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INTRODUCTION

Viewing words and relations between them from cognitive and cultural angles is known to have been in the focus of attention of modern linguistics for the last decades. These new approaches, despite the criticism they suffered, have rooted into linguistic studies and are now making their way into lexicographic works as well.

In this connection the present manuscript offers the results of the latest investigations in the field of cross-cultural problems as well as their lexicographic treatment. The authors also touch upon traditional and innovational approaches to specialized dictionaries. These problems are discussed in Part I and Part II correspondently.

Part I “Systemic and Cross-Cultural Relations of Words in the Dictionary” includes nine chapters.

Svetlana Ter-Minasova devoted her paper to the problem of presenting proper nouns in bilingual dictionaries. The author stresses that careless handling of proper nouns can inflict significant damage to intercultural communication. By giving a number of bright illustrations the author proves that in the plane of socio-cultural connotations proper names do not differ greatly from common nouns; the only difference is that the connotativeness of proper nouns is more evident and demands cultural knowledge and a stereotypical notion about the items denoted, otherwise it may distort the language and culture picture of the world.

Ashot Grigoryan and Konstantin Denisov postulate that there is no better way of learning language than through culture if the cultural component permeates discourse, text or a reference book. The authors assume that universal pragmatic meanings of interlingual transfer units collide with specific ritualistic forms of their usage based on purely cultural associations and restrictions, which might be extremely complicated to translate. The authors find it only necessary and useful to compare and contrast various aspects of lingvocultural concepts in English and Russian.

Olga Leontovich made an attempt to present an exhaustive classification of cultural meanings. The author assumes that cultural meanings accumulate the information about history, psychology, values and living conditions of the community encoded in verbal signs. Two ways of analyzing cultural meanings are offered in the paper. The first is from
dictionary meaning as a minimal basis of cultural information to contextual meaning enriched by its associations with other signs; the second is from contextual meaning to dictionary meaning as an explication of cultural information. The proposed classification is based on such criteria as: the form of verbalization; the accuracy of expression; the order of formation; the significance of the cultural component; the mode of expression; the relation with each other; the number of cultures represented in a name; the attitude to the nominated cultural notion.

Olga Uzhova discusses the problem of examples in cultural dictionaries. The author stresses that in spite of the fact that cultural dictionaries are typical learners’ dictionaries, the information category “example” is often ignored. The author shows that verbal illustrations perform such functions as: illustration of the meaning of the lemma in the corresponding sense; illustration of grammar aspect; illustration of phraseology and illustration of stylistic aspects. Much attention is given to the difference between quotations and examples. The author paid ample evidence to the fact that monolingual dictionaries exemplify a lot.

Elena Arsenteva touches upon the problems of multilingual phraseological dictionary compilation. The main problems of making “Russian-English-German-Turkish-Tatar Phraseological Dictionary” are discussed in the paper. Special attention is paid to such problems of phraseological dictionary compilation as phraseological unit arrangement in the dictionary; presentation of different variations providing the necessary connotational linguistic information, ways of translation of Russian phraseological units with a view to translation in case of zero phraseological equivalence. The compilers of the dictionary under discussion made use of the latest achievements in phraseology, lexicography and phraseography.

Tatyana Tretyakova in her paper indicates the necessity of the definition for clichés with some examples of categorization; dwells on the problem of presentation clichés in modern English grammars and indicates the use of interpretation technique in a dictionary. The author points out that in interpreting cliché meaning as stereotypes it is advisable for the lexicographer to add the new rhetorical rending of the meaning. The scholar concludes that lexicographic interpretation of clichés should lie in the field of pragmatics and discourse linguistics with different classification of interactive signs rather than traditional form structures. It is advisable for lexicographers to take into account most general types of idiomatic communicative signs and then develop a more sophisticated calculus of pragmatic meanings.
Larissa Alekseeva in her research assumes that local knowledge, being the product of cultural and historical processes, plays central role in the interpretation of a literary text. The author proves that this type of lexicon is characterized by a complex semantic and sense generating meaning. Local concepts are defined by Larissa Alekseeva as mental concentrated units referring to objects used in a certain region. The paper gives ample proofs that organization of concept structures is aimed at better understanding of the content and that local conceptualization is setting up of a new mental information structure different from the standard professional knowledge. According to the scholar, interpretation of historical and local facts in the novel, based on the lexicon of the writer, enables us to study it within a number of such functions.

