

**Citation:** Blagoeva, D., Jaskot, M. P., & Sosnowski, W. (2019). A lexicographical approach to the contrastive analysis of Bulgarian and Polish phraseology. *Cognitive Studies / Études cognitives*, 2019(19). <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.1923>

DIANA BLAGOEVA<sup>1,A</sup>, MACIEJ PAWEŁ JASKOT<sup>2,B</sup>, WOJCIECH SOSNOWSKI<sup>3,C</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute for Bulgarian Language, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria

<sup>2</sup>Pedagogical University of Cracow, Cracow, Poland

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

<sup>A</sup>[d.blagoeva@ibl.bas.bg](mailto:d.blagoeva@ibl.bas.bg)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2616-2652>

<sup>B</sup>[maciej.jaskot@up.krakow.pl](mailto:maciej.jaskot@up.krakow.pl)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8509-797X>

<sup>A</sup>[wojciech.sosnowski@ispan.waw.pl](mailto:wojciech.sosnowski@ispan.waw.pl)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9299-4505>

## A LEXICOGRAPHICAL APPROACH TO THE CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF BULGARIAN AND POLISH PHRASEOLOGY

### Abstract

This article discusses the concept behind *The Lexicon of Active Bulgarian and Polish Phraseology* [Leksykon aktywnej frazeologii bułgarskiej i polskiej] and provides an overview of the key aspects of the methodology used for selecting and composing the dictionary's entries. The authors outline the theoretical underpinnings of this project, touching on the issue of interlingual equivalence, and explain both the process of selecting and verifying phraseological material and the methodology of presenting lexicographical information in the *Lexicon*. The article includes various examples of active phraseological units from both languages.

**Keywords:** contrastive analysis; phraseology; phraseography; bilingual dictionary of idioms; interlingual equivalence; Bulgarian language; Polish language

## 1 Introduction

The year 2018 saw the centenary of diplomatic relations between Bulgaria and Poland. It was a year of reflections on a hundred years of cooperation on various levels between the two countries. During the conference<sup>1</sup> held on the occasion of the anniversary, the participants reiterated the need to create new bilingual dictionaries, both traditional and electronic, for didactic and translation

<sup>1</sup>100 lat relacji dyplomatycznych między Polską a Bułgarią, 6-7.12.2018; Uniwersytet Warszawski (<http://slawistyka.uw.edu.pl/pl/2018/11/16/100-lat-relacji-dyplomatycznych-miedzy-polska-a-bulgaria-6-7-12-2018/>).

purposes – tools that would enhance the development of cultural, scientific, political and economic relations between Poland and Bulgaria.

The latest lexicographical project of the Bulgarian-Polish scientific team, comprising Diana Blagoeva and Svetla Koeva (from BAN, the Institute for Bulgarian Language), and Maciej Jaskot (from the Pedagogical University of Cracow) and Wojciech Sosnowski (from the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences), caters to the needs of a wide circle of contemporary users from both countries. The project, work on which began in 2018, aims to create the *Leksykon aktywnej frazeologii bułgarskiej i polskiej*<sup>2</sup> (*Lexicon of active Bulgarian and Polish phraseology*) – the first work of this kind in Slavic lexicography, contrasting the phraseology of Bulgarian and Polish and presenting the current state of the phraseological resources of both languages.

The aim of this article is to outline the basic methodological assumptions adopted during the creation of the *Lexicon*. The focus will mainly be on issues related to the theoretical basis of the research, the problem of interlingual equivalence, the principles of selection and verification of the presented phraseological material, and the methodology of presenting lexicographical information in the *Lexicon*.

## 2 Status of research

Despite numerous theoretical and lexicographical studies on Slavic languages, the comparative aspect of Bulgarian and Polish phraseology has yet to be sufficiently investigated. Phraseological information has been partially included in a number of lexicographical studies such as: *Współczesny słownik bułgarsko-polski* (Satoła-Staškowiak & Koseska-Toszewa, 2014), *Bułgarsko-polski słownik leksyki potocznej* (Sotirov, Mostowska, & Mokrzycka, 2011–2013), *Leksykon odpowiedniości semantycznych w języku polskim, bułgarskim i rosyjskim* (Sosnowski, Koseska-Toszewa, & Kisiel, 2016), and in three twentieth-century bilingual works: *Podręczny słownik bułgarsko-polski z suplementem* (Sławski, 1987), *Podręczny słownik polsko-bułgarski z suplementem* (Radewa, 1988) and *Polskie i bułgarskie związki frazeologiczne* (Maldżiewa & Wójtowicz, 1994).

Some aspects of the linguistic confrontation between Bulgarian and Polish phraseology have been discussed in individual publications by Sabina Radewa and Jerzy Majchrowski (Radewa & Małkhrowski, 1979), Anna Dolińska (1988), Katarzyna Popova (1998), Iliana Genew-Puhalewa (Pukhaleva, 2003), Snezhina Karag'ozova (2004), Stanka Bonova (2009), Diliana Dencheva (Denczewa, 2013) Elżbieta Michow (2013, 2014) and Ginoeva Ovcharova (2017). The first attempts to confront the latest phraseological Bulgarian-Polish material were presented in the works of Blagoeva, Sosnowski, and Kolkovska (2018) and Sosnowski, Blagoeva, and Tymoshuk (2018). The systematisation of the current phraseological material in dictionary form can stimulate further, more extensive and more in-depth theoretical research with a view to providing a comparative description of the phraseology of both languages.

## 3 Basic assumptions of the concept of the *Lexicon of active Bulgarian and Polish phraseology*

### 3.1 General characteristics of the work

The *Lexicon of active Bulgarian and Polish phraseology* will contain over 1,000 phraseological units used actively in contemporary Polish and Bulgarian. An active phraseological unit is to be defined as one that is often used in contemporary language by native speakers in speech and / or writing and is understood by other native users.

The Bulgarian-Polish research team decided that the most important assumptions made and approved while compiling the *Lexicon of active Polish and Ukrainian phraseology* (Tymoshuk,

---

<sup>2</sup>The publication of the *Lexicon* is planned for 2020.

Sosnowski, Jaskot, & Ganoshenko, 2018) would become the methodological basis of the lexicographical work (being) developed.

Unlike a classical phraseological dictionary, the *Lexicon* allows phraseological units to be described in a more open manner and it emphasizes the significance of the practical functioning of a given unit in the language system by citing authentic examples, as well as inauthentic ones (see further).

The key advantage of the *Lexicon of active Bulgarian and Polish phraseology* is the fact that, in addition to general phraseology, it will also include selected phraseological neologisms and phraseological culturemes<sup>3</sup> (selected on the basis of their wide dissemination) which are active in contemporary language and which are often not fully equivalent, as they reflect the culture of a given nation and its linguistic worldview. As a result, the *Lexicon* will become part of a broad spectrum of works covering the linguocultural aspect in contemporary lexicography.

### 3.2 The notion of phraseological units

On the basis of the extensive literature on the subject (Bogusławski, 1989; Chlebda, 2003; Lewicki, 1976; Skorupka, 1985) the term phraseological unit can be understood as a set of multicomponent units (consisting of at least two words) which are characterized by semantic anastomosis and reproducibility. Our research, therefore, adopted as a starting point the notion of the phraseological unit as a semantically indivisible and relatively stable unit, expressing complete, special meanings that are not the sum of the meanings of the components of the expression, and which are reproduced in speech as a set lexical configuration. This represents, therefore, an intermediary link between the narrow and broad meaning of phraseology, which is the most convenient for the construction of a bilingual phraseological dictionary.

