

Hladký, Josef

Summary

In: Hladký, Josef. *The Czech and the English names of mushrooms*. 1. vyd.
Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 1996, pp. [128]-138

ISBN 8021014067

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/122819>

Access Date: 27. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

SUMMARY

In Chapter One, this study was characterized as a survey of a subject field, or a semantic field. The former term is preferred by FILIPEC (1985.151) while the latter term is more traditional. Another term is 'lexical field' (CRYSTAL 1992.346). LYONS says that 'a good deal of work has been devoted to the investigation of lexical systems ... with particular reference to such *fields* (or *domains*) as kinship, colour, flora and fauna ... The results have confirmed the pronouncements of such earlier scholars as VON HUMBOLDT, DE SAUSSURE and SAPIR to the effect that vocabularies of different languages (in certain fields at least) are *non-isomorphic*: that there are semantic distinctions made in one language which are not made in another....In Saussurean terms ... each language imposes a specific *form* on the *a priori* undifferentiated substance of the content-plane.' (1969.429). According to CRYSTAL 'the use of *semantic field* techniques was a European development of the thirties which proved to be of value, but it was very limited in scope' (1971.232). The limitations are caused by the fact that 'not all aspects of experience⁶⁵ neatly divide up into semantic fields' (CRYSTAL 1992.347). As examples of semantic field studies two papers can be quoted here: NOVOTNÝ investigated the Latin terms for 'work' (1952) and DUCHÁČEK analysed the gaps in the structure of the lexis (1970).

In more recent times, the contrastive research in the lexis is not limited to semantic fields but operates with larger areas. Ferdinand BUFFA published a study comparing the Slovak and the Polish phraseology (1993) and JURAJ DOLNÍK, JANA BENKOVIČOVÁ and ALEXANDRA JAROŠOVÁ wrote a survey of contrastive methods used in the study of lexis (1993).

Linguistic studies mentioned in the preceding chapters usually deal with the names of plants, eg MACHEK 1954, RYDÉN 1984, CALLEBAUT 1990, and may include mushrooms, eg BIERBAUMER 1975–9. Two studies were devoted to mushrooms only: MACHEK 1944, mentioned in the chapter on history, and MAJTANOVÁ 1989. MAJTANOVÁ analyses the Western Slavonic names of morels, russulas and other mushrooms. She shows that the boundaries of popular names are not identical with the boundaries of the three national languages, Slovak, Czech and Polish. An important aspect of the names of mushrooms is that in cases of very obvious features we find the use of the same metaphor in various languages, which is confirmed by some of the Czech and English names of mushrooms.

If we want to think of the present investigation into the names of mushrooms as a study of a subject (or semantic) field, we must realize that the boundaries of the field should be defined. When this is to be done, the subjective element comes in. By subjective element we do not mean *eg* the fact that all the books on mushrooms used in the research were subjective selections from the mush-

65 Experience here corresponds to extralinguistic reality.

rooms known to grow in a certain area. The selection was based on certain criteria, *eg* edibility, frequency, shape. This kind of subjectivity can be overcome if we exploit the widest possible range of resources. Moreover, the authors of books know the whole field and their selection is the result of conscious choice. (On the size of the field *see* LEISI 1985, on demarcation problems and on non-discreteness in the fields *see* GEERAERTS & GRONDELAERS & BAKEMA 1994.)

