

Phrasal equivalents with alternative elements in bilingual dictionaries: presentation problems

Odpowiedniki frazowe z elementami wymiennymi w słownikach dwujęzycznych – problemy reprezentacji

Renata Szczepaniak, Grzegorz Krynicki

Abstract

One of the difficulties that inexperienced dictionary users face is the cryptic character of dictionary text, which is full of codes, abbreviations and symbols, the significance of which has to be mastered before the microstructure can be accessed. Such devices generally serve the purpose of space conservation in paper dictionaries, and can be termed collectively, after Wiegand (1996), "methods of textual condensation". As Prinsloo and De Schryver (2002: 72) observe, "[i]ncreased text density, which should obviously stand in relation to the decoding skills of the target user, can – especially in paper dictionaries – be a virtue as long as that user can unambiguously retrieve the information." Unambiguous retrieval of information is possible provided that principles of textual condensation are explained in the metatext of the dictionary or they are sufficiently intuitive. Unfortunately, this is not always the case, and, as a side-effect of the pursuit of economy of space, the convenience of dictionary users can be compromised.

This study focuses on the use of space-saving devices indicating alternative elements of phrasal equivalents in two major bilingual dictionaries for Polish learners of English: PWN-Oxford Dictionary and Kosciuszko Foundation Dictionary. Firstly, it looks at the function of the aforementioned devices as defined in the dictionaries. Secondly, it attempts to highlight inconsistencies in their use and potential problems with their interpretation. From each side of both dictionaries, a random sample of 500 pairs of phrasal equivalents containing at least one alternation was extracted. Next, each phrase was manually annotated with respect to the difficulty of decoding as well as gravity of potential interpretation errors. The qualitative analysis of the results of annotation led to the identification and classification of potential problems with the interpretation of space-saving devices.

Keywords: bilingual dictionaries, phrasal equivalents, space-saving devices

Streszczenie

Jednym z problemów przed jakimi stają niedoświadczeni użytkownicy słowników jest często nieintuicyjny charakter oznaczeń, skrótów i symboli, których znajomość jest konieczna do pełnego wykorzystania treści. Środki te na ogół służą oszczędności miejsca w papierowym słowniku a określić je można mianem "metod kondensacji tekstowej" (Wiegand 1996). Jak zauważają Prinsloo i De Schryver (2002: 72), "[z]większona gęstość tekstu [...] może być – zwłaszcza w przypadku słowników papierowych – uznana za zaletę o tyle o ile użytkownik jest w stanie niedwuznacznie odkodować informację." Niedwuznaczne odkodowanie tej informacji jest możliwe o ile zasady kondensacji tekstowej opisuje warstwa metatekstowa słownika lub są one wystarczająco intuicyjne. Niestety, nie zawsze ma to miejsce, co może negatywnie wpływać na wygodę jego użytkownika.

W niniejszej pracy przedstawiono użycie w dwóch podstawowych dwujęzycznych słownikach wykorzystywanych przez Polaków uczących się angielskiego (PWN-Oxford i Kościuszko Foundation Dictionary) środków kondensacji słownikowej umożliwiających skrócony zapis fraz zawierających elementy wymienne. Po pierwsze, przedstawiono funkcje tych środków zgodnie z definicjami podanymi w warstwie metatekstowej wspomnianych słowników. Po drugie, podjęto próbę wykazania niekonsekwencji w stosowaniu tych środków oraz potencjalne problemy jakie mogą się nasuwać przy próbach ich interpretacji. Z każdego z tych słowników wydobyto próbkę 500 par odpowiedników frazowych zawierających co najmniej jeden element wymienny. Następnie każdą frazę oznaczono ręcznie ze względu na trudność jej interpretacji oraz wagę błędu powstałego wskutek błędnej interpretacji. Jakościowa analiza tych danych pozwoliła na określenie i klasyfikację problemów mogących wynikać z niekonsekwentnego stosowania środków kondensacji słownikowej.

