

**Krasimir KABAKČIEV**

Independent Researcher

kkabakciev@gmail.com

## TWO MAJOR MANIFESTATIONS OF COMPOSITIONAL ASPECT IN BULGARIAN

Compositional aspect (CA), a fundamental language phenomenon discovered in 1972 by Henk Verkuyl, still remains, almost half a century later, to a certain extent misconceptualized, despite the sea of publications dealing with it. CA is the mechanism of explication, at the level of the sentence, of the values of perfectivity and imperfectivity – otherwise found in verbs as lexical entries in the Slavic languages. One of the major issues of CA is: does it also exist in Slavic languages alongside verbal aspect? If it does, what are its manifestations? In spite of certain attempts, no exhaustive answer to such questions has been provided so far. The article advocates the view that CA can be said to exist in Slavic as a relatively peripheral phenomenon. A description is made of two manifestations of CA in Bulgarian.

**Keywords:** compositional aspect, verbal aspect, markers of boundedness, mapping of boundedness and non-boundedness.

*General notes on compositional aspect.* Compositional aspect (CA) is a fundamental language phenomenon discovered in 1972 by the Dutch linguist Henk Verkuyl (Verkuyl 1972; 1993). It is the explication in languages like English, at the level of the sentence, of the values of perfectivity and imperfectivity otherwise known as verbal aspect (VA), e.g., in the Slavic languages. To exemplify briefly CA, otherwise an extremely complex phenomenon (Kabakčiev 2000; 2019), consider the following English sequences/sentences:

- (1) a. The/a mechanic repaired the/a car
- b. The/a mechanic repaired cars
- c. Mechanics repaired the car
- d. Mechanics repaired cars
- e. The/a mechanic hated the/a car

If a sentence explicates perfectivity, see (1a), it is said to belong to Verkuyl's (1972) perfective schema – the subject and the object are quantified and the verb is telic. Clearly, all the four sentences that (1a) can yield (with an article – definite or indefinite) are perfective. Perfectivity is explicated thanks to the use of an article or of quantifiers – demonstratives, numerals (overt quantifiers), pronouns, proper

names, possessives (covert quantifiers). Quantifiers encode boundedness in the relevant (referent of a) nominal; non-boundedness is encoded by a single marker, the zero article. Non-boundedness is present in the object in (1b), the subject in (1c), the subject and object simultaneously in (1d). In Verkuyl's theory quantified subjects and objects plus a telic meaning of the verb trigger perfectivity of the relevant sentence, whereby the verb's telicity is as important as quantifiers in subjects and objects. Compare (1a), where the telic verb *repaired* implicates an endpoint of the situation, hence perfectivity, and (1e), where the atelic *hated* does not implicate an endpoint and triggers imperfectivity, despite the quantified subject and object. Non-quantified subjects or/and objects lead to imperfective interpretations of sentences despite the verb's telicity, see (1b-c-d). The two derivable sentences in (1b) are imperfective, as the bare object *cars* imparts a non-bounded, i.e., imperfective, meaning to *repaired*. The non-quantified nominal *mechanics* in (1c) also imparts imperfectivity to *repaired*, although the sentence could also be read as perfective; the subject *mechanics* can then be interpreted as carrying a hidden quantifier *some*. The perfective reading is, however, secondary, non-prototypical (Kabakčiev 2000: 323; 2019). Sentence (1d) definitely manifests imperfectivity through the non-quantified subject and object, as does (1e) through the atelic verb, despite the quantified subject and object.

***On the mechanism of mapping temporal values from nominal components onto the verb and vice versa.*** The CA phenomenon, briefly described above through simple sentences demonstrating the role of quantified nominals for explicating perfectivity and of non-quantified nominals for imperfectivity, can also be exemplified through more complex sentences. Sentences capable of demonstrating the CA phenomenon with several major components simultaneously are rare. But, using specific criteria, they can be found among the oceans of sentences in a language. Otherwise, without appropriate examples, it is difficult or even impossible to recognize the workings of the CA system. A sentence suitable for demonstrating the CA mechanism is (2a) below. Registered in Middle English, here it is translated into Modern English and slightly modified: the subject *she* is replaced by *the woman*. Taking into account the aspectual value of *made*, not of *drink*, (2a) is perfective. Conversely, (2b-c-d), obtained from (2a) by making the subject, the direct and the indirect object non-quantified, explicate imperfectivity:

