

## INDONESIAN–POLISH CONTRASTIVE PHRASEOLOGY

Przemysław Wiatrowski  
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań  
przemek@amu.edu.pl

### ABSTRACT

*This paper contains a discussion of the state of research recently conducted in Poland on Indonesian phraseology and contrastive Indonesian–Polish phraseology. In addition, it presents selected problems that will be faced by a linguist comparing the phraseological systems of such genetically and (partly) typologically distant languages. Indonesian and Polish phraseological terminologies are presented and compared, along with some classifications of phraseological units.*

Keywords: Indonesian language, Polish language, contrastive phraseology

### INTRODUCTION

The aim of the paper is to present the state of research on Indonesian–Polish contrastive phraseology and to discuss selected problems (terminological and classification differences) which arise in this area. The need for and significance of systematic research in the field of contrastive phraseology (including Indonesian–Polish) do not need to be emphasized. The results of this research are extremely important, for example, for bi- and multilingual lexicography and language teaching (the Institute of Linguistics at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań offers the only two-level studies – undergraduate and postgraduate – in the Indonesian and Malay languages in this part of Europe).

### PREVIOUS POLISH RESEARCH ON INDONESIAN PHRASEOLOGY

Research on Indonesian phraseology has been conducted in Poland only for a short time. The first work concerned an inventory of Nusantara realities present in Indonesian phraseology (Wiatrowski 2015g). The object of observation was fixed expressions containing lexemes referring to facts specific to Indonesia – geographical (e.g. *gunung Merapi itu pun akan aktif selamanya*, lit. the Merapi volcano will always be active), natural (e.g. *musang berbulu ayam*, lit. civet with hen feathers), historical (e.g. *bagai Belanda minta tanah*, lit. a Dutchman asking for land), and cultural (e.g. *(se)mata wayang*, lit. (one) eye of wayang, *negara tirai batik*, lit. a country behind a batik curtain).

Other studies are of a contrastive nature (they present Indonesian phrases alongside Polish ones). They have considered, among other things, the cultural specificity of the Indonesian communication community, visible by way of comparison with the Polish language (Wiatrowski 2015a). The focus here was on Indonesian lexical combinations which express the same or similar content as Polish ones, but refer to other ideas; and on Indonesian phrases that contain components naming phenomena known to the Polish communication community, but having different connotations (in Indonesian, for example, attention is drawn to the connotations of the lexeme *tikus* ‘rat’).

In another work (Wiatrowski 2015b), an analysis was made of the usefulness of the concept of dictionary equivalence, described by Wojciech Chlebda (2011), who conceives this type of correspondence as the relation of equivalence between a unit of the source language and a unit of the target language. The Polish substitutes for Indonesian phrases were assigned to the four categories of equivalents proposed by Chlebda. These are: a) full (or adequate) equivalents – when the unit of the target language is equivalent to the unit of the output language in terms of meaning and image, moreover, in terms of pragmatics, style, and often also formal (grammatical) parameters, e.g. *pencakar awan* (lit. skyscraper) – *drapacz chmur* (lit. skyscraper) ‘a very tall office building’; b) functional equivalents – here the unit of the target language is equivalent to the source language unit primarily in terms of its meaning and its communicative (pragmatic) function; differences in the imagery of the assembled units and formal differences are allowed, e.g. *kamus berjalan* (lit. a walking dictionary) – *chodząca kronika* || *encyklopedia* (lit. a walking chronicle || encyclopaedia) ‘a comprehensively educated person who knows something better than others; erudite’; c) disturbed equivalents – the unit of the target language is equivalent to the unit of the output language only partially in terms of the semantic structure, which is usually associated with pragmatic differences between the two units, e.g. *meja hijau* (lit. a green table) ‘court’ – *zielony stół* (lit. a green table) ‘a table covered with green cloth; place of meetings; meeting’, also ‘a card table; a card game’; d) zero equivalent – in the target language there is no ready way of verbalizing the concept, judgment, intention, emotion and other components *tertium comparationis* to which the unit in the output language refers. In the last case, Polish equivalents of Indonesian structures may be either explications taking the form of individual words, e.g. *(se)mata wayang* (lit. (one) eye of wayang) – *jedynak* (only child), loose word expressions, e.g. *malam panjang* (lit. a long night) – *sobotnia noc* (lit. Saturday night), or

explanatory descriptions, e.g. *jam karet* (lit. rubber hours) – *kulturowy zwyczaj polegający na nieprzychodzeniu punktualnie na spotkania, przyjęcia itp.* (a cultural custom of not arriving punctually at meetings, parties, etc.).

Chlebda's proposal of dictionary equivalence provides the theoretical background for articles on the genesis of selected Polish and Indonesian (broadly defined) phraseological units (including proverbs) (Wiatrowski 2014, 2016). These studies investigated Polish and Indonesian word combinations which realize the same or similar semantic value (full, functional and disturbed equivalents). In the course of the research the sources of compared phrases were explained, along with the mechanisms by which they were formed. Polish equivalents (of varying degrees) were also assigned to selected groups of established Indonesian word combinations, i.e. those containing culturally relevant components (Wiatrowski 2015e) and onomastic components (Wiatrowski 2015f).

In two further papers, phraseological units were compared taking into account the images contained in them (Wiatrowski 2015c, 2015d). The comparison of the phraseological systems of the two languages led to the identification of expressions that are carriers of the same image (e.g. *pucat bagai mayat*, lit. pale like a corpse – *blady jak trup*, lit. pale like a corpse), similar images (e.g. *kutu buku*, lit. a book louse – *mól książkowy*, lit. a book moth) or different images (e.g. a group of Indonesian–Polish phrases referring to death). In the second work (Wiatrowski 2015d), apparent equivalents were also considered (e.g. *anak emas*, (lit. a golden child) 'favourite' – *złote dziecko* (lit. a golden child) 'someone very good, respectable, honest').

The final work provides insights into Indonesian and Polish phraseological units that are formally identical or similar (Wiatrowski 2018). At issue here is quantitative and qualitative identity or similarity. Phraseological units that are formally identical are compounds that correspond in terms of the number of components, their order in the structure of the compound and the meaning of the elements in non-phraseological use, e.g. *hukum rimba* (lit. law of the jungle) – *prawo dżungli* (lit. law of the jungle) 'the rule of lawlessness, violence, rule of the stronger'. Phraseologisms regarded as similar in form are characterized by certain quantitative and/or qualitative differences, lexical and grammatical, e.g. *seperti ikan dalam air* (lit. like a fish in water) – *czuć się jak ryba w wodzie* (lit. feel like a fish in water) 'be in an environment that is right for one, in one's element'.

## CONTRASTIVE STUDIES ON INDONESIAN–POLISH PHRASEOLOGY: TERMINOLOGY AND CLASSIFICATIONS

The study of phraseological systems of the Indonesian and Polish languages brings with it a number of theoretical and methodological problems. These concern mainly the use of different systems of terminology, the lack of common criteria for identifying phraseologisms, and different ways of classifying discontinuous units. Since in this short review it is impossible to describe all of these problems, we shall limit ourselves to drawing attention only to certain selected issues.

*Idiom* is the term used to designate the basic phraseological unit in Indonesian linguistics, as well as in Western European and American linguistics. Some researchers define it as a one-word or multi-word language unit whose semantic value cannot be derived from the meaning (lexical and grammatical) of its constituent elements (Chaer 2007: 204). This view on the non-additive semantic significance of the discussed constructions is shared by Indonesian phraseologists (Moeliono 1982: 143; Badudu 1992: 154; Keraf 2006: 96–97; Pateda 2010: 230–233; Subroto 2011: 142; Suyatno 2012: 45). However, views on the formal aspects of the idiom are different. Some regard polylexicity as a necessary condition. Authors of Indonesian grammars write, for example, that an idiom is a combination of two or more words, the meaning of which cannot be directly derived from the semantics of its individual components (Alwi et al. 2010: 151, 241). This is the approach found most often in the work of Indonesian researchers (e.g. Kridalaksana 2007: 107; Subroto 2011: 142; Suyatno 2012: 46).

A set of properties of idioms was presented, in an Indonesian context, by Muhammad Suyatno (2012: 45–46). He refers to the multi-word nature of these constructions, their semantic globality and constancy of form, although he adds that in the case of some language units certain structural transformations are possible (this can be assumed to refer to the phenomenon of phraseological variance). He also includes among the properties of an idiom its equivalence to a word.

The term *ungkapan* also appears in the Indonesian literature on idioms. Its status is not clearly defined. Definitions of this linguistic phenomenon usually indicate that it is a single word or a lexical combination that is characterized by pictoriality, metaphorical aspect and specific meaning (Badudu 1975: 6–7; 2009: xiii). It is difficult to find a clear demarcation line between the ranges of the concepts of *idiom* and *ungkapan*. Abdul Chaer (2002: viii; 2007: 204) believes that the difference between these terms lies in their field of application: *ungkapan* appears in discussions of rhetoric, while *idiom* is reserved for semantic research. He also points out that the units called *ungkapan* are an open class – they can be created ad hoc – while idioms are existing constructions, having a fixed (unchanging) form, constituting a closed set (Chaer 2002: viii). In another work,

the same author emphasized the need to look at *ungkapan* from the point of view of linguistic expression, and sees in this construction a tool used by the sender to express thoughts, feelings, emotions and assessments (Chaer 1984: 9).

The decisions of lexicographers confirm the blurred nature of the boundary between the concepts of *idiom* and *ungkapan*. In the phraseological studies *Kamus Idiom Bahasa Indonesia* (Chaer 1984)<sup>1</sup> and *Kamus Ungkapan Bahasa Indonesia* (Chaer 2002) the respective sets of headwords overlap to a large extent.

For some scholars, the term *idiom* has a wide range and refers to the language units called *ungkapan* as well as to proverbs (Indonesian *peribahasa*). We find this point of view, for example, in the study of Muhammad A. Khak (2011). Similar statements can be found in the doctoral dissertation of Muhammad Suyatno (2012: 47).

There are noticeable differences between the Indonesian and Polish research traditions. Regarding terminology, the basic unit of description in the Polish tradition is the *związek frazeologiczny* / *frazeologizm* ('phraseological unit' / 'phraseologism'). According to Andrzej M. Lewicki (1976; 2003), a given language unit may be considered a phraseological unit if it is characterized by: a discontinuity of composition (a phraseological unit is a lexical unit of at least two words<sup>2</sup>), permanence of form (a phraseologism has a fixed structure, and the possibility of making changes within it is small and strictly defined), semantic globality or idiomaticity (the sum of the meanings of the components is not equal to the meaning of the whole), and established status in the language system (a phraseologism is reproduced in texts on the same principle as the word, that is, from the lexical resources of the speaker). Generally speaking, phraseological units are "socially consolidated combinations of words showing irregularity in some respect, e.g. they include words or word forms that do not form part of free syntactic compounds; the meaning of a phraseologism does not result from the meaning of its components; the principles of connectivity of words are violated" (Lewicki, Pajdzińska 2001: 315).

A comparison of the lists of features considered to characterize Indonesian idioms and Polish phraseological units shows some convergence. Their number depends – obviously – on the adopted perspective of description (discussion of all of the concepts is beyond the scope of this paper). In the minimalist version, the only common feature of the various viewpoints is the non-additive semantic significance of the language units in question (see Chaer's definition above). When other proposals are considered, many more common elements can be found (polylexicity, relative stability, semantic indivisibility).

Proverbs constitute a separate problem within Indonesian and Polish phraseology. A review of Indonesian definitions of this concept furnishes the researcher with difficulties in locating these structures in relation to idioms. On the one hand – as was mentioned earlier – a proverb is considered to lie within a broad definition of idioms, while on the other hand, idioms sometimes come under the concept of proverbs. This is due to the twofold explanation of proverbs. In broad terms, a proverb is a combination of words or sentences that is characterized by a constant composition of components and a specific meaning. Such a proverb includes many linguistic facts. In the narrower sense, it is a stable expression in terms of form or a coherent, concise sentence containing a comparison, piece of advice, moral, life principle, or rule of behaviour or conduct (Kridalaksana 1982: 131; Pateda 2010: 230; Suyatno 2012: 47). There are also concepts that limit proverbs to unit sentences (Suyatno 2012: 47). The features of a proverb include frequent metaphorical character, rigid formal and semantic structures, and a stabilized function within the community that uses it. It is also sometimes noted that proverbs are a decoration of speech and strengthen its meaning (Kridalaksana 2007: 107; Huang Haiyan 2016: 100–103). In the context of proverbs, the term *pepatah* often appears. The phenomena denoted by this term fall within the scope of the notion of proverbs (in the second sense) and form a subtype of it (Huang Haiyan 2016: 99–101; Suyatno 2012: 47). There is no space here to examine this issue further.

The narrow view is the closest to the Polish approach to proverbs. The common elements here are the stability of the proverb structure and its content, that of which it is the carrier, its general character, and frequent metaphorical nature. The differences relate to, among other things, formal language indicators. In the

<sup>1</sup> The author obtained this dictionary in the last quarter of 2017 while working at the University of Pasundan in Bandung, Indonesia.

<sup>2</sup> The position – similar to the one previously cited by Abdul Chaer – whereby phrases that "[...] are fossilized in a special function in singular form, cf. *spocznij!* (at ease!) (as a command), *pytanie!* (question!) (an ironic expression), etc." (Bogusławski 1989: 16) are considered phraseological units is not foreign to Polish linguistics. It is worth noting that, according to Wojciech Chlebda (1991/2003; 2010), the creator of the theoretical paradigm called the sender's phraseology (in other words, pragmatic phraseology, phrasematics), multi-word and one-word nature are not criteria for distinguishing phrases or – this is a later term – reproductions (that is, language forms usually reproduced in a specific situation for verbalizing a given bundle of meanings), but are treated as their features. Reproductions are those words or word combinations that meet the reproducibility requirement.

Polish tradition, proverbs include only structures that form sentences (Szpila 2003: 24; Nowakowska 2005: 38). Indonesian linguists have different opinions on this matter.

There are also various positions concerning constructions of comparative type, such as *lidah bercabang bagai biawak* (lit. tongue forked like a monitor lizard tongue) ‘a false man, hypocrite’; *seperti melihat cacing* (lit. like seeing a worm) ‘dislike, hate something, someone’. Indonesian linguists include these among proverbs.

The limitation of proverbs to sentences (micro-texts) would eliminate from that category lexical combinations regarded by Polish (and other) researchers as being phraseological expressions in the form of idioms, e.g. *memakai kulit harimau* (lit. wear tiger’s skin) ‘to intimidate someone, scare someone with someone in power, who is fearless’; *menuangkan air ke laut* (lit. pour water into the sea) ‘perform an activity in vain’. These examples (two of many) are not independent textual units, they are not general in nature, they do not constitute advice, they do not contain morals, they do not convey any rules of life or conduct. A similar conclusion is reached in the case of comparisons. These facts call into question the appropriateness of including this type of word combination under proverbs. The problem raised here deserves to be discussed in a separate study.

The view that comparisons can be considered proverbs is foreign to Polish researchers, although it should be noted that there are also comparative proverbs (e.g. *Kwiat bez zapachu jak człowiek bez duszy*, lit. A flower without fragrance is like a man without a soul). The stabilized comparisons and quasi- or potential comparisons discussed here (terms used by Alicja Nowakowska – 2005: 52; 2010: 80; 2011: 26) which are “non-proverbial”, e.g. *oczy świecą się jak u kota*, lit. the eyes shine like in a cat, that is ‘shine, e.g., at night’; *czerwony jak burak*, lit. red as a beetroot, that is ‘very red’; *jak z obrazka*, lit. like in a picture, that is ‘very nice, but banal’, are generally included among phraseological units.

The Polish sets of features of proverbs include – depending on the concept – from a few to more than a dozen determinants. For example, Katarzyna Kłosińska (2011) views a proverb as a unit of text, a literary-linguistic creation in the form of a sentence (often rhymed), characterized by constancy of form and “two-level” meaning. A more extensive list of properties is given by Grzegorz Szpila (2003: 24): “The proverb is a short, simple, often rhymed saying in the form of a sentence, usually metaphorical, containing some truth or wisdom based on the experience of people; used to describe a situation and instruction; of folk provenance; characteristic of the community and widely known in it; for centuries rooted in tradition and passed down from generation to generation.” Features such as: “two-level” semantics, simplicity, the presence of rhyme, folk origin, universality, tradition and the “multi-generational” aspect of proverbs are not included in Indonesian definitions. These constructions are also not assigned the status of texts. Such a position has been dominant among Polish views on proverbs (Bogusławski 1989; Lewicki 2001; Lewicki, Pajdzińska 2001). It is considered that proverbs constitute a formally and semantically closed whole, and therefore they lack the features of connectivity with other elements of an utterance. They cannot be considered equivalent to a word (Nowakowska 2005: 39). Moreover, these features of proverbs mean that they are excluded by some researchers from the class of phraseological units. “However, most phraseologists see a place for proverbs within their field. The features that most strongly affect the adoption of such a position are structural stability and reproducibility” (Nowakowska 2005: 39). Proverbs are also attributed other features that connect them with phraseological units, such as multi-word character, imagery, semantic notion and expressiveness (Nowakowska 2005: 45). The inclusion of proverbs in phraseological studies is often a consequence of the differentiation between phraseology in narrow and broad senses. Proverbs fall within the scope of phraseology interpreted more broadly.

Indonesian–Polish typologies of idioms or phraseological units also deserve consideration. They are based on various criteria. In one case, the degree of lexicalization of a language unit is considered (there is no space here to present other distinguishing criteria). Almost all Indonesian researchers distinguish complete idioms (*idiom penuh*) and partial idioms (*idiom sebagian*). The former (e.g. *lidahnya manis*, lit. sweet language, that is ‘polite, pleasant, nice and pleasing words’) are an integral, indivisible whole. They contain components that lose their lexical meaning in such a configuration. In turn, partial idioms (e.g. *anak putih*, lit. a white child, that is ‘the seventh born child’) contain an element (*anak* ‘child’) which carries a lexical meaning (see Chaer 2007: 127; 2012: 296; Suwandi 2008: 96; Suyatno 2012: 33).

Complete idioms (*idiom penuh*) correspond in the Polish approach to multi-words covered by the term *idiom*. This refers only to such expressions whose “fixed meaning is completely different from that which results from the meanings of the constituents” (Lewicki, Pajdzińska 2001: 318). The father of Polish phraseology, Stanisław Skorupka (1982: 15), puts emphasis on the untranslatability of an idiom, a view which in extreme form leads to the claim that the term should be limited to such stabilized word combinations appropriate to a given language that do not have literal equivalents in other languages. However, such a narrow understanding of the term has not become accepted in Polish phraseology.

The second type of units – partial idioms (*idiom sebagian*) – are, in the system of Andrzej M. Lewicki and Anna Pajdzińska (2001: 319), phrases (also phraseological combinations). Phrases (phraseological combinations) are fixed word compounds whose sense falls within the semantic range of a dominant component, although the whole phraseological unit is semantically irregular. Polish phrases (phraseological combinations) also include comparisons, such as *chudy jak tyka* (lit. slim as a pole) ‘very thin’. There are also idiom-comparisons, e.g. *coś idzie jak woda* (lit. something runs like water) ‘about goods: is sold very quickly’. Let us recall that Indonesian researchers include comparisons in the set of proverbs. This categorization affects the dictionary treatment of phrasal material. Indonesian practice generally omits comparisons from dictionaries of idioms or of the language units called *ungkapan*. They should be sought instead in collections of proverbs.

## CONCLUSIONS

As the foregoing remarks show, Polish research on contrastive Indonesian–Polish phraseology is still in an initial and exploratory phase. Therefore, broad perspectives are opening up for linguists working in this area. It is necessary to describe the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic properties of the compared multi-word lexical units. According to the notion that treats phraseology as a subset of lexical studies, it is important to analyse individual types of phraseological resources, for example, zoonymic, phytonymic and somatic phraseology. Indonesian–Polish phraseological relationships can also be considered as carriers of the language–man–culture relationship. Here, the task relates to the reconstruction of the linguistic image of the world emerging from phraseologisms, showing their relation to history, culture, and stereotypes of both communication communities. Another research field considers the functioning of phraseologisms in the sphere of *parole*, their use in various types of texts (e.g. spoken and written, and among the latter: literary, journalistic, advertising, etc.). An important issue concerns the equivalence of Indonesian–Polish stabilized lexical combinations. Methodological problems related to the development of an Indonesian–Polish (and Polish–Indonesian) phrasal dictionary also need to be solved. These are just some of the tasks faced by Polish phraseologists. The review of previous studies and their findings allows us to conclude that despite the apparent differences in approaches to phrasal material (its theoretical description), it is possible to use the Polish conceptual, terminological and methodological apparatus to give a comprehensive description of the universe of phenomena within the field of Indonesian phraseology.

## REFERENCES

- Alwi, Hasan, Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono, Lapoliwa, Hans & Moeliono, Anton M. 2010. *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Badudu, Jusuf S. 1975. *Sari Kesusataan Indonesia III*. Bandung: TB Bandung.
- Badudu, Jusuf S. 1992. *Cakrawala Bahasa Indonesia II*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Badudu, Jusuf S. 2009. *Kamus Peribahasa. Memahami Arti dan Kiasan Peribahasa, Pepatah, dan Ungkapan*. Jakarta: Kompas.
- Bogusławski, Andrzej. 1989. Uwagi o pracy nad frazeologią. In Zygmunt Saloni (ed.), *Studia z polskiej leksykografii współczesnej 3*. Białystok: Dział Wydawnictw Filii UW. 13–30.
- Chaer, Abdul. 1984. *Kamus Idiom Bahasa Indonesia*. Ende: Nusa Indah.
- Chaer, Abdul. 2002. *Kamus Ungkapan Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Chaer, Abdul. 2007. *Leksikologi & Leksikografi Indonesia*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Chaer, Abdul. 2012. *Linguistik Umum*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Chlebda, Wojciech. 1991. *Elementy frazematyki. Wprowadzenie do frazeologii nadawcy*. Opole: WSP.
- Chlebda, Wojciech. 2003. *Elementy frazematyki. Wprowadzenie do frazeologii nadawcy*. Wyd. 2 uzup. Łask: Oficyna Wydawnicza LEKSEM.
- Chlebda, Wojciech. 2010. Nieautomatyczne drogi dochodzenia do reproduktów wielowyrazowych. In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.), *Na tropach reproduktów. W poszukiwaniu wielowyrazowych jednostek języka*. Opole: UO. 15–35.
- Chlebda, Wojciech. 2011. Ekwiwalencja i ekwiwalenty: między słownikiem a tekstami. In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.), *Na tropach translatów. W poszukiwaniu odpowiedników przekładowych*. Opole: Wydawnictwo UO. 21–43.
- Huang, Haiyan. 2016. *Perbandingan Idiom Berunsur Nama Binatang dalam Bahasa Mandarin dan Bahasa Indonesia*. Ph.D. dissertation, Universitas Gajah Mada.
- Keraf, Gorys. 2006. *Diksi dan Gaya Bahasa. Edisi yang Diperbarui*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Khak, Muhammad A. 2011. Idiom dalam Bahasa Indonesia: Struktur dan Makna. *Widyaparwa* 39 (2). 141–153.
- Kłosińska, Katarzyna. 2011. *Słownik przysłów. Przysłownik*. Poznań: Publicat.
- Kridalaksana, Harimurti. 1982. *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Kridalaksana, Harimurti. 2007. *Kelas Kata dalam Bahasa Indonesia. Edisi kedua. Cetakan kelima*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Lewicki, Andrzej M. & Pajdzińska, Anna. 2001. *Frazeologia*. In Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.), *Współczesny język polski*. Lublin: UMCS. 315–333.

- Lewicki, Andrzej M. 1976. Wprowadzenie do frazeologii syntaktycznej. Teoria zwrotu frazeologicznego. Katowice: UŚ.
- Lewicki, Andrzej M. 2001. Uwagi wstępne o frazach. *Prace Filologiczne* XLVI. 389–402.
- Lewicki, Andrzej M. 2003. *Studia z teorii frazeologii*. Łask: Oficyna Wydawnicza LEKSEM.
- Moeliono, Anton M. 1982. *Diksi atau Pilihan Kata: Suatu Spesifikasi di dalam Kosa Kata*. Pembinaan Bahasa Indonesia. Jilid III. Nomor 3. Jakarta: Bharata.
- Nowakowska, Alicja. 2005. Świat roślin w polskiej frazeologii. Wrocław: Uwr.
- Nowakowska, Alicja. 2010. Porównanie frazeologiczne (zarys problematyki). In Stanisław Bąba, Krzysztof Skibski & Michał Szczyszek (eds.), *Perspektywy współczesnej frazeologii polskiej. Teoria. Zagadnienia ogólne*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM. 77–86.
- Nowakowska, Alicja. 2011. Wariantowość porównań frazeologicznych. In Piotr Fliciński (ed.), *Perspektywy współczesnej frazeologii polskiej. Wariantowość we frazeologii*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM. 23–32.
- Pateda, Mansoer. 2010. *Semantik Leksikal*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Skorupka, Stanisław. 1982. Klasyfikacja jednostek frazeologicznych i jej zastosowanie w leksykologii. Z *Problemów Frazeologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej* I. 7–16.
- Subroto, Edi. 2011. *Pengantar Studi Semantik dan Pragmatik*. Surakarta: Cakrawala Media.
- Suwandi, Sarwiji. 2008. *Semantik. Pengantar Kajian Makna*, Yogyakarta: Media Perkasa.
- Suyatno, Muhammad. 2012. *Idiom dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Ph.D. dissertation, Universitas Gajah Mada.
- Szpila, Grzegorz. 2003. *Krótko o przysłowiu*. Kraków: Collegium Columbinum.
- Wiatrowski, Przemysław. 2014. Jeszcze o genezie wybranych polskich i indonezyjskich jednostek frazeologicznych. *Język. Komunikacja. Informacja* 9. 147–163.
- Wiatrowski, Przemysław. 2015a. Cultural relevance of Indonesian phraseological units as contrasted with Polish. *Jurnal Humaniora* 27(1). 14–26.
- Wiatrowski, Przemysław. 2015b. Ekwiwalencja słownikowa indonezyjskich i polskich idiomów. In Gabriela Olchowa & Mieczysław Balowski (eds.), *Języki słowiańskie w okresie przemian*. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela v Banskej Bystrici. 107–125.
- Wiatrowski, Przemysław. 2015c. Indonezyjskie i polskie idiomy – w poszukiwaniu ekwiwalentów tłumaczeniowych. *Poznańskie Spotkania Językoznawcze* 29. 137–158.
- Wiatrowski, Przemysław. 2015d. Indonesian and Polish idioms – in search of translation equivalents. In Haslina Haroon, Hasuria Che Omar, Goh Sang Seong & Norizah Ardi (eds.), *Persidangan Penterjemahan Antarabangsa ke-15 (PPA-15). 15th International Conference on Translation (ITC-15)*. Kuala Lumpur: Persatuan Penterjemah Malaysia, Institut Terjemahan & Buku Malaysia, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Perbadanan Kota Buku. 433–442.
- Wiatrowski, Przemysław. 2015e. Międzyjęzykowa ekwiwalencja związków frazeologicznych z apelatywnym komponentem relewantnym kulturowo. Na przykładzie indonezyjskich połączeń wyrazowych i ich polskich odpowiedników. *Kwartalnik Językoznawczy* 1–2. 62–175.
- Wiatrowski, Przemysław. 2015f. Międzyjęzykowa ekwiwalencja związków frazeologicznych z komponentem onimicznym. Na przykładzie indonezyjskich połączeń wyrazowych i ich polskich odpowiedników. *Kwartalnik Językoznawczy* 3–4 (forthcoming).
- Wiatrowski, Przemysław. 2015g. Realia Nusantara w świetle indonezyjskiej frazeologii. In Joanna Szerszunowicz, Bogusław Nowowiejski, Priscilla Ishida & Katsumasa Yagi (eds.), *Intercontinental Dialogue on Phraseology 3: Linguo-Cultural Research on Phraseology*. Białystok: UwB. 577–599.
- Wiatrowski, Przemysław. 2016b. „Wilk w owczej skórze”, czyli „serigala berbulu domba”. Uwagi o genezie wybranych polskich i indonezyjskich jednostek frazeologicznych. In Gabriela Dziamska-Lenart & Jarosław Liberek (eds.), *Perspektywy współczesnej frazeologii polskiej. Geneza dawnych i nowych frazeologizmów polskich*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM. 185–207.
- Wiatrowski, Przemysław. 2018. Związki frazeologiczne identyczne oraz podobne formalnie w językach indonezyjskim i polskim. *Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne. Seria Językoznawcza* 25(1) (forthcoming).

## **CURRICULUM VITAE:**

Complete Name : Przemysław Wiatrowski

Institution : Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Institute of Linguistics, Faculty of Modern Languages and Literatures, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland

Education :

- Graduate Program, Polish Philology, Institute of Polish Philology, Faculty of Polish and Classical Philology, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (2003)
- Ph.D. Program, Polish Linguistics, Faculty of Polish and Classical Philology, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (2009)

Research Interests : Polish phonetics, Onomastics, Speech genres, Indonesian-Polish contrastive phraseology