

An English-Polish Glossary of Lexicographical Terms: A Description of the Compilation Process

Mirosława Podhajecka
University of Opole

Monika Bielińska
University of Silesia

In the present paper we describe the consecutive phases in the compilation of an English-Polish glossary of lexicographical terms, which is part of a larger dictionary project-still in the making. In doing so, we address some of the issues that made the compilation procedure methodologically difficult. On theoretical grounds, the main dilemma was whether lexicographical-i.e. mainly descriptive-or terminological/terminographical-i.e. mainly prescriptive-principles should be followed, inasmuch as they result in different coverage, organisation and description of data. The most pertinent practical problem that we faced was, on the one hand, the variability of terms in English lexicographical discourse and, on the other one, the incompatibility of English and Polish terminological frameworks. It was therefore envisaged that, for the glossary to be used successfully in text reception, allowing alternative terms and determining various levels of equivalence between interlingual terms would be a necessity. The issues discussed here have been illustrated with selected English-Polish contrastive material.

1. Introduction

Many language faculties at Polish universities offer regular courses in lexicography and lexicology, but despite the development of lexicography as an academic discipline, specialist dictionaries describing its (meta)language have not been available on the Polish market. Encyclopedias and dictionaries of linguistics or its subdisciplines like applied linguistics (e.g. Szulc 1997, Lukszyn 1998, Polański 1999) do not, as a rule, pay much attention to lexicographical concepts, and foreign-language dictionaries of lexicography (e.g. Bergenholtz, Cantell et al. 1997, Burkhanov 1998, Hartmann and James 2001) have not received wide recognition in Poland, primarily because of the language barrier. A reference work published in Polish would thus reach a potentially wide audience. Such a dictionary, created by a team of researchers from five Polish universities, is now nearing completion.

The dictionary is based on Polish, German, English, French and Russian literature on lexicography, lexicology and semantics. Because of this multilingual approach, it has been complemented by four bilingual glossaries (English-Polish, German-Polish, French-Polish and Russian-Polish). The present paper addresses the main issues involved in the compilation of the English-Polish glossary, which is the first fully-fledged attempt to contrast the terminological and conceptual frameworks of English and Polish lexicography. As such, it turned out to be a project at the crossroads of lexicography and terminology/terminography, with problems of both theoretical and practical nature. Following a brief introduction of the whole dictionary, the paper describes the consecutive steps taken by the authors in the compilation procedure, i.e. the planning phase, the collection of material, the selection of data, and the construction and arrangement of entries (cf. Hartmann 2001: 14-20), tackling the methodological problems that were faced *en route*.

2. Dictionary description

2.1. Target users

The dictionary is addressed primarily to students and scholars at Polish language faculties, who will be able to use it both for research as well as for didactic purposes. Another important group of target users are linguists carrying out contrastive analyses (Polish-English, English-Polish; Polish-German, German-Polish, etc.), translators and professional lexicographers. In other words, the dictionary is

intended for semi-experts and experts rather than laypersons (cf. Bowker 2003: 157), because it requires from its users at least literacy in linguistics. Consequently, terms designating the most rudimentary linguistic concepts, e.g. *fleksja* “inflection”, *morfem derywacyjny* “derivational morpheme” or *część mowy* “part of speech”, have not been included into the dictionary term list.

2.2. Background conception

As has been mentioned, apart from Polish, the dictionary describes the major European (i.e. English, German, French and Russian) lexicographical “landscapes”. The team of compilers was selected according to this criterion. There are two arguments for including foreign dictionary-making traditions. Firstly, each of the traditions has had some unique achievements, so the target user will gain a comprehensive overview of lexicography as a subject field. Secondly, contrasting different (meta)languages helped us to discover both similarities and differences between them, which directly fostered the compilation of bilingual glossaries.

