Magdalena Podolej

Culture in bilingual dictionaries: Analysis of cultural content and culture-specific vocabulary in E-P-E dictionaries

Poznań, 2009

OŚWIADCZENIE

Ja, niżej podpisana

Magdalena Podolej

....

studentka Wydziału Neofilologii

Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu

oświadczam,

że przedkładaną pracę dyplomową

pt.   Culture in bilingual dictionaries: Analysis of cultural content and culture-specific vocabulary in E-P-E dictionaries.

....

napisałam samodzielnie.

Oznacza to, że przy pisaniu pracy, poza niezbędnymi konsultacjami, nie korzystałam z pomocy innych osób, a w szczególności nie zlecałam opracowania rozprawy lub jej istotnych części innym osobom, ani nie odpisywałam tej rozprawy lub jej istotnych części od innych osób.

Jednocześnie przyjmuję do wiadomości, że gdyby powyższe oświadczenie okazało się nieprawdziwe, decyzja o wydaniu mi dyplomu zostanie cofnięta.

Poznań, 24.04.2009   Magdalena Podolej

....

(miejscowość, data)   (czytelny podpis)

Table of contents

List of tables

List of abbreviations

CSI   culture-specific (vocabulary) items

E   English

KFD   *The Kościuszko Foundation dictionary* (1st edition, 1995)

L1   first language

L2   second language

LSW   *Longman słownik współczesny angielsko-polski, polsko-angielski*
            (1st edition, 2006)

NKFD   *The new Kosciuszko Foundation dictionary* (1st edition, 2003)

P   Polish

PWNO   *PWN-Oxford wielki słownik angielsko-polski* and *PWN-Oxford wielki*
            słownik polsko-angielski (1st edition, 2007)

SL   source language

STAN   *The great English-Polish dictionary*: *Supplemented* and *The Great Polish-*
            *English dictionar*y: *Supplemented* by Jan Stanisławski (10th edition
            and 9th edition, 1998)

TL   target language

Abstract

The statement that the bilingual dictionary correlates two languages in an attempt to enable interlingual communication needs no arguing. Since each object language of the dictionary carries with it a different culture, the bilingual dictionary serves as a bridge not only between two languages, but also between two cultures. The present thesis is dedicated to various manifestations of cultural information in bilingual dictionaries, with particular emphasis on the treatment of culture-specific vocabulary items. It opens with the discussion of the notion of culture, its different classifications, and types of intercultural relations. Next the reader is provided with an insight into the bilingual dictionary and its key concept – equivalence. What follows is the discussion of the potential of bilingual dictionaries to serve as cultural repositories on the one hand, and cultural bridges on the other. Finally, an analysis of five English-Polish-English dictionaries is presented, whereby the present author attempts to identify the manifestations of cultural information recorded in the said dictionaries, and to determine the techniques most frequently used for rendering culture-specific items into the target language.

Introduction

Cultural anthropology, linguistics, and lexicography are – most rightly – recognized as independent domains. However, despite the conspicuous differences between the tree, they are inextricably connected. While the link between language and dictionaries seems intuitive – dictionaries are reference works about language, repositories of words – the one between dictionaries and culture is less obvious, but increasingly often recognized. The present thesis sets out to shed some light on how the three aforementioned disciplines come together in bilingual dictionaries.

Chapter 1 opens with the discussion of the three senses of the word *culture*, and provides a definition of culture as understood in anthropology. The following section presents some of the possible typologies of culture. Next, the link between culture and language is established. The final sections of the chapter are dedicated to the discussion of intercultural relations and the phenomenon of cultural dominance, with particular emphasis on the dominant position of Anglo-Saxon culture.

The focus of Chapter 2 rests on the category of bilingual dictionary. The definition of the bilingual dictionary provided in the first section is followed by a classification of bilingual dictionaries, and an explanation of the notions of directionality and the *active – passive* dichotomy. The remainder of the chapter is dedicated to the discussion of the central concept of bilingual lexicography – equivalence, the way of establishing it, its various types as well as different ways of handling the situations where a source-language item lacks an immediate target-language equivalent.

Chapter 3 opens with the discussion of the link between the bilingual dictionary and culture, hinted at in Chapter 1. What follows is the presentation of various elements of bilingual dictionary macro- and microstructure which have the potential of conveying cultural

information. Special attention is dedicated to culture-specific items and the techniques for rendering such items into the target language.

Chapter 4 contains an analysis of five bilingual English-Polish-English dictionaries with respect to the presentation of cultures underlying their object languages. The dictionaries selected for the analysis include: *PWN-Oxford wielki słownik angielsko-polski* and *PWN-Oxford wielki słownik polsko-angielski* (1st edition, 2007), *The new Kosciuszko Foundation dictionary* (1st edition, 2003), *Longman słownik współczesny angielsko-polski, polsko-angielski* (1st edition, 2006), *The great English-Polish dictionary*: *Supplemented and The Great Polish-English dictionar*y: *Supplemented* by Jan Stanisławski (10th and 9th editions respectively, 1988), and finally *The Kościuszko Foundation dictionary* (1st edition, 1995). The analysis comprises two parts: the first one attempts to determine the ways in which cultural information manifests itself in the special features of the selected dictionaries, the second focuses in more detail on culture-specific vocabulary items in an attempt to establish the techniques for rendering them into the target language.

Chapter 1: Culture, language and intercultural relations

1.1. The three cultures

In his lectures dedicated to the issue of psychology of culture, Sapir notices that the term *culture* may be interpreted in at least three different ways (Sapir 1993: 23-38).[1]

The first distinct meaning of the word is well illustrated in the phrase *a man of culture*. Used in this context, the term *culture* pertains to good manners and exemplary conduct. It implies the existence of models of behavior which are considered preferable to others and which "endow their practitioners with an aura of unanalyzed excellence and nobility" (Sapir 1993: 24).

Being cultured in the sense presented above means different things across civilizations. English gentlemen of the 18th century may undoubtedly be indicated as the cultured strata of their society. Invariably of noble birth, they were mostly preoccupied with hunting, playing games of cards or studying ancient writers. Their choices for professional career were usually restricted to politics, the church or the military. In China, the social class recognized as cultured were the mandarins. On the one hand they were in possession of significant wealth, on the other, they were required to pass demanding examinations on Chinese philosophy and literature. The mandarins wrote poetry, painted, and possessed an exceptional knowledge of literature. Their privileged position as the best educated members of the Chinese society enabled them to take up governmental posts. The Orthodox Jewish society produced their own cultured class of rabbis. They were distinguished by an unmatched knowledge of the Scriptures and the oral tradition. Unlike the two aforementioned

---

[1] Sapir's *The psychology of culture: A course of lectures* was reconstructed and edited by Judith T. Irvine, who compiled the work from the notes taken by Sapir's students. *1993* is the date of publication of the reconstructed notes by Irvine, the actual year when the notes were taken not being specified.

cultivated groups, rabbis were not selected on the basis of their noble birth or financial status, but rather on the basis of their education (Sapir 1993: 26-27).

As distinguished by Sapir (1993: 30-34), the second sense of the term *culture* signifies a set of qualities that permeate a given society and are common to all its people. Sapir illustrates this concept with several examples. Brightly-dressed and noisy Americans are preoccupied with making money. They exhibit high self-confidence and low regard for tradition. They are patriots and extol national values as ideal. Germans are well known for their preciseness, meticulousness, attention to detail, and love of order. They are skilled workers and attach great importance to punctuality. The people of India have a specific perception of time, very different from the one typically observed in Westerners. They do not attach importance to dates and tend to live more relaxed lives. All the aforementioned examples illustrate the fact that particular societies share a common way of making sense of the world and responding to it, which is often referred to as their *culture*.

Finally, the third meaning of the word distinguished by Sapir – which is most relevant for the purpose of this thesis – is related to anthropology.

1.2. The anthropological notion of culture

Quite a number of anthropologists, ethnologists and theoreticians, both past and present, have offered more or less comprehensive definitions of culture (in the anthropological sense), based on different scientific theories and premises (Lambert 1994: 23). While it is not the purpose of this work to present a detailed outline of how the views and ideas of human culture evolved, the explanation of what is to be understood under the term is crucial for the discussion of manifestations of culture in bilingual dictionaries. Once again, the definition provided by Sapir is both concise and transparent enough to serve this purpose.

> Any form of behavior, either explicit or implicit, overt or covert, which cannot be directly explained as psychologically necessary but can be interpreted in terms of the totality of meanings of a specific group, and which can be shown to be the result of a strictly historical process, is likely to be cultural in essence (Sapir 1993: 37).

In other words, all the components of human life and behavior which are passed from generation to generation and cannot be accounted for in terms of biology constitute culture. Naming all the constituents of culture would be a daunting – and for that matter unneces-

sary – task. The definition of culture offered in *The new Encyclopedia Britannica* names the most important elements of the phenomenon: "specifically culture consists of language, ideas, beliefs, customs, codes, institutions, tools, techniques, works of art, rituals, ceremonies, and so on" (White 1992: 874).

Once the notion of human culture has been defined and its main components enumerated, the time is now ripe to present a classification of the possible types of culture.

1.3. Classification of culture

Just as any other phenomenon in the world of science, culture too has its typology and may be classified on the basis of various parameters. One of them becomes apparent upon a closer investigation of the list of culture components offered in section 1.2. What emerges is the fact that culture may manifest itself through artifacts, that is material objects created by man, such as e.g. sculptures, pieces of clothing, jewelry or engineered structures, but it may also take the form of non-material phenomena, such as customs, beliefs, knowledge, and most notably – language. Thus, one of the basic opposition is that between material and non-material culture (Roberts 2007: 279).

Yet another typology of culture is based upon geographic and language factors. Culture so classified may be divided into national culture, transnational culture (also referred to as superculture), and subculture (Roberts 2007: 279-81).

The idea of national culture, as the very name suggests, centers around the notion of a nation. Roberts (2007: 279) discusses the traditional definition of a nation perceived as a "spontaneous association of humans bound together by shared language, culture, ethnicity and beliefs", and calls for its update, since in the modern world the situation in which the peoples of different ethnic backgrounds or mother tongues cohabit in one country is not uncommon. Thus, Roberts (2007: 279-280) proposes to see national culture as "the culture of the group sharing a geographical location, political identity, and one or more 'official' languages, but not necessarily ethnicity or native language."

Transnational culture/superculture, denotes a type of culture that oversteps the borders of a country. The membership of this particular type of culture is established on the basis of the unity of language or geographical area. Therefore, those whose mother tongue is Spanish belong to Hispanic superculture, regardless of whether they live in Spain or on

the other side of the globe – in Central or South America. By the same token, the citizens of Germany, France, or the Netherlands, even though they do not communicate in the same language, may consider themselves as full-fledged representatives of the Western European superculture, for their countries happen to be located in the same part of the European continent, and as a result share certain common features (Roberts 2007: 280).

The last type of culture discussed by Roberts (2007: 280) is subculture. The author notes that what she means by the term is very different from what is referred to as subculture in everyday language – and which, according to some, may carry negative connotations. Roberts (2007: 280) views subculture not as a substandard, or aberrant form of culture, e.g. that of skinheads or punks, but rather as a "culture of any group of people within a national culture or even a superculture, whose behaviors and beliefs include some of the dominant features of this culture or superculture, and also include certain features not found elsewhere in the given national culture or superculture." A subculture may be based upon a geographical region, e.g. New England subculture; ethnicity, e.g. Chinese subculture in the USA; language, e.g. French subculture in the Netherlands; religious beliefs, e.g. Christian subculture in India; age, e.g. teenage subculture, etc.

To conclude, the two typologies of culture offered in the present section lend credence to the notion that human culture is far from being a homogenous phenomenon. The following section sets out to explain the relation between culture and one of its most important components – language.

1.4. Language and culture

The special relationship between language and culture has already been hinted at. In the list of culture components offered by White (1992: 874) presented in section 1.2., language happens to hold a place at the very top, which indicates its status as a crucial constituent of culture. Indeed, the ability to speak a given language to a large extent determines one's cultural identity. Some go as far as to view language as the primary criterion in deciding about which (national) culture a given person belongs to.[2]

---

[2] Such a generalization is a dangerous one to make. The ties between culture and language are difficult to deny, and in many cases it can be safely assumed that, e.g. a person whose mother tongue is Polish, is a white Christian who eats with a knife and fork and shakes hands at greeting. However, one should keep in mind instances in which the same culture is shared by peoples of different languages, or vice versa.

As maintained by Guirdham (1999: 50), language is a crucial component of culture, since it is through language that other culture elements, such as the worldview or religious beliefs, are conveyed between individuals. Porter and Samovar (1995: 153) share this view: "Language does more than just permit us to communicate with one another; it is the process by which people become introduced to the order of the physical and social environment." Bassnett (1991: 14) goes as far as to refer to language as "the heart within the body of culture." Had it not been for the human ability to use language, cultures would never have been established, not to mention the fact that their transmission between individuals would be impossible.

As the final argument supporting the claim that language and culture are mutually dependent let us consider the extensively quoted views of the two American linguistic anthropologists, Sapir and Whorf, which are most often jointly referred to as the Sapir – Whorf hypothesis.[3]

> Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the 'real world' is to a large extent unconsciously built upon the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached. (…) We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation (Sapir 1949:162).

> We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face; on the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds – and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds. We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way – an agreement that holds throughout our speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language. The agreement is, of course, an implicit and unstated one, *but its terms are absolutely obligatory*; we cannot talk at all except by subscribing to the organization and classification of data which the agreement decrees (Whorf 1956: 213-14).

In brief, the hypothesis suggests that structural elements of a language used by the members of a particular culture group reflect specific meanings which are tightly connected with the said member's view of the world, therefore they exert direct influence on the way

---

[3] The passage quoted above was written by Sapir in 1929 and subsequently extended by Whorf in 1940.

in which members of the said group perceive, systematize and make sense of the world around them. Because people of different cultures use different languages, their individual understanding of the world is linked to the language group of which they are members. What follows is that people speaking different languages perceive the world differently. For this reason it is difficult or even impossible to learn a particular language without simultaneously studying its underlying culture (Hall 2002: 19-20).

As has been shown, language is a crucial component of culture. However, particular cultures differ in how they make use of their languages (Callan – Gallois 1997: 43-48). The specific way of using a language is shaped by, and directly results from, the values that a given culture carries. At the same time, it is through the characteristic use of language that certain cultures are best characterized. It is enough to think of the noisy, garrulous Americans, whose manner of speaking reveals the self-confidence and personality cult typical of the US culture, and compare them to the humble and taciturn people of Japan.

1.5. Intercultural contacts and (in)equality of cultures

In the world saturated with IT technologies, where transfer of data across continents takes fractions of a second and people travel the globe with remarkable ease, contact between cultures that for centuries had been geographically distant is easier than ever, and at the same time difficult to avoid.

Traditionally, the processes occurring when two or more cultures come into contact are classified into three major categories: acculturation, assimilation and amalgamation (White 1992: 877-878).

Acculturation is a form of intercultural relation which entails the change of beliefs, customs or artifacts of one of the culture systems. The process may be further subdivided into incorporation and direct change. The former takes place when particular elements of culture are borrowed freely, without any involvement of force or coercion. The latter is most often associated with political conquests. It takes place when members of one culture group exert political or military dominance over the other – therefore, it is an involuntary process. The conquest of American Indians by Spanish conquistadors is a good example of such involuntary acculturation.

The term assimilation is used to refer to a situation in which peoples of different ethnic backgrounds are incorporated into the dominant culture. This is achieved trough the interception of characteristic traits of the dominant culture, which may go far enough to make the members of the assimilating group hardy socially distinguishable. Similarly to acculturation, assimilation may be a an act of free will or it may involve coercion.

Finally, amalgamation takes place when two or more cultures merge into one, retaining traits of all component groups. Such a situation may be observed in Central and South Americas, where the cultures of Indians and Spaniards have become hybridized.

The characterized types of culture contact imply the existence of a certain hierarchy of cultures. From the presented definitions it is evident that some cultures fare better than others – they are more readily imitated and exert stronger influence on other cultural systems. A notion which proves helpful in discussing intercultural relations is that of the *dominant culture*, which has already been used in the discussion of the process of assimilation.

> A dominant culture is one that is able, through economic or political power, to impose its values, language, and ways of behaving on a subordinate culture or cultures. This may be achieved through legal or political suppression of other sets of values and patterns of behaviour, or by monopolizing the media of communication ("Dominant culture" 1998).

On the other end of the spectrum of cultural relations there is the notion of *cultural cringe*. The term denotes a situation in which members of a particular culture perceive their cultural heritage as inferior to that of others and develop a form of complex. This type of cultural behavior has been witnessed in – but is not limited to – post-colonial countries, such as Australia, where the term originated ("Cultural cringe" 2009).

1.6. Dominance of Anglo-Saxon culture

In the light of what has been said so far, Anglo-Saxon culture holds the position of the dominant culture, not only with respect to the countries which neighbor on the United States or the United Kingdom, but also to other countries throughout the globe.

When reflecting upon the influence which Anglophone culture exerts on the rest of the world, Aixelá asserts:

> We are immersed in an obvious process of cultural internationalisation focused on the Anglo-Saxon pole. The constant importation of consumer items (cultural and other) from English-speaking America does not just imply a growing familiarity of many societies with the Anglo-Saxon world view, but also a clear process of gradual acceptability of its values and specific cultural reality (Aixelá 1996: 54).

The culture of Anglo-Saxon countries, through its association with welfare, liberty, and endless opportunities, is readily intercepted and mimicked by members of other nations. This process is facilitated by the rapid development of information technologies and the role of mass media in disseminating British and North American cultural values. With the strong economic position of both the United Kingdom and the United States, the dominance of Anglo-Saxon culture appears to be well-rooted and unlikely to be overturned in the near future. The Anglo-Saxon cultural imperialism translates into "linguistic imperialism" of the English language, which indisputably enjoys the status of lingua franca in the world where 60%-90% of cinema screenings all over the globe are taken up by American movies, and English clearly dominates the Internet (Pilard 2002: 430).

While the relationship between Polish culture on the one hand, and the cultures of the United States and the United Kingdom on the other, is far from a cultural cringe (where Poles would dismiss their cultural heritage as inferior to that of Americans or Britons), the fact remains that also in Poland Anglo-Saxon cultural values are eagerly intercepted. Poles have long been famous for their admiration of the American way of life and their view of the United States as the promised land. The number of Poles who emigrated to Great Britain once Poland has joined the European Union indicates that the United Kingdom is also perceived as a desirable destination by Polish people.

Taking all the above into consideration, it comes as no surprise that Polish culture shows traits of incorporation of Anglo-Saxon cultural elements, while the contribution it makes to enriching the cultures of English-speaking countries is limited. What remains to be seen is what kind of treatment the national cultures of the United States, the United Kingdom and Poland receive in English-Polish-English bilingual dictionaries. Before that, however, Chapter 2 will shed some light on the bilingual dictionary itself.

Chapter 2: Bilingual dictionaries and the notion of equivalence

2.1. The bilingual dictionary

"Even the man in the street, it is said, knows that a bilingual dictionary is a list of words side by side with one or more words which translate them into a second language" (Marello 2003: 325). While the above definition reflects the idea of the bilingual dictionary held by the everyman – it by no means does justice to the real thing. The purpose of this section is to introduce the reader to the basic concepts related to bilingual lexicography.

2.1.1. Definition of the bilingual dictionary

Burkhanov (1998: 29) defines the bilingual dictionary as "a *work of reference* whose *word list* is organized in the following way: L1→L2, which means that *lemmata* of one language, usually referred to as an *object language*, are explicated using another language – a *target language*." Hartmann and James offer a slightly more extensive definition of the same:

> A type of DICTIONARY which relates the vocabularies of two languages together by means of translation EQUIVALENTS, in contrast to the MONOLINGUAL DICTIONARY, in which explanations are provided in one language. (…) By providing lexical equivalents, the bilingual dictionary helps language learners and translators to read or create texts in a foreign language. However, finding suitable lexical equivalents is a notoriously difficult task, especially in parts of languages with different cultures (Hartmann – James 1998: 14).

Finally, when defining the bilingual dictionary, it has become customary to quote Zgusta's *Manual of Lexicography*, where the author maintains that "The basic purpose of a bilingual

dictionary is to coordinate with the lexical units of one language those lexical units of an-other language which are equivalent in their lexical meaning" (Zgusta 1971: 294).

From what has been given above, the following key points may be drawn:

- The bilingual dictionary attempts to correlate the vocabularies of two languages.
- The meaning of the source-language lexical item is explicated with the use of target language equivalents.
- Establishing equivalence between lexical items of two different languages is far from easy, particularly when it involves languages which originated in distant cultures.

To do justice to modern bilingual dictionaries it should also be noted that aside from the list of source language headwords accompanied by their target language equivalents, such dictionaries offer various other types of information. The following section provides an insight into what may be found in a bilingual dictionary entry.

2.1.2. Elements of bilingual dictionary entry

Table 1 (after Atkins 1996: 519), clearly and concisely presents the possible elements of a bilingual dictionary entry, discussing the form they take, the type of information they con-vey, as well as their purpose and function (the table discusses a traditional paper-based dic-tionary entry and disregards the additional features which may be found in electronic dic-tionaries).

Table 1. The organization of a bilingual dictionary entry.

	Data Type	Mode	Information Content	Function	User
1	lemma forms	SL	lexical form(s) of the HW/ subheadword	helps user find the informa-tion being sought	enc SL dec TL
2	phonetic transcription	code IPA	how the HW is pronounced	helps the non-native speaker pronounce the word correctly	enc TL
3	grammar form	code	part of speech, gender, etc. of HW	helps user find the informa-tion being sought	enc SL dec TL
4	sense or /subsense + counter	alph /num code	this is a distinct sense or sub-sense of the HW	helps user find the informa-tion being sought	enc SL dec TL
5	grammar usage item	SL + TL	grammatical complementation of HW in this sense & its transla-tion	helps TL user use SL item correctly helps SL user identify the sense of the HW	enc TL enc SL
6	TL equivalent	TL	this is TL equivalent of HW in this sense	helps TL user understand helps both users translate	dec TL enc SL
7	gloss	TL	an explanation of HW in this sense	helps TL user understand helps both users translate	dec TL enc SL

8	typical example + translation	SL + TL	this is how the HW in this sense is typically used & translated	helps SL user identify the sense of the HW reassures SL user trying to translate SL item helps TL user use SL item correctly	enc SL enc TL
9	problematic example + translation	SL + TL	the HW in this context has a specific TL equivalent	helps SL user identify the sense of the HW helps SL user avoid translating error	enc SL
10	idiomatic example + translation	SL + TL	the HW and context have this specific TL equivalent	helps TL user understand helps both users translate	dec TL enc SL
11	diatechnical label	code	HW in this sense belongs to this semantic domain of (Music, Science etc.)	helps both user select correct TL equivalent helps SL user identify the sense of the HW	dec TL enc SL
12	stylistic label	code	using the SL or TL item in this sense is in (literary etc.) style	helps both users translate helps TL user understand helps SL user identify the sense of the HW	enc SL dec TL
13	register label	code	using the SL or TL item in this sense is in (literary etc.) style	helps both users translate helps TL user understand helps SL user identify the sense of the HW	enc SL dec TL
14	diatopic label	code	the SL or TL item in this sense belongs to X regional variety of the language	helps both users translate helps TL user understand helps SL user identify the sense of the HW	enc SL dec TL
15	diachronic label	code	the SL or TL item in this sense is (obsolete/ old fashioned etc.)	helps both users translate helps TL user understand helps SL user identify the sense of the HW	enc SL dec TL
16	evaluative label	code	using the SL or TL item in this sense is (pejorative etc.)	helps both users translate helps TL user understand helps SL user identify the sense of the HW	enc SL dec TL
17	sense indicator	SL	synonym or paraphrase of HW in this sense / other brief sense clue	helps SL user identify the sense of the HW	enc SL
18	collocators	SL	typical subjects / objects of HW verbs, nouns modified by HW adjectives etc.	helps both users translate helps SL user identify the sense of the HW	enc SL dec TL
19	collocators	TL	typical subjects / objects of TL equivalent verbs, nouns modified by TL equivalent adjectives etc.	helps both users translate	enc SL dec TL
20	cross-reference	SL	this other definiendum is relevant to the HW in this sense	helps users find the information being sought	enc SL dec TL

As is evident from the above, the elements of a bilingual dictionary entry go far beyond the headword and its equivalent, providing the users with a plethora of valuable linguistic information, ranging from pronunciation, through various types of glosses and labels, to illustrative examples. As will be shown later, some of the listed elements may also be employed to transmit information which is not purely linguistic in nature, e.g. glosses

which contain explanations of nearly encyclopedic nature. Before that happens, let us move on to discuss two important parameters in bilingual lexicography, namely that of *directionality* and *skill-specificity*.

2.1.3. Directionality and skill-specificity of bilingual dictionaries

As asserted by Piotrowski (1994: 39), directionality and skill-specificity are among the most significant parameters used in lexicography to classify bilingual dictionaries. While the two are often characterized jointly, they constitute independent criteria. The former is related to the needs of a dictionary user as a native speaker of either of the two covered languages, the latter is associated with the purpose for which the bilingual dictionary is employed by its user. Both parameters will be presented in more detail.

2.1.3.1. On the notion of directionality

Depending on their size, bilingual dictionaries are published in two parts which are either contained in separate volumes or combined into one. One such volume lists first-language (henceforth L1) lexemes and provides their equivalents in the second language (henceforth L2), the other does exactly the opposite, that is lists L2 headwords supplementing them with their L1 equivalents. Such two-way combination of languages may suggest that a given pair of bilingual dictionaries lends itself to equally successful use by native speakers of both L1 and L2. This claim is further propagated by publishers of bilingual dictionaries. However, as pointed out by Marello (2003: 335), "[t]he fact that a bilingual dictionary is in two parts (...) is no guarantee that it is truly bidirectional in the sense that it is aimed at the use of speakers from two different linguistic communities."

The directionality principle allows for differentiating between monodirectional bilingual dictionaries, i.e. such dictionaries which best cater to the needs of just one group of users, e.g. native speakers of Polish in a bilingual dictionary pairing Polish and English. By analogy, a bidirectional bilingual dictionary is a dictionary addressing the needs of both groups of native speakers. Such a dictionary may be equally successfully used by members of both linguistic communities (Piotrowski 1994: 39-40).

While bidirectional bilingual dictionaries seem a better solution in that they appeal to a larger group of users, a closer investigation of the bilingual dictionaries available on the market is likely to yield disappointing results:

> There are really few two-way and bidirectional dictionaries that can satisfy both the source-language users' needs as well as the target-language user's needs for purposes of both production and comprehension. Any high-flown statements in two languages in the prefaces of many bilingual reference works can easily be disproved by checking a few details (Marello 2003: 336).

Piotrowski (1994: 40) calls the details mentioned by the author of the foregoing quotation "irreversible components". They comprise all those pieces of information provided in bilingual dictionaries which are not symmetrical in an entry which otherwise might be treated as a symmetrical equation between the entry word and its equivalent. Such information may be useful only to one group of users, the other will find it redundant – if not downright irritating.

Some examples of irreversible information include the dictionary metalanguage, that is all the provided explanations related to entries, such as labels or glosses. A truly bidirectional dictionary should offer explanations in both L1 and L2. Grammatical information also belongs to the category of irreversible components. The language in which such information is provided is indicative of the directionality of a given dictionary. A similar statement may be me made of phonetic transcription. In a Polish-English dictionary aimed at native speakers of English information as to the pronunciation of English words would be an unnecessary waste of precious space. Piotrowski (1994: 41) further lists macrostructure as an element indicative of dictionary directionality. Let us consider the example of an English-Polish dictionary suited to the needs of Polish users. Any elements superfluous from the point of view of such users may be left out from the dictionary macrostructure. Most often such omissions involve compound words whose meaning may be deduced on the basis of their components.

As evident from the above, in order for users to be able to fully benefit from their bilingual dictionaries, they need to have them customized to their specific needs as native speakers of L1 or L2. The following subsection tackles the other important concept of bilingual lexicography, namely the active-passive dichotomy.

2.1.3.2. Active vs. passive bilingual dictionaries

The active-passive parameter – often equated with encoding vs. decoding or productive vs. receptive parameters – is used to classify bilingual dictionaries with respect to tasks for which they are employed by their users. Following Piotrowski (1994: 42-43), the basic user skills which are aided by bilingual dictionaries may be divided into passive (decoding) and active (encoding), passive skills including comprehension (L2 text → meaning) and translation (L2 text → L1 text), while active comprising translation (in the opposite direction, that is L1 text → L2 text) and production (meaning → L2 text). The aforementioned four skills correspond to the list of dictionary functions proposed by Mugdan (see Table 2 adapted from Mugdan 1992: 19).

Table 2. Classical skills for which bilingual dictionaries are used

Type	Skill
(a)	understanding a text in the foreign language without translation into the mother tongue (reception in L2)
(b)	translating a text from the mother tongue into the foreign language (reception in L1, production in L2)
(c)	creating a text in the foreign language without a model in their mother tongue (production in L2)
(d)	translating a text from the foreign language (L2) into the mother tongue (reception in L2, production in L1)

Thus, dictionaries catering for skills (a) and (d) are of the passive type, while the ones serving the remaining two skills (c) and (b) may be classified as active ones. In an ideal lexicographic world a separate bilingual dictionary would be created for each of the functions named above – to perfectly suit the needs of its users. The opinion that for each pair of languages (L1 and L2) four bilingual dictionaries are required (L2-L1 and L1-L2 aimed at native speakers of L1, and an identical combination fashioned for native speakers of L2) was expressed by the Russian linguist Lev Vladimirovič Ščerba (Mugdan 1992:17). In reality, however, this well-meaning postulate stemming from a genuine concern for the dictionary user is hardly ever fulfilled, primary reasons being too high costs and excessive effort of producing such reference works. Instead, what a user most often encounters in a bilingual dictionary is an incoherent mixture of characteristics of active and passive dictionaries (Mugdan 1992: 23).

2.1.4. Other ways of classifying bilingual dictionaries

Aside from directionality and the active-passive typology, other criteria may be used to classify bilingual dictionaries.

One of the most famous systematic classifications of dictionaries (not restricted to bilingual dictionaries but encompassing all linguistic dictionaries) is that by Ščerba. In his typology the author distinguishes between the *academic* and the *informative* dictionary, the *encyclopedic* and the *general* dictionary, the *concordance* and the *ordinary* (defining or translating) dictionary, the *ordinary* and the *ideological* dictionary, the *defining* dictionary and the *translational* dictionary, and finally, between the *nonhistorical* and the *historical* dictionary (Ščerba 1995 [1940]: 314-343). Out of the presented six contrastive pairs only three pertain to bilingual dictionaries (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 28).

The contrast between the *concordance dictionary* and the *ordinary dictionary* is a one between a dictionary which for every headword presents "all the available linguistic material" and in which "the meanings of words are empirically deduced from the linguistic material" found in the dictionary (Ščerba 1995 [1940]: 329), and "the dictionary that some-how – through explanation or translation – tries to give all the meanings for each word, bringing in examples only to illustrate its definitions" (Ščerba 1995 [1940]: 326). Concor-dance dictionaries are only possible in cases of dead languages, e.g. Latin, where the amount of the available linguistic material, i.e. citations is finite. Dictionaries of living lan-guages belong to the latter category, i.e. they are what Ščerba calls *ordinary* dictionaries.

The second opposition is the one between *ordinary* and *ideological* dictionaries. In the former type of dictionaries words are arranged according to their phonetic form, either in alphabetic order or in nests. The latter type comprises dictionaries which arrange their words by meaning (Ščerba 1995: 326). The presented opposition corresponds to what is referred to in modern lexicography as semasiological and onomasiological dictionaries (Adamska – Sałaciak 2006: 28). Bilingual dictionaries belong to the former category, while the latter category is represented by numerous thesauri.

The final juxtaposition immediately relating to bilingual lexicography – probably the best known of the six Ščerba's oppositions, and the one which inspires most comments – differentiates between *explanatory* and *translational* dictionaries. As suggested by the name of the former, explanatory dictionaries explicate their headwords with the use of definitions. They are above all aimed at native speakers of a particular language to whom

they explain the meaning of unknown words. Explanatory dictionaries also serve a normative function by establishing a standard language (Ščerba 1995: 338). Translational dictionaries, on the other hand, are created to address the users' need to understand foreign texts. They are based on the principle of equivalence, which at the same time is their gravest fault – as no two languages share an identical set of concepts (Ščerba 1995: 338). As can be easily deduced, bilingual dictionaries belong to this category.

Yet another dictionary typology was proposed by Al-Kasimi (1977: 20-21, as cited in Marello 2003: 336). The author distinguished seven binary oppositions, three of which are of relevance for bilingual lexicography, namely the ones between: dictionaries for *spoken language* and *literary language*, dictionaries for *human users* and for *automatic translation*, and finally, *general dictionaries* and *specialized dictionaries*. All three oppositions are self-explanatory, however the third one – between general and specialized dictionaries – is most relevant for the purpose of this thesis – since it is general bilingual dictionaries that it is concerned with.

Once the definition of the bilingual dictionary has been presented, together with some possible ways of bilingual dictionary classification, the time is now ripe to focus on the central concept of bilingual lexicography – the equivalence.

2.2. On the notion of equivalence

"Throughout its history, the conventional bilingual dictionary has been based on a principle which is now being increasingly probed and called into question: that of interlingual equivalence" (Snell-Hornby 1984: 274). One may wonder what has earned this time-honored principle so much criticism? Before addressing this question, let us first try to establish what equivalence is in the context of bilingual lexicography.

2.2.1. Defining equivalence

When trying to provide a satisfactory definition of equivalence, it is important to stress the fact that the term is not restricted solely to the domain of bilingual lexicography. In fact, equivalence is a concept used in three different areas of linguistics: lexicography, transla-

tion theory and contrastive linguistics, however in no two domains does it denote exactly the same phenomenon (Piotrowski 1994: 104-105). The discrepancy between equivalence as used in contrastive studies and equivalence in theory of translation stems from the different treatment of language by both. The main objective of contrastive studies is to compare and contrast language systems, while translation theory is more interested in texts (Piotrowski 1994: 105).

Equivalence in translation and lexicography are also distinctive phenomena. The main difference comes down to the unit with respect to which equivalence is established. In the case of translation theory, this unit may begin at word level and go as far as the level of text, while in bilingual lexicography it is most often restricted to a single lexeme.[4]

What has already been hinted at in the course of the present discussion is that equivalence in the context of bilingual lexicography is a form of relation between a pair of source language (henceforth SL) and target language (henceforth TL) lexical units (Piotrowski 1994: 105). Zgusta (2006 [1979]: 230) defines an equivalent as follows: "We call lexical equivalent a lexical unit of the target language which has the same lexical meaning as the respective lexical unit of the source language."[5] The author further acknowledges that the requirement that an equivalent should have the same polysemy and stylistic value as the source language item is met only in rare cases. Such 100% equivalence, while being something that bilingual dictionaries ideally should provide, is infrequent, and in most cases lexicographers – as well as dictionary users – have to settle for partial equivalents. How do lexicographers decide on which lexical units are to be placed in bilingual dictionaries as equivalents? The next section attempts to address this question.

2.2.2. How equivalence is established

Finding TL equivalents which are to be furnished to a bilingual dictionary is only seemingly easy. Situations in which equivalents are matched intuitively on the basis of bilingual competence of the lexicographer are not as abundant as it may seem. How is it, than, that upon opening a bilingual dictionary we are offered TL equivalents of nearly every word we

---

[4] Instances in which the search for equivalence in a bilingual dictionary moves from the level of a word to the level of a sentence will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

[5] Zgusta 2006 is a collection of articles whose original dates of publication were specified in square brackets.

look up? The following simplified account of the process of establishing equivalence is based on Piotrowski (1994: 106-111).

In order to establish the equivalence relation between words one needs to choose the so-called *tertium comparationis*, that is an entity against which the SL and TL lexical units will be compared, something that the two have in common. In the case of bilingual lexicography, tertium comparationis should meet two basic conditions. First and foremost it has to be external to both objects of the comparison, that is L1 and L2 lexical units. Secondly, it needs to be functional, so as not to burden the lexicographer with excessive theoretical studies.

Several proposals for a tertium comparationis in bilingual lexicography have been offered in the literature on the topic. Some examples are: the lexical meaning of the compared L1 and L2 items, the situation in which they might be used by members of both speech communities, and the so-called *applicability*, which signifies "that something which allows bilinguals to say that some L1 and L2 expressions can be used in approximately the same context" (Piotrowski 1994: 109).

In establishing equivalence between lexical units two types of analysis are employed, formal and situational:

> In formal analysis the range of collocations of the lexeme in question is studied, while in situational analysis it is the range of situations (contexts) which is taken into consideration (cf. Halliday 1966a: 20). Situational analysis can lead to establishment of equivalence between expressions of two languages, while formal analysis serves, first, to decompose a longer string of items into units of more manageable size, and, second, to establish in which lexical contexts the equivalent units of L1 and L2 are substitutable (Piotrowski 1994: 110).

Upon choosing a tertium comparationis and putting a given SL lexical item to such twofold analysis, a TL lexical unit which, in the opinion of lexicographers, is closest to it in terms of possible collocations and contexts of occurrence is selected to be placed in a bilingual dictionary.

2.2.3. Types of equivalence

Zgusta (1984: 147) distinguishes between two major types of bilingual dictionary equivalents: "From a study of the major landmarks in the history of the bilingual lexicography we

learn that an equivalent may have two different properties, which we can label translationality (or insertability) and explanatory paraphrase." According to the author, a translational (or insertable) equivalent is the one which may be readily inserted into a TL sentence producing a naturally-sounding translation – hence the name. The explanatory equivalent, in turn, has the power of explicating the meaning of the source-language item. It should be noted that an equivalent which is translational may also be explanatory – and precisely such equivalents are called by Zgusta (1984: 148) "the bilingual lexicographer's best friends."

One other type of equivalents recognized by Zgusta are functional equivalents.

> A translation should convey to its reader the same message with the same esthetic and other values that are conveyed by the original. Since languages differ in all imaginable respects, the translator must sometimes use means quite different from those used in the original in order to obtain the same result. If the different means do produce the same effect, the texts are functionally equivalent (Zgusta 2006 [1987]: 254).

Thus, in the majority of cases functional equivalence is established at the cost of semantic equivalence of lexical units. One advantage of offering such equivalents in bilingual dictionaries is the effect of naturalness of speech they produce. While the degree to which lexicographers are prepared to provide such equivalents in bilingual dictionaries varies depending on dictionary type and purpose, offering functional equivalents for certain forms of expressions has been sanctioned in bilingual lexicography, e.g. in the treatment of proverbs (Zgusta 2006 [1987]: 254).

Apart from the discussed types of equivalents, what may be found on the right side of the headword in the bilingual dictionary are explanations. Zgusta (2006 [1979]: 235) emphasizes the fact that explanations are not equal to explanatory equivalents. An explanation in a bilingual dictionary has a lot in common with a lexicographic definition found in monolingual dictionaries. Explanatory equivalent, on the other hand, is to a certain degree similar to a translational equivalent in that it is insertable and may eventually be accepted as a full-fledged lexical unit of the target language.

The most thorough classification of types of equivalence (and equivalents) known to the present author is that by Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: 103-106). Based on the study of literature on the topic, the author differentiated between four major types of equivalence and illustrated them with real-life examples (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 104):

(E) explanatory, descriptive;

(C) cognitive, semantic, systemic, prototypical, conceptual, decontextualized, notional;

(T) translation(al), insertable;

(F) functional, situational, communicative, discourse, contextual.

As suggested by the names *explanatory* and *descriptive*, equivalence in point (E) pertains to the right-hand-side data in the bilingual dictionary equation which takes the form of a definition or explanation. As noted by the author, this type of equivalence is treated by bilingual lexicographers as the last resort, since it fails to meet the requirement saying that "The equivalent should be a real lexical unit of the target language, which occurs or can occur in real sentences" (Zgusta 2006 [1979]: 230). What should be emphasized is the fact that Adamska-Sałaciak's and Zgusta's explanatory equivalents are not fully synonymous.

Equivalents of type (C) are what bilingual lexicographers aspire at. Such equivalents encompass the most central senses of the SL item, not necessarily catering to more peripheral ones. For this reason type (C) equivalents do not lend themselves to translation of the relevant linguistic unit on all occasions (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 104).

(T) equivalents are context-bound, i.e. for a particular context a respective lemma is translated in a particular way. Such equivalents make for a smooth translation when inserted into a TL text, as their denotational meaning is (almost) identical to that of the SL item (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 104).

Last but not least, type (F) equivalents are also context-dependent. What is worth emphasizing is the fact that functional equivalents need not preserve the grammatical category of the SL item, nor do they have to be arrived at by substituting SL lemmas with their equivalents of type (T) (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 104). This category corresponds to Zgusta's functional equivalents.

2.2.4. Degree of equivalence

As has already been remarked, instances in which bilingual dictionaries offer equivalents that fully match SL lexical units (with respect to denotational and connotative meaning, register, etc.) are infrequent, the simple reason being that such full equivalence between units of two different language systems is rare. And yet in the majority of cases bilingual dictionaries do provide some form of TL rendering on the right-hand side of the headword. Such proposed translations may vary in the degree to which they are equivalent to their SL

counterparts. This section elaborates on the notion of degree of equivalence and presents its classification.

Traditionally, three levels of equivalence are distinguished in the literature on the topic: full, partial and zero (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 17). Piotrowski (1994: 142-143) expands this list by one more item – inclusion.

Full equivalence is considered by Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: 117) the least interesting of equivalence degrees, since it demands little effort of the bilingual lexicographer. Indeed, it is the best case scenario, in which SL and TL lexical items are easily matched on the basis of full semantic correspondence.

Partial equivalence obtains between lexical items whose semantic features are not identical, but which to a certain degree overlap (Piotrowski 1994: 143). Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: 119) also includes in this category instances in which source and target language lexical items share denotational meaning, but differ with respect to their connotations.

The term *zero equivalence* is used to describe situations in which a respective SL item lacks an equivalent in the TL. This lack may be due to several reasons. One of them is the discrepancy between cultures underlying the juxtaposed languages. "The source-language word may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture. The concept in question may be abstract or concrete; it may relate to a religious belief, a social custom, or even a type of food. Such concepts are often referred to as 'culture-specific'" (Baker 2001: 21). Instances of culture-specific lexical items in the bilingual dictionary are more than abundant. Let us consider the example of *żur* and *bigos* as typically Polish dishes, or the name of an official known as the *Black Rod*, a person responsible, among others, for keeping the door of the House of Lords in the English parliament.

Culture-specific concepts are just one possible instance of zero-equivalence. Zgusta (2006 [1987]: 246) notices that SL words which tend to be deficient in equivalents include onomatopoeias, interjections, functional words, and particles. Yet another situation of zero equivalence arises when a SL item is not lexicalized in the TL, even though the concept is well-known (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 118). Color terms are a good example of such a situation. As it happens, the color spectrum is broken at different points in different languages. As a result, colors which are named in the SL may not have a label in the TL. Some African languages are known to operate with as few as three color terms.

Finally, the last degree of equivalence noted by Piotrowski (1994: 142-143) is the so-called inclusion. The term is used for a situation where the meaning of the SL item is

totally included in the TL item. As an example let us consider the Polish terms *ożenić się* 'to get married' (said of a man marrying a woman) or *wyjść za mąż* 'to get married' (said of a woman marrying a man), whose meanings are completely included into the meaning of the English verb *to marry*. Other authors classify this type of equivalence as partial.

2.2.5. How to cope in situations of zero or partial equivalence

It goes without saying that instances of zero equivalence make the lives of bilingual lexicographers difficult. Partial equivalence is not devoid of problems and hardships of its own either. The present section examines the various techniques employed by lexicographers when dealing with cases of non-equivalence.

Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: 120) lists seven possible techniques which she finds useful when coping with the problem of non-equivalence. Explanation of the meaning of the SL item in the TL, first on the list, is probably the most self-explanatory of all the suggested solutions. In a situation where the TL for whatever reason lacks the equivalent of the SL item, the bilingual lexicographer may be faced with the inevitable choice between providing a TL explanation or deleting a given SL item from the list of headwords. Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: 122) remarks that explanations are acceptable in the case of culture-specific concepts, while they are not recommended for dealing with function words, such as articles.

The second, somewhat surprising item on Adamska-Sałaciak's list of solutions are explanatory notes, which are separated from the entry and may take the form of boxes. While the primary function of such notes is to provide additional information concerning the usage of a respective lexical item, the author suggests that on certain occasions they may be exploited to supply information on the lack of equivalence of source and target language lexical units (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 123). She also maintains that in cases of non-equivalence explanatory notes have a wider application than explanations discussed above, lending themselves to treatment of not just culture-specific concepts, but also of lacking grammatical categories and false-friends.

Once more let us ponder over a situation of a lexical gap due to cultural reasons. Sometimes it is possible to bridge such a cultural discrepancy by providing the nearest counterpart of a source-culture item which exists in the target culture. Thus, e.g. the British

Home Office is the cultural equivalent of the Polish *Ministerstwo Spraw Wewnętrznych* 'The Ministry of Internal Affairs'. Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: 125) draws attention to the dangers inherent in providing cultural equivalents without proper typographic distinctions indicating their special status, (such as italics or the approximate equality sign $\approx$) and of the inconsistent use of such markings which may mislead the dictionary user.

Glosses are yet another possible way of handling non-equivalence in bilingual dictionaries. Following Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: 128), the term is used to refer to "additional information about the equivalent, placed immediately after it, formulated in the target language, and enclosed in parentheses." The author argues that the use of glosses is advisable with lexical items which are not likely to be well-known to the average speaker of TL or may be used in different contexts than the SL item. One another significant function of the gloss, although not immediately related to the issue of making up for non-equivalence, is specifying the meaning of the equivalent in cases of ambiguity of its meaning or its polysemy.

In a situation where for a particular SL item there is no designatum in the TL, the repairing strategy for the lack of equivalence may consist in providing two or more near-equivalents in the TL. Should such a technique be chosen by the lexicographer, he or she may achieve their goal in two ways. They may select the partial equivalents whose sum of meanings would correspond to the meaning of the SL lexical unit. The other option is to choose such partial equivalents whose meanings overlap in a place which best reflects the meaning of the SL item (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 130).

Manipulating the syntagmatic scope of the SL item is yet another strategy discussed by Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: 131-133). First and foremost, it is reserved for the treatment of idioms, the meaning of which resides in multi-word lexical items. The author notes that this strategy may also be employed for handling expressions which are difficult to render in the TL because of their connotations or register, as well as for any other lemmas which may not be successfully translated in any manner other than by offering a functional equivalent.

Last but not least, the lexicographer trying to satisfactorily cope with the problem of non-equivalence may do so by introducing an innovation. In other words, he or she may resort to borrowing. Adamska-Sałaciak (2004: 444, 2006: 133) differentiates between two types of borrowings, lexical and semantic. The former involves the transfer to the TL of both the meaning and the form of the borrowed word, the latter involves borrowing the meaning of a respective SL word and attaching it to an already-existing form in the TL as a

new sense. Unfortunately, the decision of whether to borrow a lexical item from the SL and thus introduce an innovation is hardly ever a simple one to make.

> A lexicographer who is not certain whether a recent borrowing should be allowed into a bilingual dictionary must take a number of factors into consideration. In principle, the candidate's presence in a monolingual dictionary of the target language should automatically decide in its favor. Otherwise, its frequency in TL corpora must be examined, side by side with TL speakers' familiarity with it. (...) Ultimately – however strongly we may disapprove of normative studies – the lexicographer's intuition and common sense play a significant role in the final decision (Adamska-Sałaciak: 2004: 448).

To conclude, bilingual lexicographers are armed with a number of remedial techniques, which might be used to battle non-equivalence in a more or less satisfactory way. It is such tricks of the trade that make the bilingual dictionary possible. The following chapter presents the bilingual dictionary from a different perspective – that of a carrier of cultural information.

Chapter 3: Culture in the bilingual dictionary

3.1. Culture, bilingual dictionaries and translation

Hopefully, the reasoning presented in Chapter 1, concerning the relation between language and culture, has managed to persuade the reader that the two are indeed inextricably connected. This assumption constitutes the basis for further discussion, in which bilingual dictionaries are presented as repositories of culture on the one hand, and cross-cultural bridges on the other.

3.1.1. The link between culture and bilingual dictionaries

The relation between culture and dictionaries (both bilingual and monolingual) was clearly and concisely formulated by Roberts (2007: 277), who asserts that "dictionaries present not only language, but also culture. Language represents culture because words refer to a culture. Therefore, dictionaries, which constitute an archive of the words of a language, present, *de facto*, the culture underlying the language." This view is also shared by Piotrowski (1994: 127), who claims that "on the surface the BD deals with linguistic forms, while in fact it has to do with cultural facts."

Since the bilingual dictionary is a work of reference which establishes correspondence between two languages, consequently, it also establishes correspondence between two cultures: "The left-hand side in a BD is thought to correspond to a list of cultural facts encoded by the lexemes of L2, and the right-hand side has a parallel list of equivalent cultural facts from the other language" (Piotrowski 1994: 128). The task of making intercul-

tural communication possible is inherent in the very principle on which bilingual dictionaries are created, that is in translation, discussed in more detail in the following section.

3.1.2. Bridging cultures through translation

In scholarly circles it has long been argued that perceiving translation as a purely linguistic activity reveals an incomplete picture of the process. "Most theories of translation, in ancient and modern times, have stressed so far that translation cannot be understood as just a matter of language. It may even be accepted that (…) there is a growing tendency to insist on the extra-linguistic aspect of the translation phenomenon" (Lambert 1994:17). What Lambert calls the *extra-linguistic* element are the cultural aspects translators have to deal with when performing their demanding task. A translator who attempts to separate a language from its culture treads on thin ice (Bassnett 1991:14). Such endeavors are further likened to trying to operate on a patient's heart neglecting the rest of his body. This powerful simile illustrates the fact that translation that disregards the SL and TL cultures is doomed to failure.

As maintained by Katan (1999: 7), the words *translation* and *culture* are more and more frequently found side by side, as if making translators responsible for the successful communication between the people of different cultural communities.[6] Bridging the gaps separating foreign civilizations undoubtedly is quite a challenge. The difficulty stems from the fact that just like there is no one-to-one correspondence between languages, there is no one-to-one correspondence between cultures. "Translators must grapple not only with structural differences between languages but also with cultural ones, which requires that they walk a fine line between the need for precision and the need for conveying the speaker's or author's approach or attitude" (Porter – Samovar 1995: 163).

To sum up, the task of the translator is twofold. On the one hand he/she needs to re-phrase the message expressed in the SL with the use of TL vocabulary items. On the other, his/her responsibility is to transfer the message between two cultures in such a way that it is understandable to the target-culture audience and at the same time its meaning is preserved. Keeping in mind that the bilingual lexicographer is a special kind of translator, let us have a look at how his/her task differs and what it has in common with the translation of texts.

---

[6] When entered into the Google search engine, the combination "culture + translation" yields 48 000 000 hits.

3.1.3. General translation vs. dictionary translation

The type of translation performed by the bilingual lexicographer – the rendering of SL words into the TL – is often perceived as a less demanding task when compared to translation of literary works or other types of texts (hereinafter referred to as general translation or text translation). The illusion of simplicity of dictionary translation quickly goes away when one realizes that "language is not merely an autonomous code system; nor is translation just mechanic transcoding. Although the unit of translation as concerns bilingual dictionaries is restricted to the headword in most cases, it still involves intrinsic philosophical problems about the possibility or impossibility of translation and the nature of language itself" (Zhao – Huang 2004: 177).

The unit of translation is probably the most conspicuous difference between dictionary and general translation, but certainly not the only one. Translation in bilingual dictionaries is semantics-oriented, while general translation is characterized by its focus on pragmatics. The purpose of dictionary translation is to establish static equivalence between lexical items of the source and target languages, general translation, in turn, aims at establishing dynamic equivalence. Finally, dictionary translation is a bottom-up process, i.e. it begins at the level of the word and progresses upwards, towards the sentence, the paragraph, and finally – the text. Dictionary headwords are divorced from context, while dictionary example phrases or sentences are only contextualized to a limited degree. Conversely, general translation progresses in the opposite direction, i.e. from top down (from text, through paragraph and sentence, to the word). As for contextualization, it goes without saying that any word embedded in a text has more context than a word within a single sentence, not to mention a bilingual dictionary headword stripped of its context (Zhao – Huang 2004: 180).

Regardless of the differences between general and dictionary translation listed above, both types of translation share a common characteristic: they are aimed at enabling communication between the users of two different languages belonging to two different cultural communities. The following section looks in more detail at how the task of bridging cultures is effected in bilingual dictionaries.

3.2. Manifestations of culture in bilingual dictionaries

3.2.1. The cultural box

One of the devices aimed specifically at overcoming cultural differences in bilingual dictionaries is the cultural box. It is used for the treatment of SL items recognized by lexicographers as culturally significant. Dictionary entries are supplemented with cultural boxes when it is felt that the dictionary user will benefit from an explanation exceeding the regular equivalent and/or the gloss (Rodger 2006: 571).

Rodger (2006: 568) recognizes onomastic expressions as an example of culture-specific lemmas often unsatisfactorily presented in bilingual dictionaries and therefore calling for additional information in the shape of cultural boxes. The examination of major current Spanish-English dictionaries performed by the author revealed that a situation in which an onomastic term is provided with a bare TL equivalent with no explanatory gloss is not uncommon.[7] The treatment of the Spanish term *carlismo* 'Carlism' in *Larousse gran diccionario español-inglés* (1993) is just one example.[8] Upon looking up the headword *carlismo* in the said dictionary the user will remain unaware of the meaning of the Spanish term, unless he or she has some background knowledge of the Spanish history.

One may argue that in similar cases the adverse situation may be remedied by a mere explanatory gloss. However, Rodger (2006: 569) points out that this is not always the case. He considers the presentation of the meaning of *calderoniano* 'Calderonian' in *Harrap Spanish dictionary* (2003), where the term is translated into English as *Calderonian* and supplemented with an explanatory gloss *typical of the style of the dramatist Pedro Calderón de la Barca (1600-1681)*. Such an explanation, while definitely more informative than an unaided equivalent, is still not enough. To fully give justice to the meaning of *calderoniano*, the gloss would have to at least briefly characterize the style of the dramatist.

---

[7] The dictionaries examined by Rodger included: *RCollins Spanish dictionary* (6th edition.) 2000. Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers; *Harrap Spanish dictionary*. 2003. Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap Publishers; *Larousse gran diccionario español-inglés*. 1993. Paris: Larousse; *Oxford Spanish dictionary* (2nd edition.) 1998. Oxford: Oxford University Press; *Simon & Schuster's international Spanish dictionary* (2nd edition.) 1997. New York: Macmillan.

[8] "Carlism is a traditionalist and legitimist political movement in Spain seeking the establishment of a separate line of the Bourbon family on the Spanish throne (...) significant in Spanish politics from 1833 until1975" ("Carlism" 2009).

Precisely in such situations the cultural box comes to the rescue (but not only – its use is not limited to onomastic adjectives).

According to Rodger (2006: 571-572), cultural boxes should be composed according to certain criteria. Editors of cultural-box information should guard against the presentation of a stereotypical view of the discussed culture. As for the content of the box itself, it should appeal not only to beginner learners of language (and culture) but also to those with some background knowledge. Finally, the cultural box should promote an unbiased, fair view of the source culture and do it in a transparent way which is easily understood by TL users.

Enriching a bilingual dictionary with cultural boxes has several benefits. First, the said feature makes the dictionary more browsable. Those who enjoy browsing through dictionaries for pleasure are likely to find them entertaining and educating. Moreover, cultural boxes are a valuable repair strategy for non-equivalence in vocabulary items which are not easily translatable into the TL (Rodger 2006: 571).

The cultural box is one of the explicit ways in which cultural information may be presented in bilingual dictionaries. The following section is dedicated to a less direct manner in which such information may be conveyed.

3.2.2. Dictionary illustrative examples as carriers of cultural information

While dictionary examples are more readily associated with monolingual dictionaries, in particular with those aimed at language learners, bilingual dictionary examples are not to be neglected as a less valuable dictionary feature. Following Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: 158), the term *example* is used here to refer to collocations of the headword (in a L2-L1 dictionary) or the equivalent (in a L1-L2 dictionary), taking the form of a full sentence or a phrase, either translated into the TL, or not.

The treatment of illustrative examples in bilingual dictionaries is where dictionary translation is reminiscent of general translation assuming, of course, that the examples are translated (Wu 2004: 154). If so, the process of establishing equivalence moves from the level of the word to the level of a phrase or sentence. It is also here that the bilingual lexicographer/translator is often faced with problems, which arise in relation not only to language, but also to the sphere of culture.

Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: 155) distinguishes between three main functions of dictionary examples (exclusive of explaining the meaning of the lemma or the TL equivalent), namely: grammatical, stylistic and cultural. The third category is of most interest for the purpose of this thesis. Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: 157) asserts that "[t]he cultural function of examples consists in supplying information about the L2 culture, and less obviously, in pointing to values which native speakers of L2 attach to the designata of certain culture-specific lexical items, such as social, political or religious terms, culinary or sport words etc." The cultural information may be presented in an explicit way, e.g. in the form of illustrative sentences making direct reference to the source culture, or in a veiled, implicit way, where it needs to be read between the lines (Williams 1996: 501).

Wu (2004:154) also points to the potential of illustrative examples to provide cultural information, in particular information relating to the source culture (regardless of whether it is the native or foreign culture of the dictionary user). To use the author's example, an illustrative sentence *Trespassers will be prosecuted*, offered for the headword *trespassers*, may be interpreted as an indication of the importance that Westerners attach to their privacy and private property. While shorter exemplary phrases may also be telling of some phenomena typical of a particular culture, the culture-carrying function of dictionary examples is particularly well visible when they take the form of full-sentences. Some culturally-marked full-sentence examples offered in the *Longman słownik współczesny angielsko-polski, polsko-angielski* (1st edition, 2006) for headwords *house* and *public school* include:

(1) *The President will speak to both Houses of the Congress on Tuesday.*

(2) *Many of the people in the British Government went to public schools.*

As has been demonstrated, dictionary examples are a possible channel for transmitting cultural knowledge, however, a channel not devoid of certain traps. As argued by Williams (1996: 501-503), including too much cultural information, particularly of the type which is not likely to be known to the non-native speaker, results in obscure examples of little explanatory value. What is more, in addition to conveying desirable information (both from linguistic and cultural point of view), examples may prove quite dangerous, in particular to language learners.

> Before a dictionary, especially a pedagogical one, goes to print, all its examples must be carefully reviewed, preferably not by the lexicographers or editors, but by someone who will be able to look at them with a fresh eye. One reason is to make sure that they are not inappropriate (e.g. graphic, sexually explicit) in view of the age and sensibilities of the intended users; any derogatory references to race, nationality, gender, sexual orientation, or disability must also be removed (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 188).

To sum up, aside from exemplifying headword use, bilingual dictionary examples are a possible way of presenting the foreign culture to the dictionary user, whether it is an original intention of the dictionary authors, or not.

3.2.3. Cultural significance of fixed expressions

Aside from a SL headword and its TL equivalent, a bilingual dictionary entry may also list some fixed expressions related to the relevant lemma. Such fixed expressions are yet another channel through which cultural information sneaks into bilingual dictionaries. The term *fixed expression* is used here in a broad sense to denote idioms and proverbs, but also certain restricted collocations, which will be specified in section 3.2.3.2. Similarly to illustrative examples, translation of fixed expressions in the context of bilingual lexicography involves the search for equivalents of lexical units larger than a single lexeme. Due to the fact that such fixed phrases often carry a heavy cultural load, their lexicographic treatment is a perfect example of dealing with cultural discrepancies on the pages of bilingual dictionaries.

3.2.3.1. Proverbs and idioms in bilingual dictionaries

Before embarking on the discussion of the treatment of proverbs and idioms in bilingual dictionaries, let us consider the following definitions of both terms.

> The proverb is generally considered as a brief, witty saying in common use that conveys a moral. It couches conventional wisdom in clever form and imagery, thereby making it memorable and easy to pass on from one generation to another (...) Proverbs state cultural truisms. The truism may be in the form of an empirically valid statement, or an existing superstition or social norm. It may even have a questionable logic, or make an unverifiable claim. In any case, the proverb's cultural validity is hardly disputed (Yankah 1994: 3386).

An idiom, in turn, denotes "[a]n expression unique to a language, especially one whose sense is not predictable from the meanings and arrangement of its elements, such as *kick the bucket*, a slang term meaning 'to die', which has nothing obviously to do with kicking or buckets" (McArthur 1992: 497).

The first of the two definitions presented above makes it evident that proverbs are strongly rooted in the culture of the people who coin them. For this reason, translating proverbs in bilingual dictionaries is an example of trying to find a common denominator for two cultures. Idioms may also be culturally motivated, although their cultural underpinning is less evident. Wu (2004: 155) suggests two ways of handling proverbs and idioms for the purposes of bilingual lexicography, a lexicographer may either "(1) attempt to transplant the particular cultural images and information in such a way that fits the target language or (2) substitute the cultural image of the source language with a common image of the target language without reducing any cultural information."

The author illustrates both methods on the basis of the Chinese proverb *shuo Cao Cao, Cao Cao dao* 'speaking of Cao Cao, he showed up', which is used in Chinese in a situation when a given person appears right after they are spoken of (Wu 2004: 155).[9] Thus, using the first method mentioned above, the Chinese proverb was rendered into English as 'speak of Cao Cao and he is sure to appear', and with the second as 'speak of the devil and he is sure to appear'. While the latter translation employing a functional equivalent would be perfectly understandable for most native speakers of English, the former calls for some kind of explanation in order to be fully comprehensible. Thus, handling proverbs and idioms in bilingual dictionaries relies on functional equivalence. A SL expression evoking a particular cultural image needs to be paired with a TL one which passes on the same wisdom or moral, but which may have a different form or literal meaning.

3.2.3.2. Restricted collocations

Finally, let us briefly discuss restricted collocations and their potential to transmit cultural information. Bragina (1996: 201) notices that the cultural element often serves as the "glue" holding certain collocates together. She exemplifies this statement with restricted

---

[9] Cao Cao (155-220 AD) was a Chancellor of the Eastern Han Dynasty in China who earned the reputation of a merciless tyrant ("Cao Cao" 2009).

collocations such as *motherly care* or *brotherly love*, setting them opposite such free word combinations as *fatherly care* or *sisterly love*. In the former case, the cultural motivation binding the collocates is believed to come from folk literature. In folk tales the mother is most often depicted as an embodiment of loving care towards the child, usually set against an evil stepmother (Bragina 1996: 201).The expression *fatherly care,* although seemingly very similar, is not supported with any literary archetypes, and does not carry as strong a cultural load as *motherly love*, which is why it was classified by the author as a free combination of words. Similarly, *brotherly feelings* developed quite differently from *sisterly feelings*, coming to denote close bonds between individuals not necessarily connected by blood ties, and echoing in such expressions as *brothers in arms*, or *Freedom, Equality and Brotherhood*. As has been indicated, also the type of collocations discussed above are stabilized by cultural knowledge.

Bragina (1996: 205-206) calls for a proper lexicographic treatment of such culturally motivated fixed expressions which have originated in folk stories, but also in the Bible and other important works of literature. She maintains that the "cultural glue" deserves a commentary in the body of the dictionary, at least for two reasons: First of all, it would help to do away with the notion that all collocations need to be learned by heart. Secondly, cultural information in a dictionary may be a response to the language learner's interest in the culture of the language they are learning.

3.2.4. Presentation of culture through culture-specific vocabulary items

Any bilingual dictionary contains a certain number of headwords specific to the culture of its SL. The entries dedicated to such headwords constitute an indirect description of that culture. Obviously, such a description is far from a genuine anthropological account, nevertheless it is still valuable in the hands of a competent dictionary user.

3.2.4.1. Definition of culture-specific vocabulary items

In her book entitled *Understanding cultures through their key words*, Wierzbicka (1997) emphasizes the important role of the vocabulary of a given language in conveying the cul-

tural values and ideas which underlie it. It is through lexical items present in the language of one culture and conspicuously absent from the language of the other that cultural differences manifest themselves.

> There is a very close link between the life of a society and the lexicon of the language spoken by it. This applies in equal measures to the outer and inner aspects of life. (…) It is clearly not an accident that, for example, Polish has special words for cabbage stew (bigos), beetroot soup (barszcz), and plum jam (powidła), which English does not; (…) Similarly, it is no accident that English doesn't have a word corresponding to the Russian verb xristosovat'sja (literally "to Christ one another"), glossed by the Oxford Russian-English dictionary as "to exchange a triple kiss (as Easter salutation)" (Wierzbicka 1997: 1-2).

To sum up, in every culture there exist concepts or phenomena not to be found elsewhere in the world. Such discrepancies between cultures, or cultural gaps, give rise to lexical gaps in the vocabularies of the concerned languages, manifesting themselves most vividly in the process of establishing interlingual equivalence. This, in turn, makes life difficult for both bilingual lexicographers and translators.

Vocabulary items denoting concepts characteristic of a particular culture are referred to by a number of names in the literature on the topic. Kalėdaitė and Asijavičiūtė (2005: 31) enumerate such labels as *cultural* or *culture-bound words*, *culture-specific concepts*, *realia*, *culture-bound phenomena* and *terms* and *culture-specific items*. However, the proposed labels call for a certain disambiguation.

As has been remarked, culture-specificity is not as easy to pinpoint as it may seem. There are those who argue that in fact very few – if any – vocabulary items are culture-independent: "As language is created and used in context, it is inevitable to be tinted with the color of cultural idiosyncrasies. 'Culturally loaded word' is a misnomer because all words are culturally loaded, and there is no need to distinguish so-called culturally loaded words from those that are supposedly not" (Zhao – Huang 2004: 181).

Let us consider the example cited by Piotrowski (1994: 129). Even though the words *big* and *duży* are listed as equivalents in any Polish-English or English-Polish bilingual dictionary, when used in equivalent expressions *What a big room!* and *Ale duży pokój!* uttered by a Pole and an American respectively, they are likely to be interpreted in a different way (what appears big to an American would probably appear enormous to a Pole). Similarly, Wierzbicka (2007) argues that terms such as *freedom*, *liberty* or *friend* are also culture-specific, since in every culture they are perceived slightly differently and have different connotations.

The following quotation presents a strict definition of culture-specific vocabulary items (henceforth CSI) as perceived in translation studies.

> Those textually actualized items whose function and connotations in a source text involve a translation problem in their transference to a target text, whenever this problem is a product of the nonexistence of the referred item or of its different intertextual status in the cultural system of the readers of the target text (Aixelá 1996: 58).

For the purpose of the present thesis the above definition has been somewhat relaxed to include not just " the truly unique items, but the ones which although not really unique, are felt to be different enough to potentially create communicative problems and thus to deserve rather special treatment" (Tomaszczyk 1984: 289).

3.2.4.2. Classification of culture-specific vocabulary items

Culture-specific words may be found in virtually every aspect of human culture. Newmark (1988: 95) proposes a possible categorization of CSI, distinguishing five major categories: ecology (including flora, fauna, winds, hills and plains), material culture/artifacts (food, clothes, types of houses, means of transport), social culture (comprising terms related to work and leisure), organizations, customs, activities and procedures (political, administrative, religious and artistic), and finally – gestures and habits (casual and official).

Once a possible classification of CSI has been suggested, the way of dealing with such words in bilingual dictionaries shall be discussed.

3.2.4.3. Treatment of culture-specific items in bilingual dictionaries

As has been remarked, satisfactory treatment of culture-specific words in bilingual dictionaries is quite a challenge, since – by definition – it involves overcoming non-equivalence, be it partial or full. Bilingual lexicographers, trying to provide TL equivalents of lexical items specific to the source culture, have developed certain techniques allowing them to rise to the challenge. It should be noted that many of the techniques have been inspired by or correspond to the techniques arrived at in translation studies. Let us have a look at some of the possible ways of handling culture-specific words in translation of texts.

Having consulted several relevant sources, Kalėdaitė and Asijavičiūtė (2005: 31-33) presented a classification of techniques employed for overcoming cultural non-equivalence at the word level in text translation.

One of the possible ways of dealing with such problematic words is to provide an "accepted standard (or recognized) translation" of the SL item (Kalėdaitė – Asijavičiūtė 2005: 32). This strategy relies on the fact that translation of certain terms which do not have a direct equivalent in the TL becomes standardized on the basis of a number of previous translations. One example of such a situation may be the rendering of the Polish legal term *wieczyste użytkowanie* into English as 'perpetual usufruct', which has become an accepted way of rendering this bit of Polish legal reality into English. The obvious weakness of this strategy is that only a limited number of SL culture-specific words have an official translation in the TL.

Transference, translation using a loan word, exoticization, foreignization, estrangement or *naturalization* are all labels used to denote a strategy in which a SL item is imported into the TL in an unchanged form (Kalėdaitė – Asijavičiūtė 2005: 2). An example of this strategy may be the translation of the name of the Polish lower chamber of Parliament simply as *Sejm* in any TL text. As suggested by some of the labels attached to this strategy, it imparts a sense of foreignness and exoticism to the TL translation.

Through-translation, calque or *loan translation* denote a method where a SL term is translated into the TL word for word (Kalėdaitė – Asijavičiūtė 2005: 32). An example illustrating this method is the rendering of E *flea market* into Polish as *pchli targ*. In this particular instance the loan translation was standardized and became a full-fledged item of Polish vocabulary.

Yet another strategy for overcoming cultural non-equivalence at word level discussed by Kalėdaitė and Asijavičiūtė (2005: 32-33) is *explanation*, also referred to by some scholars as *paraphrase*. Thus, a vocabulary item specific to the source culture may be explained with the use of TL vocabulary. This way its meaning is fully conveyed, but the form no longer corresponds to the original (it is no longer a single word but a multi-word expression). Explanations in text translation may be incorporated into the body of the text or be separated from it in the form of a footnote or a gloss.

Finally, providing a cultural equivalent is a strategy which might be successfully used for translation of CSI. A careful reader may notice that it corresponds to the lexicographic method for dealing with non-equivalence discussed in chapter 2. It consists in sub-

stituting a SL culture-specific word with a TL one which most closely corresponds to it. According to Kalėdaitė and Asijavičiūtė (2005: 33) the most significant advantage of this method is the sense of familiarity it evokes in TL readers.

So much for overcoming cultural non-equivalence at word level in translation of texts. The methods for dealing with the same problem in bilingual dictionaries are remarkably similar – which should come as no surprise keeping in mind that bilingual dictionaries are an outcome of a special kind of translation.

Tomaszczyk (1984: 294) enumerates five distinct ways of rendering CSI into the TL in bilingual lexicography. The list opens with the practice of introducing SL items into the TL "almost as they are", that is making the necessary changes in spelling so as to facilitate their pronunciation for the users of the TL or adjust them to the rules of TL word formation, e.g. by adding a nominal morpheme. Tomaszczyk (1984: 294) exemplifies this method with English renderings of the Polish word *Sejm* as 'Seym' or *województwo* as 'voivodship'. Such adapted TL equivalents are regarded as an attempt to bring a note of foreignness into the translation (cf. Kalėdaitė – Asijavičiūtė 2005).

The second method discussed by Tomaszczyk (1984: 294) consists in providing loan words from a third language (other than the two object languages covered by the bilingual dictionary) which are believed to be more familiar to the TL user and thus to help him/her better understand the meaning of a particular culture-specific item from the SL. Tomaszczyk (1984: 291) illustrates this technique with an example from the *Kościuszko Foundation Dictionary*, where the meaning of the Polish term *liceum* 'high school' has been explicated with the use of the French word *lycée,* denoting a high school in France. Whether such a solution proved successful remains a mystery.

The third method discussed by the author involves the extension of the meaning of a given TL word to refer to phenomena specific to source culture (Tomaszczyk 1984: 294). Thus, a word which already exists in the TL is assigned a new sense – that of the SL vocabulary item. Adamska-Sałaciak refers to this method as semantic borrowing (see section 2.2.5.). What is worth emphasizing is the fact that this method works best with cognate words, e.g. P *milicja*, which denotes police forces in the communist Poland, may be rendered into English as 'militia'.

Yet another method of handling culture-specific words may be observed when "L1 items are semantically decomposed and what are thought to be the critical components are translated into the L2" (Tomaszczyk 1984: 294). Thus, e.g. P *liceum ogólnokształcące* may

be translated into English as 'general-education secondary school'. This way the translated item is devoid of its culture-specificity and its meaning is successfully communicated to TL audience.

Finally, CSI may be translated into the TL word for word (Tomaszczyk 1984: 294). This method seems to employ the principle of least effort, and as a result, TL equivalents produced with its use run the risk of appearing awkward and unnatural to the TL user, e.g. the Polish term *urlop macierzyński* 'maternity leave' translated into English as 'motherly leave'.

One more method of handling CSI in bilingual dictionaries – which in turn does not lend itself to translation of texts – is the use of illustrations. This method was, among others, suggested by Tseng (2004: 170), who on numerous occasions noticed that English explanatory equivalents of Chinese CSI offered in some bilingual dictionaries were too wordy and awkward. As remarked by the author, sometimes "a picture would be worth a thousand words" (Tseng 2004: 170).While supplementing definitions with illustrations is a common practice in monolingual dictionaries, it is surprising how reluctant lexicographers seem to be to make use of them in bilingual dictionaries.

3.2.5. The bilingual dictionary as a witness to cultural change

One of the indirect ways in which bilingual dictionaries testify to the culture underlying their object languages (particularly the culture of the SL) is the very content of the headword list.

Bilingual dictionaries (but also monolingual ones) hold a potential to reflect culture and cultural development owing to the fact that they constitute repositories of language at a given point in time. It is not an overstatement to call dictionaries "mirrors of social and cultural change" (Persson 2005). A diachronic study of dictionaries performed by a sensitive scholar may be an indication of how societies and their views evolve over time. Such an analysis was undertaken by Persson, who examined several Swedish-English bilingual dictionaries published between 1918 and 2000. The comparison of Swedish headwords and their English equivalents in early and late twentieth-century bilingual lexicographic works of reference revealed changes in several important domains of human life. One of them was the disappearance of social stratification. Persson (2005: 428) noticed that the number of

headwords denoting various types of female and male servants tended to be lower in newer dictionaries, which he interpreted as an indication of the leveling of social strata. Similarly, the decrease in the number of Swedish compound nouns featuring the word *fattig* 'poor', such as e.g. *fattighus* 'poor-house', indicated improvement of the material situation of the Swedish society, while the introduction into newer dictionaries of such headwords as *socialbidrag* 'social allowance' and *socialvård* 'social welfare' reflects the modern ways of alleviating the hardships of Swedish citizens, should they find themselves in a financial predicament.

Yet another important cultural change codified in dictionaries was observed in the field of gender equality. The Swedish term *ordförande* was translated in the 1918 *Svensk-engelsk ordbok* edited by E. Wenström and W.E. Harlock as 'chairman', while the 1980 edition of *Svensk-engelsk ordbok* edited by R. Santesson offers three equivalents of the same term: 'chairman', 'chairperson', and 'chairwoman'. As can be seen, the situation of women in the target culture (here English) has improved enough to allow them to head meetings. However, the fact that both English and Swedish derogatory terms for *woman* outnumber those for *man* is a proof of lingering male domination (Persson 2005: 430).

Finally, a careful diachronic analysis of bilingual dictionaries may reveal the spheres of human life regarded as taboo as well as the changing attitudes towards them. Persson (2005: 430-431) notices that Swedish-English dictionaries published in the first half of the twentieth century tended to leave out swearwords, and should a more conscientious lexicographer decide to include such words in the headword list, they were treated with utmost caution and care not to offend anybody's sensibilities. More recently published dictionaries show a more relaxed approach to admitting swearwords and taboo-words, however such entries are still labeled as vulgar. Thus, what was shocking or unthinkable in the past seems to be more socially acceptable today (in both Swedish and English cultures), while the bilingual dictionary proved a valid tool for recording such changes of social attitudes.

3.2.6. Other manifestations of cultural information in bilingual dictionaries

Aside from the manifestations of cultural information in bilingual dictionaries discussed in the foregoing sections, cultural content may also be contained in special dictionary features.

Upon the examination of four principal English-French bilingual dictionaries Pilard (2002: 431) came across a significant number of cultural references to both French and Anglo-American cultures.[10] All the examined dictionaries provided culture notes pertaining to important historical events, customs and traditions, society or politics. One of the examined lexicographic works distinguished itself by providing information on how connotational meanings of certain words differ between cultures, discussing, among other things, connotations of the word *Arab* in French and British cultures. It also featured a list of the most important cultural and historical events related to Anglo-Saxon people, as well as a section explaining the meaning and origin of allusive phrases used in the English-speaking culture such as *Houston, we have a problem* or *dark satanic mills*. Yet another culturally-significant feature found in the examined dictionaries consisted of notes on national American and British sports, such as baseball and cricket, and accounts for the origin of some idioms related to the said sports.

All in all, the trend observed by Pilard (2002: 431) in lexicographic works of reference, both bilingual and monolingual, to offer an increasing amount of cultural information, is motivated by a growing awareness of the fact that such information benefits dictionary users, and in particular language learners, at least in two ways.

> It is not only possible but also necessary to exceed word knowledge in the treatment of bilingual dictionaries. It is essential in terms of either the learner's acquisition of the source language or the ever-increasing need for cross-cultural communication. Actually, language competence of the target language and cross-cultural communication are just two sides of the same coin, because without the former one cannot succeed in the latter, and without the latter one need not and cannot acquire the former (Zhao – Huang 2004: 177).

Taking the above into consideration, the presence in the bilingual dictionary of cultural information exceeding the standard linguistic data seems to be well justified and even more desirable.

To conclude, whether in an open, direct way, e.g. via cultural boxes or notes, or in a more subtle, implicit manner, bilingual dictionaries constitute a valuable source of cultural information. Their task is to enable the communication of peoples speaking different languages, but also embedded in different cultures. The following chapter is an attempt at the

---

[10] The bilingual dictionaries examined by the author included: *Larousse grand dictionnaire français-anglais anglais-français* (1988), *The Oxford-Hachette French dictionary* (2001), *The comprehensive Collins-Robert French dictionary* (2000) and *The Harrap French dictionary: Unabridged edition* (2001).

analysis of cultural content in selected English-Polish-English bilingual dictionaries with emphasis on bridging cultures through bilingual treatment of CSI.

Chapter 4: The analysis

4.1. Objectives of the study

The objectives of the present study are twofold. First of all, it seeks to determine whether the trend in lexicography observed by Pilard (2002: 431) (see section 3.2.6.), concerning the increase of cultural information in lexicographic works of reference, is corroborated in selected English-Polish-English bilingual dictionaries. Secondly, it endeavors to analyze the treatment of culture-specific vocabulary items in the said dictionaries, with the view to establishing the most common techniques of rendering them into the TL and determining whether such renderings are indicative of the dominant position of Anglo-Saxon culture.

4.2. Methodology

The study is based on five bilingual English-Polish-English dictionaries (see section 4.3). It opens with the investigation of the dictionaries' front and back matter in search of any claims made by editors concerning the treatment of cultural information, and the actual manifestations of cultural information in the body of the dictionaries.

The second part of the study consists in the analysis of the renderings of a set of CSI into the TL in the five dictionaries. The analysis is an attempt at establishing the techniques most commonly used for handling CSI in English-Polish-English bilingual dictionaries and determining whether the said techniques are in any way dependent on relations obtaining between Polish and Anglo-Saxon cultures, and in particular on the dominance of the latter. For this purpose the following assumptions were made:

- The number of borrowings from English into Polish should be significantly greater than from Polish into English – dominant culture is the one more readily borrowed from.
- The number of established renderings of CSI representing Anglo-Saxon culture should be greater than the number of such renderings of Polish terms.[11]
- The number of CSI rendered into the TL by means of a definition should be significantly lower in the case of the dominant culture owing to the fact that such culture is well-known also outside the geographical area where it originated.

4.3. Selected dictionaries

The five bilingual dictionaries selected for the study are: *PWN-Oxford wielki słownik angielsko-polski* oraz *PWN-Oxford wielki słownik polsko-angielski* (henceforth *PWNO*), *The new Kosciuszko Foundation dictionary* (henceforth *NKFD*), *Longman słownik współczesny angielsko-polski, polsko-angielski* (henceforth *LSW*), *The great English-Polish dictionary*: *Supplemented* and *The Great Polish-English dictionary*: *Supplemented* by Jan Stanisławski (henceforth *STAN*), and *The Kościuszko Foundation dictionary* (henceforth *KFD*).

For nearly half a century, *STAN* and *KFD* were the largest and most comprehensive general bilingual English-Polish-English dictionaries available on the Polish market. At the beginning of the 21st century this privilege was passed onto the new generation of bilingual dictionaries: *PWNO* and *NKFD*. *LSW*, although smaller than the remaining four dictionaries, was chosen for the present study as a representative of bilingual learners' dictionaries. The analysis presented in this chapter was conducted on the basis of the paper-based editions of the aforementioned dictionaries.

4.4. Cultural content in the selected bilingual dictionaries

This section investigates the claims made in the front and/or back matter of the selected English-Polish-English bilingual dictionaries concerning the treatment of cultural information, and the manifestations of such information in the aforementioned dictionaries.

---

[11] By *established* the present author means cases in which all the examined dictionaries are unanimous as to the TL rendering.

4.4.1. Wielki słownik PWN-Oxford

The English-Polish part of *PWNO* was the first of the two dictionary volumes to appear in Polish bookstores (first published in 2002). It covers 500 000 lexical units and has been compiled with the use of electronic corpora. *The Oxford English Corpus* constituted the basis for the English wordlist, while *Korpus języka polskiego PWN* [PWN corpus of the Polish language] served as the basis for evaluating the naturalness of Polish equivalents (Sobol 2007a: V).

As for direct statements concerning the presentation of cultural information in the dictionary, a closer investigation of the front matter reveals the following claims: "Słownik uwzględnia ponadto swoiste słownictwo kulturowe i regionalne różnych krajów an-glosaskich oraz aktualne słownictwo dotyczące życia społecznego, politycznego i kultural-nego" [Moreover, the dictionary includes cultural and regional vocabulary peculiar to vari-ous Anglo-Saxon countries as well as current vocabulary pertaining to social, political and cultural life] (Sobol 2007a: V), "Bogato reprezentowane są zatem w naszym słowniku ter-miny półspecjalistyczne dotyczące informatyki, techniki, ekologii, medycyny, zjawisk społecznych, współczesnej kultury, mediów, sportu, życia społecznego" [Therefore, the terms richly represented in our dictionary include semi-specialist vocabulary pertaining to IT, technology, ecology, medicine, social phenomena, modern culture, mass media, sports, social life] (Linde-Usiekniewicz – Geller 2007a: IX).[12] The presented statements indicate that the SL culture-specific vocabulary is recognized as an important category of lexical items included in the dictionary.

In the subsection of the "Preface" entitled "How was the dictionary created", the editors draw the users' attention to certain special dictionary features outside the list of headwords, some of which deserve to be mentioned as valuable sources of cultural infor-mation (Linde-Usiekniewicz – Geller 2007a: XII). The section "Useful phrases according to function" (pp. XXXIX-XLVII) contains a comparison of expressions commonly used by native speakers of English and Polish in 19 different everyday situations, including apolo-gizing, formulating greetings, permitting, forbidding, extending condolences and invita-tions, expressing opinions, etc. Such a juxtaposition makes it evident that utterances made in the same situation by English and Polish speakers respectively are often significantly

---

[12] All translations from Polish sources are mine, MP.

different, although pragmatically aimed at achieving the same goal. Thus, the discussed dictionary section constitutes a comparison of culturally-conditioned linguistic behaviors of the members of Polish and English-speaking cultures, emphasizing similarities and differences between them.

The subsequent section of the dictionary's front matter entitled "English and Polish correspondence" (pp. XLVIII-XCIV), contains examples of letters in both languages divided into four different categories namely: personal and social correspondence, holidays and travel plans, everyday life, and employment. Since the principles governing correspondence are to a significant extent culture-specific, the examples of English and Polish letters contained in the discussed section highlight the points of cultural differences, thus constituting an indirect source of cultural information.

The front-matter section entitled "Lexical usage notes" (pp. XCV-CXX) is yet another example of how cultural information, be it indirectly, manifests itself in the English-Polish volume of *PWNO*. The aforementioned notes, divided into 40 categories, accentuate the differences in language use, such as the different manners in which speakers of Polish and English express age or time, but also point to phenomena specific to particular cultures and suggest the ways of describing them in the TL. One such example are notes concerning administrative division, where British regions and counties or Polish regions and provinces are listed together with their TL renderings.

The Polish-English volume of *PWNO*, covering over 500 000 Polish lexical units and first published 2 years after the English-Polish one (2004), appears to be less abundant in cultural information. Disappointingly, the "Od wydawcy" [From the publisher] section of the front matter makes no direct reference to the presentation of culture, nor is such a reference made in the "Preface" to the work. The only special feature of the Polish-English volume containing some (although very indirect) form of cultural information is a list of British and American units of measurement and the way of calculating them into Polish.

4.4.2. The new Kosciuszko Foundation dictionary

As revealed in the "Introduction" to the Polish-English volume (p. IX), *NKFD* was created between 1998 and 2002 by lexicographers associated with the School of English of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. It is the successor of *The Kościuszko Foundation dic-*

tionary, first published in 1959-61.What was intended as a review of the older version of the dictionary evolved into a new lexicographic work of reference, over one and a half times larger than its predecessor.

As claimed by its authors, *NKFD*, covering 140,000 headwords and clarifying 400,000 meanings, holds a place among the largest English-Polish-English bilingual dictionaries ever to be published. While *NKFD* records mainly the American variety of English, some attention is also dedicated to other varieties of the language, most significantly – to British, but also to Australian, Canadian, Irish and Scottish. The dictionary is primarily aimed at Polish users, however, as is claimed in the Introduction to the P-E volume (p. IX) it may also be successfully used by the native speakers of English.

Rather disappointingly, the aforesaid "Introduction" (which is identical to the "Intorduction" in the English-Polish part of the dictionary with respect to content, but different as regards the language in which it was written – English vs. Polish) makes not a single direct reference to the presentation of culture within the body of the work, be it American, British or Polish. Any such claims are also absent from the "Preface".

The front- and back-matter features of *NKFD* providing some form of cultural information include the "Important public notices" section in the front matter of the English-Polish volume, which offers a list of signs typically found in public places in the United States together with their Polish functional equivalents, the "Useful expressions" section in the front matter of the Polish-English volume, containing a list of Polish everyday-language phrases and their English equivalents, as well as the section "Regions of Poland"*,* which comprises a list of Polish provinces and describes their geographical location.

4.4.3. Longman słownik współczesny angielsko-polski, polsko-angielski

The relatively small (66 500 words and expressions) *LSW* distinguishes itself by its treatment of cultural information. As early as in the dictionary's "Foreword" the user is informed of dictionary features aimed specifically at the presentation of cultural information. Fisiak (2006: III) mentions boxes which contain information on points of cultural contrast. On numerous occasions such boxes directly inform the user of the impossibility to establish full equivalence between specific Polish and English terms arising from cultural differences.

The dictionary's middle matter contains a section entitled "Cultural information" (pp. A2-A9) dedicated to selected cultural issues such as the political system, the judicial system, education, transport, sport or cuisine of the United Kingdom and the United States. The following section is the so-called "Communication skills bank" (pp. A10-A19) , which contains examples of phrases used by native speakers of English in various everyday-life situations, such as giving advice, accepting and declining offers, making requests or disagreeing, which also constitute a source of cultural information, be it indirect. It should be noted that no Polish translations of the phrases are provided.

What catches the eye is that while the national cultures of the United States and the United Kingdom receive a significant amount of attention in the analyzed dictionary's front and middle matter, Polish culture seems to be neglected. This is easily accounted for by the fact that *LSW* is mostly aimed at Polish learners of English, who are assumed to be well-familiar with the various aspects of their native culture.

4.4.4. Kościuszko Foundation dictionary

"[T]he Kościuszko Foundation, which serves as American Center for Polish Culture, has undertaken to publish, sponsor, or inspire the publication of a series of books dealing with Poland, with important aspects of Polish culture, and with Polish-American relations" (Mizwa 1995: V). *The Kościuszko Foundation dictionary* was named the "cornerstone" of the aforementioned series, known as the *Poland's Millennium Series* of the Kościuszko Foundation. Through the publication of *KFD,* the Kościuszko Foundation sought to promote the Polish language, and bring its underlying culture closer to American people. At the same time, the language and culture of the American nation were to be brought closer to Polish users. Keeping in mind the mission of the Foundation, it is all the more surprising to see that the dictionary's front matter contains no reference to the presentation of culture in the supposedly groundbreaking lexicographic work of reference.

Volume I of *KFD* (English-Polish) was first published in 1959 and had 14 printings until 1995. The front blurb of the volume boasts of the number one position of *KFD* among English-Polish-English dictionaries of its time. The then innovations introduced in the dictionary include the differentiation between the American and British varieties of English – now a common feature in any respectable dictionary, as well as the order of presentation of

senses based on the frequency of occurrence and not the historical development of the word – also a common practice in modern dictionaries (Bulas – Whitfield 1995:VIII).

As has been remarked, neither the "Preface" nor the "Foreword" to the English-Polish volume of *KFD* makes any direct claims concerning the presentation of cultural information. The dictionary's back matter contains a list of common English abbreviations, including names of institutions, which constitutes a source of indirect cultural information, but offers no Polish translations.

The front matter of *KFD*'s Volume II (Polish-English) also lacks any direct statements concerning the presentation of cultural information. The back matter of the dictionary contains a list of commonly used Polish abbreviations, again not supported with translations into the TL. Aside from the aforementioned feature, no other section of the volume may be regarded as a source of cultural information.

4.4.5. The great E-P and P-E dictionary by Jan Stanisławski

The two English-Polish volumes of *STAN* were originally published in 1964 and subsequently complemented with the two Polish-English ones. Both parts of the dictionary cover 100 000 and 180 000 lexical units respectively.

In neither part does the "Preface" contain any direct statements concerning the presentation of cultural information. The analysis of the list of contents of the English-Polish volumes reveals a section entitled "A list of famous names and well-known characters in literature", which, by pointing to figures of eminent Britons or Americans, constitutes an indirect source of cultural information. Disappointingly, dictionary users are only provided with pronunciation of the aforesaid names, remaining little wiser of which literary work they come from or which they authored. The Polish-English part of the dictionary lacks a corresponding section. Furthermore, the English-Polish part contains a list of British and American units of measurement and their Polish equivalents. Both parts of the dictionary contain sections with commonly used Polish/English abbreviations and contractions, including names of various institutions and organizations together with their renderings into the TL, which also indirectly inform of various aspects of culture.

4.5. Findings

4.5.1. Recognition of the importance of cultural information

The results of the search for any claims concerning conscious presentation of cultural information in the analyzed dictionaries proved rather disappointing. Out of the five investigated bilingual lexicographic works of reference, only two contain such declarations in their front matter.

Both in the "Preface" and the "Od wydawcy" [From the publisher] section of the English-Polish volume, *PWNO* is claimed to cover important cultural vocabulary. No statements, however, are made regarding the way in which such vocabulary is handled and whether it receives special treatment in comparison with headwords belonging to other categories. In the front matter the users are also informed of the dictionary's special features, e.g. "Useful Notes", or examples of correspondence, which exceed the usual scope of linguistic information offered in dictionaries, providing an insight into and comparison of TL and SL cultures. The Polish-English volume of *PWNO* contains no statements concerning cultural information.

The second dictionary whose front matter reveals the authors' concern for the presentation of cultural information is *LSW*. In the "Foreword" to the volume, the dictionary's chief editor mentions a special feature in the form of boxes supplementing certain entries in both English-Polish and Polish-English sections of the dictionary. Among others, the said boxes are claimed to contain information on various aspects of British and American culture (Fisiak 2006: III). No mention is made, however, concerning the presentation of any cultural information regarding Poland.

4.5.2. Special dictionary features offering cultural information

As far as manifestations of cultural information in the form of special dictionary features are concerned, again *LSW* takes the lead among the analyzed dictionaries. Not only does it contain the aforementioned boxes, which highlight points of cultural difference between Poland and English-speaking countries, but it also includes a middle-matter section dedi-

cated specifically to several aspects of British and American culture. Thus, *LSW* is the only one in the five examined dictionaries to offer explicit cultural information in the form of short essays on education, sports, political system, etc. It should be emphasized that it is only the culture of English-speaking countries which receives such treatment in the afore-mentioned dictionary.

The three dictionaries published in the new millennium, that is *PWNO*, *NKFD* and *LSW*, all contain features outside the list of headwords which indirectly furnish cultural information. Notably, *PWNO* (E-P volume) and *LSW* contain sections which list typical ways of expressing gratitude, extending condolences, making apologies, etc. in English-speaking countries. In *PWNO* the said section also provides Polish functional equivalents of such expressions. *NKFD* and *PWNO* both offer some insight into the geographical and ad-ministrative division of the countries whose languages are covered in the dictionaries. *NKFD* (P-E volume) contains a list of Polish regions and provinces, *PWNO* also suggests the ways of rendering the names of the said units of administrative division into English. *PWNO* additionally contains a list of regions (counties/states) of the UK and the USA to-gether with their Polish renderings. It is also the only dictionary which offers examples of English and Polish formal and informal correspondence. *PWNO* contains a list of British and American units of measurement translated into the metric system, while *NKFD* con-tains sections with Polish and English public notices and useful expression. *LSW* is unique in that it comprises a section with abbreviations used in English emails and cell phone text messages, thus providing an insight into an important aspect of cultural behavior related to modern technology.

When it comes to the older generation of dictionaries first published around the middle of the 20th century – *KFD* and *STAN* – they neither contain any statements concern-ing the presentation of cultural information, nor do they provide any form of explicit cul-tural information. Both *KFD* and *STAN* include lists of English and Polish abbreviations (such as names of institutions and organizations), which may be regarded as a very indirect source of cultural information. Additionally, *STAN* offers a list of British and American units of measurement as well as a list of famous names and characters in literature, how-ever only pertaining to the English-speaking world.

To sum up, the comparison of the cultural content in the two generations of exam-ined bilingual dictionaries reveals an increased consciousness of the importance of provid-ing cultural information in newer lexicographic works of reference. However, the afore-

mentioned increase is far from a lexicographic revolution and leaves plenty of room for improvement, e.g. in the form of providing cultural boxes discussed by Rodger (see section 3.2.1.) or any other form of explicit cultural information.

The cultural information contained in the examined dictionaries tends to focus on the national cultures of Anglo-Saxon countries, in particular on the United Kingdom and the United States, with the national culture of Poland receiving significantly less attention. While this tendency is easy to explain – the analyzed dictionaries are mainly targeted at Polish users – it places the non-native speakers of Polish who may use the aforementioned dictionaries in a less advantageous position.

4.6. The analysis of culture-specific vocabulary items

4.6.1. Choice of culture-specific vocabulary for the analysis

The analysis is based on culture-specific vocabulary items at the level of national cultures. The CSI selected for the analysis belong to three different categories:

- educational system
- government and administration
- customs and traditions

Each category is exemplified by 10 vocabulary items, 5 representing Polish national culture, and 5 – Anglo-Saxon culture (the latter being further subdivided into American and British terms). All the CSI selected for the present analysis belong to the grammatical category of nouns.

In the case of Polish culture, the terms in the first two categories were derived from an Internet website offering resources for Polish-English translators (http:// serwistlumacza.com/content/view/98/34/). The page contains lists of terms peculiar to Polish culture subdivided into thematic fields, together with their suggested renderings into English. The items in the first category (educational system) were also in part derived from a website containing a dictionary of Polish terms related to tertiary education (http:// www.buwiwm.edu.pl/ publ/przew/slownik.htm), while the third category comprises items selected from websites dedicated to Polish customs (http://www.federacja-

polonia.dk/tradycje.html) and traditional cuisine (http://www.staypoland.com/kuchnia-polska.htm).

The English terms were mainly derived from articles in *Wikipedia*: *The Free Encyclopedia* dedicated to education, politics and administrative division of the United Kingdom and the United States, as well as websites dedicated to Anglo-Saxon customs and traditions.[13]

The choice of the particular Polish CSI to be included in the analysis was impressionistic, the only applied criterion being the generality of the term (and at the same time the likelihood of it being included in a general bilingual dictionary). The English CSI were selected to roughly correspond to the Polish ones, so that terms within a particular category could be easily compared, e.g. Polish and British/North American units of administrative division, types of Polish and British/North American schools etc. Once the 30 culture-specific vocabulary items were chosen, they were looked up in the selected 5 bilingual dictionaries, to yield the result presented in the sections below.

4.6.2. Culture-specific vocabulary items – educational system

The terms in the category of educational system selected for the analysis include: *A-level* (UK), *sixth-form college* (UK), *public school* (UK), *minor* (US) and *associate's degree* (US) for Anglo-Saxon culture, and: *gimnazjum*, *egzamin dojrzałości*, *doktor habilitowany*, *rektor*, and *magister inżynier* for Polish culture.

---

[13] The websites looked through in search of culture-specific items representing Anglo-Saxon culture included: "Szlifuj swój angielski" (http://www.ang.pl/kultura.html?tab=5), "British culture, British customs and British traditions" (http://www.learnenglish.de/culture/educationculture.htm), "Education in the United States" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education_in_the_United_States), "Education in England" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education_in_England), "Cabinet of the United Kingdom" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cabinet_of_the_United_Kingdom) and "Politics of the United States" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics_of_the_United_States).

4.6.2.1. Renderings of British and American culture-specific vocabulary items

Table 3 presents the renderings into Polish of the first three American and British CSI in the field of education selected for the analysis.[14]

Table 3. Renderings of E *A-level*, *sixth-form college* and *public school* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
A-level	NKFD	**A level** (także Advanced level) *Br. Szkoln.* egzamin z określonego przedmiotu na zakończenie szkoły średniej (*zdawany przez uczniów w Anglii i Walii w wieku 18 lat*).
	PWNO	**A-level** GB Sch *egzamin końcowy z jednego przedmiotu w szkole średniej*
	LSW	**A level** odpowiednik egzaminu maturalnego w Anglii i Walii: *She took A levels in physics, chemistry and mathematics.*
	KFD	–
	STAN	–
sixth-form college	NKFD	**sixth-form college** *Br. szkoln.* szkoła dla osób w wieku 16-18 lat przygotowująca do egzaminów A levels
	PWNO	**sixth form college** GB Sch dwuletnia szkoła przygotowująca do egzaminu dojrzałości
	LSW	–
	KFD	–
	STAN	–
public school	NKFD	**public school** *Br.* Szkoła prywatna (*zwł. elitarna, z internatem*).
	PWNO	**public school** GB szkoła *f* prywatna
	LSW	**public school** BrE szkoła prywatna: Many of the people in the British Government went to public schools.
	KFD	**public** *Br.* szkoła prywatna (*zwł.* gimnazjum klasyczne, *zw.* z internatem, przygotowujące *gł.* do uniwersytetu i do służby państwowej);
	STAN	**public** (*w Anglii*) prywatna (ekskluzywna) szkoła średnia

E *A-level*, which stands for The Advanced Level General Certificate of Education, is "a school-leaving examination in a particular subject, normally taken at the age of 18 in England and Wales" (Crowther – Kavanagh 2000: 10). The term was found in three out of the five examined dictionaries. Its omission in *KFD* may be explained by the fact that the dictionary was compiled during the second world war and not revised, while A-levels were

---

[14] In all the tables presenting the renderings of the analyzed CSI the entry components irrelevant for the purpose of the present analysis have been disregarded, e.g. all grammatical markers have been dropped.

first introduced in 1951 ("A-levels" 2009). As for *STAN*, failure to include the term may be blamed on the negligence on the part of lexicographers. The remaining three dictionaries all resort to the same technique in handling the culture-specific item under investigation, that is they provide a TL definition. *NKFD* renders the term as 'an examination in a particular subject at the end of high school' and supplements it with a gloss 'taken by pupils in England and Wales at the age of 18'. *PWNO* defines it as 'the final examination in one subject in high school'. Rather disappointingly, only *LSW* links E *A-level* with P *egzamin maturalny*, a cultural equivalent which denotes an exam taken by Polish students at the age of 18 when leaving high school. Making such a reference brings the meaning of *A-levels* closer to Polish dictionary users by associating it with something they are familiar with. The *LSW* definition is additionally furnished with a full-sentence example.

Unlike in Poland, where students are required by law to go to school until they are 18, education in England and Wales is only compulsory until the age of 16. Those students who wish to continue education may attend what is called the *sixth form* – the final two grades of secondary school divided into the *lower sixth* and the *upper sixth*. They may also choose to attend a separate 2-year school, the *sixth-form college*, which prepares them for A-levels (Crowther – Kavanagh 2000: 493).

As evident from Table 3, only *NKFD* and *PWNO* include the E *sixth-form college* in their lists of headwords. Again, the lack of the direct Polish equivalent is compensated for in both dictionaries by the use of TL definitions. *NKFD* defines the investigated term as 'a school for persons aged 16-18, preparing for A-level examinations', while *PWNO* renders it as 'a two-year school preparing for the secondary school finals.' Interestingly enough, while in its definition of the term *A-level PWNO* makes no reference to the P *egzamin dojrzałości/maturalny*, in the definition of the *sixth-form college* this correspondence has been recognized. The analyzed term is not included in either *KFD* or *STAN*, presumably for the same reasons as in the case of the vocabulary item first discussed.

E *public school* is the final vocabulary item specific to British culture within the analyzed category of educational system – the American sense of the term was disregarded for the purpose of the present analysis. Contrary to what the name may suggest to a native speaker of Polish, education in public schools in Britain is anything but free of charge. This type of school is associated with higher academic standards and prestige. Public schools are most often boarding schools, with students living in a house system. Many public schools have a longstanding tradition, e.g. Eaton, Harrow or Winchester, while their graduates are

qualified for taking up high-powered jobs, also in the field of politics (Crowther – Kavanagh 2000: 434). Taking all the above into consideration, rendering the term *public school* into Polish simply as *szkoła prywatna* 'private school' seems an understatement.

Table 3 illustrates the renderings of the term in the analyzed dictionaries. *NKFD*, *LSW* and *KFD* all offer an explanatory equivalent *szkoła prywatna* 'private school', none of the said dictionaries, however, leaves the equivalent unaided, recognizing the significantly different associations a bare equivalent would evoke in Polish users.[15] *NKFD* supplements its explanatory equivalent with a bracketed gloss 'esp. elitist, with a dormitory'. *KFD* also offers a gloss, however a more detailed one than the one provided by its successor: 'esp. classical gymnasium, esp. with a dormitory, preparing mainly for university and for public service'. *LSW* provides additional information to its rendering in the form of a full-sentence example, which associates public schools with a position in the British government. *PWNO* is the only dictionary which offers the bare explanatory equivalent *szkoła prywatna*. *STAN* offers a slightly more extensive explanatory equivalent, with an optional bracketed element which indicates the elitist character of the school: 'private (exclusive) high school'.

Table 4. Renderings of E *minor* and *associate's degree* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
minor (US)	NKFD	**minor** *US i Can. uniw*. pomocniczy kierunek studiów;
	PWNO	**minor** US Univ przedmiot *m* dodatkowy
	LSW	–
	KFD	**minor** *US szk*. (przedmiot) poboczny.
	STAN	–
associate's degree (US)	NKFD	**associate** *US uniw*. stopień uzyskiwany po ukończeniu dwuletniego college'u
	PWNO	–
	LSW	–
	KFD	–
	STAN	–

The academic *minor* and *major* are concepts unique to the educational system of the United States (and Canada). In simplest terms, a *minor* is the secondary field of study cho-

---

[15] The present author differentiated between a TL *definition* and an *explanatory equivalent*. While both are in fact explanations of the meaning of the SL item in the TL, the latter was distinguished on the basis of its brevity, thanks to which in some contexts it may be inserted in a sentence producing a naturally-sounding translation. The line between the two categories is not clear-cut, and in drawing it the author to a large extent relied on her linguistic intuition. What is more important, however, is the fact that both categories represent type E equivalents as discussed by Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: 104) – see section 2.2.3.

sen by a particular student and pursued during their bachelor's studies (the major being the primary one). In Poland students are required to concentrate on just one field of study, both when pursuing undergraduate and graduate programs. This leads to a cultural gap, which in turn calls for ingenuity on the part of bilingual lexicographers.

E *minor* is listed in 3 out of 5 analyzed dictionaries, with *LSW* and *STAN* failing to include it in the list of headwords. *NKFD* offers an explanatory equivalent 'an auxiliary field of study', created by decomposing the meaning of the original and translating it into Polish. Not only does the offered equivalent successfully render the meaning of the source-language item, but owing to its brevity, it may also be inserted in context. *PWNO* also provides an explanatory equivalent, shorter, if less accurate. *Przedmiot dodatkowy* 'additional subject' is probably more readily associated by a Polish user with an extracurricular university course rather than a secondary field of study. *KFD* provides a similar solution, rendering *minor* as *przedmiot poboczny* 'secondary subject', also brief, and also failing to do justice to the meaning of the original English term (see Table 4).

E *associate's degree* is an academic degree awarded in the United States and specific to their educational system. Usually, it is earned over a two-years' period of study. It is ranked below the bachelor's degree (licentiate's degree), which in Poland is the lowest academic degree awarded to students. The term happens to be listed in only one of the examined dictionaries – *NKFD* (see Table 4). Rather unimaginatively, *NKFD* resorts to a TL definition of the culture-specific item under discussion: 'a degree earned after completing a two-years' college'.

4.6.2.2. Presentation of Polish culture-specific items

Table 5. Renderings of P *gimnazjum* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
gimnazjum	NKFD	**gimnazjum** *szkoln.* junior high school, middle school.
	PWNO	**gimnazjum** Szkol. 1 (trzyletnia szkoła średnia) secondary school
	LSW	**gimnazjum** n grammar school BrE, junior high (school) AmE
	KFD	**gimnazj~um** n. academic secondary school.
	STAN	**gimnazjum** *sn* grammar-school

The analysis of Polish culture-specific terms related to the educational system opened with the term *gimnazjum,* which was found to be listed in all five dictionaries (see Table 5). P *gimnazjum* is a school for children aged 13-15, attended by students between the level of elementary school and high school. *NKFD* offers two cultural equivalents of the Polish item: j*unior high school* and *middle school*. While the choice of cultural equivalents is perfectly justifiable (the correspondence between certain types of Polish and American/British schools is quite easily noticeable), what catches the eye is the lack of labeling. *Junior high school*, specific to the United States, should be marked with the label *US*, while *middle school* is a term used both in the United States and the United Kingdom, although with a slightly different meaning. *PWNO* offers *secondary school* as the sole equivalent, which – while being concise enough to fulfill the principle of insertability – is too general to do justice to the Polish term. In this context secondary school may be classified as a TL hypernym, which would greatly benefit from a gloss narrowing down its meaning.

Similarly to *NKFD*, *LSW* also offers two cultural equivalents of P *gimnazjum*, this time duly labeled. What surprises, though, is the choice of the British *grammar school* as the cultural equivalent. Grammar schools in the UK tend to charge fees and admit students with best academic results (Crowther – Kavanagh 2000: 124) – perhaps the term *comprehensive school* would be more appropriate in the above context. *KFD* offers *academic secondary school*, an explanatory equivalent also rather too general. STAN suggests a cultural equivalent *grammar-school*, which is acceptable keeping in mind the date of the first publication of the dictionary – comprehensive schools were not introduced until the late 1960s (Crowther – Kavanagh 2000: 124).

Table 6. Renderings of P *egzamin dojrzałości* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
egzamin dojrzałości	NKFD	**egzamin** *szkoln*. finals, secondary school final examinations; *Br*. A-levels
	PWNO	**egzamin** Szkol. *Polish school-leaving examination*
	LSW	**egzamin** egzamin maturalny/dojrzałości school-leaving exam
	KFD	**dojrz~ałość** final examination at a (Polish) gymnasium
	STAN	**dojrzałość** szk. egzamin ~ci secondary school finals

P *egzamin dojrzałości* is the final examination taken in several subjects by Polish high-school students. The presented definition immediately brings to mind the previously discussed British *A-levels*. It is interesting to see if particular dictionaries make use of this correspondence in providing English renderings of the investigated term.

As indicated in Table 6, *NKFD* suggests three renderings of the term. Bare *finals* is neatly insertable, but rather inaccurate. *Finals* may denote any form of final examinations, also at a university, therefore such a solution may be classified as a TL hypernym. Next in line is a TL definition. The third solution is a British cultural equivalent, linking *egzamin dojrzałości* to *A-levels*. *PWNO* suggests a TL definition emphasizing the culture-specificity of the term with the word *Polish*, while *LSW* offers an explanatory equivalent. The renderings offered by both *PWNO* and *LSW* would gain from a gloss providing information concerning the type of school which ends in *egzamin dojrzałości* – after all, *gimnazjum* also has its finals. The rendering offered by *KFD* takes the form of a TL definition. Finally, *STAN* offers a culturally-neutral explanatory equivalent.

Table 7. Rendering of P *rektor* and *doktor habilitowany* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
rektor	NKFD	**rektor** 1. *uniw*. (=zwierzchnik uczelni) president; *Br*. vice-chancellor
	PWNO	**rektor** 1 Uniw. (osoba) vice chancellor GB, president US
	LSW	**rektor** n vice-chancellor BrE, chancellor AmE: *the vice-chancellor of Oxford University*
	KFD	**rektor** 1. *uniw*. president
	STAN	**rektor** *uniw. kośc*. rector
doktor habilito-wany	NKFD	**doktor** *w Polsce* holder of a postdoctoral degree
	PWNO	**habilitowany** Uniw. doktor ~y *person with a post-doctoral degree*
	LSW	–
	KFD	–
	STAN	–

In simplest terms, P *rektor* signifies the highest academic administrator of a Polish university. *NKFD*, *PWNO* and *LSW* offer cultural equivalents of the lexical item under investigation, covering British and US cultures. Both *PWNO* and *LSW* indicate the cultures to which both equivalents belong with the use of geographic labels, *NKFD* is inconsistent in this respect, supplying only the British equivalent with a label. *KFD* offers the US cultural

equivalent (unlabelled), while STAN renders the Polish *rektor* using an English cognate – *rector*, which is rarely used in the university contexts of Anglo-Saxon countries.

P *doktor habilitowany*, abbreviated to *dr hab.*, is the highest university degree awarded in Poland, which happens to lack a full equivalent in the Anglo-Saxon culture. It is awarded solely to Ph.D. holders upon a presentation of a dissertation known as *rozprawa habilitacyjna* (and a colloquium). Rendering the names of Polish academic degrees into English has been an ill of Polish sworn translators. Only two dictionaries, *NKFD* and *PWNO*, suggest English equivalents of *doktor habilitowany*, none of the renderings, how-ever, is readily insertable in the place of *dr hab.* alongside a person's name. Both *NKFD* and *PWNO* offer TL definitions, *NKFD* being more precise in that the offered equivalent is marked as specific to Poland (see Table 7).

P *magister inżynier* is a professional title awarded to graduates of higher vocational studies with majors in technical subjects. Unfortunately, the term was not found in any of the analyzed dictionaries.

4.6.3. Culture specific vocabulary items – government and administration

The following terms were selected in the category of government and administration: *shire* (UK), *township* (US), *House of Commons (UK)*, *Lord Privy Seal (UK)*, *electoral college* (US) for Anglo-Saxon culture, and *województwo*, *sołectwo, Sejm*, *konwent seniorów*, and *wójt* for Polish culture.

4.6.3.1. Presentation of terms specific to British and American culture

Table 8. Renderings of E *shire* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
shire	NKFD	**shire** Br. *hist.*, *admin*. hrabstwo
	PWNO	**shire** GB dat hrabstwo
	LSW	–
	KFD	**shire** *Br*. hrabstwo
	STAN	**shire** hrabstwo

E *shire* denotes a former local government area in the United Kingdom equivalent to a county. The rendering of the term into Polish has long been established, therefore it comes as no surprise that the four dictionaries which include *shire* in their wordlist render it in an identical way (see Table 8). The only noticeable difference regards labeling – STAN fails to mark the term as specific to Great Britain.

Table 9. Renderings of E *township* and *House of Commons* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
township	NKFD	**township** *US i Can*. część hrabstwa
	PWNO	**township** *n* US ≈ powiat (*jednostka podziału terytorialnego hrabstwa*)
	LSW	–
	KFD	**town~ship** *US* i *Kanada* część hrabstwa
	STAN	–
House of Commons	NKFD	**House of Commons** *Br. parl*. Izba Gmin
	PWNO	**House of Commons** *n* Izba *f* Gmin
	LSW	**House of Commons** Izba Gmin
	KFD	**house** n. Br., Izba Gmin
	STAN	**commons** Izba Gmin

The American heritage dictionary of the English language (2006: 1827) defines *township* as "a subdivision of a county in most northeast and Midwest U.S. states, having the status of a unit of local government with varying governmental powers." Table 9 presents the ways in which the selected term was handled in the analyzed dictionaries. *KFD* offers a TL definition 'a part of a county', which has been retained in *NKFD*. *PWNO* provides a Polish cultural equivalent *powiat*, which also denotes a unit of administrative division, preceded by an approximate equality sign, and supplemented with a gloss defining what a township is: 'a unit of administrative division of a county.' *LSW* and *STAN* fail to include the term or its investigated sense.

E *House of Commons*, the lower house of the British Parliament, is yet another example of an item specific to British political culture. All the examined dictionaries include the term and all render it into Polish as *Izba Gmin,* thus resorting to a loan translation. What catches the eye, however, is the lack of geographical labeling in 4 out of 5 analyzed dic-

tionaries. Interestingly, *PWNO* fails to mark the term with *GB*, even though the American *House of Representatives*, the lower chamber of the Congress, is labeled as specific to the United States. *NKFD* is the only dictionary to mark *House of Commons* with the label *Br.*, indicating its geographical and cultural affiliations. Failure to provide labels may be explained by the fact that *Izba Gmin* is a full-fledged item of the Polish language and its culture-specificity somehow recedes into the background.

Table 10. Renderings of E *Lord Privy Seal* and *electoral college* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
Lord Privy Seal	NKFD	**Lord Privy Seal** *Br. admin*. podkanclerzy (*w randze ministra*)
	PWNO	**Lord Privy Seal** GB Lord Skarbnik Pieczęci
	LSW	–
	KFD	–
	STAN	**privy** Lord Privy Seal lord tajnej pieczęci
electoral college	NKFD	**electoral college** *US polit*. kolegium elektorów (*w wyborach prezydenckich*)
	PWNO	**electoral college** kolegium elektorów
	LSW	–
	KFD	**elector~al** *US*, kolegium wyborcze
	STAN	**electoral** *am* the Electoral College kolegium wyborców (obierające prezydenta St. Zjedn.)

E *Lord Privy Seal* is "the British government official who formerly kept the seal (...) of the king or queen. Today the Lord Privy Seal no longer has this responsibility, but is usually either the leader of the House of Commons or the leader of the House of Lords" (Crowther – Kavanagh 2000: 318). As evident from Table 10, *PWNO* and *STAN* both resort to loan translations in rendering the term into Polish. The equivalent of *Lord Privy Seal* provided by *NKFD* is significantly different from those offered by the remaining two dictionaries. P *podkanclerzy*, a term denoting a high-ranking official in times when Poland was a monarchy, may be classified as a cultural equivalent. The equivalent is additionally supplemented with a gloss: 'having the rank of a minister'. While all three equivalents offered by the examined dictionaries are perfectly insertable, they hold little informative value and would benefit from a gloss explaining who *Lord Privy Seal* is.

The English term *electoral college* is tied with American presidential elections. Unlike in Poland, it is the so-called electors (constituting the electoral college) and not the

US citizens who vote for a particular candidate. In providing the Polish equivalent, all the four dictionaries which list the term are unanimous with respect to the translation of its second component – *college* (see Table 10). As for *electoral*, only *KFD* retains the grammatical category of the word in its translation, the remaining dictionaries changing the English adjective into a Polish noun. Despite such an alteration, the equivalents offered by the four dictionaries may be classified as broadly understood loan translations. *NKFD* supplements its rendering with a gloss: 'in presidential elections', labels it with *US* and indicates its affiliation with politics, while *PWNO* yet again fails to label its rendering as specific to the political culture of the United States. *STAN* also furnishes its equivalent with a gloss 'electing the president of the United States' and duly labels it with *am* (for American).

4.6.3.2. Presentation of terms specific to Polish culture

Table 11. Renderings of P *województwo* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
województwo	NKFD	**województwo** *admin*. province
	PWNO	**województwo** Admin ≈ province (*in Poland*); voivodeship spec.
	LSW	**województwo** province
	KFD	**wojew~ództwo** province
	STAN	**województwo** (*jednostka administracyjno-terytorialna*) province

P *województwo* denotes the largest regional unit of administration in Poland. As indicated in Table 11, the term is included in all the examined dictionaries and all of them unanimously offer *province* as its English rendering, thus providing a cultural equivalent. *NKFD* labels the offered equivalent as belonging to the domain of administration, *PWNO* precedes the equivalent with an approximation sign to indicate partial equivalence and hints at its culture-specificity relating it to Poland. It also provides a second equivalent labeled as belonging to specialist language, *voivodeship*, which constitutes a transliterated borrowing of the Polish word combined with the English nominal morpheme *ship*. As for *LSW*, it supplements the entry for *województwo* with a box in which it is explicitly pointed out that providing a full equivalent of the Polish term is impossible due to the simple fact that it

signifies a bit of reality peculiar to Poland. *KFD* offers unaided cultural equivalent *province*, while *STAN* precedes the offered equivalent with disambiguation of the sense.

Table 12. Renderings of P *sołectwo* and *wójt* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
sołectwo	NKFD	**sołectwo** (*jednostka terytorialna*) the smallest administrative unit in Poland.
	PWNO	**sołectwo** *the lowest unit of local administration, usually comprising a single village*
	LSW	–
	KFD	–
	STAN	–
wójt	NKFD	**wójt** (*na wsi*) commune head;
	PWNO	**wójt** Admin. ≈ borough leader
	LSW	–
	KFD	**wójt** head of a village;
	STAN	**wójt** *sm* chief officer of a group of villages

The Polish term *sołectwo* denotes a unit of local government in Poland below the level of *gmina*. In both dictionaries which include the term, i.e. *NKFD* and *PWNO*, it is rendered into English with the use of a TL definition. The remaining three dictionaries either do not contain the headword s*ołectwo* at all, or fail to include the sense of the term under investigation (see Table 12).

P *wójt* denotes an official who heads the unit of Polish local government known as *gmina*. Table 11 illustrates how the selected dictionaries handle the problem of lack of cultural equivalence in this case. As it turns out, no two solutions offered by the dictionaries are identical. The difficulty of handling the term *wójt* in a satisfactory way stems from the fact that there is no established way of translating *gmina* into English. *NKFD* offers a solution which might be classified as a combination of explanatory and cultural equivalents, using the word *borough*, which both in the United States and the united Kingdom denotes a unit of local government, in particular within a city. Such a rendering is preceded by a bracketed disambiguation 'in rural area', which narrows down the meaning of the analyzed headword (in Poland there are two basic types of *gmina,* rural and municipal, with *wójt* heading the former). *PWNO*'s solution is similar to that of *NKFD* in that it is an explanatory equivalent, however, since *commune* is not a unit of local government in any of the

Anglo-Saxon countries, it may not be classified as a combination with a cultural equivalent. Both *KFD* and *STAN* provide TL definitions which are culturally neutral.

Table 13. Renderings of P *Sejm* and *konwent seniorów* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
Sejm	NKFD	**sejm** *parl.* the Sejm (=*lower House of the Polish parliament*).
	PWNO	**sejm** Polit. the Sejm, the Seym (*the lower chamber of the Polish parliament*);
	LSW	**sejm** the Sejm: *The OPZZ presented a petition to the Sejm demanding equal indexation for all.*
	KFD	**sejm** Seym
	STAN	**sejm** Seym
konwent seniorów	NKFD	**konwent** (*w Sejmie*) Sejm Council of Seniors; (*w Senacie*) Senate Council of Seniors.
	PWNO	**konwent** Polit. the Council of Senior Members (*an advisory body of the Polish parliament*)
	LSW	–
	KFD	–
	STAN	–

P *Sejm,* denoting the lower chamber of the Polish parliament, is included in all five examined dictionaries (see Table 13). *NKFD* offers an equivalent in the form of a lexical borrowing supplemented with a defining gloss. *PWNO* also provides a lexical borrowing (both exact and transliterated), accompanied with a defining gloss. *LSW* complements the offered borrowing with a culturally-loaded example. *KFD* and *STAN* both resort to transliterated borrowings, however, leaving them unaided. No dictionary exploits the possibility of providing an American or British cultural equivalent, even though corresponding bodies do exist in both cultures.

P *konwent seniorów* in the Polish parliament is a body which coordinates the cooperation of parliamentary clubs – organized groups of Polish MPs or senators. Both *Sejm* an *Senat* have their own *konwent seniorów*. *NKFD* and *PWNO* are the only two dictionaries containing the Polish culture-specific item (see Table 13). In providing English equivalents, both resort to loan translations, *PWNO* supplementing its equivalent with an defining gloss, *NKFD* differentiating between *konwent seniorów* in the *Sejm* and in the *Senat*.

4.6.4. Culture specific vocabulary items – customs and tradition

The final category of terms analyzed in the present study comprises: *Halloween* (US, UK), *mince pie* (UK*)*, *Guy Fawkes Nigh* (UK), *eggnog* (US), and *hot-dog* (US) representing American and British culture, and *mazurek*, *dyngus*, *opłatek*, *bigos*, and *marzanna,* representing Polish culture.

4.6.4.1. Presentation of Americana and British culture-specific items

Table 14. Renderings of E *Halloween* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
Halloween	NKFD	**Halloween** wigilia Wszystkich Świętych
	PWNO	**Halloween** wigilia Wszystkich Świętych
	LSW	**Halloween** wigilia Wszystkich Świętych
	KFD	**Halloween** wigilia Wszystkich Świętych (*zw*. połączona z maskaradą i płataniem figli)
	STAN	**Halloween** wigilia Wszystkich Świętych

Halloween, a holiday rooted in the Celtic tradition and celebrated in the United Kingdom and the United States on October 31, has gained popularity outside Anglo-Saxon countries, with Halloween parties thrown also in Poland. All the five dictionaries are unanimous as to the Polish rendering of the English term as 'the eve of All Saints Day' (see Table 14). Such an equivalent has been arrived at by the decomposition of the meaning of the festival's name and rendering it into Polish by way of loan translation – All Saints Day is also known as All Hollows, while the name Halloween is derived from All Hollows Eve (Crowther – Kavanagh 2000: 240). *KFD* is the only dictionary supplementing the offered equivalent with a gloss which briefly mentions what Halloween celebrations consist in: 'esp. combined with a masquerade and playing tricks'. Disappointingly, no dictionary resorts to a borrowing to render the English term into Polish. Taking into consideration the fact, that the meaning of E *Halloween* is well-known to young Poles, while the term itself is listed in dictionaries of the Polish language, e.g. in *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego PWN* (1st edition, 2006), such a solution would be justifiable.

Table 15. Renderings of E *mince pie* and *Guy Fawkes' Night* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
mince pie	NKFD	**mince pie** *Br.* babeczka z nadzieniem bakaliowym (*spożywana w okresie Świąt Bożego Narodzenia*)
	PWNO	**mince pie** GB *babeczka z kruchego ciasta z nadzieniem z bakalii, spożywana w okresie Świąt Bożego Narodzenia*
	LSW	**mince pie** babeczka z nadzieniem bakaliowym spożywana tradycyjnie w okresie Bożego Narodzenia
	KFD	**mince** ~ meat mieszanina z rodzynków, cukru, jabłek, skórki osmażanej itp. na ~pie, placek zawierający tę mieszaninę;
	STAN	**mince-pie** babeczka zawierająca leguminę zwaną "mincemeat" **mincemeat** kulin legumina z rodzynków, jabłek, migdałów, skórki pomarań-czowej i dodatków;
Guy Fawkes' Night	NKFD	**Guy Fawkes' Night** Br. wieczór 5 listopada, kiedy pali się kukłę Guy Fawkesa na pamiątkę wykrycia Spisku Prochowego z 1605 r.
	PWNO	**Guy Fawkes' Night** GB 5 listopada (*rocznica spisku prochowego*)
	LSW	–
	KFD	–
	STAN	–

E *Mince pie* is a British Christmas delicacy in the form of a sweet pastry filled with dried fruit, raisins and suet. As for the rendering of the British culture-specific item into Polish (see Table 15), *NKFD* provides a TL definition marked with the geographical label *Br.*: 'a pastry with nut and raisin stuffing', and completes it with a gloss: 'consumed in the Christmas period'. *PWNO* also offers a TL definition marked with a geographic label: 'pastry made of shortcake with stuffing of raisins and nuts consumed in the Christmas period'. *LSW* offers an almost identical TL definition with no geographical label. The remaining two dictionaries define *mince pie* as a pie (*KFD*) or pastry (*STAN*) containing mincemeat, whose meaning is defined separately (also in the form of a TL definition). Both *KFD* and *STAN* fail to label the provided equivalents as typically British.

E *Guy Fawkes' Night* is a British holiday celebrated on November 5th, commemorating the Gunpowder Plot where a group of Roman Catholics attempted to blow up the British Parliament (Crowther – Kavanagh 2000: 62). *NKFD* handles the British term by providing a lengthy TL definition: 'the evening of November 5th when the effigy of Guy Fawkes is burnt to commemorate the foiling of the Gunpowder Plot of 1605'. *PWNO*, in turn, provides an explanatory equivalent – the date on which the Guy Fawkes Night is cele-

brated 'November 5th', supplementing it with a defining gloss 'the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot'. The remaining dictionaries do not list the term under investigation.

Table 16. Renderings of E *eggnog* and *hot dog* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
eggnog	NKFD	**eggnog** korzenny napój alkoholowy na jajkach i mleku
	PWNO	ajerkoniak
	LSW	–
	KFD	**egg~flip, ~nog** napój alkoholowy z jajkiem
	STAN	–
hot dog	NKFD	**hot dog** hot dog
	PWNO	**hot dog** hot dog
	LSW	**hot dog** hot-dog
	KFD	**hot** US pot., parówka (w bułce)
	STAN	**hot** gorąca parówka podana w rozciętej bułce

E *eggnog* is a drink made of eggs, milk, sugar, nutmeg, and sometimes alcohol, and traditionally drunk in the United States in the Christmas period (Crowther – Kavanagh 2000: 167-170). The term is listed in just three of the examined dictionaries (see Table 16). *NKFD* offers a TL definition: 'spicy alcoholic drink based on eggs and milk'. *PWNO* translates *eggnog* as *ajerkoniak*, which also is an alcoholic drink based on eggs and milk, known in Poland, although not in any way associated with Polish Christmas celebrations. Although *ajerkoniak* lacks such connotations, it may be classified as a cultural equivalent. *KFD* also provides a TL definition 'alcoholic drink with egg'. No dictionary, however, makes a mention of the drink's association with the American Christmas tradition.

While the origins of the E *hot dog* are uncertain, what is known for a fact is that it was invented and popularized in the United States ("hot dog" 2009*)*. It was selected for the present analysis as an example of traditional North American food. It is interesting to observe how the two generations of analyzed bilingual dictionaries differ when it comes to providing the Polish rendering of the term. *NKFD*, *PWNO* and *LSW*, all published at the beginning of the 21st century, render *hot dog* simply as *hot dog* – that is with a borrowing which is well established in the Polish language, so well, in fact, that it is recorded in a Polish dictionary *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego PWN* (2006). *KFD* provides an ex-

planatory equivalent 'sausage (in a bun)', while *STAN* offers a TL definition 'hot sausage served in a slit bun'.

4.6.4.2. Presentation of terms specific to Polish culture

Table 17. Renderings of P *dyngus*, *mazurek* and *opłatek* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
dyngus	NKFD	**dyngus** water fights (*an Easter Monday tradition in Poland*).
	PWNO	**dyngus** *Easter Monday custom of drenching people with water*
	LSW	–
	KFD	**dyngus** = śmigus. **śmigus** water dousing (on Easter Monday).
	STAN	**dyngus** (*zwyczaj*) traditional custom of dousing womanfolk on Easter Monday
mazurek	NKFD	**mazurek** (*ciasto*) traditional Polish Easter cake.
	PWNO	**mazurek** Kulin. *shortcrust tart baked at Easter*
	LSW	–
	KFD	**mazur~ek** a kind of cake
	STAN	**mazurek** *kulin.* a kind of cake
opłatek	NKFD	**opłatek** wafer
	PWNO	**opłatek** (wigilijny) wafer
	LSW	–
	KFD	**opłatek** wafer
	STAN	**opłatek** wafer

P *dyngus*, opening the analysis of terms representing Polish customs and traditions, is celebrated on Easter Monday. The custom involves pouring water over other people, which in the past used to symbolize purification. *NKFD* and *KFD* offer brief explanatory equivalents of the Polish term and supplement them with glosses explaining when *dyngus* is celebrated. *PWNO* and *STAN* resort to TL definitions. *LSW* fails to include the analyzed item (see Table 17).

When discussing Easter customs in Poland it is impossible not to mention *mazurek*. This traditional Polish cake was listed in four out of five analyzed dictionaries, all of which offer TL definitions as the English rendering of the term. *KFD* and *STAN* provide identical solutions, too general to give justice to what *mazurek* actually is and failing to associate it with Easter. *NKFD* is the only dictionary signaling that the term is specific to Polish culture (see Table 17).

P *opłatek* is a term connected with Polish celebrations of the Christmas Eve. The custom of sharing *opłatek* round the Christmas Eve table is not commonly practiced in Anglo-Saxon countries. Again, the term is listed in 4 dictionaries. All of them unanimously render the word into English as *wafer*, thus extending the meaning of an existing English vocabulary item to include the meaning specific to Polish Christmas celebrations, that is using a semantic borrowing. Disappointingly, in no dictionary is it in any way indicated that sharing *opłatek* is a typically Polish custom.

Table 18. Rendering of P *bigos* and *marzanna* in the analyzed dictionaries.

Term	Dictionary	Rendering
bigos	NKFD	**bigos** bigos (*Polish dish of stewed sauerkraut and meat*).
	PWNO	**bigos** Kulin. *stewed dish made of sauerkraut and/or fresh cabbage, meat and mushrooms*
	LSW	–
	KFD	**bigos** hash, sauerkraut stew (t. ~ hultajski);
	STAN	**bigos** *kulin*. dish of hashed sausage, pork and beef stewed in sauerkraut;
marzanna	NKFD	**marzanna** (*kukła*) straw dummy representing winter
	PWNO	**marzanna** (kukła) dial. *a straw figure representing winter, symbolically drowned during a folk ritual in celebration of the coming spring*
	LSW	–
	KFD	–
	STAN	–

P *bigos* denotes a traditional Polish dish made of chopped cabbage/sauerkraut and meat leftovers. *NKFD* renders the term into English simply as *bigos*, i.e. using a lexical borrowing, and furnishes it with an explanatory gloss. Neither *PWNO* nor *STAN* venture a borrowing, offering TL definitions instead. Interestingly enough, *KFD* offers two renderings. The first one is a cultural equivalent *hash*, which is a dish made of chopped meat and

vegetables especially popular in the United States, although its similarity to *bigos* is rather vague. The second rendering is an explanatory equivalent *sauerkraut stew*.

Finally, P *marzanna* is a figure symbolizing winter, which traditionally is drowned by children on the first day of spring. Only two dictionaries include the term in their word-lists. Both provide English equivalents in the form of TL definitions. *NKFD* offers a concise definition explaining what *marzanna* is, while *PWNO*'s definition is significantly longer and enriched with the description of what it is used for. Again, the custom of drowning *marzanna* is not in any way indicated as specific to Polish culture.

4.7. Findings

4.7.1. Techniques of rendering CSI into the TL

Table 19 ranks the bilingual dictionaries with respect to coverage of the examined CSI.

Table 19. Coverage of the examined CSI in the analyzed dictionaries.

Dictionary	English CSI	Polish CSI	Total
	Proportion	Proportion	Proportion
NKFD	15/15	14/15	29/30
PWNO	14/15	14/15	28/30
KFD	10/15	10/15	20/30
STAN	8/15	10/15	18/30
LSW	6/15	7/15	13/30

As has been shown, *NKFD* proved to be the most thorough with respect to including the investigated terms in its wordlists, followed by *PNWO*, *KFD*, *STAN* and *LSW*. While the significantly lower inclusion rate in *LSW* may be accounted for by the smaller size of the dictionary compared to the remaining lexicographic works of reference used for the analysis, the failure to include such basic culture-specific terms as *bigos* or *shire* is rather surprising in a dictionary claimed by its authors to devote significant attention to culture. As for the coverage of American and British vs. Polish CSI, the inclusion rate in all the examined dictionaries proved very similar (if not identical – *PWNO*, *KFD*).

Table 20. Patterns of rendering Anglo-Saxon CSI into Polish.

No.	Types of Polish rendering	Proportion
1	TL definition	15/53
2	loan translation	9/53
3	explanatory equivalent	7/53
4	accepted standard translation	4/53
5	decomposition of meaning + loan translation	4/53
6	lexical borrowing	3/53
7	loan translation + supplementary gloss	2/53
8	explanatory equivalent + supplementary gloss	2/53
9	TL definition + supplementary gloss	2/53
10	cultural equivalent	1/53
11	cultural equivalent + defining gloss	1/53
12	cultural equivalent + supplementary gloss	1/53
13	decomposition of meaning + loan translation + supplementary gloss	1/53
14	explanatory equivalent + defining gloss	1/53

The analysis of the North American and British CSI in the selected dictionaries revealed 14 distinct patterns of rendering them into Polish (see Table 20).[16] The TL definition proved to be the most often exploited technique in dealing with non-equivalence due to cultural discrepancies, followed by the loan translation and the explanatory equivalent. What draws attention is the infrequent use of Polish cultural equivalents as the possible renderings of English vocabulary items, which suggests certain reluctance to define Anglo-Saxon culture in terms of Polish culture an may indicate a form of inferiority complex.

Table 21. Patterns of rendering Polish CSI into English.

	Types of English rendering	Proportion
1	TL definition	18/53
2	cultural equivalent	6/53
3	cultural equivalent, cultural equivalent (US and UK cultures)	5/53
4	explanatory equivalent	4/53
5	semantic borrowing	4/53
6	lexical borrowing	3/53
7	lexical borrowing + defining gloss	3/53
8	explanatory and cultural equivalents combined	1/53
9	explanatory equivalent + defining gloss	1/53
10	explanatory equivalent + supplementary gloss	1/53
11	cognate	1/53
12	cultural equivalent + supplementary gloss; lexical borrowing + nominal morpheme	1/53
13	loan translation	1/53
14	loan translation + defining gloss	1/53
15	cultural equivalent, explanatory equivalent	1/53
16	TL hypernym	1/53
17	TL hypernym, TL definition; cultural equivalent	1/53

---

[16] The present author distinguished between defining glosses, which explain the meaning of the TL rendering, and supplementary glosses, which provide additional information about the same.

In the case of English renderings of Polish CSI, the gamut of identified patterns proved to be slightly larger, as presented in Table 21. While the TL definition remained the most frequent way of handling non-equivalence also in the case of Polish CSI, the second most readily employed method turned out to be the cultural equivalent, either a single one or a pair representing both North American and British national cultures. What also deserves attention is the fact that in the case of Polish CSI, often several renderings are offered – Anglo-Saxon CSI all happened to be rendered into Polish in just one way at a time.

4.7.2. Manifestations of cultural dominance

As evident from Table 20, in the case of items specific to Anglo-Saxon culture, lexical borrowings, which may be deemed as indicators of cultural dominance, constitute less than 6% of all the offered renderings (3 out of 53). As for Polish terms (see Table 21), lexical borrowings, whether unaided or supplemented with a gloss, constitute 11.32 % of TL renderings (6 out of 53). Clearly, in the analyzed examples it was not the dominant culture that was more readily borrowed from.

As has already been remarked, both in the case of English and Polish CSI, definition proved to be the preferred technique for rendering them into the TL. As for English terms, TL definition accounts for 17 out of 53 renderings (32 %), including two instances when it is supported with a gloss. In the case of Polish CSI, TL definition was employed 18 times as the sole rendering and once accompanied by two other types of renderings (nearly 36 % of all renderings). The difference between the number of Polish and English TL definitions is too small to serve as an indication of the dominant status of Anglo-Saxon culture.

Finally, when it comes to established TL renderings, in case of Anglo-Saxon culture three terms, namely *shire*, *House of Commons* and *Halloween*, were rendered into the TL in an identical way by all the examined dictionaries (or al least by all the dictionaries which covered the relevant term). When it comes to Polish CSI, also three terms were found to have established TL translations: *województwo*, *Sejm* and *opłatek*. Yet again, the dominant status of Anglo-Saxon culture has not been corroborated by the TL rendering of the analyzed English items.

4.7.3. Pre-2000 vs. post-2000 dictionaries

As for the analysis of the renderings of CSI in pre-2000 and post-2000 dictionaries (*KFD* and *STAN* vs. *PWNO*, *NKFD* and *LSW*), the techniques have not changed dramatically for both Polish and English terms (see Tables 22 and 23).

Table 22. Comparison of the renderings of Anglo-Saxon CSI in pre-2000 and post-2000 dictionaries.

No.	Type of rendering	PWNO, NKFD, LSW		KFD, STAN	
		Proportion	[%]	Proportion	[%]
1	TL definition	10/35	28.6	5/18	27.8
2	loan translation	5/35	14.3	4/18	22.2
3	explanatory equivalent	5/35	14.3	3/18	16.7
4	accepted standard translation	2/35	5.7	2/18	11.1
5	decomposition of meaning + loan translation	3/35	8.6	1/18	5.6
6	lexical borrowing	3/35	8.6	–	–
7	loan translation + supplementary gloss	1/35	2.9	1/18	5.6
8	explanatory equivalent + supplementary gloss	–	–	1/18	5.6
9	TL definition + supplementary gloss	2/35	5.7	–	–
10	cultural equivalent	1/35	2.9	–	–
11	cultural equivalent + defining gloss	1/35	2.9	–	–
12	cultural equivalent + supplementary gloss	1/35	2.9	–	–
13	decomposition of meaning + loan translation + supplementary gloss	–	–	1/18	5.6
14	explanatory equivalent + defining gloss	1/35	2.9	–	–

Table 23. Comparison of the renderings of Polish CSI in pre-2000 and post-2000 dictionaries.

No.	Type of rendering	PWNO, NKFD, LSW		KFD, STAN	
		Proportion	[%]	Proportion	[%]
1	TL definition	11/33	33	7/20	35
2	cultural equivalent	2/33	6.1	4/20	20
3	cultural equivalent, cultural equivalent (US and UK cultures)	5/33	15.2	–	–
4	explanatory equivalent	2/33	6.1	2/20	10
5	semantic borrowing	2/33	6.1	2/20	10
6	lexical borrowing	1/33	3	2/20	10
7	lexical borrowing + defining gloss	3/33	9.1	–	–
8	explanatory and cultural equivalents combined	1/33	3	–	–
9	explanatory equivalent + defining gloss	1/33	3	–	–
10	explanatory equivalent + supplementary gloss	–	–	1/20	5
11	cognate	–	–	1/20	5
12	cultural equivalent + supplementary gloss; lexical borrowing + nominal morpheme	1/33	3	–	–
13	loan translation	1/33	3	–	–
14	loan translation + defining gloss	1/33	3	–	–
15	cultural equivalent, explanatory equivalent	–	–	1/20	5
16	TL hypernym	1/33	3	–	–
17	TL hypernym, TL definition; cultural equivalent	1/33	3	–	–

TL definition remained the most often exploited type of rendering of CSI in case of both older and younger generations of dictionaries, regardless of the culture represented by the term. What catches the eye in case of Anglo-Saxon CSI is the fact that the pre-2000 dictionaries on no occasion render them into Polish by means of a cultural equivalent, nor do the said dictionaries resort to lexical borrowings. In case of Polish CSI, while the pre-2000 dictionaries did make use of cultural equivalents in their renderings, on no occasion did they represent both North American and British national cultures – only one cultural equivalent was offered at a time.

4.7.4. Quality of renderings

The qualitative analysis of the renderings of culture-specific vocabulary items in the selected dictionaries allows to make the following generalizations.

Regardless of the cultural affiliations of the analyzed culture-specific term (North American/British or Polish), the definition remains the most readily employed method of overcoming non-equivalence in the analyzed bilingual dictionaries. While it successfully explains the meaning of the problematic item, it is of limited assistance for those who use the said type of dictionary as an aid in translation or language production.

The analyzed dictionaries on numerous occasions exhibit inconsistency with respect to geographical labeling. *STAN* is particularly sparing with labels, using a geographical label (*am* standing for American) on as few occasions as one (see Table 10). The remaining dictionaries, while being much more generous with labeling, also have their shortcomings in this respect, e.g. *PWNO* fails to label such CSI as *electoral college*, or the *House of Commons*).

Polish CSI are infrequently indicated as such, be it in the form of a gloss, information provided in the definition or otherwise. As few as 12 out of 53 renderings of Polish CSI (22.6%) are marked as specifically Polish. None of the analyzed dictionaries contains a label for Polish which would provide a convenient way of indicating Polish culture-specificity to non-Polish dictionary users.

Finally, the renderings of some CSI affiliated both with Polish and Anglo-Saxon cultures simply call for a gloss, and are supplemented with none. The renderings of E *Lord Privy Seal* into Polish in *PWNO* and *STAN* are a perfect example of this instance (see Table

10). Since it is doubtful whether the meaning of the English term is known to an average speaker of Polish, supplementing the Polish rendering with a defining gloss would prove beneficial to Polish-speaking dictionary users. On several occasions a gloss would also prove useful in providing additional information concerning the rendering, e.g. in the case the of E *Halloween* it could provide information on the peculiar celebrations associated with this special day. Only one dictionary (*KFD*) resorts to such a solution (see Table 13).

Conclusion

The analysis of the selected E-P-E dictionaries reveals that while the role of bilingual dictionaries as sources of cultural information is being increasingly recognized by lexicographers, the amount of explicit cultural information in the aforesaid lexicographic works of reference is still below the satisfactory level. It appears that the type and amount of cultural information depends both on the intended dictionary user and the directionality of the work. The bilingual learner's dictionary proved to be the most abundant in both explicit and implicit cultural information, while the larger lexicographic works of reference aimed at professional users dedicated less attention to the presentation of the cultures of their object languages. Since the analyzed dictionaries are first and foremost targeted at Polish users, the amount of cultural information concerning Poland tended to be smaller, based on the assumption that it is well known to the prospective user.

As for the treatment of culture-specific vocabulary items in the analyzed dictionaries, the hypothesis that the dominant status of the Anglo-Saxon culture will be indicated in the renderings of Anglo-Saxon and Polish culture-specific items into the TL was not corroborated. It turned out that the techniques for rendering such items into the TL depended first and foremost on the level of non-equivalence – items which lacked denotata in the target culture were most often rendered into the TL with the use of definitions/explanatory equivalents, regardless of the culture they represented. What caught the eye was that the analyzed E-P-E dictionaries made little use of their potential as carriers of cultural information in their treatment of culture-specific items. Language learners, but also linguists using such dictionaries would undoubtedly benefit from supplementing culturally prominent entries with additional cultural information.

Streszczenie

Niniejsza praca poświęcona jest zagadnieniom prezentacji kultury w słownikach dwujęzycznych. Słowniki takie tradycyjnie postrzegane są jako swoiste mosty umożliwiające komunikację osobom na co dzień posługującym się różnymi językami. Jako iż każdy z języków zawartych w słowniku dwujęzycznym zakorzeniony jest w innej kulturze, rolą takiego słownika jest nie tylko pomoc w pokonywaniu barier językowych, ale także w komunikacji międzykulturowej.

W rozdziale pierwszym omówione zostało zagadnienie kultury i trzy możliwe sposoby interpretacji tego słowa. Następnie przedstawiono sposoby klasyfikacji kultury w jej znaczeniu związanym z antropologią kulturową, a także podkreślono nierozerwalność kultury z językiem. Rozdział zamyka dyskusja na temat różnych typów relacji międzykulturowych oraz dominującej pozycji kultury anglosaskiej we współczesnym świecie.

Rozdział drugi poświęcony jest w całości podstawowym zagadnieniom związanym ze słownikami dwujęzycznymi. Przedstawiono w nim definicję słownika dwujęzycznego, możliwe sposoby jego klasyfikacji, a także rodzaje zadań, do jakich tradycyjnie jest on używany, takich jak tłumaczenie, rozumienie, czy tworzenie tekstu w języku obcym. Rozdział porusza też kluczowe dla słowników dwujęzycznych zagadnienie ekwiwalencji i omawia techniki wykorzystywane przez leksykografów w przypadku, gdy dana jednostka leksykalna języka źródłowego nie ma odpowiednika w języku docelowym.

Rozdział trzeci prezentuje słowniki dwujęzyczne w nowym świetle, ukazując je jako źródła informacji kulturowych oraz swoiste mosty międzykulturowe. Omówiono w nim elementy słownika, za pomocą których w bezpośredni lub pośredni sposób prezentowane są informacje dotyczące obu kultur słownika dwujęzycznego. Szczególną uwagę poświęcono kulturemom, tj. wyrazom oznaczającym zjawiska charakterystyczna dla danej kultury,

które nie mają odpowiedników w kulturach docelowych. Rozdział zamyka omówienie technik stosowanych przez leksykografów do tłumaczenia kulturemów na język docelowy w słownikach dwujęzycznych.

Rozdział czwarty zawiera analizę pięciu dwujęzycznych słowników angielsko-polskich i polsko-angielskich pod kątem prezentacji informacji kulturowych oraz tego, czy/jak słowniki takie oddają dominujący charakter kultury anglosaskiej względem kultury polskiej. W tym celu autorka niniejszej pracy przeanalizowała przedmowy wybranych słowników w poszukiwaniu wszelkich informacji dotyczących prezentacji kultury. Następnym krokiem było sprawdzenie, czy i w jaki sposób wspomniane słowniki wywiązują się z ewentualnych obietnic dotyczących prezentacji kultury. Ilość informacji kulturowych okazała się być większa w nowszych słownikach. Więcej uwagi poświęcono kulturze anglosaskiej, jako iż analizowane słowniki kierowane są głównie do polskich odbiorców.

Druga część analizy poświęcona jest technikom wykorzystywanym w badanych słownikach do tłumaczenia kulturemów na język docelowy. Autorka przyjęła założenie, że dominująca pozycja kultury anglosaskiej znajdzie swoje odbicie w prezentacji kulturemów w słownikach dwujęzycznych, jednakże hipoteza ta się nie potwierdziła. Najczęściej używana metodą tłumaczenia kulturemów na język docelowy okazała się być definicja, niezależnie od tego, czy reprezentowały one kulturę polską, czy anglosaską.

References

Dictionaries:

Bulas, Kazimierz – Francis J. Whitfield (eds.). 1995. *The Kościuszko Foundation dictionary* (*KFD.*) (1st edition.) Vol. 1: *English-Polish*. New York: The Kościuszko Foundation.

Bulas, Kazimierz – Lawrence L. Thomas – Francis J. Whitfield (eds.). 1995. *The Kościuszko Foundation dictionary* (*KFD.*) (1st edition.) Vol. 2: *Polish-English*. New York: The Kościuszko Foundation.

Dubisz, Stanisław (ed.). 2006. *Universalny słownik języka polskiego*. Vols. 1-4. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Fisiak, Jacek (ed.). 2003. *The new Kosciuszko Foundation dictionary* (*NKFD.*) (1st edition.) Vols. 1-2. New York: The Kosciuszko Foundation, Inc.

Fisiak, Jacek – Arleta Adamska-Sałaciak – Mariusz Idzikowski – Ewelina Jagła – Michał Jankowski – Robert Lew (eds.). 2006. *Longman słownik współczesny angielsko-polski, polsko-angielski*. (*LSW.*) (1st edition.) Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Linde-Usiekniewicz, Jadwiga (ed.). 2007a. *PWN-Oxford wielki słownik angielsko-polski* (*PWNO.*) (1st edition.) Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Linde-Usiekniewicz, Jadwiga (ed.). 2007b. *PWN-Oxford wielki słownik-polsko-angielski*. (*PWNO.*) (1st edition.) Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Stanisławski, Jan. 1988. *The great English-Polish dictionary*: *Supplemented* (10th edition). Vols. 1-2; *The great Polish-English dictionary*: *Supplemented* (9th edition). Vols. 1-2. (*STAN.*) Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.

The American heritage dictionary of the English language. 2006. (4th edition.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Other sources:

Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta. 2004. "Lexical and semantic borrowing in bilingual dictionary", in: Geoffrey Williams – Sandra Vessier (eds.), vol. 2, 443-450.

Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta. 2006. *Meaning and the bilingual dictionary*: *The case of English and Polish*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

"Advanced Level in the United Kingdom", in: *Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia*. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A-levels) (date of access: 7 Apr. 2009).

Aixelá, Javier Franco. 1996. "On the cultural aspect of translation", in: Román Álvarez – M. Carmen – África Vidal (eds.), 52-78.

Al-Kasimi, Ali. 1997. *Linguistics and bilingual dictionaries*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Álvarez, Román – M. Carmen – África Vidal. 1996. *Translation, power, subversion*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Asher, Ron E. – J.M.Y Simpson (eds.). 1994. *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. (1st edition.) Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Atkins, Beryl T. 1996. "Bilingual dictionaries: Past, present and future", in: Martin Gellerstam – Jerker Järborg – Sven-Göran Malmgren – Kerstin Norén – Lena Rogström – Catarina Röjder Papmehl (eds.), vol. 2, 515-546.

Baker, Mona. 2001. *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. New York: Routlege.

Bassnett, Susan. 1991. *Translation studies*. New York: Routlege.

Braasch, Anna – Claus Povlsen (eds.). 2002. *Proceedings of the Tenth EURALEX International Congress, EURALEX 2002, Copenhagen, Denmark August 13-17, 2002*. Vols. 1-2. Copenhagen: Center for Sprogteknologi.

Bragina, Natalia. 1996. "Restricted collocations: Cultural boundness", in: Martin Gellerstam – Jerker Järborg – Sven-Göran Malmgren – Kerstin Norén – Lena Rogström – Catarina Röjder Papmehl (eds.), vol. 1, 199-207.

Bulas, Kazimierz – Francis J. Whitfield. 1995. "Przedmowa" [Foreword], in: Kazimierz Bulas – Francis J. Whitfield (eds.), VII-X.

Burkhanov, Igor. 1998. *Lexicography: A dictionary of basic terminology*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej.

Callan, Victor J. – Cynthia Gallois. 1997. *Communication and culture: A guide for practice*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

"Cao Cao", in: *Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia*. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cao_cao) (date of access: 7 Apr. 2009).

"Carlism", in: *Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia*. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carlism) (date of access: 7 Apr. 2009).

Chan, Sin-wai (ed.). 2004. *Translation and bilingual dictionaries*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Crowther, Jonathan – Kathryn Kavanagh (eds.). 2000. *Oxford guide to British and American culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corino, Elisa – Carla Marello – Cristina Onesti (eds.). 2006. *Atti Del XII Congresso Di Lessicografia, Torino, 6-9 Settembre 2006 /Proceedings of the Twelfth EURALEX International Congress, Torino, 6-9 September 2006*. Vols. 1-2. Allessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

"Cultural cringe", in: *Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia*. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ Cultural_cringe) (date of access: 7 Apr. 2009).

"Dominant culture", in Gordon Marshall (ed.) (http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1O88-dominantculture.html) (date of access: 7 Apr. 2009).

Fisiak, Jacek. 2006. "Foreword", in: Jacek Fisiak – Arleta Adamska-Sałaciak – Mariusz Idzikowski – Ewelina Jagła – Michał Jankowski – Robert Lew (eds.), III.

Gellerstam, Martin – Jerker Järborg – Sven-Göran Malmgren – Kerstin Norén – Lena Rogström – Catarina Röjder Papmehl (eds.). 1996. *EURALEX '96 Proceedings: Papers submitted to the Seventh EURALEX International Congress on Lexicography in Göteborg Sweden*. Vols. 1-2. Gotebörg: Göteborg University.

Gottlieb, Henrik – Jens Erik Mogensen (eds.). 2007. *Dictionary visions, research and practice: Selected papers from the 12th International Symposium on Lexicography, Copenhagen 2004*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gottlieb Henrik – Jens Erik Mogensen – Arne Zettersten (eds.). 2005. *Symposium on Lexicography XI : Proceedings of the Eleventh International Symposium on Lexicography May 2-4, 2002 at the University of Copenhagen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Guirdham, Maureen. 1999. *Communicating across cultures*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Hall, Joan Kelly. 2002. *Teaching and researching language and culture*. New York: Longman.

Hartmann, Reinhard Rudolf Karl (ed.). 1984. *LEXeter '83 proceedings: Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9-12 September 1983*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Hartmann, Reinhard Rudolf Karl (ed.). 2003. *Lexicography: Critical Concepts*. Vol.2: *Reference works across time, space and languages*. London: Routledge.

Hartmann, Reinhard Rudolf Karl – Gregory James (eds.). 1998. *Dictionary of lexicography*. New York: Routledge.

"Hot dog", in: *Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia*. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hot_dog) (date of access: 7 Apr. 2009).

Hyldgaard-Jensen, Karl – Arne Zettersten (eds.). 1992. *Symposium on lexicography V. Proceedings of the Fifth International. Symposium on Lexicography May 3-5, 1990 at the University of Copenhagen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Kalėdaitė, Violeta – Vilma Asijavičiūtė. 2005. "Translation of Lithuanian culture-specific items into English", *Linguistics: Germanic and Romance Studies* 55,3: 31-37.

Katan, David. 1999. *Translating cultures: An introduction for translators, interpreters and mediators*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Lambert, José. 1994. "The cultural component reconsidered", in: Mary Snell-Hornby – Franz Pöchhacker – Klaus Kaindl (eds.), 17-25.

Linde-Usiekniewicz, Jadwiga – Ewa Geller. 2007a. "Przedmowa" [Preface], in: Jadwiga Linde-Usiekniewicz (ed.), IX-XII.

Marello, Carla. 2003. "The bilingual dictionary: Definition, history, bidirectionality", in: Reinhard Rudolf Karl Hartmann (ed.), vol. 2, 325-342.

Marshall, Gordon (ed.). 1998. *A dictionary of sociology*. (2nd edition.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McArthur, Tom. 1992. "Idiom", in: Tom McArthur (ed.), 497-498.

McArthur, Tom (ed.). 1992. *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mizwa, Stephen P. 1995. "Preface", in: Bulas Kazimierz – Francis J. Whitfield (eds.), V-VI.

Mugdan, Joachim. 1992. "On the typology of bilingual dictionaries", in: Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen – Arne Zettersten (eds.), 17-24.

Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A textbook of translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Persson, Gunnar. 2005. "Dictionaries as mirrors of social and cultural change", in: Henrik Gottlieb – Jens Erik Mogensen – Arne Zettersten (eds.), 427-433.

Pilard, Georges. 2002. "English, lingua franca, cultural imperialism and dictionaries", in: Anna Braasch – Claus Povlsen (eds.), vol.1, 429-433.

Piotrowski, Tadeusz. 1994. *Problems in bilingual lexicography*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Porter, Richard E. – Larry A. Samovar. 1995. *Communication between cultures*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Roberts, Roda P. 2007. "Dictionaries and culture", in: Henrik Gottlieb – Jens Erik Mogensen (eds.), 277-297.

Rodger, Liam. 2006. "Beyond butterscotch: The place of cultural knowledge in the bilingual dictionary", in: Elisa Corino – Carla Marello – Cristina Onesti (eds.), vol. 2, 567-573.

Sapir, Edward. 1949. *Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture and personality*. (Edited by David G. Mendelbaum.) Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sapir, Edward. 1993. *The psychology of culture: A course of lectures*. (Edited by Judith T. Irvine.) New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ščerba, Lev Vladimirovič. 1995 [1940]. "Towards a general theory of lexicography" (Translated by Donna M.T. Cr. Farina), *International Journal of Lexicography* 8, 4: 305-349.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. 1984. "The bilingual dictionary – help or hindrance?", in: Reinhard Rudolf Karl Hartmann (ed.), 274-281.

Snell-Hornby, Mary – Franz Pöchhacker – Klaus Kaindl (eds.). 1994. *Translation studies: An interdiscipline*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sobol, Elżbieta. 2007a. "Od wydawcy" [From the publisher], in: Jadwiga Linde-Usiekniewicz (ed.), V.

The new Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1992. (15th edition.) Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.

Tomaszczyk, Jerzy. 1984. "The culture-bound element in bilingual dictionaries", in: Reinhard Rudolf Karl Hartmann (ed.), 289-297.

Tseng, Hugo T.Y. 2004. "Rendering Chinese culture-specific vocabulary into English: Predicaments and prospects", in: Sin-wai Chan (ed.), 169-176.

White, Leslie A. 1992. "Culture", in: *The new Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Vol. 16, 874-881.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1997. *Understanding cultures through their key words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee. 1956. *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. (Edited by John B. Carroll.) Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Williams, John. 1996. "Enough said: The problem of obscurity and cultural reference in learner's dictionary examples", in: Martin Gellerstam – Jerker Järborg – Sven-Göran Malmgren – Kerstin Norén – Lena Rogström – Catarina Röjder Papmehl (eds.), vol. 2, 497-505.

Williams, Geoffrey – Sandra Vessier (eds.). 2004. *Proceedings of the Eleventh EURALEX International Congress, EURALEX 2004, Lorient, France July 6-10, 2004*. Vols. 1-2. Lorient: Université de Bretagne-Sud. Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines.

Wu, Jianping. 2004. "Equivalence of interlinguistic symbols and speech translation: Differences and requirements", in: Sin-wai Chan (ed.), 151-156.

Yankah, K. 1994. "Proverb", in: Ron E. Asher – J.M.Y Simpson (eds.). Vol. 6, 3386-3389.

Zgusta, Ladislav. 1971. *Manual of lexicography*. Prague: Academia.

Zgusta, Ladislav. 1984. "Translational equivalence in the bilingual dictionary", in: Reinhard Rudolf Karl Hartmann (ed.), 147-154.

Zgusta, Ladislav. 2006. *Lexicography then and now*: *Selected essays*. (Edited by Frederic S.F. Dolezal and Thomas B. I. Creamer.) Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Zhao, Yanchun – Jianhua Huang. 2004. "The paradox of cultural translation: How to treat cultural information in bilingual dictionaries", in: Sin-wai Chan (ed.), 177-185.