The Russian language has always been a source of borrowings. Russian words appeared in English at different periods of time. The Russian language is known to have undergone great changes during the post-Soviet period. Hence the interest on the part of linguists, Tatyana Taganova in particular, to investigate which of those changes have influenced the English language and to find out whether the English language has influenced post-perestroika Russian vocabulary. Of great importance is the question whether these changes have been the subject of lexicographic works and to what extent. The investigation into this problem made it possible to conclude that very few words of the new Russian language have become part of the English dictionaries of the national language. This accounts for the fact that Internet references today have become an indispensable source of knowledge about the newly appearing words.

Grigory Kreydlin argues that in spite of the fact that the “Dictionary of Russian Gestures” has been devised, it is not a sufficient lexicographic description of the Russian body language. In his paper the scholar comes up with quite a new approach. He assumes that to explore the process of human interaction and describe the peculiarities of coexistence of verbal and nonverbal semiotic codes in the process one needs a unified conceptual framework and offers “featured”, or “database” approach to body and to phenomenon of corporeality. It is shown in the paper that the database, keeping the results of the analysis based on this approach, yields fruitful results.

Part II “Specialized Dictionaries: Traditions and Innovations” contains fourteen chapters.

Historical-typological approach to research of special groups of dictionaries in any national lexicography was offered by Prof. Leonid Stoupin in the 70s of the XXth c. (Leningrad University) and later on was
developed in a number of works devoted to the research of various English dictionaries for general and special purposes, i.e. author dictionaries, dictionaries of synonyms, word usage, new words, terms of different subject areas and other groups of reference books.

In this part of the book Olga Karpova, while describing modern scene of Shakespeare lexicography, applies historical-typological approach to the writers lexicography, which has both many general and specific features in trends of development. Olga Karpova focuses her attention on Shakespeare encyclopedic reference books: Encyclopedias; Dictionaries of Characters and Place Names; Dictionaries of Shakespeare’s Quotations and Proverbs and linguistic dictionaries: Dictionaries of Shakespeare’s Remarkable, Slang and Obscure Words; Shakespeare Dictionaries of Terms as well as Shakespeare’s Non-Lexicographic Works; Shakespeare Internet Reference and a new group of Russian Shakespeare Dictionaries which appeared in the new millennium. Special attention is given to mega-, macro- and microstructure formation of today’s dictionaries.

Historical lexicography has always been in the centre of scholars’ attention. Valentina Skybina and John Considine trace historical development of Australian national and English dialect lexicography from their roots up to modern state. Valentina Skybina offers her own vision of development and formation of Australian general and special lexicography. Moreover, the scholar provides the modern user with a comprehensive guide among various types of special and general dictionaries. Her exhaustive list of Australian English dictionaries is both unique and user-oriented.

John Considine’s paper is devoted to dictionaries of regionalisms which have been part of the lexicographical tradition since the XIXth century. The author puts forward a question of the type of material which has to be converted in the survey on history of English dialect lexicography. The author points out that the dictionaries of regionalisms which have been surveyed can be seen as connected both methodologically and historically. John Considine stresses that a book which would describe the picture of the lexicography of regional variation in English as a unified whole would be of great value.

Some authors offer new and original dictionary projects. Larissa Alekseeva and Olga Karpova introduce a new type of encyclopedic reference work devoted to Florence. It is a dictionary of information-referential type based on the principles of modern lexicographic knowledge and technology. This dictionary is intended for those users who want to obtain in-depth knowledge of Florence. Dictionary megastructure includes three parts: introduction; A to Z corpus (registrating proper
names) and appendices, i.e. alphabetic, thematic and other indices of entry words (writers; poets; painters; sculptors; architects; scientists, etc.).

Its macrostructure contains names of European writers and artists who described Florence and its sights in their creative works. Dictionary microstructure consists of four sections: Biography, Creative Works, Florentine Influence, Learn more. The entry presents a graphic illustration (a photo, a picture, a portrait etc.); chronological label (the date of birth of the author and/or date of creation of piece of art); an encyclopedic definition; verbal illustrative examples (quotations, citations, statements, sayings, etc.). Each entry represents an unfolded hypertext containing references to dictionaries, encyclopedias and other reference resources dealing with certain places, writers and their works. Multimedia features of the dictionary provide the user with additional possibilities. Among them: visual (a film, a picture, a video) and audio material (piece of music, song). The authors consider this type of reference resource to be a model for other dictionaries devoted to any national city.

