеќе од половината од Ген.2 понекогаш посетуваат богослужба, но помалку од 30% се молат – обично на англиски или на двата јазика. Испитаниците од Ген.3 посетуваат богослужба но ниеден не се моли. Религиозниот домен може да се опише не толку како место каде што се извршуваат црковните обреди, туку како место каде што се одвиваат меѓуетнички општествени, образовни и разонодни активности. Големиот број македонски православни цркви (8) и манастири (3) во областа на Мелбурн сведочат за етничко-религиозната инфраструктура која им служи не само на редовните посетители на црквата, туку и на „повремените“ посетители на настаните организирани од црквата. Ваквата интеракција што се одвива околу и надвор од одржувањето на религиозните церемонии е погодна за користењето на македонскиот јазик. Дури се случува и оние кои не одат в црква да присуствуваат на ваквите настани. Но ретката или комплетна неприсутност во религиозните богослужби укажува на тоа дека религиозниот домен е маргинален или небитен за животот на многу од (младите) испитаници, што го исклучува како институција што може да потпомогне во одржување на јазикот, и покрај повременото присуство на настани организирани од црквата кај повеќето испитаници.

Доменот на работното место котира многу високо во користењето на малцинскиот јазик. Кај испитаниците од Ген.1А и Ген.1Б, две третини од првата и половина од втората група тврдат дека користат или користеле македонски на работното место, обично со колеги. Ова одговара и на 55% од испитаниците од Ген.2, кои тврдат дека до одредена мера користат македонски на работа, исто така со колегите. Шеесет проценти од испитаниците од Ген.3 го тврдат истото. Ова укажува дека постојат фирми/работни места кои опслужуваат говорители на македонски јазик, и како потрошувачи, и како корисници на услуги. Понатаму, ваквите резултати покажуваат дека постојат фирми/работни места каде што групи од македонски говорители успеваат да се вработат преку лични, семејни или други контакти, и каде што комуникацијата може да се одвива со националните соговорници на македонски, исто како и со други .

Трансакцискиот домен, кој се однесува на користење на продажни и други услуги, покажува дека испитаниците одат во продавници или користат услуги од фирми кои им се познати, а мотивацијата да користат одреден продавач или давател на услуги не се заснова на нивното говорење македонски јазик, туку на тоа што веќе им се познати. Користењето на јазикот е последица на ваквата мотивација, а не мотивацијата сама по себе. Кога е во прашање доменот на соседството, 40% испитаници јавуваат дека имаат соседи со кои зборуваат македонски. Сепак, географската

лоцираност на повеќето испитаници во области каде што има низок број говорители на македонски јазик упатува на тоа дека локалните социјални мрежи влијаат врз користењето на малцинскиот јазик во овој домен, а не влијае густината на македонските говорители во локалната населеност.

Вториот пристап што се користи во оваа книга е оној на етнолингвистичката виталност, пристап кој со помош на одговори добиени преку Ликертовата скала ја мери перцепцијата на австралиските Македонци за нивната моќ како заедница во однос на нивниот статус, демографија и институционална поддршка во Австралија. Преку прашањата кои ја испитуваат самоперцепцијата на членовите на заедницата, не само во однос на својата заедница, туку и на другите заедници во Австралија, се добива компаративна слика за тоа како австралиските Македонци се гледаат себеси.

Резултатите од прашањата за етнолингвистичката виталност добиени преку исказите на самите нив за себе како заедница укажуваат на ниското рангирање на: иселувањето на Македонци во Мелбурн; застапеност во локалните бизнис фирми; густината на населението во сопствената локална област; политичката моќ; самоперцепцијата како заедница која има влијание на локално и интернационално ниво. Ниско рангирање се јавува и кај: локалниот наталитет; достапноста до медиумите; јазикот како алатка за професионално унапредување; контролата врз локалните економски и бизнис прашања; обезбедувањето на настава на македонски јазик во училиштата; користењето на владините услуги. Одговорите во средното ниво на скалата се однесуваат на моќта на Македонците во Мелбурн заради бројноста во општа смисла; нивоата на ендегамија; јазикот како помош во стекнувањето пријателства; перцепцијата за богатство; застапеност во локалниот културен живот; македонската православност и владеењето на јазикот како предуслови за „македонство“; честотата на посетување на религиозните храмови. Високите нивоа на виталност се забележуваат кај: густината на населеност на Македонците општо низ Мелбурн; нормативните мислења за тоа колку „добро“ се зборува македонски во Мелбурн; историско-лингвистичкиот престиж што го носи македонскиот јазик. Кај испитаниците се забележува многу високо ниво на виталност во однос на гордеењето со културната историја и со постигнувањата.

При споредба на одговорите за етнолингвистичката виталност со оние што се однесуваат на анализата на домените, се јавуваат делови кои се идентични и делови кои се разликуваат. Во општи рамки, нивото на етнолингвистичка виталност што ја изразуваат Македонците во однос на сопствената заедница е пониско од нивото што го покажуваат социолингвистичките резултати од анализата на домените. Со други

зборови, испитаниците не ја перципираат моќта на голем број од карактеристиките на нивната етнолингвистичка заедница, за разлика од резултатите што ги покажуваат социоллингвистичките анализи на нивниот јазик.

Споредувајќи ги овие два примерока, се забележува дека совпаѓањето е помало кај нивото на ендогамија во етнолингвистичката виталност, додека вистинските нивоа на ендогамија во социоллингвистичкиот примерок упатуваат на повисоко ниво. Слично, етнолингвистичкиот примерок го потценува присуството на македонскиот како јазик што се користи во верските објекти за Македонци. Концентрацијата на Македонци е поголема во некои области на Мелбурн, но етнолингвистичките резултати покажуваат дека испитаниците сметаат дека има помалку Македонци во областа каде што тие живеат, што се коси со резултатите од социоллингвистичкото истражување. Исто така, етнолингвистичките одговори за ниското ниво на обезбедување настава на македонски јазик во училиштата, не одговара на фактот дека македонскиот јазик е релативно добро застапен во утринските саботни училишта и во јавните училишта, барем во предградијата во Мелбурн каде што концентрацијата на Македонци е најголема. Делумно ова може да се должи на помалиот број испитаници од Ген.1А кои ги пратиле децата во македонско училиште, како и помалиот број испитаници од Ген.2 кои посетувале македонско училиште.

Познавањето на македонскиот јазик е рангирано на средно ниво во етнолингвистичките одговори, додека според социоллингвистичките резултати, испитаниците го користат македонскиот јазик во голема мера и кај различните домени и во различните ситуации. Контролата врз економските и бизнис прашања, во етнолингвистичките резултати е рангирана на ниско ниво. Овој просечен резултат не отстапува од социоллингвистичките податоци кои не се фокусираат на економска контрола, туку на користењето на македонскиот јазик на работното место, каде што се забележува дека со колегите и клиентите/потрошувачите, македонскиот е често употребуван код. Конечно, присуството на македонскиот јазик во медиумите што им се достапни на австралиските Македонци се перципира како ниско. Ова не е во согласност со активната и динамична застапеност на медиумите на македонски јазик во Австралија во текот на изминатите 50 години, коишто во денешно време вклучуваат аудио и аудио-визуелни медиуми со локална, професионална продукција, и исто така медиумите кои се достапни од Македонија. Општо гледано, има малку значајни разлики во етнолингвистичките одговори на егејските Македонци во споредба со оние од Република Македонија. Сепак, постојат разлики меѓу двете генерациjsки групи: испитаниците од првата генерација

наспрема оние од втората генерација. Испитаниците од првата генерација имаат тенденција повисоко да ја рангираат виталноста на македонските медиуми во Австралија, македонскиот јазик како олеснувач и потпомагач на пријателствата и професионалното унапредување, перцепцијата за богатство и економска моќ, како и употребата на македонскиот јазик во образовните и државните институции. Значителните разлики меѓу испитаниците од првата и втората генерација во одговорите од етнолингвистичкиот примерок се однесуваат на одговорите на испитаниците од првата генерација, кои повисоко ја рангираат сопствената јазична заедница.

