

On the (re)codifications of standard Bulgarian in Vardar and Aegean Macedonia

Ana Kocheva, Ivan Kochev

Abstract. The Bulgarian literary language has a record number of writing-regional codifications. While other Balkan languages are found in two states each (Greek - in the main state of Greece and in Cyprus; Turkish - in the main state of Turkey and in Cyprus; Albanian - in the main state of Albania and in Kosovo; Romanian - in the main state of Romania and in Moldova; the situation of Serbo-Croatian in the former Yugoslavia is not fully clarified), the Bulgarian language because of Bulgaria's failure to accomplish its national unification in the 20th century and due to forced emigration of the population after a few wars displays a record number of attempts at codification of regional written norms - six in total. Of these six codifications three were made on the basis of dialects and three - on the basis of the Bulgarian literary language (in the Aegean part of Greece, in the Republic of Macedonia and in Ukraine). In the latter cases, it is not actually a primary codification but a secondary one, a (re)codification of already established (during the National Revival era) and long-used Bulgarian literary language. All six of them however provide clear evidence of the pluricentrism of the Bulgarian language which is the result of the exceptionally complex historical destiny of the Bulgarian nation.

Keywords: writing-regional codifications, pluricentrism, Bulgarian literary language

All languages in the Balkans, because of the region's specific historical destiny, have several regional forms which have allowed contemporary sociolinguists to include them in the extensive research of pluricentrism of languages in general. Recently in Bulgaria pluricentric standard Slavic languages have been discussed in greater detail in the eponymous analytical article of A. Angelov (Angelov 2017, 3-10), as well as by I. Kochev and A. Kocheva (Kochev, Kocheva 2017, 21-29). (A "pluricentric language" is a language that has more than one written norms.) The worth of this study apart from its analytical value is in the use of contemporary terminology on the subject as a counterpoint to the long outdated terminology of A. D. Dulichenko (Dulichenko 2014) about the Slavic "micro" languages which is characterized with an excessive number of names

supplied for these “languages” and with insufficient proof about their ethnicity. While other Balkan languages are found in two states each (Greek - in the main state of Greece and in Cyprus; Turkish - in the main state of Turkey and in Cyprus; Albanian - in the main state of Albania and in Kosovo; Romanian - in the main state of Romania and in Moldova; the situation of Serbo-Croatian in the former Yugoslavia is not fully clarified), the Bulgarian language because of Bulgaria’s failure to accomplish its national unification in the 20th century and due to forced emigration of the population after a few wars displays a record number of attempts at codification of regional written norms - six in total. Three of them were in Greece: the “Abecedarian” attempt in 1925; the Aegean Macedonian one in 1953 and the “Pomak” one in 1995-1996. A codification (independently from standard Bulgarian) was implemented in the Hungarian (later Romanian) region of Banat. Another codification was launched in Soviet Ukraine in the 1930s, and in the aftermath of the Second World War also in the Republic of Macedonia. Of these six codifications three (two in Greece - the “Abecedarian” and the “Pomak” ones, and one in Banat) were carried out on the basis of dialects, and three (in the Aegean part of Greece, in the Republic of Macedonia and in Ukraine) - on the basis of standard Bulgarian. In the three latter cases there is in fact no primary codification but rather a secondary **codification**, i.e., a (re)codification of the already created (as early as the National Revival era) standard Bulgarian and after the language had been used for a long time. The dialectal (or more generally, regional) features of the Skopjan variety in the Republic of Macedonia were supplemented later in time in a bid to create the false impression that a “codification” had been performed on some kind of a dialectal base, i.e., to present the process as “normal”, the way takes place in the emergence of the standard versions of other natural languages. We would term this recodification “codification of codification”.

All codifications with the exception of the Banat and the Ukraine ones have the same purpose - to either replace or modify the name of the Bulgarian nationality and of the Bulgarian language abroad. Their authors aspire in a sort of (pseudoscientific) way to justify the conquest of the Bulgarian lands after the breakup of the Bulgarian ethnic territory by all its neighbours (Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey and Romania) by virtue of unfairly imposed international treaties - the Treaty of Bucharest (10 Aug. 1913), the Treaty of Neuilly (27 Sept. 1919), and later, even without any treaties (1920). In this way for the sake of a contrived “balance” of the Balkan states and not of the ethnic composition of their population, the **national doctrines** were carried out (of course, only in part) of: Greece - for the restoration of Byzantium in the Balkans; and Serbia - for its emergence as a Piedmont of the South Slavs (after the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian and the Ottoman Empires). Greece fulfilled at least partially its ideas after the annexation of lands with Bulgarian population in Western Thrace and Aegean Macedonia. Initially, the **Greek Macedonian doctrine (Greek Macedonianism)** was of the **royal type** - aimed at full-scale Greek assimilation, and later of the **Comintern type** - seeking stage-by-stage Greek assimilation via the “recognition” of the so-called Slavic Macedonians. Recently in Macedonia itself **Greco-Serbian Macedonianism** has emerged combining the two types (Gruevski). Serbia - according to “Načertanije” (“The draft”) by

Ilija Garašanin (1844) integrated all peoples that he had identified as “Serbian” - Croats, Slovenes, Bosnians, Montenegrins and the Bulgarians from Vardar Macedonia. This is what is known as **Serbian Macedonianism** - initially of the royal type - for full-scale Serbian assimilation of the Macedonian Bulgarians (Garašanin); and after its failure - for stage-by-stage assimilation (Novaković). The **Comintern type of Serbian Macedonianism** was of the Novaković type under new federal conditions. It is not accidental that the opponents of the regime in Macedonia itself dubbed Yugoslavia *Serboslavia* having in mind the domination of Serbia in Yugoslav Macedonia after the Second World War as well. With the seizure of Vardar Macedonia declared as South Serbia (1913), and also via detaching the Western Outlands (1919), the better part of the programme of Ilija Garašanin was fulfilled. Owing to the resistance of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (IMRO) and its struggles against the new foreign domination in Vardar Macedonia, the Bulgarian ethnic element there was not denationalized and as a result another, second version of the expansionistic doctrine was applied in Serbia devised by the then-prime minister of Serbia Stojan Novaković and aimed at stage-by-stage denationalization of this Bulgarian region. The theoretical tenets of the father of Macedonianism - Stojan Novaković, as a new but Serbian school in sociology and linguistics comprise the following: “The Bulgarian idea as everybody knows has taken deep root in Macedonia ... so it is impossible to weaken it enough by setting against it the Serbian idea alone. This idea ... would not be able to force out the Bulgarian idea being its pure and bare antipode and for this reason the Serbian idea will need a kind of ally to help it which would adamantly oppose Bulgarianism and which would contain elements with a potential to attract the people and the masses breaking them away from Bulgarianism. This ally is **Macedonianism** or an expression of the Macedonian dialect and Macedonian specifics within strictly defined and wisely set limits” (Дипломатску архив - Дубровник, ПП оделъ, ф.-I-251/1888 г. / Diplomatic archives - Dubrovnik, PP department, f.-I-251/1888). The second postulate laid out by Novaković refers to the need of a Serbian lettering system as an expression of Serbianism. For the purpose he proposed the release of a Serbian primer which would be supplemented to the Macedonian one with Serbian orthography (Дипломатску архив - Дубровник, ПП оделъ, ф.-I-102/1888 г. / Diplomatic archives - Dubrovnik, PP department, f.-I-102/1888).

