

CZECH PLACE NAMES AND THEIR EXONYMS IN PARALLEL CORPUS — BETWEEN PRESERVING THE ORIGINAL FORM AND ADAPTATION*

Key words: place names, exonyms, parallel corpora, adaptation, translation

1. INTRODUCTION

Toponyms (place names) have traditionally been studied in terms of their motivation, etymology, and word-formation patterns. Recently, they are also studied in the landscape (especially in the context of the currently developing spatial studies and linguistic landscape research) and in various types of texts. In this research, we focus on toponyms and their adaptation in translations. We combine the traditional functional approach to proper names with the *Czech National Corpus*, its material and tools.

Using the parallel corpus *InterCorp*, we analyze the variants of Czech geographical names (toponyms referring to objects in the Czech Republic) used in English and German translations. We chose English, given its prominent position in international communication, and German, as a language which has enjoyed such intensive contact with Czech in the past that it has given rise to the so-called *Namenpaaren* phenomenon (e.g., Eichler, 1976; Matúšová, 2015, pp. 136–145; cf. Czopek-Kopciuch, 1995), i.e., Czech-German name pairs (*Brno — Brünn*, *Cheb — Eger*). Although it might seem that these German variants are only a thing of the past, it is still a topic that resonates in society and is a topic worthy of research (cf. David & Klemensová, 2019, 2021).

* The research was supported by the grant project entitled GAČR 22-09310 Kvantitativní onomastika: východiska, koncepty, aplikace [Quantitative Onomastics: Starting Points, Concepts, Applications], provided by the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR), Czech Republic.

Our aim is not only to analyze and interpret the practices used in the transfer of Czech toponyms into non-Slavic translations, but also to highlight the potential tools which parallel corpora (or corpora in general) provide for toponym research (cf. most recently Motschenbacher, 2020; for the Czech language see David, Klemensová, & Místecký, 2022; David & Místecký, 2023b). The problem of adaptation (including translation) of proper names is part of translational onomastics; in the Czech linguistic tradition, with a few exceptions (Knappová, 1983; Dvořáková, 2017, pp. 196–207; Špačková, 2017; cf. also Chlumská, 2017, p. 59), it is neither an established nor systematically developed discipline, unlike, e.g., in the Polish or Russian linguistic traditions (e.g., Yermolovich, 2005; Wolnicz-Pawłowska, 2014; see also studies in the Polish journal *Między Oryginałem a Przekładem*, published since 1995; see also Harris, 2004). The issue of adapting proper names from one language to another (and here specifically applied to toponyms) is an important research topic in the field of artistic translation (including e.g., the way proper names are dealt with in dubbing and subtitling), as well as in geography and cartography; it is also part of research on the language of tourism (with particular attention paid to errors in translating proper names, e.g., Durán Muñoz, 2012). Concerning the research on Czech, there are works on toponymic exonyms and adaptation of endonyms (foreign geographical names; see especially Beránek et al., 2011; Harvalík, 2017; see also Berger, 1991–1992) and ‘gender inflection’, i.e., the formation of female versions of foreign surnames (Knappová & Sloboda, 2017), where corpus-based approaches are also applied (Nádeníček, 2011; Svobodová, 2012; David & Místecký, 2023a).

2. TRANSLATION AS A WAY OF ADAPTING PROPER NAMES

Given their specific semantics, proper names are usually not included in the explanatory parts of monolingual dictionaries or in translation dictionaries. Traditionally — and as somewhat characteristic of Anglo-Saxon onomastics — proper names are viewed as linguistic units with no semantics of their own in the linguistic sense, as they only have connotations and associations (Nyström, 2016; Van Langendonck & Van de Velde, 2016). In the traditional Czech view, proper names ‘describe’. Concretely, proper names are seen as shortcuts for descriptions and, in addition, a distinction is made between the meaning of the proper name on the one hand and the semantics of the appellative of the base contained in the proper name (Šrámek, 1999, pp. 22–34; 2017). The original semantics of the appellative of the base contained in the proper name (be it real or only assumed) can be seen, for example, in non-scientific etymologies of the name, in heraldry and symbolism (e.g., speaking signs), in marketing, but it can also be reflected in the translation of the proper name or, in a way, it might condition its translatability.

