PAISII HILENDARSKI UNIVERSITY OF PLOVDIV
FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH PHILOLOGY

Maria Ivanova Anastasova

THE ANALYTIC CONSTRUCTIONS WITH THE VERBS *BE* AND *HAVE* AND A PAST PARTICIPLE IN OLD ENGLISH AND IN OLD BULGARIAN

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION ABSTRACT
for the acquisition of a PhD educational and scientific degree
Field of Higher Education: 2 Humanities
Professional Area: 2.1. Philology
Doctoral Programme: Germanic Languages: English Language

Supervisor:
Assoc. Prof. Antoaneta Stefanova Dzhelyova, PhD

Plovdiv
2022

The doctoral thesis was discussed and its public defense was suggested at an extended department meeting of the *English Philology* Department at the Faculty of Philology of *Paisii Hilendarski* University of Plovdiv on 4th July 2022.

Scientific jury:
Prof. Vera Tervel Marovska, DSc
Prof. Mariyana Petrova Tsibranska-Kostova, DSc
Prof. Elka Petrova Mircheva, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Yana Valentinova Chankova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Bozhil Petrov Hristov, PhD

The public defense of the doctoral thesis will take place on 27th September 2022 at 1 p. m. in *Compass* auditorium at *Paisii Hilendarski* University of Plovdiv, Rectorate Building, 24 Tsar Asen Str., Plovdiv.

All materials concerning the defense of the PhD thesis are available at the University Library, Rectorate Building, 24 Tsar Asen Str., Plovdiv.

INTRODUCTION

Translations of liturgical texts are a possible source for the research of grammatical phenomena comparatively and typologically. This is a research field which has not been fully explored.

The language of the first written translations of biblical texts codified the linguistic norms of many nations which had had no written language before that time. This type of linguistic data presents the grammar and the vocabulary of a language in their earliest period. The liturgical texts allow for extensive linguistic observations as far as textual linguistics, as well as grammar are concerned.

The subject matter of the thesis are the analytic constructions *be + past participle* and *have + past participle*. The thesis provides a comparative analysis of the two types of constructions in Old English and Old Bulgarian.

Sources. The Old English and the Old Bulgarian linguistic data has been excerpted from the Wessex Gospels and from the Codex Marianus, respectively. The Wessex Gospels are the first gospel text which is not an interlinear gloss of the Latin one. They are written in the West Saxon dialect which became the basis for the first standardized written English before the Norman Conquest (in 1066). The Codex Marianus, which was written in the 10th – 11th c., is the Old Bulgarian text which is considered closest to the to the linguistic archetype (Alekseev (ed.) 2005: 4). This manuscript demonstrates many ancient linguistic features as well as various innovations. The texts are mainly those from the Gospel of Matthew. What is also presented is data from other texts of the same period, referred to in dictionaries and in theoretical works on the research topic.

The object of study of the thesis are the form and content of the analytic constructions of the *be + past participle* and *have + past participle* type.

The main objective of the study is to determine both the common and the specific characteristics of the analytic structures under scrutiny, as well as the grammatical categories they represent.

Theoretical treatments:

1. The verbs *be* and *have* belong to the attractor of the complex and self-evolving language system. The attractor elements are the beginning and the center of the self-organization of the system. As parts of the system attractor, the verbs *be* and *have* are the most stable ones with the most significant functions in a language. It is through the attractor elements that both continuity and innovation in language systems are realized. The attractor elements form a mini-system. The attractor "specifies the permissible behavioural options of the system and the development of the system itself. It defines the degree of freedom of the system, its limits of change while the system still preserves its own identity, i.e. its phase space" (Dzhelyova 2015: 55). The attractor and the core are central to any system. The core is the stable microsystem containing the minimal lexical fund which is a projection of the basic human concepts and perceptions. The verbs *be* and *have* belong to both the attractor and the core of the language (Dzhelyova 2015: 55).

2. Being a complex self-evolving system, each individual natural human language in a given period of its existence reconciles phenomena with different chronology, phenomena belonging to different content (active, nominative, ergative, etc.) and formal (inflectional, agglutinative, incorporative, isolating) types while one of the types in each case is the dominant one. The suppletive paradigm of the verb *be*, the possessive expression of predication, the participles' indeterminacy as to the category of voice – all of these are projections of the typologically active past of the Proto-Indo-European language. The emergence of the verb *have* and the development of the opposition transitivity – intransitivity are characteristic of the nominative language type. In terms of formal typology both Old English and Old Bulgarian are predominately inflectional. They possess the main features of the inflectional language type: morphologically significant vowel alternations in the root and suffixes, the use of zero affixes and inflections, homosemy – the presence of different word-change patterns in one and the same part of speech, patterns inherited from different developmental stages of a language, the interaction of phonetically and morphologically determined processes, establishing cumulations and fusions in synthetic word-forms.

3. Despite their different typological features, the verbs *be* and *have* both show the features characterizing attractor elements – they are used independently with a certain lexical meaning and as auxiliary verbs in different constructions; they are interchangeable in their independent use and in analytic constructions.

4. Hybrid word forms such as the participles uniting the features of the universal word classes of the verb and the adjective (sharing its categories with the noun) are the most well suited for the study of individual/particular languages.

5. The analytic constructions under consideration combine the components that maintain the stability of the system – the verbs *be* and *have*, as well as the components that undergo the most significant innovations – the hybrid participles, in this particular case the past participle.

6. We rely on the category of *binding*. We study the formal and semantic binding of the components that the analytic constructions under scrutiny contain. In terms of semantics, it is sought in the formation of participles from different verb classes and in the combination of the verbs *be* and *have* with different noun classes so that their typological, lexical and grammatical characteristics can be specified. In terms of form, the category manifests itself in the change of inflections when the grammatical categories of gender, number, and case of the participle are expressed.

7. The emergence and development of certain analytic constructions reflects the evolution and existence of a particular morphological category or the emergence of a new category with its corresponding grammemes.

8. The semantically accurate literal translation of religious texts is suitable for the study of both the typologically similar and the specific features of a particular linguistic phenomenon, since its main goal is to convey the meaning as accurately as possible. Translations of one and the same text show the existence

of certain established patterns (grammatical calques), the result of cross-linguistic interactions, and the emergence of language-specific phenomena, the fruit of the evolution of a particular language's own linguistic system.

Objectives: In accordance with the theoretical concepts it is necessary:

1. To provide a lexical and grammatical analysis of the verbs *be* and *have* in Old English and Old Bulgarian;

2. To study the characteristics of the participles as a linguistic class as well as the participles in Old English and Old Bulgarian;

3. To explore the analytic constructions *be + past participle* in Old English and Old Bulgarian and *have + past participle* in Old English and Old Bulgarian, while also taking into account the theoretical findings on the problem;

4. To comment on the main theoretical accounts of which grammatical categories the Old English and Old Bulgarian analytic constructions with *be* and *have* and *the past participle* express;

5. To analyze the linguistic interactions and the occurrence of invocations in the realization of the analytic constructions under examination;

6. To outline the typologically common and the specific characteristics of the analytic constructions under consideration by comparing their Old English and Old Bulgarian manifestations.

Methodology: In view of the set objectives, we apply a panchronic (synchronic-diachronic) synergetic approach in our comparative study. It is through this approach that the analytic constructions with the verbs *be* and *have* and past participles can be observed, analyzed, and systematized best within the complex self-evolving systems of individual natural human languages.

THE VERBS *BE* AND *HAVE*

The parallel lexical and grammatical comparisons between the verb *be* in Old English and Old Bulgarian and *have* in Old English and Old Bulgarian show the similarities and the differences between the studied verbs belonging to both the attractor and the core of the language.

The Verb *Be*

According to Benveniste, the verb *be* exists as two separate lexemes with different functions – *a link verb (copula)* and *a full verb* (Benveniste 1974: 203).

When used as a copula, the verb that has **es* as its root expressed the identity between a bearer and a feature. In this function the following variants are possible – for the verb to be omitted or for it to be expressed (Benveniste 1974: 205). However, it is also possible for a verb lexeme different from the lexeme expressing *existence* to be used to convey identity (Benveniste 1974: 208 - 209).

In most Indo-European languages, a single verb can be used to denote existence, the same verb can also be employed as a link verb to express identity. An interesting peculiarity is that the verb has a suppletive paradigm that unites the paradigms of two verbs which were initially distinct.

In suppletivism, typical of the active Proto-Indo-European language, names of active denotata and names of inactive denotata formed oppositions. The same type of opposition was observed when the dynamic features of these denotata were referred to. The semantic dominant *activity – inactivity* manifests itself at all linguistic levels – at the lexical one (suppletivism), at the morphological one (different types of endings), at the syntactic one (different types of sentences).

Perhaps the root *bhV signified the existence of an active denotatum and its characteristic features whereas* the root *es – the existence of any denotatum and its characteristic features*. The verb with the *bhV root served as a full verb, and the one with the *es root could be both – a full verb and a copula.