Słowa kluczowe: słowniki dwujęzyczne, ekwiwalenty frazeologiczne, narzędzia kondensacji tekstu

1. Introduction

One of the problems that inexperienced dictionary users face is the cryptic character of dictionary text, full of codes and symbols, the meaning of which has to be mastered before the microstructure can be accessed. All of them serve the purpose of space conservation in paper dictionaries, and can be termed collectively, after Wiegand (1996), “methods of textual condensation”.

Space in paper dictionaries can be saved basically in two ways, by means of modifying typography and layout (e.g. manipulating font size or margins) or by shortening the dictionary text without reducing its content (i.e. modifying the lexicographic metalanguage) (Corréard 2002: 464). Among space-saving strategies listed in the metalexigraphic literature there are:

- abbreviations (parts of speech, register labels, GB/US variations);
- swung dash instead of the headword
- slashes
- niching and nesting
- giving examples in a 'canonical' form
- giving collocates as lists, not as full examples
- limited treatment of derivatives
- modifying examples
- explaining series of homogeneous lexemes only once
- concise defining styles in monolingual dictionaries or defining by synonyms
- cross-referencing
- explaining regular inflections in the *How to use the dictionary* section instead of listing them in the entry

(Corréard 2002: 464-465; Gouws 2003; Lew 2011)

As Prinsloo and De Schryver (2002: 72) observe, “[i]ncreased text density, which should obviously stand in relation to the decoding skills of the target user, can – especially in paper dictionaries – be a virtue as long as that user can unambiguously retrieve the information.” Unambiguous information retrieval is possible on condition that lexicographers follow Wiegand’s (1996) advice that the principles of textual condensation be explained in the metatext of the dictionary. Unfortunately, this is not always the case, since “[i]t often happens that the guidelines are not clear and consequently mislead the user” (Prinsloo – De

Schryver 2002: 75). As a side-effect of the pursuit of economy of space, the convenience of dictionary users will be often compromised. To illustrate the problem, we may consider the case of collapsing several variants of one phrase into a single string. A learner of Polish using the English-Polish PWN-Oxford Dictionary who is not familiar with the Polish phrase *w nadgodzinach* is likely to make an error **zakaz palenia w nadgodzinach*, after reading the following presentation of equivalents: *smoking/overtime ban = zakaz palenia/pracy w nadgodzinach* under the entry for *ban*. Apparently, effective dictionary use may be difficult and prone to errors for the majority but the most proficient language learners and skilled dictionary users.

This paper focuses on the problems engendered by the use of space-saving devices reflecting a sort of an alternative (henceforth, alternative-indicators or alternative-markers). They are: the forward slash /, round brackets, *l.*, *a.* (the abbreviations of Pl *lub*, *albo* ‘or’), *or*. The slash and brackets can be classified as *non-typographical structural indicators* (Wiegand 1989, qtd. in Gouws 2003: 35).

The section of the microstructure that seems to be the most suitable material for analyzing alternative-markers are phrases in *skeleton-type examples*: “constructions which result from applying the lexicographic techniques of simplification, abstraction, and listing. (...) Listing introduces alternatives, as in the phrase *a picture of health/virtue*” (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 159).

The term *phrase* will be understood broadly, as a lexical unit consisting of at least two words (including free and restricted collocations, compounds, idioms, formulae).

The aim of this study is to highlight some decoding problems that bilingual dictionary users may face due to the use of space-saving devices. An attempt is made to address the following questions:

- Is the function of space-saving devices indicating an alternative stated clearly in the metatext of the dictionary?
- Are ‘alternative-markers’ used consistently?
- What interpretation errors can result from the use of alternative-markers?
- How can the use of alternative-markers be made more user-friendly?

2. Methodology and data

The data under analysis in this study comes from two bilingual dictionaries for Polish learners: The New Kosciuszko Foundation Dictionary (NKFD-NKFD) and PWN-Oxford Dictionary (PWNOE-PWNO). Unlike NKFD, PWNO is non-directional (i.e. designed to serve native speakers of both languages) (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 38). Therefore, inconsistencies in the use of space-saving devices in the Source Language (SL) of the Pl-Eng part or in the Target Language (TL) of the Eng-Pl part of NKFD should have less serious consequences than similar inconsistencies in both parts of PWNO.

