Jana Davidová Glogarová (Ostrava) – Jaroslav David (Ostrava)

THEMATIZATION OF PLACE NAMES IN OPINION JOURNALISM: CZECH EXILE POLITICIANS' RADIO SPEECHES BETWEEN 1938 AND 1945[1]

This text focuses on place names and their thematization in Czech opinion journalism in the mid-20th century. After describing general features of the thematization of proper names and the ways in which this process is accomplished – i.e. (re-)semantization through the use of collocations, onymic allusions, and symbolization –, the authors turn their attention to a qualitative textual analysis of political speeches. The collection consists of radio speeches given by exiled Czech politicians based in London and Moscow during the Second World War. The texts reflect a broad spectrum of Czech politicians, ranging from democrats (Edvard Beneš, Prokop Drtina, Jan Masaryk, Jaroslav Stránský, Jan Šrámek) to Communists and their sympathizers (Zdeněk Fierlinger, Klement Gottwald, Zdeněk Nejedlý).

Keywords
place names; thematization; collocations; semantics; political discourse; radio speeches; opinion journalism; Czech exile

1. Thematization – defining the term

The term *thematization* is currently used not only in Czech media discourse (in the form *tematizace*) but also in linguistics and literary theory. However, the term is understood differently in each of these disciplines. In linguistics, *thematization* (the term *topicalization* is also used) denotes the selection of linguistic elements which form the thematic part of an utterance (the topic) – i.e. information which is given and contextually bound, as opposed to the rhematic part of the utterance (the focus) – i.e. new information (Thompson, 2006; Svoboda – Nekula, 2016). In literary criticism (which may examine, e.g. the *thematization of the mother-child relationship* or the *thematization of love*, *war*, *youth*, *women*, *time*, etc.), the expression refers to an issue or phenomenon which becomes the theme (the central idea) of a higher-order entity – i.e. a particular text (cf. Peterka, 1984, p. 377; Lautenbach, 2006; Lubkoll, 2006, p. 530).

The linguistic concept of thematization can be aptly illustrated by an example taken from a monograph by František Daneš, who gave the following commentary on the structure of a specific text (of which only a selected part is quoted here):

[1] We thank the anonymous reviewers for their careful reading of our manuscript and their many insightful comments and suggestions.

"democracy is a worldview; (4) it is based on trust in humans, humanity, and the human race, (5) and there is no trust without love, (6) and there is no love without trust (7)".[2] Daneš analyzes this text as follows: "utterance (5) thematizes one element of the preceding R4 ('trust'), and utterance (6) thematizes R5 ('love') in a highly interesting and stylistically skillful manner" (Daneš, 2009, p. 466). The linguistic concept of thematization thus concerns individual linguistic units. It is an explicit, directly observable concept – a specific thematized unit (word, phrase, etc.) occupies the thematic position within the utterance, and in semantic terms, this thematized unit is determined by the lexical meaning of the linguistic unit(s) of which it consists. Furthermore, it has to be mentioned that there is a difference between the thematization process from the perspective of the sentence and the utterance. In the textual context, any sentence can be expressed through the different structures of utterances with the same structure of sentence (cf. Daneš, 1968, p. 127; Karlík, 2016).

The literary theory concept of thematization is not primarily based on specific linguistic means of expression. One could even go so far as to state that if a *woman* (or the idea of woman) is thematized in a poem, it is not actually necessary to use the word *woman* (in its basic lexical meaning of 'a person of female sex'), or its synonym, in it. Thematic words – viewed by quantitative linguistics as the basic units in the text thematic concentration (TC) count – may not necessarily express the actual theme of the text – i.e. "what the text is about", as perceived by the reader or as intended by the author; instead, in the text, "it is possible to identify language units that can be regarded as the baerers of topic or topics […]; the measure of aiming at the topic or topics can be detected by the analysis of the frequency features of the text […]; the measure of the author's aiming at the topic or topics is not random, i.e. it is supposed to behave systematically in comparison with other text features and also pragmatic ones" (Čech, 2016, p. 3; cf. David – Čech – Davidová Glogarová et al., 2013).

In the paper, we focus on the thematization of proper names, specifically toponyms (place names). We describe the ways in which such names are thematized in texts of opinion journalism – in political speeches from a particular period. Our aim is to describe how the proper names used in the speeches perform other functions than solely the referential one, and in which way they take part in expressing and supporting the text focus. In the study, the *thematization of place names* is understood predominantly in the literary theory sense, as the process when the place names references to the geographical objects are weakening in favour of their evaluative, symbolic, comparative, metonymic, and metaphorical usages;

[2] The texts published originally in Czech were translated into English by Christopher James Hopkinson (Department of English and American Studies, Faculty of Arts, University of Ostrava).

these usages are formally expressed through their "unusual" collocations, and also through their etymologies, interpretations, and language puns (see part 3). Our analysis of toponyms focuses not only on the connection between their formal and semantic components, but also on the extent to which the toponyms reflect the purposes of the analyzed texts – especially with regard to the ideological tendencies exemplified by the texts.

2. Description of the analyzed material

After the signature of the Munich Treaty in September 1938, Czechoslovakia lost its border regions (the Sudetenland) to Germany. The resulting state – "rump" Czechoslovakia, officially the Czecho-Slovak Republic (also known as the Second Republic) – had a restricted form of the democratic government. This state ceased to exist in March 1939, when it split into the independent Slovak State and the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia (the Czech part of the country, which was subject to German rule). This situation lasted until the restoration of Czechoslovakia's independence in 1945. During this period, many Czech politicians lived in exile abroad, focusing their efforts on restoring the independent Czechoslovak state. The main centres of the Czech exile were London (the seat of Czechoslovakia's government-in-exile headed by the President Edvard Beneš) and Moscow (the centre of the Communist resistance movement). Both centres made use of radio broadcasts as a way of maintaining contact with the people back in Czechoslovakia.

