Some aspects of the Bulgarian standard language codification as a continuous process[*]

Tatyana Aleksandrova, Milen Tomov

Abstract. The article describes, in historical perspective, the process of the Bulgarian standard language codification in two consecutive periods: 1) from the first grammars in the 1830s to Bulgaria's Liberation in 1878; 2) from Bulgaria's Liberation to the present day. A comparison is made between the two periods by highlighting the common and specific features. It is demonstrated that codification is a continuous process that involves the performance of different tasks depending on specific conditions. With a standard language under development, the task is to establish the structural model of the uniform standard language, its basic phonetic, grammatical and orthographic norms. With a developed standard language, the aim is to maintain the unity, stability and functional adequacy of the already established standard language, as well as its social prestige.

Keywords: Bulgarian standard language, codification, extralinguistic and linguistic codification factors, codification in the context of a developing and developed standard language

Introduction

The issues of norm and codification are discussed within the scientific and practical discipline of *Language cultivation*, which is based on the theory of standard languages - a theory developed by the Prague school of linguistics in the first half of the previous century. In sociolinguistics, codification is an object of study in the theory of language planning, where it relates to the sum total of activities called *corpus planning*.

As is well known, the characteristics and specific functions of the standard language require strict unity both at the level of language (substance) and at the

level of territory. Unity at the level of language is a language standard and codification lies at the heart of the process of standardization[1]. In the strict sense, codification is a conscious process that involves the selection and consolidation of linguistic means, or linguistic variants, in most cases a single variant which is defined as correct and obligatory. Standard language norms are fixed as rules in official normative publications such as dictionaries, grammar books, reference books, etc. In the broad sense, the concept of codification includes the normative publications and the documents that accompany them - laws, rules, regulations, directives, etc. (so-called *language legislation*).

The processes of standardization are historically variable, which is evident from the different content of codification. With the development of the standard language, the role of purposeful selection and the forms of conscious influence gradually increase in comparison with the role of spontaneous selection. Conscious intervention in the development of the standard language is manifested in the implementation of a particular language policy by society. Codification as one of the mechanisms for the implementation of a language policy can be regarded as a continuous historical process, motivated by the constant development of the standard language. This process leads to changes in the standard language norms and to a periodic renewal of codification. Codification itself does not end with the establishment of the national standard language. Changes in the standard language structure, the extension of the regulatory framework, as well as the irregularity of codification at the separate linguistic levels necessitate its continuous renewal (Semenjuk 1970, 589). According to H. Gladkova and I. Likomanova, the claim that the development of the standard language is an open process, taking place under the influence of changing public needs, may be related to the fact that language intervention is also an "endless process" (Gladkova, Likomanova 2002, 152).

On the basis of the most important criterion - presence or absence of a nation-state - we accept that in the process of the Bulgarian standard language codification, it is possible to provisionally separate two consecutive periods: 1) from the first grammars in the 1830s to Bulgaria's Liberation in 1878; 2) from Bulgaria's Liberation to the present day. Thus separated, the periods are internally heterogeneous and various changes can be observed in them. By maintaining that a comparative approach is particularly appropriate for examining the typology of codification, in the present article, we aim to make a comparison between the two periods. Such a task requires a much more comprehensive study, whereas here we will focus only on the main factors that have influenced codification over time, as well as on some of its most important features.

---

[1] Standardization is a process of developing a uniform written and spoken language, intended for collective use in a given language community (for more details, see Garvin 1993, 46).

1. Factors influencing the Bulgarian standard language codification before the Liberation

Historically, the Bulgarian standard language codification - as a conceptual model and as practice - is, on the one hand, related to a number of cultural, historical and social factors and, on the other hand, to the specifics of establishing the norms of the language in question. These factors differ from period to period and they practically determine the specific tasks of codification. H. Gladkova emphasizes that the sociolinguistic aspects of this process have not been studied sufficiently (Gladkova 2009, 79).

