



**ELEVEN  
FRAGMENTS  
FROM THE WORLD OF  
CZECH  
AND  
SOUTH  
SLAVONIC  
LANGUAGES**

**Pavel Krejčí**

**MASARYK  
UNIVERSITY  
PRESS**



**ELEVEN FRAGMENTS  
FROM THE WORLD OF CZECH  
AND SOUTH SLAVONIC  
LANGUAGES**

Selected South Slavonic Studies 2

**Pavel Krejčí**

Masaryk University Press  
Brno 2019

All rights reserved. No part of this e-book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written permission of copyright administrator which can be contacted at Masaryk University Press, Žerotínovo náměstí 9, 601 77 Brno.

**Scientific reviewers:**

Ass. Prof. Nadezhda Stalyanova, Ph.D. (Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski")  
Roman Madecki, Ph.D. (Masaryk University, Brno)

This book was written at Masaryk university as part of the project Výzkum slovanského areálu: generační proměny number MUNI/A/1078/2018 with the support of the Specific University Research Grant, as provided by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic in the year 2019.

© 2019 Masaryk University Press

ISBN 978-80-210-9469-7

ISBN 978-80-210-9468-0 (paperback)

# CONTENT

ABBREVIATIONS .....	5
INTRODUCTION .....	7
CHAPTER 1	
<b>BRNO UNIVERSITY PRODUCTION ON SOUTH SLAVONIC OR BALKAN LANGUAGES IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY</b> (OVERVIEW No. 1).....	9
CHAPTER 2	
<b>CZECH-SOUTH SLAVONIC LEXICOGRAPHIC PRODUCTION BETWEEN 1900 AND 2019</b> (OVERVIEW No. 2).....	20
CHAPTER 3	
<b>NEW CZECH-BULGARIAN, CZECH-SERBIAN AND CZECH-MACEDONIAN DICTIONARIES IN CONTEXT OF THE CZECH-SOUTH SLAVONIC LEXICOGRAPHY AFTER 1990</b> (REVIEW & ANALYSIS).....	46
CHAPTER 4	
<b>CHORONYMS FOR BELARUS, MOLDOVA, IRELAND AND THE NETHERLANDS IN BULGARIAN</b> (PROBLEMS OF GEOGRAPHICAL TERMINOLOGY AND TRANSLATION, part 1) .....	70
CHAPTER 5	
<b>CHORONYMS FOR CROATIA IN BULGARIAN</b> (PROBLEMS OF GEOGRAPHICAL TERMINOLOGY AND TRANSLATION, part 2) .....	79
CHAPTER 6	
<b>CHORONYMS FOR CZECHIA AND BOHEMIA IN SLAVONIC AND SELECTED NON-SLAVONIC LANGUAGES</b> (PROBLEMS OF GEOGRAPHICAL TERMINOLOGY AND TRANSLATION, part 3) .....	86
CHAPTER 7	
<b>CHORONYMS FOR CZECHIA AND BOHEMIA IN BULGARIAN</b> (PROBLEMS OF GEOGRAPHICAL TERMINOLOGY AND TRANSLATION, part 4).....	94

CHAPTER 8	
<b>CHORONYMS FOR CZECHIA AND BOHEMIA IN SERBIAN &amp; CHORONYMS FOR SERBIA AND SRPSKA IN CZECH</b> (PROBLEMS OF GEOGRAPHICAL TERMINOLOGY AND TRANSLATION, part 5).....	100
CHAPTER 9	
<b>DEMONYM AND ETHNONYM FOR BOSNIANS AND BOSNIAKS IN CZECH</b> (PROBLEMS OF TERMINOLOGY AND TRANSLATION).....	115
CHAPTER 10	
<b>DEMONYMS IN CONTEMPORARY CZECH AND BULGARIAN LANGUAGES</b> (REVIEW) .....	131
CHAPTER 11	
<b>ZOONYMS AND PHYTONYMS? OR THE FLUCTUATING TERMINOLOGY IN BULGARIAN, SERBIAN AND CROATIAN LINGUISTICS</b> (A QUESTION ABOUT THE CORRECT USAGE OF LINGUISTIC TERMINOLOGY).....	141
SUMMARY .....	151
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	157

## ABBREVIATIONS

A	accusative
Adj	adjective
admin.	administratively
AVNOJ	Antifašističko v(ij)eće narodnog oslobođenja Jugoslavije (Anti-Fascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia)
B&H	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Bulg.	Bulgarian
Cro.	Croatian
Cz.	Czech
D	dative
Dem	demonym
dial.	dialect
econ.	economic
Eng.	English
Ethn	ethnonym
Fr.	French
G	genitive
geogr.	geographical(ly)
Ger.	German
I	instrumental

I&R	Imperial & Royal
journ.	journalistic
L	locative
Lux.	Luxembourgish
Mac.	Macedonian
MU	Masaryk University
N	nominative
Orig.	original(ly)
R+TV	radio and television
SCr.	Serbo-Croatian
Serb.	Serbian
SFRY	Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
Slo.	Slovenian
Slov.	Slovak
sociolog.	sociological(ly)
SR	Socijalistička Republika (Socialist Republic – in former Yugoslavia)
SSR	Soviet Socialist Republic
Subst	noun
tech.	technical(ly)
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
V	vocative
zool.	zoological(ly)

## INTRODUCTION

The book *Eleven Fragments from the World of Czech and South Slavonic Languages: Selected South Slavonic Studies 2* presents a second summary of my selected studies and analyses from the field of South Slavonic languages. The chapters are mainly lexicologically focused. The studies were originally in Czech, Serbian or Bulgarian and were published in Czech, Serbian and Bulgarian scientific periodicals and proceedings. Their content is, however, updated and completed with new knowledge. The observed phenomena in the South Slavonic languages (mainly in Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian) were examined in contrast to Czech, though the Czech element may also be present in another way. Chapters 4 and 5 are the only ones, that don't include anything Czech.

I started with a general overview of Brno Masaryk University linguistic production about South Slavonic languages in 21<sup>st</sup> century. The following two chapters addressed Czech–South Slavonic lexicographical production in 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century. In the remaining chapters I looked exclusively into onomastic questions. In chapters 4–8 I focused on the translation problematic of the selected choronyms in Bulgarian, Serbian, resp. Slavonic languages in general. I concentrated on geographical names for the Netherlands, Ireland, Belarus, Moldova, Czechia, Bohemia, Croatia, Serbia and Srpska. In chapter 9 I handled the question of semantic differentiation between Bosnian ethnonyms “Bosanac” and “Bošnjak”

(and adjectives “bosanski” and “bošnjački” connected to them) and the problematic of their translation into Czech. Chapter 10 is a review of Ts. Avramova’s monograph about *nomina habitatorum* in Czech and Bulgarian. In the last chapter I focused on the problem of (in)correct usage of the onomastic terms “zonym” and “phytonym” in Czech, Croatian, Serbian and Bulgarian linguistics.

This book is for all, who are interested in contrastive Czech–South Slavonic studies, however, primarily for specialists in the field of Balkan, Bulgarian, Serbian or Croatian studies, but also Czech and Slavonic studies. Geographers, political scientists, or historians could find useful information here as well.

At the end of this introduction I would like to thank my reviewers, who reviewed the first, as well as the second selected South Slavonic studies: ass. prof. Nadezhda Stalyanova, Ph.D. from Sofia University (SSSS 2), ass. prof. Boryan Yanev, Ph.D. from Plovdiv University (SSSS 1) and Roman Madecki, Ph.D. from Masaryk University (SSSS 1 & 2).

Pavel Krejčí, Brno, Czechia, November 2019

**BRNO UNIVERSITY PRODUCTION  
ON SOUTH SLAVONIC OR BALKAN LANGUAGES  
IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY**

(OVERVIEW No. 1)

**I.  
Introduction**

A little less than the first two decades of the new century brought quite many diverse publications in the field of linguistic Balkan studies in Brno, especially in the second decade. First of all, it would be a good idea to think about what we understand under the term “linguistic Balkan studies”. If we assume that Balkan studies is a multi-disciplinary area-based science, then its linguistic component should consequently study the languages of this area and their interrelationships and influence. This would include most of the South Slavonic languages, Romanian, Greek, Albanian, and most likely Turkish, perhaps Hungarian (not to mention micro-languages such as Banatian Bulgarian, Pannonian Rusyn, Aromanian, etc.). However, a mere, somewhat random geographical basis for linguistic research is not sufficient; modern linguistics has been dealing with typologically related languages that share a common area since the interwar period (Trubetzkoy 1930 [1928], Sandfeld 1930, before them, however, the need to examine languages that are geographically, historically and socially close, was already formulated by J. N. Baudouin de Courtenay) as part of the Sprachbund (linguistic league) theory, which unites

languages that are close geographically and which have a number of typologically identical or similar features, although they may be genetically unrelated. The expression of linguistic convergence in this sense in the Balkan Peninsula is the existence of the so-called *Balkan Linguistic League (BLL)* and the interest in the contrastive study of the Balkan languages is automatically linked to the study of the languages included in the aforementioned league. However, the Balkan Linguistic League is only composed of Greek, Albanian, Romanian, Bulgarian and, after 1945, Macedonian<sup>1</sup>, outside remains the entire Serbo-Croatian territory<sup>2</sup>, without which we cannot imagine the Balkan studies in other scientific aspects such as interliterary relations, historical processes, ethnography, folklore, international politics, etc. Another way of studying the languages of the Balkans is Slavistics. However, it logically ignores the non-Slavonic languages of the Balkans and pays attention only to the South Slavonic linguistic area, including Slovenian, which geographically does not really belong to the Balkans (and not at all to the BLL), as well as Serbo-Croatian, which is firmly anchored in the Balkans, but it is not included to the BLL (only South-Eastern Serbian dialects have BLL features). A subset of Slavonic interest in the Slavonic languages of the Balkans is Paleo-Slavonic linguistic research, as the source of the historically first Slavonic language – Old Church Slavonic – rose from the Slavonic dialects of Thessaloniki and, after relatively short Great Moravian anabasis associated with the well-known work of Byzantine scholars of St. Constantine-Cyril and his brother St. Methodius, was its further development mainly connected with the Bulgarian empire, from where it spread as so-called Church Slavonic. However, regarding a very narrow and clearly defined subject of its interest, Paleo-Slavonic is so specific that its connection with Balkan studies is not usual. For the Czech scientific environment is significant that the study of South Slavonic languages is primarily Slavonic. Therefore, we believe that to talk about Czech, respectively linguistic Balkan studies in Brno (or Balkan Linguistics in Czechia, respectively in Brno) is not entirely accurate. This should be taken

---

1 More about the languages of Balkan Linguistic League see P. Asenova (2002: 16–19).

2 Or, if you like, the territory of the so-called Central South Slavonic diasystem (“srednjojužnoslavenski dijasistem”), as described by D. Brozović (2008).

into consideration if we want to report on the development of research on South Slavonic languages at MU in Brno over the past two decades.

## II. Multidisciplinary Proceedings and Handbooks with Linguistic Component

The list of publications that relate to one of the South Slavonic languages can be started with the so-called multidisciplinary proceedings, which to a greater or lesser extent contain linguistic contributions. Symbolically we begin with the proceedings *Studia Balkanica Bohemo-Slovaca*, which has been a traditional output of Balkanological symposia organized by the Brno Balkanists at irregular intervals since the 1970s. Three proceedings were published during the observed period: *Studia Balcanica Bohemo-Slovaca V* (2002), which was edited by Ivan DOROVSKÝ, two volume *Studia Balcanica Bohemo-Slovaca VI* (2006), which were prepared for publication by Václav ŠTĚPÁNEK, Pavel BOČEK, Ladislav HLADKÝ, Pavel KREJČÍ and Petr STEHLÍK, and *Studia Balkanica Bohemo-Slovaca VII* (2017), its editors were Václav ŠTĚPÁNEK and Jiří MITÁČEK. A number of Slavonic and Balkan studies and reviews of Ivan DOROVSKÝ are gathered in his book *Studia Balkanica et Slavica* (2001). Among them are two associated with South Slavonic languages (Macedonian and Slovenian).<sup>3</sup> Other proceedings has their linguistic part associated with Balkan studies in Brno, but they are focused on particular national community: *Chorvatsko, Chorvaté, chorvatština* (“Croatia, Croats and Croatian”, 2007) and *À la croate* (2010), which were prepared for publication by Pavel KREJČÍ, resp. Jana VILLNOW KOMÁRKOVÁ, and *Studia Macedonica* (2008) and *Studia Macedonica II* (2015) prepared by Ivan DOROVSKÝ (in the first case together with Ljupčo MITREVSKI). The proceeding *Od Moravy k Moravě* (“From [Czech] Morava River to [Serbian] Morava River”, 2005) is dedicated to Serbian issues and it was created by Ladislav HLADKÝ, Bronislav CHOCHOLÁČ, Libor JAN and Václav ŠTĚPÁNEK.<sup>4</sup>

3 Publication *Studia Balkanica et Slavica II* (Dorovský 2016) does not contain any linguistic contributions.

4 Sequels were published later on (Štěpánek et al. 2011, 2017), but they do not contain contributions about language.

As is apparent from the list, the target regions in *multidisciplinary* publications (including the linguistic component) were mostly the Balkans, Croatia, North Macedonia and Serbia. Surprising is the absence of Bulgaria in this category.

### III. Linguistic Proceedings and Collective Monographs

A special place in our list includes publications associated with a conference dedicated to teaching South Slavonic languages (and later literatures) in today's Europe. The outcome of the pilot project were the proceedings *Преподаването на български език като чужд в славянски и неславянски контекст* ("Teaching Bulgarian as a Foreign Language in Slavonic and Non-Slavonic Context", 2010), followed by other proceedings, collective monographs or special journal issues: *Výuka jihoslovanských jazyků v dnešní Evropě* ("Teaching South Slavonic Languages in Europe Today", 2011), *Blok jihoslovanských studií* ("Block of South Slavonic Studies" – In: *Opera Slavica. Slavistické rozhledy*, No. 4, year XXIII/2013, p. 69–391), *Výuka jihoslovanských jazyků a literatur v dnešní Evropě* ("Teaching South Slavonic Languages and Literatures in Europe Today", 2014), *Výuka jihoslovanských jazyků a literatur v dnešní Evropě* ("Teaching South Slavonic Languages and Literatures in Europe Today", 2015) and *Výuka jihoslovanských jazyků a literatur v dnešní Evropě III* ("Teaching South Slavonic Languages and Literatures in Europe Today III", 2016). Phraseology was the central theme of the collective monograph *Jihoslovanská frazeologie kontrastivně* ("South Slavonic Phraseology Contrastively", 2016). Two hundred years since the birth of the prominent Croatian lexicographer Bogoslav Šulek (1816–1895) was commemorated by the collective monograph *Bogoslav Šulek a jeho filologické dílo / i njegov filološki rad* ("Bogoslav Šulek and His Philological Work", 2016). The common feature of the above-mentioned publications is the organizational and editorial work of Elena KREJČOVÁ and Pavel KREJČÍ.

As is clear from the list, multilingual publications predominate; the unifying element is the South Slavonic area; in principle there are only

two cases, when the publications deal with one language (a proceeding on teaching Bulgarian as a foreign language and a monograph about B. Šulek). Most of the above-mentioned publications are characterized by their multilingualism – together with Czech, Slovak and all South Slavonic languages are used, rarely also other languages.

#### IV. Linguistic Monographs and Handbooks

We present this category with one slavistically focused publication *Jazyky v komparaci 2. Charakteristiky současných slovanských jazyků v historickém kontextu* (“Languages in Comparison 2. Characteristics of Contemporary Slavonic Languages in Historical Context”, 2009), its author is the doyen of Czech Slavonic Studies and professor emeritus of Brno Masaryk University Radoslav VEČERKA (1928–2017). We can read about the South Slavonic languages on pages 60 to 95 and also in the chapter Slavonic languages non-standard, dead and so-called small standard or standard micro-languages (pp. 120–142).<sup>5</sup> Other publications of a monographic character were partly created due to the project support from the Education for Competitiveness Operational Program.<sup>6</sup> The author or co-author of five monographs and handbooks is Elena KREJČOVÁ – her diachronically focused work is *Slovosledné změny v bulharských a srbských evangelních památkách z 12. a 13. století* (“Changes in the Word Order in Bulgarian and Serbian Evangelical Monuments From the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> Centuries”, 2016) and she used her pedagogical experience in the Bulgarian monograph *Славянският Вавилон. За интерференцията между славянските езици* (“The Slavonic Babylon. About the Interference Between Slavonic Languages”, 2016). For the purpose of teaching stylistics, she prepared *Příručka pro výuku bulharské stylistiky* (“Handbook for Teaching Bulgarian Stylistics”, 2014). Together with Nadezhda STALYANOVA, they wrote the

5 Publication *Jazyky v komparaci 1* (Večerka 2008) which was published a year earlier, we do not include in the list because it primarily contains the history of Slavistics research in general.

6 Full project name: *Filozofická fakulta jako pracoviště excelentního vzdělávání: Komplexní inovace studijních oborů a programů na FF MU s ohledem na požadavky znalostní ekonomiky (FIFA)*, Reg. No. CZ.1.07/2.2.00/28.0228 OPVK.

publication *The Power of Public Speech* (2017) dealing with current issues of freedom of speech in the context of hate speech and political correctness (with examples from Bulgarian and English) and with Pavel KREJČÍ they published the book *Quo vadis, philologia?* (2017), which contains several studies dealing with didactic, sociolinguistic, lexicological, onomastic and other topics. Pavel KREJČÍ himself published two monographs focused on phraseology during the observed period – the first one *Bulharská a česká publicistická frazeologie ve vzájemném srovnání* (“Bulgarian and Czech Journalistic Phraseology in Comparison”, 2006), and the second one *Srbská frazeologie v českém a bulharském překladu. Kontrastivní analýza* (“Serbian Phraseology in Czech and Bulgarian Translation. Contrastive Analysis”, 2015) – and one sociolinguistic publication: *Eight Fragments from the World of Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin Languages. Selected South Slavonic Studies 1* (2018). Exclusively for the purposes of teaching the development of South Slavonic languages, the author of these lines has created a handbook *Přehled vývoje jihoslovanských spisovných jazyků. Od 9. do počátku 19. století* (“Overview of the Development of South Slavonic Standard Languages. From the 9<sup>th</sup> to the Beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century”, 2014).

Seven (!) handbooks for Czech-Bulgarian translation seminars deserve a special status in this category – *Bulharské texty k překladatelskému semináři, část 1., 2. a 3.* (“Bulgarian Texts for the Translation Seminar, part 1, 2 and 3”, 2014, 2015, 2018), *Bulharské texty k překladatelskému semináři, část 3. Cvičebnice* (“Bulgarian Texts for the Translation Seminar, part 3. Exercise Book”, 2019), *Texty k překladatelskému semináři pro bulharisty* (“Texts for the Translation Seminar for Students of Bulgarian”, 2015), *Kouzlo a umění překladu* (“The Magic and Art of Translation”, 2018) and *Kouzlo a umění překladu. Cvičebnice* (“The Magic and Art of Translation. Exercise Book”, 2019). All seven publications are only available in electronic form and their author is Elena KREJČOVÁ (in four cases with Nadezhda STALYANOVA).

As is evident from the list, the authors of the monographs most frequently dealt with Bulgarian language, other South Slavonic languages are represented to a lesser extent (Serbian, Croatian), or just as part of comprehensively conceived texts, without explicit expression in the title of the publication.

## V. Dictionaries

This group of publications is practically exclusively represented by specialized dictionaries for those interested in Bulgarian language. The author of all these dictionaries mentioned here is Elena KREJČOVÁ. Over the three-year period, she has gradually developed *Česko-bulharský právnícký slovník* (“Czech-Bulgarian Law Dictionary”, 2014) and *Česko-bulharský a bulharsko-český tematický slovník s úkoly na procvičování slovní zásoby* (“Czech-Bulgarian and Bulgarian-Czech Theme-Based Dictionary with Vocabulary Exercises”, 2014) – both within the above-mentioned project the Education for Competitiveness Operational Program, and later *Česko-bulharský specializovaný slovník právnícké, ekonomické a společensko-politické terminologie* (“Czech-Bulgarian Specialized Dictionary of Law, Economic and Socio-Political Terminology”, 2016) and finally *Кратък тематичен речник на българския, чешкия, полския и украинския език* (“Short Theme-Based Dictionary of Bulgarian, Czech, Polish and Ukrainian”, 2016) – this one in cooperation with colleagues in Sofia Nadezhda STALYANOVA and Olga SOROKA. The last dictionaries from this respectable series so far are *Tematický slovník češtiny, bulharštiny, srbštiny a chorvatštiny* (“Theme-Based Dictionary of Czech, Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian”, 2019), which E. KREJČOVÁ prepared along with Ana PETROV and Mirna STEHLÍKOVÁ ĐURASEK, and *Речник на лингвистичните термини за студенти слависти А–Н (български език – чешки език – полски език)* (“Dictionary of Linguistic Terms for Slavonic Students A–N [Bulgarian – Czech – Polish]”, 2019), created in cooperation with the already mentioned N. STALYANOVA.

The lexicographic production is complemented by the third edition of *Česko-makedonský a makedonsko-český slovník* (“Czech-Macedonian and Macedonian-Czech Dictionary”, 2002, first one in 1994 and 1995), its authors are Ivan DOROVSKÝ and Dragi STEFANIJA.

As can be seen from the list, the five dictionaries are Czech-Bulgarian (one of them also includes Polish and another one Polish and Ukrainian), one is Czech-“South Slavonic” (it includes Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian) and one is Czech-Macedonian.

## VI. Conclusion

Brno's publishing activity on South Slavonic languages has been varied and distinctive over the past two decades. Monographs, collective monographs, monodisciplinary and multidisciplinary proceedings, dictionaries, handbooks were published. Out of the 41 detected book, 16 publications contained Slavonic languages in higher number, often in comparison with Czech or other languages. There is a significantly higher interest in Bulgarian (16) from the titles focused on one South Slavonic language (which could again include Czech or another non-South Slavonic language). The remaining 9 titles concern Croatian (3), Macedonian (3), Bulgarian and Serbian in comparison (2) and Serbian itself (1). Striking is the lack of publications dealing with Slovenian, but this handicap (as well as the structure and proportions of titles dealing with other South-Slavonic languages) is due to the long-term absence of Slovene-oriented linguists at the Slavonic Studies in Brno.

## VII. Chronological List of Publications Mentioned in the Text by Categories

### VII.1

#### *Multidisciplinary Proceedings and Handbooks with Linguistic Component (9)*

DOROVSKÝ, Ivan: *Studia Balkanica et Slavica*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita v Brně, 2001.

DOROVSKÝ, Ivan (ed.): *Studia Balcanica Bohemo-Slovaca V*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita v Brně, 2002.

HLADKÝ, Ladislav – CHOCHOLÁČ, Bronislav – JAN, Libor – ŠTĚPÁNEK, Václav (eds.): *Od Moravy k Moravě. Z historie česko-srbských vztahů v 19. a 20. století*. Brno: Matice moravská, 2005.

ŠTĚPÁNEK, Václav – BOČEK, Pavel – HLADKÝ, Ladislav – KREJČÍ, Pavel – STEHLÍK, Petr (eds.): *Studia Balcanica Bohemo-Slovaca VI*, sv. 1 a 2. Brno: Ústav slavistiky FF MU; Historický ústav AV ČR; Matice moravská, 2006.

- KREJČÍ, Pavel (ed.): *Chorvatsko, Chorvaté, chorvatština*. Brno: SCSS; SVN Regiony, 2007.
- DOROVSKÝ, Ivan – MITREVSKI, Ljupčo (eds.): *Studia Macedonica*. Brno: František Šalé – ALBERT, 2008.
- VILLNOW KOMÁRKOVÁ, Jana (ed.): *À la croate*. Brno: Tribun EU, 2010.
- DOROVSKÝ, Ivan (ed.): *Studia Macedonica II*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta MU, 2015.
- ŠTĚPÁNEK, Václav – MITÁČEK, Jiří (eds.): *Studia Balkanica Bohemo-Slovaca VII*. Brno: Moravské zemské muzeum; Ústav slavistiky FF MU, 2017.

## VII.2

### *Linguistic Proceedings and Collective Monographs (8)*

- КРЕЙЧОВА, Елена – КРЕЙЧИ, Павел (eds.): *Преподаването на български език като чужд в славянски и неславянски контекст*. Бърно: Porta Balkanica, 2010.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena – KREJČÍ, Pavel – PRZYBYLSKI, Michal (eds.): *Výuka jihoslovanských jazyků v dnešní Evropě*. Brno: Porta Balkanica, 2011.
- Various authors: Blok jihoslovanských studií. In: *Opera Slavica. Slavistické rozhledy*, roč. XXIII, č. 4, Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2013, 69–391.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena – KREJČÍ, Pavel (eds.): *Výuka jihoslovanských jazyků a literatur v dnešní Evropě*. Brno: Porta Balkanica, 2014.
- KREJČÍ, Pavel – KREJČOVÁ, Elena et al.: *Výuka jihoslovanských jazyků a literatur v dnešní Evropě*. Brno: Jan Sojnek – Galium, 2015.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena – KREJČÍ, Pavel (eds.): *Výuka jihoslovanských jazyků a literatur v dnešní Evropě III*. Brno: Jan Sojnek – Galium, 2016.
- KREJČÍ, Pavel – KREJČOVÁ, Elena (eds.): *Jihoslovanská frazeologie kontrastivně*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta MU, 2016.
- KREJČÍ, Pavel – KREJČOVÁ, Elena (eds.): *Bogoslav Šulek a jeho filologické dílo / i njegov filološki rad*. Brno: Tribun EU, 2016.

## VII.3

### *Linguistic Monographs and Handbooks (17)*

- KREJČÍ, Pavel: *Bulharská a česká publicistická frazeologie ve vzájemném srovnání*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006.

- VEČERKA, Radoslav: *Jazyky v komparaci 2. Charakteristiky současných slovanských jazyků v historickém kontextu*. Praha: EuroSlavica, 2009.
- KREJČÍ, Pavel: *Přehled vývoje jihoslovanských spisovných jazyků. Od 9. do počátku 19. století*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2014.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena: *Příručka pro výuku bulharské stylistiky*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2014.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena: *Bulharské texty k překladatelskému semináři, část 1*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2014.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena: *Bulharské texty k překladatelskému semináři, část 2*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2015.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena: *Texty k překladatelskému semináři pro bulharisty*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2015.
- KREJČÍ, Pavel: *Srbská frazeologie v českém a bulharském překladu. Kontrastivní analýza*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta MU, 2015.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena: *Slovosledné změny v bulharských a srbských evangelních památkách z 12. a 13. století*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta MU, 2016.
- КРЕЙЧОВА, Елена: *Славянският Вавилон. За интерференцията между славянските езици*. София: Парадигма, 2016.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena – KREJČÍ, Pavel: *Quo vadis, philologia?* Brno: Tribun EU, 2017.
- KREYTCHOVA, Elena – STALYANOVA, Nadezhda: *The Power of Public Speech*. Sofia: Paradigma, 2017.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena – STALYANOVA, Nadezhda: *Bulharské texty k překladatelskému semináři, část 3*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2018.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena – STALYANOVA, Nadezhda: *Kouzlo a umění překladu*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2018.
- KREJČÍ, Pavel: *Eight Fragments from the World of Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin Languages. Selected South Slavonic Studies 1*. Brno: Masaryk University, 2018.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena – STALYANOVA, Nadezhda: *Bulharské texty k překladatelskému semináři, část 3. Cvičebnice*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2019.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena – STALYANOVA, Nadezhda: *Kouzlo a umění překladu. Cvičebnice*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2019.

#### VII.4

##### *Dictionaries (7)*

- DOROVSKÝ, Ivan – STEFANIJA, Dragi: *Česko-makedonský a makedonsko-český slovník*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2002.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena: *Česko-bulharský právnícký slovník*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2014.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena: *Česko-bulharský a bulharsko-český tematický slovník s úkoly na procvičování slovní zásoby*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2014.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena: *Česko-bulharský specializovaný slovník právnícké, ekonomické a společensko-politické terminologie*. Brno: Jan Sojnek – Galium, 2016.
- КРЕЙЧОВА, Елена – СТАЛЯНОВА, Надежда – СОРОКА, Олга: *Кратък тематичен речник на българския, чешкия, полския и украинския език*. София: Парадигма, 2016.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena – PETROV, Ana – STEHLÍKOVÁ ĎURASEK, Mirna: *Tematický slovník češtiny, bulharštiny, srbštiny a chorvatštiny*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2019.
- СТАЛЯНОВА, Надежда – КРЕЙЧОВА, Елена: *Речник на лингвистичните термини за студенти слависти А–Н (български език – чешки език – полски език)*. София: Парадигма, 2019.

## CZECH-SOUTH SLAVONIC LEXICOGRAPHIC PRODUCTION BETWEEN 1900 AND 2019

(OVERVIEW No. 2)

### I. Introduction

Thanks to the publication of two two-volume Czech–South Slavonic dictionaries (Czech–Serbian in Belgrade and Czech–Bulgarian in Sofia), the beginning of the new millennium proved very favourable for anyone who encounters South Slavonic languages – whether as a professional or a layman. Before focusing on other contemporary Czech–South Slavonic dictionaries, in the mirror of today’s linguistic and political fragmentation of the South Slavonic area, it would be good to recall that the South Slavonic languages were spoken only in two countries before 1991 – the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and after 1945 Federal Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. The official language in Bulgaria was and still is Bulgarian (*български език*), the official language in Yugoslavia was Serbo-Croatian, in the language of Serbs, Montenegrins and Bosniaks (Muslims) most often called *srpskohrvatski jezik* (*српскохрватски језик*), in the language of Croats *hrvatskosrpski jezik*. In the territory of the Yugoslav Republics of Slovenia and Macedonia, after they were established, the Slovenian language (*slovenski jezik*), resp. Macedonian (*македонски јазик*) were used as official languages. The state when the South Slavonic territory was presented almost exclusively by the two most important standard

languages – Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian – naturally manifested itself in Czech (Czechoslovak), Yugoslav and Bulgarian lexicography. So, let's first map the first nine decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

## II. Czech-South Slavonic Dictionaries from the Period 1900–1945

### II.1

#### *Czech-Serbo-Croatian Dictionaries, Czech-Croatian Dictionary*

The period under observation in the field of Czech-Serbo-Croatian dictionary production began in 1906, when the first *Slovníček srbsko-chorvatsko-český* (“Serbo-Croatian-Czech Glossary”) was published in Otto’s publishing house. It was compiled by Jindřich OČENÁŠEK. Four years later, in 1910, *Nový kapesní slovník jazyka srbocharvatského a průvodce po jazyku srbocharvatském* (“New Pocket Dictionary of Serbo-Croatian and Guide to Serbo-Croatian Language”) by professor Rudolf KOUT was published at the Jindřich Lorenz publishing house in Třebíč. The small glossary came out three more times, its last fourth edition was published fifteen years after its first one. It is actually a small Czech-Serbo-Croatian and Serbo-Croatian-Czech language guide for business and tourist purposes, with an introduction to SCr. grammar. It is good to remember that the term Serbo-Croatian is to be understood as Croatian, because the author based it on the Croatian form of Serbo-Croatian. In 1914 a Serbo-Croatian-Czech dictionary is published for the second time in Moravia – in this case in Brno. Its author is Ante JELČIĆ and the dictionary is called *Slovník chorvatsko-srbsko-český* (“Croatian-Serbian-Czech Dictionary”). It really is a trilingual dictionary, as the title suggests. The last lexicographic handbook from the “monarchy era” was published in 1916 by Rudolf BAČKOVSKÝ, the publisher and author in one person. It is *Slovníček česko-srbochorvatský a srbo-chorvatsko-český* (“Czech-Serbo-Croatian and Serbo-Croatian-Czech Glossary”).

The first dictionary from the newly formed Czechoslovakia in our list is trilingual *Kapesní slovník lužicko-česko-jihoslovanský a česko-lužický*

(“Pocket Dictionary of Lusatian–Czech–South Slavonic and Czech–Lusatian”, 1920), which was compiled by the important Czech Slavist of the first half of the 20th century, Josef PÁTA. However, it is clear from the name itself that the South Slavonic, i.e. Serbo–Croatian component, is secondary. In 1926, *Srbsko-chorvatsko-český slovník* (“Serbian–Croatian–Czech Dictionary”) by Dušan DAJIČIĆ and František ŠOBRA was published in an edition of Otto’s language dictionaries in Prague, approaching the range of medium-sized dictionaries. Other Serbo–Croatian lexicons will be published one decade later. In 1937 Jindřich Bačkovský was first to publish a book by Petr M. VELJOVIĆ with rare title *Česko-jugoslávský slovník* (“Czech–Yugoslavian Dictionary”) in his edition of the foreign language dictionaries and in 1939 *Kapesní slovník srbochorvatsko-český a česko-srbochorvatský* (“Serbo–Croatian–Czech and Czech–Serbo–Croatian Pocket Dictionary”) by Vladimír TOGNER was published in Prague publishing house Kvasnička and Hampl. The same author published at the same publishing house a year after that the above mentioned *Malý slovníček česko-srbochorvatský* (“Small Czech–Serbo–Croatian Glossary”).

One of the most important Czech–“Yugoslav” dictionaries of the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century is undoubtedly *Veliki češko-hrvatski rječnik za praktičnu i školsku uporabu* (“Great Czech–Croatian Dictionary for Practical and School Use”) by Jaroslav MERHAUT, published in Zagreb (the term “great” is misleading, the dictionary contains about 20,000 entries). Data on the year of publication vary – while in the preface to its new edition (1998), D. Sesar mentioned “1939 or 1940”, the catalogue record of the National Library in Prague states 1941. The title of the dictionary clearly reflects the Croats’ attempts to perceive their language separately from the Serbian language.

In the observed period, ten dictionaries were published – nine in Czechia and only one in Yugoslavia (Croatia).

## II.2

### *Czech–Slovenian Dictionaries*

Czech and Slovenian lexicography gave from the period of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia works of two Slovenes and two Czechs. Already in 1908,

*Česko-slovenský slovník* (“Czech–Slovenian Dictionary”) was published in Otto’s publishing house, compiled by Antonín ZAVADIL. Another small dictionary for learning Slovenian is *Slovníček slovinsko-český a česko-slovenský* (“Slovenian–Czech and Czech–Slovenian Glossary”) by František FRÝDECKÝ. The dictionary was published in 1917 in the edition of Bačkovský’s One–Crown–Glossaries of Foreign Languages.

After World War I, the publishing initiative moved to the Yugoslav side: in 1929, Fran BRADAČ published a glossary *Česko-slovenski slovar* (“Czech–Slovenian Dictionary”).

Thus, three dictionaries were published in the observed period – two in Czechia, one in Yugoslavia (in Slovenia).

### II.3

#### *Czech–Bulgarian Dictionaries*

The first lexicographic work from the observed period is *Българско-чехски речник* (“Bulgarian–Czech Dictionary”), written by Vladislav ŠAK. The dictionary is from an edition of so-called Otto language dictionaries and it was published in 1914. The same author has prepared a relatively big *Česko-bulharský slovník* (“Czech–Bulgarian Dictionary”), which was first published in the same year and by the same publishing house. This dictionary was also re-released in 1926. With the range at the opposite pole is the small *Slovníček bulharsko-český* (“Bulgarian–Czech Glossary”) by Josef FOLPRECHT. It was published in 1917 in the edition of Bačkovský’s One–Crown–Glossaries of Foreign Languages.

The fourth dictionary of the Bulgarian language was published after the war in 1922 by the Jindřich Lorenz publishing house in Třebíč. It is called *Nový kapesní slovník jazyka českého a bulharského* (“New Pocket Dictionary of Czech and Bulgarian Language”). The Czech–Bulgarian part was written by Vladimír SÍS, Boris IVANOV worked on Bulgarian–Czech part and František RUSÍNSKÝ completed it.

Thus, in the observed period, four dictionaries were published – all in Czechia.

### III. Czech–South Slavonic Dictionaries from the Period 1946–1990

In this period in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria social life was dominated by communist ideology. Publishing houses have been nationalized. This is probably why the Czech–Serbo–Croatian and Czech–Bulgarian lexicographic production is very similar. The Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences has given the scope and appearance of virtually identical dictionaries Bulgarian–Czech and Serbo–Croatian–Czech. The State Educational Publishing House (SPN) has published bidirectional handbooks for both Bulgarian and Serbo–Croatian in the edition of Pocket Dictionaries and has added a slightly smaller tourist dictionary of both languages. In this period, the State Technical Literature Publishing House (SNTL) prepared two bidirectional Czech–Bulgarian technical dictionaries (newer in cooperation with the Bulgarian State Publishing House “Tehnika”), but not even one Czech–Serbo–Croatian. In Bulgaria, a small Czech–Bulgarian dictionary was published immediately after the end of World War II. In the 1970s, at Bohemian studies in Sofia began work on a completely new and extensive Czech–Bulgarian dictionary. In Yugoslavia, the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts began working on a two volume Czech–Serbo–Croatian dictionary at the beginning of the 1970s. Czech–Slovenian dictionary production was limited to Slovenia, Czech–Macedonian did not bring any fruit neither in Czechia, nor in Yugoslav Macedonia.

#### III.1

##### *Czech–Serbo–Croatian Dictionaries*

In 1963, the *Srbocharvátsko–český a česko–srbocharvátský kapesní slovník* (“Serbo–Croatian–Czech and Czech–Serbo–Croatian Pocket Dictionary”) was prepared by Miloš NOHA and published by the SPN edition of Pocket Dictionaries. By 1990, four more editions had been published (1965, 1967, 1969 and 1984). It contains about 20,000 entries in SCr.–Cz. parts and only about 8,000 entries in the Cz.–SCr. Significant reduction in the Czech part was intentional. Explicitly for the touristic purposes, *Rečnik češko–srpskohrvatski i srpskohrvatsko–češki (sa primerima konverzacije)* (“Czech–

Serbo-Croatian and Serbo-Croatian-Czech Dictionary [with Examples of Conversations]”) prepared by Nikola KRŠIĆ and was published in edition called *Rečnik za turiste* (Dictionary for Tourists) in Sarajevo in 1966. The dictionary offers almost 4,000 Cz. entries and about 4,500 entries in the SCr.-Cz. part. The 1970s did not remain without a dictionary – in 1973 in Daruvar, Croatia, small *Slovník chorvatosrbsko-český* (“Croato-Serbian-Czech Dictionary”) was dedicated to the local Czech minority, composed by Otto SOBOTKA and published in the edition of Jednota Handbooks (estimated to contain about 30–40,000 entries). The dictionary is, from the point of view of the Czech language, rare because it is the only one that contains in Czech basically unused expression *chorvatosrbský* (Croato-Serbian, according to Cro. name *hrvatskosrpski* used only by Croats – otherwise in Czech we only come across a *srbochorvatský* [Serbo-Croatian] corresponding to original word *srpskohrvatski*). It was not until 1982 that a representative one-volume academic *Srbocharvátsko-český slovník* (“Serbo-Croatian-Czech Dictionary”) was published and group of authors, led by Jan SEDLÁČEK (together with Karel LEMARIE, Anna JENÍKOVÁ and Stanislava SÝKOROVÁ), have been working on it for more than one decade. This medium-sized dictionary is very close to Hora’s Bulgarian-Czech dictionary in terms of size and format (see below). The publication of the academic dictionary was accompanied by a brief but quite practical *Česko-srbocharvátský, srbocharvátsko-český slovník na cesty* (“Czech-Serbo-Croatian, Serbo-Croatian-Czech Travel Dictionary”) written by Jarmila GLEICHOVÁ and Anna JENÍKOVÁ and was re-released in 1987. The Cz.-SCr. part contains about 7,000 and the SCr.-Cz. part contains about 6,000 entries.

In 1977, in Czechoslovakia, few specialized dictionaries appeared *Technickoekonomický hutnický slovník, díl 1.: Srbocharvátsko-český a Technickoekonomický hutnický slovník, díl 2.: Česko-srbocharvátský* (“Technical-Economic Metallurgical Dictionary, Volume 1: Serbo-Croatian-Czech” and “Technical-Economic Metallurgical Dictionary, Volume 2: Czech-Serbo-Croatian”). Both three hundred-page dictionaries were created by Otto KŘÍSTEK and the handbooks were published for the needs of Ironworks Třinec.

Thus, in the observed period, six dictionaries – four in Czechia (one of which was a specialized in technical field) and two in Yugoslavia (one in Bosnia and Herzegovina and one in Croatia) were published.

### III.2

#### *Czech–Slovenian Dictionaries*

Reworked and extensively expanded into a small dictionary format, Fran BRADAČ wrote a new *Češko-slovenski slovar* (“Czech–Slovenian Dictionary”) in 1967. Bradač was then replaced by Ružena ŠKERLJ in lexicographic work. She first issued a small *Slovensko-češki slovar* (“Slovenian–Czech Dictionary”, 1976) which was missing from the market, and shortly after – in 1981 – a brand new *Češko-slovenski slovar* (“Czech–Slovenian Dictionary”). Three dictionaries were published, all in Yugoslavia (Slovenia), in the observed period.

### III.3

#### *Czech–Bulgarian Dictionaries*

In 1947 *Чешко-български речник* (“Czech–Bulgarian Dictionary”) by Tsvetana ROMANSKA was published in Sofia. The vocabulary was primarily intended as a tool for Bulgarian students of Czech language and literature, so it included a number of outdated or literary expressions, dialect, colloquial, or slang words. However, it also served to researchers, civil servants, tourists and other interested persons from the scientific, cultural or economic spheres. It was re-released for the second time two years later, the third, revised edition was published in 1961. This latest version contains about 35,000 words of the basic vocabulary of the Czech language of that time. In addition, technical terms or phrases occurs and the dictionary is adapted to the changed Czech orthography. It is worth recalling that academic Stoyan Romanski was also a significant contributor to the first two editions, while Svetomir Ivanchev contributed to its latest, revised version, and with his name a new, more extensive and comprehensive Czech–Bulgarian dictionary, which will be discussed below, is linked.

In 1959, one-volume *Bulharsko-český slovník* (“Bulgarian–Czech Dictionary”) written by Karel HORA in cooperation with Bohdan PROŠEK, Jaromír CHAROUS and Ružena NIKOLAEVOVÁ, was published in Prague. An overview of Bulgarian grammar was written by Antonín FRINTA. Collection of materials began in 1949 by V. CHLEBEČEK and K. Hora took over the management of the editorial office two years later. With 60,000 entries, the dictionary is regarded as a medium-sized one. Its old age is already its great

disadvantage, but we can state that it is still being sought-after, not only because another corresponding Bulgarian–Czech dictionary does not exist yet, but also because of its high-quality lexicographic processing. However, it would be desirable for a new, contemporary Bulgarian–Czech dictionary to appear on the book market as soon as possible, reflecting the current form of Bulgarian language.