- (2) a. The woman made<sub>[PFV]</sub> the child drink from the well  
 b. Women made<sub>[IMPFV]</sub> the child drink from the well  
 c. The woman made<sub>[IMPFV]</sub> children drink from the well  
 d. The woman made<sub>[IMPFV]</sub> the child drink from wells

(2a) is perfective because the three participants *the woman*, *the child* and *the well* are quantified through the definite article, and the telic verb *made* supports the perfectivity. The perfectivity is triggered by the four components ***together***, and the sentence falls into Verkuyl's (1972) perfective schema. According to my CA theory (Kabakčiev 2000), partly based on Verkuyl's (1972), the three participants here are

temporally bounded entities that simultaneously map their boundedness onto the referent of the verb, generating in it a perfective value. According to Verkuyl's (1993) modified theory, an imperfective sentence is such that, compared to its perfective variant, has at least one "imperfective leak" (Verkuyl 1993: 232-233). Compare the perfective sentence (2a) against (2b-c-d), which are imperfective because each has a leak in either of the three nominals. The leaks, henceforward called Verkuylian in honor of their finder, consist in the relevant NPs being non-quantified. Sentence (2b) is imperfective because of an imperfective leak in the subject: *women* is non-quantified (and non-bounded) due to the zero article. It transfers its non-boundedness (indefinite recurrence) onto the referent of the verb *made*. Sentence (2c) is imperfective because of a Verkuylian leak in the direct object – *children* is non-bounded due to the zero article and transfers its indefinite recurrence onto the referent of *made*. Sentence (2d) is imperfective because of a leak in the indirect object – *wells* transfers its indefinite recurrence onto the referent of *made*. If the sentences in (2) are translated into Slavic, the perfectivity of (2a) and the imperfectivity of (2b-c-d) become manifest through the obligatory use of either a perfective or an imperfective verb:

- (3) a. Жената накар<sub>PFV</sub> детето да пие от кладенеца  
 'The woman made the child drink from the well'  
 b. Жени караха<sub>IMPFV</sub> детето да пие от кладенеца  
 'Women made the child drink from the well'  
 c. Жената караше<sub>IMPFV</sub> деца да пият от кладенеца  
 'The woman made children drink from the well'  
 d. Жената караше<sub>IMPFV</sub> детето да пие от кладенци  
 'The woman made the child drink from wells'

This does not mean that the translations into Slavic of (2) "prove" the perfectivity or imperfectivity. Each sentence in (2) has its own prototypical aspectual value – perfective or imperfective, due to the internal mechanisms of the English language.

The discovery of CA took place almost 50 years ago and the phenomenon is recognized and widely known. But despite the sea of publications devoted to it, CA is still systematically misunderstood and misconceptualized (Kabakčiev 2019). One of the issues is whether CA can be applied to Slavic. In my understanding (Kabakčiev 2000; 2019), there are two major representations of aspect across languages – CA and VA, which must be kept apart. CA, characteristic of languages like English, must not be mechanistically transferred into Slavic, where the representative phenomenon is VA. The CA theory can be said to be universally applicable but, in principle, to languages that feature markers of boundedness on nouns, not on verbs. When Russian and other languages with VA but no articles are at issue, they must be analyzed by treating VA as a mirror image of CA (Kabakčiev 2000: 123-161). On the other hand, although Bulgarian is a Slavic language with a fully-fledged VA system, it *can* be analyzed in terms of CA. Verkuyl's schemata can be directly applied to it in sentences featuring biaspectual verbs or in some other semantico-syntactic conditions (see below).

The mapping between referents of nominals and verbs in English, briefly shown above, is explained in detail in Kabakčiev (2000; 2019). A first question in an attempt at finding manifestations of CA in Bulgarian would be whether this kind of mapping can take place on Bulgarian data. At first glance, mapping from nominals onto verbs ought not to exist in Bulgarian, as the expression of aspect there is governed by verbs. In languages like English, conversely, perfectivity is signaled mainly through nominals – whose temporal values are mapped onto the (referent of the) verb. Hence, if there is mapping of temporal values in Bulgarian, it ought to be in the opposite direction, from verbs onto nominals. There are two semantico-semantic spheres in Bulgarian, however, where mapping of temporal values from nominals onto verbs *can* be observed: with the use of biaspectual and imperfective verbs.