The steps undertaken to answer research questions included:

- identification of devices used to mark alternatives in the dictionaries
- extraction of phrasal equivalents containing at least one alternation
- generation of a random sample of 500 examples for each direction of each dictionary
- generation of the most intuitive readings for phrases containing alternations
- manual classification of phrases in respect of:
 - consistency in the use of space-saving devices
 - difficulty of decoding
 - gravity of potential errors

3. Functions of alternative-indicators

3.1. The forward slash ‘/’

The forward slash is a lexicographic convention commonly used instead of *or*. Although the default value of the slash seems straightforward, its significance in dictionaries does not always overlap with our intuitive understanding.

The metatext of NKFD lacks information on the use of slashes in skeleton-type examples. An explicit explanation of the function of the slash can be found in the front matter of PWNO: “Pewne wyrażenia zapisano w sposób skrótowy” [Certain expressions have been abbreviated]. There follows a cross-reference to the note: “[z]wroty o różnym znaczeniu łączące się z wyrazem hasłowym, a także ich tłumaczenia oddzielono **ukośnikami**” [non-synonymous expressions collocating with the headword, as well as their translations, are separated with slashes], e.g.

- (1) **opening hours** (...) late-night/round-the-clock ~ czynne do późna w nocy/całą dobę (PWNOE)
- (2) **głupkowato** (...) gapić się/śmiać się ~ to stare/laugh stupidly (PWNOP).

In other words, the slash, unlike *l.*, *a.*, *or*, is used to collapse two or more phrases that happen to share part of their lexical structure. Typically, there is symmetry in the entry, i.e. the number of slashes in both the SL and the TL phrase is usually the same:

- (3) **live over the road/river** mieszkać po drugiej stronie ulicy/rzeki (NKFDE)
- (4) **bilet do kina/teatru** movie/theater ticket (NKFD)
- (5) **a tennis/soccer/rock star** gwiazda tenisa/futbolu/rocka (PWNO)
- (6) **wino wytrawne/półwytrawne/słodkie/półsłodkie** dry/medium-dry/sweet/medium-sweet wine (PWNO)
- (7) **miłosny/mocny/przyjacielski/serdeczny uścisk** a loving/tight/friendly/heartfelt embrace (PWNO)

It seems that not all phrases with a shared element can be collapsed by means of slashes.

Although skeleton-type examples with alternatives separated with slashes are non-synonymous, they should have “potential for generalization”, as in *a dark dress/suit, a dark hall/corridor/alley/forest* (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006: 166) or in

- (8) **przysporzyć** komuś kłopotów/smutku/cierpienia to cause sb problems/sorrow/pain (PWNOP)

Without such potential for generalisation, the example may sound incongruous, e.g.

- (9) **real** beauty/disaster prawdziwa piękność/katastrofa; (NKFDE)

In this study, reference will be made to the categorisation of the use of slashes in Prinsloo and De Schryver (2002: 87-88). Three out of eight categories have been adopted:

I. Two or more alternatives are given separated by forward slashes; they are preceded and/or followed by one or more words: $\alpha : X/Y/Z/... : \beta$. For instance,

- (10) **złagodzić** karę/zakaz/wyrok mitigate a punishment/ban/verdict (NKFD)
- (11) **liryka** miłosna/refleksyjna/religijna love/reflective/religious poetry (PWNOP)

Two main decoding problems with this paradigm are that X,Y,Z,... should consist of a single word (= 1). Another thing is, when preceding and following words are absent ($\alpha = 0$ and $\beta = 0$), it is commas, and not slashes that should be used, according to Prinsloo and De Schryver (2002: 80).

II. A concord (paradigm) and a group of words precede two or more groups of words (X, Y, Z, ...) separated by forward slashes: $C : \alpha : X/Y/Z/... : \beta$. For example,

- (12) **pojechać do miasta/sklepu** (case: Genitive) [go to town/the shop]

Again, successful decoding of this paradigm requires that each alternative element X,Y,Z... consists of one word and all of them take the same concord. The use of slashes in example (6) does not conform to this rule, and encourages the erroneous interpretation **podrządne*^{Neuter} Gender teatr^{Masculine Gender} ‘second-rate theatre’.

