

**Citation:**

Długosz, N., & Eftimova, A. (2023). The second life of tourism – about the meaning of Pol. *koronaturystyka* and Bul. *ковидтуризъм* in the light of survey data. *Slavia Meridionalis*, 23, Article 2888. <https://doi.org/10.11649/sm.2888>

Długosz, N., & Eftimova, A. (2023). The second life of tourism – about the meaning of Pol. *koronaturystyka* and Bul. *ковидтуризъм* in the light of survey data. *Slavia Meridionalis*, 23, Article 2888. <https://doi.org/10.11649/sm.2888>

Natalia Długosz

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5654-2018>

Andreana Eftimova

Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9232-7243>

The Second Life of Tourism – About the Meaning of Pol. *Koronaturystyka* and Bul. *Ковидтуризъм* in the Light of Survey Data

The pandemic reality which the world experienced for over two years has undoubtedly left a clear mark on the languages of most societies. Gradually, more and more new publications are appearing that describe this kind of influence in the languages we are interested in, namely Polish¹ and Bulgarian,² thus showing that linguists are describing the language changes that reflect the rapid

¹ Publications dealing with the changing reality of the Polish language in the era of the pandemic include Głażewska & Karwatowska (2021); Kuligowski (2020); Makowska (2021); Rybka et al. (2021).

² Bulgarian publications on language changes due to the coronavirus pandemic include: Cheshmedzieva-Stoycheva (2021); Аврамова (2021); Андреева (2021); Бонджолова (2022); Илиева (2021); Сорока and Хороз (2021); Чешмеджиева-Стойчева (2021).

This work was supported by the project: No BG05M2OP001-2.016-0019 “Innovative education in humanitarian and social science through digital transformation and modernization of educational programmes in Veliko Tarnovo University, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, South-West University “Neofit Rilski” and Technical University – Gabrovo, in partnership with international universities from Greece, Poland and Romania”.

Authors’ contribution: both authors participated equally in the concept of the study and drafting the manuscript.

Competing interests: no competing interests have been declared.

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en>), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s) 2023.

spread or extinguishing of the pandemic in various parts of the world. Giving names to new phenomena is natural in the process of adaptation to a new and unusual reality and taming it. In a short time, the name of the disease, “COVID-19”, and the word “coronavirus” became the most frequently used words in international media, and frequently repeated new words, including borrowings and neologisms, which have quickly entered into linguistic usage. In Slavic languages, there is an increasing number of compound words whose first component is the name of the disease: the colloquial name *korona* appeared in this function in some languages (this is the case in Polish³), while in others it is COVID (the component *ковид*- prevails in Bulgarian, although in Bulgarian there are also compounds with a *корона*- component⁴).

Of new phenomena related to the pandemic, a nontrivial place is occupied by so-called *corona tourism*, generally understood as tourism during the pandemic. It is well known that the tourism industry suffered most as a result of pandemic restrictions. In this sector, the pandemic had irreversible consequences.

Struggling with the new phenomenon, tourist entities undertook various types of activities to stay on the market. Undoubtedly, the exceptional circumstances of the prevailing COVID-19 situation in the world caused a great transformation in tourism. The expectations of tourists changed diametrically, which forced tourism companies to create very different and unusual offerings that took into account the expectations of the client on the one hand, and all kinds of restrictions on the other. During the pandemic, new trends in tourism clearly emerged, such as combining holidays with remote work, a return to domestic tourism, choosing to travel to less-frequented or less disease-affected places, and a new fashion for camping and trips to agritourism farms or places previously hard to reach. Even cursory observations of the usage of the Polish word *koronaturystyka* in journalistic texts and the Bulgarian equivalent *ковидтуризъм* show us that this is a semantically unstable concept that is characterized by a kind of semantic diffusion.⁵ In both languages we are interested

³ Cierpich-Koziel (2020) wrote about a series of Polish compounds with the *korona*-component.

⁴ The following authors wrote about a series of Bulgarian compounds with the *ковид*-component: Długosz (2022).

⁵ I understand semantic diffusion as “underdetermination or indetermination of the content of linguistic signs of various formats (morphemes, lexemes, word groups, sentences, texts), the fuzzy nature of the boundaries between meanings and semantic categories in the semantic system of language and in linguistic communication” [translated by N.D.] (Kiklewicz, 2006, p. 12).

in, words are complex structures that arise as the number of compound words increases. The first component (in this case, the name of the virus) semantically defines the second one. However, even a selective and superficial analysis of selected contexts in which these lexemes have been used in the press leads to the reflection that the meaning of the first component is not its linguistic meaning, i.e., it does not mean a pandemic or a disease as such but is based on various types of connotations caused by the circumstances of the pandemic. In order to verify these observations and to determine the semantic scope of *koronaturystyka*, we decided to undertake an experimental study. This made it possible to indicate the common stabilizing features (and thus differentiating features) of the *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* concept for the Polish and Bulgarian languages and to distinguish areas of semantic references that occurred only in the indications of the speakers of one of the languages.

In this article, we attempt to create an open cognitive definition of the meaning of the *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* concept which gives access to two of the most expansive (characterized by high frequency of use) compound words in the journalistic media discourse: the Polish compositum *koronaturystyka* and the Bulgarian word *ковидтуризъм*.

The overarching goal of this cognitive definition is “to report on how the research subject is perceived by speakers of a given language, i.e., [...] from socially consolidated knowledge about the world that can be known through language and use of language, the categorization of its phenomena, their characteristics and valuating” [translated by N.D.] (Bartmiński, 1988, p. 169). The cognitive definition of the concept proposed here for both languages cannot have a final character at this moment of its historical development when this meaning is being constituted before our eyes.

At present, *koronaturystyka* or *ковидтуризъм* are not sufficiently stable units to be included in the lexicographic descriptions of these languages. Social knowledge about them has also not yet been established. The research results presented here are based on one type of data – experimental data. The basis for the reconstruction of these definientia are texts generated by the survey method. We do not include system and text data.⁶ From the data garnered through the survey, we try to extract stabilized features in the form of judgments contained in the elicited

⁶ In accordance with the assumptions of the ethnolinguistic school of Lublin, the synthetic cognitive definition includes three types of data (S-A-T data): system, survey (Polish *ankieta*) and text data (cf. Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, 2020, p. 112).

texts, in this case most often in the form of a sentence or two sentences (Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, 2020, p. 112). The definition constructed in this way extends to creative statements and considers repetitive textual uses, thus preserving the feature of openness. This type of data “can [...] confirm or even reveal regularities in humans’ way of understanding the world” [translated by N.D.] Filar (2013, p. 32). Descriptor features are further assigned to aspects. Ways of assigning these aspects were described by Małgorzata Brzozowska (2006, pp. 40–41) in the book *Język – Wartości – Polityka*. Particular importance is attached to the comparative element of the study by emphasizing similarities and differences in ways of understanding the concept, named by compound words, which are formal equivalents. The experiment was conducted in accordance with the main methodological assumptions of the Lublin cognitive ethnolinguistics school (cf. Bielińska-Gardziel et al., 2017, pp. 9–14). Two groups took part in a properly prepared survey: a group of 50 Polish students (students of the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań), and a group of 50 Bulgarian students (students of the St. Kliment Ohridski University in Sofia). Among the Polish respondents, 35 were women and 15 were men, mostly aged 19 to 30 (47 people), with three participants aged over 40. All the Polish respondents were students of humanities: Balkan studies, Bulgarian philology, Croatian philology, Czech philology, and Polish philology. Among the Bulgarian respondents, there are also more women (33) than men (15). In the two surveys, respondents did not indicate demographic data. The age of the Bulgarian students ranged from 18 to 26. Most of them were students of sociology (28) or of communication management, art studies, film studies, interior design, finance, advertising, and general or applied biology. In both surveys, an open-ended question was used: 1. pl. Co Pani/Pana zdaniem oznacza słowo *koronaturystyka*? [What do you think the word *koronaturystyka* means?]; 2. Bul. Какво означава според Вас дума *ковидтуризъм*? [What do you think the word *ковидтуризъм* means?]. All respondents answered the question, but two Polish students answered “nie wiem” [I don’t know] and one Bulgarian answered “нямам идея” [I have no idea]. For the Polish and Bulgarian questionnaires, we received 52 indications⁷ each.

In the common awareness of both the Polish and the Bulgarian students, *koronaturystyka* (in Bulgarian *ковидтуризъм*) is characterized primarily by its **physical dimension**, which indicates **when** the tourist activity is carried out. In both languages, the temporal feature of the subject of reference, i.e.,

⁷ An indication is understood as an answer that can be classified into one of the possible aspects. Some answers contain two or more indications.

the duration of the pandemic, ranks first. *Koronaturystyka* or *ковидтуризъм* are most often defined as tourist activity during the pandemic:

a) indications of Polish respondents:

turystyka/ podróżowanie/ wycieczki i wyjazdy/ zwiedzanie/ przemysł turystyczny (odbywające się) w czasach/ w dobie/ podczas/ w trakcie (trwania) pandemii Covid-19/koronawirusa (25/48%⁸);

b) indications of Bulgarian respondents:

туризъм/ пътуване/екскурзии/ посещаване (на определена дестинация/ на курорти)/ пътешествието/ осъществяване на туристически цели/ секторът туризъм по време на/ в условия на/ през (ковид) пандемия Covid-19/от коронавируса (24/47%).