In linear – nonlinear worldview, the root *bhV represents the linear model characterized by discontinuity, directionality, change of state, and increment manifested as determinacy in time and space, and the root *es represents the nonlinear model with its key characteristics identity, stability, continuity, and indeterminacy as to time and space (see Dzhelyova 2015: 128 – 129).

The two roots are unified on the basis of their shared meaning of *existence*.

The Verb Be in Old English

There are two present-tense paradigms of the verb *be* in Old English – one of them is a descendant of the Proto-Indo-European root*h_1es-, and the other one descends from the root *bhV- (represented by *bēon* in Old English). It is important to note that although most authors describe the forms *eom, eart*, etc. as the present paradigm of the infinitive *wesan*, they are in fact the descendants of the Proto-Indo-European root *h_1es-, which had no infinitive or past tense forms in Proto-Germanic. The infinitive and the past tense were derived from the root *h_2wes-.

The forms of the verb *bēon* have been incorporated in the conjugations of the verb *be* in the remaining West Germanic languages. Old English is the only language in which they have evolved into a separate paradigm.

The two roots had a functional differentiation in Old English: the forms derived from the unmarked root *s denoted present states and actions whereas those derived from the marked root *b denoted habitual states and actions, as well as future states and events (see Campbell 1991: 350 – 351, Wischer 2008: 217 – 218). Kilpiö notes that, with the exception of the use of *bēon* in passive constructions, in all other cases *bēon is stripped of the meaning 'here and now'*. (Kilpiö 1993: 111).

Kilpiö identifies the auxiliary use of *be* in passive constructions as one of its predominant functions from ancient times on. He thinks this usage may partly explain the substitution of *have* for *be* in other verb forms (Kilpiö 1997: 115).

A verb which we will not examine in detail, but which is often used as a synonym of *bēon/wesan*, is the verb *weorþan* 'to become, to happen'.

The verb *be* can have the following lexical meanings in Old English:
1) To be, to exist;
2) To be (located, situated), to find oneself somewhere, to reside, to dwell;

3) To be present, there to be – in this usage *be* is synonymous with *have*;
4) To happen, to take place, to be done, to occur;
5) To come from, to be originally from somewhere;
6) To belong, to be owned by someone, to be someone's possession;
7) To denote time or a time period – a similar usage is seen in *have*.

The grammatical functions of *be* in Old English include its participation in:

1. Compound nominal predicates;
2. Combinations with present participles of full verbs;
3. Combinations with inflected infinitives;
4. Combinations with past participles of full verbs, which form active perfect and pluperfect constructions;
5. Combinations with past participles of transitive verbs, which form passive constructions. We assume that *is + past participle*, *wæs + past participle*, and *bið + past participle* have the semantics of passive perfect, pluperfect and futurum exactum (future perfect) verb forms.

The Verb Be in Old Bulgarian

Just like its Old English counterpart the Old Bulgarian verb *be* has a suppletive paradigm – the present tense is derived from the root *es, and the infinitive, the imperfect, the future tense and the conditional mood are derived from the roots **bhū-*, *bē, **bon-d with the extension d**, *bī (see Dzhelyova 2012: 152). In addition to the present tense forms the root *es is also made use of in the derivation of the present active participle с-ъі. Unlike the present active participle, the past active participles originate from the root *bhū – бъі-въ and бъі-л-ъ.

The Old Bulgarian verb бъіти has the following primary lexical meanings:

1) To be, to exist;
2) To be (located, situated), to find oneself somewhere, to reside, to dwell;
3) To be present, there to be – in this usage *be* is synonymous with *have*;
4) To happen, to take place, to be done, to occur;
5) To come from, to be originally from somewhere;
6) To belong, to be owned by someone, to be someone's possession;
7) To denote time or a time period – a similar usage is seen in *have*.

The verb бъіти appears in various grammatical constructions:

1. In compound nominal predicates;
2. In combinations with present participles of full verbs;
3. In combinations with infinitives of full verbs;
4. In combinations with past active II participles when it forms the active perfect, pluperfect, futurum exactum, futurum exactum praeteriti, as well as the conditional mood forms;
5. In combinations with present passive and past passive participles when it forms passive analytic constructions.

The Verb *Have*

The verbs *be* and *have* present the following similarities: 1) they function as auxiliary verbs and are used for the formation of complex verb phrases; 2) they do not have passive voice forms; 3) they share the following lexical meanings: *existence*, *state*; *possession* and they can be used synonymously.

The most significant difference that the verbs *be* and *have* present is the fact that the verb *have* when used as a full verb in active voice can govern a direct object (Benveniste 1974: 210).

However, according to E. Benveniste the verb *have* looks like a transitive one only formally and it is actually not a true transitive verb. The author calls it a *pseudo-transitive* verb, since it does not express an action that truly passes over the object and changes it in some way. The verb *have* does not express a process of any sort (Benveniste: 1974: 210 – 211).

A. Meillet writes that the verb *have* is absent in most languages, and its appearance in Indo-European languages is late (Meillet 1924: 9 – 13, as cited in Benveniste 1974: 211). The primary meaning of the verb is *possessiveness*.

We agree with Benveniste's findings (1974: 212) that:
– languages expressing possession using constructions like *mihi est* 'mine is' seem to outnumber languages with a distinct verb like *habeo* 'have';
– the linguistic conveyance of possession seems to be headed in the following direction – from constructions similar to *mihi est* towards the appearance of a distinct possessive verb (like *habeo*);
– the possessive verbs of the *habeo* type are secondary, later formations which have a limited sphere of distribution.

Both ways of conveying possessiveness – by means of constructions like *mihi est*, or possessive verbs like *habere*, show the inactivity of *be* and *have*.

Confirmation that the verb *have* belongs to the group of state verbs is found in Gothic where the verb *aih* 'have' is one of the preterite-present verbs denoting subjective states, attitudes, moods, but never actions. All preterite-present verbs can be paraphrased using the verb *have*: e. g. *wait* 'to have information', etc.

The belonging of the verb *have* to the group of state verbs as well as the verb's inability to appear in present, past and future progressives in its direct sense we treat as additional evidence that the verb *have* denotes a state which has no clear beginning, end and direction and is therefore not limited in time.

According to Benveniste the presence of the verb *have* among the state verbs not only agrees with the essence of the concept of state, but also explains the appearance of the verb *have* when subjective states are expressed in many languages – e. g. 'to feel hungry, cold, etc.'. The verb *have* does not refer to an object in any of its uses, it always refers to a subject (Benveniste 1974: 214).

The Verb Have in Old English

Like most Indo-European languages, Old English has several ways of expressing predicative possession:

I. By means of the verb *bēon/wesan* 'be' and a dative noun/pronoun;
II. By means of the verb *āgan*;
III. By means of the verb *habban*.

The verb *habban* is one of the four Class III weak verb in Old English. The verb *have* has the following primary lexical meanings in Old English:

1) To have, to possess;
2) To have a descendant/relative/friend/associate/master, etc.;
3) To carry, to hold in one's arms;
4) To bring with one/oneself, to have around one/oneself;
5) To last, to continue, to turn, to become (for time, age, etc.);
6) To think someone something;
7) In combination with abstract nouns it denotes the action or the state denoted by the noun.

In Old English the verb *have* can be used:

1. With or without a grammatical object (incl. partitive-genitive objects);
2. In combination with inflected infinitives. The constructions thus formed sometimes had a modal nuance – such as 'I have the intention, I am about, I must', or 'I can, I am able to'. Sometimes, however, these combinations were used to simply express future actions;
3. With inflected or uninflected past participles.

These forms denote the result of the action expressed by the participle. They are considered the ancestors of the modern perfect and pluperfect verb forms. At first, the verb *have* was mainly combined with participles of transitive verbs, and later its usage gradually extended to participles of intransitive verbs as well.

The Verb Have in Old Bulgarian

In Old Bulgarian there are three ways of expressing predicative possession (McAnallen 2009: 131):

I. *Preposition u* 'in' + *genitive noun/pronoun + be*;
II. By means of a construction consisting of *a dative noun/pronoun + be*;
III. By means of *have*.

The first two constructions are used synonymously. This type of expression of possession is older and predates the emergence of constructions with the verb *have*. The dative case pattern is found in Old English as well.

The verb имѣти has the following primary lexical meanings:

1) To have, to possess;
2) To have a descendant/relative/friend/associate/master, etc.;
3) To carry, to hold in one's arms;
4) To bring with one/oneself, to have around one/oneself;

5) To last, to continue, to turn, to become (for time, age, etc.);
6) To think someone something;
7) In combination with abstract nouns it denotes the action or state denoted by the noun.

Grammatically, нмѣти can be combined with various arguments. It can be:

1. With or without a grammatical object;
2. In combination with infinitives – thus it forms descriptive future tense forms, in which the verb нмѣти often retains certain modal nuances – such as necessity, possibility, intention, desire, etc.;
3. In combination with past passive participles – in Old Bulgarian the participle is usually declined. The combinations, however, express the following meaning: "the result of the action expressed by the participle" (Ivanova-Mircheva (ed.) 1999: 635).

The Similarities between the Verbs *Be* and *Have*

When used as full verbs *be* and *have* have shared meanings – state; possession, belonging and they can be used synonymously.

Semantically, the verb *be is a descendent of the ancient inactive type of verbs,* and the verb *have* is indefinite in terms of its activity – inactivity that later transforms into transitivity – intransitivity. The verb *have* demonstrates features characteristic of both active and nominative language types. It denotes states, and not actions. The verb is pseudo-transitive and it does not have passive voice forms.

When used as auxiliaries *be* and *have* denote a state and possessiveness. The verb *be* also denotes identity, and the verb *have* – separable and inseparable belonging. When *have* denotes separable belonging it can govern a direct object.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPLES

The participle is a hybrid linguistic phenomenon uniting the properties of the two linguistic universals – the verb and the adjective (sharing the grammatical categories of the noun). Its verbal properties are expressed by the grammatical categories of *aspect, voice, tense*, and the syntactic relationship of *government*. The adjectival properties are expressed through the categories of *gender* and *case*. A common verbal, adjectival, and nominal category is the category of *Number*.

In different languages, the participles have a different set of verbal and adjectival/nominal categories. The Old English and Old Bulgarian participles distinguish only 2 grammemes of the grammatical category of tense – present and past. Linguistic systems distinguishing the grammatical category of voice have active and passive participles. The active participles in Old Bulgarian are 3: one present and two past ones – past active I participle and past active II participle, whereas the passive ones are 2: present and past. The participles in Old English do not distinguish the grammatical category of voice and therefore manifest only temporal characteristics and comprise just 2 members: one present and one past.

The two past active participles in Old Bulgarian differ as to in their forms due to the presence or absence of the grammatical category of case distinguished by the past active I participle and not distinguished by the past active II one.

The participles have two main functions – **attributive** and **predicative**. **The attributive participle** bears the properties of an adjective and functions as an attribute – it has a regulated position in relation to the noun it modifies and agrees with it in gender, number and case.

The participle, like the adjective, can be substantivized.

The predicative participle is used alone or combined with a finite verb. The finite verb may be either auxiliary or non-auxiliary. In the predicative function, participles express various grammatical categories, of which the universal ones are *voice* and *tense/aspect*.

Relatively independent is the use of the participle as a predicative – after verbs other than auxiliaries.

Participles are used as predicates in the **absolute constructions**, typical for ancient languages – the Old English and Old Bulgarian *Dativus Absolutus*.

Particular attention deserve the analytic constructions *be + past participle* with the indexes **d/t** and **en** in Old English and their counterparts in Old Bulgarian, which are also formed by *be* and a participle with the indexes **l, t** or **n** and **m**.

In addition to the auxiliary *be* participles with the indexes **d/t** and **en** are also combined with the possessive verb *have*. In the construction with the verb *have* the participles agree with the object. The reduction of the nominal categories of gender, case, number distinguished by the participle, and the changes in the word order, which demonstrate the changes in the type of the participle's binding, indicate its inclusion in a morphological analytic construction consisting of one component with grammatical inflection and another one that tends to a form with reduced expression of grammatical categories.

The two types of analytic constructions *be + part.* and *have + part.* have developed into 2 of the most important linguistic categories – the perfect and the passive.

The Past Participle in Old English

Formation. The past participles with the suffixes *-ed*, *-en*, *-t* take its origin in the Proto-Indo-European language, where they were verbal adjectives not distinguishing the category of voice. O. Szemerényi notes that the suffixes **-to* and **-no* were often used with an active meaning (Szemerényi 2002: 337 – 338).

Usage. The past participle was inflected as a strong adjective, but it was formed from a past verb stem. Hence, it is difficult to determine whether it is a verbal adjective or a verb with adjectival functions (Smith 2009: 84).

Callaway (1901: 142, as cited in Mitchell 1985: 413) argues the adjectival characteristics of the Old English past participle are stronger than those of the present participle, since the present participle can take an object, while the past participle cannot. Participles of intransitive verbs do not take objects to begin

with, and those of transitive verbs are passive and for this reason cannot take an object, as well (Mitchell 1985: 413).

The past participles in Old English have the following functions:

1)   Attributive – they often precede the noun and are declined to agree with the noun they modify in gender, number and case. Although seldom, they take degrees of comparison (Mitchell 1985: 413).

2)   Substantival – rarely noted and commented on. Mitchell calls it a independent usage. The participle *gecoren* 'beloved, loved' is an example of such a usage (Mitchell 1985: 414).

3)   Predicative – most often in combination with the verbs *bēon/wesan, weorþan* and *habban*. Past participles were used predicatively (or appositively) with verbs of motion, of resting, of seeming and continuing (Mitchell 1985: 413).

The predicative use of participles should be divided into two subtypes – the use of the participle as a predicative and the use of the participle in combination with the verbs *bēon/wesan*, *weorþan* and *habban* in analytic constructions that express a perfect active or perfect passive meaning.

In the construction *bēon/wesan + past participle*, the participle may be formed from a transitive or intransitive verb. The verb *be*, on the other hand, can be in the present (forms of the root **es*) or past tense. The present conjugation of *bēon* also has a future meaning.

When the past participle is within an analytic construction of the *bēon/wesan/weorþan + past participle* type, especially in earlier texts, it agrees with the subject or object depending on its meaning – whether it is active or passive. Later, when the participle began to be accepted as part of the verb form, it stopped agreeing with the nouns in the sentence.

In combination with a noun or a pronoun, the participle can be a part of an absolute construction (*Dativus Absolutus*).

Past Participles in Old Bulgarian

There are 3 past participles in Old Bulgarian. The historically older past passive participle is formed with the same formants as the Old English past participle, and the past active II participle is considered a Proto-Slavic innovation. In the excerpted material, the past passive participles are the predominant functional equivalents of the Old English past participle.

Past Passive Participle

Formation. Like the Old English past participles, the Old Bulgarian past passive participles took their origin in the Proto-Indo-European adjectives formed using **-to-* and **-no-*. The dominant index of the past passive participles is *n* – слꙑшанъ, вльчєнъ, etc. The older type of past passive participle is considered to be the one with the index *t* – бнтъ, пожрътъ, прострѣтъ, трътъ.

Some verbs can form past passive participles both with the index *t* and with the index *n* – вити (витъ and виѥнъ), etc. (Slavova 2017: 375).

Usage. Unlike the active participles, which can be used independently, the passive participles cannot, except in cases of substantivizaton, ellipsis, or in an absolute construction.

Like the past participle in Old English, the past passive participle in Old Bulgarian has 3 main functions:

1)   Attributive. It is combines with a noun with which it agrees in gender, number and case. Used attributively it can also occur in a compound form. In its attributive use the past passive participles in Old Bulgarian translates Greek adjectives. Often past passive participles used attributively are listed as adjectival participles in the Old Bulgarian Dictionary – especially when they contain the negative particle нє-.

2)   Substantival. The participle is most often a compound form, which from a modern point of view parallels a form modified by the definite article.

3)   Predicative. The combinations of бъіти with *past passive participles* are categorized as two types: compound nominal predicates, and passive analytic constructions. The past passive participles whose counterparts in Greek are adjectives are regarded as compound nominal predicates (see Havranek 1963: 95).

We believe that the analytic construction бъіти + *past passive participle* of a transitive verb denotes passive voice, which we regard as one of the grammemes of the category of the perfect – посъланъ ѥсмь, нзгънанъ бѫдетъ.

In addition to the verb *be*, the past passive participles also combine with the verb *have*. There are no analytic constructions of the *have + past passive part.* type in Old Bulgarian. In sentences with *have*, the used past passive participle determines the direct object and agrees with it in gender, number, and case.

Although there are no cases in Old Bulgarian in which the participle is not in agreement with the object, the presence of examples such as *имам дойдено*, etc. in the Western Bulgarian and Thracian dialects suggests that at a certain stage in the development of the Bulgarian language such analytic constructions appeared and became established, which is evident from their range of distribution and their preservation to the present day.

When the participle in the *have + past passive participle* construction is a transitive verb's participle that is in agreement with the object, it is ambiguous to perceive – whether it is in an attributive function, an attribute of the object, or in a predicative function in an analytic construction with a meaning synonymous with that of the present resultative. However, the view that these constructions represent the initial stage of grammaticalization of the perfect forms with *have* is prevalent among scholars. At the same time, in the above-mentioned dialects, forms of the *have + past passive participle* type with participles of transitive and intransitive verbs are found only in neuter, singular, and these constructions are regarded as expressing present resultative.

