

REVIEW

by Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vladislav Milanov

Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski", Department of Bulgarian Language

for a dissertation for the award of the scientific degree "Doctor of Science"

in the field of higher education 2.1. Philology

Professional field Bulgarian language

for the research paper of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Petya Barkalova on the topic:

THE BULGARIAN SYNTACTIC TRADITION

AND THE WAY OF THE SYNTAX ELEMENT OF GRAMMATICAL KNOWLEDGE

1. General presentation of the procedure and the dissertation

By order №P33-4964 / 13.102020 I was appointed a member of the national jury of the procedure of Assoc. Prof. Petya Barkalova (Plovdiv University "Paisiy Hilendarski") for obtaining the scientific degree "Doctor of Science". All legal requirements of the procedure are met. The author of the dissertation is one of the doyens of modern Bulgarian syntax and one of the most serious and thorough researchers of its historical development.

2. Relevance of the topic

Before I started reading the work of Assoc. Prof. Petya Barkalova, I recognized from its title a current and timely scientific study that not only fills a gap in the science of historical literary development, but creates a model describing in depth the syntactic developmental processes in the Bulgarian language, unfolding against the background of global genetically determined trends to outline their contemporary character. At the same time, he develops them with the tools and approaches of the most modern science, combining extremely successfully the modern research view with the foundations of the syntactic tradition in the Bulgarian language over the centuries against the background of ancient traditions and symbolic paths of syntactic science. shaped and exists today. This scientific work stands as the end of an extremely serious series, which includes, on the one hand, the fundamental research of L. Andreychin, R. Rusinov, Hr. Parvev, V. Popova, K. Vachkova, D. Ivanova among others, who summarize in their works the overall historical development of the Bulgarian language, and in an extremely serious setting and comparison of the processes in national and supranational terms; unfolding processes from diachrony to synchrony and vice versa. Such current studies are not only the face of the science, but are also a definite request for the European and world comparison of Bulgarian linguistics with the achievements of world linguistics today.

3. Understanding of the problem

To a certain extent, Petya Barkalova's work goes beyond what is set out in the title and at the same time, from the very beginning, she shows not just knowledge of the problem, but a deep and profound personal understanding of this problem. This stems from the fact that the researcher is one of the best modern syntax, who through her research on syntactic structure outlines a modern and unavoidable framework with clearly defined own scientific positions. It is no coincidence that before the appearance of this large-scale research project, the scientific developments dedicated to specific syntactic problems were also the work of Assoc. Prof. Petya Barkalova.

4. Methodology

The bridge between modern syntax and its history in her face finds the most reliable scientist in his analysis, who has his own methodology in describing modern processes, but has an in-depth look at the overall syntactic dynamics during the Renaissance. The combination of the diachronic with the synchronous approach has found in Petya Barkalova's work an exceptional scientific achievement not only through scientific conclusions, but through the skilful combination of the two approaches (which is a convincing example of the strength of their interaction). With this persuasiveness, with which the syntactic processes are presented in methodological terms, it is difficult to summarize by another researcher. Thus, they become a kind of history of the syntactic, which unfolds the beginnings of the basic ancient (Greek-Byzantine) works, fully covers the old Bulgarian and Middle Bulgarian syntactic heritage, to reach the syntactic concepts representative of our Revival and to motivate even more of them. background one of the syntactic modern theories, gained popularity and widely practiced at home and abroad thanks to scientists such as J. Penchev, St. Koeva and P. Barkalova.

5. Characteristics and evaluation of the dissertation and contributions.

Even the first chapter of the work unfolds in great detail the descriptions of language since Plato. The concepts of the ancient thinkers are presented with depth and precision, which the author presents systematically (referring to key studies - not only linguistic) in two types according to the methodological approach to language and according to the goals of ancient grammars: 1) The system of word classes (partes orationis, word class system, parts of speech) and 2) Hellenism. Based on already existing descriptions and analyzes, Petya Barkalova presents her deep reflections, against the background of which fundamental questions unfold, which answer the big question about the origin of syntax and syntactic teachings and their development in Bulgaria. Very precisely and scientifically substantiated Petya Barkalova defined them as theses and in fact even only this part of her research can be distinguished as an independent monograph in which the modern generative seeks the foundations of historicism to create the profile of a science. As the author of a perhaps still valid statement by Swiggers and Waters dated 2003 very accurately refers, "in the process of searching after Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics of elements of explicit syntax, of partial syntactic reflections and descriptions, it becomes clear that **"syntax suffers from the hypertrophy of morphology in the grammatical description."**