Both Polish and Bulgarian respondents perceive *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* in a **political dimension**, which overlaps with the psychological and psychosocial aspects. *Koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* understood in this way boils down to **practicing tourism, taking into account the restrictions and legal regulations related to the pandemic or traveling to places with a low level of this disease**. Therefore, we are dealing here with a kind of tourism that is based on preservative actions that are related to respecting the restrictions imposed by the authorities (political aspect) in order to minimize the risk of infection (psychological and psychosocial aspect). The psychological aspect refers to the individual's sense of threat and fear, while the psychosocial aspect is based on a sense of responsibility for the group that is manifested in the attitude of adhering to limitations for the common good:

a) indications of Polish respondents:

turystyka/ ograniczone zwiedzanie/ sposób podróżowania podczas pandemii ograniczone przez lockdown i lokalne prawa/ wszelkie restrykcje i modyfikacje/ z uwzględnieniem restrykcji pandemicznej; turystyka do krajów, w których było to możliwe; wyjazdy tam, gdzie pozwalają (na to) regulacje związane z pandemią; podejmowanie decyzji na temat destynacji na podstawie istniejących obostrzeń w danym państwie; turystyka z ograniczoną możliwością przemieszczania się (10/20%);

b) indications of Bulgarian respondents:

туризъм съобразен с ковид мерки/ съобразен с епидемиологичната обстановка/ свързан с предпазните мерки срещу Ковид 19/ организиран

⁸ In parentheses, we indicate the number or percentage of all indications.

според всички наложени рестрикции; туризъм по време на ковидкриза, което включва тестване с PCR-тестове, антигенни или сертификат за ваксинация; туризъм, повлиян от ковид – хората искат да почиват там, където заболелите са по-малко на брой (6/11%).

An important place is occupied by the **psychosocial dimension** and the **psychological dimension** of understanding *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм*. In this case, these terms refer to tourism to places with a high infection rate, tourism that carries a high risk of infection, or tourism during which infection occurs. In this dimension, *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* is **tourism practiced despite the existing restrictions and threats, with a conscious attempt to avoid the restrictions**. The psychosocial aspect, therefore, consists in disrespecting a certain social contract, the restrictions applicable to the general public, and the safety of others in order to carry out activities of an individual dimension. This aspect casts a completely different light on the picture of *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* than the political dimension discussed above.

Many Polish and Bulgarian students consider *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* to be a kind of extreme tourism that is very risky (tourism characterized by risk):

a) indications of Polish respondents:

wycieczki do krajów z wysokim wskaźnikiem zakażeń covidem; podróże zagraniczne podczas pandemii; podróżowanie do krajów, w których odsetek zachorowań jest bardzo duży i są one objęte restrykcjami; wyjazdy zagraniczne w dobie pandemii, szczególnie w największych falach wzrostu zarażeń (np. luty 2021); zwiedzanie świata mimo zakazu pandemicznego (7/13%);

b) indications of Bulgarian respondents:

посещение на населени места или обекти, за които се знае, че се струпват голямо количество хора и разпространението на заразата е високо; алтернативна форма на туризъм, която се осъществява въпреки всички наложени мерки; туризъм в който се преминава през всички страни с много болни от COVID; ходене на почивка, въпреки локдауна; да си на почивка и да се заразиш (5/10%).

In the Polish picture of *koronaturystyka*, there is a clear group of indications relating to the choice of tourist destinations where restrictions related to the pandemic are lighter or completely absent. These characteristics refer to the psychological aspect, because *koronaturystyka* understood in this way is based on individual choices of tourist destinations with a view to one's own safety and comfort. The following indications reveal this:

podróżowanie do kraju, w którym są łżejsze obostrzenia covidowe w porównaniu do własnego kraju; turystyka do regionów, w których nie wprowadzono obostrzeń lub je zdjęto; próba pominięcia obostrzeń pandemicznych poprzez wyjazdy do miejsc, gdzie obostrzeń nie ma; wybieranie takich celów podróży, które można łatwo osiągnąć bez wykonywania dodatkowych testów na obecność wirusa (4/8%).

In the answers of Polish respondents, two more aspects of the perception of *koronaturystyka* are clearly outlined: the **living** and the **historical aspects** of the concept. In the first case, it is about an understanding of *koronaturystyka* that includes an economic factor. We are talking about the **cheapness** of *koronaturystyka*, which consists, among others, in a decrease in prices (air tickets, hotel fees, etc.) due to the circumstances of the pandemic. This is revealed in the following indications:

podróżowanie/ turystyka w czasach ostrej pandemii, gdzie bilety samolotowe, pobyty w hotelach itp. były dużo tańsze niż zwykle; tanie wyjazdy turystyczne, związane ze spadkiem cen za wyjazd w związku z pandemią (2/4%).

The locative aspect appears in two responses in which corona tourism is understood as **trips to places that are somehow related to or publicized by the pandemic**. In these answers, apart from the locative aspect, there is also a kind of historical awareness of the importance of current (or just past) events, as we can see in the following indications:

nazwa turystycznych wycieczek po miejscach, gdzie działo się coś ważnego związanego z COVID-19; ruch turystyczny do kraju, w którym rozpoczęła się pandemia koronawirusa (Chiny, Wuhan) w celu odwiedzenia i sprawdzenia, jak żyją tam obecnie mieszkańcy (2/4%).