Lydia Polubichenko thinks it only necessary to consider cultural significance of history and format of dictionaries of quotations as part of natural lexicographic traditions. The author analyses British and Russian lexicographic traditions and draws the conclusion as to the marked contrast between them, with the tendency in Russian lexicography to take a more prescriptive stand. Lydia Polubichenko stresses that in the present context of multiculturalism dictionaries of quotations turn out to be instrumental in calculating in its readers the interest in other cultures.

Larissa Shestakova focuses her attention on the problem of modern tendencies of Russian author lexicography at the end of the XXth - the beginning of the XXIst century. The author dwells upon different branches in author lexicography. Of special interest is the new tendency in author lexicography – to combine several types of dictionaries in one volume which may be either a combination of registrative reference books or lexicons. Larissa Shestakova also views modern Russian author lexicography as part of cyberlexicography. The author concludes that some types of author’s dictionaries can be either complicated or expanded.

Andrej Kartashkov and Faina Kartashkova’s attention is focused on learner’s dictionaries. A place of its own in the paper takes the question of metalanguage. Different types of semantic definitions are discussed in detail, among them descriptive, transformational-descriptive, synonymic, negative and combined ones. The authors prove that the most frequently used types of definitions are descriptive and transformational-descriptive ones as they contribute to systematic learning of the language in its relation to word-formation. Comparative analysis of definition in singular
and gradual learner’s dictionaries of English as a foreign language is also given in the paper.

Valentina Perebejnos, Maria Kaul, Sarah Khidekel gave a detailed analysis of a lexico-grammatical “Reference Book on English Verb Morphology” which registers the frequency data of groups of verb forms and individual verb forms of the verb as a part of speech in different types of texts corpora as well as frequency of morphological forms of individual verbs statistically chosen for description. The authors’ understanding of the English verb paradigm is presented in individual articles of the glossary of grammar terms. Special attention is paid to the frequency of verb forms in different corpora. The reference book also shows functional peculiarities of verb forms and their variants in texts of various styles.

Tamara Petrashova concentrates her attention on piloting the new model of the dictionary of Social Work. The researcher makes focus on such functions of the dictionary under discussion as reference, systematizing, education and standardizing. The author is concerned with how to approach the dictionary in a learning context. Dictionary macrostructure and microstructure as well as methods used are discussed in the paper.

Svetlana Manik raises a very important question connected with the sphere of functioning and sphere of fixation of English political vocabulary from the point of view of Russian users. Underlying significant difference between Russian and English terms defying political lexicon, the author of this chapter offers a model of a dictionary which is addressed to Russian learners of English.

Marina Solnyshkina discusses a new type of a dictionary comprising the vocabulary used by professional sailors in oral register “English – Russian Naval Dictionary”, which is a descriptive one. The author provides the readers with full information as to the macrostructure and microstructure of the dictionary. The author notes that the search system of the Dictionary is well developed as it is possible to gain access to an entry in many ways. Of special interest is the fact that the dictionary exercises functionality to the lookup routine to handle multi-word lexical items, such as compounds or idioms.

Terminography, or theory and practice of compiling dictionaries of terms belonging to different subject areas is one of the main preferences among current lexicographic research. Not only terms of traditional domains are being described from a new angle today. New subject fields and their terminological units which have appeared during last 10 years demand research both in the sphere of functioning and in the sphere of fixation. In this connection papers dealing with the study of Tourism
subject area terms (Ekaterina Shilova) and legal terms with special reference to legal translation dictionaries (Sandro Nielsen) significantly contribute to terminography as one of the leading modern trends in dictionary making. Moreover, both authors provide a full lexicographic scene of the most reliable reference works describing tourist and legal terms.

Sandro Nielsen’s paper is devoted to legal translation dictionaries for learners. The author notes that legal vocabulary includes translation units other than terms which predetermined an increased orientation towards the function of target texts. The author shows how dictionaries can help learners translate linguistic structures typical of the legal domain and the genre conventions in legal texts. Sandro Nielsen touches upon such important lexicographic issues as: identifying user characteristics, user needs, syntactic structures, conventions and strategies, presentation of the data.

Another problem which used to be in the center of scholars’ attention is terminological phraseology. It causes a lot of discussions on international and national level in terminography, especially in the last decade. Offered by Elena Nikulina and described in detail in her article are ways of upgrading phraseological units of the Dictionary of Terminological Phraseologisms.


The editors express deep gratitude to all contributors for creative co-work and to Cambridge Scholars Publishing for interest in our research of dictionaries.

—Prof. Olga Karpova and Prof. Faina Kartashkova
PART I:

SYSTEMIC AND CROSS-CULTURAL RELATIONS OF WORDS IN THE DICTIONARY
Proper nouns – mostly anthroponyms (names of people) and toponyms (geographical names) – compose a significant part of language’s socio-cultural context and the language picture of the world, not least because they are proper, that is, they signify “individual objects without reference to their features” (Ahmanova, 2004)

Presenting proper names in a bilingual dictionary implies, obviously, their translation into a foreign language which may seem deceptively simple. Indeed, these words are special, unique, they can be just transliterated into another alphabet. However, nothing is simple in the sphere of communicating in foreign languages. Accordingly, presenting proper nouns in bilingual dictionaries requires, strange as it may seem, a great deal of caution, effort, and knowledge of the cultural background in general.

It is necessary to recognize, clarify, and follow the traditional denomination and pronunciation (for oral communication) of historical figures, geographical names, biblical characters, and so on - that is, the entire culturally significant field of background knowledge covered by proper nouns.

Proper nouns are a very important national component of both the language and culture pictures of the world, and for this reason they are yet another powerful defense weapon for national identity.

The “military” metaphor comes from the title of my recent book “War and Peace of Languages and Cultures” (Ter-Minasova, 2008), discussing the idea that language is not just a barrier separating peoples but also - and
more importantly - a shield defending the national identity of “its people”, that is, the people using it as a means of communication.

The role of proper names in the language and - especially - culture picture of the world cannot be underestimated. Here is one little example illustrating how a proper name reveals both the culture picture and its changes. The sociocultural position of women in Old Rus becomes clear from the fact that a woman seems to have been nameless as she was called by her patronymic and not by her first name.

In the famous Russian epic “The Song of Igor’s Campaign” (immortalized by Borodin’s opera Prince Igor) Igor’s wife is called Yaroslavna, which is her patronymic, that is, a derivative from Yaroslav, her father’s name. We do not know her first name. Thus, the prince was Igor, and his wife was Yaroslav’s daughter.

Careless handling of proper nouns - both anthroponyms, which name people, and toponyms, which are geographical names - can inflict significant damage on meaning, historical truth, pictures of the world, and communication in general. In other words, non-recognition or inaccurate conveyance of proper nouns can cause setbacks in communication and, instead of bringing people closer, will disjoin them.

Джон Баптист instead of Иоанн Креститель and дочь короля Генри, Мэри instead of Мария Кровавая, дочь Генриха VIII not only testify to the ignorance of the translators and authors of dictionaries and encyclopedias, but also deform and distort the Russian cultural and linguistic pictures of the world, which is much more serious and dangerous. “Mistakes” of this kind deal a blow to the general cultural level in our country. [The transliterations of John the Baptist, Henry, Mary are unrecognizable because the Russian variants Joann Krestitel (baptizer), Maria Krovavaya – the Blood Mariya (or Maria the 1st), Henrykh the Eighth are traditionally set in the Russian culture picture of the world].


This publication, striking in its incompetence, ignorance, and lack of culture, provided such a large quantity of mistakes, errors, inexactitudes, and absurdities in translation that it can serve as excellent material for academic research on translation under the section “How not to translate or what bad translation leads to.”
In the opinion of O. N. Trubachov, the translation of this “pocket encyclopedia” vividly testifies to the poor knowledge of everything that it is necessary to know – the English language, history, and culture, and European languages, history, and culture, to say nothing of the total ignorance of that which is perhaps most important for a Russian publication, which is defined as the Russian language picture of the world (Trubachov, 1997).

We will cite only some examples (to cite and count all of them is impossible) of the innumerable mistakes in reproduction of proper nouns - and not just any, but only the geographical names of those places which are witnesses of historical events, and names of people who left their mark on culture and history, that is, those of the highest cultural stratum, which was granted the honor of being included in encyclopedias and dictionaries.