- (13) ***podrządne** kino/teatr [second-rate cinema/theatre] fleapit (NKFD)

III. A concord (paradigm) and a group of words follow the alternatives: $X/Y/Z/... : C : \beta$.

The same condition for successful decoding as in category II applies. Example (7) illustrates lack of concord when one word follows two alternatives:

- (14) ***działko** l. armatka wodna water cannon. → *działko^{Neuter Gender} wodna^{Feminine Gender} (NKFD)

3.2. *l.* (= lub 'or'), *a.* (= albo 'or'), *or*

PWNOP uses the symbols *a.* (= Pl albo 'or') and PWN OE – *or*. Both are explained in the front matter: "Pewne wyrażenia zapisano w sposób skrótowy" [Certain expressions have been abbreviated]. There follows a cross-reference to the note: "wymienne używane części wyrażen" [interchangeable parts of expressions], illustrated with:

(15) **outcry** (...) to raise or make an ~ podnieść krzyk (PWNOE)

(16) **gierz go/ją ugryzł a. ukąsil** (PWNOP)

NKFD also lists the symbol *l.* (= Pl lub 'or') together with other abbreviations. However, the difference between the use of slashes and *l.* is not spelt out. Judging by the following examples,

(17) **paluszki** rybne fish sticks *l.* fingers (NKFD)

(18) ułożyć pod **sznurek** arrange *l.* put in a straight line (NKFD)

the convention is the same as in PWNO: *l.* is used to collapse two or more phrases which are closely synonymous (in free variation) and which are usually equivalents of one phrase. The situation of symmetry in translation, when Pl(X)=En(X), Pl(Y)=En(Y), Pl(Z)=En(Z), is rare:

(19) **właz** ewakuacyjny *l.* ratunkowy escape *l.* emergency hatch (NKFD)

(20) **trzymać się szlaku** *l.* drogi follow the path *l.* road (NKFD)

(21) **drenaż pieniędzy a. rynku** Ekon., Fin. draining money a. the market (PWNOP)

3.3. Round brackets (parentheses)

Unlike NKFD, PWNO explains the use of brackets: "Elementy, które można pominąć (w nawiasach okrągłych)" [Elements that can be omitted (in round brackets)], e.g.:

(22) **gąsienicz|ka** *f. dim.* (small) caterpillar (PWNOP)

Brackets should pose few interpretation problems. The user should intuitively understand that elements in brackets, e.g. *an* or *as* in examples (23), (24) can be omitted:

(23) **aspiryna** *f. med.* **wziąć** *l.* **zażyć aspirynę** take (an) aspirin. (NKFD)

(24) **twardy jak skała** (as) hard as a rock (PWNOP)

The elucidation of the significance of all alternative-indicators at one place in the front matter of PWNO is particularly user-friendly. In this way, attention is drawn to various ways of expressing the concept of an alternative.

4. Possible sources of problems with the interpretation of alternative-markers

Four categories of potential problems with the interpretation of alternative-markers emerge from the qualitative analysis of the dictionary sample:

1) inconsistent use of alternative-markers:

- the slash is used instead of *l.*, *a.*, *or*
- *l.*, *a.*, *or* are used instead of the slash
- alternative-markers are used instead of the comma

2) one or more alternative elements consist of two or more words

3) reversed word order around alternative-markers

4) lack of grammatical agreement between one or more alternative elements and the stable element of the phrase (grammatical discord)

4.1. Inconsistent use

4.1.1. The slash is used instead of *l.*, *a.*, *or*

The indiscriminate use of slashes and *l.* can prevent users from identifying the shortened forms as representing interchangeable or completely different phrases.

