

Original research article

УДК 81'55

DOI: 10.18384/2949-5075-2025-6-123-136

## ON LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL IDENTITY REPRESENTATION IN ENGLISH DICTIONARIES

**S. Ter-Minasova<sup>1</sup>, O. Vishnyakova<sup>1\*</sup>, E. Vishnyakova<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> *Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russian Federation*

<sup>2</sup> *Tula State Lev Tolstoy Pedagogical University, Tula, Russian Federation*

\* *Corresponding author, e-mail: ol-vish@mail.ru*

*Received by the editorial office 28.08.2025*

*Revised by the author 15.09.2025*

*Accepted for publication 17.09.2025*

### **Abstract**

**Aim.** The investigation refers to the area of English lexicography in terms of linguistic and cultural meanings representational specifics in dictionaries of different types. The objective of the research in question concerns ways of manifestation of cultural identity characteristics in dictionary materials.

**Methodology.** The research is based on complex methodology, which comprises descriptive, contextual, conceptual and comparative approaches to language and speech phenomena in reference to linguistic meanings semantic and linguoculturological analysis, with special attention to the process of linguistic units' representation in dictionaries of different types.

**Results.** Dictionaries as the source of linguistic and cultural information possess the ability to express linguocultural identity characteristics as referred to the English-speaking community. In accordance with their functional purposes and strategic principles of linguistic material arrangement different types of dictionaries present the information concerned, either explicitly or implicitly, with the phenomenon of linguocultural identity, in different ways, including the 'user's perspective' application as of the recent approaches in lexicographic activity.

**Research implications.** The paper opens new perspectives in lexicographic sources investigation with respect to the problem of national identity significant characteristics manifestation and their registering in dictionaries, including the users' perspective approach, which lies in the field of comparative analyses of languages and cultures, and their conceptual bases.

**Keywords:** lexicography, English, linguistic and cultural identity, cultural context, non-equivalent vocabulary

### **For citation:**

Ter-Minasova, S. G., Vishnyakova, O. D. & Vishnyakova, E. A. (2025). On linguistic and cultural identity representation in dictionaries. In: *Key Issues of Contemporary Linguistics*, 6, 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.18384/2949-5075-2025-6-123-136>

Научная статья

## К ВОПРОСУ О РЕПРЕЗЕТАЦИИ ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРНОЙ ИДЕНТИЧНОСТИ В АНГЛОЯЗЫЧНЫХ СЛОВАРЯХ

**Тер-Минасова С. Г.<sup>1</sup>, Вишнякова О. Д.<sup>1\*</sup>, Вишнякова Е. А.<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Московский государственный университет имени М. В. Ломоносова, г. Москва, Российская Федерация

<sup>2</sup> Тульский государственный педагогический университет им. Л. Н. Толстого, г. Тула, Российская Федерация

\* Корреспондирующий автор: e-mail: ol-vish@mail.ru

Поступила в редакцию 28.08.2025

После доработки 15.09.2025

Принята к публикации 17.09.2025

### Аннотация

**Цель.** Данное исследование посвящено рассмотрению специфики репрезентации языковых значений и культурных смыслов в англоязычных лексикографических источниках различных типов. В работе рассматриваются способы отражения культурной идентичности в материалах словарных источников.

**Процедура и методы.** Исследование осуществляется на основе комплексного подхода, который включает дескриптивный, контекстуальный, концептуальный, сопоставительный виды анализа явлений языка и речи, их семантических и лингвокультурологических аспектов, с особым вниманием к способам фиксации языковых значений в словарях различных типов.

**Результаты.** Словарь как источник языковой и культурной информации обладает способностью к отражению определённых черт культурно-языковой идентичности англоязычного социума. В соответствии со своим функциональным предназначением и стратегическими принципами организации языкового материала различные типы словарей представляют информацию, непосредственно или опосредованно относящуюся к феномену лингвокультурной идентичности, различными способами, включая применение «перспективы пользователя» в рамках одного из современных подходов в лексикографической деятельности.

**Теоретическая и практическая значимость** обусловлена тем, что работа открывает новые перспективы в изучении лексикографических источников в плане выявления наиболее значимых черт национальной идентичности и их фиксации в словарях, в том числе с учётом «перспективы пользователя», на основе сравнительно-сопоставительного подхода к анализу языков и культур и их концептуальных оснований.