The main problem is a deviation from and distortion of the traditional way of presenting proper names in another language and, consequently, culture (in this case – Russian). The inaccuracies and mistakes can be roughly classified in the following way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The way proper names borrowed from other languages are traditionally presented in Russian.</th>
<th>Their translation in modern texts including the Russian Edition of “Hutchinson’s Pocket Encyclopedia”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Жорж Сера (George Seurat)</td>
<td>Джордж Сейрат (transliteration; the first name-anglicized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Энгр (Ingres)</td>
<td>Ингрес (transliteration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Юджин О’Нил (Eugene O’Neill)</td>
<td>Евгения О’Нил (adding the ending –а/я turns Eugene O’Neill into a woman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Нидерланды (Netherlands)</td>
<td>Лоу кантириз, нижние страны (pronunciation and translation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. By transliteration

| Шварцвальд (Schwarzwald) | Черный лес (translation) |
| Брауншвейг (Braunschweig) | Брюнсвик |

3. By translation (of words or parts of the word)

| оз. Верхнее (the lake Superior) | Озеро Сьюпериор (transliteration) |
| Карл Великий (Charlemagne) | Карлеман (corrupted pronunciation of Charlemagne) |
| Иоанн Безземельный (John the Lackland) | Джон Лекленд (pronunciation, transliteration) |

4. By a historical tradition

| Царица Савская (Queen of Sheba) | Королева Шеба (translation + transliteration) |
| Лотарингия (Lorraine) | Лоррен (pronunciation, transliteration) |
| Беда Достопочтенный (Lat. Beda, English Bede) | Бид (pronunciation) |
| Мария Стюарт (Mary Queen of scots) | Мария, королева Шотландии; Мария, королева шотландцев; Мария, королева скотов (translation in some cases inexact – Queen of Scotland, in the last example – even rude, because скот (skot) in Russian means cattle). |

This list can be continued for a long time, but the cited examples are enough to understand that such mistakes in proper nouns related to world history and culture are by no means curious incidents or comical absurdities. Most of them are completely unrecognizable by Russian
readers and make some new non-Russian language and culture picture of
the world. They deal a serious blow to the reader, to the general level of
culture in our country, and to the Russian language and culture pictures of
the world.

The very fact that appearance of lexicographical publications with
translations of such an extremely low level is even possible leads to sad
thoughts about a contradiction between theory and practice. Indeed, the
science of translation is developing, smart and accurate books about theory
and practice of translation are being written, but the level and quality of
translations in our days is decreasing. The avarice and profit-seeking of
non-professional, unqualified publishers and equally non-professional,
unqualified “translators”, who are controlled or edited by no one, lead the
poor, deceived readers, for whom everything is written, translated, and
published, to not raise their cultural level, but rather to sink into ignorance.

After all, bilingual dictionaries, encyclopedias, and reference books are
the most authoritative, significant, and “holy” source of knowledge, which
has the last word, and the magic of its word is incomparable to that of any
other publication. And it is not surprising that in the beginning of the 90’s,
this pocket encyclopedia, “translated into the Russian language,” was
republished every year: Russia, which had long sat in isolation behind the
Iron Curtain, “opened to the world”, “entered the world community” (the
Western one) and Russia’s inhabitants rushed to the lexicographical source
of knowledge in order to fill the lacuna of ignorance. Everything was
attractive: a “pocket dictionary” (brief, succinct, giving the most basic
things), “Oxford” in the publisher’s address (what can be more prestigious
than that?).

Socio-cultural connotations present a separate problem in the
dictionary’s presentation of proper nouns. They are not immediately
recognized in the case of proper nouns – after all, these are conventional
names for objects “without reference to their features.”

However, in the living language nothing is as simple as it sounds in
academic definitions (again, dictionary ones). First, some proper nouns
have a sufficiently clear inner form: Ludmila – [Lud (people)+mila (nice)]
nice to people, Vsevolod [Vse (everybody and everything)+volod (owner)]
– owns everything, Zheleznogorsk [Zhelezno (adj for iron)+gor
(mountain)+sk (city/town suffix)] – a place where the mountains are rich
in iron, and so on. Second, and most importantly, in any natural, living,
and truly functioning language proper nouns acquire national socio-
cultural overtones characteristic of the given culture and known to the
people using this language as a means of communication.
Accordingly, a good dictionary, when presenting a proper noun, aside from encyclopedic facts (what this person is famous for, where this place is located) must give supplementary information about how this anthroponym, toponym, and so on is perceived by native speakers in the socio-cultural plane. This is very important for bilingual and general multilingual academic dictionaries.

Different socio-cultural contexts determine the difference in usage, that is, in real, traditional use of proper nouns in speech, and these contexts must be reflected in lexicographical publications.

In order to understand the socio-cultural overtones of such proper names as Vovochka, Vasily Ivanovich, Abram, Sarah, Gogi, and Hatchik, you have to know an entire stratum of Russian anecdotes.

Geographical names also often demand additional background knowledge. To say about someone “he/she is from Odessa” is to give a person a fully concrete characteristic, in which one of the obligatory components will be a sense of humor.