Последниот примерок се состои од емоционалните реакции кон трите јазични варијанти: македонски дијалект, стандарден македонски и австралиски англиски. На испитаниците им беа дадени парови од придавки во следните тематски области: практичност; естетика; регуларност; интимност. Споредбата меѓу овие варијанти покажува дека испитаниците од Ген.1А во општи рамки најпозитивно го рангираат својот домашен дијалект, по што следи стандардниот македонски, па австралискиот англиски. Испитаниците од Ген.1Б најчесто најпозитивно го рангираат својот домашен дијалект, по што веднаш следи австралискиот англиски, а на трето место е стандардниот македонски. Испитаниците од Ген.1А и Ген.1Б ги карактеризираат своите дијалекти како допадливи, пријатни и софистицирани, и ги гледаат како составен дел од нивните сегашни и тукашни животи. Кај испитаниците од Ген.2 се јавуваат мешани одговори. Изненадувачки е тоа што домашниот дијалект на нивните родители исто така предизвикува најмногу позитивни реакции (на пример „топол“, „близок“, „убав“), но и се карактеризира како „најстаромоден“, додека австралискиот англиски и стандардниот македонски се позиционираат зад него, со што австралискиот англиски се смета за „погрд“ и „почист“, но и „помодерен“ и „помлад“. Стандардниот македонски е „пософистициран“, но исто така помалку „личен“, а и „најмалку пријатен“ од сите варијанти. Кај испитаниците од Ген.3 се јавуваат мешани одговори, но и општо, многу издиференцирани погледи во однос на местото на секој јазик: македонскиот е многу „практичен“, но повеќе „старомоден“, „поблизок“, но исто така „повештачки“. Австралискиот англиски е „погрд“, но „помодерен“, помалку „точен“, но „помлад“. И двата јазика се еднакво „важни“ и „лични“. Кај помладите генерации, Ген.2 и Ген.3, гледаме лични реакции кон македонскиот кој во животот на испитаниците веќе не го зазема местото на „топлиот“ или „носталгичен“ код кој порано го слушале, а сега ретко го користат, туку код кој предизвикува лични реакции што не се само поврзани со „интимност“ и „естетика“, но и „практичност“ и „регуларност“, а дури во одредени случаи и „сегашност“.

се неочекувани за мал, преселен јазик во Новиот свет, во доминантно англофонска средина, но не се и неочекувани ако се земат предвид резултатите од другите делови од оваа книга каде што се забележуваат високи нивоа на одржување на јазикот кај сите генерации. Позитивните одговори што се јавуваат овде се битни предзнаци за тенденцијата за одржување на македонскиот јазик, за учењето и ревитализацијата, иако не го гарантираат континуираното користење на јазикот, кој зависи не само од ставовите кон него, туку и од комбинација фактори.

Следат факторите кои се одговорни за континуираното користење на македонскиот како преселен, „иселенички“ јазик, дури и меѓу говорителите од третата генерација. За испитаниците од сите генерации, македонскиот сè уште ја зазема улогата на јазик кој е функционален код со кој „работите можат да се завршат“ и со кој „работите се завршуваат“. Првиот доказ за ваквото тврдење е дијапазонот на внатре-генерациска интеракција (на пр. првата со втората, втората со третата) и меѓу-генерациска интеракција (на пр. првата со третата) што се случува во семејството, домот, и општественото опкружување, каде што според многу говорители, немаркираниот код е македонскиот. „Завршувањето на работите во семејството“, најдобро се постигнува со македонскиот. Македонскиот не е амблематичен или првенствено симболичен код (иако симболизмот е ретко целосно отсутен во изборот на кој било јазик, во која било интеракција), туку функционален домашен јазик кој говорителите на првата и втората генерација го владеат активно, додека третата генерација покажува разлики од активно познавање во сите макро-вештини, до само аудитивно разбирање на јазикот.

Проценките што испитаниците ги прават за себе се сложуваат со овој опис. Македонскиот има функционална улога што се протега отаде домените семејство/дом и религија, двата домена што традиционално се оние каде што употребата на малцинскиот јазик најдолго се одржува, и се шири до другите домени како оној на пријателството, социјалноста, трансакцискиот и доменот на соседството. Во однос на доменот на пријателството и социјалните кругови, влијанието на контактите што се поврзани со семејството може да биде значително со оглед на честите двојни или повеќеслојни врски што постојат меѓу соговорниците. Понатаму, се јавува и висока концентрација на говорители на македонскиот јазик во некои области на Мелбурн, а во многу места постои и „критична маса“ говорители од иста националност, така што македонскиот е пристапен код на немаркиран начин, или пак на амблематично ‘маркиран’ начин. Најнеочекуваното сознание кај испитаниците од сите три генерации е тоа што на работното место македонскиот е често користен код, обично со колегите, но исто така со

клиентите, потрошувачите, работодавачите и други. Ова е типично за ситуација во која јазичната заедница има „критична маса“ говорители кои се познајници, но исто така и случајни соговорници во многу комуникативни ситуации. Податоците за употребата на јазикот, повторно дури и меѓу најмладите говорители во сферата на трансакциските активности и соседството, го потврдуваат ова тврдење.

Податоците за етнолингвистичката виталност укажуваат дека македонскиот не е толку добро одржан јазик. Со оглед на нивната субјективност, етнолингвистичките одговори повеќе ја отсликуваат перцепцијата на однесувањето, одошто се емпириски собрани *примери* за однесувањето. Главното сознание од примерокот за етнолингвистичката виталност е дека овој примерок на австралиски Македонци се гледа себеси и својата јазична заедница како помалку моќна во споредба со она што го укажуваат податоците од социоллингвистичкото истражување. Тука треба да се спомене локалната ситуација на македонските говорители во Австралија и во Викторија во периодот на 1990тите, кога постоеше одредена државна и локално-државни политики во однос на начинот на кој ќе се одреди македонскиот етникум и македонскиот јазик. На овие одредби се спротивстави самата заедница на која се однесуваа – имено, Македонците – што предизвика оправдано чувство на незадоволство меѓу австралиските Македонци дека други можат некажнето да им ставаат етикети. И покрај бројната надмоќ на австралиско-македонската заедница, последиците од ваквата политика што подоцна беше променета, беше дека многу Македонци сметаа дека нивното влијание, позиција и ниво на престиж како заедница во Австралија на некој начин е подредено во однос на другите заедници. Јазичната заедница, барем на самиот почеток, ја немаше моќта да го спречи наметнувањето на оваа политика, иако успеа да направи кампања за таа понатаму да се промени. Ваквата кампања стана катализатор на активностите во рамките на заедницата, од каде што исто така произлегоа јазични последици.

Функционалните, но и симболичните и естетски карактеристики на македонскиот јазик (дијалектниот, домашен јазик, како и стандардните варијанти) доаѓаат до израз во емоционалните одговори што ги прикажуваат ставовите на испитаниците кон јазичните варијанти, вклучувајќи го и австралискиот англиски јазик, на споредбен начин. Во одговорите доаѓа до израз не само концептот за интимноста и естетиката, но и функционалните (практичните и инструменталните) атрибути на македонскиот јазик, дури и кај помладата генерација, односно говорителите од втората и третата генерација. Ова е очигледно во согласност со одговорите на испитаниците во однос на функцијата што ја игра македонскиот јазик во животот на помладата генерација. И кај



испитаниците од Ген.1А и Ген.1Б се гледа истиот тренд, кај кои македонскиот дијалект котира уште повисоко од стандардниот македонски.

На крајот, со цел накратко и не толку систематично да се осврнам на наративите претставени во оваа книга, би коментирал за тоа *како* говорителите го користат малцинскиот јазик. Во внатре-семејни ситуации, но и во други слични ситуации како на пример со пријатели, соработници, клиенти, па дури и со помалку познати, кај македонските говорители се гледа желбата во интеракцијата да се пренесе референтната содржина и нејзината вербална реализација (не на етно-стереотипски начин), вклучувајќи социјални, дискурсно-прагматички и фатички функции. Способноста релативно лесно да се пренесе референтна содржина на македонски јазик ја имаат сите испитаници од првата генерација и повеќето испитаници од втората генерација (од овој примерок). Кај испитаниците од третата генерација се јавуваат празнини во регистарот и во владеењето на некои активни вештини, но тоа не значи дека немаат комуникативна флуентност која би им пречела да ја пренесат референтната содржина. При интеракцијата со други соговорници, многу социјални, дискурсно-реторички и фатички функции, и не само тие, можат да се вршат на македонски. Ваквите функции кај испитаниците од третата генерација не се само *амблематични* (иако можат да бидат), туку се соодветни на дискурсот, ситуацијата и соговорниците со кои се одвива таа комуникација. Иако користењето на овој код е во опаѓање кај помладите говорители, сепак може да го прифатиме македонскиот јазик како јазик што се одржува.

Ова нè враќа до централното прашање кое е поставено во оваа книга: кои се карактеристиките и социолингвистичките профили на говорителите на една јазична заедница чијшто јазик е добро одржан? Повеќеслојната анализа на истите говорители овозможува минуциозна и суптилно нијансирана слика на една (дијаспорска) јазична заедница, која за нас пак ја документира не само појавноста на одржувањето на малцинските јазици, но како и зошто тоа се случува.

(Translated by Prof. Rumena Bužarovska)

## Summary in Greek / Περίληψη στα ελληνικά

### **Τρεις γενιές, δύο χώρες προέλευσης, μια ομιλιακή κοινότητα: οι Μακεδόνες της Αυστραλίας και η γλώσσα (-ες) τους**

Το βιβλίο αυτό εξετάζει ομάδες ομιλητών της μακεδονικής στη Μελβούρνη στη διάρκεια τριών γενεών και από δύο χώρες προέλευσης: τη βόρεια Ελλάδα (Μακεδονία του Αιγαίου) και τη Δημοκρατία της Μακεδονίας.

