JOANNA SZERSZUNOWICZ
The University of Białystok
joannaszersz@gmail.com

ENGLISH-POLISH CONTRASTIVE PHRASEOLOGY

Abstract. The present paper undertakes to discuss phraseological terminology, and to present selected classifications of phraseological units developed in the Anglo-American and Polish traditions. Furthermore, it seeks to outline the research done on English-Polish contrastive phraseology as well as to suggest some directions and topics of contrastive studies of English-Polish phraseology to be done in the future.

Keywords: phraseology; phraseological unit; idiom; English; Polish; contrastive analysis.

1. INTRODUCTION

Phraseology occupies a prominent place in language studies, since it is of interest to scholars of various disciplines, for instance, linguists, folklorists, social anthropologists, neurologists, psychologists, sociologists and others. The term *phraseology* can be used in the broadest sense of the word to name any phenomenon belonging to formulaic language, which means that it encompasses conventional multiword combinations as well as single-word expressions which serve speech act functions (cf. Pawley 2007: 3).

Phraseological units of a given language have developed over centuries in a particular ethnic community; thus, they are bound to reflect the culture and differ in a contrastive perspective (Szerszunowicz 2007a). In fact, cross-linguistic studies at issue "cover a wide range of challenging topics, from the simple comparisons of idioms or metaphors in two languages, to the systematic contrastive study of all categories of set phrases across different languages" (Colson 2008: 191).

It should be emphasized that the theoretical background of research studies done on phraseology is weak and has been criticized (cf. Čermák 2001). Even the term *contrastive* can be understood in more ways than one. As stated by Colson (2008: 194), it is possible to consider *contrastive* and *cross-linguistic* as synonyms, i.e. in a general sense any kind of comparison of units can be considered to be contrastive. The term *contrastive* in the narrow sense refers to a systematic comparison of two or more languages. Moreover, the term *contrastive* can be used with reference to studies in which only differences between languages are analyzed (Korhonen 2007: 575).

As Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen state:

> the difference between contrastive idiom analysis and all other cross-linguistic approaches can be explained by the following features: (a) the subject of comparison is idioms of two languages L1 and L2 (b) contrastive analysis is synchronically oriented and aims at recovering both differences and similarities between idioms of L1 and L2 (c) factors, such as genetic relationships, typological parallels, geographic contacts, do not play any role in the framework of this approach (d) the aims of contrastive analysis are mainly of practical nature (Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen 2005: 58).

In fact, the characteristics presented above outline the directions for studies on phraseological units in a contrastive perspective. The presentation of the features of contrastive research on idioms is very important, since "one of the main flaws of many traditional studies in contrastive phraseology is that they are little more than description or comparison of examples, with no particular attention being paid to the theoretical implications" (Colson 2008: 194).

As emphasized by Colson, there is no global theory of phraseology, two main linguistic schools, i.e. cognitive semantics and corpus linguistics, provide a theoretical framework for research done on phraseology across languages. Therefore, contrastive studies on phraseology deserve a lot of attention focused on terminology and methodology as well as their implementation in the new research areas.

2. CONTRASTIVE STUDIES ON ENGLISH-POLISH PHRASEOLOGY: TERMINOLOGY AND CLASSIFICATIONS

One of the first problems to be encountered in contrastive research on phraseology is connected with differences in terminology in the langu-

ages analyzed, for instance, English and Polish. Even if the scope of the analysis of terms used in research on phraseology is limited only to the Polish terms, the conclusion can be drawn that the majority of them are used in various meanings by particular linguists. Nowakowska (2005: 19) emphasizes that terminological inconsistency observed in phraseological studies is greater than in any other discipline of linguistics. Similar comments are made by English linguists, for instance, by Moon (1998: 2) who states that "terminology in this field has always been problematic. (...) There is no generally agreed common vocabulary. Different terms are sometimes used to describe identical or very similar kinds of units; at the same time, a single term may be used to denote very different phenomena."

As observed by Gläser (1998: 22), "in continental studies the term 'phraseological unit' ('phraseologism') is given preference as an umbrella term for phrases of various kinds, whereas its terminological counterpart in British and American studies is 'idiom'.[1] In fact, the Polish term *frazeologia* ('phraseology') has two basic meanings, i.e. 'a branch of linguistics dealing with the analysis and description of word combinations existent in a given language' and 'a collection of fixed word combinations existent in a given language or in a given set of texts' (Müldner--Nieckowski 2003: 15). According to *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego* (1999: 244), the term *związek frazeologiczny*, synonymous to *jednostka frazeologiczna* ('phraseological unit') or *frazeologizm* ('phraseologism'), is a combination of at least two words one of which is used in the meaning which is not typical of the constituent at issue, i.e. is different from its lexical meaning.

The Polish term *idiom* ('idiom') is treated as narrower than *związek frazeologiczny* ('phraseological unit), a superordinate term for multiword units (*Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego* 1999: 244), since it is defined as a unit composed of at least two words whose combined meaning differs from the meanings of its constituents (cf. Zakrzewski 2002).[2] In the

---

[1] In fact, it is reflected in lexicography, since most Polish monolingual lexicographic works are called "phraseological dictionaries" (*słowniki frazeologiczne*), while Anglo-American ones – dictionaries of idioms. Only one Polish dictionary, *Słownik idiomów polskich PWN* (2006) contains only idioms. The comparison of Polish and Anglo-American terminology used in the field of phraseology shows that the relation between the two basic – corresponding in terms of widespreadness – terms, *związek frazeologiczny* and *idiom*, are of complex nature.

[2] Therefore, the unit *drzeć koty* (lit. 'to tear cats'), meaning 'to quarrel', is given as

contemporary studies on Polish phraseology the term *frazem* ('phraseme') is used to name a variety of fossilized units, especially those which were hardly within the scope of traditionally understood phraseology, or even out of its scope (Chlebda 2003: 13).

As mentioned before, while the most frequently used Polish term is *związek frazeologiczny*, the most common English term is *idiom*. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language* (1996: 455) contains two definitions of the term in question, i.e. "(1) the speech proper to, or typical of, a people or place; a dialect or local language; the unique quality or 'genius' of a language: classics in the Tuscan idiom. (2) An expression unique to a language, especially one whose sense is not predictable from the meanings and arrangements of its elements, such as *kick the* bucket, a slang term meaning 'to die', which has obviously nothing to do with kicking or buckets".

In fact, in Anglo-American linguistics the term *idiom* is used as a general term for various kinds of multiword units, both semantically opaque and not (Moon 1998: 4ff). Some linguists apply this term also to non-compositional polymorphemic words, collocations and other constructions which are not freely formed (Makkai 1972) or even to single morphemes whose meanings are not be deducible (Hockett 1958: 171ff). The term *fixed expression* serves as an umbrella term to cover a number of kinds of holistic units of more than two words, such as: frozen collocations, grammatically ill-formed collocations, proverbs, routine formulae, sayings, similes (Moon 1998: 2).

Another umbrella term, in some cases used rather intuitively in research on phraseology, is *formulaic language*. Wray states that

> while most linguists accept that there is such a thing as formulaic language, consensus about what it is exactly is severely limited. Underpinning the notion of formulaic language is the sense that certain words have an especially strong relationship with each other in creating their meaning – usually because only that particular combination, and not synonyms, can be used (Wray 2008: 9).

---

an example of an idiom, while the polysemous unit *ślepy zaułek* (lit. 'blind backstreet') can be treated as an idiom or as a phraseological unit, dependent on which meaning is analyzed. The first one, 'a backstreet devoid of an exit, further part' is a phraseological unit, whereas the other one, 'a situation with no way out', is an idiom (*Encyklopedia językoznawtwa ogólnego* 1999: 244).

Wray (2008: 12) coins a new term, *morpheme equivalent unit*, defined as "a word or word string, whether incomplete or including gaps for inserted variable items, that is processed like a morpheme, that is, without recourse to any form-meaning matching of any sub-parts it may have".

Moreover, it should be noted that phraseological units are classified in many different ways. In Polish linguistics three classifications of multi-word units are of particular importance, i.e. the so-called traditional classification developed by Skorupka, the classification proposed by Lewicki and the one by Müldner-Nieckowski.

Skorupka's classification, presented in the introduction to *Słownik frazeologiczny języka polskiego* (1999: 6), is based on both formal and semantic criteria. The following kinds of units are distinguished: *wyrażenia* ('nominal expressions') – groups of words of nominal character, including binominals; *zwroty* ('verbal expressions') – groups of words in which the verb is the core unit; *frazy* ('phrases') – groups of words consisting of nominal and verbal constituents which form a sentence; proverbs, sayings, adages and mottoes also fall into this subgroup. As to the semantic criterion, the degree of fixedness is analyzed and the classification comprises the following kinds of units: *idiomy* ('idioms') – units whose meaning cannot be deduced from the meanings of particular constituents; *związki frazeologiczne łączliwe* ('collocable phraseological units') – units characterized by a high degree of habitual co-occurrence of constituents, but allowing for some lexical alternatives of one or more constituents within a rather restricted number of words, mostly synonyms; *związki frazeologiczne luźne* ('loose phraseological units') – units whose meaning is a sum of the meanings of particular constituents used in their usual meanings.

The classification developed by Lewicki (1983) is based on the syntactic function of the unit. His classification is composed of the following groups: *wyrażenia rzeczownikowe* ('nominal expressions') – units performing the function of nouns; *wyrażenia określające* ('descriptive expressions') – units performing the function of nouns, verb, adjective and adverb determiners; *zwroty* ('verbal expressions') – units performing the function of verbs; *frazy* ('phrases') – units performing the function of sentences; *wskaźniki frazeologiczne* ('phraseological markers') – units performing auxiliary functions, for instance, they perform the function of prepositions, conjunctions or particles. According to Lewicki, proverbs do not belong to phraseologisms and should be treated as ready-made texts (cf. Kowalikowa 2001), while open compounds are on the border

Zdigitalizowano i udostępniono w ramach projektu pn.
Rozbudowa otwartych zasobów naukowych Repozytorium Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku,
dofinansowanego z programu „Społeczna odpowiedzialność nauki" Ministra Edukacji i Nauki na podstawie umowy SONB/SP/512497/2021

of phraseology. The semantic division proposed by Lewicki covers two subgroups, i.e. *idiomy* ('idioms') and *frazemy* ('phrasemes').

The third of the classifications mentioned, by Müldner-Nieckowski (2003), is of functional character. The following kinds of units are distinguished: *frazeologizmy otwarte* ('open phraseological units') – autonomous groups of words produced according to a model consisting of fixed and open constituents, subordinate to grammatical rules, within the group there are three subtypes, i.e. *odtworzone* ('reproduced') – produced by a replacement of certain constituents of a model, *przekształcone* ('transformed') – created by a replacement of interchangeable constituents, *złożone* ('complex') – combining features of both reproduced and transformed units; *frazeologizmy zamknięte* ('closed phraseological units') – combinations of words with autonomous meaning which do not contain open constituents, consisting of at least two words, their structure is fixed, but in some cases constituents can be shifted or divided by other words, such units can be fixed constituents of open phraseological units; *frazeologizmy formalne* ('formal phraseological units') – short multiword expressions whose meanings are unchangeable, functioning as compounds, sentences or gerund clauses, are parts of the system of communication and do not allow for any free interpretation, e.g. in military service, medicine, etc. Moreover, Müldner-Nieckowski (2007: 94–95) draws attention to a group situated between phraseological units and syntactic groups, i.e. *zestawienia* ('set phrases'). He also states that some proverbs perform the function of phraseological units.

A functional classification was presented by Halliday (1973, 1985) who divided idioms into ideational or "the state and way of world" idioms, relational idioms and interpersonal idioms. Makkai (1972) distinguishes between two groups of phraseological units, i.e. idioms of encoding, semantic idioms, and idioms of decoding, not intelligible or ambiguous. Lexemic idioms of decoding are further divided into six groups, i.e.: phrasal verb idioms; tournure idioms; irreversible binominals; phrasal compound idioms; incorporating verb idioms; pseudo-idioms. Sememic idioms are ready-made sentence-like constructions, which express warnings, evaluations, requests, etc. They are subdivided into: "first base" idioms, highly culture-specific; idioms of institutionalized politeness; idioms of institutionalized detachment and indirectness; idioms of proposal encoded as questions; idioms of institutionalized greetings; proverbial idioms with a "moral"; familiar quotations as idioms; idioma-

Zdigitalizowano i udostępniono w ramach projektu pn.
Rozbudowa otwartych zasobów naukowych Repozytorium Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku,
dofinansowanego z programu „Społeczna odpowiedzialność nauki" Ministra Edukacji i Nauki na podstawie umowy SONB/SP/512497/2021

city as institutionalized understatement; idiomacity as institutionalized hyperbole. Makkai (1972: 134) mentions one more class of idioms, i.e. cultural idioms, short independent texts, "familiarity with which does not depend on being or not being a mature native speaker of the language, but rather on culture and education".