The quoted text clearly suggests that: 1) Macedonianism was a completely **foreign (Serbian or Greek) doctrine** imported in Macedonia. Initially it was elaborated by a Serbian agent who had been trained at the St. Sava centre in Belgrade, K. Misirkov; and 2) it was visually presented mostly in the field of orthography with the introduction of Serbian graphemes to the Bulgarian Cyrillic thus concealing the original Bulgarian language.

In the aftermath of the Second World War, Slavic scholars worldwide were totally deluded by Serbian, Soviet and last but not least, by Bulgarian scholars implementing the 1934 resolutions of the Comintern for the creation of new nations and languages for the needs of the world proletarian revolution. Glosotomy was a “natural” process common in Eastern Europe and in a few Soviet republics in Central Asia. It was already noted above that the Comintern linguistics produced two other recodified Bulgarian “languages”: the Aegean

Macedonian “language” in north-western Greece and the proletarian Bulgarian language in southern Ukraine (in the former USSR). Just like the standard Macedonian “language” in Vardar Macedonia they were neither developed on a dialectal base, nor had any preceding literature (with classic writers) and were declared in a unique way - by way of a decree passed on a fixed date.

The contemporary literary language in both Aegean and Vardar Macedonia is based on standard Bulgarian which has developed in the course of many centuries starting with the Golden 9th century of Tsar Simeon’s Bulgaria all the way to the present day. Some regional peculiarities have been supplemented to the two forms of the Bulgarian language in the Republic of Macedonia aimed to modify to a certain extent their original pattern. Many Serbianisms or Graecisms in the administrative, public or scientific styles during recodification are normally borrowed foreignisms, i.e., such elements are found in any other language across the world. Adding regionalisms to the Skopjan recodification has misled world (including Bulgarian) Slavic scholars to look for a dialectal base in the idiom in the Republic of Macedonia where an attempt was made to identify West Bulgarian characteristics.

Vardar Macedonian recodification

Strange as it may be, one of the pioneers of Comintern linguistics was American Horace Lunt known to have been the first to write “A grammar of the Macedonian literary language” (Skopje, 1952). This fact is symbolic because it suggests that a Comintern linguist should not necessarily have been a citizen of an East European country in the period prior to 1999 or member of a ruling party in such a country; it was enough to adopt the method of creating new nations and languages in Europe and Asia through glossotomy (partitioning), i.e., a method recommended and adopted by the Comintern with the purpose of weakening capitalism and attaining the goals of the world proletarian revolution. The ranks of Comintern linguists are lined up with a large number of Slavic scholars not only from the former USSR (led by Prof. S. B. Bernstein and N. I. Tolstoy) and from the countries of Eastern Europe (mostly from Poland and Yugoslavia), but also from some western countries where the pursuits of glossotomy are not fully grasped. The division of a nation into two or more parts (natiotomy) was backdated at other levels too. Apart from glossotomy the process included the division of its history (historotomy), art (artotomy), folklore (folklorotomy), etc. The leftist sectarians in Bulgaria started talking not only about a “Macedonian”, but also about “Thracian” and “Dobrudzhan” nations, i.e., about the annihilation of the Bulgarian nationality in general. In this regard it is worth recalling recent discussions about a “Shoppe” and “Pomak” nations.

The genuine theoretician and organizer of linguistic Macedonianism however was Blaže Koneski (Ljameski or Ljamevic). He studied at the Serbian school in Prilep. He received his high school education with a Serbian scholarship in Kragujevac, Serbia, where the future Macedonian leaders of Yugoslavia such as Lazar Mojsov, Lazar Kolishevski and Strahil Gigov also studied. In May 1941, B. Koneski arrived in Sofia to continue his education and became Konev. He

failed to complete his university studies and did not obtain a university certificate but later, in New Macedonia, he became an academician (just what D. Mitrev did - another great “academician” and literary scholar). Before that B. Koneski worked for the department of AGITPROP at the General Staff of NOV (the People’s Liberation Army) and championed a full introduction of the Serbian alphabet in the Republic of Macedonia. During the First Linguistic Commission, after his proposal for the full implementation of the Serbian Karadžić alphabet in the Republic of Macedonia was rejected, B. Koneski left the meetings and made use of political party mechanisms to replace certain members with new appointees thus forming a Second Political, and then a Third “Linguistic” Commission. This went on until the Serbian letters from the Karadžić alphabet љ, њ, ј, џ were adopted and the Bulgarian letter ѣ (replaced with an apostrophe) was removed despite the existence of the sound ѣ in dialects. Boosted by Djilas into the position of “Macedonian” codifier after he had been summoned to Belgrade for instructions at the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia in connection with the Serbianization of the Skopjan alphabet and with overcoming the resistance of Macedonian society, he emerged as the foremost authority of Comintern linguistics in the Republic of Macedonia. He began implementing Stalin’s postulates that “the socialist revolution has not diminished but rather increased the number of languages”. This assumption was paraphrased by B. Koneski as follows: “Certain nations are transformed into other nations.” The Bulgarian linguistic reality in the Republic of Macedonia however inexorably challenged him. However, the attempts at partial deconstruction of the long established Bulgarian literary language in Moesia, Thrace and above all in Macedonia - “the cradle of the Bulgarian Revival” (after A. Selishchev), were tolerated by Soviet political linguistics and in the first place by their leader in Moscow - Prof. S. B. Bernstein, and this led to fallacy not only in the Slavic world but in other parts of the globe as well. This paved the way for Comintern linguistics and some of its postulates have survived to date, in the post-Comintern era.

The principles of creating new nations and languages in the Soviet Bloc according to O. Kronsteyner “were always the same: first of all orthography, a grammar, a dictionary, bilingual dictionaries would be released (but never from the old to the new language, i.e., never Romanian-Moldovan but only Moldovan-Russian, etc.). Soon a historical grammar was printed too, a history of the language, as well as a history of the new nation. ‘Flank’ activities included the creation of an Academy of Sciences, a National Theatre and a National Folklore Ensemble. Simultaneously with that a national literature emerged ... All this required writing a national history ... And the direction of development was set by the (unspoken) rule ‘the worse the old language is treated, the better for the new one’, i.e., the worse Romanian is spoken/written, the better Moldovan is spoken/written. And this means an incessant widening of the gap with the old language (also with the use of force)” (Kochev, Kronshtayner, Aleksandrov 1993, 49). It is enough to add here that about ten years ago the former premier of Moldova M. Snegur compared the Moldovan situation with the Macedonian one and remarked that there was no difference between them in terms of the language.

The true picture of the glossotomy of the Bulgarian language is revealed as we read “Стенографските белешки од првата јазична Комисија” (Факсимил, Скопје, 2000) (“Stenographical notes from the First Linguistic Commission”, facsimile, Скопје, 2000) by Dr. Stojan Risteski. The participants talked freely and frankly; they did not invent a history of the “new nation” and of the “new language”. Their language was standard Bulgarian with only a slight dialect (or regiolect) stylization, cf. below **Поканата (The Invitation, p. 8); Временната легитимација (The Temporary Identification, p. 8) and Решението (The Resolution, p. 6):**

Поканата: *Поканува се Ѓорѓи Киселинов да земе учество на конференцијата за Македонската азбука и Македонскиот литературен јазик, која ќе отпочне во залата на општината у понеделник 26.IX.1944 г. у 8 саатот пред ручек. Отсуствието не е оправдано. Од Поверенството на народната просвета.*

Временната легитимација: *Лицето Ѓорѓи И. Киселинов е на служба при Президиумот на АСНОМ како член на јазиковедната конференција. Умолјават се сите војни и цивилни власти да му укажат содејствие при потреба.*

Решението: *На Антифашиското собрание на народното ослободуење на Македонија на заведуење на Македонскиот јазик како служебен јазик во Македонската држава. Чл. 1. Во Македонската држава како служебен јазик се заведуе народниот македонски јазик. Чл. 2. Ова решение влегуе веднага во сила. Во манастирот „Св. Отец Прохор Пчински“ на Илинден 2 август 1944 г. За Антифашиското собрание на народното ослободуење на Македонија. Секретар: Љубомир Д. Арсов, с.р. Претседател: Методи Андонов Ченто, с.р.*

Here are some excerpts from the Bulgarian vernacular with some western features spoken by the participants in the conference who frankly admit that there is nothing like a Macedonian literary language, and even less - a history of the language; that more needs to be done to avoid political mistakes with regard to Serbia and the federation; that National Revival leaders actually wrote in the then-Bulgarian literary language; that it is necessary to think of a common Yugoslav language; that the dialect at the basis of the literary language should be further clarified in scholarly papers, etc.

a) E. Popandov: *‘Ние треба **денеска** да ги положиме основите на нашата писменост и на нашата книжевност, установаејќи македонска азбука и македонски литературен јазик ... разбира се да вклучиме и интересите на целата заедница во која се наоѓаме, интересите на федеративна и демократска Југославија. Јас од това место сакам да ве поканам да викнеме: „Да е жив Тито“ (викане Да е жив). „Да е жива Комунистичката партија... (Да е жива!)’ (p. 1-2).*

b) R. Zohrafski: *‘Според мене, по-арно да направиме некоја граматичка грешка, отколку да направиме некоја политичка грешка’ (p. 29).*

c) B. Koneski: *‘Ако ја земеме српската кирилица, пак нашиот јазик ќе си остане македонски. Па ништо пак нема да се допринесе ако сакаме и со азбуката да подцвртам разликата меѓу нас и сѐрбите’ (p. 29-30).*

d) V. Pliev: *‘Ништо не ни пречи, никакви чувства не ни пречат од братската српска азбука да земеме љ и њ’* (p. 36).

e) G. Kiselinov: *‘Литературниот јазик го прават литераторите и журналистите, а филолозите имаат само да установаат формите на јазикот. Ама денеска ако сакаме да земеме едно наречје од нашиот јазик како литературен јазик, немаме време да чекаме да се прави тојјазик. Ние сме исправени пред вopросот да имаме литературен јазик, а немаме време и не можеме да чекаме тојјазик да го направат поети, книжевници и журналисти’* (p. 3).

f) Krume Tosheski: *‘Најубаво ќе биде, ако можеме да најдеме нешто средно, може не многу научно, ама со мера и практично’* (p. 35).

g) B. Koneski: *‘Се рече централното наречје да се земе како основа за македонскиот литературен јазик. Јас сметам дека това наречје треба да се објасни, ако се не определи географски каде се говори това наречје. Јас сметам оти не може да се определи нито по Ж (јусот), нито по Ъ (ер голем). Затова предлагам еден реферат да се изнесе за главните особености на това наречје. Без това не можеме да го определиме’* (p. 22-23).

This honesty and frankness in the speeches of the participants in the First Conference (27 Nov. - 3 Dec. 1944) of the “philological commission for the establishment of the Macedonian alphabet and the Macedonian literary language” infuriated B. Koneski who, as it was said above, left the meetings on the second day and reported to senior party bodies about the dangerous tendencies of non-acceptance of the Serbian alphabet as Macedonian. This is how the letter was written and sent by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Macedonia to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CC of CPY) dated 8 Dec. 1944 signed by L. Kolishevski, about “major difficulties on the question of the Macedonian alphabet and the language ... and certain tendencies emerged that may negatively impact on the political life of our nation. Certain fellows whose ears have not grown together with federative Yugoslavia would use and try to use the question of our alphabet to bring on division of our people and move them away from federal Yugoslavia.” The logical interpretation of the letter-malicious report is that in the Commission those “fellows” led by V. Markovski and G. Kiselinov tried to make sure Serbian letters would not be accepted and the Bulgarian letter Ъ would be kept. With the appointment by the CC of CPY of a Second and Third (this time political) commissions the road was paved for B. Koneski and his pro-Serbian political adherents for radical action aimed at distorting the language reality in the Republic of Macedonia. Later Koneski began the persecution of the so-called Bulgarophiles - litigation started against G. Kiselinov and V. Markovski was sent to the “Goli otok” concentration camp. In 1952, “Граматика на македонскиот литературен јазик. Дел I и II” (“A grammar of the Macedonian literary language. Part I and II”) by Koneski was released and republished several times in Skopje (this article refers to the 1966 edition). The grammar has formal rather than categorial character, i.e., it

quotes mostly forms without analysing more seriously the functioning of categories so as not to make obvious that they are fully Bulgarian. The appearance of the Koneski Grammar triggered large-scale writing activity in Skopje where the present day and history were revised based on the **geographic principle**. Although Macedonia during the settlement of the Bulgarian Slavs in the Balkans and during the yoke was the third part of the Bulgarian Fatherland (along with Moesia and Thrace) and as late as after the Treaty of Berlin (1878) was severed from Bulgaria for a longer time (divided between Serbia and Greece - 1912), a history, “different” from the Bulgarian one, was invented retrospectively.