In order not to repeat the conclusions summarized by Petya Barkalova, I will note the following contributions:

1) Extremely precise and in-depth analysis, based on classical studies made by scholars such as Iv. Dobrev, M. Bayramova, B. Velcheva, Eq. Dogramadzhieva, Iv. Buyukliev, E. Georgiev, A.M. Totomanova, V. Micheva and other Bulgarian and foreign scientists;

2) Encyclopedic presentation of the old Bulgarian literary tradition in the dialogue and in the continuity and with traditions from the preceding period and with invaluable references to the present;

3) Well ordered and in-depth formulations of the author about the role of Constantine-Cyril, Clement of Ohrid and John the Exarch and about the texts that set models for grammatical thinking and description.

I will pay special attention to the Fourth Chapter, entitled Grammatical and Philological Knowledge in the Middle Ages, naturally continuing the chronology in tracing the syntactic tradition. Relying on basic research in the works of St. Mladenov, K. Mirchev, I. Lekov, Iv. Dobrev, D. Ivanova – Mircheva, A.M. Totomanova, M. Spasova, V. Micheva, I. Haralampiev and others, P. Barkalova pays special attention to the role of the Tarnovo literary school and the style of "knitting words", considering in particular the convergence of Bulgarian syntactic constructions with the syntax of Greek language. I would add a non-accidental convergence. The contributions of Patriarch Evtimiy are quite naturally presented, as well as the grammatical treatises in "A Tale of the Letters" by K. Kostenechki.

The subsection "On the eight parts of speech" analyzes in depth and comprehensively the entire development of the discussion on this issue, paying special attention to Petya Barkalova on an important issue for language and linguistics, namely in the published "grammatical essay" on the place and the role of the definite article in nouns ("difference"), a typological feature of the Bulgarian language (but also of Greek), which here finds its first registered grammatical description (Barkalova 109). The conclusions presented by the author at the end of this chapter are fundamental to the development of historical science with a clear reference to thinking in modern times:

Grammatical knowledge in the Slavic Orthodox world, part of which is the Bulgarian Middle Ages, contains few documented fragments of the course of an "explicit" grammatical tradition, which is born of the Greco-Byzantine grammatical model. More evidence is found for the "practical" philology of writers, manifested in situ in the field of translation practice, in fiction and poetic texts of medieval Bulgarian literature, in the preserved to this day religious and secular literary monuments (p. 114).

In support of her conclusion, Petya Barkalova highlights and argues the following scientific arguments:

- ❖ Orthodox Slavic scribes and translators learned the language and syntax by reading each manuscript.
- ❖ Literary work is a continuous and endless practical training, perhaps comparable to the acquisition of the language by the child in close contact with the mother.
- ❖ The norms of the Old Bulgarian literary language were first established and affirmed in the translation activity of the Old Bulgarian writers. The stability of the translation model is a remarkable event in the Bulgarian verbal culture, a sign of continuity in the field of practical philology.
- ❖ The Old Bulgarian literary language is associated with a living spoken language and therefore no grammatical rules are needed in its application, unlike Latin and Greek, which are no longer living and understandable languages. It is precisely the connection with the spoken language that allows the creation of unique original works, not only translated ones, which in some respects surpass the Byzantine models.
- ❖ Grammatical practice is established not only in the field of translation. The pages of the old Bulgarian literature were also written by writers - original authors of texts with religious and secular content.