The subjective element which we mentioned above is connected with the individual speakers, with their knowledge of extralinguistic reality and their ability to communicate about the extralinguistic reality. There is a marked difference between professionals in certain area, *eg* mycologists, and non-professionals. A non-professional may be a mushroom collector with good knowledge of the field but it may be a person who knows only one name, probably 'mushroom' in English and 'houba' or 'hřibek' in Czech. The same person may refer to any kind of tree as a 'tree', to any kind of bird as a 'bird', to any kind of flower as a 'flower' *etc.* If such speaker is a small child learning its mother tongue, its fields or domains differ from those of the adult speakers. For a certain period, small children either overgeneralize, *eg* by identifying 'daddy' with all men, or undergeneralize, *eg* by identifying the word 'man' with men wearing hats (LEECH 1974.33). In doing this, they either operate within the same field and change the semantic range of naming units belonging to that field, or they have different boundaries between the fields, *eg* in the case of 'daddy', a kinship term used for men outside the family. If the speaker calling any tree just a 'tree' is an adult person, his or her semantic field of flora consists of several words only. We could even say that the semantic fields of such speakers are much wider than the fields of better educated speakers, *eg* flora, or even nature being a field. The subjective element works in the opposite direction as well, *ie* to narrower fields. Are 100,000 species of *fungi* a semantic field for a professional mycologist? If there are books on *russulas* 'holubinky' only (MELZER, SVRČEK & ERHART & ERHARTOVÁ), are the *russulas* a field? Linguistic studies of fields usually operate within smaller areas than *fungi*, trees, animals. A field should be defined on the basis of some common features. If we think of physical features, the contrast between a professional mycologist and uneducated speaker appears again. Mycologists distinguish cup *fungi*, gill *fungi*, rust *fungi* *etc.* and mushroom pickers distinguish between edible and inedible mushrooms *etc.*

We regard the present study as a study of a semantic (or subject) field, the definition of which has been given by the fact that a species was or was not mentioned in a book on mushrooms. The subjective element connected with the selection of only some species for a book has been suppressed by the number of books employed for the building of the corpus: ten Czech books and nineteen English books.

The other subjective element as described above is present in the material. It is the different attitudes of the Czechs and of the English to wild mushrooms. This subjective element is responsible for the gaps and the differences in the popular names of mushrooms, *eg* in English, the highest number of popular

names refers to puffballs while in Czech it refers to various boleti and puffballs. There are no linguistic gaps in the scientific study of extra-linguistic reality. Fungi, bugs, quadrupeds *etc* are areas where full scientific descriptions exist and every species has a scientific name.

The absence of English domestic names for some species of mushrooms is not a linguistic problem just as the abundance of words for snow in Eskimo is not a linguistic problem. They are only examples of different extra-linguistic reality and its reflection in lexis. If the Eskimos had no word for an arm, only for the left arm and for the right arm, or had two different personal pronouns of the first person plural, including the hearer and excluding the hearer, it would be a feature worth linguistic description.

Being convinced that mushrooms are a semantic field which a non-professional cannot split into smaller fields we have analysed the Czech, English and Latin names of mushrooms.

The word *mushroom* has an interesting history in English. It was taken over from French and it replaced the domestic *toadstool* as a general term and the meaning of *toadstool* was then narrowed down to 'poisonous fungus'. Some speakers use *fungus* as the general term and say 'edible fungi, collectors of fungi', evading the use of *mushroom* and *toadstool*. The most current meaning of *mushroom* is 'cultivated *Agaricus campestris*' and fungi growing in woods are often called *wild mushrooms*.

The basic difference between the Czech and the English mushroom terminology is indicated in Chapter Two. Out of more than one hundred taxonomical terms only eleven have English names while in Czech there are a domestic terms for all of them. In the anatomical terms, both languages have a full range of their own terms. However, the English terms fall into several types: *cap*, *ring*, *central* are words of everyday language functioning as terms, *conic(al)*, *lateral* are general technical terms, *adnate*, *decurrent*, *sinuate* are botanical terms, and *basidium*, *sterigma*, *volva* are mycological terms. The four groups of terms, from *cap*, *ring*, *central* to *basidium*, *sterigma*, *volva* can be viewed as elements of a scale not only from the point of view of specialization but also from the point of view of word formation. *Cap etc* are domestic words in modern English, either of Anglo-Saxon or of Latin origin, *adnate*, *sinuate* have domestic endings and *basidium*, *sterigma* have preserved their original morphological set-up. If an English speaker wants to evade a scientific term, he/she has to use a phrase, *eg adnate* = attached to stem, broadly attached, *adnexed* = narrowly attached.

When the English anatomical terms are compared with the Czech terms the following relationships can be observed:

- (i) international terms on both sides: *sterigma* — *sterigma*,
- (ii) the same as (i) but Czech has also a domesticated form of the international term: *basidium* — *basidium*, *bazidie*,
- (iii) the same as (i) but Czech has also a domestic term: *hymenium* — *hymenium*, *rouška*,
- (iv) an international terms in English only: *volva* — *pochva*, and

- (v) an anglicized form of an international term and a Czech domestic word: *adnate* — *přirostlý*.

