Composition of the Entry in a Bilingual Dictionary

Edita Hornáčková Klapicová

This paper focuses on the essential concepts of the composition of the entry in a bilingual dictionary, on the general standpoints of some lexicographers as well as on the practical usage of certain rules to be observed when elaborating the entry in a bilingual dictionary. The introductory part consists of a research of ideas of some authors regarding the science of bilingual lexicography and the analysis of their theories. The following paragraphs discuss questions of terminological dictionaries and dictionaries containing both the definitions as well as the translation of terms. Moreover, the paper ponders upon the ideas of Ella Sekaninová on the composition of the entry and the set of parameters according to which a lexical unit must appear in a bilingual dictionary. Accordingly, each of the seven parameters mentioned by Sekaninová is applied on some Slovak, English and Spanish voices.

1. The Entry in a Bilingual Dictionary

1.1 *A Bilingual Dictionary*

Dictionaries may be classified by manifold criteria, some of them obvious to everyone, such as size, but there is no standard, agreed-upon taxonomy for dictionaries. Perspective is based on how the compiler views the work and what approach he takes. First, is the work diachronic (covering an extended time) or synchronic (confined to one period)? Second, how is it organized – alphabetically, by sound (as in rhyming dictionaries), by concept (as in some thesauruses), or by some other means? Third, is the level of tone detached, perceptive (didactic), or facetious?

Martínez de Sousa defines a bilingual dictionary as a "plurilingual dictionary which registers the equivalences of meanings in two languages" (Martínez de Sousa 1995: 129). Bilingual dictionaries are seldom diachronic and usually alphabetic in arrangement. The difference between a monolingual dictionary and a bilingual one "is made not only in the number of languages in which they are written but also in their essential purpose" (Landau 1989: 7). A bilingual dictionary consists of an alphabetical list of words or expressions in one language (the 'source language') for which, ideally, exact equivalents are given in another language (the 'target language'). The purpose is to "provide help to someone who understands one language but not the other" (Landau 1989: 7).

Bilingual dictionaries may be unidirectional (monodirectional) or bi-directional; that is, they may go in one direction only, from English, let us say, to Slovak, or be combined woth another dictionary that goes from Slovak to English. In this case there are really two dictionaries. There are also dictionaries in which the entry words are translated into two other languages (trilingual dictionaries) or more than two other languages (multilingual).

1.2 *The Entry Word*

The entry "in a dictionary or an encyclopedia is each defined word or term or a group of words which create a complex lexis, such as the subordinated words (morpheme, lexeme,

etc.), i.e. everything that is capable of providing a dependent or independent lexical meaning in the form of a significant chain" (Pamies Bertán, De Dios Luque Durán 2000: 255). David Crystal (1985: 110) defines an entry as "a term used in semantics to refer to the accumulated structural information concerning a lexical item as formally located in a lexicon or dictionary," while "a dictionary is seen as a set of lexical entries." Still another definition states that an entry is "a word, expression, phrase, syntagma, sign or a unit of words or signs which heads the entry of a dictionary, vocabulary, glossary, terminology, index, etc. and is the object of definition or explanation and, eventually, of an encyclopedic treatment" (Martínez de Sousa 1995: 180). In language dictionaries, the entry is normally formed by one element only, which is generally one word or less often a unit of words or signs (Martínez de Sousa 1995: 181). The entry would, thus, form part of the macrostructure (paradigm or vertical axis) as well as of the microstructure (syntagma or horizontal axis) of the dictionary.

Haensch and Omeñaca express that the body of a dictionary is divided into articles or entries, which are its smallest autonomous unit dedicated to each of the registered lexical units. According to the type of dictionary, its extension may vary from one single line to a large paragraph. The entry is headed by a lemma (key-word), i.e. the lexical graphic representation of the lexical unit which is the object of description. Lemmatization is a system or principle according to which a lexical unit becomes represented by a lemma which heads an article in some place of the dictionary.

The type of the entry depends of the position of the elements of the entry. When the entry is lexical, i.e. when it consists of one element only, its arrangement does not present special problems. However, when it is syntagmatic, which often occurs in monographic, technical or specialized dictionaries, it can be arranged in two ways: with the direct entry or with the inversion of the terms.

2. Bilingual and terminological dictionaries. The composition of the entry

2.1. *The Role of a Bilingual Dictionary and the structure of the entry.*

The entry word in its basic form presents a lexical unit in a lexicographic work and it is highlighted graphically. The structure of a dictionary entry reveals the depth and width of meanings of lexical units in a lexicographic work (Sekaninová 1993: 135). It seems that the authors cited below do not present a unanimous answer to the question of what the role of a bilingual dictionary is and how to build its entries. In the following statements, different standpoints of past and present lexicographers will be given.

Peciar (1961) expresses some ideas to the question of translation and description of the entry in a bilingual dictionary. He presents the statement of the Bratislava Lexicographic School, which had built up its theory of a bilingual dictionary on the basis of a Soviet linguist and lexicographer Ščerba. According to this conception, "a bilingual dictionary is always supposed to be a translation dictionary, regardless its extension. The translation in such a dictionary must not be a description (explanation) but a real translation which, in its appropriate grammatical form, would fit directly in a correctly translated sentence in the corresponding language" (Peciar 1961: 24). According to this conception, the equivalent is the main organizational principle of the construction of the entry. In more complex cases, when the meaning of the entry word has several implications, it can be presented by synonyms. "It is indispensable to determine the usage of these synonyms in a dictionary by

semantics, i.e. by brief information about the extent of usage of the corresponding synonym" (Peciar 1961: 24).

These principles were later formulated by Kučerová and Lapárová: "A good bilingual dictionary may be created only through the correct combination of the interpretation and translation aspects, while the translation aspect is dominant" (Ibid.: 25). The equivalent must always be a precise translation. Words which cannot be literally translated, e.g. names of some cultural items, are just taken into the target language in their original form and the explanation of the corresponding notion is given within parenthesis (Ibid.: 25). Kopeckij, Bosák and Jehlička express the idea that the composition of the entry coming from the semantic structure of the original language helps the user to "penetrate into the inner laws of the language, realize the connection with other words, know the possibilities of word-formation and become profoundly acquainted with the language" (Ibid.: 26). According to Peciar, on the other hand, "a monolingual dictionary serves for this all. The aim of a bilingual dictionary is quite different from the aim of a monolingual dictionary" (Ibid.: 26). Peciar also touches the topic of the words and expressions impossible to translate according to the theory of Kopecký, who "considers seeking for equivalents through the confrontation of conceptual systems and their lexical expression as the basic procedure while working on a bilingual dictionary" (Ibid.: 26).

Kopeckij sees one of the essential roles of a bilingual dictionary in the elaboration of the semantic structure in the original language, i.e. in agreement with the role of a monolingual dictionary. According to Kopeckij, the difference between a monolingual and bilingual dictionary is in the fact that "a monolingual dictionary presents the description of the different meanings of the word, while a bilingual dictionary presents equivalents expressing the corresponding meanings of the entry word in stead of the description" (Ibid.: 27). On the other hand, the Lexicographical School of Ščerba and Isačenko does not consider as its aim to elaborate the semantic structure of the words in the source language in a bilingual dictionary. It sees the main role of a bilingual dictionary in exact equivalents, which in the target language express the corresponding meanings of the entry word. Peciar (1961) ponders upon the possible competence of both conceptions and he admits that just one of them might be correct and the other incorrect. In such a case, he asks which of them would be the correct one. He concludes his reflection with the statement: "It is necessary to consider more correct the conception whose result serves its aim better" (Ibid.: 27).

The proper role and aim of a bilingual dictionary is, therefore, to help the user to work with foreign lexical means. This assumes the requirement that the bilingual dictionary provide precise equivalents of particular items of the vocabulary of the source language in the target language. Nevertheless, it is not indispensable that a bilingual dictionary elaborate the semantic structure of the words in the source language.

These ideas on the elaboration of a bilingual dictionary could nowadays be considered as obsolete, since modern authors do not limit their idea of a bilingual dictionary on the structure *entry in the original language – equivalent in the target language* but they emphasize the indispensable presence of other parameters in a bilingual dictionary, such as pronunciation, orthography, grammar, etymology, the semantic structure, the stylistic characteristics, etc.

Zgusta's (1971: 294) perception of the role of a bilingual dictionary is that its "basic purpose is to coordinate with the lexical units of one language those lexical units of another language which are equivalent in their lexical meaning." The entry in a bilingual dictionary should, according to Zgusta, add grammatical indications show the entry word's paradigm

and its specifities. When preparing these grammatical indications, the lexicographer should take into consideration that they are written for foreigners, not for native speakers. They should be explicit and detailed. Furthermore, the lemma should indicate the pronunciation of the entry word in its canonical form. An appendix of the pronunciation of the source language is also welcome. The equivalents are quoted in their canonical form. If there is a multiple meaning of some entry words, partial equivalents of the target language should be given. The multiple meaning of the lexical unit of the source language is, therefore, necessarily "the basis of the whole construction of the bilingual entry, of the sequence of the senses" (Zgusta 1971: 327). Zgusta (1971: 343) adds that apart from all these indications, the entry of a bilingual dictionary may give different other information connected with the coordination of the lexical units. This could be some encyclopedic information, etymology of the lexical units or information on the lexicalized and the verbatim meaning of different morphemic and word combinations. In all, Zgustas criteria for the construction of the entry in a bilingual dictionary could be summarized as following:

(1)   a. The presence of the entry word in its canonical form
          b. Grammatical information
          c. Indication of pronunciation
          d. Equivalents in the target language in their canonical form
          e. Indication of the whole lexical meaning of the entry word by partial equivalents of
             the target language.
          f. Encyclopedic information
          g. Etymology of the entry words
          h. The lexicalized and the verbatim meaning of different morphemic and word
             combinations.

Landau (1989: 9-10), similarly to Zgusta, lists a number of desiderata for a bilingual dictionary, including the following:

(2)   a. It provides a translation for each word in the source language
          b. Its coverage of the source language lexicon is complete
          c. Grammatical, syntactic, and semantic information is provided
          d. Usage guidance is given
          e. Names are included
          f. It includes special vocabulary items, such as scientific terms
          g. Spelling aids and alternative spellings are indicated
          h. Pronunciation is included
          i. It is compact in size – which obviously limits its coverage of items 1-8.

Regarding item eight of the list above, Landau expresses that bilingual dictionaries should show only one pronunciation so as not to confuse the learner. He declares that „the foreign learner would be at loss when offered more than one variant" (Landau 1989: 97). In his opinion, pronunciation is regarded as of secondary importance in bilingual dictionaries.

To the question of grammatical information included in bilingual dictionaries, Landau responds that it (grammatical information) is more essential for the person who is trying to speak or understand a foreign language than for the native speaker. Therefore, dictionaries for sudents of a second language should provide considerably more grammatical help than monolingual adult or children's dictionaries. In bilingual dictionaries, the grammatical

categories of the source-language vocabulary and its corresponding translations should be consistent.

Haensch and Omeñaca (2004: 240) present the following structure of a word entry in a general bilingual dictionary:

(3)   A general bilingual dictionary contains many elements common with a monolingual one:
        a. statement of the lemma;
        b. indication of orthographical variants;
        c. indication of the part of speech;
        d. indications about the pronunciation and accentuation;
        e. indications about gender, formation of the feminine or neuter, irregular plural
            forms, characteristics of verbs as transitive, intransitive, reflexive, impersonal and
            defective and, in the ideal case, about verbal valences, etc.;
        f. lexicographical marks;
        g. remarks about usage restrictions;
        h. examples of application (much less frequent in bilingual dictionaries than in
            monolingual ones);
        i. in very few cases: illustrations.

Buzássyová (2001: 16) claims that the entry words of an interpretation dictionary should contain the following relevant information: phonetic and phonological characteristics (stating the pronunciation when necessary), grammatical (morphological) characteristics, stylistic characteristics and lexical-semantic characteristics (the description of meanings of polysemic verbal lexical units). She conceptually agrees with Ella Sekaninová (1993) emphasizes that a lexical unit in a dictionary entry must be presented from various points of view, it should contain the phonetic, grammatical and stylistic parameter, the parameter of equivalence, lexical stability, lexical-semantic connection potentiality and context applicability.