We consider these constructions to be a manifestation of the category of the perfect which expresses the state of the verbal subject.

In addition to the uses listed, the past passive participle in Old Bulgarian, like the past participle in Old English, can participate in the absolute construction (*Dativus Absolutus*), which also denotes a state.

The Old Bulgarian past passive participle is similar in its way of formation and usage to the Old English past participle. We find common developmental tendencies with both participles.

The Past Active II Participle in Old Bulgarian

A. Meillet thinks the participle with the index *l* had a predicative function. J. Kuryłowicz assumes that "the primary usage of the Indo-European verbal adjectives with the suffix *-l* (*lo*) was intransitive-passive, and their transitive usage was a later phenomenon" (Kuryłowicz 1972, as cited in Dzhelyova 2000:82).

Formation. The index *l* of past active II participle also characterizes the Proto-Slavic nouns of the nomina agentis and nomina instrumentalis types. The index *l* is also found in names of the nomina acti type, in which it denotes "a feature acquired from an object that cannot be changed" (Dzhelyova 2000: 79). Thus, what these names have in common with the past active II participle is that the index *l* in them denotes center and possession of a permanent feature.

The index *l* was added to the infinitive base of verbs.

Usage. The main use of the past active II participle is as a predicative – it combines with the verb бъіти to form perfect, pluperfect, futurum exactum, and conditional mood forms.

The past active II participle rarely occurs in attributive function. In these cases, it is formed from intransitive verbs – ꙁьрѣлъ, etc. (Славова 2017: 352).

The predominant predicative usage – the analytic perfect and pluperfect forms, the futurum exactum and the conditional mood forms – A. Davidov regards as new formations that arose on Slavic soil (Davidov 1991: 299).

Most authors who describe the perfect focus on its ability to express a state or a result, or both. Davidov is no exception – in his view, the perfect expresses "a state that is present at the moment of speaking and is the result of an action performed in the past" (Davidov 1991: 299). We believe resultativeness is not the invariant meaning of the perfect (see Marovska 2005). Similarly to the Old Indo-European perfect, we assume that the Old Bulgarian perfect denotes a state of the verb subject. The state follows from a feature acquired by it from its own or from another's activity. The feature acquired by the subject is its past, present or future characteristic, expressed at the grammatical level by the pluperfect, perfect or futurum exactum forms – бѣахѫ видѣли, пришьлъ есмь, родили сѧ бѫдемъ.

Another analytic construction involving the past active II participle is the conditional mood – бимь писалъ, бъіхъ писалъ, whose meaning we regard as a potential manifestation of a feature acquired by the grammatical subject.

The relationship between the past passive participle and the past active II participle is obvious. The two participles have similar functions: they participate in the active and passive variants of the same analytic constructions. Thus, in our opinion, it seems logical that they participate in the paradigm of one and the same category.

The Past Participle in Old English and its Counterparts in Old Bulgarian

In our opinion, the past participles in Old English and Old Bulgarian denote ***an acquired unchangeable feature, identical with or inseparably belonging to its bearer***.

The past participles combined with the verbs *be* and *have* in Old English and Old Bulgarian have the same indexes – in Old English *-(e)d, -t, -(e)n* and in Old Bulgarian – *-t* and *-n*. In Old Bulgarian, besides the two past participle indexes mentioned above, there is one more – the index *l* which occurs in the past active II participle.

ANALYTIC CONSTRUCTIONS WITH THE VERBS *BE* AND *HAVE* AND A PAST PARTICIPLE

We have established that the verbs *be* and *have* can be used synonymously in certain cases. The similarity between the analytic constructions in which they participate in the two languages is also obvious. We believe they follow a common path of typological development. Hence, the active perfect and the passive forms must be united within a single category. We regard the formal and semantic similarities between the two analytic constructions as an ample justification for their integration into a single category. Both the perfect active and the passive constructions denote a feature inseparably belonging to the subject.

In active perfect forms, the feature comes into being as a consequence of an activity on the part of the subject (i.e. the bearer of the feature), while in passive forms, it is the consequence of an outside activity (in the broadest sense). In most cases, the activity is on the part of another person.

E. Benveniste provides examples from Armenian, Latin and Greek in which it is quite difficult to distinguish if a construction has active or passive semantics (Benveniste 1974: 218 – 221). We believe the author's reasoning and examples serve as additional proof of the links between the active perfect forms and the passive forms. The fact that similar constructions coexist in other languages, as well, suggests a common typology of the perfect forms.

Bēon/*wesan* + Past Participle with Perfect and Pluperfect Semantics

In addition to the verb *habban* the past participle forms active perfect and pluperfect forms with *bēon/wesan*, and less frequently with *weorþan*. These verbs can combine with both personal and impersonal and intransitive verbs.

The various authors attribute different status to constructions consisting of *bēon/wesan* and a past participle. Mustanoja reckons that *bēon/wesan* acquires the status of an auxiliary verb used for the expression of perfect and pluperfect meanings (Mustanoja 1960: 500 – 501). Lussky also holds that constructions of the *bēon/wesan + past participle* type acquire the status of analytic constructions (Lussky 1922: 67), and Hoffmann devises several criteria by means of which one could determine if the participle has an adjectival or a verbal status (Hoffmann 1934: 15 – 16). Hoffmann still concludes that *bēon/wesan + past participle* is not an analytic construction, the participle is adjectival, and the verb *bēon/wesan* does not have the status of an auxiliary (Hoffmann 1934: 46).

Mitchell is skeptical and refuses to believe that the construction becomes grammaticalized at any time of the development of the English language. He thinks that what *bēon/wesan + past participle* denotes first and foremost is a state (Mitchell 1985: 304).

E. Traugott and J. Smith agree the participle's inflections prove it originally had an adjectival status. In Traugott's view, however, in Old English the status of the *bēon/wesan + past participle* constructions was at least partially redefined.

Another researcher who makes note of the fact that some of the adjectival features of the participles in these constructions were dropped in the Old English period is Ya. Chankova (2014: 86). The author also highlights the fact that the grammaticalization of the *habban + past participle* model for the expression of perfect and pluperfect semantics is probably the reason why the constructions of the *bēon/wesan + past participle* type with the same meaning when used with participles of intransitive verbs seem to be left on the periphery of scholarly interests (Chankova 2014: 79). There is no discussion of when these constructions actually became grammaticalized, perhaps because some scholars believe that they never reached that stage. Ya. Chankova lays emphasis on the fact that the relationship between the active *bēon/wesan + past participle* constructions and the passive constructions has not been sufficiently addressed in the scientific literature (Chankova 2014: 79).

In the present thesis we argue that the active and passive forms with *bēon/wesan* and a *past participle* actually belong to the category of the perfect and that there exist active and passive perfect forms in Old English and Old Bulgarian.

Bēon/wesan + Past Participle with Passive Semantics

The verbs *bēon*, *wesan* and *weorþan*, besides being used in the construction with active perfect meaning, are also found in the passive analytic constructions.

The passive voice in Proto-Indo-European was inflectional, but as many authors note, the only remnants of such synthetic forms in Old English are the singular form *hatte* and the plural form *hatton* (Traugott 1992: 198).

Mitchell reports that the constructions of the *bēon/wesan/weorþan + past participle* type are the predecessor of the present-day passive constructions (Mitchell 1985: 305).

The author divides the analytic passive forms into groups according to several criteria. First, they can be personal and impersonal. The next classification is based on semantics – whether the forms denote an action or a state. The third possible division is based on the nature of the doer – the doer can be a person or a non-person, the doer can also be explicitly stated or not (Mitchell 1985: 306).

B. Mitchell shows a synthesized paradigm of the passive forms. It includes the following forms: present indicative; present subjunctive; imperative; past indicative; past subjunctive; uninflected infinitive after and adjective; uninflected infinitive after modal verbs; accusative and infinitival constructions (Mitchell 1985: 307 – 309). The author explains the absence of progressive passive verb forms, perfect passive verb forms, combinations of perfect passive verb forms with modal verbs, as well as grammaticalized progressive "tenses" with the lack of participles like *been* and *being* in Old English (Mitchell 1985: 309).

We have an alternative take on the perfect passive forms. We believe that transitive verbs have both active and passive (plu)perfect forms, and that the voice opposition is as follows: *hæfþ gedone – is gedone*; *hæfde gedone – wæs gedone*. The *biþ gedone* type can have the semantics of a passive futurum exactum.

The status of the participle in the passive construction is a matter of debate. According to some scholars (e.g. Mustanoja 1960: 440) the participle in Old English has the status of a predicative adjective, but it gradually loses its adjectival characteristics, and according to others the participle bore verbal characteristics even at that time. B. Mitchell still draws the conclusion that the problem of determining whether a participle is adjectival, or not, is one that probably has no true solution or significance (Mitchell 1985: 315).

