

**UNIVERSITY OF PLOVDIV “PAISHI HILENDARSKI”**

**FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY**

**DEPARTMENT OF BULGARIAN LANGUAGE**

**DIANA GEORGIEVA MARKOVA**

**SEMANTICS AND PRAGMATICS OF THE “PRESENT  
PASSIVE PARTICIPLE” IN CONTEMPORARY  
BULGARIAN LANGUAGE**

**AUTHOR’S ABSTRACT**

of the dissertation for obtaining  
the educational and scientific degree  
“Doctor”

Field of higher education: 2. Humanities

Professional direction: 2.1. Philology

Doctoral program: Contemporary Bulgarian language

**Doctoral Supervisor:**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Krasimira Angelova Chakarova

Plovdiv

2024

The dissertation entitled “Semantics and Pragmatics of the “Present Passive Participle” in Contemporary Bulgarian Language” was discussed and proposed for public defense at a meeting of the Department of Bulgarian Language at the Faculty of Philology, University of Plovdiv “Paisii Hilendarski” on February 29, 2024.

The dissertation consists of a total of 388 standard computer pages and comprises an introduction, four chapters, conclusion, bibliography (112 sources), list of excerpted sources, list of abbreviations used, and appendix.

**Academic Jury:**

Prof. Dr. Krasimira Slavcheva Alexova

Prof. Dr. Dimitar Dimitrov Popov

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Maya Dimitrova Kuzova

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Petya Ivanova Nestorova

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Teodora Kurteva Rabovyanova

The defense of the dissertation will take place on June 11, 2024, at ..... in the Meeting Room of the University of Plovdiv “Paisii Hilendarski”, Rectorate, 24 Tsar Asen Street.

The defense materials are available at the University Library, Rectorate, 24 Tsar Asen Street.

## CONTENTS

### **Introduction**

**Chapter I.** The Bulgarian Participial System Through Diachrony. Historical Development of the Present Passive Participle in the Bulgarian Language

1.1. The Bulgarian Participial System Through Diachrony

1.1.1. Present Active Participle

1.1.2. Past Active Participle I

1.1.3. Past Active Participle II

1.1.4. Past Passive Participle

1.2. Historical Development of the Present Passive Participle

1.2.1. Formation of the Present Passive Participle in Old Bulgarian

1.2.2. Use of the Present Passive Participle in Old Bulgarian

1.2.3. Meaning of the etymological Present Passive Participle

1.2.4. Development of the etymological Present Passive Participle

1.2.5. The Present Passive Participle during the Bulgarian Revival period

**Chapter II.** Review of Research on the Status of the Etymological Present Passive Participle in Bulgarian Grammatical studies from the Revival Period to the Present Day (1835 – 2020)

2.1. Review of Research in Bulgarian Grammars from the Revival Period (1835 – 1878)

2.2. Review of Research in the Period from Liberation to Orthographic Reform (1878 – 1945)

2.2.1. Pre-scientific period

2.2.2. Scientific period

2.3. Review of Research in the Contemporary Stage of Language Development (1945 – 2020)

2.3.1. Grammars of Contemporary Bulgarian language

2.3.2. Modern monographs dedicated to the Bulgarian Participial System

2.3.3. Articles from Contemporary Scientific Periodicals (1945 – 2020)

**Chapter III.** Formal-Semantic and Functional Characteristics of the Deverbatives ending in the suffix *-M/-eM* in the Contemporary Stage of Bulgarian Language Development

3.1. Formal characteristics

3.1.1. Question of the formants used to form Present Passive Participles

3.1.2. Aspectual characteristic of the Present Passive Participle

3.1.3. Status characteristic of the Present Passive Participle

3.1.4. Problem of Russian influence in the formation of the Present passive Participle

3.1.5. Derivational potential of the Present Passive Participle

3.2. Semantic characteristics

3.2.1. Main semantic realisations of the Present Passive Participle

3.2.2. Criteria for recognizing the status of the deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM* – adjectives or participles

3.2.2.1. Comparison of Present Passive Participles with adjectives

3.2.2.2. Comparison of Present Passive Participles with other Bulgarian participles

3.2.2.3. Semantic substitution of the Present Passive Participle by Present Active Participle + reflexive particle *ce*

3.2.2.4. Semantic substitution of the Present Passive Participle by Past Passive Participle formed from iterative verbs

3.3. Functional-Semantic Parallels between the Bulgarian deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM* and the English adjectives in *-able/-ible* (Comparison of Translational Equivalents)

3.3.1. Translation from English to Bulgarian

3.3.2. Translation from Bulgarian to English

3.4. Functional characteristics

3.4.1. Types of uses of the Present Passive Participle in the sentence

3.4.2. Use of the Present Passive Participle in the functional styles of Contemporary Bulgarian language

3.4.2.1. Use of the Present Passive Participle in academic style

3.4.2.2. Use of the Present Passive Participle in official-business style

3.4.2.3. Use of the Present Passive Participle in journalistic style

3.4.2.4. Use of the Present Passive Participle in literary style

3.4.2.5. Use of the Present Passive Participle in conversational style

**Chapter IV: Pragmatic Characteristics of the Present Passive Participle**

4.1. Pragmatic Aspect of Linguistic Units

4.2. Language Attitudes towards the Present Passive Participle (Analysis of a Survey)

**Conclusion.** General Conclusions

**Bibliography**

**List of Excerpted Sources**

**List of Abbreviations Used**

**Appendix** (Dictionary of the Present Passive Participles in Modern Bulgarian Language excerpted from *Official Orthographic Dictionary of Bulgarian Language. Verbs*, 2016)

## GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DISSERTATION

The object of study in this scientific research is the participial system of contemporary Bulgarian language, while the subject of study is the verbal formations formed with the suffix *-m*, or the so-called present passive participles, whose status is disputed and unresolved in contemporary Bulgarian linguistics. The motivation for studying precisely this issue arises from the fact that at the current stage of development of the Bulgarian language, there is a significant productivity of deverbatives ending in *-m/-em*, but in the grammatical literature of the Bulgarian language, the understanding persists that these are “remnants of present passive participle”, which “however, have a singular character and do not exist as a clearly formed category in our contemporary language, as it was in Old Bulgarian”, and regarding their status, it is noted that “today they are perceived as ordinary adjectives” (Andreychin, Ivanov, Popov 1957: 100 – 101).

The main goal of the dissertation is to examine the extent to which the thesis of the contemporary productivity of deverbatives ending in *-m/-em* is justified and whether there are already sufficient grounds in the present stage of development of the Bulgarian language for the deverbatives ending in *-m/-em* to be considered as components of the participial system, i.e. to be used with equal status as participles. To achieve the main goal, the following tasks need to be completed:

1. Conduct a review and study the grammatical research on the so-called Present Passive Participle from the Bulgarian Revival period to the present day (including Bulgarian Revival grammars, systematic grammars of contemporary Bulgarian language, monographs dedicated to the Bulgarian participial system, as well as articles from scientific periodicals on the subject by Bulgarian and foreign linguists). Compare, summarise, and identify the prevailing tendencies among the scientific description regarding the status of the so-called Present Passive Participle in the Bulgarian morphological system.

2. Examine the question of the etymological Present Passive Participle in diachrony, tracing the development of the Bulgarian participial system, and more specifically, that of deverbatives ending in *-m/-em* in Old Bulgarian grammars and historical grammars of the Bulgarian language. Comment on

the issue of Russian influence in the restoration of the discussed type of deverbal formations during the Revival period.

3. Present the formal characteristics of the so-called Present Passive Participles and trace their mechanism of formation. Propose a classification of the so-called present passive participles based on a formal criterion depending on the formants involved in their formation.

4. Examine the main semantic realisations of the so-called Present Passive Participle – *passivity* and *modality*. Propose a classification of the so-called Present Passive Participles based on a semantic criterion, i.e., considering the semantics they express.

5. Present criteria for “identification” (determining the status) of the deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* – as participles or as adjectives.

6. Compare deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* with other participles, as well as with verbal adjectives ending in *-телен, -лив, -ив*, etc.

7. Discuss the most frequent semantic substitutions of the so-called Present Passive Participle – with past passive participle and with present active participle + reflexive particle *се*.

8. Excerpt illustrative examples of deverbatives ending in the suffix *-м/-ем* from literary, media, and specialised texts, as well as from translated literature, to compare them with their counterparts in other languages.

9. Comment on the functional-semantic parallels between the Bulgarian deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* and the English adjectives in *-able/-ible*, often presented as their translational equivalents.

10. Compile a dictionary of Present Passive Participles not only using lexicographic material from dictionaries of contemporary Bulgarian language but also with examples excerpted from the Bulgarian National Corpus, Bulgarian literature, and the internet space (articles, forums, advertisements).

11. Trace the use of the so-called present passive participles in the functional styles of contemporary Bulgarian language.

12. Conduct a survey regarding the reception of deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* by native speakers of contemporary Bulgarian language. Analyse the language attitudes towards the Present Passive Participles – whether they are perceived as adjectives or as participles by contemporary speakers of the Bulgarian language.

To achieve the formulated goals and tasks, the following methods need to be applied: 1) method of theoretical synthesis; 2) method of description and explanation; 3) comparative-historical method; 4) comparative method; 5) method of excerpting; and 6) statistical method.

In terms of structure, the dissertation consists of an introduction, four chapters, conclusion, bibliography, list of excerpted sources, list of abbreviations used, and an appendix. The first chapter is the historical basis of the study – “The Bulgarian Participial System Through the Prism of Diachrony. Historical Development of the Present Passive Participle in the Bulgarian Language”; the second chapter provides a theoretical overview of the previous research on the topic – “Review of Research on the Status of the Etymological Present Passive Participle in Bulgarian Grammatical studies from the Revival Period to the Present Day (1835 – 2020)”; the third chapter presents the formal, semantic, and functional characteristics of deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM* in the present stage of development of the Bulgarian language, and the fourth chapter is dedicated to the pragmatic aspect, including an analysis of a survey aimed at examining the language attitudes of native speakers towards the so-called Present Passive Participle. The appendix includes a Dictionary of Present Passive Participles, excerpted and supported with examples based on data from the *Official Orthographic Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language. Verbs* (Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 2016).

The **First chapter** is dedicated to the Old Bulgarian participial system and the place of the etymological Present Passive Participle within it. Following a brief overview of the Old Bulgarian participle system and the presentation of other Old Bulgarian participles, the focus is placed on the formation, use, and meaning of the Present Passive Participle, which has a unique development. In Proto-Slavic and Old Bulgarian, it was a lively and frequent category, but gradually it was displaced by the past passive participle in expressing the analytical forms of the passive voice, thus losing its predicative functions. In the Old Church Slavonic context, alongside its initial passive semantics, it acquired an additional function – expressing *possibility – impossibility*, mainly serving as a translation for philosophical-religious and legal concepts (it represents a literal translation of the Greek verbal adjectives in *-τός*, which are semantically close to Latin adjectives in *-bilis*). As its use gradually decreased



in spoken Bulgarian, remnants of it are scarcely found in the Middle Bulgarian monuments and dialects. Deverbal formations with the characteristic ending *-m* were reintroduced into New Bulgarian during the Revival period through the influence of the Russian language, which adopted Present Passive Participles from Old Church Slavonic, possessing not only passive but also modal semantics. However, when establishing the final composition of the contemporary Bulgarian participle system, the deverbatives ending in *-m/-em* remained outside its framework, primarily due to their limited and literary use being cited as the main reason. In the contemporary stage of the language, deverbatives ending in *-m/-em* are characterised by increased productivity and are prevalent in all functional styles of contemporary Bulgarian, yet their place in grammatical studies remains undetermined, lacking equal status in the Bulgarian participle system.

The **Second chapter** presents a theoretical overview of research on the status of the etymological Present Passive Participle from the first revival grammars to the present stage of Bulgarian language development. In the first Bulgarian grammars of the Revival period (1835 – 1879) three categories can be distinguished: 1) Grammars where deverbatives ending in *-m/-em* are presented as present passive participles: Hr. Pavlovich's – “Slavic-Bulgarian Grammar” (1836), Y. Gruev – “Foundation for a Bulgarian Grammar” (1858), G. Mirkovich – “Short and Methodical Bulgarian Grammar” (1860), and S. Radulov – “Initial Grammar for Studying the Bulgarian Language” (1870); 2) Grammars where the etymological present passive participles are considered as adjectives: D. Vojnikov – “Short Bulgarian Grammar with Exercises” (1864) and Iv. Momchilov's “Grammar of the New Bulgarian Language” (1868); 3) Grammars where deverbatives ending in *-m* do not appear neither as participles, nor as adjectives: Neofit Rilski – “Bulgarian Grammar” (1835), Neofit Bozveli, Em. Vaskidovich – “Slavic-Bulgarian Manual for Little Children” (1835), Iv. Bogorov – “Primary Bulgarian Grammar” (1844), Iv. Momchilov – “Grammar of the Slavic Language” (1847), T. Hrulev – “Bulgarian Grammar” (1859), S. Radulov – “Textbook for the Bulgarian Language” (1863), and T. Shishkov – “Initial Bulgarian Grammar” (1872).

Regarding Bulgarian grammars published from the Liberation (1878) to the orthographic reform (1945), they can be classified into two periods: the

pre-scientific period (so-called “school grammars”) – from the Liberation until the publication of the first systematic grammar (1878 – 1936), and the scientific period (so-called “harvesting period”), marked by the release of the first systematic grammar (1936) and extending until the introduction of the orthographic reform of the Bulgarian language (1945). The so-called “school grammars” that include the deverbal formations with *-M/-eM* are: T. Ikonov – “Bulgarian Grammar” (1881), St. Panaretov – “Bulgarian Grammar” (1881), Al. Teodorov-Balan – “Bulgarian Grammar for Lower Grades of Secondary Schools” (1898), M. Ivanov – “Bulgarian Grammar (Phonology, Morphology, and Orthography) for 2nd Grade” (1902), Iv. Topkov, D. Shopov – “Textbook of Bulgarian Grammar for 2nd Grade” (1906), while in the following grammatical works, they are not addressed at all: D. Mishev – “Guide to Bulgarian Language in Three Courses for Lower Three Grades of High Schools and Upper Course of Primary Schools. Course II” (1895), K. Karagyulev – “Short Bulgarian Grammar” (1906), At. Iliev – “Bulgarian Grammar for 1st Grade of Progymnasiums” (1910). Regarding the description of deverbal formations with the suffix *-M/-eM* within the scientific period, the following two categories can be distinguished: 1) Systematic grammars that classify the present passive participle within the participle system: P. Kalkandjiev – “Short Bulgarian Grammar (Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Orthography with Pronunciation and Information about the History of Language and Writing)” (1936) and D. Popov – “Bulgarian Grammar” (1942); 2) Systematic grammars that traditionally mention the present passive participle in the section on participles but consider it as an adjective: N. Kostov – “Bulgarian Grammar” (1939), St. Mladenov, St. Popvasilev – “Grammar of the Bulgarian Language” (1939), Al. Teodorov-Balan – “New Bulgarian Grammar” (1940), L. Andreychin – “Basic Bulgarian Grammar” (1944). It can be summarized that only during the so-called “harvesting period” is there conceptual unity regarding the description of the present passive participles: four out of six authors of grammars advocate for classifying the deverbatives with the suffix *-M/-eM* as adjectives. During this period, some of the most characteristic semantic features of the present passive participles are noted for the first time: their ability to express possibility is registered for the first time (N. Kostov, L. Andreychin), the significant prevalence of negative forms is

commented on (N. Kostov, L. Andreychin, Al. Teodorov-Balan), and their semantic substitution with other types of participles is proposed. The authority of L. Andreychin cannot be disregarded, whose “Basic Bulgarian Grammar” from 1944 had a significant influence on the authors of subsequent systematic grammars, particularly regarding the interpretation of the discussed type of deverbal formations.

In the third part of the second chapter (2.3.), a review of studies on the so-called present passive participle in the contemporary stage of language development (1945 – 2020) is provided. Three sections are distinguished: 1) Grammars of contemporary Bulgarian language, 2) Contemporary monographs dedicated to the Bulgarian participle system, and 3) Articles from contemporary scientific periodicals (1945 – 2020). In the first section, ten systematic grammars of contemporary Bulgarian literary language from the current stage of language development are examined (L. Andreychin (1957, 1962), St. Stoyanov (1980), Yu. S. Maslov (1982), BAN (1983), P. Pashov (1989), St. Georgiev (1999), Iv. Kutsarov (1998, 2007), and R. Nitzolova (2008)), with observations being summarised in tabular form. It can be generalised that contemporary grammatical works of the Bulgarian language are characterised by a uniform and standard description regarding the deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM* – traditionally mentioned within the participial system framework, but without being assigned the status of a participle; they are most commonly presented as “remnants of the present passive participle” and are treated as adjectives in contemporary Bulgarian. This viewpoint is almost unchanged from that of L. Andreychin (1944, 1957, 1962), with subsequent authors of systematic grammars repeating it without updating or questioning the traditional composition of the participial system and, in particular, without thoroughly examining the nature and essence of the present passive participle. This unification of views has not been established after many discussions or extensive research on the subject, but rather relies on a previous stage of the Bulgarian language, without considering the current trends in its development. This is evidenced by the fact that such consensus is observed only in systematic grammars, but not in authorial monographs or in a series of publications from scientific periodicals on the topic, which acknowledge the increased frequency and productivity of deverbatives ending

in *-M/-eM* in contemporary usage. In the second section of this part, monographs from the contemporary stage dedicated to the Bulgarian participial system are examined (I. Gugulanova, 2005, and K. Kutsarov, 2012), revealing the following contrast – the two authors advocate opposite views regarding the status of deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM*: I. Gugulanova considers them in line with tradition outside the bounds of the participial system (for her, these are like verbal adjectives, semantically close to types such as *-телен, -(л)ив, -чив*, and others), while K. Kutsarov shares his original concept of participles as a separate class of lexemes, presenting a different system of participles in the Bulgarian language from the traditional one, where one of the full-fledged members is precisely the present passive participle. We disagree with the researcher's thesis that this participle can form analytical forms of the verb, as we believe that at this stage there is not enough available data for the suffix *-M/-eM* to have grammaticalised in expressing the grammeme of passivity. Only in the examined articles from scientific periodicals can different trends be distinguished, which contradict the uniform description in the systematic Bulgarian grammars of the contemporary stage of the language. The prevailing views can be categorised into the following three main groups according to the attributed status of deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM*: **1) Deverbal adjective** (A. Ivanova (1957), M. Choroleeva (1970), Z. Gunova (1975), M. Metlarova (1978), I. Gugulanova (1978), H. Valter (1981), I. Tabakova (1986), B. Dikova (2001), H. Panteleeva (2004), I. Spasova (2010); **2) One passive participle** (E. Georgieva (1968) and M. Deyanova (1992); **3) Present passive participle** (H. Parvev (1969, 1970, 1976), K. Kutsarov (2001, 2011, 2012), K. Chakarova (2012), S. Petrova (2001), S. Parashkevova (2003), Ts. Boyadzhieva (2006), P. Barakov and B. Radeva (2008), V. Nakova (2008, 2009), A. Alexandrov (2009), M. Anastasova (2017)). It is notable that the articles adopting the traditional description of deverbatives with *-M/-eM* from the systematic grammars of the Bulgarian language were published relatively earlier and are closer to the orthographic reform of 1945. Conversely, after H. Parvev, who was the first in modern Bulgarian studies to express the opinion that “there are sufficient grounds to assume that a new category – the present passive participle – can be established in today's Bulgarian literary participial system” (Parvev 1970: 130), the thesis for the restoration of the present passive

participle and its increased productivity in contemporary Bulgarian is supported mainly by modern authors (from 21st century). The way in which some of the articles are titled should also be taken into account (titles featuring lexemes such as “rehabilitation”, “renaissance”, “revival” of the present passive participle). Overall, it is evident that at the current stage of development of contemporary Bulgarian, there is already sufficient evidence supporting the inclusion of deverbatives with *-M/-eM* in the contemporary Bulgarian participial system – the potential envisioned by H. Parvev half a century ago has been realised.

At the end of the second chapter, following the theoretical review of the positions regarding the status of verbal formations ending in the suffix *-M*, we align ourselves with the authors who accept that the participial system of contemporary Bulgarian is symmetrical and consists of the following four equal participles: past active participle and past passive participle; present active participle and present passive participle (Petrova 2001, Boyadzhieva 2006, Kutsarov 2012, Chakarova 2012). We also agree with the viewpoint that there is only one past active participle (the so-called past perfective active participle), and the so-called past imperfective active participle is a “pseudo-participle” (Chakarova 2012), as it essentially represents a verbal form – it participates only in the formation of renarrative and conclusive forms, lacking attributive use (Parvev 1976, Kutsarov 2012). Furthermore, we also hold the opinion that neither the *dee-participle* (which function as “deverbal adverbs” (Petrova 2001), nor the verbal nouns (which for K. Kutsarov do not differ from normal nouns (Kutsarov 2012) have a place within the participial system. We believe that the exclusion of deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM* from the participial system of contemporary Bulgarian is unfounded, especially since some of the previously highlighted reasons (“low productivity”, “literary character”, “adopted from the Russian language”, “lack in speech”, “mainly attributive use”) are no longer valid at the present stage of language development – considering the high productivity of deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM* and their use in various stylistic registers and in spoken language, especially after the decline of Russian influence. Furthermore, according to the arguments presented, another participle should also be excluded – the present active participle, which exhibits an identical development as the present passive

participle (borrowed from the Russian language during the Revival period) and predominantly possesses attributive use. If the criteria for a hybrid form are objectively applied to all participles, only the two past participles – the past (perfective) active and past passive participles – should remain within the participial system. However, in our view, the Bulgarian participial system is symmetrical and includes the aforementioned two past participles and the two present participles. The reasons why only the past participles can participate in analytical verb forms are closely related to the history of the language – the two past participles are genetically old participles, retaining their functions since the Old Bulgarian state of the language, while the two present participles were relatively recently restored in contemporary Bulgarian.

