

MIROSLAWA PODHAJECKA
University of Opole

MONIKA BIELIŃSKA
University of Silesia

AN ENGLISH-POLISH GLOSSARY OF LEXICOGRAPHICAL TERMS: A DESCRIPTION OF THE COMPILATION PROCESS*

In the present paper we describe the consecutive phases – the planning phase, the collection of material, the selection of data, and the construction and arrangement of entries – in the compilation of an English-Polish glossary of lexicographical terms, which is part of a larger dictionary project. In doing so, we address some of the issues that made the compilation procedure methodologically difficult. On theoretical grounds, the main dilemma was whether lexicographical or terminological principles should be followed, inasmuch as they result in conflicting features, i.e. different coverage, organisation and description of data. The most pertinent practical problem that we faced was, on the one hand, the variability of terms in English lexicographical discourse and, on the other one, the incompatibility of English and Polish terminological frameworks. For the glossary to be used successfully in text reception, we thus needed to determine the complex semantic relationships between intralingual terms and, even more importantly, the various levels of equivalence between interlingual terms. The issues discussed here have been illustrated with selected English-Polish contrastive material.

1. Introduction

Many language faculties at Polish universities offer regular courses in lexicography and lexicology, but despite the development of lexicography as an academic discipline, specialist dictionaries describing its (meta)language have not been available on the Polish market. Lexicons of linguistic terms do not pay enough attention to lexicographical concepts, and foreign-language dictionaries (e.g. Bergenholtz, Cantell et al. 1997, Burkhanov 1998, Hartmann and James 2001) have not received wide recognition, primarily because of the language barrier. A reference work published in Polish would thus reach potentially wide audi-

ence. Such a dictionary has now been created by a team of researchers from five Polish universities.

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

2. Dictionary description

2.1. Target users

The dictionary is addressed to students and scholars at language faculties, who will be able to use it both for research and for didactic purposes. Another important group of target users are linguists carrying out contrastive analyses (Polish-English, English-Polish; Polish-German, German-Polish, etc.), translators and professional lexicographers. In other words, the dictionary is intended for experts and semi-experts rather than laypersons (cf. Bowker 2003: 157).

2.2. Background conception

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

2.3. Dictionary structure

The dictionary, describing over 600 Polish terms (plus the cross-referenced ones), consists of the front matter, macrostructure, or 'dictionary proper', and back

matter with the four bilingual glossaries. The term list is organised on a strictly alphabetical principle. The dictionary can be used both for a single look-up and for more integrated tasks, in which the target user searches for broader information. Therefore, what plays an important role is a rich cross-referencing structure, which enables the user to identify the whole conceptual network associated with the terms that s/he is interested in. The dictionary microstructure is composed of an entry term, its etymology, alternative Polish terms, a definition, additional explanations and illustrative examples. Then come equivalent foreign terms, followed by a multilingual bibliography.

2.4. *External and internal selection*

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

3. Compiling the English-Polish glossary

3.1. *The planning phase*

Since the glossary is a dependent bilingual component of a monolingual dictionary, certain decisions had to be made as to its organising principles, design features and future applications.

The glossary is based on the Polish (the source language, or SL) term list, which was then reversed, hence it was expected that the compilation procedure would consist primarily in selecting equivalent English (the target language, or TL) terms. Concepts can be represented by both single terms (e.g. *definition*) and multi-word terms (e.g. *ostensive definition*), and both types have been taken into account here.

As users can find detailed information about SL terms in monolingual entries, the glossary excluded TL definitions or contextual uses. At the same time, however, we wanted to point to intralingual relationships (i.e. synonymy, antonymy, hyperonymy, hyponymy) and to interlingual relationships (i.e. equivalence) between

the included terms. By doing so, we hoped to enable the target group to fully efficiently use the bilingual glossary in the reception of specialist TL texts.

