Prague School of Terminology

Ivana Bozděchová
(Charles University, Prague)

Abstract

The paper reviews briefly the development of Czech theory of terminology starting from its roots in the period of Prague Linguistic Circle till nowadays. Its characteristic features, tendencies, theoretical approaches (from traditions of Czech functional structuralism to modern corpus-based and cognitive theories), concepts and definitions (*term, terminology*) are mentioned in connection with the most significant representatives of the field and their terminological works.

Streszczenie

Praska szkoła terminologiczna

Artykuł przedstawia krótki przegląd rozwoju czeskiej teorii terminologii od początków kształtowania się jej w okresie działalności Praskiego Koła Lingwistycznego po dzień dzisiejszy. Zaprezentowana została specyfika czeskiej teorii terminologii, nurty w jej obrębie, ujęcia teoretyczne (od tradycji czeskiego strukturalizmu do współczesnych teorii opartych na badaniach korpusowych i kognitywizmie), pojęcia i definicje (*termin, terminologia*) w powiązaniu z najważniejszymi jej przedstawicielami i ich dorobkiem w dziedzinie terminologii.

Introduction

In the international context, Czech linguistics have played one of the great roles and have contributed significantly in several areas of research in the period of activities of the Prague Linguistic Circle, founded in 1926. At that time also, the Czech theory of terminology began to develop systematically; therefore, the newly established Prague School of Terminology was logically built on the bases of functional linguistics. Its main representatives were Vladimír Brand, Miroslav Roudný and Rostislav Kocourek. Approximately at the same time, the oldest schools of terminology arose in the world, and they created a theoretical foundation for the development of terminology as a discipline. Apart from Prague, it was the school of Vienna (based on the Wüster's theory) and Moscow (founded by two engineers S.A. Caplygin and D.S. Lotte). In the 70ˢ of the 20th century inspired by the need to cope with the urgent problems associated with issues of bilingualism[1], one more school was established in Québec.

---

[1] See R. Temmerman (2000).

1. A Brief Development of the Czech Theory of Terminology

The aim of the Prague School of Terminology was the structural and functional description of specialized (professional, technical) language, including terms in Czech and Slovak languages. The Prague School of Terminology claimed quite significantly that terms should always be examined as units of vocabulary, as parts of vocabulary of the national language, therefore, as the specific objects of the examination of linguistics. Unlike some of the other (even newer) theories and concepts, it did not involve non-verbal semiotic parts of specialized (technical) texts into the study of terminology. The School promoted the standardization of terms by authoritative and qualified standardization institutions. The authors argued that technical language should not be equated with the sum of the lexical and phraseological peculiarities, which distinguishes it from the common language. It focused not only on the domestic (national) terms, but also analysed Latin and Greek nomenclatures, foreign terms in general, and calques. In the international context, the school is often referred to as the Czech or Prague School of Terminology and just its theoretically linguistic substance is pointed out (especially in comparison with the main multidisciplinary approaches to terminology).

The Prague School of Terminology came into international awareness thanks to terminological experts along with Rostislav Kocourek: Antonín Kučera and Josef Dubský[2]. From the beginning, linguists of the Prague school have worked closely with field specialists, terminographers, so that at that time, they followed the experience of Josef Jungmann (1773–1847) from his lexicographic work on his *Czech-German Dictionary* in five volumes (published in the years 1834–1839, and containing about 120,000 entries). In the first quarter of the century (1911–1935), the study of terminology had predominantly a functionally-structural character, and it was undertaken by Czech and Slovak linguists together. After the Second World War, the Czechoslovak Standardization Committee for Terminology was created at the Office for Standardization and Terminology Department at the Institute of the Slovak Language at the Slovak Academy of Sciences under the direction of J. Horecký[3]. The committee for terminology issued *Československý terminologický časopis* (*The Czechoslovak Terminology Journal*) edited by Jozef Horecký and published in the years 1962–1966; the journal presented results of the work of terminologists in both countries. In 1964, the principles of coordination of Czech and Slovak terminology were stated in the journal. Terminologists, in particular from the technical spheres[4], then closely cooperated with field terminological commissions. In 1965, J. Horecký emphasized that terminology convention cannot be overstated, when it is a convention of only a narrow circle of experts, who lack adequate awareness of language culture and who use terms that are unsatisfactory to the structure of the standard language.

---

[2] See R. Kocourek (2001, 2012).

[3] See Levická, J./ M. Zumrík, *Finding one's way: the case of Slovak terminology (general overview from 1844 onwards)* in this book.