From the above definition, it follows that phraseological units can only be compared semantically, as – in both languages – phraseological units develop autonomously. The universal definition models developed for the semantic interpretation of phraseological units in both languages became the starting point for the *Lexicon*. It is unacceptable to set together units on a form-form basis, as this leads to serious methodological errors.

If it is assumed that a phraseological unit is moving towards the word in terms of content, universal definition models can be used to describe phraseological units when contrasting two or more languages. This form of description was adopted in the aforementioned *Lexicon of semantic equivalence in Polish, Bulgarian and Russian* (Sosnowski et al., 2016), and allows multilingual material to be contrasted.

A review of numerous works devoted to the phraseology of Bulgarian and Polish<sup>4</sup> indicates that establishing the boundary between a phraseological unit and a non-phraseological unit is complicated. Frequently, when contrasting languages, it is very difficult to decide whether a given unit should be considered as a phraseological unit, since it is difficult to decide which differentiation criteria to apply, i.e. whether to adhere to the Bulgarian or Polish linguistic tradition, as approaches in national linguistic traditions vary considerably. For example, in the *Wielki słownik języka polskiego* (n.d.) (Comprehensive dictionary of the Polish language), phrases such as: *nóż fiński*, *kombinacja norweska*, *barszcz ukraiński* or *chłodnik litewski* are considered to be phraseological units. In the Bulgarian linguistic tradition, phrases like *фински нож*, *момина сълза*, *бяла мечка*, *кислородна вода* are treated differently, as nominative (terminological) units. Therefore, in *Речник на българския език* (Dictionary of the Bulgarian language) (*Rechnik na bŭlgarskiia ezik*, n.d.) they are described separately from phraseology in the strict sense.

After analyzing the material collected for the *Lexicon*, it was decided that it will include:

---

<sup>3</sup>By culturemes, we understand “key words important for the self-identification of a community, characterizing both its attitude to tradition and coping with the present, current experiencing the world” (Nagórko, Burkhardt, & Łaziński, 2004). In our research, the scope of this concept is expanded to also include the sphere of phraseological vocabulary, which, as it is generally known, is strongly related to the history and culture of a specific community.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. e.g. bibliography collected in works of Baĥa, 1998, 2003; Krumova-Tsvetkova & Blagoeva, 2011.

- (a) fixed word collocations, the meaning of which is not the sum of the meanings of their components, e.g. *mieć duszę na ramieniu, kopnąć w kalendarz, podłożyć (komuś) świnię, szara myszka, cyrk na kółkach, figa z makiet*; *мѣтя главата (на някого), меря си думите, мед ми капе на душата, бъркам с прѣст в раната, гушвам букета*.
- (b) idiomatic expressions with a specific figurative meaning, containing a component with a literal sense<sup>5</sup> such as *słotniany zapach, sytuacja podbramkowa, wilczy głód*; *магарешки унат, мокра порѣчка*.
- (c) fixed similes such as *głupi jak but z lewej nogi, lać jak z cebra, jak grzyby po deszczu, jasne jak słońce*; *мокр като кокошка, слаб като клечка, мълча като пѣн, изчервявам се като домати*.

### 3.3 Methods of explicating the semantics of phraseological units in the *Lexicon*

In the *Lexicon of Active Bulgarian and Polish Phraseology*, the method of defining phraseological units based on the so-called universal definition models developed for the needs of the aforementioned *Leksykon aktywnej frazeologii polskiej i ukraińskiej* (Tymoshuk et al., 2018) was applied. The adoption of such a solution made it possible to develop Bulgarian definitions of phraseological units which are analogous to the definitions in Polish. It was only after the Bulgarian definition was provided that the semantically closest unit in the Bulgarian language was assigned to it. Where this was not possible, a descriptive equivalent was used. As emphasized above, one of the methodological assumptions of the *Lexicon* is to describe a phraseological unit from content to form, as the application of the reverse order (from form to content) is considered by the authors to be potentially misleading since it may create conditions for false phraseological interlinguistic equivalence and other occurrences associated with the distortion of meaning. The third step in describing a phraseological unit was to provide an example of the use of a given unit, which would be the best illustration of its use, while maintaining the pragmatic and stylistic specificity of the given expression.

The examples presented below illustrate the basic universal definition models used in the *Lexicon*:

- (1) ‘*wtedy, gdy*’ / ‘*тогава, когато*’:

**bać się (kogoś lub czegoś) jak diabeł święconej wody**

‘wtedy, gdy ktoś się bardzo boi kogoś lub czegoś’

*Ilona boi się jak diabeł święconej wody jeżdżenia samochodem ze swoim szwagrem.*

**боя се (от някого или нещо) като дявол от светена вода / от тамял**

‘тогава, когато някой много се бои от някого или от нещо’

*От учителката по математика аз се боях като дявол от светена вода.*

- (2) ‘*o kimś, kto*’ / ‘*за някого, който*’:

**biedny jak mysz kościelna**

‘o kimś, kto jest bardzo biedny’

*Adam jest biedny jak mysz kościelna, nie stać go nawet na porządne buty.*

**беден като църковна мишка**

‘за някого, който е много беден’

*Старият човек, който живее на края на селото, е беден като църковна мишка.*

<sup>5</sup>The meaning of these collocations “is within the semantic range of the semantically dominating word, although the whole collocation is semantically irregular” (Lewicki & Pajdzińska, 2001, p. 319). The cited authors call this type of collocation a phraseme.

- (3) ‘*o czymś, co*’ / ‘*за нещо, което*’:  
**grubymi nićmi szyte**  
 ‘o czymś, co jest nieumiejętnie zamaskowane’  
*Jego zeznania są grubymi nićmi szyte.*  
*Ciekawe, czy sąd się na nie nabierze.*
- шиито с бели конци**  
 ‘за нещо, което е прикрито по неумел начин’  
*Историята, която ни разказа, е шита с бели конци, не вярвам и на дума от нея.*
- (4) ‘*o kimś (o czymś), kto (co)*’ / ‘*за някого (нещо), който (което)*’:  
**brzydki jak noc (listopadowa) kol.**  
 ‘o kimś, kto jest bardzo brzydki’  
*Nowa dziewczyna Sławka jest brzydka jak noc.*
- грозен като смъртта (като кукмявка, крокодил, бостанско плашило, чума, баба Яга)**  
 ‘за някого, който е много грозен’  
*Баща ѝ искаше на всяка цена да я омъжи, но тя беше грозна като смъртта и кандидатите бързо изчезваха.*
- (5) ‘*o takim (...), który*’ / ‘*за такъв (...), какъвто (който)*’:  
**czeski błąd**  
 ‘o takim błędzie, który powstaje poprzez przestawienie znaków’  
*W jego nazwisku popełniono czeski błąd i wniosek został odrzucony.*
- печатна грешка описателен еквивалент**  
 ‘за такава грешка, каквато се получава при разместване на буквите’

### 3.4 The issue of the interlinguistic equivalence of phraseological units

The concept of equivalence is one of the most important in the contrastive analysis of languages and translation studies. M. Jaskot (2016) notes that:

[...] the concept of equivalence when translating culture (indissociable from the language), i.e. “what differentiates and identifies us” (Durdureanu, 2011), becomes a crucial problem. As we have already mentioned, there are thousands of culture-oriented (culture-anchored) terms, which the translator has to deal with. In any respect, the challenge of the translator is to try to produce a PU [phraseological unit] equivalent to the original in the SL [source language], although the concept of equivalence applied to PUs is a dubious one, as it is often difficult to determine whether a PU used as equivalent (total or partial if we want to adopt a gradation) in the TL [target language], can really be considered equivalent.

