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Conventions and abbreviations

Double dates in references, as in Ščerba (1940/1974), indicate the date of the first publications (i.e. 1940) and the one used by the author (i.e. 1974). In the list of references the items have been arranged in the order of the date of the original publication.

References to dictionaries are always in capital letters (e.g. CONCISE OXFORD DICTIONARY); well-known abbreviations are also used (e.g. COD).

Russian characters are written in transliteration, using the method recommended by Russians, thus, for example: ч = č, ш = š, щ = šč, я = ja, etc., and Щерба = Ščerba.

The following abbreviations are used throughout:
- BD – bilingual dictionary,
- BL – bilingual lexicography,
- MD – monolingual dictionary,
- ML – monolingual lexicography.
This is a revised version of my 1990 PhD dissertation. I have been fortunate to have comments on the dissertation from several scholars: from my two reviewers, Professors Michał Post and Zygmunt Saloni, as well as from Professor Andrzej Bogusławski, Dr Reinhard R. K. Hartmann, and Professor Hans-Peder Kromann. I am very grateful to them for the time and effort they have generously given me. Their comments helped me to make the book better and more clear.

In general the revision was one of reformulation and clarification, and the content of the book practically has not been changed. A stimulus to undertaking the revision in this form was a paper by Albrecht Neubert (1992) on “Fact and fiction in bilingual lexicography”, which I could read two years after my doctoral examination; I was very glad indeed to see that his ideas were so similar to mine. The convergence of views shows that the general line of development of research on bilingual lexicography is roughly the same in various countries.

In those four years which have passed since I finished the dissertation I started to write my own dictionaries, and this experience has also strengthened my belief that the theoretical views which I have developed are correct. It is up to the reader, however, to judge whether this is actually true.

The structure of the book is as follows: it has five chapters, and Chapter 1, the introduction, discusses bilingual lexicography on a wider methodological background. Chapter 5, on equivalence, is the most important one; it treats the semantics, as it were, in the bilingual dictionary, described in the relation of equivalence. Many linguists now consider pragmatics more important than semantics, and it is similarly in lexicography: the user needs can determine the semantics in a bilingual dictionary, i.e. the type of equivalence. The user needs and the users will be discussed in the second chapter, which will also have a discussion of the functions of bilingual dictionaries. There has been much controversy over some of these func-
tions, which are examined in detail in two separate chapters: Chapter 3 will look into the function of the bilingual dictionary as a learning dictionary, while Chapter 4 will consider its function as an aid in translation. Thus, Chapters 2, 3, 4 will discuss the pragmatics of bilingual lexicography, and will introduce most of the relevant notions needed in the fifth chapter. Conclusions and a list of references close the book.

I would like also to express my gratitude to Professor Franz-Josef Hausmann, Dr Margaret Cop and Dr Laurent Bray, who made it possible for me to do an important part of my research for my PhD in Erlangen.
1. Introduction

1.1. Theory of bilingual lexicography

This book is concerned with selected problems in bilingual metalexico­
graphy\(^1\), those which the author believes are the most important issues. Meta­
lexicography can be defined as a study of the principles underlying
existing dictionaries, leading to formulation of suggestions on how to pro­
duce better dictionaries in future.

Metalexicography has several components (Hausmann 1986; Wiegand
1984). These are:

- theory of dictionaries,
- criticism of dictionaries,
- research on dictionary use,
- research on dictionary status and marketing,
- history of lexicography.

In this book the focus will be on the theory of lexicography, though it
will relate to other components as well.

The theory of lexicography can be further divided into the following
(Hausmann 1986; Wiegand 1984):

- textual theory for lexicographical texts,
- dictionary typology,
- theory of gathering and processing data,
- theory of the organisation of lexicographical work,

\(^1\) Traditionally both the practice and the theory of lexicography were called lexico­
graphy (cf. Doroszewski 1970; Ch. 2; Berkov 1973: 4), but at present the theory is often
called metalexicography, particularly by some German scholars (e.g. Hausmann 1986;
Wiegand 1984). This distinction has been introduced obviously to stress the differences:
lexicography is to produce certain concrete objects – dictionaries, rather than theoretical
constructs, while metalexicography is concerned precisely with constructions of theories,
or models, of dictionary description. Further, if scientific activity is defined as theory
construction, then lexicography is not a scientific discipline, while metalexicography can
be one (cf. Wiegand 1984).
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- theory of the purposes of dictionaries.

In this book only the component relating to the theory of the organisation of lexicographical work will not be discussed at all, while other components will be at least touched upon.

We have to ask, however, which are the most important issues in BL? Are the basic problems those which have been given most attention in the literature? Surprising as it might appear, this is not the case. There are some problems which have been discussed in detail, for example the passive – active opposition (to be discussed in Chapter 2, section 2.5), or the problem of meaning discrimination, but these are not basic issues. The passive – active opposition is not observed in many BDs, and in numerous dictionaries meaning discriminations are not provided at all, yet such dictionaries are still bilingual. The basic problems are those which relate to any BD, which can be found in any BD.

Hausmann provides an interesting list of topics of particular significance to the bilingual metalexicographer\(^2\) (Hausmann 1986):

- the functions of BDs,
- the level of equivalence that should be chosen,
- the basis of selection of equivalents,
- culture-bound aspects,
- user-oriented organisation of the microstructure,
- user-oriented typographical arrangements.

This list also includes only some of the basic issues. The most fundamental problem, relating to those listed above, will be that which is rarely discussed precisely because it seems to be non-controversial: it is that of equivalence, i.e. the nature of equivalence and various constraints on equivalents. Apart from these points, our discussion of equivalence will take up the problems of the level of equivalence, the basis of selection of equivalents, and culture-bound elements.

\(^2\) Hausmann published also another paper on basic problems in BL (Hausmann 1988), in which he discusses the distribution (Verteilung) of material in micro- and macrostructure; the organisation (Anordnung) of microstructure; and rationalization of the way collocations are entered.
1.2. Linguistics, lexicography, metalexicography

At present lexicography is under pressure from three sides: from linguistics; from its own successful practice; and from metalexicographers. For clarity we have to look into the relations between the three fields.

Lexicography is fairly independent, both in its objectives and methodology. There is a prevailing opinion at present that, though often based on linguistic research, lexicography is not a branch of linguistics (cf. Hausmann 1986; Wiegand 1984) but is most likely a discipline on its own, like onomastics (cf. Zgusta 1986). This independence of lexicography can be seen in the fact that linguists “do not actually compile dictionaries according to the theoretical principles which they spell out; when they do tackle dictionary-making, grammarians generally switch hats and become conventional lexicographers” (Pawley 1985: 99). This means also that lexicography follows some hidden principles.

The objectives of lexicographers and linguists differ: linguists are preoccupied rather with attempts at forming hypotheses, theories, etc., than with linguistic facts\(^3\). In contrast, lexicographers, even those working on scholarly dictionaries, and particularly those engaged in work on reference works for the general public, are first of all concerned with registration of linguistic facts. This is the basic difference, and traditionally one that is mentioned in descriptions of the differences between the two disciplines\(^4\).

As to methodology, linguists usually study small amounts of data in an intensive way, they study paradigmatic cases, treated subsequently as representatives of whole classes of facts. Lexicographers, on the other hand, deal with extensive, often superficial, descriptions of huge amounts of data. What is remarkable yet is the fact that the extensive description in lexicography is very expensive, while linguistics, if large corpora are not needed,

---

\(^3\) In some approaches this appears to be the most widely held view on the aim of linguistics, see e.g. Derwing 1973; Grucza 1983, though at present there is certainly a growing interest in linguistic facts, for example in the UK, where empirical traditions have always been strong (cf. Hanks 1992/1993).

\(^4\) In one influential tradition lexicography “involves cataloging actual meanings” (Frawley 1992/1993: 1).
is not too expensive. This means also that experimentation is not a standard
feature in dictionary-making, because it tends to be expensive.

Lexicography at present is generally characterized by traditionalism. According to Sinclair, lexicography is "introspective and conservative. Its security lies especially in repeating successful practice, and it is highly resistant to innovation" (1984: 5)\(^5\). It is certainly easier to use traditional approaches, because they are known to work\(^6\). Though Sinclair wrote about ML, his opinion can refer to bilingual lexicography as well: a paper by Mary Snell-Hornby (1986) was entitled "The Bilingual Dictionary: A Victim of its Tradition?". Because of the traditionalism practice in lexicography is often quite uniform\(^7\). It might seem that this uniformity results from consistent principles, underlying practice, but it is very rarely the case. Most often when the principles are examined in detail they prove to be inconsistent and even contradictory (cf. Weinreich 1962).

The principles thus are most often only some beliefs, assumptions, which the majority of practitioners tend to follow, but which are rarely examined in detail. These beliefs are actually accepted as intuitively right by the users. And of course the conservatism of the users is another powerful reason for the conservatism of lexicography. Lexicographers, however, are now under pressure of metalexicographers, who often suggest quite radical changes in the form and content of dictionaries without taking into proper consideration the beliefs shared by the users and the makers of dictionaries.

It is important to stress that the general assumption in this book will be that in the millennia-long practice some more or less optimum solutions have been found in lexicography, and that it will not do to discard them, as is often done by theorists, without careful examination. There appears to be a grain of truth in every approach, and indeed a study of the history of lexicography shows again and again that quite often seemingly novel ap-

---

\(^5\) Bailey (1987) shows both advantages and disadvantages of this traditionalism.

\(^6\) See for example Karaulov 1981: 27; a project bridging both linguistics and lexicography, based on the Meaning-Text model of language, is described in Piotrowski 1990a.

\(^7\) Quirk stresses this fact in his review of several British desk dictionaries (Quirk 1984: 73–78, 86–98), and Burchfield discusses this feature of lexicography of English, using strong words (Burchfield 1984; cf. Urdang’s retort, Urdang 1984, and Ilson 1986).
proaches were already used in the past. Lexicography is a complex field and a proper approach to its theory is to evolve a flexible framework which could include as many different approaches as possible. This is what this book attempts to do.

1.3. Bilingual lexicography

BL is occasionally given an important place in lexicography. For Ščerba (1940/74) the opposition: MD - BD was one of the four basic dimensions in lexicography. The opposition was also a primary one for Zgusta (1971: 213–214). Thus, BL can be seen as one of the basic modes in lexicography. By using the term *mode* reference is made to McArthur's general typology of reference works (McArthur 1986a; 1986b). For McArthur there are two basic modes:

- *what is handled* (things or words),
- *what is the format of presentation* (thematic, i.e. thesaurus-like, or alphabetic).

We have to add the third mode, which would be thus:

- *what is the metalanguage* (the same, L₁ - L₁, or different, L₂ - L₁).

McArthur's typology shows in a typical way that BL is not frequently considered in general accounts of lexicography. Most of metalexicographical literature is focused entirely on monolingual dictionaries, and most often monolingual lexicography is considered to be lexicography proper. If language description in lexicography is discussed, then it is MDs which are thought to be suitable for such tasks. BDs are regarded in fact as purely utilitarian, practical compendia, which are too limited to be of any interest to a student of language.

This fact is reflected in terminology: books and papers discussing only ML most often use the words *lexicography, dictionary*, etc. without indicating that only one type will be covered (e.g. Kipfer 1984; Landau 1984,

---

8 The new format of definitions, used in COBUILD dictionaries (cf. Hanks 1987), is quite similar to the format devised some 400 years ago by an English lexicographer (Stein 1985, 1986).

9 One might suppose that those who had some practice in BL – and both Ščerba and Zgusta had – do give it its proper place, while those who worked primarily with MDs – as McArthur or Landau – simply do not notice the problems of BL.
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criticised by Steiner 1986; Grochowski 1982). On the other hand, typically all studies of BL do use the word bilingual to qualify the relevant terms (e.g. in Berkov 1973, 1977).

There are also other terminological distinctions which are based on the assumption that BL is a restricted type of lexicography. Thus, BDs are often said to contain translations (e.g. Steiner 1971). This way BL is included under studies of translation. For some authors, judging by their terminology, a BD is like a type of MD, and they say that BDs include definitions (Benson & Benson & Ilson 1986), or that they explain meaning by synonyms (Landau 1984). It is similarly with histories of lexicography, in which BDs are seen only as stages that lead to the proper dictionary, i.e. the monolingual dictionary, and typically historians of lexicography do not pay any attention to BDs after the date of publishing of the first MD\textsuperscript{10}.

Yet when we look at the relations between MDs and BDs, it appears that it is the MD which could be considered to be a sub-type of the BD. First let us consider the problem from a sociolinguistic point of view. From this perspective all dictionaries which describe general, standard language have much in common with BDs. It is well known that ‘general, standard language’ is a fiction and that what exists in reality is various languages – idiolects, agrolects, etc. (cf. Hudson 1980). Standard language is one lect elevated to a privileged status. The elevation typically results in a situation of diglossia, or in one which has some features of diglossia, that is, standard language, or some of its aspects, has to be learned by many speakers exactly like a foreign language\textsuperscript{11}.

If, however, diglossia is the norm rather than the exception, then all communication is translation. Any language use can be seen as translation between various idiolects. Consequently, linguistics can be regarded as a science of translation. This is the position taken by some linguists, most notably those working within the Meaning-Text Model of Language (cf. Mel’čuk 1981 for a summary of views). In this approach then any dictionary of standard language has to be a translating, i.e. bilingual, dictionary.

\textsuperscript{10} Doroszewski (1954) is a typical historical account of Polish lexicography, and Read (1986) is a history of a certain period in English lexicography.

\textsuperscript{11} Diglossia is discussed by Ferguson (1959); Zgusta (1986) claims that all languages which use the written mode are to some extent diglotic; Piotrowski (1994: 64–78) discusses the trend towards diglossia in Poland, and contains further references.
It is also interesting that in most suggestions on how to improve explanations of meaning in MDs it is proposed that the metalanguage, though based on natural language, should be a well-defined (closed) subset of this language, i.e. a sublanguage (see e.g. Weinreich 1962; Apresjan 1972; Wierzbicka 1985). An MD using such metalanguage would be again quite similar to a BD. Such MDs would differ, however, from BDs in using extended explanations of meaning rather than one-word explanations. Yet of course single-word explanations, i.e. definitions by synonyms, have been used extensively in traditional MDs, and are still very much in use in the smallest MDs. This method of explaining meaning is very similar to that in BDs.

There are certain types of BD whose function is essentially the same as that of an MD. Zgusta (1971: 304–307) distinguishes three types of such dictionaries:

- philological BDs (of dead languages, e.g. Latin),
- ethnolinguistic BDs (of languages with no, or little, written literature, or of cultures with no, or little, interest in their language),
- quasi-normative BDs (of languages not yet fully established, or standardized, in which an attempt is made to add quickly new items to their lexical resources).

There is, however, a fourth, complex type of BD which functions like an MD, not mentioned by Zgusta. This type is used when a prestigious language, e.g. English, has to be made known in a society separated from other countries, in which consequently free cultural or trade exchange is impossible or difficult. Such was the case in the former Communist countries (see Knowles 1989 for details), particularly those completely cut off from the world, like Albania or the USSR but also, to a smaller extent, Poland, Hungary, etc. In those countries it was usually difficult to obtain a dictionary other than that published in the same country. It is self-evident then that in those countries there is a need for large, comprehensive BDs which simply have to perform the tasks which MDs have in other countries.
1.4. Bilingual metalexicography
   – an overview

BDs have been produced for millennia yet theoretical reflection on them is very recent (cf. Berkov 1973: 4). Most editors of large MDs often discussed theoretical aspects of ML either in prefaces or in separate studies but this was rarely the case with bilingual lexicographers. Thus bilingual metalexicography belongs almost exclusively to the 20th century, though it is of course possible to find theorizing on BDs earlier. In the 19th century Schröer for example had interesting views on equivalence (Schröer 1909; cf. Hausmann 1989a).

The following overview of research on BL is precisely an overview only: it is not exhaustive, is limited to those contributions which were available to the author linguistically\(^\text{12}\); it has no discussion of the views of particular authors. The discussion can be found in the relevant chapters. The aim of this section is to provide a chronologically geographical picture of what is going on in bilingual metalexicography. It also draws attention to those authors who attempted to construct general theories of bilingual metalexicography.

Most literature on BDs comes from practising lexicographers, though there are more and more scholars who write on BDs without being involved in the practice. A prolific theoretician is for example Hausmann in Germany. In BL a name that is perhaps best known is that of Lev Ščerba, an influential Soviet linguist and a practising mono- and bilingual lexicographer. Ščerba’s views can be found in the preface to the second edition of his RUSSIAN-FRENCH DICTIONARY (Ščerba 1939/1983), and in his unfinished general theory of lexicography (Ščerba 1940/1974). The best discussion of Ščerba’s views is perhaps that in Duda et al. (1986). It was Ščerba who introduced such concepts as the passive-active BD, or the idea that for each language pair there should be two sets of dictionaries for the speakers of each language. He also wrote on the constraints on equivalents and on the function of the BD in foreign language learning and translation. All of these topics will be discussed in the following chapters.

Ščerba’s ideas were discussed and further developed in the USSR. In

\(^{12}\) This means that I could use contributions in Polish, Russian, English, German and, to a limited extent, French.
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general bilingual and monolingual lexicography and metalexicography flourished in the Soviet Union\textsuperscript{13}, which can be seen from the statistics: there were possibly as many as 5,000 professional lexicographers in the Soviet Union (Knowles 1989), as contrasted with some 300 lexicographers in the USA (Gates 1986). Between 1928–1966 more than 1,000 BDs were produced in the USSR, while the figure for the whole world between 1460–1958 is probably 6,000 (Knowles 1989). Theoretical problems of BL have been ever extensively discussed in the Soviet Union, and most of the relevant discussion until the early 1970’s is summarized by Berkov in his two books (Berkov 1973; 1977).

In Germany there has been strong interest in BL, and many scholars wrote on the subject, particularly those involved in particular projects, e.g. in the German-Chinese dictionary project (e.g. Karl 1982) in the former East Germany. Also in East Germany the German-Russian dictionary projects resulted in interesting metalexicographical literature (see e.g. Bielfeldt 1956; Duda et al. 1986; Günther 1986; Lötzsch 1979 provides an overview). There is also literature relating to various projects of dictionaries of oriental languages and German (e.g. Bagans 1987). In West Germany Franz-Josef Hausmann is particularly active in the field of bilingual metalexicography (see in particular Hausmann 1977; cf. also Rettig 1985). BL has enjoyed popularity also in the Scandinavian countries, and a general theory of BL has been developed by Kromann, Riiber, and Rosbach (presented in German in 1984b; and in English in 1991).

In the English-speaking countries there was not too much interest in the theoretical aspects of BL. BDs were discussed in the proceedings of various conferences (in particular Householder & Saporta 1962; McDavid & Duc kert 1973). Some scholars also wrote extensively on particular subjects, as for example Iannucci on meaning discrimination (1957a; 1957b; 1967; 1974; 1976; 1985) but there was no attempt at a general theory of BL, though Steiner perhaps wrote most comprehensively (Steiner 1971; 1975; 1976; 1977; 1984), and Nida’s contribution has the rich background of his writings on translation and linguistics (Wendland & Nida 1983).

In Poland there was very little interest in the theoretical aspects of BL until quite recently. Significant contributions on various aspects came from Tomaszczyk (1979; 1981; 1988; 1989). Yet perhaps the most coherent and

\textsuperscript{13} And one may hope this will continue in Russia and the countries which came into existence after the collapse of the USSR.
explicit theory of BL known to me has been developed in Poland by Andrzej Bogusławski. Bogusławski’s theory is unique in many respects, he is both a practitioner and a theoretician but BL is only one of his many interests. He has written widely on all aspects of language, on translation, on monolingual lexicography (see e.g. 1976a; 1976b; 1976c; 1978; 1983; 1987; 1988a; 1988b), and this affords a unique opportunity to the analyst, because his views can be considered from several points of view. Thus Bogusławski’s theory will be often recalled in this book.

There are also available general surveys of lexicography. One, which summarizes the literature up till the start of the 1970’s, is the classic monograph by Zgusta (1971). Another general survey can be found in the International Encyclopedia of Lexicography (Hausmann et al. 1989–1991), whose second volume deals with BL; the relevant contributions are by the Scandinavian theorists mentioned above.

A significant stimulus to the development of metalexicography was the establishment of the Dictionary Society of North America in the 1970’s and the European Association for Lexicography at the start of the 1980’s, and the appearance of the journals of the societies: Dictionaries, Lexicographica, as well as their congresses (the proceedings were published in Hartmann 1984; Snell-Hornby 1988; Magay & Zigány, eds. 1990; Tommola et al. 1992), and, finally, the International Journal of Lexicography.

1.5. Terminology

There is no agreement on terminology in lexicography, or in metalexicography, whether monolingual or bilingual (see Robinson 1983). Consequently, many problems are confused or obscured by use of different terms for the same concepts. We have already noted this problem in our discussion of the terms for what appears on the right-hand side of the entry in a BD (on p. 16). Another notorious problem is that of finding out how many items (entries) the given dictionary includes: usually all dictionaries use different names for the items – words, entries, references, etc. Some of these problems are discussed by Ilson (1988), or by Riggs (1984).

A searching analysis of the terminology in BL was made recently by
1.5. Terminology

Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen (1988). They emphasize the fact that confusion reigns supreme in the terminology of BL. They also argue that if terms are considered to be manifestations of theories, then, indeed, there is probably little theory in BL. Therefore, if our discussion is to be sufficiently precise, the key terms have to be defined. The main typographical conventions relating to the terms will be also given.

L1 – first language (most often one's mother tongue),
L2 – second language (most often any language learnt after the first one),

source language – all expressions on the left-hand side in a pair of equivalent expressions, usually in bold;

target language – all expressions on the right-hand side in a pair of equivalent expressions,

macrostructure – structure of all the entries, i.e. in the whole BD,
microstructure – structure of one individual entry,

entry – a single block of information in a BD, headed by the entry-word, usually distinguished typographically from other entries (e.g. a separate paragraph),

entry-word – the head of the entry, usually the canonical form of the relevant lexeme; the expression to which most of the information in the entry relates; also an address to multi-word lexemes, of which it is a constituent; usually distinguished typographically, e.g. by larger typeface;

sense – one of the main divisions of the entry, usually marked typographically by consecutive letters of numbers,

sub-sense – one of the divisions of the sense, also marked by consecutive letters of numbers,

equivalent – a target-language expression which serves as an explanation in the senses of the entries; the expression can be usually inserted in the text of translation with little changes; as an adjective the word is used in a wider sense; two equivalent expressions are expression whose properties are at least the same, as established on some basis,

definition – a target-language expression which serves as an explanation in the senses of the entries, but which cannot be inserted in the text of translation without serious changes, being usually a sentence, in modern BL often distinguished typographically from equivalents, e.g. by italics, or by brackets, etc.,
comment – further information on the meaning of an equivalent in target language, often separated from equivalents, e.g. by brackets,
gloss – further information on the meaning of either the entry-word or the equivalent in source language,
example – any source-language expression which does not have the lexemic status, and which is not a gloss,
translation – any equivalent expression of source-language expressions which is not an equivalent, definition, comment,
meaning discrimination – any method of distinguishing the senses and strings of equivalents in meaning or in applicability.

Other terminology is based primarily on Lyons (1977) and will not be defined here.
2. Bilingual dictionaries and their users

This chapter discusses three problems: the functions of BDs, their users, and various parameters in BL. The chapter will introduce concepts which will underlie the whole of our discussion in the following chapters.

2.1. Functions of BDs

BDs have many functions, as they are used for many tasks and by many groups of users: learners, technical and literary translators, scholars, any interested individuals. Therefore the discussion of the functions has to be limited to those which can be assumed to be most typical for the whole genre, or prototypical. The typical user is a bilingual who has inadequate knowledge on some aspects of the two languages in his or her command (e.g. a translator) and who needs this knowledge to communicate something in L1 or L2, or an individual who strives to become a bilingual (a learner), i.e. who wants to be able to communicate with speakers of L2, or an individual who has no need or desire to become a bilingual but who has to, or wants to, achieve communication on the level of comprehension (e.g. a tradesman, a scientist, or a tourist).

If we generalize the three cases, then we might say that BDs are used in order to acquire some knowledge about one, or both, of the languages, knowledge which is necessary above all for communication. Thus they are typically not descriptive dictionaries – in which the aspect of communication is not important – but pedagogical dictionaries used for learning something. We should also note at this point that the concept of bilingualism is very important in bilingual lexicography, and it will be further discussed in Chapter 3, section 3.1.

A more general term for pedagogical would be predictive. Predictive dictionaries would be thus a special type of descriptive dictionary, in which
a very important function is that of communication orientation. In other words, descriptive lexicography is concerned with recording and describing a language, or languages, at some point in time (synchronic dictionaries), or along a succession of such points (diachronic dictionaries). In a way descriptive dictionaries, whether synchronic or diachronic, cover only the history of the relevant language, as attested in the occurrences found in the corpus (similar views can be found in Frawley 1985). Predictive dictionaries, on the other hand, set out to help the user to produce further occurrences – forms and meanings – of the given language on the basis of the past ones.

BDs are primarily used for prediction. As to MDs, most often large historical dictionaries are to be descriptive above all\textsuperscript{14} (e.g. OED), as are large synchronic ones (e.g. MERRIAM-WEBSTER'S THIRD NEW INTERNATIONAL), while smaller dictionaries attempt to combine description with prediction. A good example can be COD, in its 7th edition disputable uses are marked by special signs. In English ML there has developed a new genre of the MD, which is predominantly aimed at prediction, i.e. monolingual learners' dictionaries, such as LDOCE, or OALDCE.

The terms \textit{description} and \textit{prediction} are not new. Both denote an area in lexicography around which much discussion and controversy is centred. Thus in dictionaries of Slavic languages prediction was usually given priority over description. Prediction was often called the description of the norm, and predictive dictionaries were called normative dictionaries (Piotrowski 1994 has a detailed discussion). Also in American lexicography prediction is an important factor, often called authoritarianism in relevant publications (see Wells 1973). Denisov (1977a), no doubt to avoid the connotations related to the term \textit{normative}, introduces the apposition \textit{academic} – \textit{pedagogical} (i.e. \textit{akademičeskaja} – \textit{učebnaja leksikografija}), which fairly precisely corresponds to our terms descriptive – predictive. Yet the Russian term \textit{akademičeskij} can be accepted only in Soviet lexicography, as it is related to the largest monolingual dictionaries of Russian, the so called \textit{akademičeskie slovari}\textsuperscript{15}. The terms descriptive – predictive are used here to ensure neutrality.

\textsuperscript{14} Whether the primary function of large historical dictionaries is description, or whether they combine description with prescription, depends on the tradition of the given country, cf. the discussion below.

\textsuperscript{15} These dictionaries are not purely descriptive, either. Cf. Piotrowski 1994 for relevant discussion.
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Generally it is not commonly believed that BDs are, or should be, pedagogical dictionaries (and we will discuss this problem in greater detail in Chapter 3, section 3.5). It depends on the tradition of the given country whether it is the MD or the BD that is treated as a pedagogical dictionary. In lexicography of English it is precisely the learners' MDs which are thought to be pedagogical. In many other countries, and for numerous other languages, including Polish, there are no pedagogical MDs yet (cf. Hartmann 1988; Zöfgen 1991). In Soviet metalexicography the learner's dictionary par excellence is the BD (cf. Denisov 1977b; Achmanova & Minaeva 1982). These attitudes are often reflected in the approaches taken by various scholars. Thus Summers, a British lexicographer, discusses the role of dictionaries in language learning in her paper (Summers 1988b), but she finds it natural to limit her field to MDs. On the other hand, it takes some time to realize that in his discussion of pedagogical dictionaries a Russian writer discusses only BDs (cf. Denisov 1977a).

How can a predictive dictionary fulfill its function? This is an important question that has to be answered from the point of view of a foreign learner/user. What, in fact, does a predictive dictionary do? Ilson thinks that "we now know what an ideal learner's dictionary [i.e. monolingual - T.P.] should do. It should model the lexical competence of the adult native speaker" (Ilson 1985a: 2; Hausmann, Gorbahn 1989; Denisov 1977a hold the same view). This description of the function of the pedagogical dictionary can be easily adjusted to BL: a BD can be said to model the lexical competence of a bilingual speaker. Another view is that lexicographic description should be isomorphic to the language(s) it includes (Bogusławski 1987: 15–17), which means that an MD should include only linguistic units - sensu Bogusławski 1987 - and only their meanings; though this seems fairly obvious, he shows that traditional lexicography does not realize this objective. A BD should cover only Elementary Translational Correspondences (Elementarne Odpowiedniości Tłumaczeniowe).

Both views obviously amount to the same thing: language exists in its speakers, whose competence has, by necessity, to be isomorphic to the language they use, though in Bogusławski's formulation the speaker is hidden, as it were. Accordingly, in Bogusławski's approach there are only abstract structures. The statements in which the speaker's competence is taken into account can be easily challenged: no single native speaker is likely to possess all the knowledge that dictionaries contain (cf. Tickoo
1989): dictionaries seem to describe the collective competence, so to say, of a whole speech community (cf. Denisov 1977a).

We have to examine also the meaning of the terms model and to model something, as used in the formulations above. To model something may mean two things with reference to language: either to provide a representation of language, or to provide means to create further occurrences of language on the basis of the representation. Naturally this is our distinction between descriptive and predictive lexicography, thus we can talk of descriptive and predictive models.\(^{16}\)

It has to be noted that adequate representation, i.e. descriptive adequacy, is not the same as pedagogically useful representation, i.e. predictive adequacy. Thus, description of grammar in such pedagogical MDs as OALDCE or LDOCE, though more or less adequate, was found to be extremely unhelpful to learners, and accordingly changed to a more user-friendly format in OALDCE and LDOCE (cf. Herbst 1989). Therefore lexicographic description of language for pedagogical purposes has to be tailored to the needs of the users if they are to have any profit from it (cf. for example Béjoint 1981; Carter 1989).\(^{17}\)

Now we can formulate more precisely the definition of the function of a predictive dictionary. A predictive dictionary is to provide such information on linguistic facts (description) that it would enable the user to behave linguistically like a native speaker (prediction). As to BDs, they should enable the user to behave either like a native speaker of either language (e.g. for production), or like a competent bilingual (e.g. for translation).

A very important question arises: is this possible? If we limit ourselves to description – can a dictionary describe the lexical competence of a native speaker in an adequate way? And further: is adequate description a prerequisite for adequate prediction, as it is commonly believed? To answer these questions, we have to discuss further models in lexicography and linguistics.

An important question is: what do models describe? They describe something which, though called natural language, is only similar to it to

---

\(^{16}\) On models in general see Wojcicki 1987.

\(^{17}\) Models can also be understood as programs for performing some activity: a semiotic program of the world can be regarded as a program of some activity of an individual or a community (Ivanov 1965/1977). A dictionary as a model thus is a sort of program of some activity.
some degree. Linguistic models are artificial languages which simulate natural languages, according to Šaumjan (after Steiner, George 1975: 112). In linguistics and in lexicography it is impossible to describe, or even to record, data without any theoretical assumptions. Thus linguists and lexicographers have to do first with assumptions and hypotheses concerning language. These assumptions are subsequently put to work on idealized linguistic data. Models then are constructed "not of actual language-behaviour but of the regularities manifest in this behaviour (more precisely of that part of language-behaviour which the linguist defines, by methodological decision, to fall within the scope of linguistics)" (Lyons 1977: 29).

Differences between a model and the object it describes can arise because of three general factors (cf. Lem 1967: 241–245):

1. The model is an idealization.
2. There are properties of the model which are not the properties of the object.
3. The object is indeterminate in some respect.

All three factors appear in lexicography. As to point 1, idealization of data is present at any stage of lexicographic work. Lexicographers have to include only a selection of the items found in the corpora, and they describe only some meanings, or uses, of a lexeme, those which seem to be most frequent and typical. Dictionaries have to contain only generalizations about what is most typical in language (cf. Zgusta 1971).

As to indeterminacy, meaning – the central aspect of language and in many dictionaries – is generally assumed to be indeterminate (cf. e.g. Lyons 1982; Wierzbicka 1985 has a critical discussion). Indeterminacy with regard to BDs will be discussed in Chapter 5, e.g. section 5.8.

As to point 2, dictionaries obviously have many important properties which are not so important in language, or which do not exist in language at all. The most glaring example is the most common type of macrostructure ordering – the *a fronte* alphabetic arrangement of entries. It is not known very well how words are stored in the mental lexicon (cf. Carter 1987; Channell 1988; Béjoint 1988) but they do not seem to be stored on the basis of spelling. Dictionaries moreover do not show the textual frequency of linguistic items. This leads to many false statements on the nature of particular languages\(^{18}\). A very significant fact is that lexicographers have to

\(^{18}\) On the basis of dictionary data it might seem that English is a Romance language (see the discussion in Mańczak 1981: 40–101).
assume that there is a definite number of lexical items, and that each lexical item has a number of discrete meanings. Both assumptions can be challenged (see e.g. Hudson 1988; Apresjan 1974/1980 defends discreteness of meaning). BDs foster the view that any L2 (or L1) item has one or two equivalents, and do not show the whole complexity of relations (cf. Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen 1988).

It seems therefore that there is a good deal of simplification in Bogusławski’s demand that dictionary descriptions should be isomorphic to language. What they can be isomorphic to is models of language and models of lexicographic description. The two types of models are not the same: two dictionaries can share the same model of language and yet use different lexicographic models. This is the case with LDOCE and OALDCE (see Piotrowski 1989b; 1990b; 1994 for a description of the model). Thanks to these complexities there can be an infinite number of possible dictionaries. Moreover, the underlying lexicographic models can be in conflict for one genre. This seems to be actually the case with BDs. The relevant discussion will be found in Chapter 5, section 5.9. It is the task of metalexicography to uncover the models underlying actual dictionaries, i.e. to show what assumptions were employed and what sort of idealization of data was used.