[4] On the standardization of the Czech terminology in more detail see A. Tejnor (1968). The author himself, inter alia, carried out the linguistic revision of anatomical nomenclature by J. Zrzavý from 1985.

An important role for the further development of terminological theory was the establishment of the Czechoslovak Terminological Commission for Linguistic Terminology in the Czechoslovak Committee of the Slavists in 1959; Alois Jedlička (1921–2000) became its president. The commission followed up on the efforts of the Prague Linguistic Circle to elaborate terminology and a terminological system from the field of phonology (see *Projet de terminologie phonologique standardisée*, Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague 4, 1931, 309–323). Under the auspices of the Commission arose an important terminology work by Josef Vachek *Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'école de Prague* (1960) and bilingual *Rusko-český slovník lingvistické terminologie* (*The Russian-Czech Dictionary of Linguistic Terminology*, Prague 1960). Further actions of the Commission included drafting a proposal for *Slovník slovanské lingvistické terminologie* (*The Dictionary of Slavonic Linguistic Terminology*), which then came out under the A. Jedlička's editorship in the year 1977 in Prague.

In the following years, the publication of six volumes of *Terminologické studie* (*The Terminological Studies*, 1966–76) became stimulating as well as issuing of Liberec collections of *TERMINA* (1995–2004). For the development of the Czech terminology, a further significant role was played by the organization and presidency of the terminological panels in the 15th and 17th International Congress of Slavists in 1992 in Québec and 2003 in Prague[5].

2. The Concept of the Terminology in Traditions of Czech Functional Structuralism

From the historical point of view and in the international context, the main contribution and the specificity of the Czech theory of terminology is its mostly prevailing and traditional functionally structural approach to the term (despite all its internal differences in the richness and theoretical variability, see below).

The starting point of the Czech concept of terminology is the uniqueness of the vocabulary in the system of language levels; terms are understood as specific units of the national language and used in various fields. Terms represent the main semantic components of specialized texts, main characteristic of terms being – along with field specificity – their meaning thematically belonging to the field, laid down by field experts and defined by definition. The boundaries of linguistic exploration exceeding non-verbal components of specialized texts are not included in the Czech theory (semiotic terms of numeric nature, expressions of formal languages mainly from exact sciences, etc.). The properties of terms are listed: stability, systemic and international

---

[5] The modern beginnings of the Czech terminology (and in the modern sense also of terminography) are presented by A. Tejnor (1983); the author, among other, recalls some of the significant terminology works and dictionaries, e.g. K.J. Erben: *Juridisch politische Terminologie*, 1850; P.V. Šafařík: *Německo-český slovník vědeckého názvosloví pro gymnasia a reálné školy*, 1853; *Ottův slovník naučný nové doby*, 1930–43; *Masarykův slovník naučný*, 1925–33; *Komenského slovník naučný*, 1937–38, etc. On the development after the Second World War see Poštolková, B./ M. Roudný/ A. Tejnor (1983); brief overview also by F. Daneš (1997).

character, semantic transparency, accuracy, derivativness, notion substance, one-word form, synonymy, one meaning, structured nature, functionality[6].

3. The Definition of the Term and Terminology in Czech Theory

Theoretical views on the nature, definition, and characteristics of terms have been gradually elaborated, changed and fixed in development of Czech terminological theory in connection with formation and growth of a number of terms and their individual terminological systems (though not always and necessarily directly connected). Some of the main Czech theoretical concepts of the terms will be introduced here briefly and outlined.

The terms have been in Czech theory from the beginning delimited in connection with automatization in vocabulary. The concept of automatization was introduced and explained by Bohuslav Havránek (1893–1978) in his study in the proceedings *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura* (*Standard Czech and Linguistic Culture*, B. Havránek 1932: 52-53, according to the Janet's psychology and van Ginneken's wording from the year 1907): automatization as the usual, conventional use of language means, conditioned by agreement in the intention of the speaker and the expected effect. The opposite of automatization is actualization, in which the use of language means attracts attention as the unusual. Following the B. Havránek's study L.V. Kopeckij (1935: 120) introduced the first Czech definition of the term: the terms as a kind of specialized names; he ranked to them the automatized words, the automatized groups of words and automatized sentences[7]. In his definition in *Dodatky ke slovníku naučnému* (*Supplement to the Encyclopaedic Dictionary*) B. Havránek differentiated (similarly to L.V. Kopeckij) the terms in the strict sense from the automatized words and phrases:

> **terminologie** neboli odborné názvosloví je soubor odborných výrazů, užívaných v jednotlivých oborech vědeckých nebo praktických. Mluví se proto o t-i matematické, lékařské, vojenské, zemědělské, obchodní apod., někdy také prostě jen o ‚slovníku' matematickém atd., protože právě t. zabírá z příslušného odborného jazyka toliko stránku lexikální.