Nevertheless, to this day a satisfactory definition of the notion of equivalence has yet to be provided. Przemysław Wiatrowski (2015, p. 72, 2018) draws our attention to the complex and controversial nature of the phenomenon of equivalence. The author points out that “by identifying formally similar and different phraseological units, we deal with the phenomenon described by cognitive scientists as fuzzy categories. Decisions regarding the delimitation of the two types of units will always be arbitrary” (Wiatrowski, 2018, pp. 216–217).

Wojciech Chlebda (2011, pp. 22, 27), on the basis of the type of exponents of equivalence relation, distinguishes between textual equivalence, between the translation of the utterance and its original, and dictionary equivalence (aka. systemic equivalence), which connects the source language unit and the unit of the target language. A similar concept is presented by Dmitry Dobrovolski (Dobrovolskij, 2011), who makes a distinction between translation equivalence and systemic equivalence. Joanna Szerszunowicz focuses on the notion of parallel equivalence. By phraseological parallelisms she means “phraseological units/idiomatic expressions [which exist in two

or more languages], in which the logical-semiotic model, as well as the metaphorical form of implementation, coincide” (Szerszunowicz, 2004, p. 207).

Systemic equivalence is crucial for bi- or multilingual lexicography (Szerszunowicz & Vidović Bolt, 2014, p. 201). Wojciech Chlebda presents his own concept of the division of dictionary (systemic) equivalents. The author writes about four types of equivalents and emphasizes that each type is created in turn by a series of subtypes that spread the more or less pertinent equivalents on their axis; in other words, the groups of equivalents which make up particular subtypes and types merge with each other without clear boundaries between them (Chlebda, 2011, p. 38).

1. For the purposes of this article, the authors have agreed to divide the equivalents into four types. The usefulness of this division for lexicographical description has been confirmed by the Polish and Bulgarian phraseological material gathered during the work on the *Lexicon*. The following types of inter-language equivalence are reflected in the *Lexicon*: full (or adequate) equivalents<sup>6</sup> – a unit of language B is equivalent to a unit of language A mainly in terms of meaning and figurativeness (also in terms of pragmatic, stylistic and often grammatical parameters);

(6) **bać się własnego cienia**

‘wtedy, gdy ktoś się przesadnie boi,  
jest bardzo ostrożny i podejrzliwy’

*Chcesz wyjechać na miesiąc do  
Ameryki Południowej z Andrzejem?  
Dziewczyńno! Przecież on się  
boi własnego cienia.*

**боя се от собствената си сянка**

‘тогава, когато някой се бои прекалено и е много внимателен и подозрителен’

*Тя не смее вечер да ходи сама  
по улиците, бои се от собствената си сянка.*

2. functional equivalents – a unit of language B is equivalent to a unit of language A, above all in terms of meaning and its pragmatic function (there may be differences with regard to the figurativeness of the contrasted units, as well as formal differences);

(7) **jechać / pojechać po bandzie kol.**

‘wtedy, gdy ktoś bardzo w czymś przesadza’

*Nazywając szefa starym dziadem,  
pojechałeś po bandzie. Lepiej zaszukaj  
nowej pracy.*

**пресолявам / пресоля супата / манджата**

‘тогава, когато някой прекалява, стига до крайност в нещо’

*Направо пресоляхте супата  
с тези подигравки към учителката.*

<sup>6</sup>Some researchers point out that it is difficult to talk about the full equivalence of phraseological interlanguage equivalents. Joanna Szerszunowicz emphasizes that the existence of a relation of absolute equivalence “should actually be treated as an ideal balance between two phrasemes, which is virtually impossible to achieve in practice, as it must be assumed that subtle differences will appear in the multi-aspect analysis” (Szerszunowicz, 2009, p. 326). These differences may refer to semantics, connotation, variance, frequency, etc. of the phraseological unit of the source language and its equivalent in the target language. Therefore, the above-mentioned author considers it appropriate to replace the term *full (absolute) equivalents* with the term *quasi-equivalents*.

- (8) **iść / pójść po rozum do głowy**      **идва ми / дойде ми акълът в главата**  
‘wtedy, gdy ktoś zaczyna zachowywać się rozsądnie’      ‘тогава, когато някой започва отново да се държи разумно’  
*Długo myślał, jak spłacić kredyt, aż w końcu poszedł po rozum do głowy i postanowił zająć się tłumaczeniami, żeby dorobić do pensji.*      *Беше се увлякъл по една нова колежка, но най-после му дойде акълът в главата и се върна при съпругата си.*

3. displaced equivalents – a unit of language B is only partially equivalent to a unit of language A in terms of semantic structure (which is generally associated with pragmatic differences between the two units);

- (9) **widać czyjaś rękę (w czymś)**      **имам пръст (в нещо)**  
‘wtedy, gdy ktoś się zaangażował w zrobienie czegoś’      ‘тогава, когато някой е замесен в извършването на нещо, обикн. лошо, престъпно’  
*W tym doktoracie widać rękę profesora Nowaka.*      *В ограбването на склада вероятно имат пръст и вътрешни лица.*

4. zero equivalents – there is no ready way of verbalizing the concept, judgement, intentions, emotions, etc. in language B, to which the unit in the language A refers (Chlebda, 2011, pp. 38–39). In the case of zero equivalents, the authors of the *Leksykon aktywnej frazeologii bułgarskiej i polskiej* used a descriptive technique, i.e. the phraseological unit in question is described by means of the second language, e.g.

- (10) **czeski film**      **объркано положение описателен еквивалент**  
‘wtedy, gdy nie wiadomo, o co chodzi’      ‘тогава, когато не се знае за какво става въпрос’  
*Wasze opowieści z urlopu to jakiś czeski film!*

Zero equivalents, called descriptive equivalents in the *Lexicon*, constitute an interesting group from a contrastive perspective. Menachem Dagut (1981) draws our attention to the existence of two groups of such units. The first group contains phraseological units/idiomatic expressions, the meaning of which is not expressed by the phraseological unit in the target language but which is known and understood by the users of the language. For example, some Polish idiomatic expressions, such as *pozjadać / zjeść wszystkie rozumy* ‘wtedy, gdy ktoś jest przemądrzały i myśli, że wie wszystko’ (when someone is big-headed and thinks they know everything) or *sto lat za Murzynami* ‘wtedy, gdy ktoś (coś) jest zacofany(-e)’ (when someone/something is backward), do not have equivalent phraseological units in Bulgarian. The second group of zero equivalents, or phraseological gaps, are units whose idiomatic meaning in the source language does not exist in the conceptual universe of the target language users. These units mainly concern culturally-conditioned phraseological units. Traditionally, such units include phraseological units with lexical components referring to the traditions and history of a given community (*gest Kozakiewicza, krakowskim targiem, wyjść jak Zabłocki na mydle; като Марко на Косово поле, на Врџница в сряда, Гюро Михайлов, като царче Симеончо преди Девети*), containing a lexical component related to a given culinary tradition (*narobić bigosu, jak pączek w maśle; на баницата мекото, направям на пестимл / настърма / нута*), or forming an inseparable entity, in which the desemantization of the com-

ponents have reached the highest degree and have made the unit function as a phraseological cultureme.

The concept of *phraseological cultureme* requires additional explanation. The key to understanding this concept is precisely the lacunar character of a given unit in the connotative sphere (Szerszunowicz, 2004, p. 211), which becomes visible during contrastive research. A full understanding of the phraseological cultureme is possible only by referring to non-linguistic reality and considering the pragmatics of the given unit, as indicated by Jaskot and Ganoshenko (2015, p. 6):

It is natural that the primary task of the adequate reflection of pragmatics which lexicography faces is an adequate understanding of a linguistic sign, overcoming ethno-linguistic barrier, which is obviously based on the asymmetry of ethno-mental culturemes. This means dealing with two (or more) linguistic pictures of the world and with mastering non-equivalent vocabulary.

