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INTRODUCTION

There is not a slightest doubt that lexicography of today differs greatly from it was half a century ago. Not only has it gone beyond the scope of what is used to be, but has also become a mature sector of general linguistics. Theoretical and practical background of lexicography has become much more solid and is being developed. This fact accounts for appearance of a great many of non-traditional types of dictionaries. Due to the development of cross-cultural relations between different nations and peoples, cultural dictionaries have become of paramount importance.

Adequate interpretation of the so-called “culture loaded” words and word combinations is sure to prevent the interactants of different cultures from communicative failures and will contribute to mutual understanding. Another issue of interest for lexicographers is formation and development of specific subject areas. Hence a new turn in terminology and terminography studies with special reference to European languages. This accounts for the appearance of new lexicographic ways of describing terms. Terms of different special domains are viewed from the angle of the latest achievements of modern science, cognitive linguistics in particular. All the above-mentioned tendencies are international in nature, but the ways the problems lexicographers face have national grounds although the former can’t exist without the latter.

The first part of the book is devoted to the development of modern lexicographic scene in the world with special reference to key problems of dictionary-making process.

Elena Berthemet assumes that digital dictionary format is the best way to render the representation of all phraseological units systematic, believing that computer version of phraseological dictionary could reconcile the complex nature of phraseological units. E. Berthemet points out that such digital dictionary should not be limited to linear presentation and susceptible to surcharging either. As to the rules of presentation of the units under discussion the author thinks it only necessary to consider the use and the imagery which the simple nominee of language has from a phraseological unit. The researcher stresses the fact that the more languages the dictionary compares, the more complex the system for presenting entries is.
Liudmila Devel offers the description of the bilingual English-Russian learner’s lexicography covering whole lifespan between the XVIth and early XXIst centuries. The author starts with the assumption, firstly, that lexicography which is opposed to academic lexicography is smaller and more learner-oriented; secondly, that learner’s pedagogical lexicography is the one highly learner-oriented. It is on this basis that a special reference book presenting the details of more than 6 hundred dictionaries starting from the first ones produced by English Doctor Mark Ridley and philologist Richard James under the influence of the first Latin-English learner’s dictionaries appeared. The data are presented in chronological sequence and one can see the rate with which such a type of lexicography has been developing in Russia. Special features of modern English-Russian lexicography (the most widely spread one among readers in Russia) and abroad are given.

Faina Kartashkova and Olga Karpova offer in their article a profound review of a new generation of Shakespeare’s dictionaries for special purposes which have been published in the new millennium in the English speaking countries. Much attention is given to the review of new onomasticons registering proper names from the writer’s literary works with special reference to analysis of a lexical meaning of proper names based on famous scholars’ theories. Special Shakespeare reference works fixing and describing terms and whole terminological systems are being analyzed in recent musical, religious and theatrical dictionaries.

Olga Karpova highlights new tendencies in modern English and Russian lexicography. The author shows that due to the change of the language situation in both countries prescriptive academic dictionaries gave way to descriptive general-purpose dictionaries reflecting the norm of modern usage of words: from sphere of politics, zone of social attention to such units as jargon (particularly, youth slang), terms (new information technologies, finance and economics, etc.), also low-flown words, borrowings, Mass Media jargon etc. Proper names are also included in the macrostructure of literary language dictionaries nowadays. The author stresses that the range of special-purpose dictionaries is becoming more diverse: dictionaries of youth slang, new words of a certain type and others dealing with changing users’ profile due to the migration of the population from Asia and Africa to the developed countries. The article presents a detailed lexicographic analysis of these dictionaries.

Elena Koltsova and Faina Kartashkova present the results of lexicographic analysis of gender nominations of person in Modern English which was carried out on the basis of reliable English dictionaries. The analysis makes it clear that there are the following tendencies in modern
English society. On the one hand, gender asymmetry is still a mark of English society, while on the other hand, there seems to be a counterbalance: many anthroponymic names are becoming gender neutral. Of special interest is the lexicographic analysis of intertextual and zoonymic names the gender proportion of which is given on the basis of statistics.

Anna Makhonina and Marina Sternina acquaint the readers with the idea of the dictionary of a new type – English-Russian Dictionary of Non-Equivalent Substantive Lexis which aims at presenting as many non-equivalent English nouns as possible. The authors highlight the problems they faced while compiling the dictionary, the main being the one of singling out lacunae as it is still not quite clear which lexical units can be considered lacunae in another language. This accounts for urgent necessity to work out the approach of defining whether the word combination is fixed or not. Completing the dictionary under discussion presupposes dealing with such problems as unjustified usage of transliteration of non-equivalent lexis given in English-Russian dictionaries, incorrect word definitions of many Russian objects and phenomena, etc.

Leela Pienar’s article is supposed to examines which provide lexicographers and linguists with a more nuanced view of the mosaic of South African English. The author shows that inspite of the fact that various dictionaries, from Pettman’s Dictionary of Africanderisms (1913) to the Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles (1996), defined the unique vocabulary of SAE, there is no national corpus of South African English. The author examines Indian South African English (ISAE) as a small, but significant building block of South African English and argues for a balanced representation of all sub-varieties of English in South Africa through the compilation of corpora of these sub-varieties.

Ekaterina Shaposhnikova’s article is devoted to such a variety of idiomatic speech as English rhyming slang. The author stresses that despite the fact that this phenomenon has long been a point of linguistic interest, lexicographic description of English rhyming slang also requires a thorough investigation. The author presents a detailed analysis of a number of reliable dictionaries of rhyming slang wherein the peculiarities of their mega-, macro- and micro-structure, the repertoire of labels, principles of word selection, poligraphic semiotics are paid special attention to. The author also discusses special dictionaries describing this language area represented in the Internet and claims that their trustworthiness is somewhat doubtful since their authors are not, as a rule, professional lexicographers but rather amateur collectors; that these
dictionaries are more likely to be called word-lists than dictionaries proper.

Tatyana Taganova in her article stresses the fact that modern linguistics and lexicography have come to appreciate the uniqueness of “the national” (which correlates with such concepts as “nation”, “national identity”, “national character”), the demand for the dictionaries of a new type. Such dictionaries are aimed at a user who poses specific and definite questions. The author claims that if such dictionaries are compiled, they will be of great help in avoiding communication failures.

Tatyana Tretyakova’s article is devoted to Anichkov theory of Idiomatics and bilingual dictionaries of idioms and clichés. The author claims that Anichkov idea of separation idiomatics from syntax and semantics (expressed in the work “Idiomatics in the Rank of Linguistic Disciplines” (1937) which was published only in 1997) might help to provide a more systematic presentation of idioms and clichés in dictionaries. The author shows that lexicographic representation of “communicative idioms” which present the dynamic system of discourse shifters accumulating communicative situation models in bilingual dictionaries is based on integral interpretation of syntax, functional semantics and idiomatics.

Olga Uzhova’s paper is devoted to the question of definitions in monolingual cultural dictionaries the aim of which is to give students of English knowledge that can develop cultural awareness and cultural competence necessary in cross-cultural communication and the study of the country. Following Ilson’s methods of giving an explanation of the meaning of a word phrase or term two kinds of definitions - encyclopedic and semantic ones in the dictionaries are analyzed. The author comes to the conclusion that encyclopedic definitions do not define the word conceptually but referentially; they are perfectly adequate for relating the conceptual field of a domain to its extralinguistic reality.

The second part of the book “Terminology” is devoted to description of the current tendencies observed in terminology and terminography studies with special reference to modern European languages such as English, Russian, Norwegian, etc.

Olga Karpova and Margarita Kulagina analyze new types of reference books for immigrants which may be used as models for learners and terminological dictionaries for communication of immigrants with officials in social and political sphere. LSP of immigration policy, social work and a number of other spheres of activity carried out by social services in a modern highly-developed society requires reflection in special LSP dictionaries including basic terms of these new domains.
Peculiarities of functioning and fixation of terms forming new subject areas formed due to the changes of political and social spheres in modern global society are discussed in the paper.

Konstantin Averboukh describes several approaches to understanding of the nature of a word combination since 70s of the XX c. He declares the possibility of existing of no more that 10 or 12 models in any particular subject field, the length of a polycompound word depending on the function of these constructions in the notion of a specialized concept. Such constructions are treated by the author as terminological units. The article presents one of the main approaches to the determined issues, according to which a word combination is defined as a syntactical construction formed on the basis of subordinating connections: agreement, government and parataxis.

Margarita Balamakova’s paper deals with description of electronic discourse as viewed from a linguistic perspective. The author shows that modern writing systems, whose appearance and development has been triggered by rapid advance of net-based communication include but are not limited by: instant messaging, chat, blog, forum, e-mail, guest book, etc. All of them have certain distinctive features that are peculiar to electronic discourse yet they differ due to a variety of factors both of linguistic and extralinguistic nature. According to the researcher the terminology of electronic discourse is diverse as it reflects the current state of those text-and-talk speech forms and needs to be productive enough to be able to embrace the new ones yet to come. The author comes to the consideration that flexibility and diversity of electronic discourse calls for systematization and typology of terms used in its description.

Maja Bratanic’s paper shows that establishing of European Union presupposes a strong demand for developing a coherent terminological apparatus for the specific EU content, hence the urgent need of traditional terminological procedures, suitable for national-level terminologies. The author of the papers stresses the necessity of creating a universal terminological system, which precisely corresponds to all official EU languages.

Ch. Lauren shares his observation in the sphere of colloquial use of the terms following the well-established terminological methods and giving principles of creating short terms. The author presents the case study of making new Norwegian terms for the oil industry by composition with special reference to the terminologist Johan Myking (University of Bergen) beginning of the 1980s.

Konstantin Denisov suggests a new approach to the analysis of phonetic terms. His method is based on definite cognitive assumptions,
which means that terminological system of any LSP should follow and reflect the development and structure of the corresponding conceptual subject area, and the terminological corpus should serve as a prerequisite for creating a rigorous system of phonetic notions. The author gives classification of phonetic terms which can be treated as the first step of creating a special dictionary of this subject field.

Larissa Alexeeva claims that famous Russian scientist P. Florensky’s works on terminology initiated the research in the sphere of terminology in Russia and that he was the first to express the necessity to clarify the nature of the term. One of the aims of the paper is to show that P.Florensky debated the question of stability versus dialectically-based interpretations of the term and broke down the notion of the term as a stable language unit and focused on its contradictory characteristics.

In her paper Mira Milic’ analyses the main characteristics of the term in relation to the word of a general lexicon. Analysis is based on the corpus of approximately 1300 sports terms related to ball games, in English and Serbian. Definitions of the term and terminology, essential semantic and grammatical information of a terminological dictionary come into the focus of the scholars’ attention.
PART I:

LEXICOGRAPHY
Today, borderlines between sciences are becoming blurred. Phraseology cannot exist without linguistics, history of language, sociology, anthropology and ethnology. Research in phraseology is profitable to these sciences and also to the domain of automatic translation. Consideration of phraseological units could help comprehend that not only did we make language, but also that language made us. To make this reflection complete and objective, it is insufficient to consider only one language. To understand the cultural element of a phraseological unit, comparison between different languages is necessary. In fact, creating a comparative dictionary of phraseological units could help translators and students. It could help people not only to open their vision of the world, but also to understand that no one language is more beautiful than another and, perhaps, to be more respectful to other cultures. A plurilingual phraseological dictionary would allow us to understand how people see the world, and to distinguish the international basis common to several languages and those specific to one language.

The limits of phraseology are not well defined. The definition of “phraseological unit” differs from one dictionary to another. Unfortunately, exact methods are not applicable to this complex linguistic sign. In this article, the term “phraseological unit” encompasses many concepts. We propose the inclusion of comparisons, idioms and phrases under the general term ‘phraseological unit’. The word ‘unit’ reflects the interdependence of components within this entity. The term ‘phraseological’ is justified by its non-compositional aspect, the impossibility of literal translation and archaisms (lexical, syntactical and referential).
A phraseological unit is a complex linguistic sign, fixed and specific of the language. Its principal traits are:

1) the property of reproduction (they are not created in the discourse and are employed as a prefabricated block);
2) its meaning does not result from the significance of its components, but from the fusion between them;
3) it can be episodic, as in expressions, or independent, as in proverbs.

The first point can be explained by transmission of phraseological units from one generation to another. Their creation is a long process: their structure must be accepted by the community, they must be representative, not too long, easily memorisable and often pleasant.

The second point - the meaning of this linguistic sign - is much more complex than the significance of a simple word. A phraseological unit is comparable to a scene, where the referent takes the principal role and the nearest lexemes form the background. The foreground and the background are indistinguishable, the meaning of a phraseological unit results from the fusion between the sense of all the components, which are bound together. Indeed, meaning can be represented as interaction between the sense of words, the process of fusion of words where some features are updated, while others disappear completely. Sometimes this fusion of sense goes counter to logical laws and can result in an unforeseeable meaning.

Everybody agrees that such lexical signs as ‘to make a cat’s paw of someone’ (eng.), ‘to rain cats and dogs’ (eng.) and ‘to think to be the cat’s whiskers’ (eng.) make up part of phraseology; they are ‘idioms’. Indeed, their meaning is opaque: it can not be deduced from the individual components, and foreigners can have difficulty in understanding them.

On the other hand, there is another type of lexical sign that can be easily understood like ‘to fight like cat and dog’ (eng.), ‘to work like a horse’ (eng.) and ‘strong like a horse’. All European speakers will have similar referents to designate conflict (‘to fight like cat and dog’), hard work (‘to work like a horse’) and strength (‘strong like a horse’). Based upon metaphors, they contain the conjunction ‘like’, which indicates that it is a comparison. Comparisons are completely transparent, and thus easier to understand. We can imagine that an animal such as the dog will always try to annoy the cat, that the horse has always worked hard for the human and that it is strong. As well as transparent comparisons, there are some which are opaque. They are more difficult to understand, as, for example, the French comparison ‘copains comme cochons’ (lit. friends like pigs).
Indeed, habitually ‘pigs’ have a negative connotation, while in this case the meaning is positive, it designates “very close friends”.

So, we propose to distinguish two types of comparisons: transparent ('to fight like cat and dog') and opaque ('copains comme cochons' (lit. 'friends like pigs)). In both cases, the second part - 'like + referent' - can be replaced by the adverb 'very much'. Some scientists talk about intensificators (Lutikova, 2002). Can intensificators find their place within phraseological units? They can be reproduced, literal translation is sometimes impossible, they are composed from several words and are loaded with cultural significance. In spite of their disputable status, it seems not without interest to include comparisons in a phraseological dictionary.

Idioms and comparisons are episodic; they are introduced within a proposition. On the other hand, we have proverbs forming propositions. As noted above, we consider here phraseological units in the general sense; we consider proverbs as phraseological units. Proverbs are ancient; they transmit ‘popular wisdom’ from one generation to another. They are imaginary and evoke a concrete example from the past. Moreover, a locution can become a proverb and vice versa. For example, the verbal locution ‘to count your chickens before they are hatched’ can be transformed into a proverb ‘Don’t count your chickens before they are hatched’.

How should one go about compiling a plurilingual phraseological dictionary? Comparing phraseological units is not a simple task. The field of fixed expressions is particularly rich and it has not been studied enough for numerous reasons. Among other problems, there is the problem of compiling a plurilingual dictionary. Today, phraseological dictionaries abound - some of them are unilingual, others bilingual; however it is rare to find a work treating more than two languages. The work done by specialists elaborating phraseological dictionaries is admirable. Each scholar has his own reasons for classifying phraseological units in different ways, which sometimes confuses readers.

We do not claim that the current proposition is without drawbacks, but it does permit a systematic description of phraseological units. In order to do such objective comparison, all phraseological units concerning the same notion in different languages must first be found, and then each one must be studied in detail. Most of today’s dictionaries propose following points: the meaning of phraseological units and their use illustrated by examples. Some of them contain the etymology of phraseological units (Although, due to the complex nature of phraseological units, the etymology can differ from one dictionary to another.) which can help
when doing specific research. But it seems that to distinguish the basis particular to one language and to understand the cultural element contained in each phraseological unit, these three points are not sufficient. It is impossible to draw pertinent cultural conclusions, if we treat phraseological units only from the diachronic point of view.

In spite of the opinion that phraseological units are frozen and unalterable, it is wrong to think that they belong to the past. Certainly, they come from the past, but we cannot say that they are dead. On the contrary, phraseological units are part of the everyday language of all people. They are living organisms, appertaining not to the past but to the present. To study the cultural elements of phraseological units, it is necessary to consider (separately from the meaning and the etymology) the use and the imagery which the simple nominee of language gets from phraseological unit. Adopting historical methods, today’s phraseological dictionaries propose only true etymology. They do not pay attention to the cultural element contained in phraseological units independently of previous knowledge. Ordinary users cannot know the etymology of phraseological units, but in most cases they can give their own explanation of the image. Indeed, ‘folk etymology’ has nothing in common with the true one. In plurilingual dictionaries the explanation of cultural element would be more than useful; it would help understand and transmit in a source language all the various images and sentiments contained within each phraseological unit. Only the folk etymology indicates the cultural element contained within phraseological units. According to D. Dobrovol’skij, “the mental image underlying the actual meaning of a given conventional figurative unit is not only an etymological phenomenon but also of synchronic relevance” (Dobrovol’skij, Piirainen, 2005). To be more exact, true and folk etymologies exist independently and each is equally important. We insist that both diachronic and synchronic points are important.

The systemic representation emanates from these four points; namely, meaning, etymology, folk etymology (or the cultural element) and examples. Such representation could help avoid drawing the wrong conclusions about cultures.

How can we reconcile the complex nature of phraseological units and compile a pertinent dictionary which is also easy to use? A pertinent dictionary should have the following characteristics. It should:

1) be easily consultable by all users, regardless of their native language;

2) contain information about
   a) meaning;
   b) etymology;
Two main problems appear: one concerns the differences of syntax between languages and the other consists of the relativity of equivalents. It is extremely rare to find two phraseological units identical from all points of view. In fact, as Dobrovolskij (Dobrovolskij, Piirainen, 2005) says “Quasi-equivalent figurative units in different languages are never identical with regard to their semantics and/or pragmatics if their image components reveal substantial differences” (Dobrovolskij, Piirainen, 2005). Frequently, the so-called identical equivalents are in fact relative because they present a large number of nuances and degrees. Let us take four languages, belonging to different families: English, French, German and Russian. When someone works a lot, without rest and when this work is not respected and dose not achieve any result, we say ‘to work like a horse’ in English. This phraseological unit is identical in French ‘travailler comme un cheval’ (lit. to work like a horse), in Russian ‘работать как лошадь’ (lit. to work like a horse) and in German ‘wie ein Pferd arbeiten’ (lit. to work like a horse). If in English, French and Russian the verb takes the first place, it is placed at the end in German. It is easier to find the English, French or Russian expressions than the German one. Furthermore, alphabetical order is often unreliable not only because of free elements like ‘someone’ or ‘something’ which often take the first place, but also due to a number of variants and synonyms.

It seems easier to classify the preceding four units by the key word – the horse, but this solution is more difficult than one might expect. Not only because of a large number of synonyms which are distinguishable, not only by their imagery, but also by their meaning. There are many phraseological units related to ungrateful work. Thus, all four languages refer to an ox and a dog:
If these units have the same referents and are similar in four languages, each one has particular expressions to talk of difficult work. English uses such phraseological units as ‘to work like a Trojan’, ‘to work like a beaver’, ‘to be a whale for work’, ‘to work like a slave’. While English refers to a Trojan, a beaver, a whale and a slave, Russian referents are different: a camel, a bee, a squirrel, scrap-iron, somebody’s skin, a strap, a black man: ‘работать как верблюд’ (lit. to work like a camel), ‘трудиться как пчела’ (lit. to labour like a bee), ‘крутиться как белка в колесе’ (lit. to whirl like a squirrel in a wheel), ‘работать на всю железку’ (lit. to work the whole piece of iron), ‘из кожи вон лезть’ (lit. to climb out of somebody’s skin), ‘тянуть ямку’ (lit. to drag a strap), ‘работать как негр’ (lit. to work like a black man). The French refer to a frenzy and a black man: ‘travailler comme un forcené’ (lit. to work like a frenzy) and ‘travailler comme un nègre’ (lit. to work like a black person). German people talk about ‘wie ein Lakai arbeiten’ (lit. to work like a lackey).

The classification of all these synonyms seems complex: the key word can differ from one reader to another. On the other hand, how can a stranger find an expression if he does not know any of the components of the expression? The most considerable inconvenience is that the meaning of a phraseological unit cannot be deduced from the sense of its components. In fact, we cannot privilege one of the components of a phraseological unit, because its significance is comparable to a chemical link between words.

The classification by ideas may be favourable. In fact, all the previous units could be classified by the word “work”. Such classification would allow us to facilitate global understanding, but it would be to the detriment of precision. The meaning of a phraseological unit has no fixed notional centre. Moreover, the classification by themes appears incomplete and fragmented; favouring ideas, it detracts from imagery. Besides, one could
think that phraseological units have a direct link with the key-word and that they result from that key-word which is not so.

None of them is imperfect, but each has its inconveniences. It seems that a morphosyntactical classification would guarantee better objectivity. Phraseological units can be disposed in alphabetical order within morphosyntactical groups.

Such classification is not without imperfections: ‘horse medicine’ and ‘strong as a horse’ represent the same model, but are not placed in the same group; facultative words can lead to the placement of phraseological units within the same group and even between different groups. German verbal locutions should be classified by the alphabetical order of the last word, which is the verb.

Furthermore, what is idiom in one language can be one-word metaphor in another: (Fr.) ‘froid de canard’ (lit. duck’s cold) and (Germ.) ‘Hundekälte’ (lit. dog’s cold). Indeed, “One may decide to exclude lexical units like one-word metaphors from the scope of analysis of figurativeness within one single language, but this would turn out to be impossible in a cross-linguistic analysis” (Dobrovol’skij, Piirainen, 2005).

To compile a phraseological dictionary, it is insufficient to dispose entries in alphabetical order. Phraseological units exceed the limits of such categories of parts of discourse as a substantive, an adjective, and a verb. The complexity of phraseological units can be explained by the fact that in general, they denote complex ideas. To be more faithful, it seems useful to complete morphosyntactical classification by principal ideas and by hyperonyms (Hyperonym is an explication with the help of words which are not phraseologically linked, it is deprived of cultural specificity and can be translated literally).

The same strict rules of presentation must be applicable to all phraseological units. Let us try to take a picturesque English expression and translate it into the three aforementioned languages: French, German and Russian. In English, when one talks about the “temporary hoarseness or thickness in the voice; an irritation in the throat” (Laurence U., Walter W. Hunsinger N., LaRoche, 1998), one can use the phraseological unit ‘to have a frog in (one’s) throat’. In German we find the same image of the frog and in French the image changes, it refers to a cat, while the Russians do not have a picturesque expression to describe this notion. So, it could be represented thus:

(Eng.) ‘to have a frog in (one’s) throat’;
(Germ.) ‘einen Frosch im Hals haben’ (lit. to have a frog in (one’s) throat);
(Fr.) ‘avoir un chat dans la gorge’ (lit. to have a cat in (one’s) throat).
To help the unfamiliar user with one of the target-languages, the phraseological unit is translated literally. To make reading easier, the English expression as well as its literal translation is written in italics. We can say that English and German expressions are completely equal and to schematise this fact, the sign “=” seems appropriate. The meaning of the French equivalent is the same, but the image differs, which can be represented by the approximate sign “≈”. This phraseological unit is used to talk about health, and to help a stranger to find it, the entry in question can be preceded by principal ideas like

Health, hoarseness, irritation, pain, thickness, throat, voice
ENG = GERM ≈ FR
(Eng.) “to have a frog in (one’s) throat”;
(Germ.) ‘einen Frosch im Hals haben’ (lit. to have a frog in (one’s) throat);
(Fr.) ‘avoir un chat dans la gorge’ (lit. to have a cat in (one’s) throat);
(Ru.) – .

The etymology of the English expression that Brewer’s dictionary proposes is the following: “the expression is said to allude to the medieval fear of drinking water containing frogspawn, when it was believed that frogs would grow inside the body” (Room A., 1995). The popular belief is that this image is reinforced by “an obvious allusion to the hoarse, throaty croaking of frogs” (Laurence U., Walter W. Hunsinger N., LaRoche, 1998). In German, the etymology and the imagery are the same. What about the French equivalent? Alain Rey (Rey A., Chantreau S., 1993) proposes a citation from Pierre Guiraud (Guiraud P., 1962), saying that a pun on words is the origin of the expression ‘avoir un chat dans la gorge’ (lit. to have a cat in (one’s) throat). According to this linguist, ‘chat’ (lit. cat), ‘marron’ (lit. chestnut) and ‘maton’ (lit. curd cheese, lump) all designate some kind of lump or coagulation. The reason for this pun is the homonymy between the word ‘maton’ (lit. curd cheese, lump) and ‘maton’ (lit. cat). Today the referent is a cat, nobody think about the ‘maton’ (lit. curd cheese, lump). The image of a cat in the throat is unusual and monstrous; it is supported by scratching claws of this animal.

This phraseological unit has a high frequency in English, German and French and can be illustrated by the following examples:
(Eng.) I just woke up and I have a frog in my throat. Give me a minute.
(Germ.) Ausgerechnet heute Morgen muss meinen Vortag halten, wo ich einen Frosch im Hals habe (Friedrich W., 1966).
(Fr.) J’ai du mal à parler, j’ai un chat dans la gorge.

So as not to overload the dictionary, it could be made up of two parts: the first one could enlist phraseological units with the main ideas and the second one could have information about the exact meaning for each language, the etymology and the image that users have, the frequency of use and at the end, examples of how the phraseological units are used. Numerating each expression would help to find its details. Thus, the English 'to have a frog in (one’s) throat' could be numbered “1A”, the German ‘einen Frosch im Hals haben’ (lit. to have a frog in (one’s) throat) “1B”, the French ‘avoir un chat dans la gorge’ (lit. to have a cat in (one’s) throat) “1C” etc.. Users could find details of these units in the second, larger part. At the end of the work, there should be an index, which would contain two points:

1) It would withdraw the same principal ideas as in the first part in alphabetical order. Thus, under the key word ‘health’, users would find expressions like 25 A ‘in fine feather’, 235 A ‘in the pink’, 59 A ‘feed the fishes’, 333 A ‘frog in (one’s) throat’, 489 A ‘on (one’s) last legs’ and so on:
   Health (see 25 A, 235 A, 59 A, 333 A, 489 A);

2) The index would be not complete if only ideas appeared in it. In fact, users might want to know what image such and such referent in one language. He could find all the expressions concerning the horse, for example, by the same principle as the ideas: 44 A ‘horse latitudes’, 45 A ‘a horse of different colour’, 46 A ‘horse medicine’, 47 A ‘hobby-horse’
   Horse (see for English A 44-47, for German B 46-47).

This example shows that the expressions numerated 46 and 47 are the same in English and in German, but also that expressions under the number 44 and 45 do not have the same referent or they have no equivalent at all.
Let us consider now how typical expressions can be marked in a dictionary. The easiest way is to spot them with abbreviation “TYP”:

789 | A (Eng.) ‘shoot the cat’ **TYP**  
    | B (Germ.) -  
    | C (Fr.) -  
    | D (Ru.) –.  

Sometimes, a lexicographer comes across a rare phenomenon, a case of interlingual homonymy. This phenomenon proves once more that languages can be illogical when choosing a referent. Expressions like this have similar form, but different meanings.

Let us compare the following units:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘fièvre de cheval’ (lit. horse’s fever) (fr.)</th>
<th>‘im Pferdefieber sein’ (lit. to have a horse’s fever) (germ.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“a high fever”</td>
<td>“a person who adores horses”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘être à cheval sur quelque chose’ (lit. to be on the horse about something) (fr.)</th>
<th>‘быть на коне’ (lit. to be on the horse) (ru.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“to be strict about something”</td>
<td>“to achieve fame; to get angry suddenly”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘pig-headed’ (eng.)</th>
<th>‘tête de cochon’ (lit. pig’s head) (fr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“someone extremely stubborn and selfish”</td>
<td>“a dishonest person; someone who has a bad character”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘как мокрая курица’ (lit. like a wet chicken) (ru.)</td>
<td>‘poule mouillée’ (lit. wet chicken) (fr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“very wet”</td>
<td>“faint-hearted; timid; coward”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ‘to make a duck’ (eng.) | ‘faire un canard’ (lit. to make a duck) (fr.) |
| “to score zero” | “to play a false note” |

| ‘einen Bock schießen’ (lit. to kill a goat) (germ.) | ‘забивать козла’ (lit. to kill a goat) (ru.) |
| “to make a mistake” | “to play dominos” |

These phraseological units are not equivalent and can lead to different sorts of misunderstandings; they can be marked by the sign “≠” as follows:

985 A Eng. ‘chicken’  
B Germ. ‘Hasenfuss’ (lit. hare’s paw) ≈  
C Fr. ‘poule mouillée’ (lit. wet chicken) =  
D Ru. ‘мокрая курица’ (lit. wet chicken) ≠.

The best way of doing the systematic representation of all phraseological units is not a traditional dictionary, but its digital format. In fact, computer version of phraseological dictionary “is not limited to linear presentation of data and permits to present more examples and comments to guide usage” (From the speech of Janet DeCaesaris, during the VII International School on Lexicography in Ivanovo, September 12-14, 2007).

As we have seen, phraseological units have a complicated nature and can not be calculated by mathematical methods. That is why a phraseological dictionary cannot be confined to partial approaches and rules of how the units are presented must be strict. The more languages the dictionary compares, the more complex the system for presenting entries is, in spite of the apparent complications of the proposed dictionary, this would seem an appropriate way of representing all the specificities of phraseological units.
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The article is based on the newly set up directory or index on the bilingual English-Russian Learner’s Lexicography covering its whole lifespan between XVIth and early XXIst centuries (Devel, 2006; 2007). The directory has been worked out by a working team of lexicographers and bibliographers from Saint-Petersburg University (Russian Federation). The main (among about 10 virtual and real) information resource about dictionaries is the Russian National Library. The given work is based on distinguishing the following three notions in lexicography:

1. A function of learning, which is characteristic of any type of lexicography.
2. A type of lexicography being smaller and more learner-oriented than academic one can be called learner’s lexicography.
3. Learner’s or pedagogical lexicography is a highly learner-oriented lexicography whose features can be identified in its meta-language, in mega-, macro- and mini-structures.

The 2nd and 3d notions of the Learner’s Lexicography have been selected as a working principal for selecting items for the directory.

These are distinguished on the basis of multiple international studies (Béhoint, 2001; Cowie, 1999; Landau, 2001). One should mention here Russian works by Y.D.Apresyan, V.P.Berkov, O.M.Karpova, V.V.Morkovkin and others (Apresyan, 2001; Berkov, 2004; Karpova, 2004; Morkovkin, 1977; 1990). That directory presents the details of more than 600 dictionaries starting from the ones set up back in the XVIth
century by an English Doctor Mark Ridley and a philologist Richard James under the influence of the first Latin-English learner’s dictionaries.

The data are presented in chronological sequence and one can see the rate with which such type of lexicography is developing in Russia. The bibliography index is prefaced by an essay on the state-of-the-art in each of the 6 distinguished historical stages of the lexicographic development.

The availability of such directory can help both research work and improvement of English-Russian dictionaries, and provides a good reference tool for experts, teachers, translators and students. Such directory also helps to compare the development of the learner’s lexicography in different countries.

Here comes the general essay, which can be given on the basis of the newly worked out survey and the bibliography index data. While presenting the outline of the lexicographic development certain attention here is paid to step 6 - the current situation.

English-Russian Learner’s dictionaries (very often called abroad just Russian) represent a very massive type of small and medium-size lexicography, serving vast territories in Russia, some CIS countries and some other countries with both the languages of international communication. The consideration of the development steps can correlate with the main development stages of other national lexicographies, described, for example, by V.G.Guck (Guck, 1977).

One can distinguish 6 steps of English-Russian lexicography development (see Table 1):

Table 1. Russian–English Learner’s Lexicography Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
<th>Step 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVI / mid XVIIcc.–</td>
<td>beg. XIXc. - 10 / 20s-40s</td>
<td>40s-60s</td>
<td>60s-90s</td>
<td>90s- now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII / beg.XIXcc.</td>
<td>10s,20s of XXc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 1 – the first century and a half – Russian-English dictionaries are the only type of bilingual lexicography;
Step 2 – appearance of English-Russian Learner’s dictionaries and their dynamic development;
Step 3 – epoch of long-term and multiple reprints, the elaboration of the theoretical landmarks;
Step 4 – epoch of information & translation explosion, appearance of special learner’s dictionaries, implementation of methodology and statistics data;
Step 5 – Russian-English learner’s lexicography mass development;
Step 1. The First Century and a Half – Russian-English Dictionaries is the Only Type of Bilingual Lexicography

The first step of early dictionary development includes two comparatively widely known Russian-English dictionaries. The first learner’s dictionaries, books for learning Russian turned up in Britain 150 years before English – Russian dictionaries by Russian authors. The two Russian-English dictionaries were the dictionaries by Mark Ridley and Richard James. Both of them can be defined as learner’s dictionaries.

British experts in Slav and Russian languages Simmons and Unbegaun (Simmons J.S.G., Unbegaun B.O. Slavonic Manuscript Vocabularies in the Bodleian Library, «Oxford Slavonic Letters», v.II. 119-124) think that M.Ridley to a certain extent copied the then existing English-Latin Dictionary by John Reader. M.Ridley worked as doctor in Russia. And being a doctor, probably, used English-Latin dictionary. Ridley’s dictionary was set up at the end of the XVIth century, later in 1634 it was granted to Oxford University with the inscription «Liber Guilielmi Laud Archiepi Cantuar: et Cancellarii Universitatis. Oxon. 1634» (Book of William Laud, Canterbury archbishop and University Chancellor).

M.Ridley’s dictionary combines alphabetic and ideographic principles of description, which is rather up-to-date nowadays. The Russian alphabet with the names and approximate English pronunciation of its letters opens the dictionary. The total quantity of words is about 6000 units presented as a rule in an alphabetical order. There are also 4 thematic groups of words, which are primarily presented in an alphabetical order: birds (91), fish (59), illnesses (58), plants (226). All the words are given in small letters and presented in two columns on the pages. English nouns are accompanied by articles. The texts are of utilitarian/practical nature and applicable to material and spiritual conditions of life.

B.A. Larin and N.N. Amosova studied another British dictionary by R.James and are very well known in Russia. The dictionary is a small note-book with Russian words and their equivalents and also observations and commentaries regarding Russian culture and traditions.

R. James dictionary contains 79 pages, 2166 words and expressions. We observe their semantic grouping have and in this aspect it is more like an ideographic dictionary. Thematic groups do not have topical titles. The dictionary contains special technical words. Translations and explanations are mainly given in English. The author uses Latin for encyclopedic explanations very often. All Russian words are given in Latin letters. A