

Iliana Genew–Puhalewa¹
(Warszawa)

Milena Hebal–Jeziarska²
(Warszawa)

Homosexuality in Czech and Bulgarian Lexicographic Description from the Socialist Period

Keywords: minority, homosexuality, categorization, Bulgarian dictionary, Czech dictionary, repression, communist ideology, communist dictionaries

Introduction

Discussing the subject of a minority in descriptive terms inevitably entails certain forms of categorization to be established. In the context of homosexuality, the categorization process is highly subjective as defining this heterogeneous group is not based on the functioning of a primary class which would function independently from linguistic and social conventions.

The minority in question is today referred to as *komunita gayů* ‘the gay community’, ‘homosexuální menšina’, *хомосексуално малцинство* ‘the homosexual minority’, *носители/представители на феномена хомосексуализъм* ‘bearers/representatives of the homosexuality phenomenon’, *субгрупа* ‘the subgroup’, *социално малцинство* ‘social minority’. We do know, however, that the present anti-discriminatory discourse on homosexuality is largely an accomplishment of the last two decades. One fact we may find striking is that the word *гей* ‘gay’ along with the derived adjective *гейски* were first registered within the officially endorsed

¹ ORCID: 0000-0002-1780-166X

² ORCID: 0000-0002-6325-3545

Bulgarian lexicography as late as in 21st century in *Речник на новите думи в българския език*, ed. 2010, as “new” words. In Czech lexicography, the words *gay* and *antigayovský* had already been registered in the “Dictionary of New Words” (*Nová slova v češtině. Slovník neologizmů 1*, ed. O. Martincová, here: NSČ1) 1998 edition, while adjectives *gayský/gayovský* – included in the second part of the “Dictionary of New Words” (*Nová slova v češtině. Slovník neologizmů 2*, ed. O. Martincová, here: NSČ2), published in 2004. The lexeme has also been included in the presently developed (initiated 2012) academic Czech dictionary (*Akademický slovník současné češtiny*, here: ASSČ).

Claims such as that homosexual persons should constitute a *social minority* or a *distinct subculture* or that they are *sinners*, *sick individuals* or even *criminals*, are informed by socially dominant sentiments and attitudes at a given time, as well as values accepted and imposed by the state apparatuses.

Among the means of solidifying linguistic and cultural categorization are lexicographic descriptions, both traditionally structuralist definitions and those which are developed in accordance with principles of pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, ethnolinguistics, or other schools of linguistics. Let us note, however, that dictionaries and encyclopedias have often been used as tools for propaganda and ideologized exertion of control over language, as seen in the socialist period (1945–1989) in the so-called Eastern Bloc countries. Research carried out by lexicographers affiliated with representative research and education institutions was generally, although to a varying extent, subjected to political censorship (Пернишка 2016: 21, Попов 1994: 5, Dvořáková 2011: 125). Numerous instances indicate that the image of homosexuality shaped in dictionaries was subjected to ideological surveillance as to their congruence with the communist doctrine. An image of homosexual persons in the socialist era is thus formed not only via literature (both academic works and fiction), performative arts, and visual arts, but also in lexicographic and encyclopedic sources. This is why the aim of the present study is to draw an analysis of dictionary and encyclopedia entries – Czechoslovakian and Bulgarian (developed in the period of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria or the PRB, the Czechoslovak Republic, and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic). Our main area of interest are definitions of terms denoting phenomena relating to

homosexuality and the paradigmatic relations thereof. Noteworthy are the systems of references and qualifiers used in dictionaries, informative not only of usage, but also of the ways in which lexics becomes subject to ideologization.

Resource description

The material subjected to analysis presented in this study was excerpted from the following Czech/Czechoslovakian and Bulgarian sources:

Kartotéka lexikálního archivu “The Lexical Archive Catalog”, compiled between 1911–1991 (here referred to as KLA);

Příruční slovník jazyka českého, eds. Oldřich Hujer, Emil Smetánka, Miloš Weingart, Bohuslav Havránek, Vladimír Šmilauer, Alois Ziskal, published 1935–1957 (here: PSJČ);

Slovník cizích slov, zkratek, novinářských šifer, pseudonymů a časopisů pro čtenáře novin, authored by Karel Tauš, published 1946 (here: SCS).

Slovník jazyka českého, authored by František Trávníček, published 1952 (here: SJČ);

Slovník spisovného jazyka českého, ed. Bohuslav Havránek, published 1960–1971 (here: SSJČ);

Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost, eds. Josef Filipec, František Daneš, published 1978 (here: SSČ);

Ilustrovaný encyklopedický slovník, 1980–1982 (here: IES);

Malá československá encyklopedie, published 1984–1987 (here: MČE);

Българска енциклопедия. А – Ж (Братя Данчови), 1936 (here: БЕ–БД).

Български тълковен речник, published 1955, 1963, 1973, 1995 (here: БТР);

Кратка българска енциклопедия (БАН), 1963–1969 (here: КБЕ).

Речник на чуждите думи в българския език, 1964, 1978, 1982 (here: РЧДБЕ);

The “Lexical Archive Catalog” (KLA) comprises excerpted material which served as the basis for all representative dictionaries of the Czech language. Illustrative examples were excerpted from fiction, specialized literature, newspapers, magazines, and translation studies (based on <https://psjc.ujc.cas.cz/>).

The PSJČ is the most comprehensive Czech dictionary, comprising eight volumes with more than 250,000 entries. Its design was modified several times; starting in 1948, its creation was heavily influenced by Marxist-Leninist ideology. The team developing the dictionary at the time was granted the Klemens Gottwald national award (Dvořáčková 2011: 125) in 1958. The dictionary remains in use to this day. We should keep in mind that some of its volumes (including entries A–J) were released between 1935–1937, which means that the entries developed at the time were unmarked by communist ideology. However, the authors chose to include the resource in the present work, since the dictionary was both immensely popular in the socialist era and recognized and awarded by the authorities.

The subsequently created SSJČ was created in the socialist period and comprises 192,908 entries, defining words registered in texts published since the 1930s. The authors of this publication were nominated to the Gottwald national award, but did not succeed in receiving the prize – for political reasons (Dvořáčková 2011: 127). The dictionary was then reissued with minor changes in 1989.