***First manifestation of CA in Bulgarian: perfectivity and imperfectivity as a result of mapping from nominals onto biaspectual verbs.*** Apart from having perfective and imperfective verbs, Bulgarian also has biaspectual verbs, roughly amounting to 10% of the verbal lexicon. These are neither perfective, nor imperfective but in actual speech they are almost always disambiguated and forced to signal perfectivity or imperfectivity. How does this happen? The phenomenon was first described in Kabakčiev (1984). The signaling of aspect with biaspectual verbs is effectuated precisely by mapping values from certain nominals (participants in situations) onto the verb, as in English. Compare (5), equivalent to English (1), demonstrating the signaling of aspect in Bulgarian through mapping of temporal features:

- (5) a. Механиците biasp[pfv] ремонтираха КОЛАТА  
 ‘The mechanics repaired the car’  
 б. Механици biasp[impfv] ремонтираха КОЛАТА  
 ‘Mechanics repaired the car’  
 в. Механиците biasp[impfv] ремонтираха КОЛИ  
 ‘The mechanics repaired cars’  
 д. Механици biasp[impfv] ремонтираха КОЛИ  
 ‘Mechanics repaired cars’  
 е. Механиците imp[impfv] притежаваха КОЛАТА  
 ‘The mechanics possessed the car’

Recall English (1a), where the referents of the subject and the object map their temporal boundedness (encoded by an article) onto the verb and, aided by the verb’s telicity, trigger perfectivity in it. In the same way the nominals *механиците* ‘the mechanics’ and *колата* ‘the car’ in (5a) map onto the verb their temporal boundedness, encoded by an article, thus triggering perfectivity. Conversely, given a Verkuylian leak in the subject in (5b), or the object in (5c), non-boundedness in the form of indefinite recurrence is mapped onto the referent of the verb. And, as a following step, the non-bounded recurrence (iterativity) of the relevant collocation (*механици ремонтираха* ‘mechanics repaired’; *ремонтираха коли* ‘repaired cars’) is mapped onto the remaining nominal, turning it into a non-bounded (indefinitely recurring) temporal entity. Thus *колата* ‘the car’ in (5a) refers to a single entity bounded in

time, but in (5b) it already refers to a non-bounded temporal entity consisting of indefinite recurrences of a car under repair (for detail, see Kabakčiev 2019). Finally, recall that for perfectivity to be possible in (5a) and similar sentences, the verb must be telic. If it is not, as in (5d), the Verkuylian leak renders the sentence imperfective – despite the bounded subject and object.

Thus, having two relevant grammatical phenomena in Bulgarian, viz., biaspectual verbs and the definite article (without going into details of the choice of tense, person, number etc. of verb forms), such a picture of aspect appears that corresponds to CA in languages like English. Perfectivity and imperfectivity are explicated not through verbs but at the sentence level, through the CA mechanism, and it is worth emphasizing that aspect is explicated mainly thanks to a grammatical feature of nominals, an article, not so much because of the impact of the verb.

Let us now turn our attention to a similar phenomenon, adding to the idea that there exists CA in Bulgarian. The analysis will be based on the English sentence (2a) above, which cannot be rendered into Bulgarian through a biaspectual verb, as such a verb is unavailable. Therefore, a situation must be constructed similar to (2a) but with a biaspectual verb, see (6a). The “real-world setting” contains a horse convoyed through a mountain. The animal must drink water. But the guards carry water only for themselves, so they must take the horse to water from time to time:

(6) а. Двама планинари конвоираха<sub>biasp[pfv]</sub> коня да пие от близката река  
‘Two mountaineers convoyed the horse to drink from the nearby river’

б. Планинари конвоираха<sub>biasp[impfv]</sub> коня да пие от близката река  
‘Mountaineers convoyed the horse to drink from the nearby river’

