

German-Russian Phraseography: On a New Dictionary of Modern Idiomatics¹

1. Preliminary remarks

The subject of the present paper concerns the structure and principles for constructing a new German-Russian phraseological dictionary based on an analysis of corpus data.² This is also indicated by the working title of the dictionary: *Немецко-русский фразеологический словарь (на основе корпусов текстов)* “German-Russian Phraseological Dictionary (Based on Corpus Data)” or *Немецко-русский корпусный словарь современной идиоматики* “German-Russian Corpus-Based Dictionary of Modern Idiomatics”. The latter title is more accurate, since the dictionary includes only contemporary idioms, whereas other types of phrasemes (collocations, proverbs, grammatical phrasemes, etc.) are not represented, nor are units that are obsolete or becoming obsolete.

The need for a new German-Russian phraseological dictionary is motivated by the fact that existing such dictionaries do not meet present requirements. Both the vocabulary and the examples in Binovič and Grišin's German-Russian phraseological dictionary (Бинович, Гришин 1975) are out of date, and the work fails to satisfy current needs with respect to a number of other parameters as well. Although Dobrovol'skij's *Немецко-русский словарь живых идиом* “German-Russian Dictionary of Current Idioms” (Добровольский 1997) is on the whole more up to date, it also has certain shortcomings. Its idiom-list is rather limited, and illustrative examples are often arbitrary and unpersuasive, which may be because it was written back in the “pre-corpus era.” Actually, one of the basic goals of our new lexicographical project is to eliminate all the shortcomings of this dictionary and to significantly expand its idiom-list.

Yet another dictionary of this type has appeared recently: *Новый немецко-русский фразеологический словарь* “The New German-Russian Phraseological Dictionary” (Шекасюк 2010). Its phraseme-list is fairly large and up to date, but the work is difficult to use, primarily because the illustrative examples are not translated into Russian, and the division of entries into meanings and selected equivalents often appears hasty and arbitrary.

Thus there is an unquestionable need for a new dictionary containing the most widely used contemporary German idioms together with carefully selected Russian equivalents, explanations facilitating the correct use of these idioms, and good, authentic examples translated into Russian. It is also important that such a dictionary exist not only in print, but also (at least in part) in an

¹ This paper is based on work supported by the RGNF under Grants 11-04-00105a, 12-04-12041, 12-34-10413 and by the Basic Research Program “Corpus Linguistics” of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

² Cf. further Dobrovol'skij, Filipenko 2003; 2007. Fragments of this dictionary are available on the website of the Institute for the German Language in Mannheim: “Deutsch-russische Idiome online“ http://wvonline.ids-mannheim.de/idiome_russ/index.htm.

online version, which will not only provide easier access to the information but will also ensure continuous revision and improvement.

2. Parameters of the dictionary

The basic parameters upon which dictionaries can be described and compared are (1) the word-list (in our case, the idiom-list), (2) the corpus of illustrative examples, (3) the macrostructure, and (4) the microstructure, that is, the structure of the entries. Each of these parameters is briefly described below.

2.1. The idiom-list

The idiom-list of our new dictionary is based primarily on that of Dobrovol'skij's *Немецко-русский словарь живых идиом* "German-Russian Dictionary of Current Idioms" (Добровольский 1997), which was compiled by surveying informants from various regions of Germany who were given the fullest possible list of German idioms and asked to indicate which units they felt to be most widely used. The idioms receiving the most such evaluations from the various informants were included in the idiom-list (in all about 1000 items). These judgments, of course, were not optimal in all cases, if only for the fact that the survey participants were rather limited in number, consisting of about 10 linguist colleagues. Consequently, it was not possible to exclude a certain subjectivity in the evaluations. These limitations were apparent even as the dictionary was being compiled. While working on the monograph (Dobrovol'skij 1997), therefore, I conducted a new, more detailed survey in which informants were asked to take into account not only the units that they felt were widely used in contemporary speech, but also those that were judged to be generally known although not necessarily used. In other words, a distinction was drawn between passive and active command of the phraseology.

Combining these two idiom-lists resulted in a new, expanded idiom-list that was supplemented in the course of working with the corpora. At present our idiom-list contains some 2000 idioms with variants. There is reason to believe that it includes most of the generally used and best known idioms in the contemporary German literary language. Vulgar expressions were deliberately excluded, since such idioms are ill suited for active use by non-native speakers of German.³ And because the dictionary aspires to a certain extent to be active, its idiom-list focuses not so much on understanding as on use.

2.2. The body of illustrative examples

The basic difference between the present dictionary and traditional ones is that all examples of idiom usage in it are taken from the text corpora DeReKo and DWDS, and in individual cases from the German-language Internet. Parallel texts from the Russian National Corpus (RNC) are also used. These examples are especially valuable because they have been translated by professional translators rather than by the authors and editors of the dictionary. Since this part of the parallel corpus of the NRC is still rather modest in size, however, examples needed for the dictionary were rarely encountered.

³ Such idioms were included only rarely – mostly as variants of non-vulgar idioms.

The use of authentic examples based on text corpora is a new approach in bilingual lexicography. Traditional dictionaries were based on a limited body of generally randomly selected examples, and the use of the phrasemes was often not even exemplified. The advantages of using corpora consist not only in more detailed and well thought-out illustrations of the expressions being described, but also in the additional possibilities that the corpus materials provide for compiling the idiom-list and structuring entries. Thus the corpus allows us to determine the degree of frequency of an expression (at least in the written language). For example, the expression *ich fresse einen Besen* occurred in DeReKo 21 times, *Blech reden* 69 times, *bei Adam und Eva anfangen [beginnen]*⁴ 142 times, *jmdm. um den Bart gehen* 80 times, *Gift und Galle spucken [speien...]* 389 times, and *bittere Pille* 1994 times. The lower occurrence threshold for an expression to be included in the idiom-list can be set differently for different dictionaries. The important point is that together with surveys of informants, the lexicographer now has a supplemental resource for determining the frequency of each individual phraseme.

Yet another advantage of using corpora is that it increases our ability to determine the peculiarities of the formal and semantic structure of idioms, particularly in the description of the ambiguity and variation of a form. Although an analysis of examples of use clearly indicates that polysemy in phraseology is an extremely widespread phenomenon (for further detail see Dobrovol'skij, Filipenko 2007; 2009), traditional dictionaries rarely distinguish the different meanings of idioms, and seldom reflect the full diversity of variants actually represented in texts. Dictionaries often register only a single “canonized” form of an idiom that in many cases proves to be not the most frequent one.

In a number of instances text corpora allow us not only to determine the form of a lemma and a selection of its most frequent variants, but also to establish whether a given expression belongs to the sphere of phraseology. For example, Duden 11 cites two synonymous idioms with the verb *abberufen* in the passive: *abberufen werden: in die Ewigkeit abberufen werden* and *aus dem Leben abberufen werden*. The following synonymous expressions with this verb form are given in DeReKo: *aus dem Leben abberufen werden, zur großen Armee abberufen werden, in die Ewigkeit abberufen werden, ins Jenseits abberufen werden, in die ewigen Jagdgründe abberufen werden, in die ewige Heimat abberufen werden, von/aus dieser Welt abberufen werden, aus diesem irdischen Leben abberufen werden, aus unseren Reihen [aus unserer Mitte] abberufen werden, zu den Scharen der Engel abberufen werden, in eine andere Welt abberufen werden, in den ewigen Frieden abberufen werden, in ein besseres Jenseits abberufen werden, für uns alle viel zu früh abberufen werden, vom Schöpfer abberufen werden, von Gott (dem Herrn) abberufen werden, vom Tod (ins Jenseits) abberufen werden, von einem gnädigen Tod abberufen werden*. There are also expressions close in meaning in which the verb *abberufen* is used in the active voice: *jmdn. will Gott abberufen, jmdn. hat der Tod abberufen*.

These findings suggest that the sense of “calling/summoning s.o. from life” is simply a metaphorical meaning of the verb *abberufen*. Consequently, what we have to do with here is not an idiom but a series of relatively free collocations based on a metaphor.

Any discussion of the problems of bilingual phraseology – particularly the principles and methods of selecting illustrative examples – must include mention of *Random House Russian-*

⁴ Alternating components are shown in square brackets, optional ones in parentheses.

English Dictionary of Idioms (Lubensky 1995).⁵ It is not only the most complete Russian-English phraseological dictionary, with some 13,000 phrasemes and 6,900 entries, but is practically the only lexicographical description of Russian phraseology in comparison with English based on a contemporary understanding of the linguistically significant features of idiomatics.

The illustrative examples of Lubensky's dictionary are drawn from works of belles-lettres or contexts constructed by the author. All contexts are translated into English, and the literary examples draw on existing translations of the relevant works, which often offer unconventional equivalents. Such examples show, on the one hand, that the possibilities for translating idioms go beyond "dictionary equivalents," since no one dictionary can account for all acceptable contextually conditioned L2-paraphrases of utterances containing a given lexical unit, and on the other, they offer the researcher a rich body of materials for studying the influence of context on the translation of phrasemes. On these and other features of the dictionary, see the review in (Добровольский 2004).