> Do odborného názvosloví zahrnují se jednak termíny v užším smyslu slova, tj. jednoznačná slova, kterých se užívá v jediném oboru a která v základě podržují svůj odborný význam, i vyskytnou-li se v řeči o oboru jiném nebo v běžném jazyce, jednak automatisovaná slova a sousloví, tj. slova mající určitý ustálený význam v jednom oboru, ale význam jiný v oboru jiném nebo v běžném jazyce sdělovacím.

> **terminology**, or specialized vocabulary is a set of technical terms used in the various scientific or practical fields. Therefore we speak about terminology: mathematical, medical, military, agricultural, commercial, etc., sometimes also simply called a 'dictionary' mathematical, etc., because terminology takes up only lexical part of the

---

[6] See Poštolková, B/ M. Roudný/ A. Tejnor (1983).
[7] L.V. Kopeckij called automatized sentences *šablony* (templates), unlike Z. Vančura who rank among templates also non-sentence structures. In modern linguistics these structures (including terminological) are similarly evaluated according to the stability of combinations and are described on the basis of the concept of *collocation*.

appropriate professional language (*Ottův slovník naučný nové doby*, *dodatky k velikému Ottovu slovníku naučnému*, VI/2, 2002: 1074, translated by I. Bozděchová).

B. Havránek and L.V. Kopeckij considered the basic difference between these types of specialized means in the fact that only the terms have their steady, specialized meaning always, while the meaning of the automatized means is changing according to their use (in different fields or even in common, everyday communication)[8].

Although in 1935 theoretical considerations about the terminology began to develop with the issue of *Příruční slovník jazyka českého* (*The Reference Dictionary of the Czech language, PSJČ*), one of the first Czech terminological contributions was Z. Vančura's work on the economic nomenclature from the year 1934. Z. Vančura compared the terms with the so-called templates (automatized groups of words). His differentiation between constant and potential lexical elements in the specialized vocabulary is inspiring, although it does not appear to be without problems and clear formulation. L.V. Kopeckij, in 1935, understands the area of constant elements more widely. K. Hausenblas, in 1962, described later Z. Vančura's and L.V. Kopecký's somewhat vague concepts (terms) more precisely, by means of hierarchization of vocabulary according to the degree of terminologization: according to the author there are apart from the terms and non-terms also weakly terminologized namings (the so-called semi-terms used by some of other authors).

Z. Vančura's concept of the term coincides with A. Jedlička (1948: 30–33); the author presents the first definition of the term in the sense of its earlier understanding in common, everyday usage, and for the first time, he lists the definition of the meaning of a term. Namely on A. Jedlička's definition, the interpretation of the term in the above mentioned reference dictionary, *PSJČ*, is essentially based, but instead of the expression *lexikálně sémantická jednotka* (*lexical semantic unit),* the term *pojmenování (nomination)* is used for the first time:

termín, (*zast.* terminus) *název, zpr. odborný, pojmenování, zvl. s přesným významem a jednoznačné.* Jazyk anglický přečasto za jeden termin český má čtyři, pět terminů svých. Krás. Nechtějí mluvit přesnými termíny, jasně a určitě několika větami říci jádro věci. Baar. Utvořil několik set terminův nových pro pojmy abstraktní. Lum. Začali nám při vědeckých terminech říkati také vždy názvy české. Čech. Vážný zvuk prvků hebrejských kontrastuje tu s měkkými zvuky slovanských kmenů, s drsnými anglickými, užívanými zvlášť jako termínů technických. Vrch. Zde [v kostele] mohly bezpečně zjistiti, byla-li nevěsta napudrována – čili chtěla-li šiditi ještě před oltářem samého Pána Boha pomalovanou larvičkou, jak zněl zubřanský terminus technikus pro takovou nepravost *odborný název.* Vrba. První dvě [šachové partie] jsem rychle „provez", jak zní případný terminus. Čap. Ch. *Ling. lexikálně sémantická jednotka, mající přesný a jednoznačný význam, zpr. odborný.*

terminologie, -e f. *soubor, soustava termínů, odborných názvů jistého oboru, odborné názvosloví.* Zaměstnával se [Mácha] rád s Markovou logikou, doufaje, že se z ní něčemu přiučí, nejen ohledem na vědu, nýbrž i na vědecký sloh a českou teminologii. Sab. Polská

