

LEXICOGRAPHICA Series
Maior

LEXICOGRAPHICA

Series Maior

Supplementary Volumes to the International Annual for Lexicography
Suppléments à la Revue Internationale de Lexicographie
Supplementbände zum Internationalen Jahrbuch für Lexikographie

Edited by

Sture Allén, Pierre Corbin, Reinhard R. K. Hartmann,
Franz Josef Hausmann, Hans-Peder Kromann, Oskar Reichmann,
Ladislav Zgusta

43

Published in cooperation with the Dictionary Society of North America
(DSNA) and the European Association for Lexicography (EURALEX)

Symposium on Lexicography V

Proceedings of the Fifth International
Symposium on Lexicography May 3–5, 1990
at the University of Copenhagen

edited by
Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen and Arne Zettersten

Max Niemeyer Verlag
Tübingen 1992



Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Symposium on Lexicography <05, 1990, København>: Symposium on Lexicography V : proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Lexicography May 3 – 5, 1990 at the University of Copenhagen / ed. by Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen and Arne Zettersten. – Tübingen : Niemeyer, 1992

(Lexicographica : Series maior ; 43)

NE: Hyldgaard-Jensen, Karl [Hrsg.]; Københavns Universitet; Lexicographica / Series maior

ISBN 3-484-30943-1 ISSN 0175-9264

© Max Niemeyer Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, Tübingen 1992

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen. Printed in Germany.

Druck: Weihert-Druck GmbH, Darmstadt

Einband: Hugo Nädele, Nehren

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	
English	1
French	7
German	13
Joachim Mugdan	
On the Typology of Bilingual Dictionaries	17
Hans Kristian Mikkelsen	
What did Ščerba actually mean by "active" and "passive" Dictionaries?	25
Ulrich Heid	
Syntactic Information in (Machine) Translation Dictionaries - Towards a Modular Architecture for Bilingual Dictionaries	41
Klaus Schubert	
Lexicography, or Corpus-based Knowledge Acquisition?	81
Roda P. Roberts	
Methods of Bilingual Dictionary-Making: The Canadian Experience	91
Ilse Karl	
Ist die gleichartige Gestaltung von allgemeinen Bedeutungswörterbüchern verschiedener Sprachtypen erstrebenswert?	117
Albertas Steponavičius	
Basic Principles of an English-Lithuanian Dictionary of Idioms	131
Andreas F. Kelletat	
Wie kommen die Wörter ins Wörterbuch? Zur Makro-Struktur zweisprachiger Wörterbücher am Beispiel des Sprachenpaars Finnisch/Deutsch	143
Gregor Meder	
Zum Stand der deutsch-(serbo)kroatischen/ (servo)kroatisch-deutschen Lexikographie: Die wichtigsten Wörterbücher	159
Norman Shine	
Dictionaries for Specialised Languages. The Situation in Denmark Today	175

VI

Baldur Panzer	
Sellius' Vocabularium Russo-Germanicum	
und die frühe deutsch-russische Lexikographie	189
Sven-Göran Malmgren	
German-Swedish Lexicography	
in 18th Century Pomerania	201
Jørgen Erik Nielsen	
Svend Rosing, his "Engelsk-Dansk Ordbog" (1853),	
and Gyldendal	217
Inge Kabell / Hanne Lauridsen	
Charles Bertram (1723-1765): Language Teacher,	
Lexicographer and Impostor	227
Dieter Herberg	
Antonymische Beziehungen im Wortschatz	
und im Wörterbuch	245
Edward Gates	
Should a Dictionary Include only the "good" Words? ...	265
Gunnar Persson	
False and its Friends: Some Preliminary Observations	281
Bernhard Diensberg	
Lexical Change in the "Ancrene Riwe",	
with Special Consideration of the Romance and	
Scandinavian Loanwords	295
Jens Eric Mogensen	
Zur lexikographischen Beschreibung einiger inhalts-	
armer Verben im Deutschen	315
Anneliese Möller	
Zum Anteil von Wörterbüchern und Wörterverzeichnissen	
an der Ausprägung und Kodifizierung einer einheit-	
lichen graphischen Norm des Deutschen	331
Ulrich Busse	
Doppelformen von Anglizismen im Rechtschreib-DUDEN ...	341
Hans Peters	
On the Historical Development of English Boosters	373
Viggo Hjørnager Pedersen	
Center for Translation Studies. A Presentation	393
The Symposium on Lexicography 1990. List of Participants	397

APPENDIX

Broder Carstensen	
Die Lexikographie in der Informationsgesellschaft	401

Broder Carstensen	
Die Bedeutung der Lexikographie in der Informationsgesellschaft	402
Walter Voigt	
Einige Bemerkungen zur zweisprachigen Verlagslexikographie	405
Franz Josef Hausmann	
Die zweisprachigen Wörterbücher	408
Veronika Schnorr	
Lexikographie zwischen Theorie und Praxis	411
Herbert Ernst Wiegand	
Einsprachige Gebrauchswörterbücher - Verlagslexiko- graphie - akademische Wörterbuchforschung. Plädoyer für einen Diplomstudiengang zur Lexikographie	414
Günther Drosdowski	
Traum und Wirklichkeit	418
Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen	
Zusammenfassende Stellungnahme aus der Sicht eines ausländischen Germanisten	422

INTRODUCTION

The Fifth International Symposium on Lexicography at the University of Copenhagen, took place on May 3-5, 1990. The participants came from Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Great Britain, Iceland, India, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden. 30 papers were read in sections chaired by Broder Carstensen, Arne Zettersten, Hans-Peder Kromann, Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen, Viggo Hjørnager Pedersen, Dieter Herberg, Ulrich Heid, Ebba Hjorth, and Henning Bergenholtz.

At the main conference dinner, Professor Broder Carstensen, Paderborn, was elected Honorary member of the Copenhagen Symposium.

The main part of the programme was this time devoted to problems connected with bilingual lexicography. Joachim Mugdan (University of Münster) opened the symposium with a plenary lecture, "On the Typology of Bilingual Dictionaries". He criticized the differentiation of dictionaries hitherto adopted pleading for an extension of the list of dictionary functions to cover all four classical skills and multifunctional dictionaries which actually cater for the widest possible variety of user needs. An English summary is printed in this volume, the complete text "Zur Typologie zweisprachiger Wörterbücher", in Meder, Gregor/Dörner, Andreas (eds.): Worte, - Wörter - Wörterbücher (Lexicographica Series Maior).

Hans Christian Mikkelsen (Aarhus Business School) discusses the meaning of the terms "active" and "passive" dictionaries as-

cribed to the Russian linguist Ščerba. He concludes that Ščerba's concept of explanatory vs. translation dictionaries differs from the present distinction between active and passive dictionaries, which terms are not used by Ščerba in connection with dictionaries.

Ulrich Heid (University of Stuttgart) deals with much more than the title of his contribution "Syntactic Information in (Machine) Translation Dictionaries - towards a Modular Architecture for Bilingual Dictionaries" indicates. He surveys general problems of bilingual lexicography and argues for a modular system with typed feature structures developed by the Polygloss project, Bonn. As an example he describes the hierarchical lexical organisation of the syntactic properties of lexemes.

Klaus Schubert (BSO/Research, Utrecht) presents an approach to knowledge acquisition for machine translation purposes in which he attempts to automate part of the lexicographer's work. He outlines an application of this technique for an advanced form of computer aided lexicography.

Roda Roberts (University of Ottawa) outlines the methodological principles adopted in the Canadian project for a bidirectional bilingual English/French dictionary reflecting the Canadian usage.

Ilse Karl (Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin) tackles the delicate problem of using the same principle of description in dictionaries for languages belonging to different types of language, such as German and Chinese.

Albertas Stepanovičius (University of Vilnius) describes the history of multilingualism in Lithuania and the development of English-Lithuanian dictionary making, as well as the basic principles for a planned English-Lithuanian dictionary of idioms.

Andreas F. Kelletat (University of Vasa) discusses the distinction between linguistic and encyclopædic dictionaries. In his opinion this distinction cannot be maintained strictly in a bilingual dictionary but it is a question how much encyclopædic material should be included in the bilingual dictionary.

Gregor Meder (University of Essen) reviews existing German-(Serbo-) Croatian dictionaries pointing out special deficiencies in German/(Serbo-) Croatian lexicography to be remedied in future dictionaries of the kind.

Norman Shine (University of Copenhagen) surveys the situation in Denmark as regards dictionaries for special purposes.

Some papers dealt with older bilingual lexicography. In connection with his publication of "Sellius' Vocabularium Russo-Germanicum", Baldur Panzer (University of Heidelberg) surveys early German-Russian lexicography, whilst Sven-Göran Malmgren (University of Gothenburg) traces the influence of early German, especially Low-German lexicography, on the first Swedish-German dictionaries in 18th-century Pomerania.

