

Language attitudes and the codification of standard linguistic norms*

Ruska Stancheva

Abstract. The paper discusses the interaction between language attitudes and the codification practice and advances the idea that the intersection of that interaction are the symbolic functions of the standard language. In so far as language attitudes are an indicator of the degree of the representation of symbolic functions and the codification is oriented towards maintaining the latter, language attitudes can also serve as a measure of the success of the codification. From that perspective, the paper offers an analysis of data from a representative sociological survey of Bulgarians' language attitudes. The results of the analysis are correlated to specific codification decisions that illustrate the way codification props the symbolic functions of Bulgarian standard language. The correlation is done with a view to the effectiveness of the codification at present.

Keywords: language attitudes, codification, symbolic functions of standard language, Bulgarian standard language

1. Introduction

The question of the interaction between a linguistic community and a language as essential for the explanation of *language changes* was posed for theoretical discussion as early as the beginning of the last century in the works of the Prague linguistic circle. According to the *Thèses* (1929), which advanced the functional approach in linguistics for the first time, the observed “oscillations” (as V. Mathesius (1911) put it), i.e., variety of linguistic units results from the fact that language is a system of means for the purposes of communication.

* The present text is a part of the research project “A Study of public attitudes and value dispositions to contemporary Bulgarian standard language as a factor in the codification of its norms”, funded by the Scientific Research Fund at the Ministry of Education and Science, under contract DN10/5 from 15.12.2016. I wish to express gratitude for the support.

At the same time the concept of *attitudes* as used for explaining the interaction between man and his environment started to gain momentum in social psychology. The expectations of the research community were that knowing attitudes, understood as “a state of readiness ... exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon an individual’s response to all objects and situations with which it is related” (Allport 1935: 810), could provide a key to the predictability of peoples’ behaviour in various social situations (Allport 1935; Sarnoff 1970; Williams 1974; Fishbein, Azjen, 1975; Oppenheim 1982).

Thus, the functionalist study of language with a view to the variability in the optics of the social variables that generate it was inevitably directed to the study of language attitudes, regarded as a relation to language and its use in different situations. Within the framework of the outlined problematics, a new interdisciplinary research area - sociolinguistics - shaped up in the 1960s. Hundreds of studies were conducted, focused on the empirical study of data, their registration and interpretation through qualitative and quantitative methods. The studies aimed to solve specific problems in cases of bilingualism, of diglossia, or of a need for language standardization (codification). Since its beginnings sociolinguistics has been in a constant process of theoretical reformulation and methodological redefinition in its aspiration “to decipher the algorithm encrypting linguistic variations and social meaning and, consequently, to account for variability in language” (Hernández-Campoy 2014).

Among the huge number of studies of language attitudes, defined by C. Baker (Baker 1992) as a “cover term” because of the diversity of objects within the range of language, we, doubtless, also need to note the studies concerning the attitude of linguistic communities to the standard or literary language (see Garret 2010; Milroy, Milroy 1999; Svobodová et. al. 2011) and its norms in their dynamics. The interest to standard languages as historically conditioned phenomenon with specific functions found its clear expression in the Prague school’s *theory of standard languages*. At a later stage, within this theory, two models describing the processes of standardization (codification) were offered - the models of Paul Garvin (Garvin 1993) and F. Daneš (Daneš 1986). Both models stress the importance of studying language attitudes in making concrete decisions about governing linguistic practice. P. Garvin regards language attitudes as an *indicator* of the representation of the symbolic functions of standard language, while F. Daneš argues that attitudes to language are a significant factor in providing a basis for a hierarchical system of criteria for the evaluation of linguistic means in the codification process. A characteristic feature of the studies of language attitudes within the framework of the theory of standard languages is that, in addition to their theoretical value, they also have the “added value” of applicability in different linguistic situations, which in itself is evidence of their validity.

The present paper is placed within the outlined general area of sociolinguistics and the theory of standard languages in the latter’s codification concerns while narrowing down the focus of study to the interaction between *language attitudes* and *the processes of codification*.

Our view is that in the context of a *developed standard language* (see Tomov 2004), as Bulgarian is, the intersection between *language attitudes* and *codification* must be sought at the level of the symbolic functions of the standard language

(see below). Codification processes are, we contend, directed to a large extent at maintaining and explicating those functions. Language attitudes, as the theory holds (see Garvin 1993), are an indicator of the representation of the symbolic functions of the standard. Therefrom, according to us, it follows that measuring language attitudes is of a paramount importance for codification in two aspects: firstly, by language attitudes one can evaluate the effectiveness of codification decisions already made; secondly attitudes to language as a whole and to innovations in standard speech in particular need to be taken into consideration as a factor in the evaluation of the codified norm. Later on, we will focus on the language attitudes contemporary Bulgarians have to the role of written standard language and to the place of the codification practice in maintaining its symbolic functions.

