

REVIEW STATEMENT

by Prof. Vera Tervel Marovska, DSc,
professor at the Department of Bulgarian Language
at the *Paisii Hilendarski* University of Plovdiv,
on the materials submitted
for the acquisition of the educational and scientific degree of *doctor*
at the *Paisii Hilendarski* University of Plovdiv;
in the Sphere of higher education 2. *Humanities*
Area of professional qualification 2.1. *Philology* (Germanic Languages: English Language)

Author: **Maria Ivanova Anastasova**

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

Supervisor: **Assoc. Prof. Antoaneta Stefanova Dzhelyova, PhD** (Department of General Linguistics and History of the Bulgarian Language, *Paisii Hilendarski* University of Plovdiv)

1. General overview of the submitted materials

Following Order № ПД-21-1381 from 20.07.2022 of the Rector of the *Paisii Hilendarski* University of Plovdiv (PU) I have been appointed a member of the scientific jury participating in the defense procedure for the acquisition of the educational and scientific degree of *doctor*, sphere of higher education 2. Humanities, area of professional qualification 2.1. *Philology*, Doctoral Programme: *Germanic Languages (English Language)*.

The author of the dissertation is *Maria Ivanova Anastasova* – an independent doctoral candidate at the Department of English Studies. The candidate's supervisor is Assoc. Prof. Antoaneta Stefanova Dzhelyova, PhD from the *Paisii Hilendarski* University of Plovdiv, Faculty of Philology, Department of General Linguistics and History of the Bulgarian Language.

The set of documents submitted by the doctoral candidate Maria Iv. Anastasova is in accordance with art. 36 (1) of the Rulebook for Development of the Academic Staff of Plovdiv University and comprises the following documents:

1. an application to the Rector of the University of Plovdiv for opening a doctoral dissertation defense procedure;
2. a Europass CV;
3. preliminary defense minutes from the extended Department meeting;
4. doctoral dissertation abstracts;

5. a declaration for originality and authenticity of the attached documents;
6. a reference form concerning the fulfillment of the minimal national requirements;
7. a list of scientific publications on the subject of the doctoral dissertation;
8. a doctoral dissertation;
9. copies of the scientific publications;
10. 3 sets containing documents 1 – 9 on paper;
11. 7 sets containing documents 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 on a digital source.

The doctoral candidate has attached 3 publications on the topic of the dissertation.

2. Brief autobiographical data concerning the doctoral candidate

Maria Ivanova Anastasova was born on 11.06.1990 in Asenovgrad.

The candidate finished the *Ivan Vazov* Language High School in Plovdiv in 2009. In 2013 she got her Bachelor's degree in English Studies, and in 2014 she obtained her Master's degree in English Studies (Linguistics and Translation) at the Faculty of Philology of the *Paisii Hilendarski* University of Plovdiv.

In 2012 and 2013 M. Anastasova was a trainee English teacher at the *Maximum* Language School in Plovdiv. From 2014 to 2016 she was a part-time assistant professor and since 2016 she has been a full-time assistant professor of English at the Department of English Studies at the University of Plovdiv. Her work as a lecturer shows that she is erudite and responsible, with exceptional self-restraint and discipline, and we can only wish for young people who decide to dedicate themselves to the teaching profession to possess such characteristics.

3. Relevance of the topic and appropriateness of the set aims and objectives

The dissertation includes an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion and references or 222 pages in total.

The study examines the emergence, the formation of variants with different auxiliary verbs, as well as the use of the constructions with the verbs *be* and *have* and past participles in Old English and Old Bulgarian. The research interest in this issue is triggered by the intriguing fact that there were identical constructions in two historico-etymologically quite distant languages, such as Old English and Old Bulgarian. The analytic constructions under scrutiny are the basis of the morphological categories of the perfect and the passive, two categories that bring the Bulgarian language closer to the Western European languages and distinguish it morphologically from the Slavic languages.

4. Knowledge of the problem

The references that Maria Anastasova has included in her work are about 200. The historical overviews presented in the dissertation prove the author's competence in analyzing the linguistic facts of the old stages in the development of the languages under investigation and her knowledge of the available literature.

The empirical source of the study is a corpus of material excerpted from the Old English Wessex Gospels and the Old Bulgarian Codex Marianus. The texts used are mainly those from the Gospel of Matthew, and the work is supplemented with examples from the other gospels as well.

5. Research methods

In view of the set objectives, the work employs a synchronic-diachronic approach suitable for describing, analyzing and systematizing linguistic facts both in synchronic (within one or two centuries) and in diachronic (throughout the historical development of the languages under study) terms.

