

POSSIBILITIES OF LEXICOGRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION OF POLYSEMANTIC VERBS (MEGAFIELD OF MANAGEMENT) IN GERMAN (THEORETICAL AND FUNCTIONAL ASPECTS)

Tatiana S. Markova
Russian State Social University

Abstract: The present study deals with the ambiguity of German verbs of the industry-specific language of management, as well as the peculiarities of their presentation in educational dictionaries of various types. The aim of the study is a comprehensive analysis of existing variants of the lexicographic representation of polysemantic verbs (taking into account synonymy and homonymy), evaluation of their advantages and disadvantages (the target audience being the main evaluation criterion) and presenting options for forming the vocabulary and formatting the entries in the dictionaries compiled by the author. To implement these tasks, such methods as continuous sampling (during the formation of the research material), semantic analysis of terminological units and lexicographic analysis were used. Verb polysemy affects the formation of vocabulary entries in monolingual dictionaries, translation dictionaries, thematic dictionaries and in dictionaries of synonyms. The possibilities of representing polysemantic verbs based on lexical prototypes and on frame theory are analyzed. The principles of vocabulary formation in German-Russian and Russian-German synonyms dictionaries containing polysemantic verbs are considered. The reasons for the asymmetry of the dictionary corpus and the discrepancies of the entries are clarified. The reasons are given for expanding the dictionary entries by specifying additional phonetic marks (transcription for borrowed lexical items), additional grammatical information (transitivity, intransitivity, government, etc), indicating a specific field of use (micro- and macrofields of management). Different functions of educational dictionaries are analyzed, and a technique is suggested for expanding their functions – using the dictionary not only as a reference but also as a teaching aid, and the expediency of reducing the entry by placing illustrative material in appendices for more detailed study in the learning process is justified.

Keywords: verb, polysemy, seme, dictionary entry, synonym, meaning.

1. INTRODUCTION

The present study deals with the issues of including polysemantic verbs (of the German sectoral language of management) in educational dictionaries of various types, as well as with the possibilities of expanding the functions of dictionaries in the educational process. The relevance of the study lies in the fact that polysemy is not only a common but a constantly progressive phenomenon; evidence of this is the recent emergence of a whole number of verbs. For instance, the verb *surfen* was originally borrowed in German in the meaning of ‘surfing’ but over time acquired the second meaning ‘to surf/browse the Internet, to search for information on the Internet’. Expansion of the verb semantics, as a rule, occurs under the influence of extralinguistic factors, such as scientific and technical progress, the development of information technologies, etc. In other words, verbs can expand their meaning to nominate the recently appeared phenomena of reality, i.e. to fill the gaps in the language. At the same time, both borrowed verbs (like *surfen*) and German verbs can acquire

additional meanings: *wischen* – ‘to rub; wipe; quickly slide, erase’ (initial meanings) and ‘to slide your finger over the screen of a tablet, etc. to find the desired Internet page’ (acquired due to the spreading of gadgets with touch controls); *zwitschern* – ‘to chirp’ (initial meaning), ‘to send a message on Twitter’ (acquired meaning), etc.

When borrowing verbs from English, a narrowing of their meaning can occur – for example, the verb *jobben* (to work) also means ‘to work temporarily, earning money’ and sometimes ‘to gig’ (to earn money); this causes the polysemy, and the narrowing of the meaning entails a quantitative increase in the definitions reflected in the dictionary entry, i.e. makes the verb more meaningful. Since polysemy is paradigmatically related to synonymy and homonymy, this causes certain difficulties in the lexicographical representation of polysemantic words. Certainly, these issues were not left unattended by linguists – polysemy was considered in the works by O. E. Voronichev [Voronichev 2012] and A. I. Olkhovskaya [Olkhovskaya 2015] in connection with homonymy, in the articles by D.A. Ivanova [Ivanova 2017] and A.S. Trifonov [Trifonov 2015] in connection with synonymy; the works by D.V. Kachurin [Kachurin 2014], S.S. Bilyalova [Bilyalova 2015] and others are devoted to the links between the polysemy and the practice of compiling dictionaries. The possibilities of the lexicographic representation of polysemantic words were studied based on the theory of lexical prototypes [Shiryaeva 2008] which is defined as the invariant core and basis of semiosis of the polysemantic word [Pesina 2005]. Examples are given of changing the semantic volume of a word by expanding or narrowing its meaning in dialect languages [Zhdanova 2009]. Issues of expanded meanings and, consequently, of the development of polysemy were also considered by foreign authors, who emphasized the need to distinguish polysemy and homonymy of polysemantic words, including verbs [Lederhilger 2011]. The particular importance of distinguishing these phenomena in the reflection of polysemantic verbs in lexicography was noted [Nikula 2013]. This question is crucial, especially when it comes to compiling explanatory dictionaries which will be discussed in more detail below. The change in the semantic volume of the verbs was studied not only in synchrony but also in the diachronic perspective [Balode 2002].