We advocate the position that the **deverbatives ending in -м/-ем are participles**, as besides being genetically connected to the verbal paradigm (having a participle origin and being full-fledged members of the Proto-Slavic and Old Bulgarian participial system), we believe that they also possess not only nominal but also verbal characteristics in contemporary use. The condition for an inseparable verbal form to be categorised as a “participle” is precisely to be a hybrid between a noun and a verb. We contend that present passive participles have retained their verbal nature and express not only their historically inherent passive voice meaning but have also specialised as means of expressing modal possibility. The retained verbal nature can be confirmed by the following formula introduced by us: when restoring the original verb through identical reflexive-passive construction in a subordinate defining sentence, e.g. *незабравим спомен* = ‘спомен, който не може (Poss) да се (Pass) забрави (V)’; *непоправима грешка* = ‘грешка, която не може (Poss) да се (Pass) поправи (V)’, where **Poss** denotes potential/hypothetical semantics, **Pass** indicates passive meaning, and **V** – the original verb from which the given present passive participle is derived. According to us, the heightened productivity of deverbatives with -м/-ем in the contemporary state of the language is a result of the operative law of linguistic economy, aimed at maximizing phrase reduction by minimally utilizing expressive means, without losing any part of the semantics – in this specific case, using only one lexeme saves an entire subordinate sentence (as is one of the functions of participles) with a reflexive-passive: *Той допусна непоправима грешка* =

*Той допусна грешка, която не може (Poss) да се (Pass) поправи (V); or in an even more intensified variant with a participial-passive construction: = Той допусна грешка, която не може (Poss) да бъде поправена (Pass).*

In the **Third chapter**, the formal, semantic, and functional characteristics of the *-м/-ем* deverbatives are presented. To specify the formal characteristics and derive a mechanism for forming present passive participles, excerpts were extracted based on data from the *Official Orthographic Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language. Verbs* (BAS, 2016). A total of **1774** deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* were extracted, whose use was verified and supported with examples from the internet space (articles, forums, advertisements), the Bulgarian National Corpus (BNC), and Bulgarian literature. This number of lexemes is approximately 6 times greater compared to the other dictionaries (*Official Orthographic Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language*, BAS, 2012, *Reverse Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language*, BAS, 2011), which is evidence of the actual activation of the analysed type of deverbatives in the current stage of the development of the Bulgarian language. After determining the base, aspect, and conjugation of the original verb of the lexemes, we endorse the opinion that the mechanism for forming present passive participles is closely related to the verbal conjugation, as can be traced back to the Old Bulgarian state of the language. We believe that the characteristic suffix involved in their formation is *-м/-ем*, and it is incorrect for the scholars to speak of the suffix *-им*, as *-и* is the thematic vowel of the present tense verb stem for the second conjugation (in this case, the pure form of the suffix *-м* is present: *забележѝм* – осн. забележи; *завѝсим* – осн. зависи).

We propose the following classification of present passive participles according to the formants involved in their formation:

**1) Suffix *-М*:** with verbs from the second conjugation: *простим* (осн. ‘прости’, II спр., св.в.), *уловим* (осн. ‘улови’, II спр., св.в.), *уязвим* (осн. ‘уязви’, II спр., св.в.), *видим* (осн. ‘види’, II спр.). We disagree with the authors who indicate the suffix *-им* with verbs from the second conjugation since, as already noted, *-и* is the thematic vowel marking the second conjugation. Only in a few cases of deverbative formations from the first conjugation can the suffix *-им* be accepted as an exception, as they are most likely formed by analogy with the second conjugation, but due to their sporadic

nature, no clear tendency can be discerned. This category includes borrowings from Russian as well, such as *достижим*, *допустим*, *преодолим*, which look like they are derived from Bulgarian verbs of the first conjugation, but are in fact based on a Russian word-formational model (*достижим* – *достижимый*, ‘достигнуть’; *допустим* – *допустимый*, ‘допустить’; *преодолим* – *преодолимый*, ‘преодолеть’).

**2) Suffix -EM:** with verbs from the third conjugation:

2.1. *-аем/-’аем* (‘уважавам’ – *уважаем*, ‘сглобявам’ – *сглобяем*; and borrowings from Russian like *непромокаем*, *непроницаем* and others);

2.2. *-уем* (‘доказвам’ – *доказуем*; ‘описвам’ – *неописуем*; and productive neologisms like ‘рециклирам’ – *рециклируем* and ‘редактирам’ – *редактируем*).

**3) Exceptions with the suffix -OM** (e.g., *(не)ведом*, *некрадом*). These exceptions are most likely adopted from Church Slavonic, rather than being preserved from the Old Bulgarian state of the language. The mentioned archaisms are rare and have entered the Christian literature from Russian or Church Slavonic language.

According to the provided classification, three diagrams are presented based on data extracted from the excerpted dictionary entries from the three dictionaries of contemporary Bulgarian language. Further on, regarding the formal characteristics, the aspectual and status characteristics of the deverbatives with *-м/-ем* are commented upon, with statistical data presented through diagrams. Regarding the aspectual characteristic of the present passive participles, it is notable that the *-м/-ем* deverbatives, formed from source verbs with a difference in the type of producing base, are widely spread, but there is no significant difference in semantics, e.g., *сравним* (*comparable*) from ‘сравня’ (to compare, Perf., II Conj.) and *сравняем* (*comparable*) from ‘сравнявам’ (to compare, Iterative, III Conj.); *обвиним* (accusable) from ‘обвиня’ (to accuse, Perf., II Conj.) and *обвиняем* (accusable) from ‘обвинявам’ (to accuse, Iterative, III Conj.); *употребим* (usable) from ‘употребя’ (to use, Perf., II Conj.) and *употребяем* (usable) from ‘употребявам’ (to use, Iterative, III Conj.); *отменим* (cancellable) from ‘отменя’ (to cancel, Perf., II Conj.) and *отменяем* (cancellable) from ‘отменявам’ (to cancel, Iterative, III Conj.). It is entirely possible for these



uses to interchange, as the emphasis is on the possibility (or impossibility), expressed by the considered type of deverbatives, with the quantitative semantics remaining in the background, i.e., the meaning of repetitiveness is “overshadowed” by the meaning of (im)possibility.

Regarding the status characteristic, it is noteworthy that the use of negative deverbatives with *-м/-ем* is much more frequent than that of positive ones (probably due to reasons of folk psychology rather than linguistic character), and therefore it has been asserted in grammars that participles expressing negation are mainly encountered. However, this does not mean that the positive variants are defective or absent altogether. In order for a negative variant to exist, there likely exists or has existed a positive one from which the negative one is formed with the prefixoid *не-*. Furthermore, each negative variant could be likened to a positive one, with the negation shifting to the verb, e.g., *Поезията не е преводима, а превъплътима* (изт. *petkolinov.com*) (вм. *Поезията е непреводима*) и *Подобно вещно-контейнерно съотношение не е мислимо за езика.* (изт. *mediapool.bg*) (вм. *е немислимо*). Indeed, there are deverbatives with *-м/-ем* where only the negative variant is encountered, such as *нескончаем* (*endless*) (\*скончаем), *неустрашим* (*unfearing*) (\*устрашим), *неодолим* (*invincible*) (\*одолим), *неождаем* (*unexpected*) (\*ожидаем), *неминуем* (*inevitable*). However, as evident from the base verb stem, the mentioned deverbative derivatives formed with the negative prefixoid *не-* are borrowings from Russian and are most likely directly borrowed with negation into Bulgarian, which explains the absence of the positive variant. At the end of the section dedicated to word formation, the question of Russian influence in the formation of present passive participles is commented upon, and their derivational potential is examined – the ability to produce abstract nouns with the suffix *-ост*.

In the second section of the third chapter (*Semantic characteristics*), the main semantic realisations of the present passive participle (*passivity* and *possibility*) are presented, and the criteria for determining the status of the *-м/-ем* deverbatives are illustrated – as participles or as adjectives. A classification of the *-м/-ем* deverbatives is proposed based on the semantics expressed by them:

1) Present Passive Participles with *passive* meaning (*Pass*) - e.g., *дължима* сума – ‘сума, която се дължи’; *избираем* предмет – ‘предмет, който се избира’; *говорим* език – ‘език, който се говори’; *изменяема* част на речта – ‘част на речта, която се изменя’; *полагам* отпуск – ‘отпуск, който се полага’;

2) Present Passive Participles with *passive* and *modal* meaning (*Pass* + *Poss*) - e.g., *неразбираем* език – ‘език, който не може да се разбере’; *разпознаваем* почерк – ‘почерк, който може да се разпознае’; *неоспоримо* доказателство – ‘доказателство, което не може да се оспори’; *обяснима* постъпка – ‘постъпка, която може да се обясни’; *незабравим* момент – ‘момент, който не може да се забрави’; *непредвидимо* бъдеще – ‘бъдеще, което не може да се предвиди’; *непростима* грешка – ‘грешка, която не може да се прости’;

3) Desemanticised etymological present passive participles – in Contemporary Bulgarian, they are classified as adjectives since they have lost their verbal properties and the verbal base cannot be reconstructed from them; they possess only attributive meaning and can be replaced with a synonymous use of another adjective - e.g., *любим* човек = *скъп* човек; *мнима* смърт = *привидна*, *лъжлива* смърт; *необходими* средства = *нужни*, *потребни* средства; *неминуема* гибел = *неизбежна* гибел; *невредимо* цяло = *незасегнато* цяло.

Such a classification by semantic criterion is necessary because not always do contemporary present passive participles express both *passivity* and the *possibility* of performing the action indicated by the base verb simultaneously. For some of the deverbative forms ending in *-м/-ем*, only the passive meaning is present, i.e., the primary semantics of the present passive participle from the Old Bulgarian stage of the language is expressed, e.g. *обработваема* земя – ‘земя, която се (Pass) обработва (V)’; *обитаем* остров – ‘остров, който се (Pass) обитава (V)’; *охраняем* паркинг – ‘паркинг, който се (Pass) охранява (V)’. In other lexemes, which are historically related to the etymological present passive participle, we observe desemanticisation of the verbal base and neutralization of the verbal properties, from which it follows that the source verb, involved in the formation of the former participle, cannot be reconstructed. These are mainly Russian borrowings such as *любим*,

*необходим, неустрашим, неминуем, зрим, мним*, etc., which were former present passive participles and can now be identified as adjectives in the contemporary stage of language development, as they have lost the semantics carried by the source verb.

In this section, the following criteria are outlined, according to which we distinguish which *-м/-ем* deverbatives are participles and which are adjectives. We classify as **Present Passive Participles** all deverbatives with the suffix *-м/-ем* that:

1) possess the meaning of *passivity (Pass)* and/or *possibility (Poss)* to perform the action indicated by the source verb (*V*), e.g., *разпознаваемо* *име* = ‘име, което *може (Poss)* да *се (Pass)* *разпознае (V)*’; *необяснима* *постъпка* = ‘постъпка, която *не може (Poss)* да *се (Pass)* *обясни (V)*’;

2) have retained their verbal characteristics and can reconstruct the source verb from which they are derived through a reflexive-passive construction in a subordinate defining sentence, according to the proposed formula: e.g., *говорим* *език* – ‘език, който *се (Pass)* *говори (V)*’ (при наличие само на значението *пасивност*); *разбираем* *език* = ‘език, който *може (Poss)* да *се (Pass)* *разбере (V)*’ (in the presence of both meanings of *passivity* and *possibility*);

3) allow an open position for an indirect object, can reconstruct the rection of the source verb from which they are derived, and can restore the potential agent of the action through the question “by whom”, e.g., *Светът има огромно превъзходство над субекта – той е такъв, какъвто е, неизменим и непретворим от човека.* (Ат. Далчев – „Събрано“, 2020) (= светът не може да се измени и претвори **от** кого?).

We classify as **adjectives** those deverbative formations with the ending *-м/-ем*, in which:

1) there is desemantisation of the verbal base and neutralization of their verbal properties (e.g., the adjectives *мним, зрим, лаком, любим, необходим, неминуем, невменяем, нескончаем, неустрашим*, etc.);

2) it is not possible to reconstruct the source verb participated in their formation and to replace them with a subordinate clause with an identical reflexive-passive construction, using the given formula: e.g., *необходими средства* ≠ *средства, които \*не могат да се обходят (?)*; *неминуема*

*гибел* ≠ *гибел*, която *\*не може да се мине* (?); *невменяем човек* ≠ *човек*, който *\*не може да се вмени* (?);

3) it is possible to reconstruct the verbal stem form, but the deverbatives are defective in terms of *passivity* and/or *possibility* (e.g., *значим* = който значи нещо; *невредим* = който няма вреда; *независим* = който не зависи от нищо / никого).

In contemporary Bulgarian, there are also adjectivised forms of other participles, characterized by verbal defectiveness, which are now perceived as adjectives. Example include old present active participles (*вонещ*, *горещ*, *могъщ*), former past passive participles (*възпитан*, *уморен*, *влюбен*, *усмихнат*), and former past active participles (*унил*, *гнил*, *зрял*). As evident from the examples, they have lost their verbal properties, and it is impossible to reconstruct the source verb in a subordinate sentence (e.g., *горещо кафе* = *топло кафе* и *горяща печка* = ‘печка, която гори (в момента)’). Similar cases of desemantised present passive participles should also be considered exceptions; therefore, it is not justified to take them as decisive for excluding all other *-м/-ем* deverbatives, which retain their verbal features and allow for the easy reconstruction of the source verb involved in their formation.

In the semantic section of the third chapter, a comparison of the present passive participles is made both with adjectives and with other participles. We disagree with the often-presented thesis that deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* belong to the same class as adjectives such as those ending in *-телен*, *-(л)ив*, *-чив*, *-ав* (Choroleeva 1970, Gugulanova 1978 and 2005, Walter 1981), as we believe that these are not identical derivational patterns. In support of this view, the following arguments are given: 1) adjectives with the suffixes *-телен*, *-(л)ив*, *-чив*, *-ав*, etc. do not have participial origin and have never been classified into the Bulgarian verbal paradigm; 2) not always the so-called “verbal” adjectives in *-телен*, *-(л)ив*, *-чив*, *-ав* are derived from a verbal base, in many cases, their base is a noun (e.g., *внимателен*, *съзнателен*, *съболезнователен*; *миризлив*, *ревнив*; *луничав*, *червеникав*) – hence, 3) it is not always possible to reconstruct the original verbal base (e.g., *именителен*, *зрителен*, *мнителен*, etc.); and not least: 4) adjectives ending in *-телен* and *-(л)ив* (if indeed derived from a verbal base) exhibit an active character, whereas in deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем*, a passive semantic is clearly evident

(with or without expression of modality) – this is a categorical indicator of preserved voice (or verbal nature) in the examined lexemes. Examples include: *забележителна личност* = ‘личност, която е особена/важна/известна’ срещу *забележима промяна* – ‘промяна, която може да се забележи / промяна, която може да бъде забелязана’); *нетърпелив човек* ‘човек, който не може да търпи’ и *нетърпим човек* ‘който не може да се търпи’ / ‘който не може да бъде търпян’.

