

REVIEW

OF A DISSERTATION FOR OBTAINING THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR

Professional Field: 2.1. Philology, Subject Area: Bulgarian Language

by the candidate Adriana Borisova Hristova,

specialist in the Terminology and Terminography Section of the Institute for Bulgarian Language "Prof. L. Andreychin" at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

TOPIC: LINGUISTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BULGARIAN PHILOSOPHICAL TERMINOLOGY

REVIEWER: Assoc. Prof. **Valentina Ivanova Georgieva**, PhD, "G. S. Rakovski" National Defence College - Sofia

Adriana Hristova's dissertation under review is on a topical issue related to the characterization of Bulgarian philosophical terminology. The doctoral student aims to "make a linguistic description of the main terms in the field of philosophy. Attention is paid to the period IX-XIV centuries in view of the importance of medieval philosophical terms for the modern philosophical subsystem. The philosophical terms that are used today in the Bulgarian philosophical terminology have also been studied" (p. 8). The PhD dissertation is structured in six chapters (including "Introduction" and "Conclusion"), as well as "Alphabetical Index" of 2149 terms and terminological phrases on which the linguistic analysis is based, "Terms Sources", and "Bibliography" which includes 183 titles. References are a proof of the researcher's knowledge in the field.

The first chapter – "Introduction" – presents the topic, justifies the goals and the objectives of the study, sources and methods of research.

The research methodology which has been chosen is a combination of synchronous and diachronic approaches with elements of statistical method and component analysis and it corresponds to the goal and objectives of the research.

Chapter II – "Theoretical considerations" – presents the definitions of the meta terms *term* and *terminology* as well as the basic requirements for terms which have been formulated by terminologists.

Chapter III of the dissertation – “Philosophy and formation of Bulgarian philosophical terminology” – analyzes the processes in the studied terminology in the context of a very detailed (and partially redundant, as it is based entirely on citations of other researchers-philosophers) presentation of “the various views on philosophy from antiquity to the present day”, covering pages 21-33. The analysed terminological system, in contrast to the terminological systems of the natural sciences, stands out with specific features that pose certain difficulties for terminological analysis due to the fact that “Each philosophical school creates its own philosophical language, which may be close to the natural, but could also be completely incomprehensible” (p.179). The contribution in this part of the dissertation is the diachronic analysis of the medieval philosophical terminological vocabulary in the translated theological literature from the period IX-XIV centuries and of its characteristic features.

Chapter IV discusses in details the ways of philosophical terms formation: lexical-morphological, lexical-syntactic and lexical-semantic term formation, supporting the classification with a sufficient number of examples.

Chapter V is under the title of “General Linguistic Characteristics of Philosophical Terms” and is the largest, as it presents the sources for term formation, their structural and, briefly, their grammatical characteristics, and examines the semantic relations and lexical-semantic processes in the domain of philosophical terms.

The **dissertation’s scientific contribution** can be summarized as follows:

1. The term *Bulgarian philosophical culture* (българска философска култура) is substantiated as the most appropriate, adequate and productive of the existing terms - *Bulgarian philosophy* (българска философия), *philosophy in Bulgaria* (философията в България), *Bulgarian philosophical thought* (българска философска мисъл)

2. Eight types of definitions found in philosophical texts are differentiated, and they are supported by examples (pp. 47-50);

3. The sources for the creation of Bulgarian philosophical terminology are analyzed, i.e. the translated theological literature from the period IX-XIV centuries, the influence of the Greek and Latin philosophical literature, as well as the influence of the Western European philosophy;

4. The analysis of the different ways of terminological nomination is exhaustive and includes lexical-morphological, lexical-semantic and lexical-syntactic ways; the sources for the formation of philosophical terms and term elements, as well as of the lexical-semantic relations (synonymy, polysemy, homonymy, antonymy) in the modern philosophical terminology are also discussed.

5. Some general tendencies for word formation of philosophical terms have been revealed, e.g. activation of the word forming elements for expressing the opposition.

6. The ways of enriching the Bulgarian philosophical terminology, the general Bulgarian language and the terminologies of the sciences closely related to philosophy with philosophical terms are presented.

The practical and applied contributions of the dissertation, formulated by the doctoral student, are as follows:

1. The researched philosophical terms can be the basis for a philosophical terminological dictionary;

2. The dissertation will be useful for the correct usage of philosophical terminological vocabulary in the official business style, in the media and in everyday language.

The **executive summary** of the dissertation accurately presents the content of the dissertation.

The doctoral student Adriana Hristova has eight **publications** which are thematically related to the researched topic in the dissertation, of which one is in an international journal, and they were published in the period 2013-2017. She also has six citations of three of her publications.