During work on the *Lexicon*, some units which are strongly culturally conditioned were found, such as the following examples:

- |      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| (11) | <p><b>bułkę przez bibułkę</b></p> <p>‘o kimś, kto nadmiernie zważa na normy towarzyskie’</p> <p><i>Już więcej nie pójdę z Nowakowskimi na kolację. Zupełnie nie mogę się rozluźnić w ich towarzystwie: są tacy aę bułkę przez bibułkę.</i></p> | <p><b>прекалено превзет човек описателен еквивалент</b></p> <p>‘за някого, който се държи прекалено официално и превзето в обществото’</p>   |
| (12) | <p><b>kiełbasa wyborcza</b></p> <p>‘o takich obietnicach kandydata wyborczego, które on składa swoim wyborcom, ale one nie mają pokrycia’</p> <p><i>Okazało się, że projekt ustawy o związkach partnerskich był kiełbasą wyborczą.</i></p>     | <p><b>неизпълними предизборни обещания описателен еквивалент</b></p> <p>‘за такива обещания, които участващ в избори кандидат дава на избирателите си, но не изпълнява впоследствие’</p>   |
| (13) | <p><b>на куково лято разг.</b></p> <p>‘тогава, когато нещо няма да се извърши при никакви обстоятелства’</p> <p><i>Престани да давам заеми на този човек, не разбра ли, че ще ти върне парите на куково лято.</i></p>                          | <p><b>za Chiny ludowe kol.</b></p> <p>‘wtedy, gdy coś na pewno i w żadnych okolicznościach się nie wydarzy’</p> <p><i>On za Chiny ludowe nie zda tego egzaminu z języka polskiego.</i></p>   |
| (14) | <p><b>працам (някого) за зелен хайвер разг.</b></p> <p>‘тогава, когато някой успява да заблуди, да излъже някого’</p> <p><i>Чакам тук вече два часа, а никой не идва, май ме пратила за зелен хайвер.</i></p>                                  | <p><b>robić / zrobić kogoś w konia / balona / bambuko / trąbę kol.</b></p> <p>‘wtedy, gdy ktoś kogoś traktuje niepoważnie i oszukuje’</p> <p><i>Znów zrobił mnie w konia: pożyczyleś mi pieniądze na rachunki, a on je wydał na imprezy.</i></p> |



The phenomenon of interlingual homonymy has been noticed by many researchers (Khutsishvili, 2010; Jaskot, 2013; Sosnowski & Tymoshuk, 2017 and others). In Slavic languages, whose lexis is relatively mutually similar in terms of form and semantics, the units generally referred to as ‘false friends’ of the translator<sup>7</sup> are counted in tens, if not hundreds. In most cases, these are words that have common roots. A Georgian researcher, Sofia Kutsishvili (Khutsishvili, 2010), speaks of “interlanguage correspondences of a homonymous nature”. The term is quite broad, but it allows one to also classify phraseological units showing the characteristics of ‘false friends’ as these correspondences.

The comparison of phraseological systems implies, above all, the study of semantic correlation. Therefore, the juxtaposition of phraseological units which have a similar form in the studied languages can only result in a list of phraseological interlingual homonyms. This, however, cannot be the basis for a reliable, contrastive description, as has been mentioned previously.

Similarly to contrastive Polish-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-Polish studies (Jaskot & Sosnowski, 2017; Sosnowski & Tymoshuk, 2017), Polish-Bulgarian contrastive studies have resulted in separating out phraseological units which are interlingual homonyms:

- |      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| (15) | <p><b>bić się w pierś</b><br/>           ‘wtedy, gdy ktoś żałuje czegoś, okazuje skruchę i przyznaje się do winy’<br/> <i>Biję się w pierś, to ja namówiłem szefa, byśmy zaangażowali się w ten projekt.</i></p> | <p><b>бия се в гърдите</b><br/>           ‘тогава, когато някой се хвали прекомерно, незаслужено’<br/> <i>Бие се в гърдите, че само на него се дължат успехите на колектива, но това съвсем не е така.</i></p> |
| (16) | <p><b>patrzeć (na coś) przez palce</b><br/>           ‘wtedy, gdy ktoś celowo nie zwraca uwagi na coś złego’<br/> <i>Ciocia patrzy przez palce na to, że wujek coraz częściej przesadza z alkoholem.</i></p>     | <p><b>гледам (нещо, на нещо) през пръсти</b><br/>           ‘тогава, когато някой върши нещо небрежно, невнимателно’<br/> <i>Уволниха я, защото си гледаше работата през пръсти.</i></p>                       |
| (17) | <p><b>alfa i omega</b><br/>           ‘o kimś, kto wie wszystko i uważany jest za autorytet’<br/> <i>Jeśli chodzi o matematykę, to w klasie Janek jest alfa i omega.</i></p>                                     | <p><b>алфа(та) и омега(та)</b><br/>           ‘за нещо, което е най-важната и най-съществената част на нещо’<br/> <i>Смятат, че успехът е алфата и омегата на живота.</i></p>                                  |

### 3.5 The selection and verification of phraseological material

The material for the *Lexicon* was collected by means of months-long observations made by the authors on the use of idiomatic expressions in contemporary written and spoken communication. Active Polish and Bulgarian phraseology was extracted from the language of recent advertisements, press headlines and articles, dialogues of contemporary television serials and feature films, contemporary fiction books (including translated works), etc. The selected material was checked against existing lexicographical sources (phraseological dictionaries, descriptive dictionaries and

<sup>7</sup>For the purposes of this paper, we have chosen a general definition of units known as ‘false friends’, presented by Wandruszka (1978): “Words in two or more languages that have a very similar or the same form, making it easy to believe that they have the same meaning”.

dictionaries of new words),<sup>8</sup> and electronic corpora.<sup>9</sup>

The use of the corpus analysis method is a new approach in the contrastive description of phraseology and bilingual phraseography (Dobrovol'skiĭ, 2015, p. 24; Filipenko, 2008; Sosnowski, 2016). Speaking of the compilation of translational phraseological dictionaries, Dobrovol'skiĭ notes that: “The advantages of using corpora are clear not only in the more detailed and deliberate exemplification of the described expressions, but also in the additional possibilities that the corpus material provides when compiling the list of entries and the construction of dictionary entries.” (Dobrovol'skiĭ, 2015, p. 24).

In particular, based on linguistic data obtained from monolingual corpora one can:

- confirm the fixedness of the examined expression by means of corpus tools for statistical analysis (Przepiórkowski, Bańko, Górski, & Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, 2012, pp. 269–270; Szudarski, 2018);
- determine the frequency and range of use of the phraseological unit;
- analyze the contexts in which the phraseological unit is used and draw conclusions about its semantics and possible ambiguities;
- examine the variability of the phraseological unit;
- carry out research on types of texts and communicative spheres in which the phraseological unit functions in order to establish its stylistic value;
- find synonyms and antonyms of the phraseological unit (if any);
- choose the most typical examples illustrating the use of the phraseological unit.

For instance, corpus data enable the use of objective criteria (based on the frequency of use) when choosing the basic lexical or grammatical variant of specific phraseological units (Szudarski, 2018). For example, according to information from the National Corpus of Polish in contemporary Polish written texts, the variant of the phraseological unit *nie kiwnąc palcem* (428 examples) occurs over 5 times more often than the variant *nie ruszyć palcem* (79 examples).