There is no consensus among the authors on the question whether there are passive perfect forms in Old English. Some authors (e.g. Flamme 1885: 39, etc.) classify only forms containing present tense forms of the verb *be* as perfect forms. Wülfing (1888: & 405 – 406), however, lists forms of the *bēon/wesan in past tense + past participle* type as pluperfect forms. B. Mitchell holds that formally there are no forms for the passive perfect and pluperfect in Old English, but admits that the forms of the *bēon/wesan in present tense + past participle* are capable of expressing perfect passive meaning (Mitchell 1985: 233).

The same way as with the constructions with active semantics, researchers suggest that the frequent agreement of the participle in the passive constructions is indicative of the participle's predicative rather than verbal functions. There are, however, examples of uninflected participles (Mitchell, Robinson 2012: 104). E. Traugott argues that in its grammaticalization the analytic passive has undergone

developmental processes similar to those of the active perfect verb forms – the participle which was originally an adjective with a predicative function gradually becomes part of the verbal phrase (Traugott 1992: 199).

We consider forms like *is gedone*, *wæs gedone* and *biþ gedone* to be passive forms of the perfect, pluperfect, and futurum exactum. This view is based not only on the formal similarities between the two types of constructions, but also on the fact that the invariant meaning of the passive constructions is similar to that which has already been proposed for the perfect – in both cases there is a relationship of identity between the grammatical subject and the feature expressed by the participle. The difference between the active and the passive perfect is that in the former the grammatical subject is the bearer of a feature acquired through its own activity, while in the latter it is the bearer of a feature acquired through external influence.

Бъіти + Past Passive Participle

Combinations with forms of бъіти/бъівати and the past passive participle in the role of periphrastic passive constructions can be found as far back as the earliest Old Bulgarian written records.

Havranek does not consider even constructions of the бъіти + *past passive participle* type, which are not compound nominal predicates, as grammaticalized passives. He tends to agree with Potebnja, according to whom these combinations still remain compound nominal predicates (Havranek 1963: 95). Havranek adds that they are not precisely defined as to their lexico-grammatical belonging, their aspect and their tense. The interpretation of the examples he gives with forms of the verb бъіти and *past passive participles* is governed by the idea that past passive participles are old verbal adjectives which are incorporated into the verbal system and which gradually acquire the verbal categories. The author considers the structures with participles to be attributive in syntactic terms – they are attributes to nouns or are included in compound nominal predicates.

B. Havranek turns to the impersonal passives, as well. He defines the impersonal passives as passive in a broad sense as they do not refer to a subject. The participles in them are derived from transitive and intransitive verbs when their meaning lacks the idea of purpose of the action (Havranek 1963: 87 – 88).

In the constructions of the бъіти + *past passive participle* type there appear participles deriving from reflexive verbs – e.g. осклавленъ from осклавити са.

Although B. Havranek provides a potential example of the use of a past passive participle derived from an intransitive verb with active semantics (что оуво приспѣни ли въіхомъ Slepcha Apostle), the author holds that the limited occurrence of such forms in Old Bulgarian and Old Russian casts a shadow on the idea that they existed as early as Proto-Slavic. Meanwhile, however, such forms

are widespread in Old Czech and Old Serbo-Croatian and they are probably not newly formed forms (Havranek 1963: 85).

In the Bulgarian Thracian dialects there is a construction of the *be + past passive participle* type, in which the participle has lost its passive voice determinacy and the meaning of the construction is equated with that of the active forms of the perfect: *мòже да е излèзена* (Kayadzhik, Didymoteicho Region), etc. (Boyadzhiev 2012: 414).

We believe that the presence of past passive participles with active semantics in the Bulgarian dialects, as well as the examples presented by Havranek (although isolated) prove that there was such a phenomenon in the language. The examples also confirm that the participles formed with the help of the suffixes **-no* and **-to* were originally indifferent to diathesis.

The analytic constructions with past passive participles can be combined with modal or phase verbs to form compound verbal predicates. This phenomenon is attested in Old English, as well.

Combinations of the past passive participle and an active participle of бъіти are also attested in Old Bulgarian – e.g. въпрошенъ же бъівъ… Lk 17.20.

B. Havranek highlights the relationship between the active perfect forms and the *be + past passive participle* type (Havranek 1963: 88 – 90). Iv. Dobrev considers the forms посъланъ естъ and посъланъ бѣ as a passive past indefinite tense and a passive long past tense (i.e. perfect and pluperfect) (Dobrev 1991: 261). A.-M. Totomanova also believes that the predicative uses of the past active II and the past passive participle within constructions of the *be + participle* type bring the two types of participles closer together (Totomanova 2014: 77).

All in all, we believe that the reasoning presented here convincingly demonstrates the similarities between the Old English past participles and the Old Bulgarian past passive participles. We can conclude that the participles in question, as well as the constructions in which they participate, are undergoing grammaticalization, and the categories of voice and taxis (in Old English aspect) are being established. This situation is a reflection of the transition of the linguistic system from a typologically active one which does not possess the category of voice or the possessive verb *have* to a typologically nominative one with an established voice category and with a possessive verb like *have* which is used not only as a lexeme but as a grammatical device as well.

Бъіти + Past Active II Participle

In describing the perfect and its uses, most researchers focus on its distinct features in relation to the aorist. Vaillant even attempts to explain the fact that the predominantly attested perfect forms are 2nd p. sg. with the homonymy between the 2nd and 3rd p. sg. aorist forms. Meanwhile, the author also provides examples in which the aorist forms are used freely. The fact that the perfect is used to denote a state in the present which arises as a result of a past action, and the aorist is used

to denote an action performed in the past, is pointed out as the major semantic difference between the aorist and perfect forms (Vaillant 1952: 382).

P. Kuznetsov assumes that the difference between aorist and perfect is stylistic (Kuznetsov 1961: 83). Yu. Maslov believes that as early as the preliterate period a process of obliteration of the specific meaning of the perfect began, and that there are examples of synonymous usages of the aorist and the perfect in the earliest manuscripts (Maslov 1984: 39). M. Shevelyova regards the aorist as an indefinite preterite whose use with meaning synonymous to that of the perfect was possible in direct speech (Shevelyova 2009: 152).

A.-M. Totomanova observes that resultativieness is the meaning most often attributed to the perfect (Totomanova 2009: 169). There are also researchers with alternative views – I. K. Bunina thinks that it links a past action with the present moment (Bunina 1959: 75, as cited in Totomanova 2009: 169). Totomanova herself supports the hypothesis of the resultative meaning of the perfect, she even believes that this meaning is the reason why the perfect was preserved and it did not evolve into a simple preterite in Bulgarian (Totomanova 2009: 173 – 174). T. Slavova holds that the perfect denotes the result/state of a past action at the moment of speaking, it does not denote the action itself (Slavova 2017: 357). A. Izotov also believes that it is not only the action but its result that is important in the perfect. However, Izotov's understanding is that the forms of the perfect are closer to those of the present tense than to the aorist ones. (Izotov 2010: 81).

Plungian and Urmanchieva do not consider resultativeness as the primary meaning of the perfect. In the authors' opinion, *the perfect has above all characterizing and existential functions* (Plungian, Urmanchieva 2017: 50 – 51).

V. Marovska holds that with the perfect forms the speaker qualifies the subject of the verb by attributing to it the *acquired experience* (*competence*) feature. The perfect has voice variants and thus the subject's acquired experience can refer to the doing or the receiving of the action (Marovska 2005: 227). The perfect forms are active if they are made up of a past perfective active participle and passive if they are made up of a past passive participle (Marovska: 228).

We believe that the category of the perfect expresses *a state – the existence* of the subject of the verb, which is expressed through *its inherent features*, properties and the relationships in which it enters at a certain stage of its being.

The notion of existence as a state predetermine the use of the verbs *be* and *have*. The expression of the feature acquired by the subject is accomplished through the *l*-participle, if the feature is the result of an activity on the part of the subject of the verb, or through the participles with the indexes *n* or *t*, if it is not known whether the subject of the verb has or has not been active, and thus the feature is the result of an external influence. This state of affairs is characteristic of the Slavic languages.

In the Old Bulgarian analytic perfect constructions two grammemes can be distinguished – an active perfect that consists of *be* + *l*-participle and a passive perfect derived from *be* and a participle with an *n* or *t* index. The analytic perfect

construction was being established in Old Bulgarian. The few attested examples of pluperfect, futurum exactum and futurum exactum praeteriti forms indicate that they were at the beginning of their development in Old Bulgarian.

Habban + Past Participle

There is no unanimous opinion about the period in which the perfect and the pluperfect forms with the verb *have* became fully grammaticalized in the English language – according to some researchers this happened as early as the Old English period, and according to others – in the 12th – 13th or 16th century. There are also opinions that in the Old English period the constructions of the *habban + past participle* type were simple syntactic phrases that became analytic constructions later on.