в. Двама планинари конвоираха<sub>biasp[impfv]</sub> коне да пият от близката река  
‘Two mountaineers convoyed horses to drink from the nearby river’

д. Двама планинари конвоираха<sub>biasp[impfv]</sub> коня да пие от близки реки  
‘Two mountaineers convoyed the horse to drink from nearby rivers’

Compare the sentences (6) with the biaspectual *конвоираха* ‘convoyed’. In the absence of indications to the contrary, (6a) is normally read as a perfective sentence, although it could be coerced into imperfectivity through the insertion of an indefinite iterativity adverbial – *често* ‘often’ (7a):

(7) а. Двама планинари често конвоираха<sub>biasp[impfv]</sub> коня да пие от близката река  
‘Two mountaineers often convoyed the horse to drink from the nearby river’

б. Какво се случваше, когато животното искаше да пие вода? Двама планинари конвоираха<sub>biasp[impfv]</sub> коня да пие от близката река  
‘What happened when the animal wanted to drink water? Two mountaineers convoyed the horse to drink from the nearby river’

It is important to note, first, that this adverbial directly expresses the imperfectivity. Second, the indefinite iterativity adverbial in (7a) or a similar phrase showing that the situation is imperfective may be located not in the sentence itself but in the context. Cf. (7b) where the indefinite iterativity is generated by two imperfective

Imperfect verb forms in a preceding sentence. In any case, while (6a) prototypically signals perfectivity, (6b-c-d) prototypically signal imperfectivity in the form of indefinite iterativity. The verb *конвоирам* ‘convey’ in (6) is biaspectual. It can be used as an equivalent of either the perfective *съпроводя* ‘accompany’ or its imperfective counterpart *съпровождам* ‘accompany’. Suppose the biaspectual *конвоирам* in (6) must be replaced by a non-biaspectual correspondence, as in (8). It will be a perfective one in (8a), imperfective in (8b-c-d):

(8) a. Двама планинари съпроводиха<sub>PFV</sub> коня да пие от близката река  
‘Two mountaineers convoyed the horse to drink from the nearby river’

b. Планинари съпровождаха<sub>IMPFV</sub> коня да пие от близката река  
‘Mountaineers convoyed the horse to drink from the nearby river’

c. Двама планинари съпровождаха<sub>IMPFV</sub> коне да пият от близката река  
‘Two mountaineers convoyed horses to drink from the nearby river’

d. Двама планинари съпровождаха<sub>IMPFV</sub> коня да пие от близки реки  
‘Two mountaineers convoyed the horse to drink from nearby rivers’

Note, however, that although each sentence in (6) is semantically equivalent to its correspondence in (8), there is still an essential difference between (6) and (8). While (8) feature strictly fixed aspectual values of the verb for “convey” – perfective (8a) or imperfective (8b-d), the sentences in (6) can always allow the aspectual value of *конвоираха* to be coerced into the opposite one. Compare (7), where the perfective value of (6a), explicated through Verkuyl’s perfective schema with quantified participants and a telic verb, is coerced into imperfectivity in (7a) and (7b). Conversely, while in (6b) the non-bounded subject, representing a Verkuylian leak, triggers imperfectivity in the form of indefinite iterativity as a default (primary, prototypical) meaning, the addition of time adverbials strongly restricting the scope of the event trigger a perfective meaning, cf. (9a). If the time adverbial does not restrict the scope of the event too narrowly (9b), the situational reading can be that of an episode (Kabaкџiev 2000: 279-307). This reading is equivalent to the Bulgarian imperfective Aorist (9c) or to English sentences with *for*-time adverbials (9d), or similar ones like *the whole day yesterday*:

(9) a. В 17 часа вчера планинари конвоираха<sub>biasp[pfv]</sub> коня да пие от близката река

At 17 yesterday, mountaineers convoyed the horse to drink from the nearby river’

b. Цял ден вчера планинари конвоираха<sub>biasp[impfv]</sub> коня да пие от близката река

‘The whole day yesterday mountaineers convoyed the horse to drink from the nearby river’

c. Цял ден вчера планинари водиха<sub>impfv/aor</sub> коня да пие от близката река  
‘The whole day yesterday mountaineers convoyed the horse to drink from the nearby river’

d. Two mountaineers convoyed the horse for several hours to drink from the nearby river

Thus while CA – in both Bulgarian (with the use of biaspectual verbs) and in English, provides some relatively high freedom for sentences to explicate aspectual values and to alter them, VA strictly fixes the aspectual value and reduces the possibilities for alteration.