The other answers of the Bulgarian respondents contain interesting indications that refer to three dimensions of perceiving the phenomenon: psychological, physical and ethical. The psychological aspect, on the one hand, comes down to understanding *ковидтуризъм* as a way of taming the new pandemic reality, adapting to it, and trying to overcome the fears associated with it; on the other hand, it refers to the desire to fulfill individual needs and goals (tourism for medical purposes, travel business, implementation of previously difficult-to-achieve tourist goals). We can see these in the following responses:

a) **taming the new pandemic reality:**

според мен, ковидтуризъм означава туризъм в съвременния свят, в които се учиме да живееме с ковид; хората да се върнат към нормалния си начин на живот (2/4%);

b) fulfillment of individual needs and goals:

пътуване по време на пандемията с лечебна цел; пътуване, не с цел развлечение, а поради дадени ангажименти. С негативна конотация; да обикаляш места, които са били трудни за посещение преди пандемията (3/6%).

The **physical aspect** is visible in the indications that *ковидтуризъм* is understood as **tourism practiced by people suffering from COVID-19 or by convalescents**. There were three such indications in the texts elicited by the experiment: заболели с Ковид пътуват някъде; туризъм по време на Ковид пандемията, на който туристите са болни от Covid-19; туризъм, който включва хора преболеждали Ковид или го карат на момента (3/6%). The **physical aspect** also includes indications that **question or negate the existence of the *ковидтуризъм* phenomenon**. A group of such judgments is formed by the following answers: не съществува; възможен ли е туризмът по време на ковидпандемия?; нищо; да си стоиш вкъщи, но на почивка (iron.) (3/6%).

In their answers, two Bulgarian respondents explicitly point to the **ethical aspect** of the concept, assigning to it a “negative connotation” and describing *ковидтуризъм* as “something” exotic but also enigmatic and terrible: пътуване, не с цел развлечение, а поради дадени ангажименти. С негативна конотация; „ковидтуризъм” е новото екзотично – едновременно енигматично, непознато и страшно (2/4%).

One answer is metaphorical and ironic: евфемизъм, означаващ разпространението на K19 из различните държави (1/2%). In this case, *ковидтуризъм* turned out to be a euphemism, i.e., a word used to soften its actual content, which actually means ‘the spread of coronavirus in the world’.

To sum up, it is clear (from our experimental study) that the basic stabilizing features of the *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* concept are the same for both languages. Namely, both Polish and Bulgarian respondents attribute to *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* a physical feature of temporality, defining it as tourist activity taking place during the pandemic. This feature was mentioned 25 times in Polish, which is nearly 48% of all indications, and 24 times in Bulgarian, which is 47% of all indications. The picture of *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* in both languages is also explicitly dominated by the feature of self-protective behavior, which consists in practicing tourism while taking into account pandemic restrictions and legal regulations, or by choosing tourist destinations with a low infection rate (10 indications in Polish – nearly 20%; 6 indications in Bulgarian – approx. 11%). A significant role in the way the concept is understood by Poles and Bulgarians is played by

the risk that is inherent in *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм*; this is emphasized in statements that focus on understanding *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* as an activity undertaken despite existing restrictions or by consciously avoiding them, or trips to countries with a high incidence rate which entail a high risk of infection (in Polish 7 indications – 13%; in Bulgarian, 5 indications – nearly 10%). The first two features made it possible to calculate a very high rate of stereotyping⁹ of the concept for both languages. It amounted to 67.3% for Polish and 57.69% for Bulgarian.

Other characteristics are indicated much less often, so they should be treated as less-known by the respondents and thus non-conventionalized, and sometimes completely individual. Polish students drew attention to the comfort and convenience of traveling that is manifested in the choice of tourist destinations where restrictions related to the pandemic are lighter or do not exist at all (4 indications). Furthermore, when defining *koronaturystyka*, they referred to living conditions, i.e., the cheapness of tourist offers (2 indications). In two indications, they described *koronaturystyka* as traveling to specific important places related to the pandemic. However, in their answers the Bulgarian students questioned or even denied the existence of *ковидтуризъм* (4 indications), which none of the Polish respondents attempted to do. Among the Bulgarian answers, the indications according to which *ковидтуризъм* is associated with people suffering from COVID-19 or convalescents stand out (3 indications). It seems interesting to inscribe the following figurative meanings into the concept: ‘the way of taming the new reality’ (2 indications) and ‘the camouflaged way of spreading the coronavirus’ (1 indication).