2.3. Dictionary structure

The dictionary, describing over 600 Polish terms (plus the cross-referenced ones), consists of the front matter, macrostructure, or “dictionary proper”, and back matter with the four bilingual glossaries. The term list is organised on a strictly alphabetical principle. As the dictionary can be used for a single look-up and for more integrated tasks, in which the target user searches for broader information, what plays an important role is a rich cross-referencing structure allowing the user to identify the whole conceptual network associated with the terms that s/he is interested in. The dictionary microstructure is composed of an entry term, its etymology (if known), alternative Polish terms, a definition, additional explanations and illustrative examples. Then come equivalent foreign terms, followed by a multilingual bibliography.

2.4. External and internal selection

The dictionary macrostructure is by no means exhaustive, but all the concepts that are essential in (meta)lexicographical discourse have been classified and treated in detail (cf. Bielińska 2005a, 2005b). One can find core terms in it, such as *słownik* “dictionary”, *leksykografia* “lexicography”, *hasło* “entry”, *kultura słownikowa* “dictionary culture”; entries describing different dictionary genres; types of definitions, labels and lexicographical errors; components of macro- and microstructure; as well as entries describing e-dictionaries, corpora and software tools indispensable in a lexicographer’s workbench. Several terminological innovations, e.g. *struktura dostępu* “access structure”, *część ramowa* “frame structure”, *ślepy odsyłacz* “blind reference” or *elementy pozahasłowe części zasadniczej* “middle matter”, have also been proposed to fill conceptual gaps. The new terms are marked with the letter N (= neologism), so that the user could distinguish them among traditional elements of Polish terminology.

2.5. Form of publication

The dictionary will appear in print for handy use in classrooms and library reading rooms. At the same time, however, we are planning the publication of the dictionary online, via the Silesian Digital Library (*Śląska Biblioteka Cyfrowa*), linked with other digital libraries in Poland. In the future, we intend to make the dictionary available on an Internet platform, which facilitates the use of hypertext features of electronic publications. In this way, we will be able to easily update the dictionary, include more extensive bibliography and add links to online dictionaries, corpora and full-text articles. Moreover, as the dictionary back matter will include some non-textual content, i.e. images of old and rare dictionaries, the quality of the visual display is expected to be much better. We believe that the transition from the paper to the electronic medium is indispensable for such dynamically developing fields as (meta)lexicography and specialised lexicography.

3. Compiling the English-Polish glossary

3.1. The planning phase

The glossary is a dependent bilingual component of a monolingual dictionary, hence certain decisions had to be made as to its organising principles, design features and future applications. As the glossary is based on a reversed Polish (the source language, or SL) term list, it was expected that the

compilation process would consist primarily in selecting equivalent English (the target language, or TL) terms, that is both single terms (e.g. *definition*) and multi-word terms (e.g. *ostensive definition*). As the user can find detailed information about SL terms in the monolingual entries, the glossary does not have TL definitions or contextual illustrations. At the same time, however, we wanted to somehow point to intra- and interlingual relationships between the included terms, so that the target group could fully efficiently use the glossary in the reception of specialist TL texts.

3.2. The collection of material

Compilers of terminological dictionaries rely either on term banks or domain-specific texts to ensure the maximum reliability of their products. As lexicographical term banks do not exist, and the available mono- and multilingual resources, including the encyclopedia edited by Hausmann et al. (1989-91), would be insufficient for Polish-English and English-Polish contrastive goals, it was necessary to create an exemplary corpus (cf. Martin and van der Vliet 2003: 340). For this purpose, specialist texts in Polish and in English were collected, but the corpus had two drawbacks. Firstly, the textual resources were fairly disproportionate in quantity. In other words, while we had a relatively representative subcorpus of Polish lexicographical writing, providing “adequate coverage” of the TL field (Bowker 2003: 162) was next to impossible taking into account the enormous amount of English literature. This situation apparently results from a longer and more diverse English dictionary-making tradition as well as from interest in it of both native and non-native speakers of English. Secondly, most materials were available to us only in the printed form, so we could not retrieve terms electronically. Needless to say, the selection procedure turned out to be extremely labour-intensive (cf. Landau 2001: 33) and, occasionally, error-prone.