Στην Αυστραλία, η μακεδονική γίνεται αντιληπτή ως μια μεταφερμένη γλώσσα μεταναστών. Δεν είναι όμως μια γλώσσα που ομιλείται μόνο από μετανάστες, όσους έφυγαν από τη Μακεδονία και εγκαταστάθηκαν στην Αυστραλία, αλλά και από άλλους που γεννήθηκαν στην Αυστραλία (τη λεγόμενη «δεύτερη γενιά») και τα εγγόνια τους (την «τρίτη γενιά»), ενώ επίσης ομιλείται ή είναι κατανοητή και από άλλους που μπορεί να μην αυτοπροσδιορίζονται αποκλειστικά ως Μακεδόνες. Κάτι που είναι επίσης γνωστό είναι ότι ο αριθμός των ομιλητών της μακεδονικής είναι σημαντικός (είναι η δωδέκατη ευρύτερα ομιλούμενη γλώσσα στην Αυστραλία) και ότι οι μετανάστες από τη Μακεδονία δεν εμφανίζουν τα υψηλά επίπεδα γλωσσικής στροφής προς την αγγλική που εμφανίζουν άλλες μεταναστευτικές κοινότητες στην Αυστραλία, κυρίως από τη βορειο-δυτική Ευρώπη. Στοιχεία από την αυστραλιανή απογραφή που αφορούσε το ποια γλώσσα αναφέρουν οι κάτοικοι ως «τη γλώσσα που χρησιμοποιούν στο σπίτι» δείχνουν ότι η μακεδονική είναι μία από τις καλύτερα διατηρημένες μειονοτικές γλώσσες στην Αυστραλία, και η καλύτερα διατηρημένη ευρωπαϊκή γλώσσα στην Αυστραλία. Η μελέτη αυτή βασίζεται σε εμπειρικά δεδομένα που συγκεντρώθηκαν από ερωτηματολόγια και μαγνητοφωνημένες συνεντεύξεις με μεγάλο δείγμα συμμετεχόντων: 50 ομιλητές πρώτης γενιάς (ενήλικοι μετανάστες)· 10 ομιλητές της πρώτης γενιάς (παιδιά μετανάστες)· 38 ομιλητές δεύτερης γενιάς· και 10 ομιλητές τρίτης γενιάς. Μεταξύ των ομιλητών πρώτης και δεύτερης γενιάς εκπροσωπούνται μετανάστες και παιδιά μεταναστών και από τις δύο χώρες προέλευσης.

Το βιβλίο αυτό, μια κοινωνιογλωσσολογική μελέτη των Μακεδόνων της Αυστραλίας, υιοθετεί τρεις προσεγγίσεις: μια προσέγγιση κοινωνιολογίας της γλώσσας με μια ανάλυση πλαισίων επικοινωνίας, περιβαλλόντων και ομάδων συνομιλητών βασισμένη σε τομείς· μία εφαρμογή (υποκειμενικής) εθνογλωσσικής ζωτικότητας στην ομιλιακή κοινότητα των Αυστραλο-Μακεδόνων· μια προσέγγιση στάσεων απέναντι στη γλώσσα, με διαθετικές [affective] αντιδράσεις σε γλωσσικές ποικιλίες που αποτελούν μέρος του ρεπερτορίου της ομιλιακής κοινότητας. Τα δεδομένα παρουσιάζονται και εξετάζονται αφού πρώτα εκτεθεί μια σύντομη ιστορία της μακεδονικής γλώσσας

και των μακεδονικών ομιλιακών κοινοτήτων στη νοτιοανατολική Ευρώπη, η οποία περιλαμβάνει περιγραφή θεμάτων γλωσσικού σχεδιασμού. Το τωρινό καθεστώς της μακεδονικής ποικίλλει σημαντικά ανάμεσα στις χώρες προέλευσης των συμμετεχόντων: στη βόρεια Ελλάδα, η μακεδονική παραμένει μια γλώσσα που δεν αναγνωρίζεται επίσημα και αποθαρρύνεται έντονα: στη Δημοκρατία της Μακεδονίας, είναι η επίσημη εθνική γλώσσα σε όλη τη χώρα, παράλληλα με άλλες γλώσσες με επίσημο καθεστώς όπως η αλβανική, η ρομανί ή η τουρκική. Το αντίθετο κοινωνιογλωσσικό καθεστώς της μακεδονικής στις δύο χώρες προέλευσης είναι μια μεταβλητή που εφαρμόζεται πάνω στις απαντήσεις των συμμετεχόντων σε όλη αυτή τη μελέτη, μαζί με τη μεταβλητή των γενεών. Δίνονται πληροφορίες σχετικά με το συνολικό αριθμό ομιλητών της μακεδονικής στη Μελβούρνη και στην Αυστραλία, μαζί με μία ένταξη της ομιλιακής κοινότητας και των επικοινωνιακών δικτύων των ομιλητών της μακεδονικής στη Μελβούρνη στο συγκείμενό τους.

Το βιβλίο αυτό προορίζεται ως συμβολή στο σώμα της έρευνας σχετικά με τις μειονοτικές γλώσσες, και με το πώς και γιατί οι άνθρωποι που έχουν επαρκή γνώση μιας μειονοτικής γλώσσας συνεχίζουν να τη χρησιμοποιούν πολύ μετά τη μετανάστευση. Εκτός από τη μεταβλητή της χώρας προέλευσης (βόρεια Ελλάδα/ Μακεδονία του Αιγαίου και Δημοκρατία της Μακεδονίας), όπως αναφέρθηκε, η μεταβλητή «γενεά» είναι εκείνη που εφαρμόζεται σε όλα τα δεδομένα: διακρίνονται οι ακόλουθες τρεις γενιές: πληροφορητές που μετανάστευσαν από τη Μακεδονία ως ενήλικες (στο εξής «Γενιά 1Α»): πληροφορητές που μετανάστευσαν ως παιδιά (Γενιά 1Β): πληροφορητές που γεννήθηκαν στην Αυστραλία από ενήλικες μετανάστες από τη Μακεδονία (Γενιά 2): πληροφορητές γεννημένοι στην Αυστραλία των οποίων οι παππούδες ήταν μετανάστες γεννημένοι στη Μακεδονία (Γενιά 3). Η πρώτη προσέγγιση που υιοθετήσαμε, μια ανάλυση με βάση διάφορα περιβάλλοντα επικοινωνίας, επικεντρώνεται στους ακόλουθους τομείς της ανθρώπινης ζωής: οικογένεια/ σπίτι: προσωπικός χώρος (σε ποια γλώσσα οι άνθρωποι ονειρεύονται, σκέπτονται, μετρούν, βρίζουν, συνομιλούν με ζώα): μέσα ενημέρωσης: φιλία και κοινωνική επαφή: συναλλαγές, χώρος εργασίας/ επαγγέλματος και γειτονιά: εκπαίδευση: θρησκεία. Παρέχονται αναλυτικές περιγραφές του τύπου γλωσσικής χρήσης, και οι πληροφορητές μπορούσαν να επιλέξουν διάφορα σημεία σε μία γκάμα που ξεκινά από το «μονόγλωσσα μακεδονική» και φτάνει μέχρι το «μονόγλωσσα αγγλική» ώστε να καλύψουν την εκπροσώπηση μορφών και από τις δύο γλώσσες. Αντλήθηκαν δεδομένα από τη χρήση άλλων γλωσσών στις οποίες πολλοί, συνήθως πληροφορητές των Γενεών 1Α και 1Β, έχουν επάρκεια, π.χ. ελληνικής και σερβικής.

