

DOCTORAL THESIS REVIEW REPORT

Doctoral thesis topic: **Popular Models of Nomination of Traditional Types of Alcoholic Beverages in the Bulgarian Dialects**

Author of the doctoral thesis: **Aliza Taysir Halil-Konstantinova**

Research supervisor: **Prof. Dr. Ana Ivanova Kocheva**

Reviewer: **Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vladislav Vladkov Marinov** (St. Cyril and St. Methodius University of Veliko Tarnovo, Faculty of Philology, Department of Modern Bulgarian Language)

This Review Report has been written pursuant to Order РД-09-33 dd. 23.12.2021 of the Director of Institute for Bulgarian Language "Prof. L. Andreychin" as well as Minutes No. 1 dd. 05.01.2022 of the meeting of the scientific jury in relation to the thesis defence for awarding a doctoral degree to Aliza Halil-Konstantinova, a doctoral student at the Department of Bulgarian Dialectology and Linguistic Geography by Institute for Bulgarian Language "Prof. L. Andreychin", doctoral program: Bulgarian language; scientific field: 2. Humanities; professional field: 2.1. Philology.

1. Information about the doctoral student

Aliza Taysir Halil-Konstantinova was born in 1991. She completed her secondary education at *Prof. K. Irechek* 56th Secondary School of Sofia. In 2015, she acquired a master's degree in Balkan Studies at N. Rilski Southwest University (Blagoevgrad). During the studies, she took part in student internships organized by the Institute for Bulgarian Language (from 12.2014 to 03.2015). In the period from 2016 to 2019, she was a full-time doctoral student at the Department of Bulgarian Dialectology and Linguistic Geography by Institute for Bulgarian Language *Prof. L. Andreychin* (BAS). Since 2015, A. Halil-Konstantinova has been a teacher of Bulgarian language and literature at *K. Velichkov* 45th Primary School of Sofia. As can be seen, the professional development of the doctoral student is in the field of her scientific interests, i.e., the Bulgarian language.

A. Halil-Konstantinova participated in the competition with 3 publications on the doctoral thesis topic, published in journals, referenced, and indexed in world databases such as SCOPUS, ERIH PLUS, etc. In addition, the author of the thesis has presented a *Report on the National Minimum Requirements for Acquiring a Doctoral Degree*, showing that A. Halil-Konstantinova has enough points for participation in the doctoral degree awarding procedure.

The abstract (consisting of 27 pages) follows the structure of the thesis and correctly reflects the contributions of the author.

2. Relevance of the topic and general assessment of the doctoral thesis

The chosen topic is relevant as no special research has been done so far of the popular models of nomination of wine and rakia in the Bulgarian dialects. As the author noted, the problem had been partially addressed “by Olga Mladenova (in *Grapes and Wine in the Balkans: An Ethno-Linguistic Study, Ethnolinguistic Questionnaire on Traditional Viticulture and Winemaking*), in articles of the *Wine: History and Inspiration* collection (reports from a National Scientific Conference with international participation in the city of Ruse, published in 2016), and in two encyclopaedic studies” (p. 1). By choosing this topic, research supervisor Prof. Dr. A. Kocheva gave the doctoral student the opportunity to fill a gap in the Bulgarian dialect vocabulary and word formation. In addition, the thesis has examined the popular models of nomination of wine and rakia and has established that all the models can be found in the general nomination theory. A. Halil-Konstantinova took examples both from the archives of the Institute for Bulgarian Language and the dialectological material personally collected by her on field, which is one of the advantages of her thesis: the author knows very well how dialectological material is collected and processed. In the thesis, the popular wine and rakia names have been presented both in synchrony and diachrony, old Bulgarian and Middle Bulgarian sources have been used by the doctoral student, and a separate part (6) has been dedicated to the preserved-in-the-language Bulgarian attitude to alcohol abuse.

3. Evaluation of the content of the thesis

The peer-reviewed thesis (135 pages) consists of **an introduction, 7 parts, a conclusion, references, and an appendix** including *samples of field research* as well as *an index* of the popular wine and rakia names presented in the paper.

In **the introduction** (pp. 1 – 10), A. Halil-Konstantinova presented the aim of her research (however, I could not see a clearly differentiated research object), the objectives, methodology, and general data on winemaking in Bulgaria from antiquity to the present day. As the doctoral student noted, the aim of the research is “to excerpt (collect), describe, and analyse the language material, mainly with a view to the modelling¹ of the popular names and the semantics of the models of the names of alcoholic beverages in our lands.” (p. 2). The aim has been achieved by the implementation of the six objectives related to the establishment of the basic models of

¹ The term *modelling* should be interpreted as a sum of the various nomination processes that took place in the formation of the popular names of alcoholic beverages (wine and rakia). They have different scope and orientation to the different parts of the language, and, of course, mainly to lexicology and lexicography.

nomination of alcoholic beverages, the presentation of the dialect hyponyms of the *wine* and *rakia* hypernyms, the specification of the origin of the registered forms, etc. (pp. 2 – 3). Regarding the methodology, various methods were used in the thesis, both in synchrony (descriptive) and diachrony (comparative, comparative-historical, ethnolinguistic, etc.). The aim, objectives, and applied methods thus defined show the large volume of the work done by the doctoral student.

Part 1 (pp. 10 – 28) and **Part 2** (pp. 29 – 33) of the thesis present the models of nomination of wine and rakia in the territorial dialects and sociolects. The examples show that, at the dialect level, there are various nominative features associated with the origin of wine and rakia, their colour, quantity, quality, etc. Structurally, the doctoral student has noted a greater variability in the names of rakia, with predominance of the feminine-gender nouns formed with the suffixes *-itsa*; *-ka*, *-ina* and their extended variants *-ovitsa*; *enitsa*; *-ovka*; *-evka*; *-ovina*, etc. In the case of the masculine-gender nouns, single names have been registered with the suffixes *-ak* (*parvak*) and *-ok* (*stanok*), and the author has noted a prefix word formation, too, e.g., in *prepek*. The word formation of the wine names lacks such a diversity, and the nomination is associated mainly with the wine characteristics, e.g., origin, colour, grape variety from which wine is made, etc. The material in this part confirms the logical conclusion that “the nomination system of the different types of rakia has a predominant Bulgarian character, while the system of wines is richer in foreign lexical elements” (p. 28). While in the traditional Bulgarian dialects the nomination processes are relatively clear, with regard to the sociolects, the doctoral student concluded that due to their specifics (social groups in which they are used; number of participants; environment in which they are used; etc.), it is much more difficult to trace the etymology or word formation of the wine and rakia names.

In **Parts 3** (pp. 34 – 42), **4** (pp. 43 – 63), and **5** (pp. 64 – 67), A. Halil-Konstantinova traced, synchronously and diachronically, the wine and rakia lexemes in the written sources. For the purposes of the research, the doctoral student has divided the names into two groups: 1) with Slavic (Bulgarian) origin of the onomasiological feature and 2) adopted from other languages, including hybrids. The review in Part 3 “Historical characteristics of the names of the types of rakia and wine in the dialects” confirms the previous conclusions that the rakia names are dominated by domestic vocabulary (or adapted loan words), while the wine lexemes have a greater number of foreign vocabularies. Here, I would suggest that the author rename this part, as its title corresponds more to the material in the next part presenting a historical overview (in Old Bulgarian and Middle Bulgarian sources) of the wine and rakia names. From the sources excerpted, A. Khalil-Konstantinova has presented over 100 examples of the use of the *wine* lexeme (and its derivatives) and only 3 of the *rakia* lexeme (in two of the examples, it was used along with *wine*). According to the doctoral student, the registered

imbalance in the use of the two lexemes is due to the role of wine in worship (as a symbol of the blood of Jesus Christ) and the festive rites of Bulgarians, while rakia appeared later in Bulgaria. In view of the existence of the *wine* and *rakia* lexemes in the modern Bulgarian language (Part 5 of the thesis), A. Halil-Konstantinova has made a supported-by-sufficient-examples conclusion that the two lexemes are still productive today both at a literary and dialectal level. The object of **Part 6** (pp. 68 – 83) of the research are the lexemes and word combinations used by Bulgarians to nominate alcohol abuse in its various aspects (process, participants, results, etc.). More than 50 phraseological combinations, proverbs, sayings, and individual lexemes have been presented. A prevailing negative attitude toward alcohol abuse and its effects on the individual, family, and team has been noted, but also the current trends to increased alcohol use by teenagers that has reflected in their jargon.

The ethnolinguistic specifics in the symbolic meaning of wine and rakia have been discussed in **Part 7** (pp. 84 – 93). At the end of the part, there is the conclusion that, due to its later appearance, rakia has been usually present along with wine in various rituals, and there has been independent symbolism only in “proving the moral purity of Bulgarian women” (p. 93). A. Halil-Konstantinova has rightly stated that the symbolic meaning of wine intertwines pagan beliefs and Christianity, and, because of the long history of winemaking in the Bulgarian lands, wine is present in many rituals and is most often associated with health and fertility.

The conclusion (pp. 94 – 95) presents the conclusions logically following from the material analysed, with the main one being that various models of nomination of wine and rakia could be found, which once again shows the potential of territorial dialects in the field of word formation.

4. Scientific and scientific-applied contributions of the thesis

The research is undoubtedly contributing, as it is the first independent research of the wine and rakia names in the traditional Bulgarian dialects and sociolects, including not only the word-formation patterns, but also examining the traditional alcoholic beverages and the attitudes towards them recorded in the written sources. The scientific and applied nature of the work is expressed in the processing of the collected material, which can serve as a basis for a larger study on the frequency distribution of the traditional alcohol lexemes, as well as for tracing certain word-formation trends.

5. Notes, recommendations, and questions

Further to the above, before publishing her doctoral thesis as a monograph, I would recommend that A. Halil-Konstantinova restructure its content by uniting the current seven parts in three chapters, respectively 1 – 2; 3 – 5; 6 – 7. Of interest to me is also if

the doctoral student has observations which dialect area has the greatest variety of names of different wine or rakia types.

6. Conclusion

Based on what was presented in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, I declare my positive assessment of the reviewed thesis *Popular Models of Nomination of Traditional Types of Alcoholic Beverages in the Bulgarian Dialects* by A. Halil-Konstantinova. In my opinion, the thesis meets the requirements for awarding a doctoral degree and, therefore, I strongly suggest that the esteemed jury award A. Halil-Konstantinova a doctoral degree in scientific specialty *Bulgarian language*, professional field 2.1. *Philology*.

15.02.2021

Reviewer:

(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vladislav Marinov)