In 1964, the SPN published *Bulharsko-český a česko-bulharský kapesní slovník* (“Bulgarian–Czech and Czech–Bulgarian Pocket Dictionary”) in the Pocket Dictionaries edition. It was prepared by Bohdan PROŠEK in cooperation with Věra DVOŘÁKOVÁ-PROŠKOVÁ. The dictionary contains 14,000 (Bulg.–Cz.), respectively 13,000 (Cz.–Bulg.) entries. It is primarily intended for the general public. The second edition was published five years later, the third in 1976 and the last one in 1983. Roughly half the range, compared to a pocket dictionary, shows *Česko-bulharský, bulharsko-český slovník na cesty* (“Czech–Bulgarian, Bulgarian–Czech Travel Dictionary”) (7,000 entries in the Cz.–Bulg. part and 5,000 in the Bulg.–Cz. part), a specialized dictionary guide for Czech tourists heading for the beauties of Bulgarian nature, especially the Black Sea coast. It was written by Marie BUBLOVÁ and Mihail VIDENOV. The SPN published it for the first time in 1978, the second time in a modified form in 1987.

In order to illustrate the situation in 1946–1990 it is necessary to mention the specialized *Bulharsko-český a česko-bulharský technický slovník* (“Bulgarian–Czech and Czech–Bulgarian Technical Dictionary”). It was published in 1958 by SNTL. Its author is above mentioned lexicographer Bohdan PROŠEK. The dictionary contains approximately 23,000 (Bulg.–Cz.), respectively 24,000 (Cz.–Bulg.) entries. Its disadvantage had already showed in the year of its publication as it did not reflect the change in the orthography of Czech language in 1957 (it was already introduced at the time of the change). New *Bulharsko-český a česko-bulharský technický slovník* appeared on the shelves of Czech and Bulgarian bookstores in 1988. It represented a joint product of the Czechoslovak SNTL and the Bulgarian State Publishing House “Tehnika”. It was prepared by a group of authors – mainly Bulgarians, the main editor was Blanka KUTINOVÁ, editors-in-chief Martin KAPOUN, Irena ŠELEPOVÁ and Margarita KYURKCHIEVA. In essence, the dictionary copied the previous Prošek’s work in format, scope and processing, but the entries were naturally updated and supplemented.

Česko-bulharský základní hospodářský slovník pro zahraniční studenty VŠE (“Czech-Bulgarian Basic Economic Dictionary for Foreign Students of the University of Economics”, Prague) and Bulharsko-český základní hospodářský slovník pro zahraniční studenty VŠE (“Bulgarian-Czech Basic Economic Dictionary for Foreign Students of the University of Economics”, Prague) represented a certain peculiarity in Czech-Bulgarian lexicographic production. Both dictionaries with the university textbooks format were compiled by Petr PANEV and published in Prague in 1978 (Cz.-Bulg.), resp. in 1982 (Bulg.-Cz.). The rarity is trilingual *Rusko-česko-bulharský oděvářský slovník* (“Russian-Czech-Bulgarian Clothing Dictionary”), which was written by Marie KRÁTOŠKOVÁ, Věra LEITNEROVÁ and Sima VASILEVA. The 250-page A4 format dictionary was published for the needs of the Czech clothing industry in Prostějov in 1971.

Nine dictionaries – eight in Czechia (five of which specialized in technical vocabulary and one was trilingual) and only one in Bulgaria – were published in the observed period.

#### IV. Czech-South Slavonic Dictionaries from the Period 1991–2019

The collapse of communist regimes in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe has opened a wide possibility for publishing of smaller or bigger dictionaries and dictionaries of varying quality. The commercial aspect was also reflected in the publication of Czech-South Slavonic and South Slavonic-Czech dictionaries – sometimes positively, sometimes negatively. With the dissolution of Yugoslavia, Serbo-Croatian language lost not only meaning of existence but also a political support. The territory of Serbo-Croatian language of former Yugoslavia has been territorially divided into: Croatia (with Croatian official language – *hrvatski jezik*), Bosnia and Herzegovina (with three official languages: Bosnian – *bosanski jezik*, Croatian and Serbian), Serbia (with Serbian official language – *srpski jezik*) and Montenegro (with four official Slavonic languages: Montenegrin – *crnogorski jezik*, Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian). Serbia and Montenegro made up the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia between the years 1992 and

2003, it was renamed the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro just before its collapse (2003 to 2006). The old Serbo-Croatian, whose importance laid in fact that it was the language of more than 20 million inhabitants of the Balkans living in an internationally prestigious Yugoslav state, has now been probably replaced by Croatian in international significance. Less than 5 million people speak it, but thanks to the combination of the commercial and political importance of Croatia (amount of tourism in the Adriatic, or the belonging of the Croats to the Western Christian cultural sphere, as well as the fundamental socio-political consensus on sharing Western, Euro-Atlantic values, whose expression is Croatia's membership in the EU and NATO) today, in our opinion, the importance of Croatian prevails over the importance of other contemporary post-Yugoslav languages or "languages" (Bosnian, Montenegrin, Macedonian, Slovenian, but also Serbian), not to mention the fact that speaker of Croatian language can communicate in almost the entire territory of former Yugoslavia.

The new language situation in the Czech-South Slavonic, respectively South Slavonic-Czech dictionary production has been reflected in various ways. We have noticed a lexicographical "boom" especially when it comes to Czech-Croatian dictionaries. However, it did not occur immediately after the declaration of Croatia's independence (1991) – the first, in some point and also by its scope "emergency" dictionary with the *Croatian* attribute was published in 1996 and came from the Czech side. By 2000, in a relatively short period of time, another five (!) smaller or bigger dictionaries of different quality, extent and focus had been published – two of these five dictionaries were published in Czechia, three in Croatia. While on the Czech side it was mainly pocket, resp. tourist publications (two bidirectional, one Czech-Croatian), Croats had come up with more diverse dictionaries – one completely new medium size Croatian-Czech and two small Czech-Croatian, the first of which was the reprint of the nearly sixty-year-old first edition of this scarce handbook. These dictionary "incunabula" were supplemented by a number of other, exclusively pocket handbooks, of which only two were published in Croatia.

In the case of **Serbian**, the disproportion between the high number of published dictionaries of Croatian (with only one exception but mostly only in pocket format/range) and only four Serbian dictionaries, of which two are medium-sized, is clearly visible. However, it should be remembered

that the demand – whether commercial or professional – for Czech–Serbian dictionaries was not nearly as strong as it was for Czech–Croatian production, even more so as the existing large Serbo–Croatian–Czech dictionary from 1982 was sufficient enough for understanding Serbian texts.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, a long-prepared Czech–Serbo–Croatian dictionary was expected, and it eventually “lived to see” the end of Serbo–Croatian, which was reflected in its final name, but not in its content. The two volume Czech–Serbian dictionary of medium size was completely published on the threshold of the new millennium, in 2001. In addition to Serbian words, however, it also contains expressions belonging to the “Western variant”. It represents the most extensive work of Czech–South Slavonic translation lexicography. After that, two small practical bidirectional dictionaries (one in Czechia, one in Serbia) and one medium-sized dictionary in Czechia were published.

So far, we have not seen any Czech–Bosnian lexicographic record in **Bosnian**, for which we see more causes, but above all the unsatisfactory definition of what Bosnian language actually represents and how it differs from the standard form of Serbian, resp. Croatian language. Restraint is also supported by the fact that this language is not studied at Czech universities, as well as the fact that existing Serbo–Croatian, Serbian or Croatian dictionaries are quite sufficient for understanding between Czechs and Bosniaks. Basically, we could say the same thing about **Montenegrin** language.

As for **Slovenian**, three dictionary handbooks have been published since 1990, all of which are bidirectional, two of them in format for tourists. In Slovenia, a relatively rich bidirectional Czech–Slovenian dictionary was published in 1995. Essentially, the author made only a synthesis and update of the two older unidirectional dictionaries from 1976, resp. 1981 and which is in a way the highlight of the Czech–Slovenian dictionaries published in Slovenia. In 2006, a simple dictionary of the basic vocabulary of both languages was published in Ljubljana in the edition *Evropski slovarji* (European Dictionaries). For the first time since 1917, the Slovenian language was processed in the pocket-sized tourist dictionary published

---

7 Of course, we do not claim that this vocabulary was not enough to understand Croatian texts, but the strong emancipation efforts were particularly evident in Croatian, which was reflected, among other things, by certain overproduction of translation dictionaries; it was simply part of satisfying the desire for professional recognition and the social admission of the new standard language.

in Czechia in 2002, which means that those interested in a high-quality Czech–Slovenian dictionary will have to look for it in Slovenia (at least so far).

More attention has been paid to Czech–**Macedonian** dictionaries after the declaration of independence of the Republic of Macedonia, especially on the Czech side – three times the first, rather small, bidirectional translation dictionary of this relatively young language, was published by Masaryk University in Brno. Until the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, two Macedonian–Czech dictionaries appeared (the first one Macedonian and the second one Czech) and in the first decade of the new century their long-awaited Czech–Macedonian counterpart was published in North Macedonia.

As far as **Bulgarian** is concerned, it was lexicographically rather quite well represented before 1990, including technical translation dictionaries that we lack in other South Slavonic languages. Therefore, in the new era, just (i.e. “just” compared to the Croatian situation) two pocket dictionaries were published, but by the end of the 1980s, the long-awaited new Czech–Bulgarian dictionary of medium size and in two volumes was published, due to problems with the publisher, he did not get into distribution in its completed form until in 2002. The remarkable specificity of Bulgarian is also seven (!) specialized translation dictionaries, with one exception from the middle of the second decade of the new century. While one of them, also being the only one, contains two other South Slavonic languages (Serbian and Croatian) next to Bulgarian, and is therefore included into a separate subchapter.

Now, to the individual dictionaries.

#### IV.1

##### *Czech–Croatian Dictionaries*

In the light of what we have indicated in the introduction to the third chapter, it is not surprising that Czech–Croatian dictionaries, small dictionaries and conversational guides literally began to swarm in the second half of the 1990s. Already in 1996, the first one appeared on the market – *Česko-charvátský slovník* (“Czech–Croatian Dictionary”) from authors Ivan DOROVSKÝ and Věra BARTOŠOVÁ. It is a small dictionary with about 8,000 basic vocabulary entries – an emergency solution by which the authors tried to meet the

requirements of, among others, Czech students of the Croatian language. In 1998, a reprint of MERHAUT's dictionary from 1940 was published in Croatia under the title *Česko-chorvatský slovník* ("Czech-Croatian Dictionary"). At the same time in Czechia, a small and with a poorer quality *Chorvatsko-český, česko-chorvatský slovník s nejpoužívanějšími konverzačními frázemi* ("Croatian-Czech, Czech-Croatian Dictionary with the Most Widely Used Conversational Phrases") – a simple tourist guide with approximately 5,000 basic entries in Cro.-Cz. and Cz.-Cro. part created by Slavko KRTALIĆ. The following year (1999) a brand new *Hrvatsko-češki rječnik* ("Croatian-Czech Dictionary") appeared in Croatia, the medium-sized dictionary with over 50,000 entries. Its authors are Dušanka PROFETA and Alen NOVOSAD. The Czech side comes with *Česko-chorvatský a chorvatsko-český slovník na cesty* ("Czech-Croatian and Croatian-Czech Travel Dictionary"), a practical and successful tourist guide, on which the Czech Anna JENÍKOVÁ and Croatian Katica IVANKOVIĆ cooperated. The dictionary contains about 7,000 (Cz.-Cro.), resp. 6,000 (Cro.-Cz.) entries. In 2000, *Česko-hrvatski rječnik* ("Czech-Croatian Dictionary"), containing approximately 15,000 entries and, unfortunately, many uncorrected spelling mistakes and typing errors, is published in Rijeka as a teaching aid for local people interested in Czech courses. Dictionary was prepared by Milan NOSIĆ. The series of miniature dictionaries includes *Česko-chorvatský slovník* ("Czech-Croatian Dictionary"), which was published in the new millennium (2002) and was written by Ivana LISÁ. The same author then came two years later with the Croatian-Czech version (*Chorvatsko-český slovník* ["Croatian-Czech Dictionary"], 2004). Despite the miniature format, both Lisá's dictionaries declares up to 7,000 entries. The rich Czech-Croatian lexicographic production continues with one of the highest quality handbooks in pocket format *Česko-hrvatski i hrvatsko-češki praktični rječnik* ("Czech-Croatian and Croatian-Czech Practical Dictionary", 2002), an adequate small dictionary of Zagreb's Bohemist Dubravka SESAR with almost 14,000 (Cz.-Cro.), resp. almost 11,000 (Cro.-Cz.) entries, which in 2004 (and for the second time in 2007) received Czech edition under the title *Chorvatsko-český a česko-chorvatský slovník* ("Croatian-Czech and Czech-Croatian Dictionary"), and *Univerzalni rječnik češko-hrvatski, hrvatsko-češki* ("Universal Czech-Croatian, Croatian-Czech Dictionary", 2003) of other Zagreb's Bohemists Renata KUCHAR and Suzana KOS with approximately 10,000 entries from contemporary Czech

and the same number from contemporary Croatian language. The decade after 2005 is in the Czech–Croatian lexicography in the hands of practical pocket dictionaries associated with the name of Vladimír UCHYTIL. In 2005 (and in re-editions in 2007 and 2011) a small compact *Chorvatsko-český, česko-chorvatský slovník* (“Croatian–Czech, Czech–Croatian Dictionary”) firstly appeared, from authors Vladimír and Tomáš UCHYTIL with scope and focus close to Jeníková and Ivanković. Then, in 2013 *Chorvatsko-český, česko-chorvatský kapesní slovník nejen pro turisty* (“Croatian–Czech, Czech–Croatian Pocket Dictionary Not Only for Tourists”) and *Chorvatsko-český, česko-chorvatský kapesní slovník pro každého* (“Croatian–Czech, Czech–Croatian Pocket Dictionary for Everyone”) followed with uniformed design – as an author of both, only Vladimír UCHYTIL is mentioned. In the same year, two women in Croatia – Ivana BAŠIĆ and Anna PLEADIN – created *Hrvatsko-češki priručni rječnik* (“Croatian–Czech Desk Dictionary”) which contains only about 2,500 entries on 80 pages. The place of publication of this elementary tourist dictionary is significant – the Adriatic port of Split. The latest achievement in a rich but qualitatively diverse Czech–Croatian lexicographic production is the publication *Chorvatština – slovníček nejen pro začátečníky* (“Croatian – A Dictionary Not Only for Beginners”) published in 2016 as part of a series of practical language handbooks of the Brno publishing house Lingea. This latest pocket dictionary has Cz.–Cro. and Cro.–Cz. part and it contains around 30,000 entries.

In the observed period, sixteen dictionaries were published – ten in Czechia and six in Croatia.

#### IV.2

##### *Czech–Serbian Dictionaries*

Czech–Serbian lexicography was significantly poorer in the past decade. In fact, new dictionaries were published only in the new millennium. There were more reasons for this: Serbian–Czech dictionaries existed, and they were not outdated yet, but they were presented as Serbo–Croatian–Czech in accordance with the situation at that time. In addition, on the Serbian side, a political, social and cultural need to “cut off” from the past (Serbo–Croatian) was not as visible as on the Croatian side. Although the academic Serbo–Croatian Dictionary was quite enough for

orientation in both Serbian and Croatian, the Croatian side nevertheless created its Croatian–Czech dictionary, while the Serbian side did not attempt to publish the Serbian–Czech dictionary with the appropriate size. At the turn of the century, academic *Чешко-српски речник у два тома* (“Czech–Serbian Dictionary in Two Volumes”) was finally released in Serbia after years of hard work. Its authors are Emilija KAČANIK, Dragutin MIRKOVIĆ, Slobodanka UROŠEVIĆ, Krešimir GEORGIJEVIĆ, Nada ĐORĐEVIĆ, Vlado ĐUKANOVIĆ and Mirjana RADOVANOVIĆ. The first volume A–O was published in 2000, the second volume P–Ž a year later. The dictionary contains almost 78,000 entries and represents the most extensive Czech–South Slavonic lexicographic work. On the Czech side, in 2002, *Srbsko-český a česko-srbský slovník* (“Serbian–Czech and Czech–Serbian Dictionary”) was made thanks to Anna JENÍKOVÁ, doyenne of Czech–Serbian–Croatian lexicography. It is a practical and very successful dictionary which contains almost 40,000 entries – 20,000 in Serb.–Cz. and Cz.–Serb. part and it was re-released in 2014. To some extent, equivalent can be seen in Serbian *Česko-srpski, srpsko-češki rečnik* (“Czech–Serbian, Serbian–Czech Dictionary”) which was published in 2008 (and re-released in 2017) by Verica KOPRIVICA. Although the dictionary is larger in size than its Czech counterpart, it has half of the number of entries. The latest, but the most extensive contemporary Czech language dictionary of the Serbian language with about 55,000 entries is *Чешко-српски речник* (“Czech–Serbian Dictionary”), published in 2013. It was compiled by Branka RADOJKOVIĆ KUBEŠOVÁ and was credited by Serbian cultural institutions active in Czechia. The specialty of this dictionary is the short three-page dictionary of the Serbian–Czech homonyms.

Four dictionaries – two in Czechia and two in Serbia – were published in the observed period.

### IV.3

#### *Czech–Slovenian Dictionaries*

In the field of Czech–Slovenian lexicography, there have been no major changes after the declaration of the independence of the Republic of Slovenia. In 1995, *Česko-slovenski slovar, slovensko-češki slovar* (“Czech–Slovenian

Dictionary, Slovenian Czech Dictionary”) by Ružena ŠKERLJ was published in Slovenia in edition of Slovarji DZS (Dictionaries of DZS). It contains around 40,000 (Cz.-Slo.), resp. 25,000 (Slo.-Cz.) entries. In essence, the author made a synthesis of her two older dictionaries. About a decade later, Slovenians published a glossary on the range between extra small and pocket formats in the *Evropski slovarji* edition – *Češko-slovenski in slovensko-češki evropski slovar* (“Czech-Slovenian and Slovenian-Czech European Dictionary”, 2006). Its authors are Urška JARNOVIČ and Bojana MALTARIČ. This dictionary with elementary content offers about 5,000 entries in each of the two parts. The book is printed somewhat unconventionally, as it does not have a last page – from one side is a Slovenian-Czech part and if we turn the dictionary over the shorter side, we can leaf through the Czech-Slovenian part. In Czechia, Slovenian was also compiled in two handbooks in the observed period – a small tourist *Slovinško-český, česko-slovinšký slovník s mluvnicí a nejpoužívanějšími konverzačními frázemi* (“Slovenian-Czech, Czech-Slovenian Dictionary with Grammar and the Most Widely Used Conversational Phrases”), published in 2002 and for the second time in 2007, containing about 2,500 (Slo.-Cz.) resp. almost 3,000 (Cz.-Slo.) entries of basic vocabulary and it was written by Alena ŠAMONILOVÁ. The latest publication is *Slovinština – slovníček nejen pro začátečníky* (“Slovenian – A Dictionary Not Only for Beginners”) published in 2018 as part of a series of practical language handbooks of the Brno publishing house Lingea. This latest pocket dictionary has Cz.-Slo. and Slo.-Cz. part and it contains around 30,000 entries.

Four dictionaries were published in the observed period – two in Czechia and two in Slovenia.

#### IV.4

##### *Czech-Macedonian Dictionaries*

In the last decade, considerable attention has been paid to Macedonian-Czech dictionaries, especially on the Czech side. This was due to the fact that by that time no Macedonian-Czech dictionary had been on the shelves of either Czechoslovakian or Yugoslavian bookshops (this was largely due to the fact that Macedonian became official language in Yugoslav Macedonia only at the end of World War II), and secondly, due to the fact

that Macedonia became independent in the first half of the 1990s. Three editions had a handy *Česko-makedonský a makedonsko-český slovník* (“Czech-Macedonian and Macedonian-Czech Dictionary”, 1994, 1995, 2002) written by Ivan DOROVSKÝ and Dragi STEFANIJA. The dictionary contains 8,000 (Cz.-Mac.), resp. over 4,000 (Mac.-Cz.) entries. At the end of the century, the *Makedonsko-český slovník* (“Macedonian-Czech Dictionary”, 1999) finally appeared in the sale. It was being prepared for many years by the doyen of Czech-Bulgarian-Macedonian lexicography Karel HORA. This small dictionary has around 40,000 entries and it also contains the Macedonian grammar by František Václav MAREŠ. It was finished in the early 1990s, but because it had to wait a long time due to financial reasons, it was overtaken one year earlier by *Македонско-чешки речник* (“Macedonian-Czech Dictionary”) published in North Macedonia and written by Jadranka VLADOVA and David M. PASTYŘÍK. In 2006, a long-awaited *Чешко-македонски речник* (“Czech-Macedonian Dictionary”) was released in North Macedonia, prepared by Donka ROUS and František ČERMÁK together with Jasminka DELOVA and Kateřina VÍTOVÁ. Despite the promising format, it contains only about 17,000 entries.

In the observed period, four dictionaries were published – two in Czechia and two in North Macedonia.

#### IV.5

#### *Czech-Bulgarian Dictionaries*

In the late 1980s, the long-awaited new Czech-Bulgarian dictionary was practically finished. Works began in the first half of the 70s. The initiator, the necessary authority and the greatest “hard worker” was the professor of Czech studies at Sofia University of St. Clement of Ohrid Svetomir Ivanchev (1920–1991). Under his leadership, the dictionary was ready for publication in 1989. The political changes and the unexpected death of the chief editor of the dictionary S. Ivanchev complicated its publication and when changes in the standard Czech language were added to the inconveniences, it was necessary to revise the whole dictionary. It also had a positive side – it was possible to include a large number of new expressions in the dictionary and to update the semantics of the older expressions as needed to make the dictionary as close as possible to the current Czech language.

After a difficult search for a publisher (Bulgarian academic publishing house bankrupted), *Чешко-български речник в два тома* (“Czech-Bulgarian Dictionary in Two Volumes”) was finally published thanks to the combined forces of the publishing house “Trud” and “Prozorets” in 2002 (I. A–O, II. P–Ž). This medium-sized dictionary finally contains about 61,500 entries, although a total of 65–70,000 words were stated in the 1990 preface by S. Ivanchev. A slightly smaller first volume was published in early 2002, and the second volume appeared on the shelves of the bookstore at the end of that year. The editors of the dictionary were led by Svetomir IVANCHEV until his death, and Yanko BACHVAROV took over the work after him. Other members of the editorial team Ludmila KROUŽILOVÁ, Margarita KARAANGOVA, Margarita MLADENOVA, Milada MINCHEVA, Violeta MITSEVA, Violeta MILEVA, Yordanka TRIFONOVA, Stiliyan STOYCHEV and Lyudmil YANEV. This high-ranking two volume dictionary designed primarily for professional users got its pocket “companion” in 2009 – the author of *Bulharsko-český, česko-bulharský slovník* (“Bulgarian-Czech, Czech-Bulgarian Dictionary”) was Kryštof UCHYTIL. The dictionary corresponds by design and scope to an analogous Croatian dictionary from V. and T. Uchytíl. The first decade of the new century closes *Кратък чешко-български речник на не книжовната лексика = Malý česko-bulharský slovník nespisovné slovní zásoby* (“Short Czech-Bulgarian Dictionary of Substandard Vocabulary”, 2011). Yanko BACHVAROV has contributed to this remarkable lexicographic work. During many years of preparation of this remarkable dictionary, he was helped mainly by Sofia students of Czech studies of various generations (the author honestly revealed the persons forming the anonymous title “collective” on pages xxii and xxiii). The dictionary was published in edition of the Bulgarian Bohemia Club Голяма чешка библиотека (Great Czech Library) and it contains 4,000 entries representing substandard vocabulary of Czech language. Other Bulgarian dictionaries appeared in the middle of the second decade of the new century. The second pocket dictionary created after 1990 is *Bulharština – slovníček nejen pro začátečníky* (“Bulgarian – A Dictionary Not Only for Beginners”, 2016), which is part of a series of practical language handbooks of the Brno publishing house Lingea. It has Cz.-Bulg. and Bulg.-Cz. part and it contains around 30,000 entries.

The common feature of other recently published dictionary guides is their author, Elena KREJČOVÁ, and the fact that they are exclusively

specialized dictionaries. In the area of law, resp. laws, economics and socio-political sciences *Česko-bulharský právník slovník* (“Czech-Bulgarian Law Dictionary”, 2014) and *Česko-bulharský specializovaný slovník právnícké, ekonomické a společensko-politické terminologie* (“Czech-Bulgarian Specialized Dictionary of Law, Economics and Socio-Political Terminology”, 2016) are focused. For university students, theme-based dictionaries are primarily intended: *Česko-bulharský a bulharsko-český tematický slovník* (“Czech-Bulgarian and Bulgarian-Czech Theme-Based Dictionary”, 2014) and a rare four-language dictionary *Кратък тематичен речник на българския, чешкия, полския и украинския език* (“Short Theme-Based Dictionary of Bulgarian, Czech, Polish and Ukrainian”, 2016), where Nadezhda STALYANOVA and Olga SOROKA worked together with the above mentioned author. All these specialized dictionaries contain mainly basic vocabulary. The last specialized dictionary so far, prepared by the already mentioned Elena KREJČOVÁ and Nadezhda STALYANOVA, is the trilingual *Речник на лингвистичните термини за студенти слависти А–Н (български език – чешки език – полски език)* (“Dictionary of Linguistic Terms for Slavonic Students A–N [Bulgarian – Czech – Polish]”, 2019). In terms of focusing on linguistic terminology, in this observed production it is a unique multilingual dictionary and it is apparent, that soon there will be a second part published. Both of the dictionaries mentioned above were published in Bulgaria.

Thus, nine dictionaries – five in Czechia (three of which were specialized) and four in Bulgaria (one of which was a four-language specialized, the second one was a three-language terminological and the last one of substandard vocabulary) – were published in the observed period.

#### IV.6

##### *Czech-Bulgarian-Serbian-Croatian Dictionary*

We have placed *Tematický slovník češtiny, bulharštiny, srbštiny a chorvatštiny* (“Theme-Based Dictionary of Czech, Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian”, 2019) from the already mentioned group of specialized dictionaries, the soul of which is Elena KREJČOVÁ, into a separate category. The co-writers are Ana PETROV and Mirna STEHLÍKOVÁ ĐURASEK. This dictionary completes both previous theme-based dictionaries and is the only one, which includes more than one South Slavonic language alongside Czech. It was published in Czechia.

## V. Conclusion

In the period from **1900 to 1945**, **17** Czech–South Slavonic dictionaries were published; most numerous are dictionaries of the Serbo–Croatian language (10), while the ratio of Czechia : South Slavonic countries in terms of the place of publication was always in favour of Czech (Serbo–Croatian/Croatian/“Yugoslavian” 9:1, Slovenian 2:1, Bulgarian 4:0). The overall ratio was **15:2**.

In the period from **1946 to 1990**, **18** Czech–South Slavonic dictionaries were published; the most numerous were Bulgarian dictionaries (9) of which 5 were specialized, while the ratio of Czechia : South Slavonic countries in terms of place of publication were on the side of Czechia compared to Serbo–Croatian and Bulgarian (Serbo–Croatian 4:2 [without specialized 3:2], Bulgarian 8:1 [without specialized 3:1]), only when it comes to Slovenian (0:3) the ratio was against Czechia. The overall ratio was **12:6**.

In the period from **1991 to 2019**, **38** Czech–South Slavonic dictionaries were published, most of them – almost half – were dictionaries of Croatian language (16), while the ratio of Czechia : South Slavonic countries in terms of the place of publication was in favour of Czechia in case of Croatian (10:6), Bulgarian (5:4, without specialized 2:1) and Bulgarian+Serbian+Croatian (1:0). In case of Serbian (2:2), Slovenian (2:2) and Macedonian (2:2) the ratio is even. The overall ratio was **21:17**.

Thus, it is clear from the above data that most dictionaries are related to Serbo–Croatian, resp. Serbian and Croatian (SCr. 15, Cro. 17, Serb. 4 – in total 36 – in terms of periods: 10–6–20), with Bulgarian it is 22 (in terms of periods: 4–9–9), with Slovenian 10 (in terms of periods: 3–3–4), with Macedonian 4 (in terms of periods: 0–0–4) and with Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian altogether 1 (in terms of periods: 0–0–1). Approximately in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Czech–South Slavonic lexicographic production was almost exclusively connected to Czech publishers. While the communist regimes in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria dominated, the original South Slavonic production tripled in comparison with the previous period, but still twice as many dictionaries were published on the Czech side. This superiority has decreased in the post–communist era and it is worth noting that the number of Czech–South Slavonic dictionaries created in the South

Slavonic countries has multiplied more than twice compared to the previous period.

The positive thing is that every South Slavonic language (with the exception of the linguistic and historically somewhat controversial Bosnian and Montenegrin language) got a dictionary with at least 40,000 entries after the fall of communist regimes: in terms of the extent of individual *Czech-South Slavonic* lexicons, Serbian is in the best condition (two volume Czech-Serbian Dictionary from Serbia, 2001, and Czech-Serbian Dictionary from Czechia, 2013), followed by Bulgarian (two volume Czech-Bulgarian Dictionary from Bulgaria, 2002) and Slovenian (the first, much larger part of the Czech-Slovenian, Slovenian-Czech Dictionary from Slovenia, 1995). In terms of the extent of the individual *South Slavonic-Czech* lexicons, the criterion meets Croatian (Croatian-Czech Dictionary from Croatia, 1999) and Macedonian (two Macedonian-Czech Dictionaries – the first from North Macedonia, 1998, the second from Czechia, 1999). Two of these seven relevant dictionaries were created in Czechia – the rest is shared by Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, Bulgaria and North Macedonia. The challenge for lexicographers in this respect is a contemporary Bulgarian-Czech dictionary, a contemporary Serbian-Czech dictionary, a contemporary and more extensive Czech-Croatian dictionary, some significantly larger and contemporary Slovenian-Czech dictionary and a more extensive Czech-Macedonian dictionary. Extraordinary, not only in the Slavonic world, is Czech-Bulgarian translation dictionary of substandard vocabulary (2011).

## VI. Bibliographic Information on Dictionaries Spoken in the Text (Chronologically Ordered)

### VI.1

#### *Dictionaries of Slovenian*

ZAVADIL, Antonín: *Česko-slovinský slovník*. Praha: Nakladatelství Jan Otto, 1908.

FRÝDECKÝ, František: *Slovníček slovinsko-český a česko-slovinský*. Praha: Nakladatelství Bačkovský – Slovanské knihkupectví, 1917.

- BRADAC, Fran: *Češko-slovenski slovar*. Ljubljana: Jugoslovanska knjigarna, 1929.
- BRADAC, Fran: *Češko-slovenski slovar*. Ljubljana: DZS, 1967.
- ŠKERLJ, Ružena: *Slovensko-češki slovar*. Ljubljana: DZS, 1976.
- ŠKERLJ, Ružena: *Češko-slovenski slovar*. Ljubljana: DZS, 1981.
- ŠKERLJ, Ružena: *Češko-slovenski slovar, slovensko-češki slovar*. Ljubljana: DZS, 1995.
- ŠAMONILOVÁ, Alena: *Slovinško-český, česko-slovinšský slovník s mluvnicí a nejpoužívanějšími konverzačními frázemi*. Ostrava: Montanex, 2002<sup>1</sup>, 2007<sup>2</sup>.
- JARNOVIČ, Urška – MALTARIĆ, Bojana: *Češko-slovenski in slovensko-češki evropski slovar*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 2006.
- Various authors of LINGEA Publishing: *Slovinština – slovníček nejen pro začátečníky*. Brno: Lingea, 2018.

## VI.2

### *Dictionaries of Croatian*

- MERHAUT, Jaroslav: *Veliki češko-hrvatski rječnik za praktičnu i školsku uporabu*. Zagreb: Vlastita naklada, 1939? 1940? 1941?
- DOROVSKÝ, Ivan – BARTOŠOVÁ, Věra: *Česko-charvátský slovník*. Praha: Nadace Češi Čechům + L Print, 1996.
- MERHAUT, Jaroslav: *Česko-chorvátský slovník (Veliki češko-hrvatski rječnik)*. Zagreb: Naklada Nediljko Dominović, 1998.
- KRTALIČ, Slavko: *Chorvatsko-český, česko-chorvátský slovník s nejpoužívanějšími konverzačními frázemi*. Ostrava: Montanex, 1998.
- JENÍKOVÁ, Anna – IVANKOVIĆ, Katica: *Česko-chorvátský a chorvatsko-český slovník na cesty*. Jinočany: H&H, 1999.
- PROFETA, Dušanka – NOVOSAD, Alen: *Hrvatsko-češki rječnik*. Zagreb: Informator, 1999.
- NOSIĆ, Milan: *Češko-hrvatski rječnik*. Rijeka: Hrvatsko filološko društvo, 2000.
- KUCHAR, Renata – KOS, Suzana: *Univerzalni rječnik češko-hrvatski, hrvatsko-češki*. Zagreb: Mozaik knjiga, 2003.
- LISÁ, Ivana: *Česko-chorvátský slovník*. Havlíčkův Brod: Tobiáš, 2002.
- SESAR, Dubravka: *Češko-hrvatski i hrvatsko-češki praktični rječnik*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2002.
- LISÁ, Ivana: *Chorvatsko-český slovník*. Havlíčkův Brod: Tobiáš, 2004.

- SESAR, Dubravka: *Chorvatsko-český a česko-chorvatský slovník*. Ostrava: Montanex, 2004<sup>1</sup>, 2007<sup>2</sup>.
- UCHYTIL, Vladimír – UCHYTIL, Tomáš: *Chorvatsko-český, česko-chorvatský slovník*. Praha: Český klub – nakladatelství Josefa Šimona, 2005<sup>1</sup>, 2007<sup>2</sup>, 2011<sup>3</sup>.
- UCHYTIL, Vladimír: *Chorvatsko-český, česko-chorvatský kapesní slovník nejen pro turisty*. Praha: TZ-one + Edika, 2013.
- UCHYTIL, Vladimír: *Chorvatsko-český, česko-chorvatský kapesní slovník pro každého*. Praha: TZ-one, 2013.
- BAŠIĆ, Ivana – PLEADIN, Anna: *Hrvatsko-češki priručni rječnik*. Split: Slobodna Dalmacija, 2013.
- Various authors of LINGEA Publishing: *Chorvatština – slovníček nejen pro začátečníky*. Brno: Lingea, 2016.

### VI.3

#### *Dictionaries of Serbo-Croatian*

- OCENÁŠEK, Jindřich: *Slovníček srbsko- neboli chorvatsko-český*. Praha: Nakladatelství Jan Otto, 1906.
- KOUT, Rudolf: *Nový kapesní slovník srbochorvatský a průvodce po jazyku srbochorvatském*. Třebíč: Nakladatel Jindřich Lorenz, 1910<sup>1</sup>, 1913<sup>2</sup>, 1925<sup>3</sup>, 1925<sup>4</sup>.
- JELČIĆ, Ante: *Slovník chorvatsko-srbsko-český*. Brno: Nový lid, 1914.
- BAČKOVSKÝ, Rudolf: *Slovníček česko-srbochorvatský a srbo-chorvatsko-český*. Praha: Nakladatelství Bačkovský a Hach, 1916.
- PÁTA, Josef: *Kapesní slovník lužicko-česko-jihoslovanský a česko-lužický*. Praha: Česko-lužický spolek „Adolf Černý“, 1920.
- DAJIČIĆ, Dušan – ŠOBRA, František: *Srbsko-chorvatsko-český slovník*. Praha: Nakladatelství Jan Otto, 1926.
- VELJOVIĆ, Petar Milisav: *Česko-jugoslávský slovník*. Praha: Nakladatelství Jindřich Bačkovský, 1937.
- TOGNER, Vladimír: *Kapesní slovník srbochorvatsko-český a česko-srbochorvatský*. Praha: Nakladatelství Kvasnička a Hampl, 1939.
- TOGNER, Vladimír: *Malý slovníček česko-srbochorvatský*. Praha: Nakladatelství Kvasnička a Hampl, 1940.
- NOHA, Miloš: *Srbochorvatsko-český a česko-srbochorvatský kapesní slovník*. Praha: SPN, 1963<sup>1</sup>, 1965<sup>2</sup>, 1967<sup>3</sup>, 1969<sup>4</sup>, 1984<sup>5</sup>.

- KRŠIĆ, Nikola: *Rečnik češko-srpskohrvatski i srpskohrvatsko-češki (sa primerima konverzacije)*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1966.
- SOBOTKA, Otto: *Slovník chorvatosrbsko-český*. Daruvar: NN Jednota, 1973.
- KŘÍSTEK, Otto: *Technickoekonomický hutnický slovník. Díl 1. Srbocharvátsko-český*. Třinec: Třinecké železářny VŘSR, 1977.
- KŘÍSTEK, Otto: *Technickoekonomický hutnický slovník. Díl 2. Česko-srbocharvátský*. Třinec: Třinecké železářny VŘSR, 1977.
- SEDLÁČEK, Jan et al.: *Srbocharvátsko-český slovník*. Praha: Academia, 1982.
- GLEICHOVÁ, Jarmila – JENÍKOVÁ, Anna: *Česko-srbocharvátský, srbocharvátsko-český slovník na cesty*. Praha: SPN, 1982<sup>1</sup>, 1987<sup>2</sup>.

#### VI.4

##### *Dictionaries of Serbian*

- KAČANIK, Emilija et al.: *Češko-srpski rečnik u dva toma*. Beograd: SANU, 2000 (Tom I. A–O), 2001 (Tom II. P–Ž).
- JENÍKOVÁ, Anna: *Srbsko-český a česko-srbský slovník*. Voznice: LEDA, 2002<sup>1</sup>, 2014<sup>2</sup>.
- KOPRIVICA, Verica: *Češko-srpski, srpsko-češki rečnik*. Beograd: Agencija Matic, 2008<sup>1</sup>, Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike, 2017<sup>2</sup>.
- RADOJKOVIĆ KUBEŠOVÁ, Branka: *Чешко-српски речник = Česko-srbský slovník*. Praha: Srbské sdružení sv. Sáva; Srbské kulturní centrum, 2013.

#### VI.5

##### *Dictionaries of Macedonian*

- DOROVSKÝ, Ivan – STEFANIJA, Dragi: *Česko-makedonský a makedonsko-český slovník*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 1994<sup>1</sup>, 1995<sup>2</sup>, 2002<sup>3</sup>.
- ВЛАДОВА, Јадранка – ПАСТИРЖИК, Давид: *Македонско-чешки речник*. Скопје: Магор, 1998.
- HORA, Karel: *Makedonsko-český slovník s makedonskou gramatikou F. V. Mareše*. Praha: EuroSlavica, 1999.
- РОУС, Донка – ЧЕРМАК, Франтишек – ДЕЛОВА, Јасминка – ВИТОВА, Катержина: *Чешко-македонски речник*. Скопје: Филолошки факултет „Блаже Конески“, 2006.

## VI.6

*Dictionaries of Bulgarian*

- ŠAK, Vladislav: *Българско-чехски речник*. Praha: Nakladatelství Jan Otto, 1914.
- ŠAK, Vladislav: *Česko-bulharský slovník*. Praha – Bratislava: Nakladatelství Jan Otto, 1914<sup>1</sup>, 1926<sup>2</sup>.
- FOLPRECHT, Josef: *Slovníček bulharsko-český*. Praha: Nakladatelství Bačkovský – Slovanské knihkupectví, 1917.
- SÍS, Vladimír – IVANOV, Boris – RUSÍNSKÝ, František: *Nový kapesní slovník jazyka českého a bulharského*. Třebíč: Nakladatelství Jindřich Lorenz, 1922.
- РОМАНСКА [ВРАНСКА], Цветана: *Чешко-български речник*. София: Университетска печатница, 1947<sup>1</sup>, 1949<sup>2</sup>, София: ДИ „Наука и изкуство“, 1961<sup>3</sup>.
- PROŠEK, Bohdan: *Bulharsko-český a česko-bulharský technický slovník*. Praha: SNTL, 1958.
- HORA, Karel et al.: *Bulharsko-český slovník*. Praha: Nakladatelství ČSAV, 1959.
- PROŠEK, Bohdan: *Bulharsko-český a česko-bulharský kapesní slovník*. Praha: SPN, 1964<sup>1</sup>, 1969<sup>2</sup>, 1976<sup>3</sup>, 1983<sup>4</sup>.
- KRÁTOŠKOVÁ, Marie – LEITNEROVÁ, Věra – VASILEVA, Sima: *Rusko-česko-bulharský oděvářský slovník*. Prostějov: Výzkumný ústav oděvní, 1971.
- BUBLOVÁ, Marie – VIDENOV, Michail: *Česko-bulharský, bulharsko-český slovník na cesty*. Praha: SPN, 1978<sup>1</sup>, 1987<sup>2</sup>.
- PANEV, Petr: *Česko-bulharský základní hospodářský slovník pro zahraniční studenty VŠE*. Praha: SPN, 1978.
- PANEV, Petr: *Bulharsko-český základní hospodářský slovník pro zahraniční studenty VŠE*. Praha: SPN, 1982.
- KUTINOVÁ, Blanka et al.: *Bulharsko-český a česko-bulharský technický slovník*. Praha – София: SNTL; ДИ „Техника“, 1988.
- ИВАНЧЕВ, Светомир – БЪЧВАРОВ, Янко et al.: *Чешко-български речник в два тома*. София: Труд; Прозорец, 2002.
- UCHÝTIL, Kryštof: *Bulharsko-český, česko-bulharský slovník*. Praha: Český klub – nakladatelství Josefa Šimona, 2009.
- БЪЧВАРОВ, Янко et al.: *Кратък чешко-български речник на некнижовната лексика*. София: Издателство ЕТО, 2011.

- KREJČOVÁ, Elena: *Česko-bulharský a bulharsko-český tematický slovník*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2014.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena: *Česko-bulharský právníký slovník*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2014.
- KREJČOVÁ, Elena: *Česko-bulharský specializovaný slovník právníké, ekonomické a společensko-politické terminologie*. Brno: Galium, 2016.
- КРЕЙЧОВА, Елена – СТАЛЯНОВА, Надежда – СОРОКА, Олга: *Кратък тематичен речник на българския, чешкия, полския и украинския език*. София: Парадигма, 2016.
- Various authors of LINGEA Publishing: *Bulharština – slovníček nejen pro začátečníky*. Brno: Lingea, 2016.
- СТАЛЯНОВА, Надежда – КРЕЙЧОВА, Елена: *Речник на лингвистичните термини за студенти слависти А–Н (български език – чешки език – полски език)*. София: Парадигма, 2019.

## VI.7

### *Dictionary of Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian*

- KREJČOVÁ, Elena – PETROV, Ana – STEHLÍKOVÁ ĐURASEK, Mirna: *Tematický slovník češtiny, bulharštiny, srbštiny a chorvatštiny*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2019.