The authors also noticed that in many cases variants of a phraseological unit containing a perfective verb are used more often than those with an imperfective verb. To illustrate this point, in the National Corpus of Polish Language there are 530 occurrences of the variant with the perfective verb *odejść z kwitkiem* (see Figure 1, p. 11) and almost half as many examples (338) of the variant with the imperfective verb *odchodzić z kwitkiem*. In the Bulgarian National Corpus, there are 36 examples of the variant of a phraseological unit with the perfective verb *пропусна покрай ушите си* and only 9 occurrences of the variant with the imperfective verb *пропускам покрай ушите си* (see Figure 2, p. 12).

These observations motivated the decision of the authors to select or construct appropriate illustrative examples that contain the most frequently used verb form. Parallel corpora (bilingual and multilingual) can also be used as a source of linguistic information in the interlinguistic contrasting of phraseological units or in phraseographical practice (Dobrovol'skiĭ, 2015; Filipenko, 2008; Sosnowski, 2016). The data obtained from these corpora can serve as the basis for the selection of an appropriate equivalent of the examined phraseological units of the source language

---

<sup>8</sup>*Słownik frazeologiczny PWN* (Kłosińska, 2005), *Фразаеологичен речник на българския език* (t. 1–2, Nicheva, Spasova-Mikhailova, & Cholakova, 1975), *Нов фразеологичен речник на българския език* (Ankova-Nicheva, 1994) and others; *Wielki słownik języka polskiego* (n.d.; <http://www.wsjp.pl/>), *Речник на българския език* (*Rechnik na bŭlgarskiiia ezik*, n.d.; <http://ib1.bas.bg/rbe/>); *Słowa, słowa... Czy je znasz?* (Smólkowa, 2013), *Речник на новите думи и значения в българския език* (Pernishka, Blagoeva, & Kolkovska, 2001), *Речник на новите думи в българския език (от края на XX и началото на XXI век)* (Pernishka, Blagoeva, & Kolkovska, 2010) and others.

<sup>9</sup>Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego (<http://nkjp.pl>), Български национален корпус (<http://search.dcl.bas.bg/>), Polish and Bulgarian corpora on the Sketch Engine platform (<https://www.sketchengine.eu/>).

Wyszukiwarka korpusowa PELCRA dla danych NKJP (Cztowanie)

odejść z kwitkiem

Maks. odstęp: 0 Zachowaj szyk:  Wyniki: 200 Czas Profil Excel URL

Zaawansowane Podkorpus: Cały

SZUKAJ

<< Poprzednie Następnie >>

Pomoc

Przeszukiwany zbiór zawiera 1,524,696,745 słów. Znalaziono 126 akapitów pasujących do zapytania w 0.071s. Bieżąca strona zawiera 126 przykładów z 125 różnych tekstów.

1.	sprzedających. Konsumentom wolno jedynie odwrócić się i	odejść z kwitkiem	. podszedł do nas ten najwyższy dryblas i powiedział:	Gazeta Wrocławska	✓
2.	A kiedy skończył się czas i musieli	odejść z kwitkiem	. Znajomych mnóstwo. Zwłaszcza ze wsi. W takim tłoku	Weiser Dawidek	✓
3.	tłok. Gdyby nie zarezerwowany stolik Tota, musielibyśmy	odejść z kwitkiem	sprzed kasy) i 1,2 mln widzów telewizji Channel 4,	Pamiętnik Pani Hanki...	✓
4.	12 funtów za wstęp do galerii (około tysiąca musiało	odejść z kwitkiem	. nie dostając się na zorganizowany w salce na dwiecie	Polityka	✓
5.	nawet własnego sukcesu. Wielu chętnych musiało	odejść z kwitkiem	?	Polityka	✓
6.	formalności żona odstąpiła w kolejce dwie godziny, aby	odejść z kwitkiem	. To były zebrania członków, na których omawiano sprawy	Tygodnik Ciechanowsk...	✓
7.	którzy o nią proszą, są w takiej samej sytuacji mają	odejść z kwitkiem	!	Nowiny Raciborskie	✓
8.	Rady Powiatu Zdzisław Śliwiński z SLD. On również musiał	odejść z kwitkiem	. wyjaśnia jedna z kobiet zatrudnionych w Stremie.	Tygodnik Tucholski	✓
9.	Losów sprzedano łącznie 1200, a wielu chętnych musiało	odejść z kwitkiem	. nie kryły zirytowania. – Przyszłam o 6 rano. To jakaś	Dziennik Zachodni	✓
10.	Ale co miałam zrobić? Wzięłam i tyle. Lepsze to niż	odejść z kwitkiem	. Casting dla dzieci i młodzieży, który miał się odbyć w	Trybuna Śląska	✓
11.	Osoby, które musiały	odejść z kwitkiem	. W konstytucji fundacji widnieje bowiem zapis, że żaden	Trybuna Śląska	✓
12.	Chętnych było tak dużo, że wielu rodziców musiało	odejść z kwitkiem	. Nie wiem jak wytłumaczyć mojemu niepełnosprawnemu	Trybuna Śląska	✓
13.	Tłum ludzi czekających na casting musiał	odejść z kwitkiem	!	Trybuna Śląska	✓
14.	salezjańskiej fundacji, o zwrot pieniędzy będzie musiał	odejść z kwitkiem	. Organizatorzy rozdali 400 numerków, które uprawniały do	Trybuna Śląska	✓
15.	mi decyzji, co jest równoznaczne z tym, że muszą	odejść z kwitkiem	ze względu na brak środków.	Trybuna Śląska	✓
16.	Paśniak – Mało tego, prawie ją pobito, kiedy nie chciała	odejść z kwitkiem	. – Panie z pierwszej grupy ćwiczą z nami już ponad trzy	Trybuna Śląska	✓
17.	temu zjawilo się tak dużo chętnych, że większość musiała	odejść z kwitkiem	. Wprawdzie konkurs się rozpoczął, swoje próby wykonało	Dziennik Bałtycki	✓
18.	otrzymało dwie trzecie wnioskodawców, pozostali muszą	odejść z kwitkiem	. Okazuje się, że krwi jest zbyt dużo.	Dziennik Bałtycki	✓
19.	było uruchomione kolejną grupę, panie nie mogły przeczeź	odejść z kwitkiem			
20.	tysięcy fanów sportów zimowych i znowu musieli	odejść z kwitkiem			
21.	Centrum Krwiodawstwa i Krwiolecznictwa w Słupsku musi	odejść z kwitkiem			

Figure 1: Sample concordance lines for *odejść z kwitkiem* in the National Corpus of Polish Language

in the target language. However, it should be noted that the material obtained from this type of corpora mainly reflects the translation techniques and strategies used in practice, and therefore the researcher is informed not so much about the system as about the translation equivalence of interlanguage phraseological units.

Among the existing Polish-Bulgarian parallel corpora, *Polsko-bułgarski korpus równoległy*<sup>10</sup> (Polish-Bulgarian parallel corpus) is worthy of special mention. This corpus was created by a team of linguists from the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences and is among the resources of the international CLARIN infrastructure (D. Roszko, R. Roszko, & Sosnowski, 2018). In the texts contained in the corpus, there are examples illustrating different ways of translating phraseology:


- phraseological unit in language A → phraseological unit of the same meaning and close form in language B (full equivalent)

*I jeśli jakaś udreńczona, chora samica, z której została tylko skóra i kości przez ten nieustający bieg, pozostawała w tyle, była natychmiast okrążona, oblepiona, zaduszona w zwartym brzęczeniu komarów.*

*И ако някоя нещастна болна самка, само кожата и кости от този непрекъснат бяг, изостанеше, тя биваше мигновено обкръжена, облепена, задушена в плътното бръмчене на комарите.*

- phraseological unit in language A → phraseological unit of the same meaning and of a different form in language B (functional equivalent) (see Figure 3, p. 13)
- phraseological unit in language A → descriptive construction in language B (zero equivalent)

<sup>10</sup>Polish-Bulgarian Parallel Corpus, CLARIN-PL digital repository, <https://clarin-pl.eu/dspace/handle/11321/536> (R. Roszko, D. Roszko, Sosnowski, & Satoła-Staškowiak, 2018).

