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Pre-Soviet background

The historical roots of Soviet lexicography go back to Old Russia. The first glossaries were produced in the thirteenth century. As in England, they were basically devoted to so-called 'hard' words. In Orthodox Russia, however, most of these words were borrowings not from Latin, but from Old Church Slavic and from Greek. Modern pre-Revolutionary lexicography began in the eighteenth century. Its major accomplishment was the six-volume Dictionary of the Russian Academy, completed in 1794. In this first Academy dictionary, many of the words were 'nested' — a term that requires explanation. Russian, like other Slavic languages, is rich in expressive and derivational suffixes. In addition, there are in Russian numerous compounds written as one word. 'Nesting' refers to the placing of words with the identical initial root in the same entry. This procedure saves space. However, it may disrupt the overall alphabetical order and may make it difficult for the reader to find a word when a prefix precedes the root.

The first Academy dictionary did not include colloquialisms; it did list many Church Slavic forms. In 1822, the revised version (i.e., second edition) of the Academy dictionary was completed; this revision eliminated nesting and introduced an alphabetical relisting of the entries. The conflict between nesting and alphabetizing was to reappear over a century later, during the Soviet era. In 1847, the last volume of the third edition of the Academy dictionary appeared. This four-volume work still contained a large number of Church Slavic forms, not used in the spoken or bellettristic Russian of the mid-nineteenth century. In fact, its title was a 'Dictionary of Church Slavic and Russian'. A major step forward was the introduction of stylistic labels for Church Slavic forms such as glava 'head', grad 'city', etc.

A number of studies and dictionaries of Russian dialects and jargons were published during the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century (Perelmuter 1974). The most important dictionary devoted to dialectal and informal Russian was Dahl's four-volume EXPLANATORY DICTIONARY OF CURRENT GREAT-RUSSIAN. The last volume appeared in 1866. The third and fourth editions of Dahl were edited by Baudouin de Courtenay, who added many slang and vulgar terms.

---

1 For a survey, now outdated, of the history of Russian lexicography, see Cejtlin.
The first volume of the fourth Academy dictionary was published in 1895. Its original goal was to include only items used in belletristic literature during the second half of the nineteenth century. The first volume, covering the letters A to D, conformed to this principle. However, when the editorship passed from Ja. Grot to A. Šaxmatov, the situation changed. In the second volume many regional and technical terms were entered. This edition was never completed; its last fascicule was issued in 1937. It must be emphasized that no completed pre-Revolutionary dictionary described Standard Russian. This standard had come into being, under the influence of Karamzin and Pushkin, around 1830.

Early Soviet period

The chaotic conditions following World War I, the Revolution, and the Civil War paralyzed work on dictionaries for several years. Even after the country began to recover from the physical destruction that it had suffered, lexicography lagged. It was pointed out above, for example, that the fourth Academy dictionary was never finished. Two major reasons for the lag should be pointed out. The turbulence of the period 1914–1920 shook the foundations of Standard Russian itself. Many of the most highly educated people were killed or forced to flee the country. The new bureaucrats were often semi-literate dialect speakers. A veritable flood of regionalisms, neologisms, acronyms, abbreviations, vulgarisms, borrowings, and jargonisms swamped the language. One striking example of the lexical chaos of the 1920s was the wholesale transplanting of the English counting system for tennis into Russian. Česnokov's DICTIONARY OF SPORT TERMINOLOGY, lists as the norm fiftin, serti, forti, djus, ljav, etc. Later, of course, these borrowings were replaced by native forms (Benson 1958: 252).

A second factor that impeded the normal development of lexicography was the dominance of the so-called 'Marr School' of linguistics. Marr, a Georgian compatriot of Stalin, had managed to establish firmly his Japhetic theory of language origin in the Soviet Union. The Japhetic theory rejected, among other things, the Indo-European, Semitic, Finno-Ugric, etc. language families. Marr claimed that all the world’s languages were derived from a Japhetic proto-language, spoken at one time in the Caucasus. Marr advanced the fantastic claim that all words of all languages go back to the four elements sal, ber, jon, rox. Marrism crippled the study of philology and linguistics in the Soviet Union for many years (Thomas 1957).