The phenomenon of CA in Bulgarian with biaspectual verbs may appear less pronounced than CA in English, for reasons related to the restricted use of biaspectual verbs in Bulgarian. There is, however, no doubt that CA exists in Bulgarian with the use of biaspectual verbs. Aspect (perfective/imperfective) is explicated at the level of the sentence through an intricate interplay of grammatical and semantic entities, including the definite article and the lexical semantics of the biaspectual verb. And if CA exists in Bulgarian, it makes sense to think that it could be found in Slavic languages without articles as well – but in semantico-syntactic schemata different from the Bulgarian ones, because Verkuyl's schemata function properly in Bulgarian thanks to the definite article, an entity absent in most Slavic tongues.

**CA with biaspectual verbs in Slavic languages without articles?** Can CA be found in Slavic languages without articles when biaspectual verbs are used? It is logical to assume that, instead of articles, other grammatical entities (quantifiers) can be used to signify or signal boundedness in nominals: demonstratives, pronouns, etc. Let us check if (5a) above, with perfectivity explicated through the definite article in NPs and the telicity of the biaspectual verb, could be modified to explicate perfectivity in Slavic languages without articles. Compare the subject and object quantified through demonstratives in Russian (10a) and Montenegrin (10b):

(10) a. Эти механики ремонтировали<sub>biasp</sub> эту машину

'These mechanics repaired this car'

b. Ovi mehaničari su remontirali<sub>biasp</sub> ovaj automobil

'These mechanics repaired this car'

Perhaps it could be argued that in (10), thanks to the bounded nominals and the telic biaspectual verbs, perfectivity is explicated. However, in contrast to Bulgarian, where quantified NPs (5a) can stand against non-quantified NPs (*механици* 'mechanics', *коли* 'cars'), bare plurals in Russian and Montenegrin (11a-b) cannot be read obligatorily as non-quantified. In traditional grammatical terms they can be definite, indefinite, specific, non-specific, generic, etc.:

(11) a. Механики ремонтировали<sub>biasp</sub> машины

'Mechanics/some mechanics/the mechanics repaired cars'

b. Mehaničari su remontirali<sub>biasp</sub> automobile

'Mechanics/some mechanics/the mechanics repaired cars'

Hence, accordingly, quantified nominals, as in (10), are not necessarily perfective, cf. (11). Such examples show that while the CA mechanism functions well in Bulgarian with biaspectual verbs, in Slavic languages without articles it does not. Of course, future research could establish manifestations of CA with biaspectual verbs in Slavic languages without articles.

***Second manifestation of CA in Bulgarian: imperfective verbs signaling perfectivity after mapping boundedness from a nominal onto a verb.*** The fact that sometimes Slavic imperfective verbs signal perfectivity is common knowledge, registered in most grammatical descriptions (Maslov 1982: 205; Lindstedt 1985: 184-186; Rå Hauge 1999: 89-90). Examples such as (12) are usually given, where the imperfectives *ще пия* ‘will drink’ and *гледах* ‘saw’ explicate perfectivity:

(12) a. Ще пия<sub>impfv[pfv]</sub> едно кафе и ще тръгна  
‘I will drink a coffee and leave’

b. Вчера гледах<sub>impfvimp[pfv]</sub> този филм  
‘Yesterday I saw this film’

Maslov (1982: 205) notes that the verb *имам* ‘have’ is used with a perfective meaning in collocations with nouns such as *смелост* ‘valor’, *кураж* ‘courage’, *успех* ‘success’; Lindstedt (1985: 185) correctly notes that this “derived perfective” may have to do with the referential properties of the object. But Slavic grammatical descriptions fail to explain the exact mechanism by which imperfectives explicate perfectivity. Perfectivity is triggered by mapping temporal boundedness from nominals, as in English. Consider *имам* as a light verb in phrases such as *имам усложнение* ‘have a complication’, *имам достойнството* ‘have the dignity’ *имам неблагоприятно* ‘have the imprudence’. *Имам* is a prototypically imperfective verb. However, combined with a nominal featuring temporal boundedness in one way or another – whether as a lexical entry or due to the bounding effect of an article/quantifier, the NP boundedness is mapped onto the “imperfective” verb, coercing it into perfectivity:

