ANALYTICAL WORD COMBINATIONS CONSISTING OF VERB AND VERBAL NOUN ENDING IN *-NE* IN BULGARIAN

АНАЛИТИЧНИ СЛОВОСЪЧЕТАНИЯ, ОБРАЗУВАНИ ОТ ГЛАГОЛ И ОТГЛАГОЛНО СЪЩЕСТВИТЕЛНО ИМЕ НА *-НЕ* В БЪЛГАРСКИЯ ЕЗИК

Yana POMETKOVA

Angel Kanchev University, Rousse, Bulgaria
Corresponding author: Yana POMETKOVA, e-mail: pometkova@ru.acad.bg

Abstract: *The object of research in the present paper is a specific type of analytical word combinations, consisting of a verb and a verbal noun ending in –ne in Bulgarian. The terminological diversity in their naming is accounted for; the reasons for their occurrence in the language are reviewed; a special consideration is given to the controversial aspects in determining the syntactic function of the verbal noun.*

Резюме: *Обект на изследване в настоящата работа са един особен тип аналитични словосъчетания, образувани от глагол и отглаголно съществително име на -не в българския език. Отделя се място на терминологичното многообразие при назоваването им, разглеждат се причините за тяхната поява в езика, обръща се внимание върху спорните моменти при определяне синтактичната функция на отглаголното съществително име.*

Key words: *analytical word combinations, verbal noun, verb desemantisation*
Ключови думи: *словосъчетания, отглаголно съществително име, десемантизация на глаголи*

INTRODUCTION

There are verbs in Bulgarian which combine with verbal nouns to form analytical verb groups of the type: *извършвам издирване, провеждам разследване, давам нареждане, проявявам разбиране, занимавам се с лекуване,* etc.

Their existence raises a number of issues, such as: their terminological designation, the reasons for their occurrence, their syntactic function in the sentence. The paper reviews those problems, presenting the author's opinion on some of them.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The above-mentioned word combinations are called by the authors of *Phraseological Dictionary of Bulgarian Language* phraseological word combinations in which "the verb attaches to a certain semantic circle of nouns to get a common meaning, namely, performing the action denoted by the noun" [NICHEVA, MIHAILOVA, CHOLAKOVA 1974: 14].

Due to the fact that they reflect only one side of the meaning of a given word, related to a limited semantic circle of words, these word combinations are not included in the cited Dictionary. They are called phraseological also by K. Popov [POPOV 1974: 166].

The word combinations under study are given other names in the Bulgarian linguistic reference: verbal-nominal set phrases or verbal-nominal phraseological units, known also as phraseoloids [BOSILKOV 1979]; analytical word combinations of the type verb + action noun,

semantically equal to a specific verb [KABAKCHIEV 1981]; multiverbalised appellations [VIDENOV 1979]; decomposed predicates [BARAKOVA 2003].

V. Gak calls those combinations displayed nominalizations, in which "the verb is transposed into a word combination: *Той реши → Той взе решение*" [GAK 1976: 87], while E. Laguzova calls them descriptive verbal-nominal expressions [LAGUZOVA 2003].

In this paper we accept the definition analytical word combinations of the type verb + action noun, semantically equal to a specific verb, using the shortened version *analytical word combination of a verb and a verbal noun ending in -ne.*

In the formation of the analytical word combinations consisting of verb + noun M. Videnov determines the following objective laws: "the initial one-word appellation is a verb – when it is multiverbalised, it yields a deverbalised noun, which, on its turn, collocates with another verb. The latter has a weakened lexical meaning to a great extent; it also has abstract-modal character" [VIDENOV 1979: 114]. The author reviews a total of 12 types of analytical word combinations, which are most frequently collocated with the verbs съм, *имам, правя, извършвам* and others, e.g.: *правя изказване, правя допитване, давам нареждане,* etc.

What is characteristic for this type of analytical word combinations is that the main meaning 'action' is conveyed by the verbal noun, while the verb reinforces its categorical meaning 'action' and expresses the basic grammatical verb properties, thus aiding the predicative connection between the name of the property with the name of the object, e.g.: "Тя *ще се занимава с организирането и координирането* на структурата" ("24 hours" newspaper); "След това те се подсушават и *се подлагат на спичане или пресоване*" (V. DJIDJEVA et al.).

The reason for substituting the analytical word combination of a verb and a verbal noun for the verb itself is explained in different ways in the linguistic reference. For example, this phenomenon is presented as a result from a verb desemantisation, where the verb has a weakened basic meaning 'verb action', compare: *изследвам → провеждам изследване*; in this situation the simple verb predicate yields room to a compound nominal predicate with a verb connection expressed by the desemantised verb, which expresses the grammatical meaning of the verb, while the meaning of the action is expressed through the verbal noun; this phenomenon marks the tendency for analytical character of the language [VANHALA-ANISHEVSKA 1999].

Another linguist, Iv. Nedev, also sees the reason for the existence of the analytical word combinations in the vague lexical meaning of the verb, noting the following: "In the contemporary Bulgarian literary language there exists a substantial group of transitive verbs, whose lexical meaning has faded, thus binding them to a noun, which functions as a semantic core of the whole word combinations" [NEDEV 1992: 105].

G. Zolotova ranks the verbs from this group to the auxiliary verbs, naming them as compensators, because they "participate in the transposition of the means of direct nomination into a means of indirect one, thus compensating for the insufficient categorical-syntactic element of meaning" [ZOLOTOVA 1982 : 158], e.g.: *пътувам → извършвам пътуване, лекувам → осъществявам лекуване, валцувам → подлагам на валцуване* etc.

Those combinations are considered by some authors to be borrowings from Russian [VIDENOV 1979: 116; BOSILKOV 1979: 40]. K. Bosilkov connects their use in the Slavonic languages "with nominalization of the abstraction" [BOSILKOV 1979: 40].

The conclusions of Hr. Kabakchiev, who investigates the analytical combinations in Bulgarian, are interesting. He establishes a connection between the functioning of those combinations and the system of verb aspect.

His observations find that "one of the main functions of the analytical word combinations in contemporary Bulgarian is to compensate the double aspect of verbs, especially those of foreign origin" [KABAKCHIEV 1981: 429], e.g.: *атакувам → извършивам/извърша атака, демонстрирам → правя/направя демонстрация.* The author concludes that compensation of the double aspect is performed by the verbs in the analytical word combinations, which can be either of finite or non-finite aspect.

The main functions of the analytical word combinations in the contemporary Bulgarian language according to the author are to compensate the double aspect or the aspect deficiency of the verbs, thus incorporating them to the system of aspect, compare: *безчинствам → извършивам/извърша безчинства.*

V. Gak gives a different explanation for the use of these word combinations in speech: "The formation and usage of nominalising structures is related to the need for expanding the nominative means in the language. It is known that the word combination appears to be a more flexible and a finer means for creating names than the word formation models." [GAK 1976: 89].

He notes that breaking up the process into noun + verb allows finding of a grammatical means for solving a number of communicative tasks, such as using the noun to denote the process and thus formulating the characteristic of the action with the help of an adjective, which expands the communicative resources of speech, compare: *отправи му тежък поглед* and **тежко го загледа.*

A number of reasons, motivating the high frequency of the analytical word combinations reviewed, are noted by P. Barakova, the most significant being: filling in a gap, when there is no verb in the language to denote a given action, e.g. *правя самопризнания*; due to the nominative component there is space for a determining name, while the presence of a verbal component reveals a possibility for specifying the action by adding adverbial expressions or gives an opportunity for pluralisation, e.g. *провеждам преговори* etc. [BARAKOVA 2003].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There is no unified position about the syntactic function of the analytical word combination of a verb and a verbal noun ending in –ne in the sentence, either. Some authors concede that the noun functions as an object in the sentence. That is the opinion of K. Popov, but he points out a peculiarity: "With the phraseological combinations of the type *вземам решение* (= решавам), *вземам връх* (= надвивам) the direct object merges semantically with the predicate to form one notion" [POPOV 1974: 166].