 <b>BNC</b>		Български национален корпус Bulgarian National Corpus	<a href="#">Links</a>	Български
15.	Като <b>пропусна покрай ушите си</b> зловната шега на Хайд, Пирс зададе нов въпро...	+		
16.	Обикновено не достига — продължи Ротанов, като <b>пропусна покрай ушите си</b> репликата на Олег. — Второ, събрахме доста п...	+		
17.	Тези думи Марс <b>пропусна покрай ушите си</b> . — Ще ми отговорите ли на един въпрос, госпо...	+		
18.	...Рон — бързо се намеси Хари, — аз нямам нищ <b>пропусна покрай ушите си</b> и неговите думи. — Защо не идеш да намериш...	+		
19.	А. Т. и сега <b>пропусна покрай ушите си</b> моя аргумент като най-малозначещ.	+		
20.	...Имперският устав предвижда какви ли не неща, <b>пропусна покрай ушите си</b> този намек за миналото си. — Балансирана, ап...	+		
21.	...Дори да бе забелязал иронията в гласа му, Виктор <b>пропусна покрай ушите си</b> . — Да, съществуват два срока — единият е пос...	+		
22.	...Удивен съм. Дори да бе забелязал иронията в г <b>пропусна покрай ушите си</b> . — Да, съществуват два срока — единият е пос...	+		
23.	...Когато дочу за избраната от нея тема за дисертац <b>пропусна покрай ушите си</b> като случаен минавач.	+		
24.	Дрън-дрън — <b>пропусна покрай ушите си</b> хапливата забележка Мифлин. Джими се тръш...	+		
25.	Набелязваше неща, които бе <b>пропуснал покрай ушите си</b> , защото беше твърде зает да се самосъжالياва.	+		
26.	Виж, в това не вярвах, но го <b>пропуснах покрай ушите си</b> .	+		
27.	Почти го <b>пропуснах покрай ушите си</b> , но не се съдържах. — Аз съм единствената съ...	+		
28.	...Подбрах няколко колоритни парчета и така им хвъ <b>пропуснах покрай ушите си</b> молбите на Мери, на която само Лист й беше...	+		
29.	...Няма да ви избяга — мъчеха се да ги поохладят <b>пропуснах покрай ушите си</b> всички съвети.	+		
30.	Рон реши да <b>пропусне покрай ушите си</b> тези думи. — Сигурно те е поканил за своя дам...	+		

[Previous](#)
1
2
[Next](#)

Figure 2: Sample concordance lines for *пропускам* / *пропусна покрай ушите си* in the Bulgarian National Corpus

*Maria była świadoma swojej urody. Choć zazwyczaj **puszczała mimo uszu** przestrogi matki, tej jednej nie zlekceważyła: „Córeczko, uroda przemija.”*

*Тя самата впрочем знаеше, че е красива, и въпреки че често **забравяше** съветите на майка си, винаги си спомняше за един от тях: „Дъще, красотата е нетрайна.“*

Naturally, one should be aware that the degree of credibility of the linguistic information obtained from corpora depends largely on the appropriateness of the methods used in the design and creation of the corpus in question. The most important factors in corpus design and creation are the type and scope of the subject, and the scope of the collected materials. Consequently, when researching phraseology, it is worth utilizing corpora with a larger volume and a large variety of texts (Szudarski, 2018, p. 90).

### 3.6 General lexicographical solutions applied in the *Lexicon*

The phraseological units in the *Lexicon* are listed in alphabetical order, according to the Bulgarian alphabet in the Bulgarian-Polish section and according to the Polish alphabet in the Polish-Bulgarian section. In phraseological units, valent spots are indicated (where necessary), e.g. *brak (komuś) piątej klepki, szlag (kogoś) trafił / trafiła / trafia / trafi*; *слагам / сложва спирачка (на някого, нещо), вдигам / вдигна на балон (някого, нещо), вземам / взема здравето (на някого)*. The facultative/optional and alternative elements in the entries were separated out based on questionnaires. These elements are presented in two ways:

The screenshot shows the KonText interface with the following elements:

- Logo: **kon**text
- Navigation: Query | Subcorpora | Save | Concordance | Filter | Frequency | Collocations | View options | Help
- Info box: info: polish\_bulgarian\_corpus\_PL 428,530 positions
- Search results: Hits: 1 | i.p.m.: 2.33 (related to the whole polish\_bulgarian\_corpus\_PL) | ARF: 1
- Result is sorted
- Two concordance lines are shown, each with a document ID (doc#20) and a snippet of text in Polish and Bulgarian.

Figure 3: Sample concordance lines for the phraseme *wrzucić / wrzucać do jednego worka* in the Polish-Bulgarian parallel corpus CLARIN

1. Facultative/optional elements are given in brackets: *brzydki jak noc (listopadowa)*; *czepać (pełnymi) garściami (z czegoś)*; *червен като (варен) рак, капят като (гнили) круши*.
2. Alternative elements, on the other hand, are shown with a slash: *milczeć jak głąz / skała / grób*; *jechać na tym samym / jednym wózku*; *być / poczuć się / czuć się w swoim żywiole*; *слаб като щецка / клечка / вейка, пускам / пусна / пропускам / пропуска* *покрай ушите си (нещо)*.

When it is possible to use both the perfective and imperfective forms of verbs in phraseological units, these elements are marked as an alternative: *zatykać / zatkać / zapierać / zaprzec (komuś) dech (w piersiach)*; *dawać / dać (komuś) w kość, dostawać / dostać gęsiej skórki*; *пускам / пусна кепенците, бръквам / бръква с пръст в раната*.

Occasionally, the entries contain the personal forms of verbs. Personal forms are given in the past / present / future order: *włosy (komuś) stanęły / stają / staną dęba*.

The meaning of a given phraseological unit is represented by the simplest possible syntax structures. Synonymic definitions are avoided and fragmented definitions are proposed instead.

- (18) **другата страна на медала**                      **druga strona medalu**  
 ‘тогава, когато нещо има и друг аспект (обикновено негативен)’                      ‘wtedy, gdy jakaś sprawa ma inny aspekt (zazwyczaj negatywny)’  
*Другата страна на медала на спортната слава са различните травми, от които страдат много елитни спортисти.*                      *Ich propozycja jest bardzo atrakcyjna, ale jest też druga strona medalu, czyli koszty.*

In the *Lexicon*, stylistic qualifiers have been used to help the user determine in which situation a given phraseological unit can be used. Units deviating from the general language were marked with three qualifiers: kol. / разг. (colloquial), slang. / жарг. (slang), wulg. / вулг. (vulgar). The first group consists of colloquialisms, i.e. units characterized by a sloppy, free style of expression typical of spoken language, e.g. *być na topie, dawać / dać ciała, mieć haka (na kogoś)*; *ритвам / ритна камбаната, обирам си / обера си крушите*. Such phraseological units are on the fringes of the general language and are often considered to be non-normative or less polite. The second group includes phrases used in various social groups, e.g. among young people: *bez spiny, jazda bez trzymanki*; *внимавай в картинката*. The third group are vulgarisms, included in the *Lexicon* due to their frequency of use: *burdel na kótkach, gówno prawda, mieć nasrane w głowie / we łbie*.

