

**Twenty-eighth session
New York, 28 April-2 May 2014**

Item 10 of the provisional agenda

Activities relating to the Working Group on Toponymic Terminology

**Detailed Terminographic Analysis of “Glossary of Terminology Used
in the Standardization of Geographical Names” ***

Submitted by Poland

* Prepared by Marek Łukasik (Department of English Studies, Pomeranian University in Słupsk, Poland; Corpus Linguistics Laboratory, Faculty of Applied Linguistics, University of Warsaw) and Maciej Zych (Commission on Standardization of Geographical Names Outside the Republic of Poland).

DETAILED TERMINOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF *GLOSSARY OF TERMINOLOGY USED
IN THE STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES*
(SUMMARY)

The Commission on Standardization of Geographical Names Outside the Republic of Poland is planning to publish a new edition of *Glossary of Terminology Used in the Standardization of Geographical Names* [Polish: *Słownik terminów używanych przy standaryzacji nazw geograficznych*] (the latest edition was released in 1998). Before commencing any work, the Commission decided to analyze the compositional correctness of the existing dictionary. To this end, an expert lexicographic opinion had been drafted. On account of the fact that the Polish version is in many places a faithful translation of the UNGEGN dictionary, whose main part, i.e. the English version, has not undergone considerable changes since the release of the Polish version, remarks included in the opinion and this paper may, to a great extent, be applicable to the English original. These comments may prove useful for the UNGEGN Working Group on Toponymic Terminology as guidelines before undertaking a revision of the *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names*.

The dictionary was the object of terminographic analysis on three structural levels, that is its macrostructure (analysis of the general concept of the dictionary, i.e. its type, size, intended users, main components (parts), entry arrangement); mediostructure (analysis of the organisation of inner-links between various parts of the dictionary, i.e. system of cross-references between various entries); microstructure (analysis of the elements comprising a dictionary entry, i.e. structure of entries, appropriateness of definitions, etc.).

The analysis has revealed faults in the dictionary construction at each level of its composition. These errors considerably limit the functionality of the work, with the main conclusion of the paper being that it should be thoroughly revised and corrected. The entry list should be extended so as to include terminology more closely connected with the standardization of geographical names, while a number of entries representing auxiliary fields (computer science and linguistics) could be omitted. From the technical point of view, the numbering of cross-reference entries should be abandoned, while the arrangement of multi-word terms, now used erratically, ought to be reconsidered (e.g. by changing their word order). Furthermore, reference structure needs revising, so as to remove double cross-referencing or inconsistent redirections to other entries from some definitions. On the microstructural level, addition of synonymous terms (included in the dictionary as headwords of cross-reference entries), implementation of terminological labels and reworking of definitions seem necessary. It is therefore proposed that a lexicographer be invited to the team of editors of a revised edition. This observation concerns the Polish version, but it equally refers to the UNGEGN English version, all the more so as a properly compiled English dictionary could render the construction of national versions considerably easier.

DETAILED TERMINOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF *GLOSSARY OF TERMINOLOGY USED
IN THE STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES*

1. Introduction

Terminology, as linguistic (macro)sign of a conceptual system, constitutes a fundamental means of gathering, processing and transfer of specialist knowledge. It is also an important factor in facilitating administrative procedures, including national and international standardization. The most compact carrier of terminology and, simultaneously, a tool for its dissemination is the terminological dictionary [Felber – Budin 1989: 7; Lukszyn – Zmarzer 2006: 43-44].

Having the above in mind, a group of UNGEGN experts at the 1st United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names in Geneva (1967) proposed compiling a universal list of terms used in the standardization of geographical names. The list was later arranged into a dictionary, which has been published in several editions to date. Released in 1998, its Polish version is a verified translation of a dictionary published by the UNGEGN in 1997³. The translation was made by professor Jerzy Kondracki, a Chairman of the Commission on Standardization of Geographical Names for many years. The 1998 Polish edition copies the organization of entries of the English original, while employing a solution that was later utilized in the UNGEGN dictionary from 2002 with regard to other language versions: the dictionary entries, including their numbering, are identical to those in the English version, and are supplemented with their Polish equivalents and definitions. On account of the high degree of uniformity maintained between the 1998 Polish and the 1997 English edition, the two dictionaries have the same number of entries. However, as the editors put it, the Polish edition is not an exact translation of the English original⁴, as the dictionary text had been supplemented with Polish examples, while some examples irrelevant to the Polish user had been omitted (e.g. those from non-Latin scripts, and from English and Spanish). Some definitions included in the English original were considered imprecise or too broad, and therefore had been modified or re-written on the basis of Polish sources. This, in particular, refers to the terminology of linguistics, whose definitions were vague and incompatible with those widely adopted in Poland.