Ivan Nedev also considers the noun in the analytical word combinations to be a direct object: "Although the verb in such cases has a semi-abstract character, which does not allow it to function as a predicate by itself, notes the author, from the pointy of view of the formal sentence structure, the noun in it is qualified as a direct object" [NEDEV 1992: 105].

Completely contrary to the views already cited is M. Videnov's understanding that due to its faded lexical meaning the verb cannot be viewed as the core of the predicate, that is why the whole word combination fulfils the function of compound nominative predicate, in which a deverbalised noun "is in fact the predicate, the semantic core, the subject denominator, which is made actual through nothing else but the predicative connection – the abstract-modal verb" [VIDENOV 1979: 116].

The predicate function of the whole word combination is also acknowledged by G Zolotova, who notes: "The combination of abstract nouns with verbs-compensators plays the role of a single sentence component" [ZOLOTOVA 1982: 158].

According to E. Laguzova the descriptive verb-noun expressions function as simple verb predicates, since they lack the real syntactic and semantic relations of the verb, which is explained by the fading of its lexical meaning, leading to a weakened valence [LAGUZOVA 2003].

We support the view that the whole analytical word combination, formed by a verb and a verbal noun ending in -ne, functions as a predicate, since it denotes a situation. The term "situation" usually means "the non-linguistic referent of the sentence, a piece of the reality, a private event, a fact announced in the specific speech excerpt" [ARUTJUNOVA 1976: 7]. We will use the term "event" here.

The events can be marked explicitly or implicitly. The explicit sign of the event is the predicative unit, i.e. the sentence, since predicativity is expressed there by the personal verb form, which possesses the categories tense, person, mood, e.g. "*Две червенушки си бяха направили гнездо в черешата до прозореца*" (D. Ilieva).

The events can be expressed implicitly as well – through names of events, which resemble a sentence and can be transformed into one, using minimum means of expression. The verbal nouns ending in -ne can also be classified as names of event, characterized by clearly marked process characteristics: *отиване, писане, излизане* etc.

The name of event is defined as an implicit sign of the event, because as a virtual entity it does not possess the grammatical categories of tense, person and mood. Although most of the indicators of a predicative unit are not present at the expression level, at the content level the event is given full meaning, since the verbal noun possesses the taxiing categories tense, person and mood, determined relatively to the tense, person and mood of the verb-predicate in the sentence.

For example, in the sentence "*На връщане той забеляза Фани*" (D. Dimov) the tense correlation of the verbal noun *връщане* depends on the grammatical tense of the verb predicate in the sentence (*забеляза*) and is determined by the preposition *на*, which serves as a connector and means 'simultaneous expression of time and circumstances, in which the action is performed'. Consequently, there are two simultaneous real activities in the past (the verb *забеляза* is in past finite tense), performed by one and the same subject (*той*).

Often the verbal noun falls into the position of subordinate clause and then it is possible to replace it with a verb, to convert the nominalised structure with the verbal noun ending in -ne into a subordinate clause, compare for example: "*На излизане от това паметно събрание ти се спря сред улицата*" (Bl. Dimitrova) (*на излизане от това паметно събрание* – the structure with the verbal noun ending in -ne functions as an adverbial modifier for time) and "*Когато излизаше от това паметно събрание, ти се спря сред улицата*" (*когато излизаше от това паметно събрание* – a subordinate adverbial clause for time); "*До пристигането ни в Созопол ние почти не говорихме*" (Vl. Zarev) (*до пристигането ни в Созопол* – the structure with the verbal noun ending in -ne functions as an adverbial modifier for time) and "*Докато пристигнем в Созопол, ние почти не говорихме*" (*Докато пристигнем в Созопол* – a subordinate adverbial clause for time); "Лукан го обвинява *в превишаване на права*" (D. Dimov) (*в превишаване на права* – the structure with the verbal noun ending in -ne functions as an object) and "Лукан го обвинява, *че превишава права*" (*че превишава права* – a subordinate object clause).

It can be seen from the examples that the structures with verbal nouns ending in -ne are synonymous to subordinate clauses, and the clauses which contain a deverbative ending in -

634

ne are simple, monopredicative on syntactic level, but they are poli–eventful on a semantic level, i.e. they are semantically complicated simple sentences, which are asymmetrical in form and content – in form they are simple sentences, in content they represent a poli-predicative unit, built around two predicative centres, one of the predicates being direct, expressed with a verb, and the other - indirect, expressed with a verbal noun ending in -ne.

It is another issue when we have sentences including analytical word combinations of verb and verbal noun ending in -ne. It is not possible to replace the verbal noun ending in -ne with a subordinate clause in them, since the verb is devoid of semantics and cannot express an event on its own. When these sentences are transformed, the verbal noun is replaced by its derivative verb, and the verb from the word combination simply drops out, compare for example: "Сега другарите *се занимават с лекуването* ù" (D. Dimov) and "Сега другарите *я лекуват*".

Therefore, both sentences are monopredicative in form and poli-eventful in content, i.e. they are symmetrical linguistic units. This gives us ground to assume that the whole analytical word combination of a verb and a verbal noun ending in -ne functions are one part of the sentence – the predicate.

CONCLUSIONS

The analytical word combinations of a verb and a verbal noun ending in -ne enhance the expressive properties of the language and offer the speaker an opportunity for choice, depending on the purpose of the communication.

They endue an abstract character to the speech and thus can be viewed as a means for raising the language's intellectual level.

LITERATURE

1. ARUTJUNOVA, N. D. 1976: АРУТЮНОВА, Н. Д. *Предложение и его смысл.* М., 1976.
2. BARAKOVA, P. 2003: БАРАКОВА, П. *Декомпозирането на предиката в българския език ... или движението в две посоки.* –В: Славистиката в началото на XXI век. Традиции и очаквания. С., 2003, 247 – 255.
3. BOSILKOV, K. 1979: БОСИЛКОВ, К. *Глаголно-именните устойчиви съчетания – развиваща се категория в съвременните славянски книжовни езици.* – СЕ, 1979, №4, 38 – 41.
4. VANHALA-ANISHEVSKA, M. 1999: ВАНХАЛА-АНИШЕВСКА, М. *Десемантизация глагола в русской научной речи.* – ФН, 1999, №2, 64 – 70.
5. VIDENOV, M. 1979: ВИДЕНОВ, М. *Към производството на някои повечесловни съчетания в съвременния български език.* – ЕЛ, 1979, № 2, 113 – 117.
6. GAK, V. G. 1976: ГАК, В. Г. *Номинализация сказуемого и устранение субъекта.* – В: Синтаксис и стилистика. М., 1976, 85 – 103.
7. ZOLOTOVA, G. A. 1982: ЗОЛОТОВА, Г. А. *Коммуникативные аспекты русского синтаксиса.* М., 1982.
8. KABAKCHIEV, KR. 1981: КАБАКЧИЕВ, КР. *Един тип глаголно-именни словосъчетания и връзката им с видовата система на съвременния български език.* – БЕ, 1981, №5, 427 – 434.
9. LAGUZOVA, E. N. 2003: ЛАГУЗОВА, Е. Н. *Описательный глагольно-именной оборот как единица номинации.* М., 2003.
10. NEDEV, IV. 1992: НЕДЕВ, Ив. *Синтаксис на съвременния български книжовен език.* С., 1992.

11. Nicheva, K., S. Spasova-Mihailova, Kr. Cholakova. 1974: Ничева, К., С. Спасава-Михайлова, Кр. Чолакова. *Фразеологичен речник на българския език.* Том първи А-Н. С., БАН, 1974.

12. Popov, K. 1974: Попов, К. *Съвременен български език. Синтаксис.* С., 1974.