Some of the answers contained evaluative assessments of the concept as evoking negative connotations and emotions, i.e., fear of the unknown (2 indications). Moreover, *ковидтуризъм* was described as tourism practiced for purposes other than entertainment, namely for medical or business purposes (2 indications), and in one case also for the chance to travel to places previously difficult to reach. It seems, therefore, that experience in the social and individual dimension plays a dominant role in the way of understanding the *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* concept among both the Polish and

⁹ The rate of stereotyping is calculated according to the formula used to study linguistic stereotypes:

$$W_s = x \cdot 100\%$$

(Brzozowska, 2006, pp. 39–40). W_s – rate of stereotyping; D1 and D2 – descriptor features with the highest number of indications; W – number of indications.

Bulgarian respondents, while instinctive processes play an important role in this experience (cf. J. Chałasiński, Antagonizm polsko-niemiecki w osadzie fabrycznej „Kolonja” na Górnym Śląsku, „Przegląd socjologiczny” III, 1935; cited after Bartmiński, 2009, p. 55). The high level of stereotyping of the concept proves the need to tame and adapt to the new reality also at the level of language. Therefore, the study explicitly shows that we are dealing with a new concept that is still subject to the categorization process. The meanings (features) attributed by language users to *koronaturystyka* and *ковидтуризъм* reflect the complexity and dynamism of reality, and the use of these words is, according to Jolanta Maćkiewicz, “the first step on the way to transforming experiential chaos into conceptual cosmos” [translated by N.D.] (Maćkiewicz, 1990, p. 56). Therefore, we would like to emphasize that the proposed definition that is formulated here remains open to the features of the subject of the study, which can be supplemented, for example, by using system and text data.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartmiński, J. (1988). Definicja kognitywna jako narzędzie opisu konotacji słowa. In J. Bartmiński (Ed.), *Konotacja* (pp. 169–183). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Bartmiński, J. (2009). *Stereotypy mieszkają w języku*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Bielińska-Gardziel, I., Brzozowska, M., & Żywicka, B. (Eds.). (2017). *Nazwy wartości w językach europejskich: Raport z badań empirycznych*. Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Wschodnioeuropejska w Przemyślu.
- Brzozowska, M. (2006). O przebiegu badań nad zmianami w rozumieniu nazw wartości w latach 1990–2000. In J. Bartmiński (Ed.), *Język – wartości – polityka* (pp. 36–43). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Cheshmedzieva-Stoycheva, D. (2021). Covid-infected Bulgarian discourse? In A. K. Шевцова (Ed.), *На перекрестке культур: Единство языка, литературы и образования – II: Сборник научных статей II Международной научно-практической интернет-конференции, 7–18 декабря 2020 г.* (pp. 133–137). МГУ имени А. А. Кулешова.
- Cierpich-Kozieł, A. (2020). Koronarzeczywistość – o nowych złożeniach z członem korona w dobie pandemii. *Język Polski*, 100(4), 102–117. <https://doi.org/10.31286/JP.100.4.7>
- Długosz, N. (2022). Композитуми с компонента “ковид-” и “постковид-” в българския медиен дискурс. In P. Kolkovska & M. Stamenov (Eds.), *Доклади от Международната научна конференция на Института за български език “Проф. Любомир Андрейчин”* (pp. 192–200). Издателство БАН.

