
A long-awaited dictionary has at last been published, going beyond a glossary of lexicographic terms (cf. Robinson 1984) or a dictionary of a particular aspect of lexicography (cf. Cluver 1989). It is the first dictionary of basic lexicography terms. In 265 pages Burkhanov gives us a balanced view of the state of the art in dictionary form. It comprises terms typical of lexicographic work, including terms originally related to different linguistic disciplines.

The selection of the data is founded, as can be inferred from the bibliography (p. 267-285), on a solid basis. It covers publications over the last twenty years, deals with various aspects of the field and includes the most recent trends from the late eighties and the nineties, e.g. Bergenholtz and Tarp (1995), Bright (1992), Bussmann (1996), Cowie (1987), Cluver (1989), Diab (1990), Fillmore and Atkins (1992), Ilson (1991), Benson, Benson and Ilson (1986), Landau (1989), Hüllem (1990), Snell-Hornby (1990).

It is not difficult to find one's way in the dictionary: few symbols are used, most important of which are the ones indicating cross-references within the word-list. In this dictionary, though the arrangement of terms is alphabetical, conceptual relatedness between terms is not lost. Related terms are listed at the end of the explanatory text with the guide words "see also" and "compare". "See also" refers to superordinate and subordinate terms, e.g. in the lemma *lemmatization*:

> In lexicography, the term "lemmatization" is used to refer to the reduction of inflectional word forms to their *lemmata*, i.e. *basic forms*, and the elimination of *homography*. It is one of the major procedures of computational lexicography and computational linguistics in general (see *corpora analysis*) which attributes word forms to their *lexemes*. In practice, lemmatization involves the assignment of a uniform heading under which elements of the *corpora* containing the word forms of same *lexeme* are represented. Lemmatization procedures are a constituent of *concordancing programmes* intended to produce *concordances*, *reverse dictionaries*, and so on. [see also *corpora analysis*; *corpus*; *lemma*; *word form*].

A "compare" reference leads us to *co-hyponyms*, *antonyms* or otherwise associated forms of the same rank, e.g. in the lemma *complementarity*:

> The term "complementarity" is used in reference to a semantic relation-ship of opposition, particularly a lexical-semantic relation between pairs of *lexical items* called *complementaries* or *nongradable antonyms*. If two lexical items are complementaries, the negation of one implies the assertion of the other; for instance, 'John is not married' implies 'John is single'. [compare *nongradable antonym*; *converseness*; see also *antonymy*].

Therefore, what has been sacrificed in the alphabetical arrangement is almost
gained through the cross-references, which in a way represent a conceptual
system.

Within the entries there are references to:

(a) bibliographical sources to which the reader could refer, e.g. Denisov
(1977), Kipfer (1984), Wiegand (1989) in the lemma of entry,

(b) dictionaries, e.g. The Concise Oxford Synonym Dictionary (1995) in the en-
try for synonym, and

(c) the person who introduced the term, e.g. Landau (1989) in the entry for frequency label, Catford (1965) in the entry for co-text, and Trier (1931) in the entry for lexical field.

The dictionaries referred to are for English, French, German and Russian, and
many of them have been published recently (see Bibliography: 281-285), e.g.

On the whole, the cross-reference system is manageable and easy to use.
However, an alphabetical index of all terms contained in the dictionary,
including "see", "see also" and "compare" cross-references with page numbers,
should be included, e.g. in the lemma lexicographic description (p. 132), see mac-
restructure of a dictionary (p. 146), see also lexicographic investigation (p.
132); lexicographic presentation (p. 134), or in the lemma lexicographic investi-
gation (p. 132), see also lexicographic description (p. 132); compare lexicographic presentation (p. 134).

One of the advantages of the dictionary is its reference to Russian scholars
and their contributions, e.g. Morkovkin, Akhmanova, Apresyan, Mel'čuk,
Ufimceva, Smirnicky, Ščerba, Cyvin and Karaulov. More information on these
scholars is needed for non-Russian-speaking users of the dictionary and short
notes on their contributions could be included in a new edition.

In his definition of essential terms such as lexicography and lexicology,
Burkhanov gives a balanced, unbiased viewpoint. In lexicography, for example — which is a controversial term — he has highlighted different approaches:
the dictionary, Burkhanov sticks to his firm belief stated in the preface "not to
impose the author's ideas or only one, even predominant, viewpoint on the
intended audience, but to introduce the dictionary user into the heart of pres-
ent-day controversy".

All linguistic terms included are viewed from the standpoint of lexicographic theory and practice, e.g. descriptive approach: "Nowadays this term is
also implemented in reference to *lexicographic products* particularly *linguistic dictionaries and usage guides* (p. 61). In his definition of the term *target language*, which is borrowed from applied linguistics, he refers to its use in bilingual lexicography and the meaning it acquired: "In bilingual lexicography, the target language is the language whose translation equivalents are provided as definitions in the entries" (p. 239).