**Ключевые слова:** лексикография, английский язык, лингвокультурная идентичность, культурный контекст, безэквивалентная лексика

### Для цитирования:

Тер-Минасова С. Г., Вишнякова О. Д., Вишнякова Е. А. К вопросу о репрезентации лингвокультурной идентичности в англоязычных словарях // Вопросы современной лингвистики. 2025. № 6. С. 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.18384/2949-5075-2025-6-123-136>

## Introduction

At present the problem of cultural identity is one of the most painstaking issues as the society has taken the path of multiculturalism and globalization, being represented at all language levels. As for the English-speaking community, it is characterized by cultural and linguistic diversity, which causes the emergence of new approaches to the process of national identity formation. One of the most significant characteristics of the English language at the moment is its continuing spread as the language of international communication, which is manifested in a number of changes within its structural, semantic and functional spheres and which in the course of time finds its representation in dictionary materials. In various domains of its application as an international language, based on the idea of equality of variants and multiplurality, the awareness of its heterogeneity and the ability to be used in multilingual contexts are in the spotlight, first and foremost from the point of view of its wide dissemination [1, c. 184–198]. As an international language it circulates due to the fact that many individuals within the world are acquiring and constantly using it, rather than its speakers moving and migrating: “There are many more speakers of World Englishes and people who use English for international communication than there are native speakers of it” [2, p. 1]. It should be mentioned that besides other factors the phenomenon in question directly corresponds to the development of global internet culture in various communicative spheres [3], where English plays the most important role and which contributes to the emergence of new interpretations of linguistic and cultural identity issues in the multicultural English-speaking world. The ways of the notion of cultural and linguistic identity understanding are subject to transformations reflected in language, both in the specifics of its use and in the abilities of the linguistic meanings to be realized in actual speech and to be recorded in lexicographic sources. Otherwise stated, the question that arises in this connection concerns

modes of representation of linguistic meanings in different types of English dictionaries in terms of the abilities of the lexicographic sources in question to manifest the English-speaking community linguistic and cultural identity characteristics. The issues under analysis refer to algorithms and strategies of linguistic units’ lexicographic fixation according to certain types of dictionaries and the ways linguocultural identity characteristics are manifested in them. One more very important point to be discussed is the English language lexicographic description in terms of linguistic and cultural diversity as the development of identity issues is by no means connected with socio-historical context of its existence.

Thus, the fact that English-speaking people are using more and more varieties of English refers to the problem of identifying a native speaker of English in terms of linguocultural identity characteristics elicitation. The phenomenon under analysis deserves separate discussion at linguistic, cultural and interdisciplinary levels. For example, while trying to define a native speaker of English one comes across a great variety of interpretations: “For some, an essential feature of a native speaker is that English must be the first language learned; for others, to be a native speaker involves the continued use of English in that person’s life; for still others, being a native speaker assumes a high level of competence in English” [4, p. 29]. “Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture” represents the notion in question as “a person who has learnt (a particular language) from birth, usually as a result of having parents who speak it and living in a country where most people speak it: *a native speaker of English / an English native speaker / native speaker-English*”<sup>1</sup>. As Joseph J. Lee writes, when compared with non-native speakers, “native speakers have other verbal as well as nonverbal communication skills that enable them to communicate effortlessly

<sup>1</sup> Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. Essex, England: Longman, 2006. P. 932.

ly, in most instances, with other participants in communication exchanges, within appropriate sociocultural contexts" [5]. The author has identified six fundamental defining features of a native speaker, who represents a certain national identity: an early childhood language acquisition and maintaining the use of the language, intuitive knowledge of the language possession, the ability to produce fluent, spontaneous discourse, communicative competence possession, including communication within different social environmental circles, the ability to identify and be identified by a language community, lack of foreign accent [Op. cit.].

As far as linguistic and cultural identity issues are concerned, the research in the field tends to be discussed in terms of epistemological investigation, based on linguoculturological and socio-psychological approaches. Linguistic and cultural identity is referred to the area of cognitive linguistics, which means that it concerns a particular way of thinking and should be considered a mental representation that reflects a certain worldview, thus being a cognitive phenomenon [6].

In the course of the investigation experts in the field come to the conclusions that such categories as "linguistic and cultural identity", "linguistic personality" and "discourse" are intertwined issues, which by no means should be taken into special consideration. As has been already mentioned, one of the basic notions in question is linguistic and cultural diversity that requires special attention to cultural, social and religious differences that play a prominent role in a personality structural development in the modern world as they determine and serve as the basis for a linguistic personality evolution. The conception of a person's identity can be analyzed and illustrated by using a three-dimensional scheme of existential personality vectors, as the category under consideration is subject to be discussed first and foremost in terms of sociolinguistic approach [7]. Linguists state that language is the basic sign of national, linguistic and cultural identity [8],

thus being part of it. For example, S. Hamidi writes that "language is integral to cultural identity. It is how humans communicate, express themselves, convey meaning, and get their messages across. It is the medium through which people express their cultures and values. Language and culture are inter-related, with culture forming language while language reflects culture. In addition, culture is affected by the shared experiences of individuals, their civilization, and history, while the varying needs of a particular culture shape language" [9].