(25) prosić o **datki** ask for donations/contributions (NKFD)

(26) silnik **dieslowski** diesel engine/motor (NKFD)

(27) **mortal** fear/terror śmiertelny strach (NKFD)

(28) cause/create **havoc** czynić spustoszenia (NKFD)

(29) zawzięty/zaciekły **nieprzyjaciel** a sworn/irreconcilable enemy (PWNOP)

(30) wnieść **pozew** do sądu to file a lawsuit/petition/claim (PWNOP)

- (31) **to pay for/repay sth in instalments** spłacać coś w ratach (PWNOE)

Inconsistency in the use of slashes and *l.* can also be observed between singular and plural forms:

- (32) **economy/economies of scale (...)** (NKFDE)
(33) **szastać nogą/nogami** shuffle one's foot/feet (NKFDPP)

If singular and plural forms are synonymous in such cases, *l.* would be more appropriate, as in equivalents and explanations:

- (34) **gloved** w rękawiczkach *l.* rękawiczce (NKFDE)
(35) **plainsman** -men mieszkanięc równin *l.* równiny (zwl. *Wielkich Równin w USA*) (NKFDE)

4.1.2. *l., a., or* are used instead of the slash

The situation when *l., a., or* appear instead of the slash is less common. In the two bilingual dictionaries, one can observe inconsistency in the use of *l.* in abbreviations representing placeholders for complements:

- (36) **naszkodzić** sobie *l.* komuś damage one's *l.* sb's reputation (NKFDPP)
(37) **zmierzyć** się z kimś *l.* z czymś pit o.s. against sb *l.* sth (NKFDPP)

Compare with the following:

- (38) **narażać** się komuś/czemuś fall foul of sb/sth (NKFDPP)
(39) **podległy** komuś/czemuś subordinate to sb/sth (NKFDPP)
(40) mieć **pierwszeństwo** przed kimś/czymś to have priority a. precedence over sb/sth (PWNOP)
(41) przesadzić w **pochwałach** dla kogoś/czegoś to overpraise sb/sth (PWNOP)

Other cases when the slash would be more appropriate include:

- (42) **kolumna** 2- *l.* 3-drożna 2 *l.* 3-way speaker (NKFDPP)
(43) in full **fig** w pełnym stroju *l.* rynsztunku (NKFDE)
(44) the **following** (to,) co następuje; następujące osoby *l.* rzeczy (NKFDE)
(45) **to do sth through the proper** or **usual** or **normal channels** załatwić coś właściwymi or zwykłymi or normalnymi kanałami (PWNOE)

4.1.3. Alternative markers instead of a comma

As a rule, single words are separated by the comma, not the slash (or *l., a.*), this lexicographic convention being reiterated in Prinsloo and De Schryver (2002). For instance,

- (46) kanał *l.* rów **odwadniający** ditch, trench (NKFDPP)
(47) **motivation** 2. powody, powód (*for/behind sth* (dla) czegoś) (NKFDE)

It seems unusual to treat placement holders sb/sth or articles as the stable elements of the phrase, as in the following:

- (48) obejść się z kimś **brutalnie** mistreat *l.* abuse sb (NKFDPP)
(49) get sth off the **ground** zainicjować *l.* uruchomić coś (NKFDE)
(50) uczynić komuś **dyshonor** affront *l.* insult sb (NKFDPP)
(51) **ładunek** w pociągu a trainload a. carload US (PWNOP)

The following examples also seem to flout the aforementioned lexicographic convention:

- (52) **odtąd** *l.* odkąd from that time on (NKFDPP)
(53) przeprowadzić **ekshumację** exhume *l.* disintern (NKFDPP)
(54) świat **utopii** cloud-cuckoo-land *l.* cloudland (NKFDPP)

A more complex situation arises when in the SL there is a slash collapsing phrases into a string, and the corresponding TL equivalents are non-phrasal:

- (55) **in** a whisper/loud voice szeptem/głośno (NKFDE)
(56) **dark** brown/blue ciemnobrązowy/ciemnoniebieski (NKFDE)
(57) **on** foot/horseback pieszo/konno (NKFDE)
(58) **do/**nie do naprawienia repairable/irrepairable (PWNOP)

One solution would be to modify such examples by adding words on either or just the TL side, e.g.