---

[8] Cf. M. Jelínek's communication concept in *Příruční mluvnice češtiny* (2001: 767): in the act of communication the automatized means stand out of linguistic awareness of the speakers and the addressees as stabilized tools.

vojenská terminologie XV. a XVI. stol. přijata z veliké části od Čechův. Osv. **D** *vůbec nějaký způsob vyjadřování, obrážející určité nazírání.* Byl to liberalism, mluveno dnešní terminologií, integrální. Šal. Řekněme dnešní terminologií: Zeus udělil Prometheovi amnestii. Vrch.

term (obsolete *terminus*) – expression, usually specialized, nomination (naming), especially with the indirect meaning and unambiguous. (...) In linguistics: lexical semantic unit (entity), having a precise and unambiguous meaning, as a rule, specialized (professional).

terminology – collection, system of terms, specialized (professional) names of a certain field, specialized (professional) terminology. (...) any way of expression, reflecting a certain perception of things (*Příruční slovník jazyka českého*, translated by I. Bozděchová).

The terms are also understood as naming units, for example by K. Sochor (1955) or K. Hausenblas (1962). M. Roudný (1977) marked this change in concept as a shift of the starting viewpoint from the lexical site to a formal one, more accurately, however, it is an onomasiological and functional aspect (naming as a function of the word).

Terms are also traditionally linked with concepts and lexical meanings. In the Czech theory, V. Šmilauer (1951) pointed out this background explicitly (as one of the first linguists): terms express the pure concept, their meaning (content and scope of the meaning) is precisely delimited and can be defined. Similarly, K. Sochor (1955) put the emphasis on the connection of conceptual content of the term with the system of concepts of a given field. R. Kocourek (1965: 21) referred to the relationship between the concept and the term associated with it as to *definovanost* (definability) of the meaning of a term. According to Danilenko (1977: 94) a term cannot be considered full-fledged without a definition delimiting the boundaries of the content of the concept. F. Čermák (1993) understands definition as one of the major parts of the bases of the theory (in addition to the axioms and primitive statements). Cognitive linguistics combines concepts and terms on the basis of the central position of concepts in scientific categories, the lexical meaning of terms is clarified as anchoring in the system of concepts of a given field.

From the beginning of the development of the theory of terminology, along with theoretical debates about terms and terminology in general, attention gradually began to be paid to the field-defined terminologies; namely the articles about medical terminology (B. Havránek 1919) and electrical terminology (V. Ertl 1926) appeared among the first studies.

In the following years, terms were studied and classified at first, still mainly as nominating units, also later with their functional and stylistic-text aspects; it was the case for example by V. Šmilauer (1951) (terms and fixed names), or K. Sochor (1955) (terms as a permanent element of the specialized text). According to K. Sochor, with terms, unlike with other words, the expert does not have an option of their choice and substitution; however, the use of the only, unchangeable term, is not absolute, K. Sochor does not take into account e.g. the existence of the synonymy of terms. Terms were addressed by several other authors, chronologically named e.g. M. Jelínek

(1955), K. Hausenblas (1962, 1963), L. Blatná (1964), O. Man (1965), A. Jedlička (1970) (terms in the strict sense, automatized terms and templates), M. Roudný (1977), B. Poštolková (1977, 1980, 1984), J. Filipec (1955, 1985), P. Hauser (1980), Chloupek (1990), F. Čermák (1993), in: Čermák, F./ R. Blatná (1995), S. Machová (1995), E. Lotko (2000), R. Kocourek (1991, 2002), J. Kraus (2002), I. Dobrotová (2002), M. Grabmüller (2003)[9]. Most of the definitions state the following main characteristics of the terms: system character, stability, binding in use, conceptual meaning and unambiguity guaranteed by the definition of the term. Further, therefore, we introduce only selected concepts and their concept of terms including the differences between their characteristics.

M. Jelínek (1955) pointed out the fact that the unambiguity of the terms (and even outside of the context) can be achieved not only by accurate determination of the content, but also by the application of the principle of a special name for each individual concept (similarly, later M. Grabmüller 2003). According to the author, the term is fixed by the process of terminologization of one expression from the original synonymous pair or synonymous row. It probably does not apply absolutely: terminologization is not always necessarily a choice from the synonymous group of names, the same concept albeit in different fields precisely and clearly defined, can be named differently, and on the contrary, the identical expression can be used for different concepts (see polysemy of multidisciplinary terms) etc[10]. Similarly, the close liaison with the concepts is considered an essential feature of the terms e.g. by L. Blatná (1964); the author characterizes terms in relation to the extent of concepts.

