

## REVIEW

by **Assoc. Prof. Yuliana Ivanova Chakarova, PhD**  
**Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv**

on dissertation thesis  
submitted for the award of the educational and scientific degree PhD  
Area of Higher Education: 2. Humanities  
Professional Field: 2.1. Philology  
Doctoral Programme: General and Comparative Linguistics

**Author:** Pavlina Stefanova Petkova

**Title:** “The concept “air” in Bulgarian and English through the perspective of Linguoculturology”

**Academic Advisor:** Assoc. Prof. Boryan Georgiev Yanev, PhD – Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv

### 1. General description of the submitted documents

By Order No ПД-22-281 / 06.02.2025 I was appointed a member of the Academic Board for provision of the procedure for the defence of the PhD thesis entitled “The concept “air” in Bulgarian and English through the perspective of Linguoculturology” for the award of the educational and scientific degree PhD in the area of higher education 2. Humanities, professional field 2.1. Philology, doctoral programme: General and Comparative Linguistics. The author of the thesis is **Pavlina Stefanova Petkova** – a doctoral student in a regular form of studies at the Department of General Linguistics and History of Bulgarian Language with an academic advisor Assoc. Prof. Boryan Georgiev Yanev, PhD, from Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv.

The submitted by the doctoral student set of materials in paper copies is in compliance with Art. 36 (1) of the Regulations for Development of the Academic Staff at the University of Plovdiv and includes the following documents:

- An application to the Rector of the University of Plovdiv for opening the procedure for the defense of a doctoral dissertation;
- A Europass CV;
- The minutes of a department meeting related to reporting the readiness for opening the procedure as a follow-up of a discussion of the doctoral dissertation;
- The doctoral dissertation;
- An abstract of the dissertation in Bulgarian;
- An abstract of the dissertation in English;
- A list of scholarly publications on the dissertation topic;
- The copies of the scholarly publications;
- A compliance check of the minimal national requirements]
- A declaration for the originality and authenticity of the submitted documents.

The doctoral candidate has submitted 4 articles on the topic of the thesis, which together with the PhD thesis, have earned her **90 points**, thus exceeding the minimum national requirements of 80 points for obtaining the educational and scientific degree PhD.

## 2. Brief biographical data about the doctoral student

The short CV presented in the document package (in Europass format) shows an adequate foundation of previous education and qualifications required for conducting research in the chosen academic field: a Bachelor's degree in Bulgarian and English languages, as well as a Master's degree (Translation and Business Communication), which has the potential of developing language and intercultural, including linguocultural, competences relevant to the research. The indicated foreign language competences, which are directly related to the topic – C2 (according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) in English – also suggest a reliable starting point for carrying out scholarly research in the chosen academic area.

## 3. Relevance of the topic and appropriateness of the set goals and objectives

The study of a given linguocultural concept, which is related to the topic of the dissertation under review, as well as the proposed **conceptual framework** for analysis, are current and fully adequate for the anthropocentric paradigm of contemporary linguistics. The **linguocultural approach** has become an inherent characteristic of this paradigm and one of the most popular frameworks in recent linguistic studies because it's human-centered and focuses on studying the language of a given ethnic group in connection with culture and on analyzing cultural concepts. Being cognitive by nature, cultural concepts reflect the respective ethnic group's view of certain fragments of the world that hold cultural and, accordingly, axiological value. To what extent the dissertation research has achieved its stated goal is another aspect of the situation (explained in detail below).