The second part of the monograph of Assoc. Prof. Barkalova is titled extremely successfully and influentially: Syntactic knowledge and the legislator of language. For researchers of the history of the modern Bulgarian literary language it is a crown of syntactic research, for modern syntactics it is a basis from which they must start in order to comprehend the beginnings of the modern Bulgarian syntax from its revival to the present day; from his transformation from stranger to acquaintance. This chapter is very difficult to summarize, because it meets the competencies of the author in a very wide range - diachronic and synchronous; theoretical and practical. It is not just a bridge to the development of syntactic science, following the course of tradition, it is perhaps the first in-depth study of thinking about syntax, the development of syntax and the syntactic anuka from the Renaissance to the present day. The definitions of the legislator of language and the syntactic principle are presented with exceptional depth and scientific precision: the legislator of language is the people who have transferred their language through the centuries as the "House of Being"; the legislator of the language is the old Bulgarian literature, written in the Cyril and Methodius language; the legislator of the language are the Greco-Byzantine and Latin models in their Church Slavonic adaptation due to the kinship ("red thread") in the traditions; the legislator of the language is Greek as a "metalanguage" - a guide to universal rational knowledge (especially needed in the creation of a concise and terminological apparatus of grammar); the legislators of the language are "our fellow tribesmen" and the Russian language, through which they will bring to us "all the

sciences." The complexity of the description stems from the complexity of the linguistic-historical processes that determine the development of syntactic teaching. It is a very serious non-homogeneous mixture of initial linguistic manifestations, unfolding in a complex social and economic situation. However, Petya Barkalova has analyzed all these processes in a very orderly paradigm and has arranged them in a coherent presentation of the history and the current state of the syntactic beginning in the Bulgarian literary language. The analysis further deepens its parameters, unfolding the Revival tradition in the context of the ancient Greco-Byzantine influences. This not only sets the scale in scientific research, but emphasizes the very scale of our Revival writers to look for a very broad basis for their generalizations in grammars and dictionaries.

The corollaries that Petya Barkalova convincingly draws in this chapter have a generalizing character and stand as postulates for / in the description of the Revival syntax. First of all, it is important to point out that this syntax is not so strongly influenced by the Church Slavonic tradition (as Professor Rusin Rusinov claims in his classic works on INBKE), as it is essentially an analytical type. In the complex choice between the Greek influence and the Church Slavonic tradition in the Bulgarian Revival writers it seems that the orientation towards the Greek model prevails, but this is not a stable tendency, but a characteristic changing in time and in grammars. This process is very convincing against the background of the research of E. Marinova and B. Valchev, which are supplemented to some extent to lead to the conclusion that the doctrine of grammatical figures as an element of "figurative" syntax and rhetorical heritage related with Trivium (Valchev 2008, Marinova 2013) finds clear traces of the Greek theory of figures in the syntactic component of the Church Slavonic grammar of Miletius Smotritsky. The search for a unified model in toto for the concept, structure, number of sections and terminology of any Revival grammar, as the author notes, seems impossible against the background of complex twists of language theories and speech practices during the Renaissance, so the reference to the metaphorical expression of Borges "garden with branching paths" is an approach of Petya Barkalova, which accompanies her entire research. It is saturated with metaphor, inherent in the description of the syntactic in dialogue and in a request for conversation with the beginnings of stylistics during the Renaissance.

Henceforth, the author's reasoning describes all important grammars, finding elements of syntax even where they are explicitly indicated, due to the early stage of certain concepts in these grammatical works. From the very beginning, the author presents in great detail the grammar of Lawrence Zizantius, in which the terminological naming of the syntactic property of words is a "composition", although sections on orthography, prosody and etymology have been developed. At this early stage, the syntax was fairly equated with the unexplored syntactic fields through the successfully used metaphorical name "black hole" in the grammatical description. The grammar of Miletius Smotritsky is also presented in depth through the third part "Ω Svntĉi", which lays the foundations of the doctrine of the relations between the words

in the sentence as an entirely new tradition, as Smotrisky's predecessors lacked this section. "Simple" and "figurative syntax" twist complex traditions through many comparative elements. A very special example is the author's grammatical attitude to the article morpheme (successfully and precisely defined by Petya Barkalova as "genetics and selection of the article"), because "the very rule for the full article and its use still have an impact on the syntactic normative tradition and are related to syntactic knowledge, more precisely to the understanding of the incorporation of the article morpheme into the subjunctive noun phrase '. This example convincingly shows how a grammatical phenomenon is presented in depth through different historical perspectives, to its function today, without missing its key influence on authors such as Neofit Rilski, who has a fundamental role in establishing the membership form in the Bulgarian language. Here, historicism leads absolutely plausibly to modern processes, presenting them in development and in their function in a complex temporal and linguistic plan. And this is the philosophy of the whole study of Petya Barkalova.