Here is how V. Musorina describes the protagonists of her character sketch “Ah, Potatoes – Yammy!”, thriving businessmen who hail from Odessa:

The work desks of Andrei Kkononchuk and Vitaly Naumenko stand opposite one another. However, our protagonists rarely appear behind them. To find them buried in papers in a thirty-meter office is practically impossible. More often than not, they energetically move around the office, solving problems on the run. And with humor at that, add their co-workers – who, by the way, also smile very often. What a lively business!

In a word, Odessians (Musorina, 2006).

Recently, there was a show on TV about the good life in the town of Uriupinsk. It is a normal town, has many achievements, small business has flowered there, people live quite decently and are content. Nonetheless, the socio-cultural stigma covering the name of this town, which has become a symbol of a god-forsaken place is so negative that it cannot be perceived without mockery.

Thus, in the plane of socio-cultural connotations, proper nouns practically do not differ from common nouns: the path of a word’s meaning makes the same zigzag, determined by national culture on the way to reality. The only difference is that the connotativeness of proper nouns is more evident, more striking to the eye (or ear), and demands knowledge more openly from the perceiver of speech.

So then in order to understand what it means when the city of Tarusa from the Kaluga Region is called “the Russian Barbizon,” St. Petersburg –
“the Northern Venice,” Moscow in the 90s – “Chicago in the 20s”, Shanghai – “the Chinese Paris”, and mountainous or hilly landscapes – “a real Switzerland,” one must have cultural knowledge of Barbizon, Venice, Chicago in the 20s, Paris, and Switzerland, and not the general history, geography, and so on of these places, but a stereotypical notion about them.

The same knowledge is necessary for understanding the socio-cultural connotations of such expressions as “Buchenwald for Russian banks,” and “The Meshora Lowland, praised by Paustovsky as a fish and berry Klondike.”

To conclude, proper nouns present a difficult lexicographical problem, particularly because they look, in comparison with common nouns, deceptively easy, monosemantic, signifying individual objects “without reference to their features.”

In our complex world, as well as in the language that reflects (and forms) it, there is nothing simple, and the seemingly easiest things demand very attentive and careful treatment.

Not recognizing or following these requirements has the most serious unwanted consequences.

Hence, due to careless treatment of proper nouns, the general cultural standard decreases, a blow is dealt to the national language, the language and culture pictures of the world worsen, and, accordingly, the prestige of the country and its people decreases.
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Professor M.S. Kolesnikova in her monograph “The Dialogue of Cultures in Lexicography” (Kolesnikova, 2002), containing the most complete taxonomy of linguocultural dictionaries, outlines cardinal challenges on the way of compiling a bilingual reference book of this kind, the most strategic of which sound as follows:

- incongruity of cultures;
- incongruity of languages;
- existence of language variants and variations of culture in respective language communities;
- political, ideological, moral and behavioural existential frames and respective bilateral stereotypes of their cultural perception;
- problems of translation;
- methodological constraints and requirements to the lexicographic technique (the choice of entries, the selection of descriptive parameters, the structural limits and so on).
Analyzing the best possible model of a bilingual sociocultural dictionary, M.S. Kolesnikova highlights probably the main prerequisite of its creation. This possibility roots in the once elaborated approach of the country studying linguistic theory of word being fruitfully developed and expanded these days (Kolesnikova, 2002: 151). Within the framework of this theory the notion of conceptual fields seems to become a rather viable venue for the in-depth inquiry and presentation of culturally grounded lexical items. Professor O.A. Leontovitch gives the classification of cultural semantemes alongside with the definitions of main sociocultural concepts (national and cultural identity, intercultural discourse, intercultural competence etc.), which navigate the explorer in the linguocultural universe (Leontovitch, 2007).

In his textbook, called Linguistic Anthropology, A. Duranti considers culture as knowledge, as communication, as a system of mediation and as a system of practices and participation (Duranti, 2005). His survey of basic theories highlighting the interplay of language and culture persuades us to accept the assumption that there is no better way of understanding culture than through language if language itself is considered within the context of culture. A. Duranti argues that for the notion of culture as learned patterns of behaviour and interpretive practices, language is crucial because it provides the most complex system of classification of experience (Ibid: 49).