Recommendations: First of all, it would be better to shorten the content of the dissertation in its theoretical part, as there are repetitions of well-known theoretical terminological postulates which are redundant (e.g. on p. 55 the requirements for the terms are already presented on page pp. 17-18; the rule for forming terms in the form of complex words from p. 66 is repeated on p. 74; on pp. 106-107 there are some unnecessary theoretical statements about metaphor, etc.) Some repetitions in the analytical part need to be avoided (e.g. repetition of

the statements and examples on p. 64, paragraph 3, and p. 71, paragraph 1). In some parts of the dissertation there is no logical connection between the paragraphs (e.g. between the paragraphs on p. 54 and paragraph 1 on p. 55; the content of pp. 56-57 and the content of paragraph 2 on page 58), which leaves the impression of fragmentation of the narrative.

Secondly, the philosophical terms from the manuscript *Simeon's collection* from the part of the dissertation that presents the structural types of these terms (pp. 65-77), are followed by their equivalent in Greek. In my opinion, it would be more valuable from a terminological point of view to present the newly formed Bulgarian philosophical terms in context, and this recommendation is especially valid for term combinations and combinations of terms and general usage words, as in some of them (e.g. *божии разумъ* - *God's mind*) their status as terminological combinations can be accepted unconditionally, but in others (e.g. *въ видѣ сътворити, сжсъ оглаголати* on p. 70) it is appropriate to present the context of their use. The following examples also give rise to doubts about their terminological nature: *добри творения* - *good creations* (p. 53), *небес(ъ)но шествие* - *heavens march* (p. 75); *дѣствовати и творити* - *to act and create* and *тънькъ и чистъ* - *slim and clean* (p. 76); *заскобяване* - *bracing* (p. 82, p. 87); *без вѣсти* is an example of a word combination with a preposition alongside with *без вѣсти творити* (p. 75); *глас* - *voice*, *душа* - *soul*, *живот* - *life*, *радост* - *joy*, *сила* - *strength*, *ум* - *mind* (p. 55) are presented as examples of determinologisation of medieval philosophical terms, but their terminological meaning is not indicated; some of them are repeated on p. 79, and once again the statement of determinologisation of philosophical terms is repeated.

Some of the examples, in my opinion, are incorrect or incompletely presented, e.g. the term *аз-ност* - *self* on p. 93 is given as an example of a complex term with a conjunction between words; *вълнуваща причина* - *an exciting reason* on p. 99 is given as an example of a simple term phrase; the term *философска школа от Шартър* - *philosophical school by Chartres* on p. 103 is an example of a terminological combination with “noun + preposition + noun + preposition + noun” structure; p. 103 presents the statement that there are “terms word combinations in the form of a subordinate clause in which the terminological elements are connected by hyphens” and interesting examples of such terms with their definitions follow: *бумие-в-себе-си* - *being-in-itself*, *бумие-за-себе-си* - *being-for-themselves*, etc., but the source of their definition is not specified.

It is my belief that research statements need to be supported by arguments and examples. However, on p. 79, for instance, there is the statement that “Most of the obsolete forms have been replaced by new words of Latin origin under the influence of Western philosophy”, but it is not supported by examples. Similarly, on p. 152 examples with the suffixes *-не/-ция* are given and it is stated that “There is a parallel use of nouns with the suffixes *-ция* and *-не*. Nouns with the suffix *-ция* are very productive. They signify an action or the result of an action and are more abstract than the nouns the suffix *-не*”, but this is not supported by statistics or examples in context to support the statement; p. 149 states: “Antonymy, when compared to polysemy, homonymy and synonymy, is of a different order in assessing the meaning of the term. It is a common phenomenon that cannot be sanctioned.” The last sentence does not correspond to the level of the research.

The last recommendation is related to the terms that are defined as *word symbols* (p. 134), as well as to the examples of synonymous use of “terminological phrases and non-linguistic elements” on p. 152. According to a common linguistic understanding of the terms of the type *А-пропозиция, Д-Х модел*, which are presented in the study in 2.4., they should be considered *abbreviated words*, not *symbols words*, and it is more correct to classify them as a subtype in 2.5. “Abbreviations”. Following the same rule, the examples from p. 152 *двойно отрицание – DN* and *модел за обхващащия закон – ДХ* should be classified as examples of synonymous use of terminological phrases and abbreviations (instead of *non-linguistic elements*).

Regardless of the remarks and recommendations made, based on the dissertation research contributions and the positive qualities highlighted above, it can be **concluded** that the dissertation meets the requirements for obtaining the PhD degree. Therefore, I recommend that the Scientific Jury and the Academic Board of the Institute for Bulgarian Language “Prof. L. Andreychin” at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences assess the dissertation on the topic of “Linguistic Characteristics of the Bulgarian Philosophical Terminology” positively and award the doctoral student Adriana Hristova with the doctoral degree in the Professional Field 2.1. Philology, Subject Area: Bulgarian Language.

Signature:.....

Assoc. Prof. Valentina Georgieva, PhD

Department of Distance Learning, Language Training and Qualification

Language Training Chair
“G. S. Rakovski” National Defence College

09.10. 2020
Sofia