Logically, after this in-depth analysis, the texts presented 175 years after Miletij Smotrisky's "Grammar of Slovene Correct Syntagma" are revised by Avram Mrazovic, who publishes two books as independent "branches": "Guide to Slavic Grammar", published in 1794 in Vienna, and "A Guide to Slavic Eloquence for the Use of Slavic Language Lovers, published in Budin before 1821." These texts by Mrazovic prompted Petya Barkalova to discover the subtle connections between language and thinking as an explicit syntax that outlines models from the philosophy of language. In these parts the positioning of our Revival grammars in terms of the philosophy of prosody, verse metrics is convincingly developed and we come to Homer's "exile in the language", related to the Bulgarian Revival grammars, when they "reflect" the Church Slavonic tradition.

Petya Barkalova is the first researcher to develop syntactic statements in this grammar and analyze them in depth. In other studies of more general. The historical and the modern in the description are the two lines that answer not only theoretical questions (related to the names of individual constructs and syntactic terms, which introduce the rules of combination: "stick" and "agree", the first of which is synonymous of ordering (in modern dependent syntax also known as constitutive ordering) The conclusions here are fundamental, and the description of morphological and syntactic hypotheses adheres to the highest examples of scientific description:

- 1) The syntax of the names in the manual is entirely a case syntax, presented descriptively in the form of prescriptions for observance of the case norms of the language (p. 135);
- 2) The tool of the grammatical instruction are the questions with the role of identifiers of maturity meanings (p. 135).

3) The implicit and explicit traces of the octave, found in the Church Slavonic grammars, confirm the impression that they are entirely grammars for the maturity requirements of the parts of speech - nouns and verbs and their extensions (p. 141).

Venelin's grammar is a challenge for almost every Bulgarian linguist. Because of the ban on publishing; because of the concept; because of the innovation even in the absence of a strong influence on our Revival grammatical thought. However, Petya Barkalova considers a very important and little developed issue in our country, which is both linguistic and interdisciplinary. Against the background of the statement that this grammar is a way to study the Bulgarian syntactic tradition, which brings the future to the current state of syntactic knowledge, the author unfolds the scale of connections between some "language intuitions" from the syntactic section of Venelin's grammar, which have solutions today. , experimental confirmations and "extensive works" are dedicated to them. As contributing and very interesting here I find the summaries of the concepts that make an analogy between music and language. Even more contributing are the summaries of the so-called reversal (constructions and expressions) in which Venelin places his "theory" of phraseography. It is here that the summary is very important, that in order for this branch to develop, it is necessary to know in depth the "phraseography" of literature, but on the condition that it has "reached its full development." Otherwise, as Vanya Micheva explains, this discipline of the mind answers the question why the creators of the Bulgarian normative complex - Joakim Gruev, Ivan Momchilov, Marin Drinov, Lyuben Karavelov and their associates, cannot draw up rules for syntactic codification in the third quarter of XIX century, although since the time of the first damasks in the XVII - XVIII century in our literature in the native language enter the syntactic elements with the "seal of rebirth" (p. 150).

Petya Barkalova (as one of the doyens of modern syntax) easily reads the reading of Venelin's grammatical descriptions in the context of modern science; as a harbinger, as a universal picture, in which, over the years, linguistic phenomena find their answers in the methodology and tools of syntax in a non-contact period; as an echo through the centuries, read today. The comparisons with Russian and French only expand the depth of Venelin's reasoning, which the author carefully refines and clarifies in order to achieve (un) sought continuity and to summarize that the embedded comparative French-Bulgarian syntax sounds like a draft for a modern grammatical project.

The detailed analysis of the syntactic sections in the grammars of Neofit Rilski, Neofit Bozveli and Em. Vaskidovich, Ivan Bogorov in depth reveals the syntactic sections, looking for influences from various sources, described and analyzed in detail before by Petya Barkalova. The many criticisms with which almost all grammatical descriptions during the Renaissance were met are also impressive here. And this may be a good reason for the author to summarize them in an independent linguistic study, in which to present the so-called philological disputes about language.

Petya Barkalova's text not only examines the processes, comparing them in the context of current research, but also finds her own discoveries, which are the impetus for historical linguistics (for example, the manuscript grammar of Ilarion Hilendarski in 1850).

The line of syntax development through education is presented in great depth and precision, and this is an inevitable process for the Revival. The author's approach to present the definitions of the sentence is essentially not only a history of the sentence unit, but also a reason to reflect on the Bulgarian grammarians centuries ago in her projection in syntactic research today, although Petya Barkalova categorically states her desire to abstract from historicism and from the subject of influence, to dwell only on definitions as the handwriting of grammarians and as a request for the creation of science.

The contributions of this part of the research paper are indisputable and are of great importance for historical and modern syntactic science:

1) After the Liberation no significant changes were made in the theoretical basis on which the sentence was defined (Stoyan Vezhenov (1880), Stefan Panaretov (1881), Todor Shishkov (1880), Slavi Kesjakov and Petar Gorov (1882), Sava Iliev Sirmanov (1884), Dragan Manchov (1886), Dimitar Lachkov, Dimitar Mishev (1891) (1892) (1895), P. Grigorev (1897), Altunkov (1888) adhere to the logic that is still inextricably linked to grammar.

2) About the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, definitions based on the formal-grammatical theory began to appear in the grammar literature, according to which linguistic forms are essential, and not the content they express (Dragan White Beard (1898), Ivan Topkov 1899, Manol Ivanov (1901), Dimitar Mirchev (1907), Nikola Iliev (1910), Atanas Iliev Iliev (1922), Penyo Mikhailov (1922), Hristo Ivanov and Ivan Kravkov (1925) , Petar Kalkandjiev (1936), Ivan Hadzhov, T. Atanasov, A. Atanasov (1937), Stefan Mladenov (1939), Dimitar Popov (1942) define the sentence based on the presence of a verb in it.)

3) Even at the beginning of the 20th century, as Petya Barkalova notes, representatives of the logical direction were recognized - Lyubomir Andreychin, Nikola Kostov and Enyo Nikolov (1947). In honor of Bulgarian linguistics, some authors have seen a change in understandings and this is presented in great detail in Barkalova (Al. Teodorov-Balan, who in his grammars of 1898, 1899 used logical theory to define the sentence, in more In her later editions (1940, 1961) she became a supporter of the psychological school, of which she remained the only representative, and in a similar way the author summarized the place of Kliment Karagyulev (in 1906 his definition was logical, and later (1922) formal-grammatical. (p. 193).

4) In 1899 Todor Ikonov was the first to introduce the term "sentence. Ikonov's terminological clarification that "a sentence should be used in conversation and a sentence in grammar" is interesting (Ikonov 1899: 3). An exception in terms of

terminology is St. Mladenov, who uses the term "statement" (quoted in Barkalova p. 194).

5) It is quite natural for the author to summarize the modern definitions of the sentence, according to which the newer generation of syntacticians tries to "reconcile" theories: the theories of K. Popov, P. Pashov and Y. Penchev are presented in more depth.

6) In one of the last parts **Decoding of Ontologies: Cartesians vs Aristotelians** Petya Barkalova summarizes:

- The early development of syntactic terminology shows that the first Bulgarian grammarians have long been oriented in the difference between the logic of judgment and the grammar of the sentence. Although the terms are calcified and have a modern Bulgarian "appearance", behind them lies the conceptual apparatus of Aristotle's logic - subject, predicate, logical connection (copula) (p. 194).
- By coupling them into two main currents according to their views on the main parts of the sentence, Barkalova for the first time systematically presents and summarizes complex positions of Bulgarian grammarians for summarizing and grouping: Aristotelians, according to whom the main parts of the sentence are three: N cop N / N cop A: Hr. Pavlovich 1836, Iv. Bogorov 1844; Y. Gruev 1853; Hr. K. Sichan-Nikolov 1858; Parthenius Zografski 1859; G. Mirkovic 1860; Iv. Momchilov 1868; Y. Kochov 1868; T. Shishkov 1872; St. Panaretov 1881; K. Karadja 1890; Al. T.-Balan 1898.
- □ Cartesians, according to whom there is a two-component syntactic definition for the sentence of the type name - verbum finitum: T. Khrulev (1859), S. Radulov (1863, 1870), Dr. Manchov (1886), T. Ikonov (1875), St. Vezhenov (1880), S. Kesyakov and P. Gorov (1882), S. Sirmanov (1882), At. Iliev (1888), Iv. Topkov (1899), Iv. Slaveykov (1900), M. Ivanov (1901), K. Karagyulev (1906), D. Mirchev (1907), N. Iliev (1910), At. Iliev (1922), Iv. Kravkov (1925), Iv. Hadzhov (1937), P. Kalkandjiev (1936), St. Mladenov (1939), D. Popov (1942), L. Andreychin (1942), K. Popov (1979), P. Pashov (1989), J. Penchev (1984, 1993).