2.2. *Some Methods for the Elaboration of the Entry Word in a Bilingual Dictionary*

Peciar (1961) presents two methods for the elaboration of the entry word: the method of distribution according to the equivalents and the method of distribution according to meanings, for example, as in (4):

(4)   a.   According to the method of distribution according to the equivalents the Slovak
                entry word *aparát* would be constructed like this: aparát –u, m. (in different
                meanings) aparát: fotografický a.; stranícky a.; štátny a.; stranícky štátny a.;
                nervový a.; bibliografický a.; kritický a.

        b.   According to the method of distribution according to meanings, the same entry
                word would have the following structure: aparát –u, m. 1. (prístroj) aparát:
                fotografický a.; 2. (stranícky, štátny, policajný ap.) aparát; 3. anat.
                (ústrojenstvo) aparát: nervový a.; 4. (poznámkový, bibliografický, kritický ap.)
                aparát

Peciar (1961) expresses the idea that the method of distribution according to equivalents is more economical. Nevertheless, he agrees that it is appropriate to combine this basic method with the method of distribution of the entry words according to meanings in

case of a complex semantic structure. Peciar (1961) states that, in certain circumstances, the distribution of the entry according to meanings may be considered as the essential principle in a bilingual dictionary as well. It occurs when the bilingual dictionary plays, at the same time, the role of a monolingual dictionary.

Sekaninová (1993) does not suggest nesting or presenting some kinds of derived words in one entry in bilingual dictionaries. She claims that each entry and meaning in a bilingual dictionary must be accompanied by the equivalent, which in the nested word might not always agree with the entry word in its structure or the number of meanings. Peciar, on the other hand, says that certain economy may be achieved through nesting, although he agrees with the fact that nesting must be limited so as not to require cross-references, otherwise the achieved economy would be lost.

2.3. *Terminological Dictionaries and the Composition of the Entry Word*

2.3.1. *Terminological Dictionaries*
Nowadays, the most important group of dictionaries, from the point of view of number, are specialized or technical dictionaries in a broad sense, that is, not only scientific and technological dictionaries but also dictionaries containing the terminological vocabulary of any other area, such as sports, philosophy, law, gastronomy, fishing, hunting, etc. Martínez de Sousa (1995: 168) summarizes Haensch's ideas on terminological dictionaries in these words: "A terminological dictionary" is a "specialized dictionary which registers, in one or more languages, the terminology proper to a science, technique or art without encyclopedic description." A technical dictionary is closed as for the vocabulary it defines, however, it presents borders open to general lexis in order to become comprehensible.

Monolingual specialized dictionaries offer a definition of each lexical item, in many cases enriched by an encyclopedic extension and illustrations. Bilingual and multilingual specialized dictionaries, on the other hand, present the equivalents of the terms in one or more languages. It would be wonderful to have bilingual and multilingual specialized dictionaries which would offer also a definition of each term, at least, in the source language, which is the only possibility to confirm whether the equivalents in the target language(s) truly correspond with the term of the source language.

Landau (1989: 144) offers several common mistakes in defining a word entry in scientific and technical dictionaries:

(5) a. Failure to understand that a textbook type of a description is not a definition.
  b. Failure to indicate all the meanings of a term in the field covered by the dictionary. The definition should not represent one point of view only.
  c. Failure to understand that self-explanatory entries are not legitimate lexical units.

Haensch and Omeñaca explain that bilingual specialized dictionaries may contain an alphabetical classification of the entry words; however, a part of them offers a thematic arrangement, which is the type of arrangement recommended by the organs for technological standardization. When the classification of the terms is thematic, it is indispensable to offer an alphabetical index for each language in order to permit a fast consultation.

2.3.2. *Composition of the Entry in a Terminological Dictionary*

Horecký (1961) presents some ideas about descriptive and translation dictionaries. According to his theory, it is possible to start from two different departure points when elaborating the terminology of one or more languages. If the departure point is the notional system of a branch of science and the names are written down, a terminological dictionary is being created. This terminological dictionary is descriptive when the meaning of terms is explained or translating when each term of the source language is accompanied by parallel terms in one or more target languages. If, on the other hand, the departure point is the word stock of the source language, the selection of terms is restricted to the type of words and expressions used in the scientific area and these terms are accompanied by equivalents in the target language(s), a technical dictionary is created.

Horecký (1961: 41) points out that a combination of a description and a translation results from the normative character of these dictionaries. He emphasizes that it is necessary to avoid "translating" terms from the source language into the target language in technical and terminological dictionaries, since it is not the case of translating the internal form of a term into the target language but substituting a term from the source language by a term from the target language. Horecký (1961: 41) underlines the fact that a special situation is created in those cases in which a particular term is missing in one or more languages. If the term is missing in the source language, it is natural not to state it in the technical dictionary. However, if the term is missing in the target language, it can be described or a new term may be coined in the target language.

According to Horecký (1961: 41), grammatical information is indispensable in every language. It is supposed to state the correspondence with a particular part of speech, inform about the gender of nouns, present the genitive ending of nouns, state the verbal aspect. Grammatical information is only an auxiliary item in a technical dictionary, therefore, it is advisable to restrict it to the most crucial extent.

Landau (1989: 102) emphasizes the role of etymologies which should be included in scientific and technical dictionaries, „especially those for the old sciences like medicine, because they are mistakenly believed to be essential to an understanding of meaning". In fact, what is important in medicine is not a knowledge of Latin or Greek but of the modern meanings of combining forms derived from Latin and Greek. According to Landau (1989: 102), etymology's chief value lay in its historic and linguistic interest, not in its relevance to the modern meaning of scientific terms". Moreover, etymologies demonstrate that language changes in form and meaning. Even the brief etymologies in synchronic dictionaries remind people of this process and sometimes give glimpses of the way other cultures, or our own in times past, viewed particular words.

2.4. *Composition of the Entry in a Bilingual Dictionary According to the Conception of Sekaninová*

As mentioned above, Sekaninová (1993) emphasizes the indispensability of seven parameters, according to which a lexical unit in a bilingual dictionary must be presented. On the basis of this theory, the particular parameters (phonetic, grammatical and stylistic parameter, the parameter of equivalence, lexical stability, lexical-semantic connection potentiality and context applicability) will be elaborated and applied on the Slovak, English and Spanish language in the following paragraphs.

2.4.1. *The Phonetic Parameter*

Most frequently, in every language irregularities in pronunciation occur and these must be highlighted. The information about this phenomenon is normally presented in square brackets after the entry word. It is appropriate to point out to the hard pronunciation of Slovak di, ti, ni, li, de, te, ne, le especially in foreign words as a contrast to the regular soft pronunciation, e.g. in the words *diptografia* [dy-], *Títus* [tý-]. In English, pronunciation is presented after each entry word, e.g. *mercy* [mɜːsi], *heaven* [hevn]. In Spanish bilingual dictionaries, clear rules of pronunciation are normally presented in the introductory part of the dictionary in an alphabetical order and in case of necessity, pronunciation comes immediately after the entry word in square brackets, e.g. *circumcira* [-un-], *edelweis* [edelveis].

The phenomenon of transphonemization is notable especially when English words are taken into Slovak. Ološtiak (2001: 3) points out to the fact the biggest number of variants of the English anthroponyms occurs on the sound level. The sound systems of both contact languages are so asymmetrical that this asymmetry of the realization of English items in Slovak is most remarkable on the phonetic level. According to Ološtiak, the sound level crucially influences the phenomena on other language levels as well, therefore, the opinions of different linguists on the particular pronunciations of foreign names are often discordant.

Ološtiak (2001) differentiates among three types of pronunciation related to the inter-lingual relationship:

(6)   a. *English pronunciation*, which uses its own phonemic inventory and phonetic
          and phonological rules.
         b. *Slovakized pronunciation*, in which English sounds are substituted by their
          Slovak equivalents.
         c. *Slovak pronunciation.*

Another difficulty with the pronunciation of English proper names in Slovak results from the instability of the English pronunciation of some words. This instability may be caused, for example, by the consequence of its origin in generic practices, or the pronunciation of some word depends on the object it names, e.g. a toponym – anthroponym or there is a homophony of different proper names, such as *Peel, Peill, Peile* (Sekaninová 1993).

Sekaninová (1993) points out to the fact that the adaptation of pronunciation depends on the extent of asymmetry of the studied phonemic systems, while it is appropriate to evaluate separately the vocal and consonant subsystems of the contact languages because of their different functional load.

On the sound level, it is important to consider that a process of transphonemization or transformation of the sound elements (sounds, phonemes) from the source language into the target language takes place. Sekaninová (1993) differentiates between three types of transphonemization:

(7)   a. Total transphonemization – includes the transfer of those phonemes which
          are in both contact languages totally or partially equal. For example:
          Stephen [s] → [s]
         b. Partial transphonemization – when phonemes are different in the degree of openness
          (vocals) and in the place of articulation and aspiration (consonants). For example: *David*
          [dejvid].

c. Free transphonemization – is activated when the English sounds which are not available in Slovak are transphonemized with the help of orthography or some extralinguistic factors. Such "zero" places present neuralgic points, which cause   most problems for communication. For example: *sin* [sIn] – *thin* [θIn] – *thing* [θIŋ] – *sing* [sIŋ] - *sink* [sIŋk].

Ološtiak (2001: 7-8) explains that the total or partial transphonemization work on the principle of a relative phonemic parallelism. That means that in Slovakized pronunciation, English phonemes are substituted by the Slovak phonemes which are closes to them. The situation is more complex in the case of free transphonemization because the target language does not contain any 'closest' substituting equivalents. In such cases, transphonemization works on qualitatively diverse principles and the variability of substitution increases. There are cases in which it is possible to find articulation and functional equivalents, however, free transphonemization still takes place. The influence of the other language levels, e.g. morphology, orthography, extralinguistic factors, plays an important role here. For example: *Canterbury → Kanterbury, gospel music → gospelová hudba.*

Transphonemization means the articulatory, acoustic-auditory, combinatory, distributional or, in short, functional evaluation of the phoneme in the direction L1 → L2. In this way, transphonemization includes transphonization as well (the transfer of a sound on the level of a phone), and the dialectic connectedness of the particular and the general in an interlinguistic environment is thus expressed. Transphonemization also contains some other functional transformations, whole the language into which sound are taken (Slovak), actively neutralizes the English phonological opposite of lenis and fortis consonants. Syllables and accent as well as other suprasegmental features are revealed in the process of transphonemization.

2.4.2. *The Grammatical Parameter*
A lexicographical work should present parameters which place a word into certain paradigm and particularly point out to the deviations from the paradigm by the way of presenting the irregular forms. The grammatical characteristics of a word can schematically present a summary of the paradigmatic and syntagmatic characteristics. Sekaninová (1993) explains that the paradigmatic characteristic of a word is such information about the word which enables the user to create the desired form of the paradigm of the word if his/her knowledge of morphology is sufficient. This is connected to the characteristics of the parts of speech. Some parts of speech are marked by abbreviations, e.g. nouns are presented by the abbreviations of gender: in Slovak - *m, ž, s* (mužský, ženský, stredný), in English – *m, f, n* (masculine, feminine, neuter), in Spanish – *m, f, n* (masculino, femenino, neutro). Verbs in Slovak are marked with the abbreviations of aspect: *dok., nedok.* (perfect and non-perfect verbs), in English according to their classification as transitive or intransitive: *vt, vi* (transitive verb, intransitive verb). Adjectives are marked with the abbreviation *príd.* or *adj.* (adjektívum) in Slovak, *adj* (adjective) in English and *adj* (adjetivo) in Spanish. Adverbs are indicated with *prísl.* or *adv.* (adverbium) in Slovak, *adv* (adverb) in English and *adv* (adverbio) in Spanish; pronouns: *zám.* (zámeno) in Slovak, *pron* (pronoun) in English and *pron* (pronombre) in Spanish; numerals: *čísl.* (číslovky) in Slovak, *num* (numeral) in English and *núm* (número) in Spanish; prepositions: *predl.* (predložky) in Slovak, *prep* (preposition) in English, *prep* (preposición) in Spanish; conjunctions: *spoj.* (spojky) in Slovak, *conj* (conjunction) in English and *conj* (conjunción) in Spanish; particles: *čast.* (častice) in Slovak,

English and Spanish do not state them; interjections: *cit.* (citoslovcia) in Slovak, *excl* or *interj* (exclamation, interjection) in English and *interj* (interjección) in Spanish.

The selection of particular grammatical parameters in a translation dictionary depends on what language the source word originates from. Sekaninová remarks that the grammatical indicators in the target language are presented with each couple of languages when it is indispensable in case of great differences. The authors need to make this consideration themselves.

2.4.3. *The Stylistic Parameter*

Sekaninová (1993: 141) states that a differentiating process in the stylistic layering of lexis occurs as a result of changes and evolution of the social life.

Style is characterized as a language subsystem with a particular vocabulary, phraseology and constructions different from other particularities in the expressive and evaluative characteristics of its features, normally connected with certain areas of usage in speech. In linguistics, the functional aspect is connected with the social aspect when deciding upon the stylistic differentiation. Functional styles are formed on the basis of their connection to the different areas of human work. New linguistics makes use of the new theory of social communication.

The essential classification of styles was elaborated by Paulíny (1955). He differentiated between communicative and poetic styles, while the communicative style included: private, practical technical and theoretical technical styles. Ivanová-Šalingová (1974) presents the following classification of styles: colloquial, technical, literary and journalistic. J. Horecký (1971) divides the lexis into notional and emotional words, while there are three layers: (1) neutral, containing also words of journalist style, (2) colloquial, slang and vulgar words and (3) expressive words. Vertically, he classifies the vocabulary as literary and non-literary. Mistrík (1965) isolates stylistically marked words on the background of words of the basic word stock. He determines the following styles: scientific, administrative, journalistic, rhetorical, essayistic, colloquial and literary. He, thus, classifies vocabulary according to the binary principle introduced by Findra (1984), who states the stylistic standpoint as first when enumerating the differentiating criteria of vocabulary in a textbook of Lexicology (Ondrus, Horecký, Furdík 1980). M. Pisarčíková (Sekaninová 1993: 142) considers the literary and non-literary layer of the lexis as the essential classification.

Depending on the attitudes of different authors, there are diverse criteria in the area of style. Nevertheless, Horecký (1971) expresses the idea that both the national and the literary language are always dynamic. Particular layers change, overlap, in spite of that, however, certain forms of a language can be defined: the language of belle-letters, the literary form, standard language, substandard language and dialects.

Sekaninová (1993) emphasizes the role of stylistic linguistic categories indicated by terms denotation and connotation and she explains their role from the point of view of the value they give to words in addition to their indicated meaning.

With the help of stylistic qualifiers, a lexicographer expresses the semantics of a lexical unit and its stylistic evaluation. The lexis is a multiform area, classified according to the aspect of diachrony and synchrony in a horizontal and vertical way:

(8)

	I **Diachrony**	**III** **Vertically**
	Archaic	
		Poetic
	Historical	Ceremonious
Terms		Literary
II Synchrony	Neutral	
(Horizontally)	Colloquial	
		Expressive (fam., iron., jocular, pejor.) – (connotation) **IV**

Archaic colloquial   n
Slang   e   s
Substandard   o   m
Vulgarisms   l   s
                     o   i
                      g

2.4.4. *The Parameter of Equivalence*
The parameter of equivalence is essential for bilingual lexicography, since the equivalent should contain the maximal information required by other marked parameters about the lexeme in L1 transformed into L2. When defining the equivalence of lexeme L1 in L2 as a realization of particular sememes, it is possible to create groups according to the types of symmetrical, symmetrical-asymmetrical and asymmetrical equivalence.

Equivalents can be divided into homoplanned and heteroplanned. On the basis of three logically possible equivalences (total, partial and zero) between the individual meanings of the lexical unit in the couple of languages the work is done with three main types of equivalents: total, partial and zero (e.g. substituting) equivalents.

2.4.4.1. *Symmetrical Equivalence of Lexemes.* The first type of equivalence within the scope of symmetrical equivalence is consists of cases in which the lexeme in L1 as a realization of a sememe with the same semic composition fully agrees with the equivalent lexeme in L2, i.e. one lexis has one equivalent.

(9)   L1 (Sl) – Lex – oltár - /S1/ ↔ E – altar /S1/- L2 (a)
         L1 – source language, L2 – target language, Lex – lexeme, S – sememe, E –
         equivalent, Sl – Slovak, A – English, a – English (adj)

         Lexicographical scheme:
         L1 – Lex1 /S1/ ↔ Lex1 /S1/ - L2, i.e.
         L1 – Lex1 /S1/ ↔ E1 /S1/ - L2

The second type of equivalence within the scope of symmetrical equivalence consists of cases in which the lexeme in L1 as a realization of various sememes agrees with the equivalent lexeme in L2. That means, the equivalent lexemes agree in the number and content of sememes in L1 and L2. In such cases, the quivalent in L2 corresponds to the lexeme in L1. In order to preserve the semantic structure of the lexeme L1, the equivalent L2 is divided into separate parts a), b), c), etc. pointing to the sememes of the lexeme L1 included in the equivalent L2.

(10)   Sl – A
        Kvet ... (*v rôznych významoch*) 1. (*vše, i prn*) bloom, inflorescence; 2. (*časť rastliny, kt dozrieva na plod*) blossom; 3. (*kvetina*) flower; 4. (*hrom: sušené, liečivé*) herbs; 5. (*prn: vrchol*) prime, florescence; 6. (*arzénový*) white arsenic, (*zinkový*) zink flowers **(**Vilikovský & Vilikovská 1983: 278).

        A-Sl
        Miss ... (*v rôznych významoch*) 1. to fail to hit, catch *etc*: *The arrow missed the target.* minúť; 2. to fail to arrive in time for: *He missed the 8 o'clock train.* zmeškať; 3. to fail to take advantage of: *You've missed your opporunity.* prepásť; 4. to feel sad because of the absence of: *You'll miss your friends when you go to live abroad.* cnieť sa (po), chýbať; 5. to notice the absence of: *I didn't miss my purse till several hours after I'd dropped it.* zistiť, že sa stratil; atď. **(**Mončeková & Malá 1999: 453).

        Scheme:
        L1 – Lex1 /S1 – S2 – S3.../ ↔ Lex1 /S1 – S2 – S3.../ - L2, i.e.
        L1 – Lex1 /S1 – S2 – S3.../ ↔ E1 (in different meanings) a /S1/ + b /S2/ + c /S3/ ... L2

2.4.4.2. *Symmetrical-asymmetrical equivalence of lexemes.* The third type of equivalence includes cases in which lexemes in L1 and L2 are in their semic contents partially congruent and partially incongruent. These are multi-semantic lexemes, in which L1 corresponds with L2 in some cases while in others it does not.

(11)   Sl – A
        bunka... (*v rôznych významoch*) 1. (*biol*) cell; mozgová b. brain cell, pohlavná bunka generative cell, rastlinná bunka vegetable cell; 2. (*stav*) flat, suit

        Scheme:
        L1 – Lex /S1 – S2 – S3 – S4 – S5... S9/ ↔ Lex1 /S1 – S2 – S3 – S4 – S5/ + Lex2 /S6/ + Lex3 /S7/ + Lex4 /S8/ + Lex5 /S9/ - L2, i.e.
        L1 – Lex1 /S1 – S2 – S3 – S4 – S5 - ....S9/ ↔ E1 (in different meanings): a /S1/, b /S2/, c /S3/, d /S4/, e /S5/ + E2 /S6/ + E3 /S7/ + E4 /S8/ + E5 /S9/ - L2 (Sekaninová 1993: 67).

2.4.4.3. *Asymmetrical equivalence of lexemes.* Asymmetrical equivalence occurs when there is asymmetry between the lexeme and its semic contents in L1 and the number and contents of the equivalent lexemes in L2. Cases of asymmetrical equivalence create the fourth type of equivalence, when the lexeme in L1 as a realization of several sememes is equivalent to as

many different semes in L2 as many different sememes are included in the lexeme in L2, i.e. each lexeme has a different equivalent.