(13) a. Имах<sub>impfv[pfv]</sub> усложнение след операцията  
‘I had a complication after the operation’

b. Имах<sub>impfv[pfv]</sub> неблагоприятно да дам<sub>pfv</sub> в заем едни пари  
‘I had the imprudence to lend some money’

c. Имах<sub>impfv [pfv]</sub> неблагоприятно да давам<sub>impfv</sub> в заем едни пари  
‘I had the imprudence to lend [repeatedly] some money’

Of course, as CA is a sentence-level phenomenon, the perfectivity of these phrases will always depend on the rest of the sentence. Thus if the perfective *дам* ‘give’ in (13b) is changed into *давам* ‘give [repeatedly]’, cf. (13c), the aspectual value of *имам неблагоприятно* ‘had the imprudence’ becomes imperfective. There are even some extremely interesting cases (Kabačiev 2000: 52) where the verb is imperfectively marked not once but *twice*:

(14) Вратарят имаше<sub>impfvimp[pfv]</sub> отлична проява и успя да спаси дузпата  
‘The goalkeeper had an excellent feat and managed to save the penalty’

In (14) the relevant verb is imperfectively marked twice: first, with the imperfective aspect; second, with the Imperfect (tense).

Taking into account the intricacy of the phenomenon in (14), a drastic coercion into perfectivity of a verb form marked for imperfectivity not once but twice, things are complicated also in sentences such as (15):



(15) а. След шахматния двубой между двамата гросмайстори трима млади шахматисти **имаха възможността** да разговарят с тях

‘After the chess game between the two grandmasters, three young chess players had the opportunity to talk to them’

б. След всеки шахматен двубой между двамата гросмайстори млади шахматисти **имаха възможността** да разговарят с тях

‘After every chess game between the two grandmasters, young chess players had the opportunity to talk to them’

(15a-b) contain *имаха възможността* ‘had the opportunity’, a frequently used phrase, which at first glance appears to have the same aspect meaning in the two sentences. In fact, it has two different meanings here: one perfective (15a), one imperfective (15b). When perfective, *имаха* is semantically equal to and replaceable by a perfective verb, *получиха*<sub>pfvAor</sub> ‘received’. When imperfective, it is replaceable by an imperfective one, *получаваха*<sub>impfv</sub> ‘received [repeatedly]’, cf. (16) and (17):

(16) а. След шахматния двубой между двамата гросмайстори трима млади шахматисти **получиха възможността** да разговарят с тях

‘After the chess game between the two grandmasters, three young chess players received the opportunity to talk to them’

б. \*След всеки шахматен двубой между двамата гросмайстори млади шахматисти **получиха възможността** да разговарят с тях

‘After every chess game between the two grandmasters, young chess players received the opportunity to talk to them’

(17) а. \*След шахматния двубой между двамата гросмайстори трима млади шахматисти **получаваха възможността** да разговарят с тях

‘After the chess game between the two grandmasters, three young chess players received the opportunity to talk to them’

б. След всеки шахматен двубой между двамата гросмайстори млади шахматисти **получаваха възможността** да разговарят с тях

‘After every chess game between the two grandmasters, young chess players received the opportunity to talk to them’

Let us analyze the effect of the change. The replacement with a perfective and an imperfective verb produces four sentences, two of which are well-formed, two non-grammatical. Why are (16b) and (17a) non-grammatical? The former is because of the incompatibility between the adverbial of indefinite recurrence *след всеки шахматен двубой* ‘after every chess game’ and the perfectivity of *получиха* ‘received’. The latter is for the opposite reason. The single-event adverbial *след шахматния двубой* ‘after the chess game’ requires the verb associated with it to be compatible and express/explicate perfectivity. Instead, the imperfective *получаваха* ‘received’ denotes indefinite iterativity, something incompatible with the single-event adverbial already present.

