

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.22.03>.

UDC: 811.111'374:81



Oksana O. Kaliberda

Berdyansk State Pedagogical University,
Berdyansk, Ukraine

EXTRALINGUISTIC FEATURES OF THE MACROSTRUCTURE IN ENGLISH LINGUISTIC DICTIONARIES

Bibliographic Description:

Kaliberda, O. O. (2021). Extralinguistic Features of the Macrostructure in English Linguistic Dictionaries. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 22. 31–42. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.22.03>.

Abstract

The lexicographic practice of the past and present, the theoretical foundations of lexicographic science determine a fairly wide range of problems in contemporary linguistics that require their solution. One of the controversial issues is the opposition of encyclopaedic and linguistic dictionaries. In the theory linguistic and encyclopaedic dichotomy has rather clearly defined boundaries, but in practice it turns out to be quite difficult to establish where the definition of a word ends and the description of the concept that this word conveys begins.

A number of researchers adhere to the opinion that modern English linguistic lexicography is characterised by the process of integration with encyclopaedic lexicography. And nowadays we witness the emergence of hybrid dictionaries which attempt to incorporate both types of information (linguistic and encyclopaedic) in their structure.

This paper presents a study of English linguistic dictionary macrostructure with a particular emphasis on encyclopaedic component. It investigates how elements of encyclopaedic nature are interlaced with linguistic elements on the level of dictionary macrostructure.

The obtained results show that the average rate of encyclopaedization at the level of the macrostructure of the English dictionaries reaches about 13% of the total.

The analysis of the macrostructure revealed that the fundamental difference between linguistic and encyclopaedic dictionaries is in the methods of headwords selection. The macrostructure of the encyclopaedic

dictionary is limited by its register as it does not include such parts of speech as adjectives, numerals, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions. Linguistic dictionary in opposition to encyclopaedic dictionary registers all parts of speech in its macrostructure.

The results show that English linguistic lexicography tends to register both linguistic and encyclopaedic headwords in its macrostructure.

Keywords: *dictionary, macrostructure, linguistic information, encyclopaedic information, linguistic and encyclopaedic dichotomy.*

1. Introduction.

English lexicography has had a long and developed tradition of compiling dictionaries of various types. It is generally accepted that lexicographic reference books can be divided into two major groups: linguistic and encyclopaedic. This approach to classification is based on the principles of describing the headwords. In the linguistic dictionary the lexical unit is described as an element of the language system and is characterized by spelling, orthoepy, morphological, semantic, and stylistic parameters in the encyclopaedic dictionary the lexical unit is considered as the name of a certain object or phenomenon in its relation to the world. However, modern English lexicography tends to combine these lexicographic genres that violate the theoretical provision of a clear distinction between linguistic and encyclopaedic dictionaries.

Modern lexicography is characterised by tendency to examine dictionaries from various aspects: historical lexicography (Considine, 2019; Considine, 2019a; Yong, Peng, 2021); regional lexicography and varieties of English (Adams, 2019; Brewer, 2019); bilingual lexicography and translation dictionaries (Rigual, 2014; Adamska-Sałaciak, 2015; Buendia-Castro, 2020; Junying, Karimullina, Miao, 2021); theoretical problems of lexicography (Adamska-Sałaciak, 2019); digital lexicography (Langemets, Hein, Heinonen, Koppel, Viks, 2017; Granger, Paquot, 2012; Schryver, Chishman, Silva, 2019; Mavrommatidou, Gavriilidou, Markos, 2019; Frankenberg-Garcia, Rees, Lew, 2021; Kubik, 2021; Liu, Deng, Yang, 2021); treatment of headword's semantic structure (Dixon, 2018; Norri, 2018, 2020; Hanks, Može, 2019; Klosa-Kückelhaus, Wolfer, 2020; Marelllo, 2020); dictionary structure (Калиберда, 2014; Osselton, 2018; Калиберда, 2019; Farina, 2020); lexicography and natural language processing (Gantar, Colman, Escartín, Alonso, 2019); dictionary typology (Mugdan, 2017; Калиберда, 2018; Gapporov, Vositov, Ibragimova, 2020); dictionary users and dictionary use (Sköldbberg, Wenner, 2020; Knežević, Halupka-Rešetar, Miškeljin, Milić, 2021; Zhang, Xu, Zhang, 2021).

Theoretical and methodological basis of the study were universal, general and partial principles of modern theory of lexicography, in particular, the principles of typology of lexicographic reference books and approaches to the structuring of dictionaries of different types (Hartmann, 1983, 2001, 2005; Landau, 2001, 2003; Malkiel, 1963; Svensén, 2009; Swanepoel, 2003; Zgusta, 1971).

2. Aim and Objectives.

The aim of the research is to identify encyclopaedic elements at the macrostructure level of English linguistic dictionaries. According to the set aim, English linguistic dictionaries are analysed in order to determine elements of encyclopaedic nature at the macrostructure level. The process of encyclopaedization of English linguistic dictionaries is the object of the research that means the inclusion of such elements into dictionary structure that are traditionally considered as integral components of encyclopaedic dictionaries, namely, selection of headwords, introduction of encyclopaedic information into linguistic definitions in dictionary entries, and supplementary encyclopaedic material.