Professor S.G. Ter-Minasova defines language as the instrument of culture which forms the personality of the speaker by means of world vision, mentality, attitudes to people and everything else that we call culture, imposed by and inherent to that very language. She adds that, if considered from the viewpoints of its structure, functioning and acquisition, language (native or foreign) possesses the sociocultural layer or the cultural component as part of itself or the background for its existential being. At the same time cultural component is not merely some cultural information related via language, but it is an inseparable feature of the language, characterizing all its layers and branches (Ter-Minasova, 2007: 18). Therefore, we may postulate that there is no better way of learning language than through culture if the cultural component permeates discourse, text or a reference book.

Language is also an important window on the universe of thoughts, rituals, beliefs and many like things that interest cognitive scientists. Fortunately or unfortunately, this linguocultural universe consists of rather different worlds with specific, though, on the whole, cognizable landscapes. The necessity of interlingual and intercultural cognition has been discussed in the Western community of wits starting probably from mid
sixties of the previous century. Since then scholars have outlined several challenges on the way of the cross-linguistic conceptual exchange. In recent works of transfer two different orientations have become prominent – one universalist and the other relativist.

The link between relativism and transfer is highlighted by R.B. Kaplan. He argues, “Logic (in the popular rather than the logician’s sense of the word), which is the basis of rhetoric, is evolved out of culture, henceforth, being not universal” (Kaplan, 1966: 44). Consequences of discourse differences have gotten considerable attention in subsequent work on contrastive pragmatics (Kasper, 1992).

The issue of relativism remains nonetheless controversial largely because of the complexities of the relation between linguistic specificity and linguistic universals. The popular sense of R.B. Kaplan’s “logic” as a term can mean the ways of structuring, not only emotional and ethical arguments but also rational ones. Few, if any, today thinkers would equate the logical systems they have developed with a general cognitive code. Some of them even deny the usefulness of positing a universal semantic code. W.V.O. Quine argues against the notion of semantic equivalence as a neutral baseline to compare languages or to verify the accuracy of translations. He speculates on the difficulties encountered by an English linguist attempting to learn a very different kind of language and appeals to the notion of native language “habits” (Quine, 1960: 70).

The behaviourist stance on transfer here is, of course, widely challenged now (Odlin, 2002: 255). More telling, however, is the fact that W.V.O. Quine has little to say about the interlingual identifications made by bilinguals who have known two languages from childhood, and so he cannot really account for intuitions of an ordinary child or adult bilinguals. However, bilinguals establish their interlingual identifications, the process must rely on the algorithm more or less independent of the two languages. The cognitive basis for such an algorithm is perhaps best understood as the language of thought, a system flexible enough to allow humans to acquire any language and also accommodate other mental phenomena such as imagery. Taking into account the ability of structural peculiarities of any language to affect cognitive capacities, T. Odlin argues that the effect of bilingualism gives rise to the following challenges:

- Does acquiring a second language offer the possibility of new modes of habitual thinking?
- Can habitual thought patterns from native tongue interfere with the acquisition of the new modes?
The answers to both questions are presumably positive (Ibid: 256). Moreover, these issues, as we do believe, are of vital importance for both the authors and the users of a bilingual sociocultural dictionary, the necessity of which is pondered in the present article.

The growing importance of relativist approaches does not vitiate universalist insights and there will always be a need to look for the common threads running through human languages. Even while there exist language specific forms best interpreted within a relativist framework, panlinguistic patterns still characterize human languages. T. Odlin highlights that all languages have deictic elements. With regard to temporal deixis, however, not all languages grammaticalize the notion of tense. On the other hand, aspect is probably a grammatical category applicable to all human languages. Along with certain conceptions involving space and time, some other notions seem likely universals (Ibid).

S. Jarvis and others have relied on conceptions of categories in terms of core and periphery (Jarvis, 1998). Thus, for example, the prepositions and postpositions of many languages often show a core meaning that will match core meanings in other languages, even though there can be great crosslinguistic variation in the peripheral meanings, as well as in the patterns of morphosyntactic realization. If semantic universals aid in crosslingual transfer, the problem of ascertaining the specific principles that assure cognition remains.

The conceptions of N. Chomsky, often termed Universal Grammar (UG), put forward a set of rules and conditions on rules that should allow us to describe the grammar of any language and could hence be used to hypothesize the innate interpretive strategies that allow children to acquire any human language (Chomsky, 1995). In their endeavour to describe and account for difference between languages, A. Duranti argues, N. Chomsky and other generative grammarians have tended to ignore differences within the same language. Their research strategy has been to assume homogeneity rather than diversity within the same speech community (Duranti, 2005: 51).

