

Krejčí, Pavel

## Toponyms in Czech, Croatian and Bulgarian phraseology : summary

In: Krejčí, Pavel. *Toponyma v české, chorvatské a bulharské frazeologii*. Vydání první Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2022, pp. 212-220

ISBN 978-80-280-0133-9; ISBN 978-80-280-0134-6 (online ; pdf)

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/digilib.77592>

Access Date: 08. 03. 2024

Version: 20230210

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

# SUMMARY

## Toponyms in Czech, Croatian and Bulgarian Phraseology

### I.

The main publications covering the respective national phraseologies were created for Czech (Čermák 1982, 1985, 2007), Slovak (Mlacek 1977 [second edition 1984], 2001 [second edition 2007], 2007), Bulgarian (Nicheva 1982, 1987, Kyuvlieva-Mishaykova 1986, Kaldieva-Zaharieva 2013) and under reservation for Croatian as well already (Menac 2007). However, it is just Czech, Bulgarian and Croatian for that a complexly oriented phraseology dictionaries are available.

An exhaustive research of the proprial layer in phraseology in the described languages was conducted by Mária Dobříková (specialized book 2008, second edition 2014), in partial studies by Dominik Raguž (1979), Jozef Mlacek (1981), Josip Matešić (1992/1993), Katarína Habovštiaková (1994), Neda Pintarić (1997), Rudolf Šrámek (2003), Ivor Ripka (2003), Juraj Glovňa (2003), Ružena Žilová (2003), Mária Dobříková (2002, 2005, 2006, 2007), Dimitrina Mihaylova (2008), Nataša Jakop (2014), Erika Kržišnik (2018) and many others. Not enough attention was paid to the analysis of toponymic material in the discussed languages. Besides of our humble contribution (Krejčí 2015, 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2019), mainly Karel Kučera (1974), Egon Fekete (1996), Marinela Mladenova (Valchanova 2001), Ivana Vidović Bolt and Joanna Szerszunowicz (2008), Mira Menac-Mihalić (2010), Ana Vasung (2012), Mariyana Vitanova (2013) and partly Raditsa Nikodinovska (2018) devoted their attention to this area.

## II.

From formal point of view, phrasemes with toponymic component (topocomponent) we collected mainly from the existing phraseological dictionaries of Czech, (Serbo-)Croatian and Bulgarian, have a form of comparison, syntagma (collocation) and (poly)proposition. Ex visceribus, we cannot anticipate the existence of subphrasemes with toponyms (their components are of synsemantic nature only) nor the so-called one-word phrasemes in the form as F. Miko understands them (Miko et al. 1989).

### Phrasemes with the structure of comparison

A great amount of the comparisons with a toponymic component in our sample, cca 50%, involve as a comparandum *human*, in others there is either *place*, *situation* or *statement* in this position.

The position of comparatum was occupied in our units by:

- a) independent toponym (type *jako Brno, kao Grčka, kamo Ерусалим*),
- b) toponym with preposition, connected with some circumstance (type *jako v Kocourkově*),
- c) toponym specifying some feature within the frame of comparate syntagmate – as a leading substantive there is almost unconditionally a human or an animal stated (type *jako královna ze Sáby, kao Janko na Kosovu, kamo свици за Опшова*) and
- d) toponym in the comparate clause (type *jako nosit sovy do Athén, kao da je došao iz Zanzibara*).