Older Danish lexicographers are treated by Jørgen E. Nielsen (University of Copenhagen), who describes the genesis of the famous Gyldendal dictionaries, Danish-English and English-Danish, dealing at length with the works of Svend Rosing, and by Inge Kabell/Hanne Lauridsen (University of Copenhagen) who investigate the background of the Danish-English lexicographer Charles Bertram.

The second part of the programme comprised papers dealing with problems of general lexicographic interest.

Dieter Herberg (Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin) draws attention to the importance of antonymic relations in language and in lexicography and offers a suggestion as to how to im-

prove the systematic description of these relations in dictionaries.

In "Should a Dictionary include only the "Good" Words?", Edward Gates (University of Regensburg) discusses the conflicting views as to the inclusion of (potentially) morally objectionable words in general monolingual dictionaries.

As an alternative to the traditional lexicographic method of paraphrasing words as false in terms of near-synonyms, Gunnar Persson (University of Umeå) recommends a classification based on the gestalt analysis adopted by Lakoff and Johnson.

Berhard Diensberg (University of Tromsø) examines how far lexical change in Middle English has been taken into account and recorded in MED and OED.

Jens E. Mogensen (University of Copenhagen) criticises in his contribution "Zur lexikographischen Beschreibung inhaltsarmer Verben im deutschen" the presentation of these verbs in valence dictionaries of verbs, finding that they should be excluded and instead treated in valence dictionaries of nouns.

Anneliese Möller (University of Rostock) examines the role dictionaries have played for the establishment of a uniform German orthography.

Ulrich Busse (University of Paderborn) describes in "Doppelformen von Anglizismen im Rechtschreib-Duden" the changing ratio of these forms from the end of the 19th century to the present day.

Hans Peters (Freie Universität, Berlin) scrutinizes the historical development of English boosters, a special category of degree adverbs. He states that alphabetically organized dictionaries are of little help and looks forward to the publication of the Historical Thesaurus of the English language.

Viggo Hjørnager Pedersen (University of Copenhagen) presents the activities of the Center for Translation Studies and Lexicography at the University of Copenhagen.

In the appendix "Die Bedeutung der Lexicographie in der Informationsgesellschaft", Broder Carstensen publishes the papers read at the 1990 conference of the German association AnGeRo (Anglisten-, Germanisten- und Romanistenverbände) by Broder Carstensen, Walter Voigt, Franz Josef Hausmann, Veronika Schnorr, Herbert Ernst Wiegand, Günter Drosdowski und Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen.

Acknowledgements: The editors wish to thank the authors of the contributions for placing their manuscripts at our disposal and all participants, old friends and newcomers, for joining the symposium. We are indebted for financial support to the Danish Research Council for the Humanities, Einar Hansen's Forskningsfond, the Center for Translation Studies and Lexicography, and the Faculty of the Humanities, Copenhagen University, and we cordially thank the Gyldendal Publishing House and the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany in Denmark for grants to the social frame of the symposium.

Copenhagen, May 1990

The editors

INTRODUCTION

Le Cinquième Symposium International de Lexicographie organisé par l'Université de Copenhague s'est tenu du 3 au 5 mai 1990. Les participants venaient des pays suivants: Autriche, Bulgarie, Canada, Danemark, Finlande, France, Grande-Bretagne, Inde, Islande, Lituanie, Norvège, Pays-Bas, République Démocratique Allemande, République Fédérale d'Allemagne, Suède. Trente communications ont été faites dans des sections présidées par Broder Carstensen, Arne Zettersten, Hans-Peder Kromann, Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen, Viggo Hjørnager Pedersen, Dieter Herberg, Ulrich Heid, Ebba Hjorth et Henning Bergenholtz.

La majeure partie du programme de ce symposium a été cette fois consacrée aux problèmes concernant la lexicographie bilingue. Le symposium s'est ouvert sur une séance plénière, où Joachim Mugdan (Université de Münster) a pris la parole. Dans sa communication, "On the Typology of Bilingual Dictionaries", le conférencier a critiqué la différenciation qu'on a établie jusqu'à présent entre les dictionnaires, et il a préconisé qu'on élargisse la liste des fonctions dictionnairiques de sorte qu'elle englobe les quatre vertus traditionnelles et des dictionnaires multifonctionnels qui répondent réellement aux besoins les plus variés des usagers. Un résumé en anglais est publié dans le présent volume. Le texte intégral, "Zur Typologie zweisprachiger Wörterbücher", figure dans Meder, Gregor/Dörner, Andreas (éd).: Worte - Wörter - Wörterbücher (Lexicographica Series Maior).

Hans Kristian Mikkelsen (Ecole Supérieure de Commerce de Aarhus) approfondit le sens des termes "dictionnaires actifs" et "dictionnaires passifs", dont on attribue la paternité au linguiste

russe Ščerba. Il conclut en disant que le concept, établi par Ščerba, des dictionnaires "explicatifs" par opposition aux dictionnaires "traductifs" diffère de la distinction qu'on fait aujourd'hui entre dictionnaires actifs et dictionnaires passifs, termes que Ščerba n'utilise pas en relation avec des dictionnaires.

Ulrich Heid (Université de Stuttgart) va plus loin que ne l'indique le titre de sa communication, "Syntactic Information in (Machine) Translation Dictionaries - towards a Modular Architecture for Bilingual Dictionaries". Il se penche sur des problèmes d'ordre général en lexicographie bilingue et argumente en faveur d'un système modulaire à partir de structures caractéristiques développées par le projet Polygloss, Bonn. Comme exemple, il décrit l'organisation lexicale hiérarchique des propriétés syntaxiques des lexèmes.

Klaus Schubert (BSO/Research, Utrecht) présente une approche d'acquisition de savoir pour les besoins de la traduction par machine, dans laquelle il s'efforce d'automatiser une partie du travail du lexicographe. Il esquisse une application de cette technique à une forme avancée de lexicographie assistée par ordinateur.

Roda Roberts (Université d'Ottawa) définit les principes méthodologiques mis en oeuvre pour le projet canadien d'un dictionnaire bilingue bidirectionnel anglais-français, reflétant l'usage de la langue au Canada.

Ilse Karl (Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin) aborde le délicat problème qui consiste en l'emploi du même principe descriptif dans des dictionnaires de langues appartenant à des types linguistiques différents comme l'allemand et le chinois.

Albertas Stepanovičius (Université de Vilnius) relate d'abord l'histoire du plurilinguisme en Lituanie et le développement de la confection d'un dictionnaire anglais-lituanien, puis il

expose les principes fondamentaux d'un dictionnaire d'idiomes anglais-lituanien mis en projet.

Andreas F. Kelletat (Université de Vasa, Finlande) traite de la distinction entre dictionnaires de langue et encyclopédies. Selon lui, cette distinction ne peut être strictement observée dans un dictionnaire bilingue. Mais il s'agit de savoir quelle quantité de matériaux encyclopédiques doit être incluse dans un dictionnaire bilingue.

Gregor Meder (Université d'Essen) passe en revue les dictionnaires allemand-(serbo-)croate existants, en insistant sur des lacunes et des défauts spécifiques dans la lexicographie allemand-(serbo-)croate auxquels il faudra porter remède dans les futurs dictionnaires de ce genre.

Norman Shine (Université de Copenhague) présente un tableau des dictionnaires de langues de spécialités au Danemark.

Quelques communications ont porté sur la lexicographie bilingue dans le passé. En rapport avec sa publication du "Sellius' Vocabularium Russo-Germanicum", Baldur Panzer (Université de Heidelberg) se penche sur la toute première lexicographie allemand-russe, tandis que Sven-Göran Malmgren (Université de Göteborg) relève l'influence du vieux allemand, et particulièrement de la lexicographie basse allemande, dans les premiers dictionnaires suédois-allemand publiés en Poméranie au XVIII^e siècle.

D'anciens lexicographes danois sont passés en revue par Jørgen E. Nielsen (Université de Copenhague), qui relate la genèse des fameux dictionnaires danois-anglais et anglais-danois de chez Gyldendal pour terminer par les ouvrages de Svend Rosing, et par Inge Kabell et Hanne Lauridsen (Université de Copenhague), qui étudient le "background" du lexicographe dano-anglais Charles Bertram.

La seconde partie du programme s'est composée de communications portant sur des problèmes d'intérêt général en lexicographie.

Dieter Herberg (Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin) attire l'attention sur l'importance des relations antonymiques dans la langue et la lexicographie, et il suggère la façon dont on peut étendre la description systématique de ces relations dans les dictionnaires.

