The purpose of this paper is to discuss the so-called translational equivalent and its relation to different types of bilingual dictionaries. To get the proper contrast, various forms of explanatory equivalents will be mentioned as well.

The notion of the translational equivalent is well illustrated by the following quotation from an article by Lissance (1949:134):

Integration of reading matter is blocked when the dictionary gives linguistic museum pieces or, at a loss itself, merely defines the idea rather than furnishing the contemporary English equivalent with all its dynamic associations. Words like Lebensfrische and Entschlusskraft are good illustrations in point. Bilingual dictionaries render them with "freshness of life" and "ability to make up one's mind (make decisions)". These renderings evoke no familiar language patterns. If the dictionary gave 'vigor' and 'initiative' instead, the context would immediately be clear because these are words associated with concepts the reader is accustomed to manipulate in his everyday pursuits. Translations must be in the idiom of the reader. If they are not, the information, if remembered at all, becomes peripheral to his mind. Readability of a translation, therefore, is of more than academic interest.

The main requirement is well expressed here; the dictionary should offer not explanatory paraphrases or definitions, but real lexical units of the target language which, when inserted into the context, produce a smooth translation. This is a perfectly natural requirement. Lexicographers have followed it since time immemorial, but we also know that they have not succeeded in each and every case.

From a study of the major landmarks in the history of the bilingual dictionary we learn that an equivalent may have two different properties, which we can label translationality (or insertability) and explanatory paraphrase. These are not mutually exclusive. Let us consider the following example $E_1$ from Steiner's NEW COLLEGE FRENCH AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY:

$E_1$: tutoyer ... to thou, to address familiarly

Only "to address familiarly" is a real translational, insertable equivalent. It has, however, no explanatory value, because such a familiarity of address can have many different forms. Since the author does not wish to give an explanation of the form, say "(by using the second person sing.)", he gives the obsolete verb to thou, which conveys this information but which cannot be inserted into any context in contemporary language. This is, then, a purely explanatory equivalent. In another entry of the same dictionary we read:
Types of equivalence

An explanation is important in cases where the mere translational equivalent, exact as it may be, might remain only poorly intelligible. An example, \( E_3 \), comes from the OXFORD LATIN DICTIONARY:

\[ E_3: \text{puagnaculum ... a place from which one fights,}
\]

bulwark or fortification

The explanation "a place from which one fights" is necessary, because the translational bulwark and fortification have either a mediaeval connotation or they usually denote some masonry, something built or constructed etc., whereas a pugnaculum could simply be an earthen embankment which gave the advantage of an elevation.

Sometimes, the etymology or derivation seems to play a role. This stems, at least partly, from the fact that there is a vast overlap between the indication of a derivation, or etymology, on the one hand, and the notional explanation on the other. This is the case in the following entry \( E_4 \), from Smirnitskij & Akhmanova's RUSSKO-ANGLIJSKI SLOVAR':

\[ E_4: \text{Mjasopust ... Shrovetide (when it is not allowed}
\]

to eat meat)

Shrovetide is the exact translational equivalent of the Russian entry word. Both compilers were disciples of Professor Ščerba, an important theoretician of lexicography and practical lexicographer who strongly advocated the principle of the absolute predominance of the translational equivalent (the so-called translational principle) and thus would not admit any explanations in his dictionaries (cf. Žgusta 1971:318). However, in spite of this the parentheses do contain an explanation of the morpheme-to-morpheme meaning of the Russian word. Such an etymological or derivational explanation is admissible if it is done in such clear-cut and informative cases and not in too many entries.

There is a type of dictionary whose way of presenting the meaning of the entry-word must be further discussed. Let us take another example, \( E_5 \), from the OXFORD LATIN DICTIONARY.

\[ E_5: \text{puella ... (1a) female child, girl (1b) daughter}
\]

(2a) young woman (married or otherwise),

(2b) (applied to nymphs, goddesses)