Στον τομέα οικογένειας/ σπιτιού, η γλώσσα που αναφέρθηκε ότι χρησιμοποιείται εκ μέρους και μεταξύ των πληροφορητών πρώτης γενιάς (π.χ. σύζυγο, αδέρφια) είναι σχεδόν αποκλειστικά η μακεδονική, ενώ «μονόγλωσσα

μακεδονική» είναι η πιο κοινή ποικιλία που χρησιμοποιούν με τα παιδιά τους οι γονείς πρώτης γενιάς. Περαιτέρω, η επαφή με τα εγγόνια χαρακτηρίζεται επίσης από υψηλή χρήση της μακεδονικής: π.χ. πάνω από το μισό των πληροφορητών Γενιάς 1Α αναφέρουν ότι τους μιλούν «μακεδονικά» ή «μακεδονικά με κάποια αγγλικά». Μεταξύ των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 1Β υπάρχει ομοιόμορφη κατανομή της μακεδονικής και της αγγλικής με τα παιδιά τους, ενώ με τα εγγόνια μόνο οι μισοί χρησιμοποιούν τη μακεδονική σε κάποιο βαθμό. Οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 2 αναφέρουν παρόμοιες γλωσσικές επιλογές με τη γενιά των γονιών τους: η μακεδονική είναι ο κυρίαρχος κώδικας, αλλά μπορεί να υπάρξει ουσιαστική μεταβολή στην επιλογή γλώσσας ανάλογα με το θέμα ή το συγκεκριμένο των διαδράσεων με τους γονείς. Με αδέρφια, οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 2 χρησιμοποιούν κυρίως την αγγλική, αλλά περίπου το 40% ισχυρίζονται ότι χρησιμοποιούν τη μακεδονική σε κάποιο βαθμό, μερικές φορές ακόμη περισσότερο από την αγγλική. Οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 2 δεν αναφέρουν σημαντική διαφορά στις επιλογές γλώσσας με μεγαλύτερα αδέρφια σε σύγκριση με νεότερα. Πάνω από το ήμισυ των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 2 είναι σε ενδογαμικές σχέσεις, και ενώ η αγγλική είναι ο ευρύτερα χρησιμοποιούμενος κώδικας, σχεδόν το 40% δηλώνουν ότι χρησιμοποιούν και τις δύο γλώσσες εξίσου. Οι μισοί από τους πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 2 χρησιμοποιούν τόσο τη μακεδονική όσο και την αγγλική με τα παιδιά τους, ενώ το 40% αναφέρουν ότι τα παιδιά τους χρησιμοποιούν και τις δύο γλώσσες μαζί τους. Από τους πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 2 χωρίς παιδιά, η συντριπτική πλειονότητα λένε ότι θα μιλούν και τις δύο γλώσσες στα μελλοντικά παιδιά τους. Μεταξύ των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 3, υπάρχουν διαφορές ως προς την έκθεσή τους στη μακεδονική ανάλογα με τη γενιά. Αναφέρουν ότι τα αγγλικά είναι η κυρίαρχη γλώσσα που χρησιμοποιείται από τους γονείς τους (μέλη της Γενιάς 2), αλλά με συχνά παραδείγματα εναλλαγής κώδικα ανάλογα με συγκεκριμένα που αφορούν συγκεκριμένο θέμα, π.χ. ανέκδοτα, το φαγητό, οικογενειακά ζητήματα και ακόμα ζητήματα δουλειάς/ σχολείου. Η αγγλική δεν είναι η κυρίαρχη γλώσσα με τους παππούδες των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 3 –η συχνότερη απάντηση είναι ότι και οι δύο γλώσσες χρησιμοποιούνται στην επικοινωνία μεταξύ τριών γενεών. Περαιτέρω, πληροφορητές της γενιάς 3 αναφέρουν ότι ακούνε μακεδονικά όχι μόνο από παππούδες και γιαγιάδες, αλλά και από άλλους στην αμέσως προηγούμενη γενιά, δηλ. θείες, θείους και άλλους συγγενείς. Είκοσι τοις εκατό των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 3 είναι σε ενδογαμικές σχέσεις.

Αυτά τα δεδομένα γλωσσικής χρήσης σε περιβάλλοντα οικογένειας/ σπιτιού είναι δείγματα και χαρακτηριστικά μιας «καλά διατηρημένης» γλώσσας σε περιβάλλον διασποράς, δηλ. το ότι οι ομιλητές πρώτης γενιάς χρησιμοποιούν κατά κύριο λόγο τη μειονοτική γλώσσα και οι στενές και πολλαπλές σχέσεις που συνάδουν με τις νεότερες γενιές σημαίνουν ότι η γλώσσα αυτή παραμένει μια ευρέως χρησιμοποιούμενη ποικιλία. Η χρήση της μακεδονικής εδώ είναι

ταυτόχρονα ένδειξη ακεραιότητας της οικογένειας και αποτελεί δείκτη και κώδικα με τον οποίο «γίνεται η δουλειά» για τα μέλη της οικογένειας σε θέματα που είναι σημαντικά γι' αυτά.

Στον προσωπικό τομέα, οι περισσότεροι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 1A αναφέρουν ότι χρησιμοποιούν τη μακεδονική μόνο για προσωπικές δραστηριότητες: όταν ονειρεύονται, όταν σκέφτονται, όταν μετρούν γρήγορα, όταν βρίζουν και όταν μιλούν σε κατοικίδια ζώα. Για τους πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 1B, και οι δύο γλώσσες χρησιμοποιούνται για τις δραστηριότητες αυτές. Οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 2 χρησιμοποιούν ως επί το πλείστον αγγλικά όταν ονειρεύονται, σκέφτονται και αριθμούν νοερά, αλλά συνήθως και τις δύο γλώσσες για να βρίσουν και να μιλήσουν σε ζώα. Οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 3 κάνουν τα περισσότερα πράγματα στα αγγλικά, αλλά το βρίσιμο μπορεί να γίνει είτε στη μία είτε στην άλλη γλώσσα. Ο προσωπικός τομέας (με εξαίρεση την νοερή αρίθμηση) αντλείται σε μεγάλο βαθμό (αλλά όχι αποκλειστικά) από οικιακές και οικογενειακές εμπειρίες. Υπάρχει μια εναλλαγή των επικοινωνιακών διαδράσεων από τον οικογενειακό τομέα με την προσωπική-οικεία σφαίρα του ατόμου, και αυτές ενδέχεται να στηρίζουν από κοινού τη συνέχιση της χρήσης της μακεδονικής.

Στον τομέα των μέσων ενημέρωσης, οι πληροφορητές ρωτήθηκαν σχετικά με το μέσο ενημέρωσης, υποδοχής ή ψυχαγωγίας που χρησιμοποιούν: ραδιόφωνο, τηλεόραση, εφημερίδες, DVD και το διαδίκτυο. Οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 1A ακούν ραδιόφωνο πιο συχνά στα μακεδονικά, παρακολουθούν τηλεόραση πιο συχνά στα αγγλικά, ενώ οι εφημερίδες καταναλώνουν εξίσου στα μακεδονικά και στα αγγλικά. Μακεδονικά DVD παρακολουθούνται ευρύτερα απ' ό,τι τα αγγλόφωνα, ενώ ο υπολογιστής χρησιμοποιείται από μικρότερο αριθμό πληροφορητών και η χρήση της γλώσσας είναι μοιρασμένη στη μέση. Οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 1B καταναλώνουν όλα τα είδη μέσων συχνότερα στα αγγλικά, αλλά πάνω από το ήμισυ διαβεβαιώνουν ότι παρακολουθούν τηλεοπτικές εκπομπές, διαβάζουν εφημερίδες και παρακολουθούν DVD στη μακεδονική. Οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 2 βασίζονται κατά κύριο λόγο σε αγγλόφωνα μέσα ενημέρωσης. Υπάρχουν ωστόσο μέτρια επίπεδα χρήσης της μακεδονικής για όλες τις μορφές των μέσων μαζικής ενημέρωσης, εκτός από το ραδιόφωνο. Οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 3 επίσης είναι καταναλωτές αγγλόφωνων μέσων. Τα μακεδονικά καταναλώνονται από κάποιους, συνήθως σε μορφή ακουστική + οπτική που επιτρέπει στο οπτικό περιεχόμενο να συμπληρώνει ή να επαυξάνει φωνητικά κείμενα τα οποία μπορεί να μην είναι εύκολα κατανοητά σε κάποιους.

Όσον αφορά τη διδασκαλία της μακεδονικής ως μειονοτικής γλώσσας, λίγοι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 1B έστειλαν τα παιδιά τους σε μακεδονικό σχολείο, και κανένας της Γενιάς 1A. Μόνο το 18% των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 2 και το 10% της Γενιάς 3 πήγε σε μακεδονικό σχολείο. Αυτά τα ποσοστά

συμμετοχής στο μακεδονικό σχολείο είναι χαμηλότερα από εκείνα που ισχύουν επί του παρόντος για τους Αυστραλο-Μακεδόνες σχολικής ηλικίας που ζουν στην περιοχή της Μελβούρνης, εκ των οποίων περίπου το ένα τρίτο παρακολουθούν επίσημη διδασκαλία στα μακεδονικά. Αλλά μεταξύ των πληροφορητών του δείγματος αυτού, η επίσημη διδασκαλία στη μειονοτική γλώσσα δεν είναι ένας τομέας στον οποίο να μπορούν να αποδοθούν οι μεσαίες και υψηλές αυτο-βαθμολογήσεις της ακουστικής/ προφορικής δεξιότητας στα μακεδονικά που αναφέρουν, για παράδειγμα, οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 2, και τις μεσαίες προς χαμηλές βαθμολογήσεις που αναφέρουν οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 3.