The terms he has chosen come from both the theoretical and practical aspects of lexicology: *synonym, antonymy, lexis, compound, thesaurus, idiom, collocation, collect, concordance, correction file, citation slip, back matter, frame, frequency label, front matter, etc.*

Typical of his lexicographic treatment is the term *monosemy*:

The term "monosemy" was coined by Bréal (1897) to designate a concept which is opposed to *polysemy*. Monosemy was originally thought to be solely a property of *lexemes*. Nowadays it is usually defined as follows. A *linguistic sign*, i.e. a *lexical item, a morpheme, or a syntactic structure*, is characterized by monosemy if it has only one *meaning*. [see also polysemous; homonymous; compare polysemy; homonymy].

Here he gives the origin of the term, a definition, its opposite, related terms, its present-day usage — all in a well-knit whole. As Picht and Draskau (1985: 62) advocate: "A term may not be viewed as an isolated unit in terminology. Its evaluation and elaboration should always be carried out within the conceptual system, which is in turn closely related to a special subject field or a discipline." This has been Burkhanov's approach throughout the dictionary and this is the strongest point in his dictionary, following sound terminological principles.

One of the assets of the dictionary is the comprehensive treatment of the meanings of the terms provided. Burkhanov provides us with sufficient information about the term, which is a great help to lexicography students, translators and terminologists. A good example is the term *paraphrase* (p. 169-170), whose meanings are given in Hartmann and Stork (1972) and Crystal (1991), but only from a linguistic point of view:

(a) Hartmann and Stork (1972)

**PARAPHRASE** The process or result of rewording an utterance from one level or variety of a language into another without altering the meaning, as opposed to → metaphrase or translation which converts the utterance into a different language. Some types of → language teaching make use of both paraphrasing and translation to develop the skills of expressing the same meaning in a number of different ways.

(b) Crystal (1991)

**paraphrase** A term used in *LINGUISTICS* for the result or process of producing alternative versions of a *sentence* or *text* without changing the
MEANING. One SENTENCE may have several paraphrases, e.g. The dog is eating a bone, A bone is being eaten by the dog, It’s the dog who is eating a bone, and so on. Most SEMANTIC theories would treat all these sentences as having a single semantic REPRESENTATION (though variations of FOCUS and PRESUPPOSITION could differentiate them.) Linguists use syntactic paraphrase as a major procedure for establishing certain types of TRANSFORMATIONAL relations. See Clark and Clark 1977: Ch. 1.

Burkhanov deals with the different concepts which are associated with the term and relevant to lexicographic description. He gives the meaning of the term in (a) its broad sense, (b) logic, (c) transformational generative grammar, and (d) linguistic semantics, as well as the influence of all these concepts, whether explicitly or implicitly, on the development of lexicography: "To give but one example, all of the aforementioned ways of paraphrasing the lexical meaning of a lexical item are implemented in monolingual lexicography; derivation is made use of in run-ins and run-ons; replacing a one-word lexical item with a semantically-equivalent word combination is applied in analytical definitions, etc. In metalexicography, the requirements for paraphrases in logic have been applied to the evaluation of the correlation between definiendum and definiens."

He also focuses on the present usage of terms and gives the main approaches to the description of lexicographic concepts, e.g. synonym dictionary. The term, according to Burkhanov, is used "to designate a large group of linguistic dictionaries". Therefore a synonym dictionary is "any reference work (whatever its title may be) of a wider range of philological dictionaries featuring semantic affinities between quasi-synonyms and other lexical items closely related in meaning". He includes analogical dictionaries and thesauri amongst these reference works and gives The Concise Oxford Thesaurus (1995) as an example.

In some of his definitions, Burkhanov refers to the relevant sense of the term in computational lexicography, e.g. senses 3 and 4 given on p. 14 of The Concise Oxford Thesaurus:

3. the meaning in computational lexicography as a reference work containing an alphabetized index of descriptors
4. a stored list of usually one-word lexical items intended to be consulted in the course of computer-writing

Though Burkhanov's definitions meet the requirements of precision, comprehensiveness and clarity (see Heliel 1987), some of them need to be reinforced by visual illustrations. Examples are:

(a) analogical dictionary where examples from Maquet's Dictionnaire analogique could have been supplied,
(b) *explanatory dictionary* where examples from Apresyan et al.'s *English-Russian Dictionary of Synonyms* could have been given, and

(c) *collocational dictionary* where examples from Benson's *BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations* could have been provided.

Other terms that need to be supplemented by examples from different dictionaries to serve as visual aids are: *subentry, run-on, subsense, user's guide, article*, etc.

There is no doubt that the goal of the author as stated in the preface and the functions he suggests for a terminological dictionary in a burgeoning field such as that of lexicography, has been achieved. Burkhanov has:

(a) formulated the basic concepts of the field and their systems, and

(b) specified the concepts which have been borrowed from linguistic and nonlinguistic disciplines and the modifications which those concepts have undergone before becoming part of lexicographical terminology.

His dictionary may be a positive step towards clarifying and perhaps standardizing many basic lexicographic terms. The dictionary will be an indispensable tool in the hands of its intended audience. Both undergraduate and postgraduate students doing a course in lexicography will treasure it as a guide presenting the basic concepts in the field in simple language and clear design.
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