Some entries in Lubensky's dictionary lack examples. This is quite understandable, since only representative text corpora make it possible to avoid lacunae in the illustrative component of a dictionary entry. The consistent use of corpus data is in fact one of the basic differences between our dictionary and all its predecessors.

2.3. Dictionary macrostructure

The dictionary has two parts: the body, consisting of entries listed alphabetically by headword, and the index, which makes it possible to find an idiom from any of its components.

At present our dictionary contains about 2000 idioms with variants. We have reason to believe that the idiom-list covers a majority of commonly used and most familiar idioms of the modern German literary language.

The idioms are arranged alphabetically by headword, selected according to the following hierarchy:

- nouns
- adjectives (including adjectivized participles)
- adverbs (including adjectives in adverbial position and adverbialized participles)
- numerals
- verbs
- particles (with the exception of the negative particle *nicht*)
- pronouns (with the exception of the reflexive pronoun *sich*)
- prepositions
- conjunctions
- interjections

The order of this hierarchy is motivated by the variation features of the lexical structure of the idiom. Thus the verb can often be replaced by a synonym (or more rarely by an antonym),

⁵ The Russian edition appeared in 2004 in Moscow (Лубенская 2004).

whereas adjectives and adverbs are more stable elements of the structure, and it is this that accounts for their higher position in the hierarchy. Adjectives and adjectivized participles, in turn, are more stable than adverbs. For example, cf. the structurally and semantically similar idioms *es ist (nicht) gut bestellt* (um A) = дела обстоят (не очень) хорошо (с чем-л., у кого-л.) и *es ist (nicht so) schlecht bestellt* (um A) = дела обстоят (не так) плохо (с чем-л., у кого-л.). Alphabetizing them according to the adverbial constituent would necessitate entering them in different parts of the dictionary (under GUT and under SCHLECHT, respectively), which is counterintuitive. Alphabetization according to the constituent BESTELLT is much more convenient for the user.

Alphabetization is based on the first among the constituents of the idiom occupying the highest place in the hierarchy. That is, in the case of two nouns, alphabetization is according to the first noun, and in the case of two adjectives, according to the first adjective (if there are no nouns), and so on. For example, the idiom *wie die Katze um den heißen Brei (herum)schleichen* is alphabetized according to the noun *Katze* as the first noun in the lemma. The lexical element upon which the alphabetization is based constitutes the headword of the entry. For example:

KATZE

wie die Katze um den heißen Brei (herum)schleichen

If a constituent higher in the hierarchy is optional and in parentheses, it is not taken into account in alphabetization. If one of two autonomous words in an idiom is a variant and the other is optional, alphabetization is according to the variant component. The hierarchy is violated in cases where the structurally mandatory constituent according to which alphabetization should be based varies. For example:

ÄRGERN

sich schwarz ärgern (über etw. A) <...> sich grün (und blau) ärgern, sich grün (und schwarz) ärgern

Although in this idiom the verb *ärgern* is lower in the hierarchy than the adverb, alphabetization is according to the verb, since the adverbial constituent varies: *schwarz/grün/blau/gelb*. The hierarchy is also violated in the case of nominalized verbal constituents; cf. *Fahrt ins Blaue / ins Blaue fahren*. Although the word *Fahrt* is formally the first noun in *Fahrt ins Blaue*, it is intuitively more acceptable to alphabetize according to the word *Blaue*, which preserves its nominal status in the verb group *ins Blaue fahren* as well.

2.4. Dictionary entry structure

Dictionary entries open with the headword, i.e. the word on which alphabetization is based. This (word, if it is a noun) is always given in the nominative singular (e.g. KOPF, UMSTAND), even if the idioms following the headword contain forms such as *Kopfes, Köpfe, Köpfen, Umstände*, etc. The headword is followed by the lemma – the idiom in traditional dictionary form (nominative for nominal expressions, the infinitive with valencies for verbal ones).

The valencies, both obligatory and optional, of the idiom are italicized and in parentheses within the lemma field (*etw.* is followed by the case: *D, A, G*).⁶ Exceptions are attributive valencies given (in Russian and in German) without parentheses before the noun modified by this attribute, and subjective valencies, which are given in parentheses, generally at the beginning of the lemma. For example, an attributive valency: *nach jmds. Pfeife tanzen* and a subjective valency: (*etw.*)⁷ *kommt nicht in die Tüte* = (о чём-л.) не может быть и речи.

