

**ANNOTATED LIST OF ALL SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS OF
ASSOC. PROF. KRASIMIRA ANGELOVA CHAKAROVA, PHD,**
submitted for participation in the competition for the academic position
“Professor” in area of higher education 2. Humanitarian Sciences,
professional field 2.1. Philology (Modern Bulgarian Language),
as announced in the State Gazette No 98/19.11.2024

Chakarova, Krasimira. *The Category of Verbal Aspect in the Modern Bulgarian Language*. Plovdiv: Plovdiv University Press “Paisii Hilendarski”, 2025, 188 pages. ISBN 978-619-281-013-9.

The monograph is dedicated to the category of the *verbal aspect* in modern Bulgarian language. The choice of the topic is largely predetermined by the author's enduring interest in the linguistic means of expressing verbal quantity, these means constitute one of the syncategorial fields within the field of Aspectuality. In this study (just like in the book *Aspectuality and Quantity*. Veliko Tarnovo: Faber, 2003, 308 pp. ISBN 954-775-208-1) the author convincingly argues that the verbal category of *aspect* is a three-member lexical-grammatical category, formed as a result of the complex interactions among the particular functional-semantic fields in the area of aspectuality. It includes simple (primary, non-prefixed) verbs of imperfective aspect (e.g. *pisha*); perfective verbs, formed from imperfective verbs most often by prefixation (e.g. *prepisha*) and derived verbs, formed from perfective verbs by adding the morpheme *-va* (or one of its allomorphs) (e.g. *prepisvam*), which are categorised as *grammatical iteratives*. It is emphasized that in the grammatical sense (both formally and semantically) the iteratives are marked not by *verbal aspect*, but by *quantity (frequency)* – they express the idea of recurrency of a given complex action without indication of a temporal or spatial limit, and participate (as a marked member) in the two-member morphological cryptocategory **recurrency**, represented by the privative opposition *iterativity ~ non-iterativity* and closely related to the opposition *imperfective aspect ~ perfective aspect*.

The new approach in this monograph is that, after an analytical review of the studies on the category of aspect in our linguistics, the research focus shifts to the question of the composition and structure of the functional-semantic field of aspectuality in the Bulgarian

language. It is defined as a broad linguistic area, uniting diverse means of expressing the “character of the course and distribution of the action in time” (Peshkovsky 1956: 105), and at the same time as a group of syncategorial FSFs (limit, processivity, phasality, frequency, etc.), united by this feature. Although not in detail (since separate aspects of the topic have already been discussed in other publications by the author), the peripheral modifiers in the macro-field of aspectuality are presented: word-formational, lexical, morphological and syntactic. Quite reasonably, the focus of the academic research and analysis is the nuclear (core) category of the verbal aspect.

A new definition of this category is proposed: the aspect represents the action from its internal completeness (complexity), incompleteness (processivity) or complex recurrency (iterativity) regardless of its place in time. The meanings of incompleteness and complex recurrency have a common semantic feature – continuity, but differ in that in a non-actual plan, iterativity can always be transformed into complexity, i.e. it is biaspectual in its essence. This biapectuality is expressed through the structure of the language, i.e. it is grammatical, not lexical, and should not be considered as a manifestation of defectiveness.

The reasons for considering iteratives as a separate member of the aspectual system (along with imperfective and perfective verbs) are discussed. On one hand, this is due to the specific nature of the formal indicator of grammatical recurrency: it is not part of the verb's formative, but of the verb's stem, as it is “syncretic” and contains the marker of the third new Bulgarian conjugation. On the other hand, it is due to the fact that the morphological category of **recurrency** is not completely autonomous, but enters into a close, dialectically determined interaction with the verbal aspect. In other words, iteratives in modern Bulgarian language are indeed grammatical formations, but also separate words. They form a specific aspectual paradigm, functioning within the verbal aspect, which is called a “quasigrammeme”.

The formal-semantic and functional features of imperfective, perfective, and grammatical iterative verbs are examined in detail. Based on a thorough analysis, the idea of aspectual deficiency of the non-prefixed imperfective verbs is rejected. For the first time, the so-called additional meanings of the perfective verbs are presented – namely, single occurrence, effectiveness and concreteness – functioning alongside the basic meaning of totality (complexity, completeness) of the verbal action. The differences between the aspectual meaning of goal achievement of the action (effectiveness) and the meaning of resultativeness (carried by some of the temporal forms in Bulgarian), as well as the specific interaction between the additional meanings of the perfective verbs and some manners of action (single occurrence, delimitative, etc.) are

discussed. As for the iteratives, special attention is paid to the morpheme suffixoid with which they are formed and to their various semantic realizations, predetermined by the context conditions. It is specified that their durative use is one of the most frequently observed contextual realizations of iterativity, which is the main reason for the existence and widespread use of the inaccurate term “secondary imperfectives” in Bulgarian aspectology.

As the examples show, these verbs are not always secondary, and more importantly, in some cases they cannot express an imperfective meaning (cf. *V momenta *okapvam* bebeto; *Togava *napisvah* pismoto).

A separate chapter of the exposition examines the peculiarities in the functioning of the verbal aspects. A detailed commentary is made on their interaction with the categories of tense, taxis, and Aktionsart. Special attention is paid to the uses of the perfective aspect in the imperfect tense, as well as to the controversial issue of the opposition **imperfect : aorist**. It is emphasized that this opposition is of a non-oppositional type; it is a functional-semantic difference, realized in the sphere of narrativity. Such essential issues as the use of aspect in expressing prohibitiveness, in the formation of participles, as well as in the functioning of the narrative systems characteristic of the modern Bulgarian language, are not overlooked. The stylistic potential of the verbal aspect is also commented on.