Before the Czech and the English names of mushrooms could be analysed, a corpus had to be compiled. No Czech-English or English-Czech dictionary could be used for this purpose because specialized terminology is not included in general dictionaries. The only existing multi-language dictionary, KARL BERGERS *Mykologisches Wörterbuch*, proved to be very unreliable in the English part. *Amanita phalloides*, muchomůrka zelená, one of the best known mushrooms, has four English names in Berger: (i) *poison amanita*, a name found in one book only, by Rinaldi, translated from Italian, (ii) *destroying angel*, which is undoubtedly the English name of *Amanita virosa*, muchomůrka jízlivá, (iii) *death cup*, which is an obsolete term found in some North American dictionaries and in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* but not in any book on mushrooms, (iv) *death angel*, found in the *Collins English dictionary* only. The current name of the species is *Death Cap*, used in all English books on mushrooms but not in Berger.

The corpus has been compiled from a number of Czech and English books on mushrooms written for the general public. The list of the Czech and Slovak⁶⁶ books includes anything published in the last twenty-five years, the English books are mostly those available in Britain in 1994, to which a few books from the Czech and Slovak libraries have been added. Three of the English books describe the North-American mushrooms. In fact, the number of English books is quite sufficient for the present purpose, with one exception. Very few American popular names have been found and there must be many.

Both the Czech and the English books range from short guides to extensive descriptions of hundreds of species. The subjective element mentioned above is clearly seen when the species covered by Czech and English books of the same size are compared. The overlap, *ie* the percentage of the same species described both in the Czech and the English book, may be between thirty and fifty per cent (see p. 32ff.).

The main obstacle which has made the compilation of the corpus a complicated process has been the existence of synonyms among the Latin names of species. The source of the synonyms has been the constant development of the taxonomy from 1821 when the foundation of taxonomy was laid by E. M. FRIES in his *Systema mycologium*. The history of the scientific name of **Wood Blewit**, čirůvka fialová, can serve as an example. In 1789 BULLIARD called the species *Agaricus nudus*. This classification was taken over by FRIES in 1821. In 1874 KUMMER introduced the genus *Tricholoma* and moved our fungus from *Agaricus* to the new genus. In 1914 MAIRE moved the species with rosy spores from *Tricholoma* into *Rhodopaxillus* and for about twenty years our species was called *Rhodopaxillus nudus*. However, it was found that W. G. SMITH upgraded FRIES'S sub-genus *Lepista* to a genus a long time before MAIRE and as there was

66 Slovak books usually give the Czech names as well.

identity between SMITH's *Lepista* and MAIRES' *Rhodopaxillus*, the older name became the official one because it was published first.

The unfortunate thing is that three names for the **Wood Blewit** from the four quoted are still used: MAJOR (1974) uses *Tricholoma* and *Lepista*, RINALDI & TYNDALO (1974) use *Tricholoma* only, PILÁT (1969) has *Lepista* and *Rhodopaxillus* (and translates both with 'rudočechratka' = rhodopaxillus), SMOTLACHA & MALÝ, DERMEK, and DERMEK & LIZOŇ use all three, for the benefit of the reader. English books mostly use *Lepista* but also a new, fifth genus, *Clitocybe*.

A number of auxiliary lists and corpuses had to be compiled when the Czech and the English names were to be joined together as referring to the same species. One of these lists was a list of synonyms from which links could be derived between species called, *eg leccinum — boletus — krombholzia, lentinus — panus, lenzites — trametes — daedalea, lepiota — cystoderma, lepista — tricholoma — rhodopaxillus — clitocybe*.