In the concluding analysis, the historical-typological method is used, which facilitates the juxtaposition of individual linguistic phenomena in the general context both of cultural-historical processes and of the universal mental schemes which shape and reflect the specificity of natural languages.

6. Characteristics and evaluation of the dissertation

The significance of the differences being identified between the structures under consideration in historical and etymological terms, as well as their typological status, are highlighted from the very beginning of the study. This fact contributes to the work's clarity and lucidity.

The dissertation under review is among the best I have read in recent years. It is indicative of a creative maturity and determination that rarely characterize the work of our young colleagues. In the final drafting of her work, the author has disposed of quite a few pages of finished text (on Old English monuments and their relations with the Old Bulgarian ones, and some Latin and Old Greek originals), which have been evaluated as thematically different, and this is also a rare fact for a novice scholar. The foregoing contributes both to the flawlessness of the work in terms of composition and to the precise formulation of both the titles and the individual parts within the work.

I cannot help but mention the fact that such historical issues require competence that graduate students do not possess. M. Anastasova has realized this and has conscientiously and devotedly committed herself to acquiring the required literacy and awareness for her research,

including the Old Bulgarian language in practical and theoretical-interpretive, as well as formal-graphological terms. She is to be congratulated for this as one of our future extremely reliable colleagues.

Regarding the substance of M. Anastasova's work minor recommendations and remarks can be made. In most cases, however, they are not obligatory or imperative, but rather present another point of view and issues that can be discussed. What stance the doctoral candidate takes on them is her own decision.

One gets the impression from the examples that the process of grammaticalization of perfect constructions, regardless of which auxiliary verb they are formed with, is marked by the agreement of the participle with the object or with the subject, or by its lack of agreement, and this is valid for both languages.

As M. Anastasova notes herself (on pp. 94-95): "The similarity between the analytical constructions in which they (*be* and *have*) participate is evident in both languages. Based on these observations, we believe that they have a common typological development and that the active forms of the perfect and the forms for the passive voice should be united within a common category". In modern Bulgarian grammar they are unified and thus their paradigm seems logically organized, and this has the status of proof for their categorial character.

Testament to the high quality of Maria Anastasova's work is the doctoral candidate's aspiration to base her research on interpretations that are theoretically and methodologically up-to-date. This may be seen in her critical reviews of the literature on the issues she is interested in, but also in the theoretical assumptions in her research. The category of the perfect is seen and defined as independent and characteristically morphological, and the voice is naturally related to the common, usually called *resultative*, but essentially qualitative feature semantics of perfects. Thus the old disputes about the use and the translation of the aorist and the perfect become irrelevant; and Iv. Dobrev's explanation that the choice between one or the other is based on different authorial intentions or the sacrality of the message seems perfectly acceptable.

It is very appropriate that emphasis is laid on the influence of features such as personal : impersonal, animate : inanimate; action intrinsic to the grammatical subject : action extrinsic to the subject, etc., which influence and ultimately through lexical semantics specify the final grammatical semantics of the constructions with the verb *have* in Old Bulgarian and in Modern Bulgarian. In our view, they prove the unlikelihood that these verb combinations are currently undergoing grammaticalization, but are rather dialectal facts that are gradually becoming obsolete.

CONCLUSION

The dissertation *contains scholarly merit which is an original contribution to science* and it meets all requirements of the Law for the Development of Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria (LDASRB), the Rulebook for the Application of LDASRB and the corresponding Rulebook of *Paisii Hilendarski* University of Plovdiv. The presented materials and dissertation results fully comply with the minimal national requirements for the acquisition of the educational and scientific degree of *doctor*. The dissertation abstracts adequately summarize the content of the dissertation. I have not found any texts in the dissertation that show any signs of plagiarism.

The dissertation shows that the doctoral candidate Maria Ivanova Anastasova possesses theoretical knowledge and professional skills in the sphere of higher education 2. Humanities, area of professional qualification 2.1. *Philology*, doctoral programme: *Germanic Languages (English Language)* and demonstrates qualities and skills for carrying out independent scientific research.

Due to the aforesaid, I hereby confidently give my **positive assessment** of the conducted research presented in the dissertation thesis, dissertation abstract, the obtained results and scientific contributions and I *recommend to the honourable scientific jury to award Maria Ivanova Anastasova the educational and scientific degree “doctor”* (in the sphere of higher education 2. Humanities, area of professional qualification 2.1. *Philology*, doctoral programme: *Germanic Languages: English Language*).

30.08.2022

Plovdiv

Reviewer:

(Prof. V. Marovska, DSc)