Motivated by the view of the importance of language attitudes for the codification of standard norms, nine researchers from three institutions (the Institute for Bulgarian Language at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia University “St. Kliment of Ochrid” and the Economic Research Institute at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences) formed a team, headed by the present author, that is currently working on the project “A Study of public attitudes and value dispositions to contemporary Bulgarian standard language as a factor in the codification of its norms”, funded by the Bulgarian National Science Fund at the Ministry of Education and Science.

2. Empirical data and theoretical basis

An important stage in the project was devising a survey for a representative sociological study of the language attitudes of the Bulgarian linguistic community. The study was the first of its kind in Bulgaria. It was conducted among 1,000 adult Bulgarians over the period between 5-12 July 2017 and was carried out by Exacta Research Group in 125 nests in 92 locations. A three-level nested sample is attached with probabilities proportionate to the size of the given municipality. A modified cartographical method (based on Leslie Kish model) is used for the sampling frame. The applied method is the one of semi-standardized face-to-face interviews at the respondents’ homes.

The survey contains 38 questions in two formats: close-ended and open-ended ones. 11 of the questions measure a wide range of social and demographic variables on the basis of the self-assessment of the interviewees (gender, age, education, residency, occupation, professional and marital status etc.). 26 questions measure the language attitudes of the interviewees. Following the theory of language standardization (see Garvin 1993), the language attitudes in the theoretical framework of the study (see Stancheva 2017) are generalized to four: *language loyalty, pride, awareness of the norm, willingness to participate*.

For the purposes of the analysis the survey answers have been summarized in six thematic sections: a) standard language in the structure of national identity; b) functions of the standard language; c) motivation for observing standard norms; d) assessment of the qualities of standard language; e) interviewees’ assessment of e-communication according to its areas of use; f) self-assessment of

the mastery of nine grammatical norms in dynamics. The interviewees had the option of doing a short written language test, designed by the team in order to compare the *self-assessment of the respondents* of their mastery of the nine grammatical norms and *their linguistic behaviour*. The study data are currently being analysed by the mentioned thematic areas.

The purpose of the codification, according to the theory, is to support the two main structural characteristics of standard language - *flexible stability* and *intellectualization* - through timely evaluation of the status of: a) *innovations* in standard speech and b) *archaisms* in the written codified language.

In addition to its primary communicative function every natural language performs two other very important functions - a *cognitive* and a *cumulative* one, represented to a very high degree in the *codified written form of standard language*. It is these functions that make written standard language a conservation repository and a mediator in transmitting communal memory in all of its dimensions. That is why, written standard norms, derived and maintained through codification, do not only optimize the communication of a linguistic community in common (standard) situations. Without exaggeration we can define the written standard norm as a “hyper norm”, which by necessity is characterized by a certain systemic redundancy, supported by the codification. The reason for that is that codification assists in setting into operation and maintaining the symbolic functions of standard language (*uniting, discriminating, prestigious, referential* and *participatory* - see Garvin 1993) and thus turns into an instrument of sorts for “attributing value” to the standard language of a linguistic community. In support of that view of ours we can refer to G. Fishman’s observation that people today expect from language (in its standard form) more than simply being convenient for use, ordered and cleared of non-native influences (see Cooper, Fishman 1974, 23). This explains why written standard language contains remnants of former states, i.e., former norms, to which some of the language speakers are especially jealous. (Suffice it to recall the controversies around the written norm of the definite article in the history of modern Bulgarian language.)

That understanding of the functions of codification explains why we find the view that the main aim of codification is to bring the codified norm in conformity with the oral standard practice to be superficial and unwarranted, given that it is also too speculative, in that it takes into account mostly intralinguistic criteria or is based solely on corpus data. The unproductiveness of such an approach stems largely from the fact that every theoretical paradigm is intrinsically limited, since in order to build its construct it emphasizes certain characteristics of the object of study at the expense of others. In this sense the application of an interdisciplinary approach, grounded on clearly defined procedures, is highly needed when one or another codification decision, based on the theory, concerns the whole linguistic community and the attitude of that community to the decisions taken is a key factor for their effectiveness.

Thus, the study of language attitudes becomes one of the primary aims of the codification understood as a constant process.

**3. Presentation and analysis of the answers to the question
“How important are, according to you, the following functions
of the written standard Bulgarian language?”**

As already pointed out, codification is directed at maintaining the symbolic functions of standard language whose indicator are language attitudes. That means that the data of the sociological survey can also be used as a characterization of the current state of the codification of the written standard Bulgarian language. On the other hand, we will point to specific codification decisions that, according to us, maintain one or another symbolic function in order to demonstrate the interaction between language attitudes and codification.

We will analyse the answers to Question 2 of the survey, which are the concrete topic of the present study.