Idioms in propositional (personal) form are indicated in cases where the subjective valency is filled in a non-trivial way or when the infinitive of the idiom translates poorly into Russian. In such instances the lemma is registered as follows:

einen dicken Kopf haben (*von etw. D*): (*jmd.*) hat (*von etw. D*) einen dicken Kopf.

The valencies indicated at the end of the lemma field (cf. (*von etw. D*)) are located in the field of the propositional form immediately following the finite verb. Valencies are given in the same order in the commentaries.

If the structure of an idiom includes a personal or possessive pronoun that is coreferential with the subject (and which, correspondingly, changes depending on the form of the subject), this pronoun is given in the masculine and is italicized within parentheses (like an ordinary valency); cf.: (*jmd.*) *weiß nicht (mehr)*, *wo (ihm) der Kopf steht*, not *(*jmd.*) *weiß nicht (mehr)*, *wo (jmdm.) der Kopf steht*. Otherwise, the impression would arise that the dative valency is not coreferential to the subject.

The lemma or propositional form (if there is one) is followed by stylistic labels. The use of which follows the principles set forth in (Баранов, Добровольский 2008). Thus the label *разг.* (colloquial) is not used at all, since most idioms belong to the colloquial register. In other words, this label “works” by remaining silent. The following labels are used: *высок.* (high style) – for high style expressions, *книжн.* (literary) – for literary and bookish expressions, *офич.* (formal) – for expressions in official language and business communication, *нейтр.* (neutral) – for expressions in the neutral register (that is, for idioms higher than colloquial expressions on the scale of stylistic registers), *снижен.* (\approx very informal) – for idioms felt to be not entirely acceptable in the standard colloquial style (i.e. lower than *разг.*) и *зруб.* (vulgar) – for vulgar expressions. Besides register labels the dictionary uses discursive and regional labels such as *ирон.* (ironical) and *австр.* (Austrian), respectively.

The translation of the idiom into Russian is generally oriented toward the system of the language rather than toward contextual conditions. That is, if in the examples of usage an idiom is translated in a non-standard manner, this does not mean that these – often unique – ways of translating it must be registered in the translation field. There it is often expedient to indicate several equivalents, first of all, those translations that with respect to their actual meaning and inner form maximally approximate the German idiom being described. The syntactic parallelism

⁶ Reflexive verbs are formed as follows: if the reflexive pronoun *sich* is in the accusative, its case is not indicated. For example: *sich gebauchpinselt fühlen*. If *sich* is in the dative, this is indicated in italics in parentheses: *sich (D) einen Knoten ins Taschentuch machen*.

⁷ If the valency indicating pronoun *etw.* is in the nominative, its case is not marked.

of suggested equivalents is also taken into account as far as possible. If an equivalent parallel to the lemma cannot be found or if it sounds strange, what is recorded in the field of the propositional form is the syntactic version of the German expression that would best correspond to the suggested Russian translation. The translation field can also contain explanatory commentaries (italicized in parentheses) that further indicate in which of the possible meanings the suggested Russian translation is equivalent to the German expression.

The variant field follows the translation field and is introduced by the symbol O. Cf., for example:

einen dicken Kopf haben (*von etw. D*): (*jmd.*) hat (*von etw. D*) einen dicken Kopf
(у кого-л.) ГОЛОВА БОЛИТ (*из-за чего-л.*), (у кого-л.) ГОЛОВА РАСКАЛЫВАЕТСЯ (*от чего-л., после чего-л. – особенно с похмелья*)
O **einen schweren Kopf haben** (*von etw. D*)

If an idiom is found to have several meanings and the variants are relevant to all of these meanings, they can be given each time following the translation field. Often in such cases the variant is indicated in the propositional rather than the lemmatized form (since the description of individual meanings of the idiom often requires a personal form). Cf.:

satt haben (*jmdn., etw. A*)
1. (*jmd.*) hat (*etw. A*) satt; (*jmd.*) hat es satt
надоело (*что-л. кому-л.*); (*кто-л.*) СЫТ ПО ГОРЛО (*чем-л.*)
O *редко* (*jmd.*) ist (*etw. A*) satt; (*jmd.*) ist es satt
2. (*jmd.*) hat (*jmdn.*) satt
надоел (*кто-л. кому-л.*) (хуже горькой редьки)
O *редко* (*jmd.*) ist (*jmdn.*) satt

Describing variants in a separate field makes it possible not only to reflect more completely the actual variation of the structure of the idiom, but also to avoid having to burden the notation of the lemma with a series of parentheses.

In instances of polysemy individual meanings are introduced by Arabic numerals. There are various ways of describing polysemantic idioms. Ordinarily, the form represented in the lemma fully corresponds to each of its meanings. In such cases, the Russian translation is given immediately after the numeral introducing the meaning. When the use of the article or valency model varies depending on the meaning of the idiom, the corresponding form of the German expression appears after the numeral introducing the meaning. For example:

den [einen] Schalter umlegen
1. den Schalter umlegen (*bei jmdm.*)
переключить что-то (*в ком-л.*)
2. den [einen] Schalter umlegen
переключиться (*на что-л.*)
ins Bild setzen
1. ins Bild setzen (*jmdn., etw. A*)

запечатлеть, изобразить (кого-л., что-л.); передать (что-л. – на фотографии, картине, в кино или театре)

2. ins Bild setzen (jmdn. über etw. A)

сообщить (кому-л. что-л.); ввести в курс дела (кого-л.); просветить (кого-л. насчёт чего-л.)

There are some cases in which an idiom changes its meaning depending on whether one of its valencies (usually the subjective valency) is filled by an animate or inanimate noun. Here the description of each meaning of the idiom is preceded by its propositional form. Cf.:

jenseits von Gut und Böse sein

1. (jmd.) ist jenseits von Gut und Böse

(кто-л.) чужд плотским удовольствиям (часто о пожилых людях)

2. (jmd.) ist jenseits von Gut und Böse

(кто-л.) не от мира сего, (кто-л.) потерял связь с реальностью (часто о людях, находящихся в состоянии сильного алкогольного опьянения)

3. (jmd.) ist jenseits von Gut und Böse

(кто-л.) по ту сторону добра и зла

4. (etw.) ist jenseits von Gut und Böse

(что-л.) выходит за привычные рамки, (что-л.) невероятно (что-л. очень хорошо или, наоборот, очень плохо; часто о слишком высоких или слишком низких ценах)

Sometimes an actant shift is accompanied by such powerful semantic changes that the corresponding idioms are registered as homonyms. For example:

in die Welt setzen (jmdn.) I

нейтр.

родить (кого-л.), произвести на свет (кого-л.)

in die Welt setzen (etw. A) II

нейтр.

делать гласным, обнародовать (что-л.); называть (что-л. – сообщать какую-л. информацию)

In selecting illustrative examples given in the dictionary after the symbol 4, we have tried not to include examples peculiar to Austrian or Swiss usage, since these deviate from standard literary German (and due to their regional and cultural distinctiveness) do not fully satisfy the needs of a bilingual dictionary with educational goals.⁸ When there is a choice, preference is given to modern examples, that is, to contexts with idioms dating from the past fifteen years.

The search for contexts relies not only on the standard options but also on so called “co-occurrence analysis” (Kookkurrenzanalyse). This program helps to determine the lexical contexts in which a given idiom occurs especially often.

⁸ This does not mean that Austrian and Swiss sources of empirical data were excluded.

The basic source for illustrative examples is the corpus of the Mannheim Institute of the German Language (DeReKo). In individual instances (especially when the corpus fails to provide simple, comprehensible contexts that translate well into Russian) other sources are used.

All contexts are given in the current (i.e. the “new”) orthography. The peculiarities of Swiss orthography (for example, *ss* instead of the normative *ß*) are not preserved. Such deviations from prevailing standards are given in conformity with the spelling norms of the common German language. For the sake of convenience in using the dictionary, the authors have simplified extremely complex and verbose contexts. Deletions in abbreviated contexts are marked <..>. This indication is not repeated in the Russian translations. Contexts that are overloaded with specific information that is not relevant to conditions for using a given idiom are slightly modified. For example, unfamiliar proper names are replaced with neutral designations of the participants of a situation. In such cases the source is indicated (in parentheses immediately following the context) by *Nach*:. For example:

4 Am nächsten Morgen *hatte* der König *einen schweren Kopf* vom Wein. (Nach: Mannheimer Morgen, 06.12.1997)
На следующее утро у короля *болела голова* от выпитого накануне вина.

Idioms are italicized in contexts and translations, valencies are not.