It is a well-established fact that every language is unique as well as the system of traditional values for each linguocultural community manifested by cultural concepts, encoded within language [10; 11; 12]. Linguocultural identity tends to appear at all levels of language representation in various discursive practices. It encompasses individual linguocultural characteristics, at the same time indicating which linguistic cultural community the individual belongs to.

When discussing areas of linguocultural identity manifestation, we precede from the premise that not only discursive characteristics of the surrounding reality and direct communicative process in which essential and significant details are revealed, should be taken into consideration but also the whole thesaurus of linguistic material accumulated and preserved in particular formats. Thus, not only linguistic, or rather linguocultural personalities within their social and linguistic behaviour are subject to investigation but also the language they use in particular ways and situations according to certain rules that correspond to systemic and functional aspects of a certain language [13] as well as concepts they are based on, the latter including universal and cultural specific ones. Otherwise stated, the problem of linguistic and cultural identity representation is closely connected with the way the information, on the basis of which the notion in question can be distinguished and identified, is gathered, fixed and described in order to be used to increase and create knowledge.

The process under consideration also refers to the conception of language change as “change within a LANGUAGE over a period of time, seen as a universal and unstoppable process”<sup>1</sup>. Thus, the information about language is subject to change and should be recorded with maximum accuracy in a timely manner. This information directly concerns the personalities who use it and the way they use it as representatives of certain linguocultural identities.

As we turn to the domain of language we immediately discover that it is lexical meaning that comes first in linguocultural identity linguistic representation, and this should be taken for granted because lexical meaning refers to the actual content of mental structures that reverberate the world around us, which brings to life the sphere of nomination in language [14]. N. B. Gvishiani states that languages possess certain mechanisms to regulate the amount of conceptual material, which can be comprised by a lexical item on the basis of a number of parameters in terms of linguistic units correspondence with fragments of conceptual world [15, c. 122].

D. Crystal writes that the issue of meaning with respect to language evokes reference to non-linguistic factors, such as “thought, situation, knowledge, intention and use”<sup>2</sup>. O. S. Akhmanova and her disciples consider the notion of linguistic meaning in terms of reflection of an object of reality in human consciousness that becomes a fact of language due to its constant and inseparable connection with the sound form, in which it is realized [16, c. 90-91; 17, c. 11-19]. It would not be an exaggeration to say that dictionaries are the most reliable source of information about linguistic meaning in terms of its status and development, which reflects linguistic and cultural situation in a community being part of the reality represented

in human mind and verbalized by language. Language registered and described in dictionaries at the level of meanings serves an indication of linguocultural identity essentials and peculiarities, which are manifested in culture, social and linguistic behaviour, with all significant details and nuances involved.

### **The Role of Lexicographic Sources in Linguistic and Cultural Identity Characteristics Representation**

As is generally assumed, the appropriateness, validity and adequacy of a dictionary as well as its typological relevance and objectivity of the information provided are considered significant criteria in terms of lexicographic sources creation. The development of methods of compiling a lexicographic source is obviously associated with the analysis of linguistic meaning and peculiarities of linguistic units' realization in actual speech contexts. As has been mentioned above, the linguistic cultural and epistemological aspects of lexicography are concerned with such phenomena as linguistic and cultural knowledge interaction, as well as conceptualization of the world and cognitive context manifestation [18]. Cultural awareness as well as cultural sensitivity are very important categories with respect to a dictionary compiling process. As D. Crystal writes, cultural awareness “is a tricky area to explore objectively, for there are cultural sensitivities to be respected, in such areas as gender, politics, and religion, and the history of this field is littered with unpremeditated offence. On more than one occasion, a dictionary has been banned in a particular part of the world because its cultural definitions caused upset – Longman Dictionary of Language and Culture is one I recall...” [19].

The validity of contemporary languages dictionary material necessarily depends on timely recording and registering information into a lexicographic source taking appropriate linguistic and extralinguistic contexts into account. Semantic changes of words that subject to lexicographic representation in-

<sup>1</sup> Language change // Crystal D. A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics; 6th ed. Oxford: Blakwell Publishing, 2008. P. 266–267.

<sup>2</sup> meaning (n.) // Crystal D. A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics; 6th ed. Oxford: Blakwell Publishing, 2008. P. 298.

volve the researcher or dictionary compiler into the new sphere of the analysis, associated with new words emergence, including mutual influence of speech usage and extralinguistic factors determination: "When a language is adopted by a community, it is immediately adapted to meet the communicative needs of its culture, and hundreds of new words and expressions soon arise, along with pragmatic variations in such areas as politeness, topic choices, and forms of address. It is a fascinating and neglected area of study, where the issues are only to increase as time goes by" [Op.cit.]. V. I. Zabotkina writes that the process of "Worten den Welt," or the verbal nomination act, is aimed at capturing or fixation of human activity fragments in the individual and collective world view and lexicon [20]. In this regard, on the one hand, a new word that appears in a language (for example, English) may possess a temporary connotation of novelty, as long as the collective linguistic consciousness reacts to it as something new, and on the other hand, for people whose native language and culture are not English, the words under discussion can retain their novelty for quite a long time [20, c. 97]. Thus, the problem of close relationship between nominative and communicative activity arises, which largely determines the process of a word's entry into a language, frequency of occurrence and, accordingly, its dictionary representation, with respect to its cultural aspect and linguistic personalities identity references.