The search through the Czech and the English books has resulted in three corpuses (or, corpora). The Main Corpus lists 610 species with their Czech and English official and popular names. The Main Corpus is part of the present study (Part B). The second corpus is the No English Equivalent Corpus. It is a list of hundreds of species described in Czech and Slovak popular books but the size of the corpus is not very important. The Slovak and Czech books on mushroom written for the general public always give Slovak and Czech names to all species mentioned in the book, a rule not established in the English speaking countries. The third corpus contains English names of species to which no Czech counterparts have been found. Many of these species, however, are described in Czech scientific books, *eg* CEJP, PŘÍHODA & ZEJBRLÍK, but only with their Latin names. The number of entries in this corpus is relatively high: 507. About 85 per cent of the entries, however, come from two books, ARORA and MCKNIGHT. ARORA describes over 2,000 species, the highest number of all the English, Czech and Slovak books available, and quotes all known English names. MCKNIGHT describes about 1,000 species and introduces a number of English names, translations of international scientific names, which are not found in any other English book. Specimens of the no-equivalent corpuses are printed in pp. 40, 42 to 44. Full versions are not relevant for the present discussion.

In the analysis, Chapter Five, two types of mushroom names are distinguished: (i) the Czech and the English 'official' counterparts to the scientific names and (ii) the Czech and the English popular names. In the third part of Chapter Five, the field of mushrooms is compared with some other fields as to the use of proper names.

Most of the comparison between the Czech and the English names has been based on separate analysis of the heads and of the modifiers. One of the differences between Czech and Latin on one side and English on the other is in the percentage of descriptive and non-descriptive heads. The distinctly lower per-

centage in English, about 50 per cent against 80 and 90, is caused by a feature of the English names already mentioned for the taxonomical and anatomical terminology: Latin names of heads taken over into English, *eg agrocybe, armillaria, clavaria, clitocybe*. They are descriptive names in Latin and Greek but they cannot have a descriptive character in English because they are not composed of elements known from other English words (except for the initiated). The traditional non-descriptive English names are much less numerous: *blewit, chanterelle, morel, truffle, mushroom*. The lowest number of non-descriptive heads is in Latin: the traditional names *agaric, amanita, boletus, bovista etc.* A number of the Czech non-descriptive names are known from CLARETUS: *bedla, hřib, chřapáč, lanýž, opeňka, pečárka, ryzec, smrž. Kosmatka, kržatka, rážovka etc.* are more recent names but they lost their descriptive character just as the names from CLARETUS.

In the descriptive heads, English and Czech differ in the range of the use of metaphor. Names such as *bonnet — helmovka, caterpillar — housenice, club — kyjanka, coral — korálovec, jelly — rosolovec* show that a metaphorical shift of meaning in English has a counterpart in Czech derivation.

Another difference between English and Czech concerns the use of metonymy, which does not exist in the Czech names of mushrooms. The English word *cap* means 'a covering for the head' and also as 'the pileus of a mushroom or toadstool'. *Cap* occurs in a number of names, in some of which its reference is to the whole mushroom, *eg death cap, panther cap, slimy beech cap*. In other names the reference is to the top part of the mushroom, *eg brown cone cap, velvet cap*. Yet even in the second case the final reference is to the mushroom as a whole. We may claim then that the first semantic shift from 'a covering for the head' to 'the pileus of a mushroom or toadstool' was based on metaphor but that the shift from 'the pileus' to 'the mushroom as a whole' is based on metonymy. Even more convincing are the names with *stalk*: in *Big Blood Stalk, Milk Stalk, Rough Stalks* the final reference is to the mushroom as a whole. Other English words employed in this way are *gill, head, hood, leg, ring, shank*. Metonymy is not used in Czech: there are no names **lysá hlava, *límeč, *čepice* but we have *lysohlávek, límcovka, čepičatka, ie* derivations as in the case of some metaphors.

When the meanings of the Czech, Latin and English heads are compared, there are only slight differences in percentages of heads referring to the shape and the properties of the mushrooms (p. 65ff).

Nearly all modifiers are descriptive and when their meanings are analysed for each language separately, we get three strong groups, colour, properties, shape, with roughly the same percentage in the three languages. That does not mean that the name of a species in one language describes the same feature of the species as the names in the two other languages. There is more agreement between Latin and Czech than between Latin and English and between English and Czech (p. 72). This is not unexpected because the Czech names are mostly translation of the Latin names. The main source of disagreement is variation

within the three languages: the same species may be called *hlízovitý* and *zelený*; *lupenitý* and *dubový*; *vysoký* and *jedlý* etc.

Variation in modifiers is not limited to the choice between colour, shape, property etc. We find variation within these areas: in the area of colour we may come across species which are *purple-tipped* and *red-tipped* and *pink-tipped*; *black* and *slate-grey*; *blue-and-yellow* and *green*. In the area of shape we find variation of the type *collared* — *saucered*; *grooved* — *beaked*. As for properties, a species may be *waxy* and *lacklustre*; *hairy* and *shaggy* and *velvety*.

The formal analysis of modifiers has shown that the names of mushrooms do not differ from other naming units. The number of nominal modifiers in English is about seven times higher than in Czech. There is nothing of special interest in the English modifiers of the *goat moth*, *jelly antler* type but the Czech modifiers are interesting: *krásnoporka kozí noha*, *strmělka mlženka*, *choroš oříš*, *ryzec syrovinka* (masc. + fem.), *holubinka vrhavka* etc.

When the indexes of common names in fourteen English books are compared, only three names appear in all of them: **Death Cap**, *Amanita phalloides*, muchomůrka zelená; **Fly Agaric**, *Amanita muscaria*, muchomůrka červená; **Honey Fungus**, *Armillaria mellea*, václavka obecná. More precisely, the name **Honey Fungus** is used in eleven books, two books use the synonym **Honey Mushroom** and one book uses three synonyms: **Honey Mushroom**, **Honey Agaric**, **Honey Armillaria**. The species has other English names, though less frequent ones.

There are three English species which have ten different names, four species with nine names and six species with eight names (p. 83–4). This is possible in English and not possible in Czech and Latin because a number of the names used in English books are popular names by origin and do not copy the official scientific names.

An essential difference between Czech and English concerns the word order in the mushroom names. The Latin names are of a model well known from other branches of science and introduced by LINNAEUS: the head, designating the genus, comes first and is followed by a modifier which decides the species. This word order has been taken over into Czech and in modern Czech it separates the technical terms from common collocations, *eg doba bronzová*, *žláza přestojná*, *jelen sika* from *dnešní doba*, *levá noha*, *mladý jelen*. The modifier always precedes the head in an English name even when the English name is a lexical calque of the Latin name, *eg Frondose Polyporus* — *Polyporus frondosus*, **Lacunose Helvella** — *Helvella lacunosa*, **Emetic Russula** — *Russula emetica*.

When the Czech popular names are analysed as to their meaning, the basic distribution of the areas is similar to that of the official names. There are three strong groups: properties, *eg hořčák*, *panský hřib*, *psí houby*, colour, *eg krvák*, *modřínka*, *rezoun*, and shape, *eg hnáty*, *palazór*, *dědkovo štětky*. The same popular name may be used to refer to various species in various areas: the name *cikánka* refers to **The Gypsy**, *Rozites caperata*, sluka svraskalá, in the Plzeň area and to **Sooty Milk Cap**, *Lactarius lignyotus*, ryzec černohlávek, in the

Sázava area. In the Plzeň area, *Lactarius lignyotus* is then called *kominiček*. An important formal feature characterizes the Czech popular names: about 75 per cent are one-word naming units.

The English popular names share some of the features of the Czech names: the same name may refer to different species and the popular names are shorter than the official names. The English popular names reflect some of the myths about mushrooms: **Fly Agaric**, *Amanita Muscaria*, muchomůrka červená, is also called **Bug Agaric** because it was smeared over bedsteads to destroy bugs. The fairies supply a number of names: *Fairiess Bath*, *Fairies Table*, *Fairy Butter*. There was a popular belief that puffballs could cause blindness if placed to close to somebodys eyes and this is reflected in the following names: *Blind Ball*, *Blind Buff*, *Blind Harry*, *Blind Mans Ball*, *Blind Mans Bellows*, *Blind Mans Buff*, *Blind Mans Een*.

Some of the mushroom names are identical with the names of plants or of insects, both in English and in Czech, eg *Bishops Mitre*, *Dead Mans Fingers*, *Goats Beard*, *Hares Ear*; *'fajfky*, *jelení růžek*, *pantoflíček*, *tanečnice* (see pp. 89–90).

Four subject fields, stars, textiles, domestic fowls, mushrooms, are compared in 6.3 as to the way proper names are used in the formation of technical terms. The differences between the fields can be explained by the following aspects: (i) the proportion of natural and artificial development. In the field of stars and mushrooms there is zero influence of human activity while the textiles are the result of conscious human activity where, for centuries, new products have been introduced on the market. Breeding is also a conscious human activity with history shorter than the textile manufacture. Both textiles and breeding share the high proportion of international elements. (ii) the amount of innovation. Closely linked with point (i), the amount of innovation is very high in the breeding and even higher in the textiles. (iii) the geographical distribution. The stars visible by the naked eye do not change their positions and the mushrooms grow in the same areas all the time. Moreover, mushrooms, unlike textiles and fowls, cannot be shipped over long distances and introduced into completely new environment. (iv) the time span of the development. The development of the breeds of fowls was relatively shorter than the introduction of the various textiles in Europe. The mushrooms have grown here for about 350 million years and the stars have been in the sky since time immemorial. (v) the fact that giving names after living human beings only begins in France in the seventeenth century with *praline* and *mansard*. There is a difference between *mackintosh* and *Grimms law* on one hand and the name-givers who call a star, a mineral or a mushroom after themselves.

Chapter Six reviews the history of mushroom names in Czech and in English. Czech had about forty names of mushrooms in the fourteenth century and English had one name. The Czech names are recorded in CLARETUS *Glossary* and were analysed by VÁCLAV MACHEK in 1944. Most of the names survived until modern times.

The only OE mushroom name with an unquestionable reference is *swamm*, A-stem, 'fungus, sponge'. It is a Germanic word, known from Gothic *swamms*, Old Icelandic *svöppr*, Old High German *swam*, *swamp*, Dutch *zwam*. *Swam* was also part of compounds *feldswam* 'mushroom, toadstool' and *meteswam* 'edible mushroom'. Old English took over Latin *spongia*, *spongea* for the meaning 'sponge'.

The OE *swamm* disappeared in ME and a new word was introduced: *toadstool*. It referred to any mushroom but in the seventeenth century its meaning was narrowed down to 'poisonous fungus' and the general meaning was taken over by *mushroom*, a French word by origin. Although seven new names of mushrooms were introduced in the sixteenth century, *ie*, in order of appearance, *fungus*, *agaric*, *puf*, *Jews ear*, *earthnut*, *champignon*, *truffle*, and another six names appeared before 1650, *boletus*, *flybane*, *goats beard*, *meadow mushroom*, *puffball*, *St. Georges mushroom*, the total number of English names is markedly lower than the number in Czech, Hungarian and German (see p. 110–1).

In an attempt to find more English names, a number of English medieval herbals was searched but without any new names discovered. The oldest herbal was from the twelfth century and the most recent one consulted was from 1655, a translation of the famous herbal by DIOSKÚRIDÉS from the first century. Some of the herbals did not describe any mushrooms. The search was not useless, however, because in four cases the herbals quote a name before the date recorded in the *OED*: *goats beard* — PARKINSON 1640, *OED* 1688, *flybane* — PARKINSON 1640, *OED* 1863, *meadow mushroom* — GERARDE 1636, *OED* 1884, *St. Georges mushroom* — PARKINSON 1640, *OED* 1891.

The third part of Chapter Six is devoted to the English versions of KOMENSKÝ's *Janua linguarum* and to the English names of mushrooms used by the translators.

In the preface to the first edition of *Janua Linguarum*, KOMENSKÝ says that he was inspired by a book called *Ianua Lingvarum*, which was written by some Jesuit in Spain. *Ianua Lingvarum* was printed in Salamanca in 1611 and the Jesuit was Irish, his name being WILLIAM BATHE. He was rector of the Irish College at Salamanca. An English version of this *Ianua* appeared in 1615, soon followed by other editions up to an eight-language version published in 1629. KOMENSKÝ did not like the *Ianua* because it was not systematic. It was more a collection of various sayings than a systematic description of the basic human knowledge of the time.

KOMENSKÝ's *Janua linguarum* was first published in 1631 and an English and a French translation by ION. ANCHORAN, together with the Latin original, appeared in the same year under the title *Porta linguarum trilinguis*. The brief mention of the mushrooms runs as follows: *Boleti inter fungos præstantissimi*. — Mushrooms amongst toadstoles are the best. — Les potirons ou champignons sont les meilleurs entre les mousserons.