In the commentary field the symbol & is followed by information significant for the correct use of the expressions if such information cannot be derived from the valency model and/or the semantic and syntactic features of the Russian equivalents. The commentary field, which can be located in any part of the dictionary entry (depending on the nature of the information being provided), indicates, for example, the syntactic and combinatorial properties of the idiom. Thus the position of the idiom in the sentence may be noted in the commentary. Cf. the following commentary on the idiom *einen Besen fressen*:

& В немецком языке, в отличие от русского, придаточное предложение может предшествовать главному.
4 Manchmal wird das fast Unmögliche möglich. Deshalb sollte man sich mit Aussagen wie „Wenn das klappt, *fresse ich einen Besen*“ oder ähnlichen Versprechungen zurückhalten. (Rhein-Zeitung, 22.09.2007)
Иногда практически невозможное становится возможным. Поэтому лучше воздерживаться от высказываний типа «*Провалиться мне на месте*, если это получится» и других заявлений подобного рода.

Also noted are any deviations from the form represented in the lemma:

& Идиома употребляется также вне контекста с придаточным условия в форме *da fresse ich einen Besen* = *готов поспорить, ей-богу; зуб даю; чтоб мне пусто было, чтоб мне провалиться*
4 „Das Bild ist echt“, überlegte sie, „*da fress ich einen Besen*.“ (Mannheimer Morgen, 07.04.2001)
«Эта картина – подлинник, – сказала она, подумав, – *чтоб мне провалиться*».

4 „Die arbeiten mit Phantasiezahlen, *da fresse ich einen Besen*.“ (Die Presse, 26.04.1996)

«У них все данные высосаны из пальца, *готов поспорить*.»

Noted further are any significant transformational properties of the idiom, especially if they do not coincide with the syntax of the Russian equivalent. Thus the idiom *Blech redder* (unlike its Russian equivalents *пустословить, нести чепуху, болтать языком*) can be passivized. Although this is apparent from the examples, it is noted in the commentary:

& В отличие от своих русских эквивалентов, идиома употребляется в пассиве.

4 Immer wieder gibt es Forderungen aus Bundesliga-Kreisen, die Interview-Runde kurz nach Schluss eines Spieles abzuschaffen; dabei *werde* doch nur *Blech geredet*. (Rhein-Zeitung, 21.02.1998)

Представители Бундеслиги постоянно требуют отказаться от практики проведения интервью по окончании матча: мол, все равно спортсмены *несут* сплошную *ахинею*.

4 Dafür, dass *kein Blech geredet wurde*, sorgte das Fachwissen der Teilnehmer. (Nach: Kleine Zeitung, 16.09.1998)

Профессионализм участников встречи позволил *обойтись без пустой болтовни*.

Such comments are especially important in the formation of the “impersonal passive” (Eintakt-Passiv), a grammatical form that is untypical of Russian. For example:

4 Kaum ein Bereich, wo nicht *bei Adam und Eva begonnen wird* – so als ob nicht anderswo vergleichbare Erkenntnisse und Erfahrungen zu haben und zu nutzen wären. (Nach: Die Presse, 14.07.1992)

Едва ли есть сфера, в которой не *начинают* каждый раз *с нуля* – как будто не существует аналогичных знаний и опыта, которыми можно было бы воспользоваться.

Also reflected in the commentaries are features relating to the polarization (especially the negative polarity) of expressions, their aspectological peculiarities, possibilities of nominalization, characteristic metonymical shifts, etc. Cf. the following typical commentaries:

& Идиома употребляется в отрицательно поляризованных контекстах; б.ч. с отрицанием в форме *den Kopf nicht hängen lassen*.

& Немецкая идиома *an der Nase herumführen (jmdn.)* довольно часто встречается в контекстах, фокусирующих результат действий субъекта и требующих, таким образом, в переводе на русский совершенного вида. А русская идиома *водить за нос (кого-л.)* практически не употребляется в форме совершенного вида; ср.

?? *провел за нос*. Редкие исключения – это контексты с отрицательной поляризацией типа *a народ не дурак, за нос его так просто не проведешь* или *за нос такого провести нетрудно*. Иными словами, русская идиома *водить за нос (кого-л.)* – это *imperfectiva tantum* и эквивалентна немецкой идиоме *an der Nase herumführen (jmdn.)*, только если эта немецкая идиома употребляется в значении развивающегося процесса. При употреблении немецкой идиомы в значении

законченного действия эквивалентность отсутствует. В таких случаях более адекватными эквивалентами немецкого выражения будут глаголы *надуть*, *одурачить* или фразеологизм *обвести вокруг пальца*.

