

**10th International Scientific Conference “Problems in Oral Communication”,
Veliko Târnovo, November 7-8, 2014**

Oral communication is the most fluid, most volatile and infinite side of linguistics, thus the questions it raises are the most diverse of all. On the occasion of the Conference opening, speeches were delivered by Acad. M. Videnov, Rector P. Legkostup of the V.T. University “Saints Cyril and Methodius”, Prof. Stojan Burov, Head of the Coeval Bulgarian Language Chair and Prof. Hr. Staneva, member of the same Chair. Assist. Prof. R. Kotzev spoke about the importance held by magnetic recordings and by the electronically expressed corpus of oral communication existing on the Internet. During the Conference plenary session, S. Dimitrova examined “the reflection of common sense in linguistic research”; M. Videnov discussed “the internalization of vocabulary”, “the specificity of the conversational code used by the Sofia intelligentsia” and “the mixed language of the Bulgarian Romani communities”; H.W. Schaller analysed the “representative, expressive and appellative functions in the Bulgarian language”; I. Savova approached the “relay questions in spontaneous speech”, while Y. Tisheva discussed “the pragmatic markers used in spoken communication in official situations with a high degree of preparedness of the participants on the topic and social distance between them”. P. Pehlivanova and S. Burov provided details on “the opinions of contemporary Bulgarians about speech and the orthoepic norms of the Bulgarian language”. They studied “the attitudes about complying with the norms or violating them”. K.R. Hauge took on the point-like matter of “Bulgarian numerals” academically “used with nouns denoting male persons” which have actually come, as a trend, “to be used for male domestic pets”. S. Kirilova presented “the personal pronoun as the subject used in some typical expressions of colloquial speech” yet “semantically not justified”. Hr. Damianova compared the Bulgarian and Russian languages in what concerns the use made of intensity markers in oral speaking. V. Koleva supported “the thesis that the goal of the utterance plays a catalysis role in the creation of metaphors during the dialogical communication”. In what concerns a “Bulgarian-Polish Dictionary of the Lexical Corpus of Spoken Language”, A. Mokrzycka focuses on the problem of “phraseological and semantic equivalence”. R. Tsonev takes into consideration the captivating matter of the “rivalry between parataxis and hypotaxis in the Bulgarian colloquial speech”. The use made of some foreign verbs recently imported in Bulgarian through mass media and/or Internet as well as their respective impacts are analysed by T. Rabovyanova. N. Radeva investigates “the appearance in the modern Bulgarian language of some nouns and participles before the verbs themselves from which they are supposed to be derived in media, publicity, journals and even in scientific texts”. S. Mitseva explores the “colloquial elements in advertisement texts” because they are “a very common strategy which increases drastically the influence of the ads on the recipients.” S. Koeva chose to “illustrate how the expressive function of some colloquial lexical units-quantifiers-commit or facilitate manipulation with different meanings of quantity.” R. Karimova makes use of A. A. Vasilev’s works as examples in order to illustrate how the communication through the mass media might be personalized for the largest possible number of individual persons. K. Aleksova presents a statistical survey of the svrahyakane phenomenon which is actually going on in the spoken language (the excessive use made of “ya”) and of the public’s reactions towards it, in comparison

with the ones generated by the existence of other non-standard markers. V. Tatcheva and V. Goranova study "the specific verbal and non verbal factors improving oral communication" and do summarize "the communication techniques and means", also providing "examples from the specialized medical practice of efficient and inefficient communication acts between the medical staff and the patient (...)" V. Tatcheva and K. Peneva discuss "the main problems and the barriers which considerably affect the communication with a suffering child and worried relatives in hospitals" and suggest optimizing it. E. Skotchewa and V. Nyagolova chose instead the didactical perspective, by "specifying the components of the specialized oral communication competence (...) for medical purposes", and suggesting a similar instrument in the instruction of Bulgarian (as a foreign language) (...). P. Ruseva presents a statistical survey of ethnonyms in the Bulgarian diaspora, in: "An attempt to find equivalents in the lexicographic sources of Bulgarian, Ukrainian and Russian phraseology (...)". Hr. Kyutchukov approaches the specific issues of the "adult-child communication in Roma families", while S. Fetvadzhieva-Abazova statistically examines the popularity ratios of, respectively "slang, vulgar language and professional lexis"; students voted for the last one. V. Marinov presents a study in phonetics concerning the "final voicing of consonants in bilingual colloquial speech" between the Bulgarian and Romanian languages. V. Balieva describes "the structure of the bilingual linguistic personality of pre-school children from the cognitive point of view". In various styles and genres, the Bulgarians living in Vienna repeat the phrase subject in colloquial speech: this linguistic detail is studied by A. Kotcheva-Lefedzhieva. A. Getsov discusses about: "the achievement of linguistic empathy in the sentence and the possibility of its achievement as a means for constructing texts, as speech tactics and, in some discourses, as a communication strategy as well." A. Eftimova analyses the politically correct designations in media speeches, focusing on the: "semantic taxonomies of euphemisms/dysphemisms according to various semantic categories (...)". M. Dzhonova presents a statistical analysis of the "formal and functional aspects of the addressing modalities in formal spoken communication" e.g. the Parliament's debates. These rely on "various pragmatic and socio-linguistic factors (...)". S. Pitiriciu illustrates, through judiciously chosen examples, the new variants of the "wooden language" naturally generated by the Romanian political life. D.-V. Topală chose, instead, to study how G. Călinescu, in his political action from 1945 to 1965, managed to avoid the practice of the toughest "wooden language" that had been officially enforced at that time. N. Doneva speaks of the "basic verbal forms used in linguistic games" by the civil Bulgarian society on the occasions of the slogans shouted out in public demonstrations. Ts. Petkova does elucidate, in a detailed study, the presence, functioning and effects of the "hidden aggression in the communication speech acts" performed by the "statements of political subjects". M. Maneva presents a general comparative study concerning the oral communication performed by the national public Bulgarian television channel and by a private channel, in the important matter of their respective newscasts. M. Tsvetkova describes, as a new trend, the effects of the use made, "in Bulgarian unprepared oral speech", of some recently created verbs issued from nouns, adjectives or imported words. V. Petrov studies the phenomenon of the occurring "accent doublets" in modern Bulgarian, mostly understood as the collateral effect of "widespread illiteracy". A. Dobрева and V. Tatcheva present a

statistical study on the “phonation (rate, timbre, voice pitch) and kinetic (posture, facial expression, gesture) features in the oral production of 150 foreign students (...)”. S. Stavreva-Dorostolska studies the “open-response questions to text” as a valid method for stimulating the foreign students in learning Bulgarian as a foreign language. M. Mihailova “discusses communication as a manifestation of the individual, but as well as a screen that reflects the world”. M. Vatova studies “(from a cognitive point of view) the concepts of GOOD and BAD as they are reflected by the Bulgarian lexical system”. K. Marinova explains the various degrees of phraseological equivalence which exists in Bulgarian and Japanese, using as example the noun *ear/ears* through “several common theme groups”. Y. Tisheva, M. Dzhonova and K. R. Hauge plead for the admission of the “new electronic resources of Bulgarian speech” to the common language corpus. N. Tchotcheva discusses the current status of the analysis vowed to “the morphological and syntactic features of the language oral form. The description of the phonetic level is the least studied”. As we can see, the works of this scientific reunion were particularly rich and highly interesting.