In spite of the difficulties just described, Soviet lexicography began to make progress in the mid 1930s. An outstanding accomplishment was the compilation and publication of Ušakov’s EXPLANATORY DICTIONARY OF RUSSIAN. Ušakov was assisted by the leading Soviet linguists of the time: Larin, Ožegov, Tomaševskij, Vinokur, and Vinogradov. Ušakov’s dictionary was, in fact, the

2 Lenin himself is reported to have inspired the compilation of this normative dictionary in a letter written in 1920 to the Minister of Education, Lunčarskij.
first dictionary of Modern Standard Russian. The introduction to Ušakov’s dictionary gives an excellent description of the Moscow pronunciation, a description, still used in courses on Russian phonetics. Ušakov consistently gives the stress not only for the base forms, but also for the declined and conjugated forms. This is extremely important since in Russian the stress may shift from one syllable to another within the declension or conjugation. Ušakov does provide a partial respelling whenever the pronunciation does not conform to the rules, as in borrowings if a t or d is not softened before the vowel e. Ušakov’s method of dealing with pronunciation has been retained in contemporary Soviet dictionaries of Russian. In his entries, Ušakov gives a great deal of grammatical information. For example, he consistently supplies difficult genitive plural forms. The Ušakov dictionary was the first to indicate all aspectual pairs of Russian verbs. This was a significant step forward in the lexicographical description not only of Russian, but of Slavic languages in general. Once again, Ušakov established precedents that are followed by Soviet dictionaries today.

Post World War II period

After World War II Soviet lexicography became very productive. The direct continuation of Ušakov’s tradition was Ožegov’s one-volume dictionary of standard Russian — DICTIONARY OF RUSSIAN. Several revisions and reprints of this dictionary have appeared; the eighteenth printing was issued in 1986. A revised, expanded edition is scheduled for 1988 (as indicated by the publishing house Russkij jazyk in a letter to this writer dated December 13, 1984). Around two million copies of this dictionary have been sold in the Soviet Union and abroad. It is of great value to the teacher and student of Russian since it contains detailed information on Russian stress and grammar. Ožegov’s dictionary is basically normative. It consistently selects a preferred variant or two variants when several exist. Ožegov’s normative role reflects the strong pressure within the USSR for language standardization (Benson 1961).

In 1950, one year after the publication of Ožegov’s first edition, Stalin issued a pronunciamento officially putting an end to the privileged position that the Marr linguistic school had occupied. The excesses of the Marrists had obviously so embarrassed Soviet scholarship that the highest government circles felt compelled to act. The dethronement of Marr facilitated progress in all phases of Soviet linguistics, including lexicography. The first volume of the Soviet Academy of Sciences’ new multi-volume dictionary also appeared in 1950. The compilation progressed on schedule throughout the 1950s into the 1960s. The seventeenth and last volume was issued in 1965. This dictionary describes the Russian literary language beginning with the era of Pushkin. Many thousands of citations
from Russian literature are provided. It is a monumental lexicographical achievement.\(^3\)

A shorter four-volume Academy dictionary was issued from 1957 to 1961. This shorter dictionary was approximately the same size as the pre-World-War-II Ušakov dictionary. A second, revised edition of the abridged Academy dictionary was published in the years 1981–1984. This revised edition was a distinct improvement.

The publication of a large number of bilingual specialized and technical dictionaries began in the 1950s. The production of such technical dictionaries has been one of the strongest features of Soviet lexicography. Space limitations preclude even an abridged listing here of such dictionaries. A 1986 catalog of Kamkin’s Bookstore in Rockville, Maryland, for example, lists an impressive number of English-Russian specialized dictionaries in fields such as agriculture, animal husbandry, aviation, chemistry, ecology, economics, electrochemistry, metallurgy, mining, physics, railway transportation, television, textiles, etc.