Αυτό που όντως προσφέρει ο τομέας της εκπαίδευσης σε αυτούς τους πληροφορητές είναι η γνώση ότι οι εκπαιδευτικές αρχές της Βικτόρια αποδίδουν αναγνώριση και επίσημο καθεστώς στη μακεδονική. Αυτό συμβαίνει μέσω προγραμμάτων εμβάπτισης σε γενικά σχολεία πρωτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης, μέσω ένταξης της μακεδονικής ως κανονικού σχολικού μαθήματος στην πρωτοβάθμια και δευτεροβάθμια εκπαίδευση, και μέσω διδασκαλίας της σε πέντε σχολεία με κρατική στήριξη το Σάββατο το πρωί. Αυτά δεν περνούν απαρατήρητα, ακόμη και αν αυτές οι ευκαιρίες για επίσημη διδασκαλία μένουν σε μεγάλο βαθμό αναξιοποίητες από αυτούς τους πληροφορητές.

Ο τομέας της φιλίας και των κοινωνικών δικτύων δείχνει ότι μεταξύ των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 1Α οι φίλοι είναι ως επί το πλείστον μακεδονικής καταγωγής και ο συχνότερα χρησιμοποιούμενος κώδικας είναι η μακεδονική και μόνο. Το ίδιο ισχύει και για τους πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 1Β. Οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 1Β διαφέρουν ελάχιστα από εκείνους της Γενιάς 1Α από την άποψη αυτή. Μεταξύ των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 2 και της Γενιάς 3, η συντριπτική πλειοψηφία αναφέρουν ότι οι φίλοι τους είναι ένα μείγμα από «κάποιους Μακεδόνες, κάποιους μη Μακεδόνες» φίλους. Με μακεδονικής καταγωγής φίλους, το 85% των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 2 αναφέρουν ότι χρησιμοποιούν και τις δύο γλώσσες, ενώ το 30% των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 3 αναφέρουν ότι κάνουν το ίδιο με ομοεθνείς φίλους. Τα ευρήματα αυτά είναι μη αναμενόμενα. Διατυπώνω την υπόθεση ότι υπάρχουν πολύπλοκοι και πυκνοί δεσμοί εντός διευρυμένων οικογενειών, δικτύων βασισμένων στην απασχόληση (και την εκπαίδευση), κοινές δραστηριότητες γειτονιάς και αναψυχής που μπορεί να μην είναι οι ίδιες «εθνοτικά προσδιορισμένες». Αυτό δείχνει ότι υπάρχει μια κρίσιμη μάζα «γνωστών άλλων» –φίλων, γνωριμιών και επαφών, που έχουν παρόμοιες καταβολές, και όπου οι συμπατριώτες φίλοι προέρχονται από ένα μείγμα εθνοτικά προσδιορισμένων οικογενειακών ή τοπικών δικτύων καθώς και από ένα ευρύτερο μείγμα κοινωνικών επαφών, μερικές από τις οποίες συμπτωματικά είναι επίσης Μακεδόνες. Η μακεδονική ενδέχεται να έχει συμπληρωματική λειτουργία στους κοινωνικούς κύκλους των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 2 και της Γενιάς 3: ως κώδικας με τον οποίο μιλά κανείς για θέματα

με εθνοτικά προσδιορισμένο αναφορικό περιεχόμενο ως κώδικας ο οποίος παρέχει πρόσβαση σε διακριτικά σύμβολα ως γλώσσα αποκλεισμού ή μυστική γλώσσα για ιδιωτικές δυνάδες.

Για το θρησκευτικό τομέα, ομιλιακές κοινότητες που ακολουθούν κατά κύριο λόγο την ορθόδοξη χριστιανική πίστη είναι γνωστό ότι έχουν ισχυρή συμβολική και οργανωτική υποστήριξη από την εκκλησία τους στη χρήση και την καλλιέργεια της γλώσσας της ομιλιακής κοινότητας (ή τουλάχιστον μιας υψηλού υφολογικού επιπέδου μορφής της η οποία χρησιμοποιείται στη λειτουργία). Οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 1Α και της Γενιάς 1Β αναφέρουν υψηλά επίπεδα συμμετοχής σε θρησκευτικές τελετές στη μακεδονική γλώσσα (δηλ. της μακεδονικής ορθόδοξης εκκλησίας). Από εκείνους που προσεύχονται, οι περισσότεροι το κάνουν στη μακεδονική. Μεταξύ των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 2 και της Γενιάς 3, υπάρχουν χαμηλότερα επίπεδα συμμετοχής σε θρησκευτικές τελετές. Περίπου το ήμισυ των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 2 παρακολουθούν θρησκευτικές λειτουργίες σε κάποιο βαθμό, αλλά λιγότερο από το 30% προσεύχονται –συνήθως στα αγγλικά ή και στις δύο γλώσσες. Κανείς πληροφορητής της Γενιάς 3 δεν παρακολουθεί θρησκευτικές λειτουργίες και κανείς δεν προσεύχεται. Ο θρησκευτικός τομέας θα ήταν καλύτερο να χαρακτηριστεί ως ένα σκηνικό για την άσκηση όχι τόσο θρησκευτικών πρακτικών, αλλά μάλλον ενδο-εθνοτικών κοινωνικών, εκπαιδευτικών και ψυχαγωγικών δραστηριοτήτων. Ο μεγάλος αριθμός Μακεδονικών ορθόδοξων εκκλησιών (8) και μοναστηριών (3) στην περιοχή της Μεμβούρνης είναι ενδείξεις μιας εθνοθρησκευτικής υποδομής που εξυπηρετεί όχι μόνο όσους πηγαίνουν τακτικά στην εκκλησία, αλλά και «περιστασιακούς» επισκέπτες εκδηλώσεων που οργανώνει η εκκλησία. Αυτές οι διαδράσεις, γύρω και πέρα από την τήρηση των θρησκευτικών πρακτικών, συντελούν στη χρήση της μακεδονικής γλώσσας. Ακόμη και όσοι «δεν πηγαίνουν συχνά» είναι πιθανό από καιρό σε καιρό να παρακολουθούν αυτές τις διαδράσεις. Αλλά η χαμηλή ή μηδενική συμμετοχή αποτελεί ένδειξη ότι ο θρησκευτικός τομέας είναι δευτερεύων ή ασήμαντος για τη ζωή πολλών (νεότερων) πληροφορητών, και αυτό εν συνεχεία απομακρύνει το θρησκευτικό τομέα ως ένα θεσμό που μπορεί να συντελέσει στη διατήρηση της γλώσσας, μολονότι πολλοί είναι ενδεχόμενο να συμμετέχουν ευκαιριακά σε εκδηλώσεις που οργανώνει η εκκλησία.

Ο τομέας του χώρου εργασίας εμφανίζεται σε πολύ υψηλή θέση στη χρήση της μειονοτικής γλώσσας. Μεταξύ πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 1Α και της Γενιάς 1Β, τα δύο τρίτα της δεύτερης και το ήμισυ της πρώτης ομάδας ισχυρίζονται ότι χρησιμοποιούν ή έχουν χρησιμοποιήσει τη μακεδονική στο χώρο εργασίας, συνήθως με άλλους συναδέλφους. Σε αυτό προστίθεται το 55% των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 2 που ισχυρίζονται ότι επίσης χρησιμοποιούν τη μακεδονική σε κάποιο βαθμό στην εργασία, πάλι συνήθως με συναδέλφους. Εξήντα τοις εκατό των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 3 διατείνονται ότι την

χρησιμοποιούν. Αυτό δείχνει την ύπαρξη επιχειρήσεων/ χώρων εργασίας που εξυπηρετούν ομιλητές της μακεδονικής ως καταναλωτές και χρήστες υπηρεσιών. Περαιτέρω, υποδηλώνει την ύπαρξη επιχειρήσεων/ χώρων εργασίας στις οποίες, μέσα από προσωπική, οικογενειακή ή άλλες επαφές, ομάδες ομιλητών της μακεδονικής τυχαίνει να βρουν απασχόληση και στις οποίες μπορεί να διεξαχθεί επικοινωνία με ομοεθνείς ομιλητές της μακεδονικής, καθώς και με άλλους.

Ο συναλλακτικός τομέας, δηλαδή ο τομέας όπου οι ομιλητές χρησιμοποιούν υπηρεσίες ή αγοράζουν προϊόντα ως καταναλωτές, αποκαλύπτει επίσης ενδείξεις ότι οι πληροφορητές επισκέπτονται καταστήματα ή χρησιμοποιούν παρόχους υπηρεσιών που τους είναι γνωστοί, όπου το βασικό κίνητρο για την επιλογή ενός συγκεκριμένου λιανοπωλητή ή παρόχου υπηρεσιών δεν είναι ότι μιλάει μακεδονικά, αλλά ότι τους είναι οικείος. Η χρήση της γλώσσας είναι συνέπεια αυτού του κινήτρου, δεν είναι η ίδια κίνητρο. Όσον αφορά τον τομέα της γειτονιάς, το 40% των πληροφορητών αναφέρουν ότι έχουν γείτονες με τους οποίους χρησιμοποιούν τη μακεδονική. Ωστόσο, η γεωγραφική θέση των περισσότερων πληροφορητών σε περιοχές με χαμηλούς αριθμούς ομιλητών της μακεδονικής δείχνει ότι η χρήση της μειονοτικής γλώσσας οφείλεται μάλλον σε τοπικά κοινωνικά δίκτυα παρά στην τοπική πυκνότητα των ομιλητών της μακεδονικής σε αυτόν τον τομέα.