### Phrasemes with a nominal structure of collocation

From the point of syntactic structure, we can divide phrasemes including toponymic component with a nominal structure of collocation into six groups:

1. Syntactic structure of minimal phraseme (prep + TOP)
2. Syntactic structure of a phraseme as multiple-word toponym (TOP[Adj + Subst])
3. Syntactic structure of toponymic binomial (TOP + conj + TOP, resp. prep + TOP + prep + TOP)
4. Syntactic structure Adj + TOP
5. Syntactic structure Subst + TOP
6. Syntactic structure Subst + prep + TOP

### Phrasemes with a verbal structure of collocation

A number of phrasemes are of verbal nature in our sample. From the point of involvement of topocomponent into the syntactic structure of phraseme, i.e. based on its function in the sentence, we can divide them into four groups:

1. Syntactic structure TOP = OBJ
2. Syntactic structure TOP ∈ ADV

## Summary

- a) Syntactic structure TOP = ADV<sub>mod</sub>
  - b) Syntactic structure TOP ∈ ADV<sub>loc</sub><sup>dir1</sup> (where to)
  - c) Syntactic structure TOP ∈ ADV<sub>loc</sub><sup>stat</sup> (where)
  - d) Syntactic structure TOP ∈ ADV<sub>loc</sub><sup>dir2</sup> (where from)
3. Syntactic structure TOP ∈ ATR
  4. Syntactic structure TOP ∈ KL<sup>OBJ</sup>

### Phrasemes with a propositional and polypropositional structure

Many phrasemes are of sentential or compound sentential nature in our sample from the respective phraseological dictionaries or other sources. Propositional structure is dominant (f.e. Czech *Už sme/j sme z Prahy doma!*, Croatian *Puno je vode proteklo Savom* or Bulgarian *Свършил у Италия зад коша*). Polypropositional structure is present in lower extent (f.e. Bulgarian *Ходил в/на Стамбул, а царя не видял* or Czech *Byli jsme před Rakouskem, budeme i po něm*), in isolated cases polypropositional intersubjectual can be found (Czech *Jak je ti, Rakousko? – Ouzko!*), even though intersubjectivity is only illusive here (answer-back *Ouzko!* is representing an echo).

### III.

The semantic side of the collected phraseological units with toponymic component was described using delimitation of different phraseosemantic fields, that is – in line with terminology applied by F. Čermák – identified as *onomasiological category*.

Collected phrasemes with toponymic component constitute 56 onomasiological categories (phraseosemantic fields) in total:

- Onom. cat. “simple, clear”
- Onom. cat. “carefree, pleasant, beautiful (place, life)”
- Onom. cat. “ready, done”
- Onom. cat. “to be happy, express happiness”
- Onom. cat. “huge desire”
- Onom. cat. “global attitude”
- Onom. cat. “to become a poet”
- Onom. cat. “immediate material happiness”
- Onom. cat. “to discover something new”
- Onom. cat. “to make an irreversible decision, to behave bravely, decisively”
- Onom. cat. “to go to sleep”
- Onom. cat. “range, area”
- Onom. cat. “more ways how to achieve the same outcome”
- Onom. cat. “mobilization call”
- Onom. cat. “misinterpretations”
- Onom. cat. “amazement, surprise”

- Onom. cat. “inability to do (good), to change, to finish”
- Onom. cat. “reductant work”
- Onom. cat. “saying, asking about something already known”
- Onom. cat. “omission”
- Onom. cat. “refusal”
- Onom. cat. “to behave strange, not normal”
- Onom. cat. “to lie, cheat”
- Onom. cat. “indifference”
- Onom. cat. “arrogance”
- Onom. cat. “stupidity, barbarism, primitivism”
- Onom. cat. “credulity, dupability, naivety”
- Onom. cat. “decadence, downfall, moral corruption, disgrace”
- Onom. cat. “confusion, chaos, hustle”
- Onom. cat. “strange person”
- Onom. cat. “difficult, problematic, unfavourable, deadlock situation”
- Onom. cat. “something is not alright”
- Onom. cat. “unfavourable climate condition”
- Onom. cat. “impeding or ongoing physical clash”
- Onom. cat. “harsh, bad experience”
- Onom. cat. “unsatisfaction with any solution”
- Onom. cat. “financial factor, indebtedness, destitution”
- Onom. cat. “being unworthy”
- Onom. cat. “to seduce somebody”
- Onom. cat. “to divorce”
- Onom. cat. “to change manner of life”
- Onom. cat. “to die”
- Onom. cat. “physical appearance”
- Onom. cat. “female-specific physiological processes”
- Onom. cat. “to break something”
- Onom. cat. “huge distance”
- Onom. cat. “small amount”
- Onom. cat. “small, tight space”
- Onom. cat. “time factor”
- Onom. cat. “high level, intensity of something”
- Onom. cat. “unpleasant smell”
- Onom. cat. “prostration, excuse”
- Onom. cat. “to be jailed”
- Onom. cat. “departure, absence”
- Onom. cat. “loss”
- Onom. cat. “specific continent, country, region, area; water course; local, national/religious adherence”