In regard to etymological dictionaries, Soviet lexicography has made a late start. Before the Revolution, Preobrazenskij’s ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF RUSSIAN, begun in 1910 and completed as far as su-, was the only work available; the last part of this dictionary was not completed until 1949. From 1950 to 1958 an important etymological dictionary of Russian, the RUSSISCHES ETYMOLOGISCHES WÖRTERBUCH, was published in West Berlin by Max Vasmer. It was so urgently needed that the Soviet publishing house “Progress” translated it from German into Russian, deleting certain forms. The introduction to the Soviet edition contains a sentence (looking harmless to those uninformed into Soviet mores), which indicates the “removal of certain entries” that can be of interest only to “specialized scientific circles”. This sentence meant, in fact, that several colloquial-vulgar Russian terms were omitted. In 1963, Moscow University began publishing Sanskij’s new multi-volume etymological dictionary of Russian. Less than half of this dictionary has been completed. Thus, we see that in the field of Russian etymology, Soviet lexicography has a long way to go before it can match the work already done for English, German, French, and other languages.

It was mentioned earlier that pre-Revolutionary Russia saw the appearance of several dialect and jargon dictionaries. The production of such lexicons has lagged in the Soviet Union. Publication of an Academy of Sciences multi-volume DICTIONARY OF RUSSIAN DIALECTS was begun in 1965 under the editorship of Filin. By 1985, twenty volumes had been published (up to ne-). In the early period of the Soviet state, approximately up to 1932, various descriptions of professional jargons and substandard speech did appear. However, since 1932, it should be noted that the old conflict between arranging words in nests or in alphabetical order reappeared during the compilation of this dictionary. Once again, alphabetization prevailed.
practically no studies of jargons or of slang have been published. When Dahl’s dialectal dictionary was reprinted in the Soviet Union in 1935 and in 1956, the second edition was reproduced rather than the third or fourth, to which Baudouin de Courtenay had added vulgarisms.

Soviet lexicographers have devoted considerable attention to the language of individual authors. An important result of this work is a four-volume concordance—the DICTIONARY OF PUSHKIN’S LANGUAGE, 1956–1961; it was compiled at the Academy of Sciences. Work has also been done on the language of other authors such as Gogol, Gorkij, etc.

Soviet lexicography has achieved impressive results in publishing bilingual dictionaries of Russian and other Slavic languages—Bulgarian, Czech, Polish, Ukrainian, White Russian, etc. Soviet lexicography has also accomplished a great deal in the compilation and publication of bilingual dictionaries for Russian and the non-Slavic languages spoken in the USSR. Numerous bilingual dictionaries of Russian and of languages spoken outside the Soviet Union have been compiled with varying degrees of success. Some of these dictionaries are excellent; others are disappointing. Let us examine in some detail the largest and best Soviet English—Russian dictionary—Gal’perin et al., NEW ENGLISH—RUSSIAN DICTIONARY. In many respects, this dictionary is impressive with its approximately 150,000 main entries and huge number of illustrative phrases, idioms, proverbs, and set expressions. At first glance, Gal’perin’s dictionary seems to be a superb accomplishment.

