Culture phenomena: lexicographical description issues

Olga Ivanishcheva

Abstract
The article deals with the problem of ways to lexicographically describe cultural phenomena, the development of theoretical approach to the issue, namely, principles for selection of information and its introduction into dictionary corpus. Particular attention is given to such elements of lexicographical description of culture phenomena as the background knowledge of an average language speaker, which should be given in the commentary to a dictionary entry. We suggest taking into account for two principles for lexicographical description of culture phenomena — the principle of inclusiveness and completeness of description and topic-based principle for classification.
Key words: Cultural Phenomena, Dictionary, Lexicographical Description

Introduction

Knowledge of culture implies that person belongs to this nation. "A person must feel uncomfortable if he does not know who Lomonosov is and has not read "Eugene Onegin". Based on such principles a person cannot be considered belonging to the Russian culture. He is considered either foreign or illiterate" (Rozhdestvenskij, 2000: 83). As is known, the scope of the notion of "culture" has not been precisely defined yet. Everything that does not relate to nature, that is buildings, tools, clothes, cooking methods, social interaction, verbal and nonverbal communication, bringing up of children, education, religion, aesthetic references, philosophy and many other things are traditionally referred to culture. Division of culture into material and spiritual is artificial in many cases. Calling the division of culture into material and spiritual a scientific abstraction the researchers point out the unity of culture, where each material object had to evolve into an "idea" in human brain before it had been created. The components of culture cannot thus be listed. There exists an opinion that by culture they mean a very wide range of events, occurrences, attributes and objects. Out of all the variety of definitions of culture for our research we shall use the definition of culture suggested by Yu.M. Lotman who sees culture as the whole of all non-heritable information, ways of its arrangement and storage (Lotman, 2000: 395).

The interest to the "dictionary and culture" issue which is under spotlight in this paper springs from lately increasing interest to the issues of dialogue of cultures, cross-cultural communication, speech perception, cognitive paradigm for knowledge (see: Gao, 2013). Systematization of ways to lexicographically describe cultural phenomena requires not only summarizing the experience of practical lexicography in this respect, but also the development of theoretical approach to the issue, namely, principles for selection of information and its introduction into dictionary corpus.

This paper focuses on presentation of such an approach to lexicographical description of culture.

Culture Phenomena as Lexicographical Description Object

Culture phenomena are cultural events, certain "cultural objects". A culture phenomenon viewed from a linguistic perspective must have a certain word form. In

this sense a language unit itself can be a culture phenomenon as it activates certain cultural information in language speaker's mind and appeals to it (see: Alefirenko, 2015; Cukan, Korina, Lenovsky, 2014). Culture phenomena can be represented by different signs – culture signs. Concepts, loci, literary texts, idiolects, bearers of background information are some of them. They reflect the difference in people's vision of the outside world, their identity property, person's perception of another person as native or foreign.

Studying a concept as a culture phenomenon one should note that the term "concept" was first widely spread in cognitive linguistics, which studies how language units of different levels are connected with human knowledge and experience (Kubrjakova, 1999: 4-5; Hartmann, Stork, 1972: 205; Barsalou, 2003). The principles of two closely interconnected unconscious processes of conceptualization and categorization alongside with concepts and categories as the results of these processes are the primary research targets for this science (Lakoff, Johnson 1999: 17-19). At that, by concepts they mean certain figures of thought, elementary particles that form our thought (Jackendoff, 1994: 188) and by categories they mean unification of concepts into common classes based on their similarity (KKT, 1996: 93) (for instance, concepts "swallow", "sparrow" and "tomtit" go under "bird" category). The main material for cognitive studies are language units of different levels. At this the term "concept" is delimited from the term "meaning of a word" which is used only for description of language processes (Jackendoff, 1994: 202). In Russian linguistics the term "concept" appeared for the first time in works by S.A. Askol'dov-Alekseev already in the beginning of the 20th century. At that the researcher himself underlined that the issue of the nature of concepts or, in medieval terminology, the universals, is old. According to S.A. Askol'dov-Alekseev, a concept is "a mental composition, which in the process of thinking replaces an infinite variety of objects of one and the same kind", being the "incipient act" of the thinking process it expresses the subject's point of view, targeted at something real, that is its content both in subjective and objective aspects (1997: 269). In D.S. Lihachev's opinion, "a concept does not directly evolve from the meaning of a word, but is the result of the collision of dictionary definitions of words with personal and national experience of a human being" (1997: 151). Moreover, a concept becomes "the main cell of culture in person's mental world" (Stepanov, 2001: 43). Dictionaries of concepts in Russian linguistics are represented by Yu.S. Stepanov's "Konstanty. Slovar russkoj kultury (The Constants: Dictionary of Russian Culture)" (2001). A dictionary of concepts, in author's opinion, can be of two types: the notions are explained by selection of quotations by different authors (for instance, specific purpose dictionaries like – dictionaries of linguistic terms of the Prague school by J. Vachek and the American school by E. Hamp) or based on own historical surveys of the author (for instance, the work by V.O. Kluchevsky "Russian History Terminology"). But in any case a dictionary of concepts is "the collective unconscious" that exists in meanings of words (Ibid: 7–8).

The bearers of background information who are different by the nature of the background potential, as the culture phenomena can be paralinguistic units and phenomena (facial expressions, gestures, bodily movements, distance between the communication partners); verbal-and-paralinguistic notions (traditions and morals, customs, festivals, national games, etiquette, folk sayings, beliefs and stories); units of verbal communication (words for ethnic realities, phraseological units, aphorisms, quotations, precedent phenomena, personal names) (Olshanskij, 2000: 33-34).

Speaking of paralinguistic phenomena as of background information bearers, it should be noted that in the unity of "fact of verbal behavior – fact of nonverbal behavior" there are three correlations: 1) nonverbal behavior (paralinguistic unit) not

accompanied by permanent verbal form; 2) nonverbal behavior accompanied by a verbal form; 3) verbal behavior accompanied by nonverbal form. All three correlations have different degree of digestion by a bearer of one or another culture and different ways to put them into a dictionary. It is certainly easier to put a verbal form In as the linguistic and cultural dictionary by A.A. Akishina, H. Kano, T.E. Akishina (ZhM, 1991) whereas to get acquainted with foreign culture especially during initial period of language studies it is easier to digest a gesture or a facial expression: "the primate" of nonverbal communication is the base for linguistic and cultural dictionary and reference book by P.S. Tumarkin (ZhMJap, 2001) and by S.A. Grigor'eva, N.V. Grigor'ev, G.E. Krejdlin (SJRZh, 2001).

Due to multiple meanings the term *realia* as a subject for lexicographical description should be refined. Realias are usually material culture objects and spiritual culture phenomena of a certain community. This is why S. Vlahov and S. Florin suggest making a distinction between a realia-object and a realia-word. In their opinion a realia-object even within country studies has a broad meaning which does not always fit a realia-word, being an element of extralinguistic activity (1980: 7). In translation studies and in lexicography it is the word denoting an object or a phenomena of material or spiritual culture that is in demand. This is why term *realia* has gained ground in these sciences in the meaning of "names of objects of material culture, facts of history, state institutions, names of national and folk heroes, mythological creatures, etc., common to certain nations and peoples" (Tomahin, 1988: 5). However, the use of terms non-equivalent (connotative, background) vocabulary, realia, national realia, Americanism-word, etc., causing a feeling of chaos, does not hinder understating of the core.

The idea of nationally marked units (realias) got different interpretation in linguistic and cultural studies, translation studies, lexicography and cultural linguistics. In applied sciences (linguistic and cultural studies, for instance, are called a didactic counterpart of sociolinguistics, an applied aspect of linguodidactics) realia-words act as nationally marked units, that is non-equivalent, connotative vocabulary, personal names and phraseological units with a denotative realia within. The possibility to single out groups of such realias in a wide sense is based on comparison of cultures: «What leaps most to the attention of even the average layman are the cases of the so called c u l t u r e - b o u n d   w o r d s : if, say, some plants live or some things exist only in the area where the source language is spoken but not all in the area of the target language, there will be no really equivalent lexicas units ready in the target language» (Zgusta, 1971: 294). The classification of such vocabulary is based on comparison of translated equivalents.

Discussing the methodology of linguistic and cultural studies, E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov single out groups of non-equivalent and connotative lexis, and later non-equivalent and background lexis. As the connotative words of linguistic and cultural value E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov first of all reckon those which have stereotyped associations (Rus. *березка*), as well as the subjective assessment vocabulary (Rus. *волхв, суженый, тоска, Анна Каренина, Коробочка, Митрофанушка, мужичонка, бабенка*). Non-equivalent lexis, in the opinion of E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov is different from connotative lexis as «it does not have any *meaning* correspondence in the system of contents inherent to the other language», whereas the connotative lexis has matching denotations (i.e. objective content), but has no matching connotations (i.e. emotional and aesthetic associations) (see: Vereshchagin, Kostomarov, 2005: 80-94).

It should be noted that the authors of linguistic and cultural dictionaries state that the frameworks of realia dictionaries must be expanded. The authors of linguistic and cultural dictionary "France" (FR, 1997) consider linguistic and cultural realias

(linguoculturemes) the units of their dictionary and reckon *names of objects, notions, concepts,* which do not occur or occur in other kind with the representatives of Russian linguistic and cultural community: realias, that exist in the French culture and are absent in the Russian culture (state institutions, economic structures, public organizations, etc.); realias, that exist in both cultures, but differ by a certain attribute (in terms of arrangement, function, etc.); realias that have international character, but differ in national contents (ideas, philosophies, inventions originated in France and contributing to the world culture; taking into account the peculiarities, that some common European philosophy and art schools obtained owing to France) (Ibid: 1031–1032).

Representatives of comparative linguistic and cultural studies are also trying to exceed the scope of "material" realias. A.S. Mamontov, for instance divides all the words that have national and cultural markedness into non-equivalent ("realias", according to S. Vlakhov and S. Florin), partially non-equivalent (with partial discrepancy of notions: Rus. песня and Pol. piesn, piosenka), connotative (a birch as symbol of Russia, a horse as symbol of loyalty and devotion in the Arab East countries, Afghanistan, Iran, Mongolia) and background (Russian cultureme "bus" and its equivalents in the languages of Pushtu and Farsi) (Mamontov, 2000: 22–26).

Yet still the applied character of linguistic-and-cultural studies, translation theory and practice, culture-oriented and translation lexicography result in the need to limit possible options and be restricted to the words with "material" prototype, unique for one or several cultures.

However as is seen from the given list of classifications of realias in applied subjects, a group of lexis with cultural connotation is extremely variegated here and its classification is not always convincing. For instance, there is no single criterion for background and connotative lexis, unclear is the ground for introduction of folklore words or phraseological units into the group of non-equivalent lexis, unclear is the place of personal names in the classification. It goes without saying that the phenomena of the national markedness of signs is based on lacunarity in the broad sense of the word, that is why the nature of non-equivalency which are counted on in realia studies in applied subjects can be different.

Background Knowledge as Basis for Lexicographical Description of Culture Phenomena

The very essence of lexicographical description of culture phenomena is to reveal and represent it in its entirety, that is to provide all the information that a speaker of the language and a bearer of the culture knows about this realia (see: Nkomo, 2016; Schryver, Prinsloo 2011).

Knowledge as the form of existence and systematization of results of human cognitive activity is represented by different kinds: everyday and scientific, personal and social, declarative and procedural knowledge. When the point at the issue is the content of knowledge, it is a common practice to distinguish between linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge. Differences in wording (linguistic, language, verbalized; extralinguistic, encyclopedic, non-language, non-verbalized) are caused by different basis for classification – subject correlation (knowledge about the world and knowledge about language) or knowledge presentation form (worded or non-worded) (see: Zalevskaja, 2000: 67-68; Kubrjakova, 2004: 10). Encyclopedic (extralinguistic, non-language, non-verbalized) knowledge is sometimes referred to as background.

When determining background knowledge it is necessary, from our point of view, to distinguish between its cognitive and communicative essence. In the first case it is underlined that the background knowledge has an extralinguistic character by nature and as part of implicit context (background knowledge of communicants

about the preceding situation) is one of *presupposition* kinds. In the second case the background knowledge is defined as *common fund,* which allows those who speak the same language, that is those, who use the same lexical, grammatical and stylistic resources, *to understand each other,* as *mutual knowledge* of realias by speaker and listener, which is the basis of language communication. (Ahmanova, 2014: 498).

Actualization of *cognitive* essence of background knowledge gives a possibility to discover speaker's everyday (unscientific) vision of the world, for instance, his associations with one or another word. Cf.: *...spoke good Russian, which by Lord was given to express by word far more than just the meanings of the words themselves. In the Russian speech there is something – above word, beneath word, - and there is something next to it... Rightly do those who persistently master the English language. It was made exactly what a language is made for – for understanding, whereas our great and mighty – for understanding as well! – but also for something that is above.. beneath.. and next to it....*(G. Shcherbakova); *I think that when a Frenchman or an Englishman says: France! England!... he certainly imagines behind this word something real, perceivable... understandable to him... And I say – Russia and – feel that for me it is a mere word. And I have no possibility to add any precise content to this word* (M. Gor'kij).

Actualization of *communicative* essence of background knowledge allows saying that there is a certain "communicative minimum" required for communication to succeed. Not all the scope of knowledge "standing" behind athe word with the speaker is required for communication and appears an essential condition for correct perception. Moreover, this scope is often difficult to be determined even for a speaker. Thus, to describe the meaning of the word Rus. *судьбина*, according to E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov, with the same rational information with the word Rus. *судьба* is quite difficult: "...it is clear to a Russian that there is "something" in this word, but this "something" refers to a dim feeling, and in the field of emotional the use of words for paraphrase, as a rule, does not lead to success" (Vereshchagin, Kostomarov, 1973: 78).