## NEW CZECH-BULGARIAN, CZECH-SERBIAN AND CZECH-MACEDONIAN DICTIONARIES IN CONTEXT OF THE CZECH-SOUTH SLAVONIC LEXICOGRAPHY AFTER 1990

(REVIEW & ANALYSIS)

### I. Czech–Bulgarian and Czech–Serbian Dictionary

After 1990, and the collapse of the communist regimes in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, and after the dramatic break-up of the Yugoslav federation, a different language situation than in previous years was formed in the South Slavonic environment. The number of official languages increased, the problematically maintained Serbo–Croatian was initially divided into Croatian (*hrvatski jezik*) and Serbian (*српски језик*). Shortly after, however, Bosniaks (formerly Muslims) from Bosnia and Herzegovina declared their Serbo–Croatian as Bosnian language (*bosanski jezik*) and recently Montenegrins used favourable political conditions and renamed their Serbian to Montenegrin (*црногорски језик*) and declared it as official language in Montenegro. Apart from these languages, Slovenian (*slovenski jezik*) in Slovenia, Macedonian (*македонски јазик*) in North Macedonia and Bulgarian (*български език*) in Bulgaria are also official languages in the South Slavonic area.

The post-communist period brought two very distinctive works in the field of Czech–South Slavonic lexicography, which have much in common. One of them is *Česko–srbský slovník ve dvou svazcích* (“Czech–Serbian Dictionary in Two Volumes”, 2001) and the second one is *Česko–*

*bulharský slovník ve dvou svazcích* (“Czech–Bulgarian Dictionary in Two Volumes”, 2002). The fact that two two-volume Czech–South Slavonic dictionaries were published at the same time, calls for a quick comparison of both works.

### I.1

#### *What Do Both Dictionaries Have in Common?*

Both were published in two volumes, with the first volumes containing entries beginning with letters A to O, the second volumes with entries from P to Ž. The two institutions worked on the dictionaries for several decades – on the Bulgarian de facto three (if we also consider the repairs that were carried out in the 1990s and the beginning of the new century), and in Serbia even a little longer. As the basis of both dictionaries was taken from academic *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost* (“Dictionary of Standard Czech for Schools and Public”, 1978), which release was welcomed with relief, as it was not possible to build a Czech part on such a Czech dictionary that would meet the requirements for scope and up-to-dateness. There is also a shadow of death hanging over both dictionaries – the chief editor of the Bulgarian dictionary prof. Svetomir Ivanchev died suddenly in February 1991 (Yanko Bachvarov took over the work after him), but prof. Radovan Lalić, who led the Serbian dictionary work in the mid-1970s died also. Both dictionaries – despite being completed in the early 1990s – were published a full decade later.

### I.2

#### *What Makes the Dictionaries Different?*

Above all, the place of origin. The Bulgarian dictionary was created in the university environment in the Bohemistic section of the Faculty of Slavonic Philology of Sofia University of St. Clement of Ohrid. The Serbian one, on the other hand, was created in the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, where a special Department for the Processing of the Czech–Serbian and Polish–Serbian Dictionary was created. Dictionaries also differ in scope: Serbian dictionary lists about 78,000 entries, Bulgarian less than 62,000 entries. Unlike Bulgarian, the Serbian dictionary includes

much more archaic or dialectal units, but as far as terms that have entered (or settled in) the Czech vocabulary during the last few years, the approach of Bulgarian authors is much more thorough. For example, if we look at compounds the first part of which is *video-*, then the Bulgarian vocabulary lists nearly 90 examples (*videoseznamka*, *videorekordér*, *videorubrika*, etc. – Č-B-2: 855–856), while not even one is mentioned in the Serbian dictionary – after the entry *vídeňský* the entry *vidět* follows (Č-S-2: 983). Those interested in the economy might want to look at the names of companies (*společnost*). In Bulgarian, *akciová* (joint stock company), *komanditní* (limited partnership), *s ručením omezeným* (limited liability company) etc. (Č-B-2: 575) can be found. In Serbian, only *akciová* (joint stock company) from the above mentioned can be found, but the *kapitalistická* (capitalist), *socialistická* (socialist) and *třídní společnost* (class society) (Č-S-2: 640) is presented in the list.

In Serbian dictionary, the entries with toponymical character and the names of various social organizations, which are supposed to illustrate the expressions they contain, stayed virtually untouched by the changes after 1990. The best way to prove this is the name of our state: at a time when the Czech state is for the first time in modern history an independent international body, i.e. after almost ten years of existence of independent Czechia (at the time of publication of the dictionary), the authors of Czech-Serbian Dictionary say that the expression *Česko* is “archaic” (sic! – Č-S-1: 160), while the name *Československo*, the name of a non-existent state, is not specified in any more detail in this dictionary (ibid.). This incomprehensible negligence (this is the name of the state where Czech – one of the languages of the dictionary – is official and national language!) should not occur in a similarly representative dictionary. Many other entries show similar deficiencies, but fortunately nothing similar happened to the Bulgarian dictionary. Its entries are updated, or the old period is otherwise notified.

### I.3

#### *In What Way Does the Czech-Bulgarian Dictionary Exceed its Serbian “Cousin”?*

1. Greater precision in the processing of individual entries (marking the accent in the Bulgarian part, marking the endings in the Czech

part, scientific names of plants and animals, consistent graphic differentiation of the Czech text [bold] from Bulgarian [normal], which makes orientation much easier);

2. A rich list of abbreviations and geographical names and demonyms;
3. Particularly valuable is that its creators in the 1990s decided to do complex updating work so that the dictionary really reflected the time when it was published. Because of this courage, in our opinion, the writing "Guide for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century" on the cover of both volumes is entirely in place. It is a pity that the creators of the Czech-Serbian Dictionary have not taken similar step. The result is that from the turn of the millennium here in Serbia, we have a dictionary for the new century, but in certain, albeit perhaps not crucial, scale stays deep in the previous century, and thus it is obsolete.

#### I.4

#### *In what Does the Czech-Bulgarian Dictionary Lose to its Serbian Counterpart?*

The advantage of the Serbian vocabulary is above all the rich representation of low-frequency, unusual, archaic, slang or dialectic expressions, as well as the inclusion of personal names (including hypocoristic), which may be helpful when transcribing Latin or Greek ancient authors or works.

The publication of both the Czech-Bulgarian Dictionary and Czech-Serbian Dictionary is in every way the most significant event of the South Slavonic-Czech lexicography of the new millennium. This is also proved by the title "Dictionary of the Year 2002", which received the Czech-Bulgarian Dictionary in Two Volumes from the Czech Union of Interpreters and Translators in April 2003.

## II.

### **Czech-Macedonian Dictionary**

The absence of Czech-Macedonian dictionaries began to receive greater attention only after the declaration of independence of the Republic of Macedonia, especially on the Czech side. Until then, there was no Czech-Macedonian dictionary in Czechoslovakian or Yugoslavian

bookstores. The authors tried to change this situation and created *Česko-makedonský a makedonsko-český slovník* (“Czech-Macedonian and Macedonian-Czech Dictionary”) which has a large format but the content is only elementary and it was published by Masaryk University in Brno for the first time in 1994 and then in 1995 and 2002. It was written by Ivan Dorovský and Dragi Stefanija. The dictionary contains around 8,000 entries in Czech-Macedonian part, resp. 4,000 entries in Macedonian-Czech part. Only at the end of the century (1999) finally appeared *Makedonsko-český slovník* (“Macedonian-Czech Dictionary”), prepared by Karel Hora for many years. This small dictionary contains around 40,000 entries and Macedonian grammar by František Václav Mareš is included. It was finished in the early 1990s, but because it had to wait a long time for its publication for financial reasons, it was eventually overtaken by another *Makedonsko-český slovník* (“Macedonian-Czech Dictionary”) – the first one that was published in North Macedonia and which is approximately the same size as the Hora’s dictionary. It was written by Jadranka Vladova and David M. Pastyřík. *Česko-makedonský slovník* (“Czech-Macedonian Dictionary”), co-written by Donka Rous and František Čermák, together with Jasminka Delova and Kateřina Vítová, was published in 2006 – again in North Macedonia – a long-awaited counterpart of the previous two Macedonian-Czech dictionaries. Although its format is larger than both Macedonian-Czech dictionaries, it contains only about 17,000 entries. Four Czech-Macedonian dictionaries justify the perception of Macedonian as more than an equivalent to other South Slavonic languages – in terms of the number of handbooks published, it is right after the commercially and socially undoubtedly the most successful Croatian (fifteen dictionary books), alongside Serbian (also four, but more extensive) and Slovenian (also four) and before Bulgarian (three – counted without six specialized). However, this position is – in terms of objectivity – also given by the fact that all other South Slavonic languages could, after 1990, build on the more or less rich lexicographic production from the earlier period, while the Macedonian experts did not have this possibility. This shortage therefore logically stimulated relatively abundant production at a time when North Macedonia became an independent state, Macedonian studies became an independent

university field of study, and the absence of a similar handbook became increasingly urgent on both the Czech and Macedonian Slavistics' side.<sup>8</sup>

## II.1

### *How Is the First Unidirectional Czech–Macedonian Dictionary Actually?*

The need for such a dictionary has existed in Czechia and North Macedonia for a long time, despite the fact that in the meantime there were three other dictionaries of Czech and Macedonian available; two were only Macedonian–Czech and Czech–Macedonian part in bidirectional dictionary by Dorovský and Stefanija – although more extensive than the Macedonian–Czech part – by far, it could not satisfy the higher demands of both students in the respective fields in Brno, Prague or Skopje, as well as the experts Slavists and Balkanists. Even when reading the introductory part of the dictionary and bibliographic list, the number of misspellings and grammatical mistakes is unpleasant and disturbing for a work of a similar nature and it should be corrected and proofread.<sup>9</sup> Fortunately, this is not repeated in the dictionary section itself (judging by the entries we were able to check).

## III.

### **Selected Czech–South Slavonic Dictionaries – Contrastive Analysis**

In order to get a better idea of whether the dictionaries described above function as modern bilingual dictionaries for the new millennium, we made

8 See also Krejčí (2005a).

9 A hybrid record of the name of the author Jasminka Delova (Czech front page, imprint), Macedonian record of the name Kateřina Vítová as “Катержина” also “Катерина” (Macedonian front page, imprint), content refers to the chapter *Содржински и стилски кратенки* (Content and style shortcuts), while in the preface it is referred to as the list of “Стручни и стилски кратенки” (p. IX), the surname of the two authors are multiple times written not with a dash, but with hyphen (“Čermák-Křen”, p. VII and XI, two authors in the List of literature and sources), on the other hand, compound components in dictionary names are often spelled incorrectly with a hyphen, and also inconsistently (again see chapter List of literature and sources) and we are also encountered with a meaningless writing of a dash separated by a space only from the right side... In chapter List of literature and sources (p. XV and XVI), there are generally many mistakes, such as misspelling, inaccurate diacritics, inconsistency in bibliographic entry, inaccurate dating in the two-part Czech–Serbian dictionary, and even the full name is missing at the entry about *Bulgarian–Czech dictionary*. It is also not entirely clear why the list does not include the latest and high-quality two volume *Czech–Bulgarian Dictionary*, while the *Czech–Bulgarian Dictionary* by Romanska (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 1961) was cited as a source of information.

a small comparison of eight selected Czech–South Slavonic dictionaries published after 1991 on 38 selected Czech words representing standard vocabulary, as well as dialectal, colloquial or slang, in addition to the common traditional names, we have chosen technical terms or expressions indicating a quite new reality. The two volume Czech–Bulgarian (further Cz–B), the two volume Czech–Serbian (further Cz–S) and Czech–Macedonian (Cz–M) was a part of a comparative analysis with three small dictionaries (Czech–Croatian by M. Nosić, further Cz–Cro, Czech–Croatian by D. Sesar, further Cz–Cr and Czech–Serbian by A. Jeníková, further Cz–Srb) one dictionary with twice the range of Cz–M (Czech–Slovenian Dictionary by R. Škerlj, further Cz–Sl) and one with medium range dictionary (one-volume Czech–Serbian Dictionary by B. Radojković Kubešová, further Cz–Sr).

We have mainly focused on:

1. whether the selected Czech term appears in the dictionary;
2. if it occurs, whether the dictionary offers translation equivalents of all or at least the most important meanings (if it is a polysemic unit);
3. whether the South Slavonic equivalent corresponded semantically.

Before we proceed to the results of the comparison, we would like to point out that our analysis is not absolutely objective evaluation of the dictionaries analysed. To do this, a much wider selection of words from all word categories would have to be made. Nevertheless, our results may be indicative or suggestive. 38 selected Czech words were chosen to cover the widest possible range of expressions (some entries were deliberately chosen because they clearly carry the potential of semantic ambiguity), but this sample cannot be perceived as representative.

### III.1

The worst result showed the *Czech–Croatian Dictionary* of M. Nosić (Cz–Cro, 19 missing entries, i.e. 50 %). The dictionary does not include a number of colloquial or slang expressions such as *burčák*, *furt*, *kecat*, *pařit*, *pasák*, *tunelovat* etc., in order to reduce fauna-related terms, the dictionary is limited primarily to representative species or widespread terms (*datel*, *havran* or *vrána* appeared, but *strakapoud*, *žluna* or *krkavec*

are missing). It does not offer technical terms *databáze*, *přehrávač*, *raketoplán* nor *rychlouvlak*, on the other hand, it gives Croatian equivalents of *okres*, *oblast* or *shromáždění* quite thoroughly and with an emphasis on synonyms. The entry *Česko* with the relevant equivalent is not mentioned in the dictionary either, but it traditionally offers a pair of *Čechy* – *Češka* who are inaccurate at the time of their publication. *Bosňák* and *Bosňan* are in Cz–Cro separate entries, but this positive is disturbed by the fact that in both cases they have the same Croatian equivalents (*Bošnjak*, *Bosanac*), which is after 1995 already inaccurate and misleading.

### III.2

Two small dictionaries achieved practically the same result. *Czech–Serbian Dictionary* by A. Jeníková (Cz–Srb, 17 missing entries, i.e. 45 %) and *Czech–Croatian Dictionary* by D. Sesar (Cz–Cr, 16 missing entries, i.e. 42 %). However, both dictionaries do not show the absence of the same entries – they are very often “complementary”: entry *parlament* can be found only in Cz–Srb, whereas *mistrovství* can be found only in Cz–Cr; dialectal *dědina* or colloquial *furt* offers only Cz–Cr, whereas *pasák* and *kapsář* can be found only in Cz–Srb etc. Polysemic units, according to our findings, are much more elaborated in Cz–Srb, while Cz–Cr closely follows new current naming (we find here, among other things, the name of our country *Česko* with the equivalent of *Češka*, which A. Jeníková in Cz–Srb completely illogically neglected). From the inaccuracies in Cz–Cr, let us just mention the ethnonym *Bošnjak*, which only appears as a synonym for *Bosanac* at the entry *Bosňan* (which no longer corresponds to the current situation – see further in Chapter 9), while the nowadays common Czech equivalent of national, not regional name *Bosňák* is unfortunately missing as a dictionary entry and it was not possible to assign the word *Bošnjak* to the Czech *Bosňák* in accordance with its current new meaning.

### III.3

*Czech–Macedonian Dictionary* by D. Rous et al. (Cz–M) and *Czech–Serbian Dictionary* by B. Radojković Kubešová (Cz–Sr) turned out a little better with 11 entries missing (i.e. 29 %). Absence of dialectal expressions *burčák*

(only in Cz-M) or *zemák* is not that serious, but the lack of technical terms such as *raketoplán* and *přehrávač* and demonyms *Bosňák* and *Bosňan* is a major deficiency. The remaining five expressions from our selection, which are not listed in either dictionary, are nouns *krkavec*, *strakapoud* (both are missing only in Cz-M), *okruh* (in the administrative meaning), *pasák* (both are missing only in Cz-Sr), *rychlowlak*, *tunelář* and the verb *tunelovat*. In Cz-M is good that two existing Macedonian toponyms *Чешка* and *Чехуја* were used to differ *Česko* and *Čechy* (see p. 20, resp. 19), the question, however, is how much this distinction is maintained in Macedonian language in practice. In Cz-Sr, the name of the state where one of the languages of the relevant dictionary is spoken does not occur, unless we decipher the somewhat chaotic entry *Češka* “Czech woman” with explanation “*dijal. gov. Češka*” (p. 75) as a mistake in the sense that instead of the entry *Češka*, the author probably wanted to write *Česko* – but even then the stylistic would be somewhat striking. *Česko* is neither a dialect nor a colloquial expression, but the official geographical name of our country.<sup>10</sup> The author’s confusion about the geography of Czechia is topped by a statement that *Čechy* “Bohemia” is apart from today inaccurate expression *Чешка* also “*Чешке земље*” (i.e. the Czech lands – p. 72). This syntagma of course includes all three Czech lands (Bohemia, Moravia and Czech Silesia), not only Bohemia, otherwise its plural form would be unfounded – its occurrence in the Serbian language is quite questionable.

#### III.4

The *Czech-Slovenian Dictionary* by R. Škerlj achieved a very similar result with 9 missing words (i.e. 24 %). The animal names *havran* is missing from the dictionary. The entries *databáze* and other technical terms like *přehrávač*, *raketoplán*, *rychlowlak* or journalist terms *tunelář* and *tunelovat* are also absent but that can be understood with respect to the year of publication. Demonyms *Bosňák* or *Bosňan* do not appear in the Czech-Slovenian list, however, in an analogous Slovenian-Czech list, *Bosánec* is

10 In addition, the entry *Češka* appears twice in Cz-Sr – in the analysed case, in the correct place in the dictionary, but with the right side that does not correspond, in the second case with the correct right side (*Чехиња*), but in the alphabetically wrong place (between the entries *Čechy* a *čejka* – see p. 72).

translated only as *Bosňák* (p. 1119 – today an inaccurate translation) and surprisingly, the variant of *Bosňan* is not mentioned in the dictionary at all. Similarly, the dictionary only offers an entry *Čechy* (with a traditional but inaccurate translation from the contemporary point of view *Češka* – p. 672), but the name of a Czech state, *Česko*, is missing. The problem with this dictionary is mainly in the absence of an exact semantic definition of word's equivalents, which in our selection is manifested mainly in terms of law-administrative character *oblast*, *okruh*, *rozklad*, especially when a Czech user can be lost in several offered alternatives.

### III.5

The best result was achieved by the both two-part dictionaries – *Czech-Serbian* and *Czech-Bulgarian*: in both cases only 4 entries were missing (i.e. 10.5 %). In Cz-B entries *burčák*, *rychlovlak*, *Bosňák* and *okruh* (in administrative meaning) are absent, whereas in Cz-S words *databáze*, *přehrávač*, *tunelář* and *tunelovat* are missing. The outcome of both two volume dictionaries is to some extent expected, as the user rightly expect a wide range of vocabulary from similar language handbooks. Missing words in Cz-S are symptomatic for this dictionary – these are either technical terms or words whose semantics have expanded based on phenomena that occurred in society only after 1990. As far as technical terms are concerned, they are problematic in Cz-S. The words are recorded in the dictionary, but their Serbian equivalent is not accurate or is inadequate: e.g. entry *rychlovlak* meaning special high-speed trains known mainly from France, Germany, Japan or China, Cz-S translates as *брзи воз (заст.)* – an outdated term for a fast train (2. vol., p. 491). Similarly, the term *raketoplán* is translated as *ракетни авион* or *ракетна летилица* (2. vol., p. 394), which retrospectively can be translated as a jet plane. Entries that also indicate insufficient updating of the dictionary are *Bosňan* and *Bosňák*, when the first expression just refers to the second, and then we find all possible existing Serbian forms (*Босанац*, *Бошњак*, *Бошњанин* – 1. vol., p. 92), but which can only be understood as synonyms in a very superficial interpretation (*Босанац* is now used as a name of regional identity or citizenship, *Бошњак* indicates national identity and *Бошњанин* is synonym to the first but is already seen as obsolete). In

contrast, the obsolescence note is incorrectly present with the entry *Česko* (1. vol., p. 160) – this noun has never been more relevant during its more than three-hundred-year-old existence than it was just after 1993, i.e. after the dissolution of the Czechoslovak federation. At that time, the Czech state, *Česko* (Czechia), appeared for the first time in modern history on the map of Europe as an independent unit... There are also some problems with technical terms in Cz-B – it is visible for example with the word *přehrávač* (1. meaning) or *raketoplán* (the Bulgarian equivalent *савалка* is missing). It is also worth noting that Cz-B was the only one to mention at the word *pařit* its second slang meaning “play passionately computer games” (2. vol., p. 19), however, it does not mention the older slang meaning of “having fun and consuming alcoholic beverages at the same time”, which, on the other hand, is mentioned by the other dictionaries. In its separate geographic part next to toponym *Čechy* we will also come across the name *Bohémie* (2. vol., p. 1412), which, however, in our opinion, is completely unnecessary, even though it bears a note *устор.* (“histor.”). On the contrary his Bulgarian equivalent *Бохемия*, which Cz-B lists, should be present at the entry *Čechy*.

## IV. Conclusion

A problem affecting all the languages and dictionaries under observation, which would certainly be enough for a separate study, is the question of translating words indicating a geographically or administratively defined space, territory: *obec, okres, okruh, oblast, kraj*. One of the meanings of the word *obec*, very significant and important one, i.e. the summary designation for towns and villages (cf. SSČ 2000: 227), is considered only by Cz-M and Cz-B.<sup>11</sup> Other dictionaries are satisfied with the translation *општина/опćина/obćina*, which is not entirely accurate (more about it see Krejćić 2007a: 15). The Croatian term *županija* can only be found at the entry *okres* (according to us incorrectly), whereas at entries *okruh, oblast* or *kraj* which correspond better to its meaning, it are not mentioned. As

---

11 For information about the pages where the word is in the dictionary, see Subchapter VI. “Annex 2”.

the only one Cz–Srb and Cz–Cro translate the Czech *okres* with the term *округ/okrug* (according to us not very precisely) and Cz–Sr and Cz–M are the only one that translate it like Czech *kraj*, while Cz–Cr and CZ–M use *округ/okrug* correctly as an equivalent of the Czech *okruh*. The paradox occurs if we realize that only Serbia and the Serbian part of Bosnia and Herzegovina have *округ* as administrative unit from the South Slavonic countries, and therefore we would naturally expect equivalence of the *okruh* = *округ* in Czech–Serbian dictionaries (although Cz–Sr contains the equivalent of *округ*, but it is clear from the examples given in the second half of the entry that it is in the basic meaning, not administrative one). The word *pokrajina* as an equivalent (one of three) to Czech *oblast* is mentioned in Cz–Cr (there is also *pokrajina* as an equivalent for the Czech *kraj*) and as one out of six also Cz–Cro, whereas in Cz–Sr is this word only at the entry *kraj*; and at the entry *oblast* it is not mentioned in Cz–Sr or Cz–S, although in Serbia before the independence of Kosovo (2008) there were two autonomous regions, which were referred to in Serbian as *аутономна покрајина* (in Cz–S the aforementioned phrase translated into Serbian as *аутономна област*, it does not take into account the Serbian administrative structure). As the most problematic words, i.e. those with either a rare occurrence or often repeated inaccurate interpreting, together with just analysed terms *obec*, *okres*, *okruh*, *oblast* and *kraj* we would highlight colloquial *burčák*, dial. *zemák*, techn. *rychlovlak*, *raketoplán* and *přehrávač*, econ. colloquial *tunelovat* and *tunelář*, choronym *Česko*, ethnonym/demonym *Bosňák* and *Bosňan*, and animal names *krkavec* and *havran*.<sup>12</sup> It is therefore almost half of the monitored words. On the other hand, for example, the slang meaning of the verb *pařit* and the noun *pasák* or the law meaning of the noun *rozklad* can be satisfactory.

12 For entry *havran* “rook” dictionaries commonly give an etymologically related equivalent *завран/гавран* (Mac., Serb., Cro.), resp. *завран* (Bulg.), but only Cz–S and similarly Cz–Sr take into account the fact that: rook (*Corvus frugilegus*) is called otherwise in aforementioned languages – in Serb. and Cro. *зачац/гаџас*, in Bulg. *полска врана*. In Mac. is a distinguishing element of a generic classification – *полски гавран* “rook”. *Gavran/завран*, resp. *завран* without an adjective each time denotes to a raven (*Corvus corax*).

## V.

**Annex 1 – Czech–Serbian, Czech–Bulgarian, Czech–Macedonian, Czech–Croatian and Czech–Slovenian Dictionaries Included in the Comparison (Chronologically)**

1995 – ŠKERLJ, Ružena: *Češko-slovenski slovar, slovensko-češki slovar*. Ljubljana.

2000 – NOSIĆ, Milan: *Češko-hrvatski rječnik*. Rijeka.

2001 – KAČANIK, Emilija et al.: *Češko-srpski rečnik u dva toma*. Beograd.

2002 – ИВАНЧЕВ, Светомир – БЪЧВАРОВ, Янко et al.: *Чешко-български речник в два тома*. София.

2002 – JENÍKOVÁ, Anna: *Srbsko-český a česko-srbský slovník*. Voznice (1. ed.).

2002 – SESAR, Dubravka: *Češko-hrvatski i hrvatsko-češki praktični rječnik*. Zagreb.

2006 – РОУС, Донка – ЧЕРМАК, Франтишек – ДЕЛОВА, Јасминка – ВИТОВА, Катержина: *Чешко-македонски речник*. Скопје.

2013 – RADOJKOVIĆ KUBEŠOVÁ, Branka: *Чешко-српски речник / Česko-srbský slovník*. Praha.

## VI.

**Annex 2 – Selected Czech Lexical Units and their Slovenian, Croatian, Serbian, Macedonian and Bulgarian Translation Equivalents<sup>13</sup>**

## VI.1

**BOSŇÁK // BOSŇAN** (*ethnonym/demonym*)

**Cz-Sl:** Bosánek (p. 1119) // --

**Cz-Cro:** Bošnjak, Bosanac (p. 24) // Bošnjak, Bosanac (p. 24)

13 **Explanatory notes to Annex 2:** the selected Czech words are listed alphabetically, and they also include a stylistic or thematic characteristic. The next line lists the South Slavonic equivalents cited from the respective dictionaries in a geographical order: Slovenian, Croatian (Nosić, Sesar), Serbian (Jeniková, Radojković Kubešová, Kačanik), Macedonian, Bulgarian. Useless text (meanings that were not important to us, many examples, etc.) is omitted, the omission is indicated by “/...”. For each entry, there is a page, for two volume dictionaries, the number before the page is the volume. If the entry does not appear in the dictionary, this fact is indicated by “-”. The absence of occurrence is sometimes accompanied by a quotation placed in square brackets – this is when, for some reason, it makes sense to include the omitted location or part of it, or a semantically close entry. We considered words that are closely related to each other to be listed next to each other rather than as separate entry. In this case, however, they are separated by two forward slashes “//”. In total, we consider them as separate entries. In order to unify the script, we chose Latin for Serbian, Macedonian and Bulgarian, in accordance with Czech rules for transliteration of these languages. The accent – if it is mentioned in the dictionary – is denoted by a comma.

**Cz-Cr:** -- // Bosánac, Bóšnjak (p. 11)

**Cz-Srb:** -- // --

**Cz-Sr:** -- // --

**Cz-S:** **Bosňan** – Bosánac, Bóšnjak, Bošnjánin (1/p. 92) // **viz Bosňák** (ibid.)

**Cz-M:** -- // --

**Cz-B:** -- // bošnák, bósnenec (2/p. 1412)

## VI.2

**BURČÁK** (*colloquially*)

**Cz-Sl:** *dial* mošt (p. 36)

**Cz-Cro:** --

**Cz-Cr:** --

**Cz-Srb:** --

**Cz-Sr:** rampaš, šira *mlado vino* (p. 59)

**Cz-S:** *dijal.* mládo víno, rámpaš (p. 115)

**Cz-M:** --

**Cz-B:** --

## VI.3

**ČESKO // ČECHY** (*geogr.*)

**Cz-Sl:** -- // Češka (p. 672)

**Cz-Cro:** -- // Češka (p. 34)

**Cz-Cr:** Češka (p. 18) // Čěška (p. 17)

**Cz-Srb:** -- // Čěška (p. 285)

**Cz-Sr:** -- [Češka *dijal. gov.* Češka (p. 75)] // Češka, Češke zemlje (p. 72)

**Cz-S:** *zast.* Čěška (*koja obuhvata istorijsku Čěšku i Moravsku*) (1/p. 160) // Čěška (1/p. 154)

**Cz-M:** Čěška (p. 20) // Čěhija (p. 19)

**Cz-B:** Čěhija, Čěška repúblika (2/p. 1413) // Čěhija (*bez Morávija i Silézija*) (1/p. 103); Čěhija (2/p. 1413); **Bohemie** *istor.* Bohémija, Čěhija (2/p. 1412)

## VI.4

**DATABÁZE** (*tech., IT*)

**Cz-Sl:** --

**Cz-Cro:** --

**Cz-Cr:** --

**Cz-Srb:** databanka banka podátaka (p. 288)

**Cz-Sr:** databaza (p. 84)

**Cz-S:** --

**Cz-M:** báza na podatoci (p. 24)

**Cz-B:** *komp.* masív, báza dánni (1/p. 125)

## VI.5

**DATEL // STRAKAPOUD // ŽLUNA (zool.)**

**Cz-Sl:** detel (p. 54) // detel (p. 499) // žolna (p. 670)

**Cz-Cro:** djetlič (p. 38) // -- // --

**Cz-Cr:** djétlič (p. 20) // -- // --

**Cz-Srb:** détlíč (p. 288) // -- // --

**Cz-Sr:** detlič (*Dryocopus*) (p. 84) // šareni detlič (*Dendrocopos*) (p. 768) // žuna (*Picus*) (p. 1025)

**Cz-S:** detao/djétao, détlíč/djétlič (1/p. 184) // **strakapúd** šareni detao, šareni détlíč (2/p. 676) // žúna (2/p. 1463)

**Cz-M:** klukájdrvec (p. 24) // -- // klukájdrvec (*Picus*) (p. 460)

**Cz-B:** kálváč (*Dryocopus*) (1/p. 125) // **strakapúd** pástär kálváč (*Dendrocopos*) (2/p. 617) // kálváč (*Picus*) ž. **zelená** zelén kálváč (*Picus viridis*) (2/p. 1388)

## VI.6

**DĚDINA (dial.)**

**Cz-Sl:** vas, zaselek, naselek; /.../ (p. 55)

**Cz-Cro:** naselje, selo (p. 38)

**Cz-Cr:** *knj.* sélo, náselje (p. 21)

**Cz-Srb:** --

**Cz-Sr:** *knjiž.* 1. selo /.../ (p. 85)

**Cz-S:** 1. *knj. i pokr.* sélo; /.../ (1/p. 187)

**Cz-M:** sélo (p. 24)

**Cz-B:** 1. *kniž. i dial.* sélo; /.../ (1/p. 128)

## VI.7

**FURT (colloquially)**

**Cz-Sl:** *obs* venomer, nenehno, neprenehoma (p. 94)

**Cz-Cro:** --

**Cz-Cr:** *razg.* stálno (p. 35)

**Cz-Srb:** --

**Cz-Sr:** *gov., zast.* stalno, furt (p. 144)

**Cz-S:** *razg.* „furt“, úvek/úvijek, stálno, nepréstano (1/p. 352)

**Cz-M:** *razg.* stálno, postójano, nepréstano; **furt se zlobí** postójano se lúti (p. 48)

**Cz-B:** *nar. razg.* postojánno, neprekásnato, vse; **furt zlobí** a) postojánno drážni b) vsé ne slúša (obikn. za dete); **co furt máte?** kakvó vsé se zajáždate? (1/p. 226)

## VI.8

**KAPSÁŘ** (*colloquially*)

**Cz-Sl:** žepar; /.../ (p. 152)

**Cz-Cro:** --

**Cz-Cr:** --

**Cz-Srb:** džéparoš (p. 327)

**Cz-Sr:** džéparoš (p. 227)

**Cz-S:** džéparoš, džépar, késaroš (1/p. 545)

**Cz-M:** džépčija (krádec) (p. 75)

**Cz-B:** džebčija, kradéc (1/p. 355)

## VI.9

**KECAT** (*colloquially*)

**Cz-Sl:** /.../; *vulg.* blebetati, čvekati, čenčati (p. 155)

**Cz-Cro:** --

**Cz-Cr:** *razg. ekspr.* tráckati; lupétati; zézati se (p. 56)

**Cz-Srb:** --

**Cz-Sr:** *eksp. grubo* trabunjati; **co to kecám** šta to trabunjam, **nekecej, stejné ti nevěříme** ne trabunjaj, i onako ti ne verujemo, **do všeho kecá** u svakoj je čorbi mirođija, u sve se meša /.../ (p. 232)

**Cz-S:** /.../ 3. *vulg.* bŕbljati, naklápati, torókat; /.../ (1/p. 558)

**Cz-M:** 2. *eksp.* plápoti, lómoti (p. 77)

**Cz-B:** 3. *grubo* dránkam, pléštja, pljámpam, bãrbórja (*něšto*); **do všeho kecá** navsjákãde si pãha nosá, namésva se vãv vséki rázgovor (1/p. 364)

## VI.10

**KRAJ (admin.)**

**Cz-Sl:** /.../ pokrajina, okrožje, dežela; /.../ (p. 177)

**Cz-Cro:** -- [kraj; **rodný kraj** rodní kraj, zavičaj (p. 75)]

**Cz-Cr:** /.../ pókrajina (p. 62)

**Cz-Srb:** 1. (okres) óblast; /.../ 4. (oblast) región, pókrajina, provincija /.../ (p. 336)

**Cz-Sr:** 1. kraj, okrug /.../ 1b) adm. jedinica veća od sreza, region: **Jihomoravský kraj** Južnomoravski okrug /.../ (p. 263)

**Cz-S:** /.../ 5. óblast, pódručje; /.../ (1/p. 636)

**Cz-M:** /.../ 3. ókrug (p. 85)

**Cz-B:** /.../ 3. kraj, méstnost, óblast; **vinařský k.** lozárska, vinárska óblast; lozárski rajón, vinárski kraj; /.../ 4. adm. óblast: **Středočeský k.** Srédnočěška óblast (1/p. 427n.)

## VI.11

**KRKAVEC // HAVRAN // VRÁNA (zool.)**

**Cz-Sl:** krokar (p. 181) // -- // vrana (p. 576)

**Cz-Cro:** -- // gavran (p. 55) // vrana (p. 189)

**Cz-Cr:** -- // gávran (p. 37) // vrána (p. 227)

**Cz-Srb:** 1. gávran /.../ (p. 337) // gávran (p. 308) // vrána /.../ (p. 502)

**Cz-Sr:** gavran (*Corvus corax*) (p. 268) // gavran (*Corvus frugilegus*) (p. 154) // vrana (*Corvus corone*) /.../ (p. 881)

**Cz-S:** 1. gávran; /.../ (1/p. 648) // gávran; **h. polní** gáčac; /.../ (1/p. 380) // vrána /.../ (2/p. 1017)

**Cz-M:** -- // gávran (p. 52) // vrána (*Corvus cornix*) (p. 365)

**Cz-B:** 1. gárvan; **k. veliký** gárvan (*Corvus Corax*); /.../ (1/p. 438) // gárvan (*Corvus*) (1/p. 239) // vrána (*Corvus*); /.../ (2/p. 901)

## VI.12

**MISTROVSTVÍ (sport)**

**Cz-Sl:** /.../ prvenstvo (p. 223)

**Cz-Cro:** prvenstvo; /.../ (p. 87)

**Cz-Cr:** /.../ prvéntstvo, šampiónat (p. 75)

**Cz-Srb:** --

**Cz-Sr:** /.../ 2. sport. prvenstvo, šampionat /.../ 2. **mistrovství světa v kopané** svetsko prvenstvo u fudbalu, **zápas o mistrovství** prvenstvena utakmica (p. 340)

**Cz-S:** /.../ **3.** *sport.* šampiónat, prvéntstvo; **m. svéta v kopané** prvéntstvo svéta ú fudbalu /.../ (1/p. 789)

**Cz-M:** **2.** šampiónat (p. 105)

**Cz-B:** **2.** šampionát, šampiónska tíla, pärvénstvó; **nabýt m.** stána šampión; polúča šampiónska tíla; **3.** sástezanie za pärvénstvó, za šampiónska tíla; šampionát, pärvénstvó; **m. svéta v kopané** svetóvno pärvénstvó po fútbol (1/p. 551)

#### VI.13

**OBEC** (*admin.*)

**Cz-Sl:** občina (p. 282)

**Cz-Cro:** općina (p. 104)

**Cz-Cr:** ópćina; /.../ (p. 97)

**Cz-Srb:** ópština (p. 372)

**Cz-Sr:** **1.** opština /.../ (p. 425)

**Cz-S:** **1.** ópština, ópćina; /.../ (1/p. 985)

**Cz-M:** **1.** ópština; /.../ **3.** naséleno mésto (sélo, grad) (p. 141)

**Cz-B:** **1.** sélište, naséleno mjásto, nasélen punkt, sélo; /.../ **2.** *jurid. adm.* obština (*adm. órgan; žíteli*); /.../ (1/p. 697)

#### VI.14

**OBLAST** (*admin.*)

**Cz-Sl:** ozemlje; okrožje; področje, predel (p. 284)

**Cz-Cro:** oblast, područje, kraj, pokrajina, regija, teritorij (p. 104)

**Cz-Cr:** pódručje, óblast, pókrajina (p. 98)

**Cz-Srb:** óblast (p. 373)

**Cz-Sr:** oblast (p. 429)

**Cz-S:** **1.** óblast, kraj; /.../ **autonomní o.** autonómna óblast /.../ (1/p. 992)

**Cz-M:** **1.** óblast, région; /.../ (p. 142)

**Cz-B:** **1.** óblast, kraj, rajón, zóna: **horské, průmyslové o-i** planínski, industriálni rajóni; /.../ (1/p. 703)

#### VI.15

**OKRES** (*admin.*)

**Cz-Sl:** okraj (p. 306)

**Cz-Cro:** okrug, kotar (p. 111)

**Cz-Cr:** administratívno pódručje; župánija (p. 109)

**Cz-Srb:** sréz, ókrug (p. 381)

**Cz-Sr:** srez, teritorijalna upravna jedinica veća od opštine i manja od kraja (p. 474)

**Cz-S:** 1. sréz, kótar; /.../ 3. óblast, kraj, pódručje; /.../ **městský o. grádski réjon, réjon** (1/p. 1062)

**Cz-M:** 1. okólija, réon 2. óblast, ópština, kraj (p. 155)

**Cz-B:** 1. rajón 2. okólija; /.../ (1/p. 764)

#### VI.16

**OKRUH (admin.)**

**Cz-Sl:** /.../ okročje, področje, območje, pristojnost (p. 307)

**Cz-Cro:** okrug (p. 111)

**Cz-Cr:** /.../ ókrug; pódručje (p. 109)

**Cz-Srb:** réjon (p. 381)

**Cz-Sr:** -- [1. okrug; /.../ (p. 474)]

**Cz-S:** /.../ 5. ranije gubérnija; /.../ (1/p. 1062)

**Cz-M:** /.../ 3. ókrug, óblast (p. 155)

**Cz-B:** -- [4. rajón, zóna (*prostránstvo ókolo něšto*) – 1/p. 765]

#### VI.17

**PAŘIT (slang)**

**Cz-Sl:** /.../ *sl* popivati; /.../ (p. 332)

**Cz-Cro:** --

**Cz-Cr:** /.../ *razg. ekspr.* provódití se, tulumáriti (p. 118)

**Cz-Srb:** --

**Cz-Sr:** /.../ 3. *gov.* lumpovati 4. *slang* đuskati /.../ *gov., sleng:* **pařit do rána** lumpovati do zore (p. 510)

**Cz-S:** /.../ 3. *slang ekspr.* píti, lócati; /.../ (2/p. 21)

**Cz-M:** /.../ 3. *sleng. ekspr.* píe, lóka, izléguva do dócna (p. 168)

**Cz-B:** /.../ 2. *komp. ekspr.* igrája zapáleno (*obikn. kompjúturni igr*): **budu pařit hry** šte si igrája na kompjúťára (2/p. 19)

#### VI.18

**PASÁK (slang)**

**Cz-Sl:** /.../ *vulg* zvodnik; /.../ (p. 332)

Cz-Cro: --

Cz-Cr: --

Cz-Srb: /.../ 2. *expr. (dívek) podvůdač, mákro* (p. 390)

Cz-Sr: --

Cz-S: /.../ 2. *vulg. kúpler, mákro; /.../ (2/p. 22)*

Cz-M: /.../ 2. *mákro* (p. 169)

Cz-B: /.../ 2. *grubo sutenjór* (2/p. 19)

VI.19

**PŘEHRÁVAČ** (*tech.*)

Cz-Sl: --

Cz-Cro: --

Cz-Cr: --

Cz-Srb: --

Cz-Sr: --

Cz-S: --

Cz-M: --

Cz-B: *techn. 1. p. kompaktních desek, p. CD, CD p. diskovo ustrójstvo za CD-ROM 2. kazetový p. kasetofón* (2/p. 259)

VI.20

**PŘENOS** (*tech., R+TV*)

Cz-Sl: *prenos, prenašanje* (p. 412)

Cz-Cro: *prijenos* (p. 139)

Cz-Cr: *prijenos; prenošenje* (p. 150)

Cz-Srb: (*televizní*) *prenos; přímý p. diréktan přenos* (p. 419)

Cz-Sr: *prenos, prenošenje /.../ přenos rozhlasové relace prenos radioemisije* (p. 614)

Cz-S: /.../ *techn. přenos/prijenos, prenošenje, transmísija, předaja /.../ přímý p. diréktan přenos; rozhlasový p. rádio-přenos; rádio-předaja; televizní p. televízijski přenos* (2/p. 309)

Cz-M: 1. *prenos (TV); /.../ (p. 216)*

Cz-B: 1. *techn. předavane, izláčvane (črez saobštítelna téhnika): televizní p. televizióнно izláčvane, předavane; /.../ (2/p. 269)*

## VI.21

**RAKETOPLÁN** (*tech.*)

Cz-Sl: --

Cz-Cro: --

Cz-Cr: --

Cz-Srb: raketóplan (p. 427)

Cz-Sr: --

Cz-S: raketni avión, raketna letílica (2/p. 394)

Cz-M: --

Cz-B: raketoplán (2/p. 372)

## VI.22

**ROZKLAD** (*law*)

Cz-Sl: /.../ razstavljanje, analiza; /.../ (p. 448)

Cz-Cro: --

Cz-Cr: --

Cz-Srb: --

Cz-Sr: /.../ 4. analiza /.../ **podat rozklad o situaci** dati iscrpnu analizu situacije, *prav.*: **podat rozklad k zrušení rozhodnutí** podneti obrazloženje za ukidanje rešenja (p. 677)Cz-S: /.../ 5. *prav.* prígovor, prótest; /.../ 7. detáljna análiza, detáljno razláganje /.../ **podat r. o situaci** detáljno je razlózio situáciiju; **podat r. proti čemu** ízneti prígovor na štó /.../ (2/p. 445)