Further, frequently discussed semantic substitutions of the present passive participle by other participles are also examined, such as the combination of the present active participle + reflexive particle *се*, proposed by D. Popov (1942), as well as the past passive participle formed from an iterative verbal base, suggested by L. Andreychin (1944) and developed in the articles by E. Georgieva (1968) and M. Deyanova (1992).

We are not entirely in agreement with the assertion that the combination of the present active participle + reflexive particle *се* has an identical semantic function to that of the present passive participle. We acknowledge that the interchange between the two participles is possible only in cases where deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* express solely their primary passive meaning, without nuances of their secondary potential meaning. We refer to the present passive participles from the first section of the semantic criterion classification, possessing only passive meaning, e.g., *говорим* език = *говорещ се* език; *полагам* годишен отпуск = *полагащ се* годишен отпуск; *обучаеми* възрастни = *обучаващи се* възрастни; *обработваема* земя = *обработваща се* земя; *обитаемо* жилище = *обитаващо се* жилище, etc. However, when this combination replaces present passive participles, possessing both passive and modal meaning, there is some semantic deviation, as present active participles do not express a potential, hypothetical active feature but rather one that exists in principle, e.g., *неразбираем* език (‘език, който не може да се разбере’) ≠ *неразбиращ се* език (‘език, който не се разбира’); *незабравим* свят (‘свят, който не може да се забрави’) ≠ *незабравящ се* свят (‘свят, който не се забравя’).

Regarding the semantic substitution of the present passive participle with a past passive participle formed from an iterative verbal base, we do not agree with E. Georgieva's assertion that this is an “expanding, progressive” process,

which, according to her, has the potential to change the structure of the Bulgarian participial system (Georgieva 1968: 624). On this matter, we fully align with K. Chakarova, who believes that “the commented functional-semantic substitution, in our opinion, does not lead to such substantial changes as those suggested by E. Georgieva” (Chakarova 2012, [http](#)), and who uses as persuasive evidence the fact that “past passive participles formed from iteratives can never be used instead of present passive participles when expressing the specific meaning of 'possibility/impossibility' – срв.: *неуправляем* човек ( $\neq$  *неуправляван* човек), *избираема* позиция ( $\neq$  *избирана* позиция) и др.“ (Chakarova 2012, [http](#)). In support of this claim, examples can be provided with the concurrent use of present and past passive participles in a shared context, from which the difference between the two participles is clearly evident, e.g. „Според науката няма необяснимо – има само необяснено“ (А. Апостолова – „Нас, които ни няма“, 2021). We believe that the presence of parallel use of present passive participles and past passive participles in the same context is evidence that they are not semantically identical, and one cannot replace the other.

In the third chapter, functional-semantic parallels between English adjectives ending in *-able/-ible* and Bulgarian deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* are outlined, often presented as translational equivalents by contemporary linguists (Dikova 2001, Gugulanova 2005, Nakova 2009, Anastasova 2017). After analysing a large number of excerpts from contemporary English and Bulgarian literature, it is concluded that there is substantial evidence supporting the thesis that English adjectives in *-able/-ible* and Bulgarian deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* are functional-semantic equivalents. The process is bidirectional, as the correspondences are not only registered in translations from English to Bulgarian but also in the reverse translational process – from Bulgarian to English. In terms of percentage, there is a significant predominance of English adjectives in *-able/-ible* as the translational equivalent of deverbatives with the suffix *-м/-ем* in English translations of Bulgarian texts, and vice versa – deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* are the most common choice by translators for conveying the discussed English adjectives in translations into Bulgarian. Special attention is paid to examples where the translator has decided to present English adjectives in -

*able/-ible* with an identical verbal construction featuring the base verb used to form the corresponding deverbatives in *-м/-ем* (e.g., *unforgettable mistake – незабравима грешка – ‘грешка, която не може да се забрави’*). Such examples support the thesis of the retained verbal nature of a significant portion of deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* and serve as an argument in favour of restoring their status as full members of the Bulgarian participial system.

In the final part of the third chapter, the functional features of deverbatives in *-м/-ем* are presented: types of use in sentences (attributive, predicative, adverbial, and substantivised use), as well as their use in all functional styles of contemporary Bulgarian (scientific, official-business, journalistic, literary, conversational style), supported by a significant number of illustrative examples – evidence that present passive participles are not encountered solely as specialised terms or terminological phrases in legal, medical, and economic texts but are applicable to the specificities of other stylistic registers as well.

The **Fourth chapter** is dedicated to the pragmatic features of present passive participles. To examine language attitudes regarding deverbatives in *-м/-ем*, we conducted an anonymous survey of 16 questions involving a total of 705 Bulgarian language speakers – representatives from various parts of Bulgaria, of different ages and genders, with varying levels of education and from different social groups. After analysing the results, a large portion of the initial hypotheses were confirmed: the majority of language speakers prefer to use the present passive participle instead of identical variants that convey the same information but require a greater number of linguistic resources for expression. This confirms the assertion that from the perspective of linguistic economy, deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* are valuable and useful tools as they significantly shorten the phrase and avoid the introduction of subordinate clauses, e.g. *неоспоримо доказателство = доказателство, което не може да се оспори = доказателство, което не може да бъде оспорено*. In similar cases, the present passive participle is indicated as the preferred option, followed by the passive construction with a past passive participle in its composition, and thirdly, the reflexive-passive construction. Regarding semantic substitution with other participles, language speakers are categorical that the past and present passive participles are not interchangeable because the latter expresses not only the meaning of *passivity* but also the modal

meaning of *possibility*. In their free responses, language speakers demonstrate their recognition of the voice and modal semantics of deverbatives in *-м/-ем*, often replacing them with modal verbs + passive constructions (with reflexive-passive construction or with past passive participle), e.g. *необясним* = ‘който не може да се обясни’ = ‘който не може да бъде обяснен’. Regarding the semantic substitution of the present passive participle with the present active participle + reflexive particle *се*, language users are not as categorical as in the previous questions. More than half of the respondents believe that such uses are semantically identical, but the remaining portion detects some divergence in meanings, albeit not as obvious, namely that the first combination expresses both passivity and possibility, while the second one expresses only passivity. In the free-response section, the present passive participle is most commonly rendered through a modal verb and a reflexive-passive or participial-passive construction (e.g., *неразличими* = не могат да се различат / не могат да бъдат различени), whereas the combination of the present active participle + reflexive particle *се* is expressed solely through reflexive-passive construction (e.g., *неразличаващи се* = не се различават). When comparing deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* with verbal adjectives with suffixes *-телен/-лив*, derived from the same base verb, language speakers unmistakably identify the differences between them and detect the verbal characteristics of passivity and modality primarily in present passive participles, indicating that they are not of the same word-formation type, as claimed by some scholars. In the open-response section, respondents most frequently replace the verbal adjectives with other synonymous adjectives, while the participles are often conveyed through verbal constructions containing modal and passive elements or through other participles – evidence of retained verbal characteristics. To illustrate the difference between a present passive participle, possessing both passive and modal semantics, and one that has lost its verbal features and transitioned to the class of adjectives, we chose to include the lexemes *забележим* and *значим* in consecutive questions – in the first, the verbal characteristics are clearly evident and respondents acknowledge them in their answers, explaining their meaning through modal verbs and passive constructions (reflexive and/or participial), while the semantics of the second are mainly conveyed through a verb and verbal noun („е от значение“, „има



значение“) or with adjectives (such as *важен, съществен, стойностен*), rarely reconstructing the base verb from which they were derived.

In conclusion, we defend the thesis regarding the contemporary derivational activity of deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем*, asserting that they are productive across all functional styles of Contemporary Bulgarian language, including literary and conversational registers. The concise and “compressed” manner of expression provided by the present passive participles is characteristic not only of scientific discourse and applicable not only in the official business sphere. Under the influence of language economy law, they gradually penetrate the language of the media and advertising, as well as literary fiction, thus also into colloquial speech, indicating that the note about their “literary” nature is no longer relevant. Bulgarian language speakers perceive the neologistic uses of deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* as unusual and still not fully established in the language, so in writing, they sometimes frame them in quotation marks, and in speech, they pronounce them slowly and with a distinct emphasis, which serves to phonetically highlight them in the sentence. This is evidence that language speakers use them in colloquial speech despite uncertainties in their use, which is still not established by the literary norm, indicating the need to revise the viewpoints in contemporary grammars with updated guidelines regarding their use. The increasing examples of newly formed deverbatives ending in *-м/-ем* from borrowed foreign verbs, as well as the formation of neologisms following the same pattern, testify that they are necessary linguistic tools in the contemporary stage of Bulgarian language development, as the language continuously provides evidence to support this claim. We believe that they are unjustly neglected by the codifiers of Contemporary Bulgarian language, and the reason for their unrecovered status in the participial system lies in maintaining an outdated understanding for over half a century.

The dissertation concludes with a **summary**, outlining the main results of the conducted scholarly analysis, **bibliography** (112 titles), **list of excerpted sources**, **list of abbreviations used**, and an **appendix** containing the compiled dictionary of present passive participles in Contemporary Bulgarian language after extracting from the *Official Orthographic Dictionary of the Bulgarian*

*Language. Verbs*, BAS, 2016 (a total of 1774 lexemes, supported by a significant number of examples).

## CITED IN THE AUTHOR'S ABSTRACT LITERATURE

**Анастасова 2017:** Анастасова, М. 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, Пловдив, 2017, 8 – 13. [Anastasova, M. English *-able/-ible* adjectives and their counterparts in Bulgarian. // *Nauchni trudove na Suyuza na uchenite v Bulgaria – Plovdiv. Seriya A. Obshtestveni nauki, izkustvo i kultura*, tom IV, Plovdiv, 2017, 8 – 13.]

**Андрейчин 1944:** Андрейчин, Л. *Основна българска граматика*. София: Книгоиздателство „Хемус А.Д.“, 1944. [Andreychin, L. *Osnovna balgarska gramatika*. Sofia: Knigoizdatelstvo "Hemus A.D.", 1944.]

**Андрейчин, Иванов, Попов 1957:** Андрейчин, Л., Иванов, М., Попов, К. *Съвременен български език. Учебник за I и II курс на учителските институти. Част II*. София: ДИ „Народна просвета“, 1957. [Andreychin, L., Ivanov, M., Popov, K. *Savremenen balgarski ezik. Uchebnik za I i II kurs na uchitelskite instituti*. Sofia: DI "Narodna prosveta", 1957.]

**Бояджиева 2008:** Бояджиева, Ц. Още веднъж за реабилитирането на термина *сегашно страдателно причастие* в съвременната българска езикова наука. // *Словото: образи и отражения. Сборник с доклади от Националните конференции за студенти и докторанти, Пловдив, 2006 и 2007 г.* Пловдив: „Контекст“, 2008, 33 – 43. [Boyadzhieva, Ts. *Oshte vednash za reabilitiraneto na termina segashno stradalno prichastie v suvremennata balgarska ezikova nauka*. // *Slovoto: obrazi i otrazheniya. Sbornik s dokladi ot Natsionalnite konferentsii za studenti i doktoranti*, Plovdiv, 2006 i 2007 g. Plovdiv: "Kontekst", 2008, 33 – 43.]

**Валтер 1981:** Валтер, Х. Към проблема за мястото на т. нар. сегашно страдателно причастие в системата на съвременния български книжовен език. // *Език и литература*, 1981, кн. 5, 103 – 108. [Valter, H. *Kam problemat za myastoto na t. nar. segashno stradalno prichastie v sistemata na savremenniya balgarski knizhoven ezik*. // *Ezik i literatura*, 1981, kn. 5, 103 – 108.]

**Георгиева 1968:** Георгиева, Е. За някои граматико-семантични промени на миналите страдателни причастия в съвременния български

книжовен език. // *Известия на Института за български език*, кн. XVI, София: Издателство на БАН, 1968, 617 – 626. [Georgieva 1968: Georgieva, E. Za nyakoi gramatiko-semantichni promeni na minalite stradatelni prichastiya v savremenniya balgarski knizhoven ezik. // *Izvestiya na Institut za balgarski ezik*, кн. XVII, Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN, 1968, 617 – 626.]

**Гугуланова 1978:** Гугуланова, И. Синтактично-семантични признаци на отглаголните прилагателни в българския език. // *Славистични изследвания*, № 4, София, 1978, 95 – 103. [Gugulanova, I. Sintaktichno-semantichni priznatsi na otglagolnite prilagatelni v balgarskiya ezik. // *Slavistichni izsledvaniya*, № 4, Sofia, 1978, 95 – 103.]

**Гугуланова 2005:** Гугуланова, И. *Българските причастия и деепричастия в славянски контекст*. София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2005. [Gugulanova, I. Balgarskite prichastiya i deeprichastiya v slavyanski kontekst. Sofia: UI "Sv. Kliment Ohridski", 2005.]

**Деянова 1992:** Деянова, М. Към установяване на единно страдателно причастие в съвременния български книжовен език. // *Български език*, кн. 3, год. XLII, София, 1992, 166 – 172. [Deyanova, M. Kam ustanovyavane na edinno stradalno prichastie v suvremenniya balgarski knizhoven ezik. // *Balgarski ezik*, кн. 3, god. XLII, Sofia, 1992, 166 – 172.]

**Дикова 2001:** Дикова, Б. За т.нар. сегашно страдателно причастие с оглед на функционалната стилистика. // *Научни доклади. Обучението по български език в началото на XXI век*. Смолян, 2001. [Dikova, B. Za t.nar. segashno stradalno prichastie s ogled na funktsionalnata stilistika. // *Nauchni dokladi. Obuchenie po balgarski ezik v nachaloto na XXI v..* Smolyan, 2001.]

**Куцаров 2012:** Куцаров, К. *Българското причастие*. Пловдив: УИ „Паисий Хилендарски“, 2012. [Kutsarov, K. Balgarskoto prichastie. Plovdiv: UI "Paisii Hilendarski", 2012.]