The main conclusions are formulated in the final part of the monograph.

Chakarova, Krasimira. *A Handbook in Bulgarian Morphology*. Second, revised and expanded edition. Plovdiv: Plovdiv University Press “Paisii Hilendarski”, 2024, p. 278. ISBN 978-619-281-006-1.

The handbook is a revised and expanded variant of “A Handbook in Bulgarian Morphology” (2000) (Plovdiv University Press “Paisii Hilendarski”), which was published more than twenty years ago. It consists of three main sections and an Appendix.

The first section (*Tasks and Texts for Seminars in Bulgarian Morphology*) has been expanded with additional tasks and entertaining rebuses in the part, titled “Morphological Puzzles”. Some of the tasks and rebuses have been excerpted from tests, given to the participants in the annual Olympiad in Bulgarian morphology, which is traditional for the Faculty of Philology at the University of Plovdiv and has been taking place since 1999. New sentences for morphological analysis have also been added. The meanings of some rare, dialect,

or archaic words, including foreign words or specialized terms, used in the excerpted examples, have been explained in the footnotes.

In addition to the theoretical Section II (*A New Look on Some Debatable Problems in Modern Bulgarian Morphology*), which includes some of my own studies on a number of debatable topics from the Bulgarian verbal morphology, four more texts have been added, three of which are not related to the verb, but focus on a word-forming case of current interest – the question of how common gender nouns function in the modern Bulgarian language and what the status of the so called determinatives is.

The thematic selection of the bibliographic sources in Section III (*Thematic Selection of Bibliographic Sources*) has also been updated. The aim is to assist new philologists in their search for the newest and most significant studies, dedicated to various topics from the contemporary Bulgarian morphology.

The definitions of some basic concepts from functional-semantic grammar have been removed from the Appendix, but in return the third part (*Examples for a Morphological Analysis of a Sentence*) has been expanded. This decision was motivated by many years of practical work with the handbook during seminars, as well as by the feedback from students in favour of such illustrative examples, which aid the preparation process for the exam.

Chakarova, Krasimira. Once Again on the Question of the Morphological Status of the Bulgarian Determinatives. // *Scientific Works of University of Food Technologies – Plovdiv, volume LIV, issue 3, 2007, Plovdiv: Academic Publishing House of University of Food Technologies – Plovdiv, p. 344 – 350. ISSN: 1314 – 7102.*

The focus of the present research is on a group of lexical units with a disputable status within the morphological system of the modern Bulgarian language. The group in question are the invariable words of the type *imenno, chak, takmo, dazhe, samo, dori* (namely, not until, just, even, only, even if), etc., which are used very frequently in the contemporary Bulgarian speech. The main purpose of the article is to find a convincing answer to the question of the nature and place of these lexemes in the language system. The accurate answer to this question holds more than just a theoretical value, as it can shed light on a number of debatable practical cases from the translational and methodological fields.

It is concluded that in this particular instance these lexemes should be referred to as parts of an unusual (borderline) lexical class, whose members possess not so much a distinct meaning of their own, rather than an important semantic function – that of pragmatic actualization agents. Their task is to attract the recipient's attention to a particular element in the utterance, which is of a special importance to the addresser. In other words, the use of such lexemes achieves the same result as the “inversion” of the sentence word order during the so called topical (subjective) word order, e.g.: *S Ivan otidoh na kino vchera = Vchera otidoh na kino imenno s Ivan (It was Ivan I went to the cinema with yesterday = Yesterday I went to the cinema exactly with Ivan).*

However, considering the fact that the words in question form a relatively small lexical group, their differentiation as a separate part of speech (see Staniyo Georgiev) seems rather unjustified, despite their extraordinary characteristics. On the other hand, their morphological invariance, along with their ability to change the logical emphasis in the sentence, thus presenting the pragmatic viewpoint of the addresser, and the existence of their own semantic functions, provide the necessary arguments to classify them as a part of the adverbial system, if only as a separate subtype – adverbs for logical specification. Together with the demonstrative pronouns and some particles, they form the group of the lexical deictics in the modern Bulgarian language. However, unlike other reference words in Bulgarian, these adverbs also perform the essential role of pragmatic markers, i.e. agents of actualization, which explains their high frequency in the speech practice.

Chakarova, Krasimira. On the Subject of Some Specific Problems of Teaching Verbal Aspect (in View of Teaching Bulgarian as a Second Language). // Scientific Works of University of Food Technologies – Plovdiv, volume 62, 2015, Plovdiv: Academic Publishing House of University of Food Technologies – Plovdiv, p. 877 – 881. ISSN: 1314 – 7102.

The article examines the main problems of teaching Bulgarian verbal aspect, as well as the difficulties in its understanding, encountered by foreign students, whose native tongue lacks this verbal category. The paper presents a critical analysis of the methodical strategies, used for the presentation of the verbal aspect in some of the most popular contemporary textbooks for teaching Bulgarian as a second language.

The study comes to the important conclusion that teaching verbal aspect in front of an audience of people, whose first language is non-aspectual, is more than a complicated undertaking, it is a real challenge, as far as the majority of the modern textbooks for teaching Bulgarian as a second language do not fully present the components of the aspectual system, and do not emphasize enough on the characteristics of the opposition *totality ~ non-totality* and its autonomy when it comes to verb tense. The main reason for this partial (and at times inaccurate) presentation of verbal aspect in textbooks seems to be the “conflict” between the different theories concerning the nature of this category in our language.