Against the background of these large-scale developments in the second part, the definitions of the simple and complex sentence are presented quite naturally by modeling and formalizing the data. Here the author is already in her modern element and presents in text and diagrams key knowledge for modern science: naming the sentence, generic feature of the sentence and the relationship between them in the Bulgarian grammars from 1835 to 2000. The connection of the genus and the species trait is clearly presented and convincingly defended in tables.

6. Evaluation of the publications and the personal contribution of the dissertation

The dissertation's publications develop in great depth and analytically the problem in its details. Each of them is a request for the appearance of this text. Her personal contribution is indisputable. For the first time in such depth and comprehensiveness, syntactic traditions are presented in Bulgarian linguistics to explain the logic of modern syntax.

7. Abstract. The abstract authentically and very accurately follows the contents of the research paper.

8. Recommendations for future use of dissertation contributions and results.

I strongly recommend that the publication be translated into English and widely disseminated in the scientific community. The results of the research of Assoc. Prof. Barkalova will be used both for scientific purposes and for teaching in secondary and higher education. I have two questions pertaining to this.

Most likely Petya Barkalova has already answered these questions of mine, but they are dictated by the scale of her research:

1) Does the author intend to further develop her observations from the presented text in another study with an exemplary title "Renaissance syntax" and in it to present the development and typology of sentence structures during the Renaissance, including in the excerpt of the material and analysis of sentences from the letters of the literary men from Bulgarian Revival period, from the so-called newspaper language, from the prefaces of the grammars, etc.?

2) In her sixth thesis Petya Barkalova notes: *Bulgarian syntactic thinking solves its problems depending on the incoming and outgoing scientific paradigms. Teaching syntax in the Bulgarian school solves its problems depending on the incoming and outgoing educational paradigms.* **My question is: What is the attitude of the author to the teaching and study of modern Bulgarian syntax in today's high school and in modern Bulgarian universities?**

Conclusion

The inevitable multi-layered nature of Petya Barkalova's research and conclusions leads to the categorical summary that her work is not just history, although she seeks to document traditions. The approach of the generative researcher inevitably presupposes her experience with the tools of modern syntax, with combinatorics between diachrony and synchrony, through a constitutional approach and a formal record to make a family tree of grammars. The main result of the work shows that definitions are collected in a chronological network, which outline the path of syntactic science. The author's contributions to linguistics are indisputable, to interdisciplinarity and to the

philosophy of language even more, through the syntactic tradition. Historicism in the works of Petya Barkalova is necessary and inevitable to prove the deep cultural gene of grammar science. All this makes the research a fundamental scientific work of an encyclopedic nature, which no researcher can ignore. The appendices to the text in the form of diagrams and tables, as well as at the end of the research, systematize and objectify the observations and conclusions of the author and will be a reference research for both experts and students studying the history of modern Bulgarian literary language. The bibliography is complete and can serve as encyclopedic guide.

I can not but point out the interesting way in which the scientific information is presented - fascinating, concise and figurative and at the same time scientifically arranged and well substantiated. Petya Barkalova's research paper reads like those books that, once opened, we cannot close until we have read the last line. And this is proof that her work will enter the ranks of the classics of modern linguistics and through the complex transitions it makes between the centuries, and through the review and analysis that shape the appearance of modern syntactic science today - from its inception to the present day.

All of the above mentioned are the reason for my unanimous support of the work (and its author) and is an occasion to express my deep satisfaction with the appearance and its highest scientific value, which is why I vote with full conviction for the award of the degree "Doctor of Philology" to Assoc. Prof. Petya Barkalova.

30.11.2020

Sofia

Author of the Review:

(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vl. Milanov)