IFL
SAMARQAND
DAVLAT CHET TILLAR INSTITUTI

THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL LEXICOGRAPHY

THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

SAMARKAND STATE INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

F.Sh.Ruzikulov, Sh.J.Shomurodova, N.M.Suleymanova

THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL LEXICOGRAPHY

Samarkand – 2015

F.Sh.Ruzikulov, Sh.J.Shomurodova, N.M.Suleymanova. Theoretical and practical Lexicography. – Samarkand: SamSIFL, 2015. – 86 p.

This book discusses the main issues of modern lexicography, planning of lexicographic projects and some aspects of the organization of work. The aim of the book is to help young lexicographers acquire the knowledge and techniques for compiling dictionaries.

Reviewers: professor Bushuy T.A.,
dots. Ismailov A.R.

Languages declare their independence by creating dictionaries.
Richard Bailey

LECTURE 1. LEXICOGRAPHY AS A BRANCH OF LINGUISTICS

Lexicography as an independent science

It's well known that we can't imagine studying any language in the world without such an important thing as a dictionary and it plays invaluable role in studying a language. The compiling of dictionaries has been a major scholarly occupation and a flourishing business enterprise for publishers in the last two centuries. As T. McArthur puts it, the lexicography of today's English arose equally in both of the Atlantic traditions, the beginnings of each being identified with a single man: Samuel Johnson in the UK and Noah Webster in the US (3;21-23).

Most general dictionaC V ries, following in the Johnsonian and Websterian traditions, were self help books more than school books, but a tradition of dictionaries for schools as well as homes established itself at an early stage in the US. There was also a good deal of reprinting and cross-fertilization between the UK and US, but even so rather different kinds of dictionary had emerged by the end of the century in three distinct locations: in England (with the primary focus as time passed on Oxford); in Scotland (characterized in particular by Chambers in Edinburgh); and in the United States (with its centre of gravity in Springfield, Mass., the home of the G. and C.Merriam company, which promoted books in the main Webster tradition).

Lexicography is the discipline of linguistics and it is divided into two related parts: practical lexicography and theoretical lexicography.

Theoretical lexicography is the discipline of analyzing and describing the semantic relationships within the lexicon of a language and developing theories of dictionary components and structures. Some linguists use the term "lexicology" as a synonym for theoretical lexicography.

Practical lexicography is the art or craft of compiling, writing and editing dictionaries. The term dictionary comes from Latin "dictio" which means "word".

The history of compiling English dictionaries belongs to the Old

English period.They are glosses of religious books. The first English dictionary was Robert Cawdrey's Table Alphabetical which was published in 1604. It included 3 000 words. As already has been noticed, the history of English lexicography is closely connected with three names. They are Samuel Johnson, Noah Webster and James A.H. Murray.Their influence to the compiling dictionaries continues till today. In the case of Webster, through the series of dictionaries which bear his name. In the case of Johnson, through the tradition which led the Philological Society to sponsor a "new" English dictionary.

One of the best definitions of the term dictionary was given by C.C.Berg "A dictionary is a systematically arranged list of socialized linguistic forms compiled from the speech-habits of a given speech-community and commented on by the author in such a way that the qualified reader understands the meaning ... of each separate form, and is informed of the relevant facts concerning the function of that form in its community" (3;12). This definition is concerned with the central types of dictionaries, i.e. with those dealing primarily with lexical meaning.

The functions of the linguistic forms (i.e., words and other lexical units) and their meaning are, so ramified that we cannot wonder that there are many different types of dictionaries. Indeed, Y. Malkiel is absolutely right when saying that the word "dictionary" can "apply quite loosely to any reference work arranged by words or names" (1; 7). According to Shcherba a reference dictionary is "one behind which does not lie any unified language consciousness. The collected words may belong to heterogeneous speech groups of different periods and which do not in the least form a system"(4;23).

If we speak about the dictionary as a linguistic term, it is a list of words with their definitions, a list of characters, or a list of words in other languages. Dictionaries are most commonly found in the form of a book. The optimal dictionary is one that contains information directly relevant for the needs of the users relating to one or more functions. It is important that the information is presented in a way that keeps the lexicographic information costs at a minimum.

Development of the lexicography

Vocabulary study has a long history, going back in the Western world to Plato's Cratylus. The elaborate, large-scale dictionaries of today evolved by stages from simple beginnings. In the seventh and eighth centuries, the practice arose of inserting in Latin manuscripts

explanations (or 'glosses') of difficult words, in Latin or in Old English (sometimes in both). Later, the glosses were gathered together into 'glossaries'. Three types of glossaries are usually recognized. If glosses in texts are later collected, but without orderly arrangement, they are 'glossae collectae'. If they are then arranged alphabetically, they become 'alphabetical glossaries'. If, however, the glosses are arranged according to semantic fields (e.g. parts of the body, farm tools), they are "class glossaries". Glosses and glossaries came to fullfil a vital function in teaching and the transmission of knowledge. Also to be noted are the important connections between glossing and the terms used to describe it, and the structure of modern dictionary entries. The gloss is a word or short phrase used to explain a difficult Latin word— the 'lemma'—a relationship which foreshadows the pattern of the modern dictionary explanation, with its "definition" and "headword". But there is a further link with modern dictionaries. Latinwords could be used to explainmore difficult Latin ones, thus foreshadowing the monolingual dictionary, or the hard ones could be explained in Old English, in which case they pointed forward to bilingual (Latin–English)

dictionaries. It is a matter of convention that the early collections are called glossaries and the later ones dictionaries. Moreover, terminology in the Middle Ages was unstable. One picturesque name or another could be used in any given case. For instance, the first English–Latin dictionaries (fifteenth century) were called Promptorium parvulorum ('storeroom, or repository, for children') and Catholicum Anglicum ('the comprehensive English collection'). Later, in accounts of how bilingual dictionaries of the Renaissance were produced, we are given insights into the way compilers built up their alphabetical lists of headwords. So, for instance, master as the translation equivalent of magister would become a headword and, if not already independently treated, would be slotted into an English alphabetical word-list. There is a curious, but altogether predictable, result of such transfers. As many of the Latin headwords are translated not by one-word English equivalents but by a paraphrase, this reorganization has resulted in the introduction of multi-word entries. This then raises the further problem of which of the components of a multi-word unit should be regarded as determining order in the English word-list. From the middle of the sixteenth century onwards, a number of bilingual dictionaries appeared featuring English and a modern European language. These were explanatory dictionaries for English learners of the language in question— Italian in the case of John Florio's A worlde of

wordes (1598), French in the case of Randle Cotgrave's Dictionarie of the French and English tongues (1611). But people wishing to compose texts in these languages would not have been greatly helped by these dictionaries. Potential users had to wait for separate English–Italian and English–French volumes for their particular needs to be met. By the end of the seventeenth century, with monolingual English dictionaries by that time well established, bilingual works which combined English and a modern foreign language promoted from the general decline of Latin and played a major part in the promotion of the various national languages.

The study of English vocabulary, however, received a sharp boost with the interest of members of the Philological Society in making a New English Dictionary, eventually renamed The Oxford English Dictionary (Murray, Bradley, Craigie & Onions 1884-1933). In the middle of the nineteenth century, Dean Trench (1851, 1855), who had been instrumental in beginning the OED, was a significant contributor to the field. Caught in the Web of Words (Murray 1977) traces the history of this major dictionary, and Empire of Words (Willinsky 1994) critically analyzes its strengths and weaknesses.

The most important general English dictionary of the twentieth century is Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, edited by Philip Babcock Gove (1961). Its history has been traced by Herbert C. Morton (1994). The most important new specialized dictionary of the century is the Dictionary of American English (Cassidy and Hall, 1985).

The study of slang has been of greater popular than scholarly interest. Noteworthy treatments of slang are, for British English, the revision of Eric Partridge's Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English by Paul Beale (1984) and, for American English, the revision of Harold Wentworth and Stuart Berg Flexner's work under the title New Dictionary of American Slang by Robert L. Chapman (1986). The artificial and literary concoctions favoured by Time magazine from the mid 1920s to the mid 1960s have been recorded by George Thomas Kurian (1993); they are notable chiefly as examples of word play. The most important scholarly work ever done onthe subject of slang is Jonathan Lighter's (1994) Random House Historical Dictionary of American Slang.

Generally speaking, the history provides detailed, fully documented, treatments of the various scholarly projects which have been central to the development of lexicography over the centuries, and takes full account of

the impact, on English dictionaries of all kinds, of recent developments in corpus and computational linguistics.

Key words

theoretical lexicography, practical lexicography, scholarly dictionary project, computational linguistics, specialized dictionary, general dictionary, reference dictionary, glossary.

Questions and tasks

1. The role of the dictionary in the development of a certain language.
2. Explain the terms *practical* and *theoretical lexicography*.
3. What is a dictionary?
4. The most important general English dictionaries of the twentieth century.
5. Compare slangs from "Partridge's Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English" with slangs of Uzbek language.
6. The most important new specialized dictionary of the XX century.
7. What makes a dictionary reliable?

References

1. Malkiel Y. An Introduction to Modern English Word Formation. L., 1973.- 256p.
2. Oxford History of English Lexicography./ed.by A.P.Cowie.– Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009.-551p.
3. Tom McArthur. Guides to tomorrow's English // English today. Cambridge University Press, 1998.P.21-23.
4. Shcherba L.V. Theoretical Lexicography. -M., 1944. -399p.

Dictionaries

1. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. –Oxford, 1964.
2. Hornby A. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. -Lnd., 1974.
3. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. - M., 1986.
4. Webster's New World Dictionary of American English. -N.Y., 1978.
5. Апресян Ю.Д. Новый большой англо-русский словарь. -М., 1993.
6. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. -М., 1967.

LECTURE 2. STRUCTURE OF THE DICTIONARY

The constituent parts of a dictionary

People talk of 'the dictionary', but every dictionary is unique. A good dictionary reflects the type of people who will be using it and what they will be using it for. Knowing these facts helps us decide what goes into the dictionary and how the material should be structured (though in most projects, commercial constraints have a bearing on these decisions too). Despite wide variations in content, most dictionaries have two major components: the A–Z entries (or their equivalent in languages which don't use the Roman alphabet), and all the other 'non-linear' material which we can broadly categorize as 'front matter' and 'back matter'. We briefly describe these components here. Print dictionaries traditionally include material of various types as "front matter" (whatever precedes the A–Z text), and "back matter" (whatever follows it). These "locational" terms are of course irrelevant in the case of electronic dictionaries, but the same material (and often a great deal more besides) will be accessible in an electronic environment too. The content of these sections varies a great deal depending on the perceived needs of users. Pick up any two dictionaries and you will find that they have quite different material in their front and back matter. The front matter typically contains a foreword and acknowledgements, some kind of introduction to the dictionary, and an explanation of abbreviations, labels, and codes used in the text But it may also offer mini-essays on certain aspects of language ('the history of the language' or 'English throughout the world', for example), depending on the type of market it aims at. The back matter (sometimes also called the 'end matter') often includes lists such as verb tables, numbers, weights and measures, chemical elements, Roman numerals, the books of the Bible, etc., but it may also provide maps, diagrams, and other material geared to the needs of the target user. In pedagogical dictionaries (whether bilingual or monolingual), you will often find additional information in a centre section (the 'mid-matter'). This may deal with language issues (such as grammar, collocation, word formation, and regional varieties), or provide useful study aids such as guidance on writing essays, reports, and CVs, as well as model letters and emails. Bilingual dictionaries may also include lists of practical guides to various aspects of living in the countries where the two languages are spoken.

One thing that most types of English dictionary have in common is a

front-matter section called something like How to use the dictionary, which introduces the reader to the conventions of the dictionary layout.

Structure of the dictionary entry

The A–Z entries. The core of the dictionary is of course the great body of entries holding details of the meaning, grammar, and usage conventions associated with each headword. Every dictionary is subtly different from every other in the principles applied during the headword selection, and in the design and content of the various types of entries used to present the information. As always, decisions on these matters are driven by the user profile, the target market of the dictionary, its competitors in that market, and consequently its costing and budget.

The basic reference unit in a dictionary or other reference system such as a library catalogue. A wide range of formats (microstructure) is possible. In the dictionary, depending on its content and purpose, these component parts are common: the lemma (which allows the compiler to locate and the user to find the entry within the overall word-list); the formal comment on the 'topic' introduced by the lemma (spelling, pronunciation, grammar); and the semantic 'comment' (definition, usage, etymology). What follows the lemma is the main part of the entry its basic purpose is to indicate the meaning of the lexical unit in all its aspects.

In case of multiple meanings of the lemma, the entry is subdivided into (usually numbered or otherwise marked) sections called "sub-entries" or "subsenses", each of which provides the same basic information categories. Entry-line is the initial line of an entry in a dictionary or other reference work, highlighted by indentation or protrusion ("hanging indentation") and containing the headword (usually in bold) and sometimes information on pronunciation and grammar. Entry-term is the form of a word or phrase which serves as the 'main entry', or headword, for a record in a terminological dictionary, in contrast to a "secondary entry" which lists alternative terms.

The meaning of the word may be also explained by examples, i.e. contextually. The term and its definition are here fused. For example, diagonal is explained by the following context where only this term can occur: A square has two diagonals, and each of them divides the square into two right-angled isosceles triangles. Very often this type can be changed into a standard form, i.e. A diagonal is one of the two lines ..., etc.

One more problem is the problem of whether all entries should be defined or whether it is possible to have the so-called "run-ons" for derivative words in which the root-form is readily recognised (such as absolutely or resolutely). In fact, whereas resolutely may be conveniently given as a -ly run-on after resolute, there is a meaning problem for absolutely. One must take into consideration that in colloquial speech absolutely means 'quite so', 'yes' which cannot be deduced from the meaning of the corresponding adjective.

Size of the dictionaries

The last problem which we shall discuss is the size of the dictionaries. It is one of those dimensions where no precise statements, but only "impressionistic appraisals" (1;157) are possible: size is not mere bulk and so the number of the entries of a dictionary, numerically precise as it may be, is only a rough indication of its informative power. Very much depends upon how the entry itself is worked out. Much more important than the statement of the absolute number of the entries would be the indication of how great a part of the total lexicon (stock of lexical units) is presented in the dictionary; even if formulated in this more correct way, the size of the dictionary cannot be indicated precisely, because the precise value of the lexicon remains unknown.

We must not forget, either, that there is a certain relativity in different languages themselves: a language with only an unconsiderable variation and no literature spoken in a culturally simple milieu, can be treated rather exhaustively in a dictionary whose size is not necessarily too bulky, whereas a medium dictionary of a language spoken in a diversified society may be several times as big.

It would probably be better to speak about the degree of completeness, or exhaustiveness, or density of a dictionary. But while these new terms would bring new troubles of their own, "size" is a traditional term which can be safely used if it is correctly understood.

Key words

entry, lemma, multiple meanings, sub-entries, entry-line, entry-term, main entry, headword, secondary entry, definition, density of a dictionary, reference unit, comment.

Questions and tasks

1. Describe the structure of modern dictionary entries.
2. Compare the structure of modern dictionary entries with glosses.

3. Compare entries of several explanatory dictionaries.
4. What makes a good definition?
5. Describe the entry line.
6. Find examples with secondary entries.
7. The basic purpose of lemma.

References

1. Бушуй А.М. Фразеографические основы украинского толкового словаря // Вопросы филологических наук.-М.,2009.-№6.-С.26-30.

2. Бушуй Т.А. Фразеосистемность в контрастивном лексическом словаре // Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан. – Нукус, 2001. - №5. – С.92-93.

3. Malkiel Y. An Introduction to Modern English Word Formation. - L., 1973. – 256 p.

4. Oxford History of English Lexicography/ed.by A.P.Cowie. - Oxford.,Clarendon Press, 2009. - 551p.

5. Tom McArthur. Guides to tomorrow's English // English today. Cambridge University Press, 1998. - P.21-23.

6. Shcherba L.V. Theoretical Lexicography.-M., 1944. – 399 p.

7. Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. -М. 1977. – 218 p.

8. Заботкина В.И. Новая лексика современного английского языка. -М., 1989. - 147p.

9. Ивлева Г.Г. Тенденции развития слова и словарного состава. -М., 1986. – 178 p.

Dictionaries

1. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. –Oxford, 1964.

2. Hornby A. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. -Oxford, 1974.

3. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. -M., 1986.

4. Webster's New World Dictionary of American English. -N.Y., 1978.

5. Апресян Ю.Д. Новый большой англо-русский словарь. -М., 1993.

6. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. -М., 1967.

LECTURE 3. TYPES OF DICTIONARIES

Division of dictionaries according to different parameters

As we know a dictionary represents an aspect of a lexicon for a certain purpose and we can differentiate dictionaries according to a large number of parameters. Some of the more important ones are the following:

Number of languages:

1. Monolingual lexicon ("definition dictionary")
   a. dictionary
   b. encyclopedia
2. Bilingual dictionary ("equivalence dictionary")
3. Multilingual dictionary (e.g., a multilingual terminological glossary)

Scope of the speech community

1. general dictionary
2. dialect dictionary
3. socialist dictionary (e.g. coloquial language)
4. individual dictionary (e.g. dictionary of Chaucer's language)
5. technical (terminological) dictionary.

Direction of access to the linguistic sign

1. onomasiological dictionary
   a. thesaurus
   b. dictionary of synonyms
   c. picture dictionary
2. semasiological dictionary
   a. dictionary of word families
   b. retrograde dictionary
   c. rhyme dictionary

Aspects of linguistic structure

1. Aspects of the linguistic sign
   a. orthographic dictionary: (correct) spelling of words
   b. pronunciation dictionary
   c. frequency dictionary: textual frequencies of words
   d. etymological dictionaries.
2. Syntagmatic complexity ("syntagmatic dictionary")
   a. construction dictionary
   b. collocations dictionary
   c. phraseological dictionary: phrases, idioms, familiar sayings

d. proverb dictionary
e. citations dictionary
f. morphemicon: morpheme inventory

Segment of the vocabulary

dictionary of neologisms
loan word / foreign word dictionary
dictionary of slang / jargon
insult dictionary
name dictionary (onomastic dictionary): first names, last names, toponyms.
encyclopedia of a special domain (e.g. of birds).

Another classification is that of Malkiel. According to Malkiel, dictionaries can be classified (1) by their range (2) by their perspective, and (3) by their presentation.

The first category is subdivided into (a) the density of entries, (b) the number of languages covered, and (c) the degree of concentration on strictly lexical data, at the expense of realia, proper names, etc. In the second category (classification by perspective), Malkiel discerns three basic perspectives, (a) the fundamental dimension (diachronism versus synchronism) (b) the basic arrangement of entries (conventional, i.e. usually alphabetic, semantic, and arbitrary), and (c) the level of tone (objective, preceptive or prohibitive, and jocular). In the third category, the attention is focused on the definition, on the verbal documentation, on the graphic illustration, and on the presence of special features (for example, the localizations, the phonetic transcription, etc.).

According to Shcherba: (a) academic dictionary (i.e. a dictionary similar to the type we call "standard-descriptive") :: reference dictionary; (b) encyclopedic :: general dictionary; (c) thesaurus :: normal dictionary (mono- lingual or bilingual); (d) normal dictionary (monolingual or bilingual) :: ideological (i.e. synonymic) dictionary; (e) monolingual :: translational (i.e. what we call bilingual dictionary); (f) non-historical :: historical dictionary.

We shall discuss the most important types of dictionaries. All dictionaries are divided into linguistic and encyclopedic.

Encyclopedic Dictionaries

In the first place, we must differentiate encyclopedic dictionaries from linguistic ones. The latter are primarily concerned with language,

i.e. with the lexical units of language and all their linguistic properties; the encyclopedic dictionaries (the biggest and most general of which are frequently called simply encyclopedias) are primarily concerned with the denotation of the lexical units (words). They give information about the extra-linguistic world, physical or non-physical, and they are only arranged in the order of the words (lexical units), i.e., the inclusion of names of persons, places, literary works, coverage of all branches of human knowledge, extensive treatment of facts. Nowadays the biggest and most general of encyclopedic dictionaries are frequently called simply encyclopedias. But it would be useful to make a distinction between an encyclopedia and encyclopedic dictionary. The enceclopedia are more concerned with the concepts and objects of extra linguistic world, that is the things in a narrow sense they may be called "thing books". Information presented in them is under few general topics. It is the arrangement "by words" which gives encyclopedias a similarity to monolingual dictionaries. As a generally known example of an encyclopedia can be indicated the Encyclopedia Britannica. The word "encyclopedia" suggests a huge work of many volumes concerned with all the fields of human knowledge. It is irrelevant whether they are huge or whether they are concise; it is also irrelevant by what principle their entries are chosen (terms of a science, important geographical place-names, names of famous writers, etc. If we read the entry bridge in a linguistic dictionary like the Oxford Dictionary, we get (besides a statement of the archaic and etymologically related forms), above all the definitions of the word's different senses (like a structure forming or carrying a road over a river, a ravine, etc., or affording passage between two points at a height above the ground), with quotations of different passages from texts where the word occurs. In Encyclopedia Britannica, the same word bridge is the index of a long entry which consists of the following chapters: I. History. II. Notable bridges by type. III. Constructions by type, A. fixed bridges, B. opening bridges. IV. Materials of construction. V. Bridge design. VI. Manufacture and supports. VII. Erection. The entry is full of pictures, tables, formulas; in short, he who has read it knows what is worth knowing about the various objects of the material world which can be referred to as bridges.

There is no need to stress that encyclopedic entries are not always as long as the one quoted above. But it is not their length which is decisive, it is their focus of interest in the extralinguistic world, in the objects themselves. We should know that there are elements of encyclopedic

character in almost all dictionaries. Some of these encyclopedic elements are unavoidable, some are introduced because the compiler of the dictionary wishes to give his work a certain character. Another field of overlapping is the terminological dictionaries of different specialized sciences. Similar is the case of the dictionaries of names. There are many dictionaries of names of a purely encyclopedic character, with the names serving as indexes: to entries describing the respective places or the life and work of the men in question. But even in the purely linguistic dictionaries of names, there are some elements of encyclopedic character which are hard to avoid; such as for example, the statement of more important persons in history who had the name Henry, in a dictionary of English Christian names.

Linguistic dictionaries

Diachronic Dictionaries: (historical and etymological)

If we turn our attention to the linguistic dictionaries, we can divide them into different categories by different criteria. One of the most important divisions of linguistic dictionaries is that between the diachronic and the synchronic ones. Diachronic dictionaries are primarily concerned with the history, with the development of words (lexical units), both in respect to form and in respect to meaning. Among the diachronic dictionaries, we can again perceive two different types, historical and etymological dictionaries.

Historical dictionaries focus their attention on the changes occurring both in the form and in the meaning of a word (lexical unit) within the period of time for which there is historical (usually textual) evidence at hand.

Etymological dictionaries focus their interest on the origin of the words (lexical units); and as it happens that a good part of the words of any language known to-day came into existence before the beginning of the textual tradition, the etymological dictionaries can be said to deal largely with the pre-history of the words. But the origins of the more recent words are also a legitimate subject of the etymological dictionary. The two elements, the historical and the etymological, are almost always intermingled, but in the majority of cases a preference for or the prevalence of one point of view can be observed. For example, the entry "father" goes as follows in Skeat's English Etymological Dictionary : father, a male parent. Middle Eng. fader, Chaucer, C.T. 8 098. (The spelling fader is almost universal in Middle English; father occurs in the

Bible of 1551, and is due to dialectal influence, which changed -der to -ther). Anglo-Saxon faeder ... Dutch voder; Danish and Swed. fader; Icelandic fadir; Gothonic fadar; German Vater. Latin pater; Greek pater; Persian pidar;Sanskrit pitr-; Irish athair. Indo-European type pater.

As we can see, etymological dictionaries trace present-day words to the oldest forms of these words and forms of these words in other languages. The interest of an etymological dictionary is primarily in the pre-history of the language. For arriving at the parent form the lexicographer takes recourse to historical comparative method.

The dictionary with one language deals with the lexical items of one language. The entry of the dictionary is given in that language. The origin of the words is traced back to the proto language. In this process cognate forms form related languages are cited and with the help of comparative method such dictionaries develop into comparative dictionaries. The etymological (and comparative) dictionaries are usually more concerned with the form of the words than with their meaning (though semantic correspondence is a vital necessity in the comparison of words). This is certainly a pity, but it generally cannot be helped, because for the study of meaning, rich evidence, i.e. extensive collections of material and mainly contexts are necessary. But at the beginning of the history of a language, contextual quotations are scarce and they are absolutely lacking in the reconstructed period. Therefore, the etymological (and comparative) dictionaries can give only schematic indications in respect to the meaning.

In the dictionary which has many languages as its focus the entry word is given in the proto language. The developed forms in different languages are given in the description part of the entry. In a historical dictionary, the semantic developments are at least as important as those of the form of the word. The historical dictionaries also frequently indicate what new words were derived from the original one during its history. Seeing how useful both points of view are, it is no wonder that some dictionaries try to be both etymological and historical, combining the two aspects. As examples, we can indicate A. Ernout, A. Meillet, Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue latine, Histoire des mots or V.I.Abaev, Istoriko-etimologicheskij slovar osetinskogo jazyka.The construction of historical or even of etymological dictionaries is a highly specialized branch of lexicography; as far as etymological dictionaries are concerned, the work is so specialized that very frequently their compilation is not conceived as a lexicographic activity in the narrower, more technical

sense of the word.

The compilers of the very big historical dictionaries (for example, Oxford English Dictionary, I, XIII (Supplement)) frequently cannot indicate the single senses of the words, and above all not the single quotations, in their real historical sequence, because such a presentation would be rather chaotic; they must present their material, not infrequently, in logical groups, or by semantic connections, or by some other principle, and proceed historically only within these "chapters". This is one of the reasons why there is an important area of overlapping between the historical dictionaries on the one side, and the big monolingual dictionaries on the other. Although the focus of the etymological and historical dictionaries is different, they are not oppesed to each other. On the contrary, they can be helpful to each other in getting more reliable results.

Synchronic Dictionaries

Whereas the task of diachronic dictionaries is to deal with the development of the lexicon, the purpose of synchronic dictionaries is to deal with the lexical stock of a language at one stage of its development. The difference between the two species is probably fairly clear, when considered generally. Two points must however, be discussed in greater detail.

First, the concept synchronic is not synonymous with "contemporary". Any epoch in the development of language can, at least ideally, be treated synchronically. Grassman's Dictionary of the Rig Vedic Sanskrit is a synchronic dictionary, though the language it deals with, is certainly not a contemporary one but stopped being used several millenaries ago. The second point is more difficult. It is impossible to interpret for practical linguistic and lexicographic purposes, the term synchronic as if we were concerned with the state of a language at one point of time.

Key words

academic dictionary, localizations, the phonetic transcription, reference dictionary, encyclopedic dictionary, ideological (i.e. synonymic) dictionary, monolingual dictionary, translational dictionary, historical dictionary, orthographic dictionary, pronunciation dictionary, frequency dictionary, etymological dictionaries.

Questions and tasks

1. Division of dictionaries according to scope of the speech

community.

2. Division of dictionaries according to segment of the vocabulary.

3. What is the purpose of synchronic dictionaries?

4. Analyze the subject matter of etymological dictionaries.

5. What kind of dictionaries deal with the lexical items of one language?

6. The role of historical dictionaries in studying of borrowing process.

References

1. Malkiel Y.An Introduction to Modern English Word Formation, - L.,1973, 256p.

2. Oxford History of English Lexicography/ed.by A.P.Cowie.- Oxford., Clarendon Press, 2009, - 551p.

3. Tom McArthur. Guides to tomorrow's English // English today. Cambridge University Press, 1998, P.21-23.

4. Shcherba L.V. Theoretical Lexicography. -M., 1944. 399p.

5. Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. -М. 1977. – 218 р.

6. Заботкина В.И. Новая лексика современного английского языка. -М., 1989. - 147р.

7. Ивлева Г.Г. Тенденции развития слова и словарного состава. -М. 1986.178р

Dictionaries

1. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. –Oxford, 1964.

2. Encyclopaedia Britannica, A new survey of universal knowledge. In 24 vols. 10th ed. London-Chicago-Toronto, different editions, 1961.

1. Hornby A. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. -Lnd. 1974.

2. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. M. 1986.

5. Walter W. Skeat, An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, -Oxford, first edition 1879, reimpression 1958, p. 209.

3. 6.Webster's New World Dictionary of American English. -N.Y. 1978.

4. Апресян Ю.Д. Новый большой англо-русский словарь. -М. 1993.

5. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. -М. 1967.

LECTURE 4. TYPES OF LINGUISTIC DICTIONARIES

Explanatory dictionaries

There is no in English an analogy of the term "толковый", that's why such kind of dictionaries are called general dictionaries, monolingual dictionaries or explanatory dictionaries. Explanatory dictionaries are the basic part of the unilingual linguistic dictionaries. You can find almost all information about the word and there are given all characteristics (grammatical, semantical, stylistic, etymological) of the lexical units. Proceeding from this they are considered as the basis of different types of dictionaries like phraseological, synonymic and etc.

Dialectical and regional dictionaries

Dialectical and regional dictionaries describe lexics of the certain dialect or the group of related dialects. Dictionary of J.Wright is the best known (Wright J.The English Dialect Dictionary. 6 vols. Oxford, 1898-1905). There are are given almost all dialectical words of English language which are used or which have been used for the last 200 years. Dialects of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales are included and characterized in this dictionary. It is considered as the best dictionary of dialects. In the USA was published dictionary which characterizes the dialectical features of American English (Cassidy F. G. et al. Dictionary of American Regional English. Univ. of Wisconsin, 1978). There were published Dictionary of localisms, dialectisms which includes 10 thousand words (Went-worth N. American Dialect Dictionary. N. Y., Cro-well, 1944). Besides it there are several dictionaries which are dedicated to certain dialects: Grant W. The Scottish National Dictionary. Edinburgh, 1941; Chambers Scots Dictionary. Ltd., 1951; Kurath H. Linguistic Atlas of New England. 4 vols. Providence, 1939; Craigie W. A., Aitken J. A. Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue from the 12th Century to the End of the 17th. Chicago.

There are so-called regional dictionaries which characterize special pecularities of certain variants of English language. (For instance, American English, Canadian English, Australian English and etc.): Craigie W. A. and Hul-bert J. R. A Dictionary of American English of Historical Principles. 4 vols. Chicago Univ., 1938-1944; Mathews M. A Dictionary of Americanisms on Historical Principles. 2 vols. Chicago Univ., 1951; A Dictionary of Canadianisms on Historical Principles/Ed. by W. S. Avis, Toronto, Gage, 1967; A Concise Dictionary of

Canadianisms/Ed. by W. S. Avis, Toronto, 1972; Cassidy F. G. and Page Le R. B. Dictionary of Jamaican English. Cambridge, 1967; Morris E. E. A Dictionary of Australian English. Sydney Univ., 1973; Johnston G. The Australian Pocket Oxford Dictionary. Oxford, 1976; Australian National Quick Reference Dictionary and Encyclopaedia. Melbourne, Age publ., 1969; Foreman J. B. The New Zealand Contemporary Dictionary. Christchurch, Whitcombe, 1968; Yule H. and Burnett A. C. A Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases. New ed./Ed. by W. Crooke. Delhi, 1968.

Slang dictionaries

As we know, slangs are non literary words which are used to create fresh names for some things. Slang has a great expressive force when used in colloquial speech. Among widely used slang dictionaries the best known are Partridge dictionaries: Partridge E. 1) Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English. 2 vols. Ltd., Routledge; 2) Dictionary of the Underworld: British and American; 3) A Smaller Slang Dictionary; 4) Shorter Slang Dictionary; 5) The Routledge Dictionary of Historical Slang. Abridged ed. of "Slang and Unconventional English" by G. Simpson.

Wentworth's. and Flexner's Dictionary of American Slang characterize only American slangs (Wentworth H. and Flexner S. B. Dictionary of American Slang. Second supplemented edition. N. Y., Crowell, 1975). More than 22 thousand lexical units are registered in this dictionary and it serves as the basis of Wentworth H. and Flexner S. B. The Pocket Dictionary of American Slang. A Popular Abridgement of the "Dictionary of American Slang". N. Y., Pocket Books). One more important dictionary which is dedicated to American slangs is the Reference book of Berry and Bark. It includes about 76 thousand words and expressions (Berry L. V., Van den Bark M. The American Thesaurus of Slang. 1st ed. Ltd., 1947; 2nd ed. N. Y., Croweil, 1960). Wessen M. H. A Dictionary of American Slang. Ltd., Harrap, 1935; Kendall P. Army and Navy Slang Dictionary. N. Y., 1946, Granville W., Roberts F. A Dictionary of Forces' Slang (1939-45). Ltd., Routledge are also characterize some pecularities of slangs. Franklyn's Dictionary of Rhyming Slang is considered is one of the original works in this sphere (Franklyn G. A Dictionary of Rhyming. Slang. Ltd., 1960). Farmer's and Henley's Slang and its Analogues Past and Present is one of the peculiar works which includes seven volumes. It compares English colloquial

words and slangs of XVI-XIX centuries (Farmer J. and Henley W. E. Slang and its Analogues Past and Present. A Dictionary, Historical anif Comparative of the Heterodox Speech of AH Classes of Society for more than Three Hundred Years. With Synonyms in English, French, Italian, etc. Ltd., 1890-1904). This original reference book was published in the USA in 1971 and 1974.

Dictionaries of the language of writers and poets

English lexicography dispose of many works which is dedicated to the peculiar language of writers and poets. Naturally, in the first place the works which characterize Shakespeare's Lexicon. Among them: Spevack M. The Harvard Concordance to Shakespeare. Harvard, 1973; Schmidt A. Shakespeare Lexicon. 2 vols. Ltd., 1886; Onions C. T. Shakespeare Glossary. Oxford, 1911; Bartlett J. New and Complete Concordance for Verbal Index to Words, Phrases and Passages in the Dramatic Works of Shakespeare, with Supplementary Concordance to the Poems, Ltd., Macmillan, 1889. The works which analyze the Bible are in the second place. The best one is the concordance of Cruden which was published in 1937 and includes more than 250 thousand articles (Cruden A. A Complete Concordance to the Old and New Testaments. Ltd., Mutterworth, 1930). There are also dictionaries which study the language of famous British and American writers and poets: Tatlock J., Kennedy A. A Concordance to the Complete Works of Chaucer and the Romaunt of the Rose. Washington, 1929; Brad-shaw J. A Concordance to the Poetical Works of John Milton. Ltd., Allen and Unwin, 1965; Montgomery C, Hubbard L. Concordance to the Poetical Works of John Dryden. N. Y., Russe! and Russei, 1957; Cooper L. A Concordance to the Poems of William Wordsworth. Ltd., Î911; Cuthber-son J. Complete Glossary to the Poetry and Prose of Robert Burnes. N. Y., 1886; Davies D., Wrigley E. Concordance to ihe Essays of Francis Bacon. Detroit, 1973; Abbot E. Concordance to the Works of Alexander Pope. N. Y., 1965; Baldwin D., Broughton L. Concordance to the Poems of John Keats. 3 vols. N. Y., 1963. This kind of reference books are useful especially for students.

Historical dictionaries

Historical dictionary registers the lexics of the language in the certain period of its development. Sometimes it compares contemporary state of the certain language with it's past position. Historical dictionary explains the words which belong to one (sometimes several) period of

development of the language. It shows the changes of form, meaning, stylistic and lexical peculiarities of a certain period.

The most famous historical dictionary which characterizes old English lexical system is the dictionary of Bosworth. It was compiled for linguists and was published at the end of XIX century. (Bosworth J. An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.Ltd., 1882—1898). At the beginning of XX century there was published a supplement for Bosworth's dictionary (Toller T. N. Supplément. Ltd., 1908-1921). Later these works were republished (Bosworth J. and Toller T. N. Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. Supplement by T. N. Toller. Oxford).

The next authoritative reference is the dictionary of Middle English(1100-1500 yy.). It was compiled by linguists of Michigan University (Kurath H., Kuhn A. M.r Reidy J. Middle English Dictionary. Michigan Univ.). Stratmann's dictionary is also famous: Stratmann F. A Middle English Dictionary Containing Words Used by English Writers from the 12th to the 15th Century/Ed. by H. Bradley. Oxford. Smaller in volumes dictionary: May-hew A. L., Skeat W. W. A Concise Dictionary of Middle English from A. D. 1150 to 1580. Oxford, 1888. and Harrison J. A., Baskerville W. M. A Handy Poetical Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. N. Y., Ltd., 1885.

Chronological Englisn Dictionary is considered is one of the unique dictionaries: Ftnken-staedt Th. et al. A Chronological Englisn Dictionary Listing 80,000 Words in Order of their Earliest Known Occurrence, Heidelberg, 1970.

Dictionaries of Sweet, Hall, Shipley are also usefull for students of universities: (Sweet H. The Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon. Oxford; Hall J. R. C A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. 4th ed. with Supplement. Cambridge, 1960; Shipley J. T. Dictionary of Early English. N. Y., Philosophical Library, 1955).

Dictionary of neologisms

As we know, neologisms appear when there is the need to express new ideas and notions. If a word is fixed in a dictionary, it ceases to be a neologism. There are three types of neologisms:

1) terminological neologisms (newly coined words, which designate new-born concepts);

2) stylistic neologisms (words coined for expressive utterance);

3) nonce words (words coined to suit one particular occasion).

The new lexical units of English language are represented by famous

American and British explanatory dictionaries. As a rule, after publishing such kind of dictionaries the firms publish special kind of supplements to these explanatory dictionaries, for instance: 6.000 Words. A Supplement to Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Mass., Merriam, 1976). Besides it dictionaries of new words are also published separately. For example, in 1950 there were published two dictionaries of English neologisms: Berg P. C. A Dictionary of New Words in English. 2nd ed. Ltd., Alien and Unwin, Ï953; Reifer M. Dictionary of New Words, N. Y., Philosophical Library, 1955. Naturally, both of these dictionaries become obsolete in our days.

The dictionary of famous lexicographer Barnhart includes the neologisms of 1963—1972yy and it is considered is one of the best dictionaries of new words of a certain period (Barnhart C. L., Steitimetz S., Barnhart R. K. The Barnhart Dictionary of New English since 1963. N. Y., Bronx, 1973). In 1980 there was published the second edition of Barnhart dictionary: Barnhart C. L. et al. The Second Barnhart Dictionary of New English. Ltd., 1980. See also: Черная А. М. Словарь-справочник неологизмов в американской научно-технической литературе. 2-е изд. М., 1971.

Dictionary of synonyms

Synonymic dictionaries register synonyms and words with close meanings. Such kind of dictionaries are subdivided into two types: explanatory and inventory.

Explanatory synonymic dictionaries not only register the line of synonyms but give information about the description of semantical, stylistic and peculiar features of this line.

Inventory synonymic dictionaries register synonymic lines but do not describe the difference between the parts of this line. There are a lot of synonymic dictionaries in English. Sometimes such kind of dictionaries include antonyms.

The best known dictionary of synonyms was published by the Merriam-Webster (Webster's New Dictionary of Synonyms. Mass., Merriam, 1968). It is an explanatory dictionary of synonyms and was compiled taking into special consideration the difference between their meanings and special features. It is unsurpassed in the wealth of observations, and contains an interesting attempt at a theoretical interpretation: similarities and differences between synonyms are described on the basis of their implications, applications, and

connotations. For this reason, in compiling our dictionary of English synonyms we have given most careful consideration to the data in Webster's dictionary.

In view of the role Webster's New Dictionary of Synonyms has played in this work as a lexicographical source, a few words need to be said about its deficiencies as well as its virtues. It should be borne in mind that Webster reflects the level of linguistic science of the early 1950s and in particular the limited notions of synonymy then prevailing. The essence of these may be summarized as follows:

(a) Synonymy is regarded as a rather incomplete correspondence of senses, permitting substantial semantic distinctions between 'synonyms', for example door, gate, portal, postern, doorway. It would seem impossible to construct a general and sufficiently rigorous definition of synonymy which would subsume the listed words as synonyms without at the same time entailing solutions, with regard to some other facts, that would be utterly unacceptable to the author of the definition.

(b) A synonymic relationship is often established between whole polysemous words rather than between individual senses of words. Thus, in the series repair, patch, the first synonym is represented by three senses: (1) to repair, as in to repair a car; (2) to make good, as in to repair the lack of early education; (3) to restore, as in peace can be repaired. Patch is represented by four senses: (1) to patch, as in to patch overalls; (2) to save from collapse, as in to patch up one's marriage; (3) to put together, as in to patch a car together from pieces from a junkyard; (4) to produce an incomplete picture of something on the basis of fragmentary information; his life must be patched together from scattered references. These words are not synonymous; but even if some words are synonymous in several senses at once, the types of semantic, stylistic, combinatorial, and syntactic differentiation within the series are by no means always the same. In terms of scope, this is only a small part of the material contained in Webster's dictionary of synonyms. For various reasons, most of them technical, many of Webster's series have been left out, and we have not added any new series not given by Webster. Generally speaking, as we have said, in view of the experimental nature of this dictionary we do not attempt to cover all the vocabulary of English but rather to describe fully each synonym series given. A standard entry comprises the following zones: (1) headword, (2) explication, (3) translation, (4) meaning, (5) notes, (6) syntax, (7) co-occurrence constraints, (8) illustrations. We shall consider each of these in detail.

The opening line of a dictionary entry comprises the synonym series itself, that is, the ordered list of synonyms to be considered. In most cases it coincides formally with the corresponding one in Webster's synonym dictionary. Departures from Webster are as follows:

(a) sometimes synonyms unaccountably missing in Webster are added to the series; for example in the series solitude, seclusion, isolation the word loneliness, which is semantically very close to solitude, is added; (b) sometimes certain words are omitted from a series when they are semantically fairly remote from its basic meaning. Thus, from the series remember, recollect, recall the verb remind (cause somebody to remember) is excluded. From the series recede, retreat etc. the verb retract, having a transitive and causative meaning, is dropped. In the series slide, glide, glissade, slip etc. the verbs coast and toboggan are removed; (c) where two series are close they may be combined if this produces a more consistent treatment of the material in the dictionary as a whole. For example, differences in the amount of movement, when the nature of that movement coincides, are usually treated by Webster within a single entry, producing series such as the following: swing, sway, undulate, fluctuate, oscillate, vibrate; shake, quake, shiver, and many others. This justifies the amalgamation of the two series jump, leap, spring, bound, vault and skip, hop; (d) any series which brings together several different meanings of synonyms in Webster is broken down into a number of new series such that in each new series all the synonyms are represented by just one meaning, and such that all synonyms in the series have this meaning.

Laird's inventory dictionary is one of the best synonymic dictionaries in the world (Laird Ch. Webster's New World Thesaurus. N. Y., New American Library, 1971).

The best known dictionaries are: Roger's International Thesaurus. N. Y., Crowell, Soûle R. A Dictionary of English Synonyms and Synonymous Expressions/Ed. by A. D. Sheffield. N. Y., Bantam Books, Allen F. S. Allen's Synonyms and Antonyms. N. Y., Harper; CrabbG. Crabb's English Synonyms. N. Y., Grosset and Dun-lop; Feenald H. C. Funk and Wagnalls Standard Handbook of Synonyms, Antonyms, and Prepositions. N. Y.; Hogan H. Dictionary of American Synonyms. N. Y., Philosophical Library; The Nuttal Dictionary of English Synonyms and Antonyms; Reader's Digest Use the Right Word. Modern Guide to Synonyms and Related Words. N. Y. Gandelsmati A. English Synonyms Explained and Illustrated/Ed. by V. ï. Tarkhov. Moscow, 1963, English-

Russian synonymic dictionary, Apresyan Yu. M., 1979.

Phraseological dictionaries

Phraseological dictionaries are dedicated to the analysis of phraseological units and idioms of the language. Strictly speaking, phraseological dictionaries can be defined as dictionaries that focus on combinations of two or more words that function in different ways as one lexeme. If we consider the traditional distinction between dictionaries as reference works that dealwith the properties of individual words and grammars as reference works that describe how words combine to form sentences, phraseological dictionaries might even be seen as contradictions in terms. At the same time, however, the mere existence of phraseological dictionaries bears witness to the fact that the distinction between lexis and grammar is by no means as clear-cut or obvious as is often assumed. Catchphrases, proverbs, and quotations represent a special type of idiom in that they can be attributed sentence or utterance status and thus a special pragmatic function. Of course, as Elizabeth Knowles (1997: vii) points out in the preface to the Oxford Dictionary of Phrase, Saying and Quotation, proverbs and sayings frequently originate in quotations so that once again the delimitation of these phenomena is not straightforward, although such categories as proverbs, sayings, or nursery rhymes are also covered by special dictionaries. Collections of these items have existed for a long time. Another subtype of phraseological dictionary is represented by dictionaries of catchphrases: combinations such as close your eyes and think of England or beam me up, Scotty can be found in the Dictionary of Catch Phrases (1977)or the Oxford Dictionary of Catch Phrases (2002). While most idiom dictionaries do not supply any information on the history of first uses of the idioms described, The AmericanHeritage Dictionary of Idioms (1997) or the Oxford Dictionary of Idioms (2004) (ODI) provide short indications of historical origins. Nowadays popular dictionaries are Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English (Cowie A. P., Mackin R. Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English. Vol. I, Verbs with Prepositions and Particles. Oxford, 1975) and The Kenkyusha Dictionary of Current English Idioms (Ichikawa S. The Kenkyusha Dictionary of Current English Idioms. Tokyo, 1980.).

Generally speaking, Languages declare their independence by creating dictionaries. With a dictionary, a language (or language variety) is no longer a dependent or derivative, no longer insufficient and inadequate.

Key words

explanatory dictionary, dialectical dictionary, regional dictionary, analogy, idiom, catchphrase, proverb, quotation, inventory dictionary, terminological neologism, stylistic neologism, nonce words.

Questions and tasks

1. Compare Laird's inventory dictionary with A Dictionary of English Synonyms and Synonymous Expressions/Ed. by A. D. Sheffield.
2. Describe the standard entry of dictionary of synonyms.
3. What is purpose of inventory synonymic dictionary?
4. Differentiate three types of neologisms.
5. Specific features of the best known phraseological dictionaries.
6. Analyze different types of phraseological dictionaries.

References

1. Malkiel Y. An Introduction to Modern English Word Formation, -L.,1973, 256p.
2. Oxford History of English Lexicography/ed.by A.P.Cowie.- Oxford., Clarendon Press, 2009, - 551p.
3. Tom McArthur. Guides to tomorrow's English // English today. Cambridge University Press, 1998, P.21-23.
4. Shcherba L.V. Theoretical Lexicography. -M., 1944. 399p.
5. Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. -М. 1977.218р.
6. Ивлева Г.Г. Тенденции развития слова и словарного состава. -М. 1986.178р.

Dictionaries

1. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. –Oxford, 1964.
2. Encyclopaedia Britannica, A new survey of universal knowledge. In 24 vols. 10th ed. London-Chicago-Toronto, different editions, 1961.
1. HornbyA. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. -Lnd. 1974.
2. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. -M. 1986.
7. Walter W. Skeat, An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, -Oxford, first edition 1879, p. 209.
3. 6.Webster's New World Dictionary of American English. -N.Y. 1978.

4. Апресян Ю.Д. Новый большой англо-русский словарь. -М. 1993.

5. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. -М. 1967.

LECTURE 5. HISTORY OF THE BRITISH LEXICOGRAPHY

Historical development of british lexicography

There is as yet no coherent doctrine in English lexicography, its richness and variety are everywhere admitted and appreciated. Its history is in its way one of the most remarkable developments in linguistics, and is therefore worthy of special attention.

A need for a dictionary or glossary has been felt in the cultural growth of many civilised peoples at a fairly early period. The history of dictionary-making for the English language goes as far back as the Old English period where its first traces are found in the form of glosses of religious books with interlinear translation from Latin. Regular bilingual English-Latin dictionaries were already in existence in the 15th century.

The unilingual dictionary is a comparatively recent type. The first unilingual English dictionary, explaining words by English equivalents, appeared in 1604. It was meant to explain difficult words occurring in books. Its title was "A Table Alphabeticall, containing and teaching the true writing and understanding of hard usuall English words borrowed from the Hebrew, Greeke, Latine or French". The little volume of 120 pages explaining about 3000 words was compiled by one Robert Cawdrey, a schoolmaster. Other books followed, each longer than the preceding one. The first attempt at a dictionary including all the words of the language, not only the difficult ones, was made by Nathaniel Bailey who in 1721 published the first edition of his "Universal Etymological English Dictionary". He was the first to include pronunciation and etymology.

Big explanatory dictionaries were created in France and Italy before they appeared for the English language. Learned academies on the continent had been established to preserve the purity of their respective languages. This was also the purpose of Dr. Samuel Johnson's famous Dictionary published in 1755 (Johnson, Samuel. A Dictionary of the English Language in Which the Words are Deduced from Their Originals and Illustrated in Their General Significations by Examples from the Best

Writers: In 2 vols. London, 1775.). The idea of purity involved a tendency to oppose change, and S. Johnson's Dictionary was meant to establish the English language in its classical form, to preserve it in all its glory as used by J. Dryden, A. Pope, J. Addison and their contemporaries. In conformity with the social order of his time, S. Johnson attempted to "fix" and regulate English. This was the period of much discussion about the necessity of "purifying" and "fixing" English, and S. Johnson wrote that every change was undesirable, even a change for the best.

The Golden Age of English lexicography began in the last quarter of the 19th century when the English Philological Society started work on compiling what is now known as "The Oxford English Dictionary" (OED), but was originally named "New English Dictionary on Historical Principles". It is still occasionally referred to as NED.

The purpose of this monumental work is to trace the development of English words from their form in Old English, and if they were not found in Old English, to show when they were introduced into the language, and also to show the development of each meaning and its historical relation to other meanings of the same word. For words and meanings which have become obsolete the date of the latest occurrence is given. All this is done by means of dated quotations ranging from the oldest to recent appearances of the words in question. The English of G. Chaucer, of the "Bible" and of W. Shakespeare is given as much attention as that of the most modern authors. The dictionary includes spellings, pronunciations and detailed etymologies. The completion of the work required more than 75 years. The result is a kind of encyclopaedia of language used not only for reference purposes but also as a basis for lexicological research.

The conception of this new type of dictionary was born in a discussion at the English Philological Society. It was suggested by Frederick Furnivall, later its second titular editor, to Richard Trench, the author of the first book on lexicology of the English language. The first part of the Dictionary appeared in 1884 and the last in 1928. Later it was issued in twelve volumes and in order to accommodate new words a three volume Supplement was issued in 1933. These volumes were revised in the seventies. Nearly all the material of the original Supplement was retained and a large body of the most recent accessions to the English language added. The principles, structure and scope of "The Oxford English Dictionary", is considered superior to corresponding major dictionaries for other languages. The Oxford University Press published different abridged versions. "The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on

Historical Principles" formerly appeared in two volumes, now printed on thinner paper it is bound in one volume of 2,538 pages. It differs from the complete edition in that it contains a smaller number of quotations. It keeps to all the main principles of historical presentation and covers not only the current literary and colloquial English but also its previous stages. Words are defined and illustrated with key quotations.

"The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English" was first published in 1911, i.e. before the work on the main version was completed. It is not a historical dictionary but one of current usage. A still shorter form is "The Pocket Oxford Dictionary".

Another big dictionary, also created by joined effort of enthusiasts, is Joseph Wright's "English Dialect Dictionary". Before this dictionary could be started upon, a thorough study of English dialects had to be completed. With this aim in view W.W. Skeat, famous for his "Etymological English Dictionary" founded the English Dialect Society as far back as 1873. Dialects are of great importance for the historical study of the language. In the 19th century they were very pronounced though now they are almost disappearing. The Society existed till 1896 and issued 80 publications, mostly monographs.

Bilingual dictionaries of English language

English becomes a world language by the end of the nineteenth century English had gained considerable ground as the international language of commerce and travel, and the number of general- and special-purpose bilingual dictionaries compiled for non-English speakers had correspondingly increased. The language began gradually to take on the role of the language in which to write in order to reach an international audience of scholars and businessmen. French still played a similar role as the international language of culture and diplomacy and, as a matter of fact, during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries bilingual dictionaries of English and French published in Great Britain (and meant to serve an English-speaking audience) exceeded by far those pairing English with other European languages also spoken outside Europe, such as Spanish and Portuguese. A complex of well-known factors determined in the twentieth century the worldwide expansion of English: bilingual dictionaries with English mirror such a development, and American production of bilingual dictionaries featuring European languages also increased.

English and Latin. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Latin

had lost a great part of its function as a language of culture in favour of national languages. In the first half of the nineteenth century, we still Wnd scientific reports written in Latin, above all in the fields of the natural sciences, anatomy, and medicine, with the aim of reaching an international audience. Gradually, however, the study of Latin lost this communicative use, without altogether losing its cultural function. Dictionaries combining Latin and a national modern language testiWed to the improvements that had taken place in historical and comparative linguistics and remained the keys to accessing classical literature. Ethan Allen Andrews (1787–1858) published in 1852 a Latin–English dictionary which was a condensed version of the Wo¨rterbuch der lateinischen Sprache compiled by the German philologist Wilhelm Freund. Andrews's dictionary met with great success in the USA, and in British colleges, often in abridged editions. A Latin Dictionary (1879) by Charlton Thomas Lewis (1834–1904) and Charles Lancaster Short (1821–86), of 2,019 pages, was based on Andrews's dictionary 'revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten' by Lewis and Short, as stated in the Advertisement.2 An Elementary Latin Dictionary (also called Elementary Lewis) was an abridged version, published in 1891, for the use of students. The Oxford Latin Dictionary, planned in 1931, appeared in its Wrst fascicle in 1968 and its eighth and Wnal one in 1982, when it was also made available in a single bound volume. It is based on a reading of the Latin sources. The Oxford Latin Dictionary covers classical Latin with entries for approximately 40,000 words. It does not include pagan and Christian writers after ad 200, these being covered by Lewis and Short. There was a corrected reprint in 1996, edited by P. G. W. Glare. Beside these works for scholars, we should mention the Pocket Oxford Latin Dictionary (1994), designed for students, with Latin words added from the writings of Plautus and Terence, and from the study of writings belonging to the so-called Silver Latin period. This work was edited by James Morwood, as was the Oxford Latin Minidictionary (1995). The Follett World-Wide Latin Dictionary, Latin–English/English–Latin (1967) was an attempt to coin Latin words for modern objects. Similar attempts are also periodically made by other bodies which foster a return to Latin as an international auxiliary language. English and French. The number of new bilingual dictionaries appearing in the early nineteenth century and featuring English—and of updated editions of eighteenth-century dictionaries—certainly bore witness to an enlarged market and an increased demand for treatment of the up-to-date standard

language and for colloquial usage, since dictionaries are used in everyday situations and not only for reading literature or philosophical works. Though most bilingual dictionaries have two parts, we find Gasc's dictionary (1873; printed in London and reprinted in Great Britain till the end of the century) composed of just the French–English part, and the author declares that he 'does not bind himself to issue an English–French Dictionary'. It is a clear sign that in Great Britain at that point there was a larger market for reading French texts than for writing in, or translating into, that language (1873: 595). Correct pronunciation of English and French was a problem for teachers of both as foreign languages. Boyer's Royal Dictionary Abridged (1700) broke new ground in nineteenth and twentieth centuries that it included primary stress marks on English words, a practice which would become generalized later in monolingual English dictionaries and in bilingual dictionaries combining English with Italian, Dutch, and Spanish. The most influential pronouncing norms and systems of respelling in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century bilingual dictionaries were those of Walker (1791) for English and those of the French Academy and Abbe´ D'Olivet for French.

The Hachette-Oxford, edited by Corre´ard and Grundy, is also a large dictionary, Wrst published in 1994 and revised in 2001. It includes collocates in both parts.

English and Italian. Baretti's celebrated Dictionary of the English and Italian Languages was published in London in 1760. There were numerous updatings and reprints up until 1928. The dictionary had received a major revision in 1854 by J. Davenport and G. Comelati, Davenport having previously collaborated with S. E. Petronj to compile a new dictionary. In that work (Petronj and Davenport 1824), both Italian and English headwords and translation equivalents were marked with a primary accent. French equivalents were rather casually added, though with no pronunciation indicated, nor change of gender signalled. A succession of works then appeared, such as Meadows (1834), Millhouse (1849, 1853), and James and Grassi (1854), all stigmatized by O'Connor (1991) as popular, comprehensive but relying too much on Baretti's limited and dated English list of words .

Barbara Reynolds's Cambridge Italian Dictionary (1962) is, on the contrary, mainly intended for English readers of Italian literature; its English–Italian part was compiled much later, in 1981. While other dictionaries group phraseology according to meaning and in a section which follows immediately after the suggested translation equivalent,

Sansoni–Harrap (1970) and Sani (1974) do not. They give all the equivalents.

Skey (1978) has the English–Italian part based on the second edition of the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (1963) with adaptations to suit the Italian learner. For example, it deals prominently with phrasal verbs, listing them as separate subentries. The publishing house of Paravia first launched the Passerini Tosi dictionary in 1989. This later became the Oxford-Paravia (2001; second edition 2006). The English–Italian section was based on the Oxford-Hachette French Dictionary.

English and Spanish. One of the outstanding features of the English–Spanish dictionary edited by Edwin B. Williams (1955) is the close attention given to 'meaning discriminators'. The ExplanatoryNotes clearly state which meaning discriminator has to be chosen to particularize a given part of speech.

The Bantam New College Spanish & English Dictionary, considered one of the best bilingual dictionaries, with regard to the handling of sense discriminations, that had ever appeared till that date. During the last quarter of the twentieth century a number of very large dictionaries. There is also the Oxford Spanish Dictionary, which in its third edition has acquired collocates. The Colin Smith dictionary (first edition 1971), appeared in an eighth edition in 2005. It featured long, completely translated examples and cultural notes. It was the first large bilingual dictionary on which Collins publishers embarked and it set high standards which were maintained and indeed surpassed by the later French and English dictionary edited by Atkins (1978). Then, in 2003, there was Chambers Harrap, which boasted 'over 400,000 translations', and had a section devoted to false friends, but also signalled false friends in the main text after the article(s) concerned.

English and german. German and English bilingual dictionaries continued, in the nineteenth century, to be published mainly by German publishers. Fick (1802), Hilpert (1828–45), Burckhardt (1839), Grieb (1842–47), James (1846), and Wessely (1883) were all published in Germany. Nineteenth-century German philological studies made great strides in etymology, comparative grammar and morphology, and German lexicographers often used such studies as a springboard to discuss the grouping of English and German word families, or to decide at which point to start an incomplete subentry, i.e. whether to replace by a tilde mechanically the part of the subentry that was common to the entry or to identify a root.

The most impressive English–German dictionary of the first half of the nineteenth century was that of J. G. Flu¨gel (J. G. Flu¨gel A Complete Dictionary of the English and German Languages (1830, 1847–56).

In the second half of the twentieth century, the production of large bilingual dictionaries for English and German consisted of an updated reprinting ofWeir's dictionary, completely revised by H. T. Betteridge (1978) in England for Cassell, and of the already mentioned Muret and Sanders (1962–75) by Langenscheidt in Germany. There are also new dictionaries, such as the Pons-Globalwo¨rterbuch (1983), the Collins German and English dictionary (1980), Langenscheidt's Großwo¨rterbuch (1985), and the Duden-Oxford Großwo¨rterbuch (1990).

As a whole, modern English–German bilingual lexicography has capitalized well on German metalexicographic research, the most developed in the world.

The Oxford English Dictionary

In the more enlightened attitude of the Society for Pure English, as distinguished from most purist efforts in the past, it is impossible not to see the influence of a great work that came into being in the latter half of the nineteenth century. About 1850 the inadequacy of the existing dictionaries of the English language began to be acutely felt. Those of Johnson and Richardson, even in their later revisions, were sadly incomplete and far below the standards of modern scholarship. In 1857 at a meeting of the Philological Society in London a committee was appointed to collect words not in the dictionaries, with a view to publishing a supplement to them. The committee consisted of Herbert Coleridge, Dean Trench (whose little books English Past and Present and The Study of Words had shown his interest in word history), and F.J.Furnivall, that great student and inspirer of students of early English literature. Furnivall seems to have suggested the undertaking. The most important outcome of the committee's activity was a paper read to the Society by Dean Trench, "On Some Deficiencies in Our English Dictionaries." In it he laid down the historical principles on which a dictionary should be compiled. As a result of this paper the society decided that a supplement would not be satisfactory, and in January 1858 it passed resolutions calling for a new dictionary. A formal "Proposal for the Publication of a New English Dictionary by the Philological Society" was issued the following year. The two principal aims of the new project were to record every word that could be found in English from about the

year 1000 and to exhibit the history of each— its forms, its various spellings, and all its uses and meanings, past and present. The lastnamed feature was especially to be shown by a full selection of quotations from the whole range of English writings. This would of course necessitate the systematic reading of thousands of texts. A call for volunteers was issued and met with a most gratifying response. Hundreds of readers not only from England but all over the world began to send in material. This was the nucleus out of which the future dictionary grew. The number of contributors increased, and before the last part of the dictionary was published some six million slips containing quotations had been gathered. An important by-product of the dictionary enterprise was the founding of a society for the publication of unedited texts, chiefly from the Middle Ages. It was early apparent that the words from this great mass of literature could be obtained only with great difficulty as long as much of it remained in manuscript. In order to provide the machinery for the printing of this material by subscription, Furnivall founded in 1864 the Early English Text Society. Through this society more than 400 volumes, chiefly of Middle English texts, have been published. The first editor appointed to deal with the mass of material being assembled was Herbert Coleridge, already mentioned. Upon his sudden death in 1861 at the age of thirty one, he was succeeded by Furnivall, then in his thirty-sixth year. For a time work went forward with reasonable speed, but then it gradually slowed down, partly because of Furnivall's increasing absorption in other interests. Meanwhile James A.H.Murray, a Scottish schoolmaster with philological tastes, had been approached by certain publishers to edit a dictionary to rival those of Webster and Worcester. After the abandonment of this project Murray was drawn into the Philological Society's enterprise, and in 1879 a formal agreement was entered into with the Oxford University Press where by this important publishing house was to finance and publish the society's dictionary and Murray was to be its editor. From this time on the work was pushed with new energy and in 1884 the first installment, covering part of the letter A, was issued. By 1900 four and a half volumes had been published, extending as far as the letter H.World War I made serious inroads in the dictionary staff, and progress was for a time retarded. But in 1928 the final section was issued, just seventy years after the Philological Society had passed its now notable resolution looking toward "A New English Dictionary." Dr. Murray did not live to see the completion of the task that he had undertaken. But his genuine scholarship and sure judgment in laying

down the lines along which the work should be carried out were of the greatest importance to its success. In 1887 he secured the services of Henry Bradley, then comparatively unknown but instantly recognized through the merit of a long review which he wrote of the first installment. In 1888 he became a co-editor. In 1897 William A.Craigie, recently called to Oxford from the University of St. Andrews, joined the staff and in 1901 became a third editor. Finally, in 1914, Charles T.Onions, who had been working with Dr. Murray since 1895, was appointed the fourth member of the editorial staff. Two of the editors were knighted in recognition of their services to linguistic scholarship, Murray in 1908 and Craigie in 1928. But the list of editors does not tell the story of the large number of skillful and devoted workers who sifted the material and did much preliminary work on it. Nor would the enterprise have been possible at all without the generous support of the Oxford University Press and the voluntary help of thousands who furnished quotations. The dictionary was originally known by the name A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles (NED), although in 1895 the title The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) was added and has since become the standard designation. The completed work fills ten large volumes, occupies 15,487 pages, and treats 240,165 main words. In 1933 a supplementary volume was published, containing additions and corrections accumulated during the forty-four years over which the publication of the original work extended. A four-volume Supplement that absorbed the 1933 Supplement was published under the editorship of R.W. Burchfield between 1972 and 1986. A second edition by J.A.Simpson and E.S.C.Weiner in 1989 amalgamated the first edition, the Burchfield Supplement, and approximately 5,000 new words, or new senses of existing words, in twenty volumes. The second edition contains about 290,500 main entries, or about 38,000 more than the first edition with its 1933 Supplement. In the 1970s a micrographic reproduction of the first edition in two volumes made the dictionary available to many who could not afford it in its original format, and the availability of the second edition online has opened up new possibilities for the use of computer technology. In preparation for the third edition Oxford University Press is publishing supplements to the entries of the second edition and completely new entries under the title Oxford English Dictionary Additions Series. Three volumes were published between 1993 and 1997. The influence of this great publication—the greatest dictionary of any language in the world—has been far-reaching. Its authority was recognized from the appearance

of the first installment. It has provided a wealth of exact data on which many questions relating to the history of the language have been resolved. But it has had a further important effect that was scarcely contemplated by the little committee of the Philological Society to which it owed its inception. It has profoundly influenced the attitude of many people toward language, and toward the English language in particular. By exhibiting the history of words and idioms, their forms and various spellings, their changes of meaning, the way words rise and fall in the levels of usage, and many other phenomena, it has increased our linguistic perspective and taught us to view many questions of language in a more scientific and less dogmatic way. When historians of English a century or two hence attempt to evaluate the effect of the Oxford Dictionary on the English language they may quite possibly say that it exerted its chief force in making us historically minded about matters of English speech.

Key words

bilingual dictionary, supplement, micrographic reproduction, Pure English, abridged version.

Questions and tasks

1. Enumerate the dictionaries which are closely connected with the English Philological Society.
2. Characterize Robert Cawdrey's "Table Alphabeticall".
3. How many volumes of "Oxford English Dictionary Additions Series" were published between 1993 and 1997?
4. What is the second name of The Oxford English Dictionary (OED)?
5. When did the Golden Age of English lexicography begin?
6. Specific features of J.G. Flu¨gel's "A Complete Dictionary of the English and German Languages".
7. Characterize "The Oxford-Paravia".

References

1. Бушуй А.М. Фразеографические основы украинского толкового словаря // Вопросы филологических наук.-М.,2009.-№6.-С.26-30.

2. Бушуй Т.А. Фразеосистемность в контрастивном лексическом словаре // Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан. – Нукус, 2001. - №5. – С.92-93.

3. Malkiel Y. An Introduction to Modern English Word Formation, - L.,1973, 256p.

4. Oxford History of English Lexicography/ed.by A.P.Cowie.- Oxford., Clarendon Press, 2009, - 551p.

5. Tom McArthur. Guides to tomorrow's English // English today. Cambridge University Press, 1998, P.21-23.

6. Shcherba L.V. Theoretical Lexicography. -M., 1944. 399p.

7. Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. -М. 1977.218р.

8. Ивлева Г.Г. Тенденции развития слова и словарного состава. -М. 1986.178р.

Dictionaries

1. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. –Oxford, 1964.

2. Hornby The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. - Lnd. 1974.

3. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. -M. 1986.

4. Webster's New World Dictionary of American English. -N.Y. 1978.

5. Апресян Ю.Д. Новый большой англо-русский словарь. -М. 1993.

6. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. -М. 1967.

LECTURE 6. HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN LEXICOGRAPHY

Historical development of American lexicography

Curiously enough, the first American dictionary of the English language was compiled by a man whose name was also Samuel Johnson. Samuel Johnson Jr., a Connecticut schoolmaster, published in 1798 a small book entitled "A School Dictionary". This book was followed in 1800 by another dictionary by the same author, which showed already some signs of Americanization. It included, for instance, words like tomahawk and wampum, borrowed into English from the Indian languages. It was Noah Webster, universally considered to be the father of American lexicography, who emphatically broke away from English

idiom, and embodied in his book the specifically American usage of his time. His great work, "The American Dictionary of the English Language", appeared in two volumes in 1828 and later sustained numerous revised and enlarged editions. In many respects N. Webster follows the lead of Dr S. Johnson (the British lexicographer). But he has also improved and corrected many of S. Johnson's etymologies and his definitions are often more exact. N.Webster attempted to simplify the spelling and pronunciation that were current in the USA of the period. He devoted many years to the collection of words and the preparation of more accurate definitions.

N.Webster realised the importance of language for the development of a nation, and devoted his energy to giving the American English the status of an independent language, distinct from British English. At that time the idea was progressive as it helped the unification of separate states into one federation. The tendency became reactionary later on, when some modern linguists like H. Mencken shaped it into the theory of a separate American language, not only different from British English, but surpassing it in efficiency and therefore deserving to dominate and supersede all the languages of the world. Even if we keep within purely linguistic or purely lexical concepts, we shall readily see that the difference is not so great as to warrant American English the rank of a separate language, not a variant of English.

The set of morphemes is the same. Some words have acquired a new meaning on American soil and this meaning has or has not penetrated into British English. Other words kept their earlier meanings that are obsolete and not used in Great Britain. As civilisation progressed different names were given to new inventions on either side of the Atlantic. Words were borrowed from different Indian languages and from Spanish. All these had to be recorded in a dictionary and so accounted for the existence of specific American lexicography. The world of today with its ever-growing efficiency and intensity of communication and personal contacts, with its press, radio and television creates conditions which tend to foster not an isolation of dialects and variants but, on the contrary, their mutual penetration and integration.

Later on, the title "International Dictionary of the English Language" was adopted, and in the latest edition not Americanisms but words not used in America (Britishisms) are marked off.

The other great American dictionaries are the "Century Dictionary", first completed in 1891; "Funk and Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary",

first completed in 1895; the "Random House Dictionary of the English Language", completed in 1967; "The Heritage Illustrated Dictionary of the English Language", first published in 1969, and C.L. Barnhart's et al. "The World Book Dictionary" presenting a synchronic review of the language in the 20th century. The first three continue to appear in variously named subsequent editions including abridged versions. Many small handy popular dictionaries for office, school and home use are prepared to meet the demand in reference books on spelling, pronunciation, meaning and usage.

In the history of American lexicography, The Century Dictionary is a dictionary of all generations. There had been nothing like it before and there has been nothing like it since. The Century Dictionary was not a historical dictionary like the New English Dictionary (later to be called the Oxford English Dictionary) then under way in Britain, but it was a multivolume dictionary of comparable scale, and was seen to be competitive by James A. H. Murray, who attacked it with remarkable acerbity in a letter to a journal in 1890 soon after its initial volume appeared. He evidently feared that the Century was making use of the early fascicles of the New English Dictionary, and, indeed, the editor of the Century acknowledges consulting A and B, the only two letters available before the Century was completed. In the long run it is likely that the editors of the New English Dictionary made more use of the Century than its editors did of the NED.

The Century was issued in parts beginning in 1889 and was completed and bound in six volumes at the end of 1891. The price was $120, a cost that put it beyond the means of most individuals. The dictionary contained 215,000 entry words, about 500,000 deWnitions with many thousands of illustrative quotations, and 8,000 pictorial illustrations.

What truly distinguishes the Century from other dictionaries before or since are the extraordinary care taken to produce a well-crafted, handsome set of books, with clear, legible, and attractive type printed on good paper and, related to that, the large number of very Wne wood engravings and other pictorial illustrations, many composed by the best nature artists, such as Ernest Thompson Seton. Also the coverage given to encyclopedic material, particularly in the sciences and technology, but extended also to cover names of all kinds (biographical, geographical, literary and mythological characters, etc.) in the Cyclopedia of Names. Including encyclopedic material in dictionaries was nothing new, but in

Webster's early dictionaries (as in earlier British dictionaries) the choice of encyclopedic material was unpredictable and even eccentric; by contrast, the scope and systematic nature of the Century's coverage of science, technology, and other encyclopedic terms was unprecedented in American lexicography. It did not just deWne cog-wheel, for example; it included an illustration of it, and its deWnition explained how it transmitsmotion and directed the reader to several particular types of cogwheels, all included in separate entries within the dictionary. The noun count was not only defined as a title of nobility; in smaller type a short essay described the history of the uses of the term, beginning in the Roman republic and continuing into feudal times. Given the space and attention devoted to pictorial illustrations in the Century, it is remarkable how little Whitney says about them in his Preface. He says that, though they have been selected to be subordinate to the text, they have considerable independent merit and artistic value. W. Lewis Fraser, manager of the Art Department of the Century Company, which produced the Century Magazine (and from which some of the illustrations were taken) was the person responsible for them. A very large number of them are of animals and insects, and they are exquisitely drawn, mostly reproduced from wood engravings. Some of the illustrations are line drawings and a few, according to Michael Hancher, are half-tones, a relatively innovative process in 1889, but one that would become a mainstay in published books for the next century. The Century was printed in three columns with running heads at the top and with no pronunciation key at the base. The type, designed by Theodore Low De Vinne, was unusually readable for its size, and from it a number of modern typefaces have been derived. Entry words appear solid, without syllabication, and (unlike Webster's International of 1890) are not capitalized unless they are names, a practice now standard in lexicography. The pronunciation, following the entry word, is based on a respelling system employing few diacritics. The pronunciation system is not very sophisticated or innovative, but is serviceable. Following the partof- speech label is the etymology, enclosed within square brackets. Some of the etymologies in the Century are immensely long. For example, the etymology for man is fifty-eight column lines long.

Following the publication in 1890 of Webster's International Dictionary, the next major dictionary to be published was the first of Funk & Wagnalls' unabridged dictionaries, the Funk &Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of the English Language, in two volumes; the Wrst

volume was published in 1893, the second volume the following year, and the two-volume set in 1895. The Standard Dictionary reportedly covered 304,000 terms, a vocabulary almost fifty per cent larger than the Century's and nearly seventy-Wve per cent larger than that of Webster's International Dictionary. Although the Standard Dictionary was very different from the Century, it too vaunted its coverage of science and technology. In 1913, a new edition, the massive New Standard Dictionary of the English Language, containing 450,000 terms, was published in a single volume. The Funk & Wagnalls Standard and the New Standard thus continued the relentless growth of dictionaries to ever-larger and more comprehensive size, a pattern originally established by Webster's American Dictionary of 1847, which might be summarized as, 'Give them more for less', i.e. increase the coverage of vocabulary and package the book so that it can be sold cheaply. (The Century is the notable exception to this trend.) The A–Z text of the Standard runs to 2,100 pages, and of the New Standard to 2,757 pages. The prestige of owning an immense, unabridged dictionary, representing in its solid, blocklike weight the stability and power of the whole of the English language, as the Bible represented faith in God, was a powerful argument for purchase.

Clarence Barnhart had long been a major figure in American lexicography. Barnhart was best known for the series of children's dictionaries published under the Thorndike–Barnhart rubric. These were the successors to earlier children's dictionaries based primarily on the New Century Dictionary. In 1958, Barnhart was invited to prepare a very large new dictionary that would be sold with the World Book Encyclopedia, one of the best-selling encyclopedias in the United States. The new dictionary, like the encyclopedia, was designed for students at the upper-grade school and high-school levels. It would be published in two volumes in 1963 as the World Book Dictionary, and was sold both with the encyclopedia set and separately by the encyclopedia publishers. Edited by Clarence L. Barnhart and his son, Robert K. Barnhart, the World Book Dictionary originally contained about 170,000 entries, in later editions at least 225,000. Because it was meant to be compatible with the World Book Encyclopedia, it did not include biographical or geographical entries, nor did it include any detailed encyclopedic material. In light of its intended readership, the definitions are written simply whenever possible. Although the dictionary omits excessively technical terms along with most obsolete and rare words, it does cover a wide range of scientific and technical vocabulary. Perhaps the most

distinctive feature of the World Book Dictionary is its use of illustrative quotations to exemplify its definitions.

Because of the efforts of Laurence Urdang, the managing editor, the Random House Dictionary was one of the first dictionaries to make use of data processing systems, the forerunner of modern computer technology, in some phases of its editorial preparation and in its production. Such technology was used to sort dictionary entries to facilitate their distribution to subject specialists and consultants, and innovative methods for the time were used to produce typeset text including the required mark-up for styling (italic, boldface, etc.) before it was turned over to the compositors for typesetting. In summary, the 1966 Random House Dictionary was offered to the public as a distinct alternative to Webster's Third. Although calling itself Unabridged Edition, the original Random House Dictionary, with about 260,000 entries, was not nearly as comprehensive as the Webster and Funk & Wagnalls' unabridged dictionaries.

Twenty-one years later, in 1987, the Second Edition of the Random House Dictionary appeared, with a vocabulary enlarged by nearly twenty per cent for a new total of 315,000 entries. The editor-in-chief was Stuart Berg Flexner, and the managing editor, Leonore Crary Hauck. The strengths and comparative deficiencies of the First Edition remain evident in the Second Edition. As the tribulations of Webster's Third had by then receded from the public consciousness, the new preface places less emphasis on the lexicographer's responsibility to report prevailing social attitudes and more on its coverage of new terms and international usages previously neglected. In 1993, an updated edition renamed Random House Unabridged Dictionary still retained the hundreds of pages of supplementary material, but in 1997 almost all the supplementary material was dropped. The new edition, timed to coincide with the publication of the second edition of the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, was renamed once more. Webster's was added to the title, and it was reborn as Random House Webster's Unabridged Dictionary.

An adequate idea of the dictionaries cannot be formed from a mere description and it is no substitute for actually using them. To conclude we would like to mention that for a specialist in linguistics and a teacher of foreign languages systematic work with a good dictionary in conjunction with his reading is an absolute necessity.

Specific features of webster dictionaries

N.Webster's dictionary enjoyed great popularity from its first editions. This popularity was due not only to the accuracy and clarity of definitions but also to the richness of additional information of encyclopaedic character, which had become a tradition in American lexicography. As a dictionary N.Webster's book aims to treat the entire vocabulary of the language providing definitions, pronunciation and etymology. As an encyclopaedia it gives explanations about things named, including scientific and technical subjects. It does so more concisely than a full-scale encyclopaedia, but it is worthy of note that the definitions are as a rule up-to-date and rigorous scientifically.

Soon after N.Webster's death two printers and booksellers of Massachusetts, George and Charles Merriam, secured the rights of his dictionary from his family and started the publication of revised single volume editions under the name "Merriam-Webster". The staff working for the modern editions is a big institution numbering hundreds of specialists in different branches of human activity. It is important to note that the name "Webster" may be attached for publicity's sake by anyone to any dictionary. Many publishers concerned with their profits have taken this opportunity to issue dictionaries called "Webster's". Some of the books so named are cheaply-made reprints of old editions, others are said to be entirely new works. The practice of advertising by coupling N. Webster's name to a dictionary which has no connection with him, continues up to the present day.

A complete revision of N. Webster's dictionary is achieved with a certain degree of regularity. The recent "Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language" has called forth much comment, both favourable and unfavourable. It has been greatly changed as compared with the previous edition, in word selection as well as in other matters. The emphasis is on the present-day state of the language. The number of illustrative quotations is increased. To accommodate the great number of new words and meanings without increasing the bulk of the volume, the editors excluded much encyclopaedic material.

The dictionary wars of 1830-1864yy

It was natural for Webster's publisher in 1828 to regard Worcester as the best possible editor of the abridgement, for, as noted above, Worcester had just finished editing a revision of the abridgement of Johnson's dictionary. The quick succession in which the Webster

abridgement and Worcester's own dictionary, A Comprehensive Pronouncing and Explanatory Dictionary of the English Language (1830), appeared ignited the passionate conviction in Webster that Worcester had based his 1830 dictionary on the Webster abridgement with which he was obviously familiar. Worcester's first major dictionary was A Universal and Critical Dictionary of the English Language, published in a one-volume quarto of 1,032 pages, including seventy-six pages of front matter and 120 pages of appendices. Worcester's introductory essays in this, as in his subsequent larger dictionary of 1860, are informed with a sound appreciation of historical scholarship but devoid of pretentiousness or any arrogant sense of superiority such as one sometimes Wnds in Webster. He discusses in turn the principles of pronunciation, orthography, grammar, etymology, Americanisms, and includes, most originally, a history of English lexicography which includes a catalogue of English orthoepists, English dictionaries, specialized dictionaries, and encyclopedias. About Webster's dictionary of 1828 he says, 'It is a work of great learning and research, comprising a much more full vocabulary of the language than Johnson's Dictionary. . . ; but the taste and judgment of the author are not generally esteemed equal to his industry and erudition'. In the dictionary proper, headwords appear in capital letters, as was the norm for this period, and are syllabicated with major stress indicated and with diacritical marks above and below indicating vowel quality. A pronunciation key runs along the bottom of every two-page spread, a feature Worcester had introduced in his smaller dictionary of 1830, A Comprehensive Pronouncing and Explanatory Dictionary. It is clear that Worcester gave a great deal of attention to pronunciation, responding to a lively public interest and believing that a treatment of pronunciation clearly superior to that ofWebster would serve his dictionary well in a competitive marketplace. Worcester acknowledges in the Preface that his pronunciations are largely based on Walker's Critical Pronouncing Dictionary. WhereasWorcester's treatment of pronunciation in his introduction consists of a practical description of how English sounds are represented in his dictionary, Webster's was an extended exegesis on alleged inconsistencies in the treatment of pronunciation by the leading orthoepists of his day. In this respect Worcester's treatment foreshadows modern use, whereasWebster's reXects the argumentative tradition of eighteenth-century grammarians.

Worcester's dictionary includes about 5,000 synonym discriminations, a feature introduced in the Universal and Critical

Dictionary. Although the 1859 'Pictorial' edition of Webster's dictionary, revised by Chauncey Goodrich, included a 68-page Table of Synonyms by Goodrich, Worcester's synonym discriminations in his 1860 dictionary nonetheless represent a genuine advancement in lexicography and many of them (allowing for some shifts in meaning and register) would not be out of place in a twenty-Wrst century dictionary. Unlike Goodrich's, Worcester's synonym discriminations are scattered throughout the A–Z text under one of the words discussed, as they are in modern dictionaries, and his discussions appear to cover nuances of connotation, application, register, and style, whereas Goodrich's are briefer and deal with plain distinctions of meaning. Worcester also includes numerous notes on questions of usage, as on pronunciation, including differences between American and British pronunciation (as in the entry for nephew) and alleged mispronunciations; etymology; and historical uses of particular terms, especially when American use diVers from the British (as in the entry for revolution). Worcester's definitions in the 1860 dictionary are on the whole phrased in simpler and more accessible language than those of Webster's contemporaneous dictionaries of 1856 and 1859 edited by Goodrich. In coverage of the words and senses included, both dictionaries are very similar. In etymology, Worcester'sdictionary is not distinguished, but neither does it fall into the trap of including false relationships, as Webster does, based on his studies of the world's languages. Clearly, for Worcester, etymology was not a top priority.

On 26 November 1834, Webster publicly charged Worcester with 'a gross plagiarism' in copying material from the Webster dictionaries for use in Worcester's Comprehensive Pronouncing and Explanatory Dictionary of 1830. Worcester had just before, in a dictionary published in 1829, abridged Webster's 1828 dictionary. Webster felt doubly aggrieved, as he was already under attack by Lyman Cobb for inconsistencies in the spellings used in his dictionaries and for the particular choices he recommended both in his dictionaries and in his spelling book. While Webster's suspicions were understandable, they were unfounded, but Webster and his publishers, motivated at first by competition for the lucrative market for school dictionaries, and later by the growing market for ever larger, adult dictionaries, persevered in their effort to malign Worcester over the next thirty years.4 In this they were not, on the whole, successful, but the eVort to defend himself nevertheless cost Worcester dearly. After the death of Webster in 1843, the character of the dispute changed. Both publishers exaggerated the

differences between the dictionaries and the supposedly different audiences to whom they appealed— Worcester to the anglophiles, Webster to the ordinary American. As might be expected, some of Worcester's defenders went on the attack and disparaged Webster's treatment of spelling. Many of theMerriam accusations were anonymous, and pamphlets and newspaper articles on both sides frequently appeared under pseudonyms.

Webster's publishers used various stratagems in an effort to discourage bookshops from stocking Worcester's dictionaries and his geographies (which Worcester had also edited). In 1853, a British edition of Worcester's Universal and Critical Dictionary appeared under a title that included 'Compiled from the Materials of Noah Webster, LL.D.' yet with Worcester listed as the editor. Years before, Worcester's publishers had authorized their agent to explore the sale of the British rights to Worcester's dictionary. Subsequently they sent a set of plates to the agent, and these apparently were later used without their authorization by Henry G. Bohn, a British publisher, who changed the title to introduce Webster's name and omitted Worcester's remark in his preface that he had not used 'a single word, or the definition of a word' from Webster's dictionary. All of this was unknown to Worcester, who was at the time virtually blind owing to cataracts in both eyes. His publishers, who realized they could be considered complicit or at least negligent in the deception, even though they had not profted from it, concealed the existence of the contraband edition from Worcester for two years, until the time when his sight was suYciently restored and he read a letter in a Boston newspaper from the G. & C. Merriam Company calling attention to it, with the implicit suggestion that Worcester or his publishers were somehow involved in the deception. In his defense, Worcester published a pamphlet in 1854 entitled, A Gross Literary Fraud Exposed; relating to the publication of Worcester's Dictionary in London. Who exactly was responsible for this fraud remains somewhat murky. It is not unprecedented in the history of lexicography, nor in modern business practice, for publishers to make exaggerated, unsubstantiated, and even false claims about their dictionaries. It seems likely that Bohn's ethical standards were severely compromised, and that Worcester's publishers were quite uncommonly inept, even for dictionary publishers. As noted earlier, the battle between the two publishers continued sporadically until 1864, when the Merriams published a newly revised edition by Chauncey Goodrich and Noah Porter that featured new etymologies by the German

scholar, C. A. F.Mahn. Called the 'Webster–Mahn', or 'the unabridged', the new edition succeeded in capturing most of the market for a large dictionary and relegated Worcester's 1860 dictionary to a secondary status. Worcester never produced another dictionary and died in 1865. Like Webster, he was extraordinarily productive, not only editing the dictionaries described here but compiling many other valuable reference works in geography and biography, most of them for students. He is a major figure in American lexicography and in any just appraisal of lexicographical quality must be reckoned Webster's equal. The only arena in which he proved deficient was in commercial success.

Key words

Comprehensive Pronouncing, Americanisms, Britishisms, school dictionary, encyclopedic material.

Questions and tasks

1. The dictionaries which were printed by Random House.
2. The differences between S.Johnson's and Webster's definitions.
3. Characterize Worcester's "Universal and Critical Dictionary of English".
4. Webster dictionaries from 1847 to 1890.
5. Characteristic features of Webster's International Dictionary of the English Language (1890).
6. Outstanding features of "The Century Dictionary".
7. Specific features of Intermediate-sized dictionaries of American lexicography.

References

1. Бушуй А.М. Фразеографические основы украинского толкового словаря // Вопросы филологических наук. -М.,2009.-№6.-С.26-30.

2. Бушуй Т.А. Фразеосистемность в контрастивном лексическом словаре // Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан. – Нукус, 2001. - №5. – С.92-93.

3. Oxford History of English Lexicography/ed.by A.P.Cowie.-Oxford., Clarendon Press, 2009, - 551p.

4. Tom McArthur. Guides to tomorrow's English // English today. Cambridge University Press, 1998, P.21-23.

5. Shcherba L.V. Theoretical Lexicography. -M., 1944. 399p.
6. Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. -М. 1977.218р.
7. Ивлева Г.Г. Тенденции развития слова и словарного состава. - М. 1986.178р.
8. Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. -М. 1977.218р.
9. Заботкина В.И. Новая лексика современного английского языка. - М., 1989. - 147 р.
10. Ивлева Г.Г. Тенденции развития слова и словарного состава. -М. 1986.178р.

Dictionaries

1. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. –Oxford, 1964.
1. Hornby The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. - Lnd. 1974.
2. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. -M., 1986.
3. Webster's New World Dictionary of American English. -N.Y., 1978.
4. Апресян Ю.Д. Новый большой англо-русский словарь. -М., 1993.
5. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. -М., 1967.

LECTURE 7. REGIONAL DICTIONARIES OF ENGLISH

Two centuries would pass before a variety within English would begin to assert its independence. That revolution began in Scotland with John Jamieson's Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language.

The study of English lexicography has a national and regional as well as a historical dimension: it encompasses the distinctive words and meanings used in the United States and in the independent countries of the Commonwealth, and the dictionaries in which they are recorded. By the 1850s in America, lexicography had moved away from its earlier concern with lexical origins. The Dictionary of American English (DAE) was the first of these to be produced.

Dictionaries of national usages have appeared in several other countries, including India. But they are most comprehensive and scholarly in countries where there are long-established native-English-

speaking populations, such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa. In all those territories, with minor differences, a particular pattern of dictionary development has come about. First, typically, a single scholar or individual enthusiast will appear and start noting down the vocabulary peculiar to the territory-often complaining as a result that the OED is deficient in covering those usages. A small scholarly dictionary might be the next step, as in South Africa at Rhodes University, where a modest 'dictionary unit' was established, resulting in the production of a Dictionary of South African English (1978).

Scottish National Dictionary (SND) is considered as the second major work to be produced by Scottish lexicographers. Much of the collecting and preliminary editing was carried out by volunteers. To gather spoken evidence, the country was divided into dialect areas according to pronunciation. Written quotations, also excerpted by volunteers, came from a considerable number and variety of works.

Regional dictionaries and glossaries were valuable, but many of these source books were descriptions of local dialects. The first serious undertaking, as Jeannette Allsopp explains, was A Dictionary of Jamaican English on historical principles (1967), by Frederic Cassidy and Robert Le Page. This was designed to be a complete inventory of Jamaican Creole as well as a record of more educated Jamaican speech. The bulk of its data was made up of recorded responses to a questionnaire, devised by Cassidy, which focused on theworking lives of farmers, Wshermen, and so on.

The next major title was The Dictionary of Bahamian English by J. Holm and A. W. Shilling (1982). It was intended to form 'a link between the Caribbean Creoles such as Jamaican English and the English spoken today by many black people in the United States'. Analysis was restricted to the language of the most accessible islands of the chain. Richard Allsopp, eventually to assume the chief editorship of the Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage (1996), became aware while a student in Europe of differences between his own usage and British Standard English. Then, running in parallel with the expansion of text corpora, and of exceptional importance for the further development of the OED, have been the changes made possible by online editing and publication. One significant aspect has been the editorial revision of the dictionary, now on going, which has resulted in the online publication of large amounts of new and revised dictionaries.

Dictionaries of south Asian English

In the heyday of the British Empire, conditions were far from auspicious for the development of an autonomous variety of English in India. Macaulay's policy paper in 1835 had raised English above the classical languages of the region-Sanskrit and Persian-and set as a goal the creation of a new class. In the course of the nineteenth century, this policy was largely successful among Indian elites, and not until the twentieth did Gandhi (among others) point to English used by Indians as a sign of cultural subordination. The first dictionary of Anglo-Indian appeared in 1885 as the result of a decade of work by an official in India, George Clifford Whitworth. He saw it as a "Supplement to the English dictionary': "An Anglo-Indian Dictionary" should contain all those words which English people in their relations with India have found it necessary or convenient to add to their own vernacular, and should give also any special significations which pure English words have acquired in India"

Though not a citation dictionary, it is an excellent work mostly devoted to loan-words from Indian languages like sari or stupa. Distinctive English usages are also treated (e.g. serpent race, settlement, state railway.

Into this cultural mix came a remarkable volume celebrating Indian English: A Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases (1886) by Henry Yule and A. C. Burnell. Here was a work of profound scholarship with precisely identified quotations from a copious bibliography showing the evolution of expressions in the subcontinent. James Murray was an enthusiast of the work and cites it nearly five hundred times in the OED—for instance in the etymology of so English a word as elephant. The compilers were broadly interested in words that had entered English from the region and more particularly concerned with 'the common Anglo-Indian stock' in commercial and administrative use. Many of these were well established in British English: curry, toddy, veranda, cheroot. Others were more specialized and had retained connotations of their origin: pukka, mahout, nautch. The compilers were further interested in new senses of English words acquired in the region: bearer, cot, belly-band, college pheasant, chopper, summer-hand, eagle wood, jackass-copal, bobbery.

Ambivalence about the role of English after independence did not lead to consequential lexicography of distinctive uses of English in the region. Collectors national and regional dictionaries of English still publish lists of borrowings (like loofa for the product of the vegetable

sponge vine) and innovative senses (like denting for smoothing of dents in automobile bodies). (For an example of a dictionary of this type, see Hankin 2003.) As the example of Pickering reveals in the American context, recognition of distinctive English may begin with a treatment of differences between the superordinate and the subordinate variety. A rich example of this practice in India was provided in the usage dictionary by Nihalani and his collaborators. Most entries are designed to alert users to differences (for instance, jotter 'ball-point pen').

Beyond south Asia: Malaysia has adopted Bahasa Malayu as the 'national language' and marginalized the use of English for some purposes, so conditions for such work are hardly any better there.

In Singapore, government action has discouraged the recognition of a distinctive Singaporean English. Nonetheless, an edition of the Chambers Dictionary designed for Malaysia and Singapore contains an appendix of borrowed words in common use (for instance, ang moh, Mat Salleh, orang putih, all three expressions used to designate a Caucasian person). Within the main alphabet there is a category for Singapore-Malaysian English 'informal English', as shown in this entry: (2) lamp post 2. (SME informal) You might be called a lamp post if you are in the company of two people who would rather be alone together. Wei Ming, I don't want a lamp post around whenMei Ling comes afterwards, all right (Seaton 2002, s.v. lamp post). These varieties—known as Manglish and Singlish—are as revealing of their history as any of the other national kinds of English. Thus gostan 'move backwards, go slow' is derived from go astern and zap 'to photocopy' from international English. Only very recently has the power of the Internet allowed word enthusiasts, despite official indifference, to create ambitious citation dictionaries designed on historical principles.

Dictionaries of south African English

A rage for words swept through Anglo-American culture in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Ambitious dictionaries like the OED in Britain and the Century in the United States required huge investments in money and in time. Dictionary-making had become a growth industry in both Britain and the United States, and individuals elsewhere clamoured to see words from their part of the world included. In the early days of exploration, visitors to distant lands made lists of the plants and animals found in them. Now, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, visitors made lists of words. On the day of his arrival in Cape Town in 1876,

Charles Pettman began to jot down unfamiliar words in a notebook. As his collection increased, Pettman studied the work of other scholars, and was surprised to find that 'by some strange oversight' Murray's slowly emerging dictionary was deficient in representing the usages of Southern Africa (Pettman 1968: v). Works by W. W. Skeat and Yule and Burnell's Hobson–Jobson provided models for his local work. For the most part, he limited his entries to Africanderisms: 'Dutch words and idioms and use in South African English are thus designated.' Though most of Pettman's entries come from Afrikaans, he recognizes that English words have acquired African meanings: good-for meaning 'IOU', for instance. To say that a river is down is to indicate that it is in Xood and likely to overspill its banks. Tailings-the residue of earth from which gold had been extracted-though he did not know it-had come to South Africa from the gold fields of California by way of Australian miners. For the most part, however, he was interested in borrowings: The following list contains a very small proportion only of the words which have been thus annexed by the English colonist from his Dutch neighbour. They are many of them quite unknown to the great Oxford Dictionary, but the English colonist would find national and regional dictionaries of English himself sadly hampered every day had he to do without them: baas, banket, biltong, brak, erf, hamel, hok, kloof, kranz, lager, inspan and outspan, moregen, muid, nek, poort, schans, schlelm, schimmel, schut, slut, spruit, trek, tripper, veld, vlei, etc. (Pettman 1968: 15). Pettman was a careful scholar. The current edition of the OED has not been able to improve on his Wrst citation for trek 'a journey by wagon'. As a minority language community, English-speaking South Africans were not confident of their linguistic tastes, and the view held by Pickering-that one would wish to know usages departing from those of south-east England-was frequently articulated.

Attempting to provide for South Africa a usage guide to rival those of Fowler (in England) and Follett (in America), Douglas R. Beeton and Helen Dorner created a journal, in preparation for their dictionary of 1975, to solicit opinions—a procedure almost guaranteeing that someone would object to any usage nominated for acceptance. They gathered from their contributors both 'local vocabulary and idiom' (like biltong 'strips of raw, salted, dried venison or beef ') and 'mistakes and problems' found in English worldwide and, especially, in South Africa (like busy in 'They were busy to eat'). Some of these provide insight into the culture of the nation in the apartheid era. The borrowing from Afrikaans, taal 'the

Afrikaans language', might appear 'derogatorily': 'He thinks that just because he speaks the taal he is better than we are' (s.v. taal). The terrifying history of South Africa played out in the second half of the twentieth century was mirrored in its English. The zest for new words characteristic of Pettman and the desire for gentility expressed by Beeton and Dorner stimulated the creation of far better dictionaries. Jean Branford compiled the first modern compilation of 'South Africanisms'. Her hope was 'to smooth the hackles or allay the alarms of the purists' (Branford, J. 1987: xvi). In the successive prefaces to her Dictionary, Branford expressed dismay at the changing image of English in South Africa.

Though there was little reason for optimism when she wrote, Jean Branford and her husband William in 1969 had established a 'dictionary unit' at Rhodes University in Grahamstown but there were few staff and little money. Nonetheless, they persevered and their first effort brought authoritative information to a wide public: A Dictionary of South African English (1978). In 1985, the national government provided funding, partly because the Delegates of the Oxford University Press had expressed interest. Finally, in 1991, a contract was signed for an entirely new dictionary, and Penny Silva became editor.

In 1996, the finished work appeared: A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles (DSAE). Collaboration with the editors of the second edition of the OED, John Simpson and Edmund Weiner, ensured a uniform plan with the parent dictionary, then in the process of revision. The purpose of the DSAE was 'to map and illustrate that variety of English which is particular to South Africans— words borrowed from the many languages of South Africa, English words which have acquired particular senses here, and words coined for local phenomena'.

From a commercial perspective, the value of A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles lies in the authority derived from it in the production of shorter and more popular works. William Branford's The South African Pocket Oxford Dictionary drew upon Jean Branford's 1978 dictionary for 1,500 main entries and 570 compounds that were deemed necessary for South African users (Branford, W. 1986.).

Researches of Australian English and New Zealand

For Australia and New Zealand, the foundational volume was Austral English: A Dictionary of Australasian Words, Phrases and Usages, published by Edward E. Morris in 1898. Morris had been

approached by Murray to gather material for the OED, and, addressing a learned society in Melbourne in 1892. Many of the words were borrowings from Aboriginal languages and Maori, and these were frequent in the names for plants and animals-puriri 'a tree of New Zealand' (Maori), kookaburra 'a bird of Australia' (Wiradhuri). In addition to supplying quotations for both words, Morris illustrated the way in which early Australians drew upon metaphor. From the sound of the bird's cry, the kookaburra was early called the laughing jackass or simply jackass.

The great milestone for English lexicography in Australia was The Macquarie Dictionary (Delbridge 1982). A substantial volume, the book had embossed on the cover 'An Australian Achievement' and the publisher thought it necessary to introduce into the front matter a series of testimonials to its excellence by Australian journalists. Some Xavour of the patriotic vaunt can be grasped from the conclusion of the foreword: 'What the Oxford is to the British and what Webster's is to the Americans, the Macquarie is to all Australians-the first book to make us independent of any outside culture when it comes to the interpretation, understanding and use of our own language' (1. Presuming a need for justification, the editor, Arthur Delbridge, provided a prefatory essay on "The Need for an Australian Dictionary". Using a British dictionary (Hanks and Simon, 1971, based on Barnhart's American College Dictionary published in 1947), the editors weeded entries with connections to British and American social practices and, based on a reading programme, collected citations so that they might 'Australianize' the base dictionary to produce something completely new. Encyclopedic information was also provided for distinctively Australian words—for instance, a typology of kangaroos. Under kookaburra was arrayed both the expected zoological description and a thesaurus of names.The Macquarie was immediately successful and smaller works were hived off from it, one dealing with colloquialisms (Aussie Talk 1984) and another listing words of Aborginal origin (Thieberger and McGregor 1994).

In 1978, scholars began collecting in earnest for a dictionary on historical principles, and the success of the Macquarie helped spur popular (and Wnancial) support for the endeavour. A bibliography of source texts (and paid readers to select from them) and a file of 250,000 citations were compiled. W. S. Ramson, the editor, was thoroughly acquainted with the international history of regional lexicography, and he drew on the successful practices of Craigie and Hulbert, Mathews, and

others to create The Australian National Dictionary (AND) (1988). Following their practices he echoed their language. In 1988, consequent on the publication of the AND, the Australian National Dictionary Centre was established in Canberra to conduct research and toproduce dictionaries and other wordbooks (e.g. Jauncey 2004). The most important of these is a dictionary of 100,000 words: The Australian Oxford Dictionary (Moore 2004). Responding to what was seen as a demand in the marketplace, the editors have added usage notes (for instance, explaining uses of shall about which there is alleged to be 'considerable confusion') and status labels (so the expressions shag and shag wagon are described as 'coarse colloq').

If Oxford and Webster are important names in lexicography elsewhere, the great name in New Zealand dictionary-making is H.W.Orsman. He began with a Ph.D. dissertation, 'The English Language in New Zealand', in 1951 and continued with hard yacker for the rest of his life (yacker 'strenuous work' Australian Aboriginal yaga entering English there as yakka in 1888 before arriving in New Zealand in 1905). Inspired by the treatment of New Zealand in Sidney Baker's account of 1945, Orsman soon 'settled down to a long stretch of scanning. The result was The Dictionary of New Zealand English (DNZE). This work on historical principles containing 6,000 main entries and 9,300 sub-entries. Orsman provided citations to document these facts. Culturally important terms of all kinds are treated. Pakeha Maori (1832) is a European descended person who behaves like a Maori; Maori Pakeha (1867) is the reverse. Following the publication of the DNZE, the New Zealand Dictionary Centre was established at Victoria University in 1997. Orsman's citations were entered into machine-readable form and continuous collecting brought expressions new to dictionaries to the attention of lexicographers. The result was The New Zealand Oxford Dictionary (Deverson and Kennedy 2005) and abridgements parallel to those in South Africa and Australia: little, school, mini, and others.While closely resembling its Australian counterpart, the New Zealand Oxford gives special prominence to local coverage.

Canadian English

Lexicography in Canada arrived late, in part because Canadians felt caught between Yankee schoolmasters and British remittance men (Remittance man Derog. a person living in Canada on money remitted fromhis family in the Old Country, usually to insure that he did not return

home tobecome a source of embarrassment). While other nations suffering from the colonial cringe have viewed their distinctive usages as slang or nonstandard, Canadians have been discouraged by the view that their English is merely an amalgam of American and British expressions and, hence, a mongrel dialect.

The first substantial collection of Canadian expressions, upon which this idea of inferiority was founded, was gathered by A.C.Geikie in the mid-nineteenth century to illustrate the horrors of innovation.

Only as the centenary of confederation of the provinces approached was an effort made to show the evolution of Canadianisms, and the anniversary was marked by the publication of A Dictionary of Canadianisms on Historical Principles (Avis 1967). Given the climate of opinion on the very subject of Canadian English, it is no wonder that its relation to American and British English was the subject of the first sentence of the introduction. That part of Canadian English which is neither British nor American is best illustrated by the vocabulary, for there are hundreds of words which are native to Canada or which have meanings peculiar to Canada (Avis 1967).

Collecting by a group of scholars scattered across the country led to a slow accretion of evidence, but the belated interest of a Toronto publisher in issuing a centennial volume required rapid completion, and it appeared just in time for the centenary in 1967. Handsomely produced, the dictionary had abundant pictorial illustrations—a relatively uncommon feature of dictionaries of this sort. For instance, the line drawing under motor toboggan (1948) is the locus for a set of synonyms for the vehicle: autoboggan, motorized sled, motorized toboggan, power toboggan, skidoo, ski-scooter, ski-sled, snow-bug, snow-buggy, Snow Cruiser, snowmobile, snow scooter, and toboggan. Terms associated with early settlement were also treated in detail: Red River cart 'a two-wheeled cart drawn by an ox' in a brigade 'train' of westering migrants.

Marketing for subsequent general-purpose dictionaries revealed a gradually strengthening confidence in Canadian English. The Penguin Canadian Dictionary, for instance, has a seal on the front cover saying '100% Canadian Content', while on the back large letters proclaim 'The only dictionary based on a fully Canadian database' (Paikeday 1990). Unfortunately, Red River cart does not find its way into the dictionary; snowmobile carries the Can. label though the Wrst citation of it appears in an American account of an expedition to the South Pole.

Consequent on a bequest to Queen's University in Kingston was the

production of a Guide to Canadian English Usage (Fee and McLain 1997). Though not a dictionary of Canadianisms, the Guide gives dated citations supporting interpretations of Canadian practices.

Another general-purpose dictionary appeared in 1998: The Canadian Oxford Dictionary (Barber 2001). A list of pronunciation variants was provided for schedule without any notice of their distribution.

In 2006, an advisory committee was formed to assist in the preparation of a second and much enlarged edition of the Dictionary of Canadianisms on Historical Principles. A publication date has been set for the book to appear in 2012. Its offices will be at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver. All of these efforts are designed to foster national pride and cultural independence.

English in the republic of Ireland

Because English has been seen as the language of oppressors in the Republic of Ireland, there have been few dictionaries devoted to its distinctive local favour, especially in comparison to the number of dictionaries compiled for Northern Ireland. Beginnings for study are found in works devoted to the Irish of the country's great literary figures—particularly the study of James Joyce's English and the usages of other Irish writers. Words deriving from Irish Gaelic are given special attention but so are works from sources abroad-for instance, quare 'strange, odd, peculiar, memorable, queer' from eighteenth-century English. Many readers will have encountered the word in the title of Brendan Behan's 1956 play, The Quare Fellow. Since there is little explicit connection between Wall's Dictionary and Glossary for the Irish Literary Revival and other dictionaries, the reader does not discover from him that the first recorded instances of quare (also spelled queer) in this sense appear in sixteenth-century Scots poets or in so American a work as Edward Eggleston's Hoosier Schoolmaster (1871). This information is abundantly displayed in the OED. A work not so tied to literary sources is Terence Patrick Dolan's Dictionary of Hiberno-English (1998). Dolan sought to 'make accessible the common word stock of Hiberno English in both its present and past forms, oral and literary'.

Generally, National and regional dictionaries of English began to appear at the same time as revivalist movements stirring in Scotland were asserting the independence of Norwegian, Czech, modern Greek, and other European languages where the connection of language and nationhood, so strongly endorsed by Jamieson, began to be felt. New

'standards' were created for these languages, and grammars and dictionaries were produced to support their independence.

Key words

regional dictionary, canadianism, australasian words, citation dictionary, bahasa malayu, pidgin, creole.

Questions and tasks

1. Characterize "The Dictionary of New Zealand English (DNZE)".
2. Why "A Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases" are considered as one of the successful works?
3. Why have been few dictionaries compiled in Irish Republic?
4. Analyze the connection of Brendan Behan's play "The Quare Fellow" with Wall's Dictionary and Glossary.
5. Specific features of "Dictionary of Canadianisms on Historical Principles".

References

1. Бушуй А.М. Фразеографические основы украинского толкового словаря // Вопросы филологических наук. -М.,2009.-№6.-С.26-30.
2. Бушуй Т.А. Фразеосистемность в контрастивном лексическом словаре // Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан. – Нукус, 2001. - №5. – С.92-93.
3. Oxford History of English Lexicography/ed.by A.P.Cowie.-Oxford., Clarendon Press, 2009, - 551p.
4. Tom McArthur. Guides to tomorrow's English // English today. Cambridge University Press, 1998, P.21-23.
5. Shcherba L.V. Theoretical Lexicography. -M., 1944. 399p.
6. Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. -М. 1977.218р.
7. Ивлева Г.Г. Тенденции развития слова и словарного состава. -М. 1986.178р.
8. Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. -М. 1977.218р.
9. Заботкина В.И. Новая лексика современного английского языка. - М., 1989. - 147 р.
10. Ивлева Г.Г. Тенденции развития слова и словарного состава. -М. 1986.178р.

Dictionaries

1. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. –Oxford, 1964.

2. Hornby The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. - Lnd. 1974.

3. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. -M., 1986.

4. Webster's New World Dictionary of American English. -N.Y., 1978.

Internet resources

1. http://www.anu.edu.au/ANDC/ Australian National Dictionary Centre. (Accessed 23 June 2006.)

2. http://www.singlishdictionary.com/ Tsen-Ta Lee, J. (2004). A Dictionary of Singlish and Singapore English. (Accessed 22 June 2006.)

LECTURE 8. BASIC PROBLEMS OF COMPILING UNILINGUAL DICTIONARIES

General problems of compiling dictionaries

The most burning issues of lexicography are connected with the selection of head-words, the arrangement and contents of the vocabulary entry, the principles of sense definitions and the semantic and functional classification of words. In the first place it is the problem of how far a general descriptive dictionary, whether unilingual or bilingual, should admit the historical element. In fact, the term "current usage" is disconcertingly elastic, it may, for instance, be stretched to include all words and senses used by W. Shakespeare, as he is commonly read, or include only those of the fossilised words that are kept in some set expressions or familiar quotations. For the purpose of a dictionary, which must not be too bulky, selection between scientific and technical terms is also a very important task. It is a debatable point whether a unilingual explanatory dictionary should strive to cover all the words of the language, including neologisms, nonce-words, slang, etc. and note with impartial accuracy all the words actually used by English people; or whether, as the great English lexicographer of the 18th century Samuel Johnson used to think, it should be preceptive, and (viewed from the other side) prohibitive. Dictionary-makers should attempt to improve and stabilise the English vocabulary according to the best classical samples and advise the readers on preferable usage. A distinctly modern criterion

in selection of entries is the frequency of the words to be included. This is especially important for certain lines of practical work in preparing graded elementary textbooks. When the problem of selection is settled, there is the question as to which of the selected units have the right to a separate entry and which are to be included under one common head-word. These are, in other words, the questions of separateness and sameness of words. The first deals with syntagmatic boundaries of word-units and has to solve such questions as whether each other is a group of two separate words to be treated separately under the head-words each and other, or whether each other is a unit deserving a special entry (compare also: one another). That is why the definition of the scope of a dictionary is not quite as simple as it might appear at first sight. There exist almost unsurmountable difficulties to a neat statistical evaluation. Some publishers state the number of entries in a subtitle, others even claim for the total coverage with the exception of very special terms. It must be remembered, however, that without a generally accepted standard for settling the problems of sameness and separateness no meaningful evaluation of the scope of any particular dictionary is possible. Besides in the case of a living language the vocabulary is not stable, and the attitude of lexicographers to archaisms and neologisms varies.

The arrangement of the vocabulary entry presents many problems, of which the most important are the differentiation and the sequence of various meanings of a polysemantic word. A historical dictionary (the Oxford Dictionary, for instance) is primarily concerned with the development of the English vocabulary. It arranges various senses chronologically, first comes the etymology, then the earliest meanings marked by the label obs. — obsolete. The etymologies are either comparative or confined to a single language. The development is documented by illustrative quotations, ranging from the oldest to recent appearances of the word in question. A descriptive dictionary dealing with current usage has to face its own specific problems. It has to apply a structural point of view and give precedence to the most important meanings. But how is the most important meaning determined upon? So far each compiler was guided by his own personal preference. An objective procedure would be to obtain data of statistical counts. But counting the frequency of different meanings of the same word is far more difficult than counting the frequency of its forms. It is therefore not by chance that up to now many counts have been undertaken only for word forms, irrespective of meaning. Also, the interdependence of

meanings and their relative importance within the semantic structure of the word do not remain the same. They change almost incessantly, so that the task of establishing their relative frequency would have to be repeated very often. The constant revisions necessary would make the publication of dictionaries very expensive. It may also be argued that an arrangement of meanings according to frequency would sometimes conceal the ties and relationship between various elements of the semantic structure.

In editing new dictionaries the lexicographers cannot depend only on the scholarly editions such as OED. In order to meet the demands of their readers, they have to sample the reading of the public for whom the dictionary is meant. This textual reference has to be scrupulously examined, so as to account for new words and meanings making their way into the language. Here again some quantitative criteria must be established. If a word or meaning occurs in several different sources over a wide range of magazines and books during a considerable period of time, it may be worth including even into a college dictionary.

The preface to "The Concise Oxford Dictionary", for instance, states that its authors find that sense development cannot be presented in every word, because obsolete words are as a rule omitted. Only occasionally do they place at the beginning a rare but still current sense, if it can throw light on the more common senses that follow, or forms the connecting link with the etymology. The etymologies are given throughout, but otherwise the compilers do not seem to keep to any consistent principle and are guided by what they think is the order of logical connection, familiarity or importance. E.L. Thorndike formulates the following principles: "Other things being equal, literal uses come before figurative, general uses before special, common uses before rare, and easily understandable uses before difficult, and to sum up: that arrangement is best for any word which helps the learner most."

A synchronic dictionary should also show the distribution of every word. It has been traditionally done by labelling words as belonging to a certain part of speech, and by noting some special cases of grammatically or lexically bound meanings.

Many dictionaries indicate the different stylistic levels to which the words belong: colloquial, technical, poetical, rhetorical, archaic, familiar, vulgar or slang, and their expressive colouring: emphatic, ironical, diminutive, facetious. This is important, because a mere definition does not show these data. There is always a difference in style between the dictionary word and its definition. The word digs is a slang word but its

definition 'lodgings' is not. Giving these data modern dictionary-makers strive to indicate the nature of the context in which the word may occur. The problem is also relevant for bilingual dictionaries and is carefully presented in the "New English-Russian Dictionary" edited by I.R.Galperin.

A third group of lexicographic problems is the problem of definitions in a unilingual dictionary. The explanation of meaning may be achieved by a group of synonyms which together give a fairly general idea; but one synonym is never sufficient for the purpose, because no absolute synonyms exist. Besides, if synonyms are the only type of explanation used, the reader will be placed in a vicious circle of synonymic references, with not a single word actually explained. Definitions serve the purpose much better. These are of two main types. If they are only concerned with words as speech material, the definition is called linguistic. If they are concerned with things for which the words are names, they are termed encyclopaedic. American dictionaries are for the most part traditionally encyclopaedic, which accounts for so much attention paid to graphic illustration. They furnish their readers with far more information about facts and things than their British counterparts, which are more linguistic and more fundamentally occupied with purely lexical data (as contrasted to realia), with the grammatical properties of words, their components, their stylistic features, etc. Opinions differ upon the optimum proportion of linguistic and encyclopaedic material. Very interesting considerations on this subject are due to Alf Sommerfeldt. He thinks that definitions must be based on the fact that the meanings of words render complex notions which may be analyzed (cf. componental analysis) into several elements rendered by other words. He emphasises, for instance, that the word pedestrian is more aptly defined as 'a person who goes or travels on foot' than as 'one who goes or travels on foot'. The remark appears valuable, because a definition of this type shows the lexico-grammatical type to which the word belongs and consequently its distribution. It also helps to reveal the system of the vocabulary. Much too often, however, one sees in dictionaries no attention paid to the difference in distribution between the defined and the defining word. The meaning of the word may be also explained by examples, i.e. contextually. The term and its definition are here fused. For example, diagonal is explained by the following context where only this term can occur: A square has two diagonals, and each of them divides the square into two right-angled isosceles triangles. Very often this type can be

changed into a standard form, i.e. A diagonal is one of the two lines ..., etc.

One more problem is the problem of whether all entries should be defined or whether it is possible to have the so-called "run-ons" for derivative words in which the root-form is readily recognized (such as absolutely or resolutely). In fact, whereas resolutely may be conveniently given as a -ly run-on after resolute, there is a meaning problem for absolutely. One must take into consideration that in colloquial speech absolutely means 'quite so', 'yes' which cannot be deduced from the meaning of the corresponding adjective. Another dimension on which different types of dictionaries can be discerned pertains to the numbers of languages represented.

In unilingual dictionaries only one language is represented. The most important variety of this type is those dictionaries which we discussed in the preceding section; indeed, the usual situation is that a standard-descriptive, an overall-descriptive or an academic dictionary is monolingual.

When planning a unilingual dictionary, we must make two basic decisions at the very beginning. First, it is necessary to analyze the language in question and find out what varieties of it there are and how they are interconnected. Second, it is necessary to decide to what type the prepared dictionary should belong. What questions are to be asked and answered follows from the preceding chapter about types of dictionaries. The character of nearly all the lexicographer's work and his subsequent decisions on single points and problems follow (or should follow) as a consequence of these two main decisions. Before young lexicographer starts his work in order to be able to observe all information about the word and he will start from

the collection of material;
the selection of entries;
the construction of entries;
the arrangement of the entries.

The basic form of the collection of material is the excerption of texts. When he excerpts, the lexicographer takes out of a text lexical units (words) which are of interest. If the lexicographer is working on a bigger project, he will be well advised to work out some samples of entries when he thinks that his material is sufficient. The collection of the material is, however, continued and the lexicographer observes the effects the new material will have on the samples of entries. If the results of his

observation are negative (in the sense of the preceding remarks), the collection of material must remain the main task and new samples should be made later. The lexicographer has to collect also the colloquial material in the true sense of the word (not only monologues, but also elicited answers, and preferably also dialogues, talks, discussions, negotiations of affairs in business and office, etc.). An important source of information can be found in other dictionaries of the language in question, if there are any. Sometimes, one dictionary is the basis for the compilation of another; this is the case especially when a shorter version of a big dictionary is to be prepared and if a monolingual dictionary is used as the basis for a bilingual dictionary the purpose of which is to describe the source language; these are, however, only the extreme, if not unfrequent cases. The usual situation is, however, that the lexicographer has to confront his own material (and also his own statements, definitions, treatment of polysemy etc.) with the other existing important dictionaries of the language in the field of which he works. His attitude should be that of the usual scientific criticism: nothing is to be accepted from another source without a constant checking up of every detail.

The next step in the lexicographer's work is the selection of entries, i.e. the choice of the lexical units which are to be embraced in the future dictionary, as against those which are not. The individual factors which influence the lexicographer's decision can be grouped into the following two broad categories:

the form of the lexical units,

the density of the lexical units included in the dictionary.

As far as form goes, the majority of the entries in the dictionary will be concerned with the lexical units. The most usual lexical units of the Indo-European and many other languages are the words as they are constituted both by the facts of the respective languages and by their eventual linguistic (above all orthographical) traditions: The lexicographer is fully entitled to accept the tradition, with eventual minor modifications, as it is manifested in those texts which are the basis of the dictionary.

In those languages where the boundary of the word is not sufficiently clear, the lexicographer will meet morphemes about which he cannot easily and unequivocally decide whether they are words of their own or not; in the majority of cases, he will be well advised to allow them their own entries as if they were independent words, eventually with some further special indications and specifications. But sometimes the

lexicographer also indicates as an entry a mere morpheme even if there is no uncertainty about the word boundary and when it is clear that it is only a morpheme. This is the case, for example, of highly productive prefixes or compositional elements. For instance, a prefix like anti- or sur is so highly productive in many European languages, that it is impossible to indicate all the instances where it occurs; even if they were listed, new creations, and many of them only occasional, could be expected to arise at any moment.

It would be a mistake to think that a big academic dictionary lists "everything" and that the shorter variants are quantitative reductions from this basis. In reality, only a dictionary of a dead language can be complete as far as the repertory of the lexical units recorded in the preserved texts goes. Even the biggest dictionaries cannot register all the occasional words (or even all their occasional applications). The following circumstance is, however, to be taken into consideration" the dictionary of a language with scarce literary texts, or of a language in which the standard national form is only beginning to be developed usually tends to be more exhaustive (though the number of its entries is smaller) than that of a language with a long, rich literary tradition. In any case, the selection of the entries for the dictionary is a highly delicate task.

The next step is the construction of entries. Single lexical units are treated in single entries. All the entries of the dictionary should be constructed in as uniform a way as possible. Each entry should be treated as a compartment of its own, containing all the information about the respective lexical unit considered necessary for the purpose of the dictionary. There are basically two notable exceptions to this rule. First, it is not necessary to state, in the entry all the properties which the lexical unit has a member of a class (morphological, syntactic, or any other): the entry should concentrate upon just the opposite, upon the individual properties of the lexical unit in question, so that a general indication that it is a member of the respective class will suffice to inform about the shared properties. As the second exception, one can consider the fact that cross-references from one item to another are sometimes necessary and that some entries are conflated into nests. In a monolingual dictionary, only one language is used in the entry. The entry consists of two parts: in the first part (which is frequently called the lemma), the lexical unit itself is indicated; the second part contains all the other information. The most important part of the lemma is the entry word (or head word), which is the indication of each respective lexical unit. A concise information

concerning the etymology of the entry-word can belong to the lemma — unless it is given separately, as an appendix to the whole entry. This etymological information is a matter of course in the historical dictionary, but many dictionaries of the overall-descriptive, informative type also give it. In some cultural areas, such as, for example, the United States, a short etymological information is expected even in the smallest dictionaries. But it is without any doubt not obligatory to give such etymological information in the purely standard-descriptive dictionaries. What follows the lemma is the main part of the entry its basic purpose is to indicate the meaning of the lexical unit in all its aspects.

The basic instruments for the description of lexical meaning are: 1) the lexicographic definition; 2) the location in the system of synonyms etc.; 3) the examplification; 4) the glosses. The lexicographic definition overlaps to some extent with the logical definition, but there are some striking differences. Probably the most important of them consists in the fact that whereas the logical definition must unequivocally identify the defined object (the definiendum) in such a way that it is both put in a definite contrast against everything else that is definable and positively and unequivocally characterized as a member of the closest class, the lexicographic definition enumerates only the most important semantic features of the defined lexical unit, which suffice to differentiate it from other units. The indication of semantic features is based on what appears to be relevant to the general speaker of the language in question, not on properties that can be perceived only by a scientific study. Therefore Eng. water (as a general word) is much better defined as "liquid as in rivers, lakes, seas and oceans" (Hornby), than, say, as "the liquid that when pure consists of an oxide of hydrogen H20". The greatest difficulty in this respect will be caused again by technical terms. The lexicographic definition of technical words should be scientifically correct, should describe the object correctly, should reflect the generally accepted notion of the object, and difficult be generally intelligible. It will, however, frequently be difficult to satisfy all these requirements: Above all, the scientific correctness and general intelligibility will often clash. No wonder that it is above all in this sphere that lexicographic definitions tend to become encyclopedic, or at least to contain some encyclopedic elements. It may also happen that a lexical unit can be used either as a general word or as a technical term: such a situation will often have to be handled as a case of polysemy, i.e. by the construction of two definitions. The purpose of the examples is to show how the entry-word functions in

combination with other lexical units. The absolute majority of dictionaries indicate examples. We should at last mention the encyclopedic glosses which are interspersed in the text of the entries in some dictionaries. From the point of view of pure theory, encyclopedic glosses should have no place in a purely linguistic description; indeed, no linguistic dictionary should give too many of them. But on the other hand, a useful dictionary of a dead language or of a contemporary one spoken in an exotic culture will have to give encyclopedic notes on the denotate unknown to us; and there are dictionaries (e.g., Larousse, Webster) which delicately combine both the linguistic and the encyclopedic aspect. In any case, there is a considerable range of overlapping between very detailed or possibly over-specific lexicographic definitions and encyclopedic glosses. The lexicographer must be aware of the fact that he is not preparing a logical classification of notions nor a scientific systematization of classes; he must stick exclusively to what he finds in the linguistic facts and present the lexical meaning as a continuum the articulations of which may be strange, or insufficient, or overlapping or disconnected.

The lexicographer will also find that the presentation of the same lexical unit may vary from one dictionary, or scholar, to another.

The next step is the arrangement of entries. The single worked out entries must be arranged in a sequence, as wholes. For those types of dictionaries which are here the focus of attention, the only practical possibility in the majority of language is arrangement by alphabetical sequence of the entry-words. Any other arrangement, such as, e.g., arrangement by semantic connections, or by the derivation of the words, have great advantages for different purposes and for different dictionaries (e.g. for a dictionary of synonyms, or an etymological dictionary); but for general purposes, alphabetical order is optimal, because it is the least ambiguous and the simplest method now in existence. This statement applies not only to Roman script; alphabetical order will be followed also in Cyrillic, Arabic, etc. writing. Indeed, in the case of each script, methods have been developed for the unequivocal sequential arrangement of the single signs; even scripts with such complicated single characters and signs as cuneiform or Chinese have methods of their own "alphabetization" (by the location, number, and form of the strokes in each sign). The dictionary will be arranged according the alphabet or sequence of signs accepted by consensus in the respective language.

It is seldom that the lexicographer finds that he must develop an

alphabet for the language in question, because it lacks this tradition. This can today only in language only recently reduced to writing. In the majority of such cases, such a language will be written in the Roman script, possibly with some di-acriticized or other symbols. The alphabet will, then, be basically the usual Roman one, with diacriticized letters put next after their undiaeriticized counterparts. If there are elements of another script, or absolutely unusual symbols, they can be put either at the end of the alphabet, or inserted in it at a graphically or phonemically suitable place.

Key words

arrangement of entries, lexicographic definition, the exemplification, construction of entries, linguistic description, selection of entries.

Questions and tasks

1. Analyze the selection between scientific and technical terms.
2. Specific features of selection of synonyms in unilingual dictionaries.

References

1. Бушуй А.М. Фразеографические основы украинского толкового словаря // Вопросы филологических наук.-М.,2009.-№6.-С.26-30.

2. Бушуй Т.А. Фразеосистемность в контрастивном лексическом словаре // Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан. – Нукус, 2001. - №5. – С.92-93.

3. Malkiel Y. An Introduction to Modern English Word Formation, -L., 1973, 256p.

4. Oxford History of English Lexicography, / ed.by A.P.Cowie, -Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2009, 551p.

5. Tom McArthur. Guides to tomorrow's English // English today. Cambridge University Press, 1998, P.21-23.

6. Shcherba L.V. Theoretical Lexicography, -M., 1944. 399p.

7. Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. -М. 1977.218р.

Dictionaries

1. Hornby. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. -Lnd. 1974.

2. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. -M. 1986.
3. Webster's New World Dictionary of American English. -N.Y. 1978.
4. Апресян Ю.Д. Новый большой англо-русский словарь. -М. 1993.
5. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. -М. 1967.

Internet resources

1. http://www.anu.edu.au/ANDC/ Australian National Dictionary Centre. (Accessed 23 June 2006.)
2. http://www.singlishdictionary.com/ Tsen-Ta Lee, J. (2004). A Dictionary of Singlish and Singapore English. (Accessed 22 June 2006.)

LECTURE 9. BASIC PROBLEMS OF COMPILING BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES

Types of bilingual dictionaries

Two languages are represented in bilingual dictionaries. The usual aim of a bilingual dictionary is to help in translating from one language into another, or in producing texts in language other the user's native one, or both. The usual situation is that the more descriptive tasks are reserved to the monolingual dictionaries, particularly if a living language is to be described. In those cases, however, when the compilation of a monolingual dictionary is not to be expected soon, a bilingual dictionary assumes some of the descriptive tasks. Only unfrequently are more than two languages represented in one dictionary. To indicate the lexical equivalents of more than two languages simultaneously is usually possible only if we alsolutely neglect polysemy and take into consideration only the dominant senses of the single words. The situation is easier if the languages in question are closely related, but even in this case the difficulties are formidable.

If we do not take into consideration such specific works as comparative dictionaries which have etymological aims we can say that the only domain in which multilingual, more-than-bilingual dictionaries have a justification is the field of technical terminology. The meaning of technical terms is usually much more precisely defined than that of a general word, so that semantic equivalence can be established more accurately. It is also possible to neglect polysemy, to neglect, in the

indication of a term's meaning, all other senses than the terminological ones, so that it is easier to find the precise equivalents in the other languages. This is why there are some successful multilingual dictionaries of different technical terminologies. But even in this field, the difficulties are great.

The main function of a bilingual dictionary is to coordinate with the lexical units of one language those lexical units of another language which are equivalent in their lexical meaning. The first language, to whose lexical units the lexical units of the other language are co-ordinated is called the source-language: the order of the entries in a bilingual dictionary is given by the source language. The other language whose lexical units are coordinated to the first ones, is called the target language. The fundamental difficulty of such a co-ordination of lexical units is caused by the anisomorphism of languages, i.e. by the differences in the organization of denotation in the individual languages and by other differences between languages. There will be no really equivalent lexical units ready in the target language. It would be a mistake to think, that this can happen only if the two cultures are vastly different, above all if one of them is "exotic" or old. On the contrary, this situation can occur in any two pairs of languages: there is nothing similar to the American drug-store in Europe and there is no suitable equivalent lexical unit in the European languages, either.

But if there is no equivalent lexical unit in the target language, the bilingual dictionary must use other means than the coordination of lexical units mentioned above. The usual thing is that the meaning of the respective lexical unit of the source language is described by an explanation which is not dissimilar to the definition of a monolingual dictionary but is worded in the target language. In this way, we can read in a Latin-English dictionary, e.g., consul, -is, m. "the highest executive dignitary of the Roman republic".

Very frequently, it is possible to find an equivalent in the target language, but there are difference caused by the different cultural connections. Cultural change within the same society can also modify these cultural connections; the usual slowness of this process adds to the lexicographer's worries: is the extralinguistic factor of good birth and, or considerable wealth still of importance for the lexical meaning of Eng. gentleman, or is it irrelevant or less relevant by now, as in the majority of languages in which the word is borrowed. These "culture-bound words" pose very difficult problems for the lexicographer. He should not despair

if he finds that it is not possible to give all the detailed information on them in his dictionary. After all, he cannot insert long encyclopedic articles with detailed discussions of the other culture. But the basic information on linguistically relevant points should be given. Translation dictionaries give words and their equivalents in the other language. There are English-Russian dictionaries by I.R. Galperin, by Y.Apresyan and others.

When planning a bilingual dictionary, the compiler must decide to which type it will belong. At the boundaries of the single types are rather fluid, we shall discuss primarily the more important dimensions of the observable variation.

The choise of the source language and of the target language is in itself a powerful factor. It is, for example, quite obvious that the bilingual dictionary of a dead language will necessarily tend to have a rather philological character, with quotations from the authors (texts), etc. But there are not only these obvious cases; in reality, the lexicographer should always try to find out what consequences are entailed by the choice of the two languages to be dealt with in the dictionary. If the two languages belong to very distant cultures, there will be a greater need to give some encyclopedic explanations. If the grammatical structures of the two languages are very different, it will be more difficult but also more necessary to decide in advance in what forms the respective lexical units are to be coordinated. If at least one of the two languages shows diglossia, it will be necessary to decide which of the diglottic levels is mainly to be stressed, or how the situation will generally be solved. But even if there is no diglossia involved, the two languages must be compared in respect to the single style levels observable in them.

A very powerful factor in the constitution of the type of dictionary is the difference between the way the native language can be treated and the requirements necessary to deal effectively with a foreign language. There are innumerable covert facts which the native speaker knows about his language and about his culture. If the dictionary is written primarily or exclusively for him, information about such covert facts can be omitted; but since a foreigner cannot be supposed to know them, he will require much more information. This is particularly important to remember if the lexicographer compiles a dictionary which is to be used by native speakers of another language. If, for example, the native speaker of a language A compiles a bilingual dictionary A—B or B—A to be used primarily by the speakers of B, he will always have to check whether a

linguistic and semantically relevant phenomenon in A which he takes for granted, sometimes to the degree of not noticing it at all, will not be a source of difficulty to the speaker of B. This dimension overlaps with the following one see the next paragraph), but only partly; the overlapping is caused by the fact that in the majority of cases the lexicographer prepares the dictionary for his own linguistic community.

Probably the most important dimension of the typology of the bilingual dictionaries consists in the lexicographer's intention to compile the dictionary either as an aid to the comprehension of texts in the source language or of the description of the source language, or as an aid to the generation of texts in the target language.

The last dimension of variation which we shall mention is the purpose of the bilingual dictionary. This dimension overlaps to some extent with that of the intention, but the two do not coincide.

There are, however, three groups of dictionaries with a remarkably outstanding concentration upon some purpose we wish to mention. They are:

1) philological bilingual dictionaries,

2) the ethnolinguistic bilingual dictionaries,

3) onomasiologically productive or normative bilingual dictionaries of not yet fully established standard national languages.

These three classes have in common that all these dictionaries also take upon themselves some tasks which but for different circumstances - would belong to monolingual dictionaries, in the first line the description either of the source language.

Philological bilingual dictionaries are usually compiled when the source language is dead. For instance, the biggest Latin dictionary.

Collection of material

As far as the collection of material goes, the bilingual lexicographer is in an enviable situation if there is already a good, comprehensive, descriptive monolingual dictionary, preferably of the standard-descriptive type or an overall-descriptive one with a standard-descriptive nucleus at least of the non-native language of his pair of languages, but even more if there are such dictionaries of both of them. The absense of such a dictionary is always a serious handicap, because the lexicographer himself must then do much descriptive and other work which should in fact be done by the monolingual dictionary. This remark pertains not only to the collection of the material but has more general validity: in the

absence of the monolingual dictionary, the lexicographer will have not only to decide for himself what are to be considered stabilized lexical units and what not, but he will also have to deal with the multiple meanings of each lexical unit, etc. All this will make his work considerably more difficult and longer. As far as the collecting of material goes a good monolingual dictionary can be used as the basis for the planned bilingual one. If there are more several monolingual dictionaries at hand the one should be chosen which is most similar to the planned bilingual dictionary: for example, a strictly modern standard-descriptive monolingual dictionary is chosen if the planned dictionary is intended to cover only the contemporary language; a more overall-descriptive, broader monolingual dictionary is chosen if the planned dictionary is to be used for the comprehension of older texts, etc. The material (i.e., the entry-words of the future bilingual dictionary, and their multiple meaning found in the monolingual dictionary) is usually reduced, during the selection. But on the other hand, even if there is an excellent monolingual dictionary at the lexicographer's disposal, the material contained in it must not only be compared with that of other eventual monolingual dictionaries, but it must be completed from other sources, too. In the first place, there may be a difference in the area covered by the two dictionaries: e.g. the monolingual is based more on literary texts whereas the bilingual one intends to be useful also for the generation or comprehension of administrative or technical, etc., texts; or the bilingual dictionary is intended to be useful also for reading some dialectal, or older texts not taken into consideration in the monolingual one.

It is not necessary to stress that the whole material should be checked (coincidence of the evidence, of different dictionaries, of the excerption; the lexicographer's own knowledge; and that of the informants) in respect to its correctness and above all in respect to the question whether it is not obsolete.

If there is no monolingual dictionary at hand, the material for the bilingual dictionary must be gained in the same way as it is gained for the monolingual one. This is necessary for the source language irrespective of whether it is the lexicographer's native language or not, and for the target language if it is foreign to the lexicographer. Material collected for the target language should, however, be indexed and filed under the entry-words of the source language.

Selection of entries

The selection of the prospective entry-words which will be included in the bilingual dictionary should be governed by the type of the dictionary, above all by its intention and purpose. The same applies to the reduction of the multiple meanings of selected entries. In the case of a dictionary which intends to help the user to understand texts couched in a foreign language, it will be clear that the occurrence of the lexical units in those texts is the first factor which determines the selection for the entry-words; the more "text-bound" the dictionary is, the more powerful is also this factor. In a similar way, the selection for a bilingual dictionary with descriptive intentions is governed by principles almost identical to those of the corresponding monolingual dictionary. Some remarks must be made with respect to the bilingual dictionary which is intended to help the user to generate texts in the (foreign) target language. The basis of the list of prospective entry-words is, of course, the lexicon and semantic of the (native) source language. There are, however, several modifications of this general principle.

First, if the planned dictionary is not to be a big one, it is possible to leave out the less known or less used synonyms of the source language.

Second, such a dictionary, especially if it is a smaller one, should be rather reserved in its inclusion of colloquialisms, slang expressions or even vulgarities and similar levels of language; and even the bigger dictionaries of this type should be extremely cautious in this respect, lest the user be put into a ridiculous or painful position.

Third, if the target language of a dictionary of this type is spoken in a society with a different culture and in a geographical and other extralinguistic milieu vastly different from that of the source language, it will be necessary to take into consideration also the target language when the entry words of the source language are selected. Different social institutions, different plants and animals may be unimportant or non-existent in the milieu of the source language while being very important or frequent in the milieu of the target language. Because it may be legitimately assumed that the source-language speaker will use the dictionary to generate texts about the milieu of the target language (possibly also while residing in the other surroundings), the respective lexical units of the target language should be indicated. For example, an English-Russian dictionary will have to contain entries like

[Eng.] collective farm [Rus.] колхоз
Samovar, tea-urn самовар

A frequent difficulty is that there are not always some really suitable equivalent lexical units of the source language at hand to be used as entrywords. If there are not stabilized lexical units of the source language to be used for this purpose, the necessary indication of the target language should be put there where the user can be supposed to seek it. When compiling such a differential dictionary, the lexicographer should be extremely cautious, because even if the multiple meaning of both the lexical units coincides, there may be important differences in phraseology. One of the dangers of the differential dictionary is that since it is necessarily small, the lexicographer will take into consideration only the dominant senses of the two lexical units: these may happen to be identical and so the pair may be omitted, though there may be important differences in the non-dominant senses about which the user will learn nothing.

But even if it is not a differential dictionary which he is compiling, the lexicographer will tend to omit, in a very small dictionary, such internationalism as telephone, mathematics, for obvious reasons. Generally speaking, it is necessary to take into consideration that it is a language more or less foreign to the user with which we have to deal in a bilingual dictionary. This is important above all when it is the target language in which the foreign-speaking user is supposed to generate texts. But the same circumstance should be taken into account when it is the source language which is foreign to the user.

Key words

Arrangement of entries, lexicographic definition, the exemplification, construction of entries, linguistic description, selection of entries.

Questions and tasks

1. Explain the connection between the size of dictionary and arrangement of entries.
2. The best known bilingual dictionaries.
3. Characterize the stages of checking the selected material.
4. Compare the construction of entries in two or more dictionaries.

References

1.Бушуй А.М. Фразеографические основы украинского толкового словаря // Вопросы филологических наук.-М.,2009.-№6.-С.26-30.

2. Бушуй Т.А. Фразеосистемность в контрастивном лексическом словаре // Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан. – Нукус, 2001. - №5. – С.92-93.

3. Malkiel Y. An Introduction to Modern English Word Formation, - L., 1973, 256p.

4.Oxford History of English Lexicography, / ed.by A.P.Cowie, - Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2009, 551p.

5.Tom McArthur. Guides to tomorrow's English // English today. Cambridge University Press, 1998, P.21-23.

6. Shcherba L.V. Theoretical Lexicography, -M., 1944. 399p.

7. Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. -М. 1977.218р.

Dictionaries

1. Hornby. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. -Lnd. 1974.

2. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. -M. 1986.

3. Webster's New World Dictionary of American English. -N.Y. 1978.

4. Апресян Ю.Д. Новый большой англо-русский словарь. -М. 1993.

5. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. -М. 1967.

REFERENCES

1. Aitchison J. Words in the Mind: An Introduction in the Mental Lexicon -Oxford; New York: Basil Blackwell, 1994. – 290p.

2. Allwood J. A critical look at speech act theory // Look, Pragmatics and Grammar. – Department of Linguistics, 2007. – P. 53-69.

3. Backman G. Meaning by metaphor: An exploration of metaphor with a metaphoric reading of two short stories by Steven Crane. – Upsals: (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia; 75), 2001. – 243p.

4. Bates E. Language and Context: the Acquisition of Pragmatics. – New York: Academic Press, 2006. – 312p.

5. Bolinger D. Meaning and form. – New York: Longman, 2007. – 312 p.

6. Bushuy T.A. Phraseological Equivalentation as a problem of Contrastive Lexicography // Contrastive Linguistics.– Sofia, 1996. - №1.– P.30-35.

7. Bushuy Tatyana. Sinxronik va diaxronik tilshunoslik. – Umumiy tilshunoslik bo'yicha o'quv qo'llanma. – Samarqand: SamDCHTI, 2003. – 50b.

8. Contrastive Lexical semantics / Ed. by Weigand E.– Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1998. –IX. – 270p.

9. Crystal D. Prosodic Systems and Intonation in English. – Cambridge University Press, 1999. – 469p.

10. Cultural, psychological issues in cognitive linguistics / Ed. by Higara M. K. e. a. – Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamin's, 1999. – 338p.

11. Dahl O. Topic – comment revisited // Topic and comment. Contextual boundness and focus. – Hamburg, 2001. – P.10-39.

12. Discourse studies in cognitive linguistics / Ed. by van Hoek K.E.A. - Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamin's, 1999. – 187p.

13. Malkiel N. An Introduction to Modern English Word Formation. L., 1973, 256p.

14. Miller G.A. Images and models, similes and metaphors // Metaphor and Thought. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. – P. 202-250.

15.Oxford History of English Lexicography, ed.by A.P.Cowie, Clarendon Press, 2009, 551p.

16.Tom McArthur. Guides to tomorrow's English // English today. Cambridge University Press, 1998, P.21-23.

17. Quine W.V.O. Word and Object. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2004. – 464p.

18. Ralph B. Ordinary language as metalanguage in word semantics // Proceedings of the XIII International congress of linguistics. – Tokyo, 1993. – P. 932-935.

19. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Спорные вопросы семантики.– М.: Гнозис, 2005.– С. 5-6.

20. Амосова Н.Н. Основы английской фразеологии.– Л.:ЛГУ,1963-208с.

21. Арнольд И.В. Семантика. Стилистика. Интертекстуальность. –СПб.: Изд-во С. Петербург ун-та, 1999. -444с.

22. Арнольд И.В. Семантическая структура слова в современном английском языке и методика её исследования. – Л.: ЛГУ, 1966.-186с.

23. Арнольд И.В. Стилистика современного английского языка. – Л.: ЛГУ, 1981.-324с.

24. Арнольд И.В. The English word.- М.: Высшая школа, 1986.-324с.

25. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. – М.: Прогресс, 1974. – 447с.

26. Блумфилд Л. Язык. – М.: Прогресс, 1986. – 608с.

27. Бодуэн де Куртенэ И.А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. –М.: Изд-во АН, 1963, т. 1. – 384с.; т. 2. – 391с.

28. Бушуй А.М. Фразеографические основы украинского толкового словаря // Вопросы филологических наук.-М.,2009.-№6.-С.26-30.

29. Бушуй Т.А. Фразеосистемность в контрастивном лексическом словаре // Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан. – Нукус, 2001. - №5. – С.92-93.

30. Бушуй Т., Сафаров Ш. Тил қурилиши: таҳлил методлари ва методологияси. – Тошкент: Фан, 2007.– 274б.

31. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. – М.: Русские словари, 1996. – 404с.

32. Вежбицкая А. Понимание культур через посредство ключевых слов. –М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2001. – 288с.

33. Воробьев В.В. Лингвокультурология (Теория и методы): Монография.- М .: Изд-во РУДН, 1997. -331с.

34. Гальперин И.Р. Очерки по стилистике английского языка. –

М.: ИЛИЯ, 1958. – 459с.

35. Исмаилов А.Р. Прагматика фразеологии и её текстовая актуализация (на материале окказиональных преобразований фразеологических единиц английского языка). Автореф. дисс.... канд. филол. наук.- Ташкент, 2006.-28с.

36. Караулов Ю.Н. Показатели национального менталитета в ассоциативно - вербальной сети // Языковое сознание и образ мира. – М.: Ин-т языкознания РАИ, 2000. – 152с.

37. Касарес Х. Введение в современную лексикографию.- М.: Изд-во иностр. лит-ры, 1958. -354с.

38. Кожина М.Н. Взаимодействие стилистики и смежных дисциплин // Стилистический энциклопедический словарь / Под ред. А.Н.Кожиной. - М.: Флинта; Наука, 2003. – С. 25-33.

39. Колпакова Г.В. Семантика языковой единицы.–Казань: Изд-во Казанск. ун-та, 2004. – 216с.

40. Колтунова Е. О стилистических пометах в словаре современного русского языка // Studia Rossica Posnaniencia, Познаньский ун-т им. А. Мицкевича. – Познань, 2003. – Вып. XXXI. – С.121-128.

41. Колшанский Г.В. Объективная картина мира в познании и языке. – М. Наука, 1990. – 108с.

42. Кубрякова Е.С., Демьянков В.З., Панкрац Ю.Г., Лузина Л.Г. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов. – М.: МГУ, 1986. – С. 187-189.

43. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, 1986. – 336с.

44. Лапшина М.Н.Семантическая эволюция английского языка: Изучение лексики в когнитивном аспекте. – СПб.: Изд-во С.- Петерб. ун-та, 1998. – 159с.

45. Лузина Л.Г. Проблемы стилистики и лингвопрагматической интерпретации // Прагматика и семантика : Сб. науч.- аналит. обзоров.- М.: ИНИОН, 1991. – С. 67-81.

46. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология.–М.: Изд.центр. Академия, 2001.-208с.

47. Медникова Э.М. Проблемы и методы исследования словарного состава (на материале английского языка). – М.:МГУ,1972.–234с.

48. Новиков А.Л. О контекстуальном смысле слова // Филологические науки. – М., 2002. - №5. – С.82-89.

49. Орлов Г.А. Современная английская речь. – М.: Высшая школа, 1991. - 240с.

50. Ройзензон Л.И. Лекции по общей и русской фразеологии. Самарканд: Изд-во Самарканд. ун-та, 1973. – 223с.

51. Селяев А. В. Сопоставительный анализ лингвистических средств выражения положительных и отрицательных эмоций в британском и американском вариантах английского языка: Автореф. дисс. … канд. филол. наук. – Н. Новгород: ННГПИ, 1995, - 21с.

52. Смирницкий А.И. Лексикология английского языка.– М.: ИИЛ, 1956. - 260 с.

53. Соссюр Ф. де. Заметки по общей лингвистике. – М.: Прогресс, 1990. - 275 с.

54. Степанов Ю.С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры: Опыт исследования. – М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1997.-824с.

55. Тер-Минасова С. Г. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация: Учебное пособие. –М.: Слово, 2000.-624с.

56. Титкова О.И. О перспективах лингвистического исследования рекуррентных единиц лексикона // Филологические науки.– М., 2003. - №2. – С. 70-86.

57. Турниёзов Н. Ўзбек дериватологиясининг бугунги аҳволи ва истиқбол тараққиёти ҳақида // Til taraqqiyotining qonuniyatlari.– Samarqand: SamDCHTI, 2009. –B. 3-6.

58. Шаховский В.И. Эмоциональные культурные концепты: параллели и контрасты // Языковая личность: культурные концепты. – Волгоград: Перемена, 1996. – С.80-96.

Dictionaries

1. A supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary / Ed. by R.W. Burchfield. – Vol.3. –Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992. – 1579p.

2. A supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary / Ed. by R.W. Burchfield. – Vol.4. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. – 1410p.

3. Barnhart, Clarence L. The second Barnhart dictionary of New English / Clarence L. Barnhart, Sol Steinmetz, Robert K. Barnhart. – New York: Barnhart books. – cop. 2008. – XV. – 520p.

4. Barnhart C. The Barnhart dictionary of New English. – New York: The New American Library, 1999. – 1512p.

5. Brewer E.C. Dictionary of Phrase and Fable. – Philadelphia; London: James Brodie, 2003. – 1440p.

6. Chambers XX Century Dictionary. – Edinburgh: Green, 2002. – 1583p.

7. Charlton Laird. Webster's New World Thesaurus. – New York: New American Library, 1991. – 678p.

8. E.Cobham Breher. A Dictionary of Phrase and Fable. – London: Cassel and Co. LTD, 1997. – 1232p.

9. Cobuild C. English Language Dictionary. – London: Longman, 1997. –XXIV, 1703p.

10.Collins V.H. A Book of English Idioms. With Explanations.- London: Longman, 1998. -XI. -258p.

11. Collins Dictionary of the English Language. Ed. by L. Urdang, P. Hanks, Th. H. Long. – London; Glasgow: Collins, 2006. –XXXV, 1690p.

12. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. –Ed. by T.B. Sykes. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. – 1312p.

13.Courtney, Rosemary. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. – Harlow (Essex): Longman, 1983. – 734p.

14. Cowie A., Mackin R. The Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1985. – Vol. 1. – 576p.

15. Dictionary of Contemporary English. – Editor-in-chief P. Procter. – London: Longman, 1998. – XXXIX. – 1303p.

16. Franklyn J.A. A Dictionary of Rhyming Slang. – London, 2006. – 880p.

17. Freeman W. A Concise Dictionary of English Slang. – N.Y.,2008.–968p.

18. Fowler H.W. A Dictionary of Modern English Usage. – London: Oxford University Press, 2008. – 725p.

19. Funk and Wagnall's New «Standard» Dictionary of the English Language. – New York; London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1997. – 2814p.

20. Harkes, Rosemary, Machado, Teresa de Sousa. A Dictionary of Verbal Idioms. – Porto, 1983. – 283p.

21. Hornby A. S. Oxford Student's Dictionary.– Oxford, 1994.– 884p.

22. Hornby A.S. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English – London: Oxford University Press, 2005. – 1055p. (ALD).

23. Hornby A.S. The Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English. – London: Longman, 1999. – 678p. (ALD)

24. Hotton J.C. The Slang Dictionary. – London, 1887. – 382p.

25. Johnson B. A Common English Sayings: A Collection of

Metaphors in Everyday Usage. – London; New York; Toronto, 1998. – 1520 p.

26. Katzner, Kenneth. English-Russian, Russian-English Dictionary. – New York, 1984. – XIII. – 904p.

27. The Kenkyusha Dictionary of Current English Idioms. –Tokyo, 1969. – 849p.

28. The Kenkyusha Dictionary of Current English Idioms. – Tokyo Kenkyusha, 1993. -990p.

29. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English– L., 1988. – 984 p.

30. Longman Active Study Dictionary of English. – Harlow: Longman Group Limited, 1988. – 707p.

31. Longman Dictionary of English Idioms. – London: Longman, 1989. – 387p. (LDEI)

32. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. – London: Longman, 1997. – 1229 p. (L)

33. Mallinson G. The Dictionary and the Lexicon. A Happy Medium NIIL. Review of Applied Linguistics. – Leuven, 1999. – Vol. 45-46. – 456p.

34. McArthur T. Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English. – Harlow, 1991. – 910p.

35.The Merriam – Webster Concise school and office Dictionary. – Springfield: Massachusetts, 1991. – 674p.

36. The New National Dictionary.–London; Glasgow: Collins, 1999. – 608 p.

37. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. – fourth edit. A.S.Hornby, Chief Editor: A.P. Cowie Oxford University Press, 1989. – 1579p. (Published with corrections in 1993)

38. The Oxford English Dictionary. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. – Vol. 1-12. – 10989p.

39. The Pan English Dictionary. - London and Sydney: Pan Books, 1990. 1328p.

40. Partridge E. A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English. – London, 1967. – V.2. – 501p. (DSL)

41. The Penguin Dictionary, second edition. –London: Penguin, 1991. - 1014p.

42. The Random House Dictionary of the English Language. – New York: Random House, 1997. – 2059p.

43. Roget's Thesaurus of English word and phrases. – New York:

Penguin books, 1966. – 712p.

44. Roget's Thesaurus. – London: Penguin Books, 1998. – 712p.

45. Sholfield P.J. On a Non-Standard Dictionary Schema // IIL. Review of Applied Linguistics. – Leuven, 1979. – vol. 45-46. – P. 54-62.

46. The Shorter Oxford Dictionary of Historical Principles. – Third edition. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. – 720p. (SOD)

47. Thorndike-Barnhart Intermediate Dictionary.–Glenview,III., 1971. – 459p.

48. Thorndike-Barnhart Beginning Dictionary, seventh ed. – Glenview, III., 1972. – 765p.

49. Thorndike-Barnhart Advanced Dictionary. – Glenview, III., 1973. – 612p.

50. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. – Springfield (Massachusetts): G. and C.Merriam Com. Publishers, 1990. – 1532 p.

51. Webster's New World Thesaurus. – New York: The New American Library, 1995. – 1678 p. (W)

52. Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language. – Springfield (Massachusetts): G and C. Merriam Com. Publishers, 1998. – 3194p. (WNID)

53. Wood F. Dictionary of English Colloquial Idioms. – London: Macmillan, 1979. – 658p.

54. Англо-русский словарь / Сост.: В. К. Мюллер. –М.: СЭ, 1978. – 912с.

55. Большой англо-русский словарь. – Под общим рук. И.Р. Гальперина.– Т.1-2. – Изд. 2. – М.: Русский язык, 1977. – Т.I. – 822с.; Т.2. – 863с. (БАРС).

56. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь.– Изд.3-е, испр., в двух книгах.–М.: СЭ, 1967.– Т.1. – 738с.; Т.2. – 739-1264с. (АРФС).

57. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь.– Изд.4-е, переработанное и дополненное. – М.: Русский язык, 1984. – 942с. (АРФС).

58. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. Под ред. В.Н.Ярцевой.- М.: Большая Российская энциклопедия, 2002.- 709с.

CONTENT

F.Sh.Ruzikulov, Sh.J.Shomurodova, N.M.Suleymanova

THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL LEXICOGRAPHY

Муҳаррир: А.Кўчибоев
Тех.муҳаррир: Ҳ.Амирдинов
Мусаҳҳиҳ: З. Хамдамов

Босишга 26.11.2014 йилда рухсат этилди.
Қоғоз бичими 60x84 1/16. Офсет қоғози. Шартли босма табоғи 5,3.
Нашриёт ҳисоб табоғи 5,0. Адади 100 нусха. Буюртма №.25

СамДЧТИ нашр-матбаа марказида чоп этилди.
Манзил: Самарқанд шаҳри, Бўстонсарой кўчаси, 93-уй.