Gläser (in Fiedler 2007: 37) divides phraseological units into word-like phraseological units, i.e. nominations, and sentence-like phraseological units, i.e. propositions. Idioms and restricted collocations, between boundaries are fuzzy, fall into the group of nominations. Propositions are further divided into partial and complete ones. Partial propositions encompass the following: proverbial sayings; fragments of proverbs; allusions and fragments of quotations; irreversible binomials; stereotyped comparisons. Complete prepositions cover six types, i.e.: proverbs; quotations and winged words; commonplaces, e.g. *one never knows*, slogans; commandments and maxims; routine formulae.

Fernando (1996: 32) presents a classification of multiword expressions, in which two main groups are distinguished, i.e. idioms and habitual collocations. The group composed of idioms is further subdivided into the following categories: pure idioms (invariant, non-literal; restricted variance, non-literal), semi-literal idioms (invariant; restricted variance), literal idioms (invariant; restricted variance). The other one, habitual collocations, comprises the following kinds: units of restricted variance, semi-literal; units of restricted variance, literal; units of unrestricted variance, semi-literal; units of unrestricted variance, literal; units of restricted variance, literal, with optional elements.

As it can be seen from the above presentation, many definitions and classifications of fixed word combinations have been developed in Polish and Anglo-American traditions. As they are far from identical, using them for cross-linguistic research on phraseology requires a careful contrastive analysis, which renders it possible to work out terminology used for a given study.

3. PARAMETERS OF A CONTRASTIVE COMPARISON OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

Traditional approaches to contrastive research on idioms encompass three domains:

description and comparison of structural types of idioms (e.g. verbal idioms, idioms with noun-phrase-structure, idioms with sentence-structure); description of so-called *Sachengruppen* (thematic groups), i.e. idioms with constituents referring to aspects of the same semantic field (e.g. idioms with constituents denoting parts of body animals, colour, etc.); typology of cross-linguistic equivalents (Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen 2005: 59).

As Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen (2005: 67f) state, the analysis of parameters of phraseological unit comparison is very important for a few reasons. First, the results of such analyses improve the quality of bilingual dictionaries. The findings of the research at issue allow for determining false friends and quasi-equivalents, which is of importance for lexicography as well as foreign language teaching. Second, they are valuable from the point of view of theory, since they render it possible to explain the nature of phraseological unit. The parameters can be divided into three groups, i.e. parameters connected with semantic, syntactic and pragmatic characteristics of phraseological units.

As to semantics, in a contrastive perspective there are units which have the same or a very similar image, but their actual meanings differ. Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen distinguish between the following three types: idiomatic false friends, cross-linguistic near synonyms, asymmetrical polysemy. The units belonging to the first type, false friends, "turn out to be a more sophisticated problem than 'one-word false friends'" (Dobrovolskij and Piirainen 2007: 68), since the deceptive resemblance appears on the level of so-called inner form. The next group is composed of near synonyms, which convey the same or very similar images, but their actual meanings differ slightly (Szerszunowicz 2009a). Asymmetrical polysemy occurs when a phraseological unit has more than one meaning, while the corresponding equivalent has only one.

The next semantic issue to be analyzed is contrasts in the images of the units compared. Two units, a source language unit and a corresponding unit in the target language, may differ in the images conveyed. The idioms compared have identical actual meaning as well as similar syntactic and pragmatic features. However, as stressed by Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen (2007: 68), in certain contexts the image component plays a crucial role in the unit functioning; thus, the corresponding idiom is not a translation equivalent.

The analyses of the syntactic features of a given phraseological unit, also very important from the point of view of contrastive research, are

concerned with collocability, the syntactic models, in which the unit can be embedded, and the kinds of transformation it can undergo. In terms of pragmatics, differences occur in the following areas: stylistic properties of the phraseological units compared, the degree of their familiarity and/or textual frequency, the cultural components of their plane of content, and their illocutionary function.

4. FOCAL ISSUES OF RESEARCH DONE ON ENGLISH-POLISH PHRASEOLOGY

As to English-Polish contrastive research, relatively little attention has been paid so far to phraseology, since grammar and lexis have been the focal issues of analyses. However, it should be stressed that a number of phraseological issues have been discussed in a contrastive perspective. Most of studies done examined only selected groups of phraseological units; thus, they are not so much of comprehensive as of specific character. Yet, they are valuable contributions facilitating further contrastive research on phraseology, necessary for a systematic analysis of English and Polish units.

As mentioned before, the analyses tend to be focused on a selected group of units, so-called *thematic groups*. It is common to adopt the approach in the contrastive perspective, for instance, Ostaszewska (1967) analyzes body idioms in English and Polish and develops a typology of the units. More than two thousand phraseologisms are classified as belonging to the following groups: full equivalents (units of identical structure and meaning in both languages compared), units present in only on of the languages analyzed, units revealing certain common characteristics in English and Polish.

Moreover, core constituents of selected phraseological units are discussed in a contrastive perspective. For instance, Szpila (2003) analyzes connotations of insect names, which are constituents of English and Polish units, in a contrastive perspective. Attention is also paid to the connotations of proper names as the main components of phraseological units (Szerszunowicz 2009b) as well as their evaluative and emotional load (Szerszunowicz 2009c; 2009d).

Furthermore, phraseological units analyzed in contrastive research are also grouped according to their origins and widespreadness. Sikor-

ska (1979) conducts a contrastive analysis of biblical units of in English
and Polish, while Oleśkiewicz (2007) discusses biblical and mythological
phraseology in a broader perspective.[3] Studies on internationalisms tend
to be based on a multi-lingual corpus of phraseological units, in which
both English and Polish is included (Maćkiewicz 1988; Paszenda 2000;
Szerszunowicz 2004a).[4]

Certain issues connected with the naïve picture of the world reflect-
ed in phraseological units are discussed, for instance, the depiction of
unhappiness in faunal phraseology (Paszenda 1998) or stupidity (Szer-
szunowicz 2007b). Moreover, papers are devoted to selected elements of
the naïve picture of the world, which include the analysis of lexis as well
as phraseological units. In the above framework linguo-cultural pictures
of some animals, e.g. the owl (Szerszunowicz 2003) and the fox (Szerszu-
nowicz 2004b), based on a multi-lingual corpus including English and
Polish, are discussed.

Phraseological units specific to a given language are also analy-
zed in a contrastive perspective, with a special focus on their potential
equivalents in the target language (Szerszunowicz 2009a). Another pro-
blem discussed is evaluation in culture-bound expressions and its trans-
lation aspect (Szerszunowicz 2009e; 2010a; 2010b). There are some formal
analyses, too. For instance, comparative phrasemes X as Y in Polish in
comparison with selected European languages, including English, are di-
scussed (Wysoczański 1998).