& Идиома может свёртываться до предложной группы и употребляться в форме *mit schwerem Kopf, mit dickem [einem dicken] Kopf* = с раскалывающейся головой.

& Возможны метонимические сдвиги типа «город, страна → население» и т.п., то есть в позиции прямого дополнения, помимо обозначений человека, могут выступать обозначения групп людей типа *Welt, Volk*.

The commentary field has no fixed position in the structure of the dictionary entry. Accordingly, it can also occur immediately after the lemma (if the commentary refers to all the meanings of a polysemantic idiom).

3. Instead of a conclusion

The lexicographic treatment of the notion of equivalent in dictionaries based on corpus data encounters certain problems. Not infrequently, the generally accepted equivalent of an idiom cannot always be used to translate authentic texts.

Thus, to take an example cited above, it becomes obvious that the “standard” equivalent of the German idiom *jmdn. an der Nase herumführen* is the Russian idiom *водить за нос кого-л.* It would be somewhat odd to doubt that these idioms are basically equivalent, since they are identical with respect to both their lexicalized meaning and image component. Nevertheless, it turns out that it is far from always possible to translate the expression *jmdn. an der Nase herumführen* with the Russian idiom *водить за нос кого-л.*

Consequently, despite the intuitively felt equivalence of the expressions *jmdn. an der Nase herumführen* and *водить за нос кого-л.*, this equivalence cannot be considered complete. For the lexicographer interested in a maximally precise description of the material, such instances are problematical. Either we acknowledge that *jmdn. an der Nase herumführen* and *водить за нос кого-л.* are equivalent, in which case it is necessary to explain why the “standard” equivalent is unacceptable in a number of contexts, or we deny that a relationship of bilingual equivalence obtains between *jmdn. an der Nase herumführen* and *водить за нос кого-л.*, and focus exclusively on translating specific contexts. Such a solution, however, is counterintuitive.

There are at least two ways out of this cul-de-sac. Either we refrain from giving equivalents and replace them with an explanation (here permissible target-language correspondences can be given in a special field in the entry), or we provide the given equivalents with a commentary indicating relevant limitations.

Lubensky 1995 uses the first of these options. Explanations in English help the user to understand the meaning of each Russian phraseme “from within,” that is, without the inclusion of additional (and often distractive) features of the content plane of the corresponding English equivalents. Equivalents given in a special field in the entry seldom coincide with all relevant parameters of the Russian expression.

In our dictionary we have followed the second path. Thus for the German idiom *jmdn. an der Nase herumführen* we give the Russian equivalent *водить за нос кого-л* and explain divergences in the use of the idioms in the commentary (see above).

A question that arises from the perspective of phraseological theory (especially its comparative aspects) concerns the essence of cross-linguistic equivalence. It seems expedient to distinguish two different aspects of equivalence:

- a) equivalence in translation; that is, the relationship between an idiom of language L1 and its translation into language L2 in a particular text, and
- b) equivalence in the language system; that is, the relationship between the compared idioms of L1 and L2 on the systemic level.

Note: It must be observed that in reference to both systemic and translational equivalence the use of the term *equivalence* itself is not entirely rigorous. The problem is that genuine equivalence (understood very much in the mathematical or logical sense) is practically non-existent in phraseology.

One of the most important differences between translational and systemic equivalence (besides the fact that the former has to do with a concrete text and the latter with the lexical system) consists in the circumstance that equivalence in translation is a unilateral relationship, whereas equivalence in the language system is defined as bilateral. In other words, if a phraseme of language L1 is equivalent to a phraseme in language L2, this means that the L2 phraseme is also equivalent to the corresponding L1 expression. With respect to equivalence in translation, all that is being said is that an expression in language L2 is being used in the translation of some specific text in language L1 in such a way that between the L1 phraseme from this particular text and the L2 expression there is a relationship of semantic correspondence. The fact that the translation of some L1 phraseme into language L2 is its equivalent (at least with respect to this particular context) does not, of course, mean that the relationship can be reversed. That is, the L1 phraseme should not be regarded as an equivalent of the expression used in the translation of this phraseme into language L2 (even if this expression is a phraseme, which is not at all obligatory). Obviously, the study of equivalence in translation broadens our notions about the possibilities of cross-linguistic paraphrasing and about the role of contextual conditions in the selection of adequate correspondences, and it contributes to the development of both translation theory and comparative phraseology.

As for equivalence in the language system, its study has both theoretical and practical significance for phraseology. Deserving of special attention from the theoretical point of view is the question of why one and the same concept is expressed by means of an idiom in one language but not in another. Another (no less important) problem concerns the fact that between basically similar idioms in language L1 and language L2, there are practically always certain semantic, pragmatic, and collocational differences that must be discovered and described. This is especially important in cases where a traditional description postulates a relationship of “full equivalence” but ignores the absence of functional interchangeability between the idioms. The practical aspect of systemic equivalence is what is reflected in bilingual dictionaries, where the entry consists of a phraseme of language L1 (in the lemma) and its idiomatic (to the extent this is

possible) correlates in L2. Can these correlates be regarded as equivalents of the L1 phraseme? Yes and no. On the one hand, they must be at least “partial equivalents” or “phraseological analogues,” for otherwise they could not be placed in the corresponding dictionary entry. On the other, often they cannot be used in the translation of specific texts. The reason, as a rule, is that the phrasemes of L1 and L2 display certain differences in their semantic, pragmatic, and collocational features. They can be considered cross-linguistic equivalents only in a rather approximate comparison of the idioms of the given languages, and are the starting point of a thorough contrastive analysis that attempts to discover the unique properties of each idiom and thereby improve the lexicological and lexicographical description of phraseology.

Obviously, aspects (a) and (b) are, as it were, two sides of the same phenomenon or two approaches to studying it. We assume that one of the principal goals of contrastive phraseology is to discover genuine equivalents – that is, those that are as close as possible with respect to their actual meanings and – ideally – with respect to the inner form of the expressions, and that function equally well in analogous types of situations, which does not at all imply an obligatory “phraseme – phraseme” relationship. What is important for cross-linguistic correspondence, after all, is not “phraseologicalness,” but **functional equivalence**. It is this type of equivalence that is most interesting from the perspective of bilingual lexicography.

References

- Dobrovol'skij, Dmitrij O. Idiome im mentalen Lexikon: Ziele und Methoden der kognitivbasierten Phraseologieforschung. Trier: WVT, 1997.
- Dobrovol'skij, Dmitrij O., Filipenko, Tat'jana V. *Moderne Idiomatik: Deutsch-Russisches Wörterbuch: lexikographisches Format und Beschreibungsprinzipien* // Das Wort. Germanistisches Jahrbuch Russland 2003. Bonn: DAAD, 2003.
- Dobrovol'skij, Dmitrij O., Filipenko, Tat'jana V. Zur Darstellung der Idiom-Polysemie in einem zweisprachigen Idiomatik-Wörterbuch // Das Wort. Germanistisches Jahrbuch Russland 2007. Bonn: DAAD, 2007.
- Dobrovol'skij, Dmitrij O., Filipenko, Tat'jana V. Polysemie in der Idiomatik // Phraseologie disziplinär und interdisziplinär. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2009, 109-115.
- Duden 11 = Duden – Redewendungen. Wörterbuch der deutschen Idiomatik. 2., neu bearb. und aktualisierte Auflage. (=Der Duden, Band 11). Mannheim etc.: Dudenverlag, 2002.
- Lubensky, Sophia. Random House Russian-English dictionary of idioms. New York: Random House, 1995.
- Баранов А.Н., Добровольский Д.О. Аспекты теории фразеологии. М.: Знак, 2008.
- Бинович Л.Э., Гришин Н.Н. Немецко-русский фразеологический словарь. М.: Русский язык, 1975.
- Добровольский Д.О. Немецко-русский словарь живых идиом. М.: Метатекст, 1997.
- Добровольский Д.О. Рецензия на: С.И. Лубенская. *Большой русско-английский фразеологический словарь* // Вопросы языкознания, № 6, 2004, 142-148.
- Лубенская С.И. Большой русско-английский фразеологический словарь. М.: АСТ-ПРЕСС, 2004.

Шекасюк Б.П. Новый немецко-русский фразеологический словарь. Изд. 2-е, перераб. и доп. М.: ЛИБРОКОМ, 2010.

Digital resources

DeReKo – Das Deutsche Referenzkorpus des IDS Mannheim im Portal COSMAS II (Corpus Search, Management and Analysis System): <https://cosmas2.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas2-web>

DWDS – Corpora des Digitalen Wörterbuchs der deutschen Sprache des 20. Jahrhunderts: <http://www.dwds.de>

Online dictionary “Deutsch-russische Idiome online“: http://wvonline.ids-mannheim.de/idiome_russ/index.htm

RNC – Russian National Corpus: <http://www.ruscorpora.ru>