Can lexicographic description be adequate, and thus can it be a good basis for prediction? Many scholars, for example Bolinger (1985) and Frawley (1985) argue forcibly that dictionaries are very inadequate and unnatural. Above all, they present words out of their natural element, i.e. their contexts. A bilingual dictionary is even more unnatural, as it puts together items which probably never occur together in the same communicative situation (cf. Neubert 1992: 31).

An example of the inadequacy can be provided by the Explanatory-Combinatorial Dictionary, which is the dictionary component of the Meaning-Text Model of language, put forward by Mel’čuk, Apresjan (see e.g. Apresjan 1974/1980; Mel’čuk 1988, 1989; Mel’čuk & Zholkovsky 1988; one of the dictionaries is TOLKOGO-KOMBINATORNYJ SLOVAR’ SOVREMENNAGO RUSSKOGO JAZYKA: OPYT SEMANTI-KO-SINTAKSIČESKOGO OPISANIJA RUSSKOJ LEKSIKI). The dictionary is perhaps the first to attempt to provide exhaustive information on the lexical competence of the native speaker on the level of individual lexical items, and provides a stimulus to write better dictionaries in future.

First we should note its limitations: “an MTM is no more than a model,
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or a handy logical means for describing observable correspondences” (Mel’čuk 1981: 29), and language is considered only in its communicative function; an important part of linguistic meaning thus is not taken into consideration. Its exhaustiveness relates above all to collocability. and the exhaustiveness was questioned by Weiss (1981) and by Bogusławski (1986; 1988b). The latter particularly tries to show that the method of describing lexical collocability is not very useful, because the constraints on the number of lexical functions are too weak.

Traditional dictionaries have been used yet with some success, and, as we shall see, they are actually a significant factor in acquisition of lexical competence (Chapter 3, section 3.6). Thus prediction does seem to be possible without adequate description. To see how it is possible let us look at the typical situation of dictionary use. The user has typically to do with a stretch (piece) of discourse – discourse can be defined as text embedded in context – which is to be encoded or decoded, produced or understood. It is very rarely, or for very specific purposes, e.g. for etymology, or pronunciation, that words without any context, including that of situation, are dealt with. Discourse has several properties which help to interpret its constituent expressions, first of all coherence and cohesion

\[ \text{See Halliday & Hasan 1976 on coherence and cohesion; on text-constituting factors in more detail see Beaugrande & Dressler 1981. The nature of discourse will be further discussed in Chapter 4, section 4.1.} \]
generated on the basis of a dictionary. Thus it happens quite often that the user cannot say what a word means even though a dictionary was consulted, because he or she cannot generate any meaning for a particular text constituent. Further, dictionaries only disseminate meanings but they do not point out to which is the correct one, and it is the user who chooses the correct meaning. A dictionary has no claim to ontological truths but only to internal consistency.

Thus what is really important in pedagogical lexicography is how dictionaries are used. Communication is achieved at the dictionary-user interface. Prediction is possible without adequate description thanks to the user, to his or her linguistic and general abilities. Using faulty lexicographic descriptions the user will receive corrective feedback from other users, from context or from other texts. This feedback will make it possible for him/her to adjust the information to his/her needs. This may help to explain why even quite old and inadequate dictionaries can be used with some success.

The users, as we have said on page 28, cannot expect exhaustive information relating to lexical items from their dictionaries. On the other hand, they do not need such information, and they do not look for it — typically a dictionary is consulted to help at specific points of lexical deficiency. Thus a dictionary is used to provide some minimal information that would help the user process pieces of discourse, i.e. to produce, comprehend, or translate them.

The basic function of a dictionary is thus to add some more information to the knowledge the user already has. That information is rather to activate the user's linguistic skills than to instill a new lexical competence. As far as linguistic targets of dictionary consultation are concerned, a dictionary, though it cannot ensure that users will behave linguistically like native users, should lead them towards a more probable linguistic expression or meaning rather than to a less probable one in the given context.

20 This account was influenced by the views of Nalimov 1974/1976, whose approach to meaning and decoding is Bayesian, i.e. based on a posteriori probabilities.
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When the function of the dictionary is defined this way, the user is given as much importance in lexicography as adequate representation, i.e. description. It is the user who has to interpret the conventions of dictionary descriptions. A highly skilled dictionary user can extract quite a lot of information even from primitive and inadequate dictionaries. Even more frequent is the opposite situation, when sophisticated dictionaries are used in an inadequate way. Whitcut thus comments: “a perfectly intelligent Longman editor reported that during her years of using the LDOCE as a language teacher she had always thought that the small capitals we use for cross-references were a misprint” (Whitcut 1986: 116).

The importance of dictionary users in lexicography has been noticed relatively late, though of course both lexicographers and metalexicographers were aware of the fact that dictionaries can be good only so far as they are useful to their users (see Hartmann 1987 for a brief survey). In lexicography yet the stress was usually on adequate description, not on prediction, and it was commonly thought that if description were adequate, then even if it would be presented in an arcane way, the user would be satisfied. This attitude can still be found, for example in Polish lexicography (see the studies in Lubaś 1988). Even learners’ dictionaries of English had their problems with adequate presentation, as we have noted, and criticism of this lead to production of a new generation of the dictionaries (cf. Piotrowski 1994 for a discussion).

The adjustment of dictionaries to their users has been dubbed user-friendliness. To make a dictionary more user-friendly it is imperative to know who the users are and what they use dictionaries – of what sort – for. These aspects have been studied in a number of papers. According to Hartmann (1987) thirty studies were conducted until his paper, and at present there are more, and Hartmann (1989) provides a selective annotated bibliography of the major usage studies.

The majority of studies relate to foreign language learning, thus they do not reveal much as far as other groups of users are concerned. Surprisingly few studies researched the needs of those who use BDs. If BDs are taken into account, then they are there most often to be contrasted with “true”
dictionaries, i.e. with MDs. Therefore Kromann, Riiber, and Rosbach (1991) are certainly right when they underlie the fact that the user aspect has been very poorly researched in BL. In what follows the relevant studies will be briefly reviewed.

An early paper was by Tomaszczyk (1979). It is still one of the most comprehensive, though it is not always clear (see Hartmann 1987a for comments). Tomaszczyk’s study is yet particularly useful, as it discusses learners, translators, and other users, and it does not favour MDs. Another Polish study, significant but almost completely unknown outside Poland, is that by Komorowska (1978) on BDs in English learning at secondary school. After Tomaszczyk’s paper the most influential studies were by Béjoint (1981), Baxter (1980), McFarquhar and Richards (1983), Bensoussan & Sim & Weiss (1984), who dealt with MDs and BDs in foreign language learning. The BD was specifically discussed by Hartmann (1983), Hatherall (1984) and Lantolf, Labarca, and Tuinder (1985). Wiegand (1985) is on MDs, but is based on translation, so it is relevant for our needs. Perhaps the most extensive research was carried out by Atkins, Lewis, Summers, Whitcut for EURALEX and AILA (Atkins & Knowles 1990).

Caution is needed when the results of the studies are interpreted (for criticism see Hatherall 1984 and Hartmann 1987a, cf. also Hartmann 1989b). The most frequent method of getting the needed information is by means of questions and answers. It is not quite certain yet whether the answers really reveal what the users do, perhaps they show in fact what the users suppose they do, or even perhaps what they think they should do, when consulting a dictionary. Therefore some other methods were used, for example there are studies on the effect of dictionary use on the results of an assignment. In order to record what users actually do protocols can be used, or video recordings. The most ingenious method was used by Tono (1984; after Hartmann 1989), who devised a series of texts in which nonsense English words were used, and he provided the users with specially written English-Japanese dictionaries to help them with the task.

The most clear and convincing result of the studies is that BDs are indeed used as long as dictionaries of a foreign language are used, no matter what is the level of linguistic sophistication of the user. This was found by Tomaszczyk (1979) and confirmed by a number of other studies (e.g. Baxter 1980; Bensoussan & Sim & Weiss 1984; Atkins & Knowles 1990). Yet none of the studies available to me explores the problem who uses BDs
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By far the most complete theoretical discussion, supported by research, of the situations of dictionary consultation is that by Kühn (1989). Kühn discusses any dictionary consultation, not only BDs, though he has some remarks relating only to BL. Kühn presents his discussion in the convenient form of a diagram, which will be reproduced here in its original form, i.e. in German, on the next page.

Kühn's classification has the advantage of covering both the types of user and consultation objectives. Its most important drawback is that it is based on different criteria, which cannot be easily reconciled; the criteria are: the type of discourse, task, nature of dictionaries. Some of the categories are also too comprehensive, particularly the one of Textrezeption, which can include any type of user, which is perhaps why there are no users identified in the corresponding slot.

The BD, it seems, could be used for all the purposes listed, yet it is given a separate box (Übersetzungswörterbuch), presumably to stress its translating nature. Kühn in fact does not seem very much convinced as to his types, when he explains why he has singled out the BD as a separate category, while it has precisely the same functions as what he calls Nachschlagebuch: "Die Benutzung des Wörterbuchs als Übersetzungsbuch unterscheidet sich jedoch durch die Äquivalenzproblematik qualitativ von Gebrauch des Wörterbuchs als Nachschlagebuch beim Textrezeption oder -produktion" (Kühn 1989). This explanation is not convincing, as in this case Kühn does not consider the functions of a BD, but proceeds on a priori assumptions: a BD should be different from MDs. As a result what we have is a tautology – a BD differs from an MD by being a BD. Our analysis in Chapter 2, section 2.3, suggests that BDs can be used in precisely the same situations
Kühn's classification of dictionary uses
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as MDs, while MDs cannot be used in those situations in which a dictionary is to relate two, or more, languages.

Which are the most typical groups of users, and which situations of use are most important? Kühn's analysis does not answer these questions, so we have to turn to the publishers of BDs, who probably know, at least to some degree, who buys their dictionaries. A survey of blurbs, prefaces, and publicity material shows that there are three most frequent types of BD: for learners, translators, and tourists. Thus, in the Collins BDs, e.g. in COLLINS-ROBERT FRENCH-ENGLISH ENGLISH-FRENCH DICTIONARY, the intended users are described as follows: "... for French studies and translation needs" (dust cover blurb). In the KOŚCIUSZKO ENGLISH-POLISH DICTIONARY the users are: the general reader, the translator, the student and scholar (p. V). In Langenscheidt Verlagsverzeichnis Fremde Sprachen 1988 the dictionaries are to be used "für Beruf, Universität, Schule, Alltag, Reise". Similar statements can be found in Pons Gesamtverzeichnis (Klett 1988), or in the catalogues of the Polish publisher Wiedza Powszechna.

If we apply now these findings to Kühn's analysis, using the categories of users from the lowest levels, we may say that learners need a dictionary for text monitoring, production, acquisition, and translation. Translators require a BD for general and technical translation, while tourists use BDs to communicate in any way (Lebenshilfe). Any category of user can employ a BD for text reception.

Further, we have to know which information types the users consult particularly often. The most frequent category is meaning (e.g. in Tomaszczyk 1979; Hartmann 1983), described in BDs by equivalents. This confirms the findings of studies on MD use (see Hartmann 1987a). The other frequent type of information is grammar (Hartmann 1983). It is very significant yet that when asked specifically which words they consult most often (and not which information category), the users point to grammatical (function) words, which they look up most often. In other words, it is not grammar as such but rather exponents of various grammatical categories that the users need information about. (cf. Wiegand 1985; Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach 1991).

Tomaszczynk's findings are even more vivid: more students use BDs for receptive grammar (e.g. in reading) than for productive grammar – 70% and 59%, respectively, of those who use BDs for grammar. As to particular
skills, understandably translation was shown to be the most important type. Next comes reading. The only difference between users and learners of a foreign language as to their skills was, according to Tomaszczyk, that the former indicated L1 – L2 translation as a type more frequent than reading, while in the latter group reading was more frequent. Writing, speaking, listening followed, in this order in both groups in Tomaszczyk, while in Hartmann it was writing, listening, conversation. The trouble with the use of the term translation is that it is not defined, and there are certain authors for whom translation involves any use of L2.

2.4. Parameters in BL

The term parameters will refer to various features which can be used for characterizing dictionaries. It was introduced by Karaulov (1981). Parameters relate both to linguistic facts described by dictionaries and to their presentation. Only the latter type will be discussed here, as this book treats lexicography, and features of languages are relevant only so far as they have some bearing on lexicographic description. Tentative lists of lexicographic parameters relating to linguistic facts can be found in Karaulov (1981) and in Hudson (1988).

Some of the parameters discussed here have been treated most often by other authors for the purpose of constructing typologies of BDs. Typology proceeds on the basis of prototypes, which are ideal objects against which actual, real-life objects can be evaluated, and perhaps planned. Existing typologies for BL yet suffer from some shortcomings, the most important one is that they are too rigid, being usually matrix-like. In a matrix typology the ideal dictionaries are constructed by means of features arranged in vertical and horizontal columns. The matrices use typically few features, most often language- and skill-specificity (these terms are discussed in this chapter), and even so the numbers of ideal dictionaries are very high. Šcerba (1939/1983) planned four dictionaries. Duda et al. (1986) have six of them. Hausmann (after Hansen 1988) reached the figure of eight. Steiner (1986b) arrives at 18 prototypical dictionaries. The typologies are further problematic in that in real life there is a tendency in commercial lexicography to
produce all-purpose dictionaries, useful in all situations and for all types of user, thus very seldom are such typologies useful in practical lexicography.

The notion of parameters has been introduced in order to isolate characteristic features found in dictionaries, which subsequently could be used to describe other BDs, or perhaps to plan new future dictionaries. Parameters thus would be similar to distinctive features in phonology – a dictionary could be described as a bundle of parameters, rather than by comparison to an ideal, prototypical dictionary. In contrast to phonology, however, lexicographical parameters would be continuous rather than discrete: a dictionary could be characterized as tending towards one or the other extreme of the parameter scale. In this way the complexity of dictionaries could be better described.

In BL, which is the most complex type of lexicography, many parameters can be used. An important one, for example, is the format of the macrostructure: alphabetic vs. thesaurus-like (ideographic), corresponding to one of the modes in lexicography (see Chapter 1, section 1.3). Size would be also important as a parameter, and it can be treated in several ways. On the one hand it can be treated as completely independent of other parameters (cf. interesting remarks by Boguslawski 1988a). On the other hand it can be seen as being dependent on such parameters as the linguistic competence of the user, the typical usage situation, etc. (cf. Martin & Al 1990). Finally, it can be made the basis on which other parameters depend, e.g. the density of information (cf. Hausmann 1977).

There will be no attempt in this book to identify most of the relevant parameters, only some of them will be discussed, namely those which are particularly relevant to the following discussion. Establishment and description of relevant parameters in BL has to be done in a separate publication. The parameters to be discussed will relate to:

- the ultimate purpose of the BD – metalinguistic or translational;
- overall approach, and size of units included – segmental or idiomatic;
- discourse sensitivity – general or restricted;
- skill-specificity – production or reception;
- directionality – user-language specificity;
- method of presentation – monofunctional or polyfunctional.

The ultimate purpose of the BD will be treated in detail in two separate chapters (Chapter 3 and 4), therefore it will be only introduced here. Overall approach and discourse sensitivity will be discussed together, and the other
parameters will be discussed one by one, starting with directionality and skill-specificity. Before we go on, however, we have to introduce some notions necessary in our further discussion of parameters.

Any dictionary is used to explain unknown facts by means of those already known. This basic approach is common to ML and BL (this is true of the L2-L1 dictionary rather than of L1-L2 one). What the two types of lexicography differ in is the method of explanation of meaning, which is the type of information most often needed. The chief difference is, of course, that in MDs the explanation is intralinguistic: the same language is used for both sides of the entry, while in BDs explanation is interlinguistic – L1 is on one side, while L2 is on the other. From this there follow other differences. Monolingual explanations are usually definitions, or other multi-word statements of meaning, and they do not have the status of autonomous linguistic signs, or of established, lexicalized lexical items (this discussion is based on Rey-Debove 1989). The explanations are meaningful combinations of autonomous linguistic signs. Thus, if they are treated as signs, they are complex signs.

In BDs, on the other hand, the rule is that explanation of meaning should be carried out by means of autonomous linguistic signs, i.e. equivalents. If in one sense there are several equivalents, then they occur only in a simple linear sequence, forming a string without meaningful syntax. Entry-words are as a rule autonomous linguistic signs, therefore in BDs autonomous signs appear on both sides of the entry. Consequently, there are object signs and subject signs. It is impossible to confuse which are which because they belong to two different languages. In ML the metalinguistic character of complex subject signs (i.e. of definitions) has to be signalled by other means.

One consequence of the fact that MDs use complex signs which are made up of a number of simplex signs (the terms complex and simplex are used after Bauer 1983) is that it is very difficult to reverse the dictionary, i.e. to give the user access to the entries starting from explanations of meaning. An MD is an “oriented” dictionary, and its typical orientation is from form to meaning. There have been various attempts at overcoming this difficulty, particularly in thesauruses, none yet quite successful (cf. Piotrowski 1989a; Karaulov 1981; Hill 1985).

In BL reversibility is quite simple, because orientation depends on a particular viewpoint of the user: and English-Polish dictionary can be used as
a form-meaning dictionary by a Pole and as a meaning-form dictionary by a speaker of English. It is easy thus to change the direction from form-meaning to meaning-form – the metalinguistic simplex signs can, by reversal, become object signs. It is tempting thus to see the BD as an equating dictionary – if exactly the same dictionary can be at the same time meaning-form and form-meaning, then the forms on both sides have to be equal in meaning, however meaning will be defined.

2.5. Directionality and skill-specificity

The two parameters are usually discussed together: they are the most widely known principles in BL, often adopted as the basis for various typologies. Directionality is related to the needs of the speaker of a particular language. A monodirectional BD is intended for speakers of one language only. For example, a monodirectional English-Polish dictionary can be aimed at either Polish or English-speaking users only. Bidirectional BDs are to serve the needs of both groups of users. Thus the same dictionary, when bidirectional, would be used by both Polish and English-speaking users.

Skill-specificity is related to the use of a BD in a particular skill. The main division is traditionally that between receptive (passive) skills, involving comprehension of a piece of discourse, and productive (active) skills, involving generation of a piece of discourse. Though the parameters are most often treated together, they are independent. Mono- or bidirectional dictionaries may be compiled for all skills, and a skill-specific dictionary can be aimed at both groups of users.

The discussion in the metalexicographical literature on the two parameters started, it is believed, with Ščerba, who advocated the production of separate pairs of BDs for speakers of each language, thus he stressed the need for user-specific, monodirectional dictionaries (Ščerba 1939/1983, 1940/1974). However, he did not seem to notice the need to produce skill-specific dictionaries, as skill-specificity is most often believed to be automatically related to the needs of the users, therefore an L2-L1 dictionary for speakers of L1 is a passive dictionary for comprehension, while the same dictionary for speakers of L2 is an active dictionary for production. Ščerba’s
ideas have been taken up and developed by his followers (see for example Bielfeldt 1956; Duda et al. 1986; Lötzsch 1979). There were also scholars who arrived independently at the same solutions (e.g. the Americans Iannucci 1957a, 1957b, 1967; Steiner, Roger 1975, 1986a; Williams 1960), and all those ideas were in turn developed by Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach (1984a, 1984b, 1991). At present his ideas are widely accepted (see Hansen 1988).

The two parameters are related to the principle of economy and user-friendliness in lexicography. Any dictionary can include only a limited amount of data and less important or obvious facts can be omitted to make room for other data, or simply to make the facts presented in the dictionary more accessible to the user. Thus, even if a BD is treated as an equating dictionary, i.e. as one in which the relation between the entry-word and the equivalents is symmetrical, it is symmetrical only with regard to some types of information (above all that information which equivalents convey) and not to other ones, which are not symmetrical and not reversible. Thus they are important for one language and one type of user only. Inclusion of non-reversible information, which is to be useful to both groups of users, makes the dictionary bigger, more complicated, and thus harder to use.

An obvious component which is irreversible is pronunciation: a speaker of English has no need for a complete indication of English in, for example, an English-Polish dictionary, and precisely this sort of information can be very important for a Pole. Which types of information are not reversible in a BD? Let us review the main types to be found in a BD (another review can be found in Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach 1984a, 1984b, 1991).

*Metalanguage* – the language of explanation. It is believed at present that all the additional explanatory information – field, area, style labels, meaning discriminations, etc. – should be in the language of the principal user. An English user needs for example an English-Russian dictionary with all the explanations in English rather than in Russian. Therefore the KOŚCIUSZKO FOUNDATION DICTIONARY can hardly be called user-friendly because its labels are abbreviations from Polish, English, Latin. Often a particular metalinguistic component in a BD is also a linguistic component and in this case it is difficult to decide which principle should be given priority. Thus when meaning discrimination at the same time serves as an indicator of collocability, as in the Collins dictionaries, then the component does not serve the metalinguistic function well, because it has
to be in the same language as the entry-words, while it should be in the language of the equivalents to be of real value for the intended users (cf. Cop 1990).

**Macrostructure.** The principle of economy is particularly important in macrostructure, as it can lead to substantial savings of space by excluding items obvious to one type of user. Most often this principle relates to inclusion or exclusion of complex words such as compounds or collocations (see Hansen 1988; or Mugdan 1984 on German compounds). Compounds in an L2-L1 dictionary can be often omitted because most of them can be understood on the compositional basis, i.e. their meaning is a sum of the meaning of both components. Thus if the dictionary is to be used for decoding only, most of the compounds can be omitted, and the macrostructure will be less dense.

**Grammar and phonetics.** We have already touched on indication of phonetics (on page 40), and indication of grammar, i.e. parts of speech, inflection, syntax, presents similar problems: a native speaker of Polish will usually know the word-forms of a lexeme on the basis of its dictionary form (entry-word), and a foreign learner of Polish will find exactly this area of the Polish language difficult, as his or her intuition cannot be relied on. The OXFORD ENGLISH-RUSSIAN DICTIONARY, intended for speakers of English, has no indication of English grammar of pronunciation.

**Meaning.** Many authors consider symmetricality of equivalence true only to a certain degree (cf. Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach 1984b, 1991; Steiner 1971; this will be treated in more detail in Chapter V, section 5.2): no L2 item has the same meaning as the corresponding equivalent L1 item, and this difference has to be somehow made up so that the “equation” between both languages remains true. However, the exact amount of information needed depends on who the user is. Thus, in an entry from an English-Polish dictionary

**uncle** – wujek, wuj, stryj, stryjek

(the example is based on that in Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach 1984a) a Pole will know that the English word has a wider meaning than any of the Polish equivalents on the basis of the Polish equivalents, and he or she does not need explicit information on this difference. Speakers of English, on the other hand, need an explanation, because they will not be able to use the Polish word in appropriate contexts. Thus in a monodirectional active English-Polish dictionary the above entry can be like this:
uncle – (general, also maternal only), wuj, wujek (informal); (paternal) stryj, stryjek (informal)

It is interesting that though monodirectionality is what most metalexicographers advocate, they also suggest that there could be bidirectional BDs. In fact most BDs on the market claim they are bidirectional, as such dictionaries have potentially a wider appeal to the public than monodirectional BDs. Yet it has often been shown that those dictionaries are not usually truly bidirectional in that they favour one group of users, and one author even declares that it is impossible to pay equal attention to both groups of users (Harrell 1962). Consequently such false bidirectional BDs do not serve any of the groups well, as is actually the case with dictionaries of English and Polish (see Tomaszczyk 1979). The call for bidirectional dictionaries is then a call for true bidirectionality (see the discussion in Hansen 1988).

It is interesting that those BDs which do claim to be monodirectional are often quite useful to both groups of users. This is the case with the Van Dale dictionary series, e.g. with Dutch-English and Dutch-French dictionaries (see Hausmann 1988 on this point). This is also true of other dictionaries, for example the DEUTSCH-RUSSISCHES WÖRTERBUCH, which is an active BD of Russian for Germans, yet it can be used very well as a passive dictionary of German, as the experience of this writer shows. It is clear yet that directionality of BDs, though at present treated like a dogma in BL, still needs further research.

As to skill-specificity, we have already remarked that various skills call for different types of information. The skills are usually divided into passive, i.e. reading, listening, and active, i.e. writing, speaking. Yet, as we have had an occasion to see, the passive skills are not actually passive, as they require creative abilities from the decoder: the user has to be active in forming hypotheses and predictions about the meaning of text constituents. Therefore Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen (1988) use instead the terms decoding and encoding skills.

We have not included translation in the list above. In fact it is often treated as a simple combination of decoding and encoding, yet we shall treat it as a separate, fifth skill, for reasons which will be discussed in Chapter 4, section 4.9. There are two kinds of translation: from L1 to L2 and from L2 to L1. Both types present difficulties of a different scope to the translator, or to the learner. Translation into one’s own language is usually considered fairly easy, as the translator can depend on his or her own competence.
When translating into a foreign language the translator's competence cannot be relied on, particularly if the translator is a beginning learner. The two varieties of translation have two different names in French: théme is L1 – L2 translation, while version is L2 – L1 translation. Thus, dictionnaire de théme is a BD for L1 – L2 translation, while dictionnaire de version is a BD for L2 – L1 translation.

Skill-specificity can be best discussed by basing not on the psychological mechanisms during production or reception but rather on the end-products of the activity in the skills, from what the user starts to what is to be achieved. The user starts either from a text in L1 or L2, or from meaning, and is to produce a text in L1 or L2, or meaning (cf. Hausmann 1988). Thus, we have:

**passive skills:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>comprehension</th>
<th>translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L2 text ⇒ meaning</td>
<td>L2 text ⇒ L1 text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**active skills:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>translation</th>
<th>production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 text ⇒ L2 text</td>
<td>meaning ⇒ L2 text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This simple diagram is to represent the four basic types of the BD. Yet it does not include one type, an active dictionary in which the starting point is L2, not L1; monolingual learner dictionaries are exactly such dictionaries (though of course the language of explanation is L2, not L1). The diagram would be thus:

**active skills:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>translation</th>
<th>production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 text ⇒ L2 text</td>
<td>meaning ⇒ L2 text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 (item, etc.) ⇒ L2 text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

21 Those authors who were French scholars – Ščerba, Hausmann, Steiner – emphasized the need to distinguish the two varieties, and the two kinds of BDs. Hausmann (1977) uses German translations of the two terms: Hinübersetzung (version) and Herübersetzung (thème).

22 The term meaning is used here without any theoretical commitment.
Such dictionaries were described by Duda and his colleagues (Duda 1986; Duda et al. 1986). Our discussion does show, however, that rigid typologies impose too many restrictions on BDs, which are, and have to be, flexible.

2.6. Segmental and idiomatic bilingual dictionaries

Any dictionary is based on a certain view of language. The initial choice of the respective view has its bearing on most elements in a dictionary, including the level of equivalence, the size of the units which are considered to be equivalent, and the overall complexity of macro- and microstructure. Yet most probably the choice of a particular view is not conscious. This initial choice has to do with two basic views of language. In one language is considered to be an open-choice system, in the other it is an idiomatic system (the term “system” is used very loosely here). Before we discuss BL yet we have to provide the necessary background to our discussion.

In linguistics language has been usually regarded as an open-choice system. From this point of view linguists have seen “text as a series of slots which have to be filled from a lexicon which satisfies local restraints. At each slot, virtually any word can occur... This is probably the normal way of seeing and describing language” (Sinclair 1987b: 320). Yet this view has been recently challenged by linguists working with various theoretical frameworks, e.g. Bolinger (1976), Sinclair (1987b), or Fillmore & Kay & O’Connor23 (1988). Extensive research on the idiom principle in language has been carried out also by educationalists and psycholinguists (for a review see Carter 1987: 58–61).

Bolinger calls the prevailing attitude in linguistics reductionist, as it is assumed that language can be reduced to a number of minimal units – these will be called segments here – and that normal text can be produced by inserting the units in grammatical strings, where the only semantic or lexical restraints are microcontextual. Fillmore & Kay & O’Connor call this approach atomistic. The reductionist, segmental view of language has been...

23 These authors work in the generative tradition, and it is significant that generative linguists have been usually in favour of the view of language as an open-choice system.
manifested in numerous approaches to translation and to BL (see Chapter 4, section 4.1). Indeed, if this approach were true there would be little difficulty in producing a dictionary which would efficiently help produce natural texts.

Yet recently there has been a growing opposition to the atomistic approaches, probably thanks to the interest in the productive side of the linguistic behaviour as well as in text properties. Sinclair claims that “it is clear that words do not appear at random in a text, and that the open-choice principle does not provide substantial enough restraints. We would not produce normal text simply by operating the open-choice principle” (Sinclair 1987b: 320). As a result, at present a number of scholars advocate the view that in language the idiom principle dominates rather than the open-choice – segmental – principle.

What does the idiom principle depend on? We have to explain what is meant by idiomaticity and what the units of text production are. In other words, if not segments, then what are single choices for the language user?

Idiomaticity has been well researched in the literature, though there is no accepted definition. Bolinger (1976) claims that the idiom principle means that the result of combination of segments whose meaning is known will be to a high degree unpredictable. Fillmore & Kay & O’Connor (1988) define it in a similar way: an expression is idiomatic if it is given an interpretation by the speech community, yet, if somebody knows the grammar and the vocabulary of the language, then basing on this knowledge alone he would not know how to say it, or what it means, or whether it is a conventional thing to say. We should note that this is exactly the situation of a foreign user, even an advanced one. These definitions will be sufficient for our purpose.

What about the single choices of the language producer? First, what is transmitted through them? The single choices can be defined as “clusters of information including, simultaneously, morphosyntactic patterns, semantic interpretation principles to which these are dedicated and, in many cases, specific pragmatic functions in whose service they exist” (Fillmore & Kay & O’Connor 1988: 534). Thus they are complex wholes, even though they are easily analyzable into their segmental components. Thus they are, in Sinclair’s terminology, semi-preconstructed.

The most interesting problem is what the formal structure of the clusters of information is. What are the clusters built of? There is little agreement
on the formal structure and size of the clusters. Suggestions range from collocations, i.e. essentially binary lexemic structures\(^{24}\) (e.g. Bolinger 1976; Sinclair 1987b) to whole sentences, or more precisely sentential stems\(^{25}\) (Pawley and Syder 1983).

Numerous authors stress the importance of preconstructed phrases in native-like fluency. According to Pawley and Syder, studies of discourse suggest that native-speaker fluency depends on preconstructed expressions: the speakers can talk fast without interruption precisely because they use memorized expressions larger than the word. Yet the flow of speech can be fast and fluent only when familiar concepts are talked about. When new experiences are to be described, speech slows down considerably. Arguably, then, the speaker switches over from the idiom mode to the segmental one. The idiom and the segmental modes appear to be complementary, and either can be chosen by the speaker to suit the task (this is the view of Sinclair 1987b).

The importance of preconstructed expressions has been also stressed in foreign language learning: L2 learners usually start with repetition of unanalyzed sequences (cf. Ellis 1986; Klein 1986). The significance of cliche-like phrases was emphasized also by rhetoricians for the purpose of creative writing (cf. Carter & McCarthy 1988; Piotrowski 1989d). In the same vein Nabokov suggests that Conrad could use English well because he made skillful use of ready-made expressions ("iskusno pol’zovalsja gotovymi formulami", Nabokov 1954/1989: 18).

Preconstructed expressions are used to respond to, or to describe, preconstructed, fixed events, i.e. those events which are seen by the speakers as recurring and stereotyped. Preconstructed expressions are to give stereotypical, regular response to such events (Carter 1987: 59). Thus they are expressions which the native speakers usually choose when they find themselves in a given situation, which means that they are extremely context-sensitive.

\(^{24}\) It has also to be noted that collocations can be treated as linguistic signs which are more complex than their components, and that collocations can be considered then segments of language. It is very easy thus to revert to the segmental view of language.

\(^{25}\) "A lexicalized sentence stem is a unit of clause length or longer whose grammatical form and lexical content is wholly or largely fixed; its fixed elements form a standard label for a culturally recognized concept, a term in the language" (Pawley & Syder 1983: 191–192).
In order to provide examples of fixed expressions we shall use the entry think from the COLLINS-ROBERT ENGLISH-FRENCH FRENCH-ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

Example 1: Je n'ai pas eu l'idée de demander si tu ...

Example 2: Cela m'étonnerait beaucoup que ...

Example 3: j'y pensais quand je pense (aujourd'hui);

Example 4: Il se fait des illusions, il faudra qu'il y pense (aujourd'hui).

Example 5: On ne peut pas penser à tout;

Example 6: Je pensais de quoi vous avez tellement donné matière à réfléchir;...
The segmental and the idiom approaches can be both found in BL and in BDs. The approaches are reflected first of all in the level of equivalence chosen in a given dictionary. A segmental BD would be one which contains primarily L1 and L2 units at the lowest level, i.e. lexemic, and which admits longer items only when they have clearly a lexemic status. Whenever non-lexemic expressions are included, they are decontextualized to the highest degree. An idiomatic BD would be one which contains lexemic equivalents, together with preconstructed expressions, no matter how fixed they are, ranging from collocations to whole sentences. An idiomatic BD fairly generously indicates the context of included expressions. This difference can be related to that of the usefulness and user-friendliness of each type.