Since literary translation (calque or partial calque) is one of the most striking ways of adapting proper names into the target language and it contributes significantly to the formation of toponymic exonyms, we will examine it in this paper in more detail. In the creation of the oldest Czech exonyms, the most prominent adaptations were phonetical, morphological, and word-formation adaptations, e.g., *Raabs* — *Racouz*, *Roma* — *Řím*, *Gniezno* — *Hnězno*; translation was relatively rare, e.g., *Schweinfurt* — *Svinibrod*. Translations of foreign geographical names into Czech only began to appear to a greater extent later, e.g., in Czech travelogues during the 15th and 16th centuries (see Doubnerová, 1988; Prchliková, 2011). However, it was not until the 19th century, at the time of the national revival, that this practice became even more common, e.g., *Salzburg* — *Solnohrad*, often instead of the historically frequent and correct form, cf. *Salcpurk*. Similarly, direct translations were favored once the renaming of toponyms was needed in order to de-Germanize place names after the First and Second World War (cf. Matušová, 2015; Klemensová, 2021). In contemporary Czech, translation is used especially for multi-word names of administrative units, territories and names of natural features containing a translatable appellative or etymologically transparent etymon (e.g., *Dolny Śląsk* — *Dolní Slezsko* ‘Lower Silesia’, *Islas Canarias* — *Kanárské ostrovy* ‘Canary Islands’); however, forming place names in this way is not productive anymore (cf. *Cape Town* — *Kapské Město* ‘Cape Town’, but using the translated form *Nový York* for *New York* is certainly archaic nowadays; Beránek et al., 2011, p. 6; Harvalík, 2017; cf. also Špačková, 2017, pp. 149–167).

It is not our ambition to determine whether it is appropriate to translate proper names or not. Undoubtedly, translating proper names has its place in artistic literature (for translation approaches, see Dvořáková, 2017, pp. 30, 196–207) and in geography and cartography (Beránek et al., 2011). As a rule, only the generic component of a geographical name (i.e., the type of the named object) is translated, while if the name contains an additional proper name or a specific component, it is only adapted orthographically and/or morphologically, but not translated literally, e.g., *New Scotia* — *Nové Skotsko*, *Bodensee* — *Bodamské jezero*, *Saint Lawrence River* — *řeka Svatého Vavřince*. Thus, the result of this partial translation is a mixed form referred to as *partial calque*. The partial translation of toponyms is also recommended by the “Manual for the National Standardization of Geographical Names” (United Nations, 2006, pp. 104–106). However, the Manual also draws attention to cases such as *Lake Placid* (an American town located next to the lake of the same name): proper names cannot be translated mechanically, without knowledge of the named object or situation in particular. However, it is always a question of balancing the translation (with regard to the type of the proper name, the type of communication, etc.) between translating literally and providing a functional equivalent.

3. TOPONYMS IN THE PARALLEL CORPUS INTERCORP

3.1. Background

In the early 1990s, with the development of parallel corpora, large text corpora have contributed significantly to the development of translational research, especially to contrastive analysis — i.e., the comparison of languages from a synchronic perspective targeting various phenomena; corpora have also been used in second language acquisition research (see Čermáková, 2016 for an overview; cf. Čermák & Koček, 2010; Čermák et al., 2010; Čermák, 2011).

On the other hand, it is rather obvious that the research on proper names is not the main topic in parallel corpora research (cf. Johansson, 2007, pp. 14–15, notices proper names as ‘other features taken into account’ along with sentence length and punctuation; see also Johansson et al., 1999–2002, p. 26). The reasons are plentiful: be it the ambiguous definition of proper names (especially concerning chretonyms and ethnonyms), their complexity (e.g., toponyms such as *Moravská Třebová*, *Lysá nad Labem*) or the high degree of variation (e.g., anthroponyms are well-known for a wide range of hypocoristics). Furthermore, in Slavic languages, proper names behave morphologically in a slightly different manner from appellatives (cf. *Praha* — adjective *pražský*, while in English: *Prague* — adjective *Prague*, e.g., *Pražský hrad* — *Prague Castle*), and, also, often their orthographic form differs across languages. From this perspective, to use parallel (and translation-based) corpora has its pitfalls (see Martinková, 2014, pp. 273–274, for more details) and, thus, using parallel corpora is more limited concerning research on proper names than it is in the case of appellatives.

For the present analysis, the choice of the languages, texts and actual proper names was not random: our aim was to eliminate the above-discussed disadvantages. The analysis was also partly based on the findings and experiences from our previous research (cf. David, Březinová, & Reclik, 2023); we focused on web presentations of selected sites in the Czech Republic (e.g., major cities, UNESCO monuments) in various foreign languages meant to provide information to foreign tourists. We found that in the web pages (in English, German, Polish and Russian), the adaptation of proper names was very unsystematic and inconsistent, and, in addition, errors (especially spelling errors) were rather numerous. For example, in the German version of the website, the historical variants of the Czech proper names were either the only version used, or they were given in parenthesis — cf. the town *Český Krumlov* is *Český Krumlov* (*Böhmisch Krumau*), while *Olomouc* is *Olmütz* and the mountain range *Krušné hory* is *Erzgebirge*; Polish versions used either a spelling adaptation, or a literal translation: *Czeski Krumlow*, *Olomuniec*, *Rudawy*; in the Russian variant, the toponyms are both transliterated and translated: *Оломоуц* [Olomouc], *Чешский Крумлов* [Cheshkii Krumlov], *Крушиногоржи* [Krushnigorzhi]/*Рудные горы* [Rudnyye gory]. Thus, from that perspective,

only the English version of the UNESCO website showed a certain systematicity, as only the original forms of the toponyms of the localities were given.