It is worth emphasizing that selected groups of phraseological units,
for instance, faunal phraseology (Szerszunowicz 2006) and phraseological
units with onymic constituents (Szerszunowicz 2008a), are analyzed with
a view to determining false friends.[5] Some observations regarding phra-
seological units of pragmatic character are presented, such as politeness

---

[3] In her book, she analyzes Polish, English German, French and Italian phraseological
units of biblical and mythological origins.

[4] The group given most attention is composed of widespread idioms, researched within
the framework of Piirainen's (2008a: 234ff) project *Widespread Idioms in Europe and Beyond*,
in which both Polish and English are included among more than 70 other languages. The
large-scale project aims at systematically investigating the similarities observed among
idioms in as many languages as possible.

[5] It is of great importance, since so far most attention has been paid to lexical false
friends. Thanks to the research on lexis done with a view to determining false friends
some dictionaries have been compiled (Szałek 2002; Rudolf 2003; Szpila 2003), but only
in one of them some phraseological units are included (Szpila 2003).

in English and Polish (Jakubowska 1999) as well as selected genres, for instance, small talk phraseology (Szerszunowicz 2007c).

The presentation of the selection of works discussing English-Polish phraseological issues shows that the majority of them are of contrastive character in the broad sense of the term, while not so many are strictly focused on the analysis of differences between English and Polish phraseologies. In fact, in many cases the contrastive analysis of selected English and Polish phraseological units is an element of research done on a more general problem. Therefore, there is a need for works, especially of comprehensive character,[6] devoted to the contrastive research on English-Polish phraseology, which involves setting the directions and analysing the needs.

5. RESEARCH ON ENGLISH-POLISH CONTRASTIVE PHRASEOLOGY: CURRENT DIRECTIONS AND NEEDS

Research on contrastive phraseology can be placed within various frameworks, one of which is cultural linguistics (Szerszunowicz 2009f). As Sabban (2008: 229) states, "it is generally agreed that multi-word units, or phrasemes, may be 'culturally marked' to a significant extent, more so that single word units". In the same vein, Piirainen (2008b: 207) observes that "it should be emphasized that in earlier stages of phraseology research, the interest in cultural phenomena varied (...). Most current studies on phraseology, however, regard culture as a fundamentally acknowledged constant in phraseology".

As declared by Kramsch (2000:3), "language expresses cultural reality (...), language embodies cultural reality (...), language symbolizes cultural reality". The reflection of the language-culture relation described by the statement is observed in the analyses of phraseological units, since they tend to be culture-bound or culture-specific. The two terms are used in contrastive studies; yet, they differ in meaning. According to Sabban (2007: 590ff.), the term *culture-bound* is preferable to the term *culture-specific*. The latter can be used in two meanings: specific to a culture or a group, with culture referring to the group itself; specific to the

---

[6] For instance, a book similar to the one by Sosiński (2009) on Polish and Spanish phraseology in a contrastive perspective.

culture of a culture. Moreover, the term *culture-specific* may imply that culture is to manifest itself somehow. The former term encompasses similarities observed in a contrastive analyses of phraseological units.

Cognitive Semantics provides theoretical grounds for contrastive research allowing analyses of cultural aspects of phraseology. The Conventional Figurative Language created by Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen (2005) is very helpful in such research. The linguists put forward two criteria for distinguishing between figurative and non-figurative units, i.e. image component and additional naming.[7] Piirainen (2008b: 210ff) discussed the typology of aspects underlying phraseological units, which is of great importance in contrastive analyses. Three types of cultural foundation of phraseology are distinguished, i.e. textual dependence, pre-scientific conceptions of the world and cultural symbols as well as aspects of material culture and culture-based social interaction.

In cultural linguistics, thus, in cultural phraseology, the notion of naïve picture of the world is of great importance for contrastive research, since

> the naïve picture of the world represents the material and spiritual experience of the linguistic community and is specific in two respects. Firstly, the naïve worldview of a certain segment of reality may be quite different from its purely logical, scientific picture, the latter being shared by experts speaking various languages. Secondly, the naïve picture of the world obtained by the analysis of various ethnic languages may differ from one another, whereas the scientific picture of the world is not-language dependent (Burkhanov 1998: 159).

It is worth emphasizing that the naïve picture of the world is reflected in a number of language phenomena, such as single-word conventional metaphors, idioms and proverbs. Various extralinguistic factors motivated phraseological units, which is of interest in a cross-linguistic perspective. Contrastive research done on the linguistic picture of the world is of complex character, and, as emphasized by Jadwiga Linde-Usiekniewicz (2003: 360ff), is not limited to etymological explanations.

---

7 As Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen explain, "by *image component* we understand a specific conceptual structure mediating between the lexical structure and the actual meaning of figurative meaning. Hence, the content plane of a figurative unit not only consists of a pure "meaning", i.e. actual sense denoting an entity in the world, but also includes traces of the literal meaning underlying the actual meaning" (2005: 14). The second criterion is called *additional naming*. The figurative units are not primary means for naming things, actions, and the like, but additional ones.

Another direction for contrastive research on English and Polish phraseological units is to analyze them in terms of their international, national and local character. It should be emphasized that many terminological and methodological problems are bound to appear, since many key terms are not of operational character. To discuss English and Polish units as internationalisms or Europeanisms one should analyze a number of languages, as it is done within the framework of Piirainen's project. In research on English and Polish units at issue special attention is to be paid to so-called quasi-equivalents (cf. Dobrovol'skij 2007: 802).

The adjective *national* serves as an umbrella term allowing for many interpretations (cf. Teliya, Bragina, Oparina, Sandomirskaya 2001; Furdal 2002). National phraseology can be treated as culture-specific, encompassing phraseological units expressing concepts specific to given culture. For instance, some Polish language units, such as *sprawa polska a słoń*, *Mrożek by tego nie wymyślił* and *polska gościnność*, are unique to the Polish language (Szerszunowicz 2010a), while units like *English bulldog, to wet the shamrock* or *Barbury's brigade* are limited to the English language.

In the case of studies on English-Polish phraseology one can focus on phraseological units of religious motivation, since the units reflecting Catholicism as the dominant religion in Poland constitute a big and important group (Pajdzińska 1997). Another interesting aspect of English-Polish contrastive research is the past mirrored in Polish phraseology, presented by Jędrzejko (2002), contrasted with the picture of the past conveyed by English idioms. Moreover, newly coined units are also of great interest, since they reflect changes occurring in both cultures, in their economies, etc. (cf. Czarnecka 2002). One more aspect which can be studied in a contrastive perspective is the eco-cultural meaning of some elements of the world, such as, for instance, animals and plants (Fernando 1996: 90–94).

Another important direction for contrastive analyses of English-Polish phraseology is pragmatics-oriented research. As every culture develops its own repertoire of genres and speech acts, differences are bound to occur in a cross-cultural perspective (cf. Wierzbicka 1999: 228ff). Therefore, it can be assumed that they will be observed in phraseological units typical of given acts. As Colson (2008: 197) states, "pragmatic set phrases such as routine formulae are much more frequent than idioms, both in written and spoken language. This is a fundamental issue to address in further research on phraseology across languages".

Another notion of great importance is that of cultural scripts developed by Wierzbicka and her colleagues. The theory renders it possible to describe cultural norms in various languages by means of words representing universal human concepts. The patterns and values of a given culture reflected in words, fixed word combinations and grammatical structures may differ greatly from culture to culture. Therefore, it is of interest of culture-oriented phraseologists to study them, for instance, analyzing idioms and proverbs (cf. Rozumko 2009).

Moreover, in research on contrastive phraseology it is worth drawing attention to phraseostylistics (Gläser 1998, 2001). Gläser (1998: 26) characterizes phraso-stylistics defining its objectives as follows: "subjects of stylistic analysis are the communicative effects of phraseological units, (...), in a text; occasional, individual modifications of idioms and phrases; the coining of new idioms in various communicative settings, etc.". For instance, one can analyze informal phraseology, slang phraseology, etc. (cf. Sandig 2007: 171–172). The phraseographic description of stylistic properties tends to be neglected and "the basic reason for the absence of the stylistic changes of PUs in dictionary entries are the theoretical premise and lack of awareness of semantic and stylistic differences of PUs in various contexts" (Naciscione 2001: 9).

Corpus Linguistics renders it possible to analyze English and Polish languages from a different perspective (cf. *Korpusy w angielsko-polskim językoznawstwie kontrastywnym: teoria i praktyka* 2006). In fact, there are many ways of exploring the corpora in cross-linguistic research on phraseology. Corpora provide a rich and varied language material, enabling researchers to study both written and spoken varieties of languages (cf. Inoue 2007). Thanks to very large corpora available, a number of parameters characterizing given units can be researched, for instance, their frequency. One of the questions to be answered is whether set phrases are used in the same proportion in the languages compared. For instance, it remains to be answered whether English and Polish use the nominal idioms and verbal idioms in the same proportion. As a result, one can identify phraseological profiles of the two languages, which is of great importance to translators (cf. Colson 2008: 198).

A very important research topic within the framework of Corpus Linguistics is the analysis of the actual use of phraseological units and its various interactions with lexis. Such studies allow for solving many theoretical problems. Moreover, by using corpora one can analyze the

Zdigitalizowano i udostępniono w ramach projektu pn.
Rozbudowa otwartych zasobów naukowych Repozytorium Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku,
dofinansowanego z programu „Społeczna odpowiedzialność nauki" Ministra Edukacji i Nauki na podstawie umowy SONB/SP/512497/2021

co-occurrence of phraseological units and introducers, such as *przysło-wiowy* in Polish or *proverbial* in English (cf. Čermák 2002). Furthermore, analyzing large corpora allows for identifying new phraseological items functioning in Polish and comparing them with English equivalents.

Another area which needs to be given more attention in future is collocations, which, in fact, have not been given so much attention in Polish phraseological research so far. English collocations have been the object of analysis for a long time, and the difference between English and Polish studies is reflected in lexicography: the first Polish collocations dictionary proper, *Słownik dobrego stylu, czyli wyrazy, które się lubią*, was published as late as in 2006, while there are many dictionaries of English collocations (Douglas Kozłowska 1991; Douglas Kozłowska, Dzierżanow-ska 1993; Benson, Benson, Ilson 1998; *Oxford Collocations Dictionary* 2002).[8]

Furthermore, one of the focal subjects of contrastive Polish-English phraseological studies is translation. One of the key issues of translation-oriented analyses is cross-linguistic equivalence of phraseological units. The following kinds of translation equivalents tend to be distinguish-ed: full equivalence vs. quasi-equivalence (Szerszunowicz 2009a), par-tial equivalence vs. parallel structures, zero equivalence (Korhonen 2007: 575–584), as well as single-word equivalents (Szerszunowicz 2008b). Spe-cial attention should be paid to false friends, also called pseudo-equiva-lents (Gläser 2000; Szerszunowicz 2006, 2008b: 188). Moreover, research studies should be devoted to equivalence of phraseological units in lite-rature and films (cf. Widawski 2000). The research direction at issue is of great importance for translation studies.

So is also analyzing Polish phraseology with a view of determin-ing phraseological borrowings from English. The influence of English on other languages, including Polish, is observed mostly in lexis (cf. *Słownik zapożyczeń angielskich w polszczyźnie* 2010), but loan phrases are also found (Rozumko 2007). Therefore, the research area should be treated as an important one, especially taking into consideration the new domains of phraseology, such as mass media, technology, etc.

Phraseological units have to be analyzed contrastively from the view-point of foreign language teaching, too. In general, theoretical studies

---

[8] As to bilingual dictionaries, there is no Polish-English dictionary of collocations and only one English-Polish lexicographic work containing collocations, i.e. a dictionary of business collocations (Osuchowska 2001).

on phraseology have implications for language teaching, for instance, Nattinger and DeCarrico's (2001) work, shedding light on prefabricated multiword expressions in the academic discourse. Another key issue is developing phraseological competence in foreign language learners (Nosowicz, Szerszunowicz 2006; Szerszunowicz 2007d) as well as improving their awareness of language-culture relation reflected in phraseology (Szerszunowicz 2005, 2008c).

Furthermore, research on phraseology can also be directed towards the development of bilingual phraseography. The above mentioned studies on equivalence are of great importance for bilingual dictionaries to be compiled. It should be stressed that while many English-Polish dictionaries of idioms are available (Borkowski 1991; Domański 1991; Gajda 1991; Simbierowicz 2000; Wyżyński 2000; Gulland 2002), Polish-English phraseological dictionaries are relatively rare (Jaworska 2002), and some of them are limited to particular units only, for instance, those having quasi-equivalents (Kakietek 1993; Wolfram-Romanowska, Kaszubski, Parker 1999). The inclusion of cultural components is also a phraseographic issue to be tackled (Rodger 2006: 567–573).

6. CONCLUSIONS

First of all, it should be emphasized that the vast majority of studies on phraseology and related issues is focused on research in which the source language is English, not Polish. It means that the English corpus of units is analyzed with a view to determining their Polish equivalents, which can be either of phraseological or non-phraseological character. In the case of some research studies done two corpora of units are compiled, which ensures an in-depth analysis. Furthermore, the tendency to focus on English is also reflected in phraseography.

Current research trends need to be reflected in studies on phraseology, which will render it possible to provide a multiaspectual analysis of English and Polish phraseologies in a contrastive perspective. It should be stressed that such analyses are both of theoretical and practical use. As to the first one, the studies at issue enable researchers to develop the theory, or more precisely speaking theories, of phraseology, whereas in terms of the second the findings can be applied in foreign language teaching, translation studies and bilingual phraseography.

To sum up, it can be concluded that there is a need for a comprehensive work on English-Polish phraseology clarifying terminological problems, covering main issues connected with differences observed as well as suggesting a model of contrastive analysis, specifying parameters of comparison of phraseological units and developing a typology of cross-linguistic equivalents.

REFERENCES

DICTIONARIES

Bańko, Mirosław. 2006. *Słownik dobrego stylu, czyli wyrazy, które się lubią*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Benson, Morton, Evelyn Benson and Robert Ilson. 1998. *The BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Omnibus. [Original edition published by John Benjamins Publishing Company (1997)].

Borkowski, Piotr. 1991. *Angielsko-polski słownik idiomów i zwrotów. An English-Polish Dictionary of Idioms and Phrases*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Douglas Kozłowska, Christine. 1991. *English Adverbial Collocations*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Douglas Kozłowska, Christine. 1993. *Selected English Collocations*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Domański, Piotr. 1999. *Nowy słownik idiomów angielsko-polski*. Warszawa: ABC Future.

Drabik, Lidia, Elżbieta Sobol and Anna Stankiewicz (eds.). 2006. *Słownik idiomów polskich PWN*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Gajda, Roman. 1991. *Wybór idiomów angielskich*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.

Jaworska, Teresa. 2002. *Słownik frazeologiczny angielsko-polski i polsko-angielski*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.

Kakietek, Piotr. 1993. *Polsko-angielski słownik frazeologiczny. Polish-English Phraseological Dictionary*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo ENERGEIA.

Müldner-Nieckowski, Piotr. 2003. *Wielki słownik frazeologiczny języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Świat Książki.

Osuchowska, Dorota. 2001. *English at Work. An English-Polish Dictionary of Selected Collocations*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English. 2002. M. Deuter et al. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rudolf, Krzysztof. F. 2003. *Słownik angielsko-polski polsko-angielski wyrazów zdradliwych*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Simbierowicz, Lidia. 2000. *Nowy angielsko-polski słownik idiomów i zwrotów.* Warszawa: Harald G Dictionaries.

Skorupka, Stanisław. 1999. *Słownik frazeologiczny języka polskiego* (5th edition). Vol. 1–2. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.

Słownik zapożyczeń angielskich w polszczyźnie. 2010. E. Mańczak-Wohlfeld (ed.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Szałek, Marek. 2002. *Mały słownik angielsko-polskich homonimów. A Small Dictionary of English-Polish Homonyms.* Poznań: WAGROS.

Szpila, Grzegorz. 2003. *An English-Polish Dictionary of False Friends. Angielsko-polski słownik fałszywych przyjaciół.* Kraków: EGIS.

Wolfram-Romanowska, Danuta, Przemysław Kaszubski and Martin Parker. 1999. *Idiomy polsko-angielskie. Polish-English Idioms.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Wyżyński, Tomasz. 2000. *Podręczny słownik idiomów angielskich. The Compact Dictionary of Idiomatic English.* Warszawa: Świat Książki.

LITERATURE

Burkhanov, Igor. 1998. *Lexicography. A Dictionary of Basic Terms.* Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.

Chlebda, Wojciech. 2003. *Elementy frazematyki. Wprowadzenie do frazeologii nadawcy.* Łask: Wydawnictwo LEKSEM.

Colson, Jean-Pierre. 2008. "Cross-linguistic phraseological studies. An Overview", in: S. Granger and F. Meunier (eds.). 2008. *Phraseology. An interdisciplinary perspective.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 191–206.

Čermák, František. 2001. "Substance of idioms: perennial problems, lack of data or theory?". *International Journal of Lexicography* 14 (1), 1–20.

Čermák, František. 2002. "Text introducers of proverbs and other idioms", in: C. Földes and J. Wirrer (eds.). 2002. *Phraseologismen als Gegenstand sprach- and kulturwissenschaftlicher Forschung.* Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag, 27–46.

Czarnecka, Katarzyna. 2002. "Odbicie zjawisk gospodarczych we frazeologii III Rzeczypospolitej (1989–2000)". *Poradnik Językowy* 4, 32–41.

Dobrovol'skij, Dimitrij. 2007. "Kognitive und psycholinguistische Aspekte der Phraseologie/Cognitive and psycholinguistic aspects of phraseology", in: H. Burger, D. Dobrovol'skij, P. Kühn and N. R. Norrick (eds.). 2007. *Phraseologie.Phraseology. Ein internationals Handbuch zeitgenössischerForschung. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research.* Vol. 2. Berlin–New York: de Gruyter, 789–818.

Dobrovol'skij, Dimitrij, Piirainen, Elisabeth. 2005. *Figurative Language: Cross-cultural and Cross-linguistic Perspectives.* Amsterdam–New York: Elsevier.

Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego (2nd edition). 1999. K. Polański (ed.). Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Ossolineum.

Fernando, Chitra. 1996. *Idioms and Idiomacity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fiedler, Sabine. 2007. *English Phraseology*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Furdal, Antoni. 2002. "Symbolika narodowa w języka polskiego", in: W. Gruszczyński (ed.). 2002. *Język narzędziem myślenia i działania*. Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy ELIPSA, 113–118.

Gläser, Rosemarie. 1998. "A plea for phraseo-stylistics", in: P. Kakietek (ed.). 1998. *Topics in Phraseology*. Vol. 1. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 22–32.

Gläser, Rosemarie. 2000. "Phraseologismen als falsche Freunde", in: M. Dakowska (ed.). 2000. *English in the Modern World. Festschrift for Hartmut Breitkreuz on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*. Frankfurt a/M.: Lang, 213–226.

Gläser, Rosemarie. 2001. "The stylistic potential of phraseological units in the light of genre analysis", in: A. P. Cowie (ed.). 2001. *Phraseology. Theory, Analysis, and Application*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 125–143.

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1973. *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, Michael A. K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hockett, Charles F. 1958. *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.

Inoue, Ai. 2007. *Present-Day Spoken English: A Phraseological Approach*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Jakubowska, Ewa. 1999. *Cross-Cultural Dimensions of Politeness in the Case of Polish and English*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Jędrzejko, Ewa. 2002. "Obrazki z dziejów Polski – czyli jeszcze o historyczno--kulturowym aspekcie frazeologii i paremiologii", in: A.M. Lewicki (ed.). 2002. *Problemy frazeologii europejskiej*. Vol. 5. Lublin: Norbertinum, 61–78.