The phenomenon of linguistic and cultural knowledge interaction brings to life various transformations in human consciousness that occur under the influence of changes in the surrounding reality. Traditionally, lexicographic activity can be discussed in terms of two basic aspects: the practical work of creating various types of dictionaries and theoretical basics of the vocabulary choice as well as the material arrangement strategic principles elaboration. As has been stated, cultural and conceptual factors are to be taken into special consideration with reference to definitions, contextual

environment features, illustrative phraseology and commentary presentation. Linguistic and cultural knowledge manifest themselves as independent and closely interacting foundations of the process under analysis – they both determine and are both reflected in the choice and arrangement of the vocabulary material. The epistemological aspect of lexicographic activity is highly relevant for dictionaries of various types depending on what cultural and linguistic information is needed for this or that type of dictionary. The information contained in lexicographic sources may serve as a factual foundation for knowledge formation, its extension and further transfer into other cultures. In other words, the study in question contributes to the development of special domains of lexicography and opens up new prospects in identifying the role of language in preserving and passing on information regarded as the foundation for knowledge structures forming. This approach helps to convey information to the addressee and create inferential prerequisites that stimulate the process of new knowledge creation and formulate evaluative manifestations based on inferential knowledge.

The analysis of lexicographic sources creation process is the subject of a number of scientific investigations, which examine basic characteristics of dictionary typology and highlight general problems of lexicography [21; 22].

Dictionaries oriented towards the user's perspective should include appropriate explanations and are designed to ensure adequate interpretation of meanings and successful potential communication with the compiler [23]. R. Lew makes an attempt to discuss the following questions that concern dictionaries and their users: "Who are dictionary users?", "What do users use dictionaries for and how do we envisage the purpose of dictionaries?" and describes typical situations and contexts, in which a dictionary is needed. The author pays special attention to the design of a dictionary suitable for the user [24].

As is mentioned above, one of the advantages of any dictionary of a modern language is timely recording linguistic facts that refer to the emergence of new words and new meanings under the influence of cultural changing and linguistic specifications. When discussing linguocultural identity issues with respect to dictionary typology one should face with monolingual linguocultural (LCD) and bilingual or even multi-lingual country studies linguistic and cultural dictionaries (CSLCD). As the name of the latter suggests, a dictionary of this type should be considered a source of lexicographic information about language and culture in reference to a certain country, with respect to both (including the language of the user) cultures presented and their conceptual spaces incorporated. Linguistic and cultural information related to certain characteristics of a particular country (its political, economic and educational structure, basic cultural aspects, cultural values included, historical information, the population lifestyle, geography, etc) is under discussion within this area of lexicographically recorded knowledge. In this case special attention is deserved by dictionaries that contain information about the state of language and culture of one particular country, or sometimes simultaneously relate to linguocultural situations in several countries<sup>1</sup>. The dictionaries in question are in great demand with learners of other origins, whose, for example, professional expertise may refer to more complex structures than just bilingual mentality, which requires compatibility and specifications with respect to one's own conceptual and cultural basis no-

<sup>1</sup> To illustrate the point the following examples of different types of dictionaries can be adduced: Австралия и Новая Зеландия: Лингвострановедческий словарь / под общ. рук. В. В. Ощепковой и А. С. Петриковской. М.: Русский язык, 2001. 216 с.; Америка: англо-русский лингвострановедческий словарь / под ред. и общ. рук. Г. В. Чернова. Смоленск: Полиграмма, 1996. 1185 с.; Ощепкова В. В., Шустилова И. И. Краткий англо-русский лингвострановедческий словарь: Великобритания, США, Канада, Австралия, Новая Зеландия. М.: URSS, 2001. 176 с.; Томашин Г. Д. США. Лингвострановедческий словарь. М.: Русский язык, 1999. 576 с.

tions. A dictionary of this kind reflects specificity of a given culture as well as linguistic consciousness peculiarities, thus serving the national cultural and linguistic identity representative.