- Filar, D. (2013). *Narracyjne aspekty językowego obrazu świata: Interpretacja marzenia we współczesnej polszczyźnie*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Głazewska, E., & Karwatowska, M. (2021). *Maska w “czasach zarazy”: Covidowe wizerunki masek – typologie i funkcje*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Kiklewicz, A. (2006). Dyfuzja semantyczna w języku i w tekście. *LingVaria*, 1, 11–21.
- Kuligowska, K. (2020). Język w czasach zarazy: O wpływie pandemii na system leksykalny języka polskiego i rosyjskiego. *Acta Polono-Ruthenica*, 3(25), 109–126. <https://doi.org/10.31648/apr.5893>
- Maćkiewicz, J. (1990). Kategoryzacja a językowy obraz świata. In J. Bartmiński (Ed.), *Językowy obraz świata* (pp. 51–59). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Makowska, M. (2021). Język i obraz wobec koronawirusa: Przyczynek do rozważań nad komunikacją medialną w czasach pandemii. *Forum Lingwistyczne*, 8, 1–14.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, S. (2020). *Definiowanie i profilowanie pojęć w (etno)lingwistyce*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Rybka, M., Wrześniewska-Pietrzak, M., Wiatrowski, P., Zagórska, K., Kołodziejczak, M., Świerkowska, D., & Wyszynski, J. (2021). *Covid-19 czarna seria ciągle trwa: Medialny obraz koronawirusa i jego oddziaływania społeczno-polityczne*. Wydawnictwo Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne.
- Trzeciak, M. (2020). Komunikacja językowa i medialna w czasie epidemii koronawirusowej – omówienie zjawiska oraz studium przypadku (na przykładzie własnych tekstów naukowych). *Językoznawstwo*, 2020(1(14)), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.25312/2391-5137.14/2020_13mat
- Аврамова, Ц. (2021). Нов речник на новите думи в българския език. *Opera Slavica*, 31(4), 80–82. <https://doi.org/10.5817/OS2021-4-9>
- Андреева, Д. (2021). “Черен лебед”, инфодемия и научна журналистика. In *Качествена журналистика и нова комуникационна среда: Международна научна конференция на ФЖМК, проведена на 29-30.10.2020 г. / Quality journalism and a new communication environment* (pp. 301–311). Софийски университет “Св. Климент Охридски”.
- Бонджолова, В. (2022). Ковид okazjiонализми в българския език. In Л. Р. Дускаева & А. А. Малышев (Eds.), *Медиалингвистика: Язык в координатах массмедиа: Материалы VI международной научной конференции (Санкт-Петербург, 30 июня – 2 июля 2022 г.)* (Pt. 9, pp. 17–21). Медиапапир.
- Илиева, Т. (2021). Лексикални неологизми с чуждоезиков компонент в българските медиатекстове. *Годишник на Педагогическия факултет при Тракийския университет*, 18, 162–185.
- Сорока, О., & Хороз, Н. (2021). “Коронавирусните” иновации в речта на украинците и българите. In М. Илиева, В. Маринов, Т. Куртева-Рабованова, & И. Димитрова (Eds.), *Проблеми на устната комуникация* (Vol. 12, Book 1, pp. 331–343). Университетско издателство “Св. св. Кирил и Методий”.
- Чешмеджиева-Стойчева, Д. (2021). Ковидясване, коронаясване, карантинясване или езикови трансформации по време на пандемия. *Любословие: Годишно списание за хуманитаристика*, 21, 276–292.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(TRANSLITERATION)

- Andreeva, D. (2021). “Cheren lebed”, infodemiia i nauchna zhurnalistika. In *Kachestvena zhurnalistika i nova komunikatsionna sreda: Mezhdunarodna nauchna konferentsiia na FZhMK, provedena na 29–30.10.2020 g. / Quality journalism and a new communication environment* (pp. 301–311). Sofiiski universitet “Sv. Kliment Okhridski”.
- Avramova, TS. (2021). Nov rechnik na novite dumi v bŭlgarskiia ezik. *Opera Slavica*, 31(4), 80–82. <https://doi.org/10.5817/OS2021-4-9>
- Bartmiński, J. (1988). Definicja kognitywna jako narzędzie opisu konotacji słowa. In J. Bartmiński (Ed.), *Konotacja* (pp. 169–183). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Bartmiński, J. (2009). *Stereotypy mieszkają w języku*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Bielińska-Gardziel, I., Brzozowska, M., & Żywicka, B. (Eds.). (2017). *Nazwy wartości w językach europejskich: Raport z badań empirycznych*. Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Wschodnioeuropejska w Przemyślu.
- Bondzholova, V. (2022). Kovid okazionalizmi v bŭlgarskiia ezik. In L. R. Duskaeva & A. A. Malyshov (Eds.), *Medialingvistika: Iazyk v koordinatakh massmedia: Materialy VI mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii (Sankt-Peterburg, 30 iyunia – 2 iulia 2022 g.)* (Pt. 9, pp. 17–21). Mediapapir.
- Brzozowska, M. (2006). O przebiegu badań nad zmianami w rozumieniu nazw wartości w latach 1990–2000. In J. Bartmiński (Ed.), *Język – wartości – polityka* (pp. 36–43). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Cierpich-Kozieł, A. (2020). Koronarzeczywistość – o nowych złożeniach z członem korona- w dobie pandemii. *Język Polski*, 100(4), 102–117. <https://doi.org/10.31286/JP.100.4.7>
- Cheshmedzhieva-Stoicheva, D. (2021). Kovidiasvane, koroniasvane, karantinasvane ili ezikovi transformatsii po vreme na pandemii. *Liuboslovie: Godishno spisanie za khumanitaristika*, 21, 276–292.
- Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva, D. (2021). Covid-infected Bulgarian discourse? In A. K. Shevtsova (Ed.), *Na perekrestke kultur: Edinstvo iazyka, literatury i obrazovaniia – II: Sbornik nauchnykh statei II Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi internet-konferentsii, 7–18 dekabria 2020 g.* (pp. 133–137). MGU imeni A. A. Kuleshova.
- Długosz, N. (2022). Kompozitumy s komponenta “kovid-” i “postkovid” v bŭlgarskiia medien diskurs. In P. Kolkovska & M. Stamenov (Eds.), *Dokladi ot Mezhdunarodnata nauchna konferentsiia na Instituta za bŭlgarski ezik “Prof. Liubomir Andreichin”* (pp. 192–200). Izdatelstvo BAN.
- Filar, D. (2013). *Narracyjne aspekty językowego obrazu świata: Interpretacja marzenia w współczesnej polszczyźnie*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Głazewska, E., & Karwatowska, M. (2021). *Maska w “czasach zarazy”: Covidowe wizerunki masek – typologie i funkcje*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