3.2. *The collection of material*

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

3.3. *The selection of data*

3.3.1. Terminological standardisation

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

term

A word, phrase or alphanumeric symbol used by the practitioners of a specialised technical subject to designate a CONCEPT. Within the TERMINOLOGY of the whole field, the unity between term and concept is claimed to be an essential requirement of unambiguous communication, strengthened by agreed definitions and the avoidance of syn-

onymous expressions. Sometimes international, and even interlingual, STANDARDISATION is possible, and the results are recorded in terminological dictionaries and terminological databases.

The theoretical angle notwithstanding, identifying standard terms is a pertinent practical problem, because terminological vocabularies are developing continuously, and it is often unclear, even in a narrow synchronic perspective, which items, and on what grounds, should be given term status.

Within a comparative approach, terminological standardisation concerns the selection of translation equivalents for bi- and multilingual reference works, most of which are created with the aim of improving communication among specialists in the field. We did not pursue standardisation, either with reference to SL (alternative SL terms are included in the monolingual entries) or TL (alternative TL terms are included in the glossary), having assumed that the target user may encounter more terms in specialist lexicographical texts than can be found in any set of controlled vocabulary. Still, we had to solve the dilemma of how to delimit the scope of TL equivalents to suit the requirements of the basic SL term list, and what criteria should be taken into account in the face of terminological variation, or variability of terms.

3.3.2. Terminological variation

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

3.3.2.1. Regional variation

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

3.3.2.2. Social and stylistic variation

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

3.3.2.3. Field-internal variation

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

Secondly, lexicography has been drawing on related disciplines, such as theoretical linguistics (and its branches), sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics or translation studies. In consequence, some terminological cross-fertilisation has been at play, and the difference between alternative terms is often conditioned by a different research angle (e.g. *syntactic constituent structure*, *syntactic scheme* – *schemat składniowy*; *phrase*, *phraseologism*, *phraseological unit* – *frazeologizm*; *origin*, *etymological origin*, *ultimate source* – *źródłosłów*; *mother tongue*, *native language*, *first language* – *język ojczysty*; *dead language*, *extinct language*, *dormant language* – *język martwy*; *arrangement of entries*, *ordering of entries*, *lemmatisation* – *hasłowanie*).

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

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

Finally, as we have also noticed, to some extent alternative terms emerge because of the features of the linguistic system of English. For example, English nouns, like adjectives, can be used as modifiers attributively, which makes it possible to coin such terms as *language* or *linguistic norm* (*norma językowa*); *dialect* or *dialectal dictionary* (*słownik dialektyczny*); *text* or *textual word* (*wyraz tekstowy*); *picture* or *pictorial dictionary* (*słownik obrazkowy*), etc. What is more, some nominal modifiers can be used both in the unmarked form and in the Saxon Genitive, hence *native speaker* or *native speaker's dictionary* (*słownik dla rodzimych użytkowników języka*); *author* or *author's dictionary* (*słownik języka pisarza*); *user* or *user's guide* (*wskazówki dla użytkownika*), etc.

3.3.2.4. Diachronic variation

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

3.4. Construction and arrangement of entries

The basic decision at this stage was how to organise the rich but heterogeneous material in consistently structured entries (cf. Podhajecka in press). As has been mentioned, the glossary was created by reversing the Polish-English term list, in which several equivalents – collected in a linear fashion – went with one SL term. However, for the glossary to cater successfully to the needs of the target

user, every TL equivalent had to be given headword status, which means that there are far more entries in the glossary than in the monolingual dictionary. Some of the TL items are linked to the same SL term, which required additional information to be inserted. At this junction, we had to deal with several conspicuous issues, including the ones presented below.

3.4.1. Homonymy

The problem of homonymy brought us to the basic distinction between terminology and lexicography. In the words of Riggs (2001), words as linguistic units can represent more than one concept, whereas a term is a word that represents only one concept. This is a purely theoretical stance, which somehow had to be adapted practically to the context of the bilingual glossary. As the TL terms have been arranged alphabetically, we came to the conclusion that to show the differences in meaning the same word-forms could be numbered (e.g. *dialect*¹ – *gwara/dialect*² – *dialekt*) or simply included randomly one by one.