The process of compiling a monolingual linguocultural dictionary (LCD) or a dictionary of the mentioned above CSLCD type is based on the assumption that linguistic and cultural knowledge are closely interwoven, which is reflected in objectification of a linguistic meaning and the way it is registered at the level of lexicographically determined interpretation of cultural and linguistic facts. Explanations and commentaries aimed at conveying information of both linguistic and extralinguistic character should be taken into special consideration in the course of using the dictionaries under analysis. It is a well-established fact that as a rule an CSLCD is compiled as a bilingual dictionary that combines properties of a traditional bilingual dictionary and an encyclopedic source, reflecting the main specificity of linguistic cultural studies concerned with a number of corresponding academic disciplines. The dictionary users become more proficient in different linguistic and cultural knowledge possession, thus enriching their own informative and intellectual basis as well as taking certain steps in understanding other languages, cultures and linguocultural identities. Furthermore, they contribute to veracious and reliable interpretation of one's native conceptual basis compared with fundamental concepts of other cultures, some constituted by universal entities, in mutual connection with their linguistic representations.

With respect to linguistic and cultural content both CSLCD and LCD undoubtedly possess certain features of an educational dictionary, especially the former, due to presentation of two or more languages material, which can be used as a reference source for a wide range of tasks performance, including translation and transference of non-equivalent vocabulary units into a different cultural and linguistic environment. The al-

gorithm of dictionary information recording as well as its factual content structure can be considered the pivotal point in the course of linguocultural identity elicitation, which concerns both native and non-native users.

Otherwise stated, the field of the investigation in question refers to the notion of transferability, concerned with the ability of the original linguistic meaning in one linguocultural space to be transferred into another linguocultural space, taking into consideration a so-to-speak reduced form (or potential form) of a certain invariant that is conditioned and accompanied by a trans-subject semantic transfer, determined by corresponding conceptual foundation constraints. Experts state that the explication of this phenomenon concerns a total set of cognitive and linguistic procedures that serve to transfer the original subjective meaning of a linguistic unit in question to a different linguistic, cultural and conceptual area, which stimulates discovering a certain correspondence between the linguistic means aimed at designating the meanings in question in both cultures [25]. This conception may be well referred to Anna Wierzbicka's semantic primitives' theory as well as some other investigations in the field [26]. As is well-known, one of the purposes of CSLCD is to convey non-equivalent vocabulary by means of another language, which presents a difficult task for the lexicographer to transfer a concept expressed by means of a certain linguistic unit into another culture.

The traditional ways words are registered and described in dictionaries tend to elucidate specificities of their linguistic meanings in corresponding contexts as well as linguocultural conditionality of their actualization, which in some cases refer to certain linguistic personalities, which may serve as the embodiment of linguocultural identity characteristics. It should be noted that non-equivalent vocabulary, which seems to be familiar to all the speakers of English in a great majority of cases may turn up to be unrecognizable to its users – speakers of other languages, which especially concerns

some semantic peculiarities and cultural nuances, first and foremost due to the varieties existence factor. The illustrative material that follows contains a number of examples taken from lexicographic sources reflecting current trends in the Australian and New Zealand societies, which are characterized by an abundance of national and cultural realia, occasional words and abbreviations, sometimes actualized in particular contexts accompanied by special connotations that express attitudes and emotions, including national cultural peculiarities.

The ways and strategies linguistic units are presented in the following dictionaries differ according to their functional purposes and the amount of cultural and linguistic information to be conveyed, which corresponds to the goals of a particular dictionary. The most important aspect of the study in this case is the factor of addressee, whose level of cultural and linguistic knowledge the author-lexicographer is supposed to be guided by and present the data in a clear and accessible manner, providing the dictionary user with all the necessary tools for correct understanding of dictionary information. This implies the need to align the conceptual systems basics that underlie the process of a lexicographic source creation with those of its user, who is supposed to interpret the presented information with the highest possible degree of adequacy. In this respect, dictionaries with a linguocultural focus are close to educational dictionaries.

A dictionary, as a reflection of the value and cultural orientations of a society, represented in linguistic meanings, serves as a repository of its linguistic and cultural heritage, embodying values, traditions, and beliefs as well as transformations occurring within the society in the course of time. All of the components in question underlie the process of cultural and linguistic identity formation, that is, a conscious understanding of belonging to a particular cultural and linguistic community, characterized by certain conceptual foundation. It should be emphasized that this refers both to the con-

tent and amount of information recorded in a dictionary, including its conceptual basis that refers to linguistic and cultural competence of its users. Thus, passing on to the lexicographic material we will try to demonstrate the ways dictionaries present the information in terms of diversity in conceptualization and the world view characteristics manifestation.