**Накова 2009:** Накова, В. Възраждане на сегашното страдателно причастие в съвременната българска реч. // *Romanoslavica*, Vol. 45, 2009, 59 – 68. [Nakova, V. Vazrazhdane na segashnoto stradatelno prichastie v savremennata balgarska rech. // *Romanoslavica*, Vol. 45, 2009, 59 – 68.]

**Петрова 2001:** Петрова, Ст. Подсистемата на причастията в съвременния български език. // *Традиция и съвременност на българския език. Сборник в чест на проф. д-р Любомир Андрейчин, чл.-кор. на БАН*.

София, 2001, 250 – 254. [Petrova, St. Podsystemata na prichastiata v savremenniya balgarski ezik. // Traditsiya i savremennost na balgarskiya ezik. Sbornik nauchni trudove ot Natsionalnata konferentsiya s mezhdunarodno uchastie. Sofia, 2001, 250 – 254.]

**Попов 1942:** Попов, Д. *Българска граматика*. София: Книгоиздателство „Христо Г. Данов“, 1942. [Popov, D. *Balgarska gramatika*. Sofia: Knigoizdatelstvo "Hristo G. Danov", 1942.]

**Първев 1970:** Първев, Хр. Съвременният книжовен български език и проблемата за сегашно страдателно причастие. // *Известия на Института за български език*, №19, София: Издателство на БАН, 1970, 123 – 130. [Parnev 1970: Parnev, H. *Savremenniyat knizhoven balgarski ezik i problemat za segashno stradalno prichastie*. // *Izvestiya na Institut za balgarski ezik*, №19, Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN, 1970, 123 – 130.]

**Първев 1976:** Първев, Хр. Черти от семантичната характеристика на причастията в съвременния книжовен български език. // *Помогало по българска морфология. Глагол*. София: Изд. „Наука и изкуство“, 1976, 404 – 414. [Parnev 1976: Parnev, H. *Cherti ot semantichnata harakteristika na prichastiata v savremenniya knizhoven balgarski ezik*. // *Pomagalo po balgarska morfologiya. Glagol*. Sofia: Izd. "Nauka i izkustvo", 1976, 404 – 414.]

**Чакърова 2012:** Чакърова, К. Към въпроса за аспектуалната характеристика на българските минали причастия. // *40 години Шуменски университет 1971 – 2011. Сборник научни трудове от Националната конференция с международно участие*. Шумен: УИ "Епископ Константин Преславски", 2012, стр. 200 – 210. [Chakarova, K. *Kam vaprosa za aspektualnata harakteristika na balgarskite minali prichastiya*. // *40 godini Shumenski universitet 1971 – 2011. Sbornik nauchni trudove ot Natsionalnata konferentsiya s mezhdunarodno uchastie*. Shumen: UI "Episkop Konstantin Preslavski", 2012, str. 200 – 210.]

**Чоролеева 1970:** Чоролеева, М. Отглаголни прилагателни имена или адекватирани причастия. // *Известия на Института за български език*, кн. 19, София: Издателство на БАН, 1970, 163 – 169. [Choroleeva, M. *Otglagolni prilagatelni imena ili adekvatirani prichastiya*. // *Izvestiya na Institut za balgarski ezik*, kn. 19, Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN, 1970, 163 – 169.]

## PUBLICATIONS ON THE TOPIC OF THE DISSERTATION

**Markova, D. (2021a).** On the formants which take part in the formation of the “Present Passive Participle” in Contemporary Bulgarian. // *Verba iuvenium* – Voices of the Young, Issue 3. Research Papers from the 22<sup>nd</sup> Graduate and PhD Student Academic Conference. Plovdiv, 2021, 45 – 57.

**Markova, D. (2021b).** Functional-Semantic Parallels between the English adjectives ending in the suffix *-able/-ible* and the Bulgarian “Present Passive Participle” (based on translation texts). // Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv – Bulgaria. Research Papers – Languages and Literature. Vol. 59, Book 1, Part A, 2021, 378 – 391.

**Markova, D. (2022a).** Main periods in the research of the Present Passive Participle in the Bulgarian Grammatical Studies from the middle of 19<sup>th</sup> to the middle of 20<sup>th</sup> century. // *Verba iuvenium* – Voices of the Young, Issue 4. Research Papers from the 23<sup>rd</sup> Graduate and PhD Student Academic Conference. Plovdiv, 2022, 37 – 52.

**Markova, D. (2022b).** Historical notes on the development of the Bulgarian Present Passive Participle. // Scientific Works of the Union of Scientists – Plovdiv. Series B. Natural Sciences and the Humanities, vol. XXIII, Plovdiv, 2022, 129 – 134.

**Markova, D. (2023).** Description of the *-m/-em* deverbatives in the Bulgarian grammatical studies after the Bulgarian orthography reform in 1945 until nowadays. // *Verba iuvenium* – Voices of the Young, Issue 5. Research Papers from the 24<sup>th</sup> Graduate and PhD Student Academic Conference. Plovdiv, 2023, 58 – 72.

## REFERENCE TO THE SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE DISSERTATION WORK

1. The dissertation is the first comprehensive study entirely dedicated to the deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM* (or the so-called Present Passive Participles) in Contemporary Bulgarian, as until this moment, there hasn't been a comprehensive theoretical review of the grammatical literature on the topic (including grammars, monographs, publications from scientific periodicals); the issue has not been studied in diachrony as well.

2. Two classifications have been proposed – according to formal and semantic criteria, as well as criteria for identifying the deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM* – whether they function as participles or as adjectives. A formula for verifying the verbal nature by restoring the generating verb base has been introduced, which serves as a “litmus test” in determining whether the formations have retained their verbal characteristics.

3. A dictionary of Present Passive Participles in contemporary Bulgarian has been compiled based on data from the *Official Orthographic Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language. Verbs* (BAS, 2016). The created dictionary is the most extensive to date – it consists of 1774 lexemes, each supported by examples excerpted from the Bulgarian National Corpus, Bulgarian fiction literature, and the internet space.

4. The question of the formants involved in the formation of deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM* has been specified. After an analysis of the empirical material, it is concluded that the mechanism for forming the investigated linguistic units is associated with the conjugation of the original verb. Two suffixes have been proposed: *-M* and *-eM* respectively with verbs from II and III conjugation; the suffix *-uM* can only be discussed exceptionally in individual cases from I conjugation. Emphasis is also placed on the influence of the Russian language in the formation of the analysed type of deverbatives.

5. The study includes a substantial comparison with the English language – the hypothesis that Bulgarian deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM* and English adjectives in *-able/-ible* are functionally-semantic equivalents has been confirmed, with an analysis of a large number of examples excerpted

from translated literature (not only from English to Bulgarian but also from Bulgarian to English).

6. A survey was conducted among 705 native speakers of Bulgarian, aimed at examining the language attitudes regarding Present Passive Participles. The results of the 16 questions largely confirm the preliminary hypotheses: from the perspective of linguistic economy, deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM* are valuable and useful linguistic tools preferred by language speakers, as they significantly shorten the phrase and save the introduction of subordinate clauses, while conveying the same information in a synthesized form.

7. Uses of Present Passive Participles are presented in all functional styles of Contemporary Bulgarian, supported by a significant number of illustrative examples – this proves that deverbatives ending in *-M/-eM* are not only encountered as specialised terms in legal, medical, and economic texts, but are applicable to the specificities of other stylistic registers, including literary and conversational style.