Thus, the problem of polysemy of lexical units, including verbs, as well as its reflection in lexicography, is not overlooked by linguists, yet there are still a number of issues not covered by linguistic and philological the research. The theoretical novelty of the present study lies in the fact that the author considers the influence of polysemy on the representation of German verbs (mega-field of management) in various dictionaries, mainly bilingual. This, on the one hand, narrows the range of considered verb meanings, not taking into account occasional meanings and those acquired in dialects, in teen slang and in colloquial discourse. On the other hand, the mega-field of management is quite wide, including such macrofields as information, investment, banking and pedagogical management, as well as leisure management, etc., 41 macrofields in total [Milyaeva 2011], which gives a sufficient field for research. The study also substantiates the method of expanding the function of dictionaries and justifies the expediency of reducing dictionary entries by moving the illustrative material to the appendix, so that it could be elaborated in the educational process in more detail. The scientific value lies in the comprehensive analysis of possible options for the lexicographical representation of polysemantic verbs (taking synonymy and homonymy into account), in assessing their advantages and disadvantages (the target audience being the main evaluation criterion), as well as in justifying the individual approach to building the corpus and writing entries depending on the functions of the corresponding dictionary.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

For tasks implementation, the author of the present research used the method of continuous sampling (when forming the research material). The material of the study was German verbs of the **mega-field of management**, including 1,245 neologism verbs. The data array was obtained by sampling from relevant scientific, educational and periodical German literature on economics and management, as well as from Internet resources, in particular materials from the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and the University of Tübingen where neologisms are recorded since 2000. [Lemnitzer 2002-2018]. The object of the study is polysemantic verbs, while the subject is the influence of ambiguity on the reflection of these verbs in dictionaries of various types, in particular, how polysemy affects the volume of the dictionary, design of entries, etc.

Since the lexicography is limited to polysemantic verbs in the thematic field of management, this required applying the method of abstraction to a certain extent. In particular, the author did not consider the meanings used primarily in teen and colloquial discourse and the stylistically reduced (abusive, coarse, vulgar) semantics, since these semes are not inherent in the sectoral management language. A comprehensive analysis of the variants of the lexicographic representation of polysemantic verbs necessitates the theoretical analysis and synthesis of scientific literature data on topics of interest. Next, the author used semantic analysis of terminological units and lexicographic analysis to form the optimal vocabulary of educational dictionaries depending on the purpose of the dictionary and the target audience, as well as to determine the necessary minimum parameters of the dictionary entry.

The practical significance of the study is to improve the lexicographic competence of German learners due to the development of their ability to use different dictionaries and extract the necessary information from them. The expediency of reducing the dictionary entry by putting the illustrative material into the appendix (the practical part of the dictionary) was tested by the author in practice during the educational process. In other words, the author conducted a pedagogical experiment that allowed establishing the effectiveness of this technique. The sequence of the research process is as follows – the discussion of the ways to present polysemy in dictionaries suggested by other researchers precedes the presentation of the author's results of compiling educational dictionaries.

3. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

Turning directly to the possibilities of the lexicographic representation of polysemantic verbs, the author begins by describing them in monolingual educational dictionaries that best fit the task of learning to understand a foreign language without translation. The author confines herself to educational dictionaries, since a dictionary entry here is simpler than that of academic dictionaries, although the order of providing information about words in them is quite logical. The head word in bold is given in its original form. Further spelling options, if any, are indicated, outdated versions are marked with a cross, and indications are also given for the approximate date the word came out of use. Besides, in English dictionaries transcription in square brackets is given which in German dictionaries is used only for borrowed lexical items. Grammatical marks are provided (indications of a part of speech, basic verb forms, degrees of comparison of adjectives, gender and plural nouns, etc.). After the grammatical characterization, the etymology of the word (its origin and development of its forms) is indicated in square brackets. If necessary, phraseological combinations are given for each individual word meaning. In the educational monolingual dictionary, indications of etymology, orthography variants, etc. seem superfluous because the main task is the description of the word meaning. Therefore, the head word is followed by grammatical marks and by a list of numbered definitions of the word. This method has its advantages since it allows

including all the possible meanings of the word in the dictionary entry. Usage marks are given in parentheses: colloquial speech, specific field (for example, chemistry, the military sphere, sports jargon), etc. However, a number of linguists believe this principle of presenting material has its drawbacks, since the large number of definitions hinders memorizing them and does not correspond to the facts of language and consciousness, since it violates the principle of compactness of the language system [Hanks 2000].

Because of this, the author suggests the method of presenting lexical material in a dictionary based on the theory of lexical prototypes. At the same time, the author suggests distinguishing three parts in the structure of the entry: nominative-non-derivative meaning, metonymic meanings and metaphorical meanings, citing generalized semes in each part, followed by illustrative examples [Karasev 2013]. Illustrative material is necessary to familiarize users with the use and lexical compatibility of the heading word, as well as to represent the cultural background of a nation within a dictionary entry [Pogrebenko 2005]. The absence in the dictionary entry of clear distinctions of various meanings of the word, as well as the presence of illustrative examples, should stimulate the learner to independently form an integral image of the lexical sign in the consciousness.

At the same time, certain linguists have a different view on the presentation of vocabulary in educational monolingual dictionaries. Thus, Yu. D. Apresyan and N. G. Komlev do not refer connotation to the obligatory elements of the lexical meaning of a word, since the connotative meaning, although stably associated with the main denotative meaning, includes additional semantic or stylistic meanings that arise, in particular, while the expressive function of the language is implemented [Apresyan 1995; Komlev 2006]. Therefore, it is logical to include in the educational dictionaries the basic denotative meanings of the lexemes, while the additional and connotative meanings are included in the dictionary corpus as they appear in the presented educational material intended for this target group [Gündoğdu 2000].

The author of the present research tends to share this view. In addition, with respect to creating new meanings of verbs based on metonymic and metaphorical transfer, it should be noted that German verbs are characterized by low productivity of creating polysemy based on metonymic transfer. However, O.A. Nikitina notes the emergence of new lexico-semantic variants of the verb *brennen*, namely 'to burn a compact disc' (*eine CD brennen*) and 'to copy information to a compact disc' (*Daten auf eine CD brennen*), where one can note the semantic-derivative relations by the metonymic model 'action – another action that accompanies the first one' [Nikitina 2000]. In another work by the same author, the emergence of a new lexico-semantic version of the verb *abblocken* with a sharply negative evaluation [Nikitina 2009] is demonstrated. It should immediately be noted that, in case of verbs of the thematic megafield of management, metaphoric transfer is based on metaphors that extend the polysemy of words but differ fundamentally from poetic and individual metaphors, i.e. are largely devoid of vivid imagery and expression.

A new direction in linguodidactics is the frame organization of vocabulary, where the frame is understood as a hierarchical structure for representing knowledge about a stereotypical situation, as a generalized fragment of reality [Kuznetsova 2010: 5]. Vocabulary selection is associated with the lexical minimum of a certain stage of learning; frequently used vocabulary which is subject to activation at this stage is selected for the frame dictionary. Naturally, this approach has positive aspects, since it allows effectively developing speaking and writing as productive types of speech activity. However, it is not entirely consistent with the direction of the present study, since the communicative orientation of such dictionary requires including all the vocabulary in the selected lexical material, regardless of parts of speech and of polysemy of lexical units.

As already noted, monolingual dictionaries are preferable because they help students immerse in the foreign language and develop language guesswork, thereby contributing to the vocabulary expansion; they teach not only to read but also to think in a foreign language

in a certain sense. However, it is assumed that the learner's vocabulary is already sufficient for a free understanding of the foreign language text. Unfortunately, when teaching a foreign language in a non-linguistic university in conditions of a severe shortage of classroom hours allocated to the foreign language, and also considering that German is mainly taught as a second foreign language, it is necessary to take into account the fact that for learning the language of a specialty (in our case of economics and management), students have a rather limited amount of foreign words. Therefore, we are forced to use mainly bilingual or translation dictionaries as educational dictionaries; therefore, we turn to the issue of presenting polysemantic verbs in educational bilingual translation dictionaries.

In accordance with the communicative orientation of the dictionary, the thematic approach to selecting and organizing educational lexical material is used for forming the vocabulary of educational thematic dictionaries [Kuznetsova 2010: 203-204]. Therefore, the vocabulary includes lexical units characterized by a certain thematic relatedness; in our case it is the correlation with the thematic mega-field of management. In addition, two more criteria are used to include a lexical unit in an educational dictionary: part of speech (verb) and polysemy. In addition, educational dictionaries are characterized by a methodical orientation, i.e. orientation at a certain stage of training and at specific selection of language material. Since we are dealing with management (dubbed 'a mega-field' for good reason, since it covers a very wide range of concepts), we consider it expedient to compile mini-dictionaries for individual macro-fields (MAP) of management: production management, financial, banking, information management, personnel management, risk, time management, etc. Each of these thematic educational dictionaries covers the necessary lexical minimum. Compiling such smaller dictionaries has a number of advantages, including shortening the time for compiling and publishing, making it easier for learners to navigate in a limited flow of words, and creating a system of lexical exercises for easier learning of less material.

In addition, the distribution of lexical material into individual thematic dictionaries allows not only excluding homonymy but also partially limiting the polysemy of lexical units, in our case, verbs. Thus, of the two main semes of the verb *surfen*, the first one 'to surf' can be included in the macrofield 'Leisure management', and the second one 'to surf the Internet, to search for information on the Internet' can be included in the macrofield 'Information management'. Since correlation with a certain macrofield of management largely influences the verb translation, in the dictionary entry of the general translation dictionary it is advisable to indicate the sphere of use, for example: *aufbauen* to be based (on smth), to proceed (from smth), to be guided (by smth); to build, construct, create; to restore (construction management); to synthesize (chemical industry management) or more briefly: *fördern* to promote, facilitate, accelerate, encourage, support; to mine (mining industry); to reveal, make explicit (figurative meaning).

Another way of lexicographical representation of polysemantic verbs is their inclusion in the dictionary of synonyms. In this case, not all the polysemantic verbs are included in the corpus but only those which have lexical units with at least one meaning the verb has. Moreover, speaking about a comprehensive German-Russian and Russian-German dictionary of synonyms, a number of additional problems arise – as reality shows, the Russian-German and German-Russian sections of the dictionary are not identical, and this is explained by the polysemy of verbs.

In this regard, it is advisable to consider polysemantic verbs as a hierarchically organized structure, as indicated, in particular, by D.A. Ivanova in the article 'Synonymy and Polysemy: Analysis of System Interconnections'. Indeed, the structure of a polysemantic word can be regarded as a paradigm; however (as we are speaking about a dictionary of synonyms), the author of the present research tends to include not synonyms and antonyms but synonyms and homonyms in this paradigm. In addition, the structure of a polysemantic word, including a verb, is characterized by synonymous rows, and their components may

differ in stylistic coloring and shades of meanings. Series of synonyms related to the structure of various polysemantic verbs may contain the same components, which allows including these verbs in the dictionary of synonyms, for example: *agieren* – to act, to perform (on stage); *handeln* – to trade, to act; *vorgehen* – to act, to advance, to speak (publicly). On the other hand, in addition to common semes, some verbs may contain semes that are absent from partially synonymous verbs, which greatly complicates the relationship between them.

This fact is the cause of the asymmetry of the Russian-German and German-Russian parts of the dictionary. The presence of various semes in the structure of a polysemantic German word can lead to the fact that in Russian it is included in various blocks of synonyms, depending on which of its meanings is chosen as the head word (lemma) of the dictionary entry. Thus, if a user chooses the dictionary entry with the head word ‘to act’ in the Russian-German part of the dictionary, the verbs *agieren*, *handeln* and *vorgehen* can be considered as synonyms. If the head word is ‘to trade’, the verb *handeln* is synonymous to the German verb *feilbieten*, which in no way corresponds to the first group of synonyms. Finally, if the head word is the Russian verb ‘to speak’ (publicly), then the entry of the synonym dictionary includes two verbs from the first group *vorgehen* and *agieren*, but the verb *aufführen* also joins them.

Consequently, as shown by the examples, the polysemantic nature of the verbs in a certain way affects the vocabulary formation and the choice of the head words of the educational dictionary. With regard to the design of a dictionary entry, the author of the present research is guided by the criterion of expediency, sharing the view that the main principle of lexicography is “maximum information on a minimum of space – without prejudice to the interests of the reader” [Berkov, 2004: 4]. Therefore, a dictionary entry should contain a minimum of information. Mandatory parameters for a dictionary entry are the head word and the translated equivalents. Here it is necessary to observe the sequence of specifying values – first, the main (direct) meanings of the verb are indicated, then the figurative meanings are given, even if in the modern language this figurative meaning (*surfen*) is used more often than the main one and has a higher derivational potential: *absurfen* – find information on the Internet, *ansurfen* – search on the Internet, *hinübersurfen* – endlessly search for information on the Internet. At the same time, Arabic numerals are usually used in the vocabulary entry for different verb meanings, for example: *einspeichern* 1) to pile smth in the barn; 2) to enter information into memory.

The situation with verbs is somewhat more complicated – here, are dealing not only with polysemy but also with homonymy. In this case, the translation dictionary entry becomes more complex. First, verb-homonyms must be separated by Roman numerals, since one of the homonym verbs may have direct and figurative meanings which are separated, as mentioned above, by Arabic numerals. Second, if in case of lexicographic representation of polysemantic verbs, indicating the category of (in)transitivity of the verb is optional (since the verbs in their direct and figurative meanings are equally transitive or intransitive), in case of verbs-homonyms, the mark *vt* (verbum transitivum – transitional verb) and *vi* (verbum intransitivum – intransitive verb) may become mandatory. Thus, a dictionary entry may take the following form: *einsacken* I. *vt* 1) put in a bag, pack up; 2) to pocket, to hog. II. *vi* to fall exhausted to the ground, to slump to the floor. In many cases, the dictionary entry must include not only an indication of the verb (in)transitivity but an indication of the need to use a specific case with a specific preposition, since the meaning of the verb and, accordingly, the verb translation into Russian, depends on it: *anknüpfen* to connect, to tie, to attach, to start; (mit D) to contact, enter into intercourse (with smb); (an A) to proceed (from smth), to lean (on smth), to continue (smth), because a certain seme can be associated with a specific verb government. Not only homonym verbs but also individual polysemantic German verbs can be characterized by (in)transitivity depending on which meaning of the verb is used in the sentence, as is the case with *fahren* in the meanings ‘to ride’ (*vi*) and ‘to drive a car’ (*vt*).

The brevity of the dictionary entry, i.e. the lack of transcription and grammatical marks is explained by the main purpose of the dictionary – to render the content of the verb. However, the inclusion of a certain number of polysemantic borrowed verbs with significant frequency in the German industrial language of management has a definite influence on a dictionary entry design due to the need to include transcriptions in it, which is not generally accepted in German-Russian dictionaries and is a specific characteristic of English-Russian dictionaries. Nevertheless, taking into account the fact that users of the dictionary are mainly people who speak German, the author of the present research finds it necessary to include phonetic information, i.e. transcriptions, for example: *mainstreamen* ['meɪnstri:mən] – to join the mainstream; to establish mass production; to adapt to the main tendency in the field of scientific, artistic, political, publicist etc. activities; *surfen* ['sɜ:rʃən] – to surf; to search for information on the Internet.

A number of problems arise when reflecting German polysemantic verbs in the educational dictionary of synonyms, especially given that in this case we are actually dealing with two dictionaries: German-Russian and Russian-German. In addition to these reasons for the discrepancies between the German and the Russian parts of the synonym dictionary (associated with the corpus), there are also discrepancies in dictionary entries design. One of the factors contributing to the asymmetry of the Russian and German parts of the dictionary of synonyms is that Russian verbs have the category of aspect, absent in German verbs. Thus, in Russian-German translation dictionaries, in a dictionary entry for an imperfective aspect verb, a footnote is given after the head word, for instance: to recall – *see* to be recalling, etc.

Let us take a closer look at this. Imperfective verbs denote actions in situations that are repeat an unlimited or limited number of times [Kamynina 1999: 78], in other words, they denote long-term or repeated actions without indicating their completeness. Perfective verbs indicate the completeness of the action, its result, the end of the action or its beginning; here, it is appropriate to refer to the fact that the verb prefix *er-* gives the meaning of completeness of what is expressed by the notion verb, for example: *erbauen* (to build) = *fertig bauen*; *erraffen* (to get, to pick up) = *viel raffen*, etc., which brings the German verbs with the above mentioned prefix together with Russian perfective verbs. Therefore, unlike many perfective and imperfective verbs, the Russian verbs 'to be achieving' and 'to achieve' cannot be combined into one dictionary entry:

- to be achieving 1) *streben* (*nach D*) to strive, attempt, harass; 2) *trachten* (*nach D*) to seek, strive, make efforts; 3) *erstreben* to reach, strive, seek, desire; 4) *bewerben sich* (*um A*) to apply, seek, strive, compete, woo, bargain, participate in the competition for ...; 5) *aus sein* (*auf etw*) to want something, strive to possess something, want to achieve something; 6) *hinarbeiten* to seek, work towards...
- to achieve 1) *erreichen* to achieve, reach, get, catch 2) *erlangen* to achieve, get, acquire, find.

In addition to this discrepancy, differences in German and Russian also apply to reflexive verbs. Reflexive verbs denote action directed at the subject, and in German they are used with the reflexive pronoun *sich*, which requires an addition to the dictionary entry. However, it is necessary to take into account that reflexive verbs in German do not always correspond to Russian verbs that end in *-ся*, which is also reflected in dictionary entries, for example: *sich* (*D*) *zunutze machen* to use; *aufbauen* to be based (*on smth*), be guided (*by smth*); *vorgehen* to act, move. Finally, we must not forget that the word combinations *sich* (*D*) *zunutze machen* to use can correspond to the Russian words in German and vice versa: *zensieren* to mark, censor.

Thus, the dictionary entry of polysemantic verb-synonyms can include verbs similar in meaning but different in:

- government (*streben* (nach D) to achieve, strive – *erstreben* to strive, achieve, desire);
- (in)transitivity (*erbauen* to build, construct - *aufbauen* to be building, constructing);
- (non)-reflexive verbs (*vorhaben* to conceive - *vornehmen sich* to be lost in thought);
- verbs and phrases (*einstellen* hire, enlist – *in Dienst nehmen/stellen* to hire, contract).

The dictionary of synonyms, like the usual translation dictionary, contains verbs with paradigms including not only synonyms but also homonyms. Moreover, the series of synonyms itself which acts as a peculiar context can serve as the basis for the formal separation of homonyms within a dictionary entry. For example, the dictionary entry of the Russian verb 'to value' includes German verbs with the meanings 'to appreciate, determine value, quote, set a price' – *taxieren* 'to rate, regard as, appreciate'; *werten* 'to rate, to value'; as well as verbs with the meaning 'to value, set high/low, attach importance, recognize, have a high opinion of smb, honor, respect, esteem; to cherish, praise, honor, adore, appreciate, attach great importance, recognize, give justice, pay tribute, acknowledge merit – *ästimieren* to evaluate, appreciate, respect; *schätzen* to evaluate, respect, appreciate, cherish; *würdigen* evaluate, celebrate (success), appreciate, give due, honor.

The same can be said about the verb ambiguity which is usually implemented in speech, where the context clarifies one of the specific meanings of a polysemantic word, the difference being that in the dictionary of synonyms, the context is not a meaningful segment of speech but a certain series of synonyms. This is important, because the entry structure of the dictionary of synonyms differs from that of the bilingual translation dictionary due to the difference in their goals. The main purpose of the dictionary of synonyms is precisely the representation of verbs-synonyms; therefore, it is more expedient in this case not to use Roman and Arabic numerals but to specify the head word in order to exclude verbs that are not synonyms from one the same dictionary entry.

The asymmetry of the German and Russian parts of the dictionary of synonyms is also explained by the fact that not all the meanings of a polysemantic verb are included into the Russian-German part as head words but only hyperonyms – verbs with a broader meaning which determine synonymy, as opposed to hyponyms (concepts expressing a particular essence in relation to a hyperonym). In the above example with the Russian verb 'to value', the hyperonyms are 'evaluate' and 'appreciate', since these meanings help build a number of German synonyms: *ästimieren*, *schätzen*, *würdigen*. The hyponym 'to honor' (*würdigen*) does not give such opportunity with the indicated verbs. Being chosen as the head word for a dictionary entry, the Russian verb 'to honor' will entail the construction of a completely different synonymic series: *ehren*, *feiern*, *würdigen*. The verbs of this series, in turn, are polysemantic but include other semes: *ehren* – to esteem, honor, note, respect; *feiern* – to honor, celebrate, feast. Exclusively hyperonyms are chosen as the head words of the Russian-German part of the dictionary of synonyms because the vocabulary of this part of the dictionary is smaller than that of the German-Russian part.

As mentioned above, the main goal in reflecting polysemantic verbs in educational dictionaries is to transfer the semantic content of the verb; therefore, it is appropriate to reduce the volume of the dictionary entry to the necessary minimum and introduce additional phonetic and grammatical information only when it is not possible to do without it. Thus, there is a possibility of reducing a dictionary entry by introducing illustrative material in the appendix; such appendixes are usually workshops on lexical material. This practice

has already been tested by the Department of Germanic-Romance languages of State University of Management. The members of the department created the following workshops on the subject 'German Language':

- for working with a dictionary of abbreviations on the topic 'Economics and Management';
- for working with the German-Russian and Russian-German verb-neologisms dictionary;
- for working with the mini-lexicon 'Tourism and Hospitality';
- for working with the dictionary of synonyms.

As practice shows, the implementation of various kinds of lexical and grammatical assignments contributes to training the vocabulary of the dictionary in written and oral speech, because Workshops contain tasks related to writing business letters, discussing certain situations in a group, etc. In this case, the illustrative material ceases to be exclusively such and becomes educational material.

Several examples of tasks are listed below:

1. The verb *beenden* means 1) to stop or 2) to complete. Distribute the following verbs and phrases into two groups by their meaning (abbrechen – abschließen – aufhören – einhalten – herunterfahren – vollenden – einstellen (die Arbeit) – zu Ende bringen – ein Ende machen (setzen, legen) – innehalten – zu Ende führen – Schluss machen): 1) to stop; 2) to complete.

2. The verb *surfen* has several meanings. Which of the following substantive infinitives containing the verb are related to information management, sports management and leisure management? (Schultersurfen, das; Nebenbei-Surfen, das; Nacktsurfen, das; Fremdsurfen, das; Hochgeschwindigkeitssurfen, das; Gletschersurfen, das; Kitesurfen, das; Probesurfen, das).

3. Verbs can have different meanings and, accordingly, different synonyms. Which row of synonyms corresponds to each of the following meanings?

- to release (products), supply, ship, deliver;
- *liefern* – produzieren – herstellen – herausbringen;
- *liefern* – abliefern – anliefern – ausliefern – beliefern;
- to stop, complete, end, finish smth, conclude, modify;
- *beenden* – aufhören – ein Ende machen (setzen, legen) – Schluss machen;
- *beenden* – abschließen – vollenden – zu Ende bringen – zu Ende führen.

4. Verb infinitive and substantive infinitive have shades of meanings. Find the corresponding German equivalents for Russian phrases: to endlessly search for information on the Internet; information search on high-speed Internet; trial search for information on the Internet; to search for information on the high-speed Internet; surfing when one partner drags another into an extremely high wave with the help of a tow rope; kitesurfing or kiteboarding; to search for information everywhere on the Internet (Kitesurfen, das; Tow-in-Surfen, das; quersurfen; Hochgeschwindigkeitssurfen, das; Probesurfen, das; hinübersurfen; speedsurfen) [Markova 2018].

5. Which of these verbs can be used in both sentences (recherchieren, studieren, untersuchen)? Man muss dieses Problem ernsthaft... ; An Kunst-, Film- und Musikhochschulen kannst du künstlerische Fächer...

6. The Russian verb 'to return' has different meanings and, accordingly, different equivalents in German: 1) *retournieren* (to return, send back, give back); 2) *zurückgeben*

(to return, respond, give change); 3) *zurückschicken* (to give (an item) back, return to sender, send back); 4) *zurücksenden* (to return, reject); 5) *zurückzahlen* (to pay back (a debt), refund, reimburse); 6) *zurückerstatten* (to return, give back, pay back, reimburse). Complete the following sentences with the appropriate verbs:

- Wenn Sie das Buch nicht..., können die Strafbühnen den Preis eines neuen Buches sogar überschreiten.
- Können Sie nur 10 (20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90) Dollar (Euro) tauschen und den Rest in Dollar (Euro)...?
- Beim Vorabaustausch haben Sie 30 Tage Zeit, das fehlerhafte Produkt... .
- Sie müssen gleich eine Nachricht...

After completing a number of tasks, students are asked to make up sentences or situations in which these verbs can be used and to compare their results with those of group-mates and discuss the mistakes made. If the language command allows, the discussion is conducted in German. As seen, the workshops contain practical examples, demonstrating the use of polysemantic verbs in speech; therefore, the illustrative material in the dictionary entries becomes redundant, especially since students do not just get acquainted with examples but also use them in the communication process. In addition to the fact that workshops provide conscious and involuntary memorization of the lexical material of dictionaries (achieved during the performance of tasks), they also contribute to the expansion of the functions of dictionaries. V.V. Dubchinsky identifies six functions inherent in dictionaries: the scientific description of the language, the systematization of linguistic knowledge, the normative function, the explanation of obscure and borrowed words, the provision of interlingual communication and translation practice, and teaching of a foreign language [Dubchinsky 1994: 9]. They can be supplemented with an informative function (introduction to accumulated knowledge), communicative (informing users of the words of a native or foreign language necessary for communication), the function of improving the users' lexicographic competence, etc.

These functions of the dictionaries are certainly important for mastering the special vocabulary. However, as a result, the student must not only know the basic special terms but also be able to correctly use them in speech (from a grammatical point of view), as well as master the basics of selecting language tools necessary to achieve communication goals, such as: request, informing, consent, objection, instruction, refusal and others. An appropriate system of exercises and tasks should help achieve these goals [Markova 2015]. Workshops that allow activating the material of dictionaries, also allow using dictionaries not only as references but also as teaching material in class, i.e. expand the functions of dictionaries.

4. CONCLUSION

Summing up, it should be noted that the data array the author selected includes a significant number of verbs-neologisms and an equally large number of verbs firmly included in the German language, since the ambiguity of polysemy is that verb polysemy as a constantly evolving phenomenon leads to the emergence of new meanings in already existing verbs. At the same time, including polysemantic verbs in the lexical paradigm of new semes is limited by the fact that the author considers the verbs of the thematic megafield of management; thus, private or occasional meanings of verbs that go beyond the specified subject are not taken into account. Polysemy of verbs has a definite influence on the vocabulary formation and on the dictionary entry structure. When specifying different meanings of the verb, Arabic numerals are used in the dictionary entry, and it is customary to first indicate

the direct and then the figurative meanings. If there are several direct meanings, the hyperonyms are specified first. If there are homonyms, they are separated by Roman numerals. In addition, in case of verb-homonyms, the marks *vt* (verbum transitivum - transitive verb) and *vi* (verbum intransitivum - intransitive verb) are necessary. In the dictionary entry, the verb government is indicated in parentheses (the use of a certain case with a certain preposition), since certain semes may be associated with specific verb government.

When compiling thematic dictionaries for separate spheres or macro-fields of management, the verb-homonyms can correlate with different topics and, therefore, fall into different sections of the dictionary, which allows removing homonymy and, accordingly, simplifying the dictionary entry. The distribution of lexical material in individual thematic dictionaries also allows partially restricting the polysemy of verbs. The verb ambiguity also has a significant influence on the compilation of a dictionary of synonyms, which is manifested primarily in the selection of the vocabulary for the German-Russian and Russian-German parts of the dictionary. Since only hyperonyms serve as heading words (selected from the meanings of polysemantic German verbs), this makes the vocabulary list of the Russian part of the dictionary shorter than that of the German part. Polysemy affects the volume of the dictionary entry, since the presence of common and different semes in the structure of polysemantic verbs may determine the occurrence of German verbs in different synonymous series in the Russian language, which explains the discrepancy between the entries of the two parts of the dictionary.

The asymmetry of the two parts of the dictionary is also associated with inconsistent (in)transitivity of polysemantic verbs, with the absence of aspect in German verbs, as well as with the fact that in some cases verbs of one language correspond to phrases in the other. Reflexivity also determines various semes in a verb (verbs): *überlegen* – to ponder, think; *sich überlegen* – to ponder, think over, change your mind. A general conclusion can be made that polysemy of verbs affects the structure of entries in dictionaries of various types, in particular, in translation and thematic dictionaries and in the dictionary of synonyms, influences the formation of the vocabulary of the German-Russian and Russian-German synonyms dictionary (containing polysemantic verbs) and also determines the asymmetry of the Russian and German synonyms dictionary. Thus, the author of the present study identified the typological features of educational dictionaries of different spheres to determine the required volume of typical entries. It is confirmed that the volume of description of a lexical unit in an educational dictionary of the accompanying type (which presupposes a reflection of the basic meanings of a polysemantic verb) essentially differs from the description of head words in dictionaries of other types. The study discusses the method of creating workshops with the illustrative material (as applications to specific dictionaries), which makes it possible to shorten the entries and allows actively mastering the lexical material of the dictionary and accordingly expanding the functions of the dictionary.

REFERENCES

- [1] Apresyan Yu. D. Connotation as part of the word paradigmatics. Selected Works. Integral description of language, systemic lexicography, 1995. V. 2. P. 156-177.
- [2] Berkov V.P. Bilingual lexicography: Tutorial. M.: Astrel: AST: Transitkniga, 2004. - 236 p.
- [3] Bilyalova S.S. Lexicographic developments of polysemantic words in the Crimean Tatar language. Philology and Literary Studies. 2015. No.8.
- [4] Voronichev O.E. On the ambiguity and homonymy of proper names. Primary school plus before and after, M. - 2012, No. 6. P. 90-94.
- [5] Dubchinsky V.V. The art of creating dictionaries: lexicography abstracts. – Kharkov: KhSPU, 1994. - 102 p.

- [6] Zhdanova E.A. Changing the scope of the word meaning as the basis of semantic derivation (based on the verbal vocabulary of the Russian dialects of Udmurtia). *Bulletin of the Volgograd State University. Series 2: Linguistics*. 2009. 1 (9), p. 21-27.
- [7] Ivanov D.A. *Synonymy and Polysemy: An Analysis of System Relationships*. Philology. Questions of theory and practice. Tambov: Gramota, 2017. 11(1), 93-100.
- [8] Kamynina A. A. *Modern Russian. Morphology: A manual for students of philological faculties of public universities*. M.: MSU Publishing House, 1999. 240 p.
- [9] Karasev A.A. The problem of representing polysemantic words in the educational monolingual dictionary of the English language (lexico-prototypical approach). *Scientific and technical bulletin of St. Petersburg State Polytechnic University*. St. Petersburg: Polytechnic University Publishing House, 2013. 3 (179), 206 – 210.
- [10] Kachurin D.V. The problem of the distinction between homonymy and polysemy in relation to the practice of compiling explanatory dictionaries. *News of RAS. Literature and Language Series*, 2014, 73(2): 44-53.
- [11] Komlev N. G. *Components of the content structure of the word*. M.: URSS, ComBook, 2006. - 192 p.
- [12] Kuznetsova L.I. Methods of forming vocabulary of the frame training dictionary. *Bulletin of RUDN. Series: Russian and foreign languages and methods of their teaching*. 2010. 4, p. 5-12.
- [13] Kuznetsova L.I. Principles of words selection for the training frame, taking into account the linguocultural component. *Bulletin of the Krasnoyarsk State Pedagogical University*. 3: 202-206.
- [14] Markova T.S. From the experience of teaching translation of special literature to the students of the economic university. *Designing and using educational materials*. - M., SUM, 2015. – 46p.
- [15] Markova T.S. *Workshop to the dictionary of neologisms-verbs*. – M. SUM, 2018
- [16] Milyaeva N.N. The structure and semantics of the initial abbreviations of the megafield of management (on the material of the modern German language). *Bulletin of NSU. Novosibirsk* - 2011. 9(2): 13-21.
- [17] Nikitina O.A. Features of the transformation of derived word meanings based on metonymic transfer in the modern German language (on the material of the neologisms of the late 20th- early 21st centuries). *Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State Pedagogical University* 2000. 4:256-271
- [18] Nikitina O.A. The development of new meanings of words into words based on metaphorical transfer as one of the ways to update the vocabulary of the German language (based on verbs and verbal units - semantic neologisms of the late 20th- early 21st centuries). *Bulletin of Vyatka State University* 2009. 3(2):76-81.
- [19] Olkhovskaya A.I. *Polysemy as a problem of general and vocabulary lexicology*. Monograph. Moscow: Flinta, 2015, 914p.
- [20] Pesina S.A. The method for determining the meaningful core of a polysemantic noun in English. *Bulletin of RSPU named after A.I. Herzen*. 2005. 5(11):51-59.
- [21] Pogrebenko Yu.I. Place and function of quotes in the dictionary: on the material of British monolingual educational dictionaries. // M. Moscow State University Publishing House, 2005, 128 p.
- [22] Trifonov A.S. Polysemy and synonymy as functional parameters of the term. *Bulletin of Volgograd State University*. Volgograd, 2015. 3(27):97-103.
- [23] Shiryaeva A.V. Prototypical semantics as the basis of verb synonymy. *Bulletin of RSPU named after A.I. Herzen*, 2008. 54:269-274.
- [24] Balode Ineta. *Deutsch-lettische Lexikographie: eine Untersuchung zu ihrer Tradition und Regionalität im 18. Jahrhundert*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2002, 199 S.

- [25] Gündoğdu Mehmet. Sprachliche und didaktische Aspekte der mehrdeutigen Verben. *Deutsch Lernen 2000* / 1. S. 59 – 70.
- [26] Hanks Patrick. Do word meanings exist? // *Computers and Humanities*. Vol. 34. Trier – 2000, pp. 205 – 221.
- [27] Lederhilger Christoph. Homonymie und Polysemie in der Lexikographie. Ein Vergleich von Duden und Brockhaus. GRIN Verlag, Munich, 2011
- [28] Lemnitzer Lothar. Willkommen in der Wortwarte. Eine Sammlung von Neologismen. 2002-2018 - [electronic resource]. – Accessed: <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/~lothar/nw/>
- [29] Nikula Henrik. Perspektivität und Polysemie im Lexikon und Wörterbuch. Eronen, M. & M. Rodi-Risberg (toim.) 2013. Perspektivität als Herausforderung. VAKKI-symposiumi XXXIII 7.-8.2.2013. VAKKI Publications 2. Vaasa, (221–232).