Cz-M: /.../ 3. análiza, détalno razglobúvanje (p. 240)

Cz-B: /.../ 3. análiz, izložénie, razbór: **podat r. o dnešní situaci** predloža análiz na dnéšnoto položénie (2/p. 395)

## VI.23

**RYCHLOVLAK** (*tech.*)

Cz-Sl: -- (rychlo-: 2 entries – p. 459)

Cz-Cro: -- (rychlo-: no entry – p. 150)

Cz-Cr: -- (rychlo-: no entry – p. 170)

Cz-Srb: -- (rychlo-: 4 entries – p. 436–437)

Cz-Sr: -- (rychlo-: 15 entries – p. 707–708)

Cz-S: *don. zast.* břízi vóz (2/p. 491) (rychlo-: 35 entries – 2/p. 490–491)

Cz-M: -- (rychlo-: no entry – p. 245)

Cz-B: -- (rychlo-: 13 entries – 2/p. 418)

## VI.24

**SHROMÁŽDĚNÍ // PARLAMENT (admin.)**

**Cz-Sl:** zbor, shod; /.../ skupščina (p. 473) // državni zbor, parlament (p. 331)

**Cz-Cro:** zbor, skup, skupština, sabor, sastanak; **Národní shromáždění** Narodna skupština (p. 155) // parlament (p. 118)

**Cz-Cr:** /.../ skúpština (p. 177) // --

**Cz-Srb:** /.../ 2. (*zasedání*) skúpština (p. 444) // parlámen(a)t, skúpština (p. 390)

**Cz-Sr:** skupština, sabor; skup (p. 735) // parlament, skupština (p. 510)

**Cz-S:** /.../ 2. skúpština, sábor; **Národní s.** Narodna skúpština /.../ **Valné s.** OSN Generálna skúpština OUN (2/p. 551) // 1. parlámen(a)t; /.../ **zasedání** p-u sédnica parlámента (2/p. 19)

**Cz-M:** 1. sobránie; sóbir, grúpa (p. 255) // párlament (p. 168)

**Cz-B:** 1. sábranie, zasedanie, míting /.../ 2. **valné s.** a) *jurid.* óbšto sábranie b) *polit.* generálna asambléja; **Národní s.** Narodno sábranie (2/p. 476) // 1. parlamént; **svolat p.** – svíkam parlámента /.../ (2/p. 17)

## VI.25

**SPOLEČNOST (sociolog., econ.)**

**Cz-Sl:** družba (p. 491)

**Cz-Cro:** društvo, udruženje, udruga (p. 161)

**Cz-Cr:** društvo, zajednica; údruga (p. 187)

**Cz-Srb:** 1. društvo /.../ 3. (*obchodní*) kompánija: **s. s ručením omezeným** predužéce sa ográničenom odgovórnošću; /.../ (p. 455)

**Cz-Sr:** 1. zajednica, društvo 2. udruženje 3. deoničarsko društvo 4. zabava 5. pratnja (p. 760)

**Cz-S:** 1. društvo, grúpa, družína 2. društvo, udružénje; /.../ **akciová s.** akcionársko društvo; /.../ **Společnost** národů *ist.* Društvo národa; **třídní s.** klásno društvo /.../ (2/p. 640)

**Cz-M:** ópštestvo; /.../ **obchodní s.** pretprijátie, fírma; **akciová s.** akciónersko društvo (p. 267)

**Cz-B:** /.../ 2. óbštestvó, družestvo, sdružénie, organizácija: /.../ **akciová s. (a.s.)** *tǎrg.* akcionérno družestvo (AD); **komanditní s. tǎrg.** komandítno družestvo; **tichá s. tǎrg.** družestvo sás saučástie, tájno družestvo, anonímno družestvo; **s. s ručením omezeným (s.r.o.) tǎrg.** družestvo s ograničéna otgovórnost (OOD); **holdingová s. ikon.** hóldingovo družestvo, hólding;

**investiční s. ikon.** investičionno družestvo; **výsadní s. tǎrg.** monopol;  
**pojišťovací s.** zastrahovátelno družestvo; **Společnost národů istor.**  
 Obštestvo na naróдите (do Vtórata svetóvna vojná) /.../ (2/p. 574–575)

## VI.26

**STRÝC // TETA (standard)**

**Cz-Sl:** stric (p. 501) // teta (p. 527)

**Cz-Cro:** stric, ujak, tetak (p. 164) // tetka; ujna; strina (p. 172)

**Cz-Cr:** stric, újak (p. 192) // teta (p. 202)

**Cz-Srb:** (z *matčiny strany*) újak; (z *otcovy strany*) stric (p. 462) // teta (p. 476)

**Cz-Sr:** stric a teča, ujak, stric /.../ (p. 771) // 1. tetka; strina; ujna /.../ (p. 804)

**Cz-S:** *razg. ekspr. strejc* 1. stric, číka; újak, újka; teta, teča; /.../ (2/p. 684)  
 // 1. teta, teta, ujna; strina; /.../ (2/p. 786)

**Cz-M:** čičko, stríko; vújko; tetin (p. 279) // teta, teta (p. 299)

**Cz-B:** *razg. ekspr. strejc* 1. čičo, vújčo, *dial.* sváko, kaléko (po rodnínstvo)  
 /.../ (2/p. 627) // 1. lélja, lélka 2. vújna 3. strínka (2/p. 705)

## VI.27

**TŘÍDA (sociolog.)**

**Cz-Sl:** razred; kategorija, vrsta; glavna ulica (p. 536)

**Cz-Cro:** razred, klasa; ulica, bulevar; red, vrsta, stalež (p. 174)

**Cz-Cr:** rázred; vrsta, klása; avénija (p. 206)

**Cz-Srb:** 1. (společenská; jakostní) klása /.../ (p. 481)

**Cz-Sr:** 1. klasa /.../ 1. dělnická třída radnička klasa /.../ (p. 815)

**Cz-S:** 1. (společenská) klása (drúštvena); /.../ vládnoucí, dělnická t.  
 vládajúca, rádnička klása /.../ (2/p. 823–824)

**Cz-M:** 1. klása (opštestvena); dělnická t. rabotníčeska klása (p. 311)

**Cz-B:** 1. klása: dělnická t. rabotníčeska klása; vládnoucí t. upravljávašta,  
 gospodstvašta klása /.../ (2/p. 731)

## VI.28

**TUNELOVAT // TUNELÁŘ (journ., econ.)**

**Cz-Sl:** -- // --

**Cz-Cro:** -- // --

**Cz-Cr:** -- // --

**Cz-Srb:** -- // --

**Cz-Sr:** -- // --

**Cz-S:** -- // --

**Cz-M:** -- // --

**Cz-B:** nezakónno izsmúkvam, iztóčvam parí (*ot bání i pod. sled 1989 g.*)  
(2/p. 735) // /.../ 2. publ. (finánsov) dalavéradžija; šéf na finánsova  
„piramída“ (*sled 1989 g.*) /.../ (2/p. 735)

VI.29

**ZEMÁK** (*dial.*)

**Cz-Sl:** krompir; šolski sl zemljepis (p. 643)

**Cz-Cro:** --

**Cz-Cr:** --

**Cz-Srb:** --

**Cz-Sr:** --

**Cz-S:** I *don. knj. i pokr.* krómpir, krúmpir (2/p. 1349)

**Cz-M:** --

**Cz-B:** *obikn. mn.* **zemáky** kartófi: **pečené z.** péčeni kartófi (2/p. 1260)

## CHAPTER 4

**CHORONYMS FOR BELARUS, MOLDOVA,  
IRELAND AND THE NETHERLANDS IN BULGARIAN**

(PROBLEMS OF GEOGRAPHICAL  
TERMINOLOGY AND TRANSLATION, Part 1)

**I.  
Introduction**

We are noting changes on the map of Europe after 1989: since October 1990 there are no longer two Germanies – the German Democratic Republic became part of the Federal Republic of Germany; December 1991 meant a definite end of the Soviet Union (federation officially declared in December 1922), instead of that fifteen new states came into being; since June 1991 till April 1992 we were witnessing continuing erosion of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, on which remains five new states popped out, among others the last variant of Yugoslavia – the so-called third or Serbian-Montenegrin; on 31<sup>st</sup> December 1992 the last federation from the era of communism broke up – Czechoslovakia, whose two federative units – Czechia and Slovakia – became sovereign states.

The last state that dissolved only in the half of the first decade of the new century was Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, that first changed its political name to the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro in March 2002 (officially confirmed in February 2003), however by Montenegro leaving this Union in June 2006 even this Union ended. Epilogue of political changes in the former Yugoslavia was the separation of Kosovo (till that time Serbian autonomous province with Albanian majority) in

February 2008. The Republic of Kosovo became the fiftieth European state and seventh that rose from the ashes of the former SFRY.

Several new geographical terms came into being in Bulgarian with rise of these new states. Most of them existed even before 1990, however they did not designate sovereign states at that time, but federal units of former federations only. It is natural that in such a situation these were not used very often, and therefore were not object of major interest from the side of linguists, journalists etc. This caused that norm for naming some of new states was not finalized for a long time. In the following text I will try to map the situation of these states or countries, where the Bulgarian terminology shows unstableness or even inaccuracy. To the two post-Soviet countries (Belarus and Moldova) I have added two traditional European states – Ireland and the Netherlands that show the same problem.

Today's Europe is consisting of **50 states**. I am counting Turkey, Cyprus and three Caucasian countries (Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan)<sup>14</sup> in, where the convergence to Europe as a specific political and geographical unit is clearly visible and – for many reasons – understandable and acceptable. **33** European countries (that means 66 %, two thirds) are named in Bulgarian using suffix *-ия*. Names of **8** countries (16 %) is ending on *-а* (Андора, Босна и Херцеговина, Литва, Малта, Молдова, Полша, Украйна, Черна гора). **6** names (12 %) has a *consonant* ending (Азербайджан, Ватикан, Лихтенщайн, Люксембург, Кипър, Беларус), while **3** names (6 %) are ending on vowel *-о* (Косово, Монако, Сан Марино). We can find doublet forms in case of *Belarus* (Беларус vs. Белорусия), *Moldova* (Молдова vs. Молдавия), *Ireland* (Ирландия vs. Ейре) and *the Netherlands* (Нидерландия vs. Холандия). Three forms are used to name *Croatia* (Хърватия vs. Хърватско vs. Хърватска).<sup>15</sup>

## II. Belarus (Беларус, Белорусия)

Form *Беларус* is new – it was recognized in 1991 (ER: 217). Publications issued before the dissolution of the Soviet Union are using form *Белорусия*

---

14 Leaving aside separatist state units that have almost no international recognition – Transnistria, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Nagorno-Karabakh and Northern Cyprus.

15 More about this topic in the following chapter.

only (КБЕ-1: 213, R-B: 1134, B-Č: 43, Baychev – Damyanova – Tsankov 1980: 13, and so on). I have also found older form in one newer publication from 2000, which is using term *Западна Белорусия* (Manchev 2000: 325). But to put this into context, it was used when talking about period around 1945. Both forms are stated in the two-volumes Czech-Bulgarian dictionary (Č-B-2: 1411). At first glance one might think that the older form is used for period before 1991 and newer one for the later period. However, it cannot be confirmed. One of the proofs of this not being true is a text that is dealing with era at the end of the World War II, but Belarus is being named in the new way (Karagyozev 1997: 179 [this part is dated to 1993]). At the same time the newest Bulgarian general encyclopedias use the term *Беларус* solely (BER: 92, BE: 112). This unsolved and kind of problematic nature of bringing new toponym is confirmed in case of Belarus in the demonym *Belarusians* – there is a visible uncertainty between traditional *белоруси* (see e.g. BER: 94 or Č-B-2: 1411) and a newer form, derived from the state name, *беларуси* (see e.g. BE: 112 or NPR: 181). There is also undecidedness visible when it comes to adjectives – traditional *белоруски* “Belorussian” and neologism *беларуски* “Belarusian”. Fourth, amended and reworked issue of Andreychin’s dictionary of Bulgarian is solving this question by stating both forms with *бело-* as archaisms and forms with *бела-* as neutral (BTR: 56, 57). Similar attitude has D. Popov’s dictionary for orthography, orthoepy and punctuation – forms with *бела-* are stated as primary forms, while forms with *бело-* as alternative forms. Terms *белоруски*, *белорусин* are referring to forms with *бела-* exclusively (RPPP: 237).

### III.

#### **Moldova (Молдова, Молдавия)**

The difference between Moldova and Belarus lies in the fact, that it was possible to observe both forms concurrently already in the past in case of Moldova (see e.g. КБЕ-3: 462, 464, Enc: 511, 512 or B-Č: 422). It used to be explained as follows: *Молдавия* was geographical name of the back-then Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic (КБЕ-3: 462, Enc: 511), i.e. today’s Republic of Moldova, while *Молдова* was defined as “feudal state

that existed from the 14<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> century. It was established in 1359 on the territory of Bukovina, Bessarabia and the historical area of the same name (including north-eastern areas of present-day Romania – the lands between the East Carpathians and the rivers Prut and Danube)” (КБЕ-3: 464,<sup>16</sup> similarly Enc: 512). It is evident from the quote that *Молдова* is designating historical country (including from today’s point of view Romanian Moldova, the Republic of Moldova, Bukovina and Ukrainian Budjak, that is dividing the above mentioned country from the Black sea, and at the same time feudal state created in 1359, while *Молдавия* is name for state and administrative unit – part of the Soviet Union (since 1940), that is including north-eastern part of historical Moldova (area lying between rivers Prut and Dniester, that is also being called Bessarabia) and Transnistria (small elongated area at the left bank of Dniester, that was in the period of 1924–1940 part of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic as the Moldavian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic; the Black sea area of Bessarabia – Budjak was added to the Ukrainian SSR in 1940 instead).

Current situation is slightly different: the name *Молдова* is used not only for historical country (in Czech as *Moldávie* as well – see Liščák 2009: 550) and feudal state, but for today’s Republic of Moldova as well (*Moldavsko* in Czech). Based on my examination of Bulgarian media and language handbooks, I consider toponym *Молдавия* not to be in use anymore, even despite this form being in line with mainstream Bulgarian word-formation model for toponyms (what is not true for the form now in use). For example, Chukalov’s Russian-Bulgarian dictionary from 60’s is listing this term only (R-B: 1136). Exemption from the newest examined publications is the new Czech-Bulgarian dictionary that by the term *Moldavsko*, *Moldávie* shows equivalents *Молдавия*, *Молдова*, but without further details (Č-B-2: 1422). Some aspiration for semantic fulfilment of the older form even nowadays is visible for example in publication “The Flags of the Countries of the World”, that is – in the short part devoted to the Moldavian SSR – using name *Молдавска ССР* (Ivanov 2002: 137–138). Similarity of adjective with root *Молдав-* is without doubt pointing to term *Молдавия*. Even despite this, adjective *Moldovan* is not as unstable

16 Orig.: “феодална държава, съществувала от XIV до XIX век. Създадена е в 1359 на територията на Буковина, Бесарабия и едноименната историческа област (включваща сев.-изт. покрайнини на дн. Румъния – земите между изт. Карпати и реките Прут и Дунав)”.

as adjective *Belarusian*; the form *молдовски* derived from *Молдова* is being used nowadays almost exclusively (see e.g. NPR: 508). Form *молдавски* lost its justification, no matter that Попов's dictionary from 1998 still used three-part nominal derivational sequence *молдавец – молдавка – молдавски* instead of two-part *молдовец – молдовка* (RPPP: 390).

#### IV. Partial Conclusion

Bulgarian forms *Беларус* and *Молдова* are identical with original Belarusian (*Беларусь*), and Romanian form (*Moldova*). Bulgarian is not different from e.g. English in this attitude – English is using forms *Belarus* and *Moldova* nowadays, even despite the former name for these countries were *B[yl]-elorussia* and *Moldavia* (see e.g. A-Č-A: 844, Webster's 1993: 831, 881, Oxford 2000: 1395, 1396). As a proof of some instability the Illustrated Oxford dictionary can be used, where in the list of countries *Belorussia* and *Moldavia* are listed (Illustrated Oxford 1999: 978, 982).

#### V. Ireland (Ирландия, Ейре)

I have noted similar frequency of *Ейре* and *Ирландия* in case of Ireland. Originally Irish toponym *Ейре* (Irish *Éire*) got to Bulgarian most probably via English (dictionaries of English using term *Eire* are in favour of this theory – e.g. Webster's 1984: 196, Webster's 1993: 848, Oxford 1989: 741 or A-Č-A: 150; however not listed in Oxford 2000). It is being used for naming the independent Republic of Ireland, while *Ирландия* should be mainly used for naming the whole Irish island, i.e. including Northern Ireland – politically part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (КБЕ-2: 528). This solution would follow the situation with *Eire* and *Ireland* in English language. However, even the above-mentioned Encyclopedia does not follow this logical division, when it is – in the history of Irish state (*Ейре*) – describing history of the whole island (*Ирландия*) (ibid.: 272). The history of the state unit called in

Bulgarian *Ейре* should start only with the creation of independent Irish state (December 6<sup>th</sup>, 1922).

The fact that the norm is unstable and toponym *Ейре* still has not displaced competing form *Ирландия* is underlined for example by the above-mentioned handbook “The Flags of the Countries of the World”. In this handbook Irish state is named as *ИРЛАНДИЯ (Ейре)* what suggests that author of this publication is preferring the first term (Ivanov 2002: 86). New orthographic dictionary is offering term *Ирландия* only (NPR: 1007). Reasons, why Bulgarian accepted very unusual form of geographic name (unusual compared to other Bulgarian names for European countries), were explained above. Personally, I think, that the including of the term *Ейре* to the system of Bulgarian geographic names is not very suitable. There is no derived adjective from this term (\*ейрски?), nor even demonym (that should designate citizenship, not only nationality – \*ейр/\*ейрка? \*ейрец/\*ейркиня? \*ейряннин/\*ейрянка?). As there is still no derived name created, I do not expect it to be created in future either.

When speaking about Irish term *Éire* and English *Ireland*, both are naming the same (see Webster’s 1984: 196) – originally it was used for the island. After creation of a state on four fifths of this island, it is understandable that the name for island started to be used for this state as well, and by the time passing, mainly this state. The concept “state”, that means “particular internationally recognized social, political, administrative and judicial unit”, tends to gain far more communicational and identificational importance than island itself in such cases. If Czechs pronounce *Irsko* (and Bulgarians *Ирландия*), most of the time we have a state, the Republic of Ireland, in mind, not the whole island (see Liščák 2009: 338–342). The same is true for English *Ireland* and Irish *Éire* (political names that are used commonly as well to differentiate state from the whole island – i.e. English *the Republic of Ireland / the Irish Republic*, Irish *Poblacht na h’Éireann*, or Bulgarian synthesis of both *Република Ирландия / Република Ейре* – are not official – see *ibid.*: 338, 341). In cases where Bulgarian speaker has an island in mind, he can use it explicitly as *остров Ирландия*. Therefore, I think, that for Bulgarian language it would be much suitable not to complicate expressions by incoherent borrowing from Irish *Ейре* and follow established and correct Bulgarian toponym *Ирландия* as the main geographic name for the Republic of Ireland.

## VI. The Netherlands (Нидерландия, Холандия)

In case of single-word naming of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in both Bulgarian and Czech a frequent usage of incorrect toponym originating from Dutch *Holland* (Czech *Holandsko*, Bulgarian *Холандия*), instead of official geographical name derived from Dutch *Nederland* (Czech *Nizozemsko*, Bulgarian *Нидерландия*) is typical.<sup>17</sup> Meaning of Czech *Holandsko* is defined unambiguously in e.g. one-volume dictionary of Czech as “a region in the Netherlands” (SSČ 2000: 629).<sup>18</sup> Persistence of Bulgarian *Холандия* is so powerful that many serious Bulgarian guidebooks finds it important to state it right next to official name *Нидерландия*, often with specifying “non-official” or “incorrect” (KBE-: 578; Enc: 547; BE: 785; Ivanov 2002: 144). Similarly, in case of term *Холандия* guidebooks note that this is being used not only in its historical and geographical meaning, but often also for the whole Netherlands (KBE-5: 384; Enc: 912; ER: 273; BER: 1244; BE: 1254).

It might be useful to stop by the etymology of both Dutch toponyms. *Nederland* is of Dutch origin and means “the country lying down; the low-lying, lower county” (Liščák – Fojtík 1998: 646).<sup>19</sup> First part of compositum *Neder-* is in meaning not different from German naming of “lower positioned lands” – see *Niedersachsen* “Lower Saxony” or *Niederösterreich* “Lower Austria”. Etymology of toponym *Holland* is not such clear. Two explanations prevail: one sees in first part *Hol-* German *hol/hal*, meaning the same as Dutch *neder-* (ibid.; further e.g. Larousse-2: 494). The second explanation consider *Holland* to be derived from original *Holtland*, what meant “country of forests” (Diderot-3: 202,<sup>20</sup> further e.g. Brockhaus-10: 187). From today’s point of view *Holland* (*Holland*, *Holandsko*, *Холандия*) is a historical land, which is administratively divided to two provinces – *Noord-Holland* (*North Holland*, *Severní Holandsko*, *Северна Холандия*) and *Zuid-Holland* (*South Holland*, *Jižní Holandsko*, *Южна Холандия*). These two provinces – together with another

17 Compare frequency of the respective variants when searched for in search engine Google (2019-05-06): *Нидерландия* – 3,230,000 vs. *Холандия* – 6,230,000, *Nizozemsko* – 9,370,000 vs. *Holandsko* – 13,100,000.

18 Orig.: “země v Nizozemsku”.

19 Orig.: “země ležící nízko; nízko položená, dolní země”.

20 Orig.: “země lesů”.

ten – form *Nederland* (*the Netherlands, Nizozemsko, Нидерландия*). This simple state of things should be reflected in grammar guidebooks as well.

For mapping the situation, we can use mainly translation dictionaries, because defining dictionaries unfortunately omit names of states and countries (a new spelling dictionary can be considered to be an exception from this rule, as it contains *Нидерландия* in the list of states – NPR: 1008). In Czech–Bulgarian dictionaries the situation is as follows: Hora’s Bulgarian–Czech dictionary is not listing term *Нидерландия*, we can find *Холандия* only, which is translated as *Holandsko, Nizozemí* (B–Č: 1008). Prošek’s Bulgarian–Czech and Czech–Bulgarian pocket dictionary states *Холандия* (*Holandsko*) only (B–Č–B: 201, 234). Czech–Bulgarian dictionary by Ts. Romanska states all three possible Czech names, *Holandsko, Nizozemsko, Nizozemí*, but translates them every time as solely *Холандия* (Č–B: 116, 315). New two–volume Czech–Bulgarian dictionary translates *Holandsko* as *Холандия, Нидерландия* (Č–B–2: 1416). *Nizozemí, Nizozemsko* is then translated as *Нидерландия, Холандия* (*ibid.*: 1423). Raev’s practical Bulgarian language guide has in the list of names below the publisher information not quite correct Czech variant *Holandsko, Nizozemí*, in Bulgarian again as *Холандия* only (Raev – Raevová 1998: 35).<sup>21</sup>

To sum up, except of the two–volume Czech–Bulgarian dictionary all the other Czech–Bulgarian dictionaries in use nowadays omit the official Bulgarian geographical name *Нидерландия*. Therefore, they do not point to the difference in meaning of toponyms *Холандия* and *Нидерландия* (even two–volume Czech–Bulgarian dictionary fails here). The difference in the meaning of Czech toponyms *Holandsko, Nizozemsko, Nizozemí* is not explained in the above–mentioned guidebooks either.

## VII. Conclusions

In case of **Belarus** and **Moldova** a substitution of older, traditional name (*Белорусия, Молдавия*) has taken place. In the first case for the fully new

<sup>21</sup> Czech name *Nizozemí* is not a suitable name for today’s state of the Netherlands either. From the geographical point of view, under this term we understand a historical area including nowadays Benelux and northernmost part of France, i.e. the area that in 1815–1830 constituted the United Kingdom of the Netherlands (Diderot–5: 368).

(*Беларус*), in the second case for the one that was already in use, but in different meaning (*Молдова*). This is distinguishing the difference between historical Moldova (Moldavia) and the nowadays state of Moldova, and creating terminological connection with feudal principality of Moldova, in its era relatively independent.<sup>22</sup> In both cases this change was consistent, after 1991 just new names are used in Bulgarian practically exclusively. This change is most probably a political export from the respective countries – it is a form of language declaration of the end of subordination to Russian factor that can be seen in pressure on other countries too, to derive (borrow) names of both post-Soviet countries from Belarusian and Romanian, not Russian.

An attempt to describe difference in the relation to island (*Ирландия*) and state created on this island (*Ейпе*) was performed in case of **Ireland**. First term should have become hyperonym, second should have – together with name *Северна Ирландия* – constituted cohyponym alternatives. Probably because of the intensive feeling of strangeness of Irish name for Ireland, however, this was not performed, and therefore the English-derived name designates primarily even the state. *Ейпе* is then used as an alternative term in order to specify the situation (even here, as in case of Belarus and Moldova, is the parallel with English situation evident).

The problem of naming **the Netherlands** is lying in the fact that there is a widespread usage of the name of lower unit (historical region, the core of the state – *Холандия*) for the whole state (*Нидерландия*), what is evidently an inaccuracy, even though not that substantial. It is because this is restricted to spoken language and written text of minor significance. In language guidebooks or encyclopedias the Dutch state is always named correctly.<sup>23</sup>

---

22 There is a remarkable consent with English that have eliminated older names of both countries as well and replaced them by new ones – direct borrowings from Belarusian or Romanian.

23 Situation is evoking incorrect Czech name for Czechia “Čechy” (Bohemia) that is still relatively widely used. The difference is in the fact, that even some authors of publications such as dictionaries do not hesitate to ignore the correct single-word name of our country, even though we would expect them to be more informed, professional and objective.

## CHORONYMS FOR CROATIA IN BULGARIAN

### (PROBLEMS OF GEOGRAPHICAL TERMINOLOGY AND TRANSLATION, Part 2)

#### I.

With the creation of new state units in the last decade of 20<sup>th</sup> century several new geographical terms appeared in Bulgarian. Two of them (*Беларус, Молдова*) were described in the previous chapter. Many of them existed even before 1990, however they did not designate separate states back then, just federal units of former federations. It is natural that in such a state of things they were not used too often and therefore were not objects of sufficient attention of linguists, journalists etc. This might be the cause of unsettled norm in naming of some of the new states. Doublet forms are actively in use, even though these do not have semantic justification (what is the case of Croatia as well). Different existing doublet forms could help to fully distinguish historical area from the nowadays state (e.g. Central Croatia or Croatia proper from Croatia – the state, historical Moldavia from nowadays Moldova – the state, Bohemia from Czechia or Holland from the Netherlands), but this is not being done and if, then very inconsistently.

Geographical name of nowadays state of Croatia has three variants in Bulgarian usus: *Хърватия, Хърватско* and *Хърватска*. How is it possible that one state has three names in one language? And what place each of them takes in the system of Bulgarian toponyms? Only a very

low attention has been devoted to this topic from the side of Bulgarian linguists. The only one of the fundamental works on this topic that analysed this problem was the paper of Todor Balkanski (1995).

## II.

History of naming Croatia in Bulgarian is as follows: during 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century the most pervasive term in Bulgarian texts is *Кроацѝя*. According to Balkanski this term is being spread by “Bulgarian scholars that work mostly among Croats and Serbs in Austria” (Balkanski 1995: 170).<sup>24</sup> Form *Хърватско* is created in spoken language during 19<sup>th</sup> century under the impact of word-formation model *Влашко, Българско, Сръбско, Гръцко* etc. Literary language, however, sticks to form *Кроацѝя*, resisting the rivalry of colloquial *Хърватско*. Swinging of the users of language is evident even at the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century (ibid.: 170–171). Later dictionary works issued before 1990 do not include any other term than *Хърватско* (КБЕ-5: 405, Enc: 920, Ї-В: 133, Baychev – Damyanova – Tsankov 1980: 14 and others). Only Chukalov is listing form *Хърватия* as the only Bulgarian equivalent for Russian *Хорватия* (R-В: 1139). The reasons of this situation are explained by Balkanski: “Since the beginning of this century (i.e. 20<sup>th</sup> – note by P.K.) *Хърватско* is still the only national form in Bulgarian ethnonymia and successfully resists the rivalry of formally correct, but to literary language unaccepted *Хърватия* (see Bulgarian encyclopedic guidebooks)” (Balkanski 1995: 171).<sup>25</sup>

## III.

International recognition of the independent Republic of Croatia in January 1992 finally facilitated the rising frequency of usage of this geographical name of the Croatian state, compared to the period when

24 Orig.: “български книжовници, които работят предимно сред хърватите и сърбите в Австрия”.

25 Orig.: “От началото на настоящия век всъщност *Хърватско* остава единствена народна форма в българската книжовна етнимонимия и успешно отстоява конкуренцията на книжовното по форма, но неприето в книжовния език *Хърватия* (вж. в българските енци. справочници)”.

Croatia was just one of the six republics of Yugoslav federation build by Josip Broz Tito. High frequency is obviously visible mainly in media. From this area (more specifically from the Bulgarian National Television) the first Bulgarian attempt to codify traditional Bulgarian term *Хърватско* steamed on the 28<sup>th</sup> January 1993. In the same year the idea to name the Croatian state using borrowing Croatian name *Хърватска* occurred. Unfortunately, this had roots in academia. Its initializer was back-then teacher of Croatian language at the Sofia University, Mladen Matic, that persuaded ambassador of the Republic of Croatia in Sofia. Matic himself later admitted that Croatian – and Serbian as well – model, that means conversion of the feminine adjective to the form of substantive (Hrvat → hrvatska [zemlja, država “land, country”] → Hrvatska; Bugarin → bugarska → Bugarska; Čeh → češka → Češka; Nijemac → njemačka → Njemačka, etc.), is strange for Bulgarian language, and therefore should not be forced to it (ibid.). Even despite that, many Bulgarian newspapers, magazines, electronic media and even some linguists, historians and other experts use besides the correct Bulgarian names *Хърватия* and *Хърватско* an inadequate Croatian borrowing *Хърватска* as well since this time.

### III.1

As suffix *-ия* on the level of literary language and suffixes *-ия* and *-ско* on the level of spoken language are the only ones in line with the Bulgarian word-formation norm, I do follow T. Balkanski (ibid.) that a word-formation exception *Хърватско* will gradually disappear from the norm and the only official geographical name for the Croatian state will be *Хърватия*. If we say that the suffixes for toponym formation in Bulgarian are the two above stated, then we have in mind mainly European or other culturally close states. When forming names for Asian, African and American states – mostly created during the last 60 years – these are mostly borrowed directly from Western European languages of former colonial powers or from the local official language of the respective country (very often via the Western European language too); see e.g. *Вьетнам* – Vietnamese *Việt Nam*, *Шри Ланка* – Sinhala *Śrī Lankā*, *Пакистан* – Urdu *Pākistān*; *Камерун* – English *Cameroon*, French *Cameroun*,

*Зимбабве* – English *Zimbabwe*, *Нигер* – French *Niger*; *Суринам* – Dutch *Suriname*, *Парагвай* – Spanish *Paraguay*, *Барбадос* – English *Barbados*). The very same process exists in Czech as well – e.g. *Vietnam*, *Šrí Lanka*, *Pákistán*; *Kamerun*, *Zimbabwe*, *Niger*; *Surinam*, *Paraguay*, *Barbados*.

### III.2

According to my opinion, variant *Хърватска* should not be allowed by Bulgarian language norm for several reasons:

1. The word *Хърватска* is primarily singular form of feminine adjective, the usage of which naturally anticipates some associated substantive (*държава*, *армия*, *опера* “country, army, opera”, etc.). Without such substantive the stated term hopelessly cries for some continuation;
2. The usage of the term *Хърватска* as a choronym has no linguistical, geographical, historical, political, cultural, semantic nor any other justification;
3. The uselessness of this term stems from the fact that in Bulgarian language there are two official names for one state, which itself is very unusual (the existence of the third form as well, in addition of foreign origin, is even a bigger paradox);
4. Based on my own observation and research, I think that the usage of the term *Хърватска* by many journalists is nothing but an ordinary mannerism, kind of personal journalistic exhibitionism, visible in inclination to using unusual terms and expressions. Nevertheless, the motivation for using this term is something that is not underlaid by any objective need;
5. Its promotion to official Bulgarian language would be a step towards legitimization of media (more specifically some journalists, TV and radio reporters, presenters, sport commentators etc.) as one of the most influential and in fact monopolistic manipulators with language norm, and even creators of the new norm.

### III.3

Using the Google search engine for frequency of occurrence of the three toponyms in question gave the following results ten years ago: *Хърватия* –

883,000 (56.3 %), *Хърватска* – 647,000 (41.3 %), *Хърватско* – 38,000 (2.4 %). Nowadays (May 2019) the results are: *Хърватия* – 4,480,000 (81.4 %), *Хърватска* – 891,000 (16.2 %), *Хърватско* – 134,000 (2.4 %). These outcomes divided by more than ten years can be interpreted as follows: traditional Bulgarian name *Хърватско* that was practically the only used term till the beginning of 90's (20<sup>th</sup> century) has a minimal or even omissible frequency of occurrence (in both cases identically 2.4 %, even though absolute number rose more than three times). It is evident that this term is disappearing from usage, fading out to periphery. Its spot as a primary name for Croatia in Bulgarian is taken over by the new form *Хърватия* – its predominant spread and consolidation is supported by numbers: ten years ago this form was slightly prevailing, however nowadays it is so bold (81.4 %, in absolute numbers its frequency rose five times), that the toponym *Хърватия* is becoming in fact the only, unrivalled name for the Croatian state. Competing potential of the borrowed choronym *Хърватска* is visibly falling (41.3 % compared to nowadays 16.2 %, in absolute numbers it rose just by one third), so it is justified to think that this trend will follow further.

### III.4

The unstable situation that was evident in the first decade of this century mainly, is supported by an analysis of expert publications and guidebooks issued in the period 1990–2005. Most of the publications dealing with the Balkans are using in different combinations two (Karagyozov 1997, Chavdarova 1999, Georgiev 2000, Lalkov 2000, Dvornik 2001, Manchev 2001, Matanov 2002) or even three names at the same time (Manchev 2000), while with exception of Lalkov and Karagyozov I have not found any semantic or any other motivation for usage of the respective Bulgarian names for Croatia. Lalkov and Karagyozov are trying to terminologically distinguish *Croatia – a part of Yugoslav federation* (*Хърватско*) and *Croatia – an independent state* (*Хърватия*). This attitude corresponds with the case of Moldova and Belarus, even though guidebooks were different for each state. It is surprising to some extent that no attempt was made in any of the publications to use the existence of two Bulgarian geographical names for Croatia to distinguish the state area (the Republic of Croatia,

including historical areas of Central Croatia, Slavonia, Istria and Dalmatia) from central Croatian historical region (Central Croatia or Croatia proper). The reason for not utilizing this terminological potential is most probably the lack of need of average Bulgarian to know more about the inner structure of Croatia (and in fact most of the countries), so there is no need to present the above mentioned geographical and historical difference in communication. I have noted seven important publication that were using – according to my opinion – the most suitable name *Хърватия* – *История на Хърватия* (“History of Croatia” – Vozhilova 1998), *История на Балканите* (“History of the Balkans” – Castellan 2002), *Хърватия* (“Croatia” – Doukov 2006), *История на националния въпрос на Балканите* (“History of National Question in the Balkans” – Manchev 2008), *Илирия от Варна до Вилах* (“Illyria from Varna to Villach” – Kaychev 2015), proceeding *Маски долу! Национализмът на Балканите през XX век* (“Masks Down! Nationalism in the Balkans in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century” – Preshlenova et al. 2018) and magazine *Балканите* (“The Balkans”), that was being issued in the period 1999–2002. On the other hand, Croatian borrowing *Хърватска* solely is being used by e.g. V. Tsachevski (2008a, 2008b, 2011).

### III.5

Language and encyclopedic guidebooks are not consistent in opinion on naming Croatia either. New Bulgarian orthographic dictionary lists traditional *Хърватско* only (NPR: 1010). New Czech-Bulgarian dictionary in its very detailed part devoted to geographical and demonyms states both Bulgarian forms, with *Хърватско* in the first place. Older formal name *Socialistická republika Chorvatsko* is being translated by this older term only (Č-B-2: 1416). Term in BER is listed as *ХЪРВАТСКА* (p. 1258). On the other hand, BE prefers *ХЪРВАТИЯ* (p. 1265), however we can see *Хърватска* in the map, and in further parts devoted to Croatia the form *Хърватско* is found (and sometimes even *Хърватия*). *Хърватско* can be found on the political map of the World in this encyclopedia, but in web version *Хърватия* is used on the map for a change (<http://www.encyclopedia.bg/demo/ctr/europe.html>). Under this term there are also shown basic information about the country, when one clicks on Croatia. Even despite this, it is evident that

issuers of BE prefer form *Хърватия*. In publication “Flags of the Countries of the World” *Хърватия* is leading, but other two terms are stated in brackets as alternatives (Ivanov 2002: 209). Even despite the stated, it is evident that the author of this publication prefers the name *Хърватия*.

#### IV. Conclusions

Some signs of previous attitude (Belarus, Moldova) are visible even in the attempt to establish Croatian name of Croatia in Bulgarian environment (*Хърватска* ← Croatian *Hrvatska*). The official Croatian diplomatic mission stepped back from this aim, however local media took over the “rescue” mission of the – for Bulgarian – unnecessary term, showing by this their total linguistic insensitiveness and diletantism. The competition of two official Bulgarian terms for Croatia (*Хърватия*, *Хърватско*) was very quickly transformed to competition of the more “vital” from these two Bulgarian variants (*Хърватия*) and borrowed Croatian form (*Хърватска*). During the second decade of the new century, however, was the first variant (*Хърватия*) established to such extent that it in fact became the only possibility how to name the Croatian state in Bulgarian. Borrowing from Croatian (*Хърватска*) is being put aside similarly to what happened to the older Bulgarian variant (*Хърватско*) before. The success of the form with *-ия* is supported also by the fact that it does not contradict Bulgarian word-formation model for formation of geographical names (see the beginning of previous chapter). Form with suffix *-ско* with this derivational formant is an unique exception in Bulgarian, what evidently caused its recession to the periphery of literary language. The attempts to exploit both the terms with different meaning are rare; trying – according to my opinion without a reason – to note mainly the moment of political change from dependent federative unit to independent state (important is the year 1991 – similarity with change in the cases of Belarus [← Belorussia] and Moldova [← Moldavia] is clearly visible). An attempt to cover the difference in relation to *historical area* (Central Croatia) and *the state* (the Republic of Croatia), that seems to me more important, was not performed in either of the mentioned publications.

## CHORONYMS FOR CZECHIA AND BOHEMIA IN SLAVONIC AND SELECTED NON-SLAVONIC LANGUAGES

(PROBLEMS OF GEOGRAPHICAL  
TERMINOLOGY AND TRANSLATION, Part 3)

### I. Introductionary Overview

With regard to difficulties that geographical names<sup>26</sup> denoting a Central European state unit called since 1990 officially *Česká republika* (*the Czech Republic*) have encountered since the beginning of Czech statehood, it surely will not be inadequate to look more closely at the state of things in languages that are genetically the closest to Czech, that means Slavonic languages.

The word-formation suffix that was applied in the past in naming countries of the culturally closest area in most Slavonic languages is originally Latin suffix *-ia*. Practically in all Slavonic languages its pronunciation is preserved with exception of Czech where it was changed to *-ie*. The respective Slavonic languages are different in the level of usage of this suffix for naming European countries. On one hand there stands e.g. Russian, Bulgarian and Polish, where this word-formation type is predominant (Russian in 36 cases from 50, Bulgarian in 33, Polish in 30). On the other hand, in other Slavonic languages word formation using domestic suffixes *-sk-* (with variants *-šk-*, *-ck-*, *-čk-* or *-k-*)

---

26 By plural form we want to stress that we have not just Czech, but also some foreign equivalents in mind, including the most important one – English.

prevailed. This is typical mainly for Czech and Slovak – in these languages approximately two thirds of the names derived are using formant *-sk(o)* (with variants *-k(o)* and *-ck(o)*); Slovak in 36 cases, Czech in 29). In Serbian and Croatian the ratio of both main word-formation types is similar – ending with formant *-sk(a)* (with variants *-šk(a)* and *-čk(a)*) is prevailing in Croatian over type *-ij(a)* with ratio 19:15, in Serbian this ratio is 17:17. In Polish the type *-sk(a)* is represented in one case only, and that being the name of the very Poland (*Polska*). Formation with suffix/ending *-y*, that was used in some Slavonic languages to derive geographical names from demonyms in the past is nowadays non-productive and in existing names only weakly represented. In Russian is this ending visible in the name of the Netherlands (*Нидерланды*), in Polish, where the usage is wider, is included in names for Germany, Czechia, Hungary and Italy (*Niemcy, Czechy, Węgry, Włochy*). The suffix *-ia/-ie* in Czech is visible in eight cases (*Velká Británie, Belgie, Francie, Itálie, Albánie, Severní Makedonie, Arménie* and *Gruzie*), in Slovak in only one (*Veľká Británia*).

## II. Czechia in Slavonic Languages

Russian and Bulgarian names take form of *Чехия*, Ukrainian *Чехія* and Belarusian *Чэхія*. Serbo-Croatian and Slovenian form is *Češka* (in Serbian Cyrillic script written as *Чешка*), Czech and Slovak then as *Česko*. In Macedonian there are two forms existing side by side, *Чехија* and *Чешка*, what according to my opinion might be caused by the Serbian form (*Чешка*) leaking from historical and political reasons to still rather young standard language, accompanying the older form (*Чехија*). Just Polish form *Czechy* is different from the others. At this point, however, we need to note that we cannot put equation mark between this Polish term and Czech expression *Čechy*. It is not possible to mechanically identify word-formation processes in different genetically related languages just on the bases of presence of the same word-formation formants. In Czech a replacement of all older forms ending in *-y* (*Švýcarsy, Rakousy, Bavory, Španěly, Sasy* etc.) by new ones ending in *-sko* (*Švýcarsko, Rakousko, Bavorsko, Španělsko, Sasko* etc.) took place in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century. The

very same process influenced even the form *Čechy* (see Lutterer – Šrámek 2004: 63). However, because of its inveteracy and solid bind with the home country of Czechs, the full withdrawal to literary, archaic or any other stylistically marked vocabulary – as in the case of other countries – did not take place. On the contrary, in time both the forms became differentiated in content: *Čechy* was used further as a traditional label of central historical Czech land, Bohemia, the content of the name *Česko* was gradually widened and became an umbrella term for all the Czech lands (lands of the Bohemian Crown) and at the same time label for the whole Czech national area, that means the area inhabited by modern Czech nation, and the area that nowadays includes Bohemia, Moravia and the Czech part of Silesia. In Polish, however, the ending *-y* was preserved in the names of some countries till today, even though this word-formation model is not productive anymore.