3.4.2. Linguistic information

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

3.4.3. Conceptual and semantic relationships

Relationships that hold between lexicographical concepts and, consequently, terms that designate them are fairly complex. As we have found out, few corresponding terms are fully synonymous, whereas most relationships show various degrees of synonymy as well as hypernymy/hyponymy. For instance, while the terms *language correctness* and *linguistic correctness* (*poprawność językowa*) are near-synonymous, the terms *difficult word*, *confusing word* and *hard word* (*wyraz kłopotliwy*) refer to different concepts applied in different contexts. More exactly, *hard word* implies primarily the pivot of Renaissance lexicography, *confusing word* is one of a pair of paronyms, while *difficult word* refers to a word whose form or meaning poses some problems. It is clear that the analysis of contextual uses can help the compiler, at least to some extent, to delimit meanings and determine the conceptual matches and mismatches. However, to the user of the glos-

sary who will have to treat the terms at face value, i.e. out of context, they will not be fully transparent.

3.4.4. Interlingual equivalence

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

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

Less frequent are situations in which SL and TL terms are convergent in form, but not in meaning, which may lead to cross-linguistic tautonyms (*formal dictionary* ‘standard meaning-oriented dictionary’ – *słownik formalny* ‘form-oriented dictionary’; *barbarism* ‘misuse of language, indicating culturally lacking in refinement’ – *barbaryzm* ‘a foreignism, often perceived as redundant’; *orthoepy* ‘principles of correct pronunciation’ – *ortoepia* ‘principles of correct spelling and pronunciation’).

It is worthy of mention that some cultural differences have also been discerned, e.g. *makaronizm* cannot be expressed fully equivalently by *inkhornism* (*inkhorn term*) due to divergent cultural traditions that shaped the use of foreign words and expressions in Poland and in England, respectively. Some terms have the status of historicisms, which means that they are applied only with reference to the history of lexicography. For instance, there are three distinct TL terms for SL *słownik wielojęzyczny*, i.e. *multilingual dictionary*, *interlingual dictionary* and

polyglot dictionary, and although they can in fact be used interchangeably, the last one refers specifically to European dictionaries produced in the 16th and 17th centuries (e.g. Ambrosius Calepinus's *Dictionarium Undecim Linguarum* of 1590). Moreover, certain archaic SL terms, such as *słowarz*, *wokabularz* or *mownik*, do not have equally archaic TL equivalents.

Clearly, it is difficult to measure equivalence between interlingual counterparts and, even more importantly, to describe it explicitly in the glossary. One solution would be to identify the level of equivalence by means of a set of symbols used for the creation of multilingual resources, i.e. (A=B) for exact equivalence, (A≈B) for inexact equivalence, (A > B) or (B < A) for partial equivalence, and (A=B+C) for single-to-multiple term equivalence. However, this technique, apart from being time-consuming, can also be potentially confusing for the user. We therefore came to the conclusion that the complexity of the relationships would be best compensated for by a well-developed cross-referencing structure, directing the user from one TL equivalent to another (e.g. *normative dictionary – słownik normatywny/prescriptive dictionary – słownik normatywny* → *normative dictionary*).

It goes without saying that, in addition to it, all problematic cases needed to be commented upon, so that the target user could comprehend not only the semantic differences between the concepts, but also their cultural history and area of usage. In this way, we wanted to ensure a high level of user-friendliness, because, as has been claimed by lexicographic researchers (cf. Hartmann 1987: 123), even a tiny element, such as the use of typographical symbols, can make a work of reference either easy or difficult to use.