Skopje’s “neogenetic” ethnic approach did not account for the fact that until 2 Aug. 1944 the Bulgarian ethnic region of Macedonia had never been an autonomous legal entity (a state) and had not been in a position to take part in the pretended Bulgaria-Macedonia antagonism. This was the principle that provided the basis for the above-mentioned Grammar by Koneski (the main (re)codifier of the Bulgarian language in Macedonia) whose practice was soon followed by the totality of subsequent home-bred and foreign Macedonianists alike:

I. Replacement of the names of the generic notions *Bulgaria* and *Bulgarian* with the varietal notions *Macedonia* and *Macedonian*

In his Grammar Koneski begins to articulate “a Macedonian language community” (9th-10th centuries): “One of its significant features is the so-called substitution of the *yer* vowel in a closed syllable: $\text{ъ} > \text{o}$ (СЪНЬ > сон), $\text{ь} > \text{e}$ (ДЬНЬ > ген). This feature remains today as a distinctive characteristic of the **Macedonian language community**” (p. 10). After the Old Bulgarian era, the Middle Bulgarian era (12th-14th centuries) was appropriated as well: “According to a provisional estimate made by Bulgarian philologist B. Tsonev, about 80 manuscripts surviving from 12th to 14th centuries would have originated in Macedonia. So far these monuments have been termed **Middle Bulgarian** in Slavic studies, if it is possible at all to distinguish clearly Bulgarian from Macedonian monuments of that period ... The term **Middle Bulgarian** creates vagueness regarding this particular issue” (p. 11), and further: “Starting in the 14th century the influence of the Serbian version of the Old Slavonic language increased its influence in Macedonia. The reason for that was in the first place the connection of the Macedonian regions to the then state of Serbia” (p. 12). The **New Bulgarian era of literary activity** in the geographic region of Macedonia was also replaced with a Macedonian one: “In the period from the 16th century to the early 19th century we can track more clearly in manuscripts the gradual consolidation of the contemporary Macedonian national language of literature” (p. 14). “At that time the national language was established in use for liturgy” (p. 16). There is also indication of “texts in the vernacular written in the Greek alphabet - “Tetraglosson” (“Four-language dictionary”) by Daniil with a Macedonian section” (p. 19-20).

To sum up, according to Koneski, the Macedonian literary language, “different” from Bulgarian, has existed since the era of Cyril and Methodius to the present day autonomously and parallel to Bulgarian given that a state was created after 2 August 1944, i.e., the retrospection has been “validated” by a change carried out in the mid-20th century. With this “backward” logic Koneski wrote the second textbook “Историја на македонскиот јазук”, 1965 (Скопје и Белград) (“A history of the Macedonian language”, 1965, Skopje and Belgrade) in which he applied the same neoethnogenetic approach based on the geographic principle. In this way he came into blatant contradiction with R. Zhinzifov whom he had declared a Revival era Macedonian in his Grammar. Naturally, no quotation of Zhinzifov has been provided but he is widely known in world Slavic studies. R. Zhinzifov, although he lived a century before Koneski and as if foresaw the emergence of such a phenomenon one day, warned: “There are neither Macedonians nor Thracians as separate nations, there are only Slavs - Bulgarians who live in the said places and whose names can be rightfully used in the zemleopisanie (= geography - A/N), but not referring to nationality; to sum up, there is an integral Bulgarian nation and a single Bulgarian language which, like any other language, is divided into dialects” (Zhinzifov 1943, 137-138). In other words, at the very dawn of the Bulgarian Revival era in Macedonia (19th century) literary scholars from that geographic region were fully aware of the difference between language and dialect.

II. The biased attitude of Koneski on the matter shows in quoting used sources - in a way unacceptable in scholarly research

The titles of the works mentioned by him are either trimmed in half or written down in a way changing them beyond recognition. At the end of the Grammar no full bibliography is available. Table 1 gives a few examples of distorting original titles of books (and passages from them) quoted by Koneski. Their full list is very long, but in this case it is important to understand the “scholarly” approach of the author, and consequently, of his followers - local and foreign.

Table 1. A brief comparison of facts

Unauthentic presentation of titles of works (and of excerpts from them) in Koneski’s Grammar	Authentic titles of works and excerpts from them
a) p. 18 - “Nachov is inclined to accept that this text was written in the first half of the 19th century (ibid., p. 418), while A. Selishchev (Polog, 130) notes that it could have been written at the end of the 18th or the early 19th century.”	a) A. Selishchev. Polog and its Bulgarian population. Historical, ethnographical and dialectological studies of north-western Macedonia. Sofia, 1929, p. 418.

Table 1. A brief comparison of facts

<p>Unauthentic presentation of titles of works (and of excerpts from them) in Koneski's Grammar</p>	<p>Authentic titles of works and excerpts from them</p>
<p>b) p. 20 - "The lettering of words in the Macedonians section of the 'Four-language dictionary'."</p>	<p>b) A. Selishchev. Studies in Macedonian dialectology. Kazan, 1918, p. 4: "Bulgarian parallel in the four-language dictionary by the Moscopole hieromonk Hadji Daniil. The dictionary is part of his book... ("Βουλγαρικά") (= Bulgarian language). The rest three languages are Greek, Aromanian and Albanian (A/N - I. K. and A. K.).</p>
<p>c) p. 21 - "In the early 18th century the books of Joakim Krchovski and Kiril Peychinovich were printed."</p>	<p>c) "A novel about the fearful and second coming of Christ ... and translated into the most common Bulgarian language ... written by Hadji Joakim" "Mirror - describes the need and use of the most common and illiterate Bulgarian language of Lower Moesia by Kiril Tetoec Peychinovich."</p>
<p>d) p. 23 - "Therefore the release started of special textbooks for the Macedonian schools by P. Zografski and K. Shapkarev, etc."</p>	<p>d) Kuzman Shapkarev. Bulgarian primer, part A or mutual instruction tables for the dialect more legible for the Macedonian Bulgarians. Tsarigrad, 1868, p. 45. "Question: What is the most sacred thing for man? Answer: Faith and nationality. Question: What are you by faith? Answer: Christian. Question: And by nationality, what are you? Answer: By nationality I am Bulgarian. Question: Why? Answer: Because I was born to a Bulgarian father and mother and I speak Bulgarian. Question: Would a man change his faith and nationality? Answer: There are people who change their faith and nationality but they commit the gravest sin; the world sees such people as traitors; nobody loves them, and everyone hates and despises them; so I will never forgive myself should such a thing crosses my mind and will always make effort to awaken such muddle-heads."</p>