For example: “flying fox An arrangement of ropes connected to pulleys and a small platform that allows a person or goods to cross water or a gully when no conventional bridge is available. The names come from the Pacific Ireland fruit bat, in spite of the comparatively large size and furry appearance, can fly and float quite easily”<sup>1</sup>. The linguistic unit under consideration is realized in a figurative meaning and can be identified as part of the New Zealand cultural linguistic space as related to New Zealand slang. At the same time in CSLCD the unit under analysis is registered in its direct meaning and represents a concept related to the sphere of wildlife: “flying fox ... flying fox (*Pteropus*; large bat; head resembles a fox; feeds on fruits and flowers; lives in the east of Australia and the islands of the Pacific Ocean)” – “flying fox ... летучая лисица (*Pteropus*; крупная летучая мышь; голова напоминает лисью; питается фруктами и цветами; обитает на востоке Австралии и о-вах Тихого океана)<sup>2</sup>. In “Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture” it is represented by such dictionary entries as “flying fox a FRUIT BAT” and “a large type of flying animal (BAT) that lives in hot countries and feeds on fruit”<sup>3</sup>, where a direct objectified nomination of a given object of reality is registered, with reference to the territorial and fauna peculiarities of its population.

<sup>1</sup> Cryer M. The Godzone Dictionary of favourite New Zealand words and phrases. Auckland: Exisle Publishing Ltd, 2006. P. 64.

<sup>2</sup> Австралия и Новая Зеландия: Лингвострановедческий словарь = Dictionary of Australia and New Zealand / под общ. рук. В. В. Ощепковой и А. С. Петриковской. М.: Русский язык, 2001. С. 96.

<sup>3</sup> Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. Essex, England: Longman, 2006. P. 528, 556.

The next example concerns the word “Afghan” that is represented in a monolingual LCD in its direct meaning: “someone who comes from Afganistan”<sup>4</sup>. There is one more nomination, semantically derived from it that concerns the meaning “Afghan hound” – “a tall thin dog, originally used for hunting, with a pointed nose and very long silky hair”<sup>5</sup>. The next meaning registered in the dictionary is a figurative one, which partially and implicitly concerns with cultural traditions of Afghani; “a warm cover for a bed made of wool knitted in colourful patterns”<sup>6</sup>. In the bilingual CSLCD the unit in question is defined as “уст. погонщик верблюдов (*погонщики верблюдов, приехавшие в конце XIX в. в Австралию из Афганистана, Египта, Ирана, Турции и др. стран; работали в основном в засушливых р-нах континента*)<sup>7</sup>, which should be regarded as the reflection of social-historical characteristics of Australian culture, including territorial and climatic determination of linguistic meanings interpretation. As for the New Zealand cultural linguistic community, the unit “afghan”, alongside its customary meanings, represents a figurative notion that to some extent reflects its lifestyle and way of living, on the one hand, and the specifics of nomination, traditionally based on ready-made models and lexemes, on the other: “This crunchy, chocolate biscuit, usually containing cornflakes, and topped with rich chocolate icing and a walnut, has been popular in New Zealand since the 1930s. The name apparently refers to dark colour”<sup>8</sup>. It is an interesting fact that for New Zealand society the use of anthroponymic nomination

<sup>4</sup> Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. Essex, England: Longman, 2006. P. 19.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit.

<sup>6</sup> Op. cit.

<sup>7</sup> Австралия и Новая Зеландия: Лингвострановедческий словарь = Dictionary of Australia and New Zealand / под общ. рук. В. В. Ощепковой и А. С. Петриковской. М.: Русский язык, 2001. С. 27.

<sup>8</sup> Cryer M. The Godzone Dictionary of favourite New Zealand words and phrases. Auckland: Exisle Publishing Ltd, 2006. P. 9.

is typical, for example, in the field of cooking or other everyday spheres [27].

One more example from the monolingual LCD, which presents the New Zealand material, is the abbreviation borrowed from British English. It can serve as the illustration to the widely spread New Zealand tendency to optimize and minimize linguistic expressions at all levels, supplying them with various functions and meanings, including nationally and locally coloured: “aggro *abbrev.* A combination of aggravation (made worse, intensified) and aggression (over-readiness to attack), this contracted abbreviation came into use in the 1960s to indicate annoyance and exasperation. The meaning of aggro has both widened and weakened: it can indicate either a potential street fight, or something as minor as a person being a few minutes late, thus causing aggro to the person waiting”<sup>1</sup>. “Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture” suggests the definition that is characterized by more general meaning, belonging to a certain layer of language, thus providing it with a special note about its slang status: “*BrE* trouble, especially fighting, for example, between groups of young people; used especially of the behaviour of young aggressive men, who enjoy fighting”<sup>2</sup>.

The following example of abbreviation taken from the New Zealand dictionary is the unit “FOB”, in which the historical, linguistic and cultural specifics of the society in question is mirrored. The unit gives the base for its further abruption, which is marked stylistically, demonstrating its further functional semantic development: “*abbrev.* Of fresh of the boat (pronounced as fob). Pacific Island immigrants who have recently come to live in New Zealand. Originally pejorative, the term was later adopted by Pacific Islanders themselves and used positively, even, in recent years, as the name of a play and a concert. A contracted form is sometimes used: freshies”<sup>3</sup>. As for the original linguistic unit,

by analogy with which the abbreviated New Zealand expression appeared, thus renewing its motivating characteristics, it concerns an absolutely different area of human activity in its meaning and functional application: “adj. abbrev. for free on board; an expression used in business to state the price of goods at the place from which they are sent to other places. This does not include the cost of transport from that place to the buyer: *All the new car prices are quoted FOB Detroit*”<sup>4</sup>.