The first edition of the SJČ dictionary was published in 1937, co-authored by Pavel Váša. Subsequent editions were released in 1941 and in 1946. The 1952 edition used for the purposes of this study, albeit reissued as the fourth edition of the dictionary, was subjected to significant alterations, and one of the authors was removed from the works. The ideological undertone present throughout this dictionary leaves no room for doubt: in the very preface, František Trávníček makes frequent reference to works of Joseph Stalin and mentions the need for some of the vocabulary to be updated in relation to regime change.

Slovník cizích slov, zkratek, novinářských šifer, pseudonymů a časopisů pro čtenáře novin is addressed to newspaper readers and comprises foreign words, acronyms, journalist codes, pseudonyms, and names of magazines.

The SSČ dictionary comprises words registered in texts published since 1945 and consists of ca. 45,000 entries. The authors explicitly state in its preface that the vocabulary included in the dictionary is to reflect the changes taking place in today's world. Both these encyclopedic resources were published by Academia, a state-funded academic publishing house, and thus heavily influenced by communist ideology.

The predominant amount of Bulgarian material for analysis was provided by the БТР, the most comprehensive one-volume dictionary of the Bulgarian language until the 1980s. The dictionary is a collective work supervised by the prominent linguist Lyubomir Andreychin and comprising ca. 60,000 entries, aspiring to be the main source of information on form, meaning, and usage of Bulgarian words.

During the excerption process, the authors found it necessary to include the РЧДБЕ Dictionary of foreign words as a substantial share of international lexics of Greek and Latin origin is used for non-charged ways of naming the phenomenon in question. РЧДБЕ is considered to be a representative source not only due to its volume (the 1982 edition is 1012 pages long), but also its affiliation – it was developed at the main lexicography center in socialist Bulgaria, the Institute for Bulgarian Language at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, and issued by the scholarly Наука и изкуство publishing house. The preface emphasizes the fact that explications of ideological terms and notions were prepared in accordance with the “scientific materialist approach” (РЧДБЕ 1982: 11). The subjective character of the process via which terms relating to homosexuality were defined, suggests that they were indeed treated in ideological terms.

The Bulgarian encyclopedic source of data analyzed here is the five-volume *Кратка българска енциклопедия* (КБЕ), similarly prepared by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences and published in the years 1963-1969. Aspiring to be a “universal encyclopedia”, the work comprises 25,000 entries in all areas of expertise, explicated in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist perspective. For a complementary source, the authors chose to use the first Bulgarian encyclopedia *Българска енциклопедия. А – Ж* (*Братя Данчови*), published in 1936, a work which impacted the development of Bulgarian encyclopaedistics and lexicography, and which aims to transmit state-of-the-art knowledge about the world just before the advent of socialism.

The most significant Czech and Bulgarian lexicography centers where dictionaries and encyclopedias were developed were concentrated around academic institutions. Activities carried out in these institutions remained under the control of socialist authorities. Dvořáková (2011: 48) attests to the fact that starting in 1948, in the lexical archive of the Institute of the Czech Language at the Czech Academy of Sciences preference was given to Marx-

ist-Leninist works. Excerpts of future publications were subjected to collective auditing; examples were selected by a four-member committee who subsequently presented those to all employees of the Institute for them to provide a commentary. Some authors were put on lists of banned publications.

The Bulgarian Academy of Sciences followed a similar trajectory. Emilia Pernishka recounts how academic research, including that in Bulgarian lexicography, was dictated by communist policies:

Following 1944, not only linguistics, but all of Bulgarian research remained heavily impacted by Soviet way of life and of doing science, as did social, political, and cultural life of Bulgaria. The 1950s mark a socio-political and ideological breakthrough which in Bulgarian linguistics (similarly to Soviet linguistics and that of other socialist countries) is marked by Marxist notions of language [...]. Research in linguistics is more or less compliant with scientific notions proliferated in other socialist countries. [...]. Bulgarian academics organize n research teams, predominantly at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences where the main dictionaries are prepared. (Пернишка 2016: 21).

The subjection of lexicography works at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences to ideological guidelines is acknowledged in the preface to the Bulgarian dictionary *Български тълковен речник* (БТР) by its editor, Dimitar Popov. The last revisions of the dictionary after the fall of communism, i.e. in 1994, consisted in presenting the denotations in a “more updated manner”:

Numerous definitions were purged of unfitting ideological content hitherto present, and redeveloped accordingly to suit the requirements of scientific objectivity and lack of bias, so as to comply with the inherently philological character of a dictionary. (Попов 1994: 5)

Lexicographic resources analyzed here are “traditional”, i.e., lexical units are defined according to structural and semantic rules, or in fact, follow the taxonomy principle, limiting the contents to necessary traits, i.e. those sufficient for the identification of the referent (Niebrzegowska–Bartmińska 2018: 2). Rigorous definitions of this kind are presently defined as “minimal” (as opposed to “maximal definitions” proposed by cognitivist

scholars), and the components included in their definiens are considered “non-negotiable properties of semantic expressions” (Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, *ibid.*). Encyclopedic entries are broader than those in dictionaries, but they remain one-sided in their ways of explaining the phenomenon. While the definition of a lexeme such as *Marxist*: ‘an advocate of Marxism’ meets these terms, an evident exemption from the prescripts of traditional lexicography is seen in Bulgarian “socialist” definition of homosexuality as ‘perverted, unnatural sexual attraction towards members of the same gender’ (БТР), as the explication contains charged and valorizing attributes which do not form part of the lexical meaning.

From today’s perspective, it seems that vocabulary relating to homosexuality forms a large lexical and semantic field – as observed in the more recent Bulgarian, Czech, and Polish literature (Tomsik 2018, Nowak 2020, Попова 2009, Грѳев 2009). Bulgarian dictionaries of the socialist era register a strikingly small number of terms which are predominantly of foreign origin and characteristic of academic discourse. Colloquial and jargon vocabulary was omitted altogether. This fact can be attributed to repressive practices of the communist state apparatus, as acknowledged by Gergana Popova in her analysis informed by the work of Michel Foucault. Popova characterizes these forms of repression as silencing, condemning the minority to be absent and invisible, denying their existence by the assumption that there is indeed nothing (of value) to be said about homosexuality (Попова 2009). Similar points are raised by Czech researchers who testify to the fact that in the socialist era homosexual people hardly existed in public discourse; they were among the invisible minorities (Žáčková 2010). However, the authors of this article were able to gather enough lexicographic and encyclopedic material so as to accurately represent the construal of homosexuality and the perception of homosexual persons at the time.

Analysis of the material gathered

For the present analysis, the authors examined dictionary and encyclopedia sourced definitions as well as contexts illustrating the use of terms and non-terminological names relating to homosexuality. Moreover, particular focus was placed on qualifiers given to specific entries in order to indicate the context and usage of a given term or name.

The analysis showed that lexicographic descriptions are most often based on an assessment whether a given object is suitable (or not) for a certain norm relating to: 1) the category of vitality as a value centered around 'life' and 'undisturbed health' as opposed to 'sickness'; 2) the category of moral values with the notion of 'moral goodness' at its core, encompassing 'the Other's well-being' as well as 'the common weal' as opposed to 'harm' and transgression of moral norms; 3) affective values, concentrated around the notion of 'closeness' (in relation to others) and 'pleasure'; 4) utilitarian values centering around the opposition between 'usefulness' and 'uselessness' of a given object.

The category of vitality: 'health – sickness': 'homosexual person as a sick individual', 'homosexuality as sickness'

Homosexual people were for a long time perceived as unhealthy or sick individuals, as expressed in the classification of health problems applied in numerous countries for several decades: in Czechoslovakia, homosexuality was among conditions listed in the inventory of diseases as late as in 1990 (Stehlíková, Procházka, Hromada 1995), and until 1988 in Bulgaria (Груев 2009). The first official mentions of homosexual people as a group in Czechoslovakia took place in the context of sickness as well. As mentioned by Stehlíková, Procházka, Hromada (1995), the first officially circulating information concerning homosexuality was accessible as late as in 1987 in relation to AIDS prevention.

Pathology in the medical sense is explicitly referred to in some fragments of Bulgarian lexicographic description, e.g.: *отклонение от физиологичните норми* 'deviation from physiological norms', *болезнено отклонение* 'unhealthy aberration', *болестна насоченост* 'unhealthy orientation'. In the БТР dictionary, *хомосексуализъм* 'homosexualism' is defined as *извратно, противоестественно сексуално влечение към лица от същия пол* 'a perverted, unnatural sexual attraction towards members of the same gender', while the attribute *извратен* is framed as *който се отклонява от здравата нравственост* 'a person who exhibits a deviation from healthy morality'. Homosexuality is consistently classified as *извращение: противоестественно, болезнено отклонение от физиологичните и нравствените норми* 'a perversion: unnatural, unhealthy deviation from physiological and moral norms' (КБЕ).

Phrases referring to aberration from the sexual norm (*seksuální úchylka*), deviation (*deviace*) in the context of homosexuality can be found in a definition formulated in the “Small Czechoslovak Encyclopedia” (1985: 819):

homoseksualita – sexuální úchylka (deviace) charakterizovaná pohlavními styky mezi osobami téhož pohlaví (...).

‘homosexuality – sexual deviation characterized by sexual contact between members of the same sex/gender.’

The presented data is corroborated by Michail Gruev who uses Michel Foucault’s theories to assess the impact of a claim put forward by the German sexologist Otton Westphal – namely, that homosexuality should be perceived in terms of a mental problem. This approach is expressly reflected in an entry placed in the КБЕ: “homosexuality” is categorized as ‘perversion’ along with other sexual preferences considered to a greater or lesser extent to be disorders: *онанизъм* ‘onanism’, *ексхибиционизъм* ‘exhibitionism’, *педофилия* ‘paedophilia’, *геронтофилия* ‘gerontophilia’, *фетишиизъм* ‘fetishism’, *зоофилия* ‘zoophilia’, *содомия* ‘sodomy’, *некрофилия* ‘necrophilia’, *садомазохизъм* ‘sodomasochism’. With a general categorization of sexual deviations under *полови извращения (перверсии)* ‘sexual deviations (perversions)’, the cited encyclopedia explicates the phenomenon is as a “morbid redirection of sex drive which can occur in healthy, psychopathic, and mentally ill individuals” (КБЕ). Moreover, the encyclopedic definition includes an opinion as to “prevention” of perversity (including homosexuality), which unquestionably situates the phenomenon primarily in the context of health problems and additionally that of child development and formation.

In the aforementioned Czechoslovak encyclopedia homosexuality is also seen as a psychological phenomenon, described as a disorder, albeit not explicitly; the resource includes a broader and narrower definition of the notion. In its narrow sense, homosexuality is treated as an expressly narcissistic rapport between a subject and an object of the same sex/gender. In the case of male homosexuality, data was provided which relates to categories such as criminality and ‘evil’, e.g. the term *paedophile* (see further), depending upon the age gap between the partners.

Another argument to support the claim that the perception of homosexual people in the context of sickness is by no means an invention of Czech communist leaders, is seen in definitions found in canonic dictionaries published before. One example is found in the renowned *Ottův slovník naučný nové doby* from 1933 which claims that some forms of homosexuality are curable (*Někt. formy h- jsou vyléčitelné*).

The verb *страда* 'to suffer' often seen in Bulgarian definitions, esp. in fragments such as *лице, което страда от...* 'a person suffering from...' relates to sickness, e.g. *педераст: лице, което страда от педерастия* 'pederast: a person who suffers from pederasty', *лесбийка: жена, която страда от лесбийска любов* 'lesbian: a woman who suffers from lesbian love' (РЧДБЕ).

Similar phrases can be found in lexicographic archives of the Czech language. One example in a the file included in the KLA archive contains a phrase built with the verb *trpět* 'to suffer':

Škodlivý vliv básníka Alena Grinsberga, který trpí narkománií a homosexualitou, se odrazil v pedopsychiatrické praxi. 'The detrimental influence of the poet Alen Grinsberg [Allen Ginsberg] who suffered from drug addiction and homosexuality, was reflected in paedo-psychiatric practices (child and adolescent psychiatry).' (Rudé právo 1965)

'Sickness' can be also implied via the participle *stížený* 'afflicted', as in the expression *stížený homosexualitou* 'afflicted by homosexuality'. In SSJČ, the word occurs as a collocate of names of sickness and disorder, e.g. *člověk stížený apoplexií, bronchitidou* 'afflicted by/sick with epilepsy, bronchitis.'

Part of lexics relating to homosexuality, as mentioned before, was provided with the qualifier *lék/med.* and *мед.* in Czech and Bulgarian sources, respectively. This has a twofold effect: the item is given the status of a specialized term, while a sense of 'deviation from the norm/health norms' is implied. However, assigning terms to a medical discourse, and to clinical nomenclature in particular, with the choice of qualifiers, is inconsistent in the two lexicographic practices. In the Czech PSJČ dictionary, the qualifier is present in the following entries: *homosexualismus, homosexualism, homosexualita, pederastie, samcoložství, sapfismus, uranismus, uranism*. The lexeme *tribadie*, on the other hand, is provided with a qualifier informative of usage in the legal jargon; while the word *homosexualnost* lacks any qual-

ifers. This particular dictionary shows an opposition between notions of heterosexuality and homosexuality, which becomes manifest in the distribution of qualifiers. Words referring to heterosexuality were provided the qualifier *biologický* 'biological', as opposed to lexemes denoting homosexuality. This may attest to a perception of heterosexual desire as natural, and homosexual desire as contrary to nature.

The problem of qualifiers in more recent dictionaries takes a distinctly different form. In SSJČ, the lexemes *homosexualismus*, *homosexualism*, *homosexualita* were not qualified as medical terms. The qualifier *med.* only accompanies some words denoting female homosexuality, e.g. *sapfismus*, *tribadie* (*práv.* – legal – in PSJČ). The lexemes *lesbismus* 'lesbianity', *lesbický* 'lesbian', *lesbicky* 'lesbianly' lack qualifiers in any of the dictionaries. In the SSJČ, the entry for *pederastie* features information classifying this lexeme to be of formal/literary register. In the SJČ and the SSČ, these words are not provided with qualifiers referring to medical nomenclature. Dictionaries also include other items denoting homosexual people, e.g. *buzerant* 'faggot, fanny', *buzík* 'faggot, fanny', *teplý* (literally) 'warm', marked as vulgar.

Bulgarian dictionaries share the strong arbitrariness as to the principle that should govern ascribing entries relating to homosexuality to a style- or topic-related qualifier. В РЧДБЕ *уранизъм* 'uranism' and *педерастия* 'pederasty' were given the qualifier *мед.* 'medical'; *хетеросексуализъм* 'heterosexualism', *перверсен* 'perverse', *перверситет* 'deviation', *перверсия* 'perversion', *трибадия* 'tribadism' – the qualifier *книж.* 'literary/bookish', while *хомосексуализъм* 'homosexualism', *хомосексуалност* 'homosexuality', *лесбийка* 'lesbian (subst.)', *лесбийски* 'lesbian (adj.)' lack qualifiers.

In the БТР, none of the terms mentioned above is considered a medical term, while the following borrowings are considered 'literary': *перверзен*, *перверзия*, *хомосексуален*, *хомосексуализъм*, *хомосексуалист*, *хомосексуалност*, *хетеросексуален*, as well as the Orthodox *мъжеложец* and *мъжеложество*. One striking item is the strongly pejorative colloquial Turkish borrowing of Arabic origin *манаф(-ин)*. In the РЧДБЕ and the БТР, the definitions converge and both feature the qualifier *разг.* 'colloquial':

манафин: 1. турчин от някои области на Мала Азия. 2. презрително прозвище на турчин изобицо, 3. разг. развратник, полово извратен.

‘1. Turk from certain areas of Anatolia; 2. Derisive slur for a Turk in general; 3. *coll.* sexually corrupt, deviant.’

Other dictionaries, including the dictionary of Bulgarian jargon authored by Georgi Armyanov (Армянов 1993), and currently available online dictionaries such as www.bgjargon.com, qualify *манаф* as a jargon expression meaning ‘active homosexual man; bisexual man’. Contexts in which this Turkish borrowing is used indicate negative charging, due to their distribution amid vulgar vocabulary.

The available data could suggest a false conclusion that in socialist Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia homosexuality was possible to be publicly discussed, largely in two charged registers: the formal/literary, or jargon.

In this category, homosexuality and homosexual people are defined on a spectrum of negativity. Significant differences between lexicographic and encyclopedic resources are clearly visible, as well as a disparity between the Bulgarian and Czech material. The depiction of homosexual persons in Bulgarian sources is undoubtedly more stigmatizing than in Czech counterparts, while an analysis of the Czech material itself shows that the image of homosexual people present in encyclopedias is less favorable than that in dictionaries. Additionally, it is worth noting that the image created in the Czech dictionaries presented here is less stringent in its assessment, when compared to dictionaries published earlier.

Category of ethical values: ‘moral good (common weal)’ – ‘moral evil (transgression of norms)’: ‘homosexual person transgresses norms’, ‘homosexuality as a breach of norm’

The binary division drawn in terms of moral good (in a social perspective) placed homosexual people and homosexuality in a “negative” class under socialism. This was unquestionably informed by Christian morality dominant in Czech and Bulgarian areas for centuries – traditional beliefs construing homosexuality as a mortal sin to be condemned, had persisted despite the weakened position of the Church. In this vein, socialist lexicography does not censor charged terms originating in translations of the Bible, merely providing the qualifier *книж.* ‘literary/bookish’: *мъжеложец; хомосексуалист, недераст* ‘a man who has intercourse with men: homo

sexual, pederast'; *мъжеложство*: *хомосексуализъм*, *педерастия* 'intercourse between men: homosexuality, pederasty'.

The Czech PSJČ dictionary registers a derivative of the word *samcoložník*, the lexeme *samcoložství* defined as *smilstvo muže s mužem* 'debauchery/promiscuousness of a man with a man' and given the qualifier *lék*. This is an indication of the fact that in Czech lexicography, selected terms originally found in the Bible were equally left uncensored.

It is worth noting here that the Bulgarian term *мъжеложец* and the Czech *samcoložník/mužoložník* are calques of the Greek *αρσενοκοίτης*, used notably in Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians 6:9. The Christian categorization of homosexuality as *abomination* (cz. *mrzkost*, bg. *мръсотия*) and *ignominy* (cz. *ohavnost*, bg. *знущота*) (Leviticus 18:22) did not find reflection in socialist lexicography.

One expression of the Christian order among vocabulary relating to homosexual people and registered in Czech dictionaries distributed and used in the socialist period, is the lexeme *buzerant* 'faggot', qualified as vulgar. As posited by Jiří Rejzek (2001), the lexeme might be a borrowing from Northern Italian (*buzerada*), borrowed into Czech from German (*buserant* also denoting a homosexual man). The word *buzerada* 'sodomite' is derived from the late Latin *būgeru(m)*, *bulgaru(m)* 'Bulgarian', a member of the medieval religious movement, the Bogomils. The promiscuity of a "sodomite" was associated with heresy (cf. Rejzek 2001). We can see an opposition of good and evil based on the criterion of being (or not) of Christian faith, and thus engaging (or not) in heterosexual sex. A derivative of *buzerant* can be seen in the vulgar lexeme *buzna* 'faggot, fairy', among others.

All the sources analyzed registered native items derived from the **vrt-* root: in Czech: *zvrácenost* and the Bulgarian *извратен* 'deviant', *извращение* 'deviation', understood as deviance from the straight path, or going astray. As mentioned before, in the Bulgarian context the substantive *извращение* was coined as the main element hyperonymous term of *хомосексуализъм* in the collocation *полови извращения* 'sexual deviation'. The Czech word *zvrácenost* (along with its synonym *zvrhlost*) can be found in definitions (SSJČ) of the following terms: *masochismus* 'masochism', *nekrofilie* 'necrophilia', *perverse* 'perversion', *sadismus* 'sadism', *sodomita* 'sodomite'. It is not, however, indicated to be a hyperonym to the lexemes

homosexualita/homosexualismus in the following dictionaries: the PSJČ, SSJČ, SJČ, and the SSČ. In the “Newspaper readers’ dictionary of foreign words, acronyms, journalist code, pseudonyms, and magazines” (*Slovník cizích slov, zkratek, novinářských šifer, pseudonymů a časopisů pro čtenáře novin*, Karl Tauš) from 1946, homosexuality is defined with a synonymic expression including the word *zvrácenost*, cf. *pohlavní náklonnost k témuž pohlaví, pohlavní zřůdnost, zvrácenost* ‘sexual attraction towards the same sex, sexual aberration/monstrosity, perversion’.

The lexeme *zvrácenost* is also used in the PSJČ’s exemplification of *chlapcomilství*, defined by its synonym *pederastie* ‘pederasty’. There however, the item was defined as *smilstvo muže s mužem* ‘debauchery of a man with a man’.

In the dictionary explication of the Bulgarian adjective *извратен* foregrounds the trait of ‘deviance from the social/moral norm’: *за човек – който е с порочни, противоестествени наклонности, който се отклонява от здравата нравственост* ‘about a person who has bad and unnatural propensities, who deviates from healthy morality’ (БТР). This is to be understood as a ‘deviation from the socialist sexual morality’ – this interpretation is corroborated by a number of autobiographic narratives of homosexual people repressed at the time (cf. Попова 2009).

In Czech dictionaries, the definition of the adjective *zvrácený* whose derivate is the lexeme *zvrácenost*, found in the PSJČ *takový, který má obrácenou polohu než obyčejně, vyvrácený* – ‘that which is inverted, upturned or reversed’ (...) and *takový, který se odchyluje od pravidelnosti, obvyklosti; nepřírozený, zvrhlý, zvl. pohlavně* ‘that which deviates from what is regular and ordinary; unnatural, perverse, esp. sexually’. In the later issued SSJČ – the word *zvrácenost* is defined by synonyms *zvrhlost, perverse*, while the adjective *zvrácený* is defined, when relating to a person, by the following list of adjectives denoting perversion and monstrosity, e.g. *úchylný, zřůdný, perverzní, zvrhlý*. These adjectives have their derived substantives used to denote ‘perverts’, e.g. *úchyl, zřůda, zvrhlík, zvráčenec*. Gathered testimonies and/or memoirs of Czech homosexual men testify to the fact that this was indeed how they were perceived under socialism. Markéta Bernatt–Reszczyńska cites the word *úchylové* ‘deviants’ used in this context in quotation marks, which further indicates that this was indeed one of the terms used to refer to homosexual people in the period in

question. In the encyclopedic entry for *homosexualismus*, depending upon the age of the partners the following types of “homosexuals” are recognized: *efebofil, pedofil, androfil* (MČE 1985: 819).

In dictionary definitions, the adjectives *perverzni* and *перверзен/перверсен* and the substantives *perverse* and *перверзия/перверсия* are frequently indicated as synonyms of terms relating to homosexuality. According to encyclopedic data from the Bulgarian 1936 source, the Latin-borrowed adjective *перверсен* denotes *развратен, полово извратен* ‘promiscuous, sexually perverse’. Text resources describing the situation of homosexual persons in Bulgaria in the 1950s feature expressions such as *индивиди с развратно поведение* ‘individuals engaging in a promiscuous lifestyle’. The definition of the categorizing adjective *развратен* ‘promiscuous’ in the БТР dictionary clearly situates the object within the field of moral anti-values: *който живее в разврат, покварен, безпътен, безнравствен* ‘someone who lives a life of debauchery, morally corrupt, immoral’.

It is worth noting here that until 1961 the Czech Penal Code provided for imprisonment for homosexuality. This law was repealed in 1961; however, sexual intercourse with a member of the same sex was legal for persons older than 18, as opposed to sexual intercourse with a member of the opposite sex/gender, which was legal at 15 years of age. The provisions were changed only after 1990 (Stehlíková, Procházka, Hromada 1995). This information is also included in the Czechoslovak encyclopedia (MČE), in the entry under *homosexualita*.

The categorization of homosexual behaviors as a punishable ‘moral evil’ and ‘social evil’ is reflected in the Bulgarian encyclopedic definition from 1936 (БЕ–БД):

Педерастия: [...]. Днес в някои държави (Германия, Англия, Австрия, Унгария и др.) педерастията се преследва със строги наказания; във Франция и други страни тя не съставя престъпление, но се смята като позорно деяние.

‘Currently in some countries (Germany, England, Austria, Hungary etc.) *pederasty* is severely penalized; in France and other countries it is deemed abominable behavior, but is not considered a crime.’

The encyclopedia suggests that in the 1930s the homosexual minority in Bulgaria was either not persecuted for their preferences, or penalties were not severe. In practice, until 1951 – that is, already during the people’s republic – the 1896 Penal Code was in force, one which provided for three months’ imprisonment for a homosexual act between adult men. However, communist legislation (Criminal law 1951) later toughened these penalties to as long as three years of prison. Homosexual people became victims of repression, classified as criminals along with various kinds of repeat offenders. Bulgarian lexicography does not explicitly reflect this, with the exception of a concise remark in the encyclopedic entry *полови извращения*: [...] *някои П.и. са наказуеми* ‘certain sexual deviations are penalized’.

A homosexual person is not directly portrayed as someone who transgresses moral norms in Czech or Bulgarian lexicography. The categorization presented in our analysis becomes manifest in relations of paradigmatic terms, with the explication of hyperonyms – this is more evident in Bulgarian dictionaries than in Czech dictionaries, but equally visible both Czech and Bulgarian encyclopedias.

Category of affective value: ‘pleasure (in relation to others) – ‘lack of pleasure (from relationships with others)’: ‘homosexual person feels x’, ‘homosexuality as affect and/or relationship’

The typology of values proposed by Jadwiga Puzynina which serves as basis for our analysis of dictionary sourced data, the category of affective values comprises diverse phenomena related to feelings, relationships with others (i.e. members of family and/or community), as well as experiences of sexual pleasure. Puzynina allocates the following items under this category: *sex, amorous relations, love, lovemaking, lover*; that is, lexemes with ‘experiencing (sexual) pleasure’ as their definitive trait (Puzynina 1992: 169–176). The major part of denotations relating to homosexuality include the element of ‘(sexual) attraction’ or ‘sexual relation’ in their definitia, cf. definitions in the БТР, PSJČ, SSJČ:

homosexualita: pohlavní náklonnost k osobám téhož pohlaví ‘med. sexual attraction towards the same sex’ (PSJČ, SSJČ, SJČ, SSČ);

лесбийка: жена, която проявява полово влечение към друга жена ‘a woman who exhibits sexual attraction towards another woman’;

лесбийство: хомосексуална полова връзка, полови отношения между жени ‘homosexual relationship, sexual relations between women’;

педерастия: 1. *противоестествена полова връзка между мъж и малко момче*. 2. *хомосексуална полова връзка, полови отношения между мъже; мъжеложество* ‘1. an unnatural sexual relationship between a man and a boy. 2. a homosexual relationship, sexual relations between men’;

хомосексуален: *който проявява сексуално влечение към лица от същия пол или е свързан с проява на такова влечение* ‘a person who exhibits sexual attraction towards persons of the same sex, or is connected to exhibiting such attraction’;

хомосексуализъм: (*извратно, противоестествено*) *сексуално влечение към лица от същия пол* ‘(perverse, unnatural) sexual attraction towards members of the same sex’ (БТР).

In the field of the affective aspect, a clear difference is seen in how male and female homosexuality are perceived, and thus, defined: only female homosexuality, i.e. lesbian relationships, are categorized as ‘love’. The Bulgarian РЧДБЕ dictionary attributes a name of a higher feeling *любов* ‘love’ to a superordinate category, paradoxically linking it to ‘suffering’, which is a reflection of the predominantly negative attitudes and public sentiment towards the phenomenon in question. The entry also registers the idiomatic expression *лесбийска любов* which could have impacted the developed definition to some extent.

It is worth emphasizing that the dictionary sourced data analyzed and commented upon here, with few exceptions, generally relate to male homosexuality. Homosexuality in women is noted in a small number of entries in Bulgarian sources: *лесбийка*, *лесбийство*, *лесбийски* (БТР and РЧДБЕ), *трибадия* (РЧДБЕ). Only the entry for *хомосексуалист* includes the feminine form of *ж.р. хомосексуалистка* under the subordinate definition of *лице, което страда от хомосексуализъм* ‘a person who suffers from homosexuality’ (РЧДБЕ). This disparity in the linguistic representation of homosexuality in men and in women is raised by Michail Gruev who attributes it to the lack of sources depicting lesbian relations in the period on the one hand, and minor social significance on the other. Gruev emphasizes that medical science acknowledge a far lower ratio of “deviance” among women, which is an additional factor in marginalization (Груев 2009).

Czech dictionaries display a significant difference between the ways in which homosexuality in men and in women is defined. In definitions relating to female homosexuality, the affective component is foregrounded more frequently than the sexual; often the physical aspect of the relationship remains unmentioned:

lesbismus: *lesbická láska* ‘lesbian love’ PSJČ, same in SSČ;

sapfismus med. *ženská homosexuální láska*; *sapfická, lesbická láska* ‘sapphism, med. female homosexual love; sapphic, lesbian love’ (SSJČ);

tribadie tribadismus med. *řidč. ženská homosexuální láska*; *lesbická láska* ‘tribadism’ med. less common: female homosexual love; sapphic, lesbian love’;

lesbická láska: *pohlavní láska mezi ženami* ‘lesbian love: sexual love between women’ (SJČ);

lesbičanka: *pěstitelka lesbické lásky* ‘a person who cultivates lesbian love’ (SJČ);

sapfismus LĚK ukájení pohlavního pudu mezi dvěma ženami, lesbická láska ‘satisfaction of sexual attraction between two women, lesbian love’. PSJČ

Note that the sole lexeme denoting male homosexuality defined in terms of love, albeit unhealthy, is the item *pederastie* in the SJČ: *chorobná láska muže k muži* ‘morbid love of a man for a man’.

Both in Bulgarian and Czech lexicography, homosexuality is thus presented predominantly in terms of sexual attraction, with the exception of definitions of some lexemes referring to female homosexuality, in which the relationship is represented foregrounding the affective aspect.

Category of utilitarian values: ‘usefulness’ – ‘uselessness’: ‘homosexual people are useless for others’, ‘homosexuality is socially useless’

Categorization resulting from valorizing homosexuality in terms of usefulness in a socialist society is indicated in research based on normative documents of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria. Gergana Popova provides the following important facts:

On January 11th, 1945, a law called *Ordinance 8* was issued and signed by the Minister of Internal Affairs Anton Yugov, one which endorsed the creation of correctional labor camps. Among the people sentenced to be

placed there, along criminal repeat offenders, were prostitutes, pimps, beggars, vagabonds, and homosexuals who had been qualified as “idle”.

In [colonies for the “idle”] Lovech and Skravena they were isolated from the larger society as so-called “delinquents”, singled out as a potentially dangerous social group of the 1950s: thieves, crooks, drunkards, lechers, and “other incorrigible factors who are to be sent indefinitely and without due process, to be corrected in the harshest of conditions.” (Попова 2009)

This treatment of homosexual people in Bulgaria is evidenced by a rather comprehensive (for a dictionary of foreign words) definition under the categorizing superordinate term of ‘delinquent’:

хулиган: 1. Човек, който има грубо, отрицателно, подигравателно и скандално поведение към утвърдени морални и културни ценности. 2. Човек с престъпни наклонности от политическо гледище, който е против народните борби за по-добър живот; декласиран тип. (Г. Димитров, В. Коларов).