One of the initial assumptions of the *Lexicon* was the requirement to illustrate each phraseological unit with an example that would best show its use. Selected examples have been taken from the press, television, and spoken language. Some of the examples have been adapted (i.e. suitably shortened for the needs of the *Lexicon*). Some of the examples have been specially created. Although some authors refer to specially created examples with skepticism (Bańko, 2001, p. 29), the authors of the *Lexicon* have noticed their usefulness in the construction of dictionaries of active phraseology. This is due to the fact that the most recent units very often have not yet been recorded in the corpora, and some (especially colloquial units) are still rarely found in the written language.

The purpose of providing phraseological units with examples of their use is also to show the grammatical properties of words (e.g. the verb tense, the inherited prepositional and case requirements of an adjective, or the order of units having specific requirements in this respect). Descriptive equivalents which have been selected for the phraseological units are not illustrated by examples.

## 4 Results and final conclusions

The *Lexicon of Active Bulgarian and Polish Phraseology* has managed to collect 1,000 active phraseological units in Bulgarian and Polish, some of which are phraseological neologisms. These units largely reflect certain fragments of the linguistic worldview of contemporary Bulgarian and Polish society. One of the advantages of the *Lexicon* is the proposed method of contrasting phraseological culturemes and other units without equivalents.

The theoretical basis for the work has been developed with a certain degree of compromise, which is necessary due to the significant differences between the Bulgarian and Polish scientific traditions in the field of the theoretical and lexicographical description of phraseological units.

The authors of the *Lexicon* are of the opinion that, in contrastive research, the approach from content to form is the only acceptable and appropriate way to adequately interpret interlingual similarities and discrepancies. Therefore, universal definition models were applied to semantically describe the phraseological units in the work. In this way, possible methodological errors leading to incorrect interpretations of interlingual equivalence phenomena can be prevented. As a result of the use of universal definitions for phraseological units, any number of other languages (not only Slavic languages) may be added to the *Lexicon*.

## References

- Ankova-Nicheva, K. (1994). *Nov frazeologichen rechnik na bŭlgarskiia ezik*. Sofia: UI "Sv. Kliment Okhridski".
- Bąba, S. (1998). *Materiały do bibliografii frazeologii polskiej: Prace opublikowane w latach 1945–1995*. Poznań: "WiS".
- Bąba, S. (2003). *Materiały do bibliografii frazeologii polskiej: Prace opublikowane w latach 1996–2000*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo "Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne".
- Bańko, M. (2001). *Z pogranicza leksykografii i językoznawstwa*. Warszawa: Wydział Polonistyki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. Retrieved December 27, 2018, from [http://www2.polon.uw.edu.pl/banko/plik\\_i/inne/z\\_pogranicza.tif.pdf](http://www2.polon.uw.edu.pl/banko/plik_i/inne/z_pogranicza.tif.pdf)
- Blagoeva, D., Sosnowski, W., & Kolkovska, S. (2018). Frazeologichni inovatsii v bŭlgarskiia i polskiia ezik. *Balkanistichen forum*, 2018(3), 9–20.
- Bogusławski, A. (1989). Uwagi o pracy nad frazeologią. In Z. Saloni (Ed.), *Studia z polskiej leksykografii współczesnej* (Vol. 3, pp. 13–30). Białystok: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Bonova, S. (2009). *Frazeologichni edinitsi, svŭrzani s kristiianstvoto. Bŭlgarsko-polski paraleli*. Veliko Tŭrnovo: UI „Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodii“.
- Chlebda, W. (2003). *Elementy frazeamatyki: Wprowadzenie do frazeologii nadawcy*. Łask: "Leksem".

- Chlebda, W. (2011). Ekwiwalencja i ekwiwalenty: Między słownikiem a tekstami. In W. Chlebda (Ed.), *Na tropach translatów: W poszukiwaniu odpowiedników przekładowych* (pp. 21–43). Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Dagut, M. (1981). Semantic “Voids” as a problem in the translation process. *Poetics Today*, 2(4), 61–71. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1772486>
- Denczewska, D. (2013). Olej, kapusta, kalosze: Inteligencja i głupota w polskich i bułgarskich związkach frazeologicznych. *Postscriptum Polonistyczne*, 2(12), 295–301.
- Dobrowoľ’skiĭ, D. O. (2015). Korpusy tekstov i dvuiazycznaia frazeografia. *Vestnik Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta*, 5(5), 23–37. <https://doi.org/10.15293/2226-3365.1505.02>
- Dobrowoľ’skiĭ, D. (2011). Cross-linguistic equivalence of idioms: Does it really exist? In A. Pamies & D. Dobrowoľ’skiĭ (Eds.), *Linguo-cultural competence and phraseological motivation* (pp. 7–24). Baltmannsweiler: Schneider-Verl. Hohengehren.
- Dolińska, A. (1988). Ekwiwalencja somatycznych związków frazeologicznych w języku bułgarskim i polskim. In K. Feleszko (Ed.), *Polono-Slavica-Varsoviensia: Vol. 1. Problemy językoznawstwa konfrontatywnego* (pp. 189–196). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Durdureanu, I. I. (2011). Translation of cultural terms: possible or impossible? *The Journal of Linguistic and Intercultural Education – JoLIE*, 4, 51–63.
- Filipenko, T. (2008). Korpusnolingvisticheskiĭ podkhod k analizu semantiki idiom (na materiale nemetskogo i russkogo iazykov). In *Izsledvaniia po frazeologiiia, leksikologiiia i leksikografiia* (pp. 59–63). Sofia: AI “Prof. Marin Drinov”.
- Gläser, R. (1984). The translation aspect of phraseological units in English and German. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 18, 123–134.
- Jaskot, M. (2013). *Los así llamados falsos amigos del traductor entre el español y el esperanto* (PhD thesis presented at the University of Warsaw 3.09.2013).
- Jaskot, M. (2016). Equivalent culture-anchored units translation? The phraseological units issue. *Cognitive Studies / Études cognitives*, 2016(16), 57–64. <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.2016.006>
- Jaskot, M., & Ganoshenko, J. (2015). Culturemes and non-equivalent lexis in dictionaries. *Cognitive Studies / Études cognitives*, 2015(15), 115–124. <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.2015.009>
- Jaskot, M., & Sosnowski, W. (2017). O fałszywych przyjaciółach tłumacza na przykładzie Leksykonu aktywnej frazeologii polskiej i ukraińskiej. In B. Borkowska-Kępska, G. Gwóźdź, B. Borkowska-Kępska, & G. Gwóźdź (Eds.), *LSP Perspectives 2 Języki specjalistyczne – nowe perspektywy 2* (pp. 55–62). Dąbrowa Górnicza: Wyższa Szkoła Biznesu.
- Karag’ozova, S. (2004). Emotsii i mantalitet (Vürkhu material ot bŭlgarski i polski frazeologizmi za emotsii). In *Ezik i mantalitet* (pp. 46–72). Sofia: Voenna izdatelstvo.
- Khutsishvili, S. (2010). *Slavianskiie mezh’azykovye omonimy* (Doctoral dissertation). Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi. Retrieved December 26, 2018, from <http://old.press.tsu.ge/GEO/internet/disertaciebi/S.Khutsishvili%20Disertacia.pdf>
- Kłosińska, A. (Ed.). (2005). *Słownik frazeologiczny PWN*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Krumova-Tsvetkova, L., & Blagoeva, D. (Eds.). (2011). *Bibliografiia po bŭlgarska leksikologiiia, frazeologiiia i leksikografiia: 1950–2010*. Sofia: AI “Prof. Marin Drinov”.
- Lewicki, A. M. (1976). *Wprowadzenie do frazeologii syntaktycznej: Teoria zwrotu frazeologicznego*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Lewicki, A. M., & Pajdzińska, A. (2001). Frazeologia. In J. Bartmiński (Ed.), *Współczesny język polski* (pp. 315–333). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Maldzieva, V., & Wójtowicz, J. (1994). *Polskie i bułgarskie związki frazeologiczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Michow, E. (2013). *Studia nad frazeologią somatyczną języka polskiego i bułgarskiego*. Kielce: GlobalTranslator.
- Michow, E. (2014). *Semantyka polskich i bułgarskich frazeologizmów somatycznych motywowana funkcjami części ciała człowieka*. Kielce: Global Translator.
- Nagórko, A., Burkhardt, H., & Łaziński, M. (2004). *Dystynktywny słownik synonimów*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych “Universitas”.
- Nicheva, K., Spasova-Mikhaĭlova, S., & Cholakova, K. (1975). *Frazeologichen rechnik na bŭlgarskiia ezik* (Vols. 1–2). Sofia: BAN.