4. Conclusions

To sum up, the paper describes the consecutive steps taken by the authors in the compilation of a bilingual English-Polish glossary of lexicographical terms, which is part of a larger dictionary project. The procedure covered the planning phase, the collection of material, the selection of data, and the construction and arrangement of entries.

The planning phase helped us to take most decisions concerning the bilingual glossary. It was decisive as to the underlying principles and design criteria, although certain features, like the range of alternative terms, could not be predicted beforehand. The collection phase involved compiling an exemplary corpus of texts, which was somewhat unsatisfactory – it was disproportionate and available in print only. As to the selection of data, we were overwhelmed by the scope of terminological variation. Although we tried to work out a consistent approach to it, many cases had to be judged individually. The construction and arrangement of entries was the last phase, in which we decided how to describe, with existing lexicographical means, the complex inter- and intralingual relationships between concepts and terms.

The compiled English-Polish glossary is a compromise solution both with regards to the selection of TL equivalents and to their description. It links corresponding TL and SL terms on a one-to-one basis. However, we allowed a range of alternative equivalents, though without specifying preferred or non-preferred terms. An extensive cross-referencing structure helps the user to find the required SL translation equivalent or a related TL term. When necessary, the terms are accompanied by glosses or descriptive notes explaining the nature and scale of the encountered problem.

References

- Bailey, R. (ed.). (1987). *Dictionaries of English. Prospects for the record of our language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bankavs, A. (2002). *Dictionary of lexicographical terms (French-Latvian-English)*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.
- Bergenholtz, H., I. Cantell et al. (eds.). (1997). *Nordisk leksikografisk ordbok*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget AS.
- Bergenholtz, H., U. Kaufmann. (1997). Terminography and lexicography. A critical survey of dictionaries from a single specialised field. In: *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics* 18, 91-125.
- Bielińska, M. (2005a). O słownikach terminologii (meta)leksykograficznej. In: *Poradnik Językowy* 1, 27-39.
- Bielińska, M. (2005b). Wörterbücher (meta)lexikographischer Termini – Vorstellung eines Projekts. In: *Convivium*, 203-218.
- Bowker, L. (2003). Specialized lexicography and specialized dictionaries. In: Piet van Sterkenburg (ed.), *A practical guide to lexicography*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 154-164.
- Burkhanov, I. (1998). *Lexicography. A dictionary of basic terminology*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej.
- Cabré, M. T. (1999). *Terminology. Theory, methods and applications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hartmann, R.R.K. (1987). Dictionaries of English: The user's perspective. In: Richard Bailey (ed.), *Dictionaries of English. Prospects for the record of our language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 121-135.
- Hartmann, R.R.K. (2001). *Teaching and researching lexicography*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Hartmann, R.R.K., G. James (2001). *Dictionary of lexicography*. London: Routledge.
- Hausmann, F.J. et al. (eds.). (1989-1991). *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. An international encyclopedia of lexicography*. Vols. 1-3. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Knowles, F.E. (1988). Lexicography and terminography: A rapprochement? In: Mary Snell-Hornby (ed.), *ZüriLEX'86 proceedings. Papers read at the EURALEX International Congress, University of Zürich, 9-14 September 1986*. Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 329-337.
- Knowles, F.E. (1990). The computer in lexicography. In: J. F. Hausmann et al. (eds.), *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. An international encyclopedia of lexicography*. Vols. 1-3. Berlin: De Gruyter, Vol. 2, 1645-1670.

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

* This is an earlier version of a paper presented at the XIII EURALEX International Congress in Barcelona (15-19 July 2008) and published in the Congress Proceedings as:

Podhajecka, M., M. Bielińska (2008). An English-Polish Glossary of Lexicographical Terms: A Description of the Compilation Process. In: E. Bernal, J. De-Cesaris (eds.), *Proceedings of the XIII EURALEX International Congress (Barcelona, 15-19 July 2008)*. Sèrie Activitats 20. Barcelona: Institut Universitari di Lingüística Aplicada, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 1041-1049.