However, if we take a closer look, we begin to see grave weaknesses. The dictionary gives the British (Daniel Jones) phonetic transcription of English. One would have hoped for at least a summary description of American pronunciation in the introduction. Most of the translation equivalents and definitions are correct. However, the dictionary contains an enormous number of lexicographic blunders—unacceptable English and faulty translations. To demonstrate the magnitude of the problem, let us take one page, selected at random from the first volume, page 691. We can easily point out ten instances of incorrect, unacceptable, awkward English: to have immortal longings (vecno zaždat‘); all your immunities are rendered insecure by this change (v rezul’tate etoj peremeny vy možete lišit’ja vse vašix privilegij); the student immured himself for study (student zapersja v četyrex stenx, čtoby zanimat’sjaj); to impale smb. with one’s eyes (pronzit’ kogo-1. vzgljadom); impalpable powder (mel’čajšij porošok); imparadised (vkuïat’ blaïenstvo); the smoke imparted its odour to his clothes (ego odežda propaxla dymom); impartiality to pupils (bespristrastonoe otnoSenije k učenikam); to be impassible before danger (bezucastno otnosit’sja k opasnosti); impatience of contradiction (neterpimost’ k vozvraženijjam). At least five additional examples could be cited from this page. A spot check of other pages indicates that the total number of examples of unacceptable English is astronomical.
The treatment of American English in Gal’perin’s dictionary is deplorable. Whereas hundreds and hundreds of important Americanisms are totally ignored, numerous rare, dialectal, obsolete, trivial words and phrases are dredged up from various sources and attributed to American English with completely inadequate stylistic labels. Here are just a few so-called Americanisms taken from Gal’perin’s dictionary — bird = ‘military pilot’; blast v. = ‘to advertise’ (they blasted their product); blizzard = ‘accurate shot’ (to take a blizzard at something); blow-off = ‘(a performer’s) best number’; bump v. = ‘to shell’; etc.

As already stated, Gal’perin’s dictionary is large, offering an immense number of entries and phrases. Does it include enough? The answer is yes and no. Unfortunately, the dictionary includes far too many words that never should have been entered. Gal’perin lists such monstrosities as amylaceous, bonetta, chokage, decreet, ernes, forfend, etc. Such words and the phrases cited earlier do not belong in a dictionary that, presumably, describes modern, standard English — their inclusion inflates the size of the dictionary to monumental dimensions. The bloated size of the dictionary should not obscure the fact that many essential words and phrases have been left out. For example, many hundreds of important nominal compounds of the type articulated lorry, bargaining chip, case history, defense mechanism, electronic transfer, flight attendant, etc. are not given. In the area of informal phraseology Gal’perin does not give expressions such as: they blew their cover; they were bumped from the flight; to burp an infant; to field a question; to pull rank; to reverse (the) charges; to roll with the punches; to shop for bargains, etc. In regard to American realia, Gal’perin misses many items. He does not include, for example, the following: answering service; dean’s list; distributional requirements; dude ranch; to take the Fifth; garage sale; mail-order house; open admissions; to pledge a fraternity; rural-free delivery; welcome wagon, etc.

The SUPPLEMENT to Gal’perin’s dictionary, which came out in 1980, continues in the same vein. Although it contains much good material, it also contains a large number of unnecessary, seemingly non-existent English forms: acrolect, aggregation, Aunt Jane, autocide, autoput, bafflegab, boccie, boite du nuit, etc. It would appear that the most serious defects of Gal’perin’s dictionary are attributable to the lack of collaboration with native speakers of English.

A welcome breath of fresh air in Soviet bilingual English lexicography was introduced by a native speaker of English, Elizabeth Wilson, whose MODERN RUSSIAN DICTIONARY FOR ENGLISH SPEAKERS (1982) was copublished by Pergamon Press and the Moscow publishing house Russkij jazyk. Wilson concentrated on spoken English, especially the British variety. Although spotty in its coverage, this semi-Soviet dictionary is exceptional in that it contains correct, idiomatic English.

Soviet lexicography has also produced dictionaries of linguistic terminology, word stress, homonyms, synonyms, word frequency, neologisms, difficult words, etc.
Recent developments — learner's dictionaries

In the 1970s, Soviet publishers in Moscow obtained licenses to reprint two Oxford learner's dictionaries — THE OXFORD ADVANCED LEARNER'S DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH (Russkij jazyk, 1982) and THE OXFORD STUDENT'S DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH (Prosvëščenie, 1983). The publishers obtained permission to make changes and did so; key political terms were given new definitions. Thus, *capitalism* was defined as "an economic and social system based on private ownership of the means of production operated for private profit and on the exploitation of man by man". In a letter dated January 28, 1986, the Chief Executive of the Oxford University Press, G.B. Richardson, wrote that granting permission to the Soviet publishers to alter definitions had been a mistake and should not have taken place.

Considerable attention is paid in the Soviet Union to the use of school dictionaries in the teaching of Russian, especially to non-native speakers. As far back as the 1930s, L.V. Ščerba wrote in detail about the structure of bilingual dictionaries used to teach foreign languages. He advocated that separate dictionaries be compiled for those learners who wish to decode (translate from the foreign language) and those who wish to encode (translate into the foreign language). Ščerba's theories still exert influence both in the Soviet Union and abroad (Krommann 1984). The Pushkin Institute in Moscow, which promotes the teaching of Russian to foreigners, now has a Division of Pedagogical Lexicography. Many school dictionaries have been published for the foreign student of Russian. Typical are Folomkina and Weiser with about 3500 main entries and Lapidus and Ševcova with about 11,000 main entries. Both of these dictionaries have been reprinted.

Two new kinds of learners' dictionaries have appeared recently in the Soviet Union. The first is a dictionary of collocations. Such a dictionary gives the linguistic contexts in which each headword often occurs. The first such dictionary to appear was Anisimova et al., HANDBOOK OF LEXICAL COMBINATION IN RUSSIAN: A REFERENCE DICTIONARY. A larger work is Denisov and Morkovkin, LEARNER'S DICTIONARY OF WORD COMBINATIONS IN RUSSIAN. The number of main entries is disappointingly small — about 2500. Each entry shows in great detail the various combinations in which the headword is normally used. The noun entries, for example, contain those verbs that collocate with the noun: pol'zovat'sja avtoritetom ('to exercise/wield authority'); vesti bor'bu ('to carry on/wage a struggle'); proslušat' kurs ('to take a course'); pročitat' lekciju ('to give a lecture'); podat' primer ('to set an example'); okazyvat' sprotivlenie ('to offer/put up resistance'); xranit' tajnu ('to keep a secret'); etc. The dictionary provides various other types of lexical and grammatical collocations, such as adjective + noun, verb + preposition, noun + infinitive, preposition + noun, etc. If this dictionary could be expanded to include a sufficient number of headwords, its value would be greatly enhanced.
The second kind of recently published learners’ dictionary is called lingvostrannovedčeskij, literally ‘linguo-areal’. The function of such a dictionary is to provide encyclopedic information about the terminology used in a given activity. A series of such dictionaries is apparently scheduled for publication. The editors of this series are E.M. Vereščagin and V.G. Kostomarov. The first dictionary to appear in this series was Denisova’s LINGUO-AREAL DICTIONARY: EDUCATION IN THE USSR. This dictionary treats the terminology of education in great detail. The editors of this series assume that many features of the Soviet educational system do not exist elsewhere and that a linguo-areal dictionary, consequently, serves as a guide to Soviet culture.

The above survey has been brief and cannot be considered complete. Several problems referred to deserve more detailed study. My conclusion is that Soviet lexicography has achieved impressive results in publishing dictionaries of modern standard Russian, specialized and technical dictionaries, learners’ dictionaries for foreigners, and some bilingual general-use dictionaries. So far, Soviet lexicography has been disappointing in the production of etymological dictionaries, historical dictionaries, dialect dictionaries, and surname dictionaries.

The most disturbing aspects of Soviet lexicography are the following:

1. its refusal to treat Russian slang and other non-standard forms;
2. its readiness to censor, expurgate existing dictionaries;
3. its isolation from Western lexicography — the result is a failure to keep up with innovations now common in many dictionaries produced in the West, such as pictorial illustrations, main-entry status for compounds, the inclusion of real people and places, the utilization of synonym and usage essays;
4. its refusal to allow free international collaboration in the compilation of bilingual dictionaries — the Wilson dictionary is a welcome exception.

These negative features are mainly attributable to the obvious fact that lexicography in the Soviet Union is controlled by the government and party. Nevertheless, let us hope that the future will bring more contact between the Soviet and Western lexicographers. We can all learn much from each other.
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