**Michal Škrabal**
*Comparative aspects of Latvian and Czech lexicons: Materials for assembling a Latvian-Czech dictionary*
Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of PhD at
Charles University, Prague

## External examiner's report

The modern lexicography as we know is quickly changing from the traditional "manual" methods to the extensive use of possibilities given by specialized lexicographical software and corpuses. However the experience of the compiling of corpus-driven dictionaries is partly quite ambiguous (cf. the *Latvian-Estonian dictionary* (2015), which has been compiled automatically without participating of any experienced lexicographer as editor and clearly demonstrates the actual limits of fully computerized lexicography).

The dissertation of Michal Škrabal shows the ways the possibilities of the lexicographical software (TshwaneLex) and corpuses should be used while in the same time human knowledge would not be ignored. Although Michal Škrabal writes that "the author of the work was forced [! – O.B.] to consolidate traditional and modern lexicographical methods", I would like to say one of the most important (or probably namely the most important) conclusions we can draw from this dissertation is the idea, that by the compiling of a god and modern bilingual dictionary the use of software and corpus data is axiomatic, however the participation of at least one experienced (and thus accustomed with the traditions of lexicography) lexicographer and of native speakers of both languages involved is highly necessary, too (of course the lexicographer uses to be the native speaker of one of the languages involved). That is the conclusion of the author himself (cf. ".. slovníky .. automaticky extrahované z pararelního korpusu jsou pouhým východiskem pro následnou slovníkařskoŭ práci..", p. 36), however even some small errors by translating the Latvians words in parts of Latvian-Czech dictionary quoted in the dissertation illustrate just the same idea.

By compiling of Latvian-Czech dictionary (LC) Michal Škrabal has made use of some new or relatively unpopular ways of organizing the

information in the dictionary. For the users of dictionary seems to be first of all very useful such rarely used component of the lexicographical microstructure as the information about the *uzus* (informace uzuálni, s. 3.2.7); it could be used probably even more (e.g., for explaining of the peculiarities of the use of the 3. meaning ('deputy') of the word *biedrs*. As second innovative aspect of the LC I would like to mention especially the including of large amount of proper names in the dictionary. Some moments of the lexicographic interpreting of Latvian proper names to be translated (or not to be translated??) are of interest even from the point of view of theoretical onomastics; quite a lot of Latvian names are left without Czech translation, only the encyclopedic information is given (e.g., s.v. *Zane*, *Cēsis*); it is more or less clear they will be spelled in the same way in a Czech context, too. As each name is a word, and each word belongs to some language, the question will be: is the word/name Zane, when included in a Czech context, a word of Latvian or a word of Czech (if we assume the last interpretation, the question would arouse, why Latv. *Zane* is not translated as Cz. *Zane*?)? If on the contrary we would interpret *Zane* even in Cz. context as a word of Latvian (the interpretation of such kind is quite largely accepted in many European languages), an explanation of this would be needed somewhere in the dictionary, without such explanation users will probably be confused to see some Latvian name without the translation.

Among the problems probably still needing more profound analyze is an eventual difference between colloquialism and error. Is the spelling *turpretīm* a colloquialism or simply an error? Is *kad* used instead of *ka* a colloquialism or an error? To my mind these are errors. The possible criterion could probably be the condition, is the word used knowingly. A speaker can use a colloquialism knowingly, while an error is always committed unintentionally (of course, with the exception of occasion you will demonstrate an error). If we have such a lot of registrations of erroneous words in corpus, that it seems they must be included in the dictionary, should it be, however errors need probably another stylistic reference instead of "hov."

Author has had the possibility to take a detached view on some problems of grammatical interpretation of Latvian. One of such problems Latvian grammarians have different conceptions about is the division of verbs in perfective and imperfective verbs. On p. 108 author mentions "adverbia

lokálního významu které mohou dané sloveso perfektizovat a konkurují tak některému z prefiksů", e. g., cf. *stumt ārā* : *izstumt*. LVG quotes this interpretation from Vizma Kalme and Gunta Smiltniece, however a bit further on the same page both in LVG and in the dissertation we can see the contrary – and probably more accurate – interpretation of *stumt ārā* : *izstumt*, written by Andra Kalnača: "syntaktické imperfektivum [*stumt ārā*] stojí v opozici k morfologickému, prefigovanému perfektivu [*izstumt*]". To my -- as native speakers -- mind colocations as *stumt ārā* never have the meaning of perfective aspect, and only by using of a prefix (*izstumt ārā*) we can transform this collocation to have perfective meaning. That means, too, the translation of *stumt ārā* (and other collocations of this kind) should be probably only imperfective.

From the smaller translation inaccuracies only one should be mentioned here: the Latv. *ābece* don't has the meaning *abeceda* (only exception is the term *Morzes ābece*), the correct Latvian word (of course, a borrowed word) for this meaning is *alfabēts*. Latv. *ābece* means first of all 'slabikář', and thus *latviešu ābece* don't means 'lotyšska abeceda', this collocation means "lotyšsky slabikář'; the uncommon collocation pēc ābeces, if used at all, would mean 'podle slabikáře', and not 'podle abecedy'.

All my small remarks don't mean there would be some real problems with the scientific level of the Michal Škrabal's doctoral dissertation *Comparative aspects of Latvian and Czech lexicons: Materials for assembling a Latvian-Czech dictionary.*

In summary:
1. The work presented reaches the standard of a doctoral dissertation, both from the viewpoint of the theory and praxis of lexicography.
2. I recommend the dissertation for a public defense.
3. I would propose a grade of "pass", subject to a satisfactory defense.

Ojārs Bušs, Dr. habil. philol
Vice-director, leading researcher, Latvian Language Institute of Latvian University

Rīga,
19.05.2016