3.3. The selection of data

3.3.1. Terminological standardisation

One of the basic questions that the compilers of terminological dictionaries need to answer is whether standardisation of terminology is their explicit aim, inasmuch as it constitutes a key criterion determining the overall coverage and organisation of material. Terminology/terminography, by contrast to general lexicography that merely recommends usage, is a discipline that seeks to normalize and systematize the terms and concepts used in selected fields of discourse (Riggs 2001, cf. Cabré 1999, Sager 1990, Sager 1997). To put it differently, the compiler’s task is to select a preferred term—a descriptor—rather than a string of synonyms for the given concept (Knowles 1988: 332; cf. Bergenholtz and Kaufmann 1997). In their *Dictionary of lexicography* (2001), Hartmann and James explain the normative character of terminological practices in the definition of the key concept *term* in the following way:

term

A word, phrase or alphanumeric symbol used by the practitioners of a specialised technical subject to designate a CONCEPT. Within the TERMINOLOGY of the whole field, the unity between term and concept is claimed to be an essential requirement of unambiguous communication, strengthened by agreed definitions and the avoidance of synonymous expressions. Sometimes international and even interlingual, STANDARDISATION is possible, and the results are recorded in terminological dictionaries and terminological databases.

The theoretical angle notwithstanding, the selection of data is a pertinent practical problem, because terminological vocabularies are developing continuously, and it is often unclear, even in a narrow synchronic perspective, which items—and on what grounds—should be given term status. For example, that terms are applied by a wide range of specialists is usually taken for granted, but in specialised discourse some sources are clearly more authoritative than others. What this implies is that fully objective criteria of term selection, like frequency and/or distribution in texts, are often replaced by compilers’ subjective preferences, which may thus affect significantly the structure of the term list.

In a cross-linguistic perspective, the above problem concerns the extraction of translation equivalents for bi- and multilingual reference works, most of which are created with the aim of improving communication among specialists in the field. We decided not to pursue standardisation, either with reference to SL (alternative SL terms are included in the monolingual entries) or TL (alternative TL terms are included in the glossary), having assumed that the target user is bound to encounter more

terms in specialist lexicographical texts than could possibly be found in any set of controlled vocabulary. Still, we had to solve the dilemma of how to delimit the scope of TL equivalents to suit the requirements of the basic SL term list, and what criteria should be taken into account in the face of terminological variation, or variability of terms.

3.3.2. Terminological variation

Terminological variation in lexicographical discourse is influenced by a range of different factors. It has been claimed that specialist texts, and hence terms, can vary according to region, social factors, communicative situations, contexts and time-frames (Martin and van der Vliet 2003: 341). These aspects, slightly modified, will now be elaborated on and illustrated with examples.

3.3.3. Regional variation

Our corpus of texts covers different varieties of English. Thus, it comes as little surprise that it has instances of regional variation (e.g. BE *entry-word* – AE *entry*). In most cases, it takes the form of differences in spelling, primarily between British English and American English (e.g. BE *lemmatisation*, AE *lemmatization* – *lematyzacja*; BE *encyclopaedia*, AE *encyclopedia* – *encyklopedia*; BE *bilingualised dictionary*, AE *bilingualized dictionary* – *słownik udwujęzyczny*; BE *alphabetical organisation*, AE *alphabetical organization* – *układ alfabetyczny*). The decision whether or not to include orthographic variants can be based on the premise that such differences are too insignificant to be a serious obstacle in a successful reception of TL texts.

3.3.4. Social and stylistic variation

It is believed that terms are stylistically neutral, i.e. deprived of any marked stylistic value. However, while this view generally holds true, one can occasionally come across terms which are arguably less formal than others, e.g. *label*, (informally) *indicator* – *kwalifikator*; *vocabulary*, (informally) *word-stock* – *słownictwo*; *vulgar word*, (informally) *dirty word* – *wulgaryzm*; *spelling dictionary*, (informally) *spelling book* – *słownik ortograficzny*. Similarly, widespread terms can be of a higher social status than the lesser known ones, e.g. *frequency (word count?)* – *frekwencja*; *dialect (folk speech?)* – *gwara*. As compilers, we had to decide whether stylistic or social variants should go into the glossary or be left out.

3.3.5. Field-internal variation

There are a few aspects of field-internal variation that ought to be considered here. Firstly, depending on the participants of the communicative situation, be it experts, semi-experts or laypersons, lexicography can be described by means of field-internal or field-external terms, of which the former are treated as subordinate, whereas the latter – as superordinate terms. For example, a layman may know the term *stress (accent)*, but semi-experts have to differentiate between *primary word stress* and *secondary word stress*. Similarly, the term *Anglicism (anglicyzm)* encompasses both *Briticism* and *Americanism*, *defining language (język definicyjny)*, as used in minimum dictionaries, makes use of *controlled defining vocabulary*, *purism (puryzm)* can be *inter-* and *intralingual*, and *examples of usage (przykłady użycia)* are either *authentic* or *invented*, and one subtype of invented examples are *dead examples*.

Secondly, lexicography has been drawing on adjacent disciplines, such as foreign language teaching, translation studies or corpus linguistics. In consequence, some terminological cross-fertilisation has been at play, and the difference between alternative terms is often conditioned by a different research angle (e.g. *mother tongue, native language, first language* – *język ojczysty*; *dead language, extinct language, dormant language* – *język martwy*; *arrangement of entries, ordering of entries, lemmatisation* – *hasłowanie*).

Thirdly, lexicographical terminology has been changing due to novel approaches, theories and classification systems introduced by different authors, hence full conceptual overlap is not always possible (e.g. *syntactic constituent structure, syntactic scheme* – *schemat składniowy*; *dialect, slang, vernacular* – *dialekt*; *secondary entry, subordinate entry, subentry, run-on entry* – *hasło podporządkowane*; *special language, specialised language, special-field language, special-purpose language* – *język specjalny*). For instance, *analiza znaczenia*, as applied in various semantic theories,

is equivalent to *analysis of meaning*, *componential analysis* and *sememic analysis*, but it is also part of a lexicographical practice known as *sense (meaning) discrimination* (*wyróżnianie znaczeń*). Interestingly, sometimes the differences can be seen explicitly only in terms of conceptual opposition, e.g. *focal sense* ≠ *peripheral sense*; *literal meaning* ≠ *figurative meaning*, and *primary/literal meaning* ≠ *transferred meaning* (*znaczenie właściwe* ≠ *znaczenie przenośne*).

Finally, as we have also noticed, to some extent alternative terms emerge because of the features of the linguistic system of English. For example, English nouns, like adjectives, can be used as modifiers attributively, which makes it possible to coin such terms as *language* or *linguistic norm* (*norma językowa*); *dialect* or *dialectal dictionary* (*słownik dialektyczny*); *text* or *textual word* (*wyraz tekstowy*); *picture* or *pictorial dictionary* (*słownik obrazkowy*), etc. Worth highlighting are also morphological variants found in terminological synonyms, e.g. *lexicographic* or *lexicographical error*, *analytic* or *analytical definition*, *geographic* or *geographical label*, *orthographic* or *orthographical variant*, etc. What is more, some nominal modifiers can be used both in the unmarked form and in the Saxon Genitive, hence *native speaker* or *native speaker's dictionary* (*słownik dla rodzimych użytkowników języka*); *author* or *author's dictionary* (*słownik języka pisarza*); *user* or *user's guide* (*wskazówki dla użytkownika*), etc.

3.3.6. Diachronic variation

Our TL corpus encompasses not only contemporary texts, but also older ones, some of which, nonetheless, belong to the lexicographical canon (e.g. Trench 1857, Starnes and Noyes 1946, Zgusta 1971). It thus comes as little surprise that we extracted some old-fashioned variants of TL terms, though it would be hard to put them into specific time frames (cf. *cyclop(a)edia* → *encyclop(a)edia* – *encyklopedia*; *language of lexicographic description* → *metalanguage* – *metajęzyk*; *field marker* → *field label* – *kwalifikator dziedzinowy*). In other cases, by contrast, we came across terminological innovations. New terms – coinages, loanwords or calques – are usually introduced to name newly-identified concepts, but they can also designate old concepts. One might wonder whether new terms, inevitably of limited usage, should be given full attention providing that it is impossible to predict their future usage and significance. It may suffice to mention a few neologisms of a disputable status, such as *alternative dictionary* (*contradictory?*) – *słownik alternatywny*; *ghost word* (*phantonym?*) – *wyraz fantomowy*^(N); *jargon word* (*technicalism?*) – *profesjonalizm*. Although including both old and new terms may be seen as advantageous for the target user, we often had to take intuitive, and hence fairly subjective, decisions.

3.4. Construction and arrangement of entries

The key problem at this stage was how to organise the rich but heterogeneous material in consistently structured entries (cf. Karpova 2001, Podhajecka in press). As has been mentioned in section 3.1, the glossary was created by reversing the original Polish-English term list, in which several equivalents—collected in a linear fashion—went with one SL term. However, for the glossary to cater successfully to the needs of the target user, every TL equivalent had to be given headword status. This means, firstly, that the number of entries in the glossary has been increased (when compared to the monolingual dictionary) and, secondly, that some TL items were linked to the same SL term, which required additional information to be inserted. At this junction, we had to deal with several conspicuous issues briefly sketched below.

3.4.1. Homonymy and polysemy

The problem of homonymy and polysemy brings us to the basic distinction between terminology/terminography and general lexicography. As has been succinctly pointed out by Riggs (2001), words as linguistic units can represent more than one concept, whereas a term is a word that represents only one concept. This is a purely theoretical stance, which had to be somehow adapted practically to the context of the bilingual glossary. As TL terms were arranged alphabetically, we came to the conclusion that to show the differences in meaning, the same word-forms could either be numbered (e.g. *dialect*¹ – *gwara* / *dialect*² – *dialekt*) or included randomly one by one. It may be worthy of mention that while the compilers of monolingual dictionaries of lexicography (Burkhanov 1998, Hartmann and James 2001) have favoured the lexicographical solution, compilers of bilingual glossaries (cf. Bergenholtz, Cantell et al. 1997) have instead turned to the terminological one.

3.4.2. Linguistic information

Terminological dictionaries are encyclopaedic dictionaries representing knowledge, but bi- or multilingual glossaries that constitute components of such reference works are linguistic in character. Therefore, it is sometimes necessary to add explicit linguistic information to selected entry terms. This refers primarily to irregular forms of nouns, e.g. *hapax legomenon*, pl. *hapax legomena*; *corpus*, pl. *corpuses* or *corpora*; *etymon*, pl. *etyma*; *lemma*, pl. *lemmas* or *lemmata*, which the target user may not know, but which will probably be needed to decode TL texts.

3.4.3. Intralingual relationships

Relationships that hold between lexicographical concepts and, consequently, terms that designate them are fairly complex. As we have found out, few corresponding terms are fully synonymous, whereas most relationships show various degrees of synonymy as well as hypernymy/hyponymy. For instance, while the terms *language correctness* and *linguistic correctness* (*poprawność językowa*) are near-synonymous, the terms *difficult word*, *confusing word* and *hard word* (*wyraz kłopotliwy*) refer to different concepts applied in different contexts. More exactly, *hard word* implies primarily the pivot of Renaissance lexicography, *confusing word* is one of a pair of paronyms, and *difficult word* refers to a word whose form or meaning poses potential problems to language users.

It is clear that the analysis of contextual uses can help the compiler to delimit meanings and determine the conceptual matches and mismatches, but to the user of the glossary who will have to treat the terms at face value, i.e. out of context, they will not be fully transparent. However, we soon realized that a description of the complexities of intralingual relationships does not, in fact, fall within our scope of interest, as its applicability would be fairly limited. This is because such information is not sought for in a bilingual glossary for receptive purposes. It is not, after all, a rare situation in bilingual terminology/terminography that a few foreign terms go with one native term (or vice versa), so what may be necessary for the user in a successful consultation of the glossary is cross-linguistic rather than intralinguistic information. Therefore, compilers should try to throw some light on interlingual relationships, i.e. equivalence between TL and SL terms.

3.4.4. Interlingual relationships

The fields of English and Polish (meta)lexicography share many concepts, but there are also differences due to divergent linguistic, lexicographical and cultural traditions. The basic methodological problem, however, is that English and Polish lexicography are two different objects of study, whose terminological frameworks have been construed independently of one another. According to Knowles (1988: 332), “in bi- and multilingual terminographical work the assumption is that of a shared professional culture leading to an identical structuration of discourse across all the languages involved”, but this assumption does not seem well-grounded. Speaking specifically of lexicography, despite the on-going internationalisation of its terminology (cf. Knowles 1990: 1645–1665), full harmonisation in a contrastive perspective has not been achieved so far and, what is more, it may not be attained in the future. In consequence, determining the levels of equivalence between SL and TL terms is feasible, but in many cases a compromise is a must. On closer scrutiny, we identified a few typical cross-linguistic relationships.

There are numerous cases in which fully equivalent TL terms correspond to SL terms, e.g. *entry-word* (cf. *entry*, *headword*) – *wyraz hasłowy*; *borrowing* (cf. *loanword*, *loan*) – *zapożyczenie*; *example of usage* (cf. *illustrative example*, *contextual illustration*, *specimen of usage*) – *przykład użycia wyrazu*. In other situations, only partly equivalent TL terms correspond to SL terms, e.g. *catchphrases*, *hackneyed quotations* (cf. *winged words*) – *skrzydlate słowa*; *work of reference*, *word-reference book* (cf. *lexicographic(al) work*) – *dzieło leksykograficzne*; *colloquial speech*, *everyday speech* (cf. *colloquial language*) – *język potoczny*; *source of quotation*, *quotation source* – *lokalizacja cytatu*. There are also SL terms for which no lexicalised terms have been available in TL (? – *uzus*; ? – *ideologizacja słownika*; ? – *mamotrekt*; ? – *słownik natywizujący*^(N)).

Less frequent are situations in which SL and TL terms are convergent in form, but not in meaning, which may lead to cross-linguistic tautonymy (*formal dictionary* “standard meaning-oriented dictionary” – *słownik formalny* “form-oriented dictionary”; *barbarism* “misuse of language, indicating

culturally lacking in refinement” – *barbaryzm* “a foreignism, often perceived as superfluous in the borrowing language”; *orthoepy* “principles of correct pronunciation” – *ortoepia* “principles of correct spelling and pronunciation”).

It is worthy of mention that some cultural differences have also been discerned, e.g. *makaronizm* cannot be expressed fully equivalently by *inkhornism* (*inkhorn term*) due to divergent cultural traditions that shaped the use of foreign words and expressions in Poland and in England, respectively. Some terms have the status of historicisms, which means that they are applied only with reference to the historical context. For instance, there are three distinct TL terms for SL *słownik wielojęzyczny*, i.e. *multilingual dictionary*, *interlingual dictionary* and *polyglot dictionary*, and although they can, in fact, be used interchangeably, the last one refers specifically to European dictionaries produced in the Renaissance (e.g. Calepino’s *Dictionarium undecim linguarum* of 1590). Moreover, certain archaic SL terms, such as *wokabularz* or *mownik*, do not have equally archaic TL equivalents, in spite of the fact that early English glossaries were given a number of “colourful” names, such as *medulla*, *promptorium*, *abecedarium*, *thesaurus*, *manipulus*, *silva* or *bibliotheca* (Stein 2007: 29).

It goes without saying that determining equivalence between interlingual counterparts and describing it explicitly in a glossary is a difficult task. One solution would be to identify the level of equivalence by means of a set of symbols used for the creation of multilingual resources, i.e. (A=B) for exact equivalence, (A≈B) for inexact equivalence, (A > B) or (B < A) for partial equivalence, and (A=B+C) for single-to-multiple term equivalence. However, this technique can be potentially confusing for the user, the more so because some terms are used fairly inconsistently in (meta)lexicographical discourse. We therefore came to the conclusion that the complexity of the relationships would be best compensated for by a well-developed cross-referencing structure, directing the user from one TL equivalent to another (e.g. *normative dictionary* – *słownik normatywny* / *prescriptive dictionary* – *słownik normatywny* → *normative dictionary*; *equipollence* – *ekwipolencja* / *equipollent opposition* – *ekwipolencja* → *equipollence*).

Moreover, some problematic cases had to be commented upon, so that the target user could comprehend not only the semantic differences between the concepts, but also their cultural history and area of usage. In this way, we wanted to ensure a high level of user-friendliness (cf. Hartmann 1987: 123). However, due to inevitable space restrictions in a paper dictionary, we were only able to provide short glosses. It is hoped that once the dictionary appears in the electronic format, accessible over the Internet, we will provide more extensive information concerning the relationships between the SL and TL terms.

4. Conclusions

To sum up, the paper describes the consecutive steps taken by the authors in the compilation of a bilingual English-Polish glossary of lexicographical terms, which is part of a larger dictionary project. The procedure covered the planning phase, the collection of material, the selection of data, and the construction and arrangement of entries. Inevitably, it was also fraught with difficulties, some of which have been shown and discussed above.

The planning phase helped us to take most decisions concerning the bilingual glossary. It was decisive as to the underlying principles and design criteria, although certain features, like the range of alternative terms, could not be predicted beforehand. The collection phase involved compiling an exemplary corpus of texts or, more precisely, two monolingual subcorpora of SL and TL texts, respectively. Regrettably, by being disproportionate and available in print only, the subcorpora did not fully meet our needs. As to the selection of data, we were overwhelmed by the scope of terminological variation. Although we tried to work out a consistent approach to it, many cases had to be judged individually. The construction and arrangement of entries was the last phase, during which we had to decide how to describe, with existing lexicographical means, the interlingual (rather than intralingual) relationships between the concepts and terms.

The compiled English-Polish glossary is a compromise solution both as regards the selection of TL equivalents and their description. It links corresponding TL and SL terms on a one-to-one basis, but it has more entries than the monolingual dictionary. This is because we included a number of alternative equivalents, though without specifying preferred or non-preferred terms, all of which were given headword status. To alleviate potential look-up problems, an extensive cross-referencing structure was designed to help the user “navigate” through the glossary, so that s/he could quickly find a required SL

translation equivalent or a related TL term. When necessary, the terms are accompanied by glosses—which will hopefully grow into more detailed explanatory notes in the electronic version—explaining the nature and scale of the encountered problem.

Bibliographical references

Dictionaries and encyclopaedias

- Bankavs, A. (2002). *Dictionary of lexicographical terms (French-Latvian-English)*. Riga: Latvijas Universitāte.
- Bergenholtz, H.; Cantell, I. et al. (eds.). (1997). *Nordisk leksikografisk ordbok*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget AS.
- Burkhanov, I. (1998). *Lexicography. A dictionary of basic terminology*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej.
- Calepino, A. (1590). *Dictionarium undecim linguarum*. Basel: Sebastian Henricpetri.
- Hartmann, R. R. K.; James, G. (2001). *Dictionary of lexicography*. London: Routledge.
- Hausmann, F. J. et al. (eds.) (1989-1991). *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. An international encyclopedia of lexicography*. Vol. I-III. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lukszyn, J. (ed.) (1998). *Tezaurus terminologii translatorycznej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Polański, K. (ed.) (1999). *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Szulc, A. (1997). *Słownik dydaktyki języków obcych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Other literature

