Juxtaposition of Linguistic and Non-Linguistic Content in English Linguistic Lexicography

O. O. Kaliberda*

Department of Foreign Languages and Methods of Teaching
Berdyansk State Pedagogical University, Berdyansk, Ukraine
*Corresponding author. E-mail: oksanakaliberda@ukr.net

Abstract. Recently, there has been an increase of interest in the studies focusing on presentation of semantic structure of a word in a linguistic dictionary and types of information that are used to demonstrate the meaning of a headword. It has been shown that a theoretical difference exists between a dictionary and encyclopaedia. However, in practice, both types of information (linguistic and encyclopaedic) are deeply intertwined in a linguistic dictionary, since there are not so many words in language that can be described only linguistically without attaching background knowledge of encyclopaedic character. This paper presents that comprehensive explication of a word in a dictionary is possible to attain only by fixation of both types of information.

Keywords: linguistic information, encyclopaedic information, English lexicography, extralinguistic knowledge, linguistic dictionary

In all cultures with a developed written system encyclopaedias and dictionaries, which tend to accumulate and describe factual and linguistic information of a certain society, have always been a repository for codification, preservation, and transmission of knowledge in time and space. In theory linguistic lexicography is opposed to encyclopaedic lexicography, but, in practice, this provision is often violated. The aim of this paper is to study theoretical issues and to reveal main trends of English linguistic dictionaries encyclopaedisation.

Linguistic debates with regard to theoretical difference between a dictionary and an encyclopaedia are held as a part of a discussion about whether it is possible to distinguish semantics, pragmatics, and deixis. Semantics is the relation between sings and their meanings. Pragmatics implies the relation of signs to an interpreter [7, p. 484] (i.e. between signs and those who use them) therefore it has a connection with a general non-linguistic context, and thus it is relevant to the whole world and an individual. That is why the intention of a linguistic dictionary is an explication of lexical unit's semantic and pragmatic peculiarities, and encyclopaedia – deictic content of a lexical unit.

Semantics represents linguistic knowledge and pragmatics reflects extralinguistic knowledge of native speakers and their communicative interaction. Dichotomy of general knowledge into linguistic (lexical) and non-linguistic (encyclopaedic) is considered by researchers in two directions. Some linguists advocate a clear distinction of these two arears according to types of dictionaries. So B. Raskin [22, p. 92] says that linguistic knowledge is defined as knowledge of a native speaker by virtue of his knowledge of a language and it may include awareness of the meaning of words and ways of their collocability. Encyclopaedic knowledge, on the other hand, is defined as what a native speaker knows about the world in which he exists and it does not enter into his linguistic knowledge. That is why these two types of information have to be separated. G. Lakoff [20, p. 172] also points to the difference between a linguistic dictionary and encyclopaedia, namely the difference between definitional and encyclopaedic knowledge about words. Dictionary differs from encyclopaedia in treatment of lexical units. It provides information about meaning of words, but not about their referents. Dictionary entry registers formal and morphosyntactic characteristics of a headword, but it does not impart knowledge about its relations with object of reality. So a linguistic dictionary contains information about names in language, whereas encyclopaedia – about carriers of names.

Every dictionary includes semantic information about a word, which is considered exclusively linguistic by its nature, and represents only part of native speaker's knowledge about the world. Human knowledge of the world is revealed completely only in encyclopaedia, which is assumed to be aside from linguistic system as a whole. Dictionary information is regarded as conceptual (i.e. abstract), and encyclopaedic information is perceptional (i.e. it refers to observation). D.A. Cruse [12, p. 395-396] considers encyclopaedic knowledge as everything that is presented in a conceptual whole. Dictionary information is information that inherent to words. Words and concepts exist in close and interdependent relations, but it is more convenient to treat words in terms of their semantic properties, but not the same properties as that of the concepts associated with them. But, as the word is closely related to the concept, then its main function comes to activation of a concept associated with it. Thus the main part of dictionary entry information indicates which concept a word associated with. Hence the purpose of a dictionary is to identify a concept, but not to define it in detail.

Presentation of a word in a linguistic dictionary concentrates on linguistic parameters (orthography, orthoepy, meaning, derivatives). In encyclopaedias information also sometimes contains linguistic characteristics of a word, although, most of the information goes much further. In encyclopaedias a headword functions as an index-term or a heading to whole domain of knowledge. An encyclopaedic entry usually intends to involve description of all facts that may be associated with a headword [23, p. 49].

However, other researchers support the amalgamation of two types of information (linguistic and encyclopaedic) in a one reference work, because they believe that the difference between semantics and pragmatics is largely artificial, and the only viable concept of linguistic semantics is the one that avoids such dichotomy and therefore it is encyclopaedic in nature [6, p. 259; 21, p. 154-166]. To construct the microstructure of a linguistic dictionary it is necessary to describe the semantic structure of a word with the help of lexicographical tools, implying by this the system of its senses. But in order to reveal the semantic structure of a word, it is necessary, first of all, to single out the separate meanings of a certain word which are formed on the basis of encyclopaedic knowledge about its referent, and also on

the basis of experience, beliefs, prejudices, and superstitions associated with the contexts of its usage.

Thus linguistic and encyclopaedic knowledge of a lexical unit has strong ties in mental and cognitive apparatus of an individual, so sometimes it becomes very difficult to separate one from the other and draw a clear demarcation line. Human mind does not operate with *'dictionaries'*, but with *'encyclopaedias'* (i.e. the subjective lexicon possesses close connections with other knowledge about the world and is an essential part of it). Human lexicon subsystem integrates with imaginative, logical and cognitive subsystems, and in the result of this traditional lexicographic issues acquire vague outlines [9, p. 12]. Knowledge of any kind is integrated in the human mind so that it does not make sense to divide it into two areas (linguistic and extralinguistic). Avoiding the dichotomy between a dictionary and encyclopaedia is direct result of study of lexical concepts as an integral part of human cognition in general, instead of independent study of linguistic structure within the human knowledge [15, p. 647-677]. This demarcation is quite difficult to establish theoretically and if a dictionary is a *'hidden encyclopaedia'* and one of the tools to arrange and systematize knowledge, then the only possible way to demonstrate a word's semantic structure is by means of encyclopaedic elements [13, p. 68].

In the dictionary linguistic knowledge can reach different levels of abstraction. For instance, the notion of parts of speech and semantic relations of lexical units comprise abstract linguistic knowledge that the user has to understand or at least to be able to work with them. Thus dictionaries apply and at the same time create different levels of linguistic knowledge to help the user to overcome difficulties of language presentation. But to achieve successfully the same purpose, it is necessary to apply encyclopaedic knowledge too. According to W. Hüllen [17, p. 8], an individual accumulates encyclopaedic knowledge on the assumption of everyday experience part of which comprise linguistic education and professional training. If we understand under the notion *'encyclopaedia'* a whole corpus of knowledge that are universal, including very common and highly tailored, then it makes sense to call general background knowledge encyclopaedic. In natural language there are almost not any words that can be perceived without such background of encyclopaedic character. And this is the reason of interminable arguments, since it is very difficult to distinguish between linguistic and encyclopaedic knowledge. If encyclopaedic knowledge serves as a background for any linguistic knowledge, then linguistic dictionaries will register the last one and inevitably the previous one. Common definition, that dictionaries interpret language and encyclopaedias – things, is beyond question, but it is difficult to regulate it, because things can only be described through the language.

The fundamental difference between linguistic and encyclopaedic knowledge is that linguistic knowledge, properly speaking, is shared among all members of a linguistic community, while knowledge about the surrounding world is not [16, p. 14]. That, what we usually determine as encyclopaedic knowledge, is not always the competence of all native speakers of a certain language, or even their majority. In this case, the problem arises before a lexicographer, what should be distinguished between what an individual knows, as a native speaker, about words in the language, or what he knows, as a member of a certain culture, about objects, beliefs, traditions, and conventions of this

culture [14, p. 124]. Various objects of the universe are not just arranged in one row and organised in a complex sequence according to semantic relations, subordination etc. This structure is built up on the assumption of our comprehension of the world and comprises encyclopaedic knowledge, which is embedded in semantic component, and which should be registered in a linguistic description of a word because it is a part of speaker's competence [19, p. 296-297]. Encyclopaedic component retains knowledge which is accepted by linguistic society and, therefore, it is always conditioned by social and historical factors.

Thus one of the essential conditions of successful communication is availability of certain background knowledge that possesses extralinguistic character and plays an equally important role in the process of communication along with language proficiency itself. Background knowledge is based on cumulative and heuristic functions of language and its ability to act as a connecting-link between generations, repository and means for extralinguistic social experience transmission, its ability to consolidate accumulated collective experience directly in linguistic forms [4, p. 165; 8, p. 86]. The possession of extralinguistic information involves knowledge of realities which are understood as the names of mythological creatures, names of national and folklore heroes, historical facts, artefacts, public institutions which are unique to a particular nation. Realities allow of revealing proximity between language and culture. The emergence of new realities in the spiritual and material life of society results in emergence of realities in language. And primarily these are onomastic realities such as toponyms, anthroponyms, titles of literary and art works, names of state and public institutions etc. that find their place in linguistic dictionaries of the English language.

However, lexicography requires a distinction between linguistic and encyclopedic knowledge for practical reasons: dictionary entries should be limited to a certain extent and concise in form. The lexicographer's task will be impracticable if not to limit the scope and type information to be included in the dictionary. The distinction quite clearly manifested at the level of macro- and microstructure of two types of reference works and touches upon such important lexicographic parameters as selection of headwords, principles and methods of dictionary entry construction, and semantization of headwords. But despite the fact that these criteria are clearly defined in the lexicographical theory, in practice they are continually violated. Observations indicate that linguistic lexicography steadily expands extralinguistic data by adding encyclopedic information to dictionary entries [3, p. 34]. Explaining the meaning of words, dictionaries usually resort to employment of encyclopaedic elements.

The researchers note that English practical lexicography combines a linguistic definition of a headword with extralinguistic elements, and this, in turn, leads to an increase in the extent of its encyclopaedism. In theory linguistic information can be separated from encyclopaedic elements. On the basis of this provision is given a quite clear justification of opposition between two main types of reference works, linguistic dictionaries and encyclopaedias.

Of course, there are word classes that can be interpreted exclusively either from linguistic or encyclopaedic position. To the first group belong such words as, for instance, prepositions, determinatives, conjunctions, and discourse marking expressions. Their meaning is possible to explicate only within linguistic description, but not by means of ref-

erence to extralinguistic reality. The second group includes proper names of persons, places, biographical data, description of historical events, political, social and cultural institutions, geographical objects, works of arts, literature and music, myths, and mythological heroes. However, in practice it is very difficult to determine precisely where ends the treatment of a word and starts the consideration of the concept which this word expresses. An individual uses language in the process of communication to inform about various facts, things, and people, hence, words and world are inextricably linked [18, p. 59]. And boundary line between linguistic dictionaries and encyclopaedias gradually loses its outline, primarily due to the encyclopaedisation process of linguistic dictionaries, which embraces both structural and semantic aspects of a reference work.

One of the prevailing trends in modern lexicography is the desire to integral description of lexical units and comprehensive treatment of their peculiarities in a general dictionary of the English language. The researchers point out that there is a shift from purely philological treatment of words in a dictionary to the complete philological and cultural description of word-thing, word-concept, with involving of ethno-linguistic elements and encyclopaedic knowledge [1, p. 7]. J. Coleman [11, p. 584] emphasizes that dictionaries are the product of culture and this tendency is quite evident in the selection of headwords, employing different kinds of labels, quotations, designing definitions and arranging senses, etymology.

K. Allan [10, p. 573-577] indicates that for some philosophers, linguists, and psycholinguists an ideal dictionary is conceived as a part of encyclopaedia, which stores information about formal, morphosyntactic, and semantic peculiarities of words and their corresponding meanings. Encyclopaedia functions as a structured database containing comprehensive information in many fields of knowledge. In practice, the difference is not as apparent. Existing dictionaries are artifacts that serve a variety of purposes. Most monolingual dictionaries contain a large number of pragmatic and encyclopaedic information, along with information about the history of words and changes in their meanings. Most dictionaries register the names of famous people and cities. Such dictionaries functions not only as an inventory of lexical units of the language, but also as a cultural code of language and the collective beliefs of speakers. It is assumed that dictionary is a part of encyclopaedia and any language potentially has many encyclopaedias combined with a dictionary.