It is believed that the forms for the possessive perfect originated from the verbal phrases of the *habban + object + past participle* type. Originally participles were formed only from transitive verbs and they had "adjectival characteristics" (Chankova 2014: 62). It is presumed that in the archetype of the present-day perfect the participle was inflected and it agreed with the object (most often in the accusative case). It probably had passive semantics and performed an object-predicative function. However, the participle could also be uninflected and it had more of an adverbial function. It is generally accepted that the latter type of construction was crucial in the development of the perfect and the pluperfect forms (Yartseva (ed.) 1977: 32, as cited in Chankova 2014: 63).

Most authors who deal with the constructions of the *habban + past part.* type focus on the form of the participle itself – whether it is inflected or not. The presence or absence of inflections in the participles are interpreted as different stages in the grammaticalization of the forms.

Although Mitchell discusses in detail the various word order combinations of the verb *have*, the participle, and the complement, as well as the presence and absence of case inflections, he believes the inflected participle does not always have adjectival functions and the intransitive participle does not always have verbal functions. The participle's position with regard to the object does not prove its adjectival or verbal status either (Mitchell 1985: 293 – 294). Mitchell, however, agrees with authors like Visser, in whose opinion the perfect forms began to be used exactly as the modern ones only after Shakespeare's time – that is, we cannot speak of a grammaticalized perfect with *have* in Old English (Mitchell 1985: 298).

E. Traugott has the opposite view – she argues the prevalence of uninflected participles, as well as the uses of *habban* with participles of intransitive verbs and with non-accusative participles of transitive verbs, indicate that the verb *habban* served as an auxiliary as early as the Old English period (Traugott 1992: 191).

R. Hogg thinks that the word order of the verb *have*, the participle and the object cannot serve as conclusive evidence in favour of or against the idea that these constructions were grammaticalized, since different syntactic principles operate in all attested models (Hogg 2002: 89 – 92). Still, the author suggests that

the construction has embarked on the path of grammaticalization, since combinations of uninflected and inflected participles occur.

Many authors believe that in Old English the adjectival functions of the participle are not infrequently predominant (see Traugott 1992: 191, Hogg 2002: 79). R. Hogg holds that the parallel use of inflected and uninflected forms can be taken as the initial stage of a change in the functions of participles – from primarily adjectival ones to verbal ones (Hogg 2002: 79).

There is also disagreement as to the status of the *habban + past participle* constructions in Old English. According to some (Brinton 1988: 100 – 102, etc.) even the earliest attested examples of the construction are actually forms of the perfect. Rastorgueva, on the other hand, thinks that they became true (plu)perfect forms as late as the 17th century (Rastorgueva 1983: 259 – 260, 269 – 271).

As for the semantic scheme of development of these constructions, most authors propose similar models. Visser suggests that the transformation of the *habban + past participle* forms into the perfect involves the following semantic scheme: 'to have something in a particular state' → 'state as a result of a previous action' → 'completed action' (Visser 1973: 2189). Rastorgueva proposes a similar scheme, but with some modifications (Расторгуева 1989: 269 – 270). The authors assume that the same mechanisms were at work in the grammaticalization of pluperfect forms (Chankova 2014: 63 – 64).

There are also different opinions on the rates at which the grammaticalization of the *habban + past participle* constructions takes place: according to most authors (including B. Hristov 2020: 35) the static possessive meaning of *habban + past participle* is gradually replaced by a dynamic one. Thus, the construction of the *have + object + participle object complement* type becomes an analytic construction expressing a (plu)perfect meaning. At the same time, Lightfoot believes that auxiliary verbs (including *habban*) emerged in a sudden and unmotivated way only in early Modern English – 16th c. (Lightfoot 1979: 99). Ya. Chankova presents 12 representative examples that illustrate the different stages of grammaticalization of *habban + past participle* that occur in Old English (Chankova 2014: 82 – 83). The author's analysis shows that constructions of the *habban + past participle* type often express connotations like *'the result of a previous situation'* and *'the precedence of a situation in relation to another one'*. This suggests that the process of their semantic differentiation had already begun at that point (Chankova 2014: 111).

We believe that in the Old English period, and even today, more than one construction with the verb *have* and a past participle can be found in the language and they represent different grammaticalization stages of (plu)perfect forms. In fact, it is normal for expressions from previous stages of the development of a language unit to be preserved in a language in the process of grammaticalization. We agree with authors arguing that in Old English there were uses of *habban + past participle* semantically very similar to those of the (plu)perfect.

Constructions of the *Have + Past Passive Participle* Type in Old and Modern Bulgarian

It is believed that Vl. Georgiev was the first to bring up the question of the emergence of new forms for the past resultative with the verb *have* and *past passive participle* (Georgiev 1985: 113). In fact, they were discussed in *Grammar with Church Slavonic Readings. For the second year of the vernacular grammar schools* as early as 1932. A. Teodorov-Balan also treats *have + past passive part.* as a special type of construction (see Teodorov-Balan 1940: 330, 1957: 26 – 27). The author observes the fact that a large part of the Bulgarian dialect area makes use of similar constructions.

Vl. Georgiev considers the forms of the *have + past passive participle* type as analogous to the Old Greek and Latin perfects, since they denote past actions, the result of which is actual in the present (Georgiev 1985: 122).

Vl. Georgiev's views are subject to criticism based on his own reasoning – the verb *have* often retains its meaning (i.e. it does not have the status of an auxiliary), and the participle is sometimes more closely related to the object than to the verb *have*. Georgiev also cites examples in which the meaning of the verb *have* has been blurred and it is more of an auxiliary (Georgiev 1985: 122).

There are different opinions about the origin of the Bulgarian constructions of the *have + past passive participle* type. G. Popova speculates about a Romanian influence (Popova 1931: 490 – 501), Havranek – about a Romance influence (Havranek 1937: 76), etc. Only L. Miletich favours the hypothesis of independent development (Miletich 1936: 206, as cited in Georgiev 1985: 125).

T. Boyadzhiev points out the presence of numerous examples of *have + past passive participle* attested in Western and Eastern Thrace – e.g. *йà ѝмах пъмỳк сèену* (Yaylagün, Malgar). The author believes that these constructions are synonymous with the perfect, pluperfect, and futurum exactum forms, since they "can denote both an action and a result that is not expressed in a specific morphological way" (Boyadzhiev 2012: 412). Within the construction *have* is an auxiliary verb with reduced semantics, and the participle has lost its voice differentiation (Boyadzhiev 2012: 413). The fact that the meaning of the whole *have + past passive participle* construction is not the sum of the meanings of the individual components, according to T. Boyadzhiev, also proves its status as an analytic form.

The Old Bulgarian language researchers who comment on the *have + past passive participle* constructions are K. Mirchev, Iv. Haralampiev and D. Ivanova-Mircheva. K. Mirchev expresses the opinion that they must not be distinguished as a separate "tense", for they have passive semantics and no grammar of Old Bulgarian or Greek distinguishes them as special forms. The author assumes that forms like *имам писано* emphasize the possession of the result of an activity performed by someone else (Mirchev 1976: 313 – 314). Although he notes that in many of Vl. Georgiev's examples the subject of these constructions may not be

the doer of the action, and that this also proves that they are not grammaticalized, K. Mirchev nevertheless admits that there is a possibility for them to be "transitive types" (Mirchev 1976: 315). Ivanova-Mircheva and Haralampiev treat *have + past passive part.* as synonyms for the perfect (Ivanova-Mircheva, Haralampiev 1999: 140).

B. Hristov also notes that constructions of the *have + past passive participle* type are not grammaticalized (Hristov 2020: 247). According to him, the stages of grammaticalization of the Bulgarian constructions are the same as the ones in English. Hristov thinks that in literary Bulgarian there are two more steps to be taken so as to argue that the *have + past passive participle* construction is fully grammaticalized – namely, it must extend its usages to intransitive verbs and inanimate subjects (Hristov 2020: 256).

Hristov admits that the emergence of these constructions may be the result of language contact, but it would be rather difficult to prove this hypothesis empirically, as *have + past passive participle* forms are scattered all over Europe. The author points out that the construction's predominant concentration around Western Europe provides further evidence in favour of the hypothesis of Western European and/or Greek influence (Hristov 2020: 269 – 270).

Meanwhile, however, forms for the possessive perfect do exist in Armenian and Old Persian, as well. In our view, the presence of the possessive perfect in modern European languages, in addition to Armenian and Old Persian, which retain many of the features of the Proto-Indo-European language, rather speaks of common typological features – perhaps each of the modern Indo-European languages has the potential to develop and grammaticalize both a perfect with the verb *be* and a perfect with the verb *have*.

