

PROBLEMS OF NEOLOGY IN SLAVIC LANGUAGES

(Дияна Благоева, Сия Колковска, Михаела Лишкова (ред.). Проблеми на неологията в славянските езици. Академично издателство „Проф. Марин Дринов“. София, 2013, 358 с.)

Martin HENZELMANN

(Dresden University of Technology, Germany, mhenzelmann@daad-alumni.de)

Neologisms are a frequently discussed problem in Slavic languages. They are couched in a very specific linguistic nature, which means that they have to be appropriate to integrate into particular functional systems, being different one from another. This publication, at 358 pages and six chapters, focuses on that phenomenon and highlights new tendencies in Bulgarian, Czech, and Polish languages. The articles are each published in one of these three languages, while an English summary can be found at the end of the book. The project is the result of a two year collaboration between the Bulgarian and the Czech Academy of Sciences, while contributors from the Polish Academy of Science as well as from the universities of L'viv and Sofia serve to further enrich this volume.

The first part, entitled general problems in neology, is opened by one of the editors, Michaela Lišková. She analyzes the medial discourse and its impact on new structures in Czech language (11-20). Based on electronic data, she distinguishes six subgroups of neology, for which she outlines their functions and status. Lišková concludes that a large number of new terms elicit emotional attitudes with speakers and recipients (18). While her aim is not one of comparison, Joanna Satoła-Staśkowiak refers to Bulgarian, Polish, and Russian (21-30). After a short terminological introduction, the author spotlights new tendencies in the corresponding languages and comes to the conclusion that, in all three of them, derivation is the most popular method used to create new lexicon (27).

The second and largest chapter features contributions from six authors to the issue of neology in word formation in the Slavonic languages. It starts with Cvetelina Georgieva's overview on personal masculine suffixal names in contemporary Bulgarian (33-76), pointing out traditional suffixes as well as the ones related to international or loan lexic (e.g. -[а]джий(а), -[о]лог, or -ър, 38-39). In her paper, she classifies the phenomenon in several types, examining data from 1990 until 2000, and then from 2000 up to the year 2010. The frequency of use is visualized in figures (64-67), allowing the reader to get an idea of how recent trends pertaining to suffixal spread in masculine Bulgarian words. In the second text here, Nadežda Kostova discusses the lexicographical representation of one of these classes, namely the nomina agentis (77-108). Her study utilizes data from the Bulgarian National Corpus and brings us to understand that characteristic slavonic suffixes such as -не are the most important ones, while the influence of English is also given (cf. the suffixe -инг, declining from English -ing). Still, it is not sure yet whether that example should be considered a Bulgarian suffix, owing to its particular function in Slavic languages (90). Moreover, the cases given are more frequently applicable to new nouns than to new verbs (104). Article three in this chapter is dedicated to shortening, compounding and blending in contemporary Czech. Josef Šimandl explains how short word forms are structured and gives some recent examples of blending, which, in his opinion, has become a more commonly used option in word formation (109-118). Jordanka Trifonova argues that theoretical

and lexicographic problems in Bulgarian and Czech deproprial nouns can be attributed to eight processes, forming a background of analysis (119-152). She also quantifies her observations and with tables illustrates that, for instance, affixes are stronger in Bulgarian, at the same time Czech prefers composition with so called degeonyms (144). Proper nouns such as surnames serve as a basis for Vít Michalec who proves that many of them in contemporary Czech are appropriate to create neologisms, a large number of which he considers being part of peripheral lexical structures (153-162). Finally, the chapter is closed by Albena Rangelova and Zdeňka Tichá (163-182). Their contribution is to highlight new forms of abbreviations in Czech found in several references such as the Czech National Corpus or newspapers. After a general introduction to the topic, the co-authors focus in particular on expressivity of abbreviations (173-176). In the next part, three fields of study are observed, being related to neosemantic processes in Slavonic languages. First, Sia Kolkovska embraces the idea that metaphoric and metonymic structures derive from adjectives and verbs in Bulgarian (185-207). In the second article, Barbora Procházková pays attention to neosemantic phenomena in Czech in the beginning of the 21st century (208-217), before Joanna Satoła-Staškowiak compares briefly the semantics of neology in Bulgarian and Polish (218-230).

Loan lexic plays a specific role in neological terms. Hence, it is discussed in part four, starting with Renáta Neprašová. Her study is dedicated to recent German influence on Czech, which she describes as being present on numerous linguistic levels (233-241). Lucie Jílková's article includes the question of how to pronounce correctly foreign lexicon. The author points out that the convergence between orthographic and phonetic units causes difficulties, especially when considering English loans (242-256). Olga Soroka examines a subject that has scarcely been the object of interest before. She shows that the Bulgarian language is enriched by Ukrainian language, namely by phenomena of reality such as Ukraine's monetary unit or historical terms such as the Chernobyl disaster (257-273).

The only paper in chapter five is dedicated to cognitive aspect of Slavic neology. Here, analyzing various Bulgarian and Czech material, Diana Blagoeva underlines in detail the many dynamic processes in society and politics (277-319). She pays special attention to the conception of nouns such as *state*, *politics*, *democracy*, or *European integration*, and their ideological features and compounds in both languages in the last decades (282, 290-296). Section number six is the last one of this volume and establishes lexicographic aspects of neology, being represented in Bulgarian and Czech. The latter language is in the interest of Věra Dvořáčková. She discusses abbreviations in the addenda of the *Příruční slovník jazyka českého*, so far the largest explanatory dictionary of Czech (323-330), while Božana Niševa highlights recent tendencies in the formation of Bulgarian and Czech adverbs (331-347). The author embeds her examination in a database taken from contemporary dictionaries of neologisms.

Though some important Slavic languages such as Serbian are not considered in this volume (therefore one can see among others the works of Jerković (2005) or Gučkova (2014), where neology in a historical and literaric sense is discussed), this volume is a very successful collection of studies on important cases of linguistic phenomena. It represents profound analyses and solid arguments that are the result of diligent work. Overall, owing to these qualities, *Problems of Neology in Slavic Languages* is a helpful resource in contemporary Slavic linguistics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gučkova 2014:** *Gučkova, I. V.* K istorii stanovlenija serbskogo literaturnogo jazyka: neologizmy v propovedjach Gavriily Stefanoviča Vencloviča. – In: SLAVISTICA VILNENSIS 59, 2014, 95-104.
- Jerković 2005:** *Jerković, J.* Supstandard u Sremčevom „Pop Ćiri i pop Spiri“. (Povodom 150-godišnjice od piščevog rođenja). – In: Mladenović, A. (Glavni i odgovorni urednik): Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku XLVIII. Novi Sad, 2005, 109-133.