Korhonen, Jarmo. 2007. "Phraseme im Sprachgebrauch und in der Übersetzung/Contrastive phraseology and translation", in: H. Burger, D. Dobrovoľskij, P. Kühn and N. R. Norrick (eds.). 2007. *Phraseologie. Phraseology. Ein internationals Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*. Vol. 1. Berlin–New York: de Gruyter, 574–589.

Korpusy w angielsko-polskim językoznawstwie kontrastywnym: teoria i praktyka. 2006. A. Duszak, E. Gajek and U. Okulska (eds.). Kraków: Universitas.

Kowalikowa, Jadwiga. 2001. "Przysłowia jako komunikaty", in: G. Habrajska (ed.). 2001. *Język w komunikacji*. Vol. 2. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Humanistyczno-Ekonomicznej w Łodzi, 112–117.

Kramsch, Claire. 2000. *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lewicki, Andrzej M. 1983. "Składnia związków frazeologicznych". *Biuletyn PTJ* XL, 75–83.

Linde-Usiekniewicz, Jadwiga. 2003. "Uwagi o pewnych niebezpieczeństwach związanych z kontrastywnym badaniem językowego obrazu świata", in: R. Grzegorczykowa and K. Waszakowa (eds.). 2003. *Studia z semantyki porównawczej. Nazwy barw, nazwy wymiarów, predykaty mentalne*. Vol. 2. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 357–370.

Maćkiewicz, Jolanta. 1988. "Internacjonalizmy frazeologiczne a językowy obraz świata (na przykładzie frazeologizmów morskich)". *Poradnik Językowy* 7, 488–496.

Makkai, Adam. 1972. *Idiom Structure in English*. The Hague: Mouton.

Moon, Rosamund. 1998. *Fixed Expressions and Idioms in English. A Corpus-Based Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Müldner-Nieckowski, Piotr. 2007. *Frazeologia poszerzona. Studium leksykograficzne*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza Volumen.

Naciscione, Anita. 2001. *Phraseological Units in Discourse: Towards Applied Linguistics*. Riga: Latvian Academy of Culture.

Nattinger, James. R. and Jeanette S. de Carrico. 2001. *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching*. (3rd edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nosowicz Jan. F. and Joanna Szerszunowicz. 2006. "Collocations and idioms in teaching Languages for Specific Purposes", in: J. F. Nosowicz and M. Pieklarz (eds.). 2006. *Edukacja dla przyszłości*. Vol. 3. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Finansów i Zarządzania, 69–76.

Nowakowska, Alicja. 2005. *Świat roślin w polskiej frazeologii*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Oleśkiewicz, Aleksandra. 2007. *Europa języków. Związki frazeologiczne o proweniencji biblijnej i antycznej w europejskiej wspólnocie słownikowej*. Kraków: Collegium Columbinum.

Ostaszewska, Maria. 1967. "Z zagadnień frazeologii porównawczej". *Poradnik Językowy* 6, 267–279.

Pajdzińska, Anna. 1997. "Odbicie katolicyzmu w polskiej frazeologii", in: A.M. Lewicki and W. Chlebda (eds.). 1997. *Problemy frazeologii europejskiej*. Vol. 2. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo ENERGEIA, 129–135.

Paszenda, Joanna. 1998. "The dog, pig and other animals in phraseological units depicting human unhappiness in English, Polish and German, in view of the anthropocentric character of the language", in: P. Kakietek (ed.). 1998. *Topics in Phraseology*. Vol. 1. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 91–119.

Paszenda, Joanna. 2000. "Kryteria wyróżniania internacjonalizmów frazeologicznych. Zarys problematyki", in: A. Kątny and K. Hejwowski (eds.). 2000. *Problemy frazeologii i leksykografii*. Olecko: Wszechnica Mazurska, 109–125.

Pawley, Andrew. 2007. "Developments in the study of formulaic language since 1970: A personal view", in: P. Skandera (ed.). 2007. *Phraseology and Culture in English*. Berlin–New York: de Gruyter, 3–45.

Piirainen, Elisabeth. 2008. "Figurative phraseology and culture", in: S. Granger and F. Meunnier (eds.). 2008. *Phraseology. An interdisciplinary perspective.* Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 207–228.

Piirainen, Elisabeth. 2008. "Phraseology in a European framework. A cross-linguistic and cross-cultural research project on widespread idioms", in: S. Granger and F. Meunnier (eds.). 2008. *Phraseology. An interdisciplinary perspective.* Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 243–258.

Rodger, Liam. 2006. "Beyond butterscotch. The place of cultural knowledge in the bilingual dictionary", in: E. Corino, C. Marello and C. Onesti (eds.). 2006. *Proceedings XII EURALEX International Congress. Atti del XII Congresso Internazionale di Lessicografia, Torino 6–9 settembre 2006.* Vol. 1. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 567–573.

Rozumko, Agata. 2007. "Skrzydlate słowa, 'twory skrzydlatopodobne' czy przysłowia". *Poradnik Językowy* 10, 34–45.

Rozumko, Agata, 2009. "Cultural scripts in English and Polish proverbs: tradition and innovation". *Białostockie Archiwum Językowe* 9, 253–268.

Sabban, Anette. 2007. "Culture-boundness and problems of cross-cultural phraseology", in: H. Burger, D. Dobrovol'skij, P. Kühn and N. R. Norrick (eds.). 2007. *Phraseologie. Ein internationals Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research.* Vol. 1. Berlin–New York: de Gruyter, 590–605.

Sabban, Anette. 2008. "Critical observations on the culture-boundness of phraseology", in: S. Granger and F. Meunnier (eds.). 2008. *Phraseology. An interdisciplinary perspective.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 229–241.

Sandig, Barbara. 2007. "Stilistische Fuktionen von Phrasemen", in: H. Burger, D. Dobrovol'skij, P. Kühn and N.R. Norrick (eds.). 2007. *Phraseologie. Phraseology. Ein internationals Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research.* Vol. 1. Berlin–New York: de Gruyter, 158–175.

Sikorska, Elżbieta. 1974. "Polska i angielska frazeologia pochodzenia biblijnego". *Prace Filologiczne.* Vol. 24, 67–83.

