

REVIEW

by Professor Dr. Nadezhda Ivanova Mihailova-Stalyanova,

Department of Bulgarian Language,

Faculty of Slavonic Philology, Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"

on her dissertation for the award of the degree of Doctor of Education and Science

2. Humanities

Professional field 2.1. 2.1 Humanities (Applied Linguistics)

Author. Antoaneta Peteva Nacheva

Subject. "Linguocultural differences in high language etiquette"

Research supervisors: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vladislav Milanov, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dilyana Dencheva

1. General description of the presented materials

By order of the Rector of the Sofia University "St. Kl. Ohridski" № RD 38-98 from 19.02.2024 I have been appointed as a member of the scientific jury (reviewer) for the procedure for the defense of the dissertation on "**Linguocultural differences in high language etiquette**" for the acquisition of the educational and scientific degree "Doctor" in the field of higher education 2. Humanities, professional field 2.1. Philosophy (Bulgarian Language - Applied Linguistics). The author of the dissertation is **Antoaneta Peteva Nacheva** with scientific supervisors Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vladislav Milanov, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dilyana Dencheva from Sofia University "St. Kl. Ohridsky"

All documentation related to the doctoral studies and required by the Law for the Development of Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria and the Regulations for the Implementation of the Law of the Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski" for conducting the dissertation defense procedure for the acquisition of the educational and scientific degree "Doctor", were duly submitted to the Scientific Jury and fully comply with all requirements.

2. Brief biographical data about the PhD student

Antoaneta Nacheva was born in Pleven in 1993. She graduated with a bachelor's degree in Bulgarian philology in 2018. In 2019, she graduated from the Master's program in Linguistics - Language System and Speech Practices. After finishing his education he worked mainly as a journalist (Sports Department of Trud newspaper, reporter at Eurocom TV, news editor/producer at TV Evropa, economic editor at expert.bg)

All the documentation is in compliance and the PhD student fulfils all the conditions for obtaining the scientific and educational degree "PhD", the subject of the rest of the review will be exclusively the dissertation with the title "Linguocultural differences in high language etiquette".

3. Characteristics and evaluation of the thesis

The dissertation consists of: introduction, two chapters, conclusion, list of cited literature and appendices. The bibliography covers 240 titles mainly in Bulgarian, Russian and English. The total volume of the dissertation is 283 pages.

In the introduction, the author introduces the object of her dissertation, namely: political speeches, as well as the main expressions of means thanks to which they are realized - their commentaries and, in general, to what extent official public communication is successfully

realized. A. Nacheva aims to trace the markedness of expression and the ways in which speech trends develop, to highlight possible changes in the last few years, in what they are expressed and how Bulgarian citizens perceive the behaviour of Bulgarian politicians. For this purpose, in the dissertation A. Nacheva analyzes the speech behavior of some of the most popular leaders of political parties from the parliamentary rostrum of the National Assembly.

The aim of her dissertation is to trace the speech strategies in public speaking of some of the most active Bulgarian politicians.

Regarding the methodology used A. Nacheva defines *observation* as her main research method. From a theoretical point of view, this sounds unjustified, all the more so since the text of the dissertation clearly shows the application of a combination of methods - discourse, contextual, lexical-semantic method of studying the empirical material.

Chapter One: "Linguocultural Studies - Nature and Place among Other Linguistic Disciplines" is a theoretical overview of several theories and possible scientific approaches to the analysis of linguistic material. The author discusses the main postulates of linguocultural studies, the theory of the linguistic picture of the world (with a distinction between linguistic, scientific, conceptual, and paremian), the theory of linguistic relativity, discourse analysis, and speech etiquette. Due to the genre limitation of the dissertation, these theories are presented only through their main postulates and ideas, without going into details.

The second chapter "**Linguocultural Characteristics of the Chairpersons of Political Parties and Parliamentary Groups**" is the actual analysis and practical work with linguistic material. This chapter is of an applied and practical nature and contains a detailed study of selected speeches by the leaders of the political parties in the 47th and 48th National Assemblies, as well as, as the dissertation defines them, the more prominent representatives of the parliamentarily represented groups. Here we see separate subchapters, which are essentially an analysis of individual speeches by Kiril Petkov, Asen Vassilev, Boyko Borisov, Mustafa Karaday, Korneliya Ninova, Slavi Trifonov, Toshko Yordanov, Hristo Ivanov, Kostadin Kostadinov, made mainly from the rostrum of the National Assembly during parliamentary

sessions. A separate sub-chapter is dedicated to the speeches of each of these politicians. A. Nacheva makes a kind of "snapshot" of the speech behaviour of the selected subjects for analysis, focusing on key lexemes that occur in their speeches. The analysis of the speech behaviour of each politician includes a description of characteristic lexical devices, phonetic deviations from the literary norm, as well as stylistic features of the utterances. In some cases, specifics at the morphological level, characteristic of the politician's idiolect, are noted (the so-called *softness* of Kiril Petkov and Boyko Borisov). It is difficult to generalise on the approach and the way of analysis, as they are different for each politician. We find an analysis of key lexemes as well as rhetorical devices and stylistic figures. In some subchapters the speech is characterized in terms of the literary orthographic norm.

In this chapter we observe more of a discourse analysis; the scientific approach has very little to do with the linguocultural and linguistic picture of the world. I would have expected a unified approach to the excerpted material, i.e. the analysis of individual politicians to follow a common pattern, which would have made the conclusions more clearly distinguishable, but the dissertator has chosen a different approach, which is an authorial decision and also possible. My remarks are in terms of structure, the problem areas are captured by A herself. Nacheva: "Although the place of this part is in the introductory chapter, they will be commented here to create a framework for the analysis, which was separated as part of the second chapter, and in the original version of the dissertation was a separate feature in the third chapter (p. 237). The author herself notes that space is not appropriate, this would be appropriate to correct. Again, too late in the dissertation text (only on page 237, and not, as the author writes, at the beginning), we find fundamental concepts for the study only mentioned: 'For the purposes of this study, it is very important to clarify conceptually from the outset and clearly distinguish the terms political correctness (political language), political speech, political discourse and propaganda'. The references to Hegel (p. 113) and the theoretical definitions of concepts such as terror, genocide and bullying (p. 120) seem to me unnecessary and irrelevant in a practical analysis of the speech behaviour of individual politicians. There are also references in the text to authors and definitions that are not correctly cited and not mentioned in the bibliography (William Safire on p 237 and others).

The conclusion is a synthesized summary of the study that summarizes the results and highlights the conclusions drawn. The conclusions are essentially a testament to the scholarly analysis in the dissertation, especially in the part highlighting the pronounced speech aggression in Bulgarian political speech, the mixing of linguistic registers, and the overuse of clichés.

I accept the author's contributions as an adequate self-assessment of the dissertation.

The **bibliography** is rich (240 items), texts in Bulgarian, Russian, English are cited, reflecting the main works on the problem

Evaluation of the abstract:

The abstract presented by the doctoral student correctly reflects the content of the dissertation. It contains the necessary requisites, including the dissertation contributions and a list of publications on the topic.

Assessment of publications on the dissertation:

Antoaneta Nacheva has 6 publications on the dissertation topic,.

CONCLUSION: The dissertation meets the requirements for the award of a doctoral degree (independent research with the application of a specific methodology and the preparation of a complete scientific text with specially designed corpora). The abstract fully reflects the content of the submitted dissertation

On the basis of the above opinion, I propose the Honourable Jury to vote in favour of awarding Antoaneta Nacheva the PhD degree.

.....

(Professor Dr. Nadezhda Ivanova Mihailova-Stalyanova)