3. Methodology.

In theory the structure of any dictionary could be divided into macrotext and microtext. In its turn macrotext implies a whole dictionary and microtext implies a separate dictionary entry. Macrotext consists of megastructure (general composition of a dictionary), macrostructure (principles of selection and structuring headwords in a dictionary), microstructure (dictionary entry composition), and mediostructure (cross references) (Hartmann, 2001, pp. 65–66). According to H. Bergenholtz and S. Tarp (Bergenholtz, Tarp, 1995, p. 219) two more levels are identified in dictionary design: level of accessibility and level of distribution. Accessibility level is represented by lexicographic indicators that direct the user to necessary information in a dictionary. It is divided into internal and external accessibility of lexicographic information depending on the direction of dictionary search: headword, marking certain information category or meaning numbering within dictionary entry (internal accessibility); alphabetic macrostructure (external accessibility). Distribution level consists in the distribution and fixation of linguistic and encyclopaedic information in different parts of the dictionary, but this is a fairly clear concept, and concerns the problem of distinguishing between linguistic-lexical and technical-encyclopaedic knowledge (Bergenholtz, Tarp, 1995, p. 188). This problem is peculiar to any dictionary type. On the other hand, dictionaries are considered as carriers of different types of text, which can be located in the section of front matter, register of headwords and back matter. The register of headwords contains the most typical lexicographic information and each entry that forms the microstructure can be considered as a separate text (Gouws, 2003, p. 34). Despite the fact that dictionaries consist of independent texts, their entries meet all the normative criteria of referential cohesion (Hartmann, 2001, p. 59).

Thus, the text formed in the dictionary format differs from all other types of text and its peculiar feature is that the material is organized at the level of separate units, interconnected by certain relations in an ordered system, which determines the search system. Also dictionaries are envisaged as hypertext formations (Рязанцева, 2010, p. 49) that are structured in a special way and consist of homogeneous, unified elements in the form of text blocks, accompanied by a system of cross-references.

It should be noted that the construction of a dictionary of any type requires the solution of the following lexicographic problems: selection of headwords; the structure of the dictionary register and dictionary entry; the choice of ways to interpret the meanings; selection of language equivalents and variants. Dictionaries are compiled on the basis of various sources, but the main ones are already existing dictionaries (Landau, 2003, p. 85-86). Experts in various fields can be involved in writing definitions in specialized domains.

Overall dictionary composition can be described as macrotext represented by a megastructure consisting of three components: front matter, register of headwords and back matter. The register of headwords forms dictionary's macrostructure. Each headword is characterized by certain lexicographic information which depends on dictionary type and forms its microstructure.

Dictionary macrostructure is an ordered list of headwords that allows systematizing words in a register. According to R. R. K. Hartmann dictionary register is the main tool for structuring information of any type (Hartmann, 2001, p. 58). The information provided by the lexicographer in a dictionary should be accessible to the user, and the register of headwords is a fundamental ordering technique that makes reference book more convenient to use.

Dictionary macrostructure can be systematized alphabetically or thematically. In the Western lexicographic tradition an alphabetical macrostructure has been established, but it can also have a thematic order, which is not based on the alphabet of the written system used,

but is organized according to topics presented in a logical sequence. In the case of a thematic macrostructure, an alphabetical index is always added. It should also be noted that the clear alphabetical macrostructure of a dictionary can be disrupted by cluster lemmas within the dictionary entry. In compiled by alphabetic principle dictionary the internal systematization of the material is opaque and related concepts become artificially distant from each other that may result in duplication of entries and in order to avoid this problem a system of crossreferences is used to entries with additional information. The choice of macrostructure organization, alphabetic or thematic, depends on dictionary intention, its prospective users and set tasks.

According to their volume dictionaries can be extensive (include maximum number of headwords) and selective (limit the selection depending on the size and purpose of the dictionary). Principle of headwords selection into dictionary macrostructure is the fundamental lexicographic problem along with the ways of polysemantic, homonymic headwords presentation and introduction of nonlexicographic material into a dictionary structure should be solved.

However, in theoretical lexicography there are no objective criteria for the selection of lexical units into dictionary and this is due to its nature as the dictionary is simultaneously characterized by its completeness and openness. The dictionary is always open to describe new lexical units and their meanings, clearly responds to changes in language, and at the same time it is an independent, self-sufficient, complete structure. The lexical system is always dynamic, but the dictionary represents only part of the vocabulary, because an absolutely complete register of headwords for any modern literary language cannot be compiled because the continuous development of science, technology and social relations brings to life new lexical units recorded by lexicographers with some delay.

The criteria on the basis of which lexicographer selects certain words to the dictionary macrostructure can be grounded on the subjective views of the compiler about words usage and at the same time include chronological, normative, stylistic and translation parameters. The greatest difficulty for selection represents culture-specific words – culturally marked concepts, as well as proper names. Also, construction of dictionary macrostructure is primarily related to the polysemy of language (Geeraerts, 2003, p. 85). The ambiguity of word meaning raises the question which definition to prefer to explain the headword semantic structure in a dictionary. In this case of selection of words into dictionary macrostructure will be based on semantic criterion. A dictionary can be limited to words, the meaning of which belongs to a particular technical or scientific domain.

Also, only frequently used words and their meanings can be registered, or words of limited usage, in particular, which have a specific geographical distribution (dialect words), limited to a certain style (literary vocabulary) or those belonging to an earlier period of language. Thus, the selection criteria, as already mentioned, depend on the prospective users and their potential needs and a goal that a lexicographer sets for definite dictionaries.

Dictionary macrostructure can be systematized in thematic or alphabetic order. The thematic organization of lexical material, which involves combining words into thematic groups by common meanings, is the oldest, but further preference is given to the alphabetical distribution of lexical material.

While solving the problem of headwords systematisation, a collision of two fundamental principles of lexicography arises: the principle of usability, represented by alphabetical dictionaries and the principle of scientific nature, conditioned by the desire to understand the interaction of words and reflect this interaction by lexicographic methods.

Two approaches to the systematization of headwords in alphabetical order have been formed in English practical lexicography: a lexical unit by lexical unit when all constituents

of the word are taken into account, excepting those after hyphen or space and letter by letter when all constituents of the lexical unit are taken into account. Alphabetical order is also continuous, when each word explained in the dictionary has its own entry, and all entries are arranged in exact alphabetical order. The other principle of alphabetic arrangement is cluster microstructure. In that case the information about several interrelated words is united in a separate entry on the basis of morphological, syntactic or semantic characteristics, and dictionary entries are arranged in alphabetic order. In a cluster microstructure, the headword represents the main lemma, under which a cluster of entries with sublemmas is united with its own internal alphabetic order. The usage of this method results in text condensation.

The issue of distinguishing between polysemy and homonymy of words closely related to the construction of macrostructure in theoretical lexicography. Approaches to solving this problem influence on macro- and microstructure of a dictionary in different ways. If lexico-semantic variants represent the meaning of the same lexical unit, so we say about polysemy and this problem can be solved in two ways: all meanings of a polysemantic word are included into one entry and become the object of microstructure or polysemantic word is divided into separate entries that influences dictionary macrostructure. Taking into account polysemantic nature of English words, dictionaries are more inclined to register different meanings in a one entry following the established lexicographic tradition. On the other hand, homonyms are the object of dictionary macrostructure and this concerns the problem of word selection into register. In determining boundary line between polysemy and homonymy, context is the main indicator for distinguishing separate meanings of a polysemantic word and differentiation of homonyms. So the problem of dictionary macrostructure construction and determining its limits is one of the urgent in theory of lexicography.

4. Results.

Our research is focused on linguistic dictionaries of the English language in the aspect of their encyclopaedization. In order to study the nature of this phenomenon, we addressed to the materials of English linguistic dictionaries: Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture (LDEL), New Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language (NWD&ThEL), Paperback Oxford English Dictionary (POED) and The Random House dictionary of the English language (RHDEL). To analyse the peculiarities of their macrostructure 6953 entries were selected on the segment of letter S. The choice of S letter segment is explained by the fact that it is the most frequent initial letter in English words and dictionary extracts in this segment are considered representative and reflecting the general tendencies of the whole macrostructure. Selection of dictionary entries was based on the following criteria: encyclopaedic nature of headword and encyclopaedic information in definition structure.

Analysis of English linguistic dictionaries macrostructure LDEL, NWD&ThEL, POED, and RHDEL demonstrates that their registers fix both general words and words that traditionally are considered the object of encyclopaedic dictionaries. The vast majority of selected headwords belong to nouns; free phrases are quite common, and occasionally adjectives. Such lexical and grammatical classes of words are inherent in the encyclopaedic dictionary. The calculation of headwords of an encyclopaedic nature gave grounds to determine the degree of encyclopaedization of the macrostructure. The total number of entries in S letter segment in RHDEL is 13710 and among them 2243 entries with encyclopaedic component that comprises 16.4%. The total number of entries in S letter segment in NWD&ThEL is 7688 and among them 1181 entries with encyclopaedic component that comprises 15%. The total number of entries in S letter segment in LDEL is

6158 and among them 773 entries with encyclopaedic component that comprises 13%. The total number of entries in S letter segment in POED is 4046 and among them 408 entries with encyclopaedic component that comprises 10%.

The obtained results show that the average rate of encyclopaedization at the level of the macrostructure of the English dictionaries reaches about 13% of the total. The distribution of headwords with an encyclopaedic component by thematic groups is as follows: NWD&ThEL – personalities 36.5%, geographic names 30.9%, events in history 9.1%, fauna 8.0%, flora 8.0%, chemistry 5.4%, ergonyms 1.4%, culture 0.5%, names of space bodies 0.2%; LDELС – personalities 34.8%, geographic names 26.2%, culture 18.0%, ergonyms 15.0%, events in history 6.0%; POED – geographic names 55.3%, personalities 43.4%, culture 0.7%, chemistry 0.3%, names of space bodies 0.3%.

The analysis of the macrostructure showed that the fundamental difference of linguistic dictionary from encyclopaedic dictionary is in the methods of headwords selection.

The macrostructure of the encyclopaedic dictionary is limited by its register as it does not include such parts of speech as adjectives, numerals, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions. Linguistic dictionary in opposition to encyclopaedic dictionary registers all parts of speech in its macrostructure. A comparative analysis of the registers of English dictionaries LDELС, NWD&ThEL, POED and RHDEL with the register of the encyclopaedic dictionary Encyclopaedia Britannica (EB) on the segment of the letter S demonstrates that linguistic dictionaries fix words of the similar thematic groups as the encyclopaedic dictionary, however the semantic structure of headwords is different. The selection of headwords was based on the principle of extralinguistic information fixation in the microstructure of a dictionary.

The studied geographic names were classified according to quantity and classification characteristics in dictionaries. The generalized results of the analysis are the following: total quantity of geographic names EB 411, LDELС 202, NWD&ThEL 365, POED 177, RHDEL 804; among them astionyms EB 137, LDELС 48, NWD&ThEL 162, POED 54, RHDEL 902; horonyms EB 81, LDELС 56, NWD&ThEL 85, POED 62, RHDEL 88; hydronyms EB 103, LDELС 16, NWD&ThEL 47, POED 14, RHDEL 72; insulonyms EB 43, LDELС 14, NWD&ThEL 44, POED 34, RHDEL 49; oronyms EB 27, LDELС 14, NWD&ThEL 25, POED 7, RHDEL 37; urbanonyms EB 13, LDELС 48, POED 6, RHDEL 3; elements of the Moon relief RHDEL 39; drimonyms EB 7, RHDEL 39; comonyms LDELС 3, RHDEL 11. The findings show that the most numerable group among selected toponymic headwords prevail astionyms, the second place occupies horonyms, the third hydronyms, then follows insulonyms and oronyms. Besides RHDEL registers the most manifold spectrum of toponymic headwords but it represented mostly by astionyms that comprise 62% from the total of toponymic headwords in the S letter segment in this dictionary. Approximately equal number of horonyms is registered in EB, NWD&ThEL and RHDEL. Hydronyms are more represented in EB. Insulonyms are available in almost equal amounts in EB, NWD&ThEL and RHDEL. Oronyms are registered in approximately the same amount in EB and NWD&ThEL. Urbanonyms are presented in dictionaries in single inclusions, but the vast majority of them are presented in LDELС. Headwords denoting elements of the relief of the Moon are registered only in RHDEL. Drimonyms and comonyms are represented in dictionaries in small numbers.

A comparative analysis of the EB toponymic register with the toponymic registers of the studied linguistic dictionaries of the English language in the S letter segment demonstrates the degree of macrostructure identity. Approximately 30% of headwords (122 toponyms) from EB macrostructure are registered in LDELС macrostructure, 48% of headwords (196 toponyms) from EB macrostructure – in NWD&ThEL, 32% of headwords

(132 toponyms) from EB macrostructure – in POED, 55% headwords (226 toponyms) – in RHDEL. A more detailed analysis revealed toponyms that are present in the macrostructure of all studied dictionaries. The biggest group comprise horonyms (34 headwords): *Saint Kitts-Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saskatchewan, Saudi Arabia, Scandinavia, Scotland, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Shropshire, Siberia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Somerset, South Africa, Republic of, South America, South Australia, South Carolina, South Dakota, Spain, Staffordshire, Sudan, Sumer, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria*.

On the second place are astionyms (17 headwords): *Saint Andrews, Saint Louis, Saint Petersburg, Salem, Salt Lake City, Salzburg, Santo Domingo, São Paulo, Sarajevo, Seattle, Seoul, Southampton, Stockholm, Strasbourg, Stratford-upon-Avon, Swansea, Sydney*.

On the third place are hydronyms (6 headwords): *Saint Lawrence River, Seine River, Severn, River, Solent, The, Suez Canal, Superior, Lake*.

Insulonyms are represented by three headwords: *Sardinia, South Georgia, Sumatra*, and one oronym: *Sahara*.

Other categories of toponyms are presented in dictionaries in different quantitative ratios or absent. The proportionality of the representation of toponymic headwords belonging to a common thematic group in different dictionaries also did not show a general trend.

In our opinion, this approach to the fixation of lexical material is explained not so much by the volume and purpose of English dictionaries, but by the imperfection of the method and the complexity of the task facing the lexicographer.

The studied names personalities were classified according to quantity and classification characteristics in dictionaries. The generalized results of the analysis are the following: total quantity of personalities EB 774, LDELIC 269, NWD&ThEL 431, POED 177, RHDEL 549; among them real personalities EB 738, LDELIC 240, NWD&ThEL 409, POED 167, RHDEL 461; names of mythological characters EB 11, NWD&ThEL 12, POED 1, RHDEL 40; names of legendary and literary characters EB 3, LDELIC 16, RHDEL 19; names of gods EB 11, LDELIC 2, POED 5, RHDEL 11; names of biblical characters EB 2, LDELIC 2, NWD&ThEL 9, POED 3, RHDEL 9; names of dynasties EB 9, LDELIC 1, NWD&ThEL 1, POED 1, RHDEL 9; names of characters from TV series, programs and feature films LDELIC 8.

In the quantitative ratio of the selected headwords the names of real personalities dominate, the second place belongs to the names of mythological characters, in third place are the names of legendary and literary heroes. This is followed by the names of gods, biblical characters, dynastic names and the names of characters from television series, programs and feature films. The widest range of real personalities is observed in EB. Almost the same number of real personalities is registered in NWD & ThEL and RHDEL. The names of mythological characters are mostly given in RHDEL. Other groups of personalities in the studied dictionaries are represented by single patches or are not registered at all. The headwords that refer to the names of characters from TV series Avengers, programmes The X Files and Coronation Street, feature films Star Trek and Star Wars that have become popular in the UK and US are only available in LDELIC.

The comparative analysis of personalities headwords shows that about 18% of headwords (139 personalities) from EB macrostructure are registered in LDELIC, 36% of headwords (277 personalities) from EB macrostructure – in NWD&ThEL, 19% of headwords (147 personalities) from EB macrostructure – in POED, 40% of headwords (313 personalities) from EB macrostructure – in RHDEL.

There are 43 headwords among them that are registered in all studied dictionaries. The biggest group comprise representatives of literature: *Sade, Marquis de; Salinger, J.D.*;

Sappho; Sartre, Jean-Paul; Scott, Sir Walter, 1st Baronet; Seneca, Lucius Annaneus; Shakespeare, William; Shelley, Percy Bysshe; Sophocles; Southey, Robert; Spenser, Edmund; Steinbeck, John; Stendhal; Stowe, Harriet Beecher; Swift, Jonathan; Synge, John Millington. The second place occupies musicians: *Saint-Saëns, Camille; Schubert, Franz; Shostakovich, Dmitry; Sibelius, Jean; Strauss, Johann; Strauss, Richard; Stravinsky, Igor.*

Next, the selected headwords were divided as follows: philosophers (*Schweitzer, Albert; Smith, Adam; Socrates; Spinoza, Benedict de*), politicians (*Stalin, Joseph; Sulla, Lucius Cornelius; Sun Yat-sen; Sitting Bull*), artists (*Sargent, John Singer; Seurat, Georges*), explorers (*Salk, Joans; Scott, Robert Falcon; Stanly, Sir Henry Morton*), directors and actors (*Scott, George C.; Stanislavsky, Konstantin*), legendary heroes (*Spartacus*), religious figures (*Smith, Joseph*), biblical characters (*Salome; Samson; Solomon*), names of gods (*Saturn; Shiva*).

It should also be noted that the headwords denoting literary characters are represented by the names of heroes from works of world literary heritage: Virgil's *Aeneid*; Homer's *Iliad*; C. Dickens *Christmas Carol, Oliver Twist, Nicholas Nickelby*; J. Dumourier's *Trilby*; J. Orwell's *1984*; E. Ortsy *Red Primrose*; M. Peak *Gormenghast*; M. Cervantes *Don Quixote*; G. B. Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Hut*; M. Twain's *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*; W. Thackeray *Vanity Fair*; W. Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*; Sanskrit epic poem *Ramayana*; Icelandic epic poems *The Saga of the Wolsungs* and *The Saga of the Nibelungs*; fairy tales *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs, Sleeping Beauty, One Thousand and One Nights*; Roman and Greek legends; medieval English folk ballads about Robin Hood.

The next group is flora terms. The biggest group of headwords denoting flora is registered in RHDEL. Comparative analysis of flora terms demonstrates that approximately 16% of headwords (10 flora terms) from EB macrostructure are registered in LDEL, 47% of headwords (29 flora terms) from EB macrostructure are registered – in NWD&ThEL, 26% of headwords (16 flora terms) from EB macrostructure are registered – in POED, 62% of headwords (38 flora terms) from EB macrostructure are registered – in RHDEL. Among them only two headwords *spinach* and *strawberry* are common for macrostructure of all studied dictionaries.

The biggest group of headwords denoting fauna is registered in RHDEL. Comparative analysis of fauna terms demonstrates that approximately 22% (32 headwords) from EB macrostructure are registered in LDEL, 38% (56 headwords) from EB macrostructure are registered in NWD&ThEL, 23% (34 headwords) from EB macrostructure are registered in POED, 55% (81 headwords) from EB macrostructure are registered in RHDEL. Among them 19 headwords *sable, salmon, scarab beetle, scorpion, sea anemone, sea lion, sea urchin, seal, secretary bird, sheep, shrew, shrimp, snail, snake, spider, squirrel, starfish, swallow, swan* are common for macrostructure of all studied dictionaries.

RHDEL registers the largest number of headwords denoting cultural phenomena, EB and LDEL have the same number, and NWD&ThEL and POED have single inclusions. Comparative analysis of the headwords denoting cultural phenomena did not reveal common trends. It should be noted that in the EB register the focus is mainly on cultural terminology (*South Indian bronze, sun worship*); in linguistic dictionaries LDEL and RHDEL the headwords are represented mainly by the terms of secular and religious holidays (*Sadie Hawkins Day, Saint Patrick's Day*), culture specific words (*sari, sarong, sphinx*), names of work of literature and art (*Sakuntala, Swan Lake, Sense and Sensibility*), television shows (*Sesame Street, Sixty Minutes*), feature films (*Schindler's List, The Stepford Wives*), music bands (*The Spice Girls, Simply Red*).

Analysis of the headwords denoting historical events demonstrates that the largest percentage of terms is registered in EB, less in LDEL and RHDEL. In POED

the headwords of this group are not registered at all. Comparative analysis of headwords denoting historical events shows that approximately 9% (13 headwords) from EB macrostructure are registered in LDEL, 20% (28 headwords) from EB macrostructure are registered in NWD&ThEL, 11% (15 headwords) from EB macrostructure are registered in RHDEL. There are such headwords among them as *Seven Wonders of the World*, *Seven Year's War*, *Spanish-American War*, *Spanish Civil War* are common for the macrostructure of studied dictionaries. Headwords that denote historical events refer to names of war (*Spanish Succession*, *War of the*), історичних битв (*Salamis*, *Battle of*), tragedies (*Saint Bartholomew's Day*, *Massacre of*), negotiations (*Saint-Germain*, *Treaty of*), documents (*Sherman Antitrust Act*), epidemics (*Spanish influenza*), notions (*slave state*, *shogun*), high-profile lawsuits that entered the history of society (*Sacco-Vanzetti case*), historical periods (*Second Empire*).

RHDEL registers the largest number of headwords denoting chemicals. Comparative analysis of headwords denoting chemicals shows that approximately 33% (12 headwords) from EB macrostructure are registered in LDEL, 58% (21 headwords) from EB macrostructure are registered in NWD&ThEL, 38% (14 headwords) from EB macrostructure are registered in POED, 58% (21 headwords) from EB macrostructure are registered in RHDEL. Among them such headwords as *accharin*, *salt*, *selenium*, *serotonin*, *silicon*, *soap*, *sodium*, *sugar*, *sulfur*, *sulfur dioxide* are common for the macrostructure of studied dictionaries.

Analysis of ergonyms demonstrates that the largest number of such headwords is registered in the LDEL, of them 93 headwords denote the names of trademarks, 24 headwords denote the names of political parties, charitable and governmental organisations. In RHDEL: 18 – trademarks, 9 – names of political parties, charitable and governmental organisations. In NWD&ThEL: 11 – political parties and governmental organisations, 4 – institutions, 1 – trademark. In POED: 4 – trademarks, 2 – political parties and governmental organisations. In EB: 16 – political parties and governmental organisations, 10 – trademarks, 7 – institutions. Thus, the principles of fixing ergonyms in the studied dictionaries did not reveal a unified approach to the presentation of this group of headwords.

Names of space bodies are most widely presented in EB (6 headwords). Two space bodies *Saturn* and *Sun* are fixed in LDEL, NWD&ThEL and RHDEL. POED registers only headword *Sun*.

5. Conclusions.

Finalising this research, I would like to make a special emphasis on the encyclopaedic component in the English linguistic dictionary macrostructure, that is on the interlacing of the elements of encyclopaedic nature with linguistic elements on the level of dictionary macrostructure.

The obtained results show that the average rate of encyclopaedization at the level of the macrostructure of the English dictionaries reaches about 13% of the total.

The analysis of the macrostructure revealed that the fundamental difference between linguistic and encyclopaedic dictionaries is in the methods of headwords selection. The macrostructure of the encyclopaedic dictionary is limited by its register as it does not include such parts of speech as adjectives, numerals, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions. Linguistic dictionary in opposition to encyclopaedic dictionary registers all parts of speech in its macrostructure.

The presented above quantitative calculations indicate the lack of standard approach to the construction of macrostructure in lexicographic practice. The traditional theoretical

view that proper names are the subject of an exclusively encyclopaedic dictionary is not really followed. These kinds of words can be entered directly into the macrostructure of the linguistic dictionary or be registered in its separate section. In our opinion, the defining criteria for the selection of the analyzed headwords are their general educational and cultural significance, frequency of use and the reputation of the name among native speakers.

References

- Adams, M. (2019). Regional Varieties of English. In J. Considine (Ed.), *The Cambridge World History of Lexicography* (pp. 509-529). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316827437.025>.
- Adamska-Sałaciak, A. (2015) Bilingual Lexicography: Translation Dictionaries. In Hanks P., de Schryver G.-M. (Eds) *International Handbook of Modern Lexis and Lexicography*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-45369-4_6-2
- Adamska-Sałaciak, A. (2019). Lexicography and Theory: Clearing the Ground. *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 32, Issue 1, Pages 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecy017>
- Bergenholtz H., Tarp, S. (1995). *Manual of Specialised Lexicography: The Preparation of Specialised Dictionaries; with contributions by Grete Duva et al.* John Benjamins, 254 p.
- Brewer, C. (2019). Standard Varieties of English from c. 1700. In J. Considine (Ed.). *The Cambridge World History of Lexicography* (pp. 290-314). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316827437.024>
- Buendia-Castro, M. (2020). Bilingual and multilingual online environmental knowledge resources: A comparative study for translation purposes. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 33(1), pp.40-72. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecz022>
- Considine, J. (2019). Medieval Latin Christendom. In J. Considine (Ed.), *The Cambridge World History of Lexicography* (pp. 267-289). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316827437.014>
- Considine, J. (2019a). Early Modern Western and Central Europe. In J. Considine (Ed.), *The Cambridge World History of Lexicography* (pp. 290-314). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316827437.015>
- De Schryver, G.-M., Chishman, R., & da Silva, B. (2019). An overview of digital lexicography and directions for its future: an interview with Gilles-Maurice de Schryver. *CALIDOSCOPIO*, 17(3), 659–683. <https://doi.org/10.4013/cld.2019.173.13>
- Dixon, A. (2018). *The Unmasking of English Dictionaries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108377508>
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. Ready Reference, 2006 CD-ROM. © Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. 1994-2005, Merriam-Webster, Inc. © Zero G Software, Inc. 2005 © Sun Microsystems, Inc. 1994-2005.
- Farina, D. (2020). Dictionary front matter, yesterday, today, and tomorrow: what was it, what is it, and what will it become? *Lexicography: Journal of ASIALEX*, Volume 7, Issue 1-2, Pages 97–101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40607-020-00063-0>
- Frankenberg-Garcia A., Rees G. P., Lew R. (2021). Slipping Through the Cracks in e-Lexicography, *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 34, Issue 2, Pages 206-234, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecaa022>
- Granger, S., & Paquot, M. (Eds). (2012). *Electronic Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 517 p. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199654864.001.0001>
- Gantar P., Colman L., Escartín C. P., Alonso H. M. (2019). Multiword Expressions: Between Lexicography and NLP, *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 32, Issue 2, Pages 138-162, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecy012>
- Gapporov B., Vositov V., & Ibragimova G. (2020). Typological classification of dictionaries. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, Volume 81, Issue 01, Pages 581-584, <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.01.81.97>
- Geeraerts D. (2003). Meaning and definition. *A Practical Guide to Lexicography*. Edited by Piet van Sterkenburg. John Benjamins Publishing Co. Pages 83-93.
- Gouws, R. H. (2003). Types of articles, their structure and different types of lemmata, *A Practical Guide to Lexicography*, edited by Piet van Sterkenburg. John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2003. P. 34-43.
- Hanks P., Može S. (2019). The way to analyse ‘way’: A case study in word-specific local grammar, *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 32, Issue 3, September 2019, Pages 247–269. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecz005>
- Hartmann, R. K. (1983). On Theory and Practice, *Lexicography: Principles and Practice*. London and New York: Academic Press. P. 3-11.

- Hartmann, R. K. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Lexicography*. Pearson Education Limited, 211 p.
- Hartmann, R. K. (2005). Pure or hybrid? The development of mixed dictionary genres, Series: *Linguistics and Literature*, Vol. 3, №2, pages 193-208.
- Junying, L., Karimullina, R. N., & Miao S. (2021). The Lexicographical Notes in Bilingual Dictionaries. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 9 (SPE2), e1006. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2021.v9nSPE2.1006>
- Knežević, L., Halupka-Rešetar, S., Miškeljin, I., & Milić, M. (2021). Millennials as Dictionary Users: A Study of Dictionary Use Habits of Serbian EFL Students. *SAGE Open*, 11(2), pp. 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211008422>
- Klosa-Kückelhaus A., Wolfer, S. (2020). Considerations on the Acceptance of German neologisms from the 1990s. *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 33, Issue 2, Pages 150-167. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecz033>
- Kubik, T. (2021). Digital Transformation of the Etymological Dictionary of Geographical Names. *Applied Sciences* 11(1):289. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app11010289>
- Landau, S. I. Dictionary making. *Lexicography. Critical concepts. Volume I. Dictionaries, compilers, critics and users*, edited by R. R. K. Hartmann. London and New York: Routledge, 2003. P. 83-97.
- Langemets, M., Hein, I., Heinonen, T., Koppel, K., Viks, U. (2017). From Monolingual to Bilingual Dictionary: The Case of Semi-automated Lexicography on the Example of Estonian–Finnish Dictionary. Electronic lexicography in the 21st century. *Proceedings of eLex 2017 conference*, pp. 155-171. Retrieved July 23, 2021, from Dialnet website, <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/libro?codigo=708646>
- Landau, S. I. (2001). *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press, 496 p.
- Landau, S. I. (2003). Dictionary making, *Lexicography. Critical concepts, Volume I. Dictionaries, compilers, critics and users*, edited by R.R.K. Hartmann. London and New York: Routledge, p. 83-97.
- Liu D., Deng Y., Yang Sh. (2021). Evaluating popular online English-Chinese dictionaries in China by applying Lew and Szarowska's (2017) evaluation framework, *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 34, Issue 2, Pages 157–182, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecaa026>
- Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. Ed. by D. Summers. Pearson Education Limited, Second Impression, 2006. 1624 p.
- Malkiel, Y. (1962). A Typological Classification of Dictionaries on Basis of Distinctive Features, *Problems in Lexicography*, ed. by F. Householder and S. Sapporta. Bloomington, p. 217-227.
- Marello, C. (2020). New Words and New Forms of Linguistic Purism in the 21st Century: The Italian Debate, *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 33, Issue 2, Pages 168–186, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecz034>
- Mavrommatidou, S., Gavriilidou, Z., Markos, A. (2019). Development and Validation of the Strategy Inventory for Electronic Dictionary Use (S.I.E.D.U.), *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 32, Issue 4, Pages 393–410, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecz015>
- Mugdan, J. (2017). On the typology of bilingual dictionaries. In K. Hyldgaard-Jensen, A. Zettersten (Eds.), *Symposium on Lexicography V*, pp. 17-24. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111341095-002>
- New Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language. Lexicon Publications, Inc. Danbury, CT, 1993. 1216 p.
- Norri, J. (2018). Definitions of Some Sensitive Medical Words in Dictionaries of English, *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 31, Issue 3, Pages 253-273, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecx006>
- Norri, J. (2020). Treatment of words for illness and disability in monolingual English dictionaries, *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 33, Issue 3, Pages 227-250, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecz028>
- Osselton, N. E. (2018). Quotation and Example in Johnson's Abridged Dictionary (1756-78), *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 31, Issue 4, Pages 475-484, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecy002>
- Paperback Oxford English Dictionary. Ed. by C. Soanes, S. Hawker, J. Elliot. Oxford University Press, Sixth edition, 2006. 897 p.
- Podhajecka, M. (2009). Historical Development of Lexicographical Genres: Some Methodological Issues, *Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)*, ed. R.W. McConchie, Alpo Honkapohja, and Jukka Tyrkkö, p. 153-170.
- Rigual, C. C., & Calvi, M. (2014). Translation and lexicography: a necessary dialogue. *MonTI - Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación, 2014*, 37-62. <https://dx.doi.org/10.6035/MonTI.2014.6.1>
- Sköldberg, E., Wenner, L. (2020). Folkmun.se: A Study of a User-Generated Dictionary of Swedish, *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 33, Issue 1, Pages 1–16, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecz019>

Swanepoel, P. (2003). Dictionary typologies: A pragmatic approach, *A Practical Guide to Lexicography*, ed. by Piet van Sterkenburg. John Benjamins Publishing Co., p. 44-70.

Svensén, B. (2009). *A handbook of lexicography: the theory and practice of dictionary-making*. Cambridge University Press, 552 p.

The Random House dictionary of the English language. Ed. in chief: J. Stein, managing ed. L. Urdang. N.Y. : Random House, 1967. 2059 p.

Yong, H., Peng, J. (2021). *A Sociolinguistic History of British English Lexicography* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003183471>

Zgusta, L. (1971). *Manual of lexicography*. In coop. with V. Cerný e. a. Praha: Academia, 360 p.

Zhang, Sh., Xu, H., Zhang, X. (2021). The effects of dictionary use on second language vocabulary acquisition: A meta-analysis, *International Journal of Lexicography*, Volume 34, Issue 1, Pages 1–38, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecaa010>

Каліберда, О. О. (2014). Особливості структури англійських двомовних глосаріїв та словників “важких слів” [Structural features of English bilingual glossaries and dictionaries of “hard words”]. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Серія «Філологічна»*, 45, с. 22-24. [in Ukrainian]

Каліберда, О. О. (2018). Нечітка межа між енциклопедичними та лінгвістичними словниками [Blurred line between encyclopedic and linguistic dictionaries]. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Серія «Філологія»*, 4(72), сс. 117–119. [in Ukrainian]

Каліберда, О. О. (2019). Енциклопедичні елементи в мегаструктурі лінгвістичних словників англійської мови [Encyclopaedic elements in English linguistic dictionaries megastructure] *Закарпатські філологічні студії*, 9(1), с. 88-93. [in Ukrainian].

Рязанцева, Т.И. (2010). Гипертекст и электронная коммуникация [Hypertext and Electronic Communication]. Москва: Издательство ЛКИ, 2010. 256 с. [in Russian].

Бібліографічний опис:

Каліберда, О. О. (2021). Екстралінгвістичні характеристики макроструктури англійських лінгвістичних словників. *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*, 22. 31–42. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.22.03>.

Анотація

Лексикографічна практика минулого та сьогодення, теоретичні засади лексикографічної науки окреслюють доволі широке коло проблем в сучасній лінгвістиці, що вимагають свого вирішення. Одним з контрверсійних питань є протиставлення енциклопедичних та лінгвістичних словників. У теорії лінгвістична та енциклопедична дихотомія мають чітко визначені межі, але на практиці виявляється дуже важко виявити де закінчується тлумачення слова і починається опис поняття, яке це слово позначає.

Ряд дослідників дотримуються думки, що сучасна англійська лінгвістична лексикографія характеризується процесом інтеграції з енциклопедичною лексикографією. І зараз ми спостерігаємо появу гібридних словників, що намагаються інкорпорувати обидва типи інформації (лінгвістичну та енциклопедичну) у своїй структурі.

Дана стаття представляє вивчення макроструктури англійських лінгвістичних словників з акцентом на енциклопедичному компоненті. Зокрема досліджується, яким чином елементи енциклопедичної природи переплітаються з лінгвістичними елементами на рівні макроструктури словника.

Отримані результати свідчать про те, що середній показник енциклопедизації на рівні макроструктури словників англійської мови сягає близько 13 % від їхньої загальної кількості.

Аналіз макроструктури показав, що принципова відмінність лінгвістичного словника від енциклопедичного полягає у способах відбору заголовних слів. Макроструктура енциклопедичного словника обмежується його реєстром, оскільки до нього не входять такі частини мови, як прикметники, числівники, займенники, дієслова, прислівники, прийменники і сполучники. Лінгвістичний словник на відміну від енциклопедичного реєструє всі частини мови у своїй макроструктурі.

Результати демонструють, що англійська лінгвістична лексикографія має тенденцію до фіксації як лінгвістичних, так і енциклопедичних вхідних слів у своїй макроструктурі.

Ключові слова: словник, макроструктура, лінгвістична інформація, енциклопедична інформація, лінгвістична та енциклопедична дихотомія.