- (59) (talk) **in** a whisper/loud voice (rozmawiać) szeptem/głośno
(60) **dark** brown/blue (kolor) ciemnobrązowy/ciemnoniebieski
(61) (travel) **on** foot/horseback (podróżować) pieszo/konno
(62) (coś) **do/**nie do naprawienia (sth) repairable/irrepairable

4.2. One or more alternative elements consists of two or more words

Decoding phrases with alternative elements is relatively straightforward when the marker is found between two words, as in:

(63) **rule** as a (general) rule z reguły l. zasady (NKFDE)

The situation when one or more of the alternative elements is multiword can create problems with connecting the alternatives with preceding or following word(s), as pointed out in Prinsloo and De Schryver (2002). To take an example, it is conceivable that the user, on seeing:

(64) **resumując**,... to recap l. sum up... (NKFD)

will, mistakenly, choose between *recap – sum*, not: *recap – sum up*, and as a result, will produce: *to recap up*...

Let us consider three similar examples, all of them representing Type I in Prinsloo and De Schryver's (2002) categorisation. For instance, the explanation:

(65) **odejść** a. przenieść się w **zaświaty** euf. to go to glory, to depart this life (PWNOP)

can prompt the user to consider the false alternative: *odejść – przenieść* rather than: *odejść – przenieść się*, and to come up with the misinterpretation: **odejść się w zaświaty*¹. One solution could be to apply the vertical slash in order to clearly indicate the place where the multiword alternative unit connects with the rest of the phrase (Prinsloo – De Schryver 2002: 79):

(66) **odejść** a. przenieść się | w zaświaty²

From the point of view of a Polish user, more problematic are cases of multiword X,Y,Z...in English, e.g.

(67) **mówić przez megafon** speak over a megaphone l. PA system (NKFD)

Here, the false alternative that a user might choose (*megaphone – PA*) can lead to the incorrect interpretation: **speak over a megaphone system*. The lexicographic solution could involve the use of square brackets to indicate that a sequence of words represents a unit. Alternatively, a combination of the vertical slash and manipulated word order could prevent misinterpretation:

(68) speak over a megaphone l. [PA system] OR: speak over a | PA system l. megaphone

To take another example,

(69) **podano napoje i przekąski** light refreshments a. snacks and drinks were served (PWNOP)

an inexperienced dictionary user who picks the false alternative: *refreshments – snacks* rather than: *refreshments – snacks and drinks* is likely to read the phrase as **light refreshments and drinks were served* and not as *light refreshments were served, light snacks and drinks were served*. Two vertical slashes could disambiguate the equivalent:

(70) light | refreshments a. snacks and drinks | were served

4.3. Reversed word order around alternative markers

The problem of asymmetrical word order pertains mainly to slashes. Below are some examples where word order has been reversed:

(71) **gorący czas** l. okres hectic l. hot period l. time (NKFD)

(72) **gładki/miękki** jak **aksamit** (as) soft/smooth as velvet; velvety (NKFD)

(73) **schron atomowy/przeciwlotniczy** air-raid/fallout shelter (NKFD)

(74) **complete/total lack** of sth **całkowity** l. **kompletny** brak czegoś (NKFDE)

(75) **niskie/wysokie napięcie** high/low voltage (PWNOP)

(76) **tchórz** a. **strach** **ją/go obleciał** he's/she's got cold feet (PWNOP)

(77) **wziąć kogoś na** **narty/ryby/tańce** to take sb **fishing/skiing/dancing** (PWNOP)

¹ The Polish verb *odejść* 'leave, go away' is not reflexive.

² One of Polish bilingual dictionaries (NS – Piotrowski & Saloni) proposes an asterisk in the same function: ** oznacza granicę części wymiennej jednego z dwu wyrażen zawierających część wspólną [*marks the boundary between the exchangeable part of two expressions that have an element in common].*

4.4. Lack of grammatical agreement

In the sample, wrong gender of adjectives was the most frequent example of lack of grammatical concord. Explanations such as

(78) **działko** *l.* armatka wodna water cannon (NKFD)

(79) **podrzędne** kino/teatr fleapit (NKFD)

(80) wyraz/powiedzenie **slangowe** slang word/expression (NKFD)

will lead non-Polish users to produce incorrect forms: **działko wodna*, **podrzędne teatr*, **wyraz slangowe*.