1.1. Extralinguistic factors

One of the most important extralinguistic factors that influence the standardization process of a language is the type of political organization of the society that has accepted a given language as the national one[2]. In their National Revival period, Bulgarians are deprived of an independent state and Bulgarian does not have the status of an official language. There are no institutions authorized by the state to consciously intervene in the standard language. The standardization processes are also influenced by the fundamental principles of organization of Bulgarian society - democratism and egalitarianism motivated by Bulgarians' relatively equal civil status, which is regulated by the Ottoman legal system. Due to the social composition of Bulgarian society, devoid of hereditary elite, the spiritual impulses come from the rank and file. As subjects of an empire that does not pursue cultural and educational policies with respect to the non-Muslim ethnic groups, Bulgarians, on their own initiative, set up institutions which legitimize them as a separate ethnic and cultural community: a network of schools, community centres, societies, etc. Special emphasis should be placed on the role of periodicals as a kind of public forum that organizes all important debates. The absence of an autocephalous Bulgarian church is the reason why it is not possible to form a church elite that could generate conservative trends in codification.

The type of codification in the early period[3] is also influenced by utilitarianism and Enlightenment ideology, which have put a mark on all modernization processes. According to the literary scholars of the time, it is only education that could secure the general progress and prosperity of the nation, striving to occupy its rightful place among the civilized peoples of Europe.

1.2. Linguistic and sociolinguistic factors

The Bulgarian literary language of the 1830s and 1840s is not merely a language with unestablished norms - its type is in a process of clarification. The main debate is whether to adopt Church Slavonic phonetic and grammatical

---

[2] We adhere to P. Garvin's definition of a National language - this is the language that "serves as a national identity symbol for a speech community" (Garvin 1993, 40).

[3] The analysis is based on data about early codification in the 1830s and 1840s.

forms and graphic features or to follow the specifically Bulgarian peculiarities of the spoken language, as well as the orthography, which is not entirely based on the historical principle. A little later, through grammatical texts, the importance of Old Bulgarian features is also sought in the system of the New Bulgarian standard language.

During the period of national formation, there is increased participation in discussions about linguistic issues: the standard language is considered an essential element of the national project of Bulgarians; its unity is a prime task and the contribution to its perfection - a patriotic duty of every educated person.

Tradition as a historically established language practice is in a specific interaction with the principles of democratism and egalitarianism. The all-Slav role of Old Bulgarian - sacred to Slavia Orthodoxa, is the symbolic capital that will be skilfully invested in enhancing the prestige of New Bulgarian. These attitudes, however, do not lead to a strong conservative tendency in grammatical descriptions, but rather express the symbolic valuation of the language tradition. Many authors emphasize the necessity to examine the historical status of the language but few of them follow a completely archaic line.

A number of actions are taken to expand the use of the mother tongue: the legal struggle to introduce it as a liturgical language; the movement for recognizing Bulgarian as an official language; asserting the right to receive education in one's mother tongue; resistance against the project aimed at imposing obligatory study of Ottoman Turkish and others.

2. Features of codification in the early period

The above-mentioned factors largely determine the character of the initial stage of the Bulgarian standard language codification, which takes place in the absence of a nation-state and outside the control of the Ottoman Empire. The non-institutional (informal) nature of the purposeful impact on the standard language norms determines their democratism, polysubjectivity and polycentrism.

The attempts at codification (found mainly in the creation of grammars) result from the free enterprise[4] of individual representatives of the spiritual elite, under conditions of unestablished norms and incomplete functional scope of the standard language. The network model of social organization determines the pluralism of grammatical patterns and the polysubjectivity of codification. This conceptual framework provides an explanation both for the large number of grammars - 25, but together with the reprinted ones, their number exceeds 50 - and for the considerable differences between them, including differences between different editions of the same grammar.

Another peculiarity is the greater role of spontaneous selection of linguistic means, as well as the greater impact of language attitudes on codification as

---

[4] P. Garvin describes codification as a continuum, at one end of which is academy-governed codification and at the other end - free-enterprise codification (Garvin 1993, 42; for Bulgarian, see Vachkova 2008, 38).

compared to the post-Liberation period. There is an increase in the creation, translation and distribution of any type of written production with the knowledge that it is precisely language practice that will contribute to the normalization of the language through the formation of norms. Literary scholars ardently discuss linguistic issues and feel responsible to share publicly the motives for their own linguistic choices. The press of the National Revival period abounds with critical comments about someone's grammar project or language, often accompanied by emotional reactions that are taken into account in the subsequent codification actions.