## 4. Knowing the problematics

As can be seen in Chapter One of the dissertation, as well as in individual comments in the following chapters, P. Petkova is familiar with the key aspects of essential works necessary for building the general theoretical framework of the research, and it is evident that the corresponding authors are correctly cited. The framework of linguocultural studies and the rationale for classifying linguoculturology within cognitive-oriented fields are described; the emergence of linguoconceptology within this field is outlined; a list of terms from the field used in the research is proposed (unfortunately, some of them are not referenced to a source); views on the naive worldview and the worldview in language (which the author accepts as synonyms) are presented. Special attention is paid to Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis of linguistic relativity. Logically, a separate section is dedicated to the notion of *concept* – its essence according to linguocultural studies and its types, which aligns with the stated goals of the research. In the process of describing the main publications on the subject, other key terms are outlined – *cultural scripts* (A. Wierzbicka), *stereotypes* (according to Y. Bartmiński), and *prototypes* (according to E. Rosch). Even concepts like *frame* and *gestalt* are mentioned, but only according to Russian-speaking authors, despite the fact that these concepts originated in the English-speaking academic discourse. Unfortunately, the introduction of the above-mentioned, as well as other notions in the theoretical section, appears to be purely formal, as they are not used anywhere else in the research (with one exception – *concept*). The same applies to the briefly presented but completely unused *Theory of Conceptual Metaphor* (TCM) by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, which is an excellent tool for outlining the figurative aspect of any given cultural concept, but is entirely absent in the dissertation.

Furthermore, every study of this nature, in addition to a general theoretical framework, requires knowledge in the specific area of the topic, which is not demonstrated in the thesis under review. The absence of prior comparative studies on the concept AIR in the pair Bulgarian – English through the prism of linguoculturology is an indisputable fact. However, Russian-speaking linguocultural studies (“the native territory” for this type of analysis) abound with relevant publications. On the one hand,

there are hundreds of studies on linguocultural concepts that could serve as a reliable foundation for building a model depicting the structure of the concept discussed in the thesis. This layer of the scholarly discourse is almost entirely missed in the dissertation under review. On the other hand, there are several in-depth Russian-language studies (including not just articles but also dissertations) specifically on the concept of AIR – both concerning only Russian and in comparison with English, French, etc.<sup>1</sup> And thirdly, there are the studies on the concepts of SPIRIT and SOUL – perhaps the best-developed area in the field under consideration. None of this is mentioned in the thesis, which leads to the conclusion that, unlike the general theoretical issues, the dissertation does not demonstrate knowledge of the specific problems related to the topic.

## 5. Research methodology

The primary method identified in the dissertation is the **linguocultural analysis**, which is completely appropriate for research within the scope of the respective discipline focusing on the linguocultural concept. Seven complementary methods are listed, and their presence in the analysis is well-argued: lexicographic study, theoretical generalization, descriptive analysis, conceptual analysis, semantic/component analysis, comparative analysis, and associative experiment. The diversity of methods is characteristic of interdisciplinary research and is the only approach that can provide a reliable foundation for analysis and conclusions. In this sense, we believe that the **set of selected methods in this dissertation is entirely appropriate** and in line with the stated goals and objectives. Unfortunately, as in the previous point, theoretical description does not necessarily mean that they are appropriately applied. In the thesis, these methods are applied in an unbalanced way. To a big extent, the focus of the research are long lists of derivatives of the selected lexemes in both languages.

## 6. Description and evaluation of the thesis

The dissertation (total of 392 pages, half of which is the main text – 194 pages, with the rest consisting of references and material in the appendices) offers a logical structure for the stated goals and objectives. It consists of an introduction, six chapters, a conclusion, three appendices (for some unknown reason placed before the list of sources, which in research of this type should be organically linked to the main text), and a bibliography.

In the **Introduction** (pp. 6 – 12), the object, subject, goals, and specific tasks (7) of the research are correctly outlined. The innovation of the study is argued, the working hypothesis is sketched, and a synthesized overview of the content of the individual sections, including the appendices, is provided.

**Chapter One** (“Methodics of the study,” pp. 13 – 56) sets the theoretical background for the analysis. It seems more logical to use the term “methodological basis” rather than “Methodics”: the discussed issues are broader than the description of specific techniques (which is the core meaning of the equivalent word in Bulgarian). For more details on this chapter, see point 4.