Sosiński, Marcin. 2009. *Fraseología comparada del polaco y del español.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2003. "Językowo-kulturowy obraz sowy w ujęciu komparatywnym". *Białostockie Archiwum Językowe* 3, 215–225.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2004a. "Paralelizmy frazeologiczne w analizie komparatywnej". *Białostockie Archiwum Językowe* 4, 207–220.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2004b. "Językowo-kulturowy obraz lisa w ujęciu komparatywnym", in: J. Kida (ed.). 2004. *Język, kultura, nauczanie i wychowanie.* Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, 239–245.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2005. *Kulturowy aspekt glottodydaktyki frazeologii – europeizm, narodowość, koloryt lokalny*, in: K. Karpińska-Szaj (ed.). 2005. *Nauka języków obcych w dobie integracji kulturowej.* Łask: Oficyna Wydawnicza LEKSEM, 91–101.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2006. "Pseudo-equivalents in English, Italian and Polish faunal phraseology", in: E. Corino, C. Marello and C. Onesti (eds.). *Proceedings XII EURALEX International Congress. Atti del XII Congresso Internazionale di Lessicografia, Torino 6–9 settembre 2006.* Vol. 2. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1055–1060.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2007a. "Idioms as a reflection of ethnic and cultural identity", in: R. Apanavičius (ed.). 2007. *Humanities in New Europe 2. Science and Society.* Kaunas: Vytautas Magnus University, 439–447.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2007b. "Frazeoinwektywy fauniczne nazywające głupotę w ujęciu konfrontatywnym (na materiale współczesnego języka polskiego w porównaniu z włoskim i angielskim)", in: Ž. Fink Arsovski (ed.). 2007. *Slavenska frazeologija i pragmatika.* Zagreb: KNIJGRA, 203–208.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2007c. "A comparative analysis of small talk in English and Polish", in: L. N. Berlin (ed.). 2007. *Theoretical Approaches to Dialogue Analysis. Selected Papers from the IADA Chicago 2004 Conference*, Beiträge zur Dialogforschung. Band 33. Tübingen: Niemeyer Verlag, 39–48.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2007d. "Phraseological competence as a component of the language user's autonomy", in: J. F. Nosowicz and M. Pieklarz (eds.). 2007. *Edukacja dla przyszłości.* Vol. 6. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Finansów i Zarządzania, 89–96.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2008a. "On pseudo-equivalents in English, Italian and Polish onymic phraseology", in: Ā. Ptičkina (ed.). 2008. *Valodu apguve: problemas un perspektiva.* Vol. VI. Zinatnisko rakstu krajums. Liepaja: LiePA, 26–35.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2008b. "Jednowyrazowe ekwiwalenty obcojęzycznych związków frazeologicznych (na materiale wybranych języków europejskich)". *Białostockie Archiwum Językowe* 8, 175–192.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2008c. "Decoding phraseological units as a socio-linguistic problem (on the example of onomastic idioms)", in: D. Susnienė (ed.). 2008. *Nation and Language: Modern Aspects of Socio-Linguistic Development.* Kaunas: Technologija, 118–121.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2009a. "Quasi-ekwiwalenty związków frazeologicznych w teorii, frazeografii i translatoryce". *Białostockie Archiwum Językowe* 9, 323–346.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2009b. "Konotacje nazw własnych i ich frazeotwórczy potencjał w ujęciu konfrontatywnym". *Prace Językoznawcze* XI, 191–208.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2009c. "Some remarks on the evaluative connotations of toponymic idioms in a contrastive perspective", in: R. Corrigan, E. A. Moravcsik, H. Ouali and K. M. Wheatley (eds.). 2009. *Formulaic Language.* Vol. 1. *Distribution and historical change,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 171–183.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2009d. "Kolokwialne emocjonalizmy frazeologiczne z komponentem onomastycznym w ujęciu konfrontatywnym (na materiale frazeologizmów polskich, angielskich i włoskich)", in: K. Wojtczuk and V. Machnicka (eds.). 2009. *Rejestr emocjonalny języka.* Siedlce: Wydawnictwo Akademii Podlaskiej, 217–225.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2009e. "On the translation of culture-bound phraseological units", in: K. Yagi and T. Kanzaki (eds.). 2009. *Phraseology, Corpus Linguistics and Lexicography. Papers from Phraseology in Japan 2009.* Nishinomiya: Kwansei Gakuin University Press, 215–234.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2009f. "Linguo-cultural analyses of European phraseological units in a contrastive perspective", in: K. Yagi and T. Kanzaki (eds.). 2009. *Phraseology, Corpus Linguistics and Lexicography. Papers from Phraseology in Japan 2009.* Nishinomiya: Kwansei Gakuin University Press, 119–136.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2010a. "Evaluation in culture-bound proverbs and proverbial expressions as a translation problem", in: R. J. B. Soares and O. Lauhakangas (eds.). 2010. 3° Colóquio Interdisciplinar sobre Provérbios – ACTAS. 2nd Interdisciplinary Colloquium on Proverbs – PROCEEDINGS. Tavira: Tipografia Tavirense, 222–234.

Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2010b. "On cultural connotations of idioms expressing language users' collective memory in a comparative perspective. A case study: *gest Kozakiewicza*", in: J. Korhonen, W. Mieder, E. Piirainen and R. Piñel (eds.). 2010. *Phraseologie Global – Areal – Regional. Akten der Konferenz EUROPHRAS 2008 vom 13.–16.8. in Helsinki.* Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto Verlag, 317–324.

Szpila, Grzegorz. 2001. "Opis konotacyjny leksemów w analizie kontrastywnej frazeologizmów". *Poradnik Językowy* 3, 31–42.

Teliya, Veronika, Bragina, Natalia, Oparina, Elena and Irina Sandomirskaya. 2001. "Phraseology as a language of culture: Its role in the representation of a cultural mentality", in: A. P. Cowie (ed.). 2001. *Phraseology. Theory, Analysis, and Application.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 55–75.

The Oxford Companion to the English Language. 1996. T. McArthur (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widawski, Maciej. 2000. "*Ona prowadzi jak szalona*: kilka uwag o tym, jak nie należy tłumaczyć slangu", in: W. Kubiński, O. Kubińska and T. Z. Wolański (eds.). 2000. *Przekładając nieprzekładalne. Materiały z I Międzynarodowej Konferencji Translatorycznej Gdańsk–Elblag.* Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 543–596.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1999. "Akty i gatunki mowy w różnych kulturach", in: J. Bartmiński (ed.). 1999. *Język – umysł – kultura. A selection of works edited by J. Bartmiński*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 228–268.

Wray, Alison. 2008. *Formulaic Language: Pushing the Boundaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wysoczański, Włodzimierz. 1988. "Comparative phrasemes X as Y in Polish and some other European languages" in: P. Kakietek (ed.). 1988. *Topics in Phraseology*. Vol. 1. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 120–135.

Wysoczański, Włodzimierz. 2005. *Językowy obraz świata w porównaniach zleksykalizowanych na materiale wybranych języków*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Zakrzewski, Paweł. 2002. "W sprawie definicji idiomu". *Folia Linguistica* 42, 19–2.