The semantic definition of terms is applied in the works by B. Poštolková (1977, 1980, 1984); to express or highlight correlation between the concept and the term the author uses designations *notion-term* or *term-notion*, the latter in the case when starting from the form of the text (B. Poštolková 1984: 11). The author, however, also pays attention to terms from the formally-nomination aspect.

The semantic unambiguity of the terms is put to a direct relation with the requirement of the maximum exactness of specialized language by P. Hauser (1980: 32–39); the author distinguishes between absolutely and relatively unambiguous terms. The unambiguity of the term is, however, necessary to be confined within the framework of the given field, as inter-field ambiguity of the terms is relatively common; therefore, I. Dobrotová (2002) speaks about the terms with the "dual affiliation". The dual affiliation of terminology has been also emphasized by R. Kocourek (2002); a number of authors underlined its importance for the translation of specialized texts (e.g. J. Kábrt 1963: 300, for medical texts). Based on their text independency, terms can be referred to as elements of meta-language, i.e. the language with the maximum unambiguity, used to describe linguistic phenomena (e.g. F. Čermák (1993); R. Blatná in: Čermák, F./ R. Blatná (1995)). Text independency of the lexical meaning, however, does not always mean a terminological status of the expression; that is decided by the context. Yet, this definition might be relative;

---

[9] A chronological overview of their concepts see in I. Bozděchová (2009: 22–29).
[10] The requirement of relation of one term with only one notion and on the contrary is overcome by modern, in particular socio-cognitive terminological theories (see, for example, R. Temmerman 2000).

F. Čermák finds significantly different variability and status both with terms of specific, defined theories (F. Čermák 1993: 62) and with common nominations (F. Čermák 2002: 31).

J. Filipec, in *Česká lexikologie* (1985), added functional and stylistic aspects to the definition of terms – they are considered as a component of specialized (professional) functional style; their specific stylistic function, the absence or the suppression of pragmatic, attitudinal and modal components of their meaning have consequences – including their possibility of figurative meanings connected with the context.

E. Lotko (2000) reflected field affiliation of terms and their potential impact on their definition in practice; according to the degree of obligation of defining the term, he distinguished (E. Lotko 2000: 117) the prescriptive terms (their meaning is determined by the experts of the relevant thematic field usually by the definition in the first use of the term, e.g. in the exact sciences) and pseudo-prescriptive terms (their meaning is given only by the agreement accepted by the broader community, in the fields, where the attitude or consideration of the school community is important for evaluation of the phenomena, e.g. in the humanities).

Terms are traditionally attached to the rationally conceptual meaning – yet many of them are idiomatic; the Czech idiomatic terminology has been pointed out by a number of authors, e.g. F. Čermák (2001, 2002); M. Jelínek (2002); J. Kraus (2002) etc.; attention to it is paid further especially in the works of cognitive linguistics (see below). It turns out that idiomatic terms perform both nominal and cognitive functions adequately; they even can enhance the accuracy of the expression and at the same time, often fill up the gaps in the nominal system of specialized language.

For the sake of completeness and due to the fact that at the beginning of the formation of the Czech terminological theory Czech and Slovak linguists worked together, it should be noted that in principle the terms are characterized and defined in the same way both in Czech and Slovak terminological works, see, in particular, Masár (1991, 2000); Mistrík (2002). Masár (2000: 21, 49), in addition, highlights standardness of the terms (as their property), because it guarantees trouble-free communication. However, the requirement for terms to be standard words can be doubted if considered only from the point of view of the success of professional (specialized) communication. It is shown by the use of professional terms not fully standardized, of professionalisms or slangisms, used as expressions of identification or synonymy (A. Jedlička 1970: 38), and often even complementary with (real) terms (F. Čermák, in: Čermák, F./R. Blatná 1995: 111).

It is apparent from the above overview that the interest of Czech terminologists still traditionally and for practical reasons is concentrated on the accuracy and unambiguity of definition as the premise of the standardization of terms. Standardization is needed even when terminology is fixed collectively, not only for ensuring professional communication, but also for the further development of the field (see J. Chloupek 1990). New aspects of definition of terms in practice are highlighted in the theory of language management which starts to solve problems in languages by solving related social and communication problems (J. Neústupný 2002). The

emphasis is put on institutional authorization of terminology with the participation of experts on research of languages for specific purposes (Hübschmannová, M./ J. Neústupný 2004). New impulses for the description of the terms are in the Czech context presented also by corpus linguistics or cognitive sciences.

Corpus-based analysis of specialized texts helps to clarify the nature of lexical semantics of terms mainly from the point of view of its dependence on the context. Text terminology and corpus linguistics confer text dependency of meaning of the terms: lexical surroundings of the terms shows for example some idiomatic tendencies of terms (F. Čermák 2002). Indications of the text-based conception of terms can be found in the Czech theory already in some earlier works (K. Hausenblas (1963), O. Man (1965), Československý terminologický časopis, J. Filipec (1975)). So O. Man (ibid) recorded the smallest contextual dependency in the nouns (this can partially justify the predominance of nouns with the terms, given, however, especially by the need to name the category of substance). J. Filipec (1975, 1995) in the text evaluation of the terms pointed out the different range of the use of terms in different subtypes of style. Similarly, R. Kocourek (1991) added aspect of repeated use in professional texts to the conceptual definition of the terms and resolved single-subject and multidisciplinary terms. S. Machová (1995), in this context, has not found sense in the search for generally valid criteria for the determination of the boundaries between terms and non-terms, but she finds it between the term and non-term only in a specific professional (specialized) text (see F. Čermák 2002). J. Filipec and R. Kocourek's concepts of terms as units incorporated to the text can be seen as a parallel of the above-mentioned access of text terminology to the terms or to use of the concept of collocability in lexicology. The authors, however, consider only the inclusion of terms into specialized texts, not for use in non-specialized text. Just in non-specialized texts, O. Man (1965) finds determinologization of the term (opposite to the initial considerations about the preservation of the professional field affiliation of the term, see L.V. Kopeckij 1935).

Cognitive linguistics brings to the theory of terminology such topics as correlation of the prototype and term with natural and scientific categories: natural categorization is unlike scientific categorization connected with the prototype, significantly subjectively-oriented, it stems from an inaccurate generalization and shows the place of the given object in the linguistic-cultural picture of the world of the particular community. How I. Vaňková (2005: 83) shows, conceptual affiliation can be established on the basis of the verifiable evidence, and therefore, classical (logical) definition, associated with the structural approach to the meaning, is necessary for terms. Such a definition removes the semantic vagueness of natural language (concepts corresponding to the normal perception of the world frequently have vagueness of the defining characters, and therefore also vagueness of the classes of named phenomena). However, as S. Gajda (2001: 186) notes, even the definition cannot fully express all internally complicated units of concepts, especially because they are linked with other concepts and they are subject to changes in the process of knowledge.

Conclusion

The traditional and still valid functionally structural linguistic approach in the Czech theory to terms means mainly linguistic contribution for the theory of terminology, although it tends to be incorporated into a separate multidisciplinary terminological field. In recent years, however, the development of linguistics has progressed and presently is undergoing changes, which among other things lead to the expansion of the theoretical field, of the methods and tools of research. In the context of the communication and pragmatic orientation of linguistics, attention is still clearly paid to processes in which the terms actually function in the text and what specialized communication in the daily interaction of speakers looks like. Sociolinguistics and socio-terminology together with the semantically conceived modern approaches in cognitive and corpus linguistics start to complement the traditional and characteristic concept of terms as symbols in the Czech terminological theory.

References

Blatná, L. (1964), *Termín – terminologie, název – nomenklatura*. In: "Československý terminologický časopis" III, 340–345.

Bozděchová, I. (2007), *Teorie terminologie v historických a obsahových proměnách.*, In: D. Moldanová/ M. Balowski (eds), Co všechno slovo znamená. Sborník příspěvků věnovaných profesorce PhDr. Marii Čechové, DrSc. Ústí nad Labem, 65–71.

Bozděchová, I. (2009), *Současná terminologie (se zaměřením na kolokační termíny z lékařství).* Praha.

Bozděchová, I. (2015), *Word-formation and technical languages*. In: P.O. Müller/ I. Ohnheiser/ S. Olsen/ F. Rainer (eds), Word-Formation. An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe. Berlin, 2251–2266.

Bozděchová, I./ R. Kocourek (in print), *O novodobém vývoji a principech české terminologické práce. Seznam českých terminologických prací (výběr)*.

Brand, V. (1966), *Odborná terminologie jako samostatný vědní obor*. In: "Terminologická studie" 1, 3–15.