Previous research (see David, Březinová, & Reclik, 2023) has shown that there are two strategies for adapting Czech toponyms into non-Slavic languages — in English, proper names are adopted as quotation words, or, the generic component of the proper name is translated (or added); in German, on the other hand, the historical forms (Namenpaaren) are used extensively, without it being obvious that these historical forms are understandable to a German speaker (or a foreigner) without knowledge of the cultural and historical context. In contrast, in the Slavic languages related to Czech (Polish, Russian), proper names tend to be adapted by literal translations of geographical names.

The inconsistencies and divergent adaptations of endonyms can not only be observed in the Internet presentations provided by tourist information centers, but — paradoxically — also in magazines that focus on geography, e.g., the Czech magazine *Lidé a země* [‘People and World’] and the Polish *Poznaj świat* [‘Explore the World’]. Agata Rupińska’s (2020) previous research on adaptations of Czech toponyms in Polish magazines and, vice versa, Polish toponyms in Czech magazines in 1948–1960 showed that a popular strategy for the adaptation of proper names is literal translation. The lack of knowledge on both sides — Czechs not knowing enough Polish and Poles not knowing Czech — was not only reflected in the high degree of variability in the spelling of the geographical names, but also in mistranslations (cf. Rupińska, 2020, pp. 68–74; cf. also David & Rupińska, 2020, pp. 303–304).

Based on the conclusions of the previous research, we assume that English, as a Germanic language unrelated to Czech, would preserve the original forms of Czech proper names and only supplement them with a generic component (specifying the type of the named object), while German, although also being an unrelated Germanic language, would be influenced by Namenpaaren, the pairs of toponyms in Czech and German, e.g., *Plzeň — Pilsen*, *Olomouc — Olmütz*, and that the German version of the proper name would be preferred to the Czech original.

3.2. Material and methods

As already mentioned in the introduction, the analysis of toponyms is based on the material in the parallel corpus *InterCorp*, version 13, part of the *Czech National Corpus* (ČNK); in early 2022, version 14 was published, expanded to include Upper Sorbian. It is an aligned reference corpus that includes 40 contemporary languages, of which 27 are tagged (morphosyntactically annotated). The core of foreign texts in the *InterCorp*, version 13 corpus (mostly fiction with manually checked alignments) consists of 394,042,551 tokens, and the entire collection (texts acquired in multiple languages, processed, and aligned automatically) consists of 1,550,071,364 tokens.

Our original intention was to track the toponyms (lemmas) that show the highest frequency in the Czech part of the corpus. Since proper names are not specifically tagged in the corpus, we searched the corpus using the Corpus Query Language (CQL); the query: [lemma="A.*|Á.*|B.*|C.*|Č.*|D.*|Ď.*|E.*|É.*|F.*|G.*|H.*|CH.*|I.*|Í.*|J.*|K.*|L.*|M.*|N.*|Ň.*|O.*|Ó.*|P.*|Q.*|R.*|Ř.*|S.*|Š.*|T.*|Ť.*|U.*|Ú.*|V.*|W.*|X.*|Y.*|Ý.*|Z.*|Ž.*" & tag="N.*"]. However, it turned out that lemmas with an occurrence 300 and more (thus, the toponyms with the highest frequency) are not really optimal for looking at toponym's adaptation strategies (even just tracking whether the toponym is translated or not). Usually, these toponyms were just a single word, and, as such, they — as a rule — did not contain a generic component (or at least not synchronically detectable generic component), as *Praha* [‘Prague’], *Čechy* [‘Bohemia’], *Československo* [‘Czechoslovakia’], *Karlovy Vary*, etc.

Thus, we created our own set of proper names and investigated their adaptations. In the set, we included names of distinctive geographical objects: significant cities (Prague, the present regional capitals and Opava, the former capital of Czech Silesia), the names of large mountains and rivers, and, finally, names of the central Prague districts and several significant urban objects in Prague. We are aware of the somewhat subjective choice of locations and thus the proper names, but on the other hand, we expected that such important and popular objects might be well represented in the parallel translation texts.

As a rule, we only considered texts originally written in Czech, i.e., we only considered such toponymic adaptations for which the source language was Czech. The material was divided into three groups — settlement names, names of natural features (oronyms and hydronyms in particular), and specific urban place names in Prague. For reference, Table 1 summarizes the lemma frequencies of each toponym in the Czech corpus. Since the frequency of various lemmas varies considerably, we decided to look in detail at those toponyms that had a minimum frequency of 5 occurrences or more in the Czech corpus (see Table 1, highlighted toponyms). In addition to being used as a proper name (to denote a particular object), some of the toponyms are also used in other naming situations, as a part of another proper name, for instance — e.g., the hydronym *Labe* [‘Elbe’] also occurs as part of a place name *Ústí nad Labem*, *Sázava* refers both to a river and a city, etc. However, this, to us, did not constitute a reason for excluding the given toponym from the research; on the contrary, this fact allowed us to observe the behavior of a particular proper name in different communicative (naming) contexts. There are two place names we excluded (manually): the toponym *Morava* (in most of its uses, it was a surname of a character from Pavel Kohout's novel “Hvězdná hodina vrahů”), and the toponym *Hradec*, a variant of the toponym *Hradec Králové* on the one hand, but, quite often, the form *Hradec* referred both to the fictional town of *Zelený Hradec* in Josef Škvorecký's various fictional works, and, also, to the Austrian city *Graz* (the Czech variant is *Štýrský Hradec*), on the other.

Table 1. Analyzed toponyms (ZC — zero correspondence)

Toponym	Frequency		
	Czech texts	English texts	German texts
Settlement names: cities			
Brno	65	Brno: 62; ZC: 3	Brünn: 62; Brno: 1; ZC: 2
Budějovice	90	Budějovice: 78; Budejovice: 12	Budweiss: 90
Hradec (Králové)	18		
Jihlava	3		
Karlovy Vary	7	Karlovy Vary: 6; ZC: 1	Karlsbad: 7
Liberec	6	Liberec: 5; ZC: 1	Reichenberg: 4; Liberec: 1; ZC: 1
Olomouc	3		
Opava	0		
Ostrava	31	Ostrava: 28; ZC: 3	Ostrau: 26; Ostrava: 4; ZC: 1
Pardubice	6	Pardubice: 5; ZC: 1	Pardubitz: 4; Pardubice: 2
Plzeň	34	Plzeň: 22; Pilsen: 11; ZC: 1	Pilsen: 33; ZC: 1
Praha	1028	Prague: 977; Praha: 12; ZC: 39	Prag: 976; Praha: 5; ZC: 47
Ústí nad Labem	3		
Names of natural features: Oronyms: mountain ranges			
Beskydy	1		
Českomoravská vrchovina	0		
Český les	1		
Jeseníky	1		
Jizerské hory	0		
Krkonoše	10	Krkonoše Mountains: 3; Giant Mountains: 2; Krkonoše (Giant Mountains): 2; ZC: 2; Krkonoše: 1	Riesengebirge: 9; ZC: 1
Krušné hory	2		
Lužické hory	0		
Novohradské hory	0		
Orlické hory	4		
Rychlebské hory	0		
Šumava	10	Šumava: 5; Bohemian Forest: 2; ZC: 2; Sumava: 1	Böhmerwald: 10

Table 1. cont

Toponym	Frequency		
	Czech texts	English texts	German texts
Names of natural features: Hydronyms: rivers			
Berounka	1		
Dyje	0		
Jihlava	3		
Jizera	1		
Labe	19	Elbe: 11; Labe: 5; ZC: 3	Elbe: 14; Labe: 2; ZC: 3
Lužnice	2		
Morava	46	Morava: 6; Moravia: 37; ZC: 3	March: 5; Mähren: 35; ZC: 6
Odra	6	Oder: 3; ZC: 3	Oder: 5; ZC: 1
Ohře	1		
Sázava	32	Sázava: 26; Sazava: 6	Sázava: 31; Sasau: 1
Svratka	0		
Vltava	51	Vltava: 37; Vltava River: 8; River Vltava: 3; ZC: 3	Moldau: 50; ZC: 1
Urbanonyms (Praha)			
Karlův most	9	Charles Bridge: 7; Karlův Bridge: 2	Karlsbrücke: 8; ZC: 1
Staroměstská radnice	4		
Týnský chrám	4		
Malá Strana	0		
Staré Město (pražské)	6	Old Town: 6	Altstadt: 6
Nové Město (pražské)	2		
Vinohrady	19	Vinohrady: 17; ZC: 2	Weinberge: 15; Vinohrady: 3; ZC: 1
Hradčany	18	Hradčany: 8; Hradcany: 5; ZC: 5	Hradschin: 15; Hradčany: 1; ZC: 1
Petřín	14	Petrin Hill: 7; Petřín: 2; Petřín Hill: 1; Petrin: 2; ZC: 2	Laurenziberg: 12; Lorenziberg: 1; Laurenzerberg: 1
Václavské náměstí	16	Wenceslaus/Wencelas Square: 13; ZC: 2; Václavské Square: 1	Wenzelsplatz: 15; ZC: 1
Vyšehrad	22	Vyšehrad: 20; ZC: 2	Vyšehrad: 18; Vysehrad: 1; ZC: 3

With a few exceptions, we do not show the percentage proportion of the various types of adaptation: most toponyms have a low frequency and the usage is far from unified, thus, we believe that showing the data as percentages would not be representative. In addition to variations in types of adaptation, we also recorded zero correspondences (ZC), i.e., cases with no formal cross-linguistic correspondence in the corpora (see Martinková, 2014, pp. 275–276). Zero correspondence is thus a case where the toponym was completely omitted (cf. ‘V Brně v tu chvíli seděla u televizních obrazovek skupina studentů, a když krátce po skončení přenosu dostali k dispozici přepis celého pořadu, pustili se do své standardní práce.’ [‘Meanwhile in Brno, there was a group of students in front of the TV, and once the broadcast ended, they were provided with a transcript of the entire program, and started spontaneously checking the facts.’] — ‘Fact-Checking, eine typische Studenten-Idee ‘Das war eine typische Studenten-Idee’”), but not the case of replacing a toponym with a toponym-derived adjective (cf. ‘od té rajdy v Brně’ [‘from that Brno-based whore’] — ‘mit dieser Brünner Schlampe’).

3.3. Czech toponyms in English and German corpora

In the first group — settlement names (*Praha*, regional capitals and *Opava*) — we found a rather significant difference in the adaptation strategies chosen in English and German. While the original Czech forms are clearly preferred in English (with diacritics removed, in some cases, i.e., *Budejovice* instead of *Budějovice*), in German, the historical forms were favored, i.e., *Brünn* instead of *Brno*, *Ostrau* instead of *Ostrava*, *Pilsen* instead of *Plzeň*, *Pardubitz* instead of *Pardubice*, *Reichenberg* instead of *Liberec*), although e.g. the pre-war form *Aussig* (for *Ústí nad Labem*) did not appear even once. However, in the English texts, there were two exceptions to the rule of using the original Czech forms: the name of the capital (the form *Prague* prevailed in 95 % of cases), and the exonym *Pilsen* (next to the form *Plzeň*) had a significantly higher frequency. For both cases, the historical significance of both locations is the reason — the capital Prague is obvious; *Plzeň* — one of the most important royal cities and the most important Czech city on the road from Prague to Bavaria (and further to the West), and, of course, world-famous for the *Pilsner Urquell* beer brand. In addition, the frequent use of the historical German place names (*Prag* and *Pilsen* for *Praha* and *Plzeň*) also in English conveys influence and the significance German had for the communication in (the historical) Czech Lands (the Lands of the Bohemian Crown).

For the names of natural features (oronyms, hydronyms), the original Czech forms were preferred in English texts, usually accompanied by an English description (e.g., *the Krkonoše Mountains*, *the Vltava River*). There were only two toponyms that were treated differently: the name of the *Labe* river appeared often as

Elbe; this might be because the river flows through Germany as well and it flows into the North Sea, thus, the name might be taken directly from German. The second toponym treated differently is the form *Moravia* referring to the historical region — one of the three parts of the Czech Republic. The form *Moravia* came to English via Latin specifically for the historical region — the river also known as the Morava was referred to as *Morava* in the English text.

German also played a key role in the history and development of Czech toponyms and this role is clearly reflected in some Czech place names used in English: they are originally German, and were translated literally into English, i.e., by means of a calque: *the Bohemian Forest* (Šumava), *the Giant Mountains* (Krkonoše). On the other hand (and again) — the historical German place names were preferred in the German translations, e.g., *Böhmerwald* (Šumava), *Riesengebirge* (Krkonoše), *Moldau* (Vltava); in the case of the toponym *Morava*, it is clearly distinguished whether the reference is to the region (*Mähren*) or the river (*March*). An exception was the name *Sázava*: once, we found the form *der Sasau-Fluss*. We are far from being able to draw any general conclusions based on these exceptions (*Sázava* and the *Elbe/Labe* forms), but the examples show a tendency to keep the original Czech form of a toponym if it is part of another proper name, e.g., a chrematonym or a toponym. In other words: the name of the river *Labe* appears as *Elbe* if it stands alone, but if it is part of another place name, then the Czech version is used, cf. *Ústí nad Labem*; the town *Sázava* was referred to only by the form *Sázava*.

In order to verify the relevance of the conclusions based on the frequency analysis, we decided to test the significance of the following relationships statistically: 1) the relationship between the form of the toponym (adapted vs. the original preserved) and its type (settlement names vs. names of natural features) and 2) the relationship between the type of toponym and the language into which it is adapted (English vs. German). To test the statistical significance of the difference, we used the chi-squared test at the 0.05 significance level (p -value; see Chráska, 2016, pp. 64–83). We worked with the frequencies of settlement names/names of natural features in the categories “adaptation” (literal translations, as well as morphologically and orthographically adapted forms and variants from the Namenpaaren pair) and “original name” (the Czech toponym is preserved). To calculate the results, we used the calculator available at <https://www.socscistatistics.com/tests/>. If the statistical results corresponded to $p < 0.05$, we rejected the null hypothesis and assumed a relationship between the two variables. We then used Cramer’s V as the contingency coefficient to determine the effect size (significance); we used the software available at <https://mathcracker.com/>.

Differences were observed in two sets — set A included all settlement names and names of natural features, including the frequency of highly frequent toponym

Praha; in set B, the *Praha* toponym was excluded. We expect that the high frequency of the toponym *Praha* would lead to different results for the two sets.

Working with set A, we first focused on the relationship between the toponym and its type (see Table 2). The test statistic evaluated this relationship as significant ($\chi^2 = 249$, $p \ll 0.05$); the value of the coefficient V is 0.31 — thus, the relationship between the type of toponym (settlement name/name of natural feature) and the way it is presented (adaptation / original name) is moderately strong. Thus, there is especially a tendency to adapt settlement names, but this could be influenced by the high frequency of the toponym *Prague*, mentioned above. The relationship between the type of toponym and adaptations into English and German is also statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 15$, $p \ll 0.05$); however, it is a weak relationship ($V = 0.08$; see Table 3), with a stronger tendency to adapt both types of toponyms in German. This could be interpreted as a consequence of the *Namenpaaren*, i.e., in the translations, the historical German forms of Czech toponyms were chosen — and these do not exist in English.

Table 2. Relation between the type of toponym: adaptation vs. original place name

Set A (including <i>Praha</i>)		
	Adaptation (f)	Original (f)
Settlement names	2190	243
Names of natural feature	186	136
$\chi^2 = 249$, $p < 0.05$; coefficient V = 0.30		
Set B (without <i>Praha</i>)		
	Adaptation (f)	Original (f)
Settlement names	237	256
Names of natural feature	186	136
$\chi^2 = 3$, $p < 0.05$; coefficient V = 0.065		

Looking at set B (excluding the toponym *Praha*), we found that there was no significant difference between adaptation and preservation of the original form depending on the type of toponym ($\chi^2 = 3$, $p = 0.065$; see Table 2). However, there were statistically significant differences concerning the relationship between the toponym type and the language of translation ($\chi^2 = 52$, $p \ll 0.05$); the relationship was determined as moderately strong ($V = 0.35$; see Table 3), and this confirms the previous findings. Thus, it appears that the existence of *Namenpaaren* is a very strong factor that makes German prefer the adaptation strategy; this observation is not weakened even by the exclusion of the toponym *Praha* from the study set.

Table 3. Relation between the type of toponym: adaptation in English vs. adaptation in German

Set A (including Praha)		
	Adaptation in English (f)	Adaptation in German (f)
Settlement names	988	1202
Names of natural feature	57	129
$\chi^2 = 15, p < 0.05$; coefficient V = 0.08		
Set B (without Praha)		
	Adaptation in English (f)	Adaptation in German (f)
Settlement names	11	226
Names of natural feature	57	129
$\chi^2 = 52, p < 0.05$; coefficient V = 0.35		

Regarding the names of Prague districts and important objects in Prague, the situation is rather similar. In English, the names were not translated, while German used historical variants, e.g., *Hradčany* vs. *Hradschin*, *Vinohrady* vs. *Weinberge*, with the exception of the toponym *Vyšehrad* (used only in the original Czech form in both languages), and the calque toponym *Old Town* vs. *Altstadt* (for *Staré Město pražské*). A calque (or partial calque) was used for the names of *Karlův most*, i.e., *Charles Bridge* or *Karlův Bridge* (*Karlsbrücke* in German) and *Václavské náměstí* that appeared as *Wenceslaus/Wenceslas Square* or *Václavské Square* (*Wenzelsplatz* in German). However, given the low frequency of these names, we dropped the statistical testing of the differences. In addition, urbanonyms include names of various objects and, morphologically, very different types (i.e., urbanonyms have a low homogeneity) and, moreover, it is extremely difficult to clearly delimit the object categories.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The parallel corpora-based analysis allowed us to track adaptation processes on a relatively large set of texts. In addition, the context of the toponym used was taken into account and a multilingual perspective (Czech, English, German) was tested. The analysis of data from the corpus *InterCorp*, version 13 confirmed the tendencies (observed in the previous tourist-texts based research) concerning the adaptation of Czech toponyms into a foreign (unrelated) language. Earlier, non-corpus-based analyses of exonyms (i.e., English and German forms of Czech place names,

which are examined in the article) emphasized the key role played by the type of named object, and this was confirmed with the statistical test (settlement names are adapted more often than names of natural features). Nonetheless, our research, although primarily concerning Czech toponyms in translations, has highlighted other factors that might need to be taken into account — the target language and whether the language has historical variants of exonyms (Namenpaaren). If the original and target languages are genetically related, this becomes a prerequisite for the tendency to translate especially (but not only) the generic part of toponyms; the cultural and/or historical relatedness of language, therefore, highlights the tendency to use ‘historical’ place names. However, this is far from being a general rule, as shown by Renata Ondráčková’s research (2017, pp. 70–91) comparing the forms of Czech toponyms in the parallel Czech-German corpus “Das tschechisch-deutsche parallele Korpus an der Masaryk-Universität Brunn” and the German “Korpora des Instituts für deutsche Sprache Mannheim”. The research showed that the role of historical exonyms is now significantly weakened and that historical place names are now almost entirely absent from the German texts (with exceptions, cf. *Karlovy Vary* — *Karlsbad*, *Znojmo* — *Znaim*); in modern German texts, the adapted forms without diacritics are definitely more common (e.g., *Decin* instead of *Děčín*, *Přibram* instead of *Příbram*).

REFERENCES

- Beránek, T. et al. (2011). *Index českých exonym* [Index of Czech exonyms]. Praha: Český úřad zeměměřický a katastrální.
- Berger, T. (1991–1992). Tschechische Bezeichnungen für ausländische Ortsnamen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Bayern [Czech names for foreign place names with special reference to Bavaria]. *Blätter für oberdeutsche Namenforschung*, 28–29, 77–122.
- Chlumská, L. (2017). *Překladová čeština a její charakteristiky* [Czech in translation and its characteristics]. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Chráška, M. (2016). *Metody pedagogického výzkumu. Základy kvantitativního výzkumu* [Methods of pedagogical research. Basics of the quantitative research]. Praha: Grada.
- Čermák, F. (2011. Ed.). *Korpusová lingvistika Praha 2011. 1 InterCorp* [Corpus Linguistics Prague 2011. 1 InterCorp]. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Čermák, F., & Koček, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Mnohojazyčný korpus InterCorp: Možnosti studia* [Multilingual Corpus InterCorp: Research options]. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Čermák, F., Corness, P., & Klégr, A. (Eds.). (2010). *InterCorp: Exploring a Multilingual Corpus*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Čermáková, A. (2016). Kontrastivní lingvistika, translologie a korpusová lingvistika [Contrastive linguistics, translology and corpus linguistics]. In A. Čermáková, L. Chlumská, & M. Malá (Eds.), *Jazykové paralely* (pp. 12–23). Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- ČNK = *Český národní korpus* [Czech National Corpus]. <https://www.korpus.cz/>
- Czopek-Kopciuch, B. (1995). *Adaptacje niemieckich nazw miejscowych w języku polskim* [Adaptation of German place names in Polish]. Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.

- David, J., Březinová, K., & Reclik, A. (2023). Janův hrad nebo John's Castle — vlastní jména v překladu v sémantické perspektive [Janův hrad or John's Castle — Proper names in translation in the semantic perspective]. In L. Janovec et al. (Eds.), *Propria a apelativa* (vol. 2; pp. 47–56). Liberec: Fakulta přírodovědně-humanitní a pedagogická TUL — Praha: Pedagogická fakulta UK — Ústav pro jazyk český AV ČR, v.v.i.
- David, J., & Klemensová, T. (2019). Still Having a Conflict Potential? German and Hungarian Toponyms in the Czech and Slovak National Corpora Texts. *Miscellanea Geographica: Regional Studies on Development*, 23(3), 158–162.
- David, J., & Klemensová, T. (2021). Between Cultural Heritage and Marketing: German Place Names in Post-Communist Czechia. In O. Felecan, O. & A. Bugheşiu (Eds.), *Names and Naming — Multicultural Aspects* (pp. 315–329). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- David, J., Klemensová, T., & Místecký, M. (Eds.). (2022). *Od etymologie ke krajině. Onomastika pro 21. století* [From etymology to landscape. Onomastics for the 21st century]. Brno: Host.
- David, J., & Místecký, M. (2023a). Meryl Streepová a Emma Stone: přechylování cizích příjmení v češtině prizmatem korpusového výzkumu [Meryl Streep and Emma Stone: The creation of czech female forms of foreign surnames in the perspective of corpus research]. *Bohemistyka*, 23, 541–554. <https://doi.org/10.14746/bo.2023.4.3>
- David, J., & Místecký, M. (2023b). Prolegomena ke kvantitativní onomastice [Prolegomena to quantitative onomastics]. *Acta onomastica*, 64(2), 301–320.
- David, J., & Rupiňská, A. (2020). Varianty a variování zeměpisných názvů v českém politickém diskurzu) 1945–1989 [Place names variants and variation in the Czech political discourse in 1945–1989]. *Acta onomastica*, 61(2), 299–310.
- Doubnerová, J. (1988). Exonyma v českých cestopisech ze 16. století [Exonyms in Czech travel writing of the 16th century]. *Onomastický zpravodaj ČSAV*, 29, 143–149.
- Durán Muñoz, I. (2012). Analysing Common Mistakes in Translations of Tourist Texts (Spanish, English and German). *Onomázein*, 26(2), 335–349.
- Dvořáková, Ž. (2017). *Literární onomastika. Antroponyma* [Literary onomastics. Anthroponyms]. Praha: Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta.
- Eichler, E. (1976). Sprachkontakte und Sprachebenen in der Onomastik [Language contacts and language levels in onomastics]. *Slavica Pragensia*, 19, 43–55.
- Harris, B. (2004). The Translation of Names. In J.M. Bravo (Ed.), *A New Spectrum of Translation Studies* (pp. 73–92). Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.
- Harvalík, M. (2017). Exonymum [Exonym]. In P. Karlík, M. Nekula & J. Pleskalová (Eds.), *Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita. <https://www.czechency.org/slovník/EXONYMUM>
- Johansson, S. (2007). *Seeing through Multilingual Corpora: on the Use of Corpora in Contrastive Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Johansson, S., Ebeling, J., & Oksefjell, S. (1999–2002). *English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus: Manual*. Oslo: University of Oslo. <https://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/services/knowledge-resources/omc/enpc/ENPCmanual.pdf>
- Klemensová, T. (2021). *Zeměpisné názvy v pohraničí po roce 1945 na příkladu okresu Jeseník* [Geographical names in a border region after 1945 on the example of the Jeseník district]. Červený Kostelec: Pavel Mervart.
- Knappová, M. (1983). K překládání osobních jmen [On translating personal names]. *Naše řeč*, 66(4), 169–173.
- Knappová, M., & Sloboda, M. (2017). Příjmení [Surnames]. In P. Karlík, M. Nekula, & J. Pleskalová (Eds.), *Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita. <https://www.czechency.org/slovník/PŘÍJMENÍ>
- Martinková, M. (2014). K metodologii využití paralelních korpusů v kontrastivní lingvistice [On the methodology of using parallel corpora for contrastive linguistic research]. *Naše řeč*, 97(4–5), 270–285. <http://nase-rec.ujc.cas.cz/archiv.php?art=8344>

- Matúšová, J. (2015). *Německá vlastní jména v češtině* [German proper names in Czech]. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Motschenbacher, H. (2020). Corpus Linguistic Onomastics. A Plea for a Corpus Based Investigation of Names. *Names*, 68(2), 88–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00277738.2020.1731240>
- Nádeníček, P. (2011). Produktivita přechylování v dnešní češtině ve srovnání s angličtinou, němčinou a ruštinou [Productivity of derivation of female forms in Czech Today compared to English, German, and Russian]. In F. Čermák (Ed.), *Korpusová lingvistika Praha 2011: 1: InterCorp* (pp. 204–218). Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Nyström, S. (2016). Names and Meaning. In C. Hough (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming* (pp. 39–51). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ondráčková, R. (2017). *Die Übersetzung der tschechischen Toponyma in deutschen Texten* [The translation of Czech toponyms in German texts]. [MA thesis, Masarykova univerzita]. IS MU. <https://is.muni.cz/th/wdobb/>
- Prchlíková, M. (2011). *Exonyma ve starších českých cestopisech* [Exonyms in older Czech travel writings]. [MA thesis, Masarykova univerzita]. IS MU. <https://theses.cz/id/kw4ser>
- Rupiňská, A. (2020). Adaptační exonym v odborném textu — tendence, variantnost, reflexe [Adapting exonyms in specialist texts — tendencies, variability, reflections]. In E. Molnárová (Ed.), *Od textu k překladu XIV* (pp. 68–74). Praha: Jednota tlumočnicků a překladatelů.
- Špačková, S. (2017). *Rusko-česká ekvivalence propriálního lexika: vlastní jména v překladu* [Equivalence of proper nouns in Russian and Czech: Proper nouns in translation]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Šrámek, R. (1999). *Úvod do obecné onomastiky* [Introduction to general onomastics]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Šrámek, R. (2017). Propriální sféra jazyka [The propriat sphere of language]. In P. Karlík, M. Nekula, & J. Pleskalová (Eds.), *Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita. https://www.czechency.org/slovník/PROPRIÁLNÍ_SFÉRA_JAZYKA.
- Svobodová, D. (2012). Přechylování cizojazyčných příjmení ve světle aktuálního úzu [Derivation of foreign feminine surnames in the light of current usage]. In M. Ološtiak (Ed.), *Jednotlivé a všeobecné v onomastice* (pp. 93–100). Prešov: Prešovská univerzita v Prešove.
- United Nations. (2006). *Manual for the national standardization of geographical names United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names*. New York: United Nations. https://unstats.un.org/unsd/publication/seriesm/seriesm_88e.pdf
- Van Langendonck, W., & Van de Velde, M. (2016). Names and Grammar. In C. Hough (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming* (pp. 17–38). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wolnicz-Pawłowska, E. (2014). Nazwy własne w przekładzie. Zarys problematyki [Proper names in translation. An outline of the problem]. *Poznańskie Spotkania Językoznawcze*, 27, 201–214. <https://doi.org/10.14746/psj.2014.XXVII.17>
- Yermolovich, D.I. (2005). *Imena sobstvennyye. Teoriya i praktika mezhyazykovoi peredachi* [Proper names. Theory and practice of interlanguage transfer]. Moskva: R. Valent.

SUMMARY

The aim of the paper is to present strategies for the adaptation of Czech geographical names (their translation in particular) in a foreign language texts. Using the parallel corpus *InterCorp*, version 13 (part of the *Czech National Corpus*) we look at the variants of Czech toponyms (referring to objects in the territory of the Czech Republic; settlement names, names of natural features, urban names) used in English and German translations. We analyze and interpret the strategies used to incorporate Czech toponyms into non-Slavic translations; in addition, we highlight the potential which the corpora (parallel corpora in particular) have for the research of toponyms. Given the centuries-old historical contacts between Czech and German, most Czech toponyms have a German variant (i.e., *Namenpaaren*), and these German variants are used rather extensively in translations. This, of course, is very unlike the case with English, but, from a historical perspective, these German variants often stand behind the English version of the place name.