The material used for this study of the thematization of toponyms consists of the written versions (published in book form) of radio speeches given by Czech politicians who were active in exile (either in London or Moscow) during the 1938–1945 period. The first Czech language broadcast by the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) was given on 6th September 1939,[3] two days later followed by the first one in the regular series of broadcasts by the exile government's foreign minister, Jan Masaryk. The broadcasts eventually evolved to include daily news bulletins, talks on topics of current relevance, a weekly speech by Jan Masaryk (every Wednesday), a weekly political commentary (every Thursday), and a weekly summary of progress in the war (every Saturday) [cf. Beránek, 2012, pp. 87–93; Kocourek, 2013, pp. 16–47; Koutek, 2014]. Radio Moscow had already launched their Czech language broadcasting in December 1932 and when Czechoslovakia faced the most acute threat to its existence (in 1938–1939), Moscow's Czech broadcasts lasted for up to 90 minutes a day. After the signature of the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact, this Czech language broadcasting became entirely subjugated

[3] The broadcast featured the social democrat Josef Kosina reading a statement by the Labour Party politician Arthur Greenwood (Koutek, 2014, p. 31).

to the interests of the Soviet Union. This situation lasted until the German attack on the USSR in summer 1941 (Křesťan, 2014, pp. 18–22), after which broadcasts from both Moscow and London became an important platform enabling Czech exile politicians to present themselves (cf. Ježek – Šebánek, 1967, pp. 114–117; Křesťan, 2014).

When the war ended, the radio speeches broadcast by Czech politicians in London and Moscow were published in Czechoslovakia in book form[4] – either as a part of the editions of the authors' collected works (Edvard Beneš, 1946; Klement Gottwald, 1946; Jan Šrámek, 1945), or as printed volumes consisting entirely of their radio speeches (Prokop Drtina, 1945; Zdeněk Fierlinger, 1946; Zdeněk Nejedlý, 1977; Jan Masaryk, 1946; Jaroslav Stránský, 1945).

The speeches, qualitatively analyzed for this study, can be described as ideological in the sense that ideology can be characterized as the presentation of selected points of view (cf. Eagleton, 2007; Švéda, 2013; Davidová Glogarová – David, 2017, pp. 34–38), with a strong emphasis on the persuasive or propagandistic functions. The texts form a homogeneous set; their central idea (which is present across the entire political spectrum) was the struggle against Nazi Germany and/or Fascist Italy, their satellite states, and collaborators in Czechoslovakia itself. All the authors shared the same basic stance on this matter; none of them was prepared to countenance a solution other than the total defeat of Nazism and Fascism. However, apart from this basic unifying stance, the texts encompass a wide range of political standpoints, as their authors were either members of or sympathizers with several pre-war political parties (the National Socialist Party – Edvard Beneš, Prokop Drtina, Jaroslav Stránský; the People's Party (Christian Democratic) – Jan Šrámek; the Social Democratic Party – Zdeněk Fierlinger; the Communist Party – Klement Gottwald, Zdeněk Nejedlý; Jan Masaryk was not aligned to any particular party). We expect that the political diversity of the authors will be reflected in certain differences among the texts; at the centre of our interest, there is the thematization of toponyms, e.g. the ways whereby the texts attach modifying elements to toponyms such as *the Soviet Union*, *Moscow*, *Germany*, etc.

3. Thematization of toponyms

Toponyms are used in communication primarily to refer to a specific geographical object or location – e.g. something happened *in Prague*, they travelled *from Ostrava to Prague*. Toponyms thus perform three functions – individualization, differentiation, and reference to an object (Šrámek, 1999, p. 23; Hladká – Nekula,

[4] The authors of the article are aware of the specificity and differences between spoken texts and their written records. However, it is only the written versions ('literarized / transcribed') of radio speeches given by exiled Czech politicians what is analyzed here.

2016, p. 1994). Their basic, "usual" collocations in Czech are either with prepositions (e.g. *v Praze* ['in Prague'], *z Ostravy* ['from Ostrava']) or without prepositions (e.g. when accompanying a date, as in *Ostrava 31. 08. 2015*) [cf. David, 2013; David, 2014].

When analyzing the collocations of thematized toponyms, the toponym itself "usually" occupies position 0. In Czech, position -1 is most frequently occupied by a preposition (or remains unoccupied). However, if positions -1/+1 are "unusually" occupied by modifiers syntactically dependent on the toponym (in pre- or postposition) – e.g. *černá Ostrava* ('black Ostrava'), *rudé Kladno* ('red Kladno') –, or by verbs denoting activities only performed by animate agents – e.g. *Praha bojovala proti okupantům* ('Prague fought against the occupiers' – personification, synecdoche) – then the toponym no longer functions solely as a means of localization; such structures thematize the toponym in the broad sense of the word. The proprial semantic content of the toponym *Ostrava* includes elements such as 'the city at the confluence of the Odra and Ostravice rivers, the capital city of the Moravian-Silesian Region, industrial centre, location of the University of Ostrava', and so on. The phrase *black Ostrava* selects from these elements those which emphasize the industrial character of the location (coal mining and heavy industry in general), and also environmental pollution. Likewise, the phrase *red Kladno* accentuates the strong left-wing traditions of this industrial town. The clause *Prague fought against the occupiers* means that the city's people (not the city itself) did the fighting.

Toponyms in a text can be thematized in various ways, although from the semantic perspective the process always involves (re)semantization. In general terms, (re)semantization denotes a change or strengthening of the conceptual/notional component of the meaning of a lexeme (cf. desemantization; Hladká 2016). If the thematized lexeme is a toponym, it therefore undergoes (re)semantization either at the level of its proprial meaning, or at that of its appellative base. (Re)semantization can take place in various ways. The most basic way is *(re)semantization proper*, which takes place via non-prepositional (most frequently adjectival) collocations, similes, appellativization, personification or changes in grammatical categories modifying the proprial meaning of the toponym. At a higher textual level, (re)semantization may take place via *etymologization*, i.e. the use of the etymology (or folk etymology) of the appellative (or perceived appellative) base of the toponym, in the form of interpretations, etymologizing collocations or wordplays (cf. David – Davidová Glogarová, 2017). An example of this process is the toponym *Venezia*, or its adapted Czech form, *Benátky*. The proprial semantics of this toponym ('a northern Italian city situated on islands, well-known for its historical monuments, the centre of the Veneto region') are modified, more precisely restricted, to just one seme ('city situated on islands/water, with many canals') – in phrases such as *pražské Benátky* (i.e. 'Prague's Venice', in collocation with the adjectival

form *pražský*, meaning 'the part of Prague's historical centre with a high concentration of canals and bridges') or *Benátky severu* ('the Venice of the North', i.e. a metonymic denotation of St Petersburg, Bruges, Amsterdam or Hamburg).

The qualitative analysis of the texts of the wartime radio broadcasts reveals several means by which toponyms are thematized.

1. Emphasis was placed primarily on the names of countries involved in or affected by the war. The authors used evaluative and qualitative modifiers to attribute to the toponyms the characteristics reflecting their anti-Fascist stance and also to express their sympathy with certain Allied countries – most frequently the Soviet Union.
2. Meaning transfer occurs via metaphor and metonymy, drawing on contemporary, mythological and Biblical toponyms and onymic allusions.
3. The "toponymic image" of Czechoslovakia played a specific role in the speeches. Domestic toponyms functioned as symbols enabling the speakers to express their opposition to the occupation (e.g. their stance towards the renaming of towns and streets) or to reinvigorate their memories of the places that they had been forced to leave behind. Henceforth, the topics mentioned above are illustrated with examples taken from the analysed sources.

3.1 Collocation as an indicator and a means of (re)semantization of proper names

The most basic means by which toponyms are thematized in the analyzed radio speeches is by a change in their proprial semantics via collocations (cf. an analysis of opinion journalism in the communist daily newspaper *Rudé právo* in 1952, 1969, and 1977; David, 2014, pp. 111–125). Most frequently, the exiled politicians added adjectives to the names of countries, thus expressing their sympathy or aversion to the different parties in the conflict. A broad distinction can be made between toponyms denoting the Fascist (or collaborating) countries and the Allied countries.

Within the first group, the main focus of attention was on the toponym *Německo* ('Germany'), followed by other toponyms, including *Itálie* ('Italy'), *Španělsko* ('Spain'), *Maďarsko* ('Hungary') and *Slovensko* ('Slovakia'). The selection of the attributes to evaluate and characterize these countries was similar in all the analyzed texts. The common collocations included *nacistické/fašistické Německo* ('Nazi/Fascist Germany' – e.g. Beneš, 19 Sept. 1939, p. 38;[5] Masaryk, 8 Sept. 1939,

[5] The references denote individual speeches, identified by the date of their radio broadcast. The list of sources and literature gives details of the volumes in which the speeches were published.

p. 15; Stránský, 6 Dec. 1940, p. 85; Gottwald, 29 Jul. 1941, p. 138; Fierlinger, 1 Jul. 1943, p. 206 / Drtina, 25 Aug. 1942, p. 100; Drtina, 3 Sept. 1942, p. 106), as well as *Hitlerovo/hitlerovské Německo* ('Hitler's/Hitlerian Germany', e.g. Stránský, 27 Aug. 1940, p. 26; Stránský, 1 Nov. 1940, p. 55; Gottwald, 3 Sept. 1941, p. 140; Drtina, 22 Mar. 1942, p. 199; Nejedlý, 18 Jul. 1942, p. 74); likewise, the speeches also included the collocations *fašistická Itálie a falangistické Španělsko* ('Fascist Italy and Falangist Spain' – e.g. Stránský, 21 Mar. 1941, p. 155), *Mussoliniho/mussoliniovská Itálie* ('Mussolini's/Mussolinian Italy', Stránský, 18 Aug. 1941, p. 216; Fierlinger, 19 Mar. 1943, p. 191) and *Horthyovské Maďarsko* ('Horthy's/Horthyian Hungary', Fierlinger, 23 Mar. 1944, p. 310). In the context of the speeches, these primarily neutral modifiers – adjectival denotations of right-wing ideologies and associated dictators – acquired the semantic feature of a negative evaluation.[6] A similarly negative semantic feature (though in this case expressed explicitly) is present in the collocations *rasistické Německo* ('racist Germany', Stránský, 19 Nov. 1941, p. 266; cf., paradoxically, also *žluté Japonsko* ['yellow Japan'], compared with *bílá Anglie* ['white England'], Stránský, 20 Aug. 1940, p. 19), *zfašizované, krvelačné Německo* ('fascisticized/Fascism-infused, bloodthirsty Germany', Nejedlý, 30 Oct. 1942, p. 79), *útočné Německo* ('belligerent Germany', Stránský, 31 Jan. 1943, p. 356) or *hrozné a hanebné Německo* ('terrible and shameful Germany', Masaryk, 30 Jul. 1941, p. 155). In this first group of countries, the collocations consisting of a toponym preceded by a congruent modifier served to accentuate the unambiguous evaluation of the country, expressing the speaker's opposition to the aggressive, inhumane policies of the country. This view on Germany appeared in texts of all authors regardless of their political preferences and affiliation to the London and Moscow exile centres.

The second group of toponyms – denoting the countries in the Allied camp – also includes the hyperonym *Evropa* ('Europe'), accompanied by the adjectives *celá* ('whole, entire', e.g. Stránský, 20 Jun. 1941, p. 203; Beneš, 14 Mar. 1942, p. 97; Fierlinger, 6 Jul. 1942, p. 30; Fierlinger, 27 Nov. 1942, p. 149), or *osvobozená* ('liberated', Masaryk, 16 Jul. 1941, p. 150), as well as by the pair of contrasting adjectives *stará* ('old') and *nová* ('new', Stránský, 1 Nov. 1940, p. 60; Drtina, 10 Nov. 1940, p. 62; Šrámek, 28 Oct. 1944, p. 77); cf. also *nová, slušná Evropa* ('a new, decent Europe'), Masaryk, 9 Jul. 1941, p. 147, *celá reakční Evropa* ('the whole reactionary Europe'), Nejedlý, 6 Jul. 1939, p. 44, *celá tehdejší reakční Evropa* ('the whole reactionary Europe of that time'), Gottwald, 6 Jul. 1942, p. 177), etc. The use of the hyperonym *Evropa* reflects the speakers' Euro-centric view of the

[6] If the collocation *Hitlerovo Německo* ('Hitler's Germany') is used when describing, e.g. the aggressiveness and the despicable conduct of Germany or when condemning Hitler, the collocation thereby takes on a pejorative meaning.

conflict as well as their perception of Europe as the coalition of all the countries fighting against Nazism – which is represented primarily by the toponym *Německo* ('Germany'). In this way, the antithesis of Europe vs. Germany is created; Germany is presented as an alien element that was symbolically excluded from Europe because of its aggressive behaviour. These collocations thus express the idea of the unification of democratic forces against a common enemy and the creation of a new world order.

With regard to the frequency of toponyms, the main focus of attention in the Allied group was the Soviet Union, which occurred more frequently than toponyms denoting, e.g. the United Kingdom or the United States. In the case of the USA, a logical explanation for this is the country's relatively late entry into the war (December 1941). Even so, the Czech politicians used collocations expressing their positive attitude to the USA, e.g. *svobodná Amerika* ('free America', Masaryk, 26 May 1941, p. 134), "tři největší velmoci světa, *Anglie, Amerika a Sovětský svaz* […] materiální rezervy těchto tří gigantů" ('the three greatest world powers – *England, America, and the Soviet Union* […] the material reserves of these three giants', Gottwald, 3 Sept. 1941, p. 141), *nejmodernější a nejtechničtější světadíl, Amerika* ('the most modern and most technological continent, America', Drtina, 12 Apr. 1942, pp. 200–201), or merely *Amerika* without any modifiers; the toponym *Spojené státy* ('United States') does not occur. The same applies to the United Kingdom, cf. *dnešní Anglie* ('today's England', Stránský, 8 Oct. 1940, p. 43), *vítězná Anglie* ('victorious England', Stránský, 16 May 1941, p. 185), *liberální Anglie* ('liberal England', Šrámek, 2 Sept. 1943, p. 54), *Churchillova Anglie* ('Churchill's England', Masaryk, 21 May 1941, p. 133). However, in comparison with the collocations of the toponym *Sovětský svaz* ('Soviet Union'), the modifiers collocating with the toponym *Anglie* ('England') indicate a somewhat more reserved attitude – not only among the Moscow-based politicians, but also among the London exiles, cf. *bratrský Sovětský svaz* ('the fraternal Soviet Union',[7] Gottwald, 16 May 1942, p. 168), *velké slovanské Rusko* ('great Slavic Russia', Gottwald, 23 Jun. 1943, p. 201); *bratrské Rusko v Sovětském svazu* ('fraternal Russia in the Soviet Union', Šrámek, 1 Jan. 1944, p. 70); *přátelský a spojenecký Sovětský svaz* ('the fraternal and allied Soviet Union', Beneš, 10 Jun. 1944, p. 147); *náš velký spojenec, Sovětský svaz* ('our great ally, the Soviet Union', Drtina, 19 Jul. 1942, p. 232). The thematization of toponyms thus reflects the fact that Czech politicians felt

[7] The English translations given throughout this text deliberately stay relatively close to the wording of the original Czech texts, in order to make the semantic and syntactic structure of the original as clear as possible to readers. As a result, these translations may sometimes appear stylistically awkward (e.g. "the fraternal Soviet Union" would perhaps be more naturally expressed in English as "our brothers in the Soviet Union", or "our Soviet brothers").

a particularly strong affinity for the Soviet Union due to its military successes, the pro-Soviet stance of President Edvard Beneš, and the idea of a fraternal community of Slavic nations (an idea which held a particular appeal at the times when the nation was under threat). The hypothesis formulated at the outset of this study – i.e. that the thematization of the authors' attitude towards the USSR via toponyms would be influenced by their political affiliation – was thus not confirmed. Chrematonyms were treated by the authors in a similar manner, cf. *chrabrá Rudá armáda* ('the valorous Red Army'), *mocná Rudá armáda* ('the mighty Red Army', Gottwald, 29 Jul. 1941, p. 138); *statečná Rudá armáda* ('the brave Red Army', Nejedlý, April 1942, p. 68); *slavná, úžasná Rudá armáda* ('the glorious, wonderful Red Army', Masaryk, 28 Jul. 1943, p. 254); *vítězná Rudá armáda* ('the victorious Red Army', Beneš, 10 Jun. 1944, p. 147; Nejedlý, 6 Jul. 1944, p. 114); *osvoboditelská Rudá armáda* ('the liberating Red Army', Šrámek, 28 Oct. 1944, p. 78). The relatively reserved attitude towards the United Kingdom among the Czech politicians – even those based in London – was most probably caused by Britain's role as a signatory of the Munich Treaty in September 1938 (and persisted even after the British government eventually distanced itself from the agreement in August 1942) – and the reluctance with which London had recognized the Czechoslovak government-in-exile in July 1940.

The toponyms *Československo* / *Československá republika* ('Czechoslovakia' / 'the Czechoslovak Republic') appear most frequently in the speeches of Jan Masaryk, Zdeněk Fierlinger, and President Edvard Beneš – i.e. the leading figures of Czechoslovakia's foreign policy. These toponyms were most often used to denote the pre-war First Republic (1918–1938), or the idea of a future (restored) post-war republic. This is reflected in the toponyms used in the speeches, emphasizing the importance and value of the First Republic and the speakers' faith in its eventual restoration after Germany's defeat, when it would again become a strong, democratic, and independent state: "Půjdeme do boje za svobodu své staré vlasti a za vydobytí *své staré Československé Republiky*" ('We will enter the struggle for the freedom of our homeland and the recovery of *our old Czechoslovak Republic*', Beneš, 8. 6 1939, p. 32, also, e.g. Beneš, 27 Oct. 1944, pp. 153–154); "Bojujeme o *svobodnou Evropu*, protože pouze ve *svobodné Evropě* je možné *svobodné Československo*" ('We are fighting for *a free Europe*, because only in *a free Europe*, there can be *a free Czechoslovakia*', Masaryk, 28. 10 1939, p. 17; also, e.g. Masaryk, 13 Sept. 1943, p. 263); *nezávislé, silné, demokratické Československo* ('an independent, strong, democratic Czechoslovakia', Fierlinger, 10 Jun. 1943, p. 220). Other collocations accentuated the speakers' love for Czechoslovakia and the fact that the country "belonged" to the Czechoslovak people, e.g. *naše svobodné Československo* ('our free Czechoslovakia', Šrámek, 17 Sept. 1939, p. 13); *naše drahé Československo* ('our dear Czechoslovakia', Masaryk, 4 Jun. 1941, p. 138); "čistý zvuk jména *Československa*" ('the pure sound of the name *Czechoslovakia*',

Masaryk, 16 Feb. 1944, p. 268). Similarly, adjectives collocated with the toponyms *Hradčany* (the district of central Prague where Prague Castle – the official residence of the Czech President – is located), *Václavské náměstí* ('Wenceslas Square', in central Prague, named after the patron saint of the Czech nation and four medieval kings of Bohemia), and *Praha* ('Prague') expressed the aesthetic and symbolic values of these referents: *naše posvátné Hradčany* ('our sacred Hradčany', Beneš, 19 Sept. 1939, p. 39); *naše Václavské náměstí* ('our Wenceslas Square', Nejedlý, April 1942, p. 67); *naše krásná, drahá, stověžatá Praha* ('our beautiful, dear, hundred-spired Prague', Drtina, 20 Apr. 1941, p. 106); *zlatá Praha* ('golden Prague', Fierlinger, 3 Mar. 1943, p. 299; also, e.g. Stránský, 10 Oct. 1941, p. 273; Gottwald, 21 Jan. 1942, p. 155; Masaryk, 19 Oct. 1942, p. 196).

In the speeches, Czechoslovakia's loss of sovereignty following the Munich Treaty and the Nazi invasion are represented by the expressions *druhá republika* ('the Second Republic', i.e. "rump" Czechoslovakia after the loss of the Sudetenland) and *protektorát* (referring to the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia – the state entity through which the Nazi occupation was enacted). These expressions often collocate with the modifier *takzvaný* ('so-called') or its abbreviation *tzv.*, accentuating the illegitimate nature of these entities and emphasizing the refusal of the Czech exile politicians to accept and recognize their existence; cf. *tzv. protektorát/Protektorát* ('the so-called protectorate/Protectorate', Beneš, 19 Mar. 1939, p. 24; Beneš, 26 May 1943, p. 131; Masaryk, 6 Aug. 1944, p. 280), *tzv. druhá/Druhá republika* ('the so-called second/Second Republic', Beneš, 11 Dec. 1940, p. 166; Drtina, 31 Aug. 1941, p. 138; Masaryk, 5 Aug. 1942, p. 184; Beneš, 3 Feb. 1944, p. 264;). This collocation is also found in the phrases *tzv. Třetí říše* ('the so-called Third Reich', Beneš, 15 Mar. 1940, p. 46) and *tzv. velkoněmecká říše* ('the so-called Great German Empire' – i.e. the Großdeutsches Reich, the official designation of the Nazi state following the 1938 annexation of Austria, Gottwald, 17 Jan. 1942, p. 150). In fact, the collocation *tzv. druhá republika* ('the so-called Second Republic') can also be found in historical publications dating from the period after 1989 (e.g. Gebhart – Kuklík, 2004; Rataj, 1993; Rataj, 1997; cf. the collocation *tzv. Islámský stát*, i.e. 'the so-called Islamic State', in current journalism).

3.2 Meaning transfer via metaphor and metonymy

Another form of (re)semantization of toponyms is the metaphoric and (more frequently) metonymic transfer of meaning. Metonymy is used when mythological or Biblical toponyms are applied to real or contemporary places, or to describe contemporary situations. The toponym *Německo* ('Germany') is thus replaced by the mythical *Valhalla*, alluding to the pagan roots of the Nazi ideology, cf. "Zkáza vulgární Hitlerovy *Valhally* se neodvolatelně blíží" ('The demise of Hitler's vulgar *Valhalla* is drawing inexorably closer' Masaryk, 23 Jul. 1941, p. 155; also,

e.g. Masaryk, 29 Mar. 1944, p. 273) or the frequent Biblical toponym *Kalvárie* (‘Calvary’, e.g. Masaryk, 11 Dec. 1940, p. 81; Drtina, 19 Jul. 1942, p. 232; Stránský, 4 Jun. 1944, p. 459). Jan Masaryk also drew on the semantics of the toponyms *Blaník* (a mythical hill inside which the Czech knights led by St. Wenceslas lie sleeping, ready to defend the Czechlands) and *Tábor* (a Bohemian town that was the centre of the Hussite religious reform movement in the 15th century; the Hussite Wars were often simplistically interpreted as a Czech-German conflict), cf. “*Blaník* a *Tábor* přežijí *Valhallu*” (‘*Blaník* and *Tábor* will outlive *Valhalla*’, Masaryk, 1 Mar. 1944, p. 269); Masaryk also created the fictitious toponym *Slovanský ostrov* (‘Slavic Island’) to denote the place where the Slavs would gain their revenge over Hitler, cf. “A ještě ad vocem Smolenska, ten už byl také jednou obsazen a dobyvatel brzy nato zemřel na ostrově sv. Heleny. Pro Hitlera nebude ostrov, leč by to byl *Slovanský ostrov* a tam by se vybíralo vysoké vstupné” (‘And also with regard to Smolensk, that city was occupied once before, and soon afterwards, its conqueror died on the island of St Helena. There will be no island for Hitler – unless it is the *Slavic Island*, and the entry fee there would be very high’, Masaryk, 23 Jul. 1941, p. 152).