‘1. A person exhibiting an arrogant, negative, derisive, and scandalizing attitude towards the established moral and cultural values. 2. A person of criminal propensities in political terms, one who opposes the nation’s struggle for a better life; the outclassed type. (G. Dimitrov, V. Kolarov).’ (РЧДБЕ)

Substitution techniques allow for a recreation of the underlying value judgment backed (as evidenced here) by views promoted by Bulgarian communist leaders: ‘a homosexual person does not share the nation’s values; does not contribute to the socialist prosperity of others; is not useful/beneficial’.

Czech lexicographic and encyclopedic sources lack definitions which would categorize a homosexual person as a useless member of society. Nevertheless, occasional mentions of homosexual people place them in the same rank as persons of “questionable social usefulness”:

Po dobu prvního týdne vězení jsou vehnáni do cel spolu s prostými zločinci, narkomany, homosexuály a blázny.

‘During the first week of imprisonment, they are locked in prison cells along with common criminals, drug addicts, homosexuals, and madmen.’
(Totalita: Rudé právo corpus, 20 Jun 1969)

Moreover, memoirs and testimony left by some Czech homosexual people (Bernatt-Reszczyńska 2019, 2021), show that they were held in contempt in numerous areas of social life, which resulted in frequent layoffs from work, thus rendering these individuals actually redundant or irrelevant in terms of social contribution. This was also the case in political settlements, as illustrated by the notorious case of general Alexij Čepička (Erban 2015), removed from political circles following a set-up orchestrated by special services to obtain proof of his homosexuality.

Categorizing homosexual people as a socially redundant group becomes visible in Bulgarian lexicography only when adequate procedures of semantic analysis are applied. Czech dictionaries lack material which would yield such an image of the group in question. Memoirs and testimonies, however, suggest that rendering a person useless or irrelevant by depriving them of work was among the main forms of repression directed at homosexual persons.

Conclusion

Our research shows that lexicography in Czechia/Czechoslovakia and in Bulgaria in the years 1945–1989, developed in compliance with the doctrinal ideology of communism, described homosexuality in minimizing and stigmatizing ways. The scarce dictionary and encyclopedia entries devoted to homosexual people, registered a negative attitude and sentiment: deviance from the moral and natural norm was taken for a non-negotiable definitive trait of the nomenclature in question.

Noteworthy is the fact that this discriminatory view of homosexuality was shaped by available information and the traditional approach to describing a phenomenon which had been negatively viewed, and even penalized, for centuries. In the course of our analysis, we distinguished four types of categorization of homosexual people according to values of four kinds: 1) vital, 2) moral, 3) affective, and 4) utilitarian. These categories actualize such underlying (cognitive) informal and/or expert domains as: the domain of action, of the body and physical contact, that of social relations,

and that of valorizing (in terms of good/evil). It was concluded that the key cognitive operation, i.e. that of referring phenomena and their names to a specific norm, is not only time-dependent and informed by state-of-the-art knowledge or available information in a given society but is also dependent of the current political regime and its governing methods. The negative lexicographic depiction of homosexuality correlated with numerous repressive practices which homosexual people had to face under socialism, i.a. ostracism and layoffs from work and employment.

Bibliography:

- ASSČ – *Akademický slovník současné češtiny*, [online] (2017–2023). Praha: Ústav pro jazyk český AV ČR, v. v. i. Cit. 23. 11. 2023. <https://slovníkcestiny.cz> [19 XI 2023].
- Bernatt–Reszczyńska, M. (2019). *Socialistický člověk nemůže být homosexuál. Tabu, které pomáhalo StB vydírat lidi*, <https://zpravy.aktualne.cz/domaci/socialisticky-clovek-nemuze-byt-homosexual-tabu-ktere-pomaha/r~4decb-2007d0311ebb2f60cc47ab5f122/> [19 XI 2023].
- Bernatt–Reszczyńska, M. (2021). *Homosexuálové čelili za socialismu opovržení a vyhazovům z práce*, <https://www.pametnaroda.cz/cs/magazin/pribehy/homosexualove-celili-za-socialismu-opovrzeni-vyhazovum-z-prace> [19 XI 2023].
- Dvořáčková, V. (2011). *Osudy Ústavu pro jazyk český Dějiny ÚJČ ČSAV a jeho předchůdců ve světle archivních pramenů*, Praha: ÚJČ AV ČR, v.v.i.
- Erban, O. (2015). *Život gayů v Československu*, <https://www.vice.com/cs/article/jpx9ay/zivot-gayu-za-komunismu-v-cechach> [19 XI 2023].
- IES – *Ilustrovaný encyklopedický slovník* (1984–1987). Praha: Academia.
- KLA – Kartotéka lexikálního archivu (1911–1991), https://ujc.avcr.cz/elektronicke-slovniky-a-zdroje/kartoteka_lexikalniho_archivu.html [19 XI 2023].
- MČE – *Malá československá encyklopedie* (1984–1987). Praha: Academia.
- Niebrzegowska–Bartmińska, S. (2018). *O różnych wariantach definicji leksykograficznej – od taksonomii do kognitywizmu*. „Etnolingwistyka” 30, 2018, 259–284.
- Nowak, T. (2020). *Język ukrycia. Zapisany socjolekt gejów*. Kraków: Universitas.
- NSČ1 – Martincová, O. (red.) (1998). *Nová slova v češtině. Slovník neologizmů 1*, Praha: Academia.
- NSČ2 – Martincová, O. (red.) (2004). *Nová slova v češtině. Slovník neologizmů 2*, Praha: Academia.