The study emphasizes the need of a more modernized approach, which could be used when teaching aspectuality, one which successfully combines the formal-semantic and the pragmatic perspectives in the interpretation of empirical data. The educational process should be based not only on the traditional questions “What is verbal aspect?”, “How are the different verbal aspects made?”, but also on the most essential from a communicative aspect question: “How can we use the different verbal aspects in our speech and writing?”.

Chakarova, Krasimira. On the Subject of Teaching Bulgarian Verbal Aspect and How Foreign Students Learn It. // *Scientific Works of University of Food Technologies – Plovdiv, volume 62, Plovdiv: Academic Publishing House of University of Food Technologies – Plovdiv, 2015, p. 882 – 887. ISSN: 1314-7102.*

The article is an extension of a previous study focused on the problems of teaching verbal aspect in the context of teaching Bulgarian as a second language (see Chakarova, K. On the Subject of Some Specific Problems of Teaching Verbal Aspect (in View of Teaching Bulgarian as a Second Language) // *Scientific Works of University of Food Technologies – Plovdiv, volume 62, 2015, Plovdiv: Academic Publishing House of University of Food Technologies – Plovdiv, p. 877 – 881*). The paper emphasizes on the various factors which can be used for the optimization of this process and presents some specific ideas, practically applied in a real educational situation – in the process of teaching foreign students (the majority of whom are native speakers of non-aspectual languages) from the Preparatory Center of the Department of Language Training, Physical Education and Sports at the University of Food Technologies – Plovdiv.

The methodical suggestions, which are being offered, are based on the author's standpoint on the nature of the verbal aspect as a three-member category in the contemporary Bulgarian language, a position which significantly differs from the popular "morphologically centered" concept, used in a number of systemic grammar books.

These methodical ideas can be summarized in the following statements:

1. All components of the aspectual system should be introduced when teaching the Bulgarian verbal aspect – the simple imperfectives, the perfectives, formed from the simple imperfectives, as well as the verbs, formed with the formant *-va* (*-a*, *-ya*, *-ava*, *-yava*, *-uva*).

2. The decision of some authors of textbooks of Bulgarian as a second language to include "key words" for the identification of the perfect and the imperfect verbal aspects is completely justified. And if it is certain that the words and expressions for repetition can be used only with imperfective verbs – simple or complex (i.e. iteratives formed from perfective verbs), it can be argued whether the so called lexical "indicators" for perfectivity, included in the majority of the textbooks (for example modal verbs, conjunctions and particles), do actually function as such.

3. When teaching the Bulgarian aorist (Past Simple Tense), it is essential to emphasize that the aorist can be formed both with perfective and imperfective verbs (simple and complex), but there are significant semantic differences between the two combination types – while the imperfective aorist most often expresses a past action which continued for an extended period of time and "finished before the moment of speaking", the aorist, made with perfective verbs, depicts the action as whole (complex), singular and completed in a specific (particular) past moment.

4. This article stands firmly behind the belief that the last module in the sequence of lessons, dedicated to the category of the verbal aspect, should include the process of perfectivation, i.e. the process of formation of perfective verbs from simple imperfective verbs via adding prefixes with various semantics (or the suffix *-n-* for expressing single-occurrence). Only so would the main specific feature of the examined category stand out – its lexical-grammatical nature. The biaspectual character (imperfective, but also perfective – in a non-actual plan) of the verbs, made from perfectives via the formant *-va* (and its allomorphs), as well as the narrative function of such verbs, can be addressed later in the educational process.

Chakarova, Krasimira. On the Subject of the Typology of the Functional-Semantic Fields in Modern Bulgarian. // *Bulgarian Language and Literature*, Vol. 59, № 4, 2017, p. 425 – 432. ISSN 0323–9519.

The focus of the present study is on one of the key concepts in A. V. Bondarko's theory – the functional-semantic field (FSF). The main purpose is to make a new attempt for classification of the FSF in the contemporary Bulgarian language. Before embarking on this task, the paper presents a critical review of the concepts of A. V. Bondarko and I. Kutsarov on the different types of functional-semantic fields.

The classification, introduced in the article, can be defined as morphology-centered and is based on the following stratification criteria:

- 1) sphere of functioning;
- 2) presence/absence of a structural centre (nucleus);
- 3) field periphery content;
- 4) level of functional autonomy;
- 5) semantic range.

- A

c • According to their structural characteristics (presence or absence of a structural centre) FSFs can be nuclear (almost all FSFs, including the microfields of the marked n

n • According to their peripheral structure FSFs in contemporary Bulgarian can be divided into two types: FSFs with a concentrated (condensed) periphery (for example the FSFs of modality, aspectuality, comparativity) and FSFs with a "sparse" periphery (for pointed out that the microfields of the non-marked grammemes in the nucleus (core) usually have a "sparse" periphery (for example a main modifier of the primary meaning of the non-subjective modality is the specific "objective" intonation).

t

g • According to their level of functional autonomy FSFs can be self-dependent (for example temporality, modality, comparativity, voice, etc.) and dependent – they realize as separate fields within self-dependent FSFs, expressing a given meaning in a syncretic relation to the other fields from the same category (for example the FSFs of frequency and axis).