(12) Sl – A
L1 (Sl) – Lex1 – **tlač** /S1 – typografická činnosť + S2 – výsledok (noviny)/ ↔ Lex1 /S1/ - *print, printing* + Lex2 /S2/ - *press*, t.j. E1 – print, printing + E2 – press – L2

Scheme:
L1 – Lex1 /S1...Sx/ ↔ Lex1 /S1/ + Lex2 /S2/ + Lex3 /S3/ + ...Lexx /Sx/ - L2, t.j.
L1 – Lex1 /S1...Sx/ ↔ E1 /S1/ + E2 /S2/ + E3 /S3/ + ...Ex /Sx/ - L2 (Sekaninová 1993: 70)

The fifth type of equivalence includes cases in which the lexeme in L1 contains sememes with a different semic construction from that of the sememes in L2. They are the most complicated cases which prove that in any language, some semes may become relevant and creating items of a certain sememe realized by the equivalent lexeme.

(13) Scheme:
L1 – Lex1 /S1s1 + s2 + s3...sx/ ↔ Lex1 /S1s1/ + Lex2 /S2s2/ + Lex3 /S3s3/ + ...Lexx /Sxsx/ - L2, t.j.
L1 – Lex1 /S1s1 + s2 + s3...sx/ ↔ E1 /S1s1/ + E2 /S2s2/ + E3 /S3s3/ + ...Ex /Sxsx/ - L2 (Sekaninová 1993: 73)

The sixth type of equivalence includes cases in which in one reality is expressed differently in L1 and in L2, with a different morphemic composition, lexical unit or description if there is no corresponding equivalent.

(14) A – Sl
troublemaker – príčina starostí, ťažkostí; burič, **trudge** – namáhavá chôdza, **scullery** – kuchynská umývareň riadu, **Scrabble** – hra (skladanie slov z písmen)

Sp – Sl
Brabante, brabán *m* – pluh s dvoma radlicami, brabantské plátno; **chichonera** *f* – ochranná čiapka; **chilera** *f* – nádoba na ocot; **fijacarteles** *m* – lepič plagátov

Scheme:
L1 – Lex1 /S1/ ↔ Lexical unit (description) – L2, i.e.
L1 – Lex1 /S1/ ↔ ≈ E (of a different type) – L2 (Sekaninová 1993: 77)

The seventh type of asymmetrical equivalence includes cases in which the equivalent of the lexeme in L1 does not exist, since it names some cultural items in the language and forms part of the so called zero equivalent lexis. Equivalent L2 is substituted by transliteration, an approximate naming or description or substitution.

(15)   Sl – A
Slivovica *ž* – plum brandy; **bryndzové halušky** – sheep cheese gnocchi; **krpec** *m* – light shoe fastened by straps around the ankle.

A – Sl
Barbecue – piknik s opekaním mäsa; **Thanksgiving Day** – Deň vďakyvzdania (v USA, špeciálny deň ďakovania Bohu, štvrtý štvrtok v Novembri; **hamburger** – fašírka, hamburger (guľaté pečivo s fašírkou); **Union Jack** – štátna vlajka Veľkej Británie; **Emprire State Building** – jeden z najznámejších mrakodrapov (v New Yorku); **The Big Apple** – prezývka pre New York.

Sp (Spanish) – Sl
Paella *f* – paella (valencijská ryža s mäsom, údeninou, zeleninou, a i.); **taco** *m,* Am kuch. – mäsová paštéta; **poncho** *m* Am – pončo, plášť; **castañuela** *f* – kastaneta ; **chachachá** *m* – čača (tanec); **merengue** *m* – merengue (tanec; tiež cukrovinka); **zarzuela** *f* – zarzuela (opereta; tiež jedlo z rýb); **romería** *f* – púť (krátka púť veriacich, slávnostného charakteru na miesto uctievania).

Scheme:
L1 – Lex1 /S1/ ↔ Lexical expression – L2, i.e.
L1 – Lex1 /S1/ ↔ E1 (transliteration, description) or ≈ E2 (substitution) – L2

Sekaninová (1993) opens the topic of lexical connection and lexicographical semantization. By lexical connection she means the ability of a word to connect with other words; it is a possibility of realization of its semantic valences. A valency is the ability of a word to bind with other words which are indispensable for its syntactic and semantic realizations. The meaning of a word and its connection are bound together. The semantics of a word conditions its connection and a change of the lexical and syntactic connection creates conditions for the change of its meaning. Sekaninová (1993) differentiates between free and bound connection of words with three aspects: lexical, semantically bound and lexical-semantic. Active semantic valences are those which allow adding syntactically dependent word to other words and a variable quantity in the description of its meaning corresponds to each of them. The theory about the legitimacy of connection of language units has not been resolved so far and the essence of connection as the characteristics of a word has not been clarified either. Sekaninová (1993) states that the question of lexical connection is even more complicated when confronting the vocabulary of two languages, since the semantics of a word and its equivalent in another language does not usually overlap and their ability to connect does not overlap either.

It is essential to clarify in what circumstances a word as a name of an object or a phenomenon is used when identifying its meaning and how it connects with other words. The conditions of lexical-semantic connection potentiality are thus revealed. It is the role of exemplification through lexical units to point to the possibilities of lexical-semantic connection potentiality in lexicography. Sekaninová (1993) expresses that exemplification in lexicography is a context which illustrates the meaning of a word and makes it concrete and points to the possibilities of its realization in speech. A context used as exemplification in a dictionary may be minimal or extended. It is desirable to present information about the usage

of the word with the help of a minimal context, i.e. with the help of a lexical unit. There are free and fixed lexical units in a language. The fixed lexical units ma be lexical or phraseological. Phrases as well are classified according to three types: symmetrical equivalence of phrases, symmetrical-asymmetrical equivalence of phrases and asymmetrical equivalence of phrases.

It is sometimes difficult to achieve an ideal state with polysemic lexical units. The parameter of lexical-semantic connection potentiality plays an important role here along with the parameter of equivalence.

2.4.5. *The Parameter of Lexical Stability and the Parameter of Lexical-Semantic Connection Potentiality*

The parameter of lexical stability is given by the classification of lexical units as free and fixed. Fixed lexical units are placed after the particular chosen marks in the entry.

Through the study of lexical-semantic connection potentiality the lexicographers try to perceive of progressive dynamic phenomena occurring when naming realities and perceive the phenomena of lexical connection potentiality connected with the semantic valency of the united lexemes.