Despite increasing the distance to the much desired generally accepted grammar, such a conscious collective influence of society on the language has a significant advantage. Instead of being imposed institutionally, different standard language models and specific rules are accepted or rejected by consensus and by norms established through practice. Although this causes a delay in choosing the most appropriate type of standard language and, for a while, subjects language practice to instability and non-functional heterogeneity, it actually proves to have a propitious effect, as it makes the fixing of rules easier in the subsequent period.

The pluralism of codification is also related to its polycentrism - each grammar has its own "action territory", which is the result of some extralinguistic factors, and enjoys popularity in various cultural and educational centres. The reason is that authors come from different parts of Bulgaria and most of them are teachers on some kind of cultural pilgrimage. This accounts for the lack of uniform codification, which is also related to the fact that the formulated rules are not obligatory and official but followed of one's own free will. Hence, there are sufficient grounds to speak of a codification attempt during this period, rather than codification proper, as the entire set of properties of the process under discussion is not available.

Given the level of development of the standard language, the first grammars of the 1830s and 1840s could not be described as normative, i.e., they do not fix the objectively existing norms - the criteria for normativeness are not completely established yet. Descriptions are often fragmentary and dependent on the authors' knowledge and preferences. Hence, they are quite subjective and this is what makes them different from modern grammars. The rich variability of linguistic means is also recorded but it is not functionally justified. The reason is that the language is still far from its unified variant - the standard language[5]. This reduces the effectiveness and stability of codification, as evidenced by the frequently expressed dissatisfaction with it.

Early grammars are of a project type (Vachkova 2008, 34) - they present different models of standard language in accordance with the language ideal of society. They are an attempt to create and establish standard language norms rather than fix the already existing ones. That codification is a project aimed at devel-

---

[5] J. Milroy and L. Milroy, by quoting D. Leith, define a standard language as "one which has minimal variation of form and maximal variation of function" (Milroy and Milroy 1999, 22).

oping a socially acceptable model of standard language which is to go through a lengthy selection of literary linguistic means among many isofunctional variants is another fact. Despite the great number of grammars, society is painfully aware of the absence of a generally accepted grammar, which remains a cherished goal (together with a dictionary) long after the Liberation and also underlies the ideology of the Bulgarian Learned Society. In this respect, codification differs from the modern one, which is norm-maintaining.

E. Haugen treats language planning as an evaluation of language change (Haugen 1975, 443). In the Bulgarian case, however, during the National Revival period, linguistic innovations are not evaluated in order to determine their position in the system of the already established standard language. Rather, the changes that our language undergoes in the course of its historical development are generally evaluated - both at a substantive level and in terms of the social functions of language. It is necessary to evaluate the complex configuration of language idioms: traditional written languages, modern spoken dialectal formations; sample texts representing different combinations of elements of both types. The authors of grammars' task is to reduce this diversity to a single linguistic formation with unified norms.

In the conceptual framework of the theory of language planning, the codification process in Bulgaria in the early period can be related to the first of three stages: 1) collecting material on a grand scale and considering alternative action plans; 2) decision-making and 3) implementation via different methods (Haugen 1975, 444) (cf. the stages of codification, described by Daneš: descriptive, normative and applied (Daneš 1979, 79-80). One of the tasks is to identify the sources of standard rules. That is why considerable importance is attached to examining and collecting the whole wealth of resources that could be drawn from: the earliest written monuments; linguistic material from various geographical areas. The prevailing opinion is that the standard language must have a contemporary grammatical structure, based on those features of spoken language that also have historical continuity, whereas Old Bulgarian should serve as a corrective in the normative evaluation of variant forms.

Discussions are mostly centred on certain grammatical categories: cases, forms with the definite article, participles; phonetic issues, for example, the sound value of individual graphic signs like big yus and yat. Orthography is also the focus of attention because of the opinion that differences in speech practice can be masked by letter signs with historical value, for example, the role of final position yer signs and their use in mid-position, the use of big and little yus, *ю*, *я*; the availability of more than one letter for one and the same sound, etc.

The nature of early codification is also contingent on the peculiarities of the grammars themselves (there are no orthographic dictionaries during this period for a number of reasons). These grammars are mainly utilitarian, i.e., designed for education, which takes on those tasks in the language policy that later become a priority of the nation-state. Education categorically tolerates the mother tongue and grammar is conceived of as the basis of all other sciences, needed for the comprehension of any text. The teaching profession becomes the social basis of language unification and the teacher's role is often combined with that of an author of grammars. Through their creative work, the new gen-

erations of literate and educated Bulgarians help reproduce the more popular model of standard language.