- Ilieva, T. (2021). Leksikalni neologizmi s chuzhdoezikov komponent v bŭlgarskite mediatekstove. *Godishnik na Pedagogicheskiia fakultet pri Trakiiskiia universitet*, 18, 162–185.
- Kiklewicz, A. (2006). Dyfuzja semantyczna w języku i w tekście. *LingVaria*, 1, 11–21.
- Kuligowska, K. (2020). Język w czasach zarazy: O wpływie pandemii na system leksykalny języka polskiego i rosyjskiego. *Acta Polono-Ruthenica*, 3(25), 109–126. <https://doi.org/10.31648/apr.5893>
- Mackiewicz, J. (1990). Kategoryzacja a językowy obraz świata. In J. Bartmiński (Ed.), *Językowy obraz świata* (pp. 51–59). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Makowska, M. (2021). Język i obraz wobec koronawirusa: Przyczynek do rozważań nad komunikacją medialną w czasach pandemii. *Forum Lingwistyczne*, 8, 1–14.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, S. (2020). *Definiowanie i profilowanie pojęć w (etno)lingwistyce*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Rybka, M., Wrześniewska-Pietrzak, M., Wiatrowski, P., Zagórska, K., Kołodziejczak, M., Świerkowska, D., & Wyszynski, J. (2021). *Covid-19 czarna seria ciągle trwa: Medialny obraz koronawirusa i jego oddziaływania społeczno-polityczne*. Wydawnictwo Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne.
- Soroka, O., & Khoroz, N. (2021). “Koronavirusnite” inovatsii v rechta na ukrainsite i bŭlgarite. In M. Ilieva, V. Marinov, T. Kurteva-Rabovianova, & I. Dimitrova (Eds.), *Problemi na ustnata komunikatsiia* (Vol. 12, Book 1, pp. 331–343). Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodii”.
- Trzeciak, M. (2020). Komunikacja językowa i medialna w czasie epidemii koronawirusowej – omówienie zjawiska oraz studium przypadku (na przykładzie własnych tekstów naukowych). *Językoznawstwo*, 2020(1(14)), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.25312/2391-5137.14/2020_13mat

Drugie życie turystyki – o znaczeniu pol. koronaturystyki i bŭlg. *ковидтуризъм* w świetle danych eksperymentalnych

W artykule podjęto próbę sformułowania kognitywnej definicji znaczeniowej konceptu, do którego dają dostęp polskie compositum *koronaturystyka* oraz bułgarski wyraz *ковидтуризъм*. Wyniki badań opierają się na danych eksperymentalnych. Eksperyment został przeprowadzony zgodnie z głównymi założeniami metodologicznymi lubelskiej etnolingwistyki kognitywnej na 50 studentach polskich i 50 studentach bułgarskich. Podstawowe cechy stabilizujące konceptu *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* są takie same dla obu języków. Zarówno polscy, jak i bułgarscy respondenci przypisują *koronaturystyce* fizykalną cechę temporalności, definiując ją jako aktywność lub działalność turystyczną mającą miejsce w trakcie trwania pandemii. W obrazie *koronaturystyki* w obu językach dominują także cecha zachowawczości i cecha ryzyka – uprawianie turystyki z uwzględnieniem pandemicznych obostrzeń vs. uprawianie turystyki mimo istniejących restrykcji. Wskaźnik

stereotypizacji konceptu jest bardzo wysoki dla obu języków – 67,3% dla języka polskiego; 57,69% dla języka bułgarskiego.

Słowa kluczowe: *koronaturystyka*; *ковидтуризъм*; język polski; język bułgarski; znaczenie; badania ankietowe; definicja kognitywna

The second life of tourism – about the meaning of Pol. *koronaturystyka* and Bul. *ковидтуризъм* in the light of survey data

The article attempts to formulate a cognitive definition of the meaning of the concept of the Polish compositum *koronaturystyka* and the Bulgarian word *ковидтуризъм*. The research results are based on survey data collected from 50 Polish and 50 Bulgarian students in accordance with the main methodological assumptions of the Lublin cognitive ethnolinguistics school. The basic stabilizing features of the *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* concept are the same for both languages. Polish and Bulgarian respondents attribute the physical feature of temporality to *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм*, defining it as tourist activity taking place during a pandemic. The conservatism and risk traits are also dominant in the picture of *koronaturystyka/ковидтуризъм* in both languages: tourism that takes pandemic restrictions into account vs. tourism despite these restrictions. The extent to which the concept is stereotyped is very high for both languages: 67.3% in Polish; 57.69% in Bulgarian.