Dans "Should a Dictionary include only the "Good" Words?", Edward Gates (Université de Regensburg) expose les points de vue qui sont source de conflit lorsqu'il s'agit d'inclure des termes pouvant être moralement condamnables dans des dictionnaires généraux monolingues.

Comme solution de rechange au traitement lexicographique traditionnel appliqué aux mots paraphrastiques du genre faux-amis en matière de quasi-synonymes, Gunnar Persson (Université de Umeå) préconise une classification reposant sur l'analyse gestaltienne adoptée par Lakoff et Johnson.

Bernhard Diensberg (Université de Tromsø) examine à quel degré l'évolution lexicale en moyen anglais a été prise en compte et enregistrée dans MED et OED.

Dans sa communication, "Zur lexikographischen Beschreibung inhaltsarmer Verben im Deutschen", Jens E. Mogensen (Université de Copenhague) critique la présentation de ces verbes dans les dictionnaires valenciels de verbes, et il estime qu'ils devraient en être écartés pour être traités dans les dictionnaires valenciels de noms.

Anneliese Möller (Université de Rostock) étudie le rôle qu'ont joué les dictionnaires dans l'établissement d'une orthographe unifiée en allemand.

Ulrich Busse (Université de Paderborn), dans sa communication, "Doppelformen von Anglizismen im Rechtschreib-Duden", décrit l'évolution de ces formes depuis la fin du XIX^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours.

Hans Peters (Freie Universität, Berlin) étudie de près le développement historique des "boosters" en anglais, une catégorie spéciale d'adverbes d'intensité. Il constate que les dictionnaires ordonnés alphabétiquement sont d'une aide minime et il attend avec impatience la publication du Historical Thesaurus of the English language.

Viggo Hjørnager Pedersen (Université de Copenhague) trace un tableau des activités du Centre de Théorie de la Traduction et de Lexicographie de l'Université de Copenhague.

Dans l'appendice "Die Bedeutung der Lexikographie in der Informationsgesellschaft", Broder Carstensen (Université de Paderborn) rapporte les communications faites en 1990 à la conférence de l'association germanique AnGeRo (Anglisten-, Germanisten- und Romanistenverbände) par Broder Carstensen, Walter Voigt, Franz Josef Hausmann, Veronika Schnorr, Herbert Ernst Wiegand, Günther Drosdowski et Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen.

Remerciements:

Les éditeurs tiennent à remercier les auteurs de communications qui ont bien voulu leur confier leur manuscrit aux fins de publication ainsi que tous les membres du groupe lexicographique qui ont participé au symposium. Nous sommes redevables, pour leur soutien financier, au C.N.R.S. danois (Statens Humanistiske Forskningsråd), à la Fondation pour l'encouragement de la recherche Einar Hansen, au Centre de Théorie de la Traduction et de Lexicographie de l'Université de Copenhague, et à la Faculté des Lettres de cette même université. Nous remercions cordialement la maison d'édition Gyldendal et Son Excellence, l'Ambassadeur de la République Fédérale d'Allemagne, d'avoir, par leur générosité, assuré le cadre social à ce symposium.

VORWORT

Das 5. internationale Symposium über Lexikographie der Universität Kopenhagen fand in der Zeit vom 3. bis 5. Mai 1990 mit Teilnehmern aus Bulgarien, Deutschland, Dänemark, Finnland, Frankreich, Grossbritannien, Island, Kanada, Litauen, den Niederlanden, Norwegen, Österreich und Schweden statt. 30 Referate wurden in zwei Sektionen gehalten.

Im Zentrum des Interesses stand diesmal die zweisprachige Lexikographie. Joachim Mugdan eröffnete das Symposium mit dem Plenarvortrag "On the Typology of Bilingual Dictionaries", in dem er die bisher benutzte Differenzierung der Wörterbücher kritisierte und für eine Erweiterung der Zahl der Wörterbuchfunktionen plädierte, die sämtliche vier klassische Fertigkeiten einschliessen würde, und für multifunktionelle Wörterbücher, die tatsächlich die grösstmögliche Berücksichtigung der Benutzerbedürfnisse gewährleisten, eintrat.

Hans Kristian Mikkelsen untersucht eingehend die Bedeutung der beiden Termini "aktive" und "passive" Wörterbücher, die dem russischen Linguisten Ščerba zugeschrieben werden. Er gelangt zu der Schlussfolgerung, dass die Differenzierung Ščerbas zwischen "erklärenden" und "übersetzenden" Wörterbüchern nicht mit der heute gebräuchlichen Distinktion zwischen "aktiven" und "passiven" Wörterbüchern zusammenfällt.

Der Beitrag Ulrich Heids "Syntactic Information in (Machine) Translation Dictionaries - towards a Modular Architecture for Bilingual Dictionaries" umfasst weit mehr als das was der Titel andeutet. In Wirklichkeit durchmustert Heid hier die ganze Problematik der zweisprachigen Lexikographie, wobei er für die Einführung eines Modulsystems mit "typed feature structures",

das von dem Polygloss Projekt in Bonn entwickelt wurde, argumentiert. Zur Illustration des Systems beschreibt er den hierarchischen lexikalischen Aufbau der syntaktischen Eigenschaften von Lexemen. In "Lexicography or Corpus-based Knowledge Acquisition" schildert Klaus Schubert eine im BSO/Research, Utrecht entwickelte Methode zum Kenntniserwerb mittels des Computers, die darauf hinausläuft, die Arbeit des Lexikographen optimal zu automatisieren.

Roda Roberts gibt eine Übersicht über die methodischen Prinzipien, die dem kanadischen Projekt "The Bilingual Canadian Dictionary", das den kanadischen Gebrauch des Englischen und des Französischen kontrastiv verzeichnet, zugrundegelegt wurden. Ilse Karl fragt, ob man bei grosser typologischer Divergenz der beiden zu vergleichenden Sprachen - in casu Deutsch und Chinesisch - im bilingualen Wörterbuch die gleichen Beschreibungsprinzipien verwenden kann.

Albertas Stepanovičius skizziert zum einen die Geschichte der litauischen Lexikographie, zum anderen die Hauptprinzipien für ein geplantes englisch/litauisches idiomatisches Wörterbuch, während Andreas F. Kelletat das Problem der Berücksichtigung enzyklopädischen Stoffes in dem linguistischen bilingualen Wörterbuch diskutiert

Gregor Meder durchmustert die vorhandenen deutsch-(serbo)kroatischen Wörterbücher, wobei er auf gewisse Mängel aufmerksam macht, denen in künftigen Wörterbuchprojekten abgeholfen werden sollte. Über den heutigen Stand der dänisch-englischen Fachwörterbücher in Dänemark berichtet Norman Shine.

Eine Reihe von Referaten behandelten Teile der älteren zweisprachigen Lexikographie: In Verbindung mit seiner Edition von "Selsius' Vocabularium Russo-Germanicum" gibt Baldur Panzer eine Übersicht über die frühe deutsch-russische Lexikographie, während Sven-Göran Malmgren dem Einfluss der frühen deutschen, besonders niederdeutschen Lexikographie auf die ersten deutsch-schwedischen Wörterbücher im Pommern des 18. Jahrhunderts nachgeht.

Ältere dänische Lexikographen behandeln Jörgen E. Nielsen, der die Entstehung der berühmten Gyldendal-Wörterbücher für Dänisch/Englisch beschreibt, und Inge Kabell/Hanne Lauridsen, die das wechselnde Schicksal des dänisch-englischen Lexikographen Charles Bertram verfolgen.

Den zweiten Teil des Programms machten Referate, die Probleme der allgemeinen unilingualen Lexikographie aufgriffen, aus. Dieter Herberg macht auf die Rolle aufmerksam, die antonymische Beziehungen in der Sprache und in der Lexikographie spielen, und legt einen Vorschlag zur systematischen Beschreibung dieser Beziehungen in Wörterbüchern vor. In "Should a Dictionary include only the "Good" Words?" diskutiert Edward Gates die kontrover-sielle Frage, ob unanständige Wörter ins Wörterbuch aufgenommen werden sollen.

Als eine Alternative zur traditionellen lexikographischen Methode, Adjektive wie eng. false durch sinnverwandte Wörter zu paraphrasieren, empfiehlt Gunnar Persson eine auf der von Lakoff & Johnson angewandten Gestaltanalyse basierende Klassifizierung. Bernhard Diensberg untersucht, inwieweit lexikalische Entwicklungen im Mittelenglischen von dem MED und OED berücksichtigt und registriert wurden.

Jens E. Mogensen findet, dass die lexikalische Beschreibung inhaltsarmer Verben im Deutschen nicht in das Verbvalenzwörterbuch gehört, sondern in das Wörterbuch der Valenz der Substantive.