The segmental dictionary is usually very orderly, neat, compact, transparent in its structure. It offers firm guidelines to the user. Because of these reasons it is relatively easy to use. However, as our discussion above suggests, a segmental dictionary will not help very much the user to produce normal text in L2. Texts written on the basis of such dictionaries will be more or less non-idiomatic and unacceptable (this will be discussed in Chapter 4 in greater detail, section 4.9). Segmental BDs thus seem to be better suited to comprehension purposes rather than to production needs.

Idiomatic BDs, on the other hand, contain much that can be useful for the producer of a (foreign) text. There are many problems yet related to this type. As there is no agreement in lexicography as to the placing of multi-word phrases in the macro- and microstructure, such BDs are far from being lucid and transparent. By necessity the entries are long and overloaded with phrases of various sort and size. Because there is no agreement as to what a fixed expression is, two different dictionaries may vary enormously in their content. Consultation of an idiomatic dictionary is therefore time-consuming and difficult. There is plenty of information but often this infor-

---

27 The terminology should not be understood to suggest that in the segmental dictionary there are no idioms, and that in the idiomatic dictionary there are no lexemic equivalents.

28 Acceptability will depend on which languages are involved. Texts produced on the basis of a Polish and Russian dictionary will be probably more acceptable than texts produced on the basis of an English and Polish dictionary.

29 Carla Marello (1989; 1992) offers an interesting typology of bilingual dictionaries with regard to the position of multi-word expressions in the microstructure.
mation can lead the user astray because the dictionary relies to a great extent on the users’ linguistic and metalexicographic skills.

The differences between both types can be best shown on an example:

**speed n.** (rapidity) быстрота, скорость; (rate of motion) скорость; with all possible ~ как можно скорее; в скорейшем порядке; с предельной быстротой; at full, top ~ на полной скорости; полным ходом; gain, gather ~ набирать, -ять скорость; lose ~ терять, по- скоростью; my bicycle has four ~s мой велосипед имеет четыре скорости; he was travelling at ~ он ехал с большой скоростью; ~ limit дозволенная скорость; предел скорости.

v.t. 1. (send off): ~ a parting guest провожать, -ить уходящего гостя; ~ an arrow from the bow выпустить (pf.) стрелу из лука; 2. (also ~ up; accelerate) ускорить, -ить; the train service has been ~ed up on новому расписанию поезда ходит быстрее; measures to ~ production меры по повы-

**speed n.** скорость At full speed, полным ходом, во весь опор — v.t. [usu. speed up] ускорять — v.i.
1. (move rapidly; race) мчаться, промчаться ~ Speed by, промчаться ~. ~ Speed away/off, умчаться, унести. 2. (go too fast) превышать дозволенную скорость 3. fol. by up (go faster) ускорять ход — speed limit, дозволенная скорость.

**ENGLISH-RUSSIAN RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY (KATZNER)**

Other examples of segmental BDs are Bogusławski’s ILUSTROWANY SŁOWNIK ROSYJSKO-POLSKI POLSKO-ROSYJSKI or Steiner’s BANTAM NEW COLLEGE FRENCH AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY. Both Bogusławski and Steiner are also theoretical advocates of the type.

Our example demonstrates also another weakness of the idiomatic dictionary. Namely, in this type the lowest level, lexemic equivalence, can be often neglected too much, and consequently the dictionary offers only equivalents embedded in context of various kind. In the extract from the OXFORD ENGLISH-RUSSIAN DICTIONARY above senses 1 and 3 in the v. t. section are not delimited clearly. The difficulty can be best appreciated
when the example — actually a contextualized equivalent — in the v. i. section in this dictionary is compared to sense 2 in the Katzner dictionary. The Oxford dictionary abounds in entries with poorly decontextualized equivalents. Thus, in the entry in there are 19 out of 21 senses in which lexemic equivalence is not indicated.

Thus extremely idiomatic BDs can be useful only to very advanced users, who can perform segmentation of contextualized equivalents into smaller units in both languages. Frequently such dictionaries have in fact very little predictive power, as contextualized equivalents often apply only to some types of discourse (a more detailed discussion of this point can be found below). Finally, such dictionary does not have the high explanatory power which segmental BDs seem to have (see Chapter 5, section 5.11, on this aspect) — it does not produce correct analogies for the user.

It is necessary, then, to maintain a proper balance between the segmental and the idiomatic approach in a general BD. A balanced dictionary should include both segmental equivalents and equivalents of preconstructed expressions. A very good example of a balanced BD is Poldauf's CZECH-ENGLISH DICTIONARY, which always provides lexemic equivalents but has also very clear information on fixed expressions. Two examples:

**CZECH-ENGLISH DICTIONARY**
Particularly interesting in this dictionary is the use of the *cf* device (see *užuž*), which indicates very idiomatic expressions in L2 which are not, however, literal, word-for-word renderings of the L1 expressions.

Finally, let us look at the relation of this parameter to other ones, particularly those of size, ultimate purpose, and skill-specificity/directionality. Usually the segmental-idiomatic approach is related to the size of the BD: the smaller the BD the fewer preconstructed expressions it has. The largest BDs thus include the largest amount of idiomatic expressions, quite properly, as they are used most often by the advanced user. Yet this parameter is in fact independent of the size of the dictionary. Bogusławski (1988a) is quite right when he suggests that it is possible in principle to produce a very large segmental BD, and in fact the DEUTSCH-RUSSISCHES WÖRTERBUCH can be regarded as a huge segmental BD. The size is also frequently related to the ultimate-purpose parameter. The smallest dictionaries can be considered to be first of all translating dictionaries, as the users have to proceed by substitution of forms which, in L2, have little meaning for them, and are not able to use properly the imprecise presentation of fixed expressions to be found in larger dictionaries. Larger dictionaries in turn can be easily used for learning L2 and for production of L2 texts because they do include preconstructed expressions.

Let us mention also skill-specificity and directionality. In BDs aimed strictly at speakers of one language the approach can be different in the two parts. The L1-L2 side could be designed for production, i.e. it will be idiomatic, while the L2-L1 side could be used primarily for comprehension, i.e. it would be segmental. The segmental approach would allow the lexicographer to include a large number of items in a relatively small space. It is interesting yet that none of the monodirectional and skill-specific dictionaries, or dictionary projects, known to me takes this possibility into account. In contrast, such bilingual dictionaries are usually consistently productive in both of their sides, e.g. ENGLISH-CZECH DICTIONARY and CZECH-ENGLISH DICTIONARY, or DEUTSCH-RUSSISCHES WÖRTERBUCH and its projected Russian-German part (Duda et al. 1986). There are not too many differences as well between the two sides in the Van Dale series.

A dictionary that attempts precisely such differentiation is the one written by Tadeusz Piotrowski and Zygmunt Saloni, NOWY SŁOWNIK ANGIELSKO-POLSKI POLSKO-ANGIELSKI.
2.7. Discourse-specific and general BDs

Discourse was already used as a significant criterion in our discussion of consultation situations – technical dictionaries and the relevant groups of users were distinguished solely on the basis of a discourse type. Discourse also figured prominently in the section on the segmental and the idiomatic BD, as it was claimed there that the segmental BD has a more predictive power that the idiomatic one, even though the former cannot be as useful in text production as the latter. This is so because the idiomatic BD is invariably tied to the types of discourse in which the given fixed expression is usually used. By discourse type here is meant what British analysts call the field of discourse, i.e. "the particular activity, cultural feature, social institution or topic for which a particular set of ideationally related lexical items is often evolved or adapted" (Carter 1987: 50). Thus, to be able to speak about any field of discourse in a natural way it is necessary to use the relevant fixed expressions. The reverse is also true – fixed expressions can help identify a particular field of discourse.

Discourse-specificity yet relates not only to fixed expressions but to equivalents as well. This is because there are no general equivalents but, in fact, there can be as many equivalents as there are various situations of use (in particular fields of discourse). Thus, the number of equivalents depends on the range of applicability of the given source item. It is a very rare situation when an L1 unit corresponds notionally to the equivalent L2 item, and thus has only one equivalent.

Explanation of meaning by equivalents is too precise, because any equivalent is tied to a specific field of discourse. In contrast, MDs work by means of notional, vague descriptions (cf. Z gusta 1971; Neubert 1992), which, however, make it possible to describe what is common to many different uses of the defined item. This vagueness yet makes the learner MD not particularly adequate for text production, because an MD does not show

---

31 Applicability is defined and discussed in Chapter V. We should also note that applicability is important when the chief criterion of equivalence is substitutability in context. Chapter V again has a detailed discussion of this point.

32 According to Neubert, "defining dictionaries seem to offer no more than most general information, leaving the user alone to hit upon the appropriate L2 variant" (Neubert 1992: 34).
2.7. Discourse-specific and general BDs

precisely which field of discourse a given lexical unit is to be used in (for
details see Piotrowski 1989a, 1989b). And a BD potentially serves the needs
of text production very well, because it should include items to be used in
particular situations. Thus what is often called a general equivalent in BL is
an expression which can be used in many (at least more than one) situations
of use. From the point of view of applicability, a general equivalent is
a class of situational equivalents which happen to be identical in form.

As an example let us discuss further technical discourse, with which we
started this section. What is usually noticed in technical discourse is techni­
cal terms, and it is frequently believed that adequate knowledge of terms
and knowledge of general rules applying to the given language will be
sufficient to produce natural technical writing. That is why technical dic­
tionaries, no matter whether mono- or bilingual, usually include only terms,
and very rarely can collocations, or other idiomatic expressions, be found
in them. This view, however, is inaccurate: technical writing is a field of
discourse, i.e. there are specific fixed expressions and specific rules of their
combination. The expressions and the rules are conventional and language­
specific. This aspect is usually very strongly stressed by technical transla­
tors (cf. Kuznetsov 1980; Newmark 1989; Tomaszczyk 1989; Voellnagel
1974; on technical translation see Chapter 4, section 4.5).

What is needed in fact is discourse-specific dictionaries (the same claim
is made by Tomaszczyk 1989; Hollósy 1990). Such dictionaries could be
either MDs or BDs. Yet BDs seem to be potentially better in this respect,
as they are par excellence discourse-specific, as it was argued above, and
they could perhaps anticipate the needs of their users on the basis of L1. In
fact, some of the dictionaries published in the Soviet Union can be called
discourse-specific BDs, e.g. the RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY OF
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL USAGE or the thematic RUSSIAN-
ENGLISH MEDICAL DICTIONARY PHRASE-BOOK.

Discourse-specificity can be also approached from the point of view of
the lexicographer. The BD is not a general dictionary but a collection of
equivalents and expressions from various fields of discourse, but the fields
are rarely included very consistently. For example, the OXFORD EN­
GLISH-RUSSIAN DICTIONARY has several expressions from the Lord's
Prayer, i.e. a completely closed and conventional text, but the prayer cannot
be re-assembled in its entirety on the basis of the dictionary, though it would
be relatively easy to do so. In contrast, the COLLINS ROBERT FRENCH-
ENGLISH ENGLISH-FRENCH DICTIONARY includes almost the whole of the text (in various entries).

The best solution would be production of a number of discourse-specific BDs. These could be subsequently combined into a "general" BD, which could serve to describe as many fields of discourse as the users need. Such dictionaries would be uniquely suited to serve the needs of any group of users. Actually discourse-specific dictionaries are often compiled for new editions of existing BDs, and one of the most consistent sections in the COLLINS ROBERT FRENCH-ENGLISH ENGLISH-FRENCH DICTIONARY is the computer terms, which were added to the second edition. Yet it would be perhaps unreasonable to expect regular, paper BDs to offer so much differing information. Perhaps this would be possible only in a modular electronic dictionary with varying density of information, which Zgusta envisages (Zgusta 1989).

2.8. Monofunctional and polyfunctional description in BDs

Lexicographical description has to be extremely economical, that is, great amounts of information have to be put into a severely restricted space (in the paper dictionary, of course). Standard techniques used for economy include abbreviations, codes, references to general tables, and omission of information which might be considered redundant for some type of user (cf. directionality and skill-specificity).

A very frequent technique is also polyfunctional description. In polyfunctional description one information-transmitting element is used for several functions, while in monofunctional description each specific component shows only one particular type of information. It is self-evident that polyfunctional description is inherently implicit, while monofunctional components are usually explicit. Accordingly, though polyfunctional components are more convenient and economical for presentation of linguistic facts, they are inconvenient to the user, who usually has to be taught, or to learn on his or her own, what information can be retrieved from a particular component in the dictionary, as it is not obvious.

Let us look at some examples. The entry word itself can be polyfunc-
tional. In dictionaries for native speakers of English the entry-word can fulfill a wide range of functions: it is the address to the entry, it indicates spelling, and often the division rules, it is the basic form for inflection. It can also carry an indication of pronunciation, which can be shown by diacritics above the relevant letters of the entry-word, as it was traditionally done in the CONCISE OXFORD DICTIONARY, and American dictionaries still use this method. Recently, however, pronunciation is indicated in a separate component in the entry, even if the IPA symbols are not used but some diacritical respelling system. And this component shows unambiguously only phonetic information. The CONCISE OXFORD DICTIONARY actually is a good example, as it shows the movement away from the polyfunctional notation of this component to the monofunctional one in its subsequent editions.

Which components can be polyfunctional in the BD? In both MDs and BDs examples have more than one function. In MDs, particularly those for the learners, examples are to inform the user about meaning (its shades, extensions, figurative uses, etc.), the range of collocability, syntax (as they exemplify abstract codes), word order, stylistics, etc. LDOCE has a very clear policy in this respect (see LDOCE, pp. F30–F50; see 4; cf. also OALDCE, p. 1576). It is interesting yet that polyfunctionalism of examples leads the lexicographers to invent them, and this can result in such concentration of information that examples are no longer felt to be natural (cf. Fox 1987).

In BDs examples are used as widely as in MDs. In addition to the above functions, they are also to show various equivalents. In fact examples are put to so many uses in BL that Manley, Jacobsen, and Pedersen, who were commissioned to write an article on examples in BDs, were not very sure what they should write about (Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen 1988; Jacobsen & Manley & Pedersen 1991). They argue that examples with so many functions can in fact be of little use to the users, and suggest that examples are to exemplify the use of the equivalent, while other types of information, particularly those relating to equivalents, should be given in canonical form in an explicit way. Thus the suggestion is made that examples should be either monofunctional or at least that their functions should be identified.

---

33 There has been animated discussion on examples recently, cf. for example Cowie 1989; Benson 1989; Summers 1988a, 1988b.
We have already noted above that meaning discrimination can be used in a polyfunctional way. Depending on the way it is used in a BD, meaning discrimination can help one user to find his way inside the entry, while meaning discriminations can show those speaking the other language the range of collocability of the entry-word, or of one of its senses, or the relation of the entry word to other lexical fields (when meaning discrimination is by means of synonyms). We have also shown that polyfunctionalism of meaning discrimination is frequently criticized, as it fails to fulfill adequately one of its functions, and most frequently it does not adequately guide the user through the entry (cf. Cop 1984, 1990).

Yet in BL the most obvious component that can be treated polyfunctionally is the central one – the equivalent. Any information that can be derived from the equivalent and which relates to the entry-word (in one of its senses) can in principle be omitted. In the stronger version it can be claimed that it is possible to produce a dictionary in which, if not shown otherwise, the user can transfer all the properties of the equivalent to the source expression (see Berkov 1977). This of course means that the lexicographer would have to study all the possible similarities and differences between expressions of both languages. Moreover, the description would have to be unusually consistent. Yet in view of the inherent indeterminacy of meaning this version appears to be difficult to realize.

If a weaker claim is made, then it can be said that only information of some sort can be omitted from the dictionary, information that can be recovered on the basis of the equivalent. This relates above all to various syntactic features. Herbst for example argues that countability/uncountability indicators can be omitted if they agree in both languages, e.g. Eng. *milk* and Ger. *Milch* (Herbst 1980). Most frequently it is the part-of-speech label which is considered redundant (cf. Bogusławski 1988a; Berkov 1988). Actually there are dictionaries which omit this information, e.g. *ILUSTROWANY SŁOWNIK ROSYJSKO-POLSKI POLSKO-ROSYJSKI, ENGLISH-CZECH DICTIONARY*, or *NOWY SŁOWNIK ANGIELSKO-POLSKI I POLSKO-ANGIELSKI*. This is because in one approach to equivalence, called here analysis along relevant dimensions, the part of speech is one of the most important dimensions and both source and target expressions have to have the same syntactic status, while in the other approach, translational, it is not necessary to indicate the status because the user is expected only to proceed by substitution of forms (on both approaches see Chapter 5, section 5.9).
Thus, as we have seen, even though polyfunctional description seems to be very important to lexicographers, it is usually criticized as failing to provide user-friendly description. What would be the alternative to polyfunctional description? That would be a dictionary in which the entries are very long, but in the entries all relevant categories are very clearly indicated, and in each category there is the proper element, or lack of an element, which would be just as informative.

What we have described here is very close to the ideas of the scholars working within the Meaning – Text Model. They argue that the entry in a dictionary should have a clear, rigid structure, and this structure would be a sort of lexicographical questionnaire, which would yield exhaustive and very consistent information on all lexemes (cf. Apresjan 1974/1980). A bilingual dictionary which uses a rigid structure for verb entries is the NEW ENGLISH-RUSSIAN DICTIONARY (see Piotrowski 1990a). The main shortcomings are also evident: the average user will be quickly put off by the sheer size of the entries.

Another question is: how should the different category components be distinguished? Atkins & Kegl & Levin (1986) suggest that only a lexicological theory can provide a safe framework for making implicit information explicit. Yet there is no commonly accepted theory to base on, and various dictionaries would have different components if they were based on different theories. Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen (1988) suggest that metallexicography needs a set of terms (components) that would be neutral with respect to lexicology. Instead of using terms like idiom, lexeme, entry-word, use should be made of terms which identify formal components in the entry, e.g. lemma, sub-lemma, example, equivalent. Actually the main zones in the entries constructed by the proponents of the Meaning – Text Model are formal: e.g. they are: definition, syntax, example, lexical functions, etc.

A dictionary in which the user would know without any doubt what information can be found in the particular component, e.g. that examples only exemplify, would be far easier to use. But it is obvious also that polyfunctional, implicit information can be used only by users whose competence is good and who are skilled in dictionary use. Therefore it can be used in dictionaries with a high density and complexity of information. In contrast, monofunctional description should be used for beginners, whose dictionaries contain basic facts, therefore the entries are short. Having longer and less ambiguous entries the users would be able to use a diction-
ary like that more efficiently. Experimentation, when the two extremes of this parameter would be kept in balance, should allow lexicographers to work out a practical solution.

This brings our discussion of the selected parameters to its end. Again it has to be stressed that we have covered only selected parameters, those which can provide more information on terms that will be used in the following chapters. Moreover, the discussion of them was certainly far from being exhaustive, as the main purpose of this discussion was to offer a framework unifying various problems and proposals.

The following two chapters will take up one parameter more, that of the ultimate purpose of the BD. This parameter relates to the way equivalents are viewed: they can be seen either as performing essentially a metalinguistic function, or as a source of lexical units in the re-write substitution operation of translation. In its metalinguistic function the BD can be discussed as a learning dictionary, and when it is used for the substitution operation, the BD can be discussed as a translating dictionary.
3. Bilingual dictionaries and foreign language learning

This chapter falls into two broad parts. In the first the main controversy in the debate over a dictionary for students of foreign languages will be discussed, namely, which type of lexicography is more suitable: monolingual or bilingual? This controversy will be treated in a number of shorter sections, starting with a discussion of bilingualism. Next psycholinguistic evidence will be discussed, and then we are going to take up the chief problem in lexicography, that of meaning. Finally, arguments from the methodology of foreign language teaching will be reviewed. The other part will present the BD as a natural learning dictionary, natural because using a natural metalanguage (L1).

3.1. Bilingualism and bilinguals

In Chapter 2, section 2.1, we have defined the function of the predictive dictionary – to which the BD belongs – in the following way: it is to provide such information on linguistic facts that it would enable the user to behave linguistically like a native speaker. As to BDs, they should enable the user to behave like a bilingual. But, although we have discussed the way the BD can be used to the advantage of its users, we have not defined the notion of bilingualism, which we will take up in this section. We are going to deal only with late bilingualism, in which the non-native language is usually acquired in a non-spontaneous way. What we will be interested in is the situations in which a BD is likely to be used, i.e., in foreign language learning and teaching which is carried out in a formal way, in classroom conditions under the guidance of a teacher.\[^{34}\]

[^{34}]: The terms guided vs. spontaneous foreign language acquisition are used after Klein (1986); see also Snell-Hornby 1986 on BDs in both types of acquisition of the second language.
What is the aim – and task – of foreign language acquisition? It could be said that the ultimate aim would be bilingualism, which could be understood as ideal L2 competence (cf. Klein 1986), in other words, the learner becomes a bilingual when his or her command of the foreign language is the same as the command of L1. This is one of the definitions of bilingualism, though an extreme one. At the other extreme bilingualism could be defined as minimal competence in L2 in one of the four linguistic skills. Between the two extremes researchers have found 35 definitions and typologies (see Hamers & Blanc 1989 for a review). Bilingualism is then a vague notion.

Hamers and Blanc, and most other scholars, point out that nobody can be ideally competent in any language, either L1 or L2. It is not an unusual situation when a speaker is more fluent in L2 than L1 in some fields of discourse, though in other fields L1 dominates. This is typically the case with scholars, scientists, and other professionals whose work involves use of a foreign language.

Hamers and Blanc have proposed a new typology of psychological dimensions of bilingualism. The dimensions relate to:

A – *competence* (balanced vs. dominant)
B – *cognitive organization* (one conceptual framework or two conceptual frameworks)
C – *age of acquisition* (childhood, adolescence, maturity)
D – *presence or absence of L2 community in learning environment* (endogenous vs. exogenous)
E – *relative status of the two languages* (both valued: additive, L2 valued while L1 not: subtractive)
F – *group membership and cultural identity* (bicultural; L1 monocultural; L2 accultur- tural; deculturated)

(Hamers & Blanc 1989: 9).

Factors E, F are important for the whole process. It is interesting that in Factor E an important case is left out: when L2 is not valued, which happens when a foreign language is taught against the will of the learners, as was the case with Russian in Soviet satellites; apparently this situation goes against the basic tenet of foreign language acquisition, i.e., high motivation. As to Factor C, dictionary users are typically adolescents and adults. They are thus late bilinguals, and this factor has important implications for the process. Our following discussion will focus on Factors A and B.
As to Factor A, recent research shows that in the vast majority of bilinguals one of the languages is dominant, the other (or other ones) is subordinate. The dominant language is usually L1, though it has to be stressed that dominance can be chosen by the speaker (cf. Hamers & Blanc 1989). Dominance of one language is typical even of early bilinguals who have learned their languages in a spontaneous, natural way, though in some situations now one now the other language may be dominant, for example one language is used in interactions with the father, and all men, and the other with the mother, and all women, when the parents use two different languages (see Klein 1986; Tomaszczyk 1988; Hamers & Blanc 1989 for reviews).

An interesting case is that of Steiner (Steiner, George, 1975). Steiner is an ideal trilingual (English, German, French). At the deep, abstract level the three languages have an equal status, which was found in experiments under hypnosis. Yet Steiner says that when he is immersed in the culture using one of the languages (e.g., in France when using French) that language becomes then dominant. This would suggest that one language has to be dominant, and that the dominance is related to acculturation.

In guided acquisition L1, except for rare cases, simply has to be dominant, as this type of acquisition is known to be extremely inefficient, if we consider the cost and effort involved. The significance of L1 dominance will reappear repeatedly in this chapter.

A factor of even greater importance for any discussion of BDs is that relating to the cognitive organization of both languages in the mind (Factor B). Claims on the superiority of one type of lexicography are usually based on hypotheses on the representation of both languages in the mind or on those based on the differences in the operational skills in using the two languages. The cognitive organization of the mind is studied by psycholinguistics, and indeed evidence from psycholinguistic research is often brought in to the discussions of the learning dictionary. This evidence we are going to review now.

---

35 It is a sobering finding that throughout the 20th century many researchers in various countries have found that foreign-language teaching in school conditions simply does not produce the desired effects (cf. for example Sapir in Fries & Traver 1963; Marton 1978; Ingram 1975; Klein 1986). Klein suggests that a significant factor in this inefficiency may be the unwillingness of the learners to change their social roles.
3.2. Psycholinguistic evidence

Discussions of the cognitive organization yet are characterized by vagueness: the phrase used most often is that foreign-language learners should think in the foreign language (cf. Béjoint 1988). The phrase can mean two things: either that the learner should have two conceptual networks in his mind, or at least that, whatever the conceptual framework, that the foreign language is used without basing on L1, i.e. without constant translation (or, better, switching) between both languages.

It is emphasized very strongly in foreign language teaching methodology that learners should form two conceptual frameworks. A routine description of how foreign language is learned, and how dictionaries should be used in the process, is as follows (cf. Baxter 1980; Carter & McCarthy 1988; Quirk 1987): formation of the L2 system starts by basing on L1. At this stage it is possible, even unavoidable, to use a BD. Later yet a separate system of L2 is gradually built. The farther the learner progresses the less useful the BD is. This is the stage at which only MDs should be used. It is suggested that BDs can become an obstacle in acquisition of fluency in L2. The L2 system thus is conceptually different than L1. The claim is then that learners should proceed so that another conceptual system is formed in their mind.

Is L2 yet a different conceptual framework? Or perhaps with L1 it forms only one conceptual system? Is the cognitive organization, in other words, coordinate or compound? What are the facts on which this claim is based?

The facts, unfortunately, are very poorly known, moreover the various theories based on psycholinguistic experiments are contradictory. It is simply not known how the conceptual networks are organized in the mind. Moreover, in certain areas of vocabulary the networks may be either coordinate (abstract words) or compound (concrete words, cf. Hamers & Blanc 1989: 95). For various scholars evidence seems to be more in favour of a common-storage memory device (Channell 1988; Hamers & Blanc 1989).

36 The two terms were introduced by Weinreich, the conception developed by Ervin and Osgood, see Klein 1986; Hamers & Blanc 1989 for a history and criticism.
37 See Hamers & Blanc 1989 for a review; Carter 1987 and Channell 1988 have relevant discussions; Bejoint 1988 is particularly relevant, as his discussion is from the point of view of lexicography.
It is also possible that there are two separate language-specific storage sites, which then are linked to a common-storage memory. The type of organization seems to be also related to the age of acquisition: in early bilinguals the cognitive organization is typically compound, and in late bilinguals it is typically coordinate (Hamers & Blanc 1989).

Yet no theory fits the facts well. Thus it might be supposed that the cognitive organization can be quite idiosyncratic. One theory that seems to explain more facts than other ones is, according to Hamers and Blanc, the one put forward by Paivio and Begg (Paivio & Begg 1981; Hamers & Blanc 1989: 102–103): the dual coding model. The model is particularly interesting in the context of BL because it suggests that memorization and recall of lexical items is better in translation, when both L1 and L2 provide input, rather than in copying (in repetition), when only one language provides input. Yet, as usual in psycholinguistics, there are also arguments against the model, which we do not have to go into here. For our purposes it is sufficient to state that psycholinguistics cannot give support to any ideas on which type of dictionary can be recommended for learning purposes. After Béjoint we may repeat that “when the exclusive use of the monolingual L2 dictionary is recommended because it is thought to foster ‘thinking in L2’, it seems that this recommendation is based on wishful thinking more than on really scientific bases” (Béjoint 1988: 143).

We have to look also at the other claim, namely that foreign language learning and use should not be based on L1. It seems that with dominant and subordinate languages some sort of translation always occurs, even if it is not conscious (cf. Lyons 1981: 322). This unconscious translation (switching) can concern both abstract things and sentence structure: very proficient German users of English often seem to rely on German in their programming of English sentences (Klein 1986: 13). In comprehension even quite experienced users of a second language appear to rely on strategies based on those in L1 (Klein, 13; Ellis 1986).

With concepts the situation is similar. In association experiments late bilinguals give L2 responses to L2 stimuli which are either translations of L1 words or of L1 associations (Hamers & Blanc 1989: 95). The same seems to be true of denotation, which can be examined perhaps in the most convincing way. In an interesting experiment with colour terms the subjects were to name the colours shown on paper slips. There were two groups of monolinguals, English and Russian speakers, and a bilingual group (trans-
lators) whose L1 was Russian and L2 was English. Characteristically, the responses of bilinguals were extremely idiosyncratic, i.e. they were very diffuse, and they were generally more like responses by native Russians, when the responses concerned English, than those from speakers of English (Vasilević 1988). Thus it seems that not only the conceptual frameworks of foreign users are quite idiosyncratic but they are generally more like L1 than L2. This is an important point for our further discussion.

### 3.3. Meaning in MDs and in BDs

Let us look yet at some specific arguments against the BD as a pedagogical dictionary. These arguments relate above all to description of meaning, which, as we have seen, has central position in lexicography. There are two groups of such arguments, both based on a certain approach to meaning. In one approach meaning can be seen as a certain entity present in the mind. The other approach is operational: meaning is the ability to handle efficiently linguistic items. The former approach is the usual one, adopted by most linguists (cf. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 1987), while the latter is favoured by those working in the tradition of Wittgenstein, Austin, Firth (see Lyons 1982).

In the meaning-is-entity approach the entity can be given various names in various theories: concept, notion, prototype, fact of culture. What is common to all of them is that acquisition of meaning is seen as a process in which the learner is to acquire the same entities which the native speaker has. From this point of view acquisition of meaning can be seen as an all-or-none process – very little can be known about meaning of a lexical item before dictionary consultation, and much adequate knowledge can be acquired after the consultation.

Still the best discussion of the difference between the MD and the BD, based on this approach, can be found in Ščerba’s writings (Ščerba 1940/1974), and even the latest arguments from the advocates of this approach do not differ very much from Ščerba’s (see e.g. Summers 1988b). For Ščerba the BD can never be adequate in its description of meanings-entities because the entities are language-specific, and L2 equivalents will be of course related to different entities than L1 items. Thus Ščerba shows that
what we would call the prototypical meaning of Rus. *igla* is 'sewing needle', while that of Ger. *Nadel* is 'any thin sharp pointed thing' (Ščerba 1940/1970: 300). Ščerba provides many other examples of such differences. As it is well known, these differences show the anisomorphism of languages: concepts are language-specific, and the world, or the universe of discourse, is segmented in different ways in various languages (cf. Zgusta 1971; Lyons 1977).

L2 equivalents show only a part of the meaning of L2 items. There are no true 'equations' between L1 and L2 items, even in such seemingly straightforward cases as concrete nouns. Eng. *dog* is only in a part of its meaning equivalent to Fr. *chien*, Ger. *Hund*, Pol. *pies*. Thus it is not possible to translate the sentence *I patted the dog and she wagged her tail* (example taken from COLLINS COBUILD ENGLISH LANGUAGE DICTIONARY, entry *she*) using any of the above equivalents if the reference to sex is to be retained. English *dog* and its equivalents listed here are only partly equivalent in denotation: *dog* is wider in denotation than the listed equivalents. Also obviously other aspects of meaning – associations, metaphoric extensions – can vary enormously from language to language.

It is usually argued that as BDs are inadequate in describing concepts, MDs should be used instead because they can cope better with the task of describing meaning. The question, however, is: do MDs, and pedagogical MDs in particular, describe the entities well? Do they indeed describe concepts? MDs usually describe meaning by means of definition – what is then the relation between meaning and definitions?

Lexicographers do seem to think that their MDs describe meanings-entities (see e.g. Summers 1988b). But what actually standard MDs do, including pedagogical MDs, is to include in fact a fairly random selection of semantic features relating perhaps to meanings-entities. Pedagogical dictionaries are not very successful even in the relatively well-researched area of natural-kind terms (see Piotrowski 1988a).

What is important for our further discussion is that dictionary definitions

---

38 There is enormous literature now on shortcomings of MDs, and there is no need to summarize it here; see e.g. Apresjan 1972, 1974/1980; Boguslawski 1988b; Lakoff, George, 1973; Lakoff, Robin, 1973; McCawley 1973; Wierzbicka 1985. The same sort of criticism has been levelled at pedagogical dictionaries of English (see e.g. the contributions in Sinclair 1987a; Moon 1987; Piotrowski 1989b; Rundell 1988).
provide very incomplete descriptions of meaning. One reason for that is that there is no space for exhaustiveness: Wierzbicka’s ‘complete’ semantic descriptions of single words (Wierzbicka 1985) are seldom shorter than one page. It is hardly possible for dictionaries to contain entries of such length. What is more, however, lexicographers in their work usually rely on the assumption that dictionary users will be able to reconstruct the meaning of a lexical item on the basis of the knowledge they share with the lexicographer. This assumption is justified in case of native speakers: one has to make some assumptions about shared knowledge to describe meaning at all. Yet paradoxically there seems to exist an implicit assumption that the categorization of the universe of discourse of the foreign learner will be roughly the same as that of the native speaker (see Piotrowski 1989b for details).

Finally let us look at the relation between definitions and meaning. Definitions are not meaning, they are about meaning. Thus they belong to the metalanguage. An MD thus contains two levels (at least) of language: object language, i.e. the units to be described, and subject language, i.e. metalanguage. Accordingly, definitions are on a different level of language than items being defined. The logical paradoxes, for example the liar’s, which have given rise to the concept of metalanguage, do indeed show that we have to do with two different levels of language, and that the two levels are in complementary distribution (on logical paradoxes see e.g. Bar-Hillel 1970). There are important consequences of the fact that in a dictionary there are two levels of abstraction, because definitions are precisely abstractions, idealizations, and they seldom contain the same amount of meaning which the items of the object language have.