- Ovcharova, G. (2017). Frazeologiczni edinitsi s komponent “oko”: Bŭlgarsko-polski paraleli. *Studia Philologica Universitatis Velikotarnovensis*, 36(2), 273–283.
- Pernishka, E., Blagoeva, D., & Kolkovska, S. (2001). *Rechnik na novite dumi i znacheniiia v bŭlgarskiia ezik*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Pernishka, E., Blagoeva, D., & Kolkovska, S. (2010). *Rechnik na novite dumi v bŭlgarskiia ezik (ot kraia na XX i nachaloto na XXI vek)*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Popova, K. (1998). *Semantichni aspekti na frazeologizmite s komponent nazvanie na khрана i obleklo (vŭrkh materialii ot bŭlgarskiia, polskiia i litovskiiia ezik)* (Dissertation). Sofia.
- PrzepiŃkowski, A., Bańko, M., GŃrski, R. L., & Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (Eds.). (2012). *Narodowy Korpus Języczna Polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Pukhaleva, I. (2003). *Otsenŭchni frazeologiczni edinitsi v bŭlgarski, novogrŭtski i polski ezik* (Dissertation). Sofia.
- Radeva, S., & Maikhrovski, Ń. (1979). Polsko-bŭlgarski frazeologizmi s komponenti somatizmi. In *Sŭpostavitelno izuchavane na chastnite leksikalni sistemi na slavianskite ezitsi v sinkhroniia i diakhroniia* (pp. 178–183). Sofia: BAN.
- Radewa, S. (1988). *Podręczny słownik polsko-bułgarski z suplementem* (2nd ed. with suppl., Vols. 1–2). Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Rechnik na bŭlgarskiia ezik. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/>
- Rozzko, D., Rozzko, R., & Sosnowski, W. (2018). Polsko-bułgarskie korpusy IS PAN i CLARIN-PL. *Slavica Lodziensia*, 2, 59–70. <https://doi.org/10.18778/2544-1795.02.05>
- Rozzko, R., Rozzko, D., Sosnowski, W., & Satoła-Staškowiak, J. (2018). Polish-Bulgarian Parallel Corpus, CLARIN-PL digital repository. Retrieved from <https://clarin-pl.eu/dspace/handle/11321/536>
- Satoła-Staškowiak, J., & Koseska-Toszewa, V. (2014). *WspŃoczesny słownik bułgarsko-polski* (Vol. 1). Warszawa: Instytut Slawistyki PAN.
- Skorupka, S. (1985). *Słownik frazeologiczny języczna polskiego*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Sławski, F. (1987). *Podręczny słownik bułgarsko-polski z suplementem* (2nd ed. with suppl., Vols. 1–2). Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- SmŃłkowska, T. (Ed.). (2013). *Słowa, słowa... Czy je znasz?* KrakŃw: Instytut Języczna Polskiego PAN.
- Sosnowski, W. (2016). *Computerised and corpus-based approaches to phraseology: monolingual and multilingual perspectives* [*Fraseología computacional y basada en corpus: perspectivas monolingŭes y multilingŭes (Trabajos completos)*] (pp. 339–349). Geneva: Tradulex.
- Sosnowski, W. P., Blagoeva, D., & Tymoshuk, R. (2018). New Bulgarian, Polish, and Ukrainian phraseology and language corpora. *Cognitive Studies | Études cognitives*, 2018(18). <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.1768>
- Sosnowski, W., Koseska-Toszewa, V., & Kisiel, A. (2016). *Leksykon odpowiedniości semantycznych w języczna polskim, bułgarskim i rosyjskim*. Warszawa: Instytut Slawistyki PAN.
- Sosnowski, W., & Tymoshuk, R. (2017). Konfrontacja języczna polskich i ukraińskich jednostek frazeologicznych na przykładzie materiału z Leksykonu aktywnej frazeologii polskiej i ukraińskiej. In D. Blagoeva (Ed.), *Bŭlgarsko-polski studii*. Sofia: Institut na bŭlgarski ezik “Prof. Liubomir Andreiĉhich” – BAN.
- Sotirov, P., Mostowska, M., & Mokrzycka, A. (2011–2013). *Bułgarsko-polski słownik leksyki potocznej* (Vols. 1–2). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Szerszunowicz, J. (2004). Paralelizmy frazeologiczne w analizie komparatywnej. *Białostockie Archiwum Języczne*, 2004(4), 207–220.
- Szerszunowicz, J. (2009). Quasi-ekwiwalenty związkŃw frazeologicznych w teorii, frazeografii i translatoryce. *Białostockie Archiwum Języczne*, 9, 323–346.
- Szerszunowicz, J., & Vidović Bolt, I. (2014). Kulturowe znaczenie komponentu frazeologizmu a jego międzijęzyczna ekwiwalencja. *Białostockie Archiwum Języczne*, 2014(14), 195–216. <https://doi.org/10.15290/baj.2014.14.12>
- Szudarski, P. (2018). *Corpus linguistics for vocabulary*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315107769>
- Tymoshuk, R., Sosnowski, W., Jaskot, M., & Ganoshenko, Y. (2018). *Leksykon aktywnej frazeologii polskiej i ukraińskiej*. Warszawa: KJV Digital.
- Wandruszka, M. (1978). Die ‘falschen Freunde’ des Űbersetzers. In L. Grahers, G. Karlen, & B. Malmberg (Eds.), *Theory and practice of translation* (pp. 213–234). Berlin: Peter Lang.



Wiatrowski, P. (2015). Międzyjęzykowa ekwiwalencja związków frazeologicznych z apelatywnym komponentem relewantnym kulturowo: Na przykładzie indonezyjskich połączeń wyrazowych i ich polskich odpowiedników. *Kwartalnik Językoznawczy*, 2015(1–2), 62–175.

Wiatrowski, P. (2018). Związki frazeologiczne identyczne oraz podobne formalnie w językach indonezyjskim i polskim. *Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne: Seria Językoznawcza*, 25(1), 199–223. <https://doi.org/10.14746/pspsj.2018.25.1.12>

*Wielki słownik języka polskiego*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://wsjp.pl/index.php?pwh=0>

---

This work was financed by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education.

The authors declare that they have no competing interests. Maciej Paweł Jaskot is also the reviewer of this issue. All the authors participated equally in preparing conception and academic editing of this issue.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 PL License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/pl/>), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited.

© The Authors 2019

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences