REVIEW

of dissertation thesis for acquiring the educational and scientific degree "Doctor"

Field of Higher Education: 2. Humanities, Professional Area: 2.1. Philology

Doctoral Programme: Germanic Languages: English Language

Author of the dissertation: Maria Ivanova Anastasova

Topic of the dissertation: THE ANALYTIC CONSTRUCTIONS WITH THE VERBS BE AND HAVE AND A PAST PARTICIPLE IN OLD ENGLISH AND IN OLD BULGARIAN
Supervisor: Associat. Prof. Antoaneta Dzhelyova

Reviewer: DSc. Mariyana Tsibranska-Kostova, professor in the Department of History of the Bulgarian Language at the Institute for Bulgarian Language "Prof. L. Andreychin", Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.

By Order No.RD-21-1381 of 20.07.2022 of the Rector of Plovdiv University "Paisiy Hilendarski" I have been appointed as a member of the scientific jury to ensure the procedure for dissertation defense on the topic *THE ANALYTIC CONSTRUCTIONS WITH THE VERBS BE AND HAVE AND A PAST PARTICIPLE IN OLD ENGLISH AND IN OLD BULGARIAN* in purpose of acquiring the educational and scientific degree "Doctor" in Field of Higher Education: 2. Humanities; Professional Area: 2.1. Philology; Doctoral Programme: Germanic Languages: English Language. The author of the dissertation is the PhD candidate *Maria Ivanova Anastasova,* who has completed her PhD program and received approval for the defense of the dissertation at an extended internal meeting of the Department of English Philology at PU on 04.07.2022. The author currently works in the same Department. For the needs of the announced procedure, she has submitted three publications on the dissertation topic in national academic editions, two of which in English. The provided set of materials is comprehensive and fully meets the requirements of article 36 (1) of the Regulations for the Development of the Academic Staff of PU, the general requirements of the Law on Academic Staff Development and the specific requirements of the Faculty of Philology of PU in general. In my perusal of the candidate's dissertation, abstract, and published materials, I have found no evidence of plagiarism. This gives me a reason to proceed to the analysis of the content structure of the work, its methodological underpinning and the results achieved.

Above all, the cohesion between the professional competence of the candidate and the thesis topic should be noted. Anastasova holds a Master's degree in English philology and, after a fruitful practice in the secondary school, since 2016, she has been working as a tenured assistant and lecturer in the very Department of English Philology in which the present procedure takes place. The choice of the topic is very appropriate and represents a synthesis of knowledge on the history of Bulgarian and English.

The dissertation THE ANALYTIC CONSTRUCTIONS WITH THE VERBS BE AND HAVE AND A PAST PARTICIPLE IN OLD ENGLISH AND IN OLD BULGARIAN is topical first because of its theoretical ground and essential linking with the goals of linguodidactology, one of which is to establish intersystem links between diachrony and synchrony. The Old Bulgarian language is the recognized basis of Palaeoslavic and Bulgarian studies with a high international reputation. Its teaching in the system of higher education in the modern information environment determines the introduction of new research approaches to a classical language of the European Middle Ages. Proof is the fact that new grammars of the Old Bulgarian language appear in the Bulgarian research space, such as this of prof. T. Slavova (Старобългарски език. София: Св. Климент Охридски, 2017), and of the supervisor of the candidate A. Dzhelyova (Старобългарски език. Морфология. Пловдив: Паисий Хилендарски, 2019). The choice of the topic was certainly the result of a good teamwork on the part of the PhD student and the supervisor. My practice as a visiting professor in Old Bulgarian at PU in recent years has convinced me that interconnections between different academic fields and comparative studies of Old Bulgarian and Old English are not an isolated phenomenon here.

The work of M. Anastasova is 222 pages long and consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion and a bibliography with 198 cited titles, six vocabularies and five sources for excerption. The internal structuring of the chapters is methodical and adapted to the presentation of each category in both languages, Old Bulgarian and Old English, and the search for typological similarity or difference.

In the introduction, in a rather lapidary style, the author formulates the main parameters of her work and the methodology of analysis. The main object of the study is stated in the title: the analytic constructions of the verbs *be* and *have + past participle* in a comparative perspective between Old English and Old Bulgarian. She adheres to her supervisor's synergetic linguistic

theory and introduces the operative term *attractor* by her definition. This is justified and allows the objectives of the study to be fully unfolded. Despite the formal difference between *have* and *be,* it is their *attractor proto-function* (my note, in the sense of the most archaic possible grammatical component of the linguistic system) that places them at the beginning or in the centre (the core) and ensures historical continuity. The main sources are compact and sufficient for drawing conclusions: the Wessex Gospels and the 10th – 11th c. Old Bulgarian Codex Marianus, similar in chronology and typology as liturgical Gospel readings. It should be noted, however, in a wholly positive sense, that in the course of the exposition the author has exceeded them to gather evidence. Within this framework, it is logical that specific tasks require a grammatical and lexical analysis of each verb in both languages separately, and then of the participles with which they form analytic constructions. What we have before us is a clearly articulated analytical model of research, presented in a logical and explicit manner. Let us now establish how the specific analysis was carried out and what skills of comparison and synthesis the PhD candidate Anastasova has shown.

In the first chapter, the reader is easily convinced of the correctness of reasoning about the typology of *be* in a long continuum: figuratively speaking, from the Indo-European root *es as a copula between carrier and attribute, to today's problematic distinctions between compound nominal predicate and passive voice valences. In Old Bulgarian and Old English, it exhibits suppletivism and distinguishes two roots with different semantic content for existentiality and identity from which a temporal difference develops. Understandably, the author describes in considerable detail the semantic nuances of the verbs bēon/wesan around the attribute of existence (pp. 21–23), as of the combination of bēon/wesan with the present participle of a full verb (verb base + -ende). In the Old Bulgarian language, the latter are considered as calques from the Greek; they are characteristic of the Gospel, where they enter from Hebrew, and represent a purely literary phenomenon (as бѫдєши млъчѧ in Luc. 1:20). The periphrastic construction, of course, cannot be translated today as "ще бъдеш мълчащ", but requires the conjugated future "ще мълчиш". Periphrases of бъіти with infinitive, which may be dialectal, have also been developed. The PhD candidate describes the grammatical, lexical and modal aspects of бъіти as comprehensively as possible, and cites a rich scholarly literature on each of them.

In the second paragraph, the author has taken the same approach to the verb *have*. She specifies the similarities and the differences between *be* and *have*. I consider correct the author's

statement that *have* and name syntagm indicate not temporality but existentiality, an inherent feature of the bearer. The statements about the verb *have* as a verb of state are also rightly considered. In Old English, the most important is the combinations of *have* with participles, from which the modern perfect and pluperfect verb forms evolved. Of interest to me was the analysis of predicative possession in Old Bulgarian with the more archaic constructions of вꙑти with a name in genitive or dative case, with a prepositional-nominal combination, or in a case construction without a preposition, type не въ ꙋ нею 'they do not have', and the replacement by the verb *have*. The author could make here comparisons to other sources to trace the state of separate Gospel's quotations in various diachronic cuts and to establish the degree of synonymy. I recommend to emphasize also the competition between хотѣти и имѣти constructions for descriptive future tense in relation to the problem of Balkanisms in Old Bulgarian, citing the omitted but absolutely obligatory title of Angelina Mincheva's work of timeless value "The Old Bulgarian Language in the Light of Balkan Studies" 1987, pp. 27-30, insofar as one of the aims of the work is the typological modelling of phenomena in unrelated languages. This study provides valuable statistics from a Gospel context. Particularly pertinent to the dissertation, I believe, are those on the prevalence of cases of negation of имѣти. This would be a relevant addition to the exposition on p. 51. There will be a steady theoretical transition to generalizations, one of which is the quoted opinion that the verb *имам* is "one of the unusual and very characteristic fragments of the Balkan linguistic picture" (p. 55, after Petrova 2011: 396). In summary, M. Anastasova concludes that the verb *съм* can express a state of being, identity and belonging, and *имам* - a state of possession, as well as be synonymous with *съм* in some of its meanings (p. 58).

The second chapter, "Characteristics of participles," begins with a detailed exposition of commonly known grammatical statements about participles, which justify the educational aspect of the work. The analysis of the absolute constructions Dativus absolutus in the two compared languages and especially the analytical construction *am + participle* with morphemic indices *d/t* and *en* in Old English, and *l, t* or *n* and *m* in Old Bulgarian contains a real research aspect. The author highlights examples in which an analytic construction occurs in Old Bulgarian and Old English against a conjugated aorist form in Greek. In Old Bulgarian, however, there is a difference in the grammatical meaning of whether it is a temporal (with respect to past active II participle) or a verbs voice form (with respect to past passive participle). A number of important issues are

problematized here: for example, when a past passive participle is also an adjective, which is a significant lexicographical question; the analogy in the attributive, predicative, and substantive uses of the same participle in the two languages. I would add that the presence of the negative prefix нє-, especially in the Greek pattern of words with a-privativum, covers a rich class of names and participles, as does the mixed participle-adjective category, and is one of the most studied word-formation categories in Old Bulgarian, but more as a mark of translation technique and in relation to Greek. In this sense, the behaviour of the passive participle is of particular interest from a grammatical view point. Obviously, the analogies between the two languages with respect to the past participle are the result of its greater antiquity, which has allowed typological similarity to manifest itself in nonnative languages. In practice, the author proves this. I find the author's thesis that the analytic construction бъіти + past passive participle is one of the grammemes of the category of perfect to be an interesting theoretical contribution with potential (p. 82); accordingly, the system is supplemented by passive constructions analogous to the temporal ones for pluperfect and futurum exactum, i.e. passive perfect, passive pluperfect, and passive futurum exactum. This changes the notion of their frequency in the Gospel texts. With regard to the second past active participle, the presence of a feature that invariably belongs to the bearer is pointed out as its main meaning, which explains the role of the marking formant *l-* simultaneously in analytic constructions (past tenses) and in nominal categories (e.g. names of persons). This proves the cohesion between the feature and its bearer – the grammatical subject.