Moreover, the classical substitutable definition can be substitutable only in a limited number of contexts because of the reasons given above. The relation of the subject language to the object language can thus be compared roughly to that between two different natural languages. All of the reasons discussed so far explain why dictionaries differ so widely in the content of

---

39 Wierzbicka’s approach has been criticized by practical lexicographers (see e.g. Hanks 1992/1993; Landau 1992/1993; cf. her reply in Wierzbicka 1992/1993).

40 Metalanguages have large literature, a general account can be found in e.g. Jakobson 1958/1989.

the definitions they include\textsuperscript{42}. Thus, it can be said in conclusion that what an MD can offer its users is some information about the meaning of an item. That information covers a part (often substantial) of the meaning of an item. Yet this is exactly what a BD has as well: an equivalent shows only a part of the meaning being explained. In fact, we have returned to our discussions from Chapter 1, section 2.1: no dictionary can offer wholly reliable information about meaning. What dictionaries can do is to confirm a hypothesis about meaning.

It has to be noted that confirmation of hypotheses can come from other sources as well: a friend, teacher, one’s own intelligence, other texts. It is not necessary to have a dictionary when one wants to learn a foreign language. This view has been fostered recently by those who believe that meaning is always negotiated, i.e. that it is creatively constructed by the speaker on the basis of clues from context of various kind\textsuperscript{43} (see Carter & McCarthy 1988, in particular contributions by Carter and McCarthy; also Carter 1987).

We have also to consider the argument that a user can put into L2 units features which do not belong there, which are transferred from the L1 units used as explanation, or, in other words, that BDs may distort the meaning of L2 items. This argument does not have to be as serious as it appears – in the view of dictionary use proposed here the function of context is very important, as the users, it is suggested, need the dictionary primarily to help them with items embedded in context. And context is the primary restrictive factor: this means that anisomorphism does not have to be taken as seriously as it usually is in theoretical writings (cf. Béjoint & Moulin 1987).

To end the discussion of dictionary use as acquisition of meaning-entities, let us again quote Béjoint’s words:

\begin{quote}
...either dictionaries are instruments for the acquisition of meaning, in which case the process remains so mysterious that one’s recommendations [on which type of dictionary is better – T. P.] cannot really be based on scientific evidence; or dictionaries are used at a very superficial level, to allow the users to proceed to whatever they are doing, in which case there is no reasonable criterion for recommendation, apart from the satisfaction of each individual user.

(Bejoint 1988: 146).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{42} That is, if dictionaries contain genuinely new definitions, and do not copy each other; on differences in definitions in pedagogical English MDS see Piotrowski 1989b.

\textsuperscript{43} In contrast to human sources the dictionary has the obvious advantage: it is infinitely patient and can be easily carried around.
Obviously our discussion so far has tended to lean towards the other alter­
native, though we are going to identify factors which make one type of dictionary more satisfactory for users than the other in Chapter 5, section 5.11.

At present, however, we are going to discuss the arguments against the
BD based on the other approach to meaning: the meaning-is-use approach. We have to note first of all that the view that acquisition of meaning means
acquisition of some entities need not be necessarily true. We have already
noticed that the concepts of fluent L2 users can differ very much from those
of native speakers, and yet both L1 and L2 users can communicate success­
fully. Therefore it is possible to use, to speak, a language without sharing
the same meanings-entities. In fact there is plenty of evidence that even
within the same language individual speakers can possess quite different
concepts (this discussion is based on Hill 1988).

The same lexical units can be used by, for example, Euro-American and
native American speakers of English, while different concepts will be asso­
ciated with the units. It is also quite possible that language in some of its
uses is not based on concepts based on reference and yet communication
and, moreover, learning of complex knowledge can be possible. Thus, in
technical jargon frequently there is no referential basis. In loose talk it is
possible for people to learn complex knowledge without referential input.

There have been in fact many authors who point out that language use
does not have to be dependent on possession of identical mental entities,
from Humboldt (cf. Andrzejewski 1989: 151–152), through Firth (Firth
1957; for a discussion see Butler 1985), Haas (1962/1968), to Quine (e.g.
Quine 1975; for a discussion see Kirk 1986). In linguistics the meaning-is­
use approach has been perhaps best developed in British linguistics, by the
followers of Firth (see Butler 1985 for an overview of Halliday’s, Sinclair’s,
and other scholars’, views).

Quine suggests that the very notion of meaning should be abandoned. If
that would be the case, then the acquisition of meaning will mean three
different things:
- learning how to understand linguistic expressions;
- ability to judge equivalence between expressions;
- and ability to provide paraphrases of linguistic expressions\(^{44}\).

\(^{44}\) It is interesting to note in this context that this view is essentially identical to
those underlying the Meaning-Text Model of language (see Apresjan 1974/1980).
Understanding of an expression is the same as being able to use it correctly in all relevant contexts and being able to respond adequately to its use in such contexts (Quine 1975). This approach puts great emphasis on operational skills then. Acquisition of meaning is not acquisition of certain entities but acquisition of certain skills in the use of linguistic expressions. Other advocates of this approach hold similar views.

Important contributions to pedagogical lexicography based on the operational concept of meaning came from Professor John Sinclair and his colleagues at COBUILD. The contributions are both to practical lexicography — the series of COBUILD dictionaries, and to metalexicography (i.e. the contributions in Sinclair 1987a). Our discussion will be based on these contributions. The meaning-is-use principle in COBUILD dictionaries relates above all to the description of collocability, as, according to Firth, knowing the meaning of a word is to know the items which collocate with it, i.e. those which co-occur with it in a significant way.

Sinclair also offers some direct remarks on the advantage of the COL-LINS-COBUILD ENGLISH LANGUAGE DICTIONARY over BDs: "bilingual dictionaries can be made ridiculous if they are used to generate translations" (Sinclair 1987c: 106). That is, it is difficult to produce idiomatic, natural text using BDs, because they do not include explicit information on the lexical collocability of included items.

Yet this is also a problem for pedagogical MDs, which set out to provide that information. This is because descriptions of English collocations in the COBUILD dictionaries are based on criteria of transparency and extendibility (this discussion is based on Piotrowski 1989a, which has the details). Ultimately these criteria are related to meaning45.

Transparent combinations can be formed by adding an item to an item on the basis of their dictionary descriptions. The result should be an idiomatic, natural collocation. Yet such combinations are not included explicitly in pedagogical dictionaries, they can be found usually only in examples, or they do not figure in dictionaries at all.

By extendibility of descriptions of collocations is meant the method in which various words in the collocability pattern are to be treated by the user as indicators of whole groups of words related paradigmatically in meaning.

45 The term meaning will be used as a convenient label for a basically operational skill underlying the ability to produce paraphrases, and to perceive the paraphrases as equivalent, cf. Quine 1975.
For example, the user, to be able to use appropriately the description: “Food... that is stale is old and no longer fresh” (entry stale in COLLINS COBUILD ENGLISH LANGUAGE DICTIONARY), has to know what can be inserted instead of the word food if the pattern with stale is to be used in contexts other than that given (other examples can be found in Piotrowski 1994).

The chief problem with such descriptions is that they rely on operational skills which can be expected from the native speaker but which the foreign learner does not have, which he or she is to acquire. This is because for learners any combination of lexical items can appear idiomatic, or non-idiomatic, simply because they do not have the native speaker’s competence. In the example above, for example, the user has to have the same categorization of the world as the lexicographer to be sure of what is regarded as food in the English-speaking world. It is very well known that eating habits differ enormously in various cultures. In this case a good BD can be more useful than the MD, because it takes the foreign learner’s categorization into account (see Piotrowski 1989b for examples). As we see then, neither the meaning-is-entity nor the meaning-is-use approach, as used in pedagogical ML, can offer adequate arguments against the BD. Let us also look at other arguments against the BD.

3.4. Other arguments against the BD

Another argument, which can be used in either approach, is that by using the MD the learner is given more exposure to L2 than when a BD is used (e.g. Underhill 1985). Yet this argument can be turned against the MD: the COBUILD authors, among others, have shown that English in pedagogical MDs is rather unnatural. This applies to definitions and to examples alike (e.g. Fox 1987; Hanks 1987; Piotrowski 1989b; Rundell 1988). This sort of unnaturalness is justified to some extent: definitions, i.e. metalanguage, usually become less rich, less complex, than the object language, moreover, their unnaturalness is a signal that they are on a different level than the object language. The tendency to use substitutable definitions also results in their unacceptableness (e.g. definitions of intransitive verbs use otherwise regularly transitive verbs intransitively). As examples are usually to perform
more than one function, i.e. they are polyfunctional, they are usually made more informative than normal utterances are. They are, so to say, semantically saturated. Further, the pressure of tradition is so great that even obsolete forms are occasionally used (see Rundell 1988).

The COLLINS COBUILD ENGLISH LANGUAGE DICTIONARY is one of the first pedagogical dictionaries to use acceptable, idiomatic definitions and only real examples. Yet numerous authors have shown them not to be quite natural (Benson 1989; Hausmann & Gorbahn 1989; Summers 1988a): they often seem vague and ambiguous because there is no context which made them semantically complete in the first place. The explanations of meaning also do not seem quite natural (see Piotrowski 1989a).

Finally, let us look at the most important argument against the BD. The argument is important because it is in fact the only one that is based on firm facts. Simply MDs are usually superior to BDs in accuracy of description and in the wealth of material they offer (see Ellegård 1978; Hausmann 1977). Too often there are numerous mistakes, omissions and inaccuracies in BDs. Most often this is because of the fact that more money is usually available for compilation, or revision, of a pedagogical MD than for a BD, as an MD can bring higher profits by being addressed to all learners of the given language, irrespective of their L1. These learners buy the MD, thus the initial investment is justified. Few BDs, for example, can be based on large and expensive databases, on which monolingual dictionaries, such as the COBUILD dictionary, or LDOCE, rely. COBUILD, for instance, was used only for revision of some of the entries in the COLLINS-ROBERT FRENCH-ENGLISH ENGLISH-FRENCH DICTIONARY, not for the overhauling of the whole of the dictionary (Atkins forthcoming). Of course, there are BDs which have been produced on the basis of databases, as for example the van Dale series (e.g. VAN DALE GROOT VOORDENBOEK NEDERLANDS-ENGELS). This is still the exception rather than the rule.

3.5. BDs in foreign language methodology

The opposition to BDs in foreign language teaching and learning can be understood better when we look at it on a wider background, that is, when we look at the place of dictionaries in foreign language methodology.
In methodology we have, broadly speaking, two extreme positions (Klein 1986). First, L2 can be taught in a metalinguistic way, i.e. the learner is taught knowledge about L2 rather than the language itself. It is in fact the learner’s task to learn how to use that metalinguistic knowledge so that communication can be achieved. This was traditionally the approach in the grammar-translation methodology. Second, language can be taught by imitation of the real thing, i.e. only by means of communication on the basis of imitation of real-life situations. No metalinguistic knowledge is thought to be necessary, nor is it taught. This approach is very similar to the present communicative approach. L2 can be also taught in imitation of L1 acquisition (or, rather, of what is taken to be L1 acquisition). Thus, this is also an imitation of the real thing. The stress is on the internalization of L2. In this approach, called direct, the users were not taught how to use L2 in communication, in which it was similar to the first approach.

Two problems will interest us – first, the function of L1 in foreign language acquisition and, second, the place of translation. In the metalinguistic approach it was not important what the language was in which the knowledge about L2 was taught. Moreover, because of the reasons discussed at a later point, there was great emphasis on translation, which was seen as “the only sure method of transmitting meaning” (Kelly 1969: 23). Consequently BDs were extensively used in this approach: the BD became a standard teaching tool at the beginning of the 18th century, and was at the peak of its popularity in the 19th century (Kelly 1969). It is interesting, and perhaps not surprising, that the 19th century was also the period when the greatest BDs of English and German were published (Hausmann & Cop 1985; the word greatest refers both to quality and to size). This seems to be a manifestation of some deeper cultural trends.

In contrast to the grammar-translation method, in the direct approach, which followed chronologically, “the avant-garde of language teachers refused to consider translation as a valid procedure in teaching meaning” (Kelly 1969: 24). L1 was banned altogether from the classroom, as it could, it was thought, produce bad influence by interference. L2 acquisition was to be completely similar to L1 acquisition, in which all input is, usually, in one language. Therefore the supreme form of dictionary was the MD. In fact the first pedagogical MD, by Hornby, was published in the 1940’s, when the direct method was at its heyday. Yet many critics thought that rejection
of translation was the greatest failure of this approach (Kelly 1969; Palmer was one of the critics, cf. Ronowicz 1982).

The most important factors underlying the approaches seem to be hypotheses on the nature of language rather than any facts. The hypotheses, in turn, seem to result from certain cultural trends, while the facts are simply unknown. We have already noticed this in our discussion of representation of meaning above. Moreover, as any objective account of foreign language acquisition makes it clear, there is no reliable theory of L2 acquisition (Ellis 1986; Klein 1986). We can make an attempt, however, to explain the fashions in methodology by discussing the underlying cultural beliefs.

The nineteenth century saw correspondences – analogies – as the most important aspect of any process (see e.g. Łempicki 1933/1966; Barzun 1984). The processes were based on evolution. Language was also seen as a system of analogies, based on diachrony (cf. Heinz 1978). Not surprisingly the great English and German BDs mentioned above were often based on etymology in their description (Hausmann & Cop 1985). In contrast, the twentieth century views languages as primarily self-contained, unique systems, which in some approaches cannot even communicate properly (the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis). Meaning is, as we have seen, considered to be language-specific.

Consequently, in the 19th c. the BD was a natural description of a foreign language, in the 20th c. a BD appears to be a contradiction: if meaning is language-specific, it can be described adequately only in terms of the same language, within the same linguistic system. It seems thus that the arguments against the BDs are based on the most general assumptions underlying linguistics, and these can be derived from some deep cultural beliefs.

The same sort of analysis can be applied to the third approach distinguished above, the communicative one. The approach seems to reflect the current view that languages are inherently pragmatic (powerful arguments for the view are presented by Bar-Hillel 1970). We have already mentioned this approach: its supporters believe that meaning is negotiated by the participants of discourse. In the more extreme form meaning is seen as not stable at all, in less extreme versions meaning is to a certain degree stable (see the discussion in Carter 1987; Cowie 1988 and Summers 1988b defend lexicographers).
3. Bilingual dictionaries and foreign language learning

3.6. The BD as a natural learning dictionary

Recently it has been suggested that foreign language acquisition proceeds in a regular, natural order (cf. Klein 1986; Ellis 1986). That means that there is a fixed order of learning of various elements of L2 and that this order cannot be changed easily. In fact, Klein goes as far as to claim that “we may assume that the human language learning resists the various methods of instruction to varying degrees” (Klein 1986: 19). The way L2 can be learned thus does not seem to be freely manipulated. Indeed lexicography can provide some support for this view, as any available research on dictionary use does show that users prefer BDs (see section 2.2 for references). It should be stressed that this preference has been noticed for all users, and particularly those from the Western countries, who have a wide range of dictionaries in their disposal, and who choose BDs against the advice from methodologists and metalexicographers.

We have, however, mentioned that user surveys have to be approached with caution, as they do not seem to be wholly objective. We may yet support the view that BDs are indeed preferred by a fact that is totally unbiased by the methods of research, or by the views of the researcher.

In Poland on the second-hand book market, on which demand shaped the prices, the price of the largest English-Polish dictionary was almost twice as high as that of the OXFORD ADVANCED LEARNER’S DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH (reprinted in Poland). In June 1989 the price in Wroclaw was zl 40,000 and 25,000, respectively. As OALDCE is superior in any respect to the GREAT ENGLISH-POLISH DICTIONARY, this fact simply shows the true value the two dictionaries have for their buyers and sellers. The above finding has not been caused by abnormal communist economy: in 1993 a large number of copies of LDOCE II, also reprinted in Poland, were sold at a fraction of the original price, and a certain quantity was destroyed (Ewa Bluszcz, PWN, private communication).

This fact is also important because when we look into the results of the research into dictionary use, the results seem to be mutually contradictory. Thus, according to one author, a prolonged use of BDs may lead to retardation of L2 proficiency (Baxter 1980). We should note, however, that this is a hypothesis. A seemingly astonishing fact has been reported from Israel:
dictionary consultation has no effect on reading comprehension (Bensoussan & Sim & Weiss 1984). This conclusion seems to contradict any common sense approach to dictionary consultation, yet it can be fairly easily explained by the results of a large-scale study of factors influencing the formation of linguistic and communicative competence in Polish high-school students of English (Komorowska 1978).

It was found that ownership only of a BD is related in a statistically significant way to a better linguistic competence, and the correlation was quite strong ($\chi^2 = 14.75$). The BD was therefore singled out as one of the significant factors in the acquisition of linguistic competence. In contrast, an important factor in the acquisition of communicative competence was ownership of audio equipment (record player or/and a recording device).

Unfortunately the influence of the MD on linguistic or communicative competence was not studied, simply because the availability of this type was very low then in Poland. Komorowska’s study explains very well the results of the Israeli experiment: in reading communicative competence is at work rather than linguistic one, so it is no wonder that dictionaries had no effect on reading comprehension.

Thus, on the basis of our discussion in this chapter it would appear that the effects of dictionary use are long-term rather than instantaneous. This is because, it was argued, acquisition of meaning is not an all-or-none process but is instead gradual.

Now we may develop further our views on the use of a dictionary in the acquisition of meaning (the discussion concerns any type of dictionary). Meaning is used here in a theoretically uncommitted sense, to cover both approaches: the meaning-is-use and the meaning-is-entity approach.

In the acquisition of meaning there are two possible cases, which, however, amount to the same thing. First, the user has a very vague notion about the meaning of a linguistic form he meets in a context, but it is important that the user should have some notion of what the meaning can be, otherwise the dictionary is of little help. The notion is formed on the basis of the context. Let us call the notion a hypothesis about meaning. The dictionary confirms, or disproves, the hypothesis. This process forms the basis for acquisition of meaning. This first clue about a form’s meaning may develop

---

46 Linguistic competence is the internalized knowledge of the language system, while communicative competence is the ability to communicate successfully in real life situations (the distinction was introduced by Hymes 1971).
into better knowledge if it is reinforced (Carter 1987 discusses various techniques).

The other case is when the dictionary is used for reinforcement of the knowledge of a word's meaning. Again the dictionary is chiefly used to confirm, or not, the user's hypothesis about the meaning of the word. Above all at a more advanced level the dictionary may be used to learn whether the given meaning is typical in the context in which the user has found it. This account is similar to Sinclair's views in the preface to the COLLINS-COBUILD ENGLISH LANGUAGE DICTIONARY:

> the information given in this book will often confirm what you already thought was likely. That is a most important function - just as important as informing you of something you had no idea about. How often do you turn to a dictionary to learn something utterly new?... for a number of reasons, you may seek reassurance that a word means what you think it means, or that a construction is made in one way rather than another. (COLLINS-COBUILD ENGLISH LANG DICTIONARY, p. XVIII)

Thus, it may be argued that a dictionary is used chiefly to confirm the hypotheses made by the users. The accumulated effect of such confirmations is a better linguistic competence.

Yet though both MDs and BDs perform essentially the same function, users clearly prefer BDs. Evidently BDs satisfy some needs which monolinguals do not serve very well. From the users' point of view then the BD is the more natural type, and, as the surveys show, the users show a resistance to MDs. The same opinion can be found in various authors. Atkins (1985) for example also thinks that users find BDs more attractive, though she thinks they should not and that MDs are beneficial in the long run, and Thompson (1978) has no doubts that the BD is a natural learning dictionary. The reason why the BD is so attractive is simple - it uses a natural meta-language - L1.

In what follows the importance of L1 will be discussed in general terms. The specific mechanisms which are used in BDs for explanation, i.e. analogy and codability, will be treated in Chapter 5, sections 5.9 and 5.11. The present section will attempt to provide some sort of explanation to the facts discussed above. For better clarity let us summarize briefly what has been established so far.

Both MDs and BDs can be used primarily to verify certain hypotheses

---

47 Hanks 1988 discusses dictionaries as records of what is typical in language.
relating to various aspects of lexical items. What they differ in is the methods: MDs use explanation by means of L2 and BDs use explanation by means of L1. The users favour BDs, thus L1 seems to be superior – from their point of view – to L2. As to the greater exposure to L2 which MDs offer, this aspect can be dismissed, as it can be potentially harmful to the users. Another difference in methods, mentioned in section 3.6, is that in MDs the user is in fact presented with semantic options, while BDs offer lists of concrete lexical items to be used in certain situations.

The most important question is – why is explanation by means of L1 preferred to that in L2? Obviously this can be explained by the fact that explanation by means of L2 relies on the most general principle of any acquisition of knowledge: one relies on the knowledge already possessed in order to learn something new. Thus the new knowledge is incorporated into the existing cognitive structures48. Actually also pedagogical MDs are based on this principle, i.e. they use very frequent words which the user might know from his or her initial learning. Yet L1 is still favoured, therefore it has other important qualities for the user (on difficulties of using the most frequent words in pedagogical MDs see Piotrowski 1989b).

Foreign users seem to have quite a different approach to L2 than to L1. The value of L1 appears to be greater. Sapir perhaps described the situation in the best way when he said that a foreign learner’s command of L2 is never psychologically equivalent to that of the native speaker: “All that is managed, in the majority of cases, is a fairly adequate control of the external features of the foreign language” (in Fries & Traver 1963: 88). Adopting a term from computer sciences, we may say thus that foreign users are more or less efficient symbol manipulators. We have an excellent example for this – Joseph Conrad49. Conrad’s command of English surpassed that of most of his contemporaries. Yet he himself complained in a private letter at the heyday of his creative period (1907) that English was still a foreign language for him: “angielski jest dla mnie ciągle obcym językiem, którego używanie wymaga straszliwego wysiłku” (Najder 1972: 7).

---

48 This principle is discussed, in various theoretical approaches, by Ellis 1986; Hamers & Blanc 1989; Marton 1978; Nalimov 1974/1976, who presents perhaps the most detailed account of the process, basing his explanation on the Bayesian principle.

49 Nabokov’s remarks on Conrad’s English, quoted on p. 46, also suggest that Conrad was a good symbol manipulator.
What causes this difference between L1 and L2? First, L1 has a higher affective value. Second, it is an extremely rapid mnemonic for conceptualizations. Let us discuss the affective value first.

For linguists all languages are equal in status but it is not so for the speakers of the languages: L1 is ‘more equal’ for them than other languages they might know. This is clearly manifested by the fact that the relation of L1 to reality is subjectively felt to be obligatory, iconic. In unindustrialized societies the word is closer related to the referent than this relation is perceived in industrialized societies. Denotation thus does not seem to be arbitrary (see e.g. Bystron 1927/1980; Rozwadowski 1950). In general L1 does not appear to be arbitrary to its users50.

The non-arbitrary, natural connection between word and object in L1 is usually formed in childhood, during primary socialization, when the child internalizes the world, or, more precisely, the view of the world provided by his or her culture. Language is one of the most important factors in this process (the whole account is based on Berger & Luckmann 1967). Berger and Luckmann stress the fact that the reality expressed by one’s mother tongue is taken for granted, and that, even when the new language attains a reality of its own, it very rarely takes “the inevitable, self-evident reality of the first language learned in childhood. Hence derives, of course, the affective quality of the mother tongue” (Berger & Luckmann 1967: 163). Thus L1 is ‘better’ related to reality than L2.

Recently also in some theoretical approaches to L2 learning and acquisition the crucial role of L1 has been stressed. At present the assumption that L1 and L2 are learnt in basically the same way is fairly widely accepted (cf. Ellis 1986; Klein 1986), and it is said that in both cases learning depends on the innate language faculty. Support to this claim is given by the presence of the same developmental stages in L2 learners with differing L1’s, as interpreted from the results of experiments51.

---

50 Rozwadowski has a characteristic story: a young German lady started to learn French by the Direct method and, shown a piece of cheese, which the teacher called fromage, she exclaimed – “Warum fromage? Käse ist doch viel natürlicher?” (Rozwadowski 1950: 100). Many interesting examples can be found in Hanna Krall’s writings. She repeatedly shows that horrible experiences, or even familiar facts, cease to be horrible and familiar when expressed in L2 (Krall 1977), which serves as a distancing factor.

51 On the other hand, it is also claimed that the relevant research was one-sided,
On the basis of the available evidence it is also possible to form another hypothesis, namely, that L2 learning is quite distinct from L1 acquisition (Schachter 1988; Bley-Vroman 1989). It can be argued that L2 is learnt on the basis of some cognitive systems which are not specifically language learning systems, but which are only used for that purpose (these systems are for example what is usually referred to by ‘intelligence’). The L2 learner probably possesses several sources of information for the development of L2: L1, input data, non-linguistic conceptual structures. L2 learning and knowledge can be considered to be qualitatively different from learning and knowledge of L1. Further, L1 is the only fully developed linguistic knowledge, and as such it has to be regarded as the primary system. Thus it perhaps constitutes the linguistic basis for learning L2, and any other language. Also in the double-coding model of bilingualism the way to concepts via L1 is quicker and more certain than the route via L2 (see section 3.2).

This hypothesis seems to explain the various problems in L2 acquisition, touched upon in this chapter, far more adequately than the hypothesis that L2 is learned in the same way as L1. The problems are, for example, the subjective priority of L1 over L2, the better fit L1 seems to have with the reality than L2 has, the learner’s reliance on L1 to plan L2 utterances, or to form L2 concepts, etc. The hypothesis can also explain why BDs are so popular with their users.

Let us look further at the relation between language and reality. In fact we will deal with the traditional problem: does cognition depend on language? In one answer to this question it is believed that human cognition as such does not depend on language but on non-linguistic sensory and motor mechanisms. Yet conceptualizations depend on language, and specifically on L1. In this approach cognition on the whole is characterized by an integration of the innate conceptual thinking, independent of language, with conceptualizations imposed by culture and transmitted through language (Allport 1983; Lorenz 1973/1977; the latter discussed by Buczyńska-Garewicz 1982). As a result, an L1 item is actually “a mnemonic for conceptualizations which are not conventionally linguistic or psychological, and which are actualized almost unconsciously as far as the individual is concerned” (Ardener 1983: 149). In general thus L1 seems to be the fastest and most

focused only on some areas of L2 acquisition, and that some vital problems have not been solved (e.g. fossilization, L2 influence, etc., see Schachter 1988).
reliable key to the cognitive structures in our mind that we have. In this, it seems, lies its importance for learners and users of foreign languages.

We have also noted above that for its users L1 seems to be related to the external world in a non-arbitrary way. Thus the relation appears to be essentially necessary and motivated. The non-arbitrariness of L1 for its users was discussed extensively in the 1940's and 1950's (see Jakobson 1959/1972 for a summary of the various discussions). Also at present there has been a revival of interest in iconicity of language (see e.g. Haiman 1980 and the contributions to Haiman 1985). L1 can be said to be a tight system for its users, it hangs together very well. In contrast, for the foreign learner L2 appears to be extremely arbitrary. This means that the native speaker can make the system work efficiently, because everything seems to be predeter­mined. The speakers can apply relevant concepts to a large number of objects and phenomena, even those never met before, they can see a combi­nation of units as made up of more primitive elements (transparency), and they can produce new combinations of lexical items, i.e. they can explore the extendibility of patterns. Moreover, the results of these activities will usually be very similar to the majority of native speakers. L2 users, in contrast, can approach such skills only after long practice but it might be supposed that never will their ability to handle L2 be the same as that of the native speakers of that language.

So far we have been primarily discussing the L2-L1 BD, because it is most similar to the MD with which the BD has been compared. Yet BDs are of course also produced in the other direction: L1-L2. At this point the advantage of the BD is quite clear (see section 2.4 for a general account of reversibility). When can an MD be used to its full advantage? Only when the relevant item is already known to the user. Then the MD can be con­sulted and all relevant information can be reached. If, however, the user has no idea what the L2 item should be but only has a vague notion of what meaning is to be encoded in L2, then the MD is practically useless. In other words what is needed is some points of access to the L2 system.

Some roundabout way could be used to get to the relevant item, as for instance by looking up known words in order to go on to unknown ones but this would be both time-consuming and rather unreliable (see Piotrowski 1989a for examples). Or a dictionary grouping words according to meaning categories might appear to be a good solution, for example the LONGMAN LEXICON OF CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH, or LONGMAN LAN-
GUAGE ACTIVATOR. Yet this solution does not work quite well either: the arrangement of concepts and categories is usually subjective, so that an alphabetical index has to be added, and we return to the problems of regular MDs. Therefore in fact the BD has the best solution, the L1-L2 list (cf. Thompson 1978).

The list provides the quickest way of access to the system, because it is firmly based on what the learner knows best, i.e. L1. Unfortunately most often the L1-L2 productive dictionary is treated as a translating dictionary, not as an index to the L2 resources, i.e. as a tool for expression. A BD for expression should, in fact, show what the various lexical choices can be if one starts from the point of access which the L1 item provides. The choices, moreover, have to be accompanied by appropriate information, so that the items can be used properly. A very good solution to this would be a dictionary like Poldauf's CZECH-ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

By way of conclusions to this chapter let us look again at the two methods, explanation by L2 definition and explanation by L1 equivalents, from a wider perspective. The two methods are metalinguistic, but there can be also non-metalinguistic methods, of which we may mention contextual explanation, when the relevant item is shown in various contexts and the learner is to generalize the meaning by inference. In an experiment carried out by Longman (Summers 1988b) the inference-only method was shown to be inferior to the metalinguistic explanation (definition) and to the metalinguistic description, with examples, for production purposes. For comprehension there was no difference between the three methods. Unfortunately the experiment did not take into consideration the BD, which is a pity, because a comparison like that might provide valuable evidence for metallexicography. However, it might be supposed on the basis of the experiment that the inference-only method is slightly inferior to metalinguistic explanation. Metalinguistic explanation thus seems to be preferred.

Let us look then at metalinguistic explanation. Jakobson argues that perhaps the best solution to the problem of how to describe meaning in a metalinguistic way was given by Pierce: any sign can be translated into an infinite series of other signs. The signs can be considered to be equivalent when either might have been an interpretant of the other. A sign can be translated either into a complex of other signs, by which it is more fully

---

52 There are also other problems with this arrangement, see Hill 1985; Piotrowski 1989a.
developed, or into a more condensed, terser sign. And the translation of signs can be done within one language, or in a different language (Jakobson 1958/1985, 1975/1985). Thus from the most general semiotic point of view the explanations in MDs and in BDs can be considered equivalent. This is precisely the point argued here\(^5\)

We have also claimed that there is in fact no scientific basis on which the claims of the superiority of the MD are made. The claims are rather based on some a priori cultural beliefs. Actually this statement can be supported by the fact that now we are in almost the same position that Palmer was in 1917. In his 1917 book Palmer argues for the use of LI and of the BD in foreign language learning, and his discussion seems to be very familiar and similar to the disputes held now (Palmer 1917/1968; see also Palmer 1922/1964; discussion can be found in Ronowicz 1982; Tickoo 1982, 1989). This shows that indeed few new facts have been established in those past 70 years.

At the end of this chapter we may repeat the most important conclusion: the bilingual dictionary can be used as a natural learning dictionary. In the Soviet Union it is indeed used in this way, and we could mention here the series of BDs for learners of Russian, e.g. KRATKIJ RUSSKO-FRANCUZSKIJ UČEBNYJ SLOVAR' by Zaliznjak, THE LEARNER'S ENGLISH-RUSSIAN DICTIONARY, THE LEARNER'S RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY\(^5\).

\(^5\) Cf. also Neubert on this point "It turns out that translation dictionaries of the right kind can have the same generating power as defining dictionaries" (Neubert 1992: 37). The notion of "the dictionary of the right kind" will be explained in Chapter 5, section 5.11.

\(^5\) See Denisov 1977b for a description of the series, also Tomaszczyk 1981 has relevant remarks.
4. Bilingual dictionaries and translation

This chapter will discuss the other parameter relating to the ultimate purpose of the BD, that is, it will focus on the use of the BD in translating. Theoreticians have described the BD most often as a translating dictionary, and they believe that a BD can be substantially improved only when its ultimate function, i.e. translation, is recognized in all its implications (see e.g. Bogusławski 1976b, 1988a; Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach 1984b, 1991; Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen 1988; Steiner 1971; Zgusta 1971, 1988).

The opinions that can be found in the literature, however, often express a good deal of hesitation, it is not uncommon for the same lexicographers to offer conflicting and contradictory views on the subject. Perhaps the best example is that of Berkov. In Berkov (1973) he is firmly convinced that BDs can and should be used for translation. In Berkov (1977) he presents strong arguments against the use of the BD in translation – the BD can never be a source of immediately insertible equivalents, and he argues that the BD can be used best in a metalinguistic way. Yet in Berkov (1990) he returns to his earlier position and he says that “a bilingual dictionary viewed as a whole ought to be a unified translation tool” (Berkov 1990: 99). It is evident thus that he is not quite sure whether BDs can be used for translation or not.

Other lexicographers evidently share Berkov’s feelings. Śćerba, for example, apparently advocates the use of the BD for translation, yet in his opinion it would be good if translation produced by use of a BD would not be at least ridiculous in quality (Śćerba 1939/1983). Obviously he did not

---

55 Unfortunately translation is too wide a term to be really unambiguous and useful: the activity done by schoolchildren learning a foreign language is commonly called translation, but one may wonder what it has in common with professional translation of full-length books. Therefore the term translation will be most often qualified by appropriate modifiers in this book.
think very highly of that sort of translation. Very much the same opinion can be found in Atkins (1985): a BD can only lead the user to some solution when translation is being done.

At present there is a growing belief among translation scholars that BDs actually are not translation tools, they believe that the very notion of a *translation* equivalent is false, and they call the translational equivalent a fiction (Snell-Hornby 1988, 1990; Neubert 1992). Judging by the recent dictionaries (OXFORD-HACHETTE ENGLISH-FRENCH DICTIONARY) these beliefs have started to exert influence on BDs.

These notions we are going to discuss in this chapter.

### 4.1. Substitutional translation

Theoreticians of BL very rarely define translation, even though for them it is both the basis and chief objective of a BD, apparently they treat translation as non-controversial. An exception is Kromann, Riiber, and Rosbach (1984b), who do define translation in terms of its function\(^56\). Translation is:

> eine sprachenpaarbezogene unidirektionale Handlung, beim welcher der Übersetzer seine Mutter-sprache als eine der Sprachen benutzt und welche entweder auf eine Produktion äquivalenter fremdsprachiger Texte oder aber auf eine äquivalente Rezeption fremdsprachiger Texte gerichtet ist [emphasis from the original].

(Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach 1984b: 185)

Unfortunately neither text nor equivalence are defined in this definition, which makes it rather vague. Nor is *Handlung*, i.e. the actual activity, described in more detail.

We may also ask whether comprehension (*Rezeption*) can be described as translation. In comprehension we have to do with some mental activity which is not very well understood (as we have argued in the previous

\(^{56}\) We will use the original German version, as the English one is, unfortunately, less informative, and defines translation by a tautology: "By translation we understand here a language-pair-related unidirectional activity where the translator uses his or her native language as one of the two languages, translating to or from the native language." (Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach 1991: 2117). Thus, translation is the activity of translating.
chapter). Apparently translation is understood in this definition as any use of L1 for explanation of L2 or as a means of reaching the needed L2 expression. Perhaps the name translation should refer only to an activity which aims at producing text, and this is actually the basis of Hausmann’s typology, discussed in section 2.5 (Hausmann 1988). Therefore translation as a mental activity should have a different name, e.g. switching from one language to another one (this is actually the term used in psycholinguistics, see Hamers & Blanc 1989), and the common use of translation in a classroom could be called glossing.

In contrast, Bogusławski (1976b, 1978) defines translation on the basis of the operation that is done in the act of translation: translation is a substitution of strings of basic linguistic units from one language by strings of such units from the other language (Bogusławski 1978). Bogusławski’s approach is typical of those lexicographers who believe that a BD should offer immediately-insertible equivalents, and we will discuss it now.

The general idea in this approach is as follows: texts are considered to be made up of primitive units (most often understood as units of meaning). Once the units are isolated, properly described, and entered in a dictionary, they can be used again and again to produce new texts. This idea will be called here the substitutional view of translation. Without doubt this view has enjoyed immense popularity with lexicographers because it has been the usual way of approaching text and language in linguistics (cf. Sinclair 1987b; for a discussion see section 2.6 here). In the segmental approach the meaning of discourse is treated as a sum of meaning of its constituents. Meaning thus is seen as fairly precisely quantifiable, a piece of discourse is simply a receptacle of meaning, and equivalence is sought between primitive, semantic units.

To understand fully these approaches we have to return to our earlier

---

57 Yet some theoreticians think that translation on the basis of a BD is essentially a re-write operation, it is formal, in which knowledge of meaning is not in fact used. According to Duval (1986; also to Bogusławski 1976b) this is the only sort of operation which the BD makes possible. This claim finds some support in the observation that professional translators can produce acceptable, or even good, translations without actually understanding what they translate (Slocum 1985/1989; this has been the experience also of the present author). This shows that translators, like foreign learners, can be to a large extent considered to be also very efficient symbol manipulators (cf. p. 77).
discussion: language can be approached either as an open-choice (reductionist) or an idiomatic system. Let us recall the basic notions. In the open-choice approach language, and text, is thought to be reducible to a number of units of meaning, and it is suggested that normal text can be produced by combining the units. In the idiomatic approach, text cannot be easily reduced to strings of semantic units, as on each level of analysis there seems to exist some additional meaning: the meaning of a text is only partly predictable from the meaning of its constituents, as this additional meaning has to be added by the interpreter-decoder. The same principle works in the other direction, i.e. in production.

Haas explains this additional meaning by suggesting that in analyzing, or producing, texts meaning from a higher level of organization is always presupposed. Therefore meaning of any unit can be established only by analyzing that unit in a higher-level unit, but not the other way round (we will discuss some examples at a later point). Meaning thus does not reside in linguistic units in a compositional, atomistic way (Haas 1960). This is true even of texts – any text makes sense only when embedded in a larger context, in the ‘text’ of culture. Thus meaning of a piece of discourse is not the sum total of the constituent expressions.

For some (meta)lexicographers translations can be also a source of equivalents. Already Ścerba insisted that equivalents were to be found in the existing translations, not invented, and he advocated the use of translations and originals in lexicography (Ścerba 1939/1983). The segmental approach can be seen even more vividly in this principle. It would be easy to obtain equivalents for BDs if an L1 text, for example, and its L2 translation were in a one-to-one correspondence, that is, if there would exist what we would call canonical translations. If such would be the case, both L1 and L2 texts could be segmented and correspondence between the segments established. In fact, it would not matter very much which direction we take when we look for equivalents, we could proceed either from the original to the translation, or from the translation to the original, because the meaning, or the amount of meaning, in both texts would be identical (in fact this is what Boguslawski suggests, Boguslawski 1976b).

Lexicographers like Ścerba or Boguslawski regard the complete relation between BL and translation as circular. Equivalents come to BDs from translations and go from them to produce further translations. A BD thus, produced on the principle of this translational circle, can be regarded as
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Are there any canonical translations? And, what is more important, can there be any? It is a fact of life that there are very many translations of the same text, and that translations can differ enormously. Let us have an example of two translations into Polish of a semi-technical text in English. The original text seems to be completely unproblematic:

original – Try to make your contribution one that is true. Do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

(Grice 1975/1976: 87)

I translation – Staraj się uczynić swój udział takim, by był zgodny z prawdą. Nie mów tego, o czym sądzisz, że jest fałszem. Nie mów tego, dla czego nie masz należytego uzasadnienia.

(Grice 1975/1977: 89; transl. by Wajszczuk)

II translation – Staraj się, by twój wkład w konwersację był prawdziwy. Nie mów tego, o czym jesteś przekonany, że nie jest prawdą. Nie mów tego, do stwierdzenia czego nie masz dostatecznych podstaw.

(Grice 1975/1980: 77; transl. by Stanosz)

There are conspicuous differences between both translations with regard to numerous words: contribution is translated as I: ‘udział’ and II: ‘wkład w konwersację’, true as I: ‘prawdziwy’, II: ‘zgodny z prawdą’, make as
I: ‘uczynić’, II: ‘by’, etc. But it would be very easy to produce far more translations of this passage. The ‘bare’ imperative is not very polite in Polish, and to weaken it the translator can use impersonal pronouns and constructions, and the beginning of the translation could read, for example: należy się (starać, etc.) or powinno się (starać, etc.).

It is not an unusual situation when there are ten, or more, translations of a single work (typically of a work of literature; see e.g. Lyra 1973 on Polish translations of Poe). Does this multitude have its source in the carelessness of translators? This is what Bogusławski seems to think. Or does it result simply from the nature of translation? The latter answer seems to provide a better explanation of what is involved.

Translation is simply characterized by indeterminacy, therefore the translator chooses such solutions in his work that need not be repeated by another translator. The most extreme position with regard to indeterminacy of translation has been taken by Quine. The main version of Quine’s indeterminacy thesis runs as follows:

Our ordinary notion of sameness of meaning is such that rival teams of linguists, applying this notion to a given pair of languages but deliberately disregarding all constraints of simplicity and practicality, could produce rival manuals of sentence translation which fitted all the physically statable evidence (or facts), yet were mutually incompatible.

(Kirk 1986: 251)

As there is no criterion for the sameness of meaning, the amount of meaning is not quantifiable, and, therefore, it cannot be established whether two texts have the same amount of meaning. What is important is that various translations of the same text can be compatible because the translators do take into consideration simplicity and practicality. Moreover they work within certain frameworks, to which the term paradigm could be perhaps applied. It can be said in this case that a BD should record the paradigm, and we will discuss this idea below.

We have already discussed the nature of text above, in Chapter 3, section 3.3, so at this point we can repeat the main ideas from the discussion.

58 Translation II is better stylistically for me, and characteristically it uses multi-word Polish equivalents of single English words. This feature of Polish translations will be discussed in more detail later on in this chapter.

59 Cf. Quine 1960; Quine’s views are discussed in detail by Kirk 1986; for Polish translations see also Stanosz 1993.
At present it is believed that much of text meaning is pragmatic. Text (or, more precisely, discourse) is not a receptacle for meaning, instead, it is a blueprint for meaning - a model to be followed in constructing the meaning. Text meaning is basically an interactive, creative task - the decoder produces meaning, basing on the constituents of the text and on all of the linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge that is available to him.\(^{60}\)

In any text there are formal and semantic contrasts and oppositions which may override the contrasts and oppositions which exist in the language system. In other words, text has its own dynamics of meaning, based on, but also interacting with, the dynamics of the language system. Further, meaning of text is not distributed in a linear way, i.e. meaning of any text constituent depends on the meaning of the whole text. The meaning of any text constituent is very complex, and it results both from the meaning given to the constituent in the language system and from the meaning given to it by the text.

Čukovskij has an excellent example of the influence of the macrocontext on the selection of relevant items by the translator: the Russian translator of a Faulkner novel had to change the Russian adjectives relating to a female character when the character’s development in the novel was taken into full consideration. Thus lips, which were first described as *tolstye* ‘thick’, became *puchlye* ‘full’, skin changed from *bescvetnoj* ‘colourless’ to *matovoj* ‘mat’ etc. (Čukovskij 1988: 95). Titles also provide excellent examples: a title can be translated adequately only when its whole context is known, i.e. the content of the relevant work.

The view presented here is certainly very similar to that of Mukařovský:

> a dynamic semantic unit differs from a static one by virtue of the fact that if occurs

---

60 This idea is shared by authors of various persuasion. Thus, in his philosophical papers Bachtin always stressed this point (Bachtin 1976/1986): comprehension of a text is always an interaction between two thinking subjects. The same idea was developed by Nalimov (1974/1976), whose approach is that of a statistician. From a linguistic point of view the creativeness of comprehension is also presented by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981). It is very significant also that the creators of the machine translation system ETAP-2 conclude that their work shows extremely clearly that human beings engage creatively in the activity of text comprehension, and that it is illusory to hope that use of semantic, pragmatic, situational, encyclopedic or any other type of complex information will make it possible to establish the correct interpretation of a sentence by a machine, which humans find so simple (Apresjan et al. 1989: 288).
4. Bilingual dictionaries and translation

as a gradually realized context. The relationship between a static and a dynamic semantic unit, as is obvious, is reciprocal. A dynamic unit, being a mere semantic intention in itself, needs static units for its embodiment; a static unit, on the contrary, acquires an immediate relation to reality only in a context.

(Mukafovsky 1975: 50; after Virgilio 1989: 69–70)

It follows also that the meaning of any text constituent is always unpredictable to some degree. Consequently equivalents of such constituents range from predictable to unpredictable. The term predictable means that a competent bilingual can find the adequate equivalent basing only on some minimal cues, while unpredictable means that adequate equivalents can be found only on the basis of complex criteria.

Unpredictability of translation was often discussed in the literature, for example by Martinet (1985). Her argument is very similar to the one presented here: in translation a word "should be considered a concept related to the conceptual semiotic system itself, and to its environment, or in its contextuality and intertextuality" (Martinet 1985: 37), and she provides excellent examples of wholly unpredictable equivalents (e.g. lollipop in one language becomes immersion heater in another). Birkenhauer and Birkenhauer (1989) show how in one translation English September had to become German März. Rzyman in his analysis of translations of Lem’s novel from Polish into English has, among other examples, the one of fraszka with the equivalent ‘nothing’ (Rzyman 1993). How many equivalents thus can a text constituent have? Quite probably we have to do with infinite numbers here.

4.3. The unit of translation

Another difficulty in the segmental approach is the unit of translation. In the substitutional approach, in which translation is said to proceed on the basis of lists of equivalent expressions, there can be only little variation in the size and level of the equivalent expressions. The unit of translation has to be the same as in the lists. Yet it has been noticed that in real-life translation there is, in fact, no stable unit of translation (cf. Catford 1965; Barchudarov 1975). An L2 expression, constant in various L2 texts, can be, or has to be, translated by L1 units of other levels. Thus, a word is translated
into bound morphemes, collocations, groups, sentences (some examples will be given below). Therefore a BD, to be useful indeed for translators, would have to provide all those choices, though it is hard to imagine how one would use such a dictionary, because it would be monstrous in size.

Perhaps the best explanation of the problems of the unit of translation has been given by Haas (1962/1968). Haas' theory of translation helps also to provide some solutions to all the problems we have mentioned so far. The translator has no lists of correspondences to rely on. Yet some correspondence has to be established, that is, some expressions of both languages have to be viewed as equivalent. The size of the translation units has to be kept to a minimum, and the text has to be broken down into more manageable segments to be translated. The translator in fact makes his own choice what units to translate. Those units are either those that he thinks do correspond (at this point indeterminacy is at work) or those which can be made to correspond (at this point the dynamics of text meaning can be used). In short: "the translator, dealing with free constructions, constructs freely" (Haas 1962/1968: 107–108). The translator thus, not lists of equivalent expressions, is at the centre of translation (cf. also Hartmann 1980; Kielar 1988; Steiner, George 1975).

4.4. The paradigm of translation

Though translation solutions are in principle unique and atypical, that is, they apply to individual texts, yet translators often do agree in their work. In an interesting experiment it was found that experienced translators agree in 60% of their translation solutions (Recker 1974). This is possible because translators work within an established paradigm, within a scheme of translation. The paradigm can be seen as conventions which are used in translating, as a store of existing solutions to some problems. For some researchers the BD is essentially a record of these solutions: "the bilingual dictionary as handed down to us can be regarded as the result of many separate translations fossilized into lexical equivalents" (Hartmann 1989a: 10; cf. Nielsen 1988).

Paradigms can be made conscious when the older, established paradigm gives way to a new one. This is precisely what happens in Poland now (cf.
Pomorski 1985). Traditionally Polish translations often changed the stylistic value of the constituents of the original (the description follows Sienkiewicz 1979). The tendency was to level out extreme differences, slangy, obscene passages were made more neutral, acceptable. Neutral, down-to-earth passages, in contrast, were made more literary, more 'beautiful'. Still it is very difficult to translate very colloquial foreign texts into Polish because there is simply no tradition: Polish dialogues are most often written in a highly literary style (cf. Pomorski 1985). In the new paradigm the tendency is to render in Polish all stylistic variants of the original as closely as possible.

Another characteristic feature of the traditional paradigm is that repetition of the same word in a Polish text is considered to be bad style – a text should be varied lexically. The translator into Polish therefore has to vary the equivalents. Anna Pelech has found that in the short passage she analyzed 6 English lexemes (reporting verbs) were translated by as many as 28 Polish lexemes (Pelech 1993).

It is clear that if a dictionary were indeed to be a description of a translational paradigm, then English-Polish BDs should record such possibilities. A slang expression should be given both a slang equivalent and a neutral one. A neutral expression should be given a neutral equivalent and a more elevated one. Yet this is not what dictionaries do.

These problems exist not only for Polish. S'Addedin (1989) shows that text is developed in an oral manner in Arabic, and in a written manner in English. A translator has to switch not only between the two languages but also between the ways of text development. The latter is of course also related to the choice of the relevant lexical unit, and the problems are roughly similar to those in Polish.

4.5. Technical translation

In an influential book on machine translation (Revzin & Rozencvejg 1963) translation is divided into two types: interpretation and translation

Nor are they in fact expected to include such equivalents – with one exception perhaps: obscene expressions, which in many BDs are actually given neutral expressions (e.g. in the otherwise excellent ENGLISH-CZECH DICTIONARY).
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proper, i.e. substitutional translation. Translation proper is, above all, technical translation. It might be argued thus that we have been discussing interpretation so far, not translation. Therefore we have to look at the problems of technical translation to see whether our findings apply also to this type of translation. In fact what can be found in the relevant literature provides support to our discussion.

In technical texts key-words are usually terms. Adequate translation of terms should result in adequate translation of the whole text, and in this case good BDs would be invaluable. Is this assumption true yet? Newmark (1989) does not think so, and suggests that terms constitute only 5–10% of technical text. He does not provide any evidence for this figure, yet, and, judging by statistical counts, terms are fairly frequent: there are 750 terms among the 1,000 most frequent words in texts on physics (Alekseev 1980).

Tomaszczyk (1989) has perhaps the most detailed account of the work of a technical translator. For a piece of translation he was doing terms constituted 80% of the items he consulted in dictionaries. It is also remarkable that he checked about 50% of the terms to confirm his predictions as to their meaning, thus he did not need a bilingual dictionary, because the same fact could be established by reference to an MD. Tomaszczyk even suggests that in technical translation one can go a long way without a BD at all. This suggestion is confirmed by Maclean (Snell-Hornby 1989: 229).

In his paper on translation from English to Hungarian Heltai in fact describes all the factors we mentioned which make purely substitutional translation impossible. Thus in an English technical text it is possible to use non-technical synonyms for technical terms. This is very rarely done in Hungarian. In English the head of a compound may appear in the text as a synonym of the whole compound. One noun can serve in this way as many nouns, and it can be disambiguated only on the basis of co- and context. In Hungarian this is not, again, possible (Heltai 1988). Thus, also in technical translation the dynamics of the text is very important. It is a fiction to suppose that technical terms have an extremely fixed meaning in text. Terms, like any other lexical items, are defined by their context (cf. Phillips 1988; Gerzymisch-Arbogast 1989).

What requires more attention than terms in technical translation is the collocability of terms, i.e. it is more difficult to find the semi-fixed expressions with which a term is associated than the equivalent of the term itself (Kuznetsov 1986; Tomaszczyk 1989). Collocability is discourse-specific,
and Newmark (1989) argues that technical translation is above all translation of a type of discourse. Thus, what a technical translator needs even more than comprehensive dictionaries of term equivalence is good discourse-specific dictionaries with collocations of the terms. Such BDs are already available for Russian and English, e.g. the general RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL USAGE, or RUSSIAN-ENGLISH MEDICAL DICTIONARY PHRASE-BOOK (cf. also Knowles 1989).

4.6. The infinitude of equivalents

From our theoretical discussion it follows that translational equivalence is in fact infinite. In order to be an adequate translational dictionary, a BD thus would have to deal somehow with infinite numbers of equivalents. It has to be noted also that the inclusion of the most frequent of the equivalents in a BD is no guarantee of adequate translation on this basis: the most frequent equivalents reveal something about the texts having been already worked on, i.e. about the past translation. The fact that an equivalent was used in the past does not mean that it can be used in translation to be done as well. A translational equivalent is a function of a lexical slot, so to say, within an extremely large context.

The potentially infinite number of translational equivalents has been noticed, and stressed, by various metalexicographers from the nineteenth century to the present day. One of the earliest was Schröer (1909, after Hausmann in print, cf. also Hausmann 1989a: 220). Hausmann also subscribes to the idea (e.g. Hausmann 1986), as does Zgusta (1971: 322), even though both authors think that a BD has to include translational equivalents.

The confusion over the translational nature of the BD has its roots in the failure to notice that the translational equivalent is something different than the one in the BD (cf. Snell-Hornby, ed. 1989). What does the difference depend on? In the study of language we have to do with two aspects – with language as text, i.e. essentially with the results of human linguistic activity, and with language as system, i.e. with the regularities which are believed to underlie that activity, and which the linguist analyzes (the terms are those of Lyons 1977). The distinction is of course familiar, it is that between
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**ergon: energeia, la parole: la langue, performance: competence** (though in each case the stress is on different aspects). Basing on the distinction between text and system, Lyons very carefully distinguishes between text-sentences and system-sentences. Text-sentences are embedded in their unique contexts, system-sentences are maximally decontextualised. He also stresses the fact that unwillingness, or inability, to distinguish between both types of sentence leads to extreme confusion and is the origin of pseudo-problems.

This is precisely the case with equivalents. We have text-equivalents, which, determined by complex factors, exist in translation, and system-equivalents, which are decontextualised and typical rather than individual (we are going to explore their typicality in the next chapter). From another point of view, the language system comprises semantic units, while in the text we have to do with uses of the units. Further, it is often suggested that text belongs to *la parole*, and that translation is *la parole* as well (cf. Barchudarov 1975). This has given rise to the idea that equivalents in BDs belong to *la parole* as well (Hausmann 1986).

Yet, on the basis of our discussion, this view does not seem to be correct: equivalents in the BD appear to belong to *la langue*. Thus Bogusławski, and other scholars who think along similar lines, is certainly right when he suggests that individual equivalents should not be taken into account in BL: it is impossible to list all possible uses of a lexical unit, and that is what a complete list of equivalents would be. Yet he is wrong when he extends this sort of thinking to translation.

4.7. Translation – specific problems between English and Slavic languages

So far translation has been discussed in a general, theoretical way. In this section we are going to look briefly at some specific problems of translation between English and Slavic languages such as Russian and Pol-

---

---

62 We do not commit ourselves to any approach to translational equivalents by using the term here. Translational equivalents are simply those pairs of L1 and L2 expressions which can be actually found in the text of translation. In particular no invariance is assumed here.
ish. These problems are related to the different ways in which meaning is usually encoded by linguistic forms in the respective languages. Our discussion leads to the same conclusions as those from the theoretical discussion above: equivalence is in essence infinite and substitutional translation does not work properly for the languages mentioned.

Our analysis will develop Hawkins' study of English and German contrasts (Hawkins 1986), and Comrie's findings on English and Russian typological differences (Comrie 1986; it is relevant also for other Slavic languages). We shall provide further evidence for Comrie's hypothesis that in its surface forms Russian (and other Slavic languages) is more explicit semantically than English.

English, when contrasted with German or with Slavic languages, is more ambiguous and vague in its surface forms, and it depends to a great degree on pragmatic and contextual clues in specifying the exact interpretation of its linguistic forms. In English one linguistic form can be used to encode a variety of meanings (e.g. various semantic roles), while in German or the Slavic languages the mapping between form and meaning is more one-to-one.

In the lexicon these differences are shown by the preferences of the speakers of English for certain types of lexeme. Hawkins claims that to encode a message English speakers usually choose lexemes very broad in meaning, rather than more specific lexemes, which is possible because English has both very broad lexemes and specific ones. In contrast, broad lexemes often do not exist in German or in Slavic languages. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šit' plat'e</td>
<td>make (sew) a dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peē' chleb</td>
<td>make (bake) bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varit' čaj</td>
<td>make (brew) tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vit' gnezdo</td>
<td>make (weave) a nest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proložit' dorogu</td>
<td>make (lay) a road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Comrie 1986: 1162)

If language is seen as a system of choices, then English, in contrast to German, Russian, etc., has one choice more: that between broad and specific lexemes. The claim that the broad lexemes are indeed preferred by

---

63 Hawkins (1986: 29) discusses English-German examples.
speakers of English can be supported by results from the COBUILD research: English text is usually made up of words which are either completely or partly delexicalized (Sinclair 1987b). English text is thus fairly ambiguous.

How can the meanings of such broad lexemes be described in dictionaries? The following remark from a monolingual dictionary is typical:

Make is one of the most common verbs in English. It is often used in expressions where it does not have a very distinct meaning of its own, but where most of the meaning is in the noun that follows it.

(COBUILD ENGLISH LANG DICTIONARY, make)

The contexts of make cannot be described properly, as they are not exhaustible, or sufficiently restricted. They can be only described as extremely broad semantic classes, so broad that they are most often useless for the foreign learner or user. Because of this infinitude of the contexts, the equivalents are also infinite in number, because they have to map an extremely indeterminate meaning. Thus, equivalents for the most important words of English cannot be exhausted in an English-Slavic BD.

The broad lexemes show that English text is indeterminate paradigmatically, in the choice of lexemes which are to occur in particular syntactic slots. Yet also the syntagmatic dimension provides evidence for indeterminacy of English text. The syntagmatic dimension is not discussed by Hawkins or Comrie, and it is even more important for our discussion. Syntagmatic indeterminacy is known very well to translators, who are well aware of the fact that in translating from English to Russian (Polish, etc.) it is necessary to use more content words than the original has in order to produce a natural text. It is possible, and often necessary, to omit many words in the opposite direction of translation. This is known even to beginning translators, or to amateurs, who have to translate in the 1980's by 'w latach osiemdziesiątych', when the superordinate lata has to be added in Polish (cf. also 1984, an Orwell novel, and its Polish version Rok 1984).

This feature of Russian-English translation has been noticed by Soviet translators and theoreticians (e.g. Barchudorov 1975: 221–226; Le Vickaja & Fiterman 1976: 26–27; both have many examples), and a number of examples can be found in Falla's OXFORD ENGLISH-RUSSIAN DIC-

64 Broad lexemes are those which are used most often in English: be, do, have, take, make, thing, etc.
Bilingual dictionaries and translation

TIONARY (e.g. at party he puts party before country – 'on stavit interesy partii vyše interesov rodiny'). To my knowledge this problem has not been researched in Poland. Let us have some examples from actual translations between English and Polish (1) and Russian (2, 3)⁶⁵:

1. walk in space on Gemini 4 (Mailer 1972: 158) 
   spacer w przestrzeni (w locie "Gemini 4") (Mailer 1978: 218)

2. Patting her bronze-brown bun (Nabokov 1966: 36)
   Pochlopyvaja ladoniju po bronzovatomu şin'onu na zatylke (Nabokov 1965/1989: 52)

3. arctic Canada (Nabokov 1966: 33)
   pripoljarnye oblasti Kanady (Nabokov 1965/1989: 47)

The added lexemes have been underlined.

The translator from English to Polish, Russian, etc. thus has to resolve the indeterminacy of the English text by adding the missing information to the translation. In the other direction he has to make the text in English more indeterminate than the original Russian or Polish text was. The simplest explanation of this phenomenon is that specific Russian or Polish lexemes cannot be combined directly but some intermediary stages are needed. The intermediary lexemes are most often abstract lexemes.

Can the choice of such "additional" lexemes be somehow predicted, so that they could be included in a BD? Sometimes it is possible, particularly when they are parts of stereotype collocations. Very often, however, they are not predictable, because the choice is based not so much on linguistic skills, but rather on extralinguistic knowledge. Cf. example 1, or 2: the decoder simply has to know what Gemini refers to, or has to have some knowledge about the geographic location of Canada, to be able to translate the passage properly.

In an MA dissertation by Kruk, in which translational equivalents were studied, this finding was supported by textual evidence: she has found 14 tokens – Polish words – to which no corresponding original expressions

⁶⁵ In examples 2 and 3, Nabokov is both the author and the translator. This is important, because Nabokov was an early bilingual, and, being equally competent in both Russian and English, he was obsessed with literal translation (see Steiner, George 1975 for an excellent discussion of Nabokov and his translation of Evgenij Onegin). Therefore it can be supposed that both his English and Russian texts contain exactly the same meaning (whatever that might mean), which is expressed by adequate linguistic means.
existed, and concludes that "The translators probably added them to clarify the meaning of the Polish phrases. There is no regularity in these equivalents, so we cannot formulate any general rule for adding new words to Polish translations" (Kruk 1993).

In conclusion: the substitutional approach does not appear to be possible in translation between English and Slavic languages, and the BD cannot offer immediately insertible equivalents for the translator between those languages.

4.8. Bilingual dictionaries and professional translators

Our discussion above was concerned with the problem whether lists of L1-L2 correspondences (i.e. primarily BDs) can serve as the basis for translation. We have come to the conclusion that the most important factor in translation is the translator. Another question that has to be asked is whether BDs are useful for the translator: if BDs are not very suitable for translation, then translators should not use them very often in their work.

We shall treat this problem in this section. Our discussion can moreover provide some information on what translators actually expect from dictionaries.

In most practically-oriented books on translation dictionaries are extensively discussed (e.g. Florin 1983; Newmark 1989; Recker 1974; Voellnagel 1974). At present there are also specialist treatments of the relation between lexicography and translation (e.g. Snell-Hornby 1989; Vermeer 1989). It is remarkable that the views expressed there are fairly unanimous. For translators all reference books, however bad, are potentially useful: MDs, BDs, lexicons, encyclopedias, etc. Florin (1983) thinks that it is reasonable to buy any dictionary which might be used three times a year. Bornemann (1989) is even more liberal: a dictionary may be bought if it contains only one needed entry. Then it can be thrown out. This situation results from the fact that, as Florin states perhaps most clearly, the translator's needs are far in excess of anything that can be found in dictionaries. And the translator needs a lot of information which is encyclopedic, cultural, rather than linguistic (cf. above). Vermeer (1989) underlines this fact
very strongly: "je weniger ein Wörterbuch Wörterbuch nur ist, desto hilfreicher ist es für den Translator".

Translators in fact do not look for ready equivalents in BDs 66, but use them as the starting point for their own solutions. Recker (1974) shows very explicitly how translators can reach their target expression: they need either good descriptions of meaning of source expressions, or good equivalents. As to meaning, obviously an MD can often be more adequate than BDs. On the other hand, MDs cannot solve all the problems, because their descriptions are not language-specific, and this is what good BDs can offer. As to equivalents, they serve only as cues for the translator’s own search, by pointing to lexical fields in which appropriate target expressions can be found. This confirms what we have already found out (see p. 93): actually it is not necessary to use BDs in translation; MDs can be used to establish meaning, and MDs and synonym dictionaries in the other language can be consulted for equivalents.

This would be possible, however, if the translator could always find an L1 equivalent in his or her mind with which to start the search procedure in the synonym dictionaries. However, very often a translator is at a loss because, though he knows more than adequately the relevant L2 meaning of some expression, he cannot find any equivalent in L1 67. A BD can actually bridge L2 and L1 for the translator. The quality of this bridging is not really very important: the translator needs in fact only some point from which he can go to look for adequate equivalents. This aspect is also stressed by Neubert: a BD cannot provide all translational equivalents, because these are infinite in number, and because, when translating into L1 is involved, the lexical competence of the translator surpasses anything that can be included in a dictionary, but the BD should adequately cover the whole area of possible equivalents, providing prototypical equivalents (Neubert 1992). This would appear to be a very important function of BDs 68.

66 We have already discussed technical terms, which seemingly constitute a category apart, in section 4.5.

67 That would support the view that, at least in some areas, the translator’s bilingualism is coordinate, cf. here section 3.1 for discussion of bilingualism.

68 Thus the GREAT ENGLISH-POLISH DICTIONARY does not fulfill this function well in the case of *pour* because it does not indicate that the word has at least two prototypical equivalents in Polish: *(of liquids)* lac; *(of dust, flour, etc.)* sypač. The latter equivalent is not provided in the dictionary.
Practice then seems to confirm our theoretical discussion: the BD cannot be regarded as the translating dictionary par excellence. It is only one of a number of various dictionaries available to the translator. We have also found that, according to translators, a good translating dictionary has to be focused on description of meaning: the entry in a BD should be organized around the meaning structure of the source language rather than around equivalents. This finding is in sharp contrast to what can be found in the literature (e.g. Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen 1988; Zgusta 1971). Further, translators usually stress the importance of extensive information on paradigmatic and syntagmatic dimension in BDs, with regard to both source and target expressions (cf. Recker 1974; Vermeer 1989). Finally, Vermeer suggests that the more discourse-sensitive a translating dictionary will be, the more it will be useful for the translator (cf. the conclusions to the section ‘General and discourse-specific BDs’, section 2.7).

4.9. Non-professional translations and BDs

Translation, however, is not only done by professionals, that is, there are individuals who have to, or want to, do translation, but it is not a source of income for them. Two large groups can be established, though they most often overlap (cf. Snell-Hornby 1990). One group is that of learners of foreign languages, the other includes those who want to understand an L2 text, but whose command of L2 is so poor that they actually have to translate the text word by word. Word-by-word translation is occasionally used for expressing oneself in L2. The second group comprises people whose needs extremely differ. Tourists typically belong here, but also scientists and scholars who want to read a specialist paper in a foreign language in which they have no further interest. One factor yet is common for both tourists and scientists: extra-linguistic knowledge and situations are more important in their case than linguistic knowledge or skills. The scientist, basing on his knowledge of the relevant field, usually knows to some degree what the text will be about after he has translated the title. The tourist finds herself in situations in which much is fairly obvious.\(^{69}\)

\(^{69}\) That is why phrase-books are so popular: they are thematic dictionaries based on predictable, typical situations.
If the BD is not suitable for the professional translator then perhaps it can be used with some success by the two groups mentioned above. In fact this is the position towards which some metalexicographers' views evolve, in particular the views of Kromann, Riiber, and Rosbach. In Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach (1984b) the BD is firmly related to any translation process. In the English version of this work this view is seriously weakened: "The words 'translation' and 'translator' are not to be understood as applying literally to professional translators and translations" (Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach 1991: 2717). The trouble with this formulation, as we have noted on page 84, is that the words translation and translator are very vague. The crucial question obviously is: can the BD be really useful to the two groups?

In Chapter 3, section 3.5, we have already touched upon the controversy over the use of translation in foreign language teaching. The main points are as follows: methodologists do not view translation as a proper method to teach a foreign language in this century. From this point of view the BD can be dismissed as potentially inhibiting the progress of the learner. Yet this view is not shared by all methodologists. Moreover, surveys of dictionary use (e.g. Hartmann 1983; Tomaszczyk 1979) show clearly that translation is indicated as an important activity by the learners. In fact, translation is favoured by many teachers as a very convenient method (even though in Poland this sort of translation is really glossing).

Again we have to note that most probably the controversy over the function of translation in foreign language teaching depends to a large degree on the vagueness in the use of the term translation mentioned above. Thus from many points of view text-translation has to be considered a completely unsuitable method, particularly for beginners, and is certainly abused in the class-room. Text-translation is the most complex of skills, but it is a skill that has to be learnt separately – it is not a combination of decoding and encoding (cf. Krzeszowski 1970). This type of translation can be invaluable for very advanced learners (cf. Snell-Hornby 1987).

Yet there is nothing wrong with item translation, when L2 is used for explanation of L1, or when L1 is used as a starting point to reach appropriate L2 items, when the purpose of the translation is to help process items in a context. (The next chapter treats this problem in detail.) But, to be really adequate for this purpose, the BDs would have to be designed so that they would really be suitable for the described tasks.
One possible solution towards this objective is BDs which are more consistently explanatory-translating. Duda et al. (1986) describe the project of such dictionary of Russian for Germans. Also the ENGLISH-CZECH DICTIONARY and the CZECH-ENGLISH DICTIONARY are such dictionaries. The term translating is used here to refer, strictly speaking, to some qualities of the BD which are not related to the purpose of text-translation. Another solution, outlined by Snell-Hornby (1987), is BDs which are truly contrastive, i.e. which are explicitly devoted to description of significant contrasts between L1 and L2. To some degree ANGLO-RUSSKIJ SINONIMIČESKIJ SLOVAR' is also a dictionary of that type. There are also possible other types of dictionary, for example with contrastive colloccability, as, for instance, ENGLISH-RUSSIAN DICTIONARY OF VERBAL COLLOCATIONS. Still another possibility is a BD which would be in fact a multifaceted description of grammar and vocabulary in the convenient dictionary format: the interesting OXFORD-HACHETTE ENGLISH-FRENCH DICTIONARY perhaps will serve as such dictionary.

One major problem with BD-based text-translation for learning purposes is that, as it is often shown (e.g. Hatherall 1984), such translation is usually hardly acceptable, being unidiomatic and unnatural. The blame is usually put on the BD. Yet, as we shall see in the next chapter, the BDs are produced in such a way that they are indeed unsuitable for substitutional translation. This non-translational quality of BDs is in fact implicitly or, rarely, explicitly, inbuilt in the theory. This is a major inconsistency in the theory.

In this chapter we have looked in some detail at the function of the BD in both professional and non-professional translation. The detailed discussion was considered to be necessary, as it is often argued that the BD is a translating dictionary par excellence. It has been shown that the BD is a translating dictionary only for a very restricted type of translation, usually item-translation. A BD can be only one of the many translating aids. All of the chapters so far have been leading us to the central part of this book, and indeed, of any theory of BL: the discussion of equivalence in BL. The discussion was often anticipated in the preceding pages, and it can be found in the following chapter.
5. Equivalence

This chapter will discuss the central aspect of BL, i.e. equivalence. What is equivalence in BDs based on? In what way is it established? How are equivalents found? How do lexicographers cope with the infinitude of equivalents? These are some of the questions which we shall attempt to answer in this chapter, and its structure will roughly correspond to the order of the above questions.

First we are going to treat equivalence, and we will discuss *Tertium Comparationis* (TC) relevant to BL. Having established the TC, we shall show how it can be used practically for finding equivalents to be included in a particular BD. Then the notion of cognitive equivalence will be introduced and defined: it is one of the means of restricting the number of equivalents in a BD. The differences between cognitive and translational equivalence will be subsequently discussed. The discussion will then focus on various types of relations between L1 and L2 equivalent items; the relations are based on some tacit assumptions, which again act as a restrictive factor on the number of equivalents. The assumptions will be identified and related to the notion of codability. Finally, we are going to treat the tension in BL between semantic completeness and high codability of equivalents.

5.1. Equivalence
- terminological preliminaries

How can equivalence be defined? Interestingly enough, theorists of BL very rarely offer an explicit definition of equivalence. Evidently they do not think that the establishment of equivalence is very important in BL. A typical position is that of Berkov, who describes equivalents as the items which can be found in a BD (Berkov 1977: 49). This way he avoids the question of how the items got into the BD at all, i.e. on what basis they were chosen.
At most some imprecise remarks can be found in theories of BL (cf. Krommann & Riiber & Rosbach 1984b, 1991).

As usual the most clear definition of equivalence in BL can be found in Boguslawski’s publications (cf. Bogusławski 1976a, 1976b). He formulates explicitly what is usually assumed tacitly in most theories of BL – that equivalence in BL is a type of ‘generalized’ translational equivalence (cf. also Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen 1988 for a very explicit statement). Yet, as we have seen in the previous chapter, it is not correct to approach BL equivalence as translational equivalence.

There are several reasons why BL equivalence is equated with translational equivalence. One is the a priori assumption that the BD is a translating dictionary, discussed in detail in Chapter 4. Further, there are terminological reasons. The term equivalence is used in theories of BL, of translation, and in contrastive linguistics. In none of the disciplines the term is used to refer to the same notion. The difference between contrastive linguistics and translation theories depends on a different approach to language, and it boils down to the difference between system and text (cf. Chapter 4, section 4.6). Contrastive linguistics studies language-systems, while in theories of translation the focus is on texts. Accordingly in a textbook on translation a distinction is made between correspondence in contrastive studies and equivalence in translation theories (Koller 1987), in order to underline the difference.

The term equivalence in fact has been given so different interpretations by various authors that some scholars suggest that it should not be used in BL. Snell-Hornby has found 64 different uses of the term, and she thinks that any discussion in which the term is used without any definition is inherently vague (Snell-Hornby 1989). In this book BL equivalence will be defined as a manifestation of a certain relation (or relations) obtaining between L1 and L2 lexical items. A BD is a record of these manifestations. This formulation is intentionally imprecise, it does not describe what the

---

70 Cf. de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981, who called language-systems virtual systems.

71 The terms equivalence and equivalent thus have little semantic relation to the homophonic words equivalence and equivalents used for example in logic and related disciplines, in which equivalence should be symmetrical, transitive and reflexive. We are going to use the term equivalence because of tradition, and in order to make the discussion intuitively simple and not to proliferate terms. In Polish possible misunderstandings can be avoided by the use of relatively non-technical odpowiedniość and odpowiednik. In English this is unfortunately impossible.
relations are and what they depend on. In this it contrasts with the definition given by Kromann, Riiber, and Rosbach (1991): "equivalence is understood as a relation between the individual meanings of the lemmatized word and the equivalents", in which equivalence is based on a metalinguistic notion of meaning and of particular meanings of a word (this will be discussed below). Formulated this way, our definition does not presuppose what the function of the BD is and what equivalence is based on. These have to be further defined to make the definition precise. Our definition thus is fairly similar to the definition of translational equivalence given by Koller (1987), which also has to be supplemented by more precise statements.


(Koller 1987: 186)

For further clarity, it has to be noted that in this book equivalence is considered as a non-symmetrical relation. Accordingly, equivalents are only right-hand expressions in a BD entry, and equivalence holds between entry-words and equivalents.

Anticipating our further discussion, it can be said that the particular readings of the definition can range from equivalence of a translating type, i.e. between texts (Koller's equivalence), to equivalence between language-systems (Koller's correspondence). Thus, the range of interpretation will be from the metalinguistic to the translational view of the BD.

5.2. Tertium Comparationis – applicability

This section will discuss the basis of equivalence in BL. For simplicity we will assume in our following discussion that in equivalence we have to do with two entities: L1 and L2 items. In order to be able to compare two entities it is essential to have a third one against which both could be described, evaluated, etc. The third entity is usually called Tertium Comparationis\(^\text{72}\). The relevant TC should meet some requirements: it should be

\(^\text{72}\) This discussion owes very much to Boguslawski 1976a.
sufficiently external to both entities being compared; for BL it should be also practical, i.e. the TC should enable the lexicographer to work efficiently without prior extensive theoretical studies.

In the literature various suggestions can be found on TC (cf. Hartmann 1980, 1985a; 1991; Janicki 1986; Krzeszowski 1984), but not all of them are directly applicable to BL. In BL lexical equivalence is obviously of prime concern, i.e. equivalence between segments called words, usually intuitively known. Yet very seldom is lexical equivalence treated as a separate case by these authors⁷³. It is usually subsumed under some type of formal equivalence (e.g. morpheme equivalence), or under semantic equivalence, that is, the meaning of lexical items is usually discussed on the background of broader semantic categories. But in BL the ill-defined word is most important, and this importance will be discussed in the section on codability.

Lexical equivalence is most often based on the notion of lexical meaning. The various suggestions can be reduced to variations on the semiotic triangle, for example the suggestions of Krzeszowski (1984):

```
concept

sign ——— referent
```

In the triangle either referents or concepts can be treated as TCs. We can reject referents as a TC because, as Haas eloquently puts it, there are no pure references, i.e. the very act of distinguishing a referent depends to a large degree on the relevant language (Haas 1962/68; see also Lyons 1977). Nor do concepts seem to be suitable TCs⁷⁴. First of all, concepts are not suitably external to any language⁷⁵. Further, any approach based on concepts can be called metalinguistic (Bogusławski 1976a). Metalinguistic

---

⁷³ The reluctance to discuss equivalence on the level of words was probably a result of the vagueness of the term word.

⁷⁴ The term concept is very general here, it is used to cover semantic traits, features, prototypes, stereotypes, etc.

⁷⁵ There are suggestions that they are external to languages (cf. Baldinger 1971), yet there are convincing reasons to the contrary (cf. Matthews 1979; Lyons 1977), and language-independent concepts evoke the image of a Platonic world of ideas.
notions derive from metalanguages, i.e. from various theories of language. Because of this metalinguistic notions have little practical value, as a substantial theoretical description of both languages on the same basis is first required. No such descriptions are known to me.

A TC relevant to BL would have to be different than the categories based on the semiotic triangle. The TC, as Bogusławski aptly says (Bogusławski 1976a), has to include both L1 and L2 items and at the same time should transcend them, be above them, so to say. One important factor of language use can be used as a TC – the situation. This factor has been neglected in the studies of language until quite recently (cf. Goffman 1964/72; Hymes 1964/72; Fishman 1969/72). Very early in contrastive studies situations were suggested as adequate TCs, for example by Matthijs (cf. Danes 1987). Also Bogusławski (1976a) advocates the use of situations in contrastive studies, including lexicography. Also contrastive sociolinguists have recently acknowledged the importance of situations (cf. Janicki 1986), though on deeper levels of their analyses they again replace situations by metalinguistic notions, for example by semantic categories.

The difference between such TCs as meaning and the situation can perhaps be shown best on the basis of two questions which have to be answered in order to establish equivalence. “How meaning X is expressed in L1 and L2?” is a question based on meaning. This question proceeds from the vague notion of meaning, about which there is little theoretical agreement, and goes to two unknowns: L1 and L2 items. Simplifying, we can say that we have to do with three unknowns here. The other question will be: “In the situation S, when an expression X is used by the L2 speaker to speak of Z, what would be the most natural expression Y used by the L1 speaker?” The latter question does not depend on any theoretical assumptions, and it includes two known entities (S and X), which are used to reach the third entity (Y). Competent bilinguals can easily answer such questions.

It is important to note that this TC is not symmetrical, in contrast to the conceptual TC. Situations are either typical of L1 or of L2, and linguistic

---

76 Perhaps the descriptions carried out within the Meaning-Text model of language will satisfy this requirement.

77 Lyons even suggests that the response from bilinguals to such questions is usually intersubjectively identical (Lyons 1977); on the other hand, the differences one sees in BDs make this belief rather doubtful.
expressions are included in the situations, not vice versa. Situations, in turn, cannot be separated from wider contexts, ultimately from the context of culture. That is why lexical comparison is ultimately based on cultural comparison (this will be discussed in more detail below).

Actually the basis for the TC is not so much typical situations but rather that something which allows bilinguals to say that some L1 and L2 expressions can be used in approximately the same context. That something is called *applicability* by Lyons (1977: 213, 237). As applicability is obviously of central importance in BL, we will provide a direct quotation from Lyons:

> If we use the term *applicability* for the admittedly rather ill-defined wider relationship that holds between language and the external world we can say that a particular lexeme (or expression, or whole utterance) is applicable (i.e. may be correctly applied) in a certain context, situational or linguistic...; and that it is applicable to individuals or properties of individuals. We may use the term ‘*applicability*’, in fact, for any relation that can be established between elements or units of language... and entities in, or aspects of, the world in which the language operates. If we consider the applicability of a lexeme with respect to the question whether it is true of the entity to which it is applied, we are concerned with its denotation. If we consider the applicability of an expression with respect to the question whether it is intended to identify some entity or group of entities about which something is being said, or some question is being asked, etc., on some particular occasion, we are concerned with its reference.

(Lyons 1977: 213)

Applicability is thus a wide notion, it includes both denotation and reference. It does not usually include sense (i.e. syntagmatic-paradigmatic relations of a lexical item). This is an important point for our discussion, and it will be developed in more detail below. Applicability is also so wide that it can be used both for metalinguistic and translational purposes, so it does not bias our discussion in any direction. Even the fact that applicability is ill-defined can be an advantage for the bilingual lexicographer as well, as we shall see on page 132.

### 5.3. Establishment of equivalence

Even though applicability as a Tertium Comparationis satisfies the requirement of being sufficiently external to L1 and L2, it is not very practical: it would be very difficult to use applicability practically as a TC, be-
cause most often it has to do with situated linguistic expressions, i.e. with expressions embedded in complex contexts. It is utterances which are used to fit particular contexts, and utterances can be defined as contextualized longer strings of linguistic signs, usually of sentence length. Thus on the basis of applicability bilingual lexicographers would have to deal very often with contextualized sentences. For the purpose of a BD utterances have to be broken down into smaller units. Thus applicability is the basis for a complex sequence of operations which lead to the establishment of equivalence for a BD. In this section we will first describe the operations theoretically, and then provide relevant examples.

There are certain general principles which underlie those operations (the following account is based above all on Bogusławski 1976b and Halliday 1966a). The chief principle is that two approaches are used in BL: situational and formal, and the basic unit of analysis is a collocational-colligational pattern. Collocation has to do with the lexical environment of a lexeme, while colligation refers to the syntax and inflection of the environment (both terms are Halliday's). Of course, in BL we have to do with two patterns, in L1 and L2, which are considered equivalent on the basis of applicability. A given pattern can be a contextualized sentence, or any sentence fragment.

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. Accordingly, two basic operations can be distinguished in the establishment of equivalence of a single lexeme.

First, utterances with the lexeme are treated as sentences, or as sentence fragments, that is, situated expressions are decontextualized. If the situation

---

78 Halliday's term for situational is contextual; Bogusławski's term for formal is substitutinal; Apresjan 1962 uses the term distributional for our formal.

79 Collocation thus corresponds to what Apresjan calls semantic and lexical combinability of a lexeme, and what for Allerton is semantic and locutional co-occurrence. Colligation can be related to Apresjan's morpho-syntactic combinability and to Allerton's syntactic co-occurrence (Apresjan 1974/80; Allerton 1984).
itself, or the context, is an important factor in the meaning of the whole expression, then the contribution of the situation is recorded as a label, gloss, comment, etc. The significance of the situation can be seen also in the necessity to use another equivalent pattern in the other language. The decontextualized string is then treated as a collocational-colligational pattern of a lexeme (key-word) in question. Particular elements in the pattern are then replaced by other expressions in a commutation test. The expressions to be replaced should differ widely in their meaning (e.g. animate – inanimate, human – non-human, etc.). Also some transformations can be performed on the pattern, e.g. negation, interrogation, change of the thematic-rhematic structure, etc.80

Second, the patterns which emerge as a result of the commutation described above have to be contextualized again, i.e. treated as LI and L2 utterances for use in some situation (context). Equivalence between LI and L2 utterances again is found on the basis of applicability.

As we can see, analysis alternates between situational and formal dimensions. It is very difficult to formalize the operations, as the analyst has to take into consideration a very large number of various factors, performing the operations in an intuitive way; in short, the complexity calls for competent bilingual lexicographers. Bogusławski (1976b) does have some notational formalisms, but he himself admits that the analysis is very difficult and probably cannot be formalized in an algorithmic way.

It is also evident that in both dimensions of the analysis commutation is used. In situational analysis whole utterances are commuted in (roughly) the same contexts (situations). In formal analysis commutation is performed on elements in the collocational pattern. Thus formal analysis can be defined as a contrastive study of the paradigmatic dimension of syntagmatic expressions (collocability patterns). Collocability patterns can range from two-constituent structures (collocations) to whole sentences, that is, they can be constituent or sentential (cf. Haas 1987). In other words, the syntagmatic expressions are lexemes whose right- and left-hand contexts are presented as variables, and the variables are defined with respect to which linguistic expressions can be substituted for them.

Let us deal with an example that will illustrate the main points discussed...
in this section. The example will be Russian and Polish, because thus it can be related to the best segmental dictionary available, ILUSTROWANY SŁOWNIK ROSYJSKO-POLSKI POLSKO-ROSYJSKI by Bogusławski. However, it can be easily changed into Russian-English, as we shall see. We shall look at an expression which occurs in a very determinate type of situation, in titles of musical works, and it can be easily found on record envelopes, or in programmes, etc. The expression is, in Russian, koncert dlja fortep'jano, and in Polish, koncert na fortepian ‘concerto for piano’. In Polish there is another possibility – koncert fortepianowy ‘piano concerto’, clearly restricted in its collocability range, and both patterns, koncert na fortepian and koncert fortepianowy are synonymous and can be used in the same situations. In Russian there is no other possibility of saying 'piano concerto' than that provided here. Let us look at the collocability ranges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
<th>POLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>koncert</td>
<td>koncert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dlja</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fortep'jano</td>
<td>fortepian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sonata</td>
<td>sonata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muzyka</td>
<td>muzyka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strunnnych</td>
<td>strunnnych</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>udarnych</td>
<td>udarnych</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumentov</td>
<td>instrumentov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orkestra</td>
<td>orkestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pily</td>
<td>pily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pilowy</td>
<td>*kołowy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kołowy</td>
<td>*orkiestrowy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*orkiestrowy</td>
<td>skrzypcowy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*fortepianowy</td>
<td>*fortepianowy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In English the pattern is similar in its range to the Polish one: concerto for piano/violin/orchestra, etc., and piano/violin concerto, but *orchestra concerto. Clearly we have to do with segmental equivalence between Russian and Polish, based on the central element, dlja – na. The equivalence thus is Rus. X dlja Y – Pol. X na Y, where X is the name of a piece of music, and Y is the name of an instrument. This is semantic collocability, i.e. it is sufficient to describe the collocates in terms of their meaning to achieve a description that can be used to generate correct collocations (the termino-
ology is Apresjan’s 1974/80; we shall not discuss the morpho-syntactic restrictions). The pattern is infinitely productive. In a segmental BD thus it is sufficient to include separately the lexemes, and to indicate the pattern at *dlja* and at *na*.

In the pattern with *koncert fortepianowy* we have to do with lexical collocability, it cannot be generalized semantically, but the collocates have to be listed for the user, so that he or she can use them to produce correct collocations. The Russian-Polish side can include both versions, but the best place would be the entries for the relevant names of instruments, e.g. *fortepe’jano*, etc. In the Polish-Russian side such information would have to appear in the adjectival entries, i.e. *fortepianowy*, etc. An idiomatic dictionary, on the other hand, can include this pattern in all relevant entries, e.g. Rus. *koncert*, Pol. *koncert*, etc.

Let us look at what the strictly segmental dictionary by Bogusławski has. First, when using the dictionary it would be very difficult to choose any prepositional equivalent which appears in the entries *dlja* and *na*, because there is not sufficient information there. Let us look only at the entry *dlja* in the Russian-Polish side:

*dlja 3 (g. o sosudach) na... butylka – moloka butelka na mleko*  
(ILUSTROWANY SŁOWNIK ROSYJSKO-POLSKI POLSKO-ROSYJSKI)

*Na* appears only in the third sense. The example and the gloss suggest a concrete meaning rather than an abstract one. The entry *na* has similar information. Further, at Russian *fortepe’jano* ‘piano’, *skripka* ‘violin’, *koncert* ‘concerto’ there are no collocations given. Nor are there any at Polish *fortepian* ‘piano’ or *koncert* ‘concerto’. At *skrzypce* ‘violin’ we do find some indication of the pattern: “*skrzypce... ♦ na skrzypce (np. koncert) dlja skripki*” can be found in the section where idioms are included. The adjectival entries *fortepianowy* etc. do not have the needed information. The treatment in this otherwise excellent dictionary thus obscures the pattern, which is quite easy to describe.

Generally our approach to equivalence is in agreement with the theoretical view that meaning, however defined, is carried by larger linguistic expressions rather than by single lexemes, advocated by some logicians (e.g. Quine 1969) and by some linguists (cf. Apresjan 1974/80; Mel’čuk & Pertsov 1987). Recently this view has been adopted by monolingual lexicographers (cf. the contributions in Sinclair 1987a, and the relevant
The two dimensions - formal and situational - have been already described in the metalexicographical literature, but they were usually considered separately. Bogusławski (1976b) provides an excellent description of the formal dimension, but he disregards the importance of the situational dimension. The same can be said of Apresjan (1962). Hartmann, on the other hand, stresses the significance of the situational dimension in BL (Hartmann 1980). He describes situations as types of discourse. A text embedded in a context (situation) is a piece of discourse, so in fact the situational dimension is a discursive dimension. Applicability thus can be said to be based on types of discourse rather than on those of situations. We do not use the term *discourse* here, as analysis of discourse is often based on metalinguistic notions. In Hartmann (1980) there are important suggestions as to discursive equivalence, but he believes that the operation of distinguishing relevant units in contextualized texts is obvious and does not have any explicit suggestions on how to do it.

It is important to stress also that the two dimensions are not theoretical, but that bilingual lexicographers do work on their basis, though most probably the stages in the procedure, being intuitive, are not brought to their consciousness. Here are some examples. Veronika Schnorr, a lexicographer who has been on the teams of several Collins English and German dictionaries (e.g. COLLINS PONS ENGLISH-GERMAN DICTIONARY), says explicitly:

> We lexicographers do not only use texts for our work but actual living situations, too. A native English colleague of mine who was working on the German *Machtwort* was stymied by the definition offered her by the monolingual dictionary, ‘abschließender Befehl einer Autoritätsperson’ (‘final order by a person of authority’). To help her, I described a situation in which the sentence “Sprich du mal ein Machtwort” was used and from which the sense 'exercise one’s authority' immediately became clear.

(in Snell-Homby 1989: 227)

As can be seen from the quotation, the trouble was with the method used by the lexicographer, who apparently wanted to find an equivalent of an isolated lexeme on the basis of its dictionary definition. This method did not work, so the more experienced lexicographer used first the formal analysis - put the word in a collocational-colligational pattern, and then made use of the situational analysis.
Lexicographers usually start from the formal dimension, and then go on to the situational analysis, as linguistic expressions seem to be more tangible, more determinate, than situations. It is relatively easier to list the most frequent items in a language and to proceed to their most frequent and typical collocability patterns, than to attempt to list situations – there is no limit to them – and to provide linguistic expressions which fit the situations.

The more determinate a situation (or a type of discourse) can be made, i.e. the more rigorously it can be described, the better results can be achieved in lexicography. (cf. Haas 1987). At present different linguistic expressions used in the same type of discourse are not covered consistently enough in one dictionary (cf. Hartmann 1980 for some examples). Thus in fact the best results would be obtained if the basis for BL was what Firth called restricted languages: “A restricted language serves a circumscribed field of experience or action and can be said to have its own grammar and dictionary” (Firth 1968: 87), or genres (cf. Coulthard 1985; the same ideas can be found in Bachtin 1976/1986). An important task therefore would be to establish which types of discourse should be served by BDs, and to attempt to list linguistic expressions typical of the types. In formal analysis only the most typical, frequent collocability patterns can be taken into account, i.e. only focal distributions of a lexeme could be considered. On focal distribution (or collocation), which is a Haas term, Lyons has the following to say:

It may very well be the case that many everyday lexemes can be put into correspondence across languages by virtue of their more or less complete translational equivalence in what Haas (1964, 1973) has referred to as their most normal – i.e. their most distinctively normal, or focal – collocations. That distinctive collocational normality, in this sense, can be established, if not wholly, at least partly, in terms of frequency of occurrence is a plausible suggestion.

(Lyons 1979: 115)

It is necessary, however, to have a list of focal collocations of lexemes

---

81 Daneš 1987 has some general critical remarks on situations as the departure for linguistic analysis.

82 A temporary solution to the problem can be found in the section 5.7 Equivalence – the paradigmatic dimension.
In another example we can look at how an entry in an English-French dictionary was being written. We can see again how both types of analysis, situational and formal, interact to produce better and better equivalents. The example comes from Sue Atkins (personal communication), the editor of COLLINS ROBERT FRENCH-ENGLISH ENGLISH-FRENCH DICTIONARY. What follows is a transcript of handwritten notes on the process of compilation of the entry *stuff*. Only one pattern will be shown. There are four stages in the work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>notes for French editor</th>
<th>outline of entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I DRAFT A: skeleton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(compiled by English editor for French editor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edible, writing,</td>
<td><em>It is good stuff!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>music,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architecture, film,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(almost anything)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II DRAFT A: skeleton**
(after French editor provided equivalents)

| edible, writing,        | *It is good stuff! c’est vraiment bien!* |
| music,                  | (but what about 1. There’s some good stuff in that essay?, all that stuff about the government caring for the people, etc.?... 2. it’s poor stuff: TR (=translation) as straight negative would be too strong? discuss) |
| architecture, film,     |                  |
| legislation,            |                  |
| promises                |                  |
| (almost anything)       |                  |

**III DRAFT B**
(compiled from A draft by English editor for French editor to work on)

| edible, writing, music, | his new book is good stuff vraiment bien? |
| architecture, film,     | there’s some good stuff in what he writes +intéressant |
| legislation, promises   | his pictures are poor stuff |
| (almost anything)       | +music etc. |

83 For English this has already been done, in the COLLINS COBUILD ENGLISH LANGUAGE DICTIONARY. The dictionary, with requisite additions and revisions, could be used as a starting point for an English-foreign dictionary.
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| IV DRAFT B  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(after French editor’s work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>edible, writing, music, architecture, film, legislation, promises (almost anything) +music etc. better just: bien? (it’s good stuff) but what about: I can’t stand his stuff: je détest ce qu’il fait or sth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his new book is good stuff son nouveau livre est bon or bien there’s some good stuff in what he writes il y a des choses intéressantes or de bonnes dans ce qu’il écrit, il y a de bonnes choses dans ce qu’il écrit his pictures are poor stuff ses tableaux ne valent pas grand-chose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final entry looks like that:

```
stuff [stuf] 1 n (U) (a) (gen) chos(2) truc* m. look at that ~ regarde ça, regarde ce truc*: it’s dangerous ~ c’est dangereux; radioactive waste is dangerous ~ les déchets radioactifs sont une substance dangereuse or constituent un réel danger; what’s this ~ in this jar? qu’est-ce que ça or que ce truc* dans ce pot?: his new book is good ~ son nouveau livre est bien; there’s some good ~ in what he writes il y a de bonnes choses dans ce qu’il écrit, his painting is poor ~ sa peinture ne vaut pas grand-chose; I can’t listen to his ~ at all je ne peux pas souffrir sa musique (or sa poésie etc); (pej) all that ~ about how he wants to help us toutes ces promesses en l’air comme quoi il veut nous aider; that’s the ~ (to give them or to give the troops)!* bravo, c’est ça! ~ and nonsense! balivernes!: he is the ~ that heroes are made from, (liter) he is the ~ of heroes il a l’étoffe d’un héros; it is the ~ of life c’est ce qui s’appelle vivre; he knows his ~* il connaît son sujet (or son métier). il s’y connaît; do your ~! vas-y!, c’est à toi! he did his ~ very well* il s’en est bien sorti; she’s a nice bit of ~* c’est une jolie môme* or nana*; V green, hot, stern* etc. |
```

In this example equivalence does not go below the level of the sentence. Evidently the lexicographers feel that sentences as wholes demonstrate the sameness of applicability between two languages in the best way. The users of the resulting dictionary are not shown whether there are some smaller constituents in the sentences which exhibit sameness of applicability, though one can suppose that there is some recurrent relation if the sentences are equivalent. Yet few users, as we have noted in our discussion of the segmental dictionary in Chapter 2 (section 2.6), can treat equivalent sentences as models, as collocability patterns, to be used in generating further instances of equivalence.

The expressions dealt with should be delimited to constituents which can be said to be applicable in a recurrent way. The process of decontex-
Equivalence, once begun, should be carried on until recurrent equivalent constituents of sentences are found. This should be a general rule in BL. Admittedly it would not be easy to delimit satisfactorily the constituents in the example above, as *stuff* can be applied almost to anything, so also almost anything can appear as an equivalent. But this is precisely information that the users do not have, i.e. the lexical contexts which can be found in the notes for the lexicographer are not incorporated in some way into the entry. In many cases yet it is relatively easy to delimit the appropriate segments which are in equivalent sentences or utterances. This is, however, not done. Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen (1988) show a number of such cases, and argue that equivalents should be presented in their canonical forms. Let us look at two examples, in which the same pattern is properly delimited in one dictionary and in the other dictionary it is embedded in context. Both dictionaries were produced by the same team of lexicographers and were published by the same publisher:

lend... to – o. s. to sth se prêter à qch.
COLLINS ROBERT CONCISE FRENCH-ENGLISH
ENGLISH-FRENCH DICTIONARY

lend... 1 vt (b)... it would – itself to a different treatment cela se prêterait à un autre traitement; it doesn’t – itself to being filmed cela ne donnerait pas matière un film; I shall not – myself to your scheme je ne me prêterai pas à votre projet;
COLLINS ROBERT FRENCH DICTIONARY
FRENCH-ENGLISH ENGLISH-FRENCH

As can be seen in the former extract, the equivalence relation is maximally decontextualized, while in the latter one the recurrent relation is obscured by contextual clues, even though they are very valuable for the advanced user, or the translator. Traditionally BDs provided contextual restrictions on equivalents, yet this was done in a rather haphazard manner. Only recently there have appeared BDs in which due attention is given to equivalence between collocability patterns. One of the BDs is the DEUTSCH RUSSISCHES WÖRTERBUCH, for example:

---

84 Some recent dictionaries attempt to show such difficulties between both languages, e.g. the OXFORD-HACHETTE ENGLISH-FRENCH DICTIONARY.
ketten 1 jdn. an sich _ binden privjazyvat'... kogo-n. k sebe. sich an jdn. _ privjazyv-at'sja... k komu-n. (durch etw.) an jdn. gekettet sein byt' (cem-n.) svjazanym s kem-n. etw. kettet jdn. an jdn. ēto-n. svjazyvaet kogo-n. s kem-n. (privjazyvaet kogo-n. k komu-n.)...

DEUTSCH-RUSSISCHES WÖRTERBUCH

This is a monodirectional BD for German learners (users) of Russian. Another example can be given from the CZECH-ENGLISH DICTIONARY by Poldauf, which is also an active dictionary for Czech users (learners) of English:

pátrat 3. kde (po čem) search a place (for a t.)

škola ve — le 1. at school 2. v budove školy in the school (ale call in at school) 3. při školní práci in school (we learnt this in school)

CZECH-ENGLISH DICTIONARY

In this dictionary there are some general collocates, of which t. (for thing) is used in the example. Other general collocates are p (person), place, in a way, so much.

5.4. Sources of equivalents

Apart from the following general remarks we shall not go into details as to how equivalence is established in a practical way, i.e. what sorts of corpora should be used, etc. Zgusta (1971) has a relevant discussion, and a very valuable treatment of this can be found in Hansen (1988). Steiner (1976) has very interesting practical suggestions. We will touch only on some points of controversy.

Generally, there are three sources for the lexicographer: documented description of the language, introspection, texts (Sinclair 1985). Recently there is an opposition to the use of reference works as the basis for the compilation of another dictionary. In BL, for example, the MD was and still is used as the basis corpus, so to say. Its use was even advocated by some theoreticians (e.g. Zgusta 1971). At present yet it is argued that the BD differs so much in purpose and methodology from the MD that it should rely on independent corpora at the stage of compilation (e.g. Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach 1991; Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen 1988).
A defense of the traditional view can be found in Duda et al. (1986). They argue that there is no reason why the bilingual lexicographer should not use the results of the analysis of a corpus done by a competent native lexicographer, and that the MD can certainly be used, provided it is supplemented by other sources. Also it is common for bilingual lexicographers to use the existing BDs as the sources for their own dictionaries. Most often all the inadequacies of the earlier BDs are copied this way into the derivative works (many examples can be found in Steiner 1986a). As Gold correctly remarks, "there is nothing wrong in copying (indeed it is a virtue to build on the work of others), provided that one copies correct information, one eliminates any skewing or bias in the work being copied from, and one supplements it with fresh information if needed" (Gold 1986: 291). This is by far the most practical view.

From our point of view it does not matter very much where the material to be worked on in the process of compilation comes from, as it will have to be reworked extensively in the course of finding equivalents, preferably by native speakers of both L1 and L2.

5.5. Level of equivalence

Our view of what constitutes equivalence in a BD can have an influence on the solutions to some points of controversy, as found in the literature. In what follows we are going to treat the following topics: the level of equivalence, description of collocability, and meaning discrimination.

Many authors differ with respect to whether equivalence obtains between whole lexemes or between senses of lexemes. Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach (1984b; 1991) argue that equivalence holds between separate senses of lexemes, otherwise there would be few candidates for equivalence if the totality of meaning of an L1 lexeme was to be measured against the totality of meaning of an L2 lexeme. For other metalexicographers, for example for Berkov (1977), equivalence is a relation between whole lexemes, because senses are distinguished metalinguistically, therefore there is no agreement, and no adequate criteria, as to how to distinguish relevant senses, and consequently the differentiation of lexemes into senses differs enormously from MD to MD, and from BD to BD.
In our approach equivalence does not hold between single lexemes in L1 and L2, or between their senses, but between whole syntagmatic expressions, i.e. between collocability patterns which contain the lexemes. These patterns are, in our view, particular senses of a lexeme (cf. Cruse 1987), though for practical reasons there would be too many of such senses, and, for quicker orientation within the entry, some division into larger senses could be used, but it will be only a rhetorical device for the benefit of the users, and it will not have any impact on the equivalents themselves.

5.6. Collocability and meaning discrimination

The approach adopted here can explain also the different methods of description of collocability in the BD, and some suggestions on further improvement could be made. This can be best discussed on the basis of segmental and idiomatic dictionaries.

The whole difference between the segmental and the idiomatic dictionary can be reduced to the difference in the way the contexts (collocability patterns) are described in both types. First, the segmental dictionary can, and often does, present equivalence as obtaining between single lexemes, considered in isolation, though this most often means that the description of contexts is covert (this is the case most often with small pocket dictionaries). The idiomatic dictionary shows equivalence between expressions which are indicated either as contextualized lexemes or as collocability patterns. Second, when contexts are shown in both types, then the segmental BD most often indicates contexts as semantic collocability (semantic features), while in the idiomatic BD they are shown as lexical combinability (lists of collocates). However, description of collocability, when shown as semantic combinability, is often too strong, and can lead the user to producing unidiomatic strings.

This difference is in fact referred to by Halliday in his discussion of the two ways of presenting equivalence: ‘to climb (mountains etc.)’ and ‘to climb a mountain’. The former indicates in a way semantic collocability, i.e. ‘mountain etc.’ is taken to refer to expressions synonymous to ‘mountain’, and perhaps even to expressions denoting any high, rigid structure,
thus it is treated as a semantic feature of the class of expressions that can collocate with ‘to climb’. The latter shows lexical collocability, i.e. it only indicates that ‘to climb’ collocates with ‘a mountain’. Other collocates would have to be listed separately. Halliday warns that “the contextual equivalent of ‘climb’... might not in fact collocate with all the words that are contextual equivalents of ‘mountain’ (still less with those of the ‘etc.’)” (Halliday 1966b: 139). The point is that ‘to climb’ does not have to refer to expressions denoting rigid structures, as can be seen in to climb a rope. In COLLINS CONCISE ITALIAN DICTIONARY the collocability of to climb is given in the following way:

climb 2 vi (.... tree, ladder etc.)... (: staircase)... (: mountain, wall)... to – a rope...

This dictionary varies its description of contexts from semantic (tree, ladder etc.) to lexical (: staircase), (: mountain, wall), and includes what is treated like an idiom: to climb a rope, which in its semantics is rather unlike the other contexts.

Let us look also at how a predominantly segmental BD and a basically idiomatic BD show the collocability of the same lexeme. The segmental BD:

land – v. i. 2 (touch down, as of an aircraft) prizemljat’sja
(Katzner) ENGLISH-RUSSIAN RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY

And the idiomatic BD:

land v. i. (of aircraft) prizemljat’sja...; delat’ posadku; (on water) privodnjat’sja...;
(space-craft on moon /sic/) prilunjat’sja...; (on Mars) primarsit’sja
THE OXFORD ENGLISH-RUSSIAN DICTIONARY

Prizemljat’sja is still closely related to its etymological meaning, i.e. to zemlja ‘solid ground, the Earth’, and it cannot be used in all those contexts in which land can occur.

The description of collocability exerts some influence also on the method of meaning discrimination: collocability patterns can serve to dis-ambigu ate lexical items. At present the most frequent disambiguation method is paradigmatic, i.e. synonyms in L1 or in L2 are given for the relevant meaning of the lexeme (cf. land (touch down) in the entry above). This method is based on irrelevant criteria, if the approach advocated here
is adopted, because in order to disambiguate the particular patterns properly, the whole semantic structure of the word on left-hand side of the entry has to be imposed on the entry in the BD, which results in confusion, because the same patterns often have to be repeated in particular senses (on the complex issue of meaning discrimination in BL see in particular Cop 1990). Moreover, this method serves only one type of user well, whose L1 is the language on the left-hand side of the entry: synonyms belong to the paradigmatic dimension of language and as such they are implicit in texts, and it is the L1 user who can benefit from such descriptions. By contrast, description by means of collocation patterns can serve both types of user, primarily because syntagmatic patterns occur explicitly in texts.

5.7. Equivalence – the paradigmatic dimension

A discussion of the paradigmatic dimension in the BD can provide us with further valuable insights as to the methods used in BL. More precisely the term ‘paradigmatic dimension in the BD’ can have double reference. First, it can refer to microstructure, i.e. to the vertical dimension of the collocability patterns within the entry. This was discussed in the previous section, and it will be taken up again in a later section. Second, it can refer to macrostructure, i.e. to entries related paradigmatically (in one language) in the BD. The latter will concern us in this section.

Let us examine the equivalents which appear in entries of related items in one dictionary. The items are the most frequent synonyms of the verb *to shout*. They were taken from the ROGET'S INTERNATIONAL THESAURUS, entry 59.6 (except for the stylistically marked ones), which indicates that they are the most frequent words. The BD is a very good segmental dictionary: Katzner’s ENGLISH-RUSSIAN RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY. It has been chosen because its compilation has been executed in a very meticulous way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>shout</em></td>
<td>kričat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cry</em></td>
<td>(za) kričat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>call</em></td>
<td>zvat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>scream</em></td>
<td>kričat'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Equivalence

For nine entry-words the dictionary has only four equivalents: kриčать (also occurring in multiword equivalents) is used four times, визжать – twice, and there are single occurrences of звать and реветь. Yet a dictionary of Russian synonyms, modest in size, offers seven synonyms for kриčать:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kриčать</th>
<th>gorlaniť</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>orать</td>
<td>gorloparniť</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вопить</td>
<td>nadryvat'sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>реветь</td>
<td>nadsažyvat'sja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SLOVAR' SINONIMOV. SPRAVOČNOE POSOBIJE)

It might be supposed that the Katzner dictionary used simply the most frequent Russian items. This, however, is not the case. In a dictionary of Russian core vocabulary we find four lexemes, which are also words that Katzner did not use as equivalents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kриčать</th>
<th>вопить</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>orать</td>
<td>nadryvat'sja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(LEKSICESKAJA OSNOVA RUSSKOGO JAZYKA)

Let us look at what equivalents the four Russian items have been given in the Katzner dictionary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kриčать</th>
<th>shout, yell, scream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>orать</td>
<td>yell, scream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вопить</td>
<td>cry out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>надрываеться</td>
<td>to yell at the top of one's lungs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Кatzner) ENGLISH-RUSSIAN RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY

Both very frequent Russian lexemes, надрыватьсь and вопить, then, can be found only in the Russian-English side, so the English users have no access to them from their own language.

A conclusion that can be drawn is that the dictionary provides the user neither with a more or less complete range of Russian synonymous lexemes, nor with the most frequent items in the language. It is precisely
the translator who might require access to the former group of items, while it is the learner who certainly needs the latter items. The dictionary thus does not appear to be very much useful to either group of users. In fact it might be supposed that what the dictionary presents is the lexicographer’s own idiolect.\textsuperscript{85} It is even more important that obviously the equivalents in this dictionary have a metalinguistic function – they are to describe the meaning of the English or Russian items. This point will be developed on page 140.

It has to be noted that the majority of BDs that have been examined for this book also use the same methods. It is extremely rare when a BD has a wider range of equivalents in entries related paradigmatically, and that the equivalents are used in a discriminating way, so that the same equivalent is not repeated in a number of entries. Florin (1975, abridged in Florin 1983) examined a number of English and Russian BDs, as well as Bulgarian and Russian and English, and found the same regularities with nouns (relating to swords). One of the rare BDs that do discriminate equivalents in related entries is VAN DALE GROOT WOORDENBOEK NEDERLANDS-ENGLISH, for example:

\begin{verbatim}
indelen 0.1 divide → order, classify, group, arrange
rangschikken 0.1 classify → order, range, group, class, file
classificeren 0.1 classify → class, group, order, rank
ordenen 0.1 arrange → sort (out), organize, put/set in order
\end{verbatim}

VAN DALE GROOT WOORDENBOEK NEDERLANDS-ENGLISH

Thus, lexicographers generally seem to pay little attention to equivalents in entries related paradigmatically. As a result, BDs often fail their users. The use of a paradigmatic dictionary, such as a Roget’s thesaurus, would be of enormous importance in BL. A thesaurus can serve as a collection of useful phrases for the lexicographer, phrases which can be easily related to

\textsuperscript{85} This became also obvious to me when I worked on the Polish-English side of the NOWY SŁOWNIK ANGIELSKO-POLSKI I POLSKO-ANGIELSKI, produced by conversion of the English-Polish side (cf. Piotrowski 1994: 198–200): the choice of Polish entry-words reflected both the sources of the English-Polish side and the preferences of the compilers.
some fields of discourse. This is possible because a thesaurus is not, in fact, a dictionary of synonyms (cf. McArthur 1986a; Piotrowski 1994; forthcoming), but is simply a collection of items grouped on a loose basis of relatedness. The relatedness is often based on the function of items in a field of discourse. The entry Water Travel (275) in ROGET’S INTERNATIONAL THESAURUS has a great number of items used in relation to this topic, and it includes collocations and phrases. This useful material is otherwise hard to find at one place. Roget originally thought of using his dictionary in foreign language learning, and he even envisaged a parallel, bilingual thesaurus (cf. Roget 1852/1962).

On the other hand, the above remarks should not be taken to mean that it would be possible to match LI and L2 expressions on a one-to-one basis. Any lexical item is very much indeterminate, and in the act of reference it is made more precise by the contexts. For many reasons there is a great deal of overlapping of semantic ranges and uses of particular items. This was found by Tomaszczyk (1976), who wanted, as precisely as possible, to find equivalents of English society, organisation, association, and concluded that it was impossible. Benson (1985) achieved the same results in his attempt to match unequivocally Serbo-Croatian katedra, odsek, seminar, zavod with American English equivalents. Therefore it has to be said that usually a group of lexemes corresponds to a group of equivalents, i.e. that items covering a certain universe of discourse correspond to items in another language which cover the same universe of discourse (we shall assume that identification of the identity of a universe of discourse depends on applicability). Thus in equivalence the rule seems to be multiple equivalence (Multivergenz in terms of Rettig 1985).

5.8. Equivalence – the ultimate basis

When two items from two languages are considered applicable in the same situation by a bilingual, what makes the bilingual perceive the identity of applicability? It seems that there must be something in the L2 situation, in which the L2 item is applicable, which is similar to the L1 situation. What does this similarity depend on? Obviously it depends on similarities be-
5.8. Equivalence – the ultimate basis

between L1 and L2 cultures, i.e. on cultural similarities. In other words applicability depends on the degree of cultural overlap (Lyons 1968, 1977). Thus on the surface the BD deals with linguistic forms, while in fact it has to do with cultural facts. Consequently, the more two cultures are similar, the more they overlap, and the easier it is to produce a BD (cf. Zgusta 1971). Accordingly, it is certainly easier to make a dictionary between two Slavonic languages than a BD between English and a Slavonic language.

What has been said above is also true of translation: it is certainly easier to translate from Russian to Polish than from Russian to English. The very possibility of making a translation and of producing a bilingual dictionary depends on cultural overlap. There is the major difference yet that in BL we have to do with cultural overlap of more or less stable facts (concepts, etc.), as encoded in the linguistic forms in the relevant language, while in translation we have to do with complex messages based on the encoded concepts. Yet if there is little intercultural identity between the encoded concepts, then, it seems, both translation and lexicography become very difficult to realize. Lenneberg argues that

the cultural and physical contexts of Chukchee utterances are... incompatible with the contexts within which English is spoken... Thus, practically no common frame of reference, no basis for a segmental, one-by-one comparison exists between these two languages. Translation here can be only a very rough approximation of what has been said and intended originally.


We may add that it would be very difficult to produce a bilingual dictionary as well with that language, a BD that would contain equivalents, not glosses.

For many lexicographers BDs are directly related to the tasks of intercultural comparison. Williams expresses this explicitly, for him the bilingual lexicographer is confronted with “the task of equating two civilizations” (Williams 1959: 246). There are also many implicit remarks to the same effect. A reviewer of the OXFORD ENGLISH-RUSSIAN DICTIONARY, for example, criticizes it on the grounds that

Some of the English examples seem odd for use in the USSR. ‘I’ll put him in the

---

86 In this discussion the assumption will be that it is known, in an intuitive, pre-scientific sense, what culture is, therefore no definition will be offered.
best bedroom' would have little application in Moscow, where nearly every room is used as a bedroom every night by one or more people. (Wilson 1985: 126)

In other words, she argues that it would be difficult to find the appropriate context (situation) for the Russian equivalent of the sentence above because of a cultural difference. Many examples in BDs show also this belief. Steiner in his THE BANTAM NEW COLLEGE FRENCH AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY (the series was edited by Williams) included such entries:

cheval... metric or French horsepower (735 watts)
horsepower... (746 watts) cheval-vapeur anglais

THE BANTAM NEW COLLEGE FRENCH AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY

Cheval, thus, in the appropriate meaning, is thought to belong only to French culture, while horsepower is related only to English culture.

Our examples show indeed that 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.

Generally it is believed that the entry in a BD is an equation, i.e. that the amount of information on both sides has to be identical (cf. Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach 1984b, 1991; Steiner 1971). Obviously L1 and L2 cultural facts are not identical: they are both similar and different in some respects. Most metalexicographers believe that it would be possible to establish more or less precisely what the similarity is on a negative basis, i.e. when the differences have been described, what is left is the fairly non-controversial common core, the point of cultural overlap, which the user can be expected to know on the basis of his or her knowledge of L1 (cf. Berkov 1975, 1977, Berkov explicitly calls for a differential dictionary; a similar idea is present in Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach 1984b, 1991). The differences should be described by metalinguistic comments, glosses, etc. The common core is specified by the equivalent. Further, it is believed that no lexical item, or at least that few of them, are culture-independent (cf. Berkov 1975, 1977; Tomaszczyk 1983). Thus it is only logical that a BD should become a cultural encyclopedia (cf. Berkov 1977; Nida 1958; Vereščagin & Kostomarov 1980).

And because lexicographers have been interested in what L1 and L2 items differ in, the differences in the area of culture have been treated in
some detail in lexicographical and lexicological literature. The difference most frequently referred to is anisomorphism, i.e. the differences in the categorization of the universe of discourse. It has been discussed by the majority of scholars dealing with semantics, from Boas, Sapir, Whorf, to Hjelmslev and Lyons. Zgusta (1971) and numerous other authors adapted the discussion to the needs of BL. Apart from anisomorphism also the differences in connotations (associations, etc.) are frequently mentioned (cf. Berkov 1977; Havás 1957).

There are also other cultural differences. Any lexeme which is based on the notion of the norm can exhibit some cultural idiosyncrasy, for example gradable lexemes, antonyms, synonyms, etc. What a big room! and Ale wielki pokój!, uttered by an American and a Pole, respectively, in a flat, will certainly refer to quite different dimensions: an American room will be usually far bigger than a Polish one. Other differences can be revealed by different morpho-syntactic combinability of L1 and L2 lexemes. English police occurs with a plural verb, and Polish policja occurs with a singular verb. It might be supposed that the police in English denotes a group of individuals, and that it refers to an institution only in a derived sense, while in Polish policja is used first of all in the institution meaning (cf. Nakhimenovský 1977 on English and Russian contrasts in this respect). Can all these differences be somehow incorporated into BD entries? That would be required if the BD were to be a cultural encyclopedia.

Obviously a very important assumption is made at this point: that the meaning of a lexeme, including its cultural background, is finitely describable, that "semantic information is always all-or-nothing, that anything we may be able to say about the meaning of an expression presupposes that we know all of it" (Haas 1987: 349) (we shall return to the idea that meaning is described exhaustively in a BD in a later section). This belief is not true – it is doubtful whether a complete description of a lexeme can ever be achieved. In the contextual approach, particularly appropriate to BL, the meaning of an item does not seem to be finitely describable (Cruse 1986: 16) because the number of contexts is inexhaustible, and new contexts can invest a linguistic form with novel meanings.

What is more important, a complete description of meaning has to involve a description of the greater part of the culture to which the word belongs (Brown 1958: 260). Any attempt to show the differences between English democracy, freedom, law, etc., and Polish demokracja, wolność,
prawo, etc. would have to be extremely complicated. Staniszkis (1989) argues that the key terms in the culture of communist Poland have to be discussed on three levels: the level of what there is, of practice, real life, and two levels of mythical concepts. On one mythical level there are concepts used in official, communist propaganda, and on the other level there are popular beliefs, which are often simple black-and-white reversals of the official myths, but which at the same time incorporate many assumptions from the official level. While the three levels still exert their influence in post-communist Poland, there is also felt an impact of concepts, again encoded by the same lexemes, taken from Western democracies. Perhaps a book-long study would give justice to this conceptual confusion. Actually, Benedict (1946) made an attempt to describe Japanese culture by describing the key words (cf. Brown 1958).

In his famous passage, Ščerba in fact discussed such difficulties as those referred to above, when he considered the “ideological” aspects of the BD:

... v samom dele, množestvo ponjatij izmienilos’ u nas v svoem soderžanii, no kak otrazit’ eto prosto i ponjatno v perevode? Soversenno očevidno, naprimer, čto naš prokuror ne tó že samoe, čto v buržuaznych stranach, no tem ne menee my perevodim ego slovom procureur, i tak v beskonešnom rjade slučaev.

(Ščerba 1939/83: 8)

The view that the BD is “to equate two civilizations” can be given a too narrow interpretation, which we have seen on page 128, and it actually contradicts the requirement that the BD should be a manual of translation, even though it is precisely the latter requirement that is used as a reason for the former (cf. Berkov 1975, 1977). When we look again at the bedroom example above (page 127-128), then obviously the Russian equivalent sentence has an excellent context in which to appear – a translation from English about English culture. In a similar way, cheval is not always ‘metric horsepower’, but it can refer to the English unit as well.

Lexemes are not uniquely related to their original cultural background, and translation depends on their ability to appear in new contexts. If lexemes were wholly determined by their contexts, then not only translation but any linguistic change would be impossible. As Haas puts it “one is always free to go against the tendencies inherent in usage by using an expression in a novel context. Indeed, not only is one free to do this but language is powerless to stop one doing so” (Allerton & Carney & Hold-
5.8. Equivalence – the ultimate basis

croft 1979: 14). Nothing is wholly impossible in the lexicon of a language, provided that appropriate contexts are used (cf. Halliday 1966a). Truly translational dictionaries have to be quite imprecise in their description of cultural facts (one example is ILUSTROWANY SŁOWNIK ROSYJSKO-POLSKI POLSKO-ROSYJSKI), if they are to be useful in a wide variety of contexts.

Bilingual lexicographers certainly concentrated too much on the differences between languages. Lyons (1977) for example argues that the advocates of the linguistic relativity hypothesis, i.e. those who stressed the importance of anisomorphism, which was adopted by the theoreticians of BL, exaggerated the role of linguistic differences, overlooking the significance of the similarities. Thus what is in fact really important is what the similarities between L1 and L2 items, which are said to be equivalent, depend on. We can only touch on the most basic aspects, relevant to our further discussion, in what follows.

Any object can be described from two points of view: from the point of view of its form (appearance) and from that of its function. Interestingly, in ML form has been usually given priority in definitions (cf. Hanks 1987; Piotrowski 1988a), because in MDs definitions were supposed to provide criteria which would enable the users to distinguish the relevant objects in the world, and function is not immediately apparent in the objects. In BL, on the other hand, function seems to be more important: form, appearance, is disregarded in equivalence (on the basis of applicability). There are many examples of the different approaches. Vachek (in Mathesius 1975), among other examples, has the following one, which can be applied to other Slavic languages:

the piece of reality denoted by... Czech... chleb 'bread' has the shape of a strongly baked loaf made mostly of rye flour and is cut centripetally into relatively thick slices;... what the English call bread has the shape of a softly baked cube (or, rather, of a brachy-pyramid) made of wheat flour and cut in a parallel manner into relatively thin slices.

(Mathesius 1975: 177–178)

Numerous examples can be also found in Berkov (1975; 1977), Vereščagin & Kostomarov (1980).

Thus, it is the similarity of the purpose the given object is used for, or of the way something is operated, rather than similarity in form, that is at the basis of applicability. That similarity of purpose will be seen, however,
only by somebody who knows both cultures equally well. After Lyons (1968) we may say that translators and bilingual lexicographers usually consider equivalence to be culture-invariant, and in doing so they typically disregard the relations of sense of the given lexeme(s). In translation, however, it depends on the purpose of a specific translation task whether sense relations are preserved in translation or not; when translating an important philosophical text, for example, the translator may want to preserve them. As to BL, in the following section (5.9) we shall see that very often there is an attempt to preserve sense relations of a lexeme and its equivalent(s) in BDs. There is more research needed, however, on this important issue.

In other words, culture-invariance depends on the similar place both objects have in their respective culture. And the similarity of function within the system of culture is evidently perceived on the basis of analogical reasoning. In this type of reasoning facts from different cultures are equated because of some vague similarity, and otherwise important differences between cultural facts are not taken into account. Analogical reasoning is basically metaphoric thinking, and the importance of this type of reasoning in language has been stressed by many authors, e.g. Lakoff and Johnson (1980). As we have noted, the notion of applicability is ill-defined and inherently vague, and it is exactly this imprecision which allows the lexicographers to make sweeping analogical equations between two cultures.

Analogical comparisons are very commonly used outside BL to provide some important information, which, though imprecise, nevertheless imparts some significant characteristics of the object, which it would be very difficult to describe explicitly. Dziewanowski, for example, in his book on the British Empire, in the description of British India, has the following information: Indian Simla is an English Brighton, is a Polish Sopot (Dziewanowski 1989: 338), to which one can add: it is a German , it is a Russian . This analogical chain is left open, because it can be extended indefinitely. It is obvious that this way the reader is very quickly and efficiently informed of something significant.

87 In the Polish series of translations of classical philosophical texts Biblioteka Klasyków Filozofii this is often achieved by providing the original key words, or expressions, together with their Polish equivalents. This way the readers know that the Polish words are different only apparently, in fact they are 'the same words', and the readers can reconstruct the original sense relations of key items.
The same method is used in BL. Here is an example from the COLLINS CONCISE ITALIAN DICTIONARY:

camera 1 b) C ~ dei Deputati Chamber of Deputies; \(\equiv\) House of Commons (Brit), House of Representatives (Am)

The list on the right-hand side can be easily added to: in (former) Rhodesia and South Africa there was the House of Assembly. Moreover, the British term applies also to Canadian culture, and the American one to Australian culture, and appropriate labels could indicate this. Further, more general and neutral items can be used as equivalents, to serve the needs of translation of texts about other cultures, for example Polish, or German: lower house, lower chamber.

On the left-hand side camera can be replaced by Polish Sejm, German Unterhaus, French Chambre des Deputes, etc. In fact we have to do with an analogical chain in this case. What is left out in BDs, in comparison to expressions like "Miłosz is a Polish Eliot", is the article a, i.e. the whole expression a sort of..., an indicator of imprecision. It is the lack of an overt exponent of this indicator in BDs which has given rise to many misconceptions about lexicographical equations in BL. In some dictionaries the approximate equality sign, like the one in the entry above, is used, e.g. in Smirnitsky and Akhmanova's RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY, or in the Collins BDs. Its meaning is explained in the COLLINS ENGLISH-GERMAN DICTIONARY as follows:

\(\equiv\) indicates that the translation is the cultural equivalent of the term and may not be exactly the same in every detail

(COLLINS ENGLISH-GERMAN DICTIONARY, p. xvii)

But, in the light of the above discussion, one may wonder which equivalents are not cultural in a BD, and whether two terms may ever be exactly the same in every detail. As it happens, the sign would have to be used in the majority of cases in a BD if it were to be used properly.

---

88 ROGET'S INTERNATIONAL THESAURUS was the source of this information.
5.9. Cognitive equivalence

This section will further discuss equivalence, and certain restrictions imposed on it in BL. We shall attempt to show that equivalence can be split into two types: cognitive and translational, and that cognitive equivalence is considered to be the basic type in mainstream BL. Also it will show that the model of mainstream BL is in fact contradictory. The terms ‘mainstream BL’ and ‘mainstream BDs’ will refer to the most frequent theoretical views and to what can be found most often in BDs.

The mainstream theory of BL is based on certain assumptions, some explicit, some implicit. The explicit assumption has been discussed extensively in the previous chapter - it is assumed that the BD is a translating dictionary, that it is a manual of translation. In the implicit assumption, which we are going to discuss in this section, it is assumed that equivalence should be cognitive (this will be defined on p. 139). In practice, most BDs do include cognitive equivalents as the most important type of equivalence but, as a result, the BD cannot fulfill adequately its function of a translating dictionary. Obviously there is an internal inconsistency in BL between the implicit and the explicit assumption.

Let us start our discussion by taking up, again, the ultimate purpose of the BD, i.e. its function as a manual of translation. In the previous chapter we have mentioned that BDs are not considered to be suitable even for non-professional translators. The blame is usually put on the BD, which is said not to contain adequate translational equivalents as widely as they can (e.g. Gallagher 1986; Hatherall 1984; Tomaszczyk 1989; Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen 1988). This can be, however, formulated in another way: the problem may be that BD equivalents are not, in fact, translational, or perhaps they are translational only to a certain degree. This is the hypothesis that we are going to verify in this section.

We shall start discussing the hypothesis by considering the faults which the authors quoted above found with the BD. They often note that

dictionaries are not very good at conveying the realisation that an English noun, for example, need not and often does not have a German noun as its functional equivalent (Hatherall 1984: 188).

We may ask why the term “functional equivalent” is used in this quota-
tion instead of the simple "equivalent". Actually there are interesting theoretical reasons for this terminology.

The non-equivalence of parts of speech in translation has been noticed by other authors. Gallagher (1986) provides a detailed discussion of some problems in this area in English-German translation. He notes that there are many instances when the English (abstract) noun, or a nominal construction, has to be translated by a German verb. In response to his paper other translators between English and German, or between English and French, provided further evidence, and Gallagher (1989) has an extended analysis of the problem. Evidently this is a remarkable problem for the translator. Gallagher's conclusion is that

we may posit that the interchange of various parts of speech is one of the fundamental devices by which the information structure of a clause may be preserved in German-English and English-German translation [emphasis added]

(Gallagher 1989: 64).

The translational part-of-speech interchange occurs also in translation between other languages, English and Slavonic, or between German and Slavonic. Standard Soviet books on translation usually discuss the problem (e.g. Barchudarov 1975). An interesting explanation of the difficulty in English-Slavic and English-German translation has been offered by the Praguians. Mathesius (1975) and Vachek (1961/76) argue that in English the semantic function, and the dynamism, of the verb is greatly reduced. In the Slavonic languages, and in German, the verb is more important than the noun (Vachek provides many examples, and further references). It is also highly significant that bilingual lexicographers are fully aware of this problem (see Duda et al. 1986: 37; the relevant quotation is below).

This discussion suggests that indeed in translation changes in the part-of-speech status are often the norm rather than the exception. For the translator thus the part-of-speech status, and a corresponding label, is of secondary importance. Again this can be explained by the fact that the translator most often ignores the sense relations of the items in the text to be translated. What about bilingual lexicographers? It is evident that in BL the part-of-speech status is very important. We may provide the quotation from Duda et al. (1986) to show this (it also anticipates our further discussion):

beim konkreten Übersetzungsvergung [muß] das im Wörterbuch genannte Äquivalent für ein bestimmtes russisches Wort in jedem Fall die für die jeweilige Textstelle der
5. Equivalence

Unfortunately Duda and his colleagues do not explain why this contradictory strategy is used. For explanation we have to go to the classical text by Zgusta, who formulates the objectives of BL as follows:

The logical outset for the search for equivalents is a comparative analysis of the structures of the two languages. The lexicographer must ascertain what categories of lexical units (i.e. traditionally what parts of speech) are present in both languages, and must decide which pairs of categories will be considered equivalent. This is relatively easy if there are observable similar or identical categories in the two languages: it will be easy to decide that a French noun will be considered equivalent to an English one, that a Russian verb will be considered equivalent to a German one, etc. The lexical equivalence will, then, be preferably chosen in such a way that they belong to the categories considered equivalent.

(Zgusta 1971: 313)

Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen (1988) correctly point out that this view presupposes that, first, an independent semantic analysis of the two languages involved is done, and, second, only after this has been done can matching of the items from both languages go on. They also stress the fact that prior considerations of meaning do not lead to adequate translation.

Zgusta in his publications (Zgusta 1971; 1988) argues that an equivalent has two dimensions: meaning and translatibility. The ideal equivalent should be identical, or almost identical, in meaning to the source expression, and it should be substitutable for it in relevant contexts. In other words, the equivalent should be semantically complete and translationally adequate (cf. also Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach 1984b; Steiner 1971). The part-of-speech status is apparently treated as a semantic feature (actually it is treated like that in most traditional grammatical descriptions). Yet it is, as we have seen, of secondary importance in translation. But, what is important, BDs usually do not make any distinctions between lexemes of the same part of speech, but with distinctly differing syntactic requirements, e.g.

kwaadgezind... evil-minded → ill-disposed (towards), scheming,... malevolent

VAN DALE GROOT WOORDENBOEK NEDERLANDS-ENGELS
scheming is usually used as an attributive adjective, and this feature was apparently considered unimportant in this dictionary. What was important was the broad category “adjective”.

Certainly there is a conflict in BL between the requirement that equivalents should be both semantically complete and translationally adequate. Let us look at this issue closer. As we have seen in the previous chapter, in certain approaches to BL it is axiomatic that the most frequent equivalent in the corpus is the best one. Catford (1965) provides some statistics on the equivalence between English and French articles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ø</th>
<th>the</th>
<th>some</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>le</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>du</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>un</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Catford 1965: 81).

The figures relate to percentages: 100 would mean that whenever a French article appears in the original, the corresponding English article would be used in the translation; they were calculated on the basis of actual translations. Here is what can be found in two French-English dictionaries with regard to *du* (i.e. *de*):

*de* 2... *(a)... some (souvent omis)...*

(COLLINS ROBERT FRENCH DICTIONARY)

*de... some, any... *(Non traduit)...*

(DICTIONNAIRE MODERNE FRANÇAIS-ANGLAIS)

Evidently the most frequent equivalent, i.e. Ø in this case, is not treated as the most important one in the two BDs: it is not accurate to state that *some* is frequently not used in translation of *de/du*. On the contrary, *de* is most often translated without any overt equivalent. The implications are far reaching. It might be supposed that *some* is given as the most frequent equivalent of *de* because positive equivalence, i.e. when the equivalent is a lexical item, appears to be more important than negative equivalence, i.e. when a metalinguistic gloss has to be used instead of a lexeme. This
will be discussed in the next section. It is also evident that in this case *de* is
equated with *some* not because *some* is a translational equivalent of *de* but
because it seems that the meaning is described in this way (the same con-
clusions can be drawn from Pedersen 1984). *Some* is used because it is
believed that it has roughly the same place in the system of English as *de*
has in the system of French. The place of an item in a linguistic system is
determined by its sense relations. Therefore the two articles are shown to be
equivalent because their sense relations are thought to be roughly the same.

The term ‘a semantically complete equivalent’ will mean an equivalent
which overlaps in its applicability and sense relations with the relevant
dimensions of meaning of the source expression. The part-of-speech status
can perhaps be treated as a sense-relation. But it is precisely the sense
relations of an item which are disregarded in translation. A semantically
complete equivalent very often cannot be used in translation, and that is
why, it seems, mainstream BDs are not very efficient manuals of transla-
tion. Truly translational equivalents have the same applicability as the
source expressions, but they do not preserve sense relations. Therefore most
often they are not immediately understandable to the user. To make the user
better understand the translational equivalent Bogusławski, for example, has
to include illustrative material in such entries in his BD, though such ma-
terial appears there very rarely. For example:

```plaintext
bać się... boi się... straśno... boję się mnie straśno
(ILUSTROWANY SŁOWNIK ROSYJSKO-POLSKI POLSKO-ROSYJSKI)
```

In this case a Polish verb corresponds to a Russian adverb.

It is remarkable how far the discussion of equivalents parallels the
discussion of synonyms within one language. There are usually two criteria
provided for synonyms, as there are for equivalents: identity of meaning,
and substitutability in the relevant contexts (cf. Apresjan 1974/80; Lyons
1977). Actually occasionally equivalents are called synonyms (Landau
1984), but Lyons (1968) argues this is incorrect because sense relations are
not preserved between two items in the relation of equivalence. This is of
course true of translation but, as we have just seen, in BL there is an attempt
to match equivalent items also along the dimension of sense relations.

---

89 In this respect it is certainly interesting that in machine translation the part of
speech is also preserved (cf. Apresjan et al. 1989).
Lyons further suggests that the two criteria for synonymy, i.e. semantic identity and substitutability, are logically independent. This is also true of lexicographical equivalents. It seems therefore that Lyons' approach can be adopted for our purpose, and we shall call semantic identity cognitive equivalence, while substitutability will be called translational equivalence. Lyons' approach has been criticized, as the criterion of semantic identity requires prior identification of relevant dimensions of meaning, and Lyons has not specified how many dimensions of meaning there are (Cruse 1986: 292). Yet this is only advantageous for the lexicographer, because the number of dimensions of meaning can be established to suit the particular purpose (the specific dictionary). As a result, we might say that a translational equivalent has to be substituted for the source expression in all relevant contexts, while a cognitive equivalent has to be identical with the source expression on all relevant dimensions of meaning. The translational equivalent thus corresponds to Lyons' total synonymy, and the cognitive equivalent to complete synonymy.