Η δεύτερη προσέγγιση που εφαρμόζεται σε αυτό το βιβλίο είναι εκείνη της εθνογλωσσικής ζωτικότητας, μια προσέγγιση που μετρά, μέσω απαντήσεων της κλίμακας Likert, τις αντιλήψεις των Αυστραλο-Μακεδόνων για την ισχύ τους ως ομάδας σε σχέση με το καθεστώς, τη δημογραφία και τη θεσμική στήριξη που διαθέτουν στην Αυστραλία. Με τη χρήση ερωτήσεων που αφορούν τις αυτο-αντιλήψεις των μελών της ομάδας σχετικά όχι μόνο με τη δική τους ομάδα, αλλά και με άλλες ομάδες στην Αυστραλία, συνάγεται μια συγκριτική εικόνα για το πώς βλέπουν τους εαυτούς τους οι Αυστραλο-Μακεδόνες. Τα ευρήματα από την εξέταση των αντιλήψεων για την εθνογλωσσική ζωτικότητα της δικής τους ομάδας αποκαλύπτουν ότι καταγράφονται πολύ χαμηλά ποσοστά για τα εξής: τη μετανάστευση των Μακεδόνων στη Μελβούρνη· την εκπροσώπηση σε τοπικούς επιχειρηματικούς φορείς την πυκνότητα του πληθυσμού στην περιοχή όπου κατοικούν οι πληροφορητές την πολιτική εξουσία· τις αντιλήψεις για τους εαυτούς τους ως ομάδα που διαθέτει κύρος σε τοπικό και διεθνές επίπεδο. Χαμηλά ποσοστά καταγράφονται για: τα τοπικά ποσοστά γεννητικότητας· τη διαθεσιμότητα μέσω μαζικής ενημέρωσης τη γλώσσα ως εργαλείο για επαγγελματική ανέλιξη τον έλεγχο επί τοπικών οικονομικών και επιχειρηματικών θεμάτων την παροχή διδασκαλίας στα σχολεία στη μακεδονική γλώσσα τη χρήση της σε κυβερνητικές υπηρεσίες. Απαντήσεις μεσαίου επιπέδου καταγράφονται για την αριθμητική ισχύ των Μακεδόνων της Μελβούρνης κατά γενική έννοια· τα επίπεδα ενδογαμίας· τη



γλώσσα ως καταλύτη φιλίας· τις αντιλήψεις περί πλούτου· την εκπροσώπηση στην τοπική πολιτιστική ζωή· τη μακεδονική Ορθοδοξία και τη γλωσσομάθεια ως προαπαιτούμενα της «μακεδονικότητας»· τη συχνότητα επισκέψεων σε χώρους λατρείας. Ευρήματα υψηλής ζωτικότητας καταγράφονται για τα εξής: την πυκνότητα του πληθυσμού των Μακεδόνων εν γένει σε όλη τη Μεμβούρνη· κανονιστικές απόψεις για το πόσο «καλά» ομιλείται η μακεδονική στη Μεμβούρνη· το ιστορικο-γλωσσικό γόητρο που ασκεί η μακεδονική. Οι πληροφορητές κατέγραψαν πολύ υψηλές βαθμολογίες για την υπερηφάνεια από την πολιτιστική ιστορία και τα επιτεύγματα.

Αν ανιχνεύσουμε τις αποκρίσεις από τις ερωτήσεις εθνογλωσσικής ζωτικότητας, υπάρχουν τομείς όπου αυτές συνάδουν με τις απαντήσεις του δείγματος ανά τομέα και τομείς όπου διαφέρουν. Σε γενικές γραμμές, το επίπεδο εθνογλωσσικής ζωτικότητας που ανέφεραν οι Μακεδόνες για τη δική τους ομάδα είναι χαμηλότερο από το επίπεδο που δείχνουν τα πραγματικά κοινωνιογλωσσικά δεδομένα μέσω της ανάλυσης ανά τομέα. Με άλλα λόγια, οι πληροφορητές θεωρούν ότι πολλά χαρακτηριστικά της δικής τους εθνογλωσσικής ομάδας δεν είναι τόσο ισχυρά όσο δείχνουν στην πραγματικότητα τα κοινωνιογλωσσικά δεδομένα σχετικά με τη χρήση της γλώσσας τους.

Κοιτάζοντας τα δύο δείγματα, υπάρχει χαμηλότερο επίπεδο αντιστοιχίας μεταξύ των δύο στα ποσοστά ενδογαμίας που αναφέρθηκαν στην «εθνογλωσσική ζωντάνια», ενώ τα πραγματικά επίπεδα ενδογαμίας από το κοινωνιογλωσσικό δείγμα δείχνουν υψηλότερο επίπεδο. Ομοίως, το εθνογλωσσικό δείγμα υποτιμά κάπως την παρουσία της μακεδονικής ως γλώσσας που χρησιμοποιείται σε χώρους λατρείας για Μακεδόνες. Η συγκέντρωση Μακεδόνων είναι υψηλότερη σε ορισμένες περιοχές της Μεμβούρνης από άλλες, αλλά τα εθνογλωσσικά δεδομένα υποδηλώνουν ότι πληροφορητές αισθάνονται ότι υπάρχουν λιγότεροι Μακεδόνες στην περιοχή που ζουν, απ' ό,τι τα κοινωνιογλωσσικά δεδομένα υποδηλώνουν. Ομοίως, υπάρχουν χαμηλά επίπεδα εθνογλωσσικών απαντήσεων όσον αφορά την παροχή διδασκαλίας της μακεδονικής στα σχολεία τη στιγμή που, στην πραγματικότητα, η μακεδονική εξυπηρετείται αρκετά καλά τόσο από ειδικά σχολεία που λειτουργούν Σάββατο πρωί όσο και από δημόσια γενικής εκπαίδευσης, τουλάχιστον στα προάστια όπου υπάρχει υψηλότερη συγκέντρωση Μακεδόνων στη Μεμβούρνη. Αυτό μπορεί εν μέρει να οφείλεται στη μείωση του αριθμού των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς Α που στέλνουν τα παιδιά τους σε μακεδονικό σχολείο, και στο μικρό αριθμό πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 2 που πήγε σε μακεδονικό σχολείο.

Η επάρκεια στη μακεδονική γλώσσα έχει μεσαίου επιπέδου βαθμολογία στις εθνογλωσσικές απαντήσεις, ενώ στα κοινωνιογλωσσικά δεδομένα η χρήση της μακεδονικής εκ μέρους των πληροφορητών είναι εμφανής σε μεγάλο αριθμό

τομέων και σε μεγάλο αριθμό περιστάσεων. Χαμηλές εθνογλωσσικές βαθμολογίες δίνονται για τον έλεγχο επί επιχειρηματικών και οικονομικών θεμάτων. Αυτή η μέση απόκριση δεν αποκλίνει από τα κοινωνιογλωσσικά δεδομένα που επικεντρώνονται όχι στον οικονομικό έλεγχο, αλλά στη χρήση της μακεδονικής στο χώρο εργασίας, όπου καταγράφηκε ότι η μακεδονική είναι ένας κώδικας που χρησιμοποιείται συχνά με τους συναδέλφους και τους πελάτες. Τέλος, υπάρχουν χαμηλές απαντήσεις ως προς την αντίληψη της παρουσίας Μακεδόνων στα μέσα ενημέρωσης που είναι διαθέσιμα στους Αυστραλο-Μακεδόνες. Αυτό έρχεται σε αντίθεση με την ενεργό και δυναμική παρουσία ΜΜΕ στη μακεδονική γλώσσα στην Αυστραλία κατά τα τελευταία 50 χρόνια, τα οποία σήμερα μεταδίδουν ακουστικό και οπτικοακουστικό υλικό που έχει παραχθεί τοπικά (και επαγγελματικά), καθώς και με τη διαθεσιμότητα ανάλογων ΜΜΕ από τη Μακεδονία. Σε γενικές γραμμές, υπάρχουν λίγες σημαντικές διαφορές στις εθνογλωσσικές απαντήσεις που έδωσαν οι Αιγιάτες Μακεδόνες σε σύγκριση με εκείνους από τη Δημοκρατία της Μακεδονίας. Ωστόσο, υπάρχουν ορισμένες διαφορές μεταξύ δύο γενεακών ομάδων: πληροφορητών πρώτης γενιάς έναντι εκείνων της δεύτερης γενιάς. Οι πληροφορητές πρώτης γενιάς είναι πιο πιθανό να δώσουν υψηλότερες βαθμολογήσεις σε σχέση με τη ζωτικότητα των μακεδονικών ΜΜΕ στην Αυστραλία, τη μακεδονική γλώσσα ως καταλύτη τόσο για τη φιλία όσο και την επαγγελματική ανέλιξη, τις αντιλήψεις περί πλούτου και οικονομικής δύναμης, καθώς και τη χρήση της μακεδονικής σε εκπαιδευτικά και κυβερνητικά περιβάλλοντα. Όπου υπάρχουν σημαντικές διαφορές μεταξύ των πληροφορητών πρώτης και δεύτερης γενιάς στις απαντήσεις στο εθνογλωσσικό δείγμα, οι πληροφορητές πρώτης γενιάς είναι αυτοί που καταγράφουν τις υψηλότερες βαθμολογήσεις της δικής τους ομιλιακής κοινότητας.