Buzássyová, K. (1983), *Dynamika v odbornej terminológii*. In: "Jazykovedný časopis" 34, 132–144.

Čermák, F. (1993), *Základy lingvistické metodologie. Nástin hlavních principů na pozadí obecné teorie vědy*. Praha.

Čermák, F. (2001), *Propoziční frazémy a idiomy v češtině*. In: M. Balowski/ W. Chlebda (eds), Frazeografia słowiańska. Opole, 93–101.

Čermák, F. (2002), *Termín a frazém (Případ překrývání a periférie dvou nominativních oblastí)*. In: Termina 2000. Sborník příspěvků z II. konference 1996 a III. konference 2000. Praha, 31–36.

Čermák, F./ R. Blatná (eds) (1995), *Manuál lexikografie*. Praha.

Daneš, F. (1997), *Jazyk vědy*. In: F. Daneš et al., Český jazyk na přelomu tisíciletí. Praha, 68–83.

Danilenko, V.P. (1977), *Russkaja terminologija*. Moskva, cited according to Buzássyová (1983), 133.

Dobrotová, I. (2002), *K právnímu a právnickému diskurzu.*In: Termina 2000. Sborník příspěvků z II. konference 1996 a III. konference 2000. Praha, 261–266.

Ertl, V. (1926), *České názvosloví elektrotechnické.* In: "Elektrotechnický obzor" 15, 829–833.

Filipec, J./ F. Čermák (1985), *Česká lexikologie.* Praha.

Gajda, S. (2001), *Styl naukowy.* In: J. Bartmiński (ed.), Współczesny język polski. Lublin, 183–199.

Grabmüller, M. (2003), *Problematika vytváření české terminologie odborného jazyka evropských společenství.*In: "ToP XIV", 66, 27–31.

Hauser, P. (1980), *Nauka o slovní zásobě.* Praha.

Havránek, B. (1919), *O lékařském slovníku.*In: "Naše řeč" 3, 72–80.

Havránek, B. (1932), *Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura.* In: B. Havránek/ M. Weingart (eds), Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura. Praha, 32–84.

Hausenblas, K. (1962), *K specifickým rysům odborné terminologie.* In: Problémy marxistické jazykovědy. Praha, 248–262.

Hausenblas, K. (1963), *Termíny a odborný text.* In: "Československý terminologický časopis" II, 7–15.

Hübschmannová, M./ J.V. Neústupný (2004), *„Terminological" Processes in North-Central Romani.* In: "Current Issues in Language Planning" 5, No. 2, 83–108.

Chloupek, J. et al. (1990), *Stylistika češtiny.* Praha.

Jedlička, A. (1948), *Josef Jungmann a obrozenecká terminologie literárněvědná a lingvistická.* Praha.

Jedlička, A. (1960), *Ustavení Čs. terminologické komise při Čs. komitétu slavistů.* In: "Slovo a slovesnost" 21, 158–160.

Jelínek, M. (1955), *Odborný styl.* In: "Slovo a slovesnost" 16, 25–37.

Jelínek, M. (2002), *O potřebě verbonominálních spojení v intelektualizovaných textech vůbec a odborných zvlášť.* In: Termina 2000. Sborník příspěvků z II. konference 1996 a III. konference 2000. Praha, 204–211.

Kábrt, J. (1963), *Ještě k lékařskému názvosloví.* In: "Československý terminologický časopis" II, 299–304.

Kardela, H. (1993), *Analiza semantyczna wyrażeń języka naukowego*. In: J. Bartmiński/ R.Tokarski (eds), O definicjach i definiowaniu. Lublin, 141–151.

Kocourek, R. (1965), *Termín a jeho definice.* In: "Československý terminologický časopis" IV, 1–25.

Kocourek, R. (1989), *Définition, sémantique lexicale et théorie linguistique.* In: "ALFA", vol. 2, 26–50.

Kocourek, R. (1991), *La langue francaise de la technique et de la science.* Wiesbaden.

Kocourek, R. (2001), *Terminologie a odborná lingvistika na přelomu století: směry, vývoj a posun cílů*. In: Termina 2000: sborník příspěvků z II. konference 1996 a III. konference 2000. Praha, 12–30.

Kocourek, R. (2002), *Terminologické anglicismy: příčiny jejich vzniku, jejich lingvistická povaha a místo v slovní zásobě.* In: Termina 2000. Sborník příspěvků z II. konference 1996 a III. konference 2000. Praha, 196–203.