Table 1. A brief comparison of facts

<p>Unauthentic presentation of titles of works (and of excerpts from them) in Koneski's Grammar</p>	<p>Authentic titles of works and excerpts from them</p>
<p>e) p. 24 - "The main representatives of our literature of that time were the poets Konstantin Miladinov, Rayko Zhinzifov and Grigor Parlichev."</p>	<p>e) V. Markovski about Konstantin Miladinov at the First Linguistic Conference (Stenographical notes, Skopje, 2000, p. 15): "He (K. Miladinov) wants to adjust the Macedonian language to the Bulgarian literary language which was being formed at that time ... If we analyse his song 'Melancholy for the South' it has rhythm only with the Bulgarian accentuation. Look (he chants). But if we use the typical Macedonian accent on the third syllable from the end of the word ... you can see there is no rhythm."</p> <p>A poem. "Dove" by R. Zhinzifov (1860):</p> <p>When you reach my land In the Bulgarian Macedonia You will see Bulgarian strong men Fearless Macedonians.</p> <p>. . .</p> <p>Rise you all - together And open Bulgarian schools Read in Bulgarian in churches And fear no one.</p> <p>Autobiography of G. S. Parlichev (1885):</p> <p>"Then I went to Rangavis and told him I had written 'Αμαρτόλος'. He received me with kindness...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How old are you? - I am 30. - What is your nationality? - Bulgarian. - It is not possible for a Bulgaria to have dark hair and dark eyes. <p>I gave no answer to that."</p>

Table 1. A brief comparison of facts

Unauthentic presentation of titles of works (and of excerpts from them) in Koneski's Grammar	Authentic titles of works and excerpts from them
<p>f) p. 19 - "And the very miscellany of the Miladinovs was initially written with the Greek alphabet and after its release was re-written in the Cyrillic by Konstantin Miladinov."</p> <p>Non-quoting the title of the volume by Koneski created a lasting practice with Skopjan scholars of distorting original texts. D. Mitrev, K. Penushliski and A. Spasov released "Bulgarian folk songs" in 1962 under the title "Miscellany".</p>	<p>f) The authentic title of the miscellany is Български народни пѣсни собрани одъ братья Миладиновци Димитрия и Константина. Въ Загребъ 1861. (Bulgarian folk songs collected by the brothers Miladinov, Dimitriya and Konstantina. In Zagreb 1861.)</p> <p>An announcement by Miladinov brothers for recruiting subscribers for the miscellany "Bulgarian folk songs" dated 7 Feb. 1861 in "Dunavski lebed" newspaper, Belgrade, No. 20: "We started collecting the songs six years ago from Western Bulgaria, i.e., from Macedonia."</p>

Summary: The world scholarly community is so very much accustomed to this deeply unscholarly practice of distorting titles and of voluntary intervention in quoted texts (in Koneski and after Koneski) that it no longer pays any attention to it. At least the authors of this article are not aware of any foreign researcher who has reacted to the change in the title of the collection of S. Verković "Народне песме македонску Бугара" ("Folk songs of the Macedonian Bulgarians") made by the same three publishers - D. Mitrev, K. Penushliski and A. Spasov, and transformed into "Македонску народни песни" (Kkonje, 1961) ("Macedonian folk songs", Skopje, 1961).

Astonishingly enough, from among Slavic scholars of international acclaim it was S. B. Bernstein who joined the manipulative game. For example, he replaced the title of the work by H. Kodov "Тракуйѣкуме говору кamo преход между узточнобългарскуме и македонскуме говору". Ksiega referatow, Sekcja I. Językoznawstwo. Warszawa, 1934, c. 54-55. ("Thracian dialects as a transition between eastern Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects", A volume of reports, Section I. Language and literacy, pp. 54-55) by removing the word *dialects* after *Macedonian* to create an impression that what is actually meant is *language*. The "new" title is "Тракуйѣкуме говору кamo преход между узточнобългарскуме и македонску" ("Thracian dialects as a transition between the eastern Bulgarian ones and Macedonian").

III. Direct copying (plagiarism) from Bulgarian grammatical works

Such cases are countless. The case here is not about theft of ideas or solutions, because the language (Bulgarian) is in both cases one and the same but rather about full language and textual proximity of authors. Naturally, borrowing took place from Sofia-based grammatical sources, because they apart from containing studies by distinguished scholars (Acad. S. Mladenov, Acad. L. Miletič, Acad. B. Tsonev, Acad. V. Geogriev, CM L. Andreychin, CM K. Mirchev, Prof. S. Stoykov, etc.) are also dated much earlier. The study “The unity of the Bulgarian language in the past and today” (Edinstvoto na balgarskiya ezik v minaloto i dnes 1978) identified a range of cases, therefore here some new ones are included to draw up the picture of the “establishment and utilization” of the new literary language, i.e., the speedy recodification of the old one. The texts quoted in Table 2 come from the two grammar books by L. Andreychin (“Основна българска граматика” / “A basic Bulgarian grammar”) and of B. Koneski (“Граматика на македонскиот литературен јазук” / “A grammar of the Macedonian literary language”). The comparison clearly shows that B. Koneski followed quite closely the text of L. Andreychin without replacing the examples and their order of appearance.

Table 2. A comparison between Andreychin’s and Koneski’s grammar book

<p>L. Andreychin “A basic Bulgarian grammar”, 1942, p. 64</p>	<p>B. Koneski “A grammar of the Macedonian literary language”, 1966, pp. 61-62</p>
<p>a) “If we compare words and forms such as <i>бера</i>, <i>брах</i>, <i>избирам</i>, <i>избор</i>, it is clear that they have been formed from the same root although in <i>бера</i> it appears in the form of <i>бер-</i>, in <i>брах</i> in the form <i>бр-</i>, in <i>избирам</i> in the form <i>бир-</i> and in <i>избор</i> in the form <i>бор-</i>.”</p>	<p>a) “In a certain amount of words formed from the same root a difference is seen in the root vowel: <i>бере</i>, <i>брал</i>, <i>престира</i>, <i>избор</i>. In the quoted words the root appears in the forms <i>бер-</i>, <i>бр-</i>, <i>бир-</i>, <i>бор-</i>.”</p>
<p>b) “The main correlation of vowels which alternate in some verbs and nouns formed from the same root is <i>e - o</i>, i.e., <i>бера - сбор</i>, <i>тека - ток</i>, <i>река - пророк</i>, <i>лежа - полог</i>, <i>стеля - стол</i>, <i>депа - раздор</i>, <i>неса - внос</i>, etc.”</p>	<p>b) “The alternation of the vowels we can find in some verbs and nouns formed from one and the same roots is most often <i>e - o</i>: <i>бере - избор</i>, <i>рече - пророк</i>, <i>урок</i>, <i>лежа - полог</i>, <i>постеле - стол</i>, <i>дере - раздор</i>, <i> внесе - внос</i>, <i>пренесе - пренос</i>, <i>лее - лой</i>, etc.”</p>
<p>c) “In other cases as a result of later sound-related processes or of other reasons another vowel appears instead of e or there is no vowel at all: <i>бия - бой</i>, <i>вия - завой</i>, <i>гния - гной</i>, <i>пия - водопой</i>, <i>лея - лой</i>, <i>пея - песнопоец</i>, <i>крия - покров</i>, <i>рия - ров</i>, <i>взра се - взор</i>, <i>извра - извор</i>, <i>мра - мор</i>, <i>зафра - запор</i>, <i>простра - простор</i>, etc.”</p>	<p>c) “The following examples stand out with that in verbs u appears in the root, or there is no vowel at all: <i>бие - бој</i>, <i>вие - повој</i>, <i>гние - гној</i>, <i>ние - уној</i>, <i>крие - покров</i>, <i>рие - ров</i>, <i>прозре - пророрец</i>, <i>извре - извор</i>, <i>умре - мор</i>, <i>напре - напор</i>, <i>простре - простор</i>, etc.”</p>

IV. Covering up the truth about the abandonment of linguistic Macedonianism by its leading representatives and about their reversion to the views of the ethno-national roots of the language of Macedonian Bulgarians

The Koneski Grammar dedicates a whole chapter to the first (Macedonianistic) period in the activity of K. P. Misirkov. It however makes no mention of the second (basic, Bulgarian) period. It is exactly during the first period in the wake of the Ilinden-Preobrazhenie Uprising of 1903 and the disenchantment that followed it that the brochure "On Macedonian affairs" by Misirkov was released which is usually defined as a manifesto of Macedonianism and especially of its linguistic aspect. Apart from being written in a dialectized standard Bulgarian it put a few questions which can be summed up as follows (from the standpoint of Misirkov and Koneski):

1. IMRO set up in 1893 pursued as its main goal a revolution against the Turkish yoke that it would carry out using its own (internal) resources. However there are a few gaps in its program regarding work in the cultural and language aspects (the absence of an autonomous standard language). The IMRO leaders and the people in Macedonia, under the influence of Greater-Bulgaria activists, believe that the Bulgarian literary language in Macedonia should remain in its form available prior to the Uprising: "With the success of the uprising, if they ask what language should be used by the judges in the court of justice, let say in Tetovo, the autonomous government that will be formed by the 'majority' will answer - Bulgarian; the same will be the answer of the locals ... The issue of the language will be resolved in favour of Bulgarians also in town and village districts" (Misirkov 2000, 47). In the case of failure of the uprising - Misirkov thought - his option of the language should be adopted. In this way the gap in the IMRO ideology would be recompensed.

2. The new language should be based on the central dialect spoken in the regions of Veles - Prilep - Bitola - Ohrid. According to Misirkov, this dialect would be equally distant from the states with national propagandas. Thus the new language should include words with a dropped-out *ѣ* (*чоек, прао*). *Шт* should be replaced with *шч* (*шчо, обичина*); it needs to reflect the metathesis of *j* (*уважејн'е, здружејн'е*). In 3sg the forms of the verbs should keep a *т* (*можит, бидит*). Regarding orthography it is better to apply the phonetic principle with a slight concession to the etymological one. The softness of consonants *л, н, к, з* should be marked with an apostrophe - *л', н', к', з'*.

Unfortunately (according to Koneski) the brochure failed to reach the people and was not used either during the First Linguistic Commission - in December 1944 or during the Second and Third Commissions - in May 1945. Its second edition in Skopje came out in 1946. It was important though that such an attempt had been made.

This is not the place to comment whether a man with a single brochure and with several old articles is capable of devising on his own another language different from the language that the people of Macedonia had used to speak and write in the course of 11 centuries; or whether this is within the capacity of a commission staffed with a dozen members who worked in the course of one

week and compiled a few rules passed by voting. This is however the place to oppose the covering up of the fact that subsequently the main players in the (re)codifications denied what they had done, condemned it and returned to their original views about the ethno-national roots of the language of Macedonian Bulgarians. On this occasion Misirkov wrote many articles and the large volume “Dnevnik”, and Venko Markovski released a thick book with a suggestive title, “Blood is thicker than water” (prose) (Markovski 2003) as well as the epic “Saga of Testaments” (poetry) dubbed “Bulgariad” with a good reason.

This article explores the views of K. Misirkov from the second period (views not put to analysis in Skopje) so as to give a more comprehensive idea about his work. This is done without any comments as was the case in the book “Insights”, a collection of some of his worthwhile views on issues discussed so far. (In quotes taken from “Insights” the page of this collection volume is written first, and after the slash also a number standing for the line of the quoted subheading from it.) As mentioned above the dividing line between the two periods is his act of denial of his brochure “On Macedonian affairs”. Misirkov himself (p. 43) self-critically remarks in flawless standard Bulgarian: *“The readers of this article (“Notes on...”)* will probably be surprised by the huge contradiction they will come across in it compared to what they have read or can read in my brochure ‘On Macedonian affairs’. To resolve this contradiction it is enough to recall that in that brochure I acted as an improvised politician.”

Declared after a poll in Skopje “the greatest Macedonian of the 20th century” whose name has been given to the Institute for Macedonian Language, K. Misirkov (p. 14) wrote: *“The beginning of the 20th century saw Macedonia with Greek clergy and Bulgarian national awareness. But at this point there was an outcry from Macedonians: We are Bulgarians, more Bulgarians than Bulgarians themselves in Bulgaria ... You could have defeated Bulgaria, imposed various agreements, but this does not change our conviction, our consciousness that we are not Serbs; that we have been called Bulgarians so far, we are called like this today and we want to be called like this in the future. We shall be more Macedonians than Bulgarians, but Macedonians with an own consciousness other than the Serbian one, with an own historical past, with an own literary language common with Bulgarian, with an own Macedonian-Bulgarian national school and with an own national church. Whether we are called Bulgarians or Macedonians we always think of ourselves as having a nationality absolutely different from the Serbian one; a nationality with Bulgarian consciousness.”*

Starting with this general conclusion about the ethnic character of the population of Macedonia the author provides more detailed comments:

a) common national consciousness:

- “The Bulgarian epic tradition in compliance with the historical record speaks of **Bulgarian national consciousness of Macedonians** in the 14th century and the centuries that followed to the present day.” (p. 33/ No. 43)

- “As to the **Bulgarian national consciousness** in the lands that under the Berlin Treaty became part of the Kingdom of Serbia for the final quarter of last century, it is a well-known fact that they were Bulgarian.” (p. 35/ No. 44)

- "We always think of ourselves as a separate nationality, quite different from the Serbian one and with Bulgarian national consciousness." (p. 16/ No. 16)

b) a common name:

- "Resulting from the agreement between Serbia and Greece, Bulgaria was plundered and two million **Slavo-Bulgarians** were enslaved ... The bloodshed for the freedom of **Bulgarians in Macedonia** may summon to justice in front of the Slavic public consciousness the Serbo-Greek attempt on the freedom of the **Bulgarian people, of the Bulgarians from Macedonia.**" (p. 19-20/ No. 5)

- "**The population** of Skopje and the Skopje region is purely **Bulgarian** ... We, the **Macedonian Bulgarians**, want to believe that Russia will not be unfair to us." (p. 19/ No. 24)

- "The **Macedonians**, whether they call themselves **Macedonian Bulgarians** or prefer to be called Macedonians, have always been good and loyal **Bulgarian citizens.**" (p. 17/ No. 17)

- "We love the **Bulgarian national state** like **our own.**" (p. 17/ No. 17)

- "We, Macedonians, have nothing against the **Bulgarian national name** which we were named with by the Greeks at the beginning of the 9th century." (p. 15/ No. 15)

- "When in Macedonia and Bulgaria there was not even a hint of a Bulgarian Exarchate, the Greeks who obviously were well-versed in Balkan nationalities **made no difference whatsoever** between a **Bulgarian** and a **Macedonian Slav**. We, Macedonians, cannot and have no reason to ignore this and similar facts which can be quoted by the hundreds." (p. 15/ No. 15)

- "In it (the uprising) only the **Macedonian Slavs** called Bulgarians held a leadership role." (p. 9/ No. 3)

- "Everybody said that the Macedonians are Bulgarians." (p. 9 and 10/ No. 5)

c) a common language:

- "We, Macedonians, have voluntarily chosen a **literary language to share with Bulgarians** even before the liberation of Bulgaria when it was not more cultured than us and could not prevail either culturally or politically. In other words, we have a **literary language** which is our **own, domestic affair** and the result of free choice. The ban imposed upon us by the Serbs for using this **literary language of ours**, which is the sole connection between us and the Bulgarians, is a flagrant violation of our human rights."

- "The (committees) are ready to provide all sorts of guarantees to Europe that Macedonia would not unite with Bulgaria but they would never concede on the use of the **Bulgarian language** and the **Bulgarian name** in Macedonia." (p. 11/ No. 8)

One particularly important point made by K. Misirkov is that the Serbs are in fact the engineers of the doctrine for a separate Macedonian nationality and language, i.e., that this doctrine is foreign and imported and that K. Misirkov is not its author: "Finally, they (the Serbs) took hold of the concept of a **peculiar Macedonian** nationality which they fitted into southern Macedonia; they declared northern Macedonia purely Serbian and central Macedonia - an ethnically transitional region from the Serbian language to the **Macedo-**

nian one." (p. 18/ No. 21) Obviously, this is a reference to Novaković with whom Misirkov was in close contact during the first period of his activity and followed strictly his instructions.

d) a common history:

- "Having got embroiled in various lies in their attempts to crush the souls of the Macedonian population the Serbs have distorted **history as a whole**. There is something abnormal in this Serbian logic, in these Serbian sentiments, which attests to the weakness of the Serbian state and national system." (p. 22/ No. 31)

- "(The Serbs) with the help of intrigues and of Balkan allies seized the larger share of Bulgarian Macedonia. However, the Serbian acquisitions from 1912 triggered the war in 1913; they prompted the war between Serbs and Bulgarians in 1915-18 and will cause countless new wars unless the Dušan Empire is annihilated like in the 12th century based on the principle of self-determination of the nations." (p. 21/ No. 29)

- "Why the Serbs claim Macedonia - this purely Bulgarian country which has been such since the 6th century to the present day despite all vicissitudes of history." (p. 20/ No. 28)

- "Autonomous Macedonia as a way towards the unification of Macedonia with Bulgaria is something that Serbia will never permit." (p. 12 / No. 10)

- "There are outcast Macedonian brainworkers - priests, teachers, lawyers, journalists, professors, doctors, people of all trades, who cherish their enslaved motherland and will not let Serbia falsify the recent and distant history and ethnography of Macedonia." (p. 22/ No. 32)

- "In vain the Serbs impute to Bulgarians the perversions of history ... We, Macedonians, can rightfully resent the rigidity of the Bulgarian historical science." (p. 24/ No. 36)

e) a common church:

- "This spiritual unity of Moesians, Macedonians and Thracians precedes and follows the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate and the liberation of Bulgaria." (p. 16/ No. 16)

- "More public-spirited Macedonians ... side by side with the Bulgarians from Bulgaria and Thrace began the struggle for national education and a national church." (p. 16/ No. 16)

- "In connection with the establishment of an autonomous Serbian archbishopric we should remember well that the Serbian church until then was only a distant uncultured eparchy of the Ohrid Archbishopric." (p. 25-26/ No. 38)

- "The Ohrid Archbishopric of the whole of Bulgaria is our historical heritage and our ideal for church liberation from the hateful Serbian Sava slavery." (p. 15/ No. 15)

f) common feasts:

- "The Serbs not only want to colonise Macedonia with Serbs from other lands of Yugoslavia, but also want to kill our Bulgarian consciousness and to force us to forget all our distinguished public figures from the distant and recent past and to replace them with Serbs: Saints Cyril and Methodius, St. Kli-

ment, St. Naum with St. Sava; Gotse Delchev and Dame Gruev with Kara Georgi and Dobrica Markovic.” (p. 24/ No. 35)

- “The Serbs imposed the feast of ‘saint’ Sava upon the enslaved population which has been banned from celebrating the all-Bulgarian feast of Saints Cyril and Methodius and the anniversary of the Ilinden Uprising.” (p. 25/ No. 37)

The above review of the views of K. Misirkov after he abandoned the Novaković (Serbian) ideas about the Macedonian nation and language makes clear that presenting Misirkov as “the greatest Macedonian” of the 20th century in the Republic of Macedonia is one-sided, incomplete, untruthful and biased. It is questionable whether the Skopje Linguistic Institute should bear his name, because based on the above quotes we can rightfully claim that K. Misirkov was one of the greatest Bulgarian intellectuals in Macedonia who fought for the promotion of national consciousness, a common name, a common language, a common history, a common church and common feasts with Bulgaria.

With regard to his views he does not differ from the great German Balkan scholar G. Weigand (Weigand 1924, 79) who wrote a dedicated chapter in his monograph “Ethnography of Macedonia” entitled “The Macedonian Bulgarian language” which draws an important conclusion: “*Whichever area of the language we consider it is completely clear that we are dealing with Bulgarian, not with Serbian. All attempts of Serbian chauvinists to present the Macedonian language as a Serbian dialect or as a mixed language with an indefinite character are futile.*”

The Aegean Macedonian recodification

This recodification was carried out in the 1950s by activists of the Greek Communist Party, most probably of Bulgarian descent (who had full command of standard Bulgarian) from the time of (and after) the Civil War in northern Greece predominantly fought by the remaining (not extradited after the Balkan wars) Bulgarians. “A grammar in Macedonian language” that came out 1953 (*Gramatika po makedonski ezik 1953*) was released by the “New Hellas” publishing house (the city of release has not been cited but is most probably Bucharest) and addressed the Bulgarian children from Aegean Macedonia scattered across Eastern Europe in the aftermath of the failure of the Civil War. To serve them other textbooks in a “language” other than the Skopje version were written (in the same year). The two grammars differ as to the degree of their candour - the “Aegean” one openly admits that it was created based on “A Bulgarian grammar” by L. Andreychin (et al.) from 1947 (Andreychin 1947) while the “Vardar” one conceals this fact terminologically and proving the plagiarism of B. Koneski becomes possible after making certain comparisons.

To dispel any doubts about the aforesaid regarding the Bulgarian language, the full Preface to the “Aegean” grammar is quoted below: “*With the liberation of a large part of Aegean Macedonia by the Democratic Army of Greece (DAG) in the years from 1946 to 1949 where the Slavo-Macedonian people became real masters of their native land and the power went fully into their hands conditions were created for the development of a free national life in liberated regions. All functions of the people’s*

authority in those regions were performed in the Macedonian language; the first Macedonian schools and cultural-educational institutions opened. This brisk development of a free creative life of the Macedonians from the Aegean continued and continues to the present day in the countries of the People's democracy where thousands of banished Slavo-Macedonian children and political emigrants received hospitality. Scores of books were published in the Macedonian language - textbooks, fiction, political literature, newspapers and magazines; young literary workers were trained and a literary language of the Slavo-Macedonians from the Aegean gradually started to emerge. The compilation of this first Macedonian grammar for the Slavo-Macedonians from the Aegean is a legitimate result and product of this brisk development of our people. It makes an attempt to formulate the main grammar rules of the Macedonian language as it is being formed today in Aegean Macedonia especially after the launch of the radio transmission in the Macedonian language by Free Greece radio station. The Macedonian section of the 'New Hellas' publishing house is convinced that this first Macedonian grammar for the Slavo-Macedonians from the Aegean will be of great help to our young people and to the teachers of the Macedonian language for the proper study of the new literary language and for the formation of the common people's Macedonian language of the Aegean. The main reference sources for compiling the grammar include: "A Bulgarian grammar" by Dr. Lyubomir Andreychin, N. Kostov, E. Nikolov. Sofia, 1947; and "A grammar of the Russian language" by A. S. Matiychenko, Uchpedgiz - 1952." The Macedonian section of "Nea Hellas" publishing house.

General conclusion

From the total of six codifications of the Bulgarian language this article has focused on the Vardar Macedonian and the Aegean Macedonian ones, i.e., on two of the recodifications. All six of them however provide clear evidence of the pluricentrism of the Bulgarian language which is the result of the exceptionally complex historical destiny of the Bulgarian nation.

References

- Andreychin 1947:** Л. Андрейчин. Българска граматика. София, 1947. (L. Andreychin. Balgarska gramatika. Sofia, 1947.)
- Angelov 2017:** A. Angelov. Pluricentric Slavic languages. - *Linguistique balkanique*, 56, 2017, 1, 3-10.
- Dulichenko 2014:** А. Д. Дуличенко. Введение в славянскую филологию. Москва, 2014. (A. D. Dulichenko. Vvedenie v slavjanskuju filologiju. Moskva, 2014.)
- Edinstvoto na balgarskiya ezik v minaloto i dnes 1978:** Единството на българския език в миналото и днес. (Български език, 1). София: БАН, 1978. (Edinstvoto na balgarskiya ezik v minaloto i dnes. (Balgarski ezik, 1). Sofia: BAN, 1978.)
- Gramatika po makedonski ezik 1953:** Граматика по македонски език. Издателство „Неа Елада“, 1953. (Gramatika po makedonski ezik. Izdatelstvo "Nea Elada", 1953.)

- Kochev, Kocheva 2017:** I. Kochev, A. Kocheva. On the recodification and pluricentrism of standard Bulgarian. - *Linguistique balkanique*, 56, 2017, 2, 21-29.
- Kochev, Kronshtayner, Aleksandrov 1993:** И. Кочев, О. Кронщайнер, И. Александров. Съчиняването на т.нар. македонски книжовен език. София: МНИ, 1993. (I. Kochev, O. Kronshtayner, I. Aleksandrov. *Sachinyavaneto na t.nar. makedonski knizhoven ezik*. Sofia: MNI, 1993.)
- Markovski 2003:** В. Марковски. Кръвта вода не става. София: Книгоиздателска къща „Труд“, 2003. (V. Markovski. *Kravta voda ne stava*. Sofia: Knigoizdatelska kashta “Trud”, 2003.)
- Misirkov 2000:** К. Мисирков. (Без коментар) Прозрения от: I „За македонските работи“ II „Бележки по южнославянската филология и история“ и др. София: МНИ, 2000. (K. Misirkov. (Bez komentar) *Prozreniya ot I „Za makedonstskite raboti“ II „Belezhki po yuzhnoslavvanskata filologiya i istoriya“ i dr.* Sofia: MNI, 2000.)
- Weigand 1924:** Г. Вајганг. Етнография на Македония (превод от немския труд *Ethnographie von Makedonien*). Leipzig, 1924. (G. Weigand. *Etnografiya na Makedonia* (prevod ot nemskiya trud *Ethnographie von Makedonien*). Leipzig, 1924.)
- Zhinzifov 1943:** Р. Жинзифов. Избрани съчинения. София, 1943. (R. Zhinzifov. *Izbrani sachineniya*. Sofia, 1943.)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ana Kocheva, PhD

Department of Bulgarian Dialectology and Linguistic Geography
 Institute for Bulgarian Language “Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin”
 Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
 52 Shipchenski prohod blvd., bl. 17
 1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
 Email: anak@abv.bg

Prof. Dr. Ivan Kochev, PhD

Institute for Bulgarian Language “Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin”
 Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
 52 Shipchenski prohod blvd., bl. 17
 1113 Sofia, Bulgaria