Olga Ivanishcheva
Murmansk Arctic State University

ENDANGERED-LANGUAGE DICTIONARIES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE DICTIONARY MAKER AND SPEECH COMMUNITY[1]

Abstract: The article discusses issues related to making a dictionary of an endangered language, specifically the case of Kildin Saami, the language of the ethnos that inhabits only the Kola peninsula in Russia. The article considers three oppositions: "dictionary versus language", "dictionary versus user", and "dictionary versus dictionary maker", which lead to a conclusion regarding the peculiarities of the work of a lexicographer making such a dictionary. The article describes issues related to the variety of language and orthography selected and the scope of the speaker's background knowledge, which has a tendency to shrink or transform under conditions where speakers are aging, traditional folk culture is being lost, and there are global changes in the sociocultural environment of the ethnos.

1. Introduction

Creating an endangered-language dictionary involves consideration of several possible oppositions: "dictionary versus language", "dictionary versus user", and "dictionary versus dictionary maker". In every opposition, the role of a dictionary is determined by its primary and original purpose – as a collection of words – but has its own peculiarities that distinguish an endangered-language dictionary from dictionaries of major languages. The issues common to the endangered languages – the aging of language speakers, the disappearance or decline of literature in the language, the neglect of culture for political, social and economic reasons, and the degeneration or extinction of the ethnos – are reflected in the content of a dictionary, the extent to which the language is preserved, motivation to study it, and how it is taught.

---

2. Research

2.1. Article Focus

The article is focused on the dictionary versus dictionary maker opposition. A maker of an endangered-language dictionary can be either a native speaker or a researcher with no command of the language. The purpose of such dictionaries is study and translation and they are often intended to help representatives of the ethnos to study or improve their understanding of their own language. In this situation, it is of interest to explore the issues which the maker of a dictionary for a critically endangered language faces with regard to the speech community. These have not been addressed in the literature, although they are mentioned (for instance: Mosel 2011). I was forced to address the issues when making three dictionaries of the Kildin Saami language, which is represented only in Russia on the Kola peninsula (the Murmansk region). Our experience of long-term field research, and scientific discussions with colleagues and speakers, support the ideas of Mosel: that the purpose of an endangered-language dictionary is not translation or language studies, but its description for the purposes of revitalization and scientific research (Mosel 2011).

2.2. Research Subject and Approaches

The issue of Kildin Saami language revitalization has arisen recently in the Saami community and especially sharply in Russian and foreign research.

The Saami languages belong to the Finno-Ugric branch of the Uralic language family and are divided into western and eastern groups of dialects based on phonetic and morphologic differences.

The western dialects (Southern Saami in Sweden and Norway; Ume Saami in Sweden; Pite Saami in Sweden and Norway; Lule Saami in Sweden and Norway; North Saami in Sweden and Norway) and the eastern dialects (Inari Saami in Finland; Skolt Saami in Finland, Norway and Russia; Akkala Saami in Russia, Kildin Saami in Russia, Ter Saami in Russia) are, in some sources, referred to as separate languages (see, for instance: Rieβler 2007; Шеллер 2010). In this paper, the Saami languages of the Kola peninsula are referred to as the Kola Saami languages.

An analysis of the sociolinguistic situation of the Kola Saami languages shows that they have lost their position due to a centuries-long Russian-speaking environment. A number of historic, demographic, social, and institutional factors have contributed to this situation.

In spite of state policy and the work of public organizations there has not been result in an increase of the Kola Saami-speaking population. The limited everyday

functions of these languages, the lack of motivation for study of the Kola Saami languages among the youth of the Murmansk region compared to their interest in studying the languages of the Norwegian Saami (the North Saami), and the aging of speakers have all led to a deterioration in the situation of the Kola Saami languages.

The work of E. Scheller, a researcher from the Arctic University of Norway, has contributed to research into the Kola Saami languages, addressing the social factors affecting their function and concluding that all four are seriously endangered by a language shift from Saami to Russian (Scheller 2004; 2007; Шеллер 2010; 2012). Scheller's works describe the conditions needed for the revitalization of Kola Saami languages. The Saami community in Russia is also actively suggesting measures for the preservation and revitalization of their language, in particular the language nest methodology, an immersion-based approach to early childhood education. This methodology has revitalized the North Saami languages in Norway and is also used for teaching the Saami languages in Finland.

Making dictionaries and scientific research into the Kola Saami languages will definitely contribute to their revival. This is why the identification of issues related to the lexicographical description of endangered languages is of immediate interest for both the scientific community and for the speech community. Kildin Saami is the subject of our research for several reasons: first of all, there are no dictionaries of any Kola Saami language other than Kildin; secondly, Kildin Saami is the basis of the Kola Saami writing system; and, thirdly, I has contributed to research and lexicographical description of the Kildin Saami lexis.

2.3. Research Methods

When making Saami dictionaries, we used the following sociolinguistic methods: a field study, questionnaires, written surveys and interviews, an expert survey, and a biographical approach (a case study used to examine contemporary life). We also used the Saami archives and libraries of the Murmansk region alongside descriptive methods, componential analysis, definition analysis, and continuous and random sampling.

2.4. Results

2.4.1. Dictionary versus Language

 In the context of an endangered language, the dictionary versus language opposition refers to the correlation between the composition of presently available dictionaries (including the coverage of the lexis/lexes) and the language material they represent.

The most well-researched area of Saami language is the toponymy lexis (Керт 2007). Grammar and phonetic features were studied by P. Zaykov (Зайков 1987), G. Kert (Керт 1971), G. Kostina (Костина 2006), P. Sammalahti (1998), and S. Tereshkin (Терешкин 2002). The issue of borrowings and substrate lexis (originally Saami) was raised in the works of Kert (Керт 1971). A stratum of borrowings from Baltic, German, and Russian languages into the was also studied by Kert (Керт 1971; 2009). The fullest dictionary of eastern dialects of the Saami language is the two-volume "Koltan-ja Kuolanlapin Sanakirja" by T. Itkonen (1958). This dictionary contains important lexical material; however, the headwords belong to Paatsjoki Saami which makes working with the dictionary challenging despite the fact that the second volume contains indexes in Finnish, German, and one of the Norwegian Saami dialects (Зайков 1987, 10; Терешкин 2002, 18). "Comparative and Onomasiologic Dictionary of Karelian, Vepsian, and Saami Dialects" (Баранцев/ Зайков/Зайцева и др. 2007) contains approximately 1500 notions in 24 Karelian, 6 Vepsian, and 5 Saami dialects, arranged by notion and topic, and including an index of topics and register of notions. There are three translation Kola Saami dictionaries: the "Saami-Russian dictionary" (Куруч 1985) which has 8000 entries, the "Saami-Russian and Russian-Saami dictionary" (Керт 1986) which has about 4000 entries and "Saami-Russian dictionary" (Антонова 2014) which has 7500 entries. The multimedia Kola Saami lexicography project of Giellatekno, the Saami Language Technology Center at the Arctic University of Norway is designed for a wide audience. All modern IT-based dictionaries serve the needs of those who study Kola Saami languages and represent the lexis and grammar of different Saami dialects. The work of the Saami Language Technology Center underlines the importance of language technology and they emphasize that their electronic dictionaries combine a dictionary and a morphological analysis, and also provide grammar details (Тростеруд 2012). Russian electronic dictionaries contain translation equivalents and basic grammar (http://saami.forum24.ru/). Development of a language resource tool like WordNet is required for automatic processing of texts in a given language. The closest things to these for the Kola Saami languages are produced by the developers at Giellatekno. A project to develop Samoyed multimedia dictionaries, managed by J. Normanskaya, is based on unique software which will allow all researchers who possess fieldwork recordings to create multimedia dictionaries that combine the sound, dialect, and etymological aspects of a dictionary (http://lingvodoc. ispras.ru/).

In our opinion, the primary issue in the framework of the "language versus dictionary" opposition is the lack of a full database of Kildin Saami language

2.4.2. Dictionary versus User

Within the dictionary versus user opposition we consider the correlation between the potential and the real users of an endangered language (see, for instance, De Schryver/Prinsloo 2011; Hornáčková-Klapicová 2012; see also: Шеллер-Больтц 2015, 160; Огнева 2011, 423; Вадас-Возьны 2010).

Considering this with respect to the available Kildin Saami dictionaries: "Saami-Russian and Russian-Saami dictionary" (Керт 1986) is a study dictionary intended for primary-school children, and its purpose, as described by the author, is to aid students to master the native (Kildin Saami) language and Russian; "Saami-Russian dictionary" (Куруч 1985) is intended for Finno-Ugric language specialists, ethnographers, and others interested in the Saami language; and "Saami-Russian dictionary" (Антонова 2014) is for anyone studying the Saami language, including native speakers who would like to learn to write and read in the language, and teachers and specialists in the Saami and other Finno-Ugric languages (Антонова 2014, 5). "Saami-Russian dictionary" (Антонова 2014) appeared in conjunction with her Saami translation of "Pippi Longstocking", a book by Swedish author A. Lindgren. According to Scheller, a member of the editorial group, the dictionary is an additional tool that will help those reading the book "Pippi Longstocking" in Saami.