Otherwise stated, the information presented in dictionaries under discussion illustrates differences in lexicographic fixation in terms of their structure and content, which reflects differences in conceptualization with respect to various English-speaking communities. At the same time the differences under consideration refer to different linguistic cultural identities that represent different linguistic, cultural and conceptual world-view varieties.

As has been stated above, the appropriateness of including regional, territorial, colloquial, occasional, and abbreviated units into a dictionary is also in the focus of special attention of linguists, depending on the dictionary mission and functional assignment, including its educational purposes. This problem arises in connection with the new stage of language's existence, caused by the emergence of artificial intelligence and new cultural traditions of speech behaviour, as well as new trends in conceptualizing the world in the representatives of various social, cultural and multicultural groups' consciousness.

## Conclusion

In the course of the analysis we have come to the conclusion that in a sense dictionaries serve as the source of linguistic and cultural identity representation. This is due to the fact that they contain evidence-based and conceptually sound information about

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit.

<sup>2</sup> Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. Essex, England: Longman, 2006. P. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Cryer M. The Godzone Dictionary of favourite New

Zealand words and phrases. Auckland: Exisle Publishing Ltd, 2006. P. 965.

<sup>4</sup> Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. Essex, England: Longman, 2006. P. 529.

language and its use in actual speech in various situations and cultural contexts, which makes it possible to identify the specificity of a linguistic personality as the subject of its embodiment and as the representative of linguocultural identity in question.

Transformations and changes within the language sphere, most of which depend on transformations within human society are to be registered in dictionaries in a timely manner and thus new trends in the linguocultural identity development are captured, recorded and preserved. This is especially important in terms of registering lexical meanings subject to various kinds of alteration.

Thus, beside the validity and adequacy of linguistic and cultural material presentation within a dictionary the impetus of the compiler is determined by the necessity to pass the information, both explicitly and implicitly, that concerns linguocultural identity features manifestation. The linguistic and cultural information presented and analyzed concerns identity characteristics' conceptual basics that underlie the English-speaking community world view formation and refer to cultural and linguistic behaviour typical of a certain part of the community in question. Within the scope of a dictionary the linguistic manifestations of the issues above are organized according to certain strategies accepted in particular lexicographic sources, correspondingly reflecting and highlighting linguocultural identity peculiarities of a certain society by means of linguistic meanings and their most significant linguocultural features representation.

The analysis has shown that as dictionaries of different types represent information in different ways in accordance with their strategic orientation and functional purposes, the ways of linguocultural identity characteristics manifestation, though similar in many of their general aspects, are characterized by a number of nuances as far as the choice of the material is concerned as well as the conceptual foundations of some basic strategies implementation. For example,

dictionaries oriented to both linguistic and cultural approach include many of the units with national cultural component, linguistic and cultural realia, ethnonyms, some of them vividly reflecting linguocultural identity features of the society under analysis, with special attention to cultural code manifestation and world perception national peculiarities.

In dictionaries that concern with general language fixation much attention is given to the units that serve to represent the core of a concept, often actualized in a similar way in the whole English-speaking community space. In dictionary entries the information contains the example of use, most common synonyms, sometimes supplied by linguistic and cultural information, which accompanies the information on the linguistic unit usage peculiarities, and can be often connected with other units registered in the same dictionary, either semantically or conceptually. As for linguistic and cultural identity properties manifestation, it should be noted that the description of this phenomenon goes beyond the scope of this type of dictionary thus being a secondary task, although in some cases it contains linguocultural information that may be of some interest from the point of view of identity representation.

In a number of cases illustrative phraseology and corresponding contexts or commentaries may also serve the purpose.

As far as a bilingual (or multilingual) dictionary it is important to emphasize that its authors should be oriented towards conceptual differences in linguocultural identities of native speakers and non-native speakers, taking into account the factor of addressee who would presumably use the dictionary, thus corresponding to the user's perspective conception, which associates with educational dictionary compiling principles. This approach constitutes the integral part of the modern dictionary creating approach, which helps to achieve compatibility of people of different identities with respect to their conceptual spheres and world view peculiarities.