In order to lexicographically describe a culture phenomena one must select something important, long-standing, typical. As a matter of practice this principle is extremely difficult to be applied. There is a lot "hidden" behind a word with a speaker: associations that are social and personal, infant and adult, everyday and literary. That is why in order to define the content of background knowledge of a speaker on must resort to the notion of "average language speaker". The notion of "average language speaker" has not been defined in the literature and the scope of his cultural knowledge has not been thoroughly described for any language. For an average speaker they take *our contemporary* with secondary education (graduated from school not less than ten years ago) with no regard to age, gender, occupation, career field (Vereshchagin, 1969: 120); *author of the study* (Vuchkova, 1984: 3); *average linguistic identity,* i.e., one abstract speaker instead of a totality of individuals in a mass linguistic study (*you, me, they, an old man, Napoleon, Muhammad... in one*) (Karaulov, 1999: 120).

As far as the perception of a word and a text is connected with the scope of knowledge that a speaker masters in the process of sociologization, including schools studies, it would be reasonable, from our point of view, to consider that an average language speaker is any person who finished secondary school.

A scope of knowledge of an average language speaker, from our point of view, is determined by the parameters: what to know and how much to know. *What* and *how much to know* can be compared to a comment to a text: that, what is commented, is unknown to the reader. But *what* exactly and *how* to comment is determined depending of the need of a *text* and a *reader*. To determine *what* an average speaker should can on the one hand stand for determination of "minimum of

cultural literacy", i.e., what any one born, grown up and finished secondary school in a certain country *should know*, on the other hand, what a language speaker *actually knows*. The first is easier to be systematized: there are standard school curricula, but such an approach results in idealized speaker. The second one is hard to extract, but real, though an element of subjectivity cannot be excluded. One of the ways to reveal the *actual knowledge* of an average speaker can be a polling survey and association experiment data. The scope and content of background data of an average speaker are partially described in country studies textbooks. Though they do not always contain material adequate to the knowledge of an average speaker. For instance, is there a Russian who presently knows "why they thought that he who died at Easter will definitely go to Heaven"? (Proskurjakova, Zubareva, 1998: 41). The scope of country specific knowledge is not always sufficient as well. Thus, descriptions of Russian customs and traditions not always mention the Old New Year, which is well known to all bearers of the Russian culture.

So, the notion of an average language speaker is quite unclear. But sometimes, according to A. Potebnja, "it is better to find dark sides of an object than to consider this object almost or completely clear" (Potebnja, 1976: 84). A notion of an average speaker is needed to assume approximate scope of background data.

As to the languages of indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, "dying" languages, especially promising is the focus on the cumulative language function ensuring accumulation and storage of verbalized experience of spiritual and material culture life of people. In a situation when natural transfer of a language tends to disappear, it is important for a linguist to make a point of essential language function – the function of accumulation of knowledge and cultural experience of speakers. This position allows not only to preserve the cultural wealth accumulated by a language for future generations, but also to understand people's psychology, and thus to work out right strategy for its revitalization. In situation of a "dying" language by resorting to the background knowledge the researcher preserves not only the language, but also, to some extent, the ethnos itself.

In order to study background knowledge of speakers of indigenous small-numbered people's language, from our point of view, it is natural to resort to their cognitive, not communicative essence, because if the background knowledge is defined as a common fund, which allows the speakers of the same language to understand each other, it should be assumed that there is an actively functioning language environment.

The sociolinguistic analysis of the situation of the language of the Kola Saami, who live in the Russian Federation on the Kola Peninsula and amounting to 1771 people revealed that the number of the Saami language speakers is rather limited, the number of works of fiction is limited as well, there is no journalism at all, there are few Saami language dictionaries, which are translation and dialect, there are no defining or association dictionaries (see: Ivanishcheva 2014). Hence the typical ways to reveal the background knowledge of a speaker (interviews, analysis of dictionary entries and texts of fiction and journalism) cannot be used to a full extent. In such situation a researcher should record all knowledge of a speaker making no distinction between private and social. A speaker who can be an informant, describing his personal experience represents typical and usual, because the social environment, which he grew up in, preserved only such knowledge. The background knowledge of the Saami language speakers, in our opinion, must be studied from two aspects: firstly, a number of active and passive speakers and therefore informants, must be kept in the view; secondly, one should take into account the specific character of background knowledge with a lack of live speaking environment, conditions for use of a language in private and social life, advanced age of active language speakers, separation of

speakers from the language environment – material and spiritual culture. One of the tasks for lexicographical description of culture phenomena is to record the background data in a dictionary entry.

Specific Features of Lexicographical Description of Culture Phenomena in Different Kinds of Dictionaries

If the classification of dictionaries is based on the principle of account of the level of user's knowledge and needs, one can speak of cognitive-and-communicative approach to such classification. It seems that the traditional division of dictionaries into linguistic and encyclopedic shall be seen wider – as division into linguistic and nonlinguistic. Classification of dictionaries into linguistic and nonlinguistic is given by Yu.S. Maslov. In his opinion linguistic dictionaries collect and record lexical units of a language (words and phraseological units) from one or another perspective while in nonlinguistic dictionaries lexical units are just starting point to communicate certain information about objects and phenomena of extralinguistic activity. Thus Yu.S. Maslov's classification of dictionaries into linguistic and nonlinguistic corresponds to classification into linguistic and encyclopedic (Maslov, 1998: 120). The notion of "nonlinguistic dictionaries" is broader than that of "encyclopedic dictionaries" not only by scope, but also due to completely different classification basis. Classification of dictionaries into linguistic and nonlinguistic can be based on the form / content feature, where form stands for a word as a whole of its grammatical characteristics, and content stands for meaning and sense of that word. According to Yu.S. Stepanov, "meaning of a word is such object or objects which this word is correctly used for in accordance with the standards of a certain language and a concept is the sense of a word" (Stepanov, 2001: 44). If an object (realia) is a material culture element, then concept is a spiritual culture element.

Being an element of spiritual culture concept is a subject for culturological dictionaries. Being an element of material culture a realia can be a subject for culturological, country-specific and encyclopedic dictionaries.

Whereas for linguistic and non-linguistic dictionaries it is the focus on availability / lack of language speaker's / culture bearer's *knowledge* that can serve the basis for further classification (with a view to non-specialist user). Thus, linguistic dictionaries depending on user being / not being the speaker / culture bearer are represented by monolingual and bilingual types. Monolingual dictionaries (defining, phraseological, synonyms dictionaries, etc.) are intended for user being the speaker / bearer of the culture and aimed at meeting the user's need to improve his existing knowledge of a word. The bilingual dictionaries meet the need of a user not being a speaker / culture bearer in obtaining such knowledge.

Depending on the focus the nonlinguistic dictionaries are classified into encyclopedic and culturological dictionaries (focus on knowledge of a speaker / culture bearer) and cross-cultural dictionaries (focus on knowledge of non-speaker / non-culture bearer).

A country-specific dictionary differs from an encyclopedic dictionary by description object: an encyclopedic dictionary describes notions and personalia from all the fields of knowledge, including the humanities (history, sociology, ethnography, religion, arts) irrespective of belonging to one or another culture, one or another nation; whereas a country-specific dictionary describes notions and personalia belonging to one and the same country, culture, nation. The result of BES (2000) and ISS (2000) analysis showed that this fact determines the difference between an encyclopedic and a country-specific dictionary within the word list and the content of the entry.

Our analysis revealed that culturological dictionaries unlike country-specific dictionaries are focused on the knowledge of a user who is a language speaker and can have realia and concepts as the lexicographical description target Thus, RD (2003) is announced by the authors as a culturological dictionary devoted to the Russian countryside life. It's objective is to expand reader's idea of everyday life, traditions and life of a Russian village, ease the lexical difficulties when working with texts, stimulate the interest to the Russian language and reading of written works concerning countryside. When selecting the words the authors were guided by the principle of culturological value of a word, i.e., its role in the process of learning the national culture and mental characteristics of the Russian language. Thus, the dictionary includes lexis which traditionally is used in working, cultural, ceremonial and everyday life of Russian countryside (RD, 2003: 5–7).

The dictionary includes the words belonging to various thematic groups, that is, reflecting various sides of people's material culture (names for countryside housing and farmstead, household items, traditional food, clothes, farming tools, farm machinery and vehicles, crafts, kinship terminology), which does not defy thematic integrity of the dictionary. However the principle of culturological dictionary – focus of the *knowledge* of a speaker has been defied. And it's not about the fact that the it includes words which do not require explanation for Russian native speakers: Rus. *арбуз* 'watermelon', *базар* 'bazaar', *баня* 'steam bath', *береза* 'birch', *блин* 'pancake', *бревно* 'log', *бочка* 'barrel', *ворота* 'gate', *горох* 'pea', *гриб* 'mushroom', *грибной* 'mushroom' (adjective), *деревня* 'countryside', *зерно* 'grain', *картошка* 'potato', *каша* 'cooked grain', *коза* 'female goat', *козёл* 'male goat', *конь* 'male horse', *кобыла* 'female horse', *корзина* 'basket', *корова* 'cow', *курица* 'hen', *мука* 'flour', *петух* 'cock', *пила* 'saw', *пирог* 'pie', *пчела* 'bee', *рак* 'crayfish', *ручей* 'stream', *сало* 'salo', rather *how* some of these words are defined in the dictionary. For instance, the definition of *mushroom* as of *a special plant, comprising a stem and a cap* will hardly meet the need of a Russian language speaker and culture bearer. Focus on understanding does not imply definition of words on such level. More likely is the contrary, the reader is expecting the dictionary to be more informative. This is why the definition dictionaries present a *mushroom* as a *special organism, bearing spores* (see: SOSH (1993), BTS (2000)), to say nothing of encyclopedic dictionaries.

Culturological dictionaries of realia just like encyclopedic dictionaries should meet the needs of a language speaker in improving current knowledge, but they differ from encyclopedic dictionaries by topic-based principle for material presentation.

A bilingual translation dictionary, as equivalent to bilingual definition dictionary should be focused on knowledge of non-speaker of language / non-bearer of culture in a way it should be done is a country-specific dictionary. The peculiarity of a bilingual dictionary user is that he is a speaker of only one of two given languages, so this dictionary should be bidirectional. Focus on active user (native-foreign) and passive user (foreign-native) binds the dictionary to follow a specific structure (NLO, 1997: 84–85; see: Landau, 1984: 5-10; NSL, 1991: 33; Svensén 1987: 12).). At that, what any user needs in the first place is the translated equivalent, though the additional information as well (see: Hornáčková-Klapicová 2012).

Commentary as the Form of Lexicographical Description of Culture Phenomena

Commentary as part of reference apparatus can explain a word (word commentary), a text (text commentary), a situation (situation commentary), though traditionally this term is used for note to a text in order to direct reader's perception. As is known, the place for additional notes (commentary) in a dictionary entry can be

different: they can be detached into a special area and included into a commentary or used as description elements in definition. There are no criteria determining the place for such notes, that is why it is in the dictionaries it is defined by author's intuition. Speaking about the scope of a commentary, it should be noted that it is often difficult to draw a line between definition of a lexical meaning of a word and additional information about realia, which are a part of a commentary.

Information about realia as of a culture phenomena, from our point of view, should be included into the commentary to a word in a dictionary entry. Such commentary can be of different type: *factual* and *culturological*. Factual commentary corresponds to the level of description of a scientific notion (element, process, historical fact, biological entity, social life fact, etc.). It's peculiar features are objectivism, accuracy, specificity. A remarkable example of a scientific notion description are definitions of terms in a special dictionary as well as in an encyclopedic and defining. Properties of an object actualized in factual commentary most often correspond to its properties presented in an encyclopedic dictionary. A culturological commentary differs from factual by information related to a language speaker (function of an object not in the nature but in relation to a man, its use by man, application in human practice, etc., that is role of a an object in cultural life). The following example from a Manden-Russian dictionary shoes the difference between a factual and a culturological dictionary. Thus, in the dictionary entry for Man. *bawòló* with meanings «1. Egyptian goose; 2. Shoveler» there is just a factual commentary for the second meaning (drake: black-and-green head and neck, chestnut belly; white breast and lower neck, the upper part in darker; spatula-shaped beak is bluish-black; duck: with brown speckles, upper body is darker, chestnut belly; wing is 22-25 cm; breeding season in the temperate climate areas of Eurasia), whereas the first one includes a culturological commentary (general coloring is lightish brown, upper part of wings is white, flights are black, primaries are shimmering green, internal are chestnut and olive; black rump and tail; chestnut spot on the breast; wing is 35-42 cm, weigh is about 2.5 kg; diet includes new grass and seeds; flesh is insipid, sometimes almost inedible) (MRS, 1999). Analysis of dictionaries shows that the word commentary is in some cases is unreasonably too detailed. V.D. Devkin denotes that country-specific dictionaries are congested with information (2000: 240–241). The authors of country-specific dictionary "France" on the contrary consider the additional information to be an advantage of their dictionary (FR, 1997: 1027), for instance, the detailed description of architectural details.

Even for encyclopedic dictionaries of different fields of knowledge various encyclopedic information can be important provided the necessary minimum. Thus, different properties of objects can be of interest for different sciences: plants and animals in biology are classified based on biological properties, in agronomy and agriculture they get their characteristics from the aspect of breeding, practical use, etc. Let's consider the dictionary entries for Rus. *балалайка* 'balalaika' as an example.

V.I. Dal''s dictionary (1989) suggest the following encyclopedic information as *how to play balalaika* (folk musical instrument with stops and two or three gut strings, *that are thrummed by all the fingers shaking the hand, E-string pitch)*, the BES (2000) describes the history of the instrument (*known since the beginning of the 18th century, upgraded in 1880-s* (under supervision of V.V. Andreev) by V.V. Ivanov and F.S. Paserbsky, who designed a family of balalaikas and later by S.I. Nalimov). Culturological dictionaries of different types draw users attention of the *symbolism of balalaika* for Russian culture, its popularity, folk character: a stringed musical instrument with a three-sided body, *played esp. in Russia* (DELC, 1992); a folk three-stringed musical instrument. It has been known since the end of the 17th century. The balalaika is often mentioned in Russian folk songs. The

balalaika acquired its modern shape in the late 19th century on the initiative of V. Andreyev, a balalaika player and the founder of the first orchestra of Russian folk instruments. Balalaika occupies one of *the leading positions in the traditional Russian orchestras of folk instruments. It is the traditional symbol of Russian folk music* (RAKS, 2002); «"a guitar-like musical instrument having a triangular body and 2–4 strings, *popular in Russia and other Slav countries*"» (DOFR, 2002).

It is only evident that the information for definition is selected with regard to the type of a dictionary and its purpose. To introduce the reader to the culture of Russia, to outline the cultural background knowledge without which communication of Russia to the world and the world to Russia would be impossible (RAKS, 2002: 3); to transfuse the wealth and peculiarity of native culture in socializing with foreigners (Ibid: 5; DOFR, 2002: 5) – is the task for culturological and linguistic-and-culturological dictionaries; to be a universal reference book – is the task for encyclopedic dictionaries. The dictionary by V.I. Dal' (1989) is renowned for the richness of ethnographic material.

It is our profound conviction that for lexicographical description of realia needs an extended commentary (culturological and factual), especially for vocabulary of "dying" languages.

Principles for Lexicographical Description of Culture Phenomena

As was said above, the perfect form for presentation of culture phenomena in a dictionary is the presentation of background knowledge of an average speaker to the fullest extent possible. The scope of background information in case of "dying" languages, which the language of Kola Saami is, depends of what a speaker can know (or remember).

For instance: Kildin Saami *вунхэмушш* – matchmaking that is a custom preceding marriage. The research proved that the speaker remembers the following information about this phenomena: *Matchmaking could be different. In some areas it was connected with handshake, after which the agreement was considered made, in others it was not. Handshake had the legal force. Handshake was done the following way: fathers gave hands each other and after that somebody set them apart after which vodka was served by the groom's side. Only after this the agreement was considered made. Handshake could be done with the groom if ha came without relatives* (Haruzin, 1890: 277). *The matchmaking differed from settlement to settlement as well: in some the groom came to matchmaking alone, in others together with the matchmaker or two matchmakers. Sometimes the father and the mother adopted the role of marriage brokers, in other cases all the relatives came along with the young man. There exist detailed descriptions of matchmaking of the Saami from the settlements of Lovozero* (Ibid: 276)*, Pazretsk* (Ibid: 277-279), *Notozero, Songelsk and Babino* (Ibid: 279-281). *After the matchmaking and the handshake the young man obtained the right to visit his bride and the more often he did the stronger his feeling was considered. The period between matchmaking and marriage was not defined, but usually less than a year* (Ibid: 281).

Presentation of all available information about a cultural phenomena in a dictionary entry in this case is a necessity. Firstly, it would hardly be possible to define what details of the realia (cultural phenomena of *matchmaking*) are important, that is to shorten the article. Criteria for importance or unimportance of information will be changing depending on the language, dictionary type, dictionary user, etc. Secondly, to record all the information about a phenomena is a specific mission of "dying" languages researcher. It is essential to preserve everything possible while the speakers are alive.

So, one of the principles for lexicographical description of culture phenomena is the principle of inclusiveness and completeness of description. Such presentation, even with electronic dictionaries, where an entry can be quite extensive, is practically impossible. The background knowledge should be structured for lexicographical description of culture phenomena. A dictionary assumes systematization of material. For cultural phenomena it seems reasonable to use topic-based principle for lexis arrangement, when the lexis is extracted within a certain topic and semantic connection to it.

Topic-based principle for classification is based on the notion of a topic group, which is a group of semantically-related words and as a result being a single component of people's *material* culture. The linguistic basis for a topic group is the semantic kinship of its members, based on associations by adjacency and thus being 'a formal equivalent of a semantic field' (Paducheva, 2004: 42–50). The extralinguistic grounds for topic groups are defined by relation to the speaker's experience and extralinguistic reality.

The way from a notion to a word underlies ideographical dictionaries. Ideological (i.e. ideographical) dictionaries – are the dictionaries which fully or partially use the principles of classification of speech facts (*pity* is included into the notion of *altruistic feelings,* which go under *feelings in general*, which in their turn go under *mental phenomena* category). When it is referred to classification of certain words, then, according to C. Bally, another principle is used - the principle of arrangement of words by topics (2001: 151–155). V.V. Morkovkin defined three main types of ideographic dictionaries: thesaurus – LORA (1984); analogical – not available for Russian, and topic-based – TMS (2000)) and noted that in a topic-based ideographic dictionary unlike an ideographic thesaurus, a meaning (topic) range is not reconstructed, but assigned based on some or other practical (mainly pedagogical) needs (Morkovkin, 1970: 26–28).

Analysis of LORA (1984) and TMS (2000) showed that the difference between ideographic thesauri and topic-based dictionaries is to a large extent defined by *what* is a subject of lexicographical description – a class of notions, denoting abstract relations and forms of matter existence, and a class of notions, denoting the material world in all of its variety.

In the opinion of Yu.N. Karaulov, the structure of ideographic dictionaries is one of components of the "world image", though the ideological position of the author makes impact on the relations hierarchy (1976: 249–259; see also: Shcherba, 2002: 77-84).

Topic-based classification as a classification of material objects reflects real connections and relations existing in the culture of certain people. Thus, in the group of "Nuts and Fruits" of medieval Arabian and Persian topic-based dictionaries there were subtopics "those with outer part eaten" (cherries, peaches) and "those with internal part eaten" (watermelon, walnut, etc.) (Bertel's, 1979: 25).

Topic-based principle for presentation of material provides grounds for a more comprehensive presentation of cultural component of a word's meaning.

Actually, the idea of people's material culture often gets more precise if there is an opportunity to present every part of it as an element of a system. In this sense topic-based dictionaries can be called culturological. It was already L.V. Shcherba who wrote that dictionaries of synonyms can to some extent be considered ideographical (Shcherba, 2002). In foreign lexicography it is also the crosswords dictionaries that should be called ideographical (for instance, KOL (1994)).

In definitions of words meaning material culture objects, a bilingual dictionary, for example, should whenever possible use a topic-based principle, which, however, is different from that of a culturological dictionary.

If in a culturological dictionary the topic-related arrangement of material is based on realias of *one and the same* culture and comparison of realias' properties of realia in order to specify their characteristics, in a bilingual dictionary, as well as in a country-specific dictionary, the topic-based principle is done for *different* cultures.

Thus the note "*as distinct from light cream and half-and-half*" to *heavy cream* (AM, 1996: 396, 413, 532) suggests knowing the elements of material culture and if *"light cream"* and *"heavy cream"* are understandable to a bearer of Russian culture, the term *"half and half"* yet needs explanation. It would be reasonable to provide an explanation within brackets comparing the realia not only within a topic line for one and the same culture, which is foreign to the dictionary user, but within different cultures, comparing a foreign realia with realias of the same function in the native culture (*heavy cream* - 33% fat cream as distinct from *light cream* - 11% fat cream and *half-and-half* - 22% fat cream). In such presentation an equivalent with the same function from other culture is given and the topic-based principle is used in intercrossing fields: topical group of foreign culture is perceived against a background of own culture.

At this it is important that the comparison is done within the framework of *own – foreign* culture, not *foreign – foreign* culture. So the notion of Rus. *бюджетный год* 'budget year' is given in the country-related dictionary "France" in comparison with the same realia in the USA, England, Japan, Canada, Sweden and Norway (FR, 1997: 48), but not in Russia, though the dictionary is intended for a Russian speaker and culture bearer, and the realia of Rus. *государственная администрация* 'state administration' is presented in comparison with Anglo-Saxon administration model (Ibid: 28–29).

Inclusion of information comparing realias of different cultures into a bilingual dictionary is possible not for all the topic groups. For instance, some military ranks have no equivalents. The 'non-equivalent elements' of such topic group can be presented only within one and the same culture. Compare presentation of the rank of *Adjudant* in the dictionary "France": *the third non-commissioned officer rank in the ground forces, air forces and gendarmerie; between the Staff Sergeant or Chief Marshal of Lodgings and Chief Adjudant; corresponds to Master Chief Petty Officer in the naval forces; career officer; insignia: in the army – two white bars with red gap on shoulder marks; in air forces – red grade chevron with white trim; in gendarmerie - two white chevrons with a red gap* (Ibid: 28). The principle for comparison of realias within two cultures and the principles of bilingual dictionary as of a country-related encyclopedia are to the fullest extent possible implemented in SNRORD (2003). Actually taking into account interests of both Norwegian and Russian user the authors managed to provide important information, showing the peculiarities of both cultures. At that the dictionary reflects both verbal and verbal-and-paralinguistic bearers of background country-related information. For instance, it is said how to properly start a telephone conversation in Russia and in Norway (SNRORD, 2003: 1294) or how to address each other (Ibid: 307). The dictionary includes a comparison of the so called precedent names, that is proper names connected, in particular, with a well-known text (RKP, 2004: 23–26): Nor. *Askelladen* and Rus. *Иванушка-дурачок*; Nor. *Bamse Brakar* and Rus. *Михайло Иваныч, Топтыгин* (SNRORD, 2003: 75, 107). Besides the information given in the annex the dictionary has comparative comments to the topic group "Education System", for instance, Rus. *аспирант, оценка, кандидат* (Ibid: 75, 200, 589), "Holidays" (Ibid: 576–577) etc.

It seems extremely valuable that in SNRORD (2003) dictionary the authors focus on the background knowledge of a dictionary user, by firstly excluding the possibility for different notions to overlap (Rus. *фронтовик* (Ibid: 414)), and

secondly, on the contrary, by using this possibility (Rus. *дихлофос, трудовое обучение,* TV programme name Rus. *«Вести»,* pet names Rus. *Мурка, Борька* (Ibid).

Topic-based arrangement of learner's dictionaries is stipulated by communicative focus of training and in a defining dictionary it reflects the categorization and systematization of environment in the linguistic consciousness of a culture bearer. The latter is especially valuable for a dictionary. In this respect another important principle for lexicographical description of culture phenomena is the topic-based arrangement principle. For instance, the topic of reindeer husbandry lexis has the following subtopics: "Domestic Reindeer", "Reindeer Herders and Unions of Reindeer Herders", "Reindeer Herder's Gear", "Reindeer Distinguishing Marks", "Reindeer Herding Dog", "Places and Structures for Herding, Keeping, Counting and Culling of Reindeer", "Reindeer Harness and Sledge", "Reindeer Pack Load", "Reindeer Slaughter", "Reindeer Skin Treatment". Topic subsection "Reindeer" includes such sections as "Reindeer Buck", "Reindeer Doe", "Reindeer Fawn", "Reindeer by Household Use", "Reindeer by Position in a Team", "Reindeer by Antlers Presence (Absence)" etc. Section "Reindeer Fawn" includes subsections "Reindeer Fawn from Birth to Three Months", "Reindeer Fawn from Three to Six Months", "Reindeer Fawn from Six to Eighteen Months", which is presented in the dictionary by O.N. Ivanishcheva and A.M. Ershtadt (2015). Such a dictionary allows implementing the gnoseological function of a dictionary of a dying language to a full extent as it will reflect the present state of language and culture and will be intended for learning, meaning recovery of this language and culture.

Conclusion

A dictionary plays an important role in people's spiritual life. Dictionaries accomplish different social functions: informative, communicative and normative. The principal purpose of any kind of dictionary as of a didactic composition is to close a gap between individual knowledge and knowledge of whole collective. The history of dictionary making shows that the informative function was prevailing in the first dictionaries made. The communicative function became especially important under last decades. Contemporary dictionaries play an important role in cross-cultural communication issues as they represent not only the facts of material culture, but also the present linguistic consciousness of speakers, its values system.

Development of theoretical provisions for lexicographical description of culture phenomena must be based on the very subject of research – the culture phenomena, its specificity and peculiarities connected with functioning in cultural environment. A dictionary has different possibilities to outline a concept of culture: its focus determines the structure and the content of a dictionary entry and selection of headwords. The problem is *what* and *how* to include in a dictionary. As to the question *what,* the contemporary lexicography offers readers dictionaries and reference books of different kinds. The question *how* to describe the realias listed above has not been paid a lot of attention, though these issues, common for the theory of lexicography, get thrown into sharp relief for lexicographical description of culture. We suggest taking into account for lexicographical description of culture phenomena – in this article realias – the background knowledge of an average language speaker, which should be given in the commentary to a dictionary entry.