In **Chapter Two** (“Lexemes within the concept *air* in the lexical-semantic field of Bulgarian and English,” pp. 57 – 86), syntagmatic, paradigmatic, and derivational relationships (in general) are discussed. The lexemes *въздух*, *душа*, *дых*, *дъх*, *душама* and their correspondent English words (*air*, *soul*, *spirit*, *breath*, *breathe*) are grouped into thematic categories. Word formation models for *душама*

<sup>1</sup> E.g.: Hen, B. S. Kontsept VOZDUH v sovremennom russkom yazyke. Dis. ... kfn. Moskva, 2006; Livenets, I. S. Kontsept VOZDUH v lingvokul'turologicheskom aspekte (na materiale tekstov K. Paustovskogo i M. Sholohova). Dis. ... kfn. Belgorod, 2007; Legostaeva, O. V. Kontsepty „vozduh“ i „air“ v russkom i angliyskom yazykah. Sistema zadaniy kontseptnoj metodiki pri izuchenii imeni prilagatel'nogo // Nauchno-metodicheskij elektronnyj zhurnal „Kontsept“. 2012. № 3: 66 – 70; Bocharova, A. V., Shatilova, L. M. Sravnitel'no-sopostavitel'nyj analiz yadernyh leksem kontseptna vozduh v russkom i frantsuzskom yazykah // Gramota. Tambov, 2019. T. 12, vyp. 6: 207 – 210.

and *breathe* (it is unclear why only these lexemes from the list above) are presented. In parallel tables, extracts of the meanings of *въздъх* and *air*, *душа* and *soul*, *дух* and *spirit*, *дъх* and *breath*, *дишам* and *breathe* are shown (these 10 pages of dictionary meanings are completely unnecessary here, as they are included, albeit in a different format, in Appendix 1). A comparative commentary is proposed, where collocations of the lexemes are mixed with some ethnographic facts about traditions, religious practices, beliefs, etc.

**Chapter Three** (“Verbalization of the concepts *air*, *breath*, and *breathe* in Bulgarian and English Phraseology<sup>2</sup> and Paremiology,” pp. 87 – 100) offers a brief overview of idioms, proverbs and folklore as sources of cultural information, before moving on to the concepts (sic!) of *air*, *breath* and *breathe*, verbalized in phraseology and paremiology. In practice, it consists of long lists of idiomatic expressions in Bulgarian and their equivalents in English, with brief commentary on the presence or absence of the corresponding lexeme.

**Chapter Four** (“Conceptualization of the ideas about soul and spirit in the Bulgarian and English worldview,” pp. 101 – 124) offers, in addition to somewhat loosely connected comments on Bulgarian and English culture, lists of translations of combinations containing the lexemes *душа* and *дух* (over 15 pages, again unnecessary here as much of them is presented in Appendix 1) with brief comments.

**Chapter Five** (“Air as a secondary indicator of the conceptual field *wind*”, pp. 125 – 169) describes in detail (but unnecessarily for this dissertation) various derivational processes, followed by dozens of pages listing various examples of word formation models of the lexemes *вятър* and *wind*, with translations of words and phrases containing them.

**Chapter Six** (“Comparative analysis in the semantics of the lexemes *вятър* and *wind*,” pp. 170 – 169) again begins with tables containing dictionary meanings of the lexemes in question. A brief comparison of the semantic features – matching and specific – is made. This is followed by a section dedicated to the verbalization of *wind* in phraseology and paremiology.

The lists of examples from the dictionaries, especially in the last three chapters, seem to occupy about half of the entire text – when one looks at them without connection to the title of the respective chapter, they seem to differ very little from Appendices 1 and 2.

In the **Conclusion**, the goals and objectives outlined at the beginning are repeated, summary of the results is offered, and contribution moments are indicated. The concluding statements are based on the material included in the main text.

Three **appendices** follow, taking up half of the pages of the dissertation.

The **List of References** consists of **120 titles**, including significant authors and studies relevant to the topic under consideration. For illustrative material, 37 dictionaries were used, including 28 print editions and 9 electronic sources, among which – reputable dictionaries such as Merriam-Webster, Cambridge Dictionary, the Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language (from the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences), and others.