### III. Bohemia in Slavonic Languages

Differentiating between *Česko* and *Čechy* by using toponym containing in its word base the originally Czech lexical morpheme *čech-* on the one hand and borrowing and customized Latin toponym *Bohemia* (originally Germanic) on the other is not as consistently applied in Slavonic languages as in Romance and Germanic languages (see above). The stated Latin-Czech pair can be found in Polish (*Bohemia* vs. *Czechy*), Belarusian (*Багемія* vs. *Чэхія*), Ukrainian (*Богемія* vs. *Чехія*), Russian (*Богемия* vs. *Чехия*), Bulgarian (*Бохемия* vs. *Чехия*), and even Serbian (*Бохемија*, [*Бохемска*] vs. *Чешка*), Croatian and Slovenian (both *Bohemija* vs. *Češka*).<sup>27</sup> Slovak differentiates both terms in the same way as Czech does (*Čechy* vs. *Česko*), that is by two different word-formation types, using Czech root in both cases. An attempt to distinguish content of both the above-

27 We were not able to find any proof of any form of Latin *Bohemia* in Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian in either of the examined defining or translational dictionaries, but these are used to some extent in practise – often under direct influence of English or German, from that is Serbian, Croatian or Slovenian text being translated; the question of frequency of their occurrence in these languages and not just there, would require a separate research, as – according to our for now incomplete information – it should be higher among Eastern Slavs and in Bulgarian than in Polish or in the area of former Yugoslavia.

mentioned terms is offered for Macedonian in the Czech–Macedonian dictionary from 2006 that lists *Чехуја* as an equivalent to *Čechy*, while for Serbian borrowing *Чешка* it is *Česko* (Č–M: 19, 20).

Non-Slavonic name is used in respective languages mainly to designate Bohemia inside the Habsburg Monarchy (1526–1918) or in the period before Slavs entered this area. Slavonic name labelled middle-age Czech state and continually, with falling importance of Czechia, it started to weaken and was used together with non-Slavonic toponym to name only area of Bohemia (Latin *Regnum Boemiae*). In 20<sup>th</sup> century, after the creation of Czechoslovakia, Bohemia was named solely by the respective Slavonic term (*Чехия/Чехія/Чэхія, Чешка/Češka, Czechy*). This, at the same time, was used in common, non-formal communication as more acceptable (even though inaccurate) replacement for the too long and unusual mutation of the name *Československo* (Czechoslovakia) in other Slavonic languages. One-word umbrella term for the Czech lands in Czech during the existence of Czechoslovakia was never a political priority. Czechoslovakia was understood as a home for Czechs, as a modern “Czech” state, therefore even in other languages there was no need to distinguish between *Čechy* (Bohemia) and *Česko* (Czechia). Just the difference between the state, Czechoslovakia, and its respective historical lands, Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Slovakia and till 1939 even Carpathian Ruthenia was held. The federalization of Czechoslovakia by legislative act in autumn 1968 and the creation of the Slovak Socialist Republic and the Czech Socialist Republic did not bring any further widening of toponym *Česko* in the society either – communist governments not only here were fond of long, at least three-word political (formal) names, that were naturally often shortened (Czechoslovakia → ČSSR, Czechia → ČSR, Slovakia → SSR); these shortcuts were preferred in texts of different character over the more natural geographical names, so the adherence to the more “developed” part of the World was stressed. To illustrate this, let us remind naming of the back-then republics of the USSR, where we would hopelessly look for Ukraine, Lithuania or Kazakhstan – instead, forms the Ukrainian SSR, the Lithuanian SSR, the Kazakh SSR etc. were used.<sup>28</sup>

28 In a similar way were named republics of Yugoslav federation (SR Srbija, SR Hrvatska, SR Makedonija etc.) – in these cases, however, the geographical name was not lost, as Serbo-Croatian norm for

## IV. Czechia and Bohemia in Germanic and Romance Languages

In Germanic and Romance languages, the naming of respective Czech lands is derived from originally Latin forms *Bohemia*, *Moravia*, *Silesia*. Choronym *Čechy* and with that connected expressions *Čech* (demonym) and *český* (adjective) is therefore in these languages created using word-formation base *bohem-* (English *Bohemia* – *Bohemian*, *Bohemian*; German *Böhmen* – *Böhme*, *böhmisch* etc.).

The name of the current Czech state in Western European languages is derived from a base that includes originally Czech root *čech-* (pron. [tʃekh]). This is visible since the creation of Czechoslovakia (1918) – the first state unit in that Czech name for Czechs became part of its geographical name in all the non-Slavonic languages: translational equivalents in Germanic and Romance languages are de facto phonetically and in terms of word-formation appropriately customized Czech forms – English *Czechoslovakia*, German *Tschechoslowakei*, French *Tchécoslovaquie*, Spanish *Checoslovaquia* etc. The only logical and linguistically acceptable attitude to creation of the name of the Czech state after the dissolution of Czechoslovakia in these languages is the one when we add the most appropriate suffix from each of the languages in question to the root morpheme (i.e. in our case *Czech-*, *Tschech-*, *Tché-*, *Chec-*). Therefore, for *Česko* there is an English translational equivalent *Czechia*,<sup>29</sup> German *Tschechien*, French *Tchéquie*, Spanish *Chequia* etc. Equation mirroring the historical and geographical structure of the Czech state that is in Czech *Česko* = *Čechy* + *Morava* + *Slezsko*, is in selected Western European languages *Czechia* = *Bohemia* + *Moravia* + *Silesia* (English), *Tschechien* = *Böhmen* + *Mähren* + *Schlesien* (German), *Tchéquie* = *Bohême* + *Moravie* + *Silésie* (French) and *Chequia* = *Bohemia* + *Moravia* + *Silesia* (Spanish).

---

formation of political names of states was and is till today **(Adj)A-SubstF-SubstG**, while traditional Czech model is based on formula **AdjG-(Adj)A-SubstF**, where G = geographical component (e.g. Serbia, Czech...), F = form of state system (e.g. republic, kingdom...), A = eventual further, defining attribute (e.g. socialist, federative...).

29 This expression has roots in Latin where it started to spread in 16<sup>th</sup> century (see Šitler 2017).

## V. Situation after 1993 – Czechia

Year of 1993 meant a restoration of independent Czech statehood, even though most of the Czechs did not understand the end of Czechoslovakia as an achievement or restoration of independence and emancipation from subjection to some dominating political subject (as was the case of most of the new states of so-called Central–Eastern Europe), but as a loss of part of its very territory, their “own” Czechoslovakia. The indifference on the Czech side is partly understandable. Czechia gained its independence *de facto* passively – by Slovakia leaving Czechoslovakia. Independent (or more accurately lonely) Czechia “fall straight into our lap”, without Czech society even doing anything in that case. Czechs considered the fight for their own state – democratic republic – to have ended for ever after the First (1918), in repetition after the Second World War (1945) and third time after the fall of communism (1989). All the bitterness and frustration caused by repeated loss of three-times hardly carved-out and in the meantime two-times (1939, 1948) lost or enslaved Czechoslovakia transformed in the minds of many Czechs i.a. to irrational hate towards the (for decades already existing) geographical name of the old (new) home of Czechs, that was during its three hundred years of existence patiently waiting for its opportunity – and gained it only now. The naming potential of toponym *Česko* could be implemented in full only in the last decade of 20<sup>th</sup> century. Although the above-described refusing attitude could be understood from the psychological point of view, however it could not be accepted in any case, as it could be ultimately used at any time to derogate and even question the international position of Czechia. In other Slavonic countries there was no reason to reject the name of the newly-created Central–European state or even the state itself, so the respective Slavonic name – practically the only existing in all the cases, let it form be *Чехия/Чехія/Чэхія*, *Чешка/Češka* or *Czechy* – became an official and commonly-used geographical name designating in spoken and written communication today’s Czech Republic. Overusing the formal name (i.e. stubborn and unconditional sticking to functionally and/or in stylistic view inappropriate usage of official political name – in this case *Česká republika*, *the Czech Republic*, *die Tschechische Republik* etc. –

instead of official geographical name – in this case *Česko*, *Czechia*, *Tschechien* etc.) use to be in these languages an “export” from Czech uniformness, ignorance or dourness, the pressure of the Czech advocates of this attitude in particular cases (publication, geography, sport etc.) or the effect of English influence (say in translation from English) that – as the only European language! – even after a quarter-century of existence of independent Czechia is not able (or at least its speakers are often pretending) to reflect this geopolitical reality in an appropriate and widely-acceptable one-word way.<sup>30</sup>

## VI. Situation after 1993 – Bohemia

Bohemia is in Slavonic languages named nowadays in two ways – first by a term of Latin origin (to simplify, let us call it B-variant), in this form mainly in texts of scholar character, second by Slavonic term (therefore Cz-variant), often with inevitable defining attribute “central”, “old”, “historical” etc. The need to distinguish lower historical and administrative units is naturally more often in scholar (linguistic, geographical, natural-science, political, sociological, historical etc.) or official texts, that – in contrast to common communication – require certain level of punctuality in expressions. Therefore e.g. translation of the political name *Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia* to Bulgarian is more precise in form *Протекторат Бохемия и Моравия* than in form *\*Протекторат Чехия и Моравия*, from today’s point of view de facto inaccurate. Name of the Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (Czech *Komunistická strana Čech a Moravy*)

30 About the peripeteia (not only) with official geographical English name *Czechia* see e.g. Krejčí (2007b). Signalling a change to better in the field of English language is the rising number of English–Czech and Czech–English dictionaries, where form *Česko* is translated with a correct equivalent *Czechia*, but more importantly a note of American geographer Alexander Murphy in the preface to his book *The European culture area*: “As for the names of independent countries, we have opted for commonly used anglicized short forms rather than formal country names (Germany instead of Federal Republic of Germany or Bundesrepublik Deutschland). The one case that might be less familiar to readers concerns the Czech Republic. Increasingly one hears the short form *Czechia*. Even though that name is not as widely known as other truncations (e.g., Slovakia for the Slovak Republic), we have decided to use *Czechia* for consistency and to reflect its growing use in the country itself” (Murphy et al. 2008: XV). The officialization of the expression *Czechia* as the only English equivalent to *Česko* was finalized by *Czechia* and other single-word equivalents being noted in the respective databases of UN – UNGEGN and UNTERM – during the spring and summer 2016 (see e.g. <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/geonames/> or [https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/countries\\_en](https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/countries_en)).

should – for a change – in Russian translation be *Коммунистическая Партия Богемии и Моравии*, not *\*КП Чехии и Моравии*. Incorrect would not be even freer translation *КП Чехии*.<sup>31</sup>

There is no need felt in everyday communication in Slavonic languages to name historical Bohemia in a specific way, what is natural – foreign historical areas of lower degree, moreover not existing nowadays anymore, are not often a topic of non-formal speeches or texts of lay character. If a Russian or Bulgarian visited Czechia, it is not important for him if he was in Bohemia, Moravia, or Silesia, as well as an ordinary Czech tourist is not interested if he visited Dalmatia, Istria or Slavonia – it is important for him that he was in Croatia (to provide an evidence of naturally higher importance of state, let us mention that in the Yugoslavian era we used to travel “to Yugoslavia”, not “to Croatia” [and not at all “to Dalmatia”]), that used to be just one of the six Yugoslav republics. Few people knew that the Yugoslavian Adriatic was largely Croatian).

31 A sad rarity was in this way a name of Czech football association, that was *Českomoravský fotbalový svaz* (could be translated as the Bohemian–Moravian Football Association); therefore – before it changed its name to *Fotbalová asociace České republiky* (Football Association of the Czech Republic) in 2011 – it was the only football association in the World (!!) that did not mirror the name of the state it was based in. That name 1. was just a compound of historical lands, and that without a reason, 2. moreover, this compound was not geographically consistent (Silesia was missing) and 3. was incorrect from the orthographic point of view as well (based on its coordinating character it should be *Česko-moravský*, e.g. connected with both Bohemia and Moravia; the form *Českomoravský* is non- logically pointing to motivating expression *\*Česká Morava* (= Bohemian Moravia), however there is no such geographical body)... The mentioned name was of course very difficult to translate to other languages (the problem steamed mainly from the insecurity how to understand the first part of compound, *Česko-*: Bohemian-, or Czech-?), what was solved with Salomonian wisdom by the Association – English translation was formed – in the era of the first, as well as the second Czech name – as *Football Association of the Czech Republic*.

## CHORONYMS FOR CZECHIA AND BOHEMIA IN BULGARIAN

### (PROBLEMS OF GEOGRAPHICAL TERMINOLOGY AND TRANSLATION, Part 4)

#### I.

The concurrence of toponyms *Чехия* and *Бохемия* is not as obvious as in the preceding terms at first sight. *Чехия* is nowadays the only Bulgarian name for the Czech state, *Czechia*. Bulgarian norm is clear here. A problem occurs when we want to express the difference between *Czechia* (the state) and *Bohemia* (the biggest Czech historical land, the core of the Czech state) in Bulgarian.

Slavonic languages most often do not possess Latin-originated term *Bohemia* (in the respective Slavonic mutations) to clearly distinguish *Bohemia* (German *Böhmen*, French *Bohême*, Spanish *Bohemia*) from *Czechia* (German *Tschechien*, French *Tchéquie*, Spanish *Chequia*). If it does (e.g. Russian *Богемия*, Bulgarian *Бохемия*), it is mainly understood as the middle-age territory before the Slavs entered it (Czechs and other tribes) and the Latin origin is highlighted: “name of the area where the Czech state was established in 9<sup>th</sup> century” (KBE-1: 280); “Latin name of the central Czech land based on Celtic tribe of Boii (Enc: 92); “1. Latin name of the territory inhabited by the tribe of Boii, 2. official name of the central Czech land (1526–1918) in the Habsburg Empire”

(BE: 146).<sup>32</sup> Very unclearly is the expression defined in BER: “current Western–European name of Чехия [? – i.e. the central Czech land? or Czechia?]” (BER: 1290).<sup>33</sup> If the term Чехия is understood as a name of state, then the stated definition is totally incorrect. The difference in meaning between toponyms *Бохемия* and *Чехия* is explained in the most complex, however still not fully correct way, by S. Vlahov: “BOHEMIA – 1. original name of territory where the Czech state was established, 2. old name for the central Czech land; Czechia (without Moravia) as a part of the Habsburg Empire (1526–1918)” (ER: 56). “CZECHIA – 1. the Czech state inhabited by Bohemians, Moravians and other Western–Slavonic tribes in the era of early feudalism (since 10<sup>th</sup> century), 2. the Czechoslovak Republic, officially, after the dissolution of Austria–Hungary (1918–1939); (...) after the occupation of the country by the Hitlerists that declared it to be «Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia» (...), 3. the Czech Socialist Republic, independent state (after 1945) within Czechoslovakia” (ibid.: 280).<sup>34</sup> Inaccuracies are visible mainly in point 3. Point 2 is suggesting, that the name Чехия was sometimes used in order to simplify for the whole Czechoslovakia.

## II.

Bulgarian–Czech dictionaries issued in the previous century note mainly the form Чехия. Form *Бохемия* is listed by K. Hora only (B–Č: 56). Czech equivalent of both expressions used to be toponym *Čechy* (B–Č: 56, 1025, Č–B: 45, B–Č–B: 204, 220). This situation is not existing in Bulgarian only – practically no dictionary of Czech and other Slavonic language before 1990 lists expression *Česko*, a one–word geographical name

32. Orig.: “Название на територията, върху която през IX в. е основана Чехия”; “латинско название на Чехия по името на келтските племена бои”; “1. латинско име на територията, населявана от племето бои, 2. офиц. име на Чехия (1526–1918) в Хабсбургската империя”.

33. Orig.: “Сегашното западноевропейско име на Чехия”. However, it is not clear whether Чехия means Bohemia or Czechia (note by P.K.).

34. Orig.: “БОХЕМИЯ – 1. първоначално название на територията, където се е образувала държавата Чехия, 2. старото име на Чехия; Чехия (без Моравия) в състава на Хабсбургската империя (1526–1918)”. “ЧЕХИЯ – 1. Чешка държава, населена от чехи, моравци и други зап.–слав. племена през ранния феодализъм (от 10. в.), 2. Чехословашка република, офиц., след разпадането на Австро–Унгария (1918–1939); (...) след окупирането на страната от хитлеристите, които я обявяват за «Протекторат Бохемия и Моравия» (...), 3. Чешка социалистическа република, самостоятелна държава (след 1945) в състава на Чехословакия”.

including in its meaning all three Czech historical lands, and therefore term having for the Czech nation and the Czech statehood a significant geopolitical meaning (the ignorance of the name *Česko* could not be excused as non-existing in era when the mentioned dictionaries were published; the oldest written document is from 1777, moreover, even older document was found recently – from 1704 – see Čižmárová 2016: 3–4 or 1999: 4).

The outlined situation might be weird, but still explainable. It is important to realize that the whole generations of Czechs understood as their national state, as “Czech” state, Czechoslovakia. Let us add, that justly. That is why Czechs during the existence of Czechoslovakia did not feel any need for single-word geographical name that would separately denote Czech national territory, the Czech lands, e.g. in fact today’s Czech Republic. First louder echoes of such need popped out in spring of 1939 when the break of Czechoslovakia occurred and when the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia was created out of the Czech lands (German protector, however, did not have any interest in using an umbrella term originating in Czech national name for the Czech national territory). Further in autumn 1968, when a law about federalization of back-then Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, that “promoted” Slovakia to republic appeared, there was no other option that to unify the Czech national territory to another republic. In the most powerful way, the need for one-word name of the Czech state came up in the second half of 1992, when it was obvious that on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 1993 Czechia will become independent on the international scene, without Slovakia. Both newer significant eras had something in common: most of the Czechs – unlike Slovaks – did not show any will to administratively or terminologically highlight their national territory. The cause of it was stated above already – almost full historical, political, national and psychological identification with Czechoslovakia.

### III.

After dissolution of Czechoslovakia a Bulgarian toponym *Чехия* noticed some shifts (similarly as in case of *Молдова*): meaning “historical land,

Bohemia” was marginalized, and a new meaning, “modern Czech state, Czechia” gained prominence. This shift is fully understandable, as meaning “state” i.e. particular internationally recognized social, political and legal unit is far more important in communication than meaning “historical land”, therefore something what is just a part of the respective state. If an ordinary Bulgarian uses name Чехия, practically all the time has a state, the Czech Republic, in mind, not one of the historical Czech lands.

In Bulgarian language – as I have suggested already – the name *Бохемия* is in use as well; expression, that means clearly and without any other meaning central Czech historical land only – Bohemia. Because it used to be mechanically referred in the past to the term *Čechy* only via Bulgarian Чехия (and vice-versa), the expression *Бохемия* was usually missing in Bulgarian language dictionaries. In the era of Czechoslovakia, it was probably seen as unnecessary. It was being pushed to the area of history and was explained as a synonym of Чехия (see e.g. КВЕ-5: 460). In ordinary communication an equation Чехословакия = Чехия + Моравия + Силезия + Словакия was valid. After 1993 this equation was rewritten to Чехия = ? (*Бохемия?*) + Моравия + Силезия, and therefore the position for the term that would denotate historical Bohemia only was released for usage. *Бохемия* was included again in several encyclopedias (e.g. ER: 56 or BE: 146) but is listed even in important scholar publications (e.g. Dvornik 2001). The toponym *Бохемия* is used in the two-volume Czech-Bulgarian dictionary (Č-B-1: 103, 110). However, here a question arises why it was not listed on the place where it should have been in the first place (taking into consideration they are operating with it already) – as a translation of Czech toponym *Čechy* (that is translated there as “Чехия (*без Моравия и Силезия*)” – see *ibid.*: 103). In the list of geographical names *Бохемия* is listed together with the traditional Чехия as a Bulgarian equivalent of the Czech *Bohemia* (sic!) (Č-B-2: 1412), we would not find it stated by the toponym *Čechy*.

It is obvious that the expression *Бохемия* will be used by scholars mainly – historians, philologists, political science scholars and geographers, therefore those, who need in their work to distinguish lower units within some geographical unit. This expression will stay unknown to an ordinary Bulgarian, or he will not be sure what precisely it means.

It is not anything unusual – many Czechs will not probably be able to correctly localize Dobruja, Mazovia, Limburg, Frisia, Karelia, Cantabria or Sanjak. That should not be a reason of non-including of such expressions to translational dictionaries, mainly if the language included in dictionary is spoken in the respective historical land or region.

The term *Бохемия* therefore should be present not only in encyclopedia, but even in more important dictionaries of Bulgarian (if the geographical names are included) and mainly in Czech–Bulgarian translational dictionaries. Normalization of this expression as the only Bulgarian equivalent for Bohemia would bring a clear line between socially highly needed name of state, its citizens and state-forming nation (*Чехия*, *чехи*) and socially far less important name of historical land and its inhabitants (*Бохемия*, *бохемци*). Why should Bulgarians speak about Bohemia as *Чехия* with some defining attribute or as *Чехия* “без Моравия и Силезия” (Czechia, without Moravia and Silesia), if they could every time simply use the choronym *Бохемия*?

#### IV. Conclusions

The problem with naming Bohemia lies in the fact that a name of the state (*Чехия*) is often used in synecdoche way for the lower unit that is just its part (*Бохемия*). That might not officially be incorrect, but due to homonymy with more important name of the state this effect quite often unnecessarily complicates its understandability. For a common communication it is not such a major fault – people rarely talk about lower units of foreign states, so it is evident that speaker has almost every time a state in mind. In scholar area things are different, though – geographical, historical, sociological, linguistic, political–science and other texts often working with geographical names require factual accuracy. When analysing Czech realia it is inevitable to clearly distinguish between concepts *Čechy* “Bohemia” and *Česko* “Czechia” using expressions *Бохемия* and *Чехия*, if they want to evade 1. undesirable homonymy, 2. official name *Чешка република* “the Czech Republic”, that is unsystematic and

for similar texts stylistically and factually inaccurate,<sup>35</sup> or 3. expression *чешките земи* “the Czech lands”, that degrades the Czech state to the level of no-name body of marginal provinces.

---

<sup>35</sup> Moreover, there used not to exist a body with this name before 1990, therefore, to use name *Česká republika* and its foreign equivalents for era before this year is a total nonsense and recklessness.

## **CHORONYMS FOR CZECHIA AND BOHEMIA IN SERBIAN & CHORONYMS FOR SERBIA AND SRPSKA IN CZECH**

(PROBLEMS OF GEOGRAPHICAL TERMINOLOGY  
AND TRANSLATION, Part 5)

### **I. Introduction**

Translation of the geographical names is not a particular problem, because it is a system which has been already built in the past. The modern situation is a result of a common choice of speakers where some forms have become part of the linguistic standard, while other forms have remained outside the standard, mostly older forms. This equally applies to the Czech geographical terminology. However, there are cases that somewhere in the world there is an appearance of new or renaming of an existing geographical reality. This is nothing unusual, for example, in Africa, where in the past sixty years there have been significant political changes that have also been expressed in the change of the name of newly born states or cities. However, for modern Europe such changes are not so typical. Socio-political changes from the beginning of the 1990s and the collapse of three Slavonic federations (the Soviet Union at the end of 1991, Yugoslavia in early 1992 and Czechoslovakia in late 1992) brought the need of new states on the map of Europe, but those states have had their traditional names as members of disintegrated federations (with one exception – Czechia, and that caused difficulties with a geographical name of the Czech state in some European languages, particularly in

English – see more in Krejčí 2008, 2009a). However, in Europe, namely in Bosnia and Herzegovina, new, previously non-existent state-political formation appeared: the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republic of Srpska (the topic of our analysis will be the other one because it is obvious that a collision with an equivalent for choronym *Serbia* can occur).

## II. Geographical Names

In the very beginning, before we begin to analyse an issue interesting from the point of view of onomastics, translatology, geography, political science, history, and perhaps some other disciplines, an issue concerning the existence of the concepts “land of the Czechs” and “land of the Serbs” and the possibilities to translate such a concept into a foreign language, it would be helpful to explain briefly what we mean when we speak of a geographical name, and what is the difference between that concept on the one hand and the so-called political or official name on the other hand. When we look at a map of Europe, we can now count fifty independent sovereign states and several autonomous territories or islands with limited sovereignty (such as Gibraltar, the Channel Islands or the Faroe Islands). All of these countries have a name – most commonly written with one (Bulgaria, France, Denmark...) or less often with two or more (Bosnia and Herzegovina, North Macedonia, Great Britain & Northern Ireland) autosemantic words. A proper noun, which designates some kind of territory, belongs to the group of the so-called **geographical names**, toponyms, more specifically choronyms (see e.g. Čermák 2010: 277). Czech choronyms were stabilizing and stylistically varied mostly during 19<sup>th</sup> and in the first half of 20<sup>th</sup> century (see more in examples of Czech equivalents for *Serbia* – among mentioned writers in 19<sup>th</sup> century some other forms that are not used today can be seen, *Srbsko* is the only one that stayed). Choronyms in geographical terminology are fulfilling the role of geographical names. Geographical names are mostly in form of one word, they are used in everyday communication, in different type of texts, including also official texts. They name specific region in present and can be used for the name of a region with respect to the past. They do

not change in case of a change in the state order (Lutterer – Šrámek 2004: 3). In some way they have symbolic importance because they are names of the homeland. In English handbooks, the geographical name is commonly called *short name*.

At the same time, geographical names are one of the word-forming categories in the process of derivative word formation of nouns. The Bulgarian or the Czech choronyms of the European countries is generally based on the same principles: in both languages, we mainly use domestic versions, the so-called exonyms, although, when we compare Bulgarian and Czech maps of Europe, we can say that Bulgarian language is more influenced by the original (or at least the international) form than Czech language – compare Bulgarian *Ирландия* or *Ейре* (English *Ireland*, Irish *Éire* vs. Czech *Irsko*), *Нидерландия* or *Холандия* (Dutch *Nederland* or *Holland* vs. Czech *Nizozemsko* or *Holandsko*), *Германия* (German *Deutschland*, English *Germany*, French *Allemagne* vs. Czech *Německo*), *Австрия* (German *Österreich*, English *Austria* vs. Czech *Rakousko*), *Беларус* (Belarusian *Беларусь*, English *Belarus* vs. Czech *Bělorusko*), *Молдова* (Romanian *Moldova*, English *Moldova* vs. Czech *Moldavsko* or *Moldávie*)<sup>36</sup>. Geographical names are used in everyday communication and in texts of various types, including official ones. They designate the territory from the point of view both of modernity and the past. They are not subject to change upon change in the form of state government, and they have important symbolic meaning (motherland, home).

### III. Political Names

Almost every country, in addition to its traditional, geographical name, has the so-called **political** (or official, formal) **name**, which is usually a combination of a geographical name and a common noun, such as *republic*, *kingdom*, *principality*, *federation*, etc. (*Republic of Serbia*, *Kingdom of Sweden*, *Principality of Monaco...*), sometimes with an additional specifying attribute (*Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, *People's Republic*

36 As regards the issue of doublet names of some European countries, see Krejčí (2005b), or previous chapters 4 and 5.

of Bulgaria...). Political or official name is not used so much in everyday communication. It is mostly used in the statements of an official or ceremonial character. It is used as the name of a particular region only if it is in that moment an official name. It has legal-political significance – only under its official title a state is recognized as a subject of international law. In English handbooks, the political name is usually called *official name*. Example – Serbia is today officially called *the Republic of Serbia*, but, before 1990 it was called *the Socialist Republic of Serbia*, before 1963 *the People’s Republic of Serbia*, before *the Kingdom of Serbia*, at the beginning of modern Serbian state it was called *the Principality of Serbia*. It is therefore not surprising that it must be distinguished when it comes to the history of, say, the German Democratic Republic or the Federal Republic of Germany, and when it comes to the history of Germany. The same is with the history of the USSR – it is not the same as history of Russia. About differences among geographical and political name see more examples about Czechia: “Another disadvantage of the name *Česká republika*, apart from its two-word form, is that it relates to state territory in an administratively political aspect; moreover, the name *Česko* is also a noun of a geographical and residentially historical unit, which is independent from the political establishment in the country, therefore being neutral in this sense. We can easily call our homeland by the name *Česko* in any historical period and under any social conditions.” (Lutterer – Šrámek 2004: 3–4; underlined by me).<sup>37</sup> Typically, the political name consists of several words (at least two), its use in daily communication is minimal, it is used mostly in communicative situations of official and/or solemn nature. It designates the territory only in terms of its current-day validity. The political name has an important administrative meaning (the state with its official name is a subject of international law).

Derivative types used in Serbian and in Czech to form a geographical name are:

Serbian:	-ска (-шка, -чка) 17x,	-uja 17x,	others 16x.
Czech:	-sko (-cko, -ko) 29x,	-ie 8x,	others 13x.

37 Orig.: “Jméno *Česká republika* má kromě své dvouslovnosti ještě tu nevýhodu, že se týká státního území v pojetí administrativně politickém; jm. *Česko* je však navíc vlastní název geografického a sídelně historického celku, který je nezávislý na politickém zřízení v zemi, a proto je po této stránce neutrální. Českem můžeme dobře pojmenovat naši vlast v kterémkoli jejím historickém čase a za jakýchkoli společenských podmínek”.

The illustrative data refers to names of European countries – it shows that in Czech language the domestic suffix *-sko* has a higher frequency than the international suffix *-ie* (the ratio is 29:8), unlike Serbian language where the ratio *-ска* : *-ија* is equal – 17:17.

The method of formation of official (political) names is more complex. The form of the political name may be based on the model  $(Adj)_A - Subst_F - Subst_G$ <sup>38</sup> (this model is typical of English, German, Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian and many other languages – e.g. *Kingdom of the Netherlands*, *Grossherzogtum Luxemburg*, *Република Българија*, *Савезна Република Југославија*) or on another model which is typical, for example, of Czech, Slovak or Hungarian:  $Adj_G - (Adj)_A - Subst_F$  (see e.g. *Československá socialistická republika*, *Francúzska republika*, *Magyar Köztársaság* or for German – atypical *Deutsche Demokratische Republik* or *Tschechische Republik*). Even at first glance, there is a difference – in the Serbian example, the geographical component of the given name is a noun, which is the last word of the word combination, while in the Czech example the geographical component is most often transformed into an adjective, and is found in the beginning of the word combination. As to its symbolic meaning, the geographical name of the common territory of a nation is just as important for its national identification as the other national and state symbols. In this sense, the political name fulfils rather a formal function with no pronounced symbolic elements.

#### IV.

### Today's Meaning of the Czech Concepts *Česko* and *Čechy*

The modern meaning of the choronym *Čechy* is “historical territory in the Czech Republic,” the choronym *Česko* means “the Czech Republic” (SŠČ 2000: 627).<sup>39</sup> The definition of the Serbian equivalent *Чешка* is “a country in Central Europe where the population is predominantly Czech

38 Subst = noun; Adj = adjective; G = geographical name in the form of a noun or transformed into an adjective; F = form of state organization; A = additional attribute, which brings into the name another significant feature of the state organization or the social-political organization; see also Krejčí (2010: 97), or Chapter 6.

39 Orig.: “Čechy – historické území v ČR; Česko – Česká republika”.

(previously within the former Czechoslovak Republic)” (RSJ 2007: 1514).<sup>40</sup> Based on the data, we can easily conclude that the Serbian equivalent *Чешка* today means the state Czechia, i.e. *Чешка* is the equivalent of the Czech word *Česko*.<sup>41</sup>

The question is how do we translate the choronym *Čechy* into Serbian? What is the situation in other Slavonic languages – that is what we discussed in Chapter 6 and partly in Chapter 3. In various European languages there is the so-called B-variant of the toponym related to the Czech space, and the so-called Cz-variant of the same toponym.<sup>42</sup> For example, Germanic and Romance languages denote the Czech space with a toponym containing the original Czech lexical morpheme *čech-* (the Cz-variant in question), and in addition to it with a borrowed and phonetically and morphologically adapted Latin toponym – *Bohemia*, of Germanic origin (the so-called B-variant). The Cz-variant, being related to the ethnonym *Czech*, has a newer meaning, it always means only the Czech state, *Czechia*, *Česko* in Czech, while the B-variant is related exclusively to the historical territory, *Bohemia*, *Čechy* in Czech.<sup>43</sup> In Slavonic languages, the situation is more colorful as well as somewhat less clear: in some there are both the Cz-variant and the B-variant (Russian *Чехия* vs. *Богемия*, Ukrainian *Чехія* vs. *Богемія*, Belarusian *Чэхія* vs. *Багемія*, Bulgarian *Чехия* vs. *Бохемия*, Polish *Czechy* vs. *Bohemia*). In others, there is definitely a Cz-variant, but the existence of the B-variant is questionable (Serbian – *Чешка* vs. *?Бохемија*, *?Бохемска*, Croatian and Slovenian – *Češka* vs. *?Bohemija*).<sup>44</sup> Two Cz-variants are in use in Czech and Slovak language – *Česko* vs. *Čechy*, and in Macedonian language – *Чешка* vs. *Чехија*<sup>45</sup>. As we can see from the examples, in Serbian we can even assume the existence of two B-variants, which could be considered a semantic equivalent to the Czech choronym *Čechy*. However, more often

40 Orig.: “Чешка – држава у средњој Европи у којој основно становништво чине Чеси (раније у саставу бивше Чехословачке Републике)”.

41 However, both small bilingual Czech-Serbian/Serbian-Czech dictionaries still do not reflect this fact, and explain the word *Чешка* only as the equivalent of the Czech word *Čechy*.

42 For details on versions in Slavonic languages, see Krejčí (2010), or Chapter 6.

43 Compare English *Czechia/Bohemia*, German *Tschechien/Böhmen*, French *Tchéquie/Bohême*, etc.

44 We personally noticed a B-variant in a Serbian translation of a Czech text, which mentions “Univerzitet zapadne Bohemije u Plzenju” (in Czech “Západočeská univerzita v Plzni”), as well as in a Serbian geographical reference book, which says: “Na Z[apadu] je visoravan Bohemija. Na istoku je pretežno brdovita pokrajina Moravska” (Ostojić 2006: 106).

45 For details, see Krejčí (2010: 95), or Chapter 6.

we notice the form *Бохемија*. As *Бохемија* is not a common equivalent to the western part of Czechia, and the very word *Чешка* in this sense is inappropriate due to unwanted semantic ambiguity, the question of how should Serbs translate *Čechy* can only be solved using a specifying attribute. What should it be? When we look at how things are in Serbia itself, we see that, for example, statistical reference books regularly need to distinguish between the state Serbia and Serbia without its northern province Vojvodina. Serbia without Vojvodina is called *ужа* or *централна Србија* “Central Serbia or Serbia proper”. In the same way, we could solve the issue of distinguishing between the state Czechia, and the same place without the eastern Czech lands – Moravia and Silesia. While in Czech language is valid the following equation *Česko = Čechy + Morava + Slezsko*, its English version being *Czechia = Bohemia + Moravia + Silesia*, and the German one being *Tschechien = Böhmen + Mähren + Schlesien*, in Serbian it should be *Чешка = Бохемија (ор ужа/централна/историјска Чешка) + Моравска + Шлезија*. In Bulgarian, similar to Serbian, the B-variant is not quite expanded and automated, which is only logical because the internal divisions of foreign states are not part of the active speech manifestations of ordinary Bulgarians but rather of expert historians, political scientists, geographers, linguists, etc. However, the B-variant in Bulgarian is much more expanded than in Serbian. Our equation for the Bulgarian language, considering the above facts, looks like this: *Чехия = Бохемия (ор централна/историческа Чехия) + Моравия + Силезия*.

## V.

### Today’s Meaning of the Serbian Concepts *Србија* and *Српска*

#### V.1

The modern meaning of the choronym *Србија* is “a) a state in the northern part of the Central Balkans, inhabited predominantly by Serbs; b) *historically* the name of various Serbian state organizations in the past”

(RSJ 2007: 1260).<sup>46</sup> In recent times, the choronym *Српска* has not yet become sufficiently automated as it is not a standalone article even in the newest dictionary of the Serbian language of 2007 – we can only find there a subarticle on *Република Српска* (within the article on the adjective *српску*), where we can read the following: “a state–legal unit within Bosnia and Herzegovina with a high degree of autonomy, mostly inhabited by Serbs” (RSJ 2007: 1263).<sup>47</sup> However, the choronym *Српска* is included in the glossary part of *Правонис српскога језика* (“Orthography of Serbian Language”), where there is only a brief explanation: “(named) Republic of Srpska” (PSJ 1994: 470).<sup>48</sup> The fact that *Српска* is a proper noun and that this name is not a neologism, as many people mistakenly believe, is proven by *Речник српскохрватскога књижевног језика*<sup>49</sup> (“Dictionary of Serbo–Croatian Standard Language”) and also by the Serbian Dictionary<sup>50</sup> by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić. In both cases, however, the choronym *Српска* is seen as a synonym for *Србија*, which is only logical – until the early 1990s there didn’t exist two Serbian states designated with a geographical name derived from the ethnonym *Србин* (by the way, the same applies to the original synonymy of the Czech choronyms *Česko* and *Čechy* after the second noticed appearance of the new form *Česko* [1777])<sup>51</sup>.

## V.2

As for the definitions of the Czech name for Serbia *Srbsko*, in the dictionaries of the Czech language it always means a Serbian state or land. In addition to *Srbsko*, Josef Jungmann gives in brackets the already archaic form *Srby*<sup>52</sup>. *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého* (“Dictionary of

46 Orig.: “Србија – а. држава на северу централног Балкана, већином насељена Србима; б. ист. назив за разне српске државне организације у прошлости”.

47 Orig.: “Република Српска: државно–правна јединица у оквиру Босне и Херцеговине с високим степеном аутономности, претежно насељена Србима”.

48 Orig.: “(поименичено) Република Српска”.

49 “Српска – в. Србија – Вражје племе позова народе ... Мурат Српску, а Вајазит Босну. Његош” (RSHKJ–V 1967–76: 977).

50 “Српска – Serbien, Serbia, vide Србија” (SR 1966 [1818]: 789).

51 “Tak vidíme při zemích německých Česko, Moravu, Rakouské Slezsko...” (Knihy metodní pro učitele českých škol). For details, see Čizmarová (1999). However, in the first noticed appearance (1704) the meaning is summarizing – *the Czech lands*: “... leč já ku příkladu Vlaško, Německo, Nyderlandsko, Česko, Polsko, Uhersko dřívěji psáti nebudu moci, leč dřívěji Španielsko celé s přináležejícími krajinami popišu...” (Atlas Marianus). For details, see Čizmarová (2016).

52 “Srbsko (Srby) – země Srbská na Dunaji, Serbien” (SČN 1838: 264).

Standard Czech Language”, 1<sup>st</sup> edition as 4 thicker volumes 1960–71, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition as 8 thinner volumes 1989) contains as many as four forms of the choronym *Serbia*: the active *Srbsko* and the archaic *Srby*, *Serbie* and *Srbie* (SSJČ–5 1989: 500).

### V.3

When it comes to the Czech translation of the Serbian state–legal formations, we have to take into account three concepts: 1. the state *Republic of Serbia*; 2. *historical Serbia*, i.e. the same as the first one except for the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina; 3. the so–called *Republic of Srpska*, i.e. a Serbian administrative–legal unit within Bosnia and Herzegovina. There is no problem with the translation of the first concept into Czech – the choronym *Srbsko* is used. However, when looking for a Czech equivalent to the so–called Central Serbia (the second concept), it is obvious that in the Czech language there isn’t such a geographical name in active use, which could be used to designate this part of Serbia. The aforementioned three archaic forms will not do the job exactly because of how archaic they are, and in addition, just like looking for the appropriate equivalent to *Čechy* in Serbian or Bulgarian, such an equivalent would only be used by a very small number of specialists. Therefore, as the most appropriate solution, we propose the consistent use of a version with a specifying attribute. As regards to what this attribute should be – we already said that at the end of the previous point: since Serbs use the unambiguous word combinations *ужа* or *централна Србија*, Czech specialists, who occasionally need more precise geographical terminology, could also adhere to the Czech equivalents of these Serbian concepts, i.e. *užší* or *centrální Srbsko*.

### V.4

The third concept – Republic of Srpska – is the most problematic one. In this case, difficulties in translating it into any language come from not one, but two directions:

1. languages almost certainly have no second, “empty” form for the name of another Serbian state, which they could use in this case; when

such a form does exist, it is already hopelessly outdated. By the way, its possible expansion and hypothetical “revitalization” is also prevented by the low level of frequency of the geographical concept in question; people just cannot get used to an old form, which is new to them;

2. the Serbian form *Српска* is, as we already said, a noun, which has arisen as a result of the substantivizing of the adjective *српска* “Serbian” [земља, држава “land, state”]. This fact, however, has not been understood precisely because of the homophonic collision of the toponym *Српска* with the adjective *српска*. The error has also gained ground due to the fact that the inverse word order version  $Adj_G - Subst_F$ , i.e.  $Subst_F - Adj_G$ , has also not been foreign or unknown to some European languages (for example French, Italian, Romanian, Albanian, Polish or Czech). In our opinion, this fact has fully opened the door to the incorrect translation of *Република Српска*, i.e. a name corresponding to the  $Subst_F - Subst_G$  model, as per the  $Subst_F - Adj_G$  model – in Czech language became *Republika srbská*, in Bulgarian for example – *Република Срџбска*. At the same time, this fact has led to a certain satisfaction, as a result of which in European languages there is no search, nor attempts to intensely seek solutions to these interesting geographical–historical–political–linguistic issues.

Does the Czech language have any other possibilities at all? We could point out three methods that are theoretically at our disposal:

1. **Using various word-forming suffixes:** in the Czech language, the most common suffixes are *-sko*, *-ie*, *-y* (i.e. there are the versions *Srb-sko*, *Srb-ie/Serb-ie*, *Srb-y*). As we already said, the first one is already taken, the third is irreversibly outdated and no longer productive. The *-ie* suffix is the only alternative. But is it a real one? We do not think so because: a) ordinary people will not make a difference between the toponyms *Srbsko* and *Srbie* just because of the different suffix; the model, which works in our own country (*Česko* vs. *Čechy*) will not work in the case of foreign territories (this is proven, for example, by the synonymy of *Moldavsko* and *Moldávie*, where the potential for distinguishing between the state Moldova and the historical territory in Romania has not been fulfilled); b) if the form *Srbie* was to be officially accepted, this

could lead to a quite problematic “cross” situation, in which Србија would be translated as *Srbsko*, and *Српска* as *Srbie*. This would most likely cause an undesirable shake-up and insecurity in the semantics of both Czech names.

2. **Adopting the original foreign language word:** since there are already Serbian language toponyms in the Czech language, such as *Bosna*, *Raška*, *Bačka*, *Mačva*, why can't we also accept *Srpska*? Or *Srbska*? This solution is actually much more acceptable than those given under point one. The only problematic issue to us seems to be the atypical for the Czech language consonant structure [sřpsk-], which in Dative and Locative Case would alternate with the form [sřpsc-]: N \**Srpska*, G \**Srpsky*, DL \**Srpsce*, A \**Srpsku*, V \**Srpsko*! I \**Srpskou*. As regards the form of the lexical morpheme *Srp-* or *Srb-*, the first solution (p-solution) seems more appropriate to us, because in the b-solution (\**Srbska*) there may again be ambiguity and a possible semantic “confusion” with the form *Srbsko*.
3. **Forming a word combination:** *Západní Srbsko* “Western Serbia”, *Bosenské Srbsko* “Bosnian Serbia”, *Nové Srbsko* “New Serbia”...? Such a solution would probably be most effective as due to the specifying attribute there would be no semantic collision and confusion, notwithstanding the fact that the word combination would include the choronym *Srbsko* and not another with the same basis. The problem with such a potential solution, however, is that the Czech (or any other) form cannot differ so much from the original as to have elements that are not present in the original name. Until the Serbs from Bosnia and Herzegovina themselves change the name of their country, this solution would not be accepted due to administrative-political reasons rather than to linguistic reasons.

## V5

An interesting development can be traced to a representative Czech geographical edition *Státy a území světa* (“States and Territories of the World”) in the first edition of 1996, the article is called *Srbská republika* with a note: “Due to logical alphabetical order, the article is called *Srbská republika*, however, the name *Republika srbská* is furtherly used in the text to distinguish from *Srbská republika* (i.e. Serbia)” (Liščák – Fojtík

1996: 715).<sup>53</sup> The data itself states: “*Republika srbská*, in Serbian *Republika srpska* (sic!)” (ibid.).<sup>54</sup> In the second edition of 1998, the article is once again called *Srbská republika*, the data itself states (this time without a misspelling): “official name *Republika srbská*; Република Српска” (Liščák – Fojtík 1998: 821–822).<sup>55</sup> In the third edition of 2009, the article is the same, but there is a change in the data (and again a misspelling, this time in the Czech form): “official formal name *Srbská republika*, *Republika Srbská* (sic!); Република Српска; official shortened name *Српска*” (Liščák 2009: 752).<sup>56</sup> As can be seen in the quotation, in the third edition the neutral model  $Adj_G - Subst_F$  of the political name is now officially admitted, and not only the model  $Subst_F - Adj_G$ , which is inversive to the Czech language; furthermore, V. Liščák already recognizes the toponym *Српска* as an existing geographical name of this administrative-political unit.

We would like here to put the accent on those five points:

1. Determinant does not correspond to the Czech rules, it mainly appears in the journalistic and scientific functional texts and it is listed as a Czech variant in further information. When is said *Srbská republika*, most of Czechs will present Serbia, not *Srpska*. In this moment this is not helping to better distinguish both Serbian republics even though in Czech language in last twenty–thirty years “Serbian” model  $Subst_F - Subst_G$  that acts together with traditional “Czech” model  $Adj_G - Subst_F$  is more and more used. This means that *Srbská republika* today can represent Serbia, but *Srpska* too, while *Republika Srbsko* just Serbia and *Republika srbská* just *Srpska* (nevertheless the third form potentially can also mean Serbia);
2. Czech rule, however, in this case is not corresponding with modern Czech language practice of forming political names of states; word order in *Republika srbská* is representing a model which was maybe used as stylistically neutral before WWI. In 20<sup>th</sup> century it exists just

53 Orig.: “Z důvodů logického abecedního řazení je v nadpisu hesla použito jméno *Srbská republika*, v textu se však dále používá názvu *Republika srbská* na rozlišení od *Srbské republiky* (*Srbsko*)”.

54 Orig.: “*Republika srbská*, srbsky *Republika srpska*”.

55 Orig.: “úřední název *Republika srbská*; Република Српска”.

56 Orig.: “oficiální plný název *Srbská republika*, *Republika Srbská*; Република Српска; oficiální zkrácený název *Српска*”.

as archaic or poetical expression. In modern Czech language this word order is not accepted as stylistically marked, except the regular exceptions like *Spojené státy americké*, *Spojené státy mexické* – in Serbian *Сједињене Америчке Државе*, *Сједињене Мексичке Државе*);

3. This formal anomaly is, according to our opinion, caused by understanding the original name – *Republika Srpska* is not formed according to type Subst<sub>F</sub> – Adj<sub>G</sub>, but according to Subst<sub>F</sub> – Subst<sub>G</sub>. Collision is due to the fact that Serbian language has forming type *-ска/-шка* that is the same as adjective, and by conversion comes to the change of the type and meaning of word. And when source language does not have the equivalent, then is even easier to expand and eradicate the irregular form;
4. Liščák in his encyclopedia, however, lists forms that are not regular in Czech rules, but in the third edition of his encyclopedia his effort to find a form that is more adequate to Czech formal rules can be seen – compare 1998 and 2009 edition.
5. Geographical name *Srpska* is mentioned even in the third edition of his encyclopedia, but without Czech equivalent. Here we would also like to express our doubts about term *zkrácený* “shortened”: geographical names are not “shortened names” but independent words which are, as existing words, included in structure of the political (formal) name, not the other way around. About shortened names we can discuss, for example, in the case of names Soviet Union (← Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), United States (← United States of America) or United Kingdom (← United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

## VI. Summary of the Situation in English and German

Native speakers of English and German are not very clear either how to call the Serbian state in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Among the English options, on the one hand we see complete acceptance of the Serbian form *Republika Srpska*, a hybrid word combination *Republic of Srpska*, and a word combination with a hybrid form of the toponym *Republic of Serbska* – these options clearly demonstrate a desire to observe the form Subst<sub>F</sub> – Subst<sub>G</sub>, which is not only typical of the English language but also corresponds to

the Serbian original. However, on the other hand we find entirely English political names, but using the model Adj<sub>G</sub> – Subst<sub>F</sub>: *Serb Republic* and *Serbian Republic*. A German version – *Serbische Republik* – also complies with the latter model. In addition to it, it is possible to come across the composite version *Serbenrepublik*. However, neither English nor German has an equivalent to the toponym *Српска*. An interesting attempt to change this somewhat deadlock and anomalous situation is made by Serbian linguist Branislav Brborić, who explicitly translates *Република Српска* into English as *Republic of Serbland* and in German as *Republik Serbland* (Brborić 2007: 26). From these political names, we can now easily extract a potential geographical name that we have been searching for so intensely: *Serbland*. Whether the word *Serbland* will become the norm in English or German depends on the Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina themselves and their political representatives because this is the requirement of the UN procedure for the adoption of new political and/or geographical names in the world's languages (as regards the problems related to the process of adopting the English geographical name *Czechia* – see Krejčí 2009b).

## VII. Conclusion

As a conclusion on the issue is there a Czech (or Bulgarian, English...) equivalent to the Serbian choronym *Српска*, in our opinion the answer is that in some languages there is more hope, in others less, and the situation would change sharply and the search would be catalysed following the hypothetical independence of the Republic of Srpska. Right now, we can only establish that the Czech language does not yet have a suitable equivalent to this Serbian choronym. While the Republic of Srpska is a part of another state, Bosnia and Herzegovina, for Czechia this is not so important, the socio-political present and internal administrative differences of Bosnia and Herzegovina are discussed above all in certain branches of Czech science, less in publicist. For the future development it will be important, if the need for precise equivalent for Srpska shows up, most probably the original form *Srpska* would be accepted, maybe orthographically modified as *Srbska*. Nevertheless, another possibility that we have not mention might be acceptable – if it

comes to the substantivizing of adjective *srbská*. Choronym \**Srbská* would then be declined as adjective feminine singular (NV *Srbská*, GDL *Srbské*, AI *Srbskou*). In support of this variant of the solution of the “Serbian issue” in the Czech language we can state some names of Czech regions and settlements in the form of adjectives as *Haná*, *Karviná*, *Orlová*, *Planá* [nad *Lužnicí*], *Blatná*, *Česká*, *Hluboká* [nad *Vltavou*], *Světlá* [nad *Sázavou*], *Třemošná*, etc.

In Bulgarian language, there is a real possibility to substantivizing the form *Срѣска* (since Bulgarian people, and especially Bulgarian journalists, have been totally unimpressed by the atypical and useless loanword *Хрватска*, “promoted” once by Croats themselves, who at that time did not take into consideration the Bulgarian traditions of formation of geographical names).<sup>57</sup> Germans will probably choose – when the issue comes up – between Brborić’s form *Serbland* and the typical German compound *Serbenrepublik*. For now, English has the largest number of potential versions (*Srpska*, *Serbska*, *Serbland*), the highest chances in our opinion having the forms *Srpska* and *Serbland*. However, as far as we know, English will, passively and without any particular emotions, accept what the Bosnian Serbs themselves have to say, so it is largely up to them which equivalent will be chosen. Currently in English the Government of the Republic of Srpska prefers the term *Srpska*.

---

57 See Balkanski (1995) or Krejčí (2005b), resp. Chapter 5 for more details.

## DEMONYM AND ETHNONYM FOR BOSNIANS AND BOSNIAKS IN CZECH

(PROBLEMS OF TERMINOLOGY AND TRANSLATION)

### I.

#### Historical Introduction (the Period before 1990)

The dissolution of Yugoslav federation (1991–1992) did not mean the creation of new state units on the map of Europe only, but also a creation of new ethnic situation (mainly as a cause of war in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo). Part of this new situation was a change of national name of Yugoslav, mainly Bosnian–Herzegovinian Slavonic Muslims (let us remark that from historical reasons the Slavonic Muslim element in the former Yugoslavia was – and still is – situated mainly in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Sanjak, a region on the borders of Serbia and Montenegro).

The Muslim element in Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H) was named in the past by names derived from the area where it was settled. This relation can be schematized as *Bosna* → *Bošnjani*, *Bošnjak*. The term *Bosani* is a newer one, and one more name was in use as well – *Bosnlija*. This is noted in the Serbian Dictionary by Vuk S. Karadžić (1818, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 1852), in that (in both editions) the terms *Bošnjak* and *Bošnjani* are understood as primary ones:

*Српски рјечник* (SR 1966 [1818], also 1852):

**БОШЊАК** – der Bosnier, Bosnus homo

**Бошњанин** – der Bosnier, Bosnus (p. 43, also 38)

**Босанац** – vide Бошњак

**Босанлија** – vide Бошњак (p. 42, also 38)

In the era of national-integration processes and forming of modern South-Slavonic nations the gradual identification of Bosnian-Herzegovinian Catholics with Croatian national idea and those Orthodox ones with Serbian identity took place. The Muslim element was expected to accept either Croatian or Serbian identity with time, however at the end Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims chose their own path that was to some degree a reaction to Serbian-Croatian broaching over Muslims, as well as to the fact, that if the different historic experience and different religion is a sufficient reason for non-unity otherwise in language area practically identical Serbs and Croats, why could not the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Muslims with the same historical experience go their own way? (see more in an article by Josip Ljubić from 1895 *Spor između Srba i Hrvata* – see Hladký 1996: 49–50). This own way was named by term *bošnjaštvo* and was supporting the idea of building their own community named by the ethnonym *Bošnjaci*, derived from the very same area that was their historical homeland. Therefore, in general: “we are not Croats nor Serbs, we are Bosniaks”. If the idea of *bošnjaštvo* (“being a Bosniak”) was aimed mainly inside the very Muslim community, and it was already showing “features of ethnical and political conscience” (Hladký 1996: 48),<sup>58</sup> then the idea of *bosanstvo* (“being a Bosnian”) “was built mainly on the areal and regional conscience” (ibid.).<sup>59</sup> Therefore, in general: “Muslims, Orthodox, Roman Catholics – not important, what is essential is that we are all Bosnians”. The flourishing of both ideas occurred in the era when Bosnia and Herzegovina was administrated by I&R finance minister Benjamin Kállay (1882–1903).<sup>60</sup> He was supporting

58 Orig.: “prvky vědomí etnického a politického”.

59 Orig.: “stavěla především na vědomí zemském – regionálním”.

60 After Austria-Hungary gained mandate to acquire and administer Bosnia and Herzegovina at the Congress of Berlin in 1878, this new body in the monarchy was not included in Austrian nor Hungarian part but became a special territorial unit that was administered by I&R finance minister. Annexation of B&H from the side of Habsburg monarchy occurred in 1908, since the end of 1918 till spring 1992 was B&H part of Yugoslav state (with exception of era between 1941 and 1945 when it was a part of the so-called Independent State of Croatia). In first, royal Yugoslavia B&H was not constituting any administrative unit, only in the communist federal Yugoslavia after 1945 it gained a status of one of six federation units. After the declaration of independence and the consecutive

mainly Bosnian regional patriotism, as he saw it to be a barrier against Croatisation or Serbisation of the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The term (*bosanski muslimani*) “(Bosnian) Muslims” started to be used in higher degree at the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century as a replacement for the – till that time used – *mohamedani* “Mohammedans” what was by the very Muslims in B&H criticized as “a European figment”, that was not used by the Muslims themselves (*ibid.*: 50). The spread of this de facto religious label ended in gradual marginalization of ethnonym *Bošnjaci* that did not gain the appropriate “vitality” among other things due to the unfinished national and integrational process of Muslims in B&H, that would logically and finally anchor this ethnonym in Yugoslav and then in international discourse as well.

The term *Muslimani* (with capital letter) was first used during the Second World War already – the oldest record we found is from *The Resolution on the Establishment of AVNOJ* from November 1942 (see Krejčí 2018a: 92).<sup>61</sup> Muslim nationality (*Muslimové* in Czech)<sup>62</sup> was first officially introduced in Yugoslavia for census in 1961 (Mrdjen 2002).

At the same time, the term *Bosanci* spread during the era of federal Yugoslavia. Information about the meaning of ethnonyms *Bosanac*, *Bošnjak*, *Bošnjанин* and *Musliman* is provided in dictionaries that were issued back then:

*Речник савременог српског књижевног језика с језичким саветником* (RSSKJ 2000 [1966]):

**Босанац** – становник Босне; Човек родом из Босне. *вар.* Бошњац, Бошњанин (p. 55)

**Бошњац, Бошњанин** – в. Босанац (p. 56)

---

bloody civil war (1992–1995) Bosnia and Herzegovina gained the today’s shape of state composed of two so-called entities (the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republic of Srpska) and the Brčko District – district in the north-eastern Bosnia with a specific status.

61 “Narod je krvavo platio u takvim krajevima svoju naivnu veru u sporazum četnika sa ustašama i okupatorima, i taj se sporazum na delu pokazao kao sporazum za masovno ubijanje Hrvata i Muslimana od strane četnika, a Srba od strane ustaša, no na mnogim mestima pokolje vrše svi ti zlikovci zajedno i nad Srbima i nad Hrvatima i nad Muslimanima” (*The Resolution on the Establishment of AVNOJ*, 1942, p. 4).

62 Czech language simply overtook writing with first capital letter from Yugoslav norm. SSJČ nor SSČ does not recognize term *Muslim*, as opposed to *Slovník cizích slov* that defines it as “adherent to the national group in Bosnia” (orig.: “příslušník národnostní skupiny v Bosně”) (Klímeš 1994: 495).

*Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика* (RSHKNJ 1962, 1988):

**Босанац** – 1. становник Босне; онај који је пореклом из Босне. *исп.*

Босанлија, Бошњак (1), Бошњан, Бошњанац, Бошњанин (р. 73)

**Бошњак** – 1. в. Босанац (р. 85)

**Бошњанин** – в. Босанац (р. 86)

**муслиман** – 2. (Муслиман) припадник југословенског народа ове конфесије, насталог углавном од исламизираниог становништва у српскохрватској језичкој области, који највећим делом живи у СР Босни и Херцеговини (р. 313)

*Речник српскохрватскога књижевног језика* (RSHKJ 1967, 1969):

**Босанац** – човек из Босне (р. 253)

**Бошњак** – а. Босанац; б. *заст.* муслиман из Босне (р. 256)

**Бошњанин** – *заст.* Босанац (р. 256)

**муслиман** – 2. (Муслиман) припадник народа ове конфесије који највећим делом живи у СР Босни и Херцеговини (р. 466)

*Рјечник hrvatskosrpskoga književnog jezika* (RHSKJ 1967):

**Bosanac** – čovjek iz Bosne (р. 241)

**Bošnjak** – а. Bosanac; б. *zast.* musliman iz Bosne (р. 242)

**Bošnjанин** – *zast.* Bosanac (р. 242)

It is obvious from the data that the term *Bosanac* is unambiguously understood as a name of citizens, while *Bošnjанин* is either with reference to *Bosanac* or with attribute *archaic*. *Bošnjak* is also noted with reference to *Bosanac*, RSHKJ or RHSKJ however states the meaning “Muslim from Bosnia” as well, with attribute *archaic* (authors of dictionary of course could not know that this term will be very actual a quarter a century later).<sup>63</sup>

63 The identical interpretation of the terms in question in RSHKJ and RHSKJ is in line with the commitment that both dictionaries that were issued by both national Matrixes (*Matrix Serbica* in Novi Sad and *Matrix Croatica* in Zagreb), will be identical in content and will differ only in the fact that the dictionary of the *Matrix Croatica* will be written in Latin script and Ijekavian pronunciation, while the dictionary of the *Matrix Serbica* in Cyrillic script and Ekavian pronunciation. Both dictionaries also state on the front page the names of both organizations and lists of both collectives of authors. The difference is however in their destiny as well: while the *Matrix Serbica* finished in the era 1967–1976 all six volumes, the *Matrix Croatica* issued in 1967 only first two volumes (A–F and G–K) and then – due to a rise of Croatian nationalism visible also in critique of infringement of

The term *Musliman* is missing in *Moskovljević* (RSSKJ) and in RHSKJ, as it ends with letter K. Both multi-volume dictionaries of Serbo-Croatian (RSHKNJ and RSHKJ), prepared however in Serbia, has this specific ethnonym as a second meaning of expression *musliman* “Muslim”.

## II. The Period after 1990

The revolutionary socio-political changes of the first half of 90's meant among other things a change in national self-identification of Bosnian-Herzegovinian Muslims – on the People's Assembly of Bosniaks that took place in Sarajevo in 1993 they decided to leave the name *Musliman* that was widely spread during the reign of Yugoslav communists and come back to the old name *Bošnjak* as a traditional and by its form natural ethnical name, that would help them define themselves in the varied ethnic structure of Bosnia and Herzegovina against there-living Serbs and Croats. This new development can be seen in the defining dictionaries issued after 1990:

*Školski rječnik bosanskog jezika* (ŠRBJ 1999):

**Bosanac** – čovjek iz Bosne (p. 125)

**Bošnjak** – pripadnik bošnjačkog naroda; Musliman (etnički), Musliman-Bošnjak, Bošnjanin (*hist.*) (p. 126)

**Bošnjanin** – Bošnjak, Bosanac (p. 126)

**bosanski musliman** – Bošnjak, musliman (p. 125)

*Rječnik bosanskog jezika* (RBJ 2007):

**Bosanac** – stanovnik Bosne (p. 46)

**Bošnjak** – pripadnik bošnjačke nacije (p. 47)

**Bošnjanin** – naziv za narod koji je živio u srednjovjekovnoj Bosni prije dolaska Turaka (p. 47)

---

the so-called Novi Sad Agreement about Serbo-Croatian from 1954 (well-known *Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika* [1967]) and culminating in the so-called Croatian Spring (1971) – resigned to finish next volumes. *Rječnik hrvatskosrpskoga književnog jezika* is therefore just a torso.

*Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika* (RHJ 2000):

**Bosanac** – *etn.* 1. čeljade koje je rodom iz Bosne; 2. osoba koja živi u Bosni (p. 93)

**Bošnjak** – *etn.* 1. čovjek rodom iz Bosne; Bosanac; 2. stanovnik Bosne; 3. *pol.* bosansko–hercegovački musliman (p. 94)

*Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika* (VRHJ 2003):

**Bosanac** – 1. *razg.* stanovnik Bosne; Bošnjakin 2. v. Bošnjak (p. 106)

**Bošnjak** – 1. stanovnik i građanin Bosne kao nosilac uređenja Bosne kao zemlje i države u različitim političkim i kulturno–prosvjetnim programima; Bosanac 2. pripadnik nacije kojoj je Bosna domovina (Musliman) (p. 106)

**Bošnjakin** – *arh. knjiš.* v. Bosanac (1) (p. 106)

**musliman** – 2. (Musliman) *pov. neol.* pripadnik muslimanske nacionalnosti u BiH; Bošnjak (p. 789)

*Речник српскога језика* (RSJ 2007):

**Босанац** – 1. становник Босне; човек пореклом из Босне (p. 104)

**Бошњак** – а. муслиман из Босне; б. припадник јужнословенског народа исламске вероисповести, претежно насељеног у Босни (p. 105)

New dictionaries are in general in agreement over the definition of inhabitant name *Bosanac*, only VRHJ is identifying it in the second meaning with the first meaning of *Bošnjak*, that is understood here as an inhabitant name (“inhabitant and citizen of Bosnia”). This meaning is noted by RHJ as well (first and second meaning). RSJ understands this name as either non-ethnic name for Bosnian Muslim (see also *bosanski musliman* in ŠRBJ), or as an ethnonym. And this ethnonymic function is noted by all the other dictionaries (ŠRBJ, RBJ, RHJ – third meaning<sup>64</sup> and VRHJ – second meaning). The expression *Bošnjakin* is not mentioned in RSJ nor RHJ, according to VRHJ it contains an attribute of archaism and tushery, is understood as a synonym to *Bosanac* (VRHJ), or to *Bošnjak*, *Bosanac* (ŠRBJ). The authors of RBJ see it as historicism. Expression

64. However, without the mild language nuance recognized in RSJ.

*Musliman* as a specific ethnonym lost political support relatively quickly after dissolution of SFR Yugoslavia and creation of independent Bosnia and Herzegovina and was relatively successfully replaced by ethnonym *Bošnjak*. Therefore, it is understandable that practically all the current post-Serbo-Croatian dictionaries are ignoring it – with exception of Anić’s VRHJ that defines it very similarly to older RSHKJ and RSHKNJ, only with attribute “historicism” and “neologism” (*pov. neol.*) and, moreover, is accompanied by synonym *Bošnjak*, currently in use.

From the recherche of post-Yugoslav dictionaries it is obvious that revitalization of name *Bošnjak* and actualization of its meaning was noted and accepted in all post-Serbo-Croatian languages, *Bosanac* is keeping its function of inhabitant name. Both names thus have their own content and they cannot be under any circumstances interchanged or seen as synonyms.

### III. The Adjectives *Bosnian*, *Bosniak*

If we are dealing with names *Bosanac* and *Bošnjak* and their content, it is suitable to mention in this place adjectives *bosanski* and *bošnjački*, as they are tightly connected with them (and with toponym *Bosna*) and it is crucial to know in which context we can use the first one and in which the second adjective. Let us have a look into dictionaries again:

#### **BOSANSKI/БОСАНСКИ “BOSNIAN”:**

- koji se odnosi na Bosnu; koji pripada Bosni; koji je poreklom iz Bosne (RSHKNJ 1962: 73)
- koji se odnosi na Bosnu i Bosance (RSHKJ 1967: 253)
- koji se odnosi na Bosnu i Bosance (RHSKJ 1967: 241)
- koji se odnosi na Bosnu i Bosance (RHJ 2000: 93)
- koji se odnosi na Bosnu (kao ime zemlje) i Bosance (VRHJ 2003: 106)
- koji se odnosi na Bosnu i Bosance (RSJ 2007: 104)
- koji se odnosi na Bosnu i Bosance (RBJ 2007: 46)

**BOŠNJAČKI/BOŠŃAČKI “BOSNIAK”:**

- који се односи на Бошњака, Босну (RSHKNJ 1962: 86)
- који се односи на Бошњаке; босански (RSHKJ 1967: 256)
- који се односи на Вошњакe; bosanski (RHSKJ 1967: 242)
- који се односи на Вошњакe (RHJ 2000: 94)
- који се односи на Вошњакe (VRHJ 2003: 106)
- који се односи на Бошњаке (RSJ 2007: 105)
- који се односи на Вошњакe (RBJ 2007: 47)

From the recherche of Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav dictionaries<sup>65</sup> it is obvious that the agreement in the opinion on the meaning of both adjectives is practically complete: expression *bosanski* is in general explained as “connected to Bosnia and its inhabitants, that are originally named *Bosanci*”, expression *bošnjački* is explained as “connected to name *Bošnjak*”. Slight difference is visible in lexicographic explanation before 1990 and after this year. Dictionaries of both Matrixes understand this adjective explicitly as a synonymic to *bosanski* (what is not surprising if we compare once more the back-then explanations of names *Bosanac* and *Bošnjak*), while current dictionaries (Croatian, Bosnian and Serbian) do not allow such explanation and their definitional unity is complete.

**IV.****Partial Conclusion**

The situation in post-Serbo-Croatian area is therefore relatively clear – *Bosanac* is a name denotating any inhabitant of Bosnia (as well as names *Hercegovac*, *Dalmatinac*, *Slavonac*, *Vojvođanin* etc. are denotating inhabitants of Herzegovina, Dalmatia, Slavonia, Vojvodina etc.), it is local or regional term. *Bošnjak* is a national name (ethnonym), a name of nation which characteristic feature is Islamic religion (not at all times), culture, traditions and in most cases Bosnia as a motherland as well (this is of course not the case of Muslims of the same nationality from

65 The only dictionaries that are not noting any of the adjectives in question are RSSKJ and ŠRBJ.

Serbia or Montenegro). Adherents of this nation in the era of communist Yugoslavia were labelled with unusual ethnonym *Muslimani*.

## V. Czech Language Reflection on the Above Described Situation

If we need to express not completely simple, but in general relatively clear terminological situation describing the socio-political reality of Bosnia and Herzegovina in other languages we can experience various problems:

- language we are translating into does not have such expression in its vocabulary at all;<sup>66</sup>
- language we are translating into does not need to have appropriate equivalent expressions, considering slighter nuances in the original language;<sup>67</sup>
- language we are translating into has potentially equivalent expressions, but those cannot be used due to various reasons.<sup>68</sup>

If we have a closer look at dictionaries of Czech language, we will find out that Czech in general have the needed expressions to express specific reality of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Dictionaries include proper names *Bosňan* and *Bosňák* and adjectives *bosenský* and *bosňácký*. Their description is as follows:

*Slovník jazyka českého* (SJČ 1952 [1934–1937])

**Bosna** – země; *bosňácký*: příd. k *Bosňák*, *bosňák*

**Bosňák**: obyvatel Bosny, rodák z ní

**Bosňan**: *Bosňák* (p. 98)

**bosenský** – příd. k *Bosna* (p. 98)

66 In such cases an overtaking is in place – f.e. English *Wales* – Czech *Wales*, Croatian *Wales*; Croatian *Lika* – Czech *Lika*, English *Lika*.

67 F.e. Russian *русский* vs. *российский* – Czech only *ruský*, English only *Russian*; Serbian *Србин*, *српски* vs. *Србијанац*, *србијански* – English as well *Serb* vs. *Serbian*, Czech only *Srb*, *srbský*.

68 F.e. Serbian *Србија* vs. *Српска* – English as well *Serbia* vs. *Srpska*, Czech *Srbsko* vs. ? (see previous chapter).

*Příruční slovník jazyka českého (PSJČ 2007–2008 [1935–1937])*

**Bosňan** – obyvatel Bosny, Bosňák

**Bosňák** – obyvatel Bosny, Bosňan

**bosenský** – adj. k Bosna

**bosňácký** – adj. *lid. a arch.* k Bosňák, bosenský

*Slovník spisovného jazyka českého (SSJČ 1989 [1960])*

**Bosna** – (...) Bosňan; Bosňák v. t.; bosenský (p. 153)

**Bosňák** – *ob.* obyvatel Bosny; Bosňan; bosňácký (p. 154)

**bosenský** – v. Bosna (p. 153)

**bosňácký** – v. Bosňák (p. 153)

*Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost (SSČ 2000 [1978])*

**Bosna, Bosna a Hercegovina** st.; Bosňan, bosenský (p. 626)

The problem thus is not a lack of terms, but their explanations what is caused mainly by obsolescence of Czech dictionaries – only one is issued after 1990 (SSČ), but this lacks toponyms and ethnonyms as an independent terms, where there would be more space for detailed description of meaning, and it is needed to have a look at a special list of geographical names, where there is only a very short information found, without description. We will find out only that an inhabitant of Bosnia (or the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina) is *Bosňan* and adjective connected to this area is *bosenský*. Older dictionaries are naturally not in line with current situation, *Bosňan* and *Bosňák* are understood as synonyms, *bosenský* is explained as “connected to Bosnia”, while *bosňácký* as “connected to *Bosňák*” and essentially as synonymous to *bosenský*. We can conclude that if a user of Czech wants to express current socio-political situation in B&H terminologically correctly, dictionaries would not help him at all, or even will provide inaccurate, incomplete and misleading information.

## VI. Internal Political Reality of Bosnia and Herzegovina

The difficulty of internal political reality of Bosnia and Herzegovina presented in its language (whatever is the name of it) does not help to simply express oneself in other language. The state does not have any official political name, only a geographical name *Bosna i Hercegovina* is used.<sup>69</sup> Its two entities have the opposite problem.

### VI.1

#### *Federacija Bosne i Hercegovine* (“*Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina*”)

*Federacija Bosne i Hercegovine* is a formal name that – if we stick to language form – can be explained as a federation of two lands (Bosnia and Herzegovina)<sup>70</sup> or as an official name of state (federation of two entities created in fact according to national key). None of the explanations is correct, the form of the name is very misleading. Due to this immediately after its creation<sup>71</sup> journalists and politicians were trying to specify its name, and thus were using non-official, but more or less accurate descriptive names, most often *muslimsko-chorvatská federace* (Muslim–Croat Federation), *bosensko-chorvatská federace* (Bosnian–Croat[ian] Federation) and marginally even *bosňácko-chorvatská federace* (Bosniak–Croat Federation). Problematic content of the first two forms is however obvious (federation of Croats with some Muslims? federation of Bosnia with Croatia?), while third variant was presenting reality much better (however only if we expect the adjective *bosňácký* “Bosniak” to be interpreted correctly, what is not possible without correct understanding of ethnonym *Bosňák* “Bosniak”). In fact, it is a federation of ten autonomous cantons, and can be also interpreted as a federation of Bosniaks and Croats living in B&H. As this political unit has no history, there is no geographic name for it either. This is why mostly the form *Federacija BiH* or just *Federacija* is used as a shortened version of the official (political) name, if it is possible in the given context.

69 It is no exception in Europe, similarly without official (or formal) name is Ukraine, Romania, Hungary, Montenegro, Georgia and Ireland.

70 As f. e. *the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*.

71 The Federation of B&H was established in March 1994 and was constituted by regions of B&H controlled by Muslims (Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina) and Bosnian–Herzegovinian Croats (Croatian Republic of Herzeg–Bosnia).

## VI.2

### *Republika Srpska* (“*Republic of Srpska*”)

The second entity is officially called *Република Српска*.<sup>72</sup> Its problem was (and to some degree still is) in the fact that its creators revitalized a long-obsolete and archaic name for Serbia and included it into the name of their “Serbia”, lying in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The name (choronym) *Srpska* is in fact substantive, but citizens in Bosnian–Serbian environment are still having difficulties to accept it, therefore next to this independent usage of this choronym (f.e. in the name of air company Air Srpska or website ReStart Srpska) there is still dominating usage of formal (political) name. The second entity therefore has its geographical name, but its independent usage is still not spread and accepted enough.

## VI.3

### *Bosanski jezik* (“*Bosnian language*”)

The most numerous nation in B&H were in Yugoslav times there–living Muslims, that are since 1993 officially labelled as *Bošnjaci*. Language they are speaking is however called *bosanski*, not *bošnjački*, what could be expected regarding ethnic key for naming languages in post–Yugoslav area (“Serbs speak Serbian, Croats Croatian, Montenegrins Montenegrin, therefore Bosniaks speak Bosniak”). Why is it like that is explained mainly in declaration called *Povelja o bosanskom jeziku* from March 2002 (more about it and the problem of naming language of Bosnian–Herzegovinian Muslims see Krejčí 2018a: 89–95 or 2018b: 30–35, about historical connections of revitalization of term *Bosnian language* see Hladký 2005: 280–281). One of the main arguments is a link–up to long tradition of this glottonym. Surely, official attitude of Croatian and Serbian linguists does not help understanding of the whole situation, as these name the language *bošnjački* – with a reference to the above–mentioned ethnic key.

---

72 The Republic of Srpska was established in January 1992, back then as the Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

## VII. Czech Language Reflection of Inner Political Reality of Bosnia and Herzegovina

### VII.1

#### *Bosňan vs. Bosňák* (“Bosnian vs. Bosniak”)

In order to name inhabitants of Bosnia or citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina without regard to nationality or religious adherence, the only possible inhabitant name is the word *Bosňan*, that is equivalent to original *Bosanac*. To name adherent of one of the three constitutive nations of Bosnia and Herzegovina that is characterized by Islamic religion and/or tradition and culture, the only possible ethnonym is the word *Bosňák*, that is equivalent to original *Bošnjak*.

### VII.2

#### *Bosenský vs. bosňácký* (“Bosnian vs. Bosniak”)

To express connection to Bosnia (but also to the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina, if it is not crucial to explicitly state two-component adjective *bosensko-hercegovský* “Bosnian-Herzegovinian”) or to inhabitant name *Bosňan*, the only possible adjective is *bosenský*, that is equivalent of original *bosanski*. To express connection to national name *Bosňák*, the only possible adjective is *bosňácký*, that is equivalent of original *bošnjački*. The only exception for naming the language of Bosniaks (Bosnian language) – the only possible equivalent of original *bosanski jezik* is *bosenský jazyk*. Serbian nor Croatian preferred form *bošnjački jezik* is not in this case much relevant, Czech translation should reflect situation in the national language in question, not situation in other national languages.

### VII.3

#### *Federace Bosny a Hercegoviny* (“Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina”)

Translation of name of the bigger of the two entities of B&H can in Czech reflect the attitude in original language – i.e. *Federace Bosny a Hercegoviny*, in short form *Federace BaH*, or just *Federace*, if it is clear from the context

what administrative unit is in question (similarly as was in context of the Second World War used in Czech discourse f.e. *Protektorát* “Protectorate [Bohemia and Moravia]”). From the non-official descriptive names that we have stated above, we prefer the form *bosňácko-chorvatská federace*, as it expresses the best what this subject really in ethnical and political sense is.

#### VII.4

#### *Republika srbská* (“*Republic of Srpska*”)

Translation of the name of the smaller of the entities of B&H is from the point of level of equivalence the biggest problem – even though in the Czech norm the translation *Republika srbská* found bases and is used, this by form anomalous name steams from the corrupted imagination that original *Srpska* is an adjective.<sup>73</sup> However, the question is how else should we translate that name as Czech does not have any other exonym for Serbian state than already taken *Srbsko*. There is a possibility of using a non-inversion form *Srbská republika*, but only in case if a body called in Serbian *Република Србија* would be systematically translated as *Republika Srbsko*. Then for the body called in Serbian *Република Српска* could be used form *Srbská republika*. Another hypothetical possibility is substantivizing of Czech adjective *srbská*. There are many toponyms of feminine case with adjective declination in Czech (f.e. Haná, Karviná, Orlová, Planá [nad Lužnicí], Blatná, Hluboká [nad Vltavou], Třemošná, exonym Čenstochová [in Polish originally Częstochowa] and others) and this group can be extended by form *Srbská*, that would function as an equivalent to original *Српска*. However, we must accept now the fact that geographical name *Српска* does not have an equivalent in Czech and official name of *Република Српска* is translated inversely and not fully in line with practises of Czech as *Republika srbská*.

---

73 See the previous chapter for more details.

## VIII.

## Sources

- PSJČ 2007–2008 [1935–1937]: *Příruční slovník jazyka českého. Díl I. A–J*. O. Hujer, E. Smetánka, M. Weingart, B. Havránek, V. Šmilauer, A. Získal (red.). Praha: Česká akademie věd a umění, Státní nakladatelství, 1935–1937. Digitalized edition: Ústav pro jazyk český, v. v. i., 2007–2008 [online]. Available at: <<https://bara.ujc.cas.cz/psjc/>>.
- RBJ 2007: *Rječnik bosanskog jezika*. I. Čedić (ur.). Sarajevo: Institut za jezik, 2007.
- RHJ 2000: *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. J. Šonje (gl. ur.). Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža; Školska knjiga, 2000.
- RHSKJ 1967: *Rječnik hrvatskosrpskoga književnog jezika, knjiga prva: A–F*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1967.
- RSHKJ 1967: *Речник српскохрватскога књижевног језика, књига прва: А–Е*. Нови Сад: Матица српска, 1967.
- RSHKJ 1969: *Речник српскохрватскога књижевног језика, књига трећа: К–О (коцјерић – огранути)*. Нови Сад: Матица српска, 1969.
- RSHKNJ 1962: *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика, књига II: богољуб – вражогрнци*. Београд: САНУ, 1962.
- RSHKNJ 1988: *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика, књига XIII: Моуре – наклапуша*. Београд: САНУ, 1988.
- RSJ 2007: *Речник српскога језика*. Нови Сад: Матица српска, 2007.
- RSSKJ 2000 [1966]: М. МОСКОВЉЕВИЋ: *Речник савременог српског књижевног језика с језичким саветником*. Београд: Гутенбергов Алакисија, 2000 (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1966).
- SJČ 1952 [1934–1937]: [P. VÁŠA and] F. TRÁVNÍČEK: *Slovník jazyka českého. Čtvrté, přepracované a doplněné vydání*. Praha: Slovanské nakladatelství, 1952 (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1934–1937).
- SR 1852: В. СТЕФАНОВИЋ КАРАЏИЋ: *Српски рјечник, истумачен њемачкијем и латинскијем ријечима*. Беч: У штампарији јерменскога манастира, 1852 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) [online]. Available at: <<http://digital.bms.rs/ebiblioteka/pageFlip/reader/-/index.php?type=publications&id=1255&m=2#page/1/mode/2up>>.
- SR 1966 [1818]: В. СТЕФАНОВИЋ [КАРАЏИЋ]: *Српски рјечник, истолкован њемачким и латинским ријечма*. Wien: P. P. Armeniern, 1818 – published as *Српски рјечник (1818)*. Сабрана дела Вука Караџића.

- Књига друга. Београд: Просвета, 1966.
- SSJČ 1989 [1960]: *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého. I a–g*. B. Havránek (hl. red.). Praha: Academia, 1989 (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1960).
- SSČ 2000 [1978]: *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost*. J. Filipec a F. Daneš (hl. red.). Praha: Academia, 2000 (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1978).
- ŠRBЈ 1999: Dž. ЈАНИЋ: *Trilogija o bosanskom jeziku, knjiga III. Školski rječnik bosanskog jezika*. Sarajevo: Ljiljan, 1999.
- VRHЈ 2003: V. ANIĆ: *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2003.

## CHAPTER 10

# DEMONYMS IN CONTEMPORARY CZECH AND BULGARIAN LANGUAGES

(REVIEW)

Цветанка АВРАМОВА: *Имена на жители (nomina habitatorum) в съвременния чешки и съвременния български език*. София: Парадигма; Бохемия клуб, 2013, 158 p., ISBN 978-954-326-198-7.

In the monograph written by ass. prof. Tsvetanka Avramova, a graduate of Sofia Bohemistics and a prominent researcher in the field of comparative Slavonic linguistics, the topic that she has been working on for many years is elaborated. Her first book, *Словообразователни тенденции при съществителните имена в българския и чешкия език в края на XX век* (“Word-formation Tendencies of Nouns in Bulgarian and Czech at the End of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century”, Sofia 2003), proceeded from her dissertation thesis and it deals with the dynamics of word-forming processes in Czech and Bulgarian nouns. The continuation, or rather deepening of this direction, is the reviewed monograph, which deals in detail with one particular type of nouns, the so-called demonyms (*nomina habitatorum*, Bulg. *жителски имена*). At the very beginning, the assigned task showed several problematic elements, to which the author had to react in some way with the chosen contrastive method, to deal them with them and to incline to one of the existing opinions (especially in the first section *Main theoretical problems of research*, p. 15–60, but it also deals with theoretical questions in other sections).

**The first** question raised is: are demonyms common nouns or proper nouns? Situation: in the Bulgarian language they are written with a small initial letter, which indicates their affiliation to common nouns; in Czech, they are written with a capital letter, which in turn signals their belonging to proper nouns.

**The second** question raised is: do masculine demonyms have a word-forming meaning “a person X regardless of gender associated with the place Y”, or “man X associated with place Y”, or within polysemy the lexical units under observation (at least) both meanings apply?

**The third** question raised is closely related to the previous one: are feminine demonyms derived directly from the name of the place inhabited by women or it is a gender-marking form, which motivating expression is relevant masculine demonym? And if the latter is true, we go back to the second question. In terms of perception of feminine demonyms, this question is quite essential (see e.g. p. 33), because in the first case they would be demonyms from the perception of word-forming meaning (mutational word-forming pattern: “person X is the person somehow associated with the place Y” would apply), whereas it would not be true in the second case (modification word-forming pattern “person X is feminine, i.e. gender-marking variant of person Y” would apply here)...

**The fourth** question raised is: what is the motivated relationship between demonyms, name of a place and related adjectives? And this includes the subquery: are all demonyms derived from names of the places in sense of pattern “person X is inhabitant of place Y” or that apply only for some, whereas with others the motivational relationship, resp. relation of foundation is reverse, i.e. “place X is the place where inhabitants Y live?” And further – what is the ratio between word-forming meaning given by general pattern “word X is derived from the word Y”, preferred within given word-forming category and historical reality? In other words – to what extent the word-forming theory reflects the real process of naming a territory, which was influenced by the ethnic (tribal, national, etc.) name of the people who inhabited such a territory, resp. the actual process of naming the population that has been influenced by the name of the territory in which they originate or are living in?

We will briefly present the content of the reviewed monograph before returning to the questions raised. The second part *Creation of*

*demonyms in Czech and Bulgarian language* (p. 61–98) primarily classifies individual suffix formants that are involved in the creation of the given names in both languages, primarily in terms of their productivity. Especially in this section, the author discusses in detail the part of the fourth raised question, which is perhaps the most problematic in terms of the “demonyms are always derived from a name of a place” – it is about nomina habitatorum with i.e. zero suffix type *Čech, Bulhar, Dán, Rus*. The third part *The word-forming models of demonyms in Czech and Bulgarian language* (p. 99–105) deals with the relation between the structure of word-forming base and the derivative suffix – the resulting models are then classified according to whether they are common to both languages or whether they are specific to Czech or Bulgarian. The fourth part *The dynamics of models of demonyms in Czech and Bulgarian language* (p. 106–119) is primarily concerned with the variation and/or competition of the derivative means in observed word-forming category, where in addition to the usual variation/competition represented by the existence of two formants, there are exceptional examples with three such formants. Except traditional chapters such as *Introduction* (p. 7–9) and *Conclusion* (p. 120–125) and the aforementioned four core parts of the thesis, there are chapters *Subject, tasks and methods of research* (p. 10–14), *Summary in Czech and English* (p. 126–136), *Index of the Czech demonyms included in the research* (p. 137–143) and *of the Bulgarian demonyms* (p. 144–149), *List of abbreviations* (p. 150), *Bibliography* (p. 151–157) and at last *Sources* (p. 158).

Now we will try to interpret to what conclusions Ts. Avramova comes up with theoretical–methodological questions formulated in the introduction of the review. At the very beginning, it should be noted that the author approached each question very conscientiously, presenting various interpretations of the problem, which she provided with her own critical commentary resonating often with objections of other professional authorities that Avramova presents in support of her claims. She relies not only on Bulgarian and Czech linguistic works, but also, where possible, on Russian, Polish or Slovak professional literature.

**Ad 1:** The author, based on a detailed examination, questions the character of the demonyms as proper nouns (p. 21–22 as a conclusion of the whole point 2.1). It is based on both the statements of Bulgarian

linguists and the “approval” statements in several Czech grammars, which at least admit the ambiguity of the classification of demonyms among the proper nouns. Writing a large initial letter in Czech is rather a matter of spelling convention (let us add that it prevails at least in the Slavonic world).

**Ad 2:** The author, on the basis of careful excerpts from monolingual dictionaries, analysis of word-forming studies and examination of language practice, supports the view that feminine demonyms should be presented in dictionaries as separate entries, since their lexical meaning is much tighter than with the masculine demonyms (p. 25–26). However, dictionary practice – both Czech and Bulgarian – is inconsistent in this respect. Definitions from the handbooks or chapters devoted to Czech word-formation say that masculine demonyms are founding/motivating for the respective feminine demonyms, however, the ambiguity remains, according to the author, on how to understand masculine demonyms – whether in a broader sense (“person, inhabitant without a gender feature”) or in a more narrow sense (“masculine person” – p. 31).<sup>74</sup>

The situation in the Bulgarian handbooks under the observation is also not entirely clear. The author outlines on p. 34 the illogical word-forming-semantic consequences that would occur, if we had understood the masculine demonyms from the point of view of the natural gender as marking and only then derived feminine forms from them \*(“Pražanka [= a female Prague citizen] is a female Pražan [= a male Prague citizen]”) and logically seeks a solution to the whole issue in this custom. It follows that masculine demonyms refers to 1) a person linked to a certain place (in a broad sense), 2) a man linked to a certain place (in a broad sense) (see p. 38).

74 Example given on p. 30 at demonym *Netoličan/Netoličák* and its interpretation cited from Dokulil's *Tvoření slov v češtině* (“The Word-formation in Czech Language”, Daneš – Dokulil – Kuchař et al. 1967: 409) “obyvatel Netolic, člověk (muž) pocházející z Netolic” (the inhabitant of Netolice, person [man] coming from Netolice), however, in our opinion, it is not possible to interpret it as *only* a male person, as the author does on the page in question, but as “a) *inhabitant* regardless of gender (e.g. *Na náměstí se shromáždili skoro všichni Netoličané* = men and women), i.e. *masculinum* is non-marked in terms of natural gender, or b) *person* with specification *man* coming from Netolice (because in the context of where one comes from, a woman would not have the form of a male but a female – e.g. *Pocházím z Netolic, ne z Bavorova, takže jsem Netoličanka*), i.e. *masculine form* is in this case in terms of natural gender marking”.

**Ad 3:** Thanks to the solution of the previous problem, the author concludes in the third question raised that the proven existence of a generic meaning in the masculine demonyms allows the perception of the female forms of demonyms (but also rarely occurring forms in the neuter gender such as Bulg. *българче, чехче* “a child of Bulgarian/Czech origin” etc.) as being of gender-marking form from masculine forms, and thus she does not have to deal with them in her work, as they are not directly founded or motivated by names of the places (see p. 38).

**Ad 4:** Tsvetanka Avramova thoroughly analyses the information from the Czech and Bulgarian specialized literature and once again states that the handbooks, in terms of the foundation and motivation, are not united. However, she concludes that a distinction needs to be made between lexical meaning and diachronically viewed motivation and word-forming meaning and synchronously viewed motivation, whilst leaning towards the view that in terms of name of a place – demonym perceive as a founding/motivating the name of a place and demonym is always derived (founded, motivated). This also applies to demonyms with the so-called zero suffix (*Švéd, Rus, Čech, Kazach, Bulhar, Srb, Chorvat* etc.), which in accordance with V. Radeva and some Polish linguists the author calls paradigmatic derivatives (p. 97). At the same time, she notes that, unlike Czech, this type of demonyms is very rare in Bulgarian (e.g. *словак* ← *Словакия* or *чех* ← *Чехия* – p. 98). As far as the relative adjective is concerned, this can be desubstantial both in relation to the place (*kub-ánský* ← *Kuba*), and in relation to demonyms (*kubán-ský* ← *Kubánec*) (p. 48). The motivational role of this type of relative adjectives (ktetics) for demonyms at least in some cases of the type *Angličan* ← *anglický* ← *Anglie* or *Belgičan* ← *belgický* ← *Belgie* Avramova questions and prefers the immediate link demonyms ← name of a place (p. 50).

Avramova’s book is very readable and gives a dynamic and fresh impression precisely because the author is not hesitant to argue with the established but not always fully supported claims, profoundly weighs the various approaches and arguments and tries to reach some valid outcome. Despite the commendable diligence, however, in the text we occasionally come across claims that – in our opinion – are either controversial in some respects, or perhaps inadequately thought-out. For example, the form *Brazilčan*, labelled by author as occasional (p. 49) and excerpted by

F. Štícha (2011) from the electronic corpus of Czech language, we would see as peripheral expression adopted from Slovak (Slov. *Brazilčan*), more than occasional viable Czech alternative to codified *Brazilec*. F. Štícha even mentions this form in another work as equivalent to the codified one (Štícha et al. 2013: 120). The author devotes quite a lot of space to the suffix *-[č]an* (within the solution of the question of motivation of names *Angličan*, *Belgičan* etc.) and in this context, in addition to the *Brazilčan*, she also reflects about forms *Lucemburčan* and *Lotrinčan*. At the expression *Lucemburčan*, the author concludes that this demonym is derived from name of a place *Lucembursko* with the suffix *-[č]an*, which corresponds to the overall concept preferred by the author that demonyms are always derived from name of a place. In principle, we can agree, but we believe that the underlying name of a place is in fact *Lucemburk* (city), not *Lucembursko* (state).<sup>75</sup> The author's conclusion could be accepted, if she simply relied on the preferred axiom of demonyms, which states that the word-forming meaning of demonyms is "X /person/ lives in or originates from Y /place/" and that thus demonym understood like this is always motivated by name of a place (see in particular point 3.3.5 – p. 96). We can either agree or disagree, if we prefer a different concept. Instead, the author tries to support her claim by finding that *Slovník spisovné češtiny* ("Dictionary of Standard Czech", SSČ 1994: 632) at the entry *Lucemburk* does not contain demonym, while at the entry *Lucembursko* it does (p. 49). However, this argument cannot be accepted, since the SSČ does not systematically mention demonyms in the list of geographical names, whereas it does systematically state them in the names of states or other administrative units. Czech forms demonyms from the names of settlements type *Rumburk*, *Nymburk*, *Hamburk*, *Norimberk* etc. by derivative formant *-[č]an*, where the consonant *č* is the result of phonetic alternation *k/č* (see also Štícha et al. 2013: 118). It can therefore be assumed that the same model was applied in the diachronic aspect at demonyms *Lucemburčan* ← name of a place *Lucemburk*, although this demonym is nowadays mainly used in Czech as a name for an inhabitant of the state and only to a much lesser extent as a name for

75 In the official languages of Luxembourg, in English and, after all, in Bulgarian, the name of the state does not differ from that of its capital (Lux./Ger./Fr. *Lëtzebuerg/Luxemburg/Luxembourg*; Eng. *Luxembourg*; Bulg. *Люксембург*).

an inhabitant of the city. On the p. 50, there is cited opinion of F. Štícha (2011: 246), that *-č-* in *Lucemburčan* ← *Lucembursko* could be understood as an alternation of *-k-* in *-sk-* analogous to pairs like *Maročan* ← *Maroko* is, in our opinion, unjustified, because among other things, it does not address the question of where and why the remaining suffix *-s-* would be lost, and there is no analogy for this procedure in Czech (although the author at p. 50 asserts the opposite, based on Štícha's presented example of *Maročan* etc.). Suffix *-sk-* normally alternates to *-šl-* (e.g. *Ralsko* → *Ralštan*, *pozemský* → *pozemštan*)<sup>76</sup>. In Academic Grammar is *Lucemburčan* listed in the demonyms category existing to the names of states ending with *-sko* and having the suffix *-an* (together with *Alžřřan*, *Moldavan*, *Rakuřřan*, *Tunisan* – see Štícha et al. 2013: 120). Alternant *-č-* is therefore perceived as part of the word-forming base, without further explanation of its origin. At *Lotrinčan* ← *Lotrinsko* can be historically assumed that Czech *-č-* is an alternative to the velar occlusive consonant that occurs in the German and Latin forms of this choronym (*Lothringen*, *Lotharingia*), both of which were certainly known to Czechs in the past. A shift *g* → *k* in German toponyms as a precursor to the final alternation *k* → *č* is not uncommon for Czech – see exonym *Tubinky* ← *Tübingen* or even name the castle *Kyřperk* ← *Gřrsberc*, *Geiersberg*, *Gyrsbergh* (Lutterer – Šřárek 2004: 148), Czech version of *křeft* from German *Geschřft* etc.

We would like to express a similar objection, as in the case of the interpretation of the demonym *Lucemburčan*, on the interpretation of the demonym *Čech*, which according to the author's preferred direction of foundation and motivation, should be derived from name of a place *Čechy* (and today – with regard to the name of the modern Czech state – also *Česko*). In support of this claim, the author cites an etymological dictionary by Holub and Kopečňý (1952: 90), who argue that both demonym *Čech* and the adjective *český* are not only word-forming but also historically derived from name of a place *Čechy* (p. 94). In this case, we think that Lutterer and Šřárek (2004: 63–64), who see diachronic motivation in the

76 However, if we perceive the term *pozemřtan* "earthling" in terms of synchronously understood word-formation, when the demonym is always motivated by the appropriate name of a place, then the motivating name of a place is undoubtedly *Země* "Earth" (not *země* "ground"), which implies that *pozemřtan* "inhabitant of the Earth" is derived in a prefixing-suffixing way by formants *po-* and *-[řt]an* attached to the base *-zem-...* In addition, this term should be capitalized (such as *Martřan* "inhabitant of Mars" – see p. 12), as Ts. Avramova rightly points out on p. 21.

opposite direction – name of a place *Čechy* is motivated by demonym *Čech*, will be closer to the truth. Implicitly, Rejzek also advocates such opinion (2001: 112). We perceive the somewhat questionable interpretations of demonyms *Čech* and *Lucemburčan* as basically an unnecessary pressure in an attempt to support or clarify the synchronously understood foundation also historically (at least where it may be possible).

Of the few minor inaccuracies, we would just point out the presented form *Súdánsko* (p. 45), which, however, does not occur in Czech as a variant to *Súdán* (not even on a substandard level). Demonym *Alžířan* should be perceived as a derivative from name of a place *Alžířsko* (state), not (or hence secondary) *Alžíř* (city) (p. 102). Demonym *Arménec* (← *Arménie*) (p. 95) is not a standard form (but we can hear it especially in the lay public<sup>77</sup> – perhaps under the influence of others, Caucasus-bound demonyms such as *Gruzínec*, *Čečenec*, *Ázerbájdžánec*, *Dagestánec*?) – codified form is *Armén* (see also e.g. SSJČ-1 1989: 52, SSČ 2000: 625 or Štícha et al. 2013: 119). The lack of quantity in the demonym related *Austrálie* (p. 93), in turn, inspires the notion that the demonym *Austrálec* cannot be considered as sufficient – this term refers only to the marginal indigenous population of the continent (see, for example, *Small Illustrated Encyclopedia – A-Ž* 1999: 76), here, non-marked demonym is *Australian*. Finally, on p. 101 the pair *Словакия* → *словак* can be, apparently accidentally, found in the list 4.1.1.2 (here by mistake), but also in v 4.1.1.3 (here correctly).

**In conclusion**, we would like to elaborate on the preferred understanding of the relationship demonym ← name of a place in terms of synchronously conceived word-formation, which should be completely applicable, i.e. also for demonyms with zero suffix.<sup>78</sup> This can be unconditionally accepted, if we really understand demonyms only as names marking “a person X who is a resident of Y or who comes from Y” and if we totally leave out other meanings of the analysed ethnonyms and historical reality, where it is relatively well provable. Indeed, the author herself has already made clear in the opening chapters that demonyms often function as ethnonyms (“national names”), but in her monograph, they are analysed not as ethnonyms, but only in the meaning

77 Thus, this form is also admitted by Štícha et al. (2013: 120).

78 In this note, we are naturally interested in naming the inhabitants of states, territories, regions and other larger geographical units, not settlements.

of “inhabitant of the state called by a founding/motivating name; one who lives in a state called by a founding/motivating name and/or is coming from that state” (p. 12). In support of the demonym ← name of a place approach, she should add one more point – in order to be confident that a zero suffixed demonyms signal a non-derived term, and thus that the bearers of a particular ethnonym by their occurrence in a certain territory only historically motivated its name, i.e. the derivation of name of a place, such demonym would have to logically exist in given language. In some cases, this is clearly true – regardless of current word-forming preferences (Czech: *Čech* → *Čechy/Česko*; Croatian: *Hrvat* → *Hrvatska*; Hungarian: *magyar* → *Magyarország*; German: *Deutsche* → *Deutschland* etc.), in other cases there is demonym with the suffix *-in*, but that is not a derivative (e.g. Serbian: *Србин* → *Србија*; Bulgarian: *българин* → *България*). However it is important, that when comparing a number of languages, we may not always find a consensus on this aspect: e.g. Czech demonym *Fin*, we could understand both the foundation and motivation for name of a place *Finsko*, similarly in English *Finn* → *Finland*, but in the case of Serbian and Croatian, the direction of motivation and foundation from the form of demonym is not so obvious, because both demonym and name of a place contain suffixes: demonym *Finac*, name of a place *Finska*. In Bulgarian, the direction of the foundation is clearly the opposite: *финландец* ← *Финландия*. And it is Bulgarian that corresponds to Finnish in this case – Finnish demonym *suomalainen* is derived from name of a place *Suomi*. If we continue to look after how it is with the name of Finland in terms of etymology, V. Liščák says: “Today’s name in most European languages derives from the Germanic *Finland* (“land of Finns”), which originates from the ethnonyms *Fenni* (in Tacit) or *Fenland* (“land of swamps”, from *fens* “swamps, mud”). Finnish *Suomi* is interpreted as “land of marshes and lakes” (from *suo* “wetland”). The older Czech name was *Čuchonsko* (derived from *čudové* = Finns)” (Liščák 2009: 245). Thus, even from this interpretation it is not entirely clear what was earlier. Despite the obvious deficiency of trying to push diachronic approach into synchronously conceived word-formation, another question is, perhaps justified – what is the motivating and founding expression for creating the names of states, territories, regions and other administrative units? Or perhaps the nouns like *Česko/Чехия*, *Vulharsko/България*, *Маd'arsko/Унгария*, *Turecko/Турция*, *Belgie/Белгия*,

*Kazachstán/Казахстан* etc. are not motivated and therefore not derived? Probably not, as many of the demonyms still function as an ethnonym, which historically demonstrably motivated the later naming of a territory that the relevant ethnic group occupied (and its descendants often inhabit today), which should somehow be reflected in synchronously understood word-formation (e.g. word-forming chains Czech *Kazach*<sup>Ethn</sup> → *Kazachstán* → *Kazachstánek*<sup>Dem</sup>, *Kazach*<sup>Dem</sup>; *Bulhar*<sup>Ethn</sup> → *Bulharsko* → *Bulhar*<sup>Dem</sup>; *Čech*<sup>Ethn</sup> → *Čechy/Česko* → *Čech*<sup>Dem</sup>/*Čech*<sup>Dem</sup>; *Belg*<sup>Ethn</sup> → *Belgie* → *Belgičan*<sup>Dem</sup>; Serbian *Srbín*<sup>Ethn</sup> → *Srbija/Srpska* → *Srbijanac*<sup>Dem</sup>, *Srbín*<sup>Dem</sup>/–).<sup>79</sup> After all, the tension between the perception of demonyms as exclusively derived names and the role of some of them in a different meaning as historically motivating the creation of name of a place is the content of virtually the whole of point 3.3.

The minor deficiencies or uncertainties described above do not in any way reduce the high quality of the monograph reviewed – it is definitely worth reading, because it is written with erudition, boldly, forcing to think and able to evoke a sincere interest in word-formation as a linguistic discipline. Tsvetanka Avramova certainly deserves credit for this.

---

79 Demonym *Kazach* and *Kazachstánek* are variant/competitive forms in Czech today; name of a place *Čechy* and *Česko* are not variant because they have different lexical meaning (denote different geographical unit); the *Belgae* were an ancient Celtic tribe; *Srbija* is Serbian name of the Serbian state (Serbia), *Srpska* is Serbian name of Serbian administrative unit within Bosnia and Herzegovina; whereas *Srbín* primarily means “member of the Serb nation”, *Srbijanac* is demonym related exclusively to today’s Serbia (Serb. *Srbija*) and distinguishing between Serbs from Serbia and Serbs from other regions.

## ZOONYMS AND PHYTONYMS? OR THE FLUCTUATING TERMINOLOGY IN BULGARIAN, SERBIAN AND CROATIAN LINGUISTICS

(A QUESTION ABOUT THE CORRECT USAGE  
OF LINGUISTIC TERMINOLOGY)

In the framework of the research in the field of phraseology, we often encounter phrasemes that contain a zoological or botanical component. In the titles of a number of phraseological studies or publications, we find the word “zoonymical (phytonymical) component”. But is the use of these terms somewhat inaccurate or even misleading? Here we try to find the answer of this question.

### I. Examples from the Bulgarian Linguistics

The proper names, that we give to animals, are called zoonyms, the proper names we give to plants are called phytonyms. Of course, more often we give names – and in this way we individualize – animals (domesticated), whereas we give individualizing names to plants very rarely.<sup>80</sup> But some scientists consider the appellatives that we use to name a certain animal or plant species (Czech/Croatian/Bulgarian: *pes – pas – куче, kůň – konj –*

---

80 The Czech scientific literature gives very little examples of this fact – it points out *Semtsinská lípa*, which grew almost 300 years on a place where there were no other trees in an area called *Český ráj* (in 2000 it was destroyed by a strong storm), from the Bulgarian examples we can point out *Байкышевата мря* – the oldest tree in Pirin Mountain, whose estimated age is 1300 years.

кон, *lípa* – *lípa* – *lipa*, *růže* – *ruža* – *роза* “dog, horse, linden, rose” etc.), zoonyms respectively phytonyms. This view is also supported by the authors of the three-volume edition *Българска лексикология и фразеология* (“Bulgarian Lexicology and Phraseology”), according to them names of animals are zoonyms (зооними) and names of plants are phytonyms (фитоними) (Krumova-Tsvetkova et al. 2013: 440, 443). However, it is clear from the context that they have in mind the lexical wealth of the Bulgarian language related to flora and fauna, i.e. the sphere of appellatives (ibid.: 440). We can also mention the Bulgarian phraseologist Rayna Holandi, who in her monograph entitled *Зоонимната фразеология в английския и българския език* (“The Zoonymical Phraseology in English and Bulgarian”, 2010) deals with the names of the animals, not their own/proper names, without mentioning anywhere in the definition of the term *zoonym*. In the bibliography of the monograph we find two studies, the title of which contains this term,<sup>81</sup> and it is very likely that these studies are concerned with the common name of animals and not with actual zoonyms.

## II. Examples from the Croatian Linguistics

With similar thematic focus is the monograph of Croatian Ivana Vidović Bolt *Životinjski svijet u hrvatskoj i poljskoj frazeologiji I.* (“Animal World in Croatian and Polish Phraseology I.”, 2011). Unlike R. Holandi Vidović Bolt refers to the term *zoonym* itself, saying: “We chose the term *zoonym* because of its wider acceptance and stability not only in Croatian, but also in other languages” (Vidović Bolt 2011: 11).<sup>82</sup> In a footnote, she cites two Polish researchers in support of his claim, but in our view not very convincing.<sup>83</sup> Another Croatian monograph that contains the

81 The Russian authors R. Gazizova and N. Dmitrieva – “Вторичная номинация лица путем метафоризации зоонима (на материале русского и болгарского языков)” (Gazizova – Dmitrieva 1985: 27–35) and the Bulgarian E. Nedkova – “Експресивно назоваване на човешки качества посредством фразеологизми с компоненти зооними в българския език” (Nedkova 2006: 328–336).

82 Orig.: “Odabran je termin zoonim zbog šire prihvaćenosti i učestalosti ne samo u hrvatskom, nego i u drugim jezicima”.

83 I. Vidović Bolt points the claim of A. Spagińska-Pruszek (2005: 174), that “zoonym is a designation

term “zonym” in its title is *Lingvokulturologija i zoonimska frazeologija* (“Linguoculturology and Zoonymical Phraseology”, 2017), whose author is Branka Barčot, where she motivates similarly her choice of terms.<sup>84</sup> Another Croatian researcher with the same opinion is Ana Vasung – in the introduction to her study she points out: “The theme of this article are the phrasemes with component *dog* and *cat* in Croatian and Bulgarian. The phrasemes with zoonymical component, together with those with somatic component, are the biggest group in the fond of phrasemes” (Vasung 2009: 1).<sup>85</sup> The author considers it a terminological fact that the names *pas* “dog” and *mačka* “cat” are zonyms, not finding it necessary to discuss this fact.<sup>86</sup> As perfectly naturally terminological names of animals are considered as zonyms also by Dubravka Sesar and Martina Grčević, who in their study on parts of the animal body as a component of idioms, point out: “Of course, it is an idiom with a somatic component, that belongs to the sphere of animals and we can find it in zoonymical phraseology” (Sesar – Grčević 2014: 2),<sup>87</sup> and also by the Slovenian phraseologist Erika Kržišnik in her research on Slovenian comparisons with an animalistic component (Kržišnik 2014). The term “zoonymical component” is also used in the title of Slovak linguist Ema Krošláková (1997), although in the text itself she avoids its use and uses the descriptive “zvierací komponent” (i.e. animal component).

---

of the representative of all species” (“zoonim predstavlja naziv za predstavnika svake vrste”), and also according to J. Szerszunowicz (2011: 14) lists various terms used for animal names, both in Polish and in Italian or English scientific literature; in one case this is the term *frazeologia zoonimiczna* (see Vidović Bolt 2011: 11). The unwarranted interpretation of onomastic terms, which, unfortunately, is found in a large number of South Slavonic researchers, is vividly manifested in Neda Pintarić’s statement “the alegoremic toponyms include designations of towns, rivers, areas and countries and demonyms derived therefrom” (“[u] alegoremne toponime ubrajaju se nazivi za gradove, rijeke, pokrajine i zemlje te iz njih izvedena imena za stanovnike”, Pintarić 1997: 165 – the emphasis is mine), in which among the toponyms she includes the names of the inhabitants, i.e. the subgroup of anthroponyms, or statement “the idiomatic proverb *noga lička, a cipela bečka* (...) contains an ethnonym (lički from Lika) and a toponym (bečki from Beč) as adjective components” (“[f]razeologizirana uzrečica *noga lička, a cipela bečka* [kaz. Marina Trumić] ima etnonim [lički od Lika] i toponim [bečki od Beč] u svojim pridjevnim sastavnicama [...]”, *ibid.*: 172 – the emphasis is mine), where she considers adjectives as onyms.

- 84 B. Barčot agrees with the onomastic definition of the term “zonym”, but motivates her choice by saying that it is a Croatian phraseological tradition that originated in a Russian pattern. For alternatives to designating the animal component, she offers terms *animalizam* or to some extent also *zoosem* (Barčot 2017: 69).
- 85 Orig.: “Tema ovog rada su frazemi sa sastavnicama *pas* i *mačka* u hrvatskom i bugarskom jeziku. Frazemi sa zoonimskom sastavnicom su uz somatizme najveća skupina u frazeološkom fondu”.
- 86 Explicitly her position is supported by the cited study by M. Ljubičić “O hrvatskim zoonimima: konotativno značenje i frazeologija” (Ljubičić 1994: 245–252).
- 87 Orig.: “Riječ je, naravno, o somatizmu koji pripada životinjskom (animalnom) svijetu i pojavljuje se u zoonimnoj frazeologiji”.

### III. Examples of Ambiguous Interpretation of the Terms

The opinion of the Serbian lexicologist Rajna Dragičević is ambiguous – in her *Лексикологија српског језика* (“Lexicology of Serbian”) she points out: “Onomastics deals with the names of people (**anthroponyms**), designations of plants (**phytonyms**), designations of animals (**zoonyms**), designations of places (**toponyms**) (...)” (Dragičević 2007: 23 – bold also in the original).<sup>88</sup> Everything testifies that the concepts *име* “name” and *назив* “designation” are used as synonyms (according to Šimunović [2009: 74] the term *назив* according to tradition should only be used for toponyms). She further refers to the author of a monograph: “She compared the so-called onyms (hydronyms, phytonyms, zoonyms and so on), that came from the synonymous adjectives, for example: *туст*, *мастан*, *дебео*, *зуст*” (ibid.: 23–24).<sup>89</sup> Based on this, we can assume that she unambiguously recognizes zoonyms and phytonyms as proper names. Her reference to the publication of D. Simonović *Ботанички речник имена биљака* (“Botanical Dictionary of the Names of Plants”, 1959) (ibid.) however, in relation to the work on the Serbian “phytonymia”, indicates that this Serbian author also accepts the term *phytonym* at least very broadly, i.e. for indicating the appellative names of the plant species.

Surprisingly incomplete, strict and not clear is the definition in *Enciklopedijski rječnik lingvističkih naziva* (“Encyclopedic Dictionary of Linguistic Terms”) by the Croatian linguist Rikard Simeon – in the dictionary article *fitonim* we see only a concise definition “ime biljke” (name of plant) (Simeon 1969: 343), there is no dictionary article *zoonim* in the dictionary at all. However, it is not clear whether the word *ime* Simeon means proper name or a name in general (about that also Šimunović 2009: 74).<sup>90</sup> Equally unclear is the interpretation of Y. Ignatovich, who in his

88 Orig.: “Ономастика проучава имена људи (**антропоними**), називе биљака (**фитоними**), називе животиња (**зооними**), називе места (**топоними**) (...)”.

89 Orig.: “Она је упоређивала тзв. „ониме“ (хидрониме, фитониме, зоониме итд.) који су настали од синонимних придева, као што су: *туст*, *мастан*, *дебео*, *зуст*”.

90 For designation of proper names by terms of domestic origin in Czech there are two terms: *vlastní jméno* and *vlastní název*, and the attribute *vlastní* is compulsory, because only *jméno* (but also *název*) not semantically transparent enough and the differences between nouns and appellatives are determined precisely by the attribute *vlastní*, resp. *obecné jméno*. Similarly in Croatian is used the designation *ime* and *naziv*, the first is used for designation of proper names of living creatures, the second for abonyms; the term that includes the content of both words would be “proper name

classification of the onyms in the definitions uses the term *собственные имена* (“proper names” – for example phytonyms are “собственные имена растений” [proper names of plants] – Ignatovich 2012: 2), but zoonyms are defined only as “имена и клички животных” (names and proper names of animals) (*ibid.*). In Bulgarian linguistics Nikolay Kovachev (1982) and Tsanka Konstantinova (1996) found two areas of use of the term zoonym (Šćepanović 2002: 324).<sup>91</sup>

#### IV.

#### Defense of the Ambiguous Interpretation by S. Novokmet

A broader interpretation is presented by Slobodan Novokmet, who in one of his studies dedicates an entire chapter to the definition of the term zoonym (the chapter is entitled “The Term *zoonym* in Lexicology Teaching and the Anthroponyms Motivated by Zoonyms”).<sup>92</sup> Novokmet based on the dictionary of foreign words by I. Klajn and M. Šipka (2007), where the term *зооним* is defined as “a noun that denotes an animal” (“именица која означава неку животињу”) and interprets the qualifier лингв. as a belonging of the term to the linguistic sciences (Klajn – Šipka 2007: 479, quote as per Novokmet 2018: 108).<sup>93</sup> As opposite view he cites

(*onym*, i.e. a word that is written with capital initial letter)” (“*vlastito ime [onim, tj. riječ koja se piše velikim početnim slovom]*”, Šimunović 2009: 74). The Slavonic Congress in Sofia (1962) set out to create a modern Slavonic onomastic terminology. Mandatory publications containing onomastic terminology are *Základní soustava a terminologie slovanské onomastiky* (1973) and the proceeding *Osnoven sistem i terminologija na slovenska onomastika* (1983) (“Basic System and Terminology of Slavonic Onomastics”). Thanks to them, onomastic terminology is gradually being defined, which means that the Serbo-Croatian word *naziv* is used in the meaning of appellatives, whereas the word *ime* begins to be used in the sphere of *propria* (*ibid.*, see also Pleskalová 2014: 11–12). Šimunović emphasizes, however, that newer and more precise terms with a component *-onim* are used in onomastic discourse, while traditional terms (*vlastito ime, prezime, mjesno ime* and so on) are used more – but not exclusively – outside of specialized discourse (Šimunović 2009: *ibid.*).

91 From the statement of Šćepanović “Kovachev (...) points on two spheres of usage of the term *зооним* in Bulgarian: proper name of an animal and a name in general” (“Ковачев (1982: 207–209) у бугарском језику за термин *зооним* констатује двије сфере његове употребе, као лично име животиње, и друго, као општи назив”, Šćepanović 2002: 324). However, it is not entirely clear whether the Serbian linguist is merely referring to the factual statement in Bulgarian, or his agreement as a specialist with this duality. Considering the new edition of his monograph and the data in it, we assume that Kovachev means the first option.

92 Orig.: “Термин *зооним* у настави лексикологије и антропоними мотивисани *зоонимима*”.

93 In the 2010 edition, the definition is the same (Klajn – Šipka 2010: 488), for a more complete idea, we also specify the definition of terms *зоонимија* – “лингв. скуп назива за животиње у неком језику или дијалекту” (*ibid.*), *фитоним* – “име, назив биљке”; *фитонимија* – “наука о именима биљака” (*ibid.*: 1340). The review of Czech or Bulgarian dictionaries of foreign words gives us the following results: the Czech Academic Dictionary of Foreign Words defines *fytonymum* as “*vlastní*

M. Šćepanović (1997), who according to him concerning the term zoonym “includes in anthroponomastic categories” (Šćepanović 1997: 68, quote as per Novokmet 2018: *ibid.*);<sup>94</sup> but the citation of Novokmet is not precise, Šćepanović does not claim anything like this, it includes the zoonyms to the so called *atoponomastic* categories (атопономастичке категорије – see Šćepanović 1997: 67–68), which is actually his author’s neologic term – in this category he proposes to include sub-categories of the theonyms, cosmonyms, non-anthropological bionyms, and chrematonyms (see *ibid.*: 68). When we talk about the zoonym within the onomastic category, it means only proper names given to animals, but according to Novokmet “it is very often used also as a designation of animal species or a single animal (f.e. *dog, cat, horse, lion* etc.). In fact the name belongs to the onymic lexical level, whereas the designation belongs to the appellative (common) nouns, that means to the level of common lexicon” (Novokmet 2018: 109).<sup>95</sup> He ends the rationale for this opinion with the statement (in a comprehensive footnote) that it is not uncommon in Serbian linguistics to use a term with two meanings (*ibid.*).

## V. Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian Linguists who Understand the Terms Only in an Onomastic Meaning

Against the looser interpretations above is the Zhivko Boyadzhiiev’s definition: “3. The proper names of animals (pets, circus; heroes in fairy tales or literature) belong to the sphere of zoonyms, for example *Sharo, Vihar, Baba Metsa, Belcho, Sivushka, Beliyat zab*. 4. The sphere

---

jméno rostliny” (ASCS 2001: 252) and *zoonymum* analogically as “vlastní jméno zvířete” (*ibid.*: 823); the Dictionary of Foreign Words by L. Klimeš does not have dictionary article for *zoonymum*, *fytonymum* is defined as “vlastní jméno rostliny” with example *Semínská lípa* (Klimeš 1994: 211). The Bulgarian Dictionary of Foreign Words does not contain dictionary entries зооним, зоонимия neither фитоним, the term фитонимия is defined as follows “1. Дял от езикознанието, който се занимава с наименованията на растенията. 2. Съвкупност от имената на растенията” (Milev – Nikolov – Bratkov 2000: 803). Unlike Czech dictionaries of this type, this Bulgarian dictionary offers only appellative lexicological perception, and like the quoted Serbian dictionary it is unclear why it does not register the onomastic (the primary) meaning of the defined term – if we accept the opposition lexicological vs. onomastic.

94 Orig.: “смешта у антропономастичке категорије”.

95 Orig.: “све чешће се употребљава и као назив животињске врсте или појединачног представника врсте (нпр. пас, мачка, коњ, лав и сл.). Заправо, име припада онимском лексичком нивоу, а назив апелативним (заједничким) именицама, тј. нивоу опште лексике”.

of phytonyms. Phytonyms are the names of unique specific plants, for example *Baykushevata mura* (in Pirin Mountain), *Stariya bryast*, *Vazoviya dab*” (Boyadzhiev 2007: 106).<sup>96</sup> Stanyo Georgiev in the dictionary article *Ономастика* (“Onomastics”) in *Енциклопедия на съвременния български език* (“Encyclopedia of Contemporary Bulgarian”) focuses on several sub-disciplines, including “zonymy – proper names of animals” (“зоонимия – за собствени имена на животни”, Georgiev 2000a: 281). Similarly Varban Vatov defines zonymy as “proper names of domestic animals – *Dorcho, Belcho, Grivcho, Murdzho, Karaman* etc.” (“собствени имена на домашни животни (*Дорчо, Белчо, Гривчо, Мурджо, Караман* и т.н.) – изучават се от дела **зоонимия**”, Vatov 1998: 244 – bold in the original), they are defined in the same way in the dictionary of Liliya Manolova in her dictionary of linguistic terms (Manolova 1999: 69). This perception of the term is also emphasized by Nikolay Kovachev (1987), according to whom “*the sphere of zonymy* contains and profoundly studies the proper names of pets and domestic animals in private and in common agricultural cooperations – *the zonymy*” (Kovachev 1987: 184),<sup>97</sup> and in that spirit the whole chapter of Zonymy – names of domestic animals – sounds (ibid.: 184–190).<sup>98</sup> The same applies to the zonymy (as well as the phytonym) the author of the Introduction to Croatian onomastics Petar Šimunović, which is clear from the whole chapter Zoonimija (imena životinja, zoonimi) (Šimunović 2009: 323–332) and mainly from his definitions of those terms, that he presents in his small dictionary of Croatian onomastic terminology: “**phytonym** = proper name of plant: *Gupčeva lipa, Drvo života, Kaštelanovi jablani*” (ibid.: 76); “**zonym** = proper name of animal: *Dorat* (horse), *Bilova* (cow), *Bimbo* (dog) etc.” (ibid.: 79) (bold in the original).<sup>99</sup> Novokmet’s free interpretation is also categorically rejected by Serbian onomast Mihailo Šćepanović, who critically notes that “after two decades since the issuing of *Basic System and Terminology*

96 Orig.: “3. Със собствените имена на животни (домашни, циркови; герои на приказки, на белетристични произведения) се занимава зоонимията, например *Шаро, Вихър, Баба Меца, Белчо, Сивушка, Белият зъб*. 4. Фитонимия. Фитонимите са имена на уникални растителни представители, напр. *Байкушевата мура* (в Пирин), *Стария бряст, Вазовия дъб*”.

97 Orig.: “зоонимията събира и всестранно проучва собствените имена на домашните животни в личните и обществените стопанства – зоонимите”.

98 However, Kovachev does not mention phytonyms in his publication.

99 Orig.: “**fitonim** = vlastito ime biljke: *Gupčeva lipa, Drvo života, Kaštelanovi jablani*” (ibid.: 76); “**zoonim** = vlastito ime životinje: *Dorat* (konj), *Bilova* (krava), *Bimbo* (pas) itd.” (ibid.: 79).

of *Slavonic Onomastics* (Vidoeski et al. 1983), works that deal with these problems still do not manage the usage of the basic terminology distinction *zoonym vs. appellative (nomenclature designation)*” (Šćepanović 2002: 322).<sup>100</sup> Equally critical to such manifestations of terminological hesitations is the Bulgarian linguist Boryan Yanev – in his comparative study *Образните сравнения с антропоцентричен характер в българския и английския език* (“Images Associated with Human Appearance. Bulgarian–English Parallels”) he quotes the aforementioned publication by R. Holandi and notes the observed terminological problem: “the usage of the term “zoonymical” is not correct, because *zoonyms* are proper names of animals, but not their designation” (Yanev 2013: 84).<sup>101</sup>

## VI. Czech Linguists who Accept the Terms Only in an Onomastic Meaning

The Czech publications that we have looked at in terms of this issue are unanimous – whether this is the system of onyms of F. Čermák (as examples of *zoonyms* he gives the names *Rek*, *Sultán* [dogs], *Micka* [cat], example for *phytonym* is *Semtinská lípa* – see Čermák 2010: 277), the including of the *zoonyms* and *phytonyms* with examples within the classification of proper names in R. Šrámek (1999: 165), the examples for “jména zvířecí” (names of animals) in M. Čechová et al. (2011: 69) or the dictionary articles in *Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny* (“New Encyclopedic Dictionary of Czech”) *Zoonymum* (M. Knappová), *Fytonymum* and *Vlastní jména – třídění* (both J. Pleskalová). Pleskalová points out an interesting note in her second mentioned dictionary article: “The terms *zoonym*, *phytonym* are not properly used sometimes in linguistics for appellative designation of an animal (*byk* “bull”) or plant (*lípa* “linden”)” (Pleskalová

100 Orig.: “након безмало двије деценије од појављивања *Основног система и терминологије словенске ономастике* (Видоески et al. 1983), радови који су посвећени овој проблематици и даље не познају основну терминолошку дистинкцију *зооним – апелатив (номенклатурни назив)*”.

101 Orig.: “използването на термина „зоонимен“ обаче не е коректно, тъй като зооними са собствените имена на животните, а не самите названия на животни”.

2017b, see also 2017a).<sup>102</sup> We will finish our review of Czech linguists with a glance at the dictionary of linguistic terms by E. Lotko. In it the author explains the term *fytonymum* briefly as “proper name of plant” (“vlastní jméno rostliny”, Lotko 2000: 40), the dictionary does not contain the dictionary article *zoonymum*, but the term *zooapelativum* is specified as “a noun that designates an animal; for example zooappellatives *dog* and *horse* are often a basic component of Czech idioms” (ibid.: 127).<sup>103</sup> Just these terms (zooappellative, analogically phytoappellative) according to our opinion they can answer the need to easily name the group of appellatives meaning animals or plants.<sup>104</sup> We consider the usage of the terms *zoonym*, resp. *phytonym* in this meaning wrong as due to unwanted ambiguity (one term cannot mean two opposing phenomena within one category – regardless of the desire to theoretically justify this approach or its direct application by a number of linguists – see the same argument in Šćepanović 2002: 322), but also because in that case we could mark without a token of remorse also the lexem *člověk/čovjek/човек* “man” as anthroponym, the lexem *město/grad/град* “town, city” as oikonym, the lexem *kopec/brdo/холм* “hill” as oronym and so on. In this case, these special linguistic (onomastic) terms would de facto lose their meaning, as this would eliminate the distinctive characteristic of an appellative and an onym.

## VII. Conclusion

The argumentation of the proponents of the purely onomastic concept of the above terms is, in our view, more precise from a scientific point of view, we can summarize it in appeal “we do not have to give up the international terminology, but just the opposite – we have to keep to

102 Orig.: “Termíny *zoonymum*, *fytonymum* jsou v jazykovědě někdy nepatřičně užívány pro apelativní pojmenování živočicha (*býk*) a rostliny (*lípa*)”.

103 Orig.: “podstatné jméno označující zvíře, např. *zooapelativa pes* a *kůň* jsou častým základem českých frazeologismů”.

104 For example in the study of Eva Mrhačová *Česká a polská přísloví na bázi zooapelativ* (Mrhačová 2003) or Snežana Popović and Mirjana Stevanović in their article *Srovnání českých a srbských zooapelativních frazémů* (Popović – Stevanović 2006).

the international terminology: *-оним* (*антрон-*, *мон-*, an so on) for different types of proper names, *-онимија* for the complex of these onyms, *-ономастика* for their study” (Vidoeski et al. 1983: 36, quote as per Šćepanović 2002: 323).<sup>105</sup> In addition, the term *zoonym* first appeared in Russian onomastics<sup>106</sup> exactly in order to be able to indicate proper names especially of domestic animals (Šćepanović 2002: 324). The arguments of the representatives of the broader view are either nonexistent or, in our view, unconvincing (referring, for example, to tradition or to dual perception), moreover, for the need for the usual designation of a wide variety of plants and animals can serve, without any hindrance, the terms *phytoappellatives*, resp. *zooappellatives*. The terminology dictionaries that we included in our study also do not recommend the dual perception of the terms (lexicological vs. onomastic) and do not even mention it.

---

105 Orig.: “не треба одступати од интернационалне терминологије, већ досљедно задржати ту терминологију: *-оним* (*антрон-*, *мон-*, итд.) за појединачна властита имена, *-онимија* за скуп тих имена, *-ономастика* за њихова истраживања”.

106 According to Šćepanović this term is used for the first time by P. T. Porotnikov (1972), when he studied Ural zoonyms. He used this term for substitution of the older *кличка* (Šćepanović 2002: 324).

## SUMMARY

The first chapter **Brno University Production on South Slavonic or Balkan Languages in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Overview No. 1)** summarizes the linguistic and language publications that concern South Slavonic languages and that were published in the period 2000–2019 at the Masaryk University in Brno, Czechia. We pay attention to four types of publications: 1. multidisciplinary proceedings and handbooks with linguistic component, 2. linguistic proceedings and collective monographs, 3. linguistically oriented monographs and study guides, 4. dictionaries. In this way, we totally recorded 41 publications.

The second chapter **Czech–South Slavonic Lexicographic Production Between 1900 and 2019 (Overview No. 2)** provides an overview of Czech–South Slavonic and South Slavonic–Czech lexicographic production in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century. The selected period is divided into three parts: 1900–1945, 1946–1990 and 1991 to present. Each stage yet had their own characteristics and their preferences. Most dictionaries are related to Serbo–Croatian (15), resp. Serbian (4) and Croatian (17), in total 36, with Bulgarian it is 22, with Slovenian 10, with Macedonian 4 and with Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian altogether 1.

The third chapter **New Czech–Bulgarian, Czech–Serbian and Czech–Macedonian Dictionaries in Context of the Czech–South Slavonic Lexicography after 1990 (Review & Analysis)** focuses on three

fundamental Czech–South Slavonic dictionaries issued in the first decade of the new century – two–volumes Czech–Serbian (2001), two–volumes Czech–Bulgarian (2002) and Czech–Macedonian (2006). The second part of the chapter presents an analysis of eight selected Czech–South Slavonic dictionaries (3x Czech–Serbian, 2x Czech–Croatian and 1x Czech–Bulgarian, Czech–Macedonian and Czech–Slovenian) conducted by selecting 38 Czech words and evaluation of their processing.

The fourth chapter **Choronyms for Belarus, Moldova, Ireland and the Netherlands in Bulgarian (Problems of Geographical Terminology and Translation, Part 1)** concentrates on the problem of doublet forms in contemporary Bulgarian geographical terminology of four states' names. In case of Belarus and Moldova, it came to substitution of the older, traditional name (*Белорусия, Молдавия*). In the first case – by completely new name (*Беларус*), in the second – by a name used in the past, but with a different meaning (*Молдова*). In the case of Ireland, an attempt was made to emphasize the difference between *the island* (*Ирландия*) and *the state on this island* (*Ейре*). The aim was to express the relationship *Ирландия = Ейре + Северна Ирландия*. Maybe because of the unfamiliarity of the Irish name of Ireland it did not happen and so the name from English is used primarily also for the state. At the Netherlands we see usage of the name of a state unit (*Холандия*) for the whole state (*Нидерландия*). In this case it is an obvious inaccuracy, which is not so serious. It appears only in the spoken language and in written texts not of major importance. In specialized language publications and encyclopedias, the Dutch state almost everywhere appears with the correct name.

The geographical name of nowadays state of Croatia has three variants in Bulgarian usus: *Хърватия, Хърватско* and *Хърватска*. How is it possible that one state has three names in one language? And what place each of them takes in the system of Bulgarian toponyms? The answers are in the fifth chapter **Choronyms for Croatia in Bulgarian (Problems of Geographical Terminology and Translation, Part 2)**. The first two toponyms are with Bulgarian origin, the third one is new and with Croatian origin. Although Bulgarian does not need the third variant, the name *Хърватска* still exists in this language, because it is often used by Bulgarian mass media for example. There is no reason for this, it is just a journalistic stereotype. The first of them will be the only one to

be used, because it is not in conflict with the Bulgarian word-formation model for geographical names of European states.

The following three chapters are thematically connected with the problems of semantic differentiation between the term that designates the whole Czech state (*Česko*, in English: *Czechia*) and the term that designates only the central Czech historical territory (*Čechy*, in English: *Bohemia*). The sixth chapter **Choronyms for Czechia and Bohemia in Slavonic and Selected non-Slavonic Languages (Problems of Geographical Terminology and Translation, Part 3)** presents both the past of these two geographical terms and the difference between them from contemporary point of view mainly in Slavonic languages. The Germanic and Romance languages use for making the difference between “*Česko*” and “*Čechy*” the existing semantic opposition of B-variant (historical territory, *Bohemia*) and Cz-variant (country, *Czechia*), in Slavonic languages this opposition is less used, mainly in Eastern Slavonic languages and in Bulgarian. The primary meaning of Cz-variant on the whole Slavonic territory today is surely “a country”.

The seventh chapter **Choronyms for Czechia and Bohemia in Bulgarian (Problems of Geographical Terminology and Translation, Part 4)** were focused also on the problem with naming Bohemia, which lies in the fact that the name of the state (*Чехия*) is often used in synecdoche way for the lower unit that is just its part (*Бохемия*). That might not officially be incorrect, but due to homonymy with more important name of the state this effect quite often unnecessarily complicates its understandability. For a common communication it is not such a major fault – people rarely talk about lower units of foreign states, so it is evident that speaker has almost every time a state in mind. In scholar area things are different, though – geographical, historical, sociological, linguistic, political-science and other texts often working with geographical names require factual accuracy. When analysing Czech realia it is inevitable to clearly distinguish between concepts *Čechy* “Bohemia” and *Česko* “Czechia” using expressions *Бохемия* and *Чехия*, if they want to evade 1. undesirable homonymy, 2. formal name *Чешка република* “the Czech Republic”, that is unsystematic and for similar texts stylistically and factually inaccurate and unusable in the past (administrative-political unit named “the Czech Republic” was not exist before 1990), or 3. expression *чешките земи* “the

Czech lands”, that degrades the Czech state to the level of no-name body of marginal provinces.

In the eighth chapter **Choronyms for Czechia and Bohemia in Serbian & Choronyms for Serbia and Srpska in Czech (Problems of Geographical Terminology and Translation, Part 5)** we analyzed the above mentioned semantic, terminology and translatology problems in Serbian. In Serbian – unlike Bulgarian – the B-variant is not common for designation of central historical Czech land. That is why it is necessary to look for other functional decisions. The second part of the chapter is dedicated to a similar problem that is connected with two Serbian choronyms designating Serbian area – *Србуја* “Serbia” and *Српска* “Srpska”. In the first half of the 90-ies of past century in Serbian appeared the name *Srpska* which till this period was not used in everyday communication. We can say that this word came into active usage as response of the wish of the Bosnian Serbs, most often as a part of the political name *Republika Srpska* “Republic of Srpska”. Due to home and foreign media the new name very quickly came into usage in the European and world society. The question that came up immediately was the problem of its translation, because we can not expect that other languages dispose of two or more possibilities to name the state of Serbs. In this chapter we described three possibilities of finding out the Czech equivalent of the Serbian choronym. First, the word formational principles typical for the Czech language (*Srbsko, Srbije/Serbie, Srby*), second, taking the original word and its grammatical, eventually morfonological adaptation (*\*Srpska, \*Srbska, \*Srbská*), third, the usage of the name *Srbsko* “Serbia” in word combination with specifying attribute (*\*Západní Srbsko, \*Bosenské Srbsko, \*Nové Srbsko* “Western Serbia, Bosnian Serbia, New Serbia” etc.). In our opinion, the most probabal option for development in future is the second possibility.

The nineth chapter **Demonym and Ethnonym for Bosnians and Bosniaks in Czech (Problems of Terminology and Translation)** deals with the older and current meanings of Bosnian (or Serbo-Croatian commonly) onyms expressing the basic socio-political facts of contemporary Bosnia and Herzegovina (*Bosanac, Bošnjak, Musliman, Srpska*), the meanings of adjectives *bosanski* and *bošnjački* and their translation equivalents in Czech. It concludes that, despite the data in older Czech dictionaries, Czech equivalentents *Bosňan* “Bosnian” and *Bosňák* “Bosniak” cannot currently

be understood as synonyms, and the same is true of adjectives *bosenský* “Bosnian” and *bosňácký* “Bosniak”, Czech equivalents of the respective Bosnian (Serbo-Croatian) adjectives. The use of terms related to the difficult socio-political situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina in foreign languages needs to be very cautious.

The tenth chapter **Demonyms in Contemporary Czech and Bulgarian Languages (Review)** is a review of Tsvetanka Avramova’s monograph about *nomina habitatorum* in Czech and Bulgarian. The autor asks four basic questions. The first question raised is: are demonyms common nouns or proper nouns? Situation: in the Bulgarian language they are written with a small initial letter, which indicates their affiliation to common nouns; in Czech, they are written with a capital letter, which in turn signals their belonging to proper nouns. The second question raised is: do masculine demonyms have a word-forming meaning “a person X regardless of gender associated with the place Y”, or “man X associated with place Y”, or within polysemy the lexical units under observation (at least) both meanings apply? The third question raised is closely related to the previous one: are feminine demonyms derived directly from the name of the place inhabited by women or it is a gender-marking form, which motivating expression is relevant masculine demonym? And if the latter is true, we go back to the second question. In terms of perception of feminine demonyms, this question is quite essential, because in the first case they would be demonyms from the perception of word-forming meaning (mutational word-forming pattern: “person X is the person somehow associated with the place Y” would apply), whereas it would not be true in the second case (modification word-forming pattern “person X is feminine, i.e. gender-marking variant of person Y” would apply here). The fourth question raised is: what is the motivated relationship between demonyms, name of a place and related adjectives? And this includes the subquery: are all demonyms derived from names of the places in sense of pattern “person X is inhabitant of place Y” or that apply only for some, whereas with others the motivational relationship, resp. relation of foundation is reverse, i.e. “place X is the place where inhabitants Y live?” And further – what is the ratio between word-forming meaning given by general pattern “word X is derived from the word Y”, preferred within given word-forming category and historical reality? In other words –

to what extent the word-forming theory reflects the real process of naming a territory, which was influenced by the ethnic (tribal, national, etc.) name of the people who inhabited such a territory, resp. the actual process of naming the population that has been influenced by the name of the territory in which they originate or are living in?

The last chapter **Zoonyms and Phytonyms? or The Fluctuating Terminology in Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian Linguistics (A Question About the Correct Usage of Linguistic Terminology)** was inspired by the research in the field of phraseology and idiomatics. We often encounter phrasemes that contain a zoological or botanical component. In the titles of a number of phraseological studies or publications, we find the word “zoonymical (phytonymical) component”, but their authors very often have on mind appellative component, not onymic. However, is the use of these terms somewhat inaccurate or even misleading? In the chapter we show different points of view of Croatian, Serbian, Bulgarian, Czech and other linguists and we incline to the opinion that does not recommend the mixing of the onymic and appellative function of the observed terms. Just these terms (zoappellative, analogically phytoappellative) according to our opinion they can answer the need to easily name the group of appellatives meaning animals or plants. We consider the usage of the terms *zoonym*, resp. *phytonym* in this meaning wrong as due to unwanted ambiguity (one term cannot mean two opposing phenomena within one category – regardless of the desire to theoretically justify this approach or its direct application by a number of linguists), but also because in that case we could mark without a token of remorse also the lexem *člověk/čovjek/човек* “man” as anthroponym, the lexem *město/grad/град* “town, city” as oikonym, the lexem *kopeć/brdo/хълм* “hill” as oronym and so on. In this case, these special linguistic (onomastic) terms would de facto lose their meaning, as this would eliminate the distinctive characteristic of an appellative and an onym.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A-Č-A – FRONEK, J. *Anglicko-český, česko-anglický slovník*. Praha: Leda, 1998.
- A-Ž 1999 – A-Ž – *Malá ilustrovaná encyklopedie*. Praha: Encyklopedický dům, 1999.
- ASCS 2001 – *Akademický slovník cizích slov*. Kolektiv autorů pod vedením V. Petráčkové a J. Krause. Praha: Academia, 2001.
- Asenova 2002 – АСЕНОВА, П. *Балканско езикознание. Основни проблеми на балканския езиков съюз*. Велико Търново: Faber, 2002.
- Аврамова 2003 – АВРАМОВА, Ц. *Словообразователни тенденции при съществителните имена в българския и чешкия език в края на XX век*. София: Heron Press, 2003.
- Аврамова 2013 – АВРАМОВА, Ц. *Имена на жители (nomina habitatorum) в съвременния чешки и съвременния български език*. София: Парадигма; Бохемия клуб, 2013.
- B-Č – HORA, K. *Bulharsko-český slovník*. Praha: Nakladatelství ČSAV, 1959.
- B-Č-B – PROŠEK, V. *Bulharsko-český, česko-bulharský kapesní slovník*. Praha: SPN, 1964.
- Balkanite 1999-02 – БАЛКАНИТЕ+. *Събития и тенденции*. София, 1999-2002.
- Balkanski 1995 – БАЛКАНСКИ, Т. *Кроати, хървати – Кроатия, Кроация, Хърватия, Хърватско, Хърватска*. – *Български език*, 1-2/ XLV (1995), 168-171.
- Barčot 2017 – BARČOT, B. *Lingvokulturologija i zoonimska frazeologija*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 2017.

- Baychev – Damyanova – Tsankov 1980 – БАЙЧЕВ, Б. – ДАМЯНОВА, М. – ЦАНКОВ, К. *Да говорим български език*. Велико Търново: Университетско издателство, 1980.
- BE – ТРУД – *Българска енциклопедия А-Я*. София: Труд, 2002.
- BER – GABEROFF – *Български енциклопедичен речник А-Я*. Велико Търново: Gaberoff, 2002.
- Boyardzhiev 2007 – БОЯДЖИЕВ, Ж. *Увод в общото езикознание*. Пето издание. София: Парадигма, 2007.
- Bozhilova 1998 – БОЖИЛОВА, Р. *История на Хърватия*. Малка историческа библиотека. София: Абагар, 1998.
- Brborić 2007 – БРБОРИЋ, Б. *Стандардни језик и језички стандард*. – In: *Српски језички приручник*. Београд: Београдска књига, 2007, 11–36.
- Brockhaus-10 – BROCKHAUS *Enzyklopädie in 24 Bänden*. 10. B. Mannheim, 1989.
- Brozović 2008 – BROZOVIĆ, D. *Povijest hrvatskoga književnog i standardnoga jezika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2008.
- BTR – АНДРЕЙЧИН, Л. и кол. *Български тълковен речник*. Четвърто издание, допълнено и преработено от Д. Попов. София: Наука и изкуство, 2005.
- Č-B – РОМАНСКА, Ц. *Чешко-български речник*. Трето, преработено издание. София: Наука и изкуство, 1961.
- Č-B-1\_2 – ИВАНЧЕВ, С. – БЪЧВАРОВ, Я. и кол. *Чешко-български речник в два тома = Česko-bulharský slovník ve dvou dílech*. Том I: А-О; Том II: P-Ž. София: Труд; Прозорец, 2002.
- Č-M – РОУС, Донка – ЧЕРМАК, Франтишек – ДЕЛОВА, Јасминка – ВИТОВА, Катержина: *Чешко-македонски речник*. Скопје: Филолошки факултет „Блаже Конески“, 2006.
- Č-M-Č – DOROVSKÝ, I. – STEFANIJA, D. *Česko-makedonský a makedonsko-český slovník*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 1994<sup>1</sup>, 1995<sup>2</sup>, 2002<sup>3</sup>.
- Č-S-1\_2 – КАЧАНИК, Е. и кол. *Чешко-српски речник = Česko-srbský slovník*. Београд: САНУ; Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, 2000 (Том I: А-О); 2001 (Том II: P-Ž).
- Castellan 2002 – КАСТЕЛАН, Ж. *История на Балканите (XIV–XX век)*. Превод от френски Л. Цанева. Пловдив: ИК „Хермес“, 2002.
- Čechová et al. 2011 – ČECHOVÁ, M. – DOKULIL, M. – HLAVSA, Z. – HRBÁČEK, J. – HRUŠKOVÁ, Z. *Čeština – řeč a jazyk 3., rozšířené a upravené vydání*. Praha: SPN – pedagogické nakladatelství, a. s., 2011.
- Čermák 2010 – ČERMÁK, F. *Lexikon a sémantika*. Praha: NLN, 2010.
- Chavdarova 1999 – ЧАВДАРОВА, М. *Балкански страни. Политика, икономика, междunarодни врџки*. София: Парадигма, 1999.

- Čižmarová 1999 – ČIŽMÁROVÁ, L. K peripetiím vývoje názvů našeho státu a postojů k nim od roku 1918. – *Naše řeč*, 1/82 (1999), 1–15.
- Čižmarová 2016 – ČIŽMÁROVÁ, L. *Jak se jmenuje naše vlast*. Edice Věda kolem nás – pro všední den. Praha: Středisko společných činností AV ČR, v.v.i., 2016.
- Daneš – Dokulil – Kuchař et al. 1967 – DANEŠ, F. – DOKULIL, M. – KUCHAR, J. a kol. *Tvoření slov v češtině 2. Odvozování podstatných jmen*. Praha: Academia, 1967.
- Diderot-3/5 – *Všeobecná encyklopedie DIDEROT v 8 svazcích. Sv. 3, 5*. Praha, 1999.
- Dorovský 2016 – DOROVSKÝ, I. *Studia Balkanica et Slavica II*. Brno: Tribun EU, 2016.
- Doуkov 2006 – ДОЙКОВ, В. *Хърватия*. Географска библиотека. София: Издателство Ковачев, 2006.
- Dragićević 2007 – ДРАГИЋЕВИЋ, Р. *Лексикологија српског језика*. Београд: Завод за уџбенике, 2007.
- Dvorník 2001 – ДВОРНИК, Ф. *Славяните в европейската история и цивилизация*. Превод от английски език В. Дудеков-Кършев и Г. Лозанова. София: Издателство „ГАЛ-ИКО“, 2001.
- Енс – *Енциклопедия БАН А-Я*. София: Издателство на БАН, 1974.
- ЕР – ВЛАХОВ, С. *Енциклопедичен речник от Август до Яфет*. София: ИК „Петър Берон“, 1996.
- Gazizova – Dmitrieva 1985 – ГАЗИЗОВА, Р. – ДМИТРИЕВА, Н. Вторичная номинация лица путем метафоризации зоонима (на материале русского и болгарского языков). – *Съпоставително езикознание*, 4/10 (1985), 27–35.
- Georgiev 2000 – ГЕОРГИЕВ, Л. *Балканите и новият световен ред*. София: Филвест, 2000.
- Georgiev 2000a – ГЕОРГИЕВ, С. Ономастика. – In: *Енциклопедия на съвременния български език*. Съставители Р. Русинов, С. Георгиев. Велико Търново: ИПК „Свети Евтимий патриарх Търновски“, 2000, 280–281.
- Hladký 1996 – HLADKÝ, L. *Bosna a Hercegovina. Historie nešťastné země*. Brno: Doplňěk, 1996.
- Hladký 2005 – HLADKÝ, L. *Bosenská otázka v 19. a 20. století*. Ediční řada Monografie. Svazek č. 12. Brno: Masarykova univerzita v Brně, Mezinárodní politologický ústav, 2005.
- Hollandi 2010 – ХОЛАНДИ, Р. *Зоонимната фразеология в английския и българския език*. Благоевград: Университетско издателство „Неофит Рилски“, 2010.

- Holub – Kopečný 1952 – HOLUB, J. – KOPEČNÝ, F. *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha: Státní nakladatelství učebnic, 1952.
- Ignatovich 2012 – ИГНАТОВИЧ, Я. П. Фразеологические единицы с компонентом-именем собственным в английском языке. – In: *Студенческий научный форум – 2012. IV международная студенческая научная конференция*, 1–17 [online]. Available at: <<https://scienceforum.ru/2012/article/2012001088>> [2018–11–28].
- Illustrated Oxford 1999 – *Illustrated Oxford Dictionary*. Praha: Ikar, 1999 (under license Oxford University Press, Oxford/New York, 1998).
- Ivanov 2002 – ИВАНОВ, И. *Флаговете на страните в света*. София: ИК „Петър Берон“; Академично издателство „Проф. Марин Дринов“, 2002.
- Karagyozov 1997 – КАРАГЪЗОВ, П. *Някогашните славяни днес*. София: ИК „Славика“, 1997.
- Kauchev 2015 – КАЙЧЕВ, Н. *Илирия от Варна до Вилах. Хърватското национално възрождане, сърбите и българите (до 1848 г.)*. София: Парадигма, 2015.
- KBE-1\_5 – *Кратка българска енциклопедия БАН, том 1–5*. София: Издателство на БАН, 1963–1969.
- Klajn – Šipka 2007/2010 – КЛАЈН, И. – ШИПКА, М. *Велики речник страних речи и израза*. Нови Сад: Прометеј, 2007, 2010.
- Klimeš 1994 – KLIMEŠ, L. *Slovník cizích slov*. 5., přepracované a doplněné vydání. Praha: SPN, 1994.
- Knappová 2017 – KNAPPOVÁ, M. Zoonymum. – In: *CzechEncy – Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. P. Karlík, M. Nekula, J. Pleskalová (eds.) [online]. Available at: <<https://www.czechency.org/slovník/ZOONYMUM>> [2018–09–02].
- Konstantinova 1996 – КОНСТАНТИНОВА, Ц. Зоонимите и зоонимната лексика в казанлъшката лексика. – In: *Ономастично и етнолингвистично пространство на езика. Астроними, вентоними, еортоними, зооними, фитоними, хрононими и др.* Сборник в чест на професор Николай Ковачев, том I. Гл. ред. Т. Балкански. Велико Търново: „Знак ‘94“, 1996, 213–222.
- Kovachev 1982 – КОВАЧЕВ, Н. *Българска ономастика. Наука за собствените имена*. Велико Търново: Великотърновски университет „Кирил и Методий“, 1982.
- Kovachev 1987 – КОВАЧЕВ, Н. *Българска ономастика. Наука за собствените имена*. София: Държавно издателство „Наука и изкуство“, 1987.
- Krejčí 2005a – KREJČÍ, P. Ivan Dorovský – lexikograf. – In: *Slavista s duší básníka. Sborník k sedmdesátinám Ivana Dorovského*. Brno – Boskovice: ALBERT, 2005, 17–22.

- Krejčí 2005b – KREJČÍ, P. Proč má Chorvatsko v bulharštině tři jména? (plus pět případů dublet v bulharském zeměpisném názvosloví). – In: *Littera scripta manet. Сборник в чест на 65-годишнината на проф. д.ф.н. Василка Радева. Ю. Стоянова (ред.)*. София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2005, 609–626.
- Krejčí 2007a – KREJČÍ, P. Chorvatsko – geopolitický, demografický, historický a jazykový profil. – In: *Chorvatsko, Chorvaté, chorvatština. Sborník referátů přednesených během Týdne chorvatské kultury* (Brno, duben 2006) a dalších kroatisticky zaměřených textů. P. Krejčí (ed.), sestavili P. Krejčí, J. Komárková. Brno: SCSS; SVN Regiony, 2007, 9–19.
- Krejčí 2007b – KREJČÍ, P. Czechia: devadesát let po vzniku Československa, patnáct let po jeho rozpadu, ale i deset let po naganském triumfu. – *Klaudyán. Internetový časopis pro historickou geografii a environmentální dějiny*, 2/IV (2007), 51–58 [online]. Available at: <<http://www.klaudyan.cz>>.
- Krejčí 2008 – KREJČÍ, P. Don't be afraid of CZECHIA, it needs your help! – *Klaudyán. Internetový časopis pro historickou geografii a environmentální dějiny*, 1/V (2008), 30–37 [online]. Available at: <<http://www.klaudyan.cz>>.
- Krejčí 2009a – KREJČÍ, P. Česko svůj oficiální anglický překlad má. Už 16 let! – *Vesmír. Časopis akademické obce*, 3/88 (139) (2009), 200–202.
- Krejčí 2009b – KREJČÍ, P. 15 let samostatného českého státu – 15 let zmatků v jeho pojmenování. – In: *Паисиеви четения. Интеркултурният диалог – традиции и перспективи. Езикознание. Ж. Чолакова и кол.* (eds.). Пловдив, 27–28 ноември 2008. Научни трудове, том 46, кн. 1, сб. А. Пловдив: Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски“, Филологически факултет, 385–397.
- Krejčí 2010 – KREJČÍ, P. Чешките географски названия Česko, Čechy и техните еквиваленти в други славянски езици. – *Славянски диалози. Списание за славянски езици, литератури и култури*. Кн. 10–11/VII (2010). Пловдив: Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски“, Филологически факултет, 93–99.
- Krejčí 2018a – KREJČÍ, P. *Eight Fragments from the World of Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin Languages. Selected South Slavonic Studies 1*. Brno: Masaryk University, 2018.
- Krejčí 2018b – KREJČÍ, P. Lingvonyma v ústavách postjugoslávských státních útvarů (Chorvatsko, Bosna a Hercegovina, Srbsko a Černá Hora). – In: *Area Slavica 2. Slovanské jazyky ve světle termínu*. I. Bogoczová, Z. Nedomová (eds.). Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita, 2018, 23–39.
- Krošláková 1997 – KROŠLÁKOVÁ, E. Frazеologické prirovnania so zoonymickým komponentom. – In: *Frazеologické štúdie II*. Ed. P. Ďurčo. Bratislava: Esprima, 1997, 103–112.

- Krumova-Tsvetkova et al. 2013 – КРУМОВА-ЦВЕТКОВА, Л. – БЛАГОЕВА, Д. – КОЛКОВСКА, С. – ПЕРНИШКА, Е. – БОЖИЛОВА, М. *Българска лексикология и фразеология. Том 1: Българска лексикология*. София: Академично издателство „Проф. Марин Дринов“, 2013.
- Kržišnik 2014 – KRŽIŠNIK, E. Zoonimi v slovenskih frazeoloških primerah. – In: *Životinje u frazeološkom ruhu*. Zbornik radova s međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa Animalistički frazemi u slavenskim jezicima održanog 21. i 22. III. 2014. na Filozofskom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Ur. I. Vidović Bolt. Zagreb: FF-press, 2014, 1–20 [online]. Available at: <<http://www.animalisticki-frazemi.eu/index.php/znanstveni-skupovi/znanstveni-skup-21-i-22-ozujka-2014/zbornik-radova>> [2018-11-25].
- Lalkov 2000 – ЛАЛКОВ, М. *Югославия (1918–1992). Драматичният път на една държавна идея*. София: Издателство с печатница „Даниела Убенова“, 2000.
- Larousse-2 – LAROUSSE *Trois Volumes en couleurs*. T. 2. Paris, 1966.
- Liščák 2009 – LIŠČÁK, V. *Státy a území světa*. Praha: Libri, 2009<sup>3</sup>.
- Liščák – Fojtík 1996/1998 – LIŠČÁK, V. – FOJTÍK, P. *Státy a území světa*. Praha: Libri, 1996<sup>4</sup>, 1998<sup>2</sup>.
- Ljubičić 1994 – LJUBIČIĆ, M. O hrvatskim zoonimima: konotativno značenje i frazeologija. – *Filologija*, 22–23 (1994), 245–252.
- Lotko 2000 – LOTKO, E. *Slovník lingvistických termínů pro filology*. Druhé, přepracované a doplněné vydání. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2000.
- Lutterer – Šrámek 2004 – LUTTERER, I. – ŠRÁMEK, R. *Zeměpisná jména v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku. Slovník vybraných zeměpisných jmen s výkladem jejich původu a historického vývoje*. 2. vyd. Havlíčkův Brod: Tobiáš, 2004.
- M-Č98 – ВЛАДОВА, Ј. – ПАСТИРЖИК, Д. *Македонско-чешки речник*. Скопје: Магор, 1998.
- M-Č99 – HORA, K. *Makedonsko-český slovník s makedonskou gramatikou F. V. Mareše*. Praha: Euroslavica, 1999.
- Manchev 2000 – МАНЧЕВ, К. *История на балканските народи (1918–1945)*. София: Парадигма, 2000.
- Manchev 2001 – МАНЧЕВ, К. *История на балканските народи (XIV–XX век)*. София: Парадигма, 2001.
- Manchev 2008 – МАНЧЕВ, К. *История на националния въпрос на Балканите*. София: Парадигма, 2008.
- Manolova 1999 – МАНОЛОВА, Л. *Речник на лингвистичните термини в българския език*. София: Наука и изкуство, 1999.
- Matanov 2002 – МАТАНОВ, Х. *Средновековните Балкани. Исторически очерци*. София: Парадигма, 2002.

- Miley – Nikolov – Bratkov 2000 – МИЛЕВ, А. – НИКОЛОВ, Б. – БРАТКОВ, Й. *Речник на чуждите думи в българския език*. Пето издание, допълнено и основно преработено от Е. Пернишка. София: Наука и изкуство, 2000.
- Mrdjen 2002 – MRDJEN, S. Narodnost u popisima. Promjenljiva i nestalna kategorija. – *Stanovništvo*, br. 1–4, 2002, 77–104.
- Mrhačová 2003 – MRHAČOVÁ, E. Česká a polská přísloví na bázi zooapelativ. – In: *Parémie národů slovanských*. Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference konané u příležitosti 150. výročí úmrtí F. L. Čelakovského a vydání jeho „Mudrosloví“. Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Katedra slavistiky, 2003, 107–115.
- Murphy et al. 2008 – MURPHY, A. B. – JORDAN-BYCHKOV, T. G. – BYCHKOVA JORDAN, B. *The European Culture Area*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008.
- Nedkova 2006 – НЕДКОВА, Е. Експресивно назоваване на човешки качества посредством фразеологизми с компоненти зооними в българския език. – In: *Арнаудов сборник. Доклади и съобщения*, т. 4. Състав. Р. Русев и др. Русе: Лени Ан, 2006, 328–336.
- Novokmet 2018 – НОВОКМЕТ, С. Називи животиња у настави лексикологије српског језика. – *Књижевност и језик*, 1–2/LXV (2018), 107–120.
- NPR – *Нов правописен речник на българския език*. София: Издателство на БАН; Издателство „Хейзъл“, 2002.
- Ostojić 2006 – OSTOJIĆ, D. *Države sveta. Statistička enciklopedija*. Beograd: Teovid, 2006.
- Oxford 1989 – *Oxford Student's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Oxford 2000 – *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Pintarić 1997 – PINTARIĆ, N. Pragmatične osobine vlastitih imena u hrvatskom i poljskom jeziku. – *Croatica*, 45–46/XXVII (1997), 157–176.
- Pleskalová 2014 – PLESKALOVÁ, J. *Vlastní jména osobní v češtině*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2014.
- Pleskalová 2017a – PLESKALOVÁ, J. Fytonymum. – In: *CzechEncy – Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. P. Karlík, M. Nekula, J. Pleskalová (eds.) [online]. Available at: <<https://www.czechency.org/slovník/FYTONYMUM>> [2018-09-02].
- Pleskalová 2017b – PLESKALOVÁ, J. Vlastní jména – třídění. – In: *CzechEncy – Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. P. Karlík, M. Nekula, J. Pleskalová (eds.) [online]. Available at: <[https://www.czechency.org/slovník/VLASTNÍ\\_JMÉNA – TŘÍDĚNÍ](https://www.czechency.org/slovník/VLASTNÍ_JMÉNA_TŘÍDĚNÍ)> [2018-09-02].

- Popović – Stevanović 2006 – ПОПОВИЋ, S. – STEVANOVIĆ, M. Srovnání českých a srbských zooapelativních frazémů. – In: *Studia Balcanica Bohemo-Slovaca VI, svazek 2*. K vydání připravili P. Boček, L. Hladký, P. Krejčí, P. Stehlík a V. Štěpánek. Red. V. Štěpánek. Brno: Ústav slavistiky FF MU; Historický ústav AV ČR; Matice moravská, 2006, 1049–1070.
- Porotnikov 1972 – ПОРОТНИКОВ, П. Т. Из уральской зоонимии. – In: *Восточнославянская ономастика*. Ред. А. В. Суперанская. Москва: Наука, 1972, 210–230.
- Preshlenova et al. 2018 – ПРЕШЛЕНОВА, Р. и кол. *Маски долу! Национализъмът на Балканите през ХХ век*. София: Парадигма, 2018.
- PSJ 1994 – *Правопис српскога језика*. Нови Сад: Матица српска, 1994<sup>2</sup>.
- PSJČ 2007–08 [1935–37] – *Příruční slovník jazyka českého. Díl I. A–J*. O. Hujer, E. Smetánka, M. Weingart, B. Havránek, V. Šmilauer, A. Ziskal (red.). Praha: Česká akademie věd a umění, Státní nakladatelství, 1935–1937. Digitalized edition: Ústav pro jazyk český, v. v. i., 2007–2008 [online]. Available at: <<https://bara.ujc.cas.cz/psjc/>>.
- R–B – ЧУКАЛОВ, С. *Руско-български речник*. Москва: ГИС, 1962.
- Raev – Raevová 1998 – RAEV, I. – RAEVOVÁ, N. *Bulharština – praktický jazykový průvodce*. Bučovice: Ro-to-m, 1998.
- RBJ 2007 – *Rječnik bosanskog jezika*. I. Čedić (ur.). Sarajevo: Institut za jezik, 2007.
- Rejzek 2001 – REJZEK, J. *Český etymologický slovník*. Voznice: Leda, 2001.
- RHJ 2000 – *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. J. Šonje (gl. ur.). Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža; Školska knjiga, 2000.
- RHSKJ-1\_2 1967 – *Rječnik hrvatskosrpskoga književnog jezika. Knjiga I–II*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1967.
- RPPP – ПОПОВ, Д. – СИМОВ, К. – ВИДИНСКА, С. *Речник за правоговор – правопис – пунктуација*. София: Атлантис, 1998.
- RSHKJ-1\_6 1967–76 – *Речник српскохрватскога књижевног језика. Књига I–VI*. Нови Сад: Матица српска, 1967–1976.
- RSHKNJ-2 1962 – *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика, књига II: богољуб – вражогрнци*. Београд: САНУ, 1962.
- RSHKNJ-13 1988 – *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика, књига XIII: Моуре – наклапуша*. Београд: САНУ, 1988.
- RSJ 2007 – *Речник српског језика*. Нови Сад: Матица српска, 2007.
- RSSKJ 2000 [1966] – МОСКОВЉЕВИЋ, М. *Речник савременог српског књижевног језика с језичким саветником*. Београд: Гутенбергов Алаксија, 2000 (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1966).
- Sandfeld 1930 – SANDFELD, K. *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats*. Paris: Champion, 1930.

- Šćeranović 1997 – ШЋЕРАНОВИЋ, М. Ономастичке категорије и српска ономастичка терминологија. – *Књижевност и језик*, 2–3/XLV (1997), 65–69.
- Šćeranović 2002 – ШЋЕРАНОВИЋ, М. Зооним као ономастички термин. – *Српски језик*, 1–2/VII (2002), 321–326.
- SČN 1838 – JUNGSMANN, J. *Slownjik česko-německý. Djl IV. S–U*. Praha: Knjžecj arcibiskupská knihtiskárna, 1838 [online]. Available at: <<https://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/moduly/slovníky/digitalni-kopie-detail/JgSlovo4/>>.
- Sesar – Grčević 2014 – SESAR, D. – GRČEVIĆ, M. *Papci i drugi meronimi životinjskih udova u frazemima hrvatskoga i pojedinih slavenskih jezika*. – In: *Životinje u frazeološkom ruhu*. Zbornik radova s međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa Animalistički frazemi u slavenskim jezicima održanog 21. i 22. III. 2014. na Filozofskom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Ur. I. Vidović Bolt. Zagreb: FF–press, 2014, 1–22 [online]. Available at: <<http://www.animalisticki-frazemi.eu/index.php/znanstveni-skupovi/znanstveni-skup-21-i-22-ozujka-2014/zbornik-radova>> [2018–11–25].
- Simeon 1969 – SIMEON, R. *Enciklopedijski rječnik lingvističkih naziva I. A–O; II. P–Ž*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1969.
- Simonović 1959 – СИМОНОВИЋ, Д. *Ботанички речник научних и народних имена биљака са именима на руском, енглеском, немачком и француском језику*. Београд: Научно дело, 1959.
- Šimunović 2009 – ŠIMUNOVIĆ, P. *Uvod u hrvatsko imenoslovlje*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga, 2009.
- Šitler 2017 – ŠITLER, J. *Czechia si to bude muset protrpět*. – *Lidové noviny*, 1. 7. 2017 [online]. Available at: <[http://www.czechia-initiative.com/cesko\\_clanky.html](http://www.czechia-initiative.com/cesko_clanky.html)> [2019–05–10].
- SJČ 1952 [1934–37] – [VÁŠA, P. –] TRÁVNÍČEK, F. *Slovník jazyka českého*. Čtvrté, přepracované a doplněné vydání. Praha: Slovanské nakladatelství, 1952 (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1934–1937).
- Spagińska-Pruszk 2005 – SPAGIŃSKA-PRUSZAK, A. *Intelekt we frazeologii polskiej, rosyjskiej i chorwackiej. Z problematyki językowego obrazu świata*. Drugie poprawione wydanie. Łask: Oficyna Wydawnicza LEKSEM, 2005.
- SR 1852: В. СТЕФАНОВИЋ КАРАЦИЋ: *Српски рјечник, иступачен њемачкијем и латинскијем ријечима*. Беч: У штампарији јерменскога манастира, 1852 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) [online]. Available at: <<http://digital.bms.rs/ebiblioteka/pageFlip/reader/index.php?type=publications&id=1255&m=2#page/1/mode/2up>>.

- SR 1966 [1818] – СТЕФАНОВИЋ [КАРАЦИЋ], В. *Српски рјечник, истолкован њемачким и латинским ријечма*. Wien: P. P. Armeniern, 1818 – published as *Српски рјечник (1818)*. Сабрана дела Вука Караџића. Књига друга. Београд: Просвета, 1966.
- Šrámek 1999 – ŠRÁMEK, R. *Úvod do obecné onomastiky*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 1999.
- ŠRBJ 1999 – ЈАНИЋ, Дž. *Trilogija o bosanskom jeziku, knjiga III. Školski rječnik bosanskog jezika*. Sarajevo: Ljiljan, 1999.
- SSČ 1994/2000 – *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost*. J. Filipce, F. Daneš (hl. red.). 2. přeprac. vyd. Praha: Academia, 1994<sup>2</sup>, 2000<sup>4</sup> (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1978).
- SSJČ-1\_8 1989 – *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého. I–VIII*. B. Havránek (hl. red.). Praha: Academia, 1989 (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1960–1971).
- Štěpánek et al. 2011 – ŠTĚPÁNEK, V. – KOPRIVICA, V. – KORDA-PETROVIĆ, A. (eds.) *Od Moravy k Moravě II. Z historie česko-srbských vztahů*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska; Matice moravska, 2011.
- Štěpánek et al. 2017 – ŠTĚPÁNEK, V. – HLADKÝ, L. – KOPRIVICA, V. (eds.) *Od Moravy k Moravě III. Z historie česko-srbských vztahů*. Brno: Matice moravska; Matica srpska, 2017.
- Štícha 2011 – ŠTÍCHA, F. *Názvy osob jako obyvatel (názvy obyvatelské)*. – In: *Kapitoly z české gramatiky*. Ed. F. Štícha. Praha: Academia, 2011, 233–252.
- Štícha et al. 2013 – ŠTÍCHA, F. a kol. *Akademická gramatika spisovné češtiny*. Praha: Academia, 2013.
- Svoboda et al. 1973 – SVOBODA, J. – ŠMILAUER, V. – OLIVOVÁ-NEZBEDOVÁ, L. – OLIVA, K. – WITKOWSKI, T. *Základní soustava a terminologie slovenské onomastiky*. Zpravodaj místopisné komise ČSAV, č. 14. Praha: Místopisná komise ČSAV, 1973.
- Szerszunowicz 2011 – SZERSZUNOWICZ, J. *Obraz człowieka w polskich, angielskich i włoskich leksykalnych i frazeologicznych jednostkach faunicznych*. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 2011.
- Trubetzkoy 1930 [1928] – TRUBETZKOY, N. S. Proposition 16. – *Actes du Premier Congrès International des Linguistes à La Haye, du 10–15 avril 1928*. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1930, 17–18.
- Tsachevski 2008a – ЦАЧЕВСКИ, В. *Балканите. Краят на конфликтите*. София: Изток–запад, 2008.
- Tsachevski 2008b – ЦАЧЕВСКИ, В. *Балканите. Новата Югоизточна Европа. От разделение към регионално сътрудничество и евроинтеграция*. Второ допълнено издание. София: Изток–запад, 2008.
- Tsachevski 2011 – ЦАЧЕВСКИ, В. *България и Балканите в началото на XXI век. По пътя на европеизацията*. София: Изток–запад, 2011.

- Vasung 2009 – VASUNG, A. Frazemi sa sastavnicama pas i mačka u hrvatskom i bugarskom jeziku (semantička analiza). – *Филологическе заметки = Philological Studies*, № 2/7 (2009), Пермь, 1–10 [online]. Available at: <[http://philologicalstudies.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=blogcategory&id=46&Itemid=93](http://philologicalstudies.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogcategory&id=46&Itemid=93)> [2018-11-26].
- Vatov 1998 – ВЪТОВ, В. *Лексикология на българския език. Лексемика, ономастика, фразеология, лексикография*. Велико Търново: Абагар, 1998.
- Večerka 2008 – VEČERKA, R. *Jazyky v komparaci 1. Nástin české jazykovědné slavistiky v mezinárodním kontextu*. Praha: NLN, 2008.
- Vidoeski et al. 1983 – ВИДОЕСКИ, Б. и др. *Основен систем и терминологија на словенската ономастика*. Скопје: Македонска академија на науките и уметностите, 1983.
- Vidović Bolt 2011 – VIDOVIĆ BOLT, I. *Životinjski svijet u hrvatskoj i poljskoj frazeologiji I*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 2011.
- VRHJ 2003 – ANIĆ, V. *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2003.
- Webster's 1984 – *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language*. New York: Warner Books, 1984.
- Webster's 1993 – *Webster's Universal Dictionary and Thesaurus*. New Lanark: Tormont Publications Inc., 1993.
- Yanev 2013 – ЯНЕВ, Б. *Образните сравнения с антропоцентричен характер в българския и английския език (изследване и речник)*. Пловдив: Университетско издателство „Паисий Хилендарски“, 2013.

## **Scientific Editorial Board of Masaryk University**

prof. PhDr. Jiří Hanuš, Ph.D.

PhDr. Jan Cacek, Ph.D.

Mgr. Tereza Fojtová

doc. JUDr. Marek Fryšták, Ph.D.

Mgr. Michaela Hanousková

doc. RNDr. Petr Holub, Ph.D.

doc. Mgr. Jana Horáková, Ph.D.

prof. MUDr. Lydie Izakovičová Hollá, Ph.D.

prof. PhDr. Tomáš Janík, Ph.D., M.Ed.

prof. PhDr. Tomáš Kubíček, Ph.D.

doc. RNDr. Jaromír Leichmann, Dr.

PhDr. Alena Mizerová

doc. Ing. Petr Pirožek, Ph.D.

doc. RNDr. Lubomír Popelínský, Ph.D.

Mgr. Kateřina Sedláčková, Ph.D.

doc. RNDr. Ondřej Slabý, Ph.D.

prof. PhDr. Jiří Trávníček, M.A.

doc. PhDr. Martin Vaculík, Ph.D.

Pavel Krejčí

## **ELEVEN FRAGMENTS FROM THE WORLD OF CZECH AND SOUTH SLAVONIC LANGUAGES**

Selected South Slavonic Studies 2

Cover design and prepress by Pavel Pilch

Published by Masaryk University Press, Žerotínovo nám. 617/9, 601 77 Brno, CZ

1st electronic edition / 2019

ISBN 978-80-210-9469-7

The background of the page is a complex, abstract composition of overlapping lines. There are several solid lines in shades of blue, green, and purple, and several dashed lines in shades of red, orange, and yellow. The lines are of varying thickness and curvature, creating a sense of movement and depth. The overall effect is a layered, geometric pattern that fills the entire page.

**MUNI**  
PRESS

**MUNI**  
ARTS