In conclusion, we clarify that in this chapter we do not claim that modern Bulgarian has fully grammaticalized forms of the *have + past passive participle* type, which are synonymous with the Slavic perfect type (*be + l-participle*). Rather, we agree with the authors who believe that such constructions do exist and that they are at a certain stage of their grammaticalization Furthermore, we believe that the development of forms for the possessive perfect in English and Bulgarian is not solely and exclusively due to the influence of third language(s). The ability of many Indo-European languages to develop such forms under certain favourable conditions is more of a typological feature.

The *Be + Past Participle* and *Have + Past Participle* Analytic Constructions in Old English and Old Bulgarian

One of the common trends in the study of the perfect active forms in Old English and Old Bulgarian is that they are taken as innovations for the respective language systems. The same opinion is held about the analytic passive forms.

We agree that constructions like *be + past participles* and *have + past participles* may not have fully established themselves as grammatical categories, but we believe that they are still analytic constructions.

We divide the analytic structures into *morphological* and *syntactic analytic structures*. The difference between the two types lies in the type of *binding*. In a morphological analytic structure, there is inseparable binding, which manifests itself in the semantic and grammatical constraints on the functioning of the two components. In syntactic analytic structures the binding is free. One of the components is a specific lexeme or a very restricted range of lexemes, while the other one has a broad lexical base and is usually represented by an invariable form (see Dzhelyova 2011 and Dzhelyova 2019: 51).

In general, we believe that in both Old English and Old Bulgarian, the analytic constructions with the verbs *be* and *have* and past participles undergo a transition from syntactic analytic structures to morphological analytic structures. The transition can be observed both in terms of the lexical base from which the participles are formed, as well as in terms of the verbal and nominal categories they exhibit.

We presume that at first there were only forms of the *be + past participle* type, which were indeterminate as to the category of voice and could express both perfect and passive meanings depending on the context. Evidence supporting such a hypothesis can be found in both Old English and Bulgarian: in forms such as *wesan ġewanod*, which can have both active and passive semantics, and in constructions of the *be + participle with -n/-t*, which express an active perfect meaning in the Bulgarian Thracian dialects. Subsequently, due to this homonymy it became necessary to differentiate the forms with active and passive meanings – in English through the use of different auxiliary verbs, and in Bulgarian through participles which distinguish the category of voice. The fact of the matter is, however, that in the Bulgarian dialects we find such examples as *имам дойдено*, in which the participle with the index *n* has active semantics. Thus, we can conclude that Old English and Old Bulgarian exhibit typological closeness in rendering perfect active and perfect passive meaning.

Interesting patterns occur in the corpus under examination:
- in cases in which an analytic construction in Old English corresponds to an analytic one in Old Bulgarian, it is usually of the *be + past passive participle* type;
- the combinations *have + past participle* (with an inflected or uninflected participle) are limited in number.

The evidence and observations presented here prove, on the one hand, the typological similarities between the Old English and Old Bulgarian perfect constructions, andthe need for active perfect analytic constructions and passive analytic constructions to be considered together, on the other. The second claim is in agreement with the theoretical concepts of A. Vaillant (1952: 387), Iv. Dobrev (1982: 260 – 261), V. Marovska (2005: 94).

CONCLUSION

Having analyzed the empirical data and theoretical propositions regarding the common typological and the specific features in the development of the unrelated languages Old English and Old Bulgarian with regard to the use of the constructions formed by the verbs *be* and/or *have* and *past participles*, we can draw the following conclusion:

1. The verbs *be* and *have* have synonymous lexical meanings and identical functions. Both verbs denote *existence* and *state* and *possession*, meanings which have various degrees of overlapping in each language.

2. In both languages the past participles containing the *n* (*en*) and *d/t* (*ed*) indexes denote *a feature acquired by the verb subject as a result of external (sometimes internal as well) activity*.

3. In both languages the past participles (in Bulgarian the past passive participle) are combined with the verb *be*, and the verb *have*.

4. Even in the oldest written texts in the compared languages the invariant meaning of the constructions with *be* and *have* and *past participles* was *a state of the grammatical subject which is the bearer of a feature identical with it and/or inseparably belonging to it*. This invariant meaning corresponds to the category of the *perfect*. The category of the perfect includes all the suppletive forms of the verbs *be* and/or *have* and a past participle – pluperfect, futurum exactum, etc.

5. As definitions of perfect, pluperfect and futurum exactum we adopt A. Dzhelyova's definitions, which pertain to the same category but in Old Bulgarian (Dzhelyova 2019: 159 – 162). The same definitions can be applied to the Old English category, as well. In our opinion the perfect denotes a feature acquired by and identical with its bearer. The pluperfect denotes "a past manifestation of [an acquired] feature" of the grammatical subject, and futurum exactum denotes "a future manifestation of a feature" belonging to the grammatical subject.

6. The combinations of forms of the verb *be* and past participles undergo a transition – from syntactic analytic constructions to morphological analytic constructions which act as substitutes for the ancient synthetic perfect.

7. Both languages (each in its own way) have established a formal differentiation between the active and the passive forms of the *be + past participle* and *have + past participle* constructions – the Old English participle has remained indeterminate as to the category of voice and the voice differentiation has been accomplished by means of the employment of different auxiliary verbs whereas Old Bulgarian has kept the verb *be* as an auxiliary in the active and the passive constructions but pairs of active and passive participles have evolved in it.

The outlined common typological and specific characteristics of the analytic constructions with the verbs *be* and *have* and a *past participle* are only the first of a number of prospective studies of various grammatical phenomena in the two unrelated languages which descend from a common proto-language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY CITED IN THE DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Alekseev (ed.) 2005: Алексеев, А. А. *Евангелие от Матфея в славянской традиции*. Санкт-Петербург, 2005.

Asenova 2002: Асенова, П. *Балканско езикознание*. Велико Търново: Фабер, 2002.

Benveniste 1974: Бенвенист, Э. *Общая лингвистика*. Москва: Прогресс, 1974.

Boyadzhiev 2012: Бояджиев, Т. Аналитични форми с глагола имам в тракийските говори. // *Книжовен език и диалекти*. София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски", 2012.

Bunina 1959: Бунина, И. К. *Система времен старославянского глагола*. Москва: Издательство академии наук СССР, 1959.

Callaway 1901: Callaway, M. Jr. The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon. // *PMLA*, 1901, Vol. 16, No. 2, 141 – 360.

Campbell 1991: Campbell, A. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Chankova 2014: Чанкова, Я. Развитие на категорията перфект в стандартния английски език. Благоевград: УИ „Неофит Рилски", 2014.

Davidov 1991: Давидов, А. Минало неопределено време (перфект). // Дуриданов, Ив. (гл. ред.). *Граматика на старобългарския език*. София: БАН, 1991, 299.

Dobrev 1982: Добрев, Ив. *Старобългарска граматика. Теория на основите*. София: Наука и изкуство, 1982.

Dobrev 1991: Добрев, Ив. Вид на глагола и видови двойки. // Дуриданов, Ив. (гл. ред.). *Граматика на старобългарския език*. София: БАН, 1991, 262 – 267.

Dzhelyova 2000: Джельова, А. За огледалото и отраженията в езика. // *Изворът на нарцис*. Сборник научни статии. Съставители: Ив. Русков и Мл. Влашки. Пловдив: изд. „Страница", 2000.

Dzhelyova 2011: Джельова, А. Липсата на граници в езика и формално-типологичните ѝ прояви при простите езикови знакове морфема и дума. // *Следите на словото. Юбилеен сборник в чест на проф. д.ф.н. Диана Иванова*. Пловдив: Контекст, 2011.

Dzhelyova 2012: Джельова, А. Глагол быть – ядро языковой системы. // *Вісник Запорізького національного университету. Філологічні науки*, 2012, № 1.

Dzhelyova 2015: Джельова, А. *Типологична характеристика на глаголно-именните словосъчетания с родителен и с дателен падеж в старобългарския книжовен език*. Дисертация. Пловдив, 2015.

Dzhelyova 2019: Джельова, А. *Старобългарски език. Морфология*. Пловдив: УИ „Паисий Хилендарски", 2019.

Flamme 1885: Flamme, J. *Syntax der Bückling Homilies. Doktorschrift*. Bonn, 1885.

Georgiev 1985: Георгиев, Вл. *Проблеми на българския език*. София: БАН, 1985.

Havranek 1937: Havránek, B. *Genera verbi v slovanskych jazycích*. T. 2. Praha: Kr. Česká spol. nauk, 1937.

Havranek 1963: Гавранек Б. Залог (Genera Verbi) в старославянском языке в сравнительном плане. // *Исследования по синтаксису старославянского языка*. Прага, 1963, 15 – 100.

Hoffmann 1934: Hoffmann, G. *Die Entwicklung des umschriebenen Perfektums im Altenglischen und Frühmittelenglischen*. Ph.D. Thesis. Universität Breslau, 1934.

Hogg 2002: Hogg, R. *An Introduction to Old English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002.

Hristov 2020: Hristov, B. *Grammaticalising the Perfect and Explanations of Language Change: Have- and Be-Perfects in the History and Structure of English and Bulgarian*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2020.

Ivanova-Mircheva (ed.) 1999: Иванова-Мирчева, Д. *Старобългарски речник*. Том I. Отг. ред. Д. Иванова-Мирчева. София: Валентин Траянов, 1999.

Ivanova-Mircheva, Haralampiev 1999: Мирчева, Д., И. Харалампиев. *История на българския език*. Велико Търново: Фабер, 1999.

Izotov 2010: Изотов, А. И. *Старославянский язык в сравнительно-историческом освещении. Учебное пособие*. Москва: Азбуковник, 2010.

Kilpiö 1993: Kilpiö, M. Syntactic and Semantic Properties of the Present Indicative Forms of the Verb *to be* in Old English. // Rissanen, M., M. Kytö & M. Palander (eds.). *Early English in the Computer Age: Explorations through the Helsinki Corpus*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1993.

Kilpiö 1997: Kilpiö, M. On the Forms and Functions of the Verb *to be* from Old to Modern English. In: Rissanen, M., M. Kytö & K. Heikkonen (eds.). // *English in Transition. Corpus-Based Studies in Linguistic Variation and Genre Styles*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997.

Kurylowicz 1972: Kurylowicz, J. Miejsce aspektu w systemie koniugacyjnym. // *Symbolae polonicae in honorem Stanislai Jodlowski*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1972, 93 – 98.

Kuznetsov 1961: Кузнецов, П. С. *Очерки по морфологии праславянского языка*. Москва: Академия наук СССР, 1961.

Lightfoot 1979: Lightfoot, D. *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. Cambridge, 1979.

Lussky 1922: Lussky, G. F. The Verb Forms Circumscribed with the Perfect Participle in the Beowulf. // *Journal of English and Germanic Philology 21*. 1922, 32 – 69.

Małecki 1935: Małecki, M. Cechy bałkańskie w jezykach Macedonii. // *Sprawozdania*, PAU, XL, 2, 1935, 25 – 27.

Marovska 2005: Маровска, В. *Новобългарският перфект – функционални метаморфози и теоретични предизвикателства*. София: Ромина, 2005.

Maslov 1984: Маслов, Ю. С. *Очерки по аспектологии*. Ленинград: Издательство Ленинградского Университета, 1984.

McAnallen 2009: McAnallen, J. Developments in Predicative Possession in the History of Slavic. // *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 74. München – Berlin – Wien, 2009, 131 – 142.

Meillet 1924: Meillet, A. Le développement du verbe «avoir». // *Antidoron: Festschrift J. Wackernagel*. Gôttingen, 1924, 9 – 13.

Miletich 1936: Милетич, Л. *Македонски преглед*, год. 10. 1936.

Mirchev 1976: Мирчев, К. За съчетанията на глагол имам + минало страдателно причастие в български език. // Пашов, П., Р. Ницолова (съст.) *Помагало по морфология. Глагол*. София: Наука и изкуство, 1976.

Mitchell 1985: Mitchell, B. *Old English Syntax, Volume I: Concord, the Parts of Speech, and the Sentence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Mitchell, Robinson 2012: Mitchell, B., F. C. Robinson. *A Guide to Old English*. 8th Edition. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Mustanoja 1960: Mustanoja, T. F. *A Middle English Syntax*. Part 1. Helsinki: Société néophilologique, 1960.

Plungian, Urmanchieva 2017: Плунгян, В. А., А. Ю. Урманчиева. Перфект в старославянском: был ли он результативным?// *Slověne. International Journal of Slavic Studies*. Vol. 6, № 2. Москва: Московский педагогический государственный университет, 2017, с. 13 – 56.

Popova 1931: Попова, Г. Употреба на минало страдателно причастие с глагола „имам" в българския език. // *Известия на семинара по славянска филология*, 1931, кн. 7, 490 – 501.

Rastorgueva 1983: Rastorgueva, T. A. *A History of English*. Moscow: Vysshaja shkola (Высшая школа), 1983.

Shevelyova 2009: Шевелева, М. Н. «Согласование времен» в языке древнерусских летописей (к вопросу о формировании относительного употребления времен и косвенной речи в русском языке). // *Русский язык в научном освещении*, 2 (18), 2009, 144 – 174.

Slavova 2017: Славова, Т. *Старобългарски език*. Университетски учебник. София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски", 2017.

Smith 2009: Smith, J. J. *Old English: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Szemerényi 2002: Семреньи, О. *Введение в сравнительное языкознание*. Москва: УРСС, 2002.

Teodorov-Balan 1940: Теодоров-Балан, А. *Нова българска граматика*. София: Т. Ф. Чипев, 1940.

Teodorov-Balan 1957: Теодоров-Балан, А. Особит състав с глагола имам. // *Известия на института за български език*, 1957, кн. 5, 23 – 29.

Totomanova 2009: Тотоманова, А.-М. Към историята на българската темпорална система. // *Из история на българския език. Сборник статии*. София: ПАМ Пъблишинг Къмпани ООД, 2009, с. 169 – 175.

Totomanova 2014: Тотоманова, А.-М. Единството на българския книжовен и некнижовен език през X – XI век. // Попконстантинов, К., Тотоманова, А.-М. *Епохата на българския цар Самуил. Език и писменост*. София: АИ „Проф. Марин Дринов", 2014, 79 – 173.

Traugott 1992: Traugott, E. Syntax. // Hogg, R. (ed.). *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume 1: The Beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, 168 – 289.

Vaillant 1952: Вайан, А. *Руководство по старославянскому языку*. Москва, 1952.

Visser 1973: Visser, F. Th. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language. part 3. Syntactical Units with Two and with More Verbs*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.

Wischer 2008: Wischer, I. On the use of *beon* and *wesan* in Old English. // Lenker, U, J. Huber & R. Mailhammer (eds.). *English Historical Linguistics 2008*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008, pp. 217 – 236.

Wülfing 1888: Wülfing, J. E. *Darstellung Der Syntax In König Alfred's Übersetzung Von Gregor's Des Grossen Cura Pastoralis*. Inaugural-Dissertation. Bonn, 1888.

Yartseva (ed.) 1977: Ярцева, В. Н. (ред.). *Историко-типологическая морфология германских языков. Категория глагола*. Москва: Наука, 1977.

SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE DISSERTATION

1. A semantically accurate translation of liturgical texts (characteristic of textual linguistics) is introduced as a new possibility for the study of typological and specific grammatical phenomena.

2. The highest achievement of the classical scientific paradigm, the systemology, is united with the current field of synergetics which belongs to the post-neoclassical scientific paradigm.

3. The language systems of Old English and Old Bulgarian are presented as complex self-evolving systems. The analytic constructions with the verbs *be* and *have* and the *past participle* are interpreted according to the interactions and influences of linguistic phenomena varying as regards the time of their occurrence and the scope that they have, phenomena belonging to the main content (active, nominative) and formal (inflectional) language types.

4. High informativeness of the text – thorough knowledge of the theoretical perspectives on the problem. New connections and relations between existing grammatical phenomena have been outlined and these connections and relations have been interpreted.

5. The theories on the typology of The Perfect are supplemented by offering new solutions to controversial issues. The Perfect's invariant meaning is defined.

6. A logical and non-controversial point of view is presented. It traces phenomena and processes both universal and unique to each of the languages under consideration. The analytic verb constructions are studied and analyzed as a holistic union of stable and variable components.

7. New perspectives for comparative studies between Old English and Old Bulgarian – an underdeveloped but extremely fruitful research field – are opened up.

8. The theoretical perspective developed in the thesis is applicable to teaching practice and may facilitate students' perception of the complex phenomena of synthetism and analytism in language.

PUBLICATIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF THE PHD THESIS

1. **Anastasova, M.** English -able/-ible Adjectives and Their Counterparts in Bulgarian. // *Научни трудове на Съюза на учените в България – Пловдив. Серия А. Обществени науки, изкуство и култура, том IV* [Scientific works of the Union of Scientists in Bulgaria–Plovdiv, series A. Public sciences, art and culture, Vol. IV]. Пловдив, 2017. с. 8 – 13.

2. **Anastasova, M.** A Contrastive Analysis of the English Past Participle and the Bulgarian Past Passive Participle. // *Научни трудове*, том 55, кн. 1, сб. Б, 2017 – Филология. Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски" – България [Research papers, vol. 55, book 1, part B, 2017 – Languages and Literature. Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv – Bulgaria]. Пловдив, 2017, с. 136 – 146.

3. **Anastasova, M.** Глаголът *съм* в старобългарски и староанглийски език – лексикални и граматични особености. // *Славянски диалози*. Кн. 27. Пловдив: Университетско издателство „Паисий Хилендарски", 2021.

CONTENTS