The **strongest aspects of the dissertation**, in my opinion, are:

- Accurate definition of the object and subject of the research; clear formulation of the goal and adequately set tasks that would lead to its achievement. The question, however, is whether they have been fulfilled as stated.

<sup>2</sup> Not clear why in Bulgarian the word is in Pl.

- Wide theoretical foundation consisting of up-to-date approaches relevant in contemporary linguistics and linguocultural studies.
- An impressive scope of empirical material, carefully processed.
- Potential for application in an academic context: the broad theoretical foundation of the research, combined with the rich empirical material, can be used in various courses on word formation, phraseology, translation and (after addressing the problematic areas outlined below) studies in language and culture.

## 7. Contribution and significance of the work to the theory and practice

The significance of this dissertation can be defined as **contribution to the applied research** in the field. As mentioned in point 6, the theoretical frameworks outlined in the work have the potential to serve as a reliable foundation for a more comprehensive study of the chosen concept, including elements of *cognitive* linguocultural studies. Such study would aim at clearly describing its structure – the center and periphery – and delving deeper into the extremely important aspect: the images and associations related to its names and their functioning. This could truly reveal how the concept is presented in the linguistic worldview of both Bulgarian and English speakers.

An academic research, even when it does not reach exhaustive answers, is also valuable for the direction it sets and the questions it raises (even if implicitly). The concept in question (chosen with the decisive participation of the academic supervisors) undoubtedly possesses vast potential for further in-depth research, particularly because of the etymological connection between *въздух, дух, дух и дъува* (in Bulgarian), as well as between *air, spirit and soul; wind and window* in English, etc. It would be interesting to explore the associations and attitudes of speakers from both cultures in question (and other English-speaking cultures), as well as the presence or absence of this connection in their linguistic consciousness.

## 8. Evaluation of the publications on the topic of the doctoral thesis

As mentioned, the doctoral candidate has submitted 4 articles, which exceeds the minimum national requirements by one. Three of them are the result of presentations at national conferences with international participation: MU – Plovdiv (2022), ShU (2023), and MU – Varna (2023), and one is published in the journal “Foreign Language Teaching” (2022). The texts of the articles are included in the dissertation, so it is not surprising that some of them (2) contain the conceptual errors which will be discussed further below (*дууам* and *breathe* as concepts, discussing proverbs with the “concept” of *wind* while lexemes are provided as illustrative material; *wind* is defined not only as a concept but also as a *realm of concepts* – Rus. *conceptosfera*, etc.); the other 2 focus solely on word formation models.

## 9. Original contribution of the doctoral candidate

I have no reason to doubt that the submitted text is original and, to the best of my knowledge, does not contain any improper copying or incorrect citation. I believe that the contributions outlined above are a personal achievement of P. Petkova.

## 10. Abstract

It’s **32 pages** long and contains 23 pages of main text, with the rest being the contents of the full thesis text, a list of contributions, cited literature in the abstract, and publications related to the dissertation topic.

The abstract **provides a general overview** of the content in summarised form but doesn’t accurately reflect the structure of the dissertation with its chapters and sections.

For example, the title of the First Chapter, which presents the theoretical material, is different in the dissertation and the abstract: in the abstract, it is titled “Research program. Theoretical aspects of linguocultural studies. Key concepts,” whereas in the dissertation text, it is titled “Methodics of the study.” Similar discrepancies exist in the titles of some other chapters.

## 11. Critical remarks and recommendations

Due to the volume of this review, I will only mention the most important – primarily conceptual issues related to the object of the research, terminology, main definitions, methodologies, etc.