è • According to their semantic range FSFs can be categorial (the fields of the self-dependent functional-semantic categories, in I. Kutsarov – macrofields), syncategorial (the fields of the dependent FSFs) and grammeme (i.e. microfields) – for example the FSFs of

à

h

h

e

f

d

self-dependent FSFs, the microfields of the grammemes in the dependent categories can also be described as dependent.

The paper specifically focuses on the functions of the peripheral modifiers (used independently or combined): 1) to complement the semantic capabilities of the nucleus (core) and 2) to be used (even if rarely) instead of specific nuclear (core) agents. Particular attention has been placed on the following dependency: the bigger the structural motivation of a particular meaning, explicated by certain peripheral modifiers, the smaller the dependency of these modifiers from the nucleus is. They are characterized by a bigger functional activity, and can even substitute the core modifiers (for example the demonstrative pronouns can completely “compensate” the lack of a member morpheme when expressing individual determination).

Chakarova, Krasimira. Formal-Semantic Characteristics of the Common Gender Nouns in the Contemporary Bulgarian Language. // *Traces of Speech. A Jubilee Collection Dedicated to Prof. Diana Ivanova, Dsc. Plovdiv: Context, 2011, p. 324 – 340. ISBN 978-954-8238-34-2.*

The article examines the so called common gender nouns in the modern Bulgarian language. It provides a detailed analysis of their formal and semantic specifications which distinguish them from the other groups of defective nouns in Bulgarian (the non-personal nouns of mixed gender (*nomina heterogena*), e.g. *gaz* (*gazat, gazta*) “*gas/the gas*”, *diplom* (but also *diploma*) “*diploma/the diploma*”; the masculinized nouns (e.g. *direktor, ministar*, etc.) “*director, minister*, etc.”; the collective nouns (*kumove, svatove, balgari, provdivchani*) “*sponsors, in-laws, Bulgarians, Plovdivers*”, etc. The article reaches the conclusion that the system of the Bulgarian *nomina communia* constitutes of four groups of personal nouns (common nouns and proper nouns). In two of them the bigenderness is semantically motivated (these nouns refer to people of both genders, e.g. *pianitsa, haymana, budala, nevezha; Toni(to), Pepi(to), Nasse(to), Vasse(to), Aleks, Kris*, etc.) “*drunkard, scapegrace, simpleton, know-nothing; Toni(to), Pepi(to), Nasse(to), Vasse(to), Alex, Kris*, etc.”, whereas in the other two groups the bigenderness is structurally motivated (they refer to people of a specific gender, but due to the neuter gender inflexion the concord is double, e.g. *atashe, konferansie, krupie, parvenyu, Mime(to), Geri(to), Mite(to), Zhore(to)*, etc.) “*attache, conferencier, croupier, parvenu, Mime(to), Geri(to), Mite(to), Zhore(to)*, etc.”. One characteristic feature of the common gender nouns is the asymmetry between the plane of expression and the plane of

content, which is the reason why many authors interpret them as defective lexemes. This defectiveness is expressed mainly in the variability of the concord and more rarely – in the limitations of the vocative forms. As far as the other morphological categories, inherent to nouns as a lexical class, the examined nouns make no exception – they can have an article and can change their grammatical number. Another characteristic feature of *nomina communia* is their stylistic markedness, as their connotational “range” is very wide (they can express disapproval, antipathy, irony, as well as sympathy, tenderness, affection, etc.).

The study addresses the fact that the group of the Bulgarian common gender nouns includes a limited number of names (of domestic or foreign origin), moreover, there is a tendency towards the reduction of its lexical inventory. The process has mostly affected the group of the “real” common gender nouns such as *haymana*, *mizhiturka* “scapegrace, chicken-heart”, etc., whose number has significantly decreased in comparison to previous periods in the history of the Bulgarian language. Still, it has been agreed that the group in question is not closed – even if sporadically, new words, created by analogy with domestic or foreign word-building models, do enter the group (e.g. *antipatyaga*, *rabotyaga*; *Aleks*, *Kris*, etc.) “*twat*, *hard-worker*; *Alex*, *Kris*, etc.”.

Chakarova, Krasimira. On the Question of the Functional Equivalents of the Bulgarian Inferential Mood in Serbo-Croatian. // *The Language of Time. Proceedings on the Occasion of the 70th Anniversary of Prof. Ivan Kutsarov, Dsc.* Plovdiv: Paisii Hilendarski Plovdiv University Press, 2012, p. 270 – 281. ISBN 978-954-423-797-4.

The study focuses on the question of the Serbo-Croatian functional equivalents of one of the Bulgarian subjective modal grammemes – the so called inferential mood (conclusive), which expresses an action (or action result), determined by the speaker through deduction, generalization and assumption.

In the very beginning of the article it is stated that the Serbo-Croatian (as well as Bulgarian) linguistic literature hasn't paid enough attention to the various ways in which inference is expressed in the Serbo-Croatian language. This modal meaning is usually interpreted as a function of specific temporal forms (for example in A. Belich, M. Stevanovich, T. Maretich, Y. Ham, L. Lashkova) or as a result of the combination of specific components within the utterance (this idea can be found in A. Belich and Y. Vukovich).

The analysis does not aim to describe all language means with conclusive semantics in Serbo-Croatian, but to comment on the use of one particular grammeme, which formally coincides with the Bulgarian conclusive past tense and is actively used as its translational correlate – the Serbian perfekat (perfect tense), whose modal characteristics are mentioned in the majority of grammar descriptions of the Serbo-Croatian language. The article introduces a systematic review of the uses of this grammeme as a functional equivalent of the Bulgarian conclusive aorist, without ignoring the essential question regarding the differences between these two grammar forms.

A conclusion has been reached that the Serbo-Croatian perfect is the most used functional equivalent of the Bulgarian conclusive aorist, the reasons for which should not be searched only in the formal similarity between these two forms, but also in their semantic resemblance. Moreover, there is also a striking structural-typological asymmetry between them. Unlike Serbo-Croatian, in which the inferential meaning of the perfect tense is a peculiar modal nuance within the indicative mood, the Bulgarian conclusive aorist is a separate modal grammeme, functioning (albeit subsidiarily) within the structure of the specific for the Bulgarian language inferential mood. In other words, the expression of the same semantics in the compared languages happens in an utterly different manner – systematically, with the aid of various language means from the nucleus of the functional-semantic field of the conclusive modality (in the Bulgarian language), and through peripheral (non-nuclear) modifiers (in Serbo-Croatian). An important evidence in proof of the systematic nature of the expression of inference in our language is the existence of formal indicators – the actualized imperfect morpheme in combination with the auxiliary verb *sam* “be”, which is preserved in all forms of the conclusive paradigm.

Chakarova, Krasimira. Typology of the Optative Constructions in Bulgarian, Russian and Polish. // *Slavic Philology, volume 25. Articles for the 15th International Congress of Slavists in Minsk, Belarus, 2013.* Sofia: Prof. Marin Drinov Academic Publishing House, 2013, p. 88 – 99. ISBN 978-954-322-575-0.

The study examines the optative constructions in three Slavic languages – Bulgarian, Russian and Polish. The main purpose is to systemize the signs of cross-language symmetry and asymmetry in the expression of volition (optativity). The scientific analysis is based on the concept that imperativeness and optativity are not contradictory and can be consolidated within

the same modal functional-semantic field – the microfield of volitive modality (with its nucleus (core) – the grammeme imperative mood). This notion does not contradict the idea of the scientific focus being directed specifically at the language means for the expression of volition in the three examined languages. Only a detailed description of these means can resolve some theoretically important problems: 1) Which of the analysed languages has the richest formal inventory of optative modifiers?; 2) What is the distribution of these modifiers within the microfield of volitive modality? Which modifiers function as components of the field centre (the nucleus) and which belong to the functional-semantic periphery?

After a detailed analysis, verified with a large number of excerpted examples, it is concluded that in all three compared languages volition is verbalized through various verbal constructions (of a morphological or syntactic type) – elements from the functional-semantic microfield of volitive modality. The Bulgarian language is characterized with the largest number of volitive modifiers and is the only Slavic language with a strictly specialized sequence of optative forms (*dano* + verb in present tense) (*if only* + verb in present tense).

It should be noted that the majority of Bulgarian optative modifiers (the forms with *dano*, with *neka*, and the *da*-constructions) (the forms with *if only*, with *come on*, and the *let's*-constructions) belong to the nucleus (core) of the modal microfield, while in the Russian and Polish languages the use of peripheral means is preferred for the expression of similar semantics (the Russian conjunctive mood, the Polish constructions of the type *gdybym mógł*, etc.). This difference is of an essential theoretical value: it proves that the strong tendency towards morphologization of the analytical formations (typical in one degree or another for all Slavic languages) has reached its highest level in the Bulgarian language, rightfully called by S. Ivanchev “both classic and exotic”.

Chakarova, Krasimira. On the Status of the Constructions of the Type *Sam* + Past Passive Participle. // *Slavic studies IV. Articles in Honour of the 15th International Congress of Slavists in Minsk, Belarus, 2013*. Plovdiv: Paisii Hilendarski Plovdiv University Press, 2013, p. 70 – 84. ISBN 978-954-423-856-8.

The paper examines the problem regarding the status of the constructions, made with the auxiliary verb *sam* (*be*) and the past passive participle, which are interpreted differently in the linguistic science (some linguists consider them to be analytical verb forms, while others

view them as syntactic structures). The main purpose of the study is to present the author's standpoint on this debatable question, as well as to outline some characteristic features, specific to these constructions.

For this purpose the article formulates some criteria, which can aid the differentiation of the analytical verb forms from the syntactic constructions: 1) the ability to change the participle within categories, which are not typical of verbs as a word class, for example the use of an article or of a grammatical comparison (if such a possibility exists, the construction is not a passive verb form); 2) explicitness of the actants (the passive participle construction is realized as an analytical verb forms every time when the position of the indirect object is taken, i.e. is explicit); 3) direct combination of the participle with adjectives or with nouns, used as predicatives (e.g. *Nyakoi ot lozyata byaha **veche obrani** i pusti* "Some of the vineyards **were picked and empty**") – in this example the participle is a component of the compound nominal predicate); 4) the ability to combine the participle with noun prefixoids such as *svrah-*, *super-*, *nedo-*, *polu-*, etc. (in such instances the construction is not an analytical passive form); 5) the use of participles, made from the so called reflexive-middle verbs such as *zasmeya se*, *usmihna se*, *razseya se*, *skaram se*, etc. (*laugh*, *smile*, *get distracted*, *scold*, etc.) (e.g. *Keyt **beshe zasmiana*** "Kate was **all smiles**" – a compound nominal predicate).

Special emphasis has been placed on the commented by some linguists parallel between the constructions with a participle (*cheten e* "it is read") and the explicators of the so called "reflexive passive" (*chete se* "it is read"). With the aid of specific arguments, the articles argues that the search of an analogy (resp. substitutability) between the two types of constructions cannot be accepted as a reliable "test" for the distinction between the analytical verb and the syntactic structures.

The main conclusions of the scientific analysis are summarized at the end of the study: 1) The constructions of the type *sam* + past passive participle are the only morphological explicators of passiveness in Modern Bulgarian. As to the "reflexive passive", it can be considered a syntactic unit, used for the expression of passiveness; 2) The paradigm of the participle passive in the Bulgarian language consists primarily of resultative forms, used most actively in perfect, plusquamperfect and futurum exactum. These forms are made freely with all of the three verbal aspects in the Bulgarian language (perfective, imperfective and iterative), but usually they are combined with the perfective aspect (even in the non-actual present tense); 3) the reasons for the observed functional ambiguity of the analyzed passive constructions on one hand, as well as for the contradictions in their status definition, on the other, are all of objective nature and can be explained with the complex qualities of the category of voice,

which proves to be closely connected to the lexical meanings of the verbs and to the syntactic structure of the sentence; the explanation is also found in the higher level of adjectivization of the past passive participles in comparison to the active participles, as well as in the absence of an adequate definition of the term *analytical word form*.

Chakarova, Krasimira. The Bulgarian Perfective Imperfect and Its Analogies in Russian. // *Scientific Perspectives of Contemporary Bulgarian Studies. A Mai Bulgarisztika Tudományos Perspektívái. Articles from the International Conference on the Occasion of the 60th Anniversary from the Establishment of the Subject “Bulgarian Philology” at the “Loránd Eötvös” University. Budapest: Bolgár Kulturális Fórum, 2015, p. 307 – 314. ISBN 978-963-12-2873-1.*

This comparative study focuses on the problem of the functional-semantic analogies of the Bulgarian perfective imperfect in Modern Russian. The main purpose is to outline the translation strategies, used in the search of a proper translation equivalent, in spite of the absence of an imperfect tense in the Russian language, i.e. to outline the available instruments for a “functional-semantic compensation” in the contemporary Russian language.

The first part of the article presents the characteristics of the perfective imperfect (Im) – a specific “contradictory” verb form, which is not used in autonomous sentences, but in poly-predicate (“frequency-correlative”) constructions (complex sentences with dependent [adverbial clauses and others](#)), and which is positioned in the subordinate clause. Such positional obligatoriness can be explained with one characteristic feature of the perfective aspect, which some aspectologists mention in their works – its sequentiality (the ability to express a connection with the future or past action), which is seen as a separate functional feature and not as an invariant meaning. Specific taxis relations are realized between past actions, as the function of a reference point is performed not by the aorist, but by the perfective, i.e. there is a temporal-aspectual transposition.

In respect to its semantics, the perfective imperfect usually expresses repetitiveness, and very rarely indicates singular situations. It is not actively used in the speech practice. More often than not its very “identification” as a normative grammar form proves to be problematic for language speakers. Its low frequency of use is due to the fact that within the same syntactic

conditions it can be freely replaced with the iterative imperfect (which is marked both with totality and repetitiveness).

Further in the analysis the article summarizes the main ways through which the Bulgarian perfective imperfect can be translated into Russian. A conclusion is reached that the modern Russian language has at its disposal a whole range of language means to convey the meaning of this specific form. The most common analogies are the derived verbs with the morpheme *-va* and its allomorphs (i.e. the iteratives), which, as was clarified, are actively used in the Bulgarian language as accurate functional equivalents of the perfective imperfect. It should be noted that in the majority of cases in which the perfective imperfect is marked with a repetitive semantics, the Russian translation uses frequency-correlative constructions, i.e. despite the morphological asymmetry between the two languages, an appropriate syntactic analogy of the original meaning is found.

Chakarova, Krasimira. On the Subject of One Specific Case Regarding the Use of Cardinal Numbers in Modern Bulgarian. // *Scientific Works – Plovdiv University "Paisii Hilendarski". Philology, volume 54, book 1, part A, 2016. Plovdiv: Plovdiv University Press "Paisii Hilendarski", 2017, p. 193 – 205. ISSN: 0861-0029.*

The study focuses on one specific use of the cardinal numbers (numerals) in the modern Bulgarian language. More precisely, on these cases in which the numerals (cardinal or ordinal) function as prepositive quantifiers towards co-ordinatively connected (with the conjunction *i* (*and*) two or more head nouns, the first of which is masculine (e.g. *Tozi nesseser vklyuchva nyakolko otlichitelni funktsii – ima myasto za 6 himikala i moliva*) (*This case has a few distinctive features – there is enough space for 6 pens and pencils*). This use hasn't been specifically studied in the linguistic literature. The only author, who gives similar examples in his commentary on the count plural form in our language, is E. Georgieva (Georgieva, E. Some Questions Regarding the Use of the Count Plural Form of the Masculine Nouns. // *Bulgarian Language, 1964, book 2 – 3, p. 214 – 216*).

The main goals of the study are: 1) to examine the different ways in which the language speakers perceive the semantics and the grammatical structure of such constructions; 2) to find the reasons for the structural-semantic polysemy, observed in some of the examples, and 3) to differentiate the types of phrases in which the polysemy is overcome.

The starting point for the analysis are the results of an anonymous survey with sixty respondents who were given the following task: to examine five groups of examples, presenting different collocations of the type [numeral + coordinate nominal phrase with the connector *i (and)*], and to answer two questions – 1) whether the given sentence is correct or incorrect and 2) what is the number of the quantified objects in the sentence. The one common thing between the separate examples in the selected groups is that they all have a co-ordinative construction, containing two impersonal nouns, the first of which is masculine. After a recap of the results, it becomes evident that a major part of the examples are perceived ambiguously by the language speakers. One of the main reasons for this has been commented by a number of linguists – the lack of a fixed rule, which determines the use of the count plural form and the common plural form in the different styles of the modern Bulgarian language.

The paper also focuses on the cases in which the polysemy in the examined type of constructions is overcome.

In the conclusion part of the study it is noted that if the speaker wants to emphasize on the quantity of each object and not on their total number, then, when counting two different objects, denoted with nouns in the co-ordinative phrase, the repetition of the cardinal number proves to be the more successful (and recommended) strategy in comparison to its ellipsis before the second head noun. This repetition can be considered as one of the displays of the mandatory (grammatical) pleonasm in Modern Bulgarian.

Chakarova, Krasimira. Observations on the Use of Invariable Words of Turkish Origin in the Modern Bulgarian Language. // *The Responsibility Towards Language. Book 4. Proceedings on the Occasion of the 65th Anniversary of Prof. Dobrina Daskalova, PhD.* Shumen: University Press “Episkop Konstantin Preslavski”, 2016, p. 73 – 87. ISSN 1313-695X.

The object of scientific analysis in the present article is the use of invariable words of Turkish origin (including Arabic-Turkish or Persian-Turkish) in the contemporary Bulgarian language. The words in question are mostly adverbs and particles such as *adzheba, andzhak, asla, bashka, belki(m), chunki(m)*, etc. Unlike most autonomous words (mainly nouns), which have entered the Bulgarian language through Turkish, the examined invariable words have never been the object of a specific linguistic research. The main purpose of this study is to outline the functional specifics of these lexemes by emphasizing their stylistic potential.

The conducted observations show that the lexico-morphological status of the analysed lexemes is not distinctly determined in the lexicographic database, used in this study. In some of the dictionaries there is no information on the stylistic features of particular words (colloquial, substandard, dialectic, etc.). In addition, the interpretive methods are mixed up: only a small part of the definitions accentuate the functional and pragmatic characteristics of the studied words (i.e. analyse them from a communicative perspective), in other dictionaries the Turkish word is simply “replaced” with an appropriate Bulgarian synonym.

It can be concluded that, when it comes to their functioning, the invariable words of Turkish origin (adverbs, particles and interjections) are mostly used (but significantly less frequently than the nouns and their Turkish borrowed prototypes) when the desired effect is quasi-conversationality (colloquialism), which is of pragmatic nature.

Chakarova, Krasimira. Once Again on the Question of the Passive Conditional in Modern Bulgarian. // *International Jubilee Conference of the Institute for Bulgarian Language – 15th and 16th May 2017, Sofia. Proceedings of The International Jubilee Conference of The Institute For Bulgarian Language “Prof. Lubomir Andreychin”. Part 1. Sofia: Institute For Bulgarian Language, 2017, p. 25 – 33. ISBN: 978-954-92489-9-9.*

The article examines the verb structures of the type *bih bil* + past passive participle, defined by some authors (see I. Kutsarov, R. Nitsolova, etc.) as passive forms of the conditional mood (passive conditional), which are structurally asymmetric due to the presence of an additional element (the participle *bil*) in comparison with the active conditional forms (cf.: *bih bil priet* and *bih ∅ priel*) (*I would be accepted* and *I would ∅ accept*). A starting point for the analysis is the notion that in the contemporary developmental state of our language these structures have not yet reached their final phase of grammaticalization. They are formations of a transitional type whose status in the paradigm of the Bulgarian conditional cannot be determined.

The main purpose of the study is not only to expand their linguistic “portrait”, but to trace the current trends regarding their functioning in the speech practice, thus verifying the hypothesis (see Chakarova, K. Subjective Modality and Passiveness – Mechanisms of Their Combination in the Modern Bulgarian Language. // *Scientific Works – Plovdiv University “Paisii Hilendarski”. Philology, volume 40, book 1. Plovdiv: Plovdiv University*

Press “Paisii Hilendarski”, 2003, p. 105 – 116) that the complete grammaticalization of the passive conditional would lead to the omission of the participle *bil* or to the transformation of the auxiliary verb *bih* into an invariable component, similar, for example, to the Polish *by*.

The first step towards the implementation of this task is the analysis of a rich corpus of examples, excerpted from the global network, in part of which the passive conditional constructions are either reduced through the omission of the participle *bil/bili*, or contain the invariable component *bi*. A survey with 160 respondents (philologists and non-philologists) was conducted in order to check how the language speakers perceive such examples, with the respondents having to rate the grammatical accuracy of eight sentences and to correct the ones that are perceived as wrong.

After the survey results were generalized, a conclusion was reached that the development of the passive conditional in Modern Bulgarian is marked by an accelerated dynamics, which would probably lead to a gradual simplification (contraction) of the constructions and to the establishment of a formal analogy between them and the active conditional forms. This is proved not only by the examples which illustrate the various changes in the form, but also by the fact that part of the language speakers perceive the contracted variants as grammatically correct. In other words, there are reasons to believe that in the current state of development of the Bulgarian language the passive conditional constructions are directly affected by the process of grammaticalization, mentioned by a number of linguists.