Early grammars are both educational and scientific[6]. The share of scientific description is generally modest, although in some of them, for example Neofit Rilski's grammar, the application of established philological methods is quite clear. Here the figure of the linguist, the scholar as a subject of codification, is absent, although some of the authors have a brilliant philological background. Grammatical descriptions are often based on fragmentary scientific knowledge (see Teodorov-Balan 1987 (1898), 51 et sq.). Authors are also highly influenced by the traditional notion that grammatical rules themselves are a prerequisite for the establishment of standard forms and for the improvement of language. It is evident that there is a certain amount of constructivism, boosted by the view that all languages are described by means of universal categories already established in ancient grammars and the features of Bulgarian should find their place in those categories (see Aleksandrova 2011).

It is important to note that there are no national academic institutions whose task would be to theoretically ensure standardization. This reflects on the depth of linguistic analysis, so necessary for the evaluation of linguistic facts. By contrast, language planning in Bulgaria today is theoretically well-founded, which allows for an adequate evaluation of linguistic facts and effective decision-making.

The symbolic functions of language[7] exert their influence on the codification of Bulgarian throughout the two periods - with certain peculiarities. Grammars are seen not only as cognitive and utilitarian but they are also assigned identification and national unification functions. For our native literary scholars, the attempt to describe the Bulgarian language is a symbolic act, through which the capacity of the language to serve cultural communication is legitimized. Generally accepted grammatical and orthographic rules are conceived of as basic knowledge in the process of creating a shared vision about the past, territory, ethnic origin and political future. Written language furnished with grammar is a property associated with refinement and prestige, and it gives us the confidence to compare with the civilized nations.

3. Factors influencing the Bulgarian standard language codification after the Liberation

3.1. Extralinguistic (social and political) factors

After the Liberation, the Bulgarian state system is restored. From 1879 to 1946, Bulgaria is a constitutional and parliamentary monarchy. Sofia is emerging as an important economic, political, social and cultural centre. In 1944,

---

[6] Vasil Aprilov refers to this type of grammar as a *philological book for learned Bulgarians*.
[7] For more details on the symbolic function and its three sub-functions - unifying, differentiating and prestigious, see Garvin 1993, 47.

"popular democracy" is established as a variety of the Soviet system of government.

After the Liberation, Bulgaria's population has a relatively homogeneous social structure. Until the 1940s, the vast majority of Bulgarians live in the countryside and are engaged in farming. The industrialization of the country brings about changes in the class, social and professional structure of the population but there is no middle class as a social component of modernity. There is an increase in the number of people with higher education, the artistic and scholarly elites are also formed. During the socialist period, the restructuring of all areas - economy, culture, science, education, social and demographic relations - leads to linguistic changes as well. One of the highly influential extralinguistic factors is socialist ideology. The period lasts until the collapse of the totalitarian regime at the end of the 1980s, when the country begins its transition to democracy and market economy.

3.2. Linguistic and sociolinguistic factors

The restoration of the Bulgarian state system is accompanied by changes in the sociolinguistic situation. Obligatory primary education is introduced along with the measures for accelerated economic development of the country and as a result, the number of literate people increases. Linguistic disciplines are introduced as subjects of study in the Higher School, opened in Sofia. The Bulgarian Learned Society, transferred from Brăila to Sofia, resumes both its activity and the publication of the "Periodical Journal". Other journals are also published and they further contribute to the clarification of a number of linguistic issues. The Bulgarian standard language becomes official for all kinds of events - social, state, administrative, cultural, educational, military, etc. (Parvev 1983, 298-299). All this enables enhanced unification processes to take place at all linguistic levels (Andreychin 1973, 373).

At the beginning of the period, the standard language still has a very narrow social base - its users are the highly educated Bulgarians (still of limited social strata) and the intelligentsia, who live mostly in cities. Civilizational achievements such as theatre, cinema and later on the electronic media, as well as the involvement of the linguistic community in science, literature and the arts via obligatory education help expand the areas in which the standard language functions. There is an increase in the quantity of administrative, journalistic, fictional and specialized texts; the lexical stock of the standard language expands. People's instruction in the use of the standard language is carried out by the system of public education, which becomes obligatory (for more details, see Videnov 1990, 41-54).

As early as the end of the 19th century, the Bulgarian standard language is relatively established in terms of its lexical stock and grammatical structure. The official approval given to the normative system of *Directions for General Orthography* by T. Ivanchev from 1899 marks the beginning of the stabilization of standard language norms in all the functional varieties. The initiated developmental processes depend on the functioning of the standard language itself, which is a sign of a new stage when the standard language is already a self-regulating

system. After the Second World War, the number of people using the standard language grows considerably, whereas territorial dialects are restricted mainly to non-public spheres. The tendency towards normative unity (unification) and internal integration continues (Videnov 1990, 55-62). Processes of intellectualization and internationalization take place throughout the whole period and since the beginning of the 21st century, the Bulgarian standard language has been functioning in the context of globalization and increased foreign language influence, especially that exerted by the English language.

4. Features of codification after the Liberation

The new sociolinguistic situation after the Liberation necessitates the rapid establishment of a uniform orthography as well as the publication of a Bulgarian dictionary and grammar. In the presence of a relatively established standard language, the ways of influencing the language and the role of linguists in this process are reconsidered. The authority of individual writers and literary scholars gradually ceases to be a determining factor in language planning. Society is confronted with the need for an organized and systematic implementation of a language policy and its institutionalization.

In order to solve the orthographic issue, committees are appointed to examine and remedy the shortcomings and inconsistencies of the Bulgarian orthography of the time, making first attempts to compile an orthographic dictionary. In the new sociolinguistic situation, our first linguists are faced with problems whose solution reveals the linguists' ability to make scientifically sound decisions. Recognizing the profound importance of the uniform standard language for the nation's development, when selecting sources of normativeness, scholars are guided by the conviction that it is precisely the standard language (not dialects) that should be the main corrective in the orthography codification, since the standard language norm is in essence relatively established. When a selection is made from the available linguistic and orthographic variants, the comparison with Church Slavonic, typical of the first period, is practically abandoned. The revival process of forming a general supra-dialectal standard language continues, but in the course of codification, the emotional and romantic attitudes to the language are minimized and a scientific approach is adopted. The development of linguistics as a factor in the state's language policy after the Liberation determines the emergence of the specialists/non-specialists opposition. Resolving standard language issues is no longer a personal initiative or a patriotic deed but an organized institutional activity - a necessity which is the result of the increased prestige of the standard language as a mandatory attribute not only of the nation but of the state as well.

Although for one reason or another the orthographic issue after the Liberation is not immediately settled, the efforts put in resolving it give rise to the emergence of theoretical perspectives and scientific criteria and principles of language planning, which could be applied to codification (Tomov 2011). Despite the fact that at some points, our first linguists' theoretical perspectives give credit to the historical period in which they emerged (the influence of the

Neogrammarian school of linguistics as well as the use of comparative-historical linguistics methods), on the whole, they are the fruit of modern times along with the needs arising from the existing linguistic situation. Fulfilling those needs would be impossible without an adequate language policy and scientifically substantiated language planning. This is how a scientific tradition is created as the basis of solving orthographic and, in certain cases, linguistic issues, with an already relatively established and later on developed standard language. Subsequently, our first linguists' theoretical conceptions are expanded and enriched in accordance with the solutions of linguistic and orthographic problems, now in the context of newer linguistic trends: Prague functionalism, sociolinguistics, pragmatics.

When discussing the peculiarities of the Bulgarian standard language codification after the Liberation, it is necessary to take into account the existing nationalistic language ideologies (Stancheva 2008, 341-345). In this respect, the publication of six systematic scientific grammars within a short period of time is indicative not only of the growing tendency towards a scientific description of the Bulgarian language but also of the reorientation of our linguistics from diachrony to synchrony. Particularly important is the nationalistic context, which helps emphasize the symbolic function of the language as a sign of ethnicity and nationality. Another important observation is that the new grammars also play the role of codifying works and in this way, they fulfil the need dictated by the status of our standard language and its changing functions in the first half of the 20th century (Stancheva 2008).

5. Institutionalization of codification

Until the mid-twentieth century, the language policy is implemented without the mediation of a centralized institution for standard language codification and regulation. Language planning is in accordance with the inherent language competence and practice (in the sense of accumulated texts) and with the traditional purist language ideology accepted by society and related to the historical past and literary tradition as national cultural and linguistic heritage. This ideology is built on the public consensus about the need for national unity and language purity (cf. codification efforts in lexis - Stancheva 1995).

The orthographic committees appointed by the Ministry of Public Education can be regarded as institutional mechanisms, but it should be noted that from the Liberation to the second half of the 20th century, the standardization and cultivation of the literary language are carried out by combining official and individual efforts[8].

At the beginning of the 1950s, there comes a historical moment when the state decides that language planning should be implemented by linguistics in the

_____

[8] For instance, school orthographic dictionaries and manuals (Charalozova 2011), as well as some individual orthographic projects (Iv. Vazov, St. Romanski), can be seen as products of individual initiative, serving the public interest.

person of the Institute for Bulgarian Language at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (BAS). One of the Institute's main tasks is to codify the orthographic norms by unifying them, and another one is to issue the orthographic standard in the form of an official orthographic dictionary (Tomov 2001/2002). With this act, the Bulgarian standard language codification becomes of a monosubject type. When a more significant change should be made, such as the orthographic reform of 1945, for example, scientific conferences and forums are convened and particular decisions are taken. Yet, it is the Institute for Bulgarian Language that has a leading role in making changes to the standard language norm codification. What largely contributes to this fact is the social prestige of linguistics.

After the Second World War, a number of works on orthography, grammar and lexicography are created in our country and they all have a codifying function.[9] The main normative edition and official codification document, obligatory for the public sphere, is the orthographic dictionary of the Institute for Bulgarian Language, which also functions as a pronunciation and grammar reference book. In the course of the institutionalization process, individuals and social circles gradually cease to be a leading factor in the normative impact on the standard language.

In the modern period, codification is carried out in the context of established and fixed grammatical, lexical, pronunciation, orthographic and punctuation norms. The developed standard language, however, has relative fixedness as it contains some points of fluctuation[10]. Thus, codifiers' efforts are directed at improving, maintaining and strengthening certain norms against the background of the fully functioning language standard.

Democratism and unity are still two of the main principles of codification, but they are already subordinated to a new type of linguistic and social situation. Codification is already *norm-maintaining*: the aim is to maintain the already established standard language norms and put them into practice. There is also a tendency to cover more and more levels of the language system.

Codification today is carried out via the application of a modern theory of Language cultivation, which takes into account both the scientific traditions and the modern trends in this particular field of research. In their work, codifiers rely on language practice, authoritative sources of normativeness and speech models from different functional areas, while at the same time the attitude to linguistic traditions is also preserved to an extent that is justifiable in a specific

---

[9] *Dictionary of Modern Standard Bulgarian* (1955-1959); *Unilingual Bulgarian Dictionary* (1955), *Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language* (1977-), *Modern Standard Bulgarian Grammar* (1983); *Orthographic Dictionary of Modern Standard Bulgarian* (1983), *New Orthographic Dictionary* (2002), *Official Orthographic Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language* (2012), etc.

[10] Such are, for example, the pronunciation of variable *я* /ya/ and the occurrence of depalatalization in certain forms (*вървяли* /varvyali/ instead of *вървели* /varveli/; *говорителa* /govolitela/ instead of *говорителя* /govoritelya/), fluctuations in the cardinal and ordinary plural form of masculine nouns used after a cardinal number (*петима ученика* /petima uchenika/ and *петима ученици* /petima uchenitsi/), the so-called "mekane" (generalization of the suffix *-ме* /-me/ in the 1st person plural form for all verbs (*пишеме* /pisheme/, *бориме се* /borime se/), fluctuations in the forms *кой/кого* /koi/kogo/ (who/whom), fluctuations in some instances of agreement, etc.

case. When evaluating linguistic phenomena, specialists apply both objective multiple criteria for normativeness and theoretical principles of normative intervention in the standard language.

Codification is supported by a variety of activities such as: language consultation via the Language Consultation Service and regular columns in specialized editions[11] and electronic media, the creation of linguistic online resources, promotional activities.

Conclusion

As demonstrated above, the standardization processes are different in the different historical periods: codification helps solve specific problems at each one of the separate stages. With a standard language under development, the aim is to establish the structural model of the uniform standard language, its basic phonetic, grammatical and orthographic norms. With a developed standard language, efforts are directed at maintaining the unity, stability, functional adequacy and viability of the already established standard language, as well as its social prestige that derives from its symbolic functions. After the uniform standard language is relatively established, attention is focused on some particular problems: obsolete and redundant norms and rules are revoked, individual cases are further codified, the existing rules are refined. A basic principle of codification in the context of a developed standard language is the avoidance of abrupt changes mainly through the acceptance of doublet forms.

Being poly-subject, polycentric and non-institutional (informal) in the early period, codification becomes of a mixed type in the years after the Liberation and is later on established as monosubject, monocentric and institutional (academic). In the first period, codification is inconsistent and dynamic, being the result of free enterprise, whereas in the modern period, it acquires the features of organized and scientifically substantiated language planning.

For all its specifics during the separate historical periods, the Bulgarian standard language codification as a continuous process is characterized by its continuity motivated by one main goal - to establish and maintain the unity of the standard language and its functioning in all spheres of public communication.

References

Aleksandrova 2011: Т. Александрова. Българският национален език в граматичните и в образователните проекти през Възраждането. - В: От любословие към езикознание. История на нормите и кодификацията на новобългарския книжовен език. София, 2011, 7-24. (Български език, Приложение). (T. Aleksandrova. Balgarskiyat natsionalen ezik v gramatichnite i v

---

[11] The journal *Balgarski ezik* ("Bulgarian Language"), published by the Institute for Bulgarian Language at BAS, has an important promotional role with its specialized columns on various linguistic issues.

obrazovatelnite proekti prez Vazrazhdaneto. - V: Ot lyuboslovie kam ezikoznanie. Istoriya na normite i kodifikatsiyata na novobalgarskiya knizhoven ezik. Sofia, 2011, 7-24. (Balgarski ezik, Prilozhenie).)

Andreychin 1973: Л. Андрейчин. Унификационни процеси в българския книжовен език през първите две десетилетия след Освобождението. - Български език, 1973, 5, 370-375. (L. Andreychin. Unifikatsionni protsesi v balgarskiya knizhoven ezik prez parvite dve desetiletiya sled Osvobozhdenieto. - Balgarski ezik, 1973, 5, 370-375.)

Charalozova 2011: К. Чаралозова. Кодификация на правописните норми в правописните речници от началото на XX век (1899-1921). - В: От любословие към езикознание. История на нормите и кодификацията на новобългарския книжовен език. София, 2011, 109-136. (Български език, Приложение). (K. Charalozova. Kodifikatsiya na pravopisnite normi v pravopisnite rechnitsi ot nachaloto na XX vek (1899-1921). - V: Ot lyuboslovie kam ezikoznanie. Istoriya na normite i kodifikatsiyata na novobalgarskiya knizhoven ezik. Sofia, 2011, 109-136. (Balgarski ezik, Prilozhenie).)

Daneš 1979: F. Daneš. Postoje a hodnotící kritéria při kodifikaci - In: Aktuální otazky jazykové kultury v socialistické společností. Praha, 79-91.

Garvin 1993: P. Garvin. A conceptual framework for the study of language standardization. - International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 100-101, 1993, 1, 37-54. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1993.100-101.37. [Accessed: 15 July 2019].

Gladkova 2009: Х. Гладкова. Кодификацията на българския книжовен език. Структурно-езиков или социолингвистичен процес. - В: Отговорността пред езика. Кн. 3. Сборник, посветен на 65-годишнината на проф. д-р Кина Вачкова. Шумен, 2009, 74-86. (H. Gladkova. Kodifikatsiyata na balgarskiya knizhoven ezik. Strukturno-ezikov ili sotsiolingvistichen protses. - V: Otgovornostta pred ezika. Kn. 3. Sbornik, posveten na 65-godishninata na prof. d-r Kina Vachkova. Shumen, 2009, 74-86.)

Gladkova, Likomanova 2002: Х. Гладкова, И. Ликоманова. Языковая ситуация: истоки и перспективы (болгарско-чешские паралели). Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Nakladatelstvi Karolinum, 2002. (H. Gladkova, I. Likomanova. Jazykovaja situacija: istoki i perspektivy (bolgarsko-cheshskie paraleli). Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Nakladatelstvi Karolinum, 2002.)

