

SCIENTIFIC OPINION

of a Member of the Scientific Jury Ani Ivanova Kemalova
Associate Professor at Plovdiv University Paisii Hilendarski

On a Dissertation for the Award of the Educational and Scientific PhD Degree
Scientific Field 2. Humanities. Professional Field: Philology, Code 2.1

Author of the Dissertation: Snezhana Kocheva Aleksandrova, a Doctoral Candidate at the Department of Bulgarian Dialectology and Linguistic Geography of the Institute for Bulgarian Language "Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin" – BAS

Topic of the Dissertation: "Names Related to Clothing and Its Making (Lexico-Semantic Characteristics)"

The documents and the materials presented to me with regard to the procedure on the public defence of the dissertation fully meet the requirements of the Act on Development of the Academic Staff of the Republic of Bulgaria and its Rules of Procedure.

The content of the paper is valuable and has a scientific appearance. The topic is inspired by the lack of a more detailed study in a linguo-geographic aspect of the system of names for clothing in Bulgarian dialects. Responding to this, the dissertation completely meets the criterion of scientific relevance.

The structure of the paper is appropriate (**Introduction**; Chapter on the **Theoretical Basis of the Research**; Chapter on the **Classification of the Names Related to Clothing and Its Making (Lexico-Semantic Characteristic)**; **Conclusions** – Summary, Literature Cited, List of Abbreviation) and specifically subordinate to the problem under consideration, and at the same time adheres to the established research standards. In accordance with the requirements of the procedure Snezhana Aleksandrova has included at the end of her paper a **Reference of the academic merits of the dissertation** and a **List of publications on the topic of the dissertation**.

In the dissertation an in-depth study is made of a wide range of scientific fields, which reveal the creative interests of the doctoral candidate. The exposition in the **first chapter** and the impressive number of titles (393) referred to in **Literature** definitely prove that the author has approached with sufficient understanding and thoroughness the discussed topic and its presentation in the scientific literature so far. The necessary attention has also been paid to the theoretic formulation of the systemic relations on a lexical level, and the studies closely related to clothing and its making in an ethnological, socio-cultural, linguistic and lexicographic aspect.

The subject, goals and tasks formulated by the doctoral candidate give perspective for multi-layered and wide angle interpretation of the material which is object of the research. With this in mind I find suitable the selected system of methods and approaches which are applied according to the specifics of the individual components of the analysis.

I totally agree that the paper of Snezhana Aleksandrova has all the contributing moments formulated at the end of the dissertation. I will briefly try to highlight the ones that impressed me the most.

The analyses in the **second chapter**, which examine the objects through the prism not only of lexical semantics and word formation but also of linguo-geography and even ethnography, exceeds the limits of the set goals and objectives. Proof in this direction is the presented interesting information about some of the borrowed words in our vernaculars and their presence today in the language from which they originated.

Indisputable merit of the dissertation is the decision of the candidate to add etymological references for the examined words and most of all to suggest her own hypotheses in this area, even though they “don’t claim to be exhaustive and cogent”.

Place is found within the dissertation for valuable observations of ethnographic, culturological and, in particular, forematologic nature, which enrich the usefulness of the study and significantly expand the circle of future readers.

Examined in the dissertation are the very impressive 1673 lexical units which represent a valuable thematically-oriented lexical corpus.

The significance and the credibility of the conclusions made are reinforced by the large volume (80 titles) and the wide range of excerption sources – both as a manner (personal material gathered through fieldwork, archives, dialectological dictionaries and monographic studies, lexical maps, ethnological research, etc.) and a time range (from the late 19th century to the 70’s of 20th century “with manifestations in modern times”).

The list of publications and the candidate’s participation in scientific forums on the topic of the dissertation reveals the long-standing and lasting interest of Snezhana Aleksandrova in the researched issues. The candidate presents seven of her publications (in three foreign and four Bulgarian journals) and the same number of participations in prestigious scientific conferences in Bulgaria and abroad.

My impressions of Snezhana Aleksandrova’s paper are excellent, and yet I have some recommendations. I hope that they will be useful to the doctoral candidate in refining her laborious and valuable research. The second of the tasks listed in sixth page (*“Some scientific theses on examining and analyzing the specifics and changes in the lexical system of dialects, also valid with regard to names of clothing and its making”*) could be better formulated. It’s not clear in what aspect the scientific theses are a specific task for achieving the goals of the research.

More attention could be paid to some imperfections of the literature cited. For example, the whole paragraph on eighth page which begins with the theory of the semantic field, ends in (**quoted from Boyadzhiev 2002: 48-49**), but there is no marker for the borders of the citation and the author’s words.

As I have already had the opportunity to emphasize, the analyzed volume of lexical material is impressive and with a very interesting content. In order for it to be applied both as a reference source and as a basis for further studies in the sphere of Bulgarian dialect linguistic richness, I would welcome a separate **alphabetical list** of the interpreted lexemes. I

make this suggestion only in the perspective of a future publication of Snezhana Aleksandrova's dissertation, which I highly recommend.

The printed abstract reflects reliably and comprehensively the content of the dissertation, all genre specifics of the summary text are observed.

In conclusion I'll once again express my firm opinion that the candidate's dissertation is a valuable and thorough lexico-semantic study which presents its author not only as a skilled philologist, but also as a researcher with interdisciplinary interests.

Therefore I strongly suggest to the members of the esteemed Scientific Jury that Snezhana Aleksandrova be awarded the Educational and Scientific PhD Degree, Scientific Field 2. Humanities. Professional Field: Philology, code 2.1.

Plovdiv,
September 25, 2020

Author of the Scientific Opinion:
Associate Professor Ani Kemalova, PhD