(3a) young maiden as an object of sexual interest

(3b) (spec.) one's girl, sweetheart

(4) a slave-girl
The correctness of the indications the entry comprises is unimpeachable, of course. However, is what we read under (3) really an explanation of a sense of the word *puella*? One of the best contexts quoted as an example in this section is taken from Propertius 1.1.5: (Amor) me docuit castas odisse puellas "(Love) taught me to hate chaste girls". It may be that we learn from this much about Propertius, or the society in which he lived, or at least about the topics of such gallant poetry; but as far as the word *puella* goes, the only thing that we learn is that it collocates with *casta*: there is no perceivable semantic effect present here which would deserve a treatment by a separately numbered sense, plus explanation. In a similar way, if we take (2b), we see that it has to do with antonomasy, not with any semantic effect: if I refer to the goddess Venus as, say, *the divine girl, the source and ruler of love*, it is the same antonomasy as if *Elizabeth II* is referred to as the present Queen of Great Britain. Clearly, we are much more in the domain of the philosophy of language than in the field of semantics. We shall avoid falling into this snake-pit; may it suffice to repeat that this does not seem to have anything to do with the word *puella* and its meaning. The reason for presenting the meaning of the entryword in this way seems to consist of the fact that this is a dictionary which is closely attached to the interpretation of Latin texts: it helps the reader to understand them by grouping the attested contexts according to their contents.

It is only natural that such text-oriented dictionaries are most frequently found in the field of the classical languages and their largely literary texts. However, any dictionary that is closely connected with a recorded corpus of texts can operate on this principle.

What can the lexicographer do when there is absolutely no equivalent in the target language? One of the possibilities is to try to create an equivalent, frequently by borrowing the expression from the source language. An explanation then gives the user an understanding of the meaning. This is the way Smirnitskij & Akhmanova construct entry *E*₆ in their RUSSKO-ANGLIJSKIJ SLOVAR':

**E*₆**: *essentuki* ... *essentuki* (kind of mineral water)

In this case, they adhere more strictly to the translational principle than they do in *E*₄ above; they do not give the explanation that Essentuki is the place close to the Caucasus where this mineral water is found.

The absence of an equivalent is frequently connected with differences in culture and in the surrounding world. An interesting group of words that often have no equivalents in other languages includes onomatopoeias, interjections, functional words, particles and similar lexical units. Two entries from Lambrecht's IFUGAW-ENGLISH DICTIONARY (1978) illustrate this.

**E*₇**: *hukhuk* ... onomatopoeic word used by gamblers when they shuffle the cards

**E*₈**: *Gga* ... squealing of pigs
Let us now turn back to the translational equivalent. When the mere glossaries developed into real dictionaries, the extensive use of the translational equivalent had some typical consequences. One of these is the tendency to indicate many equivalents as if they were synonymous, another the superabundance of many different collocations, with yet other translations. This is well illustrated by the partial entry Eg from the venerable DICTIONNAIRE FRANÇOIS-LATIN (1539) of Robert Estienne, or Robertus Stephanus.

Eg: Abonder, Abondant, Abondance, Abondamment.
    Abonder de toutes pars, Praescatere.
    Qui abonde en quelque chose, Dapsilis.
    Abondant, Affluens, Huber, Hubertur, Profusus.
    Abondante nourriture, Alimentum largum.
    Homme abondant & riche, Copiosus.

It is natural that a dictionary whose purpose is to help the user write good Latin should offer him as many equivalents as possible. This is a dictionary for someone who already knows much but wishes to improve his Latin style, a reasonable purpose for a dictionary published at that time and in that sociolinguistic and cultural situation, but not to be imitated by every bilingual lexicographer.

Another early dictionary, Cotgrave's DICTIONAIRIE OF THE FRENCH AND ENGLISH TONGUES of 1611, already shows some differentiation:

E10: Fin: f. A fine, end, issue, conclusion, successse; also, a finishing, ceasing, ending; also, a seame, or veine, in a quarrey of stone; also, a barre, exclusion, refusall, or exception, urged, or pleaded in issue; & sometimes th'issue it selfe. Fins de non proceder. Are no better then dilatorie pleas; as an exception, against the jurisdiction of the Court, or by reason of the qualitie of the person unfit to be impleaded therein, &c.
    Fins de non recevoir. Looke Recevoir.

We see from E10, that many equivalents or purported equivalents are offered, without a discrimination of their meaning. However, the juridical term fins de non proceder is treated by an explanation, and a strongly encyclopaedic one at that. This is because the dictionary is intended for an English speaker who wishes to understand French texts. One of the greatest dangers of the translational equivalent consists of the possibility or even necessity of using many different expressions of the target language to generate a really smooth translation in varying contexts. However, if such an equivalent has no explanatory power by itself, its value is limited to the context(s) or collocation(s) to which it applies.

The search for a really natural-sounding translation in the target language can result in a movement away from the central meaning of the entry-word. Compare the entries E11 and E12 in Wilson's MODERN RUSSIAN DICTIONARY FOR ENGLISH SPEAKERS. The purpose of this dictionary is to provide for an English speaker the vocabulary he might want to use in speaking or writing Russian. The editor is a lexicographic disciple of O.S. Akhmanova, so that she continues the line of Ščerba's doctrine. True to the expectation, her dictionary is fully based on the translational principle.
It is the practice of perhaps all dictionaries based on the translational principle that an entry word for which there is no good equivalent that would cover many possible contexts is followed by a colon. The meaning of the colon is: what follows is a mere exemplification of the entry-word's use(s), with translation(s); a generalization is impossible or too complicated.

\[E_{11}:\text{admittedly: admittedly it's not easy priznat'sja,}\]
\[\text{ëto nelegko}\]

The literal meaning of the Russian translation is "to confess" (i.e., to tell the truth), "this is not easy". There is no doubt that the choice of this example is an adroit one, because this use of admittedly is most frequent. The translational equivalent offered here has, then, the advantage of being statistically central, so to speak: there will be many English contexts directly parallel to this example. But the chain of translational equivalents can get too far away from the entry-word, as in \(E_{12}\) from Wilson's dictionary.

\[E_{12}:\text{upheaval: social/political upheavals}\]
\[\text{social'nyje/političeskije sdvigи; I don't want to move again - it's such an upheaval ja ne khocu bol'še pereezžat', ëto očen' tjaželo}\]

The literal meaning of the Russian translation of the example is "I don't want to move again, it is very difficult". This is an example of a Russian colloquial sentence rather than a translational equivalent of the entry-word.

Towards functional equivalence

No-one will fail to perceive that all this is connected with the problem of the functional equivalence of a translation. A translation should convey to its reader the same message with the same aesthetic and other values which are conveyed by the original text. Since languages differ in all imaginable respects, the translator-lexicographer must sometimes use means quite different from those used in the original in order to obtain the same results. If the different means do produce the same effect, the texts are considered functionally equivalent.

Functional equivalence can be achieved by various means. Let us compare the treatment of the same entry-word in four different dictionaries. Under Pumpernickel we find \(E_{13}\) in COLLINS GERMAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY (Terrell et al.), \(E_{14}\) in Wildhagen & Héraucourt's ENGLISCH-DEUTSCHES, DEUTSCH-ENGLISCHES WÖRTERBUCH, \(E_{15}\) in LANGEN-SCHEIDTS ENZYKLOPÄDISCHES WÖRTERBUCH DER ENGLISCHEN UND DEUTSCHEN SPRACHE, and \(E_{16}\) in OXFORD-HARRAP STANDARD GERMAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

\[E_{13}:\text{Pumpernickel ... pumpernickel}\]
\[E_{14}:\text{Pumpernickel ... Westphalian rye bread}\]
\[E_{15}:\text{Pumpernickel ... (gastr.) pumpernickel, Westphalian rye bread}\]
\[E_{16}:\text{Pumpernickel ... (comest.) (bread) pumpernickel}\]
Thus we have a purely translational equivalent without explanation, an explanatory paraphrase, a translational equivalent with explanation and register label, and an equivalent with register label and semantic gloss.

Other possibilities exist for supplying information necessary for the user's orientation. The entry E₁₇ from Wolff's DICTIONARY OF CEBUANAO VISAYAN illustrates this.

\[ E₁₇: \textit{pyāt} \ldots \text{squeal to the authorities, betray a secret about a crime} \]

The simplest translational equivalent here would be just \textit{squeal}; betray a secret can also be considered a translational equivalent, while \textit{to the authorities} and \textit{about a crime} are explanatory additions.

**Conclusion**

A dictionary designed on the pure translational principle is best suited to a user who is trying to understand a given text; any polysemy of a particular word will be disambiguated by the context in which the reader finds it. It is perhaps less suitable as an aid to writers in the production of text; there is no indication as to which translational equivalent belongs to which sense of a word with multiple meanings.

A translation dictionary designed for the production of texts in a foreign language, as exemplified by entries E₉, E₁₁ and E₁₂ above, can achieve much by the excellence of its translations in so far as the exemplifying collocations are well selected; but it tends to restrict its applicability to the data indicated in it.

Let us compare a larger entry from a translation dictionary with one in a dictionary with a more explanatory orientation. E₁₈ is taken from the CAMBRIDGE ITALIAN DICTIONARY, E₁₉ from the SANSONI/HARRAP STANDARD ITALIAN AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

\[ E₁₈: \textit{spirit} \text{-m.} \text{ breath of life; spirit; ghost; mind; soul; wt; uomo di —, witty man; courage; temper; boldness; prontezza di —, ready wt; presenza di —, presence of mind; — depresso, low spirited; humour; head, leader, inspiration; egli fu lo — della tavoletta, he was the leading spirit of the troupe; — d’osservazione, power of observation; (theol.) — santo, Holy Spirit, Holy Ghost; lo — di Dio, the Spirit of God; spirituality; darsi alla —, to devote oneself to spiritual things; influenza dello —, mental philosophy; natura lo —, with a burning desire to improve one’s mind by good reading; uomo povero di —, humble, (pop.) stupid; opinion, feeling; — di corpo, 
voglia de corpi, corporate feeling, loyalty; — di parte, party spirit; lo — pubblico, public spirit; alcohol; una tetta sgridata —, a lax on spirits; lampadina a —, spirit lamp; — di legno, methyl alcohol; — denaturato, methylated spirit; (Gk. gramm.) — breathing; (naut.) — della corrente, strongest part of the current. —ate adj. spiritual, holy, divine; inspired; soulful. —are [lxr] intr. (aux. essere) to be possessed (by a demon, etc.); —are dalla paura, to be beset oneself with fear; (colloq.) —are dalla fame, dal freddo, to be shivering with hunger, cold. —ato past. adj. possessed (by an evil spirit); crazy, mad; terrified; (colloq.) —ato. imp of mischief, n.m. one possessed by an evil spirit; entro uno un —ato, he entered like one possessed. (Ital. adj.) —ato. imp of mischief, n.m. one possessed by an evil spirit; entro uno un —ato, he entered like one possessed. (Ital. adj.) —ato. imp of mischief, n.m. one possessed by an evil spirit; entro uno un —ato, he entered like one possessed. (Ital. adj.) —ato. imp of mischief, n.m. one possessed by an evil spirit; entro uno un —ato, he entered like one possessed. (Ital. adj.)
There is no way of measuring in a really exact manner the density of the information offered. Given the assumption that it is roughly the same in both entries, we can see that E/spirit is more compact. Opinions may differ on whether it is easier to locate a collocation, or a sense, in a presentation like E/spirit or E/spirit? in any case, dictionaries built on the translational principle tend not to separate numbered senses because they treat multiple meaning as a continuum. It is interesting to observe, however, that the two entries show some overlap, e.g. the accumulation of translation equivalents in senses 5 and 6 of E/spirit clearly shows the influence of the translational principle. However, the semantic disambiguating gloss that precedes these equivalents in parentheses makes the presentation nearly as useful for the Italian user's comprehension of Italian. On the other hand, the presentation in E/spirit contains explanatory components as well: notice that the label of sense 16 in E/spirit indicates only 'grammar' as the register in which the translation breathing, aspiration applies, whereas E/spirit ties it more specifically to 'Greek grammar'.
The reason for this overlapping is clear: the statistically 'normal user' does not wish to buy several dictionaries of the same language, and therefore many dictionaries are designed to serve more than one purpose. Observably, one of the purposes taken care of in such a multi-purpose dictionary usually enjoys a degree of preference; nevertheless, the chance of being useful to more sets of users and therefore appealing to a broader public (i.e. more buyers) proves to be attractive to many editors and to most publishers.

Since no dictionary will ever contain every piece of information that may be needed, the important thing seems to be that the entry-word should give the user, either by the concatenation of the equivalents or by other means, a notional understanding of the entry-word so that he will be able, in so far as he knows the target language, to choose from the equivalents and translated collocations offered and if necessary to go beyond that.

Notes
1 I am grateful to Reinhard Hartmann for suggesting ways of cutting the original paper down to an appropriate size by removing many additional examples while keeping the overall structure intact.
2 In the monolingual dictionary these aspects of meaning specification correspond to the synonym (paraphrase and definition).
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