Cognitive equivalence corresponds to cognitive synonymy, which can be defined as follows:

X is a cognitive synonym of Y if
1) X and Y are syntactically identical, and
2) any grammatical declarative sentence S containing X has equivalent truth-conditions to another sentence S', which is identical to S except that X is replaced by Y

(Cruse 1986: 88).

This definition can clearly be also accommodated to BL. Point 2 refers to denotation, but denotation is too narrow for BL, and it has to be replaced by the wider notion of applicability. Cognitive synonyms are for example synonyms which differ only by one dimension of meaning, e.g. by their expressive value. Fiddle and violin are thus cognitive synonyms (Cruse, 88). It is certainly interesting that BDs often include cognitive synonyms as equivalents, e.g.:

pochlebovat... 2... adulate a p., toady to a p., fawn upon a p.
svléct... 3... strip/divest a p. of a t.

(CZECH-ENGLISH DICTIONARY)

These equivalents are not differentiated in their stylistic value.

As to cognitive equivalence, it is important to discuss what relevant
dimensions of meaning there are. We have mentioned two: applicability and
sense. Berkov (1977) discusses syntactic, stylistic, associative, connotative,
areal, and frequency dimensions. Zgusta shows how the number of dimen-
sions which the theoreticians suggested should be used for finding equiva-
Ients keeps growing: some authors require that all parameters of possible
variation (style, etc.), should be taken into account, others added to this
requirement the demand that the collocability, metaphoricality, ironic usage
of two equivalent items should be the same, and other scholars also believe
that syntactic patterns should be also the same, and he wonders “how
frequently one would find a pair of expressions in two languages endowed
with this degree of both semantic and formal identity” (Zgusta 1988: 41).
The best solution would be to choose the dimensions that are to be
preserved in a BD, and their number may vary depending on the purpose of
the dictionary.

In both theory and practice cognitive equivalence has been considered
to be more important than translational equivalence. As to the theory, the
terminology is very significant. Many practitioners and theoreticians do use
some sort of contrast between equivalents (i.e. cognitive equivalents) and
functional, or pragmatic equivalents (i.e. translational equivalents). This ter-
minology suggests that functional equivalence is a special type of equi-
\valence, that it is subordinate to cognitive equivalence, that translational
equivalents are simply textual variants of cognitive equivalents. Implicitly
thus it is assumed that system equivalence is the basic sort of equivalence.
(Actually, the opposite is true: cognitive equivalents are translational equi-
\valents which are thought to have roughly the same sense as the left-hand
expression.) Logically then the most important objective of BL should be
not provision of translational equivalents but instead a comparison of two
language systems. Implicitly thus it is believed that the basic function of
BDs is to be a metalinguistic description, while explicitly it is said that their
function is to serve as an aid in translation.

Also in practice, in BDs, there is ample evidence that the basic type of
equivalence is cognitive equivalence. This can be seen in the treatment of
both types of equivalent in the BDs. Cognitive equivalents are given the
most conspicuous place in the entry. At this place they are decontextualized,
therefore they can be easily retrieved. In contrast, translational equivalents
are very difficult to retrieve – they are hidden in the entry and usually
embedded in context, often of complex type. It is often difficult for the user
to distinguish them from other information categories such as idioms, illustrations, etc. In other words, cognitive equivalents are given segmental treatment in BDs, while translational equivalents are given idiomatic treatment. This point has been emphasized by Manley & Jacobsen & Pedersen (1988). Finally, translational equivalents are usually entered only in one side of the BD. Yet it is precisely translational equivalence that most often allows the user to produce idiomatic text in the other language, therefore this policy inhibits production of idiomatic texts. Let us have a simple example:

walker 1. Spaziergänger; Wanderer; Geher. to be a fast/slow — schnell/langsam gehen

(COLLINS ENGLISH-GERMAN DICTIONARY)

walker 1. (a) marcheur; promeneur. he's a good/bad — il est bon/mauvais marcheur; he's a fast — il marche vite

(COLLINS ROBERT FRENCH DICTIONARY)

walker 1. piechur, miłośnik wycieczek pieszych; to be a good/poor/ — dobrze /słabo/ chodzić; mieć dobre /kiepskie/ nogi

(GREAT ENGLISH-POLISH DICTIONARY)

These dictionaries do not include the expression to be a ___ walker at, respectively, gehen, marcher, chodzić in the other sides.

Cognitive equivalence has an important function in BL. First, it can be used to restrict the number of equivalents and it makes the search for equivalents easier. The search is easier because the lexicographer knows roughly that the equivalent item will have some predictable characteristics. This is known in advance. Nothing is known in advance in the case of translational equivalents, for which the only criterion is substitutability in relevant contexts. Nothing is therefore predictable.

Second, cognitive equivalence is important for the user, because the user can employ the mechanism of analogy with great success in this case, while the mechanism is not as useful with translational equivalents. In Polish a good translational equivalent of English of is the hyphen plus a complex syntactic description:

of 6.... a giant of a man człowiek-gigant

NOWY SŁOWNIK ANGIELSKO-POLSKI POLSKO-ANGIELSKI
This equivalent requires complex activity from the users, it is "unusual" for them. With cognitive equivalents, for example

of 5. na (umrzeć na raka die of cancer)

the user has the feeling of grasping the essence of the L2 item, and expects the speaker of the other language to have similar feelings when the L1-L2 BD is used. The exact nature of this mechanism will be described in more detail in the section on codability (5.11).

5.10. Typologies of equivalence

Most authors who write on BL use some sort of typology of equivalence relations, because it is now commonly believed that the degree of equivalence is not stable but it differs for particular pairs of items (cf. Gold 1987; Hartmann 1985a; Snell-Homby 1987). Various typologies were offered by Berkov (1977, with many examples), Duda et al. (1986), Hausmann (1977), Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach (1984b, 1991), Rettig (1985), Zgusta (1971). The discussion of typology in this section will again serve to reveal some hidden assumptions as to BL. Some of these assumptions will then be taken up in the last section.

Duda et al. (1986) divide all typologies into two broad types: qualitative (the basis is the nature of equivalence), and quantitative (the basis is the number of equivalents), and we shall follow this division, discussing first qualitative classifications.

In qualitative typology the most typical division is into three types: full, partial, and nil equivalence. This is used by nearly all the scholars referred to above. By equivalence here cognitive equivalence is meant, and the degree of semantic overlap of L1 and L2 items. Nil equivalence means that L1 and L2 items have no semantic features in common, while in full equivalence they share all semantic features. The typologies need some clarification, because they reflect contradictory views on BL and, though apparently obvious, are not very clear.

It is not difficult to see that the typologies can be represented by the Venn diagrams:
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1. partial equivalence, i.e. overlap (class A and class B have members in common, each has members not found in the other);
2. full equivalence, i.e. identity (class A and class B have the same members);
3. inclusion (class B is wholly included in class A);
4. nil equivalence, i.e. disjunction (class A and class B have no members in common)


It is evident from the diagrams that few authors, with the exception of Berkov (1977), notice the third case, though, as we have argued in Chapter 4, section 4.7, the relation of inclusion is very frequent between English and Slavonic lexemes.

The most important question with respect to typologies is: what are they related to? The diagrams may represent either relations between classes (sets), or between terms of propositions. Equivalents are not propositions (though they are derived from sentential patterns), so we have to do with relations between classes. What do the classes relate to? Do they relate to extension or to intension of lexical items, or, in other words, to denotation (here to applicability), or to connotation? Connotation can be construed as
a class of semantic features. Denotation can be interpreted as a class of entities, while applicability could be understood as a class of situations, or of contexts. Thus our question in fact is: do the typologies relate to classes of semantic features, or to classes of contexts (the terminology is from Lyons 1977)?

It is important to pay due attention to this duality, as sameness of intension, however it is understood, is not directly related to translatability. Translatability depends on context, and even from a theoretical point of view the contextual requirements of a lexeme cannot be derived from its semantic properties, i.e. even when the language system is considered, the contexts that a given lexeme occurs in are not determined by its meaning (Lyons 1977).

Therefore in fact we should have two sets of the Venn diagrams for typologies of equivalence relations. One set would represent intensional relations, and the other would show extensional relations. A pair of equivalent items, then, should be classified on the basis of the identity of semantic features and of their contexts. It is not difficult to find items which have no semantic feature in common but which occur in the same contexts and are thus equivalent. Many expressions used in phatic communion would belong to this category, for example English *Yours sincerely* – Polish *z poważaniem*; Polish *Remanent* – Russian *Magazin zakryt na ščet* (the latter from Bogusławski 1976b). Hausmann (in print) has an excellent example of the equivalence Fr *feu* Lat *aqua*, used in a French and Latin BD. In French one shouts *Feu! ‘fire’* when a fire is seen, but the ancient Romans used to shout *Aqua! ‘water’* in the same situation. On the other hand, it is difficult to think of items that would be identical in meaning but which did not overlap in contexts. Perhaps some taboo words could be used in this way.

Let us mention some problems with qualitative typologies. First of all a typology based on meaning can be established only when both L1 and L2 items have been described in the same, precise way. To my knowledge this has not been done so far. Secondly, it is again assumed that the meaning can be described in its totality, otherwise it would not be possible to postulate sameness or difference in meaning. When discussing semantic differences it is difficult to stop in the analysis, and in an extreme case the analysis of meaning is the same as the analysis of culture. What is more interesting yet is the fact that almost all the typologies are believed to be based on semantic identity or difference, but the differences are discussed on the
basis of translatability between various languages. Thus the typologies are again about language systems.

The other type of typology is quantitative, and it was used by Hausmann (1977). He introduced the terms Divergenz – when a LI lexical item corresponds to two, three, etc. L2 items, and Konvergenz, when two, three, etc., lexical items in L2 correspond to one LI item. Thus

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{L2} \\
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{L1} \\
\quad a \\
\quad b \\
\end{array}
\]

Divergenz

Yet at the same time Hausmann is an advocate of the view that equivalence is infinite, that in most cases the number of equivalents cannot be exhausted. It seems thus that the two views are contradictory: if the number of equivalents is infinite, then how can there be Divergenz\(^{90}\)? It seems that for Hausmann the primary aspect to be dealt with is the meaning of both items, though it is not clear how this meaning is determined. Probably thus his typology can be represented as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{L2} \\
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{L1} \\
\quad 1_a \quad 2_a \quad 3_a \quad 4_a \quad 5_a \\
\quad 1_b \quad 2_b \quad 3_b \quad 4_b \quad 5_b \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus, an equivalent lexeme has two meanings, and all equivalents are in a paradigmatic relation of chain synonymy to the two meanings. Yet again the primacy of meaning is initially assumed.

In what follows we shall discuss the three relations of qualitative equivalence in more detail. Inclusion will be omitted.

\(^{90}\) This contradiction could be solved by postulating that Divergenz is related to prototypical equivalents (sensu Neubert 1992), not to all possible equivalents.
Full equivalence. In this type both items have the same meaning and/or the same contexts. This is a rare type of equivalence, restricted to terminology in the sciences and technology. Take the example of laser, and laser beam/weapon, laser-sharp, and the Polish equivalents. The most obvious equivalent is 'laser'.

Admittedly the meaning of English laser is the same in all the examples, but let us look at the equivalents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Pol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>laser n.</td>
<td>laser n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laser (weapons) n.</td>
<td>(broń) laserowa adj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laser-sharp n.+adj.</td>
<td>ostry jak przy użyciu lasera comp. phrase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A term thus corresponds to a cognitive equivalent, an adjectival equivalent, and a free syntagm. This is the usual situation with terminological equivalents between English and Slavonic languages.

Partial equivalence. This is said to be the most frequent type of equivalence. It has to be noted only that the degree of the overlap of semantic features can be manipulated by the lexicographer, who can make the identity of meaning greater or smaller, depending on how many dimensions of meaning he or she will consider relevant (cf. p. 140).

Nil equivalence. This is the most interesting case, in which the hidden assumptions can again be revealed. Nil equivalence has been extensively discussed, usually on the basis of Zgusta (1971). Zgusta distinguishes three categories of lexemes which can have no equivalents: non-designative items, e.g. prepositions; culture-specific lexemes; and lexical gaps (the terms have been slightly changed). We shall not examine the categories in detail (cf. e.g. Schnorr 1986; Tomaszczyk 1984).

As Rettig (1985) notes, it can be said that there is nil equivalence only when a very important assumption is adopted. The assumption is related first of all to the formal status of both equivalent items, but ultimately the assumption has a wider significance, as we shall see in the following section. The assumption is: the source item and its equivalent(s) should both be at the same formal level, i.e. a one-word L1 lexeme should correspond to a one-word L2 lexeme, and an L1 idiom (a multiword-lexeme) should correspond to an L2 idiom (a multi-word lexeme) (Steiner 1971 is perhaps most explicit on this point). This principle is often weakened in that

---

91 This example shows again that semantic equivalence is not the same as contextual equivalence.
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a lexeme should correspond to a lexeme, and no further suggestions are made on how many words the lexemes have.

If this assumption would not be adhered to in BL, i.e. if a lexeme could correspond to a free syntagm, of various length and complexity, then probably there would be no instances of nil equivalence. What is expressed in one language by a one-word lexeme, i.e. what is encoded paradigmatically, can be usually expressed by a combination of lexemes in the other language, i.e. it can be encoded syntagmatically (Lyons 1968, 1977). Yet free syntagms, although they are often used in translation, are not accepted as lexicographic equivalents. As we have argued in Chapter 4, section 4.7, the equivalence: lexeme – free syntagm, is the norm between some languages. Fairly regularly Slavonic languages have to encode syntagmatically what has been encoded paradigmatically in English. Thus the insistence on paradigmatically encoded equivalents in BL does not serve the translational purpose of a BD. Hence it cannot be explained by referring to the needs of the translator.

5.11. Semantic completeness and high codability

In this chapter we have repeatedly pointed out that equivalents in a BD are more often used for metalinguistic description. Equivalents can overlap with source expressions on two broad dimensions: meaning and contexts. Of the two requirements imposed on BD equivalents, namely to be semantically complete and to be translationally adequate, it is the former which appears to be considered to be more important in mainstream BL and BDs. In this section we shall provide further evidence that equivalents are to be semantically complete, rather than to be adequate for translation. It will be shown also that there is a conflict in BL between the requirement that equivalents should be semantically complete, and the requirement that they should be lexemic. The lexemic status of equivalence will be related to the notion of codability.

The requirement of semantic completeness can be related to the view, discussed earlier in the chapter, that it is possible to indicate what the difference in meaning between two equivalent items is, which will be help-
ful for the translator. As we have shown, this view rests on the assumption that meaning of a lexical item is finite. Further, such indications will be of dubious use to the translator, because there is not any stable unit of translation (cf. Chapter 4, section 4.3), which results from the fact that semantic contribution of a lexical item to text is not the same for all texts, but it depends on the function of the given item in the given text. In translation any lexical unit can be used in a very 'imprecise' way, when e.g. its criterial features are suppressed, while non-criterial ones become the most important ones (see Cruse 1986 for a theoretical discussion). In some contexts many semantic features of the item, usually implicit, will have to be provided explicitly by the translator. Thus a paradigmatically encoded source expression has to be clarified, developed syntagmatically, but there is no limit to the extent of the development. Thus it is not very infrequently that footnotes can be met in a translation, in which the syntagmatic development of the equivalent is text-long. As there are no rules for text production, there are no rules for extending equivalents.

When translating English traffic, for example, it is possible to use only 'ruch' in Polish (cf. Na ulicach jest duży ruch 'There is heavy traffic in the streets'), or it will be necessary to use 'ruch uliczny/na ulicach' (cf. Na Zachodzie ruch uliczny jest bardzo intensywny 'In the West there is a high concentration of traffic'), or, in a crime novel, it might be necessary to add that in Britain traffic is left-handed (lewostronny ruch uliczny).

This problem has been noted by Gold in his review of (strictly translational in intention) THE BANTAM NEW COLLEGE SPANISH AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY by Williams.

The dictionary has, for example:

purser contador de navio, comisario de a bordo

THE BANTAM NEW COLLEGE SPANISH AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY

Gold shows that I'm a purser will be indeed translated by 'soy contador de navio' but where's the purser?, when uttered on board ship, would have to be 'Dónde está el contador?' (Gold 1987: 303–304). The equivalent is thus 'contador (de navio)', where the parentheses indicate an optional element. The equivalent in the dictionary is unnecessarily extended syntagmatically.

In BDs one can find many syntagmatically extended equivalents. As is
usual with lexical items, it is always possible to devise contexts in which the extended equivalents can be used as translational units. This, however, does not change the fact that such equivalents are in fact definitions. This means that bilingual lexicographers describe in fact isolated lexical items by means of metalinguistic explanations, not by translational equivalents, though the widespread belief that equivalents should be lexemic interferes with this practice. This conflict is the source of tension in BL, and in the vast majority of BDs, which makes them vulnerable to criticism. Let us have examples.

\[\text{negate... (deny truth of) nier la vérité de; (deny existence of) nier (l'existence de)}\]

\text{COLLINS ROBERT FRENCH-ENGLISH ENGLISH-FRENCH DICTIONARY}

The tension can be seen very clearly in this example. It is rather difficult to explain why a part of one French equivalent is in brackets (i.e. it is a comment), or why the other equivalent has no such brackets (i.e. it is an extended equivalent), or why there are any brackets at all. Further, we have actually two English definitions in this entry, and the French equivalents are exact translations of the English definitions. Thus in fact we have to do with four definitions here. We can contrast this treatment with an entry from another dictionary, the \text{DICTIONNAIRE MODERNE FRANÇAIS-ANGLAIS ANGLAIS-FRANÇAIS}:

\[\text{negate nier}\]

\text{DICTIONNAIRE MODERNE FRANÇAIS-ANGLAIS ANGLAIS-FRANÇAIS}

in which the equivalent is strictly segmental.

Even otherwise segmental BDs contain entries which exhibit the tension:

\[\text{zarja 1 glow on the horizon before sunrise or after sunset (Katzner) ENGLISH-RUSSIAN RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY}\]

This lengthy definition can be perhaps used only in a footnote. Other dictionaries do provide one-word equivalents:

\[\text{zarja 1 daybreak, dawn;... afterglow, evening glow RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY}\]

In another example from Katzner’s BD the compiler evidently could not
decide whether he wanted to define the meaning or to provide a translational equivalent or two items closely related in meaning:

- sunrise voschod (solnca)
- sunset zachod solnca

Gold (1987) has many examples from the Williams BD. Steiner shows in his reviews that the objects of transitive verbs are often shown as a part of the equivalent, as if they were a part of the meaning of the verb (e.g. Steiner 1984). Zgusta (1988) has numerous examples as well.

Zgusta (1971, 1988) calls extended equivalents ‘explanatory’, and suggests that they are very general, being notional (i.e. related to notions, concepts) in nature rather than translational. As we shall see, ‘translational’ here does not seem to refer to translation. This tension between the two requirements is often resolved by suggesting that the translational equivalent should be maximally delimited, in a lexemic form, and that it should be segmental. The remaining part of the explanation should be separated from it by means of typography. This is what many authors suggest, for example Berkov (1977), or Kromann & Riiber & Rosbach (1984b).

It is very rarely that a BD does not include, at least occasionally, such extended equivalents. There are also dictionaries, particularly the older ones, in which such explanations of meaning are the rule rather than the exception. This is the case for example with English and Polish BDs, which simply have numerous translations of definitions from MDs (for examples and discussion see Piotrowski 1988a).

From our discussion so far it has become clear that it would be very convenient for bilingual lexicographers to include extended explanations of meaning in their BDs, as such equivalents are semantically ‘complete’. The urge to use such equivalents in BDs seems moreover irresistible. Nevertheless bilingual lexicographers and metalexicographers insist that in BDs predominantly lexemic equivalents should be used. Again the translational purpose of BDs is offered as an explanation, though BD equivalents are most often not very useful for translation. Therefore this insistence must have its source elsewhere. If we can solve this puzzle perhaps we will see what value lexemic equivalents have in fact for dictionary users.

To explain this problem we have to consider what it means for an equivalent to be lexemic, to be a lexeme. Thus, first of all an equivalent has to be regarded as a unitary, established unit by the native speakers. In other
words, an expression has to be lexicalized to be a lexeme\textsuperscript{92}. A lexicalized item can be defined primarily as a stable lexical item which can be seen to refer to a stable, familiar notion or situation, contrasting thus with a potential, free syntagm (made up either of morphemes or of words). The lexeme thus is a standard label for a stable, recurrent meaning, which is important in the culture of the given speech community (cf. Brown 1958; Lyons 1977).

For some bilingual lexicographers it seems entirely appropriate to create nonce lexical items for use in a BD in the case of what they call nil equivalence, as the nonce formations are felt to be more useful in translation than extended explanations. This method was used in Soviet lexicography, cf. Zgusta 1971, 1988). The principle was probably introduced by Ščerba, who used it in his RUSSIAN-FRENCH DICTIONARY, e.g.

\begin{quote}
oblomovščina veulerie, inaction, paresse; oblomovehtchina (ayant trait à Oblomov, personnage du roman de Goncharov)
\end{quote}

(Ščerba) RUSSIAN-FRENCH DICTIONARY

The artificial item has been underlined. Ščerba was followed by Smirnitsky and Achmanova in their RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY (the example is based on Zgusta 1988).

Translators actually do use this technique in their work, i.e. they coin nonce words if the need arises. Zygmunt Kubiak, for example, created the word \textit{eburn} `ivory' in his translation of Virgil's \textit{Aenaid} into Polish (Kubiak 1987). Yet this method is opposed to by many lexicographers (see the discussion in Zgusta 1971, and Schnorr 1986): the BD is to contain established lexical items, only occasionally resorting to explanations, and should not include artificial items.

The stability of meaning of a lexeme has also another dimension, which we shall call codability. The notion of codability was studied in relation to linguistic determinism, and the term itself was apparently introduced by Roger Brown (1958: 235–240), though the importance of the phenomenon was noticed earlier, by Sapir (1921/49; cf. also Lyons 1977). Codability

\textsuperscript{92} There is a great number of terms relating to this phenomenon. Thus, \textit{lexicalization} and \textit{institutionalization} are used by Bauer (1983), Lyons uses \textit{petrification} and \textit{fossilization} (1977). For French linguists an item can be \textit{codé} (cf. Béjoint 1989 for a brief survey, specifically related to lexicography). Zgusta (1971) and Pawley (1985) also discuss lexicalization. The three authors provide some criteria for recognizing lexicalization, which we will not discuss.
relates to a psycholinguistic and semantic difference between autonomous linguistic signs (lexemes, particularly one-word) and free word combinations. Ultimately codability is related to the availability or non-availability of readily recalled perceptual categories to the user of the language. It is a gradable phenomenon, i.e. an item may have low or high codability, and codability may increase or decrease.

Thus codability relates to the way the world is perceived by means of language. If the designative unit is a longer syntagm, i.e. a non-lexicalized free combination of words, the speakers usually do not have the relevant category for their perception of the world. Consequently the speakers can be expected to hesitate before applying the newly described category, to disagree among themselves in its application, and to be inconsistent from one occasion to another. When the designative unit, on the other hand, is a (preferably one-word) lexeme, or a lexicalized syntagm, the speakers can respond quickly, in perfect agreement with one another, and usually quite consistently. This is because a highly coded linguistic expression is an instrument for triggering that spontaneous, instant categorization which was acquired during primary socialization (on which see Chapter 3, section 3.6). The more frequent the expression, and usually the shorter it is, the better the recall of the relevant category will be.

Neubert, using a more fashionable terminology, says essentially the same: “the target words on the right-hand side of the «bilingual equation» are not primarily translations but should be taken as translated cognitive orientations... They are... prototypical lexical patterns”, (Neubert 1992: 34), “prototypicality... integrates the L2 word also into an L2 frame, which... is a kind of cognitive program or scenario helping a speech community to implement the interpretation and communication of their experiences and ideas” (Neubert, 41).

On the basis of our discussion so far we can explain more adequately the tension between extended and lexemic equivalents. Extended equivalents are not related to expressions which activate readily available categories. The emphasis on lexemic equivalents is motivated not by translational adequacy but rather by the wish to use expressions which would be the best possible means of activating the user’s cognitive structures in the mind. Cognitive lexemic equivalents thus are used to provide the user with the best possible metalinguistic explanation of the meaning of the source expression.
Though this explanation applies to the L2-L1 BD above all, yet the notion of codability can be also used with reference to the L1-L2 BD. Let us consider first the left-hand side (these remarks are relevant in fact to both L1-L2 and L2-L1 BD). Also in this case it is a general rule that entry-words should be lexicalized items rather than potential formations. Yet there seems to exist also another requirement: entry-words should have a high degree of codability. Thus, even though some multi-word lexemes are extremely petrified, and no variation in their form is possible, e.g. English *kith and kin*, or Polish *od Sasa do lasa*, they are usually found within the entries, rather than as separate entry-words. The rule thus seems to be that the addresses to the entries (entry-words) should correspond to more readily available concepts rather than to less frequent ones\(^{93}\), i.e. to L2 items. In the L1-L2 BD the entry is thus structured from very well known concepts to unfamiliar, or totally unknown ones. In fact the basic difference between the two opposite structures of macrostructure, i.e. strict alphabetization and nesting, can be explained by the notion of codability, but we will not go into this in greater detail here.

From this point of view also the suggestion that the L1-L2 dictionary should contain entries whose addresses are non-lexemic items, occurring in the L2-L1 side, does not appear to be correct (this was suggested by Gold 1986). The user will probably not look for such entries at all, because they are not related to any available category in his/her experience.

As to the right-hand side in the L1-L2 BD, i.e. to L2 equivalents, the user whose command of L2 is rather poor should be given equivalents which should be immediately relatable to categories which are readily available to the L2 speaker, because faulty production can be easier understood if it is based on highly coded categories. However, this hypothesis would have to be empirically checked.

The notion of codability helps also to explain the wider popularity, noted in Chapter 2 and 3, which BDs enjoy in contrast to MDs. We have already shown that extended definitions are used most often in MDs. Such definitions are composed of a number of discrete components: labels, words, syntax. This is an analytical way of explaining meaning. The users have to synthesize the components into a meaningful whole: a lexical unit. It is certainly a very difficult task, difficult also for native speakers.

\(^{93}\) Of course the significance of writing conventions, i.e. of spaces, should not be overlooked, cf. the different placing of *despite* and *in spite of* in dictionaries.
BDs work in a quite different way. An adequate equivalent relates the user at once to a known category, by the powerful mechanism of analogy\(^94\). The foreign item seems to be endowed with the same sense of familiarity which the L1 word has. This also explains why the foreign item can be said to be acquired only when an L1 item can be associated with it (cf. Tomaszczyk 1983; for a fuller discussion see Piotrowski 1989a).

Thus in BL we have to do with the application of what is called the iconicity metapriniciple:

>a coded experience is easier to store, retrieve and communicate if the code is maximally isomorphic to the experience

(Givón 1985: 189).

For the L1 speaker L1 is maximally isomorphic to his or her experience, and L2 is isomorphic to the experience to the extent of being made isomorphic to some degree to L1. And this is what the BD helps the user to achieve.

Lexicographers and metalexicographers did notice this relation of equivalents to highly coded concepts. As early as in 1949 Lissance in his paper on German-English BDs and translation stressed the fact that a BD should “furnish the contemporary English equivalent with all its dynamic associations” rather than merely define the idea, because the definitions “evoke no familiar language patterns”. A BD should provide “words associated with concepts the reader is accustomed to manipulate in his everyday pursuits”. The information which a definition gives “if remembered at all, becomes peripheral to [the user’s] mind” (Lissance 1949, after Zgusta 1988: 1). Evidently what Lissance describes is codability. Yet Zgusta reinterprets the passage, and claims that it is about the translatability principle\(^95\).

It can be easily seen that the fact that a foreign language is approached via L1 in the BD is seen as a virtue here rather than a vice. Usually the BD is condemned precisely on the grounds of this.

Snell-Hornby claims that

cultures and concepts must be viewed in their own terms... the bilingual dictionary

---

\(^94\) This is analogy in a loose sense, not a proportionate analogy; on the importance of loosely defined analogy see Hockett 1958, and a discussion in Lyons 1968; Krapiec 1985 argues that all language use is analogical.

\(^95\) Perhaps in the remaining part of Lissance’s paper translatability is also discussed.
should help to clarify alien concepts against their own cultural background and not limit language to the status of a mere code consisting of varying labels (Snell-Homby 1986: 216).

In the light of our approach to the equivalence unit, which is a collocability pattern, a BD cannot be seen as an inventory of labels, and equivalents are not mere ‘labels’ for the user of a BD, but have a very important function for them. Thanks to the equivalents the BD can be seen as a natural learning dictionary. As we have seen, the BD uses techniques which, though given misleading labels, strengthen its explanatory power.

At the end of this chapter let us look again at the main issues which have been discussed here. The chapter concentrated on that aspect of the BD which makes it a BD, i.e. on equivalence. First we defined the notion of equivalence on the background of other definitions. The definition, and the notion itself, can be understood in two ways: either as a relation between units in L1 and L2 language systems, or as a relation between constituents in L1 and L2 texts. In the former case equivalence is based on the identity of the units along relevant dimensions of meaning. This type of equivalence was called cognitive equivalence. The latter type is based on adequate substitutability in relevant contexts, and it was called translational equivalence.

Further the notion of applicability was described, which we described as the foundation for lexicographical comparison in BL. To be useful practically, applicability has to be applied in a sequence of operations, which fall into two broad categories: formal and situational. The basic unit of equivalence is the collocability pattern.

The sections on the paradigmatic dimension in BDs and on typologies of equivalence relations have shown that equivalents are most often used as a sort of metalanguage for explanation of meaning of source expressions. The explanatory power of the equivalents was also treated. What is usually called the ‘translational’ equivalent turns out to be a cognitive lexemic equivalent which is, moreover, highly coded. Its value for translators lies not in providing them with ready equivalents, but in giving them clues in their search for equivalents. The chief function of the ‘translational’ equivalent is actually to relate the users to the cognitive categories which are most readily available to them.
6. Conclusions

This book was concerned with the discussion of the central aspect in any bilingual dictionary – equivalence. Before we could discuss equivalence properly, we had to clear the ground by treating the relevant terminology and notions. In the first chapter we considered bilingual lexicography itself, arguing that it should be regarded as one of the principal modes in lexicography.

In the following chapter we have shown that though a bilingual dictionary, like other dictionaries, is an imperfect method of describing the lexicon in one or two languages, yet, given the nature of dictionary consultation, it can be successfully used in prediction, i.e. in production of linguistic forms or meanings which serve in the process of communication. Moreover, the users seem to appreciate intuitively the value bilingual dictionaries have for them in that they clearly prefer bilingual dictionaries to monolingual ones. Our discussion then centred on parameters – general features which can be found in dictionaries. Some of the parameters are well known from the literature, as for example directionality and skill-specificity, some have been researched less adequately, for example discourse-specific description, mono- and polyfunctionality of a dictionary, while other the parameter on segmental and idiomatic approach to description of language has received scanty attention, while it is one of the basic ones, together with the metalinguistic-translational parameter (discussed in the next two chapters). The two parameters exert the greatest influence on all elements of a bilingual dictionary, from equivalence presentation, through the microstructure, to the macrostructure.

The other extremely important parameter, that relating to the ultimate function of the BD, was treated in two separate chapters. Chapter 3 is on the highly controversial problem of the use of bilingual dictionaries in foreign language learning. On the basis of our discussion the bilingual dictionary can be treated as a natural learning reference work.

The next, fourth chapter discussed the function of the bilingual dictionary as an aid in translation: such dictionaries are supposed to be translating
dictionaries par excellence. In the chapter we point to the fact that most often the word translation is used with reference to very different procedures, and we argue that a bilingual dictionary cannot in fact offer the user readily insertible equivalents to be used in translation because equivalents are text-specific, they are to a large degree unpredictable, or their number is too large to be included in a dictionary. For the professional translator the bilingual dictionary, though very important, is one of the whole range of reference works. The chief value the bilingual dictionary can have for such translators is to help them find the most adequate equivalent in the text by indicating the range of possible equivalents. A bilingual dictionary is, however, very useful to the user who does not know L2 well, and who uses the dictionary for producing glosses.

The last chapter, on equivalence, is the central one in this book. It dealt first with the basis of equivalence – that basis is applicability, and, ultimately, cultural overlap – and then with establishing equivalence between lexical items of two languages in a practical way. Equivalents can be found in a two-stage operation, consisting of formal and situational analysis. Next we introduced the notions of cognitive and translational equivalence and equivalents, which correspond to two ways a lexicographer views the objective of the dictionary. If the chief objective of a dictionary is descriptive adequacy in description of meaning, then the dictionary would be based on cognitive equivalents, and if the goal of dictionary description would be translational adequacy, i.e. suitability in substitutional translation, then the lexicographer would favour translational equivalents.

In bilingual dictionaries the former view is most often present: bilingual dictionaries are typically descriptions of lexical semantics rather than manuals of translation. Thus the dominant model in bilingual lexicography is that in which the metalinguistic function is given prime importance, while in the model which is described in theoretical discussions the stress is usually on the translational function of bilingual dictionaries. The two models are thus in conflict, and that situation results in various conflicts in lexicographic description, described in the fourth chapter.
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