Keywords: *koronaturystyka*; *ковидтуризъм*; Polish language; Bulgarian language; meaning; survey study; cognitive definition

Natalia Długosz (natalia.reczek@amu.edu.pl) – językoznawczyni, slawistka, profesor na Uniwersytecie im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, pracuje w Instytucie Filologii Słowiańskiej. Absolwentka studiów podyplomowych *Psychologia w zarządzaniu* na Uniwersytecie Ekonomicznym we Wrocławiu. Tłumaczka przysięgła języka bułgarskiego. Jej zainteresowania badawcze koncentrują się na słowiańskim słowotwórstwie porównawczym, kognitywno-komunikacyjnym opisie nowej leksyki, etnolingwistyce, legilingwistyce i językach mniejszościowych (zwłaszcza na etnolekcie gorańskim). Wspiera działalność wydawniczą o tematyce regionalnej na Śląsku, gdzie mieszka. Autorka lic-

nych artykułów i książek naukowych: *Słowotwórstwo polskich i bułgarskich deminutywów rzeczownikowych* (2009); *O znakach ubezwłasnowolnionych, czyli o nowych polskich i bułgarskich compositach bezafiksalnych w medialnym dyskursie publicystycznym* (2017), a także tekstów popularyzujących kulturę słowiańską m.in. dla portalu wachtyrz.eu.

Natalia Długosz (natalia.reczek@amu.edu.pl) – Linguist, Slavist, professor in the Institute of Slavic Philology at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. A postgraduate of *Psychology in management* studies at Wrocław University of Economics. Sworn translator of the Bulgarian language. Her research interests focus on Slavic comparative word formation, cognitive and communicative description of new lexis, ethnolinguistics, legilinguistics and minority languages (especially the Gorani ethnolect). She supports publishing activities on regional topics in Silesia, where she lives. Author of numerous scientific articles and books: *Słowotwórstwo polskich i bułgarskich deminutywów rzeczownikowych* [Word Formation of Diminutive Nouns in Polish and Bulgarian, 2009]; *O znakach ubezwłasnowolnionych, czyli o nowych polskich i bułgarskich compositach bezafiksalnych w medialnym dyskursie publicystycznym* [On Signs Incapacitated: The Latest Polish and Bulgarian No-affix Compounds in Public Media Discourse: A Cognitive and Communicative Approach, 2017], as well as texts popularizing Slavic culture, e.g., for the wachtyrz.eu website.

Andreana Eftimova (a.eftimova@uni-sofia.bg) – bułgarska językoznawczyni, profesor na Uniwersytecie im. Klemensa Ochrydzkiego w Sofii, pracuje na Wydziale Dziennikarstwa i Komunikacji Masowej. Jej zainteresowania badawcze koncentrują się zwłaszcza na zagadnieniach z zakresu psycholingwistyki, tekstologii, medioznawstwa i socjolingwistyki. Regularnie współpracuje z bułgarskimi mediami. Autorka licznych artykułów i książek: *Невербална комуникация в телевизията* [Niewerbalna komunikacja i telewizja, 2002]; *Ефективната невербална комуникация* [Efektywna komunikacja niewerbalna, 2008]; *Винаги малко повече* [Zawsze trochę więcej, 2010]; *Невербална комуникация: медии и медиатори* [Niewerbalna komunikacja: media i mediatorzy, 2011]; *Есето в академичната и журналистическата практика* [Esej w akademickiej i dziennikarskiej praktyce, 2011]; *Медиен език и стил: теория и съвременни практики* [Język mediów i styl: teoria i współczesne

praktyki, 2014]; *Двойственият език в медиите: езикът на политическата коректност vs езика на омразата* [Podwójny język mediów: język poprawności politycznej i mowa nienawiści, 2016]; *Регистри в журналистическия дискурс* [Rejestry w dyskursie dziennikarskim, 2018].

Andrea Eftimova (a.eftimova@uni-sofia.bg) – Bulgarian linguist and professor at the Faculty of Journalism and Mass Communications at “St. Kliment Ohridski” University in Sofia. Her research interests focus on issues in the fields of mediallynguistics, textolinguistics, psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. She regularly collaborates with Bulgarian media. Author of numerous articles and books: *Невербалната комуникация в телевизията* [Nonverbal Communication and the Television, 2002]; *Ефективната невербална комуникация* [Effective Nonverbal Communication, 2008]; *Винаги малко повече* [Always a Little More, 2010]; *Невербална комуникация: медии и медиатори* [Nonverbal Communication: Media and Mediators, 2011]; *Есето в академичната и журналистическата практика* [Essay in Academic and Journalistic Practice, 2011]; *Медиен език и стил: теория и съвременни практики* [Media language and Style: Theory and Contemporary Practices, 2014]; *Двойственият език в медиите: езикът на политическата коректност vs езика на омразата* [The Dual Language of the Media: The Language of Political Correctness and Hate Speech, 2016]; *Регистри в журналистическия дискурс* [Registers in Journalistic Discourse, 2018].