New Approach to the Yakut Language Dictionary: Preface as Paratext

Elena Stepanovna Rufova [1], *

[1] Department of Oriental Languages, M.K. Ammosov North-Eastern Federal University, Yakutsk 677000, Russia.

* Corresponding Author: el.rufova@yandex.ru.

ABSTRACT: This article investigates the communicative and pragmatic potential of the lexicographic preface, with a focus on the preface to the *Dictionary of the Yakut Language* by E.K. Pekarsky (1907), which creation is associated with the Sibiryakov's (Yakut) expedition of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society (1894-1896). Publishing of this dictionary is determined as a significant scientific fact for researchers of the issues of Yakut linguistics in the context of the scientific paradigm of Russian Turkology. The present study aims to explore the historical, social, and cultural factors influencing the creation of the preface, using a socio-pragmatic and anthropocentric approach. The research utilizes contextual, comparative, and source analysis methods to examine how paratextual elements in the preface shape the reader's understanding of the dictionary. By analyzing Pekarsky's rhetorical strategies, such as his self-presentation and engagement with the reader, the study reveals how the preface communicates the significance of the dictionary's creation. The findings underscore the informative-pragmatic function of the preface, highlighting its role in conveying historical and research insights into the development of the Yakut-Russian dictionary. Ultimately, the preface serves as a key paratext that informs the reader about the lexicographic and historical context of the dictionary.

Keywords: autographic paratext; paratext; written communication; preface; dictionary of the Yakut language by E.K. Pekarsky; Yakut lexicography.

I. INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the issue of such a property of the text as communicativeness, dialogueness was considered in relation to fiction [1]. However, many researchers have proven that a scientific text, including its paratextual elements, is also aimed at a dialogue with the reader [2, 3]. The relevance of this study is determined by the shift in the linguists' interests from studying the laws of language to studying the laws of human communication. The focus of the study is on a person and his linguistic manifestations in certain types of communication, including scientific communication [4, 5].

The concept of paratext refers to elements that are located near the main text of the work and surround it prospectively (epigraph, content, titles), retrospectively (afterword, conclusion) and introspectively (comments, notes, footnotes) [6]. In this study, paratextual elements are considered as optional components of a scientific work that give some freedom of expression to the author, do not constrain him by the framework of scientific style and are a special way of communication between the author and readers. The preface to a scientific text as a paratextual element creates a frame construction for the text and is considered as a secondary (peripheral) text that emphasizes the beginning of the author's text. It is noted that the emergence of secondary textuality is conditioned by the pragmatic component of the communicative situation [7].

This topic was chosen because of its dual relevance: first, as a critical component of modern lexicographic theory and second, as an intersection of historical linguistics and communication. The study of the lexicographic preface of Pekarsky's Yakut-Russian dictionary remains significant, as it contributes to ongoing

237

discussions about preserving endangered languages and the role of paratexts in mediating historical lexicographic practices.

The study of the concept of paratext can be further deepened by analyzing dictionary prefaces, in this case to the Yakut-Russian Dictionary by E.K. Pekarsky. Eduard Pekarsky (1858-1934) was exiled to the Yakut region as a political criminal, where acquaintance with the Yakut language was initially only of a practical nature. However, Pekarsky was one of the first researchers of the Yakut language, and his scientific work *Dictionary of the Yakut Language* is still a fundamental study of Turkic linguistics [8], which became the basis for subsequent bilingual Yakut-Russian and Russian-Yakut translation dictionaries [9]. In previous studies, the *Dictionary of the Yakut Language* acts as an object of linguistic analysis, and the study of the author's preface is presented only fragmentarily. Thus, there is a research gap that needs to be minimized to determine the significance and role of this dictionary as a massive information resource and scientific source. The purpose of this study is to identify the specifics of the preface to the *Dictionary of the Yakut Language* by E.K. Pekarsky as a form of written communication, in which the author undoubtedly enters into a dialogue with the reader, which will reveal the communicative-pragmatic potential of paratextual elements of a scientific text. The novelty of this research is that studying of Pekarsky's lexicographic preface within the framework of the paratextual problematic enables to expand the conceptual space of a scientific text, and will also help readers of the Yakut-Russian dictionary to get an idea of the historical and research situation in this area of lexicography of the late 19th – early 20th centuries.

Within the structural composition of this article, the literature review section reveals the theoretical basis of the research, where the problem of paratext is considered in the context of an integral part of the structure of the work, which is a set of near-text components that have a communicative-pragmatic attitude. The "Materials and Methods" section presents the scientific methods used in the study and the research material. The "Results" section reveals the history of the creation of the *Dictionary of the Yakut language* and its preface, updates the author's significance and substantiation for preparing the preface, and clarifies the novelty of the research. The "Discussion" section presents a textual analysis of the preface to the *Dictionary of the Yakut Language* by Pekarsky as an autographic paratext, identifies the functions, and reveals the milestone factors of its creation. The "Conclusions" section presents the main conclusions of the study, revealing the communicative and pragmatic potential of E. K. Pekarsky's paratext of the *Dictionary of the Yakut Language*.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Dictionaries are an important social phenomenon, and their creation is directly related to the evolution of a given society, the development of intercultural relations and other extralinguistic factors [10]. The diversity of linguistic facts subjected to primary lexicographic processing and partially receiving theoretical generalization in the lexicographic description itself is the initial basis for further research in the field of lexicology, history of language, functional stylistics and stylistics of artistic speech and many other aspects of linguistics [11]. Bilingual and multilingual dictionaries are also a means of interlingual and intercultural communication and indicate the level of cultural and scientific contacts between speakers of these languages [12, 13].

One of the under-investigated topics of Yakut linguistics is the history of the development of Yakut lexicography, which onset dates back to the 17th century, when a list of Yakut words appeared in the materials of the geographer N. Witzen (1692) [14]. The next stage of interest in Yakut terminology dates back to the second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries, characterized by the appearance of the *Yakut-German Dictionary* by academician O.N. Böhtlingk [15] and the fundamental work of E.K. Pekarsky *Dictionary of the Yakut Language* [16, 17]. Meanwhile, these first periods of studying the Yakut language are characterized by the following features: the first researchers of the Yakut language were non-native speakers, these include participants in various expeditions and political exiles. The Yakut language was studied, for the most part, by amateurs who did not have a special linguistic education, but because of various circumstances got acquainted with the Yakut language. The first studies of the Yakut language were mainly of a historical and comparative nature [18]. Nevertheless, the first stages of studying the Yakut language made it possible to begin its comparative study with other Turkic languages, and accumulate significant linguistic and historical material, which provided researchers with valuable information on the history of the Yakut language [19]. Turning to the first scientific

238

studies on the Yakut language will allow us to highlight not only the issues of Yakut lexicography, but also to reveal the historical specifics of the development of the territory of Siberia and the Far East [20].

Scientific interest in dictionaries is also determined by the interest of researchers in their textual nature [21]. E.A. Bazhenova [22], studying the issue of the "pragmatic framework" of a scientific text, which is formed by the title, abstract, preface, conclusion, references and table of contents, identifies the preface as an independent, relatively complete text, semantically connected with the main part of the scientific text, while at the same time being substantively and compositionally outside it [22]. The preface as an object of research is associated, first of all, with the sphere of the author's intentionality (the semantic orientation of the work) [21] and the author's relevance. Researchers of scientific prefaces come to the conclusion that the preface has a number of features of the category of textuality inherent in the text—comprehensiveness, dismemberment, coherence, relative integrity, auto semantics [22]. At the same time, it is distinguished from the main text by its prospective focus on subsequent presentation and inexhaustibility of the author's intention [22]. The study of the lexicographic preface does not remain unnoticed by researchers, but is more often presented in examination of the structural features of dictionaries [23].

Each text has its own syntagmatic boundaries that separate it from other texts. These boundaries are not limited to just the beginning and ending; special elements can be placed on those boundaries that simultaneously belong and do not belong to the text itself. In linguistics and literary criticism, this text is usually referred to as primary or original [24]. This topic is relevant from the viewpoint of its broad functional orientation and connection with applied linguistics, particularly with studies of textual criticism and editorial practice [24-29]. The problem of paratext is also considered in the context of expanding the meaning of the literary work, the organization of the narrative [30]; additional semantic and emotional impulses that shape the perception of the problematics of literary works [31, 32]; and terminological discussions around the concept of paratext [6, 33].

Terminological diversity is currently observed within the framework of studying the so-called textual periphery. The following terms were used to denote the off-text environment: supertext, hypertext, frame elements of the text, secondary text, text periphery, and paratext. The concept of paratextuality in modern literary criticism is associated with the publications of the French researcher Gerard Genette, who used this term to denote "the structural and semantic connections of off-textual formations with the text itself within the framework of an entire literary work" [24]. Vikulova [34] defines paratext as an integral part of the structure of a work of art in handwritten or printed form, which is a set of off-text components that have a communicative-pragmatic attitude" [34]. According to Kornienko [35], the paratext is considered a textual periphery, but at the same time, it can be an important source for obtaining national and cultural information. Galkina [36] writes in her publications that paratextual elements occupy a strong position in the text since they are isolated from the main text and are communicatively completed. In the terminology of Kuzmina [37], such elements are extremely powerful energy signs in which the author's presence is always felt and the authors implicitly transmit information that is significant for them.

The function of paratextual elements is to establish contact between the author (publisher, critic) and the reader [35]. This function is directly related to another crucial function of the paratext-information function. Vikulova [34] refers to this function as a representative one; that is, paratextual elements represent certain information to the reader. A paratext indicates the genre of a given text to the reader. The author's paratext functions as an auto-interpretation of the text and expresses the author's intentions [34].

The concept of paratextuality in modern literary criticism owes much to the French theorist Gerard Genette, who pioneered the systematic study of paratexts. Genette defined paratexts as "the structural and semantic connections of off-textual formations with the text itself within the framework of an entire literary work" [24]. According to Genette, paratextual elements like prefaces, epigraphs, and notes play a crucial role in bridging the reader's understanding and the author's intentions. He emphasized that paratexts operate on a meta-level by "guiding, controlling, and directing the reception of the main text" [24]. Genette identified two main functions of paratexts: to act as a threshold that the reader crosses when engaging with the text, and to frame the text in a way that conveys its purpose and context [30]. This framework aligns closely with the analysis of Pekarsky's lexicographic preface, as it demonstrates how paratextual elements shape the reader's presuppositions and pragmatic conditions for understanding a text.

The concept of intertextuality is another component of the paratextual elements theory. The term "intertext as a textual interaction that occurs within a separate text," introduced by poststructuralist researcher Kristeva [38], can be defined as dialogic and polylogic relations between texts. This theory is based on the idea of Mikhail Bakhtin that any literary work is in dialogue with other works, reality, the author, the reader, and the literary process [1].

Intertextual relations are realized not only with regard to the main text but also between the paratextual elements [39]. Researchers of paratextuality are faced with a logical question regarding the function of paratextual elements in a text. Thus, Genette argued that a paratext is primarily intended to prepare and direct the reader's perception of the text. This function can also be called metatextual, that is, the paratext "specifies the program for reading the text, its code' [24]. In other words, paratextual elements "form the reader's presupposition and create pragmatic conditions for understanding the text as a metatext' [40].

Vikulova [34] and Kornienko [35] have emphasized the communicative and pragmatic value of paratexts. According to Vikulova, paratextual elements represent crucial information and act as tools for the author to reduce the interpretive distance between themselves and the reader [34]. Similarly, Kornienko has highlighted the role of paratexts in conveying cultural and national information embedded in linguistic structures [35]. The current study builds on these perspectives to argue that Pekarsky's preface serves not only as an informative resource but also as a medium for engaging in a scholarly dialogue about linguistic preservation and historical context.

The study of the lexicographic preface in the context of the paratext problem is a relatively new scientific direction, and the aforementioned studies do not provide exhaustive answers. Our article highlights the pragmalinguistic characteristics of paratextual elements of a scientific text. Thus, the following hypotheses of scientific research are formulated:

H1: The preface as a paratextual element reflects the intertextual connections of all components of a scientific study and serves to reduce the distance between the main text and the reader, facilitating the understanding of a scientific study.

H2: The linguistic personality of the author is manifested both in the main text and in paratextual elements (primarily in the preface), which are not static, template formulas, but are found in different combinations and vary in quantity and linguistic content, providing an opportunity for the author's recommendations to the reader, reflections, remembrances, explanations, and expression of emotions.

III. MATERIAL AND METHOD

The study of lexicographic paratext is directly related to the problem with the author's self-expression and worldview, which is reflected and documented in language in the form of mental models of the linguistic world image, is a cultural-linguistic correlation; it is quite multifaceted and represented by a number of methodological approaches. The socio-pragmatic approach is one of the most relevant for this study; within this approach, speech genres are considered a means of organizing social interactions [34]. Thus, the Dictionary of the Yakut language by Pekarsky is considered a historical monument, an interdisciplinary information resource, rather than a lexicographic publication. Anthropocentrism is the methodological principle of research with this approach, when a scientific object is studied on the basis of its role in human beings, by its function in the development of human personality and its improvement. Scientists studying the problems of historical texts have noted absolute anthropocentrism as a fundamentally significant substantive feature of the text, both in the form of expression and content [41-43]. Thus, the study of the preface to the Dictionary of the Yakut Language was conducted in the context of Pekarsky's activities, considering the historical, social and cultural conditions for the creation of the scientific text. The sources were personal notes, diaries and correspondence from the personal archive of E.K. Pekarsky, revealing the historical facts of his participation in Sibiryakov's (Yakut) expedition, communications with the expedition participants and Yakutia's political exiles. Moreover, the study was conducted by examining primary sources: the first translated editions of church literature into the Yakut language, documents of local government bodies of the Yakut region of the late 19th century. Source analysis of primary sources makes it possible to reveal that the author's linguistic personality is manifested in the main text and in paratextual elements of the scientific text. Thus, analyzing the source context is a vital requirement for penetrating the semantic depths of paratext, which is an essential prerequisite for

240

understanding the author's concepts and primary intuitions. In terms of the overall evolution of scientific thought, it is necessary to simultaneously and equally evaluate intimate, specific, and distant universal contexts.

1. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of this study is to analyze the pragmalinguistic characteristics of lexicographic paratextual elements, focusing on the preface of *The Dictionary of the Yakut Language* by E.K. Pekarsky. This analysis aims to uncover how the author's linguistic personality and intertextual connections are manifested in paratexts and their implications for modern lexicographic practices.

2. RESEARCH DESIGN

This research employed socio-pragmatic and anthropocentric approaches to study lexicographical sources and applied source analysis, contextual, interpretive, and comparative methods. These methods were systematically applied in a step-by-step manner to achieve the research objectives.

3. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

A detailed step-by-step analytical framework was implemented to address the research objectives:

1. Contextual Analysis: historical and cultural contexts surrounding the creation of *The Dictionary of the Yakut Language* were examined. This included Pekarsky's personal notes, diaries, and correspondence, alongside archival documents from the late 19th century.

2. Source Analysis: primary sources such as the first translations of church literature into Yakut, local government documents, and lexicographic materials were analyzed to understand the linguistic personality of the author.

3. Paratextual Analysis: a close reading of the preface was conducted to identify its intertextual connections and the linguistic strategies employed for self-expression and communication.

4. Comparative Method: the findings from the contextual and paratextual analyses were compared with secondary literature, focusing on theories of paratextuality by Gerard Genette and other scholars.

5. Interpretive Method: the results were interpreted to understand the pragmatic functions of the preface in reducing the interpretive distance between the main text and the reader.

4. APPROACHES TO ANALYSIS

The socio-pragmatic approach considers speech genres as tools for organizing social interactions [35]. This perspective positions Pekarsky's dictionary as an interdisciplinary resource and a historical monument rather than a mere lexicographic publication. By applying this approach, the study highlights how the preface mediates social and cultural exchanges and reflects Pekarsky's communicative intentions.

The anthropocentric approach, which prioritizes the human-centered nature of linguistic expression, was employed as a guiding principle. This approach facilitated the exploration of how Pekarsky's linguistic personality was shaped by his historical, social, and cultural environment. The analysis considers anthropocentrism in both the form and content of the preface, illustrating how it functions as a reflection of Pekarsky's worldview.

5. DATA COLLECTION

The study relied on archival materials from E.K. Pekarsky's personal archive, including personal notes, diaries, and correspondence related to the Sibiryakov's (Yakut) expedition as well as primary sources such as church literature translations and government documents from the Yakut region in the late 19th century. These sources provided a robust foundation for analyzing both the linguistic personality of the author and the cultural-linguistic correlations in his work.

6. BIASES AND LIMITATIONS

While analyzing historical texts, potential biases such as retrospective interpretation and the limited availability of archival materials were addressed by triangulating multiple sources. The use of both primary and secondary materials helped mitigate interpretive biases, ensuring a balanced and comprehensive analysis.

7. RELEVANCE TO MODERN PRACTICES

The methodological framework and findings have direct implications for modern lexicographic practices, particularly in documenting endangered languages. The study demonstrates how understanding the socio-pragmatic and anthropocentric dimensions of paratexts can enhance the effectiveness of lexicographic works in preserving linguistic heritage.

IV. RESULTS

1. PREFACE PUBLICATION CONTEXT

The preface to *The Dictionary of the Yakut Language* by Pekarsky was published in the first issue of the dictionary in 1907 at the Imperial Academy of Sciences printing house in St. Petersburg [16]. In the first edition of the first issue, published in 1899 at the Yakut regional printing house, the author mentioned that the preface to the dictionary would be presented in "one of the next issues." Only explanations about the deviation from the spelling proposed by O.N. Böhtlingk [44] were published. The special mention of the preface in the next issue emphasizes its importance as a separate genre, appealing to readers' attention and increasing their interest.

The mention of the preface's deferred publication underscores its unique position as a distinct component of the scientific work, signaling its significance as a separate, self-contained genre that draws attention to the overall dictionary project.

2. PARATEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE PREFACE

This study considers the preface to *The Dictionary of the Yakut Languag*e through the problems of paratext. Paratext, as part of a scientific text, not only fulfills an informative function and reveals communicative and pragmatic potential but also identifies the author's characteristic features. The author's preface is significant because paratextual aspects complete the lexicographic publication and emphasize its internal and external unity.

The preface is not merely an introduction but a crucial part of the text's paratextual framework, playing a key role in shaping the readers' understanding of the dictionary's purpose, scope, and intellectual grounding.

2.1. Informative Function

Pekarsky's preface is characterized by informational richness, implementing its main function by focusing on the history and chronology of dictionary creation. It documents events, sources, dates, and names while explaining the alphabet and structure of the dictionary. The preface employs a "reconstruction" approach to present the history of dictionary creation, with the author commenting on and evaluating the events. This provides a communicative influence that resonates with contemporary readers.

Pekarsky's preface serves as a historiographical tool, intertwining factual documentation with personal commentary to present the dictionary's creation, influencing how the dictionary is perceived by its original and future audiences.

2.2. Communicative and Pragmatic Potential

The preface reflects Pekarsky's self-reflection and his objectives for creating the dictionary. He communicates the richness of the Yakut language, engaging readers through repetitions, epithets, and emotionally charged expressions. This activates readers' attention and fosters interest in the dictionary as a scholarly and cultural milestone.

2.3. Author's Linguistic Personality

The preface reveals Pekarsky's linguistic personality and his approach to compiling the dictionary as a fundamental research project. Pekarsky was not merely a compiler; he developed the dictionary as an independent, multifaceted system with internal connections at micro- and macro-levels. The preface allows Pekarsky certain freedoms of expression within the framework of a scientific text, which is evident in his direct appeals to readers and his detailed recounting of the dictionary's creation.

Pekarsky's linguistic personality emerges clearly in the preface, as he presents himself as more than a compiler. His work is framed as a groundbreaking intellectual achievement, demonstrating his ambition to create a comprehensive linguistic resource that bridges scientific rigor with cultural depth.

2.4. Research Novelty

For the first time, this research examines the preface to *The Dictionary of the Yakut Language* in the context of the author's paratext. This approach uncovers the communicative and pragmatic specificity of paratextual elements in a scientific text, highlighting its relevance in understanding the dictionary's broader academic and cultural significance.

This study breaks new ground by analyzing the preface as a paratext, providing fresh insights into how Pekarsky's communicative strategies and linguistic choices influence the perception of his lexicographic work, shedding light on its wider implications for both the field of linguistics and Yakut culture.

V. DISCUSSIONS

The concept of "paratext" in the study of the *Dictionary of the Yakut Language* by E.K. Pekarsky is implemented through the epigraph and preface preceding the main text of the scientific work. Following E.R. Obatnina [32], we argue that these paratextual elements give some freedom of expression to the author, do not constrain him by the framework of scientific style and are a special way of communication between the author and readers.

The epigraph that precedes the preface is one of the paratextual elements of Pekarsky's *Dictionary of the Yakut Language*. In the 1899 publication, it was presented on the second page after the title page; in the 1907 edition, on the contrary, it was printed on the title page. In both editions, the epigraph is presented in a smaller font with a special position to the right of the title, as well as additional information indicating the source. Pekarsky uses his quote from the literary and political journal *Russian Thought* (1886) as an epigraph: "*The language of a tribe is an expression of its entire life; it is a museum in which all the treasures of its cultural and higher mental life are collected*" [16]. This epigraph succinctly reflects the gist of compiling a dictionary, carries a dialogizing function, introduces the author's viewpoint and position, and testifies to his attitude towards the object of his research. The transfer of the epigraph to the title page in the second edition of the dictionary emphasizes the indirect expression of the author's position regarding the importance of studying the Yakut language and the need to compile a dictionary.

The preface is the next element in the author's paragraph. Referring to the preface by E.K. Pekarsky as a paratext, according to the proposed classification by Genette [24], we distinguish the first type of paratext—autographic—created directly by the author of the text. The preface by Pekarsky is immediately supplied with a footnote in which the author indicates that most of the preface was presented in his previously published articles in the News of the Imperial Academy of Sciences (1905), the Yakut Regional Gazette (1895), the letter addressed to the East Siberian Department of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society (IRGS) (1898), and the first edition of the dictionary (1899). Nevertheless, the author underlines that the presented material has been refined and supplemented. This thorough approach to writing a preface characterizes the author as an inquisitive researcher and justifies the need for a preface as a structural element of the dictionary as a whole. All of these facts speak to the labor-intensive work involved in preparing the dictionary for publication.

Among all paratextual elements, the preface stands out for its special informational richness [35]. The informational vector of Pekarsky's preface is aimed at the potential reader; the author introduces the historical context of the work on the dictionary to the reader, revealing in detail all stages of this work.

For example, from the first sentence of the preface, Pekarsky introduces the chronology of creating the dictionary, indicating the exact dates and events.

"*I began work on a dictionary of the Yakut language back in* **1881**, *i.e., in the* **year of my arrival** *in the* **Yakut region***. Living in an area inhabited exclusively by Yakuts, I naturally had to try to get acquainted with the language of the outlanders around me and* **began to write down** *Yakut words, pursuing only practical goals – I* **wanted to attain the opportunity to maintain** *relations with the people around me*' [16, p. 1].

Notably, Pekarsky characterizes his interest in the Yakut language as a natural process of becoming familiar with the language of the surrounding reality. He emphasizes that his main goal was initially the practical need to "attain the opportunity' to communicate with people around him. This approach of a young educated man who arrived in a harsh region unknown to him and many characterizes E.K. Pekarsky as a true linguist researcher who understands the significance of knowing the language and communicating with the local population in their language of communication, although the author himself initially emphasizes only a practical interest in the language. Moreover, this is confirmed by his words about the significance of books, which, in addition to recording words from living speech, Pekarsky tried to obtain literature about the Yakut language to the best of his ability. Thus, his first printed sources were *A Brief Grammar of the Yakut Language* by Khitrov and translations of church literature.

In his preface, E.K. Pekarsky describes in detail the methods of his work in preparing the dictionary: "I put down borrowings from living speech", "having preserved … the spelling generally accepted in the Yakut region, I tried only to come close to the spelling method of Böhtlingk", "I tried to stock up on printed sources available to me at that time", "I arranged them in alphabetical order", "I constantly replenished it", "I found it necessary to make comparisons with similar Tatar and Buryat words", "I continued to make extracts mainly from printed sources", etc. [16, p. 198]. The author mentions that in compiling the dictionary he uses early studies in the Yakut language, the first translations of church literature into the Yakut language, and handwritten dictionaries of other political exiles, comparing them with his notes and conducting a comparative study with other Turkic languages. All these factors speak of the labor-intensive nature of the work in preparing a scientific paper. The preface explicates the main criterion for selecting language material: "the more Yakut words I collect, the more valuable material I will be able to give to other researchers for understanding the "soul" of the Yakut people" [16, p. 198]. At the same time, the quoted fragment speaks of E.K. Pekarsky's great diligence and desire to present the reader with the richness of the Yakut language. The image of the author is formed, which becomes a reference point for the potential reader.

The primacy of the source is emphasized in the preface to the dictionary as an element of the axiological hierarchy of verbal values in the author's world image. From this perspective, the role of Christian culture in the development of literature on the Sakha people is emphasized. Owing to the activities of the sanctifier Innokentiy Veniaminov, a committee was established in Yakutsk in 1853 to translate sacred and liturgical books into Yakut. As a result of the activities of this committee, church books and *A Brief Grammar of the Yakut Language*, *Yakut-Russian Literacy Primer*, compiled by Archpriest D. Khitrov, were published in the Yakut language. Precisely this printed literature in the Yakut language became the basis for the systematization of Yakut words by Pekarsky, who recorded them in alphabetical order and compiled a dictionary, which "*he did not part with for a single minute, constantly looking into it to talk with the Yakuts and constantly adding to it*" [16, p. 1].

The *Yakut-German Dictionary* by academician O. Böhtlingk [15] was another source of the Yakut language dictionary about which Pekarsky wrote that he had not heard of it before. Around this time, Eduard Pekarsky found information in the newspaper *Nedelya (Week)* and the Minutes of the Meeting of the Moscow Society of Lovers of Natural History, Anthropology, and Ethnography in a message by I.I. Gamow that the Yakut language includes only approximately 3,000 words. Pekarsky suggested that such information was based on the dictionary of O.N. Böhtlingk and made preliminary comparisons with his own notes:

"*It is obvious that the determination of the number of words in the Yakut language was based on the Böhtlingk dictionary. Having compared this latter with the material that I had accumulated, I noticed that Böhtlingk did not have any commonly used words at all and he did not show all the meanings of the registered words*" [16, p. 2].

Here, we can trace Pekarsky's indignation in the previously published dictionary by Böhtlingk, which was one of the existing sources of the Yakut language at that time. Criticisms from Pekarsky regarding the absence of commonly used words and all the meanings included in the Yakut-German dictionary of words prove that he already had a good command and was well versed in the Yakut language.

The preface to the dictionary clearly outlines and explains Pekarsky's standpoint on how to write down Yakut words:

"***Having kept*** in my dictionary the spelling generally accepted in the Yakut region (in Russian letters), I ***tried***, if possible, ***to get closer*** to Böhtlingk's spelling method. It ***seemed*** to me then that the introduction of Böhtlingk spelling would be considered an innovation; as many still think, it would be possible to do without this innovation, and using the dictionary ***could be highly complicated*** for people who have long been accustomed to writing Yakut words in the Russian alphabet' [16, p. 2].

In this sentence, it is evident that the author explains his initial desire to use the generally accepted writing of Yakut words in Russian letters, but further in the text, he explains the course of his thoughts and searches, characterizing his actions a little harshly:

"*Here I **consider it necessary to mention** that owing to Mr. Ionov, I began to **gradually free myself from slavish imitation** of Böhtlingk and **began to write down** all the features in the pronunciation of Yakut words...*" [16, p. 2].

However, in the next appendices of the preface, Pekarsky explains the need to conduct comparative studies of the Yakut language with the Tatar and Buryat languages, and to study interjections, Yakut nicknames, and toponyms as practical materials, which leads to the following conclusion:

"*It is not superfluous to mention here that, for almost ten years, using exclusively the Russian alphabet to depict Yakut words, adjusting the generally accepted method of spelling to Böhtlingk's, for practical reasons, **I finally decided to irrevocably accept strictly phonetic orthography**, almost entirely Böhtlingk's*" [16, p. 3].

The description of the experience of using different ways of writing Yakut words in the text of the preface, an explanation of their reasons, comparative studies, and even an experiment on the perception of different ways of writing – all of which testify to the author's self-reflection. Thus, the author emphasizes the importance of the *Yakut Language Dictionary* and conveys the process of its creation in his own subjective world.

E.K. Pekarsky's preface is full of explicit assessments that demonstrate the pragmatic level of the linguistic personality. The scientific approach and passion for literature merge in the compiler of the dictionary with the desire to study the language and culture of the Yakut people. In the preface, the author critically evaluates the early information about the Yakut language published in the *Nedelya* newspaper and the minutes of the meetings of the Moscow Society of Lovers of Natural Science, Anthropology and Ethnography, expressing the hope that the material he had collected would be useful in scientific terms. Thus, in the preface, information about the work on compiling the dictionary becomes a reason to emphasize its necessity, highlight the stages of work and express gratitude to the individuals who made an invaluable contribution to its compilation.

In addition, in the preface to the dictionary, E.K. Pekarsky indicated the names of people who in one way or another helped in compiling the Yakut dictionary; for example, he mentioned "the handwritten dictionaries of Albov, Nattanson, and Orlov". We venture to suggest that Eduard Pekarsky studied the handwritten dictionaries of other exiles, of which, according to N.K. Gogoleva [45], there were a large number in that period – "in the second half of the 18th to early 19th centuries Yakutia remained the main place of detention for Polish prisoners of war" [45, p. 7]. Eduard Pekarsky received great support from the priest Vasily Popov, who provided "*full disposal of all his material*" for the compilation of a bilingual dictionary. Foremost, Pekarsky singled out Archpriest Dimitrian Popov, referring to him as a "local expert" of the Yakut language, and quoting his words about Yakut:

"*I was convinced of my thoughts about the richness of the Yakut language by a local expert on this language, Father Archpriest Dimitrian Popov, who then expressed that "the Yakut language is as inexhaustible as the sea," and at the same time kindly offered his assistance, which did not stop until his death*" [16, p. 3].

It is known that the Archpriest Dmitrian Popov was a descendant of the Orthodox clergy who came to the Yakut region to spread Christianity. In modern times, he is known as a descendant of a dynasty of famous clergy and artists in Yakutia, and also as one of the first teachers in school education history to teach children their native Yakut languages. Dmitrian Popov also kept records of Yakut vocabulary and communicated closely with Dmitry Khitrov, a member of the Committee for the Translation of Sacred and Liturgical Books into the Yakut Language and a compiler of Yakut grammar. According to Pekarsky, Archpriest Dmitrian Popov assisted him in compiling the dictionary until his last days, and the author mentioned his name on the dictionary title page. The name Vsevolod Ivanovich Ionov, a political exile who later participated in Sibiryakov's (Yakut) expedition, is mentioned alongside the Archpriest Dmitrian. Pekarsky considered Ionov's contribution to the compilation of the dictionary as a watershed moment in the revision of Böhtlingk's alphabet. Eduard Pekarsky emphasized that Ionov identified previously undescribed palatalized consonants d, ' l, ' n '

in the Yakut language; moreover, he underlined the significance of interjections, nicknames, and toponyms, highlighting Yakut language imagery.

Thus, judging by the text of the preface, it may be argued that in the period from 1881 to 1894, Pekarsky conducted a large amount of work on studying the Yakut language and compiling the dictionary. Starting with the practical goals of communication, the author came to the fundamental goals of understanding the importance of studying the Yakut language in a scientific setting. This is confirmed by an integrated approach to the study of the Yakut language: in addition to fieldwork, studying previous publications, consulting with "local experts," Pekarsky conducted comparative studies of the vocabulary of the Yakut language with the Tatar and Buryat languages, based on the material of available manuals (26 units were indicated in the references).

It can be stated without prejudice that by the time of planning Sibiryakov's expedition, Pekarsky had already been known as the compiler of the Yakut-Russian dictionary only in the Yakut region, as well as for members of the East Siberian department of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society. Pekarsky himself wrote that at this time he turned to the study of Yakut folklore and phraseology, the significance of which was highlighted to him by D.A. Clements, organizer of Sibiryakov's expedition:

"*I **admit** that my immediate acquaintance with the fairy-tale and song-like language **made me regret** the time I spent for **relentless studying** translations of holy books, the translators of which tried to convey the Church Slavonic **text too literally, raping** the Yakut language in an **impossible way**"* [16, p. 4].

This sentence reveals Pekarsky's obvious pain and regret about wasting time in translated literature. Although these harsh words and negative assessments indicate his ability to critically evaluate the research material, which only confirms his knowledge of the Yakut language, it also indicates a certain stage in the development of linguistics as a whole. Actually, the resort of Pekarsky to the "fairy-tale and song-like language" allows us to see the wealth of Yakut linguistic material and emphasize the shortcomings of translated church literature, which the Yakuts and "even Russian intelligent people who understand Russian well" did not understand.

Compositionally, Pekarsky's preface consists of two parts: the first, more voluminous part, reveals the history of the dictionary creation; in the second part, the author provides information about the research material presented by the dialects of four districts (Yakut, Verkhoyansk, Vilyui and Olekminsk), and explanations on the presented vocabulary.

The communicative potential of a written text is implemented in the author's preface: Pekarsky addresses readers and visualizes them as researchers. This is confirmed by the repetition of the author's words about the significance of the Yakut language *"not only in practical, but also in scientific terms"*, *"about the richness of the Yakut language"*, moreover, the author points to the principle that guides the dictionary compilation:

"*The more Yakut words I collect, the more accurately each of them is explained, the more valuable material I will be able to give to other researchers for understanding the "soul" of the Yakut people*" [16, p. 3].

Moreover, when speaking about the Yakut language, E.K. Pekarsky uses epithets and comparisons that are not typical for a scientific text, thereby trying to attract the reader's attention: "rich", "inexhaustible as the sea", "enrichment of the dictionary", "the soul of the people is in the language". Through numerous repetitions about the versatility and figurativeness of the Yakut language, the author enhances the reader's interest, and characterizes the Yakut language, thereby increasing the reader's concernment. Noteworthy, E.K. Pekarsky always uses the possessive pronoun "my" when mentioning the dictionary. The use of means of expressing possessiveness has a number of specific features, including pragmatic ones [46]. For example, in such expressions as "my dictionary", "the fate of my dictionary", "with my dictionary" the author's tactics of emphasis are determined, expressing the author's intention to emphasize, highlight a certain point, in this case, to underline the dictionary as the result of his scientific research. It is characteristic for Pekarsky to use the first-person singular pronoun as a subject: "I wanted to achieve the opportunity to maintain relationships with the people around me", "I have read", "I paid attention", which is also one of the main means of implementing the self-presentation tactics. In this way, the author influences the reader, positions his authorship, role and contribution to scientific research, makes the reader respect him and incline to recognize the authority of his opinion. The linguistic personality of E.K. Pekarsky is manifested in the text of the preface through a set of speech and stylistic means, characterized by the depth and accuracy of the reflection of historical reality.

Undoubtedly, in the preface to the *Dictionary of the Yakut Language* Eduard Pekarsky emphasized the significance of the Yakut language and the need to compile a dictionary, thoroughly revealed the history of its creation, cited sources, and used exact dates and personalities, described in detail the features of the alphabet used, thereby formulating the author's communicative intention to convince the addressees of the importance of the dictionary, and helping to reduce the distance between the text dictionary and readers.

These facts convincingly prove that paratextual elements are independent components of a scientific study, but are inseparable from the main text, since they contain the author's remarks to the reader that are necessary for the integral perception of the entire scientific study, in this case the Yakut-Russian dictionary; they set up the scientific interest of the reader, and remove questions that arise when using the dictionary.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Within the framework of this research, for the first time, Pekarsky's lexicographical preface is specifically highlighted in the context of studying the problems of paratext. This study aims to identify the communicative and pragmatic potential of the preface to the *Dictionary of the Yakut Language* by E.K. Pekarsky as a paratextual element of a scientific text.

Thus, as a result of the study, we come to the conclusion that Pekarsky's preface as a paratextual element reflects the intertextual connections of all components of the *Dictionary of the Yakut Language*. The preface reveals the history of its creation, which was lasted over a quarter of a century and is presented in 13 volumes of the dictionary. It brings the reader closer to understanding the lexicographic situation of the creation of the dictionary, explaining early scientific studies in the Yakut language and the first attempts to create an alphabet for the Yakut language. Moreover, the lexicographic preface reveals the personality of the author of the scientific text himself, and contains remembrances and explanations of E.K. Pekarsky on the reasons and purpose of compiling the dictionary, participation in Sibiryakov's (Yakut) expedition, and assistance from church ministers, officials of the Yakut region and political exiles of Yakutia. From the perspective of the communicative situation, the author's expression of gratitude and appeal to the reader in the text of the preface is a written speech genre that reveals the communicative and pragmatic potential of the paratext of a scientific text.

Thus, Pekarsky's preface as an autographic paratext is characterized by the freedom of the content-conceptual component, implemented in the representation of eventfulness, the author's self-reflection, and verbalization of the author's communicative and pragmatic intentions toward readers. In theoretical terms, the research results expand the study of the problem of the paratext of a scientific text, and in practical terms they reveal the specifics of the history of Yakut lexicography and the first scientific studies in the Yakut language.

This study has several limitations. Within the framework of this research, the preface to the scientific text was studied regarding the historical, social and cultural conditions of its creation, which undoubtedly allowed for the identification of the specificity of paratextual elements. However, it is undesirable to extrapolate the results of this study to any other dictionaries, because of the different conditions of their creation, the functional and pragmatic orientation of paratextual elements. The application of a similar approach to the study of lexicographic paratext is applicable to dictionaries that obviously differ in the history of creation to record the differences in the results.

Future research should focus on the study of the scientific text periphery leads to the current problems of modern applied linguistics. This research is a link in the study of human factors in language since the peripheral path of communication with the reader comes from the author as a linguistic personality and is expressed by linguistic means that depend on this personality. Theoretical understanding of the paratext based on the material of a lexicographic dictionary in historical dynamics makes it possible to further develop the problem of publishing paratext, which largely determines the fate of a classical publication, and to continue developing cardinal problems of theoretical linguistics such as speech influence and optimization of the social function of language. The study of the scientific text periphery leads to the current problems of modern applied linguistics, which have linguistic potential – the encoding of information by verbal and iconic means and its design in printed text. This study is a step toward further research on scientific text as a unit of written communication in diachrony.

Funding statement

Author contribution

This study was conducted solely by the corresponding author.

Conflict of Interest

The author has no potential conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgements

REFERENCES

1. Bakhtin, M. M. (**1979**). *Aesthetics of verbal creativity*. Iskusstvo: Moscow, Russia.
2. Kusova, M. L., & Tabatchikova, K. D. (**2023**). Scientific text as a linguocultural phenomenon. *Bulletin of Philological Sciences, 3*, 132–139.
3. Shakhin, A. A. (**2022**). Scientific text as an open system. *Text in the system of teaching Russian language and literature. Proceedings of the X International Scientific and Practical Conference*, Yekaterinburg, Russia, 115–119.
4. Tabanakova, V. D. (**2023**). Review of the collective monograph "Discursive foundations of speech studies: scientific text – new knowledge – translation". *Philological Sciences. Science Reports of Higher Education, 5*, 149–154.
5. Syrova, O. V. (**2021**). Educational and scientific text: Discursive features. *East Slavic Philology. Linguistics, 12*, 229–237.
6. Lutkova, S. P., & Savchenko, L. V. (**2022**). The relationship between the concepts of "paratext" and "paratextuality". *Media Vector, 3*, 74–76.
7. Boldyrev, N. N., & Efimenko, T. N. (**2022**). Secondary interpretation of scientific knowledge in mass media discourse. *Media Linguistics, 9*, 355–368.
8. Danilova, N. I. (**2020**). Yakut linguistics in the context of the scientific paradigm of Russian Turkology. *North-East. Humanities Bulletin, 3*, 77–87.
9. Monastyrev, V. D., Vasilieva, N. N., & Ammosova, I. V. (**2021**). The Great Explanatory Dictionary of the Yakut Language: A new achievement of Yakut lexicography. *Questions of Lexicography, 92–108*.
10. Shestakova, L. L. (**2011**). *Russian author's lexicography: Theory, history, modernity*. "Languages of Slavic Cultures" Publishing House: Moscow, Russia.
11. Blinova, O. I. (**2012**). Theory → dictionary → theory → dictionary. *Issues of Lexicography, 1*, 6–26.
12. Popov, R. V. (**2020**). Regiolect dictionary as a dictionary of a new type. *Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University, 1*, 133–141.
13. Sabirova, M., Kalibekuly, T., & Jeldybayeva, R. (**2024**). Linguocultural aspect of phraseological units (Guanyongyu) in modern Chinese language. *Global Chinese, 10*, 155–173.
14. Vasilyeva, N. M. (**2022**). Spelling dictionaries of the Yakut language: Formation and current state. *Questions of Lexicography, 30–50*.
15. Böhtlingk, O. (**1849**). *Yakut-German Dictionary. Über die Sprache der Jakuten*. Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften: St. Petersburg, Russia.
16. Pekarsky, E. K. (**1907–1930**). *Dictionary of the Yakut Language*, compiled by E. K. Pekarsky with the close participation of Archpriest D. D. Popov and V. M. Ionov (editions 1-13). Publishing House of the Russian Academy of Sciences: St. Petersburg, Russia.
17. Akimova, A. S., & Borisova, Y. M. (**2022**). Stages of the terminology system formation in the Yakut language (based on terminological dictionaries). *Sociolinguistics, 2*, 124–147.
18. Filippov, G. G. (**2006**). History of the Yakut language and its prospects. *Bulletin of Yakut State University, 3*, 58–63.
19. Sivtseva-Maksimova, P. V. (**2021**). Source analysis of V. F. Troshchansky's works on the ethnography of the Yakuts in the context of research into the heritage of A. E. Kulakovsky. *Bulletin of M. K. Ammosov North-East Federal University, 1*, 78–88.
20. Rufova, E. S. (**2023**). Results and scientific significance of the Sibiryakov's (Yakut region) expedition (1894–1896). *Revista De Investigaciones Universidad Del Quindío, 35*, 57–66.

21. Bakashova, Zh. K., & Duishenbaev, P. (**2023**). Work that rediscovers the unique orientalist, Vasily Radlov. *Philological Sciences. Science Reports of Higher Education, S6*, 162–169.

22. Bazhenova, E., Tihomirova, L., Kyrkunova, L., Danilevskaya, N., & Karpova, T. (**2019**). Scientific text semantic structure modeling. *Amazonia Investigativa, 8*, 163–167.

23. Gulomaseynov, S., & Mamadnazarov, A. (**2020**). Comparative analysis of the macrostructure of dictionaries of literary terms in the Tajik language. *Bulletin of Pedagogical University, 6*, 35–42.

24. Genette, G. (**1982**). *Palimpsestes: La Littérature au Second Degré*. Seuil: Paris, France.

25. Likhachev, D. S. (**1983**). *Textology. Based on the Literature of the 10th-17th Centuries* (2nd ed.). Nauka: Leningrad, USSR.

26. Lotman, Y. M., Tolstoy, N. I., & Uspensky, B. A. (**1981**). Some issues of textual criticism and publication of Russian literary monuments of the 18th century. *News USSR Academy of Sciences, Series: Literature and Language, 40*, 312–324.

27. Foucault, M. (**1994**). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences* (V. P. Vagin & N. S. Avtonomova, Trans.). A-cad: St. Petersburg, Russia.

28. Reformatsky, A. A. (**1987**). *Linguistics and poetics*. Nauka: Moscow, Russia.

29. Uspensky, B. A. (**1995**). *Semiotics of art*. "Languages of Russian Culture" School: Moscow, Russia.

30. Urtmintseva, M. G., & Yanina, P. Y. (**2019**). Paratextuality of M. Gorky's early journalism (1895–1901). *Scientific Dialogue, 7*, 192–207.

31. Abdullina, A., Lysova, O., Safina, R., & Mogilnikova, L. (**2020**). Paratext in V. Tendryakov's story *The Hunt*. *International Independent Scientific Journal, 18*, 31–34.

32. Obatnina, E. R. (**2024**). Paratext in the artistic system of Alexei Remizov. *Siberian Philological Journal, 1*, 133–147.

33. Titova, E. V. (**2019**). The dramaturgic paratext: Towards the definition of an issue. *RSUH/RGGU Bulletin of Literary Theory, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies, 2*, 30–40.

34. Vikulova, L. G. (**2008**). Personality of the publisher as a mediator in literary communication. In *Personality and modes of its implementation in the language: A collective monograph* (pp. 188–206). Irkutsk State Linguistic University Press: Irkutsk, Russia.

35. Kornienko, E. R. (**2019**). Preface as a paratext (based on the legacy of N. I. Novikov). *Political Linguistics, 3*, 89–95.

36. Galkina, I. V. (**2011**). Paratextuality in the novel *Generation 'P'* by V. Pelevin. *Bulletin of IGLU*, 78–81.

37. Kuzmina, E. V. (**2012**). Ways of expressing the semantic-pragmatic category of politeness in texts of electronic communication (exemplified by the Spanish language). *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 19: Linguistics and International Communication, 1*, 79–88.

38. Kristeva, Y. (**2004**). *Selected works: Destruction of poetics*. Russian Political Encyclopedia (ROSSPEN): Moscow, Russia.

39. Melamedova, E. A. (**2009**). *Paratextual elements in English-language scientific and popular science literature* (PhD thesis). Volga State Social and Humanitarian Academy, Samara, Russia.

40. Ferre, K. (**2021**). Horse breeding vocabulary in the *Dictionary of the Yakut Language* by E. K. Pekarsky: Wanderings of lexemes between Altai languages. In *Siberia as a Field of Intercultural Interactions: Literature, Anthropology, Historiography, Ethnology* (pp. 310–327). LLC Publishing Center "Azbukovnik": Moscow, Russia.

41. Sedykh, A. P., Ivanishcheva, O. N., Koreneva, A. V., & Ryzhkova, I. V. (**2018**). Modern philological knowledge: Anthropocentrism and linguistic identity. *International Journal of Engineering and Technology, 7*, 447.

42. Mukhin, S. V., & Zotikova, O. D. (**2022**). Anthropocentrism in culture codes of Old English paroemias. *Vestnik Moskovskogo Gosudarstvennogo Lingvisticheskogo Universiteta. Gumanitarnye Nauki, 13*, 41–48.

43. Kushkimbayeva, A., Tymbolova, A., Yessenova, K., Sultaniyazovad, I., & Remetove, M. (**2024**). Increasing students' self-esteem based on the pragmatic level of linguistic personality. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 72–80.

44. Pekarsky, E. K. (**1899**). *Dictionary of the Yakut Language* (Wörterbuch der jakutischen Sprache von E. Pekarskij). Yakut Regional Printing House: Yakutsk, Russia.

45. Gogoleva, N. K. (**2017**). From the history of the Yakut exile of the 17th–early 20th centuries. *Siberian Exile: Collection of Scientific Articles, 8*, 227–246.

46. Butorin, S. S. (**2021**). Ways of expressing attributive possessiveness: Possessive syntactic constructions. *Siberian Philological Journal, 2*, 235–251.