The grammaticality/non-grammaticality interplay here reveals an all-pervading and perpetual process of mapping temporal features between referents of verbs, nominals and temporal adverbials in Bulgarian, a feature claimed as universal (Ка-

bakčiev 2019: 212), i.e., for all languages. On the other hand, a conclusion can be drawn that biaspectuality, as in the case of the verb *имам* ‘have’, can even be regarded as *necessary* – because the use of regular perfective and imperfective verbs may clash semantically with adverbials and trigger non-grammaticality. The verb *имам*, being aspectually flexible, helps the speaker avoid non-grammaticality. The same with other biaspectual verbs that could also be (provisionally) regarded as devices for avoiding semantic clashes between aspectually rigid regular verbs (non-biaspectual) and adverbials. Here the high prevalence in Bulgarian of both *имам* ‘have’ and of biaspectual verbs must be taken note of. Furthermore, biaspectual verbs are intensively on the rise, due to the massive influx of foreign (English) lexical entries. If biaspectuality were a detrimental phenomenon, it would have been eliminated in Bulgarian through internal language mechanisms. It has not – and is obviously here to stay.

**Conclusion.** CA exists in Slavic alongside VA – and this is a firm conclusion, but for the time being confirmed on Bulgarian data only. CA can easily be observed in Bulgarian, a language that features not only verbal aspect (perfectivity and imperfectivity) but also a definite article. The contrast between the definite and the zero article helps the explication of perfectivity or imperfectivity with biaspectual and imperfective verbs and is effectuated through Verkuyl’s schemata and the mechanism of mapping temporal values from nominals onto verbs. The definite article systematically renders participants in situations temporally bounded; the zero article renders them non-bounded. The (referents of) NPs in sentences with biaspectual and imperfective verbs map their boundedness or non-boundedness onto the (referent of the) verb and coerce it into perfectivity or imperfectivity. As for Slavic languages that feature no article and thus differ significantly from Bulgarian, this study cannot offer a conjecture that CA exists in them in the two spheres explored (with biaspectual and imperfective verbs). However, future research on Slavic languages without articles could throw more light on whether CA exists there, and if it does, to what extent and in exactly what conditions.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Abraham, Leiss 2012:** Abraham, W., E. Leiss. The Case Differential: Syntagmatic Versus Paradigmatic Case – Its Status in Synchrony and Diachrony. // *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 110, 3, 316–341.

**Borer 2005:** Borer, H. *The Normal Course of Events*. Oxford: OUP, 2005.

**Borik 2006:** Borik, O. *Aspect and Reference Time*. Oxford: OUP, 2006.

**Gelderen 2018:** Gelderen, Elly van. *The Diachrony of Verb Meaning: aspect and argument structure*. New York/London: Routledge, 2018.

**Kabakčiev 1984:** Kabakčiev, K. The article and the aorist/imperfect distinction in Bulgarian: an analysis based on cross-language ‘aspect’ parallelisms. // *Linguistics*, 22, 643-672.

**Kabakčiev 2000:** Kabakčiev, K. *Aspect in English: a “common-sense” view of the interplay between verbal and nominal referents*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2000.

**Kabakčiev 2017:** Kabakčiev, K. *An English Grammar: main stumbling blocks for Bulgarians learning English*. Stuttgart: Mariana Kabakchiev Verlag, 2017.

**Kabakčiev 2019:** Kabakčiev, K.. On the history of compositional aspect: vicissitudes, issues, prospects. *Athens Journal of Philology*, Vol. 6, 3, 201-224.

**Lindstedt 1985:** Lindstedt, J. *On the Semantics of Tense and Aspect in Bulgarian*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1985.

**Maslov 1982:** Maslov, J. *Gramatika na balgarskiya ezik*. Sofiya: Nauka i izkustvo, 1982.

**Rå Hauge 1999:** Rå Hauge, K. *A Short Grammar of Contemporary Bulgarian*. Bloomington, Indiana: Slavica Publishers, 1999.

**Verkuyl 1972:** Verkuyl, H. *On the Compositional Nature of the Aspects*. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1972.

**Verkuyl 1993:** Verkuyl, H. *A theory of Aspectuality. The Interaction between Temporal and Atemporal Structure*. Cambridge: CUP, 1993.