¹ Assistant professor at the Department of English Studies, Pomeranian University in Slupsk, Poland; Member of Corpus Linguistics Laboratory, Faculty of Applied Linguistics, University of Warsaw, (m.lukasik@uw.edu.pl).

² Cartographer, Vice-chair of the Commission on Standardization of Geographical Names Outside the Republic of Poland.

³ *Glossary of toponymic terminology*. Version 4.0, 1 January 1997, 7th United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names, New York, 13-22 January 1998, E/CONF.91/L.13. In 1989 professor J. Kondracki published an alphabetic list of 114 entries, translated into Polish on the basis of the English version of the 1984 dictionary. The set was released in a collection titled *Problemy standaryzacji nazw geograficznych* [en: *Issues in the Standardization of Geographical Names*], “Przegląd Zagranicznej Literatury Geograficznej”, Volume 1, published by Instytut Geografii i Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania PAN [Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization of the Polish Academy of Sciences], pp. 111-132.

⁴ J. Kondracki, when referring to his translation strategies, referred to the words of D. Block, an author of the preliminary version of the dictionary. In the introduction to his work, Block noted that the definitions provided were meant to be merely a hint while discussing and explaining the meaning of notions related to standardization. As Block put it, the definitions were not to become binding rules, but rather guidelines leading to greater clarity and precision of expression [Kondracki, 1989: 112-113].

The *Glossary of Terminology Used in the Standardization of Geographical Names* [Polish: *Słownik terminów używanych przy standaryzacji nazw geograficznych*] has been used by the two Polish standardization commissions⁵, however practice has shown that the work has its advantages, but also disadvantages. The Commission on Standardization of Geographical Names is planning to publish a new edition of the *Glossary*. Before commencing work, however, the Commission had decided to analyze the lexicographic compatibility of the existing dictionary. To this end, an expert lexicographic opinion had been drafted, with the aim of providing instructions for the compilation of a new edition. On account of the fact that the 1998 Polish version is a translation of the UNGEGN dictionary (whose main part, i.e. the English version, has not undergone considerable changes since the release of the Polish edition⁶), remarks and comments included in the opinion and in this paper may, to a great extent, be applicable to the English original. Therefore, they may prove useful for the UNGEGN Working Group on Toponymic Terminology as guidelines before undertaking the revision of *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names*.

2. Methodology

The methodology employed for the lexicographic evaluation of the *Glossary* is based on the elements of terminographic analysis, which is a research procedure whose primary goal is to assess the state of terminography on a given publishing market. The goal is realised, *inter alia*, by investigating terminographic works (their parameters) against the background of theoretical assumptions, market requirements and needs of particular user groups [Łukasik 2007; 2010; 2012; 2013; 2014]. Terminographic analysis is part of specialised lexicography (or terminography), that is the theory and practice of specialised dictionary-making. It is also a practical realisation of a demand, having been put forward by theoreticians of lexicography for many years, that systematic research of existing dictionaries should be undertaken [Bergenholtz, Tarp 1995: 30; Hartmann 2001: 6-8, 27-30]. Today, terminography is a recognized field of theoretical study and area of practical work, whose results influence the methodology of dictionary-making, and thus facilitate professional communication in the fields where terminological dictionaries are used. Among the greatest Polish contributors in the field of terminography are: Sergiusz Czerni [1977], Franciszek Grucza [1991], Stanisław

⁵ i.e. the Commission on Standardization of Geographical Names Outside the Republic of Poland [Komisja Standaryzacji Nazw Geograficznych poza Granicami Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej] and the Commission on Names of Localities and Physiographic Objects [Komisja Nazw Miejscowości i Obiektów Fizjograficznych].

⁶ In 2002 the final version of the dictionary was presented at the 8th United Nations Conference on Standardization of Geographical Names, and is titled *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names*, edited by Naftali Kadmon, Convenor, Working Group on Toponymic Terminology; United Nations Publication, New York, 2002. The work consists of six parts, each of which is a different language version: English, French, Spanish, Russian, Chinese and Arabic. The English version and the numbering used therein have been considered primary, so the remaining language versions copy its arrangement of entries, where each entry comprises a headword in the form of an English term, followed by its equivalent and definition in a given language. The number of entries in the said edition is identical to that in the 1997 edition: it consists of 375 dictionary articles, where 233 are main entries, 65 are cross-reference entries redirecting from synonymous terms) and 77 are cross-reference entries redirecting from multi-word terms of different word-order. In comparison to the 1997 edition, the 2002 dictionary exhibits slight modifications of its definitions (mostly of stylistic nature, but also some factual ones). In 2007 a supplement to the dictionary was published (titled: *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names. Addendum*, United Nations Secretariat, 2007), in which 6 definitions have been changed, and 17 new entries have been added: 7 main dictionary articles (with definitions) and 10 cross-reference entries (5 from synonymous terms, and 5 from multi-word terms of different word order).

Gajda [1990; 1999], Łukasz Karpiński [2008], Kazimierz Leski [1978], Jurij Lukszyn [2006], Witold Nowicki [1986], Joanna Tomasiak-Beck [1977; 1995], and Wanda Zmarzer [2006].

There are two types of terminographic analysis: general and detailed. The task of general terminographic analysis is to determine the existence or lack of terminological dictionaries for particular fields or of specific types. The aim is to assess the state of terminography on a particular publishing market as well as discover general tendencies in the development of specialized dictionary-making. Detailed terminographic analysis studies particular parameters of individual terminographic works [Łukasik 2010; 2012]. Results of detailed terminographic analysis considered against the background of theoretical assumptions for particular dictionary types and, above all, user needs set in a concrete market reality enable to indicate strong and weak compositional elements of particular dictionaries (types of dictionaries) as well as to suggest optimal lexicographic solutions in the scope analyzed. In cases where no terminological dictionary exists (e.g. for terminology of a particular branch), results of terminographic analysis help establish the type and structure of the terminographic work that needs to be compiled for a particular user group [see e.g. Łukasik 2014]. In this way terminographic analysis fulfils one of the major aims of terminography, namely construction of ever better terminographic works [Łukasik 2007].

Detailed terminographic analysis of the *Glossary*, whose results are presented below, was carried out on three structural levels: macro-, medio-, and microstructure of the dictionary. Macrostructure is the general concept of a dictionary, delineating general lexicographic parameters, such as dictionary type, size, scope of terminology presented, intended users, major compositional elements, as well as the manner of entry list arrangement. **Mediostructure** is the system of interconnections between various dictionary elements on both formal (i.e. cross-references between entries) and conceptual level (internal (deep) semantic structure existing between terms/concepts). **Microstructure** of a dictionary comprises the elements making up an entry [see e.g. Bergenholtz, Tarp 1995: 15; Wiegand 2004].

3. Results of analysis

3.1. General terminographic analysis

*Glossary of Terminology Used in the Standardization of Geographical Names*⁷ was an object of general terminographic analysis in 2006, when the author analysed existing specialised dictionaries with English and Polish published in Poland. Results of the analysis were published in 2007 [Łukasik 2007: 119], with a conclusion being that the dictionary in question has been the only work of its kind published in Poland since 1945 to date. It has to be emphasized that the very fact of publishing a narrow-field terminological dictionary for a specific user group (field specialists) is in itself a highly positive development, since specific terminology can rarely be found in general technical/scientific dictionaries.

More specific remarks resulting from detailed terminographic analysis are presented below.

⁷ Edited by I. Krauze-Tomczyk and J. Ostrowski; translated by J. Kondracki; published by Główny Urząd Geodezji i Kartografii, Warszawa, 1998, 87 pp.; ISBN 83-7239-441-5. Online version available from the website of the Commission on the Standardization of Geographical Names Outside the Republic of Poland: http://ksng.gugik.gov.pl/pliki/publikacje/slownik_terminow.pdf (last accessed on: 15.12.2013).

3.2. Detailed terminographic analysis

3.2.1. Macrostructure analysis

The work analyzed is a bilingual, English-Polish terminological dictionary, consisting of an introduction (*From the Editor*, p. 5, and *Introduction*, p. 7), the main dictionary body (p. 11-82) and an index of Polish terms (p. 83).

The first macrostructural element to be investigated is the title. The title is an important element of lexicographic evaluation, as it enables to precisely determine the thematic scope of a dictionary, and hence assess its content. It is also a vital identification tag for potential users, also on account of the fact that library catalogue descriptions are often limited.

Considering the thematic scope of the *Glossary*, it has to be emphasized that it had been correctly narrowed by its title, in accordance with the intentions of the authors of the English original. Serious reservations arise, however, when one takes into account the terminological content of the dictionary, as determined by the entry list. This will be discussed below.

Taking the content into account and according to the generally accepted nomenclature used in terminography, the work analyzed is not a glossary (in the strict sense), but a terminological dictionary (this stems from the fact that it provides definitions/descriptions of headwords)⁸. Moreover, the inclusion of terminology in two languages (English headwords and Polish equivalents and definitions) requires that it should be termed a bilingual dictionary, a fact that had been omitted by Polish editors (this information is absent from the Polish title). This may lead to a false conviction that the user is dealing with a monolingual work. This potentially limits the usefulness of the dictionary, since, e.g. translators, misled by the title, may not refer to the work when looking up equivalents of terms belonging to such a narrow field as the standardization of geographical names. Therefore, we propose a change of the title in the future versions of the dictionary.

Another element of lexicographic evaluation is the introduction (preface, foreword, etc.), as it defines the vital macrostructural parameters of the dictionary: its size, potential users, scope of terminology presented, entry elements, etc. The authors frequently explain there the lexicographic and technical decisions they had taken. The *Glossary* largely includes this kind of information. The initial part, i.e. *From the Editor*, presents a brief history of the English version of the work, as well as a concise note on the Polish version. An interesting statement can be found there, namely that “[t]he Polish version of the glossary is a translation from English. It contains all entries present in the original” (emphasis ours – M.L., M.Z.). Similar wording is used in the *Introduction* (p. 7). It needs to be emphasized here that according to the rules of terminographic work, language versions of a dictionary are not translations of the original, but rather new dictionaries (language editions), based on the original, yet adapted to the needs of the target language users (determined, *inter alia*, by the requirements of professional communication). The contention seems to be confirmed by the scope of lexicographic tasks performed by the editors while compiling the Polish version of the *Glossary*. Moreover, the English version is a monolingual dictionary, with both headwords and definitions presented in English, while the Polish version is a bilingual (English-Polish) work, where headwords are in English, and equivalents and definitions are in Polish. Moreover, the latter also contains „An Index of Polish Terms” (p. 83) so as to increase its functionality. Other modifications introduced to the Polish version are listed in the

⁸ Editors of the Polish version seem to equal the two (so much different) notions. Consider the following excerpt from the *Introduction* (p. 7): “The work takes the form of a terminological dictionary (glossary)” (translation and emphasis ours – M.L., M.Z.). See also the term *glossary* (120) in the dictionary.

Introduction, and include: supplementing the definitions with examples from Polish, omission of examples insignificant to the Polish user, modifications or ‘complete re-writing’ of some definitions or addition of synonymous terms. Also a different title of the Polish work when set beside the title of the English (source) version seems to confirm the creative nature of the Polish work⁹.

In addition to the above-mentioned metalexigraphic information, the *Introduction* contains all necessary data required in this part of a dictionary, that is the statement of aim, the outline of macrostructure parameters (size, thematic scope), indication of source texts as well as a list of lexicographic symbols used in the dictionary.

The *Glossary* consists of 375 numbered entries. However, it has to be recognized that the actual number is in fact lower, mainly on account of the numbering of 130 cross-reference entries (redirecting the user to main entries). Cross-reference entries include multi-word terms with the word-order different from that applied for main entries, synonymous terms and an abbreviation. The Polish version of the dictionary provides a Polish equivalent of a headword of some cross-reference entries. This in particular concerns synonymous terms redirecting the user to main entries (where the headword is probably the preferred term).

An important parameter of macrostructure that undergoes evaluation is the thematic scope of the work, as outlined in an introduction and then reflected by the contents of the main body of a dictionary. In the *Introduction* the editors point out that the *Glossary* “encompasses terminology of geography (mainly referring to toponyms and localization of objects), linguistics and computer science” (p. 7, translation ours – M.L., M.Z.). It has to be acknowledged that the terminological content corresponds to the scope declared in the introduction, with the vast majority of entries being in fact toponomastic terms. However, it is worth reconsidering whether the inclusion of some linguistic or computer science terms is justifiable. The problem here concerns some basic terms, such as e.g. *letter* (160), *language* (145), *computer file* (see *file*, *computer* (098)), *computer program* (see *program*, *computer* (268)), which – in our opinion – occupy precious space in a work primarily devoted to different thematic scope. The conciseness of definitions in the *Glossary* additionally precipitates the risk of knowledge distortion. Misinterpretations may stem from simplification on account of the need of space saving (such is the case with the definition of the term *language* (145)¹⁰). Surprisingly, the number of computer science terms totals 32 (including cross-references), and includes some genuinely basic terms (particularly in today’s computerized world), and also some very specific ones, such as *vector mode* (364) or *raster mode* (272)¹¹. In a work primarily focussing on standardization, more space should be devoted to the field in question (e.g. by including terms pertaining to standardization work in committees), while terms from other fields should be limited in number, and if used, they ought to be defined from the perspective of the main field represented in the dictionary.

Entries in the *Glossary* are arranged alphabetically, although some inconsistency exists in case of multi-word terms (both in the English and Polish version), at least from the perspective of the user. The authors of the English version adopted a specific, non-natural word-order for multi-word terms, the rationale probably being that the first word in sequence will be the terminological root, which will be alphabetized (the solution had also been copied in the Polish edition). Multi-word terms of this kind appear in the dictionary twice: in their

⁹ As in the case of other dictionaries published in different countries as ‘language versions’, the title of the *Glossary* in Polish could be identical to that of the English version, with an addition of a subtitle *English-Polish* or *Polish edition/version*.

¹⁰ Admittedly, the definition in the English version of 2002 does contain a reservation reading „In the context of this glossary”, yet the definition is still far from optimal.

¹¹ The usefulness of such terms in the *Glossary* has to be reconsidered.

natural word-order as cross-reference entries¹², and in non-natural word-order as main entries. Such arrangement is advantageous if one wants to gather together terms with a shared terminological root¹³, and where cross-reference entries help users find the appropriate main entry. Unfortunately, some entries in the *Glossary* have been listed inconsistently. For example, the entries *alphabetic sequence* (014) and *alphabetic sequence rules* (015) are defined one after another (and close to their terminological root *alphabetic* (009)), whereas the entry *alphabetic script* (013) is a cross-reference, redirecting to the main entry *script, alphabetic* (284) (which in turn appears after its terminological (superordinate) root *script* (283)). This decision does not raise any doubts, although some lexicographers emphasize preponderance of nominalization in such multi-word terminological units. However, the entry *transliteration alphabet* (353) exhibits signs of inconsistency: even if it stands next to the term *transliteration* (352), it is only a cross-reference entry, redirecting the user to the main entry *alphabet, transliteration* (012), while *transliteration key* (354) is suitably presented next to *transliteration* (the same problem applies to the main entry *alphabet, transcription* (011)¹⁴). Another example of faulty arrangement of conceptually-related content, resulting from inconsistent use of word-order of multi-word units is seen in the entries *generic element* (110) and *specific element* (307), which are defined in the *Glossary* in distant places, yet are considered complementary terms (even by the editors themselves, see a note in the definition of *generic element*). Also unexpected is the treatment of the word *generic* as a terminological root for the entries *generic element* (110), *generic element, false* (111) and *generic term* (112)¹⁵.

3.2.2. Mediostructure analysis

Mediostructure evaluation concerned the system of cross-references between entries. Analysis of semantic links between terms had not been undertaken, primarily on account of a limited scope of the dictionary studied, but also taking into account technical limitations: in order to reconstruct the semantic network encoded in the terms included in a dictionary (and more precisely in their definitions), it would be necessary to compare its content with the whole terminological lexicon of the field, which was not feasible at this stage of analysis¹⁶. Therefore only organisation aspect had been examined. Remarks presented below equally apply to English and Polish version of the dictionary.

(i)

Our first observation concerns a highly arbitrary use of cross-references included in definitions. For example, the definition of the term *acronym* (001) reads: ‘Word formed from the initial letter or letters of each of the successive or major parts of a composite term [...]’ (emphasis ours – M.L., M.Z.). The definition cited does not contain any cross-reference, although the term *letter* (and *syllable*, as in the definition of the 1998 Polish version) has been defined in the dictionary (respectively as *letter* (160), *syllable* (325)), and in definitions of other terms cross-references to *letter* and *syllable* are in fact present (see entries: *alphabet* –

¹² However, not always. An instructive example is the term *name, alternative* (210), which is not listed in its natural word-order (i.e. *alternative name*), and merely becomes a cross-reference entry redirecting to *allonym* (005).

¹³ This may, however, result in a situation, in which the headword becomes to a certain extent unintelligible (cf. e.g. *standardization, international, geographical names* (313)), particularly for a less proficient speaker of English (for such a person reconstruction of the ‘original’ (or natural) word-order, along with appropriate prepositions and/or articles) may prove too difficult.

¹⁴ The editors might have reverted to the definitions, in which the *genus proximum* is in fact the term ‘alphabet’. Yet, the notions are more closely connected with ‘transliteration’/‘transcription’ than with ‘alphabet’.

¹⁵ *Generic* is not a term in the first place.

¹⁶ Especially as it would require the construction of a field-specific thesaurus, which could reflect the conceptual system as a whole. Only then could the conceptual evaluation of the *Glossary* be possible.

(008), *alphabetic sequence* (014), *diacritic* (064) as well as e.g. *logogram* (179), *syllabary* (320), and *vowel* (370)).

(ii) Cross-reference entries deserve particular attention.

a. As has been mentioned earlier, cross-reference entries comprise synonymous terms, multi-word terms with a word-order different from that adopted for main entries, and one abbreviation – GIS (GIS, (119)). The problem of multi-word terms has already been discussed, while the cross-reference entry *GIS* correctly redirects to the main entry *geographic information system* (118). What seems to be an issue is cross-references from synonymous terms. Such terms are used in the dictionary only once (as headwords of cross-reference entries) and are not repeated within the microstructures of main entries (to which they redirect). This leaves the user in doubt as to whether the term in the cross-reference entry is a synonym, non-preferred term or is in subordinate-superordinate relation to the main entry term¹⁷. Therefore, if applicable, each main entry should be supplemented with the synonymous term(s) used as headwords in cross-reference entries, and provided with a terminological label, indicating the terminological status of the latter unit, e.g. ‘non-preferred’ or ‘synonym’. One example of such an issue lies with the entry *full title* (104), redirecting to *long form* (183)¹⁸.

b. The faulty nature of in-definition cross-references within main entries is proven by the fact that some of them redirect users to cross-reference entries, rather than main entries. This is certainly the case with the definition of the term *data base, digital toponymic* (051), which contains a redirection to the cross-reference entry *digital data base* (068), which in turn sends the user to *data base, digital* (050). Such double cross-referencing are more frequent¹⁹, are unjustifiable, and hinder effective access to the dictionary content²⁰. Furthermore, in the case of the 2002 English version of the dictionary, the definition of the term *vowel* (370)

¹⁷ The abbreviation GIS is actually repeated within the entry *geographic information system* (118).

¹⁸ Other examples include the following entries: *name, alternative* (210), *variant name* (363), *name, variant* (231), redirecting to the entry *allonym* (005). It remains unknown whether the entries *script ideographic* (288, cross-reference entry) and *script, logographic* (289, main entry) are to any extent synonymous, have common scope, etc.

¹⁹ An extreme example of how such lexicographic error may hinder access to the content is a cross-reference included in the definition of the term *generic element* (110), redirecting to the entry *false generic element* (084), which in turn sends the user to *generic element, false* (111). An attentive reader will probably notice that entry *generic element, false* is printed directly below the entry *generic element*, and will not lose their precious time. However, if the entry were published on the following page or would not fit the computer screen (in the case of an electronic version), then the user is forced to page through the dictionary (this is certainly the case with the 2002 Chinese version of the *Glossary*, where the entry *generic element* (110) is printed on page 181, while *generic element, false* (111) on page 182). Another triad of this kind includes entries numbered 005/062/339/ redirecting to 334 and again to 094.

²⁰ Lack of consistency in the use of cross-references can be easily demonstrated, especially against the background of entries with correct redirections. The latter include, e.g. the entry *feature, man-made* (091), correctly redirecting to *feature, natural* (092). However, in the very same definition another cross-reference is incorrect, as it redirects to the entry *topographic feature* (334), which in turn sends us to *feature, topographic* (094), so an entry printed next to the first entry considered (cf. the numbering). Perhaps the intention of the authors of the English version was to preserve the natural word-order in the definition. This lexicographic error could have been avoided by providing cross-references in parentheses. Thus, the definition of, e.g. the entry *feature, physical* (093) could read: „Any topographic feature (→feature, topographic) that can be observed visually [...]”. The error is even more pronounced in the Polish version, where cross-references are already provided in parentheses (through English terms), and there was no need to preserve the natural word order of cross-referencing terms.

Such lack of consistency also exists in the 2007 update of the *Glossary* (titled: *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names. Addendum*), despite a very limited number of terms presented. There, the entry *authorized name* (A019) redirects to *name, authorized* (A211), while it in turn sends the user to *name, official* (223), while the entry *standard name* (A317), correctly redirects to *name, standardized* (228), and not to the entry *name, standard* (A227).

contains a cross-reference (indicated by the arrow sign → and bold font) to the entry *diphthong* (073), and also to the non-existent entry *triphthong* (the term *triphthong* is described within the definition of the term *diphthong*²¹).

3.2.3. Microstructure analysis

Assessment of the microstructure starts with the evaluation of its composition. The main entry in the Polish version of the *Glossary* consists of a headword, its Polish equivalent and definition in Polish. Additionally, some cross-reference entries provide Polish equivalents. Based on the remarks presented throughout this paper, we conclude that main entries in both language versions (i.e. Polish and English) should be expanded (to include, e.g. synonyms) and corrected in terms of cross-referencing. It is worth considering introducing labels and/or additional symbols in place of overt verbalization of metalexicographic content (as in the case of the entries *syllabic* (321, 322), where additional notes had been introduced to indicate part of speech: ‘*as a noun*’ (321) and ‘*as an adjective*’ (322), respectively).

Some main entries in the Polish version lack their Polish equivalent (i.e. entries *map script*, *multilingual* (190), *map script*, *multiscriptual* (191), and *trigraph* (355)). Despite being a serious omission in a bilingual dictionary, the fault may in fact be regarded as only a slight disadvantage, because the terms in question have concise definitions in Polish, which – in certain cases – could substitute equivalents.

We have noted punctuation and spelling mistakes in the Polish version of the *Glossary*. If misspellings concern headwords, there is a danger of the mistake being repeated in other parts of the work. Spelling mistakes that we were able to spot are as follows: in entry-terms (entries: 073²², 134, 240); (ii) in definitions (entry: 370).

The correctness of definitions is of utmost importance in a terminological dictionary. In fact, users should be able to substitute a term for a definition, without loss to the quality of the message. Unfortunately, some definitions seem to be faulty: too narrow, introducing insignificant information or revealing other faults, including technical ones.

In the case of the 1998 Polish version:

- The definition of the term *acronym* (001) provides an example of RADAR as an acronym. However, the full description of the acronym contains an error (Radio Detecting and Ranging; should be: Radio Detection and Ranging; emphasis ours – M.Ł., M.Z.).
- In the definition of *diphthong* (073) letters of Latin alphabet rather than IPA symbols are used.

In the case of the 2002 English version:

- The definition of *diphthong* (073) also contains the definition of the term *triphthong* (see above), which from the perspective of the equivalence between left and right side of a definition (i.e. the *definiendum* and *definiens*) is incorrect.

In both English and Polish versions:

- The definition of the term *mother tongue* (204), which reads “The first language acquired within one’s family” (emphasis ours – M.Ł., M.Z.) is too narrow and imprecise (because of the phrasing used).

²¹ There are no other cross-references to *triphthong* throughout the *Glossary*, cf. *syllable* (325).

²² The entry-term contains a spelling mistake: *diphtong <instead of diphthong> (copied with the mistake in definitions of the following entries 284, 325, 370).

- The definition of the term *noise, graphic* (240) seems to be less formal than other definitions, also because of the phrase used, namely «“snow” on a television screen», where “snow” is in fact white noise or interference.
- The definition of the term *endonym* (076) reads: “Name of a geographical feature in one of the languages occurring in that area where the feature is situated. *Examples*: Vārānasī (not Benares); Aachen (not Aix-la-Chapelle); Krung Thep (not Bangkok); al-Uqşur (not Luxor); Teverya (not Tiberias)”²³. It remains unclear how to use the examples cited, and more specifically the names in parentheses with the label ‘not’.

4. Conclusion

It follows from the considerations and conclusions presented throughout this paper that the *Glossary of Terminology Used in the Standardization of Geographical Names* and the UNGEGN English original need careful revision and thorough correction. Faults on all structural levels of the *Glossary* significantly limit its functionality. Firstly, change of the dictionary title, particularly in its non-English versions, should be considered. Taking into account the terminological content of the work, it is proposed that the list of terms should be broadened so as to include more terminology connected with standardization, while some other terms referring to auxiliary fields (computer science, linguistics) should be deleted. From the structural perspective, we suggest against using numbering of cross-reference entries and recommend re-organizing the arrangement of entries comprising multi-word terms, and using the adopted principle consistently. Moreover, cross-references need reviewing and correcting (in order to eliminate e.g. double redirections). The dictionary entry could be broadened to include synonymous terms (present in the dictionary as cross-references to preferred terms) as well as terminological labels (referring to the status of a terminological unit, e.g. preferred term, synonymous term, non-preferred term, etc.), while some incomplete definitions should be re-written. The whole dictionary text should be proof-read to eliminate typos.

We conclude that dictionary compilation should be supported by a lexicographer, who could ensure correctness of the dictionary composition and construction process. This does not only apply to the work on the planned new Polish edition of the *Glossary*, but even more so to the work on the revision of the English version (supervised by UNGEGN Working Group on Toponymic Terminology). An accurate source dictionary (the English version) would admittedly make the compilation of national versions (including the Polish one) significantly easier.

Bibliography:

- Bergenholtz, H., Tarp, S. [red.], 1995**, *Manual of Specialised Lexicography*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam-Philadelphia.
- Czerni, S., 1977**, *Słowniki specjalistyczne [Specialised dictionaries]*, Wydawnictwa Naukowo-Techniczne, Warszawa.
- Felber H., Budin G., 1989**, *Terminologie in Theorie und Praxis [Terminology in Theory and Practice]*, Gunter Naar Verlag, Tübingen.
- Gajda, S., 1990**, *Wprowadzenie do teorii terminu [Introduction to the Theory of Term]*, Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna, Opole.