However, no matter how this process is regarded in theory, in practice it is difficult to find a dictionary of the English language without encyclopaedic elements in its structure. Moreover, a hybrid type of dictionary emerges that combines linguistic and encyclopaedic data about a headword. The appearance of such type of reference work is primarily linked to the pragmatic and commercial interests of publishers and the rapid development of science, technology and culture, which become the property of the general public. That is why there is a need in the dictionary, which, combining key features of a linguistic dictionary and encyclopedia, could become a universal reference work designed for a wide readership.

In modern linguistic lexicography, in addition to the detailed semantic treatment of a headword and information which is usually provided in general dictionaries, are given synonyms and antonyms to different meanings of a word, etymology and date of word's fixation, word's combinabil-

ity, difficulties of its usage, and material that is usually presented in ideographic dictionaries. Such dictionary is not only a general dictionary, but an orthoepic, etymological, ideographic, and also a dictionary of synonyms and antonyms. Reference work of such format is possible to call a universal one. However, universalisation of a dictionary may take place not only in a linguistic aspect, but in combination of both linguistic and encyclopaedic features. British and American linguistic lexicography respond to this process by increasing encyclopaedic elements.

It is considered that encyclopaedism of general dictionaries has always been one of the characteristic features of American lexicography. Lexicographic practice demonstrates that it is possible to create a reference work in which general dictionary and encyclopaedia are harmoniously combined. Encyclopaedisation of linguistic dictionary may occur in several directions and be reduced to combination of encyclopaedic and linguistic dictionaries in a single work, introduction of encyclopaedic information into a dictionary entry in a form of a special rubric or area after traditional linguistic definition of a headword, insertion into the microstructure various encyclopaedic material by way of explanations, examples, pictures, charts, and tables that demonstrate the structure, organisation, or physical characteristics of the relevant objects of reality.

According to researchers dictionary should reflect the average language competence of native speakers. The level of language that is reflected in the press and non-specialised periodicals with a sufficient quantity of everyday and special terms quite precisely corresponds to the average level of language competence of native speakers [2, p. 525]. In English speaking countries the profile of a dictionary user is changing and directed to linguistic and encyclopaedic treatment of words. It enhances cultural and interdisciplinary orientation of dictionaries. Modern dictionaries inevitably acquire some encyclopaedic features because they have to expand the users' horizon. O. M. Karpova [5, p. 79-80] emphasizes that a new direction has been formed in modern theoretical and practical West European lexicography. It has got the name of *'dictionary sociology'* and its essence is studying the needs and demands of users to dictionaries of certain genres. This method is actively used by leading publishers which publish dictionaries for foreigners and native speakers: Cambridge Dictionaries, Cassel Dictionaries, Collins-COUBILD Dictionaries, Oxford Dictionaries, specialising in publishing modern dictionaries of English. In recent decades, according to the idea of their authors and the results of users' questionnaire, these dictionaries have combined the features of linguistic and encyclopaedic lexicography, including a significant amount of onomastic material. Thus the comprehensiveness and content of lexicographical information directly related to its specific orientation on a certain user.

Thus the juxtaposition of linguistic information as essential, or nuclear, and encyclopedic information as excessive, which besides nuclear contains surplus information, can be deleted if to take into account that conception, of what is essential and what is accidental, changes from individual to individual and from culture to culture. Hence, a linguistic dictionary has to register encyclopedic information because different kinds of background knowledge comprise part of linguistic knowledge of a native speaker and successful communication is impossible without it.

REFERENCES

[1] Apresyan, Yu.D. Lexicographic Conception of the New Big English-Russian Dictionary / Yu.D. Apresyan // New Big English-Russian Dictionary: in 3 vol. / Yu.D. Apresyan, E.M. Med-nikova, A.V. Petrova, et al. Edited by E.M. Med-nikova and Yu.D. Apresyan. Vol. 1. – M. : Russian Language, 1993. – P. 6-17.

[2] Gak, V.G. From General Dictionary to Encyclopaedia of Language (From the Experience of Modern French Lexicography) / V.G. Gak // Izvestiya AS USSR. Department of Literature and Language. Vol. XXX. Issue 6. – M., 1971. – P. 524-530.

[3] Zubkov, M.G. Ukrainian Language: Universal reference book / M.G. Zubkov – Kh. : VD «School», 2004. – 496 p.

[4] Kalamazh, M. Cultural Component in a Culture-specific Vocabulary / M. Kalamazh // New philology. 5. Coll. Sc. Papers. – Zaporizhya : ZNU, 2009. – № 33. – P. 162-169.

[5] Karpova, O.M. New Tendencies in Modern Lexicography / O.M. Karpova // Collected articles Lexis and Lexicography. RAS FL. – M. : Orlovsk State Technical University, 2000. – Is. 11. – P. 63-75.

[6] Rozina, R.I. New in Theory and Practice of English Lexicography / R.I. Rozina // Soviet Lexicography : Collection of articles / Editorial board: Yu.N. Karaulov, et al; AS USSR. Scientific Council on Lexicology and Lexicography. – M. : Russian Language, 1988. – P. 252-271.

[7] Selivanova, O.O. Modern Linguistics: Terminological Encyclopaedia / O.O. Selivanova – Poltava : Dovkillya-K, 2006. – 716 p.

[8] Uzhova, O.A. Evolution of Linguistic and Area Studies Dictionary / O.A. Uzhova // Bulletin of Ivanovo State University. – Series Philology; Is. 1 / Ivanovo State University. – Ivanovo: IvSU, 2004. – P. 84-89.

[9] Shirokov, V.A. Information Theory of Lexicographic Systems / Shirokov V.A. – K. : Dovira, 1998. – 331 p.

[10] Allan, K. Dictionaries and Encyclopedias: Relationship / K. Allan // Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. – 2nd ed. – Elsevier Science, 2006. – Vol. 3: Con-Dt. – P. 573-577.

[11] Coleman, J. Lexicography / J. Coleman // The handbook of English linguistics. Edited by B. Aarts, A. McMahon. – Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2006. – P. 581-600.

[12] Cruse, D.A. Prototype Theory and Lexical Semantics / D.A. Cruse // Meaning and Prototypes: Studies in Linguistic Categorization. Edited by Savas L. Tsobatzidis. – Routledge, 1990. – P. 382-402.

[13] Eco, U. Dictionary vs. Encyclopedia / U. Eco // Chapter two in his: Semiotics and the Philosophy of language. – London : McMillan, 1984. – 46-86 p.

[14] Fillmore, C.J. Types of Lexical Information / C.J. Fillmore // Studies in Syntax and Semantics. F. Kiefer (Ed.). – Dordrecht: Reidel, 1969. – P. 109-137.

[15] Geeraerts, D. Cognitive Grammar and the History of Lexical Semantics / D. Geeraerts // Rudzka-Ostyn, Brygida, ed. Topics in Cognitive Linguistics. – Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1988. – P. 647-677.

[16] Goddard, C. Semantic analysis. A practical introduction / C. Goddard – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1998. – 411 p.

[17] Hüllen, W. English Dictionaries, 800-1700: the Topical Tradition / W. Hüllen – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2006. – 544 p.

[18] Kirkness, A. Lexicography / A. Kirkness // The Handbook of Applied Linguistics. Edited by A. Davis and C. Elder. – Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2006. – P. 54-81.

[19] Klinkenberg, J. Problèmes de la synecdoque. Du sémantique à l'encyclopédique / J. Klinkenberg // Le français moderne 51, 1983. – P. 289-299.

[20] Lakoff, G. Women, fire and dangerous things / G. Lakoff – Chicago : Chicago University Press, 1987. – 614 p.

[21] Langacker, R.W. Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical Prerequisites. Vol. 1 / R.W. Langaker – Stanford : Stanford University Press, 1987. – 540 p.

[22] Raskin, V. Linguistic and encyclopedic knowledge in text processing / V. Raskin // In: Mario Alinei (ed.), Round Table Discussion on Text / Discourse I, Quaderni di Semantica 6:1, 1985. – P.92-102.

[23] Swanepoel, P. Dictionary typologies: A pragmatic approach / P. Swanepoel // A Practical Guide to Lexicography. Edited by Piet van Sterkenburg. – John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2003. – P.44-70.