#### IV.

Concerning motivational aspect we aimed mainly at the level of projection of cultural and historical, as well as geographical and morphological, or other association connected with the respective toponymic component into the meaning of the respective phraseological unit. Perception of any event or other phenomenon associated by users of specific language with the respective toponym is to some degree projected into the resulting meaning of the phraseme. This degree can be significant, vague or null – based on this we can speak about essential or strong, weak or null associative motivation.

#### **Essential associative motivation**

In case of phrasemes with toponymic component that is – regarding association that are invoked by itself – according to our opinion participating significantly on the meaning of the whole unit, topocomponent is often designating area, that is generally connected f.e. with prison or other restrictive institution, with psychiatric clinic or other similar institution, with cemetery... Toponym can be used for its semantic transparency (often from the point of language reality only illusive, shallow, therefore it is a functional toponym or for this aim constructed quasi-toponym) or other stylistic features (humour, rhythm, rhyme...), that are unambiguously identified by the speakers of the respective language. Toponym can be also used for unambiguous, i.e. at least in given language area widely known historical, biblical or other mythological connotations, unambiguous, i.e. widely known geographical and social or climate connotation or widely understandable delimitation of some area.

#### **Weak associative motivation**

Phrasemes with toponymic component that is – regarding associations that are invoked by itself – according to our opinion participating only limitedly, weakly on the meaning of the whole unit, are f.e. various language mutations on phraseme *objevit Ameriku*;<sup>144</sup> connection of the Americas and something new, relatively recently discovered, is notorious, however the all-over semantics of this phraseme (connected with naivety, crudeness, eventually arrogance) is not directly connected with the association that comes to one's mind in connection with America.

#### **Null associative motivation**

Phraseme with toponymic component that is – regarding associations that are invoked by itself (if there are any at all) – according to our opinion is not participating on the meaning of the whole unit, are f.e. Czech phrasemes *vypravovat se jako vrabci z Čech*; *nosit sovy do Athén*; *Všechny cesty vedou do Říma*; *Byli jsme před*

---

144 “To discover America” similar meaning to *reinvent the wheel* used in English.

*Rakouskem, budeme i po něm, Croatian phrasemes dužan kao Grčka; kao da je došao iz Zanzibara; briga koga što Mađarska nema more/mora; Nešto je trulo u državi Danskoj or Bulgarian phrasemes в Цариград живял, царя не видял; нерде Шам, нерде Багдад; като свини за Оршова; тѣрся към Душан от Ниш.*

## V.

Typology of toponymic components is derived from the understanding of toponyms as a class of proper nouns, that is part of the superior class of geonyms (and that part of the superior class of abionyms – see Šrámek 1999) and at the same time divided into narrowly-specified subclasses based on the kind of the geographical object this toponym is naming. It is obvious from the collected material found mainly in the respective phraseological dictionaries that oikonoms (68) are the most prone to become phraseological components, choronyms (35) and urbonoms (21) are represented there to lesser degree, while hydronoms (8) and oronyms (8) are represented minimally.

Based on the data for the respective national phraseologies it is evident, that in case of two out of three examined languages, the most toponymic component are from the sphere of oikonoms – in case of Czech slightly over half of all toponyms, in case of Bulgarian even around 60%. In Croatian their quantity is only about 36%.

Choronyms are in all two out of three examined languages the second most frequent toponymic components. Their percentage share is, however, varying – while in Czech and Bulgarian it is 21–23%, in Croatian it is about 36%, that is the same as the number of Croatian oikonoms.

Somewhere in the middle between frequent and infrequent toponyms, there are urbonoms – names of the parts of settlements, i.e. places, that are not independent as towns, but are part of some larger location, often parts of city or districts. We noted the highest portion of urbonoms in Croatian phraseology – 17%. Somewhat lower share of urbonoms is in Czech – almost 14% – and Bulgarian phraseology (not exceeding one tenth).

The second least frequent topocomponents are hydronoms. The share of hydronoms is 5–7%, and we have not found any component that would designate other water source other than the mentioned rivers.

The least frequent in the examined national phraseologies in the role of topocomponent are oronyms. Their share never exceeded 6%. The fact, that no terrain elevation is typical for international phraseology (and therefore included in all the examined national phraseologies like hydronym *Rubicon* or oikonym *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*), suggests, that these elevations are very diverse in sense of historical circumstances and localization.

### Toponyms and quasi-toponyms

Besides the six exemptions (choronyms *Tramtárie* [Czech], *Tunguzija* and *Dembelija* [Croatian], urbonyms *Boevtsi* and *Boychevtsi* [Bulgarian] and hydronym *Léthé* [Czech]) the quasi-toponyms we found are names of settlements, i.e. oikonoms. As we are dealing with fictive names, we examined the possible motivation of their creation. Based on this criterium we divided our quasi-toponyms into 2 groups:

1) in the first group, there are toponyms with denotate that is not existing, therefore there are the authentic or undisputed quasi-toponyms. There are 7 of them in our sample:

*Léthé, Tramtárie/tramtárie, Dembelija/dembelija, Kocourkov, Zlámaná Lhota, Hovžzí Lhota, Спѣхуѣ*

2) in the second group, there are toponyms with denotate that exists, but:

2a) such toponyms are included in the phrasemes deliberately for their functionally convenient (appropriate) form; therefore we can track the semasiological process of creation (there are 9 such toponymic components in our sample):

*Спанчевци, Брусѣ, Плачковци, Боевци, Боѣчевци – Плачковци, Раѣousy, Дрѣздѣny – Beroun, Tunguzija*

or

2b) the sameness of toponymic component of the phraseme and real settlement is accidental (what can be only assumed, based on the commentaries in the respective dictionaries), and therefore we cannot anticipate onomasiological process of creation (there are 3 such toponymic components in our sample, in case of the first two as real paronomasia, third as the so-called pseudo-etymological proprium, based on classification of J. Glovňa [2003]):

*Nemanice, Vystrkov, Hajany/hajany*

In case 1) these are indisputably *quasi-toponyms* we can label as *authentic*.

In case 2a) we can talk about toponyms, however the chosen propria are on the first sight by their semantically transparent creation considered (or can be considered) as fictive toponyms, so we understand them as “artificial” or “virtual” quasi-toponyms, “quasi-quasi-toponyms”.

However, in case 2b) situation is not that simple, as process of creation of such phraseme, including its toponymic component, is – according to lexicological authorities – like the one in case 1), i.e. it is deliberately constructed as functionally appropriate quasi-toponym, that is not motivated by existence of identical, in real world existing model. Such explanation is supported f.e. by commentary in SČFI for (quasi-)oikonoms *Nemanice* or *Hajany*. The problem of this group is well described by K. Kučera (1974) – even though he is speaking about Czech examples, we can apply his words to situation in other languages as well: “(...) it is more a wordplay created either by playful understanding of etymology of local name already existing, or creation of certain constructs, i.e. artificial forms imitating real geographical names. We cannot deny the possibility that in some cases the



form nowadays in use is a product of both processes, from both sides, so a double, particularly interesting wordplay was created.”