²³ In the 2007 addendum the definition is modified, preserving, however, original examples, except for the last one (which was deleted).

- Gajda, S., 1999**, *Languages for special purposes in Poland in the 20th century and their investigation. A survey*, [in:] Hoffmann, L., Klaverkämper, H., Wiegand, E. [eds.], *Languages for Special Purposes. International Handbook of Special-Language and Terminology Research*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, pp. 1551-1558.
- Gruca, F., 1991**, *Teoretyczne podstawy terminologii [Theoretical Foundations of Terminology]*, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław.
- Hartmann, R.R.K., 2001**, *Teaching and Researching Lexicography*, Pearson Education Limited, Harlow.
- Kondracki, J., 1989**, *Problemy standaryzacji nazw geograficznych [Issues in the Standardization of Geographical Names]*, „Przegląd Zagranicznej Literatury Geograficznej”, Vol. 1, Instytut Geografii i Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania PAN, Warszawa, pp. 111-132.
- Leski, K., 1978**, *Zasady budowy tezaurysów [Principles of Thesauri Construction]*, OIN PAN, Warszawa.
- Lukszyn, J., Zmarzer, W., 2006**, *Teoretyczne podstawy terminologii [Theoretical Foundations of Terminology]*, Wydział Lingwistyki Stosowanej, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warszawa.
- Lukasik, M., 2007**, *Angielsko-polskie i polsko-angielskie słowniki specjalistyczne (1990-2006). Analiza terminograficzna [English-Polish and Polish-English Specialised Dictionaries (1990-2006). A Terminographic Analysis]*, Katedra Języków Specjalistycznych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa.
- Lukasik, M., 2010**, *Testy specjalistyczne a konstruowanie terminograficzne [Specialised Texts and Specialised Dictionary-Making]*, Wydział Lingwistyki Stosowanej, Warszawa. An unpublished doctoral thesis.
- Lukasik, M., 2013**, *Słownictwo specjalistyczne w Polsce po 1945 roku (wybrane aspekty analizy terminograficznej słowników terminologicznych angielsko-polskich i polsko-angielskich) [Specialised Dictionary-Making in Poland after 1945 (Selected Aspects of Terminographic Analysis of English-Polish and Polish-English Dictionaries)]*, [in:] Fordoński, K., Karpiński, Ł. [eds.], *W dialogu języków i kultur 3*, Lingwistyczna Szkoła Wyższa, Warszawa [in print].
- Lukasik, M., 2012**, *Terminological dictionary as a comprehensive cognitive and linguistic tool*, „Language in Different Contexts: Research papers”, Volume 5, 2012, s. 98-108.
- Lukasik, M., 2014**, *Na krawędzi wszechświata. Analiza terminograficzna słowników z terminologią astronomiczną [On the Edge of the Universe. Terminographic Analysis of dictionaries with astronomical terminology]*, [in:] Fordoński, K., Karpiński, Ł. [eds.], *W dialogu języków i kultur 4*, Lingwistyczna Szkoła Wyższa, Warszawa [in print].
- Nowicki, W., 1986**, *Podstawy terminologii [Foundations of Terminology]*, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Warszawa.
- Tomasik-Beck, J., Ścibor, E., 1995**, *Metodyka budowy tezaurysów [Methodology of Thesaurus Construction]*, Instytut Informacji Naukowej, Technicznej i Ekonomicznej, Warszawa.
- Wiegand H.E., 2004**, *Reflections on the Mediostructure in Special-Field Dictionaries. Also According to the Example of the Dictionary for Lexicography and Dictionary Research*, “Lexicos”, No. 14, pp. 195-221.

Dictionaries:

- Kadmon, N. [red.], 1997**, *Glossary of Toponymic Terminology – Version 4*, United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names, Working Group on Toponymic Terminology, New York.
- Kadmon, N. [red.], 2002**, *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names*, United Nations, New York.
- Kadmon, N., 2007**, *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names. Addendum (Document ST/ESA/STAT/SER.M/85/Add.1)*, United Nations, New York.
- Krauze-Tomczyk, I., Ostrowski, J. [red.], Kondracki, J. [transl.], 1998**, *Słownik terminów używanych przy standaryzacji nazw geograficznych [Glossary of Terminology Used in the Standardization of Geographical Names]*, Główny Urząd Geodezji i Kartografii, Warszawa.