Kocourek, R. (2010), *The uniqueness of human natural languages: An anniversary causerie on a text-related linguistic focus* (*Jedinečnost lidských přirozených jazyků: výroční causerie o textově zaměřeném pojetí jazyka*). In: M. Malá/ P. Šaldová (eds), ...for thy speech bewrayeth thee: A Festschrift for Libuše Dušková (...vždyť i tvé nářečí tě prozrazuje. Sborník na počest Libuše Duškové). Praha, 121–151.

Kocourek, R. (2012), *Slovo k jazykovědnému studiu terminologie.* In: S. Čmejrková/ J. Hoffmannová/ J. Klímová (eds), Čeština v pohledu synchornním a diachronním. Praha, 41–48.

Kopeckij, L.V. (1935), *O lexikálním plánu hospodářského jazyka.* In: "Slovo a slovesnost" 1, 120–122.

Kraus, J. (2002), *Společenské komunikační procesy a terminologie*. In: Termina 2000. Sborník příspěvků z II. konference 1996 a III. konference 2000. Praha, 185–188.

Laurén, C./ H. Picht (eds) (1993), *Aussgewählte Texte zur Terminologie.* Wien.

Lotko, E. (2000), *Slovník lingvistických termínů pro filology.* Olomouc.

Machová, S. (1995), *Terminografie.* In: F. Čermák/ R. Blatná (eds), Manuál lexikografie. Praha, 137–157., F.

Man, O. (1965), *Termín a kontextové vztahy.* In: "Československý terminologický časopis" IV, 80–84.

Masár, I. (1978), *O lingvistickom opise terminológie.* In: "Kultúra slova" 12, 334–340.

Masár, I. (1981), *Sémantická stránka termínu.* In: "Jazykovedné štúdie" 16, 207–209.

Masár, I. (1991), *Príručka slovenskej terminológie*. Bratislava.

Masár, I. (2000), *Ako pomenúvame v slovenčine. Kapitolky z terminologickej teórie a praxe*. Bratislava.

Mistrík, J. (2002), *Lingvistický slovník*. Bratislava.

Neústupný, J. (2002), *Sociolingvistika a jazykový management*. In: "Sociologický časopis" 38, 429–442.

Ottův slovník naučný nové doby. Dodatky k velikému Ottovu slovníku naučnému. Paseka / Argo, Praha 2003.

Poštolková, B. (1977), *K vlivu odborné terminologie na národní jazyk*. In: "Slovo a slovesnost" 38, 112–120.

Poštolková, B. (1980), *K specifičnosti významu termínů*. In: "Slovo a slovesnost" 41, 54–56.

Poštolková, B. (1984), *Odborná a běžná slovní zásoba*. Praha.

Poštolková, B./ M Roudný/ A. Tejnor (1983), *O české terminologii*. Praha.

Příruční mluvnice češtiny (2001), 2., opravené vyd. Brno.

Příruční slovník jazyka českého (1951–1953). Praha.

Rondeau, G. (1981), *Introduction à la terminologie*. Montréal.

Roudný, M. (1977), *Z historie českých definic odborného názvu*. In: "Slovo a slovesnost" 38, 237–240.

Sochor, K. (1955), *Příručka o českém odborném názvosloví*. Praha.

Šmilauer, V. (1951), *Zásoba slovní a význam slov*. Praha.

Tejnor, A. (1962), *Užitečná publikace o technické terminologii* (recenze). In: "Československý terminologický časopis" 1, 216–226.

Tejnor, A. (1968), *Normalizace terminologie jako součást péče o kulturu spisovného jazyka*. In: "Slovo a slovesnost" 29, 303–312.

Tejnor, A. (1983), *Současný stav a vývojové tendence českého odborného názvosloví*. In: "Přednášky na Letní škole slovanských studií", 26. Praha, 38–48.

Temmerman, R. (2000), *Toward New Ways of Terminology Description*. *The socio-cognitive approach.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia.

Vančura, Z. (1934), *Hospodářská linguistika, pokus o její teorii a doklady z anglického účetního názvosloví*. Praha.

Vaňková, I./I. Nebeská/L. Saicová Římalová/J. Šlédrová (2005), *Co na srdci, to na jazyku*. Praha.

Wüster, E. (1974), *Die allgemeine Terminologielehre, ein Grenzgebiet zwischen Sprachwissenschaft, Logik, Ontologie, Informatik und den Sachwissenschaften*. In: "Linguistics" 12 (119), 61–106.

Zrzavý, J. (1985), *Latinsko-české anatomické názvosloví*. Olomouc.