Bibliograpic references

AHMANOVA, O.S. 2014. Slovar' lingvisticheskih terminov: 4-e izd., stereotipn. Moskva: Editorial URSS. 576 p. ISBN 978-5-397-03655-9

ALEFIRENKO, N. 2015. Language as a State of Ethno-Cultural Consciousness. In XLinguae Journal, Vol. 8 Issue 3, June, pp. 3-18. ISSN 1337-8384

AM, 1996. – Americana. English-Russian Encyclopedic Dictionary. Edited and supervised by Prof. G. Chernov. Smolensk: Polygramma. 1185 p. ISBN 5872640404

ASKOL'DOV-ALEKSEEV, S.A. 1997. Koncept i slovo. In Russkaja slovesnost': Antologija / Pod red. V.N. Neroznaka. Moskva: Academia, pp. 267-280. ISBN 5-87444-045-3

BALLY, C. 2001. Francuzskaja stilistika: 2-e izd., stereotipn. Moskva: Editorial URSS. 392 p. ISBN 5-8360-0407-2

BARSALOU, L.W. 2003. Situated Simulation in the Human Conceptual System, In Language and Cognitive Processes, Vol. 18 Issue 5-6, October, pp. 513-562. ISSN 1464-0732

BERTEL'S, A.E. 1979. O proishozhdenii rubrik tematicheskih (ideogra-ficheskih) slovarej // Perevodnaja i uchebnaja leksikografija / Sost. V. D. Uvarov. Moskva: Russkij jazyk, pp. 7-28.

BES, 2000. – Bol'shoj jenciklopedicheskij slovar': 2-e izd., pererab. i dop. Moskva; Sankt-Peterburg: Norint. 1456 p. ISBN 5-85270-160-2; 5-7711-0004-8

BTS, 2000. – Bol'shoj tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka / Sost. i gl. red. S.A. Kuznecov. Sankt-Peterburg: Norint. 1536 p. ISBN 5-7711-0015-3

CUKAN, J. – KORINA, N. – LENOVSKY, L. 2014. Culture – Language – Identity (problem of relations) In XLinguae Journal, Vol. 7 Issue 4, October, pp. 21-32. ISSN 1337-8384

Dal', 1989. – Dal', V.I. Tolkovyj slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo jazyka: T.1. Moskva: Russkij jazyk. ISBN 5-200-01250-3

DELC, 1992. – Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. [S.1.], Longman Group UK Limited. 1528 p. ISBN 0-582 -23730-3

DEVKIN, V.D. 2000. Ocherki po leksikografii. Moskva: Prometej. 395 p. ISBN 5704209602, 9785704209607

DOFR, 2002. – Kabakchi, V.V. The Dictionary of RUSSIA (2 500 cultural terms). Sankt-Peterburg: Publishing house "SOYUZ". 576 p.

FR, 1997. – Franzija: Lingvostranovedcheskij slovar. Pod red. L.G. Vedeninoj. Moskva: "Interdialekt+"; ICHP "AMT". 1037 p. ISBN 5-89520-003-6

GAO, J. 2013. Basic Cognitive Experiences and Definitions in The *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, In *International Journal of Lexicography,* Vol. 26 Issue 1, March, pp. 58-89. ISSN 1477-4577

HARTMANN, R.R.K. – STORK, F.C. 1972. Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. London, Applied Science. 302 p. ISBN 08533 4534 1

HARUZIN, N.N. 1890. Russkije Lopari (Ocherki proshlogo i sovremennogo byta). Moskva: Tovarishchestvo Levenson. 472 p.

HORNÁČKOVÁ-KLAPICOVÁ, E. 2012. Bilingual Lexicography and a Slovak-Spanish-English Theological Dictionary. In XLinguae Journal, Vol. 5 Issue 3, June, pp. 2-41. ISSN 1337-8384

ISS, 2000. – Krjukov, A.A. Izrail' segodnja: Stranovedcheskij slovar'-spravochnik. Moskva: ID «Muravej-Gajd». 272 p. ISBN 5-8463-0112-6

IVANISHCHEVA, O.N. – ERSHTADT, A.M. 2015. Slovar' leksiki tradicionnyh promyslov i hozjajstvennyh zanjatij kol'skih saamov: na materiale kil'dinskogo dialekta saamskogo jazyka. Moskva; BerlIn Direkt-Media. 237 p. ISBN 978-5-4475-3306-9; Available online: http://biblioclub.ru/index.php?page=book&id=274432.

IVANISHCHEVA, O. 2014. The Kola Saami Languages: Contemporary Sociolinguistic Situation. In Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal, vol. 1, n. 6, pp. 96-109. ISBN 2055-0286

JACKENDOFF, R. 1994. Patterns in the mind. Language and human nature. N.Y.: Basic Books. ISBN 0-465-05462-5

KARAULOV, Yu.N. 1976. Obshhaja i russkaja ideografija. Moskva: Nauka. 355 p.

KARAULOV, Yu.N. 1999. Aktivnaja grammatika i associativno-verbal'naja set'. Moskva: IRJA RAN. ISBN 5-88744-021-X

KKT, 1996. – Kubrjakova E.S., Dem'jankov V.Z., Pankrac Yu.G., Luzina L.G. Kratkij slovar' kognitivnyh terminov. Moskva: Izd-vo Mosk. un-ta. ISBN 978-5-903262-67-0

KOL, 1994. – Nilsson, L. Korsordslexikon från A till Ö. Stockholm: ICA bokförlag. 1077 p. ISBN 91-534-1498-5

KUBRJAKOVA, E.S. 1999. Semantika v kognitivnoj lingvistike. (O koncepte kontejnera i formah ego ob'jektivacii v jazyke.) In : Izvestija RAN. Serija literatury i jazyka, № 5-6, pp. 3-12. ISSN 0321-1711

KUBRJAKOVA, E.S. 2004. Jazyk i znanie: Na puti poluchenija znanij o jazyke: Chasti rechi s kognitivnoj tochki zrenija. Rol' jazyka v poznanii mira. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury. 560 p. ISBN 5-94457-174-8

LAKOFF, G. – JOHNSON, M. 1999. Philosophy in the Flesh. The Embodied Mind and It's Challenge to Western Thought. [S. l.], N.Y.: Basic Books. 624 p. ISBN 0-465-05674-3

LIHACHEV, D.S. 1997. Konceptosfera russkogo jazyka. In Russkaja slovesnost': Antologija / Pod red. V.N. Neroznaka. Moskva: Academia, pp. 28-37. ISBN 5-87444-045-3

LORA, 1984. – Leksicheskaja osnova russkogo jazyka: Kompleksnyj uchebnyj slovar' / V.V. Morkovkin, N.O. Bjome, I.A. Dorogonova, T.F. Ivanova, I.D. Uspenskaja; Pod red. V.V. Morkovkina. Moskva: Russkij jazyk. 1168 p.

LOTMAN, Yu.M. 2000. Semiosfera. Sankt-Peterburg: Iskusstvo-Spb. 704 p. ISBN 5-210-01488-6

MAMONTOV, A.S. 2000. Jazyk i kul'tura: osnovy sopostavitel'nogo lingvostranovedenija: Avtoref. dokt. dis. Moskva.

MASLOV, Yu.S. 1998. Vvedenie v jazykoznanie: 3-e izd., ispr. Moskva: Vysshaja shkola. 272 p. ISBN 5-06-003376-7

MORKOVKIN, V.V. 1970. Ideograficheskie slovari. Moskva: Izd-vo Mosk. un-ta. 71 p.

MRS, 1999. – Manden-russkij slovar. T.1 / V.F. Vydrin, S.I. Tomchina. Sankt-Peterburg: Dmitrij Bulanin. 342 p. ISBN 586007171X, 9785860071711

NKOMO, D. 2016. An African User-Perspective on English Children's and School Dictionaries, In International Journal of Lexicography, Vol. 29 Issue 1, March, pp. 31-54. ISSN 1477-4577

NLO, 1997. – Nordisk leksikografisk ordbok / H. Bergenholtz, I. Cantell, R.V. Fjeld, D. Gundersen, J.H. Jónsson, B. Svensén. Skrifter utgitt av Nordisk forening for leksikografi, n. 4. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. ISBN 82-00-22901-7

NSL, 1991. – Nordiske studier i leksikografi: Rapport fra konferanse om leksikografi i Norden. 28–31 mai 1991. Skrifter utgitt av Nordisk forening for leksikografi, n.1. Oslo: Nordisk forening for lexikografi. 561 p. ISBN 82-91121-00-1

OLSHANSKIJ, I.G. 2000. Lingvokulturologija v konze XX v.: itogi, tendenziji, perspektivy. In Lingvisticheskije issledovanija v konze XX v.: Sbornik obsorov. Moskva: INION RAN, pp. 26-55. ISBN 5-248-01339-9

PADUCHEVA, E.V. 2004. Dinamicheskie modeli v semantike leksiki. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury. 609 p. ISBN 5-94457-161-6

POTEBNJA, A.A. 1976. Estetika i pojetika. Moskva: Iskusstvo. 612 p.

PROSKURJAKOVA, I.G. – ZUBAREVA, V.S. 1998. Tradicionnaja russkaja kul'tura. Sankt-Peterburg: S.-Peterb. gorn. in-t im. G.V. Plehanova. 53 p.

RAKS, 2002. – Burak, A.L., Tjulenev, S.V., Vihrova, E.N. Rossija: Russko-anglijskij kul'turologicheskij slovar' / Pod obshh. ruk. S.G. Ter-Minasovoj. Moskva: OOO «Izdatel'stvo Astrel'»: OOO «Izdatel'stvo AST». 128 p. ISBN 5-17-041473-4; 5-271-03858-0

RD, 2003. – Russkaja derevnja – XX vek: Kulturologicheskij slovar' / I.V. Andrejev, N.V. Basko. Moskva: Flinta: Nauka. 304 p. ISBN 5-89349-379-6; 5-02-002760-X

RKP, 2004. – Russkoe kulturnoe prostranstvo: Lingvokulturologicheskij slovar'. Vyp. 1 / I.S. Brilyova, N.P. Volskaya, D.B. Gudkov, I.V. Zaharenko, V.V. Krasnyh. Moskva: Gnozis. 318 p. ISBN 5-94244-003-4

ROZHDESTVENSKIJ, Yu.V. 2000. Vvedenije v kulturovedenije. Moskva: Dobrosvet. 288 p. ISBN 5-88711-009-0

SCHRYVER de, G.–M.― PRINSLOO, D.J. 2011. Do dictionaries Define on the Level of their Target Users? A Case Study for Three Dutch Dictionaries, In International Journal of Lexicography, Vol. 24 Issue 1, March, pp. 5-28. ISSN 1477-4577

SHCHERBA, L.V. 2002. Opyt obshhej teorii leksikografii. In Izbrannye raboty po jazykoznaniju i fonetika. T.1. Sankt-Peterburg: Izd-vo S.-Peterb. un-ta, pp. 54-91.

SJRZh, 2001. – Grigor'eva S.A., Grigor'ev, N.V., Krejdlin, G.E. Slovar' jazyka russkih zhestov. Moskva-Vena: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury; Venskij slavisticheskij al'manah. 256 p. ISBN 5-7859-0149-8

SNRORD, 2003. – Stor norsk-russisk ordbok. Hovedredaktør Valerij Berkov. Redaksjon Helgi Haraldsson, Steinar Kottum. Oslo: Kunnskapsforlaget. 1602 p.

SOSH, 1993. – Ozhegov, S.I., Shvedova, N.Yu. Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka. Moskva: AZЪ. 960 p. ISBN 5-85632-002-6

STEPANOV, Yu.S. 2001. Konstanty. Slovar russkoj kultury: 2-e izd., ispr. i dop. Moskva: Akademicheskij Proekt. 990 p. ISBN: 5-8291-0007-X

SVENSÉN, B. 1987. Handbok i lexikografi: Principer och metoder i ordboksarbete. Stockholm: Norstedts. 279 p. ISBN 91-7227-238-4

TOMAHIN, G.D. 1988. Realii-amerikanizmy: Posobie po stranovedeniju. Moskva: Vysshaja shkola. 239 p.

TMS, 2000. – Sajahova, L.G., Hasanova, D.M., Morkovkin, V.V. Tematicheskij slovar' russkogo jazyka / Pod red. prof. V.V. Morkovkina. Moskva: Russkij jazyk. 556 p. ISBN 5-200-01099-3

VERESHCHAGIN, E.M. – KOSTOMAROV V.G. 1973. Psihologicheskaja i metodicheskaja harakteristika dvujazychija (bilingvizma). Moskva : Izd-vo Mosk. un-ta. 160 p.

VERESHCHAGIN, E.M. – KOSTOMAROV V.G. 2005. Jazyk i kul'tura. Tri lingvostranovedcheskie koncepcii: leksicheskogo fona, reche-povedencheskih taktik i sapientemy / Pod red. i s poslesloviem akademika Yu.S. Stepanova. Moskva: «Indrik». 1040 p. ISBN5-85759-289-5

VLAHOV, S. – FLORIN, S. 1980. Neperevodimoe v perevode. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija. 343 p.

VUCHKOVA, V.C. 1984. Kulturno-konnotirovannaja leksika v slovare i v perevode (na materiale bolgarskogo i russkogo jazyka): Avtoref. kand. dis. Leningrad.

ZALEVSKAJA, A.A. 2000. Vvedenie v psiholingvistiku. Moskva: Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj gumanitarnyj un-t. 382 p. ISBN 5-7281-0282-4

ZGUSTA, L. 1971. Manual of Lexicography. Mouton; The Hague; Paris. 360 p.

ZHM, 1991. Akishina A.A., Kano H., Akishina T. E. Zhesty i mimika v russkoj rechi. Moskva: Russkij jazyk. 146 p. ISBN 978-5-209-02805-5

ZhMJap, 2001. Tumarkin, P.S. Zhesty i mimika v obshhenii japoncev. M.: Russkij jazyk. 64 p. ISBN 5-200-02787-X

Words: 9 104
Characters: 61 513 (34, 17 standard pages)

Prof. Olga Ivanishcheva, Ph.D
Department of Intercultural Communication,
Language Theory and Journalism
Murmansk State Humanities University
15, Kapitan Egorov Str.
183038 Murmansk
Russia
kafcj@mshu.edu.ru