With regard to the third chapter on the analytic constructions of *be* and *have*, the following can be said. It is summative and comparative, since the preceding chapters have already set the research pattern. What is new here is that the author traces the formation of the theoretical principles of categories on a broader background – from E. Benveniste to contemporary authors for both Slavic and English material. She consistently defends her thesis that the active forms of the perfect and the forms of the passive voice should be analyzed into a common category of analytic forms on a formal and semantic basis. This conclusion results directly from the adopted attractor model. It helps to explain systematic historical changes in Old English that are based on the formation of category perfect with active and passive forms, i.e. the theoretical setting is applied to explain the development of the forms *bēon/wesan* and past participle, *habban* + past participle, their relation to each other and to the modern so-called telescopic constructions with combinations

of the basic verbs *have* and *be* in various modal, perfect, passive, continuous verb phrases, etc. (p. 123). As far as the Old Bulgarian language is concerned, the author here sets out in more detail the scholarly opinions on the degree of grammaticalization of къⱕти and past passive participle, but some repetitions have inevitably occurred. The positive side is that phenomena of various status become object of examination. For example, the analysis extends to purely dialectal forms for which a historical explanation can be given, the type *мо̀же да е излѐзена* in Thracian dialects that no longer express passive voice meaning, but purely temporal. I would recommend stressing more clearly the influence of the Greek source in purely literary phenomena, such as the combination of past passive participle and past active II participle, which creates no pattern and remains exception (p. 132). Within the theoretical framework of the analytic constructions of *be* with participles, the well-known facts of the few examples of perfect forms in Old Bulgarian, alignment with the aorist, resultatives, modal and stylistic differences, etc., are considered here. The author remains faithful to her thesis about its meaning of state and possession, relative to the verbal subject. I see some inconsistency in the fact that it is only on page 144 that the so-called holistic approach appears, whereas terms of this type with adequate explanations should have been part of the operational language defined at the beginning of the study (the synonymy between *минало деятелно второ и елово причастие* also appears at a later stage). I accept, however, that the terms *analytic perfect structure*, *active and passive perfect* are a consequence of the whole exposition, of the rearrangement, reformulation and accepted type of systematization of known phenomena according to the author's theoretical conception.

The author applies a similar generalizing approach in the paragraph on *habban* + past participle. Of the equivalents in Old Bulgarian, the explanation of the type *have* + past passive participle in the context of the being of *be* and *have* as attractors is noteworthy, but with an exposition of the multiple opinions on the matter and a maximum dissection of the dialectal types of combinations of *be* and *have* with participles (summarized Slavic, Romance and hybrid types). In my opinion, this paragraph on Bulgarian and Slavic material is best developed with illustrations, with consideration of rare examples, with all the complexity of problems of grammaticalization, temporality, factors of influence, etc., that have not yet been fully resolved. The author's final statement is expected: typological similarity between perfect constructions in Old English and Old

Bulgarian and the necessity of a general consideration of active perfect analytic constructions and passive analytic constructions (p. 200).

The conclusions are brief and concise, set out over two pages in line with the same style of statement of aims and objectives at the beginning. These are undoubtedly fulfilled. I would like to point out in particular the following positive qualities of the work: a high level of knowledge of the relevant theoretical formulations on Indo-European, Old Bulgarian and Old English; successfully combining the problems of general linguistics with the specificity of Old Bulgarian and Old English; achieved relationship between diachrony and synchrony, in which the modelling of diachronic development allows the application of modern approaches to the attested dialectal continuations of historical phenomena; successful correlation between the scientific and educational aspects of exposition; logic, conciseness, methodological soundness. In order to fulfill her very clear goals and objectives, the author has declared only the application of the panchrony method (panchronic, synchronic-diachronic synergetic approach - p. 8), but in practice, she applies the descriptive, subcomponent analysis and above all the system-structural approach, which is the basis of linguistics as a science. The works and the theoretical concept of the scientific supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dzhelyova have had a positive impact on the creation of a completely original and in-depth work, but also on finding followers in the field of modern and somewhat experimental grammatical theory.

The abstract and the publications are fully consistent with the content of the work and present it appropriately. However, I have a recommendation for the author to expand her publishing activity, including in indexed journals at home and abroad, as the topic and results fully allow it. I recommend that the work be printed.

In conclusion, I express my approval categorically and unambiguously, and propose to the honorable jury to vote positively, on the basis of the results achieved in the doctoral dissertation *THE ANALYTIC CONSTRUCTIONS WITH THE VERBS BE AND HAVE AND A PAST PARTICIPLE IN OLD ENGLISH AND IN OLD BULGARIAN,* the author **Maria Ivanova Anastasova** to be awarded the scientific and educational degree "Doctor" in Field of Higher Education: 2. Humanities; Professional Area: 2.1. Philology; Doctoral Programme "Germanic Languages: English Language".

05.08.2022   Reviewer:

Sofia   Prof. Mariyana Tsibranska-Kostova