"The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography" describes several types of dictionary users. The authors claim that the way to make a dictionary that meets a particular demand is to study the requirements of the user: his needs and skills. One must clearly understand who will use the dictionary, what for, and what skills they will need. In order to decide which group the user belongs to, one needs answers to the following questions:

U s e r   t y p e: Is the user an adult, a young child, or a school pupil? If they study the language, is it at beginner, intermediate, or advanced level? Are they a general user or a specialist (if so, in what field)? What are the user's aims: learning, personal, or professional?

U s a g e   t y p e: Why does the user need the dictionary? Is it for general purposes (looking up meanings of unknown words, checking spelling or pronunciation, doing crosswords); study of a particular subject; language studies; translation from one language to another; producing text in the language; preparation for written or oral examination?

U s e r   s k i l l s: What type of skills does the user already have? Do they have knowledge of the peculiarities of lexical and grammatical structure of languages in general and a certain language (or languages) in particular? Are they able to use dictionaries in general? It is very important to have information about what potential users do when they use a dictionary, what they like and do not like about particular dictionaries, and what their expectations are (Atkins/Rundell 2008, 28–33).

The user of Kildin Saami dictionaries described in the guidelines and forewords of the existing dictionaries is a native speaker and/or a person who is studying the language. No portrait of such a language user has ever been made. Nevertheless, it is extremely important for determination of dictionary type. Our research shows that the potential and real users of the Kildin Saami language are not the same.

This happens first of all for sociolinguistic reasons that depend on such factors as the number of Kildin Saami speakers and number of those who would like to study it. The exact number of people who know Kildin Saami is not known. According to the 2010 Russian population census data, 15,7% of 1771 Kola Saami can speak their native language (Национальный состав 2013). Systematic language teaching for the Saami is available at only one Russian school – the state-financed Lovozero Comprehensive secondary school. Presently there are 21 pupils studying the Saami language. There are also some optional irregular Saami language classes in different localities in the Murmansk region. Consequently, dictionary usage is mostly confined to a small group of people who have a desire to study the language and the possibility of doing so. This group of users uses the dictionary to study the language and translate from one language into another (usually for the translation of literature from Russian into Saami and from Saami into Russian). The skills of these dictionary users are limited to a command of the spoken language with no knowledge of grammar and, in some cases, with no dictionary-use skills at all.

The needs of a user/culture-bearer and user/language researcher have sometimes been replaced with one another in the history of the Kola Saami dictionaries. For instance, the "Saami-Russian dictionary" (Куруч 1985) was issued by a Moscow publishing house under the auspices of the Russian Academy of Science in an edition of 1720 copies (the number of Saami ABC copies was 500 published at the same time). According to the community, it was not a Saami-Russian dictionary that should have been published but a Russian-Saami one, because the Saami know Russian well but do not know their native language (Смирнов 1989). This need was partially met in 1986 when "Saami-Russian and Russian-Saami dictionary" (Керт 1986) was published, although it was intended for primary-school children and not well disseminated.

The latest "Saami-Russian dictionary" (Антонова 2014) solves this problem because the foreword says that the dictionary is intended as an aid for reading a book, i.e. for passive language knowledge.

2.4.3. Dictionary versus Dictionary Maker

2.4.3.1. Background

In the dictionary versus dictionary maker opposition we consider the correlation between "dictionary maker" and "language researcher". This opposition is the focus of this paper and is especially important for endangered languages.

As in presented in Mosel's description of documentation of the endangered languages in Papua New Guinea (the endangered languages of Papua New Guinea (Samoan languages)), the principal differences between making a dictionary for a major language and an endangered language is that documentation of endangered languages is a non-profit enterprise, and those creating databases are not native speakers. However, as explained in the previous section, dictionary-making should be preceded by understanding who will use the dictionary and for what purpose: that is, a dictionary should meet the interests of both speakers and researchers. The best option would be to make two dictionaries: one meeting the needs of language speakers, and the other meeting the needs of researchers and their scientific work. But, if it is not possible to make both, the first option has priority. Making an endangered-language dictionary is connected with several issues crucial for researchers, such as, for instance, choice of the base dialect for the dictionary, definition of dictionary type, and decisions about the spelling of individual words. Speakers of a language should decide which dialect is to be primary for the dictionary, but if this right is given to the researcher, they should decide based on the number of speakers of each dialect, their age, and how the dialect is used for different functions. If an endangered language has no standardized orthography, the dictionary maker should consult the language community. When doing so, they should remember that this issue is often political. Despite the fact that alternative spellings can make the dictionary bulky, sometimes keeping such alternatives cannot be avoided (Mosel 2011).

Our experience of making Kildin Saami dictionaries confirmed Mosel's claims and also revealed issues with the selection of language variant, orthography, and information to be included in definitions.

2.4.3.2. Language Variation and Orthography Selection

A special issue arises if the maker of an endangered-language dictionary does not know the language or knows only one of its variants. In such situations, the requirement that a dictionary addresses the interests of both language speakers and language researchers becomes more important than ever. The maker of a Kola Saami dictionary maker needs to select both a dialect (base language) and its orthography.

The Kildin dialect (Kildin Saami language) was selected as the base for writing Saami from the moment it was developed from a Latin base in the 1930s. Kildin stood above the Tuloma Saami and Ter Saami dialects because in the areas where it was spoken there were well-trained teachers who knew both Russian and Saami. In the 1930s, Kildin Saami began to be "standard Saami" (see, for instance, ГАМО 1935).

The makers of the three current bilingual dictionaries of Kildin Saami had different views on the orthography of this language.

The discussion between the supporters of the different orthographic systems (that of Kuruch et al. and that of Kert) is focused on two letters: h and j. These phonemes have a different graphical image in the dictionary by P. Sammallahti and A. Hvorostuhina (1991): ' and й respectively. The same letters are used in the "Saami-Russian Dictionary Primary School Handbook" (Куруч/Виноградова/ Яковлева 1991).

The supporters of graphemes h and j (or ' and й in other sources) believe that the letter j stands for a voiceless palatal fricative sonant j, and the letter h is used for preaspiration before voiceless p, t, k and affricates t͡s, t͡ʃ (Куруч 1985, 529). The opponents of this theory think that these letters duplicate the existing letters x and й and do not stand for a particular sound (Керт 2007, 12). It should be noted that Kert's opinion regarding the absence of particular sounds for letters h and j is based on experimental work at a phonetics lab whereas the opinion of h and j supporters is based on the personal linguistic feelings of speakers. Phonetic research into the consonant system of Kildin Saami has not been carried out by anyone but Kert.

Use of ä and ӭ to indicate semi-palatalization of a preceding consonant also causes disagreement, and use of special characters to indicate the vowel length is controversial too. The reasons for the appearance of palatalized consonants are also under discussion, as is their indication. M. Rieβler (2007) considers palatalization to be due to inherent language reasons, while Kert (Керт 2007, 12) says it demonstrates the influence of Russian.

Two orthographic systems hinder not only dictionary-making, but also teaching, and the spread of Kola Saami languages on the whole and Kildin Saami in particular.

2.4.3.3. Definition Content

On the one hand, lexicography is a descriptive science since it describes the attributes of a word and, on the other hand, it is an interpretive science as we can see if we consider the content of a dictionary entry.

The issue of the essence and structure of a dictionary definition has not been yet settled. According to some researchers, we should distinguish between the terms definition, interpretation, and description.

An interpretation enables a word to be understood generally and properly; the notion of an interpretation of a word is wider than that of a definition. There

is a concept according to which a lexical meaning of a word is found within its interpretation which is seen as translation of a word into a special semantic language (Апресян 1995, 69). The term interpretation is often understood in a broad sense, for instance, as explanation of a word's sense (Перцова 1988, 4). However, in bilingual lexicography, the term is understood in a narrow sense – as a way to translate non-equivalent lexis: "a descriptive equivalent" (Берков 1996, 181), "a description-definition" (Бурак 2002, 27).

When distinguishing a definition from a description, E. A. Nida (Найда 1983, 66) notes that a definition gives the minimum necessary information about an object whereas a description contains more than just a word's meaning.

In logic, description is considered to be a technique similar to ostensive definition: explanation by example, characteristics, and comparisons. As such, and unlike a definition, the description does not differentiate between distinctive/non-distinctive or essential/non-essential because the only aim being pursued is to find out as many properties of the object being described as possible (Ивлев 1997, 159). Description therefore appears to be a logical operation, a mental technique used to find, clarify, and specify the meaning of a sign expression in one language or another (Горский 1974, 100). The cognitive function of description is closely connected with its purpose – to expose the content of a certain notion, to characterize a certain object in a way that will allow us to distinguish it from other objects. This is why "to give a good definition is to expose the essence of the object under definition". One should take into account the relativity of such an essence: what is primary for one purpose might be secondary from the viewpoint of another purpose (Ивин 2002, 93–94).

I am interested not in form of the definition (which is well-studied), but the content By the definition content we mean the set of features associated with an object/notion. The basic principles to be taken account when selecting the features in a dictionary definition are discussed in linguistic literature: they are essentiality, sufficiency, fullness. The way such information is presented in a dictionary can be considered as a bracketed commentary. A commentary as part of the reference apparatus may specify a word (word commentary), a text (text commentary), or a situation (situation commentary), although traditionally a commentary is understood to be an explanation added to a text in order to directly manage the reader's perception.

Additional information in a dictionary entry can have a range of positions: it may be detached in a special area, included in a commentary, or used as a descriptive element in a definition. There are no criteria determining the place for such notes: it is decided by the intuition of the dictionary's author. Thus, in "The Unabridged Defining Dictionary" (Кузнецов 2000) the encyclopedic information is either marked with a • sign, or included in the body of the interpretation in brackets or a with a prepositional phrase like "In ancient Rome", "In the Middle Ages in Western Europe", "In Christianity", etc. Analysis of dictionary entries shows that additional

information is divided into information about a notion/realities and information about a word, although the latter is actually the privilege of linguistic (philological) dictionaries and should not have anything to do with an encyclopedic dictionary.

Thus, information about a notion/object in "The Unabridged Defining Dictionary" is represented by following rubrics: 1) history of an object/notion; 2) description of an object – either without any introductory formula or using "depicted as"; 3) area of its application/distribution – information presented using formulas like "used as", applied as", "inhabits", "widespread in", "is typical for"; 4) composition, content, features – using formulas like "is made of", "mostly"; 5) period of application/distribution – indicated using the formulas "initially", "earlier", "in the old days"; 6) superstitious beliefs and symbology connected with the object/notion – with the formula "is considered".

Information about a word in "The Unabridged Defining Dictionary" is presented in the form of an etymologic note, that is, interpretations using the formulas "according to", "in the name of…", "by …" (e.g. IL – from the name of aircraft designer S. V. Ilyushin (1894–1977) (Кузнецов 2000, 388)) or "originally" to indicate an obsolete meaning of a word (e.g. anecdote – originally: amusing or insightful story from the life of a historic person, legendary hero, etc. (ibidem, 40)).

In many cases in an entry of "The Unabridged Defining Dictionary" there is a shift of information about a word and a notion: sambo – a combat sport, allowing submission holds (acronym for: self-defense without weapons; developed in the USSR in the 30s by combining most effective techniques of other martial arts) (Кузнецов 2000, 1142).

2.4.3.4. Culturological Commentary in Definitions

If the information about a word can be called a linguistic commentary, the information about a notion/realities can be a commentary of two different kinds: factual and culturological.

A factual commentary corresponds to a level of description of a scientific notion (element, process, historical fact, organism, fact about community life, etc.). Its characteristics are objectivity, exactness, and specificity. Perfect examples of scientific notion descriptions are the definitions of terms in specialist encyclopedic and defining dictionaries.

Features of an object that are actualized in factual commentary most often correspond to its features as presented in an encyclopedic dictionary. For instance:

dágbɛ – the kob antelope, antelope horse [black head, white face and mane, horns up to 1 m long, bended backwards; shoulder height 1.5 m, weight up to 350 kg; feeds in the mornings and in the evenings by the water; of belligerent character, especially males] (Выдрин/Томчина 1999, 252–253).

Compare this to the information in "The Unabridged Encyclopedic Dictionary":

> antelopes – a group of even-toed ungulate species of the bovidae family; most of male bovids have horns; occur mostly in Africa (wildebeests, hartebeests, roan antelopes, gemsboks, etc.) and Asia (nilgais, four-horned A., goitereds, saiga antelopes, chamois); many A. are hunted (meat, leather); number of some species is decreasing, some are protected; some species exist mostly in national parks (Прохоров 2000, 57).

Though in "Mandinka-Russian dictionary" the focus is on the animal's appearance and habits, and in "The Unabridged Encyclopedic Dictionary" it is on their biological features, kinds, and habitat, in both cases the information uncovers a scientific notion.

A culturological commentary differs from a factual one by giving information that is related to a language speaker: it describes the function of an object not through its nature, but in relation to man, that is its practical use, the role of the object in cultural life.

The following example from a "Mandinka-Russian dictionary" shows the difference between a factual and a culturological dictionary. In the dictionary entry for Mandinka bawɔ̀lɔ�́ with meanings

> "1. Egyptian goose; 2. Shoveler", there is just a factual commentary for the second meaning: "(drake: black-and-green head and neck, chestnut belly; white breast and lower neck, the upper part in darker; spatula-shaped beak is bluish-black; duck: with brown speckles, upper body is darker, chestnut belly; wing is 22–25 cm; breeding season in the temperate climate areas of Eurasia)"

whereas there is also a culturological commentary on the first meaning (general coloring is lightish brown, upper part of wings is white, flights are black, primaries are shimmering green, internal are chestnut and olive; black rump and tail; chestnut spot on the breast; wing is 35–42 cm, weigh is about 2.5 kg; diet includes new grass and seeds; flesh is insipid, sometimes almost inedible) (Выдрин/Томчина 1999, 119).

See also the description of bɛɛ́-ká-dɔ́ɔnin-tìgɛ 'take little by little' game, where, alongside the factual commentary there is a culturological one:

> They put a twig into a pile of sand; the players sit around it and take sand by small portions to the rhythm of a song until the twig falls down; the one who was the last to take the sand loses [symbolizes joint meal] (Выдрин/Томчина 1999, 128).

Commentary content is determined by several factors, including the type of lexis, the purpose of the dictionary, and, in the case of a bilingual dictionary, the difference of cultures.

It takes a lot of effort to gather the information for making such a commentary. The first issue that a dictionary maker faces is what information sources to

use. Traditional methods such as fieldwork, association experiments, and the use of national databases, should, in the case of endangered languages, be accompanied by analysis of written sources, if there are any, and data from ethnographic sources. This recursive use of material (the dictionary maker has to use facts recorded by another researcher) creates subjective presentations of realia in the dictionary, but there is no other way. Work with consultants is hindered by their age (they tend to be seniors) and that their interpretation of the word is dependent on their life experience and their understanding of a word's meaning.

Thus, we found some discrepancies between the meanings of Kildin Saami words belonging to the "Terrain" thematic group recorded in consultants' data and those in the Kola Saami dictionaries. For instance, the word уррьт, according to the consultant, means "large mountains (like Lovozerskie)". In the dictionaries this word is given with somewhat different meanings: "high mountain, rocky mountain" (Антонова 2014, 325), "mountain (rocky)" (Керт 1986, 100), "rocky mountain" (Куруч 1985, 373). If a speaker has never seen the Lovozerskie mountains, he will assign another meaning to this word. One should see a realia to exactly define the meaning of a word. Most detailed commentary was obtained for the lexeme кāнньт, which is recorded in the dictionaries as "hill, mountain, upland" (Куруч 1985, 99; Антонова 2014, 88; Керт 1986, 36) but, in the consultant's interpretation, this was expanded by the inclusion of a number of characteristics such as size, vegetation, and how easy it is to travel through.

The basics of traditional culture in endangered-language communities are often connected with aspects of trades and tourism. The first implies the use of a trade lexis in trades and household activities, and the second represents the symbolization of culture and language. One Saami language researcher notes that a minority language is seen as a language different from all other languages. It is considered not a means of communication, but as a symbol for something different and as something that cannot be studied, only forgotten. And this is one of the reasons why teaching minority languages has poor results, because the original purpose is not to study the language but to perform a symbolic act (Тростеруд 2012, 5).

2.4.3.5. Dependence of Dictionary Type on Researcher's Interests

According to Mosel, dictionaries of endangered languages are most often compiled by a teacher or a missionary who has regular contact with languages speakers or lives in the community: a dictionary is usually a by-product of their research (Mosel 2011).

It is evident that in such cases the dictionary type can depend on the researcher's scientific interests. They are often connected with the mission that the researcher has assigned himself to.

The making of our dictionaries (Иванищева/Бакула 2013; Иванищева/Эрштадт 2014; Иванищева/Митина 2015) arose from the need to preserve

the unique linguistic material belonging to different thematic groups, reflecting notions vital for the Saami connected to the environment, flora, and fauna, and terminology connected with the household and spiritual worlds.

This task has, to a large extent, defined the conception of our dictionaries. Our starting point was that a Kildin Saami dictionary has to carry out a very important function – the preservation of components of a traditional worldview, which encapsulates the most important life senses of the northern ethnos. The lifestyle of indigenous minority people is determined mainly by three factors: weather conditions, settlement type, and household type. The last two determine the type of the culture. The knowledge of such people reflects a more archaic, fundamental human attitude to the world, one arising from the viewpoint of the senses and the utilitarian values of folk culture.

Our dictionaries are translation (bilingual) dictionaries, i.e. they contain an original Saami word and a dictionary entry with translated equivalent, most often in the form of a description. Apart from the Saami lexis, equivalents, comments, and explanations are given in Russian. But the focus in the dictionaries is not on the grammatical features of a word, but on a culturological commentary that reflects the background knowledge of a speaker. For example:

> тāссэм – belt, waistband (for men, made of Russia leather or dry cow leather, up to 10 cm wide, fastened with decorated metal buckles. Festive belt has a decor of metal or bone; on the left side there is a sheath fastened to the belt with chains, on the right side there is a leather bag for papers etc.). Commentary: Malitsa 'deerskin overcoat' shirts are belted with a leather belt – tasma 'reindeer herder's belt', decorated with bone (of reindeer horn) or metal plate. It is fastened with a shaped copper buckle. Metal decorations for this peculiar belt, according to consultants, were earlier brought from Pechora. Essential tasma attributes are also a sheathed grindstone (туамчас топпенесьт), a reindeer herder's tag (нуури логогойне), a knife (ныийп) in a sheath (тоххп), and a tool for repair of lasso (вуэррь). A knife was necessarily fastened to a multiple strand chain. Behind a tasma there might sometimes hang a charm (паннь) finished and fastened to a rawhide belt and made of bear's tooth (нагпаннь) or wolf's tooth (пальтеспаннь) (Иванищева/Эрштадт 2014, 74–75).

A native speaker is "hiding" a lot behind a word: associations that are social and personal, childish and adult, from everyday experience and literature. A standardized set of such data is often called the background knowledge of a native speaker and is accumulated gradually. According to V. Kasevich, a language is the fruit of the cultural evolution of particular communities (Касевич 2013, 161).

As for the languages of the indigenous minorities of the North, the "dying" languages, the focus on the cumulative language function is especially promising in terms of ensuring the accumulation and storage of a verbalized experience of the spiritual and material culture of a people. In a situation where the natural transfer

of a language tends to disappear, it is important for a linguist to make a point of the essential function of language – to accumulate the knowledge and cultural experience of speakers. This position allows us not only to preserve the cultural wealth accumulated by a language for future generations, but also to understand people's psychology, and thus to work out a suitable strategy for the revitalization of the language.

3. Conclusion

Analysis of different approaches to making dictionaries of endangered languages, specifically study of the oppositions dictionary versus user, dictionary versus language, and dictionary versus dictionary maker/researcher, allows to conclude that, when the purpose of a dictionary is to describe an endangered language to enable revitalization and research rather than for translation or language study, it is the principles of the lexicographer's and researcher's work that are of critical importance. In this situation, they should pay attention to the variety of language selected, orthography, and the scope of the speaker's background knowledge, which tends to be reduced or changed as speaker's age, traditional folk culture is lost, and the sociocultural environment of the ethnos changes. It is therefore possible and desirable to shift the type of dictionary from a simple dictionary to a translation dictionary that includes a culturological commentary. This approach not only allows knowledge of the folk culture to be preserved for future generations, but also promotes revitalization of the language.

Bibliography

Atkins, B. T. S./Rundell, M. (2008), The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography. New York.

De Schryver, G.-M./Prinsloo, D. J. (2011), Do dictionaries Define on the Level of their Target Users? A Case Study for Three Dutch Dictionaries. In: International Journal of Lexicography. 24 (1), 5–28.

Hornáčková-Klapicová, E. (2012), Bilingual Lexicography and a Slovak-Spanish-English Theological Dictionary. In: XLinguae Journal. 5 (3), 2–41.

Itkonen, T. I. (1958), Koltan – ja kuolanlapin sanakirja. Helsinki.

Mosel, U. (2001), Lexicography in endangered language communities. In: <http://www.linguistik. uni-kiel.de/sldr/stuff/CUP_Mosel_Lexicography140809.pdf> [accessed: 20 XII 2015].

Riessler, M. (2007), Grammatical borrowing in Kildin Saami. In: Matras, Y./Sakel, J. (eds.), Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective. Berlin, 229–244.

Sammallahti, P. (1998), The Sámi languages. An introduction. Kárášjohka.

Sammallahti, P./Hvorostuhina, A. (1991), Удць Сāмь соагкпэгка. Ohceojhka.

Scheller, E. (2004), Kolasamiska – språkbyte eller språkbevarande? En sociolongvistisk studie av samernas språksituation i Ryssland. D-uppsats. Umeå.

Scheller, E. (2007), Samiska i Ryssland – planläggning av en sociolingvistisk utredning. In: Bull, T./Kusmenko Ju. (eds.), Språk og språkforhold i Sápmi. Berlin, 173–200.

Антонова, А. А. (2014), Саамско-русский словарь. Сāмь-рӯшш сāннҍнэххьк. Мурманск.

Апресян, Ю. Д. (1995), Избранные труды. Лексическая семантика. Москва.

Баранцев, А. П./Зайков, П. М./Зайцева, М. И. и др. (2007), Сопоставительно--ономасиологический словарь диалектов карельского, вепсского и саамского языков. Петрозаводск.

Берков, В. П. (1996), Двуязычная лексикография. Санкт-Петербург.

Выдрин, В. Ф./Томчина, С. И. (1999), Манден-русский словарь (манинка, бамана). 1: A, B, D–DAD. Санкт-Петербург.

Бурак, А. Л. (2002), Просто о сложном. Опыт создания русско-английского переводческого словаря. В: Вестник Московского университета. 1, 25–32.

Вадас-Возьны, Х. (2010), Языковая картина мира и перевод: ошибки и заблуждения W: Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski. I, 493–508.

ГАМО (1935), Государственный архив Мурманской области. Ф. Р-194. Оп. 1. Д. 45. Л. 1

Горский, Д. П. (1974), Определение: Логико-методологические проблемы. Москва.

Зайков, П. М. (1987), Бабинский диалект саамского языка (фонолого-морфологическое исследование). Петрозаводск [диссертация].

Иванищева, О. Н./Бакула, В. Б. (2013), Словарь лексики духовной культуры кольских саами. Мурманск.

Иванищева, О. Н./Эрштадт, А. М. (2014), Словарь лексики традиционных промыслов и хозяйственных занятий кольских саамов (на материале кильдинского диалекта саамского языка). Мурманск.

Иванищева, О. Н./Митина, Ю. С. (2015), Зоонимикон кильдинского диалекта саамского языка: учебный культурологический словарь. Мурманск.

Ивин, А. А. (2002), Практическая логика. Москва.

Ивлев, Ю. В. (1997), Логика. Москва.

Касевич, В. Б. (2013), Когнитивная лингвистика: в поисках идентичности. Москва.

Керт, Г. М. (1971), Саамский язык (кильдинский диалект). Ленинград.

Керт, Г. М. (1986), Словарь саамско-русский и русско-саамский. Ленинград.

Керт, Г. М. (2007), Проблемы возрождения, сохранения и развития языка и культуры кольских саами. В.: Наука и бизнес на Мурмане. 5(62), 9–16.

Керт, Г. М. (2009), Саамская топонимная лексика. Петрозаводск.

Костина, Г. В. (2006), Вокалическая система кильдинского диалекта саамского языка в свете русско-саамской интерференции. Санкт-Петербург [диссертация].

Кузнецов, С. А. (2000), Большой толковый словарь русского языка. Санкт-Петербург.

Куруч, Р. Д. (ред.) (1985), Саамско-русский словарь. Сāмь-Рӯшш Соагкнэhкь. Москва.

Куруч, Р. Д./Виноградова, И. В./Яковлева, Р. И. (1991), Саамско-русский словарь. Пособие для начальной школы. Мурманск/Москва.

Найда, Ю. (1962), Анализ значения и составление словарей. В: Звегинцев, В. А. (ред.), Новое в лингвистике. 2. Москва, 45–71.

Национальный состав (2013), Национальный состав и владение языками, гражданство населения Мурманской области. В: Итоги Всероссийской переписи населения. 4 (2), 450–451.

Огнева, Е. (2011), Культурно-маркированные тексты: проблемы перевода. W: Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski. II, 415–426.

Перцова, Н. Н. (1988), Формализация толкования слова. Москва.

Прохоров, А. М. (2000), Большой энциклопедический словарь. Москва/Санкт-Петербург.

Шеллер, Е. (2010), Ситуация саамских языков в России. В: Наука и бизнес на Мурмане. 2 (69), 15–27.

Шеллер, Е. (2012), Ревитализация кильдинского языка — неиспользованные ресурсы. В.: Иванищева, О. (ред.), Саамская идентичность: проблемы сохранения языка и культуры на Севере. Мурманск, 38–47.

Шеллер-Больтц, Д. (2015), Фиксирование интернациональных связанных корней в двуязычных толковых словарях. W: Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski. VI/1, 153–165.

Смирнов, В. (1989). О саамской азбуке и азбучных истинах. В: Полярная правда. 16.06, 2.

Терешкин, С. Н. (2002), Йоканьгский диалект саамского языка. Санкт-Петербург [диссертация].

Тростеруд, Т. (2012), Роль языковой технологии в сохранении и ревитализации языка. В: Иванищева, О. (ред.), Саамская идентичность: проблемы сохранения языка и культуры на Севере. Мурманск, 4–12.