2.4.6. *The Parameter of Context Applicability*

A full-meaning word has the characteristics connected with its essence as a lexical unit and it also contains the characteristics directed outwards, connected with its relationship to the surrounding part of language structure within the same context. The meaning of a word is realized in its usage in speech and can be analyzed on the basis of its usage. The exacting function of the context is to revel the meaning of the lexical unit. The context is understood as a form of realization of a concrete meaning, which is potentially included in the word. The context can be imagined as a system of equations in which a particular meaning of a semantic variable quantity is realized or as a system of equations on the basis of which the searched meaning of the semantic variable quantity is revealed.

Due to the surrounding speech context, all the secondary meanings of the word which might arise from the polysemy of the lexical unit are excluded. Only one meaning of a polysemic word is realized in the speech act. It would be impossible to identify the particular meanings of a polysemic word without a context.

In a bilingual dictionary, it is indispensable to select an appropriate equivalent in L2 which would contain all the parameters of the lexeme in L1 and would be substitutable into the translated context. The role of a bilingual lexicography is not only to choose the appropriate equivalent but also point to its lexical connection potentiality and illustrate the usage of the equivalent in speech through the presentation of a minimal context of exemplification within the limits of the speech norm.

3. Conclusion

The art of bilingual lexicography has developed throughout the history of dictionary writing. It seems that the creators of the conception of the entry and the ideas of its composition in a bilingual dictionary have acquired different viewpoints since first bilingual dictionaries were produced. This fact may be due to two phenomena: first, to the advances made in the

theoretical study and practical application of bilingual lexicography and second, to the recent needs and circumstances in which bilingual dictionaries are created.

The study of some modern lexicographers who present their concepts of the craft of producting bilingual dictionaries has proved that they agree on the essential parts of the construction of the entry word and are aware of the difficulties caused, for example, by the lack of direct equivalents of some lexical units in the target languge. They present intructions and suggestions on how to overcome these complications without lowering the quality of the dictionary.

The indispensable parts of the entry word in a bilingual dictionary proposed by the above mentioned authors could be summarized as follows: the presence of the entry word in its canonical form, grammatical information in the extent required by the presupposed user of the dictionary, pronunciation of the entry words in the source laguage (in case of need in the target language as well, orthographic information, equivalents in the target language in their canonical form, indication of the whole lexical meaning of the entry word by partial equivalents of the target language, description (definition of the entry), etymology of the entry words (especially in terminological and technical dictionaries), the lexicalized and the verbatim meaning of different morphemic and word combinations, lexicographical marks, remarks about usage restrictions, examples of application and, in a very few cases, illustrations.

References

Baunbjerg-Hansen, G. 1990. *Artikelstruktur im zweisprachigen Wörterbuch.* Tübingen: Max Niemayer Verlag.

Carrera Díaz, M. 2000. *Curso de lengua italiana.* Barcelona.

Crystal, David. 1985. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford-New York: OUP.

Dubský, Josef et al. 1993. *Velký španělsko-český slovník I, II*. Praha: Academia Praha.

Dubský, Josef. 1977. *Základy španělské lexikologie (pro překladatele a tlumočníky).* Praha: SPN.

Dolník, Juraj. 1983. "Motivácia a hodnota termínu." Kultúra slova, 17. Martin: Vydavateľstvo Matice slovenskej v Martine, 133-140.

Dolník, Juraj. 2003. *Lexikológia.* Bratislava: UK.

Dolník, J. et al. 1993. *Porovnávací opis lexikálnej zásoby.* Bratislava: Veda.

Diccionario de la Lengua Española. De Real Academia Española, 22nd ed., 2 vol. Madrid: ESPASA-CALPE SA.

Ďurovič, Ľubomír. 1953. "Z diskusie." In: Š. Peckař (ed.), *Lexikografický sborník*. Materiály z I. celoštátnej konferencie československých lexikografov. Bratislava, 1952. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV, 127-128.

Ďurovič, Ľubomír. 1961. "Ekvivalent v dvojjazyčnom slovníku." In: V. Blanám (ed.), *Lexikografický sborník*. Materiály z porady o prekladových slovníkoch. Piešťany, 1959. Bratislava: SPN, 1961, 78-87.

Felber, H. 1986. "Všeobecná teória terminológie." *Kultúra slova*, 20. Martin: Vydavateľstvo Matice slovenskej v Martine.

Filipec, Josef. 1973. "Ekvivalenty a synonyma v slovní zásobě." In: J. Ružička and I. Poldauf (eds.), *Slovo a slovník.*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV.

Filipec, Josef. 1985. "Problematika konfrontace v lexikální zásobě." *Slovo a slovesnost*, 46, 201-214.

Findra, Ján. 1984. "Štyléma a text." In: F. Ručák (ed.), *Štylistické otázky textu*. Prešov: PF UPJŠ, 14-25.

Findra, Ján. 1993. "Štyléma." In: *Encyklopédia jazykovedy*. Bratislava: SPN, 442.

Gromová, Edita. and Hrdlička, M. 2003. *Antologie teorie odborného překladu.* Ostrava: Repronis.

Gromová,Edita. 2003. *Teória a didaktika prekladu,* Nitra: UKF.

Haensch, G. and Omeňaca, Carlos. 2004. *Los diccionarios del español en el siglo XXI*, Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

Hayeková, Matilda. 1992. *Dejiny slovenských slovníkov II. 1946-1975.* Bratislava: UK.

Horecký, Ján. 1956. *Základy slovenskej terminológie.* Bratislava: SAV.

Horecký, Ján. 1961. "Problémy terminologických slovníkov." In: V. Blanár (ed.), *Lexikografický sborník.* Materiály z porady o prekladových slovníkoch. Piešťany 1959. Bratislava: SPN, 34-45.

Horecký, Ján. 1971. *Slovenská lexikológia I. Tvorenie slov.* Bratislava: SPN.

Horecký, Ján. 1975. *Úvod do jazykovedy.* Bratislava: SPN.

Horecký, Ján, Buzássyová, Klára, and Bosák, J. et al. 1989. *Dynamika slovnej zásoby súčasnej slovenčiny.* Bratislava: Veda.

Ivanová-Šalingová, Mária. 1974. *Štylistika.* Bratislava: UK.

Isačenko, A.V. 1961. "Zásady lexikografickej práce." In: V. Blanár (ed.), *Lexikografický sborník.* Materiály z porady o prekladových slovníkoch. Piešťany 1959. Bratislava: SPN, 18-23.

Ivić, Milka. 1970. *Trends in Linguistics.* Paris: Mouton.

Kirkpatrick, Betty. 1998. *The Concise Oxford Thesaurus.* A dictionary of synonyms. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kollár, Dezider. 1973. "Prekladový význam – jeho podstata a problémy." In: J. Ružička and I. Poldauf (eds.), *Slovo a slovník.* Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV, 121-130.

Kollár, Dezider. 1973. "K probleme sopostaviteľnogo analýza russkogo i slovackogo jazykov." Československá rusistika 18, 98-104.

Kollár, Dezider. 1973. "Špecifikum systémového opisu lexiky v konfrontačnom pláne." Československá rusistika 19, 74-80.

Kačala, Ján (ed.). 1987. *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka.* Bratislava: Veda.

Kromann, Hans-Peder; Riiber, Theis, and Rosbach, Paul. 1996. "Principles of Bilingual Lexicography." In: F. J. Hausmann – O. Reichmann – H. B. Wiegand – L. Zgusta. (eds.), *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography.* Third volume. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2712-2728.

Krupa, Viktor and Genzor, Jozef. 1996. *Jazyky sveta v priestore a čase.* Bratislava: VEDA.

Kussmaul, Paul. 1995. *Training the Translator.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Landau, Sydney I. 1989. *Dictionaries. The Art and Craft of Lexicography.* Cambridge: CUP.

Ondrejovič, Slavomír and Považaj, Matej (eds.). 2001. *Lexicographica '99.* Zborník na počesť Kláry Buzássyovej. Bratislava: Veda.

Manley, James; Jacobsen, Jane Rosenkilde; and Pedersen, Viggo Hjørnager. 1986. *Telling lies efficiently: Terminology and the Microstructure in the Bilingual Dictionary.* In: *Symposium n Lexicography III.* Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Lexicography. Copenhagen.

Martínez De Sousa, José. 1995. *Diccionario de lexicografía práctica.* Barcelona: Biblograf.

Masár, Ivan. 1991. *Príručka slovenskej terminológie.* Bratislava: Veda.

Massariello Merzagora, Giovanna. 1983. *La lessicografia.* Bologna: Zanichelli.

Malmkjær, Kirsten (ed.). 1991. *The Linguistics Encyclopedia.* London: Routledge.

Mistrík, Jozef. 1965. *Slovenská štylistika.* Bratislava: UK.

Mistrík, Jozef. 1999. *Jazyk a reč.* Bratislava: Mladé letá.

Miššíková, Gabriela. 1998. *Konfrontačný opis slovnej zásoby. Anglická a slovenská stomatologická terminológia.* Nitra: UKF, FHV.

Miššíková, Gabriela. 1997. *Approaching linguistic subjects through text analysis.* In.: *Medacta '97.* Medzinárodná konferencia 'Vzdelávanie v meniacom sa svete.' Nitra: UKF, 42-46.

Miššíková, Gabriela. 1997. *Štylistická analýza textu. Na materiáli anglického jazyka.* Nitra: FF UKF.

Miššíková, Gabriela. 1997. *Linguistic Stylistics.* Nitra: FF UKF.

Miššíková, Gabriela. 1998. "Konfrontačná analýza štruktúry pomenovaní v angličtine a slovenčine." In: *Reflexie lingvistických konfrontácií II.* Nitra: FHV UKF, 81-87.

Mončeková, Elena and Malá, Eva. 1999. *Password. Anglický výkladový slovník so slovenskými ekvivalentmi.* Bratislava: SPN.

Moliner, María. 1998. *Diccionario de uso del español*. Madrid: Gredos.

Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.

Ološtiak, Martin. 2001. *Transfonemizácia v kontaktovom vzťahu angličtina – slovenčina*. Bratislava: SAV.

Ondrus, Pavel. 1972. *Slovenská lexikológia II. Náuka o slovnej zásobe.* Bratislava: SPN.

Ondrus, Pavel; Horecký, Ján and Furdík, Juraj. 1980. *Súčasný slovenský spisovný jazyk. Lexikológia.* Bratislava: SPN.

Pamies Bertrán, Antonio and Durán, Juan De Dios Luque (eds.). 2000. *Trabajos de lexicografía y fraseología contrastivas*. Granada: Método.

Pauliny, Eugen. 1955. "O funkčnom rozvrstvení spisovného jazyka." *Slovo a slovesnosť* 16, 17.

Peciar, Štefan. 1961. "K niektorým problémom dvojjazyčného slovníka." In: V. Blanám (ed.), *Lexikografický sborník*. Materiály z porady o prekladových slovníkoch. Piešťany 1959. Bratislava: SPN, 18-23.

Rubio,Vila. and Nieves, María. 1999. *Así son los diccionarios*. Lleida: Universidad de Lleida.

Sekaninová, Ella. 1968. "Leksičeskoje značenije vdvujazyčnom plane russko-slovackom." *Slavica Slovana* 3, 69-77.

Sekaninová, Ella. 1973. "Význam lexikálnej jednotky z konfrontačného aspektu." In: J. Ružička – I. Poldauf (eds.), *Slovo a slovník*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV, 113-120.

Sekaninová, Ella. 1981. "Prekladové ekvivalenty v dvojjazyčnej lexikografii." *Československá rusistika* 26, 101-111.

Sekaninová, Ella. 1988. "Východiská a ciele skúmania lexiky konfrontačnou a ekvivalenčnou metódou." *Slavica Slovaca* 23, 225-238.

Sekaninová, Ella. 1993. *Dvojjazyčná lexikografia v teórii a praxi*. Bratislava: Veda.

Pisárčiková, Mária. 2004. *Synonymický slovník slovenčiny.* Bratislava: VEDA.

Szende, Thomas. 2000. *Approches contrastives en lexicographie bilingue.* Paris: Honoré Champion.

Trup, Ladislav. 1993. *Úvod do štúdia španielskeho jazyka.* Bratislava: UK.

Trup, Ladislav. and Kotuliaková, T. 1997. *Španielsky odborný jazyk (Archeológia).* Bratislava: Stimul.

Užáková, Mária. 2000. *Frazémy v anglickom odbornom texte*. Nitra: SPU.

Vilikovská, Júlia and Vilikovský, Pavel. 1983. *Slovensko-anglický slovník*, Bratislava: Mladé letá.

Zgusta, Ladislav. 1971. *Manual of Lexicography*. Praha: Academia.

Edita Hornáčková Klapicová
Valova 14
921 01 Piešťany

E-mail: ehornackova@progresit.sk