



Ethno-Cultural Vocabulary in Bilingual Dictionaries by I. I. Giganov (In Comparison with Turkic Languages of South Siberia)

Alina Damirovna Hayrullina¹, Alfiya Shavketovna Yusupova², Guzel Amirovna Nabiullina³, & Nurila Gabbasovna Shaymerdinova⁴

¹Corresponding author, Department of General Linguistics and Turkology, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University; alinkhairullina@mail.ru

²Department of General Linguistics and Turkology, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University; alyusupova@yandex.ru

³Department of General Linguistics and Turkology, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University; Email: GuzelNab2@yandex.ru

⁴Department of Turkology, Faculty of International Relations, Eurasian National University L.N. Gumileva, Kazan Federal University; nurila1607@mail

Abstract

The lexicographic works by I. I. Giganov brought us the lexical richness of the Siberian Tatar language of the 19th century. The article is devoted to the study of the most important layer of the language vocabulary - ethnocultural vocabulary, recorded in the bilingual dictionaries by I.I. Giganov. In this study, the ethnocultural vocabulary of the Siberian Tatars is considered on the basis of thematic groups, namely: the vocabulary of clothing and jewellery; the vocabulary of food and traditional dishes; the vocabulary related to kitchen utensils. The study used descriptive and comparative methods and partly etymological analysis techniques. Studying the bilingual dictionaries by I. I. Giganov, we came to the conclusion that the compiler sought to preserve the features of vocabulary-language signs and their grammatical design, taking into account the existing sign-evaluative and specific-verbal expressions, the unique features of the figurative language system of his time, observing these lexical-grammatical canons and obeying the laws of science of language.

Keywords: Bilingual Dictionaries; Ethnic-Cultural Vocabulary; Vocabulary; Language; Siberian Tatars.

1. Introduction

Dictionaries record the state of the language at a certain point of an ethnic group historical development. Bilingual dictionaries allow you to document the role and place of certain languages in the history of culture during certain historical periods, the relationship of these languages, including their relationship with third languages. When they study such dictionaries, one can focus on the linguistic material of one of two languages without prejudice to the scientific objectivity requirements. Specialized lexicography dictionaries support their users in a much better way (Aslam, Tahir, & Qadeer, 2019; Liu, 2018; Nasution, Murakami, & Ishida, 2018; Ozyumenko & Larina, 2018; Xiangqing, n.d.). The Dictionary of Lexicography describes lexicography as the technical activity and academic area concerned with DICTIONARY and other REFERENCE WORKS. It has two basic divisions: lexicographic practice, or DICTIONARY-MAKING, and lexicographic theory, or DICTIONARY RESEARCH (Hartmann & James, 1998). A more thorough overview of both divisions continues, including a listing of some lexicography branches, e.g. author lexicography, bilingual lexicography, encyclopedic lexicography, advanced lexicography, lexicography of thesaurus. It splits dictionary study into four components by means of a diagram, i.e. history, typology, criticism and usage, while dictionary-making is split into three components i.e. fieldwork, definition and presentation. However, one fails to mention the user, the contents, the structures and functions of the dictionaries and in the dictionary mentioned in the cover as a "professional



handbook" a reference to different theories of lexicography (M Plankina, S Pestova, H Tarasova, & M Yakhina, 2019; Yuliya Yurisovna, Rafisovna Alikberova, & Kamilevna Khabibullina, 2019).

A comprehensive treatment of lexicography is found in *Lexicography* (Burkhanov, 1998): A dictionary of fundamental terms. Lexicography's disciplinary status, its connection with other linguistic and non-linguistic disciplines, the nature of the lexicographic definition, the methodology of lexicographic study, the typology of reference works created in the sense of lexicography, lexicographic presentation techniques, are the key issues referred to. Lexicography is considered to be a field of applied linguistics, a branch of information science, a province of philological and historical studies, a subject field whose theoretical aspect falls within the field of theoretical linguistics, while its practice relates to the field of applied linguistics. Different perspectives on the role of lexicography are also given (Burkhanov, 1998). The fact that lexicography has been successfully developing its own theory is also alluded to by Burkhanov. He also believes that the term lexicography refers to the process, outcome, and theoretical assessment of reference works that reflect a broad range of heterogeneous structures of information. Whereas the above-mentioned specialized lexicography dictionaries agree that lexicography has both a functional and a theoretical aspect, one of the first key issues in the discussion of lexicography, as found in scientific journals, is whether or not the notion of lexicography theory is accepted. Different methods prevail, ranging from Atkins & Rundell (2008) arguing that they do not agree that such a thing exists with respect to a theory of lexicography.

Lexicography is divided into two categories that are distinct but equally important:

The art or craft of collecting, writing and editing dictionaries is realistic lexicography.

Theoretical lexicography is the empirical discipline of analyzing and explaining the semantic, syntagmatic, and paradigmatic relationships within a language's lexicon (vocabulary), developing theories of dictionary components and frameworks that connect data in dictionaries, users' needs for knowledge in particular types of situations, and how users can better access the integrated data

As distinct from lexicography, there is some debate on the concept of lexicology (Babušytė et al., 2011; Sha, 1996; Vera, 2002; Wikberg, 1983). Some use lexicology as a synonym of theoretical lexicography; others use it in a specific language to mean a branch of linguistics relating to the inventory of words. The emphasis of general lexicography is on the design, compilation, use and evaluation of general dictionaries, i.e. dictionaries which provide a general language definition. Such a dictionary is commonly referred to as a general or LGP dictionary (Language for General Purpose). Specialized lexicography focuses on the design, collection, use and review of specialized dictionaries, i.e. dictionaries dedicated to a (relatively limited) set of linguistic and factual elements, such as legal lexicography, of one or more specialized subject fields. For particular purposes, such a dictionary is commonly called a specialized dictionary or language dictionary, and after Nielsen (1994), specialized dictionaries are either multi-field, single-field or sub-field dictionaries. As the key topic of research in lexicography is the dictionary, it is now generally agreed that lexicography is a scholarly discipline in its own right and not a sub-branch of applied linguistics. There are many tasks involved in practical lexicographic practice, and the compilation of well-crafted dictionaries requires careful consideration of all or any of the following aspects:

1. Profiling the intended users and defining their needs (i.e. linguistic and non-linguistic competencies)
 - Defining the dictionary's communicative and cognitive roles
 - Selecting and arranging dictionary components
 - Choosing the necessary structures in the dictionary for presenting the data (i.e. frame structure, distribution structure, macro-structure, micro-structure and cross-reference structure)
 - Selecting terms and affixes as entries for systematization
 - Choosing collocations, sentences and examples
 - For each word or part of the word to be lemmatized, the choice of lemma forms
 - Defining terms
 - Arrangement of meanings
 - Specifying word pronunciation
 - Definitions and pronunciations for register and dialect marking, where applicable,
 - In bi- and multi-lingual dictionaries, the option of equivalents
 - In bi- and multilingual dictionaries, encoding collocations, phrases and examples



Developing the best way for users to access information in printed and electronic dictionaries

One essential objective of lexicography is to keep the lexicographic knowledge costs borne by dictionary users as minimal as possible (A Bashkirova & I Galeeva, 2019; A Kosharnaya, I Chumak-Zhun, I Plotnikova, Y Maltseva, & M Boldyreva, 2019; Minnezufarovna Nurullina, Giniyatovna Latfullina, & Abrarovna Usmanova, 2019; R Babko, O Samarkina, & Carlson, 2019).

Lexicographic works in the field of linguistics by I. I. Giganov are considered the most valuable and useful material for the Tatar language teaching (Kasemu, Yusupova, Denmukhametova, & Mugasimova, 2018; Safiullina, 2016; Alfiya Shaukatovna Yusupova, 2014; Alfiya Shavketovna Yusupova & Denmukhametova, 2015). They played an equally important role in the study of Turkic languages. First of all, the dictionaries by I.I. Giganov brought us the lexical richness of the language of the Siberian Tatars. They were very popular among intellectuals from the Siberian Tatars and Bukhara, as well as Muslim clergy from Tobolsk and other cities of Siberia. Many of them assisted I.I. Giganov with their language materials, tips and comments. Moreover, some mullahs wrote in Tatar with the Arabic script positive reviews on Giganov's works and sent them to Alexander I.

The first Russian Turkologist Joseph Ivanovich Giganov (? - September 7, 1800) was born in a religious family. He was a priest of the St. Sophia Cathedral in Tobolsk and at the same time taught the Tatar language at the Tobolsk main public school. During that time, I.I. Giganov was considered one of the best experts on the Tatar language, which explains his craving for teaching and scientific activities. I.I. Giganov is also known as the author of the works in the field of lexicography. He created the Tatar-Russian and Russian-Tatar dictionaries, which served as the basis for learning the language of the Tatars living in Tobolsk, and are one of the most valuable sources in Turkology.

The work by I. I. Giganov, entitled "Root words that are needed for the Tatar language teaching, collected at the Tobolsk main school by the Tatar teacher, St. Sophia Cathedral priest Joseph Giganov and certified by Yurt mullahs" was presented by the author as an appendix to his Tatar grammar (Giganov, 1801). It should be noted that this is the first experience of a printed thematic Tatar language dictionary compilation. This dictionary contains a large lexical material that refers to the language of the Siberian Tatars (Alahmadi & Foltz, 2020; Kasemu, N Denmukhametova, & G Khisamitdinova, 2019; Kogan, 2019; Nycz & Tęcza, 2020; Rodríguez Álvarez, 2019). The dictionary by I. I. Giganov (75 pages) is close by structure to handwritten dictionaries and phrasebooks of the 18th century. The distribution of lexical units in it is carried out according to the thematic principle, and the main evidence for this is the inclusion in it of only actively used words in the speech of that time.

Another dictionary by I. I. Giganov is known as the "Russian-Tatar Dictionary, compiled in the Tobolsk main public school by the Tatar language teacher I.I. Giganov and the mullahs of Yurt" (Giganov, 1804). It was published in St. Petersburg at the Imperial Academy of Sciences (1804). As the author points out, the dictionary is "printed according to the HIGHEST command." Its volume is 672 pages. It contains more than 12 thousand words that characterize all aspects of people life. Even phonetic variations are represented by separate dictionary entries. The main goal of the author was to collect lexical units of the Tatar language and teach free communication in this language. It is important that both dictionaries provide a literal translation. The main part of the lexical structure of the "Russian-Tatar Dictionary..." is the words characteristic of the colloquial and written speech of the Tatar people of that time, and also used in the language of the Siberian Tatars. This dictionary is active for the Russian-speaking population since the first language is Russian.

1.1. Research Objective

The article is devoted to the study of ethnocultural vocabulary, the most significant layer of the language vocabulary, documented by Giganov in the bilingual dictionaries.

2. Material and Methods

The purpose of this article is to study ethnocultural vocabulary by thematic groups and a comparative description with other Turkic languages of Southern Siberia. The source of the study is the Tatar-Russian and Russian-Tatar dictionaries by I.I. Giganov (1801; 1804)

The study used descriptive and comparative methods and partly etymological analysis techniques (Malykhina et al., 2017; Merkel & Yakovleva, 2018; Molchanova, 2019). The descriptive method is represented by such techniques as



the continuous sampling method, processing, interpretation method, as well as lexical and semantic analysis. The comparative method is based on the comparison with the East Turkic languages of Siberia, in order to clarify the specificity of lexical units. The methods and approaches used in work are determined by the complex nature of the study.

3. Results and Discussion

The lexical composition of each language, the national culture of the people is most clearly manifested in bilingual dictionaries, the words with national-cultural semantics are fixed as a national-cultural component. The works (Denmukhametov & Mugtasimova, 2016; Khusnullina, Nurmukhametova, Zamaletdinov, & Sattarova, 2018; Sahin, Kirillova, Mugtasimova, & Yerbulatova, 2017; Salakhova & Sibgaeva, 2014; Wierzbicka, 1992), indicate that culturally-marked vocabulary is the collection of lexical units that are direct carriers of information about the specific features of given linguistic community culture. Thus, the study of such language units makes it possible to plunge into the culture of native speakers, as well as to get acquainted with the background knowledge of foreign language culture.

Ethnocultural vocabulary represents the culture of the people, being a regional cultural component, constitutes the national cultural background of the language (Kazanbaeva, Tursunova, & Zhuyntaeva, 2012; Nurmukhametova, 2016). Ethnic culture covers the phenomena in the sphere of material and spiritual culture (housing, household items, dishes, utensils, food, clothes, shoes, etc.). Therefore, ethnocultural vocabulary is semantically diverse. It reflects the national characteristics of culture, the features of national-ethnic character, conveys a national character, historical and cultural flavour. Analyzing the ethnocultural material formed through the stereotype, much can be learned about the life, mentality, moral standards, customs and traditions of the people.

The vocabulary, which is endowed with national-cultural semantics, is of great interest in the bilingual dictionaries by I.I. Giganov (Gladkova, 2013; Lavrenova, 2019; Levisen, 2012). Each word reflecting the cultural and national specificity requires special attention. In the framework of one article, it is impossible to analyze a wide and diverse group of words, which makes the vocabulary of ethnic culture. From a large number of ethnocultural vocabulary recorded in the I.I. Giganov's dictionaries, we turned to such thematic groups as the vocabulary of clothing and jewellery; the vocabulary of food and traditional dishes; the vocabulary related to kitchen utensils.

The thematic group of clothes and jewellery can be divided into several subgroups: clothing, hats, shoes, and fabrics.

Among the words presented in the bilingual dictionaries by I.I. Giganov, there are words that indicate clothes and toilet articles. For example, tun - fur coat, kulmek - shirt, tolip - sheepskin coat, bishmyat - cotton caftan (Giganov, 1801), kukrekche - a vest (Giganov, 1804), biyeley - mittens, tunbrak - dress, ekta - robe, tambal - pants, ishim, paypak - stockings, chalbar - harem pants (Giganov, 1801).

Bishmet - wool caftan (Giganov, 1801)- was one of the most common types of basic outerwear. The word is recorded in many bilingual dictionaries of the XIX-th century, but it is not reflected in the dictionary by M. Kashgari and in the "Codex Kumanikus". The considered lexeme is found in a number of Turkic languages, mainly in the Kypchak and Karluk groups.

The Tatar-Russian and Russian-Tatar dictionaries of the XIX century fixed the narrowing of the meaning of tun to the meaning of "fur coat". This word in the Old Turkic dictionary is fixed in the meaning of "clothing". In the same meaning it is noted by the work "Kudatgu Bilik", by the manuscript in honour of Kul-Tegin, and in the dictionary by M. Kashgari.

The word kurt, kurtnu (Giganov, 1801) is quite ancient. According to some Russian etymologists, the Russian word "jacket" also comes from the word kurti (Fasmer, 1986). The kurte lexeme, which is used in the meaning of "quilted sleeveless jacket," preserved in the Kazan region medium dialect.

The dictionaries contain names of various types of shoes. For example chabata - bast shoe, oltan chabantasi - the sole of the boot, oeik - stockings, kyebich - shoe, kyektye - prikopotki, socks for stockings, kunuch - shank cover, kunichbau - garter, atus - ichigi, kyabis - shoe (Giganov, 1801), ayakchu - footcloth (Giganov, 1804). There are also the words that denote hats: kyalyabash - girl cap, siraus - the hair lift (Giganov, 1801).



After the analysis, they singled out the lexemes common for the East Turkic languages: Khakass, Altai, Shor, Tuva, Yakut. For example, *tere ton*, *nekey ton* (fur coat) (alt.), *meeley* (mittens) (alt.), *shalmar* (harem pants) (alt.), *ton* (coat) (Tuv.), *chuvur* (pants) (Tuv.), *odik* (boot(s)) (Shor.), *shtan* (trousers) (Shor.), *poruk* (hat) (Shor.), *kogenek* (shirt) (Khak.), *pörük* (hat) (Khak.), *istan* (pants, trousers) (Khak.), *ton* (fur coat) (Khak.), *kiis ödikter* (Khak.), *kiis maymahtar* (boots) (Khak.), etc.

Food is one of the oldest elements of the material culture of any people. The age-old traditions of the ethnos are especially clearly manifested in it. Therefore, the vocabulary of this group should be considered as inextricably linked with the history of the people. The names of food and drink reflect the socio-economic conditions, the nature of the population occupation. Therefore, this thematic group is of interest not only as a historical-ethnographic, but also a linguistic source. For example, *byalesh* - round cake, *koymak* – pancakes, *nan* - bread, *serte* - drawn butter (Giganov, 1801).

The lexical unit *bolamik* - stew (Giganov, 1801) was widespread among the Tatars. This word meant flour porridge brewed in boiling water and seasoned with butter. This dish is present in the traditional cuisine of many Turkic peoples.

Belesh - a round pie made from fresh or yeast dough stuffed with pieces of fatty meat, cereals or potatoes is also beloved by the Tatars and no less ancient (Akhmetyanov, 2001). Concluding the list of flour products of the Tatars, we cannot but mention *koymak* made from liquid yeast or unleavened wheat dough. *Koymak* was fried on coals in a furnace, which gave them a special aroma. Usually, *koymak* was served for breakfast with melted butter, and certainly on religious holidays.

In this thematic group, lexical-semantic parallels with East Turkic languages are rarely used. For example, *bidaa* (chowder) (Tuv.), *Itpek* (bread) (Shor.), *Palik* (fish) (Shor.), *Ipek* (bread) (Khak.), *palih* (fish) (Khak.), etc.

An important place is occupied by household utensils in the material culture of any nation. Inventing tools, a person gives them appropriate names. The names designating the names of dishes make up an ancient layer of vocabulary. Kitchen utensils, dishes are very diverse, and therefore this thematic group includes a large number of items. The bilingual dictionaries by I.I. Giganov have a large number of lexemes, indicating dishes, and kitchen utensils. The words recorded in bilingual dictionaries reached us without any changes. For example, *chinayak* - a cup (Giganov, 1804), *ayak* - a bowl, *ayak kashik* - a spoon, *azan* - a cauldron, *tabak* - a large wooden dish, *chanichki* - a fork, *pchak* - a knife, *chulmek* - a pot, *ilyek* - a sieve, *chilyak* - a bucket, *kirgich* - a grater (Giganov, 1804), *ashlav* - a trough, *kapkir* - a ladle, *shabalya* - a spoon, *halva tabak* - a plate (Giganov, 1801; 1804), *kadyah* - a bowl (Giganov, 1804).

The very concept of “dishes” in I. Giganov’s works is conveyed by the word “*sauyt*” - dishes. Used with the defining words, *savit* expresses new concepts: *toz savuti* - salt shaker (Giganov, 1801).

The word *ayak* (Giganov, 1801) is a very ancient Turkic-Tatar lexical unit. In written manuscripts, the *ayak* lexeme is marked with the meaning “bowl, rinse”: “*Ber ayakni ballap bir, ber ayakni agulap bir*”. The same component makes the part of the words *chinayak*: *chin ajq* - Chinese dishes or a cup, *gham ayak* - bucket, bowl (Akhmetyanov, 2001).

As a result of the analysis, lexemes are common for the East Turkic languages. For example, *ayak* (cup, plate, dish) (Alt.), *ayak-kazan* (dishes) (Alt.), *tabak* (large dish, basin) (Alt.), *elgek* (sieve) (Alt.), *bedrek* (bucket) (Alt.), *biscak* (knife) (Alt.); *ayak* (cup) (Tuv.), *shishkish* (sieve) (Tuv.), *tavak* (plate) (Tuv.), *dus savasi* (salt shaker) (Tuv.); *kabichak* (bag) (Shor.), *kazan* (boiler) (Shor.), *kapchak* (bag) (Shor.), *odun* (firewood) (Shor.), *orgak* (sickle) (Shor.), *hap* (bag) (Khak.), *tabah* (plate) (Khak.), *kazan* (cauldron) (Khak.), *pichah* (knife) (Khak.)

As our studies show, the dictionaries by I.I. Giganov have an ethnocultural vocabulary common to the Siberian Tatars and the Tatar language, it's middle and Mishar dialects.

4. Summary and Conclusion

Studying the bilingual dictionaries by I.I. Giganov, we came to the conclusion that the compiler sought to preserve the features of vocabulary-language signs and their grammatical design, taking into account the existing sign-evaluative and specific verbal expressions of his time. The author tried to interpret the words correctly, to note the positions of words in the lexical system of the language, to identify their features, conditions for their use, connection



with life, which constitutes their very essence. The study of culturally marked vocabulary in the Turkic-Tatar lexicographic manuscripts allows us to revive some forgotten traditions, makes it possible to find common and specific elements in the ethnic cultures of Turkic peoples.

The dictionaries by I.I. Giganov are the works of various types and purposes. If the first was compiled as an application to grammar and includes only active words of the Tatar language, then the second, the Russian-Tatar dictionary, is an academic work. The vocabulary of these lexicographic works gives an idea of the Tatar language active vocabulary in the XIX-th century. It should be noted that dictionaries were compiled on the territory of Siberia, where Siberian Tatars live. All linguistic features of the Siberian Tatar language are reflected in the dictionaries under study.

The bilingual dictionaries by I.I. Giganov strove for the most complete and consistent solution of important linguistic and cultural problems. This characteristic, as it seems to us, is explained by the tasks and goals of the dictionary, since this is not only the collection of language vocabulary but also the reflection of the educational achievements of the nation in the field of material and spiritual culture, the level of linguistic and cultural development of the ethnic group in the 19th century.

In our opinion, the commonality of the Tatar language with the Middle and Mishar dialects is probably related, on the one hand, to the preservation of the lexical units of the common Turkic language in the Volga-Ural region, and, on the other hand, the centuries-old close contacts of Siberian Tatars with the peoples from the Middle Volga Region. It should be noted that most of these words are currently actively used not only in the language and dialects of the Siberian Tatars but also in the language of the East Turkic peoples. First of all, this is due to territorial proximity, close economic, commercial and cultural ties with the Siberian population. In our opinion, this community is historically explained with the original habitat of the Kimak-Kipchak tribes, which formed the ethnic basis of the Siberian Tatars in Altai.

4.1. Contribution

In the Turkic-Tatar lexicographic manuscripts, the study of culturally marked vocabulary helps us to revive some lost customs, enabling the ethnic cultures of Turkic peoples to locate common and particular elements.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- A Bashkirova, K., & I Galeeva, G. (2019). Linguopsychological Analysis of the Characters of Guy De Maupassant on the Example of Short Story "Pierrot." *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 732–739.
- A Kosharnaya, S., I Chumak-Zhun, I., I Plotnikova, L., Y Maltseva, G., & M Boldyreva, S. (2019). The Title of a Literary Text as a Discursive Phenomenon. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 396–404.
- Akhmetyanov, R. G. (2001). Brief historical and etymological dictionary of the Tatar language. *Kazan: Tat. Kit. Nashr*, 272.
- Alahmadi, A., & Foltz, A. (2020). Exploring the effect of lexical inferencing and dictionary consultation on undergraduate EFL students' vocabulary acquisition. *PloS One*, 15(7), e0236798.
- Aslam, M., Tahir, A., & Qadeer, A. (2019). Reconceptualization of Lexicography: An Analysis of Monolingual and Bilingual Pakistani Dictionaries. *Erevna Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 3(1), 19–36.
- Atkins, B. S., & Rundell, M. (2008). *The Oxford guide to practical lexicography*. Oxford University Press.
- Babušytė, D., Kundrotas, G., Račienė, E., Barniškienė, S., Lassan, E., Kohrs, J., ... Poliakovas, O. (2011). *Europeisms: The concept of inter-lexicology theory based on the results of empirical research of German, English, Lithuanian, Russian, and Ukrainian texts from newspapers* (PhD Thesis). Vilniaus universitetas.



- Burkhanov, I. (1998). *Lexicography: A dictionary of basic terminology*. Wydawn. Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Rzeszowie.
- Denmukhametov, R., & Mugtasimova, G. (2016). Toponymic field of tatar folk riddles. *International Business Management, 10*(21), 5107–5109.
- Fasmer, M. (1986). Etymological dictionary of the Russian language. *T. I (AD): Translation from German and Supplement by ON Trubachev/Editorial and Foreword by BA Larin. 2nd Ed. Moscow: Progress.*
- Giganov, I. I. (1801). Root words that are most needed for teaching the Tatar language, collected at the Tobolsk main school by the teacher of the Tatar language, St. Sophia Cathedral priest Joseph Giganov and certified by yurt mullahs. St. Petersburg, 75 p. [In Russian]
- Giganov, I.I. (1804). The Russian-Tatar dictionary compiled in the Tobolsk main public school by the Tatar language teacher I. Giganov and the mullahs of Yurt. St. Petersburg: Imp. AS, 627 p. [In Russian]
- Gladkova, A. (2013). “Is he one of ours?” The cultural semantics and ethnopragmatics of social categories in Russian. *Journal of Pragmatics, 55*, 180–194.
- Hartmann, R. R. K., & James, G. (1998). *Dictionary of lexicography*. Psychology Press.
- Kasemu, S., N Denmukhametova, E., & G Khisamitdinova, F. (2019). Synonyms in Explanatory Dictionary of Turkic Languages. *Research in Applied Linguistics, 10*(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 1025–1032.
- Kasemu, S., Yusupova, A. S., Denmukhametova, E. N., & Mugtasimova, G. R. (2018). Traditions of compiling bilingual dictionaries for Turkic peoples. *Amazonia Investiga, 7*(13), 156–161.
- Kazanbaeva, A., Tursunova, M., & Zhuyntaeva, Z. (2012). The use of ethnocultural vocabulary in artwork. *European Researcher, 37*(12 Part 2), 2182–2185.
- Khusnullina, G. N., Nurmukhametova, R. S., Zamaletdinov, R. R., & Sattarova, M. R. (2018). The Lexicon Of Tatar Language: Names Of Food For The Future And Utensils For Storage. *Modern Journal Of Language Teaching Methods, 8*(9), 72–77.
- Kogan, L. (2019). Additions and Corrections to Wolf Leslau’s Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez (1987–2017). *Journal of the American Oriental Society, 139*(4), 893–906.
- Lavrenova, O. (2019). *Spaces and meanings: Semantics of the cultural landscape* (Vol. 8). Springer.
- Levisen, C. (2012). *Cultural semantics and social cognition: A case study on the Danish universe of meaning* (Vol. 257). Walter de Gruyter.
- Liu, L. (2018). Partial equivalences in bilingual dictionaries: Classification, causes and compensations. *Lingua, 214*, 11–27.
- M Plankina, R., S Pestova, M., H Tarasova, F., & M Yakhina, A. (2019). Evaluative Component in the Meaning of Verbal Phraseological Units of English, Russian and Tatar Languages. *Research in Applied Linguistics, 10*(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 1009–1016.
- Malykhina, T. M., Larina, L. I., Pisareva, L. E., Pravednikova, T. V., Kuzmina, A. V., Kositsyna, N. O., & Starodubtseva, E. A. (2017). The Concept Of “Russia” Through Ethno-Linguistic And Etymological Analysis. *Russian Linguistic Bulletin, 3* (11).
- Merkel, E., & Yakovleva, L. (2018). Experiment of the South Yakutia Toponymy’s Lexicographic Description. *SHS Web of Conferences, 50*, 01104. EDP Sciences.
- Minnezufarovna Nurullina, G., Giniyatovna Latfullina, L., & Abrarovna Usmanova, L. (2019). The Valuable Potential of the History of Learning Turcisms in Russian Language. *Research in Applied Linguistics, 10*(Proceedings of the 6th

International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 702–709.

- Molchanova, D. V. (2019). Limological Methodology Of Linguocultural Concept Description. *Лингвистическая Лимология*, 97–101.
- Nasution, A. H., Murakami, Y., & Ishida, T. (2018). Designing a collaborative process to create bilingual dictionaries of Indonesian ethnic languages. *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*.
- Nielsen, S. (1994). *The bilingual LSP dictionary: Principles and practice for legal language* (Vol. 24). Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Nurmuhametova, R. S. (2016). Ethnocultural Vocabulary of the Tatar Language. *Tatarica*, (1), 27–42.
- Nycz, K., & Tęcza, Z. (2020). On the Pronunciation Dictionaries of Contemporary German: Principles of Selection and Lemmatization of Lexical Material. *International Journal of Lexicography*.
- Ozyumenko, V., & Larina, T. (2018). Cultural Semantics in Second Language Teaching: A case study of Russian drug and English friend. *INTED2018 Proceedings*, 9149–9158.
- R Babko, K., O Samarkina, N., & Carlson, C. (2019). The Real Psycholinguistic Meaning of a Word and Metaphorically Reinterpreted Component Correlation (Based on English Phraseological Uni. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 855–861.
- Rodríguez Álvarez, A. (2019). The medical entries in John Kersey's abridged Dictionarium Anglo-Britannicum (1708) or how to retain highly demanded lexical material in a short dictionary. *Token*.
- Safiullina, G. (2016). Bilingual Lexicography in the Republic of Tatarstan in 1990-2010. *Proceedings of the XVII EURALEX International Congress. Lexicography and Linguistic Diversity*, 6–10.
- Sahin, L., Kirillova, Z. N., Mugtasimova, G. R., & Yerbulatova, I. K. (2017). *Culture-specific terms as verbal expressive peculiar features of national cultures*.
- Salakhova, R. R., & Sibgaeva, F. R. (2014). Cross-linguistic differences as a type of lexical difficulties in Russian-Tatar translations. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(4), 325–328.
- Sha, Y. (1996). On the development of human concept from lexicology of Mosuos. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 28(03), 328–333.
- Vera, J. E. D. (2002). *A changing world of words: Studies in English historical lexicography, lexicology and semantics* (Vol. 141). Rodopi.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, culture, and cognition: Universal human concepts in culture-specific configurations*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Wikberg, K. (1983). Methods in Contrastive Lexicology. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(3), 213–221.
- Xiangqing, W. (n.d.). *On Lexicographical Translation in Bilingual Dictionaries and its Multi-disciplinary Theoretical Basis*.
- Yuliya Yurisovna, K., Rafisovna Alikberova, A., & Kamilevna Khabibullina, E. (2019). A Critical Look at of Russian Language and Culture in the XVI-XVII Centuries: A Comparative Linguistics Focusing on Russian and Korean Corpora. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 1262–1269.
- Yusupova, Alfiya Shaukatovna. (2014). Russian-Tatar Dictionaries of the First Half of the 19th Century. *Tatarica*, (2), 29–46.



Yusupova, Alfiya Shavketovna, & Denmukhametova, E. N. (2015). Bilingual Dictionaries of the Turkic People as Indicator of Identity of Cultures. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(6 S2), 87.



© 2020 by the authors. Licensee Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0 license). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