## VI.

For classification according to origin of toponymic components from phrasemes collected for this paper, we have chosen the following categories:

1) toponyms connected with mythology or Bible, i.e. such topocomponents that are parts of replica or phrasemes originating in mythology in general or the Holy Scripture,

2) toponyms connected with literature, movies etc., i.e. such topocomponents that are parts of replica or phrasemes originating in literature (however not oral tradition), movies, or even in modern music production,

3) toponyms connected with historical circumstances, i.e. such topocomponents that are parts of replica or phrasemes originating in specific historical affairs (however, not Biblical ones),

4) other toponyms, i.e. such topocomponents that cannot be included in either of the above stated categories.

Ad 1) Topocomponent connected with mythology or Bible is included in relatively small number of phrasemes (12 of 199, i.e. 6.0 %). All phraseological dictionaries of the examined languages note binomial phraseme *Sodom and Gomorrah*. In Czech and Croatian phraseology also phrasemes including toponym *Babylon* are noted (in Bulgarian phrasemes found in dictionaries only its derivatives). Other Biblical toponyms are naturally connected mainly with geography of Israel (Israel, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Tabor), exception is the already mentioned Babylon and Sheba). Surprisingly low portion of toponyms is of non-Biblical mythological origin – we noted only quasi-hydronym *Lethe* in Czech phraseology and choronym *Arcadia* in Bulgarian phraseology, both originating in Greek mythology. Examples from Czech phraseology clearly dominate here.

Ad 2) Topocomponent connected with literature, movies etc. are present in phraseologies of the examined languages only slightly less than the above-mentioned category (in 11 phrasemes of 199, i.e. 5.5 %). Half of this number is constituted by Czech phrasemes. Croatian and Bulgarian language are represented mainly thanks to their mutation of *the uncle from America* and Shakespeare's *Denmark*. Examples from Czech phraseology are dominating even more than in the previous category, including f.e. quasi-toponyms (*Kocourkov*, *Zlámaná Lhota*) as well as the only example inspired by a movie (*Humpolec*).

Ad 3) Phrasemes including topocomponent connected with a certain historical affair were the most frequent compared to the two above-mentioned categories (33 of 199, i.e. 16.6 %). Bulgarian has the biggest share (almost one half), a somewhat lower number of units can be found in Czech (almost one third), followed by Croatian (circa one fifth). All the phraseological dictionaries of the examined

## Summary

languages note phrasemes *to cross the Rubicon* and *to discover America*. In Czech several phrasemes connected with historical (negative) experience from the era of Habsburg rule caught our eye. The most typical Czech historical phrasemes include toponym *Chlumec*. South Slavonic languages are connected by historical experience localized in *Kosovo* – phrasemes referring to lost medieval battle on the Kosovo field can be found in each of them. Bulgarian also has a specific phraseme including oikonym *Batak*, special history has phraseme with oikonym *Chirpan* as well. Historical connotation have also Bulgarian phrasemes connecting two main centres of Christian, later Islamic power with representatives of the respective believe (pope, Byzantine emperor, Ottoman sultan), or state (the Roman Empire, the Byzantine Empire, the Ottoman Empire): *в Рим живял, папата не видял; в Цариград живял, царя не видял; ходил в/на Стамбул, а царя не видял*.

Ad 4) Number of phrasemes including topocomponent that, based on its origin, cannot be connected to any of the preceding sphere, is standing out (143 of 199, i.e. 71.9 %). The most phrasemes of this type can be found in Croatian (more than 40 %), almost the same number of units can be found in Czech and Bulgarian (27–30 %). Phrasemes in this group are naturally very different, connection that can be found in some cases is of phraseosemantic and/or motivational character (typically f.e. phrasemes and components *Sahara* or *Rusko/Sibiř/Sibérie* “Sahara, Russia/Siberia” in Czech and *Afrika* or *Sibir* “Africa, Siberia” in Croatian).