Porta linguarum trilinguis was the first English version of *Janua*. A second version by TH. HORN and J. ROBOTHAM, *The Entry-Doore of Languages Un-*

locked, appeared in 1636 for the first time as a third edition. There are no records of the first and second edition, though. The HORN-ROBOTHAM translation is based on the 1933 Gdansk edition of *Janua*.

Boleti, tubera, ruffuli, inter fungos præstantissimi sunt.

Mushrooms, pufs, and the reddish ones are the most excellent among toadstooles.

The translator knew three terms, **mushroom**, **puf**, **toadstool**, but did not know how to translate capreolini and ruffuli. He left out the first one and described the third one (**reddish ones**, referring to the **Milkcaps**, ryzce, obviously). **Puf** was the predecessor of **Puffball** and referred to the Latin *Tuberus*, which is either the modern **truffle**, lanýž, or the modern **morel**, smrž.

The third version of *Janua, Janua Linguarum Trilinguis* (English, Latin, and Greek), was first published in London in 1659 and went through several editions. It was based on Latin version D (Saros Patak 1652). The Saros Patak edition was used as basis for two other English versions, *Latinæ Linguæ janua reserata* by William DU-GARD (1656) and *Janua*linguarum cum versione Anglicana* (1670), the second one being *Janua Linguarum Trilinguis* without the Greek text.

All the English versions based on the Saros Patak edition differ from the previous English editions both in scope and in arrangement. They give eight names of mushrooms: *agaric, boletus, fly-bane, goat's beard, mushroom, puff, puffball, toadstool*. If there was no English name known to the translators, they referred to the species by descriptions: **the reddish ones** = *rufuli*, **the spongy ones** = *spongiolæ*, and **the pepper-tasted ones** = *piperites*.

Let us now summarize the main observations derivable from the preceding pages:

1. English has a number of mushroom names. The number is lower than in Czech but high enough to cover the most current species.
2. The standard practice in Czech popular books on mushrooms is to give a Czech name to every species described. Thanks to this practice the number of Czech names has no limits. If a Czech popular book were to be published describing North American species, they would all be given Czech names.
3. Most English names do not copy the international names.
4. The Czech names are usually calques of the international names.
5. The English names vary in size from one to four words.
6. The Czech names are always binomial.
7. The English names, even when they calque the international names, observe the usual word order: the modifier precedes the head.
8. The word order in Czech names copies the word order of the Latin names. This is usual in other branches of science, eg *doba bronzová, žláza předstojná, káň lesní*, but not in the areas of technology. The technological terms follow the usual Czech word order: *předpjatý beton, vysoké napětí, numerická klávesnice*. If the order were reversed we would get **beton předpjatý, *napětí vysoké, *klávesnice*

numerická. In Czech popular names the modifier precedes the head: *baziliščí vejce*, *hořký modrák*, *obyčejný janek*.

9. The number of mushroom names has been lower in English than in Czech since the Middle Ages. Moreover there is no continuity between Old English and Middle English. The only OE name *swamm* does not appear in ME texts.

10. A number of Czech names has been known since the fourteenth century, thanks to CLARETUS, and some of them have common Slavonic roots.

11. The well-known preference for cultivated mushrooms in the English-speaking countries means that the number of speakers acquainted with the names of mushrooms is low. Those who know use the names as printed in the books.

12. The popularity of mushroom picking in this part of Europe means that many speakers know the names of mushrooms but they do not use the unnatural names given in books.

13. As the English names do not copy the Latin names and as the English books give a number of one-word names, some species have more English names, including three species with ten synonymous names.

14. As the Czech names are translations of the Latin names, the Czech books give synonyms only if there are synonyms in the international terminology. In Czech popular names, however, we find species with many synonymous names, mostly of the various boleti and of puffballs.

15. Most English and Czech names, both official and popular, describe the shape of the species, its colour or its properties, including taste and smell. Only small groups of mushrooms are referred to as growing in a particular habitat. A few names reflect the various myths about mushrooms.