Chakarova, Krasimira. On the Topic of the Structure of the Functional-Semantic Field of Gender in Modern Bulgarian. // *Bulgarian Linguistic Readings. Proceedings of the International Conference Dedicated to the 130th Anniversary of the Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, 19th – 20th November 2018*. Sofia: Faculty of Slavic Philologies, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, 2019, p. 176 – 186. ISBN 978-619-7433-31-9.

The object of study in the present article are the structural characteristics of the category of gender (grammatical gender) in Modern Bulgarian, which has not been the object of a detailed functional-semantic description. The starting point for the scientific analysis is the theory of the functional-semantic fields (FSFs), presented in the works of A. V. Bondarko and made popular in our linguistic science by I. Kutsarov, the author of the only functional-semantic grammar of the Bulgarian language. The purpose of the study is to introduce the most

important characteristics of the functional-semantic category of gender by emphasizing on the specific features of its field nucleus (core) and by making a classification of the peripheral language means used to express gender. A critical commentary has been made on two concepts regarding the structure of the studied FSF – that of I. Kutsarov and of the Russian linguist S. G. Memechkov. The article introduces an alternative standpoint, which establishes the stratification of the nuclear (core) and peripheral language means in the functional-semantic field of gender.

A conclusion is reached that gender is a nominal, and not a “general” functional-semantic category. Nouns (and in particular personal nouns, as well as the names of some animals) are the only word class, within which gender is semantically based (there is a reference to a particular physiological gender). With impersonal nouns it can be argued that there is a stylistic reconsideration of the generic semantics. The morphological category of gender (common to nouns, as well as to verbs) is of an entirely co-ordinative nature and is a part of the periphery of the FSF of gender in the modern Bulgarian language. The nucleus (core) of this independent categorial field is the lexical-grammatical category of noun gender. The field periphery can be described as “sparse”. Closest to the nucleus (core) of the FSF are these peripheral “modifiers” (the term belongs to I. Kutsarov) which participate actively in the expression of true generic semantics and can often compete with the nuclear means. This group includes the substantives for people, the gender suffixes, the gender inflexions, etc. The rest of the generic modifiers add to the semantic capacity of the core and are positioned in the more distant periphery of the FSF.

Chakarova, Krasimira. Lexical and Syntactic Means for the Expression of Inferential Modality in Modern Bulgarian. // *The Responsibility Towards Language. Book 7. Proceedings on the Occasion of the 90th Anniversary of Prof. T. Boyadzhiev, PhD.* Shumen: University Press “Episkop Konstantin Preslavski”, 2021, p. 234 – 249. ISBN 1313-695X.

The object of the present study are some of the peripheral modifiers in the microfield of inferential modality in Modern Bulgarian – the lexical and syntactic means. The main purpose of the scientific analysis is to present the most important structural-semantic characteristics of these modifiers and to comment on their role in the expression of inferential semantics.

The interest towards this topic was prompted by two important circumstances: 1) in comparison with the rest of the peripheral means of the examined functional-semantic microfield, the lexical modifiers stand out as the ones with the highest functional activity; 2) up to this day there is no thorough description of the syntactic means which participate in the expression of the epistemic modal meanings of inference and supposition.

The observations on the taxonomic material prove beyond doubt that the modern Bulgarian language has a wide range of inferential lexical modifiers (e.g. *nesamnenno, ochevidno, bezsporno, stoprotsentno, deystvitelno, naistina, navyarno, veroyatno, mozhe bi, kato che, sigurno, edva li, nadali, may, predpolozhenie, vazmozhnost, dopuskam, podoziram, etc.*) (*undoubtedly, obviously, indisputably, a hundred per cent, really, indeed, most likely, probably, maybe, as if, surely, unlikely, hardly likely, may, supposition, possibility, assume, suspect, etc.*), which are used for the expression of the various shades of inference (supposition or conclusion), as well as for the different levels of certainty of the speaker, regarding the plausibility of the supposition or conclusion. The other group of peripheral modifiers – the syntactic ones (e.g. *sas sigurnost, s golyama veroyatnost, ima veroyatnost, pravya izvod, stigam do zaklyuchenie, predpolaga se, siguren sam, vazmozhno e, kakto se vizhda, po vsichko lichi, vidi se, etc.*) (*certainly, most probably, likely, conclude, infer, it's presumed, to be sure, it's possible, as it seems, as it appears, it's obvious, etc.*) stand out with their structural diversity. Some of them are functional competitors against the lexical modifiers, but are not completely identical to them in a semantic or pragmatic aspect (cf. *sigurno* and *sigurno e*) (*certainly* and *it's certain*). What makes impression is that both the lexical and the syntactic peripheral modifiers for the expression of inference can be combined with the nuclear (core) agents of the modal microfield (the specialized forms of the inferential mood), as well as with other peripheral means. Quite often they can be used autonomously – as sole explicators of inferentiality. Some of them can be used to overcome the homonymy between the inferential and the renarrative verb forms in the first and second person, as well as to actualize the subsidiary function of the indicative perfect tense in its role of an inferential aorist form – cf. *Toy e zhivyal v Parizh* (*He has lived in Paris*) (perfect tense), but: [*Mozhe bi/po vsyaka veroyatnost/navyarno/yavno (e), etc.*], *che toy e zhivyal v Parizh* [*Maybe/most probably/most likely/obviously*] *he has lived in Paris* (inferential aorist).

Participant in the competition:.....

(Assoc. Prof. Krasimira Chakarova, PhD)