## REFERENCES

1. Aleksandrova, O. V., Akhrenova, N. A., Bakhtiozina, M. G. et al. (2023). *World languages and cultures as an object of philological investigation*. Moscow: Nauka publ. (in Russ.).
2. Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes. Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Akhrenova, N. A. & Zaripov, R. I. (2023). Linguopragmatic Scopes of Modern Media Texts. In: *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 14 (3), 801–817. DOI: 10.22363/2313-2299-2023-14-3-801-817.
4. McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an International Language: rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Lee, J. J. (2005). The Native Speaker: An Achievable Model? In: *Asian EFL Journal*, 7 (2), 152–163.
6. Sedykh, A. P., Emanuele, V. & Kugan, E. I. (2022). Linguistic and cultural identity: epistemological review. In: *Research Result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 8 (3), 20–37. DOI: 10.18413/2313-8912-2022-8-3-0-2.
7. Karasik, V. I. (2020). Social and linguistic identity: dynamics, virtualization, modeling. In: *Russian Language Abroad*, 1 (278), 31–37. DOI: 10.37632/pi.2020.278.1.006 (in Russ.).
8. Crystal, D. (2000). *Language death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Hamidi, S. (2023). The Relationship between Language, Culture, and Identity and their Influence on One Another. In: *Teaching Foreign Languages and Linguistic Studies : Referred Research Papers of 4th International Conference (Marmara University, Turkey, December 14th & 15th, 2023)*. Ankara: UZUN DİJİTAL MATBAA, pp. 40–59.
10. Maramukova, E. V. (2024). Linguistic projection of ethnospecific information in languages with different structures. In: *Key Issues of Contemporary Linguistics*, 3, 43–53. DOI: 10.18384/2949-5075-2024-3-43-53 (in Russ.).
11. Ter-Minasova, S. G. (2008). *Language and intercultural communication*. Moscow: Moscow University Press publ. (in Russ.).
12. Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
13. Vishnyakova, O. D. & Ivanova, O. A. (2025). Comparison in the author's fairy tales by F. Tegetthoff as part of the German-speaking society worldview. In: *Key Issues of Contemporary Linguistics*, S1, 79–92. DOI: 10.18384/2949-5075-2025-S1-79-92 (in Russ.).
14. Aleksandrova, O. V. (2023). The surrounding world: its codification and decodification. In: *Cognitive Studies of Language*, 5 (56), 15–18 (in Russ.).
15. Gvishiani, N. B. (2025). *Modern English: Lexicology*. Moscow: Yurait publ. (in Russ.).
16. Akhmanova, O. S. (1957). *Essays on General and Russian Lexicology*. Moscow: Uchpedgiz publ. (in Russ.).
17. Aleksandrova, O. V. & Vishnyakova, O. D. (2025). The problem of meaning in the works of O. S. Akhmanova in terms of expanding the boundaries of research. In: *Theoretical foundations of modern English studies*. Moscow: Nauka publ. (in Russ.).
18. Vishnyakova, O. D., Lipgart, A. A. & Lebedeva, I. L. (2025). Linguistic and Cultural Knowledge Interaction as a Basis for Country Studies Linguistic and Cultural Dictionary Compiling. In: *Issues in Journalism, Education, Linguistics*, 44 (2), 336–346. DOI: 10.52575/2712-7451-2025-44-2-336-346 (in Russ.).
19. Crystal, D. (2017). My priority for the next 50 years: An online cultural dictionary. In: *Training, Language and Culture*, 1 (1), 14–27. DOI: 10.29366/2017tlc.1.1.1.
20. Zabotkina, V. I. (2012). *Word and Meaning*. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities (in Russ.).
21. Fillmore, Ch. J. (1985). Frames and the semantics of understanding. In: *Quaderni di Semantica*, 6 (2), 222–254.
22. Fillmore, C. J. & Atkins, B. T. S. (1994). Starting where the dictionaries stop: The challenge for computational lexicography. In: Atkins, B. T. S. & Zampolli, A. (eds.). *Computational Approaches to the Lexicon*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 349–393.
23. Hartmann, R. R. K. (ed.) (1983). *Lexicography: Principles and Practice*. London: Academic press.
24. Lew, R. (2015). Dictionaries and Their Users. In: *International Handbook of Modern Lexis and Lexicography*. Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-45369-4\_11-2.

25. Vishnyakova, O. D. & Lipgart, A. A. (2024). Transferability and conceptual analysis as linguocognitive constituents of translation process. In: *Cognitive studies of language*, 2-2 (58), 276–279 (in Russ.).
26. Wierzbicka, A. (2021). “Semantic Primitives”, fifty years later. In: *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 25 (2), 317–342. DOI: 10.22363/2687-0088-2021-25-2-317-342.
27. Vishnyakova, O. D. (2015). The language sign in the referential field of the cultural memory of society. In: *Moscow University Bulletin. Series 19. Linguistics and Intercultural Communication*, 4, 50–66 (in Russ.).

#### ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Мировые языки и культуры как объект филологического исследования: коллективная монография / О. В. Александрова, Н. А. Ахренова, М. Г. Бахтиозина и