Anneliese Möller weist nach, welche Rolle die deutschen Wörterbücher für die Heranbildung einer einheitlichen Orthographie des Deutschen gespielt haben, während Ulrich Busse in "Doppelformen von Anglizismen im Rechtschreib-Duden" die wechselnde Dominanz dieser Formen vom Anfang des 19. Jhs. bis heute beschreibt.

Hans Peters analysiert die historische Entwicklung der sog. boosters im Englischen, und abschliessend stellt Viggo Hjørnager Pedersen das Center for Translation Studies and Lexicography der Universität Kopenhagen vor.

Im Appendix "Die Bedeutung der Lexikographie in der Informationsgesellschaft" publiziert Broder Carstensen die Referate, die 1990 auf der gleichnamigen Fachkonferenz der AnGeRo (Anglisten-, Germanisten- und Romanistenverbände Deutschlands) in Bonn gehalten wurden. Unter den Referenten waren Vertreter der Universitäten und der Verlage, die u.a. zu Themen wie Theorie und Praxis der Lexikographie, Verlagslexikographie versus Universitätslexikographie, Ausbildung der Lexikographen Stellung nahmen.

Die Herausgeber danken sehr herzlich den Autoren für ihre Bereitschaft, die Manuskripte ihrer Beiträge für den Druck zur Verfügung zu stellen, sowie den Mitgliedern unserer Forschergruppe für ihre aktive Teilnahme an dem Symposium. Wir sind auch dem Dänischen humanistischen Forschungsrat, der Humanistischen Fakultät der Universität Kopenhagen und Einar Hansens Forschungsfond für die finanzielle Unterstützung der Veranstaltung sowie dem Gyldendal Verlag und dem Botschafter der Bundesrepublik Deutschland für Beiträge zu den Rahmenveranstaltungen sehr zu Dank verpflichtet.

Kopenhagen, im Mai 1990

Die Herausgeber

Joachim Mugdan

ON THE TYPOLOGY OF BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES*

1. "Active" vs. "Passive": A Reappraisal

In bilingual lexicography, it has become commonplace to contrast "active" and "passive" dictionaries or dictionary functions according to the following scheme (cf. Löttsch & al. 1983-84:VII, Hausmann 1977:56-58, Kromann/Rieber/Rosbach 1984:185):

dictionary	source lg.	target lg.	purpose
active	native	foreign	production, encoding, <i>Hinübersetzung</i>
passive	foreign	native	reception, decoding, <i>Herübersetzung</i>

Table 1

This distinction is often attributed to Lev Vladimirovic Ščerba (1880-1944), who maintained that

"for each pair of languages, four dictionaries are needed - definitely two explanatory foreign-language dictionaries with explanations in the mother tongue of the user of the respective dictionary and, depending on actual needs, two dictionaries of a special kind [...] for translating from the mother tongue into the foreign language." (Ščerba 1974[1940]: 303, transl. J.M.)

* This is a revised summary of my contribution to the symposium. I have discussed the topic in more detail in "Zur Typologie zweisprachiger Wörterbücher", to appear in: Meder, Gregor / Dörner, Andreas (eds.), *Worte - Wörter - Wörterbücher: Lexikographische Beiträge zum Essener Linguistischen Kolloquium 1982-1987*, Tübingen: Niemeyer (Lexicographica Series Maior).

Ščerba emphasized that a Russian-French dictionary for speakers of Russian must be quite different from one for French-speaking users, but what he had in mind was not the *active/passive* dichotomy as we know it today (and he did not apply these terms to dictionaries either). While his "dictionaries of a special kind for translating from the mother tongue into the foreign language" can be identified with the active type, the explanatory dictionaries should not be mistaken for passive translation dictionaries - to which Ščerba objected. In his opinion, lists of translation equivalents give an inadequate impression of the true meaning of a word and therefore do not help the user to fully understand the foreign text. Ideally, he felt, the student of a foreign language should work with a monolingual explanatory dictionary. (In the Russian tradition, the term *explanatory dictionary* [*tolkovyj slovar'*] refers to a work which provides explanations of meanings; the word *definition* is inappropriate in this context, cf. Wiegand 1985.) Ščerba realized, however, that this might be too difficult for users with little competence in the foreign language. The idea of designing special monolingual dictionaries for learners did not occur to him; instead, he proposed a bilingual dictionary which explains the meanings of the foreign words in the user's mother tongue without necessarily offering translation equivalents. Essentially, these explanations could correspond to those in a monolingual dictionary. (In Bielfeldt's *Russisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch* of 1958, the best-known representative of the explanatory type, one finds many translations of the explanations in a monolingual Russian dictionary, Ožegov 1952.)

According to Ščerba,

"the fundamental rule of foreign language teaching methodology is never to translate from the mother tongue but to try and think in the foreign language as far as one's knowledge of it permits." (Ščerba 1974[1939]:307)

This is why he attached so much importance to a correct understanding of the foreign text, assuming that "anyone who has understood a book can also choose the words for a translation if he needs one" (Ščerba 1974[1939]:307). The fundamental rule led him to the conclusion that, theoretically, bilingual

dictionaries for translating from the mother tongue (L₁) into the foreign language (L₂) are unnecessary and undesirable.

"If need be, one should resort to large foreign explanatory dictionaries with rich phraseology: there one will always find models for one's own foreign utterances." (Ščerba 1974 [1939]:307)

Ščerba recognized, however, that (due to bad teaching methods) most students have a poor command of the foreign language, and he therefore saw a need for special translation dictionaries of what we would now call the active type.

In the typology of dictionaries by Duda & al. (1986:5f), Ščerba's explanatory dictionary is taken into account:

dictionary	source lg.	target lg.	purpose
active translation dict.	native	foreign	text production
passive translation dict.	foreign	native	text production
explanatory dict.	foreign	native	text reception

Table 2

It should be noted that *production* and *reception* are not used in the same sense as in Table 1. There, the terms apply to the foreign language; here, any activity which results in a new text (in either language) is called *production*. Of course, translation always involves reception in one language and production in another. In this respect, the classification in Table 2 is not quite convincing. Moreover, it fails to mention dictionaries which are intended to aid the user in producing utterances in the foreign language without translating from the mother tongue - an activity explicitly mentioned by Ščerba. The list of dictionary functions must therefore be revised so as to include all of the classical "four skills":

-
- (a) understanding a text in the foreign language without translation into the mother tongue (reception in L₂)
 - (b) translating a text from the foreign language (L₂) into the mother tongue (reception in L₂, production in L₁)
 - (c) creating a text in the foreign language without a model in the mother tongue (production in L₂)
 - (d) translating a text from the mother tongue into the foreign language (reception in L₁, production in L₂)
-

Table 3

2. Multifunctional Dictionaries

A dictionary can serve more than one of the four functions shown in Table 3. The explanatory bilingual dictionary (function (a)) and the passive translation dictionary (function (b)) are easiest to combine. Hausmann (1977:145f) describes "understanding" and "translating from the foreign language" (*Herübersetzung*) as the two functions of a "reading dictionary" (*Lesewörterbuch*, a somewhat misleading term), and most L₂-L₁ dictionaries exhibit features of both types (cf. also Duda & al. 1986:23). Just as a monolingual dictionary can often satisfactorily explain meanings by means of synonyms, it is perfectly acceptable to resort to translation equivalents in an explanatory bilingual dictionary. In Ščerba's view, they are suitable "in all cases where this simplifies the explanation and is in no way detrimental to a full understanding of the true nature of the foreign word" (1974[1940]:301), and Bielfeldt often uses them in his explanatory Russian-German dictionary (1958). Similarly, passive translation dictionaries frequently supplement translation equivalents by paraphrases or other comments in order to disambiguate them. This may be necessary, for instance, if the L₂ equivalent has a wider meaning than the L₁ item (e.g. *mormor* - (*maternal*) *grandmother* in a Swedish-English dictionary) or if the user cannot be expected to be familiar with it (e.g. *cariún* - *gelding* (horse) in an Irish-English dictionary).

We should remember, however, that understanding a foreign text and translating it into the mother tongue are different tasks - a dictionary which serves one of these functions does not automatically serve the other as well. Hausmann may be right that a series of equivalents should "in principle" suffice to clarify the meaning of a word (1977:56), but when one looks at actual dictionaries with such mysterious translations as "passable; omissible" (for Lithuanian *praleidžiamas*), Ščerba's scepticism appears to be more realistic. Obviously, understanding is a necessary precondition for correct translation. On the other hand, it is not sufficient. Ščerba's

belief that one can think of a suitable equivalent once one has understood the foreign word was rather naive: If a dictionary explains the Russian word *ocěski* as "what remains when you comb or hackle", a speaker of English will understand what it means - but will he know that the English equivalent is *combing*s? A good passive translation dictionary will therefore have to be explanatory as well, while the usefulness of an explanatory dictionary can be substantially enhanced if it also offers suitable translation equivalents.

Some lexicographers have suggested that the relationship between the tasks (c) and (d) in Table 3 (free production in L₂ and translation from L₁ into L₂) is parallel to that between (a) and (b). Hausmann (1977:145f) ascribes both functions to a "writing dictionary" (*Schreibwörterbuch*), Löttsch & al. (1983-84:VII) claim that "active" dictionaries can be helpful in using the foreign language or (*bzw.*) translating into it. It should be clear, however, that if we really try to "think in the foreign language", we typically consult a dictionary in order to check our assumptions about the spelling, pronunciation and/or meaning of an L₂ item that comes to mind or to find out more about its grammatical properties, collocations etc. If, for instance, a speaker of German wants to employ the English word *different* but is not sure which preposition comes after it, a translation dictionary of the active type, which might provide the information under the German entries *verschieden*, *unterschiedlich* or *anders*, would obviously be less suitable than a dictionary with English lemmas - be it a monolingual (learner's) dictionary or a bilingual dictionary with English as the source language.

It is thus not the active but the passive translation dictionary (or explanatory dictionary) which can be used for production in L₂ if it provides the required phonological, morphological, syntactic information etc. about the source language items. Interestingly, the planned passive Russian-German dictionary described in Duda & al. (1986) is to contain such information, which is quite superfluous for the primary "passive" function. The only exception seems to be information on inflection: The authors assume that a user who finds an

inflected Russian word in a text can normally determine the corresponding citation form; if the dictionary indicates the inflection pattern, he can check his assumptions (cf. Duda & al. 1986:53). A much better method would be to explain how to derive citation forms from others in the paradigm (cf. Mugdan 1989:736f) and to enter cross-references to the appropriate lemma for all forms to which the general rules do not apply. Principal parts or paradigm numbers after the lemmas are therefore not required in a genuine passive translation dictionary. Although Duda & al. (1986:24) assume that the users of their dictionary will have questions about the pronunciation, the grammatical properties or the collocations of certain Russian words, they fail to notice that such questions are most likely to arise in the course of producing a Russian text without a German model - they justify the inclusion of the relevant information with their "descriptive intentions" (1986:23), whatever that may mean.

We have seen that an L₂-L₁ dictionary can help speakers of L₁ with three of the four tasks, (a) - (c). For speakers of L₂, a dictionary with L₂ as the source language and L₁ as the target language could only serve function (d), translation from the mother tongue into the foreign language. A combination of an active translation dictionary for one speech community with a passive/explanatory dictionary for the other may at first sight appear to be a step in the wrong direction. But upon closer examination, it turns out that most of the demands the two kinds of dictionaries should meet (cf. Kromann/Riiber/Rosbach 1984) are compatible with each other. For instance, both the lemmas and the equivalents can be accompanied by phonological or morphological data - the problem of space limitations can be overcome if the information is restricted to irregularities (the regular cases being covered by a general statement in the introduction or a grammatical sketch).

Occasionally, there seems to be a danger of unnecessary repetition if features of active and passive dictionaries are combined. Thus, meaning discrimination in the source language is essential in an active dictionary, as in the following English-Spanish example from Kromann/Riiber/Rosbach (1984:201):

race (contest of speed) *carrera*;
(subdivision of mankind) *raza*.

Since *carrera* and *raza* also have other meanings ('running pace' and 'split, crack', respectively) they must be disambiguated in a passive dictionary; Kromann/Riiber/Rosbach (1984:201) suggest:

race (pugna de velocidad) *carrera*;
(subdivisión del género humano) *raza*.

A combination of the two entries (with the explanation after the equivalent, which seems to be more appropriate) would result in:

race (contest of speed) *carrera* (pugna de velocidad);
(subdivision of mankind) *raza* (subdivisión del género humano).

Here, the disambiguating gloss "pugna de velocidad" appears to repeat the information provided by the meaning discriminator "contest of speed" (although it serves a different purpose and stands in an implicit opposition to "paso del que corre" rather than "subdivisión del género humano"). It could be omitted if the entry contained several equivalents which disambiguate each other.

In other cases, the principle that the metalanguage of an active dictionary must be the source language and that of a passive dictionary the target language should not pose any serious problems either. For example, it seems to matter very little whether abbreviations of subject-field labels are based on one language or the other if they are explained in both (especially if internationalisms are available, such as English *phys[ics]*, German *Phys[ik]*, French *phys[ique]* etc.).

Ščerba's considerations and the more recent work on the typology of bilingual dictionaries suggest that, ideally, a dictionary should be designed for one speech community - but for many language pairs (such as Lithuanian-English, Serbocroat-German, Bambara-French), this will not be feasible. One should therefore try to develop a reference work which - unlike the many that claim to be "universal" but inconsistently mix features of active and passive dictionaries - actually caters for the widest possible variety of user needs.

3. References

- Bielfeldt H[ans] H[olm] (1958): *Russisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Berlin [DDR]: Akademie-Verlag
- Duda, Walter / Frenzel, Maria / Wöllner, Egon / Zimmermann, Tatjana (1986): *Zu einer Theorie der zweisprachigen Lexikographie: Überlegungen zu einem neuen russisch-deutschen Wörterbuch*. Berlin [DDR]: Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Zentralinstitut für Sprachwissenschaft (Linguistische Studien, Reihe A: Arbeitsberichte 142)
- Hausmann, Franz Josef (1977): *Einführung in die Benutzung der neufranzösischen Wörterbücher*. Tübingen: Niemeyer (Romanistische Arbeitshefte 19)
- Kromann, Hans-Peder / Riiber, Theis / Rosbach, Poul (1984): "Überlegungen zu Grundfragen der zweisprachigen Lexikographie." In: Wiegand, Herbert Ernst (ed.), *Studien zur neuhochdeutschen Lexikographie V*. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Olms (= *Germanistische Linguistik* 3-6/84), 159-238
- Löttsch, Ronald and collective (1983-84): *Deutsch-Russisches Wörterbuch*. 3 vols. Berlin [DDR]: Akademie-Verlag
- Mugdan, Joachim (1989): "Grundzüge der Konzeption einer Wörterbuchgrammatik". In: Hausmann, Franz Josef / Reichmann, Oskar / Wiegand, Herbert Ernst / Zgusta, Ladislav (eds.), *Wörterbücher - Dictionaries - Dictionnaires: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie - An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography - Encyclopédie internationale de lexicographie*. Vol. I. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 5.1), 732-749
- Ožegov, Sergej Ivanovič (1952): *Slovar' russkogo jazyka*. 2nd edition. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyh i nacional'nych slovarej
- Ščerba, Lev Vladimirovič (1974): *Jazykovaja sistema i rečevaja dejatel'nost'*, ed. L. R. Zinder / M. I. Matusevič. Leningrad: Nauka
- Ščerba, Lev Vladimirovič (1974[1939]): "Predislovie [k Russko-francuzskomu slovarju]." In Ščerba (1974:304-312) [originally in: Ščerba, Lev Vladimirovič / Matusevič, Margarita Ivanovna (1939): *Russko-francuzskij slovar'*, 2nd ed. Moskva]
- Ščerba, Lev Vladimirovič (1974[1940]): "Opyt obščej teorii leksikografii." In Ščerba (1974:265-304) [originally in: *Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR, Otdelenie literatury i jazyka* 1940.3, 89-117]
- Wiegand, Herbert Ernst (1985): "Eine neue Auffassung der sog. lexikographischen Definition". In: Hyldgaard-Jensen, Karl / Zettersten, Arne (eds.), *Symposium on Lexicography II. Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Lexicography May 16-17, 1984 at the University of Copenhagen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer (Lexicographica Series Maior 5), 15-100

Hans Kristian Mikkelsen

"WHAT DID ŠCERBA ACTUALLY MEAN BY "ACTIVE" AND "PASSIVE" DICTIONARIES?"

1. Introduction

In the present paper I intend to draw attention to the use of the terms "active" and "passive" in connection with dictionaries. In article 285 (= Kromann/Riiber/Rosbach in print) in the not yet published volume two of the International Encyclopedia of Lexicography, active and passive dictionaries are defined in the following way: "By an active dictionary, then, we understand a monofunctional L1>L2 dictionary; by a passive dictionary, a monofunctional L2>L1 dictionary." - where "L1" stands for native language, "L2" for foreign language, and "monofunctional" for the aiming of the dictionary at the speakers of only one of the languages in question. In short, active dictionaries are used to translate from the native to the foreign language, while passive ones serve the opposite function, to translate from foreign to native language.

In establishing the active/passive typology as a central concept of bilingual lexicography the authors rely on Smolik 1969, but the mere idea of distinguishing between L1 and L2 stems from 1936 and the Russian linguist Lev Vladimirovic Ščerba: "Ščerba, unlike previous lexicographers, thus placed crucial emphasis on the fact that a dictionary user has native-language competence. Out of these ideas have grown more elaborated proposals for a typology of translation dictionaries, operating with four dictionaries per language-pair." (Kromann/Riiber/Rosbach in print). The authors correctly state that Ščerba did not have the same kind of L2>L1 dictionary in mind as they do. One might further add that Ščerba did not mean the same thing by "active" and "passive" as do Kromann/Riiber/Rosbach.

What I intend to describe in this paper concerns partly the substance of Ščerba's bilingual lexicographic theory as expressed in the question "**What is an L1>L2, resp. L2>L1, dictionary in Ščerba's conception?**", partly the terminological question "**What did Ščerba mean by "active" and "passive"?**". It is already indicated by the two different questions that it would be mistaken to identify dictionaries operating between an L1 and an L2, i.e. monofunctional bilingual dictionaries, with active and passive dictionaries. In order to answer the two questions one has to embrace the broader

historical and linguistic background of Ščerba's ideas. Finally, it would be appropriate to try to ask: "Have Ščerba's thoughts about bilingual lexicography survived, and if yes, in what form did they survive?" In this respect it is natural to look at trends in modern Eastern and Western lexicography.

2. Ščerba's thoughts about bilingual dictionaries

In the twenties and thirties Ščerba was a member of a special lexicographic commission within the Academy of Science, and during this work he himself compiled, or as he preferred to call it, "created" part of the articles of the letter "i" (namely, from "i" to "idealizirovat'sja") in a big, never finished, monolingual Russian dictionary, which had been initiated towards the end of the 19th century. In 1936 Ščerba was the general editor of a completely new Russian-French dictionary. New editions, based on the second edition from 1939 of this dictionary, are still being published.

On the basis of this practical experience Ščerba worked out some theoretical reflections which a lot of people consider the beginning of theoretical lexicography. These theoretical conclusions were originally published as the preface to the Russian-French dictionary and as an article in a publication from the department of literature and language under the Soviet Academy of Sciences. The latter was meant as the first in a series of five studies in the general theory of lexicography. It contains the typology of dictionaries, while the following were to elaborate on the nature of the word, its meaning and use, its relations to other words, and, finally, the structuring of semantic, grammatical and stylistic information in the dictionary article. Unfortunately, the first study is also the last: the planned ones were never written, which was mainly due to the Second World War. Ščerba died in Moscow in December, 1944.

In the following I will be concerned with Ščerba's ideas about bilingual lexicography. The main sources are, naturally, the two above mentioned publications, but I will also take other works Ščerba's into consideration, because I am convinced that one has to include especially his general linguistic and pedagogical views in order to fully understand what his thoughts about dictionaries are all about.

Ščerba (Ščerba 1940) operates with six binary oppositions in order to establish a typological skeleton. The one which is interesting in connection with bilingual dictionaries is number five, i.e. the distinction between an **explanatory** and a **translation** dictionary. It is interesting to notice that the difference between monolingual and bilingual dictionaries is not found typologically important. Generally, one might say that Ščerba's opinion of the so-called translation dictionaries is very low, and that goes not only for the evaluation of the existing instances of this type, but also for the concept of translation dictiona-

ries as such. It is, therefore, ironical that the bilingual dictionary for which Ščerba himself was responsible can only be classified and understood as a translation dictionary.

The translation dictionary is characterized by Ščerba as a *malum necessarium*, a necessary evil, as long as translation from native to foreign language is in question, and until the ideal onomasiologically based dictionary can be realised. Recognizing that the fulfilment of a true onomasiological dictionary was totally unrealistic at the time when he presented his thoughts, Ščerba instead decided to get the best out of the translation dictionary. For translation from L2 to L1 he proposed a mixture of an explanatory and a translation dictionary to which I will return. But let us first look at the concept for an L1>L2 dictionary.

Ščerba's main complaint about L1>L2 dictionaries is that they do not give the user the help he needs in order to produce translations which will turn out to be, not only understandable, but also non-ridiculous. The problem is that the lexicographers have not duly considered the user's L2 or lack of L2 competence. What is needed, then, for a Russian who wants to translate into French, is a dictionary which can lead her or him safely to an equivalent which will fit into the given context. Ščerba therefore formulates five principles whose essence can be rendered as follows:

- 1) Provide a translation, not an explanation, that will, in the appropriate grammatical form, fit into a correct French sentence which has been translated from a Russian sentence. Of all the possible candidates choose the one which fits into most of the Russian contexts. If no general equivalent is found, make sure that the intended user has enough information to judge which one will serve him best.
- 2) Reject the translations which are "too French" and metaphorical, and take only the simplest ones in order not to let the user seem ridiculous.
- 3) Throw away all approximate translations and synonyms - again in order not to make anecdotal translations possible.
- 4) If no precise equivalent is available, give the approximate ones together with the corresponding explanations. If not even an approximate equivalent can be found, leave the lemma as untranslatable, followed by an explanation in brackets. Under certain circumstances bring a translation of whole contexts.
- 5) Provide the necessary grammatical information, so that the user can produce the correct morphological and syntactic forms.

It is evident from these methodological principles that Ščerba has a very modest opinion of the use of an L1>L2 dictionary. The main advantage of L1>L2 dictionary, compiled

on this basis, is that it will help an L1 user, who has very little knowledge about L2, to make correct, simple translations. The "tuning" of the dictionary to an L1 (Russian) user on a rather low level of acquaintance with L2 (French) entails that an L2 user, i.e. a Frenchman, will not be well suited with this dictionary. The reason for this lies partly in the microstructure - as can be seen from the five principles mentioned - partly in the macrostructure.

With regard to the macrostructure the selection of lemmata in an L1>L2 dictionary does not coincide with the selection in an L2>L1 dictionary. The L1>L2 dictionary must consider what can be translated into an **active vocabulary**, typical of an L2 user. The L2>L1 dictionary, on the other hand, must include the **passive vocabulary** which is typical for the L2 user. In other words, a Russian-French dictionary for a Russian user must include only those Russian words which the user can translate into a French active vocabulary, while a Russian-French dictionary for a French user must concentrate on the Russian passive vocabulary. This means that the French user cannot expect the Russian-French dictionary for a Russian user to contain information needed to read e.g. classical Russian literature. Further, it means that the lexicographer cannot simply make a left side out of the right side from existing dictionaries which operate in the opposite direction. The practice in Russian-French pre-Šćerbian lexicography built upon this method, due to the fact that the tradition in Russian-French/French-Russian lexicography began with the collection of Russian equivalents to French explanations in French monolingual dictionaries.

As far as the microstructure is concerned, one can foresee the problems an L2 user may have interpreting the usage information, provided for the benefit of an L1 user, the most evident feature being the formulation of metalinguistic information in the L1. I.e., it is not appropriate for a Frenchman to have this type of information in Russian. Apart from this obvious practical hindrance, there is another problem, which in Šćerba's opinion is even worse, namely that a translation dictionary never conveys the **understanding** of any of the languages involved. And here we come to the problem of L2>L1 dictionaries.

Šćerba's main objection against translation dictionaries is that they do not provide information about the language system, but rather pretend isomorphism, or as Šćerba puts it "adequacy", between the conceptual systems of the languages involved. This criticism can be ignored only when L1>L2 translation of the most primitive kind is in question, and this purpose constitutes the *raison d'être* of such dictionaries. But, when it comes to L2>L1 translation, according to Šćerba, one can no longer leave out of account the obligation of the dictionary to convey real information about the foreign language. The problem is that the L1 equivalents in such a translation dictionary have their own meanings

and nuances which may or may not coincide with the meaning potential of the L2 lemma. Therefore, one can only use such an L2>L1 dictionary for the purposes of reading in and translating from L2, because it serves to exhibit potential L1 equivalents. In other words, it lets the user make a qualified guess about the contextually correct, actual equivalent. (It may be recalled from the reflections about the L1>L2 dictionary that actual equivalence is exactly what is aimed at in that kind of dictionary, an intention which is only made realistic by the restricted selection and the principle of presenting just the most generally applicable equivalents.)

It is essential for Ščerba that the L2>L1 dictionary also gives information which can be used the other way round, that is, when the user needs to translate from L1 to L2. Normally information about the paradigmatic and syntagmatic characteristics of a given lexical entity can be found in the typical monolingual dictionaries. What is needed is then a fusion of the explanatory and the translation dictionaries. In principle there is nothing that speaks against simply translating monolingual dictionaries of the L2 into the L1, thus taking over the monolingually relevant lexicographic principles. This means, among other things, that the semantic structuring which is relevant for the monolingual description is automatically found to be the right one also in the bilingual L2>L1 dictionary. The rule is, consequently, that the definitions or explanations to the L2 lemmata are accepted without ceremony. Exceptions are possible: if an L1 equivalent can be found which does not disturb the full comprehension of the L2 word's true nature it can replace the explanation.

Now, it is clear why Ščerba became famous for his statement about the necessity for four user-profiled bilingual dictionaries for each pair of languages. Only, I find that this statement is often exaggerated in a way that, I am sure, Ščerba would not have agreed with. Without discussing here to what extent Ščerba's conception of bilingual dictionaries coincides with what is nowadays referred to as "active" and "passive" dictionaries, I want to stress that Ščerba only stated the need for L2>L1 dictionaries of the above mentioned hybrid nature. The L1>L2 dictionary - of which Ščerba's own Russian-French dictionary is an instance - can on the other hand, at least theoretically, be dispensed with as far as the ideal mastering of the L2 goes not via the L1 or any other language except for the L2 itself. I will return to the reason for this the following sections.

3. Evaluation of Ščerba's concept of bilingual dictionaries

Already in 1936, i.e. the year the first edition of Ščerba's Russian-French dictionary was published, Lucien Tesnière, the famous French slavist and russist, wrote a short review of this small precious stone, as he called it, hoping hereby not to let it disappear in the vast anonymous mass of commercial, industrially produced, dictionaries. Tesnière's

manuscript was published posthumously in 1958 and in a Russian translation (Tesnière 1958).

Tesnière draws attention to the thesis requiring four dictionaries for each pair of languages and calls it revolutionary. He compares the inclusion of the user aspect to the contemporary development in the Russian theatre, where the audience was being included as a participant on the same level as the author and the actors. Transferred to lexicography the author corresponds to the dictionary, the actors to the words included in the dictionary and the audience to the user. It goes without saying that there is a direct line to Tesnière's own syntactic theory of actants.

He also uses another metaphor to explain the difference between an L1>L2 and an L2>L1 dictionary. The dictionary is like a ticket "there-and-back": the Frenchman needs a ticket from Paris to Moscow and back from Moscow to Paris, whereas the Russian needs a return ticket to Paris. Just as it is not necessary for a travelling Frenchman to have both a "there" and a "back" ticket in the same direction, e.g. Paris-Moscow, so it is also unnecessary to have a dictionary which helps both the French and the Russian traveller.

Tesnière welcomes and wholly accepts Šcerba's concept. It is interesting to notice that new editions of Šcerba's Russian-French dictionary seems to be useful also to Frenchmen, although not intended to be so. As a part of the grammatical back matter an overview of Russian morphology with commentaries in French is now published together with the the other material, which is primarily intended for the Russian user.

It seems clear that apart from the mere requirement for the user profiling of bilingual dictionaries there are some quite serious differences from the way bilingual lexicography is practised today. In the following I will point out these differences, looking at Šcerba's bilingual concept from the angle of the modern state of research. In addition to exposing **what** these differences consist of, it will be natural to ask **why** it is that Šcerba's lexicographic viewpoints are as they are.

3.1. In the context of the present state of research

The demand for more than the classical two bilingual dictionaries for each pair of languages did not stop with Šcerba's four, but has, as it is well known, been extended to the requirement of both six and eight dictionaries, or at least: dictionary functions. On the basis of the discussion of these problems in Hausmann 1977, Karl 1982, Duda/Frenzel/Wöller/Zimmermann 1986 and Duda 1986, I think it is fair to conclude that while translation from L1 to L2 always tends to aim at the providing of actual equivalents, i.e. equivalents which can be put directly into the context, the translation from L2

to L1 seems to cover three different aspects. Correspondingly, an L2>L1 dictionary may be intended to cope with 1) potential equivalence, which is needed when one wants to understand a text in an L2, 2) actual equivalence, which is what one needs in order to produce a translation in the L1, and finally, 3), comprehension of the system of L2. The ultimate position is to require one dictionary for each of these four functions, and adopted to a native user from each of the languages included. That makes up eight dictionaries. The more moderate claim for six dictionaries draws upon a two-fold distinction in the translation process. So, e.g., the GDR team behind the new Russian-German dictionary operates with a distinction between production- and reception-oriented translation from L2 to L1, where the latter is the objective of their dictionary.

The development in theoretical bilingual lexicography demonstrates that the most successful of Šcerba's bilingual dictionary types is the one that copes with L1>L2 translation. His L2>L1 concept has not survived, at least not in the intended form. In a way this may seem ironical, considering how low Šcerba estimated the pedagogical value of translation dictionaries. By the way, Šcerba used the term "translation dictionary" only in the meaning L1>L2 dictionary. His ideal L2>L1 dictionary is, as already said, primarily an explanatory dictionary.

The requirements concerning the macro- and microstructure of L1>L2 dictionaries, as they are presented e.g. by Kromann/Riiber/Rosbach 1984 and in print, are very much the same as the principles formulated in the Russian-French dictionary. An L1>L2, or in Kromann/Riiber/Rosbach's terms an active dictionary's microstructure is different from an L2>L1, i.e. a passive, dictionary because of the meaning discriminating and compensating comments, the idiosyncratic phrases and a maximum of grammatical information on the equivalent side. Moreover, the macrostructure, i.e. the selection of lemmata, is rather restricted with regard to regionalisms, special vocabulary, orthographical and morphological variants.

On the other hand, what is considered the ideal L2>L1 dictionary today, has not got very much in common with Šcerba's translated explanatory dictionary. According to Kromann/Riiber/Rosbach the L2>L1 dictionary in opposition to an L1>L2 dictionary is characterized by an undifferentiated lining of equivalents, by omission of transparent idiosyncratic phrases, and by non-transparent morphosyntactic information. All in all, this concept of L2>L1 dictionaries corresponds more directly to the L1>L2 dictionary. Both concepts are developed from the kind of translation dictionaries where no attention is paid to the user.

From a Šcerbian point of view the concept of bilingual dictionaries has been rather much narrowed down. Although the characteristics of the modern L2>L1 translation dictionary

are logically connected to the L1>L2 dictionary, and one would find it natural if the man behind the L1>L2 dictionary would at the same time have invented the L2>L1 translation dictionary, there is no trace whatsoever of such reflections in Šcerba's lexicographic theory. Instead of finding inspiration in the L1>L2 concept, thus taking the first steps towards an autonomous bilingual lexicographic theory, Šcerba preferred to believe in the monolingual lexicographic principles as better suited for an ideal L2>L1 dictionary.

One of the few, or perhaps the only, instance of an L2>L1 dictionary, worked out without knowing it in accordance with Šcerba's principles, is the Russian-German dictionary from 1958, edited by H.H. Bielfeldt. It was explicitly intended for German users, but has undergone severe criticism, especially for leaving out German equivalents, for not separating explanation and equivalent, for presenting examples and derived words without German translations. These points may be said to concern the concrete manifestation of the Šcerbian L2>L1 concept, but there is another criticism which seems to invalidate the concept itself. According to Duda 1986 it is questionable, whether this kind of dictionary enables the user to go from the comprehension of the L2 to the translation into L1.

The solution, as Duda sees it, is to change the priorities of explanation and equivalent, so that the translation aspect is considered more important than the comprehension aspect.

Nevertheless, Šcerba's concept of L2>L1 dictionaries has not completely disappeared. In 1988 a Soviet lexicographer, V.K. Scerbin, claimed that Šcerba's criticism of bilingual dictionaries is just as relevant today as it was in 1940. Scerbin repeats Šcerba's statement that an L2>L1 dictionary must provide knowledge about the foreign language and not only give hints for the finding of contextually bound equivalents. Scerbin refers to V.G. Gak and S.S.-D. Kim for raising the same criticism, and they all agree that an L2>L1 dictionary must at the same time serve as the basis for production in the L2.

It is, then, possible to conclude that the bilingual apple of Šcerba's eye, i.e. the L2>L1 concept, has had little, if any, impact on today's theory and practice in ordinary bilingual lexicography, while his stepchild, the L1>L2 concept, has gained overwhelming success. The truth is, however, not without modifications. In chapter 5 I will try to show how Šcerba's L2>L1 concept has survived in parts.

3.2. In the context of Šcerba's linguistics

Lev Vladimirovič Šcerba continued the tradition of the so-called Kazan' School, whose initiator was Baudouin de Courtenay. The school is today known as the Leningrad

School, as opposed to the Moscow School, which stems back from Filip Fedorovic Fortunatov.

One of the characteristics of the Leningrad School has always been the focusing on the human being in connection with language. In the work of Ščerba this guideline can be followed everywhere, e.g. in his general language theory and in his pedagogical theory and practise, as well as in every application of theoretical principles. I will here stick to Scerba's bilingual lexicographic principles in order to try to make clear how such super-ordinate viewpoints constantly guide Scerba.

One might ask why Scerba is so sceptical towards the mere concept of translation dictionaries that he completely rejects it as a principle for L2>L1 dictionaries, while he emphasizes the limitations of the L1>L2 translation dictionaries. Apart from the limitations resulting from the specific user profiling there are also certain limitations for the intended L1 user (see above). The reason for this negative attitude can be sought in the methods and reflections about the purpose of second language learning, defended by Ščerba. And these viewpoints are again closely connected to his thoughts about bilingualism. As for bilingualism, defined as the ability of a group of people to speak two languages, Ščerba distinguishes between a "pure" and a "mixed" type. In the pure bilingualism the speaker has at his disposal two different language systems which he does not mix, whereas the mixed type is precisely characterized by mixing together the two systems. In a pure bilingual relation the differences between the two language systems is maintained; this is illustrated by among other things the introduction of loan words from one language to the other, in order to compensate for the lacking equivalence. In contrast to this, the mixed bilingualism tends to eliminate the differences between the two languages in such a way that it tends to make one system out of the two.

(The impacts of mixed bilingualism finds its extreme in the Sorbian situation. The Slavic language Sorbian, which served as the source for Ščerba's doctoral dissertation in 1915, was at that time a forbidden language spoken by a minority and completely surrounded by German. All the Sorbian speakers are bilingual German-Sorbian, and this has developed into a situation, where the only thing that is left of the original Sorbian language is the expression side, while the content has been wholly identified with the German. That goes not only in the lexicon, but also for the grammar, where, contrary to most Slavic languages, an article has been introduced into the noun system and a perfect tense into the verb system. In consequence, Scerba treats the Sorbian case as pseudo-bilingualism; there is in fact only one language in question, but a language with two expressions, or "terminals". (Ščerba 1925))

It is evident that the aim of foreign language teaching cannot be a mixed bilingualism, with the consequence that the Russian pupil transfers his own language system into the other, e.g. French. It therefore seems that the so-called "natural" or "direct" method, which focuses on unconscious and intuitive language learning, must be the pedagogically best suited way to a foreign language. As a matter of fact this is exactly the attitude against which Scerba reacts. There are two reasons for this (Scerba 1934): one concerned with the circumstances under which children, and human beings generally, learn foreign languages, and one concerned with the pedagogically superior goals of general education:

Conscious learning is the only one practically possible in the Soviet society - in contrast to pre-revolutionary Russia where it was possible for the nobility to virtually isolate the children together with their foreign governesses. Consequently, one might as well make a virtue of necessity. Scerba sees the virtue of conscious foreign language learning in its bearing for the native language comprehension. The device is that the best way to learn one's own language is to learn a foreign language, and further, to emancipate the thought from its language bonds. If the L2 is important for the L1, the opposite can also be stated, i.e. knowledge of the L1 can be positively exploited in the L2 teaching. Scerba speaks in favour of a widely application of contrastive language descriptions. (His famous French phonetics (Scerba 1937) is built on this principle).

On the other hand, the contrastive method only goes for L2 learning at the beginner's level, because in the end it will lead to a mixed bilingualism due to numerous transfers from L1. Therefore, in order to refine the L2 skills the pupil must begin to learn thinking in the L2.

This digression into other spheres of Scerba's activities may shed light upon his concept of bilingual dictionaries. One might tentatively divide the users into two groups: the beginners and the advanced learners. The bilingual dictionaries, both the L1>L2 and the L2>L1 ones, are exclusively intended for the beginners. Only they need to learn the L2 through the L1.

In translating from L1 to L2 there is no other way to go for the beginner than to translate from L1. The drawback of this way of producing L2 text is that it easily leads to false transfers from L1. Therefore, the L1>L2 dictionary must carefully follow the principles of a restricted macrostructure and a microstructure which contains only the most general equivalents, and if there are more than one, the equivalents must be clearly differentiated from the others. It is obvious why this dictionary can only cope with the most simple expressions of the L2. The advanced learner, on the other hand, must get rid of the L1 as an

auxiliary tool for L2 learning, and instead start to think in the L2. This also means that he will no longer need the "necessary evil" of the translation dictionary.

The argument for the L2>L1 explanatory dictionary is as follows: Again the beginner is forced to learn the L2 through the L1. But at the same time he can learn to look at his own language, the L1, as a system of its own. In order to do this he must have direct access to the L2 system, and this can only be done by providing the L2 lemma with its paradigmatic and syntagmatic surroundings. Translation is in the respect of language learning of very little importance, for which reason it can more or less be ignored. At a more advanced stage of L2 learning the pupil is better off with a monolingual dictionary.

4. Šcerba's understanding of "active" and "passive"

After the discussion of Šcerba's ideas about bilingual dictionaries, I come to the terminological question about Šcerba's understanding of "active" and "passive". Let me be quite straightforward about this: Šcerba does not use these terms in combination with the word "dictionary", at least not in the literature I am acquainted with. That does not mean that it is impossible that these terms, which are currently the generally accepted substitutes for the term "a monofunctional L1>L2 dictionary" (= active dictionary) and "a monofunctional L2>L1 dictionary" (= passive dictionary), might originally come from Šcerba. As a matter of fact these notions are very important for his general language theory as such, and for its various applications, e.g. in pedagogics. On the other hand, in Šcerba's use, active and passive are not confined to bilingual matters. Let me therefore try to explain the meaning of these terms, primarily in the context of Šcerba's language theory, but also in its most important pedagogical implications.

In 1931 Šcerba formulated his own threefold language theory, to a certain degree similar to that of Saussure. But, contrary to Saussure's bipartite distinction between *langue* and *parole*, Šcerba's theory contains three aspects, namely the **system**, the **activity**, and the **material**. The system consists of **grammar and lexicon**, the activity of the **processes of speaking and understanding**, whereas the material consists of **texts, i.e. what is actually spoken (/written) or understood**. The three aspects are internally ordered: the text presupposes the activity, which again presupposes the system. The system itself is extra-linguistically determined by time and place, i.e. by an actual society.

The system is always hidden for the unconscious language user. That is why the system of a native language has to be learned. If we take a look back on Šcerba's bilingual dictionaries, we will see that the explanatory L2>L1 dictionary intends exactly to reveal the language system of the L2, and indirectly also of the L1.

The terms "active" and "passive" are only used in connection with the activity aspect of language. They cover the two already mentioned processes: speaking and understanding, respectively. It seems all right to call Scerba's L1>L2 dictionary "active", because its function is to make possible a process of speaking. But it would be mistaken to assign the label "passive" to the L2>L1 dictionary, because what it primarily does is not to facilitate an understanding activity of the L2 text, but rather to provide insights into the language systems. It is interesting to notice that the **thinking** skills in Scerba's conception are only directly accessible through the language system. That is also why it is so important to stress the positive effect of L2 learning with regard to system learning, and thereby to the emancipation of the thought from the language.

Active and passive language skills are relevant for both native and foreign language **communication**. It is therefore not surprising that these terms are used in connection with monolingual, as well as bilingual questions.

Scerba speaks explicitly about an active and a passive grammar. A passive grammar is one which helps to understand, i.e. to get from the expression to the content, whereas an active grammar operates the other way round: from the content to the expression. In addition to the Russian-French dictionary Scerba wrote a short active grammar, which serves exactly the same goal as the dictionary itself, namely to get from content conceived in Russian to the French expression. (The overview of Russian morphology, which I mentioned earlier, has the characteristics of a passive grammar and is intended for the French user. It was written by I.M. Pul'kina and was later developed into her famous Short Reference Grammar of Russian.)

It can be concluded that Scerba uses the terms "active" and "passive" much the same way as the terms "onomasiological" and "semasiological" are used. In fact, Scerba might well have applied the distinction for one of his dictionary types. I have in mind the fourth opposition, the one between an ordinary (explanatory or translation) and an ideological dictionary, i.e. the distinction between an alphabetically (semasiologically) and a notionally (onomasiologically) structured dictionary. These dictionaries are the ones to take over when the learner leaves the beginner's level.

Finally, the active/passive concept is used in combination with "vocabulary". It is essentially the same meaning: an "active vocabulary" is the set of lexical items one uses as output when speaking, whereas the "passive vocabulary" is the much bigger set of lexical items which serves for understanding. I have already mentioned the impact of these notions on the macrostructure of the two bilingual dictionaries (cf. chapter 2 above).