- PSJČ – Hujer, O.; Smetánka, E.; Weingart, M.; Havránek, B.; Šmilauer, V.; Ziskal, A. (red.) (1935–1957). *Průruční slovník jazyka českého*, Praha: Státní nakladatelství.
- Puzynina, J. (1992). *Język wartości*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Rejzek, J. (2001). *Český etymologický slovník*, Voznice: LEDA.
- SCS – Tauš, K. (1946). *Slovník cizích slov, zkratek, novinářských šifer, pseudonymů a časopisů pro čtenáře novin*, Blansko: Karel Jelínek.
- SJČ – Trávníček, F. (1952). *Slovník jazyka českého*, Praha: Slovanské nakladatelství.
- Skoumalová, H.; Bartoň, T.; Cvrček, V.; Hnátková, M.; Kocek, J. (2010). *Totalita: korpus jazyka komunistické totality*. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Praha, <http://www.korpus.cz> [19 XI 2023].
- SSČ – Filipец, J.; Daneš, F. (red.) (1978). *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost*, Praha: Academia 1978.
- SSJČ – Havránek, B. (1960–1971). *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého*, Praha: Academia.
- Stanley, J. (2004). *Report: Poland and neighboring countries*, http://www.glbqtarchive.com/ssh/poland_S.pdf [19 XI 2023].
- Stehlíková, Dž.; Procházková, I.; Hromada, J. (1995). *Homosexualita, společnost, AIDS v ČR*, Praha: Sdružení organizací homosexuálních občanů (SOHO) v České republice.
- Taylor, J. R. (2001). *Kategoryzacja w języku*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Tomasik, K. (2012). *Gejerel. Mniejszości seksualne w PRL-u*, Warszawa: Krytyka Polityczna.
- Žáčková, A. (2010). *Prezentace „podivného“ v české kultuře a festival Mezipatra*, <https://is.muni.cz/th/vwtlc/?id=121273> [19 XI 2023].
- Армянов, Г. (1993). *Речник на българския жаргон*, София: 7М + Логис.
- БЕ – Данчов, Н. Г.; Данчов, И. Г. (1936) *Българска Енциклопедия. А – ж*, София: Книгоиздателство Ст. Атанасовъ.
- БТР – Андрейчин, Л.; Георгиев, Л.; Илчев, Ст.; Леков, Ив. (1955, 1963, 1973, 1995). *Български тълковен речник*, София: Наука и изкуство.
- Груев, М. (2009): *Комунизъм и хомосексуализъм в България (1944–1989 г.)*, „Либерален преглед“, <https://www.librev.com/index.php/discussion-bulgaria-publisher/762-19441989> [20 XII 2023].
- КБЕ – *Кратка българска енциклопедия* (1963–1969), Авторски колектив, София: Издателство на БАН.
- Пернишка, Е. (2016). *Развитие и облик на българската лексикология през последните 70 години (кратък обзор)*. В: Лексикографията в началото на XXI в. Доклади от Седмата международна конференция по лексикография и лексикология (София, 15–16 октомври 2015), София: Издателство на БАН „Проф. Марин Дринов“, 17–29.

- Попова, Г. (2009). *Забраненият език – от дискурсивното обезличаване до фактическата асимилация на хомосексуалните в България в периода 1945–1989 г.*, <https://notabene-bg.org/read.php?id=13&fbclid=IwAR0LA2bh2SgWMgIsGplXkv03WmPefGEY0X4cR9rLBDfj-bhWeMgVK-fQoubA> [20 XII 2023].
- РЧДБЕ – Милев, А.; Братков, Й.; Николов, Б. (1964, 1978, 1982). *Речник на чуждите думи в българския език*, София: Наука и изкуство.

Transliteration

- Armīanov, G. (1993). *Rechnik na bŭlgarskiĭa zhargon*, Sofiĭa: 7M + Logis.
- BE – Dančov, N. G.; Dančov, I. G. (1936) *Bŭlgarska Entsiklopediĭa*. A – ж, Sofiĭa: Knigoizdatelstvo St. Atanasov.
- BTR – Andreĭchin, L.; Georgiev, L.; Ilchev, St.; Lekov, Iv. (1955, 1963, 1973, 1995). *Bŭlgarski tŭlkoven rechnik*, Sofiĭa: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Gruev, M. (2009): *Komunizŭm i khomoseksualizŭm v Bŭlgariĭa (1944–1989 g.)*, „Liberalen pregled”, <https://www.librev.com/index.php/discussion-bulgaria-publisher/762-19441989> [20 XII 2023]
- KBE – *Kratka bŭlgarska entsiklopediĭa (1963–1969)*, Avtorski kolektiv, Sofiĭa: Izdatelstvo na BAN.
- Pernishka, E. (2016). *Razvitie i oblik na bŭlgarskata leksikologiĭa prez poslednite 70 godini (kratŭk obzor)*. In: *Leksikografiĭata v nachaloto na XXI v. Dokladi ot Sedmata mezhdunarodna konferentsiĭa po leksikografiĭa i leksikologiĭa (Sofiĭa, 15–16 oktombri 2015)*, Sofiĭa: Izdatelstvo na BAN „Prof. Marin Drinov“, 17–29.
- Popova, G. (2009). *Zabraneniĭat ezik – ot diskursivnoto obezlichavane do fakticheskata asimilatsiĭa na khomoseksualnite v Bŭlgariĭa v perioda 1945--1989 g.*, <https://notabene-bg.org/read.php?id=13&fbclid=IwAR0LA2bh2SgWMgIsGplXkv03WmPefGEY0X4cR9rLBDfj-bhWeMgVKfQoubA> [20 XII 2023]
- RChDBE – Милев, А.; Братков, Й.; Николов, Б. (1964, 1978, 1982). *Rechnik na chuzhdite dumi v bŭlgarskiĭa ezik*, Sofiĭa: Nauka i izkustvo.

Note:

This article was created with equal (50%) participation of both authors in conceptual work, excerption of material, and analysis development.

Summary

The article is devoted to vocabulary and expressions referring to homosexuality, used in dictionary and encyclopedic entries. The material analyzed was that included in Czechoslovak and Bulgarian lexicographic resources published in the socialist era. The research focused on relations between hyperonymous and synonymic terms as well as systems of references used in the dictionaries and encyclopedias examined. For the sake of analysis, the authors distinguish four types of categorization applied to homosexual people according to the following values: 1) vital, 2) moral, 3) affective, and 4) utilitarian. These categories actualize specific underlying (cognitive) informal and/or expert domains. It was concluded that the key cognitive operation, i.e. that of referring phenomena and their names to a specific norm, is not only time-dependent and informed by state-of-the-art knowledge or available information in a given society, but also dependent of the current political regime and its governing methods.

Iliana Genew–Puhalewa, Assistant Professor at the Institute of Western and Southern Slavic Studies, Faculty of Polish Studies, University of Warsaw. Her main areas of interest are contrastive and applied linguistics, terminology studies, ethnolinguistics, and axio-linguistics.

e-mail: i.genew-puhalewa@uw.edu.pl

Milena Hebal–Jeziarska, Assistant Professor at the Institute of Western and Southern Slavic Studies, Faculty of Polish Studies, University of Warsaw. Her main research focus is on contrastive and corpus linguistics.

e-mail: m.hebal-jeziarska@uw.edu.pl