- Bailey, R. (ed.) (1987). *Dictionaries of English. Prospects for the record of our language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bergenholtz, H.; Kaufmann, U. (1997). "Terminography and lexicography. A critical survey of dictionaries from a single specialised field" [online]. *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics* 18. 91-125. http://www.iula.upf.edu/materials/050606tarp_2.pdf [Access date: 7 February 2008].
- Bielińska, M. (2005a). "O słownikach terminologii (meta)leksykograficznej". *Poradnik Językowy* 1. 27-39.
- Bielińska, M. (2005b). "Wörterbücher (meta)lexikographischer Termini – Vorstellung eines Projekts". *Convivium*. 203-218.
- Bowker, L. (2003). "Specialized lexicography and specialized dictionaries". In Sterkenburg, van P. (ed.). *A practical guide to lexicography*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 154-164.
- Cabré, M. T. (1999). *Terminology. Theory, methods and applications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hartmann, R. R. K. (1987). "Dictionaries of English: The user's perspective". In Bailey, R. (ed.). *Dictionaries of English. Prospects for the record of our language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 121-135.
- Hartmann, R. R. K. (2001). *Teaching and researching lexicography*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Knowles, F. E. (1988). "Lexicography and terminography: A rapprochement?". In Snell-Hornby, M. (ed.). *ZüriLEX'86 proceedings. Papers read at the EURALEX International Congress, University of Zürich, 9-14 September 1986*. Tübingen: Francke Verlag. 329-337.
- Karpova, O. (2001). "Leksikografičeskaja terminologija i ee opisanija" [online]. *Vestnik VGU, Seria lingvistika i međunarodnaja komunikacija* 2. <http://www.vestnik.vsu.ru/pdf/lingvo/2001/02/karpova.pdf> [Access date: 3 February 2008].
- Knowles, F. E. (1990). "The computer in lexicography". In Hausmann, J. F. et al. (eds.). *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. An international encyclopedia of lexicography*. Berlin: De Gruyter. Vol. II. 1645–1670.

- Landau, S. I. (2001). *Dictionaries. The art and craft of lexicography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, W.; Vliet, van der H. (2003). "Design and production of terminological dictionaries". In Sterkenburg, van P. (ed.). *A practical guide to lexicography*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 333-349.
- Podhajecka, M. (in press). "A project in bilingual terminography: Where lexicography, terminology and translation studies meet". In Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B.; Thelen, M. (eds.). *Translation and Meaning, Part 8. Proceedings of the Lodz Session of the 4th International Maastricht-Lodz Duo Colloquium on "Translation and "Meaning", Held in Lodz, Poland (23-25 September, 2005)*. Maastricht: Zuyd University, Maastricht School of International Communication, Department of Translation and Interpreting.
- Riggs, F. W. (1989). "Terminology and lexicography: Their complementarity". *International Journal of Lexicography* 2 (2). 89-110
- Riggs, F. W. (2001). *Electronic term list (ETL). A proposed tool for conceptual and terminological analysis* [online]. <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~fredr/termlist.htm> [Access date: 15 February 2008].
- Sager, J. C. (1990). *A practical course in terminology processing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sager, J. C. (1997). *Handbook of terminology management*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Starnes, de Witt T.; Noyes, G. E. (1946). *The English dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson, 1604-1755*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Stein, G. (2007). "The emergence of lexicology in Renaissance English dictionaries". In Considine, J.; Iamartino, G. (eds.). *Words and dictionaries from the British Isles in the historical perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Sterkenburg, van P. (ed.). (2003). *A practical guide to lexicography*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Trench, R. C. (1857). *On some deficiencies in our English dictionaries. Being the substance of two papers read before the Philological Society*. London: John W. Parker.
- Zgusta, L. (1971). *Manual of lexicography*. Janua Linguarum Series Maior 39. Prague: Academia / The Hague: Mouton.