11.1. Regardless of the cited definitions of the concept by emblematic researchers in the field, the working definition mentioned in the dissertation, as well as the proposed understanding of the linguocultural concept, which is main object of research, are **not entirely correct and contain contradiction**. According to the definition given in the dissertation, the concept is “conceptual meaning or a set of conceptual meanings” (p. 48). It’s common knowledge that the term *conceptual meaning* itself is used in structural semantics and refers to the *designatum* (Maslov 2005: 99 – 100<sup>3</sup>). According to this “classical” understanding, it is the core of lexical meaning and *does not* include connotations. Therefore, the definition in the dissertation contradicts with Petkova’s own statements that connotations are an important part of the concept’s structure (p. 54); the importance of connotations in the work under review is evident from the fact that a separate section is devoted to them, as well as from comments on individual connotations of the examined language units. See also: “the entire potential of meanings of the word is a concept, which contains not only its main meaning but also all possible nuances and associations related to culture, personality, nationality, and others” (p. 88). The aforementioned definition also contradicts with the widely accepted understanding in linguocultural studies by Dm. Likhachev (although the Russian linguist has been cited in this dissertation on numerous occasions) – that the concept does not directly develop from the meaning of a given word; it is enriched with the experience of the individual and the entire nation (Likhachev 1993: 4<sup>4</sup>). In general, according to the text of the dissertation, the concept is primarily understood as lexical meaning – the main focus is on the definitions of the lexeme in explanatory dictionaries, as well as listing the lexemes used for naming it. Meanwhile, it has been overlooked that even in studies where concepts are described primarily through the linguistic semantics of their word representations, an *interpretive field* is included in the analysis as an important element (see, for example, Popova, Sternin 2010: 110 – 115<sup>5</sup>, etc.), which is not mentioned in the dissertation, although certain aspects of it have been commented on.

11.2. Probably due to the unclear outlining of the linguocultural concept in the dissertation, one of the most drastic conceptual inaccuracies arises – **overlapping between the notions of concept and lexeme** (as its main representative or belonging to its semantic field). This fact is not an incident that appears once. This understanding is evident throughout the entire text of the dissertation, as well as in the abstract and some of the accompanying publications. I drew attention to this serious – in my opinion – issue at a very early stage of the study, but unfortunately, it has not been addressed. Thus, the basis of the research has been built on an approach that is considered incorrect according to commonly accepted understanding, and yet, at the same time, it hasn’t been properly argued, which brings its consequences.

Maslov, Yu. S. *Vvedenie v yazykoznanie*. 4-e izd., ster. SPb: Filologicheskij fakul’tet SPbGU; Moskva: Akademia, 2005.

Likhachev, D. S. Kontseptosfera russkogo yazyka // *Izv. RAN. SLYa*, 1993, №1: 3 – 9.

Popova, Z. D. i Sternin, I. A. *Kognitivnaya lingvistika*. Moskva: ACT: Vostok – Zapad, 2010.

For instance, in Chapter 2 (p. 78), there is a paragraph on *air* as an important phenomenon for humans, followed by a paragraph on ethnospecific **concepts**, and the next paragraphs – without any transition or explanation – discuss the meanings of the **lexeme** *air* in various collocations (such as *air of confidence*, *air of innocence*, etc.). There is a discussion on the conversion of the lexeme, as well as on component analysis of combinability – these are in fact features of the language representations of the concept, not of the concept itself. The main negative consequence of this fact is the **unclear boundaries and structure of the concept**, which is the subject of the study – is it just *air*, what is its core, what are its constituents, which ones can be attributed to the periphery and why (for this, as is known, an analysis of images and associations is necessary...). Also puzzling are formulations where the name of the concept can be a verb – see the statements about the “concept” *breathe* in the dissertation, abstract, and the accompanying articles.

This leads to a number of terminological and conceptual inconsistencies in the text and in the titles of sections. For example, in Chapter 2, *air*, *soul*, *spirit*, *breath*, *breathe* are initially called lexemes (in 2.1.), while in 2.2. all these units become separate concepts without an analysis of the basis for this transition. In Chapter 3, again concepts *air*, *breath*, *breathe* are discussed.

Here are some more specific examples, where the term *concept* is used, but what is discussed is the *lexeme* and its features (these are excerpts from the main text of the dissertation or the abstract, but the statements are exactly the same in the submitted articles – their text is included in the dissertation)<sup>6</sup>:

“In many of the examples [...] in both languages the **concept** *is represented by composition*, typical for word formation in English [...]” (p. 63);

“[...] the word formation system the *only verb among our concepts* – *breathe* [...] It is much richer in affixes [...]” (ibid.);

“In both Bulgarian and English, *дууам* and *breathe* as well as *дых* and *breath* are **concepts**” (p. 100).

„*Derivational field with the subconcept* “*spirit*” (p. 281).

**Abstract:**

“They [the concepts – my note] **are linguistic units** whose meanings constitute the content of national linguistic consciousness and form the naive perception of the world of the language speakers. **Concepts are these lexemes** [...]” (pp. 6 – 7). .

“[...] the *derivational activity* of the **concepts** *breathe* and *wind*” (p. 8)

“Translation of concepts” (p. 44) has also been discussed, which is again incorrect because concepts are mental formations and cannot be translated; they can only be transposed into other cultures through their representatives at various levels (lexical, phraseological, grammatical, etc.).

Subtitles in Appendix 1 are equally puzzling. Here, the term *subconcept* appears for the first time while it has not been discussed in the main text of the thesis earlier (see also our comments that the structure of the studied concept has not been clearly described). In this appendix, there are sections on “derivational fields of the corresponding subconcept” (sic!) – of *wind*, *breathe*, *spirit*, *soul*.

11.3. The understanding of the notion *realm of concepts* (Rus. *conceptosfera*) is also ambiguous, and the corresponding term is inconsistently used. Alongside the famous definition of this phenomenon provided by Dm. Likhachev as the “set of all concepts of a given nation” (p. 6), there are statements that *breath*, *breathe*, *spirit*, and *soul* are part of *air* as a realm of concepts (p. 10); the lexeme *wind* is also at one point characterised as *conceptosfera* (pp. 173, 181, etc.).

<sup>6</sup> Emphasis by italics and bold in the examples is mine.

11.4. From the chosen methodology for analysing the concept (pp. 14 – 15), based on the structure of the phenomenon proposed by V. I. Karasik, almost an entire aspect is missing – for example, the figurative aspect, which could most convincingly be illustrated through metaphors (here, the use of TCM would have been perfect).

11.5. The thesis includes parts that do not belong to this genre because they contain well-known information – this part rather sounds like a textbook. For example, section 5.2. offers a detailed and lengthy (12 pages) description of various derivational models, not necessarily related to the lexemes discussed in the study.

The examples of the described derivational models with the examined lexemes are not directly related to the linguocultural analysis or at least cannot be its main focus. It is well known that derivation is not the leading aspect when studying a given linguocultural concept, and the examples provided in the study of certain derivational models that could provide some information about mentality are rather exceptions. This is evident in the dissertation, where the connection between the dozens of models presented with their hundreds of examples and the linguistic consciousness of the respective linguocultural community is either not shown at all or barely addressed – there is no analysis on the issue what kind of information about linguistic consciousness would be provided by the large number or the type of models.

In outlining the models, there are also some inaccuracies: *-еене* in *ветреене* is not a single morpheme, as stated (p. 138); several combinations like *влажен есенен вятър* (*wet autumn wind*), *влажен студен вятър* (*wet cold wind*), *рязък есенен вятър* (*sharp autumn wind*), *рязък морски вятър* (*sharp sea wind*), etc., are not two-component phrases, and it is not clear on what basis they have been selected – for instance, why similar phrases like *рязък океански вятър* (*sharp ocean wind*) are missing...; *window-shop* is not one word, as stated on p. 150, etc.

11.6. In addition to that, the work under review contains other inaccurate statements:

- “So far there hasn’t been significant research in the field of the realm of linguocultural concepts [conceptosfera]” (p. 8) – see comment in section 4.
- *Infix* in Bulgarian and Russian is mentioned (p. 127). As is known, such a morpheme (an affix in the root) is absent in modern languages (with very few exceptions) – perhaps what is meant is *interfix*?
- A model that is actually becoming increasingly productive in Bulgarian is characterized as non-productive – the formation of neologisms using borrowed nouns without any change as attributes, such as *бизнес сделка*. On p. 137, it is stated (sic!): “The spread of such a combination in Bulgarian is not as widespread [... ]”. We believe this statement is far from the actual state of affairs. Here are just a few examples from hundreds similar examples available: the emblematic *душкабина/душ кабина/душ-кабина*, also *душ гел*, *душ батерия*, etc.; *туроператор*; *слот машина*; *гольф игрище*; *тенис корт*; *боулинг писта*; *дринк-бар/лоби бар*; *шокуейв терапия*; *Еразъм мобилност*, *Еразмус студент* (with variations in spelling – without quotes or even without capitalization of the name like *еразмус семестър*) and many others. P. Petkova uses such a term herself – *зоо названия* (p. 161).
- Key notions and statements in the field (not just once – both in the text of the dissertation and in the submitted articles, which proves that this is not an incidental mistake) are attributed to authors who have cited them secondarily, not from the original source – for example, the statement about the key characteristic of linguocultural concept – *полиапеллируемост* (an option



to refer to a specific concept using many names). It is claimed that it belongs to Y. Kirilova but the original authors are V. I. Karasik and G. G. Slyshkin (Karasik, Slyshkin 2003<sup>7</sup>).

11.7. There are also statements that appear to be illogically positioned or disconnected from their respective section in the text: for example, it is unclear why the paragraph about cultural codes is placed in the section on paremias (p. 91).

11.8. And the last point here, the **technical formatting** of the text is not precise. There is **lack of consistency in the designation of even the basic units under consideration** (*air, wind*, etc.): sometimes they are introduced without any identifying marks, sometimes in quotation marks, with apostrophes, sometimes in bold, etc. There are a number of typographical errors in the text; inconsistency in the transcription of emblematic names (*Лейкоф – Лейкѳ*); incorrect initials of emblematic names (*Й. Апресян* instead of *Ю. Д. Апресян*); inconsistency in formatting in the references regarding italics and punctuation.

## **12. Recommendations for future use of the doctoral thesis contributions and results**

As already mentioned, the thesis provides a broad theoretical foundation for conducting a study in the field of language and culture, as well as vast empirical material, and can be useful in courses on derivatology, phraseology and linguoculturology. If the publication of the text is planned, I recommend addressing the aforementioned shortcomings in order to fully utilize its potential.

## **CONCLUSION**

Despite the critical notes, I will focus on the already mentioned positive aspects and contributions.

The PhD thesis under review comprises theoretical and applied results which represent an original contribution to scholarly research and meet the requirements of the Act for the Development of the Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria, the Regulations for the Implementation of the ADASRB and the corresponding Regulations of Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv.

The dissertation demonstrates that the doctoral candidate, Pavlina Petkova, possesses the necessary theoretical knowledge and professional skills for processing the empirical material in the research field, which could be applied for further in-depth studies in this area.

In view of the facts mentioned above, **I give my positive evaluation** of the undertaken study presented by the reviewed above dissertation work, abstract, achieved results and contributions and propose to the esteemed Academic Board to **award the educational and scientific degree PhD to Pavlina Stefanova Petkova** in area of higher education 2. Humanities, professional field 2.1. Philology, Doctoral Program of General and Comparative Linguistics.

March 28, 2025

Reviewer: .....

Assoc. Prof. Yuliana Chakarova, PhD

<sup>7</sup> Karasik, V. I., Slyshkin, G. G. Lingvokul'turnyj kontsept kak element yazykovogo soznania // *Metodologia sovremennoj psiholingvistiki*. Sb. statej. Moskva; Barnaul: Izd. Alt. universiteta, 2003.