Το τελευταίο δείγμα αποτελείται από διαθετικές απαντήσεις σε τρεις γλωσσικές ποικιλίες: διαλεκτική μακεδονική, τυποποιημένη [standard] μακεδονική και αυστραλιανά αγγλικά. Στους πληροφορητές δόθηκαν ζευγάρια επιθέτων στους ακόλουθους θεματικούς τομείς: πρακτικότητα· αισθητική· κανονικότητα· και οικειότητα. Η σύγκριση μεταξύ των ποικιλιών αυτών αποκαλύπτει ότι οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 1Α σε γενικές γραμμές βαθμολογούν την οικιακή τους διάλεκτο με τον πιο θετικό τρόπο, ενώ ακολουθεί η τυποποιημένη μακεδονική και μετά τα αυστραλιανά αγγλικά. Οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 1Β τείνουν να βαθμολογούν την οικιακή τους διάλεκτο με τον πιο θετικό τρόπο, ενώ ακολουθούν αμέσως μετά τα αυστραλιανά αγγλικά, με τη τυποποιημένη μακεδονική στην τρίτη θέση. Οι πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 1Α και της Γενιάς 1Β αποδίδουν θετική απήχηση, κοσμιότητα και εκλέπτυνση στις διαλέκτους τους, και σε μεγάλο βαθμό τις βλέπουν ως μέρος της ζωής τους εδώ και τώρα. Μεταξύ των πληροφορητών της

Γενιάς 2, υπάρχει ένα μίγμα αποκρίσεων. Παραδόξως, η οικιακή διάλεκτος των γονέων τους προσελκύει επίσης τις πιο θετικές αντιδράσεις (π.χ. «ζεστή», «οικεία», «όμορφη»), εκτός από τις περιπτώσεις όπου αξιολογείται ως η πιο «παρωχημένη», ενώ η αυστραλιανή αγγλική και η τυποποιημένη μακεδονική έρχονται μετά, με την πρώτη να είναι «άσχημη» και «καθαρότερη», και πιο «μοντέρνα», καθώς και «νεότερη». Η τυποποιημένη μακεδονική είναι πιο «εκλεπτυσμένη» αλλά και πιο «απρόσωπη», και επίσης η λιγότερο «ευχάριστη» από όλες. Μεταξύ των πληροφορητών της Γενιάς 3, υπάρχουν μικτές αντιδράσεις και, σε γενικές γραμμές, πολύ διαφοροποιημένες απόψεις για τη θέση κάθε γλώσσας: η μακεδονική είναι πιο «πρακτική» αλλά πιο «παρωχημένη», πιο «οικεία» αλλά και πιο «τεχνητή». Τα αυστραλιανά αγγλικά είναι πιο «άσχημα», αλλά πιο «μοντέρνα», πιο «ανακριβή», αλλά πιο «νέα». Και οι δύο γλώσσες είναι εξίσου «σημαντικές» και «προσωπικές». Στις νεότερες γενιές, τη 2 και την 3, βλέπουμε συμπεριφορικές αντιδράσεις στη μακεδονική οι οποίες επιβεβαιώνουν ότι υπάρχει στη ζωή των πληροφορητών όχι ως ένας «καλοσυνάτος» ή «νοσταλγικός» κώδικας, που κάποτε άκουσαν αλλά σπάνια χρησιμοποιούν τώρα, αλλά ως ένας κώδικας που προκαλεί συμπεριφορικές αντιδράσεις σχετικές όχι μόνο με την «οικειότητα» και την «αισθητική», αλλά και με την «πρακτικότητα» και την «κανονικότητα», και μάλιστα σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις την «συγχρονότητα». Τα ευρήματα αυτά είναι απροσδόκητα για μια ήσσονα γλώσσα μεταφερμένη σε μια κοινωνία του νέου κόσμου, κατά βάση αγγλόφωνη, αλλά όχι απροσδόκητα εάν ληφθούν υπόψη τα πορίσματα από άλλα μέρη αυτού του βιβλίου που καταγράφουν ισχυρά επίπεδα διατήρησης της γλώσσας μεταξύ όλων των γενεών. Οι θετικές απαντήσεις που αναφέρθηκαν εδώ για τη μακεδονική είναι σημαντικοί πρόδρομοι για τη διατήρηση, τη μάθηση και την αναζωογόνηση της γλώσσας, αν και δεν αποτελούν εγγύηση ότι θα συνεχιστεί η χρήση της γλώσσας, πράγμα που δεν καθορίζεται μόνο από τις στάσεις αλλά από ένα συνδυασμό παραγόντων.

Οι παράγοντες που ευθύνονται για τη συνεχιζόμενη χρήση της μακεδονικής ως μεταφερμένης, «μεταναστευτικής» γλώσσας, ακόμη και μεταξύ των ομιλητών τρίτης γενιάς, είναι οι ακόλουθοι. Για τους πληροφορητές όλων των γενεών, η μακεδονική εξακολουθεί να αποτελεί έναν λειτουργικό κώδικα με πρακτική αποτελεσματικότητα, με τον οποίο «μπορεί να γίνει η δουλειά». Η πρώτη απόδειξη για τον ισχυρισμό αυτό είναι η γκάμα ενδογενεακών διαδράσεων (π.χ. από πρώτη προς δεύτερη, από δεύτερη προς τρίτη) και διαγενεακών διαδράσεων (π.χ. από πρώτη προς τρίτη) που εμφανίζονται μέσα στην οικογένεια, το σπίτι και το κοινωνικό περιβάλλον στο οποίο, για πολλούς ομιλητές, ο μη σημαδεμένος κώδικας είναι η μακεδονική. Από την άποψη της πρακτικής αποτελεσματικότητας, μεταξύ των μελών της οικογένειας αυτή συνήθως επιτυγχάνεται καλύτερα στη μακεδονική. Η μακεδονική δεν είναι εμβληματικός ή κυρίως συμβολικός κώδικας (αν και ο συμβολισμός

οποιασδήποτε επιλογής γλώσσας σε κάθε διάδραση σπάνια απουσιάζει παντελώς), αλλά μια λειτουργική δημόδης, την οποία κατέχουν ενεργά οι πρώτη και δεύτερης γενιάς ομιλητές, ενώ οι ομιλητές τρίτης γενιάς επιδεικνύουν σε αυτή επάρκεια που κυμαίνεται από την ικανότητα χειρισμού σε όλες τις μακρο-δεξιότητες μέχρι την απλώς παθητική κατανόηση. Οι εκτιμήσεις των ίδιων των πληροφορητών είναι σύμφωνες με αυτή την περιγραφή. Ο λειτουργικός ρόλος που καταλαμβάνει η μακεδονική εκτείνεται πέρα από τον οικογενειακό/ οικιακό και το θρησκευτικό τομέα, τους δύο τομείς στους οποίους η χρήση των μειονοτικών γλωσσών παραδοσιακά διατηρείται για περισσότερο καιρό, σε άλλους τομείς, όπως ο φιλικός και ο κοινωνικός τομέας και οι τομείς του επαγγέλματος, των συναλλαγών και της γειτονιάς. Σε σχέση με τον φιλικό και τον κοινωνικό τομέα, η επιρροή επαφών που συνδέονται με την οικογένεια μπορεί να είναι σημαντική λόγω των συχνά διπλών ή πολλαπλών σχέσεων που προσιδιάζουν στους συνομιλητές. Επιπλέον, υπάρχει επίσης υψηλή συγκέντρωση ομιλητών της μακεδονικής σε ορισμένες περιοχές της Μεμβούρνης, και σε πολλά περιβάλλοντα υπάρχει μια «κρίσιμη μάζα» ομοεθνών, έτσι ώστε η χρήση της μακεδονικής να είναι ένας κώδικας διαθέσιμος κατά μη σημαδεμένο τρόπο, ή κατά έναν εμβληματικό «σημαδεμένο» τρόπο. Το λιγότερο αναμενόμενο εύρημα που προέκυψε από πληροφορητές και από τις τρεις γενιές είναι ότι στο χώρο εργασίας, η μακεδονική ήταν ένας κώδικας που χρησιμοποιείται πολύ συχνά, συνήθως με συναδέλφους, αλλά και με πελάτες, εργοδότες και άλλους. Αυτό είναι τυπικό για μια κατάσταση στην οποία μια ομιλιακή κοινότητα έχει μια «κρίσιμη μάζα» ομιλητών οι οποίοι είναι γνωστοί, αλλά και απρόβλεπτοι συνομιλητές σε πολλές επικοινωνιακές καταστάσεις. Τα στοιχεία σχετικά με τη χρήση της γλώσσας, και εδώ μέχρι και μεταξύ των ομιλητών της νεότερης γενιάς για τους τομείς των συναλλαγών και της γειτονιάς, υποστηρίζουν αυτόν τον ισχυρισμό.