Sociolinguists have criticized this strategy and chosen the opposite route. They have started from the empirical observation that there is a considerable amount of differentiation within any given speech community in terms how people pronounce, construct and interpret utterances, and produce more complex discourse units across social contexts. On the basis of this observation, scholars have devised methodologies for the systematic study of linguistic variation and its relation to contextual factors. This research dealt with a number of issues ignored by formal
grammarians, like, for instance, the challenging goal of defining the boundaries of speech communities and the type of knowledge that is necessary for being a competent member of any such community.

Nevertheless, N. Chomsky prompted numerous universalistic studies where transfer has attracted considerable attention, much of it in the context of arguments made by R. Bley-Vroman (Bley-Vroman, 1989). As he observes, adult learners may have no access to UG. On the other hand, there are two possible affirmative answers to the access question. Adults may have direct access, sharing with children some sense of what a language must look like; alternatively, whatever access adults have, might be channeled through their native language.

The logic of the second approach runs as follows: like every other human language, the learner’s native tongue instantiates UG principles and thus serves as a reference point for deciding what can or cannot be characteristic of any other language. Not all learner intuitions, however, are accurate and they may often reflect only some language specific characteristics (in which case transfer may terminate in a flop). The access question has led to numerous studies, many of them reviewed by L. White (White, 2000).

S.M. Gas and J. Ard identify six different sources for language universals: a physical, a perceptual/cognitive, a neurological, a diachronic, and an interactional, plus one possibly available only to children, a language acquisition device (LAD) (Gas, Ard, 1984). Six bases for universals may overlap considerably, although the diversity of the sources argues against any reductionist approach to universals. These basic sources are deeply grounded in human nature, but it is still believed that emotive displays and language never interact constructively as far as cognition goes. If it were really so, the role of affect would hold little interest for linguists in case of language transfer. However, one likely universal is that all languages can express affective states, and it is natural to wonder if there are any other universals involving emotion and language. On the other hand, considerable evidence indicates that language specific patterns can have affective consequences, in which case transfer seems inevitable.

T. Odlin notes an instance of how a semantic difference in cognate words has affective consequence (Odlin, 2002: 260). The English for pregnant and the Spanish precada are transparently similar, but the latter has a restriction not found in English: precada normally does not indicate the state of a human female. From this restriction, precada may often seem to Spanish speakers to be the wrong word to guide them in their search for an appropriate English form. Consequently, Spanish speakers
frequently refuse to use *pregnant* to describe a picture of an expecting mother. In their mind this form contains inappropriate emoseme (attitudinal content).

This case, as well as quite a number of similar ones, has crucial implications for contrastive analysis and translation. The actual similarity or dissimilarity of forms and meanings is only one factor at work in transfer; the judgment of each individual speaker matters just as much. One should emphasize the importance of judgments in the area of idioms, which shows the value of considering learner perceptions of language distance (Ibid). When we get into constructing stereotypical scenes and characters, we are entering the realm of culture. How do we represent, for instance, the meaning of *sad, happy, angry, offended, pleased* and the like? It depends on what conditions a given group of people is associated with such states of mind. In some cultures, for instance, people might be characterized as sad when they are alone in their house, whereas in other cultures the same situation may be seen as blessing.

To crown it all, we’d like to hypothesize that many an instant of interlingual transfer units contain a certain paradox: universal and easily inferred pragmatic meanings of those words and collocations collide with specific ritualistic forms of their usage, based on purely cultural associations and restrictions, which might be extremely complicated to assume and translate without knowing their cultural background. Here we tackle again the dialectical interplay of cultural background and language, mentioned by S.G. Ter-Minasova and the notion of a *shared code*, so much criticized by relativists.

O.A. Uzhova outlines the peculiarities of lexicographic description of culturally and historically bound nominations (toponyms, anthroponyms and the like), the cognition of which cannot suffice without acquiring parallel background knowledge. It can be deciphered through the appropriate construction of the dictionary megastructure including cultural associations produced and reproduced by this or that entry (Uzhova, 2009: 180). The inferential method of implementing cultural associations, in our opinion, should be exploited more efficiently. One may think that cultural inference is something optional. We assume that cultural associations, as far as culturally grounded concepts go, should be considered basic for the shared semantic code functioning. They actually form a considerable part of the cultural background of language.

Furthermore, those cultural associations, after a thorough analysis on the historical and cultural landscape of the base language should be explained away to the user (the native speaker of the target language) through the prism of the cultural continuum on the axes of contrastive