Table 1. Survey Question 2

**2. How important are, according to you, the following functions
of the written standard Bulgarian language?**

(Answer on every line, answers are read out)

1. *Very important*
2. *Relatively important*
3. *Not important at all*
4. *No opinion*

	1	2	3	4
1. <i>To set the system of mandatory written rules</i>				
2. <i>To serve as a means of communication</i>				
3. <i>To serve as a means of integration</i>				
4. <i>To serve as a means of discriminating literate from illiterate people</i>				
5. <i>To assist the preservation of our national cultural identity</i>				

This question is with a structured (optional) answer. Each of the five statements presents a different aspect of the role of the written standard Bulgarian language in public communication. Each is formulated in such a way so that it can be used to measure one language attitude. The interviewees are to evaluate each of the statements on a four-degree scale (see the question in Table 1). The objective is to extract information about the sign of the attitudes, i.e., *positive*, *negative* or *neutral*.

In Table 2 we present the correlation between the statements in the answers to the question, the language attitudes and the functions of standard language.

Table 2. Correlation between the statements in the answers to the Survey Question 2, the language attitudes and the functions of standard language

Statement in the answers to the Survey Question 2	Attitude	Function
1. To set the system of mandatory written rules	Awareness of the norm	Referential (exemplary)
2. To serve as a means of communication	Instrumental (to achieve an end)	Instrumental
3. To serve as a means of integration	Language loyalty	Unifying
4. To serve as a means of discriminating literate from illiterate people	Pride in mastery of the norm	Prestigious
5. To assist the preservation of our national cultural identity	Language loyalty	Discriminating

Attitudes to written standard language - positive, negative, neutral

Firstly, we will consider the sign of the attitudes: *positive, negative* and *neutral*, according to the answer distribution on the scale: *Very important - Relatively important - Not important at all - No opinion*.

We will start with the distribution of the answer “No opinion” from column 5 of Table 3. This answer will be interpreted as a *neutral attitude*.

As Table 3 clearly shows, the percentage of people who have no opinion about the importance of the standard Bulgarian language as “a means of integration” is the highest one (10.3%), i.e., every tenth interviewee has no attitude to the *unifying symbolic function* of our standard language.

The lowest number are the people who have no opinion about the importance of standard Bulgarian language as “a means of communication” - only 3.3% of all interviewees.

Among those is the group of respondents (6.1%) who have no attitude with respect to the *exemplary function* of standard language, and close to it, with 5.2%, is the group of those with no attitude to its *prestigious function*. Only 4.1% of the interviewees have no opinion about the discriminating function of standard language.

We will try to make a generalized profile of the respondents who gave a “No opinion” answer as an expression of a neutral attitude to all statements in Question 2. More than half of those say that they “live in poverty”. They report that they and their parents have *elementary or lesser education*. The answer “No opinion” is selected mostly by respondents whose first language is different from Bulgarian and those who state that they are unemployed or part-time employed.

We may generalize that the answer “No opinion” is selected by the group of those Bulgarian citizens for whom the “world of words” is mainly oral and the standard or any other written language are of no import other than

Table 3. Attitudes to written standard language according to the distribution of the answers to Survey Question 2

	2_1. To set the system of mandatory written rules				Total
	<i>Very important</i>	<i>Relatively important</i>	<i>Not important at all</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	
Total	79.4%	13.5%	1.0%	6.1%	100.0%
	2_2. To serve as a means of communication				Total
	<i>Very important</i>	<i>Relatively important</i>	<i>Not important at all</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	
Total	85.9%	10.0%	0.8%	3.3%	100.0%
	2_3. To serve as a means of integration				Total
	<i>Very important</i>	<i>Relatively important</i>	<i>Not important at all</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	
Total	68.5%	18.7%	2.5%	10.3%	100.0%
	2_4. To serve as a means of discriminating literate from illiterate people				Total
	<i>Very important</i>	<i>Relatively important</i>	<i>Not important at all</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	
Total	72.8%	19.3%	2.7%	5.2%	100.0%
	2_5. To assist the preservation of our national cultural identity				Total
	<i>Very important</i>	<i>Relatively important</i>	<i>Not important at all</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	
Total	87.2%	7.6%	1.1%	4.1%	100.0%

as a constant reminder that they lack knowledge and power (Hobsbawm 1996, 124).

Let us now consider the group of people with a categorically declared *negative attitude* to the importance of the five functions of standard language listed in Question 2. This attitude is marked by the selection of the answer “Not important at all” (see the distribution of the selected answers in column 3). As a whole, that percentage is very low as it is within the range of 0.8-2.7%, which, according to us, makes any further analysis of the answers to individual statements pointless.

The percentage of the interviewees with a *positive attitude* to the importance of written standard Bulgarian language is determined by the selection of the answers “Very important” and “Relatively important” for each of the survey statements. The answers “Very important” distinctly outnumber the answers “Relatively important” (as well as the other answers - “Not important at all”

and “No opinion”). The percentage of people who preferred the answer “Very important” for each of the listed roles of written standard language is within the range of 87.2 and 68.5%.

If we merge the answers of columns 1 and 2 of Table 2 by the character *important functions*, we will get the distribution of positive attitudes and will be able, on the basis of the correlation attitude - symbolic function, to derive the degree of importance of the functions of written standard Bulgarian language in descending order according to the interviewees’ opinions:

- a total of 95.9% of the interviewees are with an *instrumental* attitude, i.e., what is important to them is the *communicative* (instrumental) function;
- a total of 94.8% of the interviewees are with an attitude of *language loyalty* as an indicator of the importance of the *discriminating* symbolic function;
- a total of 92.9% of the interviewees are with an attitude of *awareness of the norm* as an indicator of the importance of the *referential* symbolic function;
- a total of 92.1% of the interviewees are with an attitude of *pride* as an indicator of the importance of the *prestigious* symbolic function;
- a total of 87.2% of the interviewees are with an attitude of *language loyalty* as an indicator of the importance of the *uniting* symbolic function.

According to the data presented, all symbolic functions of the written standard Bulgarian language are developed to a high extent and in the opinion of contemporary Bulgarians these functions of standard language carry the same weight as the instrumental (communicative) function does.

Later on, we will characterize the answers in the range of *positive language attitudes*.

According to the survey data, two language attitudes - the *instrumental* attitude and *language loyalty* - are equally shared.

The instrumental attitude

The evaluation of the importance of written standard Bulgarian language as a means of communication was included in the survey mostly with a view to comparing the *instrumental function* with the different manifestations of the *symbolic function* of written standard Bulgarian language.

The *instrumental language attitude* shows moderate relatedness with the *standard of living* and *ethnicity* of the respondents. It is notable that with the decrease of the standard of living there comes a distinctive decrease in the instrumental attitude. Among those respondents who state that they live “in poverty” that attitude to the written standard language is the least represented one. Which means that for that group of people the “world of the written word” is of no special importance for communication. We could surmise that these are passive bearers of the written norm, who most probably use standard Bulgarian language in its spoken form mainly.

As far as the ethnicity of the interviewees is concerned, those who self-identified as “Bulgarian” or “another ethnicity” share the instrumental attitude to written standard language to a much higher degree than those who identified themselves as “Turkish”. Only 45.0% of those respondents reckon the communicative function of written standard language to be *very important*, while more

than 1/5 have no opinion on the matter, which makes us presume that the main means of communication for a substantial part of that group is their first language in non-formal environment, and when they do use standard language, that most probably involves predominantly its spoken form and contexts of formal communication.

We will not discuss the role of codification in maintaining the instrumental function of standard language, since that function lies at the basis of language and its maintenance by codification is of paramount importance.

The attitude of language loyalty

We will analyse in more detail the attitude of *language loyalty* according to the data of the answers to Survey Question 2. This attitude is measured by the statements that “written standard Bulgarian language”: “serves as a means for integration” and “assists the preservation of our national cultural identity”. The inclusion of these statements in the question is based on the theory (see Garvin 1993), which takes the attitude of *language loyalty* to be an indicator of representation of two symbolic functions of standard language: the *uniting* and *discriminating* ones.

The comparison of the answers on the scale “very important” shows that the interviewees with an attitude of *language loyalty* stress the discriminating function of Bulgarian standard language, since for 87.2% of them it is very important whereas the uniting symbolic function is pointed as very important by 68.5% of the respondents. In addition, it is in evaluating the importance of this role of written standard that the percentage of those selected the answer “No opinion” is the highest - 10.3%.

In that case we can generalize that, according to the survey data the interviewees with an attitude of *language loyalty* place the two symbolic functions of written standard Bulgarian language, to which the attitude is related, in distinct hierarchy.

How can we explain the fact that the language loyalty of the interviewees clearly gravitates around the discriminating symbolic function of the written standard?

Firstly, we can look for reasons in the context of globalization, which inevitably gives rise to separatist responses. (Brexit and the attempt of Catalonia to gain independence from Spain are two recent symptomatic phenomena.) On the other hand, the EU language policy, based on the principles of multiculturalism and linguistic pluralism as well as the status of standard Bulgarian as an official EU language (since 2007) help to enhance the *discriminating function* of standard Bulgarian language. The status of the Cyrillic alphabet as an official EU alphabet undoubtedly raises its prestige. An eloquent example of that is the citizens’ initiative “For Bulgarian Cyrillic alphabet”, launched in 2014 (see Zabalgarska kirilitsa 2014) and demanding standardization of Bulgarian graphic space and pushing the Russian Cyrillic alphabet out of it.

The analysis of the answers, reflecting the language loyalty of the respondents, oriented to the *discriminating symbolic function*, shows that there is a moder-

ate connection with the variables *education* and *standard of living*. The positive attitude to this symbolic function decreases with the decrease in the level of education and the standard of living of the respondents.

However, it is very important to try to answer the question of how codification has contributed to the maintenance and development of the *discriminating symbolic function* of our standard language. Throughout the whole of 20th century codification was highly active in both of its stages - *descriptive* and *evaluative* (see Daneš 1986), preceding the stage of the *codification proper* in dictionaries and grammars. The linguists' main tool to influence the language attitudes of the bearers of standard language was the genre of the linguistic note in specialized journals and broadcasts of the national radio and television.

There are a number of examples from different levels of standard language system that can be adduced as being direct results of the codification processes, directed at maintaining and emphasizing the discriminating function of our standard language. Doubtless, here we have to include the results of the processes of: a) *phonetic* and *morphological adaptation* of various loan words; b) *Bulgarianization* of international lexis through the instrument of calquing; c) the imposition of *Bulgarian word-formative suffixes*; d) *taking* foreign lexis out of the range of standard language.

The *phonetic adaptation* deals mostly with Russian loan words (e. g., the establishment of forms such as *възмездие, възхищение, забрава, кръжок, закусвалня, преврат, поврат* and many others). The principle of *morphological adaptation* by gender depending on the formal ending of the loan words was applied in the first scientific Bulgarian grammars from the middle of the last century and concerns mainly internationalisms (cf. the gradual establishment of the forms *адрес, анализ, генезис, метод, проблем, синтез, флот* etc. instead of *адреса, анализа, генеза, метода, проблема, синтеза, флота*).

The result of applying the instrument of *calquing* for the purposes of the Bulgarianization of "western-europeisms" is not so much the removal of foreign words (predominantly internationalisms) from the domain of standard Bulgarian language as the appearance of new synonymous sets in which the loan word stimulates the coinage of its Bulgarian equivalent (cf., e. g., *намеса* and *интервенция, действителност* and *реалност, напредък* and *прогрес, индекс* and *показалец, главен* and *кардинален, състен* and *кондензиран, веществен* and *материален, рудник* and *мина*, and many others) (see Stancheva 1995).

The recommendation of Bulgarian suffixes as one of the manifestations of the maintenance of the discriminating symbolic function of standard language is also a constant trend within standard word formation. We find it in the recommendation of *-ува-* (instead of *-ова-*), *-ичен* (instead of *-ически*), *-не* (instead of *-ние*). This process of codification started at the beginning of the last century and continued throughout the century. Here, in most cases, we also witness a specialization of the pairs of forms (cf., e.g., *образовам* and *образувам, образование* and *образуване, посвещение* and *посвещаване, извлечение* and *извличане* etc.).

Most of the lexical and word-formation pairs have gradually specialized by register and thus have actually provided impetus to the intellectualization of standard language as its structural trait.

A distinctive trend in the codification practice throughout the 20th century is the recommendation for eliminating the use of *Russianisms* (e.g., *сторонник, немедлено, острожно, болшинство, одареност, полушарие* и др.) and *Turkicisms* (e.g., *агет, зевзек, борч, хал* etc.) from standard Bulgarian.

All of the facts about the codification process that have been adduced so far give us a reason to emphasize its importance for the maintenance of the standard language's *discriminating symbolic function* as *dominant* in the last century. That is why we think that the codification has influenced the language attitude of loyalty along the line of establishing the discriminating symbolic function of the written standard as primary.

According to the survey data the *language loyalty* of contemporary Bulgarians is significantly less pronounced in the *uniting function* of written standard language. Only 2/3 of all interviewees define that role of the standard as "very important". If we try to outline their profile, we will find out that the huge majority of them identify themselves as people of "another ethnicity" (i.e., non-Bulgarian, non-Roma, non-Turkish), with a higher education degree, living a well-off life in a central regional city, aged 50-59.

It is worth commenting on why the respondents who state that they are of "another ethnicity" distinctively dominate with 89.5% among those who described the *integration function* of written standard language as very important. (Among those who self-identify as "Bulgarians" that function is indicated as very important by 70.9%.) Most probably, written standard Bulgarian as the official language is of key importance for a number of aspects of the integration of the Bulgarian citizens of the group under consideration. We think that their language loyalty with respect to the integration role of standard language is represented in its *pragmatic* aspect (see Garvin 1993), in so far as these respondents realize that it is not their Bulgarian citizenship but rather their adequate mastery of the standard that will ensure their real equality. We could add that these Bulgarian citizens do not comprise compact groups, in which they could use their first language, which is another reason for them to stress the uniting role of written Bulgarian standard language.

Unlike them, however, significantly fewer of the other interviewees that declared to be non-Bulgarian, i.e., bearers of a first language, different from Bulgarian, share the opinion that the integration function of written standard language is very important - only 36.7% of the Turks and 44.4% of the Roma. Why, according to the survey, do the two poles in the opinions of the importance of the uniting symbolic function of written standard Bulgarian language today determine the respondents declared themselves to be non-Bulgarian? We can surmise that standard language in its written form has a discriminating rather than a uniting role for respondents self-declared to be "Turkish" or "Roma". Unlike other "non-Bulgarians" these interviewees live in sub-communities, in which the official language is most probably not the dominant one in communication.

Why does the uniting function of written standard language turn out to be the one the least often indicated as "very important", among the other functions of written standard language, by Bulgarian citizens as a whole today? This state of affairs may have both historical and social dimensions. Undoubtedly, it is a consequence of the fact that the uniting symbolic function of standard language

today is not as perceptible for the bearers of the language as it was in the initial stages of the building and establishing of Bulgarian standard language, when most of the processes taking place in it were processes of *unification*.