5. Final remarks

The investigation of a sample of 2000 phrases in skeleton-type examples in NKFD and PWNO helped to highlight certain problems that the use of alternative-markers may pose to less advanced language learners or dictionary users not fully conversant with lexicographic conventions. Each case of the misleading use of alternative-markers requires individual solutions. However, a few general suggestions can be made with a view to improving the intelligibility and user-friendliness of the dictionary metatext in this respect:

1. clear formulation of rules for alternative-indicators in the front matter
2. consistency in applying the rules
3. precise rendering of word order around alternative markers in TL equivalents
4. ascertaining that all words separated with alternative markers take the same concord
5. introducing additional devices and techniques if connecting the multiword alternative unit with the rest of the phrase turns out to be problematic:
 - the vertical slash | indicates the place where the multiword alternative unit connects with the rest of the phrase (Prinsloo – De Schryver 2002: 79)
 - square brackets [] could indicate that a sequence of words represents a unit (whenever the vertical slash turns out to be ineffective)
 - manipulating the order of alternative elements

It remains to be seen how dictionary users actually cope with various categories of problematic use of alternative-markers singled out in this paper. A separate follow-up empirical study should verify our predictions concerning interpretation problems stemming from careless use of alternative-indicators. Ultimately, the results would point to specific aspects of lexicographic description that require improvement.

References

Dictionaries:

NKFD = Fisiak Jacek (ed.) 2003. *The new Kosciuszko Foundation dictionary*. Vols. 1-2. (Vol. 1: *English-Polish* edited by Arleta Adamska-Sałaciak [NKFD]; Vol.2: *Polish-English* edited by Piotr Gąsiorowski. [NKFD]) New York – Kraków: The Kosciuszko Foundation – Universitas.

NS = Piotrowski, Tadeusz – Zygmunt Saloni (eds.). 1992. *Nowy słownik angielsko-polski, polsko-angielski*. (Vol. 1: *English-Polish*; Vol.2: *Polish-English*). Warszawa: Spotkania.

PWNO = PWNOE + PWNOP

PWNOE = Linde-Usiekniewicz, Jadwiga. (ed.). 2002. *PWN-Oxford wielki słownik angielsko-polski*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

PWNOP = Linde-Usiekniewicz, Jadwiga. (ed.). 2004. *PWN-Oxford wielki słownik polsko-angielski*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Other works

Adamska-Sałaciak A. 2006. *Meaning and the bilingual dictionary: The case of English and Polish*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang Verlag.

Corréard, Marie-Hélène. 2002. 'Are space-saving strategies relevant in electronic dictionaries?' In: Braasch, Anna – Claus Povlsen (eds.) *Proceedings of the Tenth EURALEX International Congress, EURALEX 2002*, Copenhagen, Denmark, August 12-17, 2002, Vol.2. Copenhagen: Center for Sprogteknologi, Copenhagen University, 463-70.

Gouws, Rufus. 2003. 'Types of articles, their structure and different types of lemmata. A practical guide to lexicography.' In: Sterkenburg, Piet van (ed.), *A practical guide to lexicography*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 34-43.

Lew, Robert. 2011. 'Space restrictions in paper and electronic dictionaries and their implications for the design of production dictionaries.' In: Bański, Piotr – Beata Wójtowicz (eds.), *Issues in modern lexicography*. München: Lincom Europa.

Prinsloo, Daniel Jacobus – De Schryver, Gilles-Maurice. 2002. The use of slashes as a lexicographic device, with special reference to the African languages. *South African Journal of African Languages* 22/1: 70–91.

Wiegand, Herbert Ernst. 1996. 'Textual condensation in printed dictionaries. A theoretical draft.' *Lexikos* 6: 133-58.