The common means of exploiting the metaphorical and metonymic potential of toponyms were simple similes and the use of onymic allusions. The similes involve the preposition *jako* (‘like’), e.g. “Spojenci převyšují Německo *jako Sněžka* krtčí domeček” (‘The Allies tower above Germany *like Sněžka* [the highest mountain in the Czech part of Czechoslovakia] towers above a house of a mole’, Masaryk 1 Jan. 1941, p. 91), or they make a creative use of language, e.g. “sledovat Německo na cestě do hlubin, i když se šplhá na Kavkaz nebo na Himaláje” (‘watching Germany descending into the depths even though it is climbing the Caucasus or the Himalayas’, Stránský, 9 Aug. 1942, p. 320). Not only did the similes express the contrast between totalitarianism and democracy; they also helped to make obscure places more familiar to Czech listeners. Jan Masaryk, describing a scene in London, likened it to the rural cottage that is the main setting of the much loved Czech classic novella *Babička* (‘The Grandma’) by Božena Němcová (Masaryk, 14 May 1941, p. 131), and Prokop Drtina explained the English toponym *Stoke-on-Trent* as follows: “[…] to ‚on‘ je jako naše ‚nad‘ a Trent je jméno řeky. Je to tedy, jako když u nás řekneme Ústí nad Orlicí anebo Týn nad Vltavou nebo Brezno nad Hronom nebo podobně” (‘the ‘on’ in the name is like the word ‘nad’ in Czech, and ‘Trent’ is a name of a river. So it’s like when we say ‘Ústí nad Orlicí’ or ‘Týn nad Vltavou’ or ‘Brezno nad Hronom’, and so on’, Drtina, 13 Sept. 1942, pp. 252–253). Discussing Stoke-on-Trent, the author also gave an etymological explanation of the toponym.

The analyzed speeches also include onymic allusions to places associated with notorious events, especially connected with military conflicts: “Také Paříž má již za sebou svůj 15. březen a Francie svůj *Mnichov*. Nejen po Příkopech a Národní

třídě, také po Champs Elysées a po Place de la Concorde rachotí německé tanky a klapou vysoké prušácké boty" ('Paris, too, has experienced its own March 15th [i.e. the date of the Nazi invasion into the Czechoslovak Second Republic in 1939], and France has experienced its own *Munich*. German tanks are rumbling and Prussian jackboots are stamping not only along Na příkopě and Národní třída streets [two central Prague boulevards], but also along the Champs Elysées and the Place de la Concorde', Drtina, 26 Jun. 1940, p. 22); "Či zapomene snad španělský lid na Guernicu, tyto *první evropské Lidice*?" ('Or, shall the Spanish people forget Guernica, the first European *Lidice* [a village near Prague completely destroyed by the Nazis in 1942]?', Drtina, 7 Jun. 1943, p. 329); "Stalingrad jako *sovětský Verdun* této války" ('Stalingrad as the *Soviet Verdun* of this war', Fierlinger, 15 Oct. 1942, p. 127); "Již dnes se situace nacistického Německa podobá *rozvrácenému a korumpovanému starému Římu*" ('Already these days, the situation in Nazi Germany resembles the *disintegrating and corrupt ancient Rome*', Fierlinger, 1 Apr. 1943, p. 206). Onymic allusions bringing contemporary relevance to toponyms that denote the locations of historical battles can be seen as part of the speakers' war-based rhetoric, making use of language associated with military conflicts.[8]

3.3 The toponymic map of Czechoslovakia

The analyzed speeches create a mental "toponymic map" of Czechoslovakia, which enabled the authors to inhabit metaphorically – at least in their memories – a space that they had been forced to abandon temporarily. Most frequently when commemorating a Christian or national holiday, they inserted toponymic descriptions into their speeches, expressing their homesickness and nostalgia. These descriptions also included cases of synecdoche, as the names of selected cities or representative parts of the Czech landscape stood as symbols for the whole of Czechoslovakia. One example of this can be found in Edvard Beneš's description of Czechoslovakia, broadcast shortly before Christmas: "Vidím krásnou naši *Prahu*, která i v dnešním svém smutku přece jen se bude radovat radostí nezměrnou ve vědomí brzkého vykoupení, jež jí letošní Ježíšek slibuje, vidím *Plzeňsko* a *Domažlicko*, jež gangsterské botě nacistické odolává a odolá a o vánocích se ve svém odporu ještě posílí, vidím *Tábor* a *jihočeský kraj*, který v den naší odplaty zase národní odboj povede, vidím *východní Čechy* a pevnou, nezdolnou *Moravu*, naše Slezany s *Ostravou*, *Slovensko* od *Trenčína* ke *Košicím* a od *Tater* k *Bratislavě*

[8] Cf. the common use of similes in place branding and place marketing by means of emphasizing places known for their historical or cultural value (cf. Lennon, 2004, pp. 38, 266–268; David – Semian, 2015; David – Davidová Glogarová, 2017, pp. 206–207; Davidová Glogarová – David, 2017, pp. 180–182).

[…] A v ty doby bude zase *Praha* ještě krásnější a ještě majestátnější a republika ještě pevnější a vznešenější, nežli kdy byla v minulosti!" ('I can see our beautiful *Prague*, which even in its current sadness will, nevertheless, feel immeasurable joy in the knowledge of the approaching redemption that awaits it as this year's Christmas gift; I can see the *Plzeň* and *Domažlice* regions, which are resisting the gangster boots of the Nazis, and whose resistance will become even stronger at Christmas; I can see *Tábor* and *South Bohemia*, which, on our retribution day, will lead our national resistance again; I can see *East Bohemia* and strong, indomitable *Moravia*, our Silesians and *Ostrava*, *Slovakia* from *Trenčín* to *Košice* and from the *Tatra mountains* to *Bratislava* […] And in those times, *Prague* will become even more beautiful and even more majestic, and the republic will be even stronger and nobler than it has ever been in the past!', Beneš, 23 Dec. 1940, p. 62). Another example is Zdeněk Nejedlý's text celebrating the Hussite movement associated with the town of Tábor: "I dnes český lid musí se stát *Táborem*, to je jediná možná odpověď i dnes" ('These days, too, the Czech people must become *Tábor* – this is the only possible answer even today', Nejedlý, 6 Jul. 1944, p. 114). Similar cases can be found in Masaryk's broadcast for All Souls' Day (Masaryk, 6 Nov. 1940, p. 75), or in Stránský's Easter broadcast (Stránský, 23 Apr. 1943, p. 379).

In connection with the occupation of Czechoslovakia, changes of place names (renamings) were also thematized, especially in the category of urbanonyms (names of streets and squares). The new German names were interpreted as a temporary manifestation of the subjugation of the Czech (or Slovak) nation: "Jak pěkné to bude, až se bude zase *Mozart-Platz* jmenovat *náměstí Bedřicha Smetany*, a až naše Praha bude zase všechno, co byla, a až tedy bude zase také doopravdy Mozartovou a ne už Heydrichovou a Frankovou Prahou" ('How good it will be when *Mozart-Platz* is again called *náměstí Bedřicha Smetany* [Bedřich Smetana Square] and when again our Prague is everything that it used to be, so that it will truly be Mozart's city, and not the city of Heydrich and Frank [two of the highest-ranking Nazi officials in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia]', Stránský, 10 Dec. 1941, p. 273; also, e.g. Stránský, 7 Mar. 1941, p. 231; Stránský, 29 Oct. 1941, pp. 259–260); "*Heydrichovo nábřeží* v Praze je neslučitelné s celou historií našeho slavného národa" ('*Heydrichovo nábřeží* [Heydrich's Quay] in Prague runs contrary to the entire history of our glorious nation', Masaryk, 19 Oct. 1942, p. 195); "nacistické obrácení *Bratislavy* zase na *Prešpurk*" ('the Nazis renaming of *Bratislava* to the former *Pressburg*', Drtina, 19 Dec. 1943, p. 379). The name *Lidice* – a village near Prague that was completely destroyed by the Nazis in 1942 as a retribution for the assassination of Heydrich – occupied a special position with regard to renaming. The speakers noted how places all around the world had been renamed *Lidice*, so this toponym symbolized not only the suffering of the Czech people under the Nazi occupation but also the world's

revulsion in the face of the Nazis' atrocities, cf. "V několika dnech velká obec u Chicaga bude překřtěna na *Lidice*" ('In several days' time, a large municipality near Chicago will be renamed *Lidice*', Masaryk, 8 Jul. 1942, p. 181; also, e.g. Gottwald, 6 Jul. 1942, p. 177; Drtina, 13 Sept. 1942, pp. 252–253); "Jméno *Lidice* stalo se symbolem. Symbolem toho, proti čemu bojujeme, i toho, zač bojujeme, a jestliže je všechny svobodné národy světa vepisují dnes na svůj štít, činí tak v pevné jistotě, že s Lidicemi, vzkříšenými k novému životu, znovu opanují svět věčné ideály lásky, které jsou cennější než naše časné životy" ('The name of *Lidice* has become a symbol. A symbol of what we are fighting against, and what we are fighting for – and if all free nations of the world are writing this name into their emblems these days, they are doing so in the firm certainty that as Lidice is resurrected to live again, the world will again be the domain of the eternal ideas of love – ideals which are more valuable than our temporal lives', Šrámek, autumn 1942, p. 36).

4. Conclusion

This study is a first attempt at a comprehensive and systematic account of thematization using the example of proper names. We studied the thematization of toponyms in radio speeches by Czech politicians who spent the Second World War exiled in London and Moscow. Toponyms were not used only to refer to the places – they have proved to be an important element in the thematic structure of the texts and an important means of expressing the authors'/speakers' views; at the deep level, the toponyms are (re)semantized, which is manifested at the surface level in the form of adjective collocations, similes, onymic allusions, and emphasis on the name's symbolic function. The authors used this (re)semantization primarily to express their negative or positive attitudes to the denoted places and their opposition to Nazi/Fascist ideology. Another important factor in the thematization of toponyms is the fact that the texts were written in exile but they were aimed at the domestic audience; one function of the toponyms is to revive nostalgic memories of the homeland that the authors had temporarily abandoned. This raises the question of the possible similarities and differences between these texts and, e.g. speeches by Adolf Hitler, Joseph Stalin, or Winston Churchill; this represents one potential avenue for future research.

Besides this project, we also plan to focus on other types of proper names – especially anthroponyms and chrematonyms – and explore how these are used in similar speeches. We also intend to expand the range of genres analyzed in order to include, e.g. memoirs, travel literature, and marketing texts.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the University of Ostrava's internal grant (SGS) project no. 02/FF/2018–2019 *Vytváření reality prostřednictvím jazyka – kvalitativní analýza novočeských textů* [Reality Creation through Language – A Qualitative Analysis of Modern Czech Texts].

REFERENCES

BENEŠ, E. (1946): *Šest let exilu a druhé světové války. Řeči, projevy a dokumenty z r. 1938–1945*. Praha: Orbis.

BERÁNEK, J. (2012): Volá Londýn. Vysílání československé sekce zahraničního servisu BBC o atentátu na Heydricha. *Historie a vojenství* 61 (2), pp. 87–93.

ČECH, R. (2016): *Tematická koncentrace textu v češtině*. Praha: Ústav formální a aplikované lingvistiky.

DANEŠ, F. (1968): Typy tematických posloupností v textu (na materiále českého textu odborného). *Slovo a slovesnost* 29 (2), pp. 125–141.

DANEŠ, F. (2009): *Kultura a struktura českého jazyka*. Praha: Karolinum.

DAVID, J. (2013): Historická sémantika proprií. In: J. David – R. Čech – J. Davidová Glogarová et al., *Slovo a text v historickém kontextu. Perspektivy historickosémantické analýzy jazyka*. Brno: Host – Ostravská univerzita, pp. 100–125.

DAVID, J. (2014): Kolokace vlastních jmen. In: E. Minářová – D. Sochorová – J. Zítková (eds.), *Vlastní jména v textech a kontextech*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, pp. 61–65.

DAVID, J. – ČECH, R. – DAVIDOVÁ GLOGAROVÁ, J. et al. (2013): *Slovo a text v historickém kontextu. Perspektivy historickosémantické analýzy jazyka*. Brno: Host – Ostravská univerzita.

DAVID, J. – DAVIDOVÁ GLOGAROVÁ, J. (2017): The thematization of proper names in travel literature: Czech travelogues of visits to the USSR. *Slovo a slovesnost* 78 (3), pp. 195–213.

DAVID, J. – SEMIAN, M. (2015): Bohemian Manchester, Moravian Klondike and Silesian Versailles. Attributive Structures of Foreign Place Names in Contemporary Czech Journalism. *Slovo a slovesnost* 76 (2), pp. 129–147.

DAVIDOVÁ GLOGAROVÁ, J. – DAVID, J. (2017): *Obrazy z cest do země Sovětů*. Brno: Host.

DRTINA, P. (1945): *A nyní promluví Pavel Svatý… Londýnské rozhlasové epištoly z let 1940–1945*. Praha: Vladimír Žikeš.

EAGLETON, T. (2007): *Ideology. An Introduction*. London – New York: Verso.

FIERLINGER, Z. (1946): *Od Mnichova po Košice*. Praha: Práce.

GEBHART, J. – KUKLÍK, J. (2004): *Druhá republika. Svár demokracie a totality v politickém, společenském a kulturním životě*. Praha: Paseka.

GOTTWALD, K. (1946): *Deset let. Sborník statí a projevů 1936–1946*. Praha: Svoboda.

HLADKÁ, Z. (2016): Desémantizace. In: P. Karlík – M. Nekula – J. Pleskalová (eds.), *Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, pp. 320–321.

HLADKÁ, Z. – NEKULA, M. (2016): Vlastní jméno (proprium). In: P. Karlík – M. Nekula – J. Pleskalová (eds.), *Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, pp. 1994–1996.

JEŽEK, V. – ŠEBÁNEK, J. (1967): *Souboj v éteru*. Praha: Naše vojsko.

KARLÍK, P. (2016): Věta x výpověď. In: P. Karlík – M. Nekula – J. Pleskalová (eds.), *Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, pp. 1958–1959.

KOCOUREK, M. (2013): Od začátků rozhlasu do konce druhé světové války. In: M. Kocourek (ed.), *Volá Londýn. Historie českého a slovenského vysílání BBC*. Praha: Ottovo nakladatelství.

KOUTEK, O. (2014): Zahraniční odboj na vlnách BBC. *Paměť a dějiny* 8 (1), pp. 30–44.

KŘESŤAN, J. (2014): Hovoří Moskva – Moskva hovoří! *Paměť a dějiny* 8 (1), pp. 18–29.

LAUTENBACH, H. (2006): Téma a réma. In: A. Nünning (ed.), *Lexikon teorie literatury a kultury*. Brno: Host, p. 767.

LENNON, P. (2004): *Allusions in the Press. An Applied Linguistic Study*. Berlin: Mouton Oxford University Press.

LUBKOLL, CH. (2006): Motiv, literární. In: A. Nünning (ed.), *Lexikon teorie literatury a kultury*. Brno: Host, pp. 530–531.

MASARYK, J. (1946): *Volá Londýn*. Praha: Práce.

NEJEDLÝ, Z. (1977): *Hovoří Moskva. Rozhlasové projevy z let 1939–1945*. Praha: Odeon.

PETERKA, J. (1984): Téma. In: Š. Vlašín (ed.), *Slovník literární teorie*. Praha: Československý spisovatel, p. 377.

RATAJ, J. (1993, ed.): *Z druhé republiky* I–II. Praha: Historický ústav Armády České republiky.

RATAJ, J. (1997): *O autoritativní národní stát. Ideologické proměny české politiky v druhé republice 1938–1939*. Praha: Karolinum.

STRÁNSKÝ, J. (1945): *Hovory k domovu*. Praha: František Borový.

SVOBODA, A. – NEKULA, M. (2016): Tematická posloupnost. In: P. Karlík – M. Nekula – J. Pleskalová (eds.), *Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, pp. 1832–1833.

ŠRÁMEK, J. (1945): *Politické projevy v zahraničí*. Praha: Výkonný výbor československé strany lidové.

ŠRÁMEK, R. (1999): *Úvod do obecné onomastiky*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

ŠVÉDA, J. (2013): Populární a braková literatura v kontextu ideologie a třídy. Několik komentovaných poznámek z četby. *Slovo a smysl. Časopis pro mezioborová bohemistická studia* 10 (20) [online]. Accessed 2017-10-23. <http://slovoasmysl.ff.cuni.cz/node/489>.

THOMPSON, G. (2006): Theme in Text. In: K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* 12. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 658–668.

TEMATIZACE TOPONYM V PUBLICISTICE: ROZHLASOVÉ PROJEVY ČESKÝCH EXILOVÝCH POLITIKŮ V LETECH 1938–1945

Studie se zabývá toponymy a jejich tematizací v české publicistice 20. století. Na pozadí obecných charakteristik tematizace proprií a způsobů její realizace, např. (re)sémantizace prostřednictvím kolokací, onymických aluzí a symbolizace, se zaměřuje na kvalitativní textovou analýzu politických projevů. Analyzovaný korpus textů zahrnuje rozhlasové projevy českých exilových politiků působících v době druhé světové války v Londýně a Moskvě. Texty odrážejí širokou škálu politického spektra, od demokratů (Edvard Beneš, Prokop Drtina, Jan Masaryk, Jaroslav Stránský, Jan Šrámek) ke komunistům a jejich sympatizantům (Zdeněk Fierlinger, Klement Gottwald, Zdeněk Nejedlý).

Klíčová slova
toponyma; tematizace; kolokace; sémantika; politický diskurz; rozhlasové projevy; publicistika; český exil

Jana Davidová Glogarová
jana.davidova@osu.cz
University of Ostrava
Faculty of Arts
Centre for Economic and Social History
Reální 5
701 03 Ostrava
CZECH REPUBLIC

Jaroslav David
jaroslav.david@osu.cz
University of Ostrava
Faculty of Arts
Department of Czech Language
Reální 5
701 03 Ostrava
CZECH REPUBLIC