Haugen 1975: Е. Хауген. Лингвистика и языковое планирование. - В: Новое в лингвистике, 7. Москва, 1975, 441-472. (E. Haugen. Lingvistika i jazykovoe planirovanie. - V: Novoe v lingvistike, 7. Moskva, 1975, 441-472.)

Milroy and Milroy 1999: J. Milroy, L. Milroy. Authority in Language. Investigating Standard English. 3rd edition. London, New York, 1999.

Parvev 1983: Х. Първев. Българският книжовен език в края на XIX в. и началото на XX в. - В: Първи международен конгрес по българистика. Исторически развой на българския език. 1. София, 1983, 298-319. (H. Parvev. Balgarskiyat knizhoven ezik v kraya na XIX v. i nachaloto na XX v. - V: Parvi mezhdunaroden kongres po balgaristika. Istoricheski razvoy na balgarskiya ezik. 1. Sofia, 1983, 298-319.)

Semenjuk 1970: Н. Семенюк. Норма. - В: Общее языкознание. Формы существования, функции, история языка. Москва, 549-596. (N. Semenjuk. Norma. - V: Obshhee jazykoznanije. Formy sushhestvovanija, funkcii, istorija jazyka. Moskva, 549-596.)

Stancheva 1995: Р. Станчева. Кодифицирането на западноевропеизмите в българския книжовен език през XX век. - Български език, 1995, 1-2, 9-17.

(R. Stancheva. Kodifitsiraneto na zapadnoevropeizmite v balgarskiya knizhoven ezik prez XX vek. - Balgarski ezik, 1995, 1-2, 9-17.)

Stancheva 2008: Р. Станчева. Кодификаторската практика на първите български научни граматики (върху материал от описанието на имената). - В: Българите, книжовността, езикът. XIX-XX век. София, 2008, 341-387. (R. Stancheva. Kodifikatorskata praktika na parvite balgarski nauchni gramatiki (varhu material ot opisanieto na imenata). - V: Balgarite, knizhovnostta, ezikat. XIX-XX vek. Sofia, 2008, 341-387.)

Teodorov-Balan 1987 (1898): Ал. Теодоров-Балан. Към историята на българския език. - В: Избрани произведения. София, 1987, 45-102. (Al. Teodorov-Balan. Kam istoriyata na balgarskiya ezik. - V: Izbrani proizvedeniya. Sofia, 1987, 45-102.)

Tomov 2001/2002: М. Томов. Начало на езиково планиране в Института за български език. - Български език, 2001/2002, 1, 65-69. (M. Tomov. Nachalo na ezikovo planirane v Instituta za balgarski ezik. - Balgarski ezik, 2001/2002, 1, 65-69.)

Tomov 2011: М. Томов. Принципи за езиково планиране на първата българска правописна комисия (1893 г.). - В: От любословие към езикознание. История на нормите и кодификацията на новобългарския книжовен език. София, 2011, 80-108. (Български език, Приложение). (M. Tomov. Printsipi za ezikovo planirane na parvata balgarska pravopisna komisiya (1893 g.). - V: Ot lyuboslovie kam ezikoznanie. Istoriya na normite i kodifikatsiyata na novobalgarskiya knizhoven ezik. Sofia, 2011, 80-108. (Balgarski ezik, Prilozhenie).).

Vachkova 2008: К. Вачкова. Характер на нормализацията и кодификацията на българския книжовен език през Възраждането. - Български език, 2008, 2, 31-40. (K. Vachkova. Harakter na normalizatsiyata i kodifikatsiyata na balgarskiya knizhoven ezik prez Vazrazhdaneto. - Balgarski ezik, 2008, 2, 31-40.)

Videnov 1990: М. Виденов. Българска социолингвистика. София, 1990. (M. Videnov. Balgarska sotsiolingvistika. Sofia, 1990.)

Assoc. Prof. Tatyana Aleksandrova, PhD
Institute for Bulgarian Language
"Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin"
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
52 Shipchenski prohod Blvd., Bl. 17
1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
Email: t_alexandrova_@mail.bg

Assoc. Prof. Milen Tomov, PhD
Institute for Bulgarian Language
"Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin"
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
52 Shipchenski prohod Blvd., Bl. 17
1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
Email: tomovm@ibl.bas.bg