Τα δεδομένα εθνογλωσσικής ζωτικότητας δίνουν αποκρίσεις που δείχνουν ότι η μακεδονική δεν είναι τόσο καλά διατηρημένη γλώσσα. Οι εθνογλωσσικές αποκρίσεις, όπως και αυτές που εκφράστηκαν υποκειμενικά, αντανακλούν αντιλήψεις συμπεριφοράς, και όχι *παραδείγματα* συμπεριφοράς που συλλέχθηκαν εμπειρικά. Το κύριο εύρημα του εθνογλωσσικού δείγματος ζωτικότητας είναι ότι το συγκεκριμένο δείγμα Αυστραλο-Μακεδόνων αντιλαμβάνονται τον εαυτό τους, ή την ομιλιακή τους κοινότητα, ως λιγότερο ισχυρή από ό,τι δείχνουν τα κοινωνιογλωσσικά δεδομένα. Υπάρχουν στοιχεία που προσιδιάζουν στην τοπική κατάσταση των ομιλητών της μακεδονικής στην Αυστραλία, και στη Βικτόρια, από την περίοδο της δεκαετίας του 1990 κατά την οποία υπήρχαν ιδιαίτερες εθνικές και κρατικές πολιτικές σε σχέση με τις ονομασίες της μακεδονικής εθνότητας και της μακεδονικής γλώσσας. Οι ονομασίες συνάντησαν την αντίθεση της ίδιας της ομάδας στην οποία αναφέρονταν –δηλαδή των Μακεδόνων- και οδήγησαν σε μια δικαιολογημένη

αίσθηση αδικίας μεταξύ των Αυστραλο-Μακεδόνων για το γεγονός ότι άλλοι μπορούσαν να τους κολλάνε ετικέτες με προφανή ατιμωρησία. Παρά την εμφανή αριθμητική ισχύ της Αυστραλο-Μακεδονικής κοινότητας, η συνέπεια των πολιτικών αυτών –που στη συνέχεια αποσύρθηκαν- ήταν να δημιουργηθεί σε πολλούς Μακεδόνες η εντύπωση ότι η επιρροή, το κύρος και το επίπεδο του γοήτρου τους ως ομάδας στην Αυστραλία ήταν, από ορισμένες απόψεις, κατώτερη από άλλων ομάδων. Η ομιλιακή κοινότητα, τουλάχιστον αρχικά, δεν είχε τη δύναμη να αποτρέψει την επιβολή αυτών των πολιτικών, αν και ήταν επιτυχής στην εκστρατεία της ώστε να αποσυρθούν τελικά. Αυτό υπήρξε καταλύτης για δραστηριότητες εντός της ομάδας, οι οποίες είχαν και γλωσσικές συνέπειες.

Τα λειτουργικά, καθώς και τα συμβολικά και αισθητικά χαρακτηριστικά της μακεδονικής (τόσο των διαλεκτικών/ οικιακών δημωδών όσο και της τυποποιημένης ποικιλίας), υπογραμμίζονται μέσα από τις διαθετικές απαντήσεις που καταγράφουν τις νοοτροπίες των πληροφορητών απέναντι σε γλωσσικές ποικιλίες, περιλαμβανομένης και της αυστραλιανής αγγλικής κατά συγκριτικό τρόπο. Οι απαντήσεις υπογραμμίζουν όχι μόνο την έννοια της οικειότητας και της αισθητικής αλλά και τα λειτουργικά (πρακτικά και εργαλειακά) χαρακτηριστικά της μακεδονικής, ακόμη και για νεότερους ομιλητές, δηλ. εκείνους της δεύτερης και της τρίτης γενιάς. Αυτά ξεκάθαρα συνάδουν με την καταγεγραμμένη λειτουργία που επιτελεί η μακεδονική στη ζωή των νεότερων πληροφορητών. Αυτό ισχύει επίσης για τους πληροφορητές της Γενιάς 1Α της Γενιάς 1Β, οι οποίοι καταγράφουν ακόμα υψηλότερες βαθμολογίες για τα διαλεκτικά μακεδονικά, πάνω από την τυποποιημένη μακεδονική.

Τέλος, και για να αναφερθώ εν συντομία σε παραδείγματα αφηγήσεων που παρουσιάζονται σε αυτό το βιβλίο με λιγότερο συστηματικό τρόπο, υπάρχουν μερικά σχόλια που μπορούν να γίνουν σχετικά με το πώς χρησιμοποιούν οι ομιλητές τη μειονοτική γλώσσα. Οι ομιλητές της μακεδονικής σε ενδο-οικογενειακές καταστάσεις, αλλά και σε άλλα περιβάλλοντα, όπως με φίλους, συναδέλφους, πελάτες, ακόμη και με άλλες, λιγότερο στενές γνωριμίες, διαδρούν με τρόπους που περιλαμβάνουν την επιθυμία να μεταδώσουν αναφορικό περιεχόμενο και την επιθυμία να επιτελέσουν λεκτικά (κατά τρόπο μη εθνο-στερεοτυπικό) η οποία περιλαμβάνει κοινωνικές, πραγματολογικές και φατικές λειτουργίες. Την ικανότητα να μεταδίδουν αναφορικό περιεχόμενο με σχετική ευκολία στη μακεδονική την διαθέτουν όλοι οι πληροφορητές πρώτης γενιάς, και οι περισσότεροι ομιλητές δεύτερης γενιάς (σε αυτό το δείγμα). Για τους ομιλητές τρίτης γενιάς υπάρχουν κενά ως προς την πλήρη δυνατότητα χειρισμού διαφόρων επιπέδων ύφους και ορισμένων ενεργών δεξιοτήτων, συνήθως μόνο εκείνων που απαιτούν αλφαριθμητισμό. Αλλά αυτό ελάχιστα περιορίζει την επικοινωνιακή τους άνεση, και μπορούν με σχετική ευχέρεια να χρησιμοποιούν τη μακεδονική για να μεταφέρουν αναφορικό περιεχόμενο. Όταν

διαδρούν με άλλους, πολλές κοινωνικές, πραγματολογικές και φατικές λειτουργίες, και όχι μόνο αυτές, μπορεί να επιτελούνται στη μακεδονική. Η επιτέλεση αυτών των λειτουργιών μεταξύ ομιλητών τρίτης γενιάς δεν είναι πρωτίστως *εμβληματική* (αν και μπορεί να είναι), αλλά αντικατοπτρίζει το λόγο [discourse], το περιβάλλον και τους συνομιλητές με τους οποίους πραγματοποιείται η επικοινωνία. Αν και η μακεδονική είναι ένας κώδικας σε υποχώρηση για αυτούς τους νεότερους ομιλητές, μπορούμε ακόμα να την εννοήσουμε ως μια γλώσσα που διατηρείται.

Αυτό μας φέρνει πίσω σε ένα κεντρικό ερώτημα που το βιβλίο αυτό επεδίωξε να εξετάσει: ποια είναι τα χαρακτηριστικά των ομιλητών και ποιο το κοινωνιογλωσσικό προφίλ των ομιλητών μιας ομιλιακής κοινότητας της οποίας η γλώσσα είναι γνωστό ότι είναι πολύ καλά διατηρημένη; Μια ανάλυση των ίδιων ομιλητών από πολλαπλές προοπτικές επιτρέπει να σχηματίσουμε μία λεπτή και διαφοροποιημένη εικόνα για μια (διασπορική) ομιλιακή κοινότητα, η οποία μας τεκμηριώνει όχι μόνο το φαινόμενο της συντήρησης των μειονοτικών γλωσσών, αλλά και το πώς και γιατί μπορεί αυτό να εμφανιστεί.

(Translated by Dr. Akis Gavriilidis)