The analysis of the answers concerning the *uniting symbolic function* shows that there is a moderate connection with the variables of *the standard of living* and *the level of education* of the respondents.

It is indicative that those who live in poverty demonstrate mainly *neutral* (85.7%) or *negative* (14.3%) rather than *positive* (0.0%) attitude to the uniting function of written standard language. The answers of those respondents put into question the level of mastery of the written standard not only actively (composing written texts in standard language), but also passively (reading) and raises a more important question - the one about the exclusion of that group from public communication, where the standard in its written form reigns.

With the decrease in the level of education there is a noticeable decrease of the positive attitude to this symbolic function of the written standard language - with an increase of the percentage of the neutral attitude (38.1%) among respondents with a level of education below elementary.

These data definitely suggest the conclusion that today the codified written Bulgarian standard language in its social dimension, as the interviewees see it, is not a uniting but rather a discriminating marker within the linguistic community as a whole.

Let us try to sketch the role of codification for the maintenance of the uniting symbolic function of our written standard language today. According to us, it is expressed mostly through the use of *the instrument of doubling*. A number of doublets (both on the *horizontal* and the *vertical axis*) can be regarded as concrete results of the codification with respect to the maintenance of the uniting symbolic function of standard language (see Stancheva 2018). The former can be taken to include the maintenance of *e* (so-called *ekavi*) and *ya* (so-called *yakavi*) forms in a limited number of lexemes of the type of *невяста* and *невеста*, *пръсна* and *пресна* etc., through which the codified norm legitimizes the peculiar truce between the two big language communities east and west of the so-called yat border. Through this type of doubling the codification strives to ensure the unity of standard language by presenting it as a “depository” containing the diversity of the living language of the whole territory in which it is spoken.

On the other hand, in order to maintain the uniting function on the *vertical axis* (i.e., in time) the codification preserves a number of redundant means with frequent occurrences in our classical literary works (cf., e.g., *нога* and *крак*; *мливар* and *мленичар*; *двама сина* and *двама синове*; *постѣлѣх* and *постѣлѣх* etc. - see OPR 2012).

The codification of redundant means to maintain the uniting symbolic function of written standard language takes into consideration the fact that people in current linguistic communities want their language to reflect both who they are at the moment and who they have previously been as well as who they expect they will be in the future (Eastman 1983, 7). It is clear that the observed redundancy is a result of the opposition *retrospection* - *prospection* in the codified written language rather than of its indeterminacy. We must, however, stress that

the maintenance of doublets on the vertical axis has also another result - deepening the intellectualization of written standard language. It suffices to point that in individual terminological registers (as an area of the codified norm) there are units with a high level of specialization, which, though, have been removed, by the codification, from the neutral register as archaic (such are, e.g., lexemes marked by *jur.* - *влагение, владелец, приобретател* etc.).

The attitude of awareness of the norm

According to the survey the attitude of *awareness of the norm* is widely shared among contemporary Bulgarian citizens as 79.4% of them state that it is *very important* that written standard language *sets the system of mandatory written rules*, i.e., serves as a standard for language use. If we try to outline the profile of these nearly 4/5 of the interviewed Bulgarian citizens, it would be as follows: those are people with higher or secondary education, working or studying, living a well-off life.

In general, this attitude is homogeneously represented in the sample. The only demographic characteristic with a moderate connection to the studied factor mark is *the standard of living*. None of the respondents who say that they live in poverty has evaluated the referential function of written standard language as “very important” while the answer “No opinion” is the predominant one (71.4%) in this group, which may be interpreted as evidence that the group in question does not actively use written standard Bulgarian language and is therefore with a neutral attitude to its exemplary symbolic function.

The role of codification for the maintenance and strengthening of this symbolic function of our written standard language has, according to us, to be sought in two directions: a) *representation* and b) *accessibility* of the codification documents - dictionaries and grammars with an official status. The history of the codification of the written norms provides us with enough facts to claim that there is an aspiration for an ever more complete description of the codified norms of Bulgarian standard language. Suffice it to mention the academic grammar in its two editions (see GSBKE 1982-1983; GSBKE 1998), the series of spelling dictionaries that have appeared since 1945 and especially the three academic spelling dictionaries published in 1983, 2002 and 2012, the multi-volume academic (semasiological) dictionary (RBE 1977-), the terminological dictionaries, the dictionaries of new words - all of which are compiled by the Institute for Bulgarian Language at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (see <https://ibl.bas.bg/struktura/>). The provision of a wider accessibility of codification documents in the form of electronic resources with free access is among the primary tasks of the codification institution, the Institute for Bulgarian Language at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.

The attitude of pride

The language attitude *pride*, according to the theory, (see Weinreich 1953) is in correlation with the prestigious symbolic function of standard language, understood as “the value of language for upward social mobility”. This attitude has both a *collective* and an *individual* dimension (see Garvin 1993).

The suggested answer to the survey question aims to measure the individual range of this attitude and the extent to which the mastery of standard norms gives, according to the interviewees, an advantage to an individual in the social sphere and places him/her higher in the social hierarchy.

If we try to draw a profile of those almost 3/4 of the Bulgarian citizens who attach special importance to literacy, it would be as follows: those are people who identify their ethnicity as “another ethnicity” (94.7%) and “Bulgarian” (75.2%), are well-off (84.3%), live in central regional cities (80.2%), have a higher education degree (82.7%), are over 50 years of age (75.7%), study (79.2%) or work full-time (73.7%).

The data for the representation of this attitude show moderate connection with the variable *standard of living* of the respondents. Only 14.3% of the respondents who live in poverty state that this function is “relatively important”, while the 85.7% of this group are with a neutral attitude (answering with “No opinion”). This again makes us surmise that most probably we have a case of unfamiliarity with the written standard as evidenced by the answers in the written test that were given by the respondents from this group for some of the rules (for the use of *definite/indefinite articles*, *who-/whom*-forms and verbal adverbs) - they gave only “wrong answers” and, as a whole, the general result of the test of those interviewees is within that of the “weak group”.

The survey data lead to the conclusion that today, in general, literacy continues to be considered a guarantee for social success. Bulgarians believe that it operates as that “invisible hand” that has a bearing both on the labour market and the access to a better education.

We will try to explain how codification maintains the prestigious symbolic function of standard language. We think that the formation of the attitude of pride is related to the mastery of a number of standard rules. According to us, those are mostly grammatical rules with regard to which there have been a decades-long discrepancy between the spoken and written standard norm. In these cases, codification definitely operates retrospectively, maintaining the written tradition (e.g., the rule of the *whom*-forms). Doubtless here we also need to include the norm for the use of definite and indefinite articles. The norm was introduced (by Neophyte of Rila in 1835) to activate the uniting symbolic function of standard language and was directed at inducing the attitude of *language loyalty*. Today its mastery is linked with the attitude of *pride*, which makes it one of the manifestations of the prestigious function of written standard language. The rules that today make Bulgarians feel *proud* for having mastered them also include a number of rules of a metalinguistic character (e.g., those for the capitalization of compound proper names, for hyphenation as well as the punctuation rules). All these facts of the codification contribute to the maintenance of the prestige of standard language in linguistic consciousness.

4. General conclusions

The presentation of the answers to the Question 2 of the sociological survey of the language attitudes of Bulgarian citizens gives a reason to conclude that the positive attitudes to written standard Bulgarian language distinctly predominate among the interviewees. All language attitudes: the *instrumental* one, the attitudes of *loyalty*, of *awareness of the standard norm* and of *pride* are represented to a very high degree.

The consideration of language attitudes as an indicator of the representation of the functions of standard language - *instrumental* (communicative) and *symbolic* - allows us to draw the conclusion that there is a substantial *consistency* between the *instrumental* (communicative) and *symbolic* functions of standard Bulgarian language (in its four varieties: *uniting*, *discriminating*, *referential* and *prestigious*).

Noticeably, the interviewees with the attitude *language loyalty* stress the *discriminating* function of Bulgarian standard language rather than its *uniting* function. That supports the supposition that today written standard Bulgarian language is perceived more as a discriminating marker - both in a national and in a social aspect.

The socio-demographic characteristics with a moderate impact on the commented language attitudes are mainly *the standard of living*, *ethnicity* and *education* with the impact of *the standard of living* being the most pronounced one. Unlike the other respondents, those living in poverty most often manifest a neutral attitude to written standard language that finds expression in their preference for the answer "No opinion", which, according to us, show incapability to hierarchize the functions of the standard due to their lack of knowledge of it.

The view of codification as a main means for the establishment and maintenance of the symbolic functions of standard language allows for diagnosing the state of the codification through measuring attitudes. On the basis of the analysis of the answers to Question 2 it can be concluded that contemporary codification operates in the direction of maintaining and deepening all of the symbolic functions of standard language, where its most pronounced impact is on the bearers of language with respect to two of them - the *discriminating* and the *exemplary* functions.

References

- Allport 1935:** G. W. Allport. Attitudes. - In: C. Murchison (ed.). Handbook of Social Psychology. Worcester, MA: Clark University Press, 1935, 798-844.
- Baker 1992:** C. Baker. Attitudes and Language. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1992.
- Cooper, Fishman 1974:** R. Cooper, J. Fishman. The Study of Language Attitudes. - International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 1974, 3, 5-20.
- Daneš 1986:** Fr. Daneš. Values and attitudes in language standardization. - In: J. Chloupek, J. Nekvapil (eds.). Reader in Czech Sociolinguistics. Praha: Academia, 1986.

- Eastman 1983:** C. Eastman. *Language Planning: an introduction*. San Francisco, 1983.
- Fishbein, Ajzen 1975:** M. Fishbein, I. Ajzen. *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. London, 1975.
- Garret 2010:** P. Garret. *Attitudes to Language*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- 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.
- GSBKE 1982-1983:** Граматика на съвременния български книжовен език. Т. 1-3. София, 1982-1983. (Gramatika na savremenniya balgarski knizhoven ezik. T. 1-3. Sofia, 1982-1983.)
- GSBKE 1998:** Граматика на съвременния български книжовен език. Т. 1-3. София, 1998. (Gramatika na savremenniya balgarski knizhoven ezik. T. 1-3. Sofia, 1998.)
- Hernández-Campoy 2014:** J. M. Hernández-Campoy. Research methods in Sociolinguistics. - *AILA Review* 27, 2014, 1, 5-29. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277915981_Research_methods_in_Sociolinguistics [Accessed: 25 June 2019].
- Hobsbawm 1996:** Е. Хобсбом. *Нации и национализъм от 1780 до днес*. София, 1996. (E. Hobsbawm. *Natsii i natsionalizam ot 1780 do dnes* (Nations and Nationalism since 1780). Sofia, 1996.)
- Mathesius 1911:** V. Mathesius. *On the Potentiality of the Phenomena of Language*, 1911. Reprinted in: J. Vachek (ed.). *A Prague School Reader in Linguistics*. Bloomington, 1964, 1-32, and again in: J. Vachek, L. Dušková (eds.). *Praguiana: Some Basic and Less Known Aspects of the Prague Linguistic School*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 1983, 3-44.
- Milroy, Milroy 1999:** J. Milroy, L. Milroy. *Authority in Language. Investigating Standard English*. 3rd edition. London, New York, 1999.
- Oppenheim 1982:** B. Oppenheim. An exercise in attitude measurement. - In: G. M. Breakwell, H. Foot, R. Gilmour (eds.). *Social Psychology: A Practical Manual*. London, 1982, 38-56.
- OPR 2012:** Официален правописен речник на българския език. София, 2012. (Ofitsialen pravopisnen rechnik na balgarskiya ezik. Sofia, 2012.)
- RBE 1977-:** Речник на българския език. София, 1977- (Rechnik na balgarskiya ezik. Sofia, 1977-.) Available from: <http://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/> [Accessed: 28 June 2019].
- Sarnoff 1970:** I. Sarnoff. Social attitudes and the resolution of motivational conflict. - In: M. Jahoda, N. Warren (eds.). *Attitudes*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1970, 279-284.
- Stancheva 1995:** Р. Станчева. Кодифицирането на западноевропейските 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 2017:** Р. Станчева. Теоретична рамка на изследването на обществените нагласи към българския книжовен език като фактор при кодификацията на нормите му. - *Български език*, 64, 2017, Приложение, 11-40. (R. Stancheva. Teoretichna ramka na izsledvaneto na obshtestvenite naglasi kam balgarskiya knizhoven ezik като factor pri kodifikatsiyata na normite mu. - *Balgarski ezik*, 64, 2017, Prilozhenie, 11-40.) Available from: <http://www.balgarskiezik.eu/p-2017/R-STANCHEVA-full-11-40.pdf> [Accessed: 28 June 2019].
- Stancheva 2018:** Р. Станчева. Дублетността - необходима и неизбежна. - *Български език*, 65, 2018, 3, 48-61. (R. Stancheva. Dubletnostta - neobhodima i neizbezhna. - *Balgarski ezik*, 65, 2018, 3, 48-61. Available from: <https://www.balgarskiezik.eu/3-2018/Stancheva-RED-48-61-full.pdf> [Accessed: 28 June 2019].

- Svobodová et al. 2011:** J. Svobodová, I. Adámková, I. Bogoczová, E. Jandová, R. Melková Svobodová, D. Svobodová. Fenomén spisovnosti v současné české jazykové situaci. Ostrava, Ostravská univerzita, 2011.
- Thèses 1929:** Thèses présentées au premier Congrès des Philologues slaves. - In: Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague. Praha, 1929, 3-29. Reprinted in: J. Vachek, (ed.). A Prague School Reader in Linguistics. Bloomington, 1964, 33-58.
- Томов 2004:** М. Томов. По въпроса за кодификацията на нормата на развития книжовен език. - В: Закони на/за езика. София: Хейзъл, 2004. (М. Томов. По въпроса за кодификацията на нормата на развития книжовен език. - В: Закони на/за езика. София, 2004.)
- Weinreich 1953:** U. Weinreich. Languages in Contact. New York, Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953.
- Williams 1974:** F. Williams. The identification of linguistics attitudes. - International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 3, 1974.
- Za balgarska kirilitsa 2014:** За българска кирилица 2014. (Za balgarska kirilitsa 2014.) Available from: <http://cyrillic.bg/manifest/> [Accessed: 7 July 2019].

Assoc. Prof. Ruska Stancheva, PhD

Department of Modern Bulgarian Language
Institute for Bulgarian Language
“Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin”
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
52 Shipchenski prohod Blvd., Bl. 17
Email: rustancheva@gmail.com