

STANDPOINT

related to a competition for taking the academic position “associate professor” in 2. Humanities, 2.1 Philology (Slavic languages – Czech language)
published in State newspaper, issue 93 from 26.11.2019 (p. 114/128)
with a candidate STILIJAN IVANOV STOYCHEV

Member of the scientific committee: prof. Dr. Petya Nacheva Osenova

Dr. Stoychev completed his higher education in Czech language and literature together with General Linguistics at Charles University in Prague. There he also received his PhD in 1985.

The candidate has a longstanding experience as a lecturer and scientist in Sofia University “St. Kl. Ohridski”. He teaches practical sessions in Czech and Comparative Grammar as well as the lectures in all linguistic levels of the Czech grammar. He was a lecturer in Bulgarian in Minsk, Belorussia (1988-1991). Apart from the 34 authored publications, Dr. Stoychev has also 26 co-authored publications. It is worth mentioning his participation in the creation of three dictionaries and 18 learning materials. Impressive are the various interests of the candidate – ranging from scientific problems related to contrastive grammar (with a focus on morphology) through lexicography and lexicology (with a focus on phraseology) to the development of pedagogical materials.

In this competition Dr. Stoychev participates with the following publications: 2 monographs – a habilitation book and a book based on his PhD dissertation; 13 authored articles (one of which in a refereed and indexed edition) and 1 authored long paper. Since the dissertation was already evaluated in a previous procedure, I will not evaluate it in my current standpoint. Dr. Stoychev outlined 16 citations to these publications, some of which from abroad.

The candidate made available correctly the documentation and references related to the current procedure. He adequately fulfills the scientific requirements issued by NACID.

Most of the candidate’s publications are related to verbal morphology (11 publications). The remaining ones (3 publications) are related to phraseology. Dr. Stoychev’s publications present the researched topics in a Bulgarian-Czech contrastive aspect. The phraseology-related publications are numbered 14 and 15 together with the long article numbered 16. The long article expands the number 15 publication with more details.

In these publications the candidate focuses on seemingly non-typical for the phraseology problems. On the one hand, they refer to the wider understanding on the existence of lexical idioms which are often autosemantic in nature (idiomatic verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs). On the other hand, the focus is on words with a very narrow compatibility (the so-called mono-collocable words) and on the survey of their primary and secondary narrow compatibility in a diachronic aspect.

The remaining publications from the presented list of publications are devoted to the ideas of structuralism in the Bondarko and Kutsarov school (publication 3); on the syncretism of the Bulgarian verbal paradigm in comparison to Czech (publications 9 and 10); on the past and future tenses as well as on other verbal categories in a contrastive aspect (publications 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13).

Since the main research, related to this procedure, is the habilitation monograph "The Bulgarian morphological relative and the Czech language", it will be in the center of my standpoint analysis.

In the beginning I would like to stress that Dr. Stoychev's scientific interest in this topic comes naturally, given the context of his dissertation thesis. There the candidate surveys the dimension of the Bulgarian resultative in comparison with Czech. In his current research he investigates Bulgarian relative as part of the taxis category and again in comparison to Czech. Dr. Stoychev defends the idea that the Bulgarian temporal system with 9 members is actually a complex combination of three distinct morphological categories: tense, taxis and type of action. This is not the traditional understanding about the temporal system in Bulgarian grammar (compare the works of L. Andreychin, V. Stankov, R. Nitsolova, G. Gerdzиков, P. Pashov, etc. who view the distinct characteristics within the tense category). However, Dr. Stoychev's opinion is close to Ivan Kutsarov's ideas and logically adheres to his typology of verbal categories.

I think that Dr. Stoychev's cross-language perspective is very valuable, i.e. the comparison of two languages with rich morphology but with differing ways of expressing certain morphological categories which often result in language asymmetries.

The most contributing part of the survey is section three of the book. It includes 11 subparts that correspond to the related verbal categories: aspect, status, number, person, gender, tense, type of action, evidence of action, mood, voice, type of utterance. Of big importance are candidate's conclusions referring to the areas of predominant symmetries and asymmetries. In the area of symmetry between Bulgarian and Czech the following categories

belong: aspect, status, number, person, mood, voice. In the area of both – symmetry and asymmetry the following category belongs: gender. In the area of asymmetry, the following categories belong: tense, type of action, evidence of action, type of utterance. To me the presented viewpoint on the category of tense is interesting. In its scope the freer behavior of the Czech equivalents related to taxis are outlined in comparison to the limitations in Bulgarian (including the reduction of the three grammemes to two in the relative). But the most outstanding asymmetry concerns the category of taxis. A conclusion is made that while in Bulgarian this category is a main one, in Czech it is peripheral and this fact activates the syntactic means as functional equivalents.

With a big added value are also the results from the survey which remains outside the scope of the above mentioned 11 categories. From these I would mention the following: the conclusion that none of the languages has morphological means for expressing relativity in present and futurum; the complementary distribution of the relative grammemes in both languages – in Bulgarian language taxis is present within the modally non-marked indicative and modally marked imperative, but never in the modally marked conditional, while in Czech it is present only in the modally marked conditional.

I would like to note that there exist different models of the Bulgarian temporal system – logically oriented, structuralist oriented, etc. The model that is presented by Dr. Stoychev is modular and multistratal, i.e. considers various levels of representation. I think that the advantage of such a model is that it gives a clear idea about the behavior of the categories in a contrastive aspect. The detection of functional equivalents shows also that we should talk rather about morphosyntax, but not about morphology and syntax as distinct levels.

In its completeness and depth Dr. Stoychev's monograph can be considered as one of the excellent examples for scientific research. It exhibits: a perfect text structure, logically sound ideas, excellent knowledge of the topic related literature. Last but not least, I would like to stress that Dr. Stoychev makes his observations objective by using excerpted examples from electronic parallel corpora.

CONCLUSION

In sum, I think that Dr. Stoychev has sufficient and high quality scientific and scientific-applied contributions. He conforms to the national minimal science requirements.

Thus, based on my high evaluation of the candidate, I convincingly suggest that Stiliyan Ivanov Stoychev takes the academic position “associate professor” in the area **2. Humanities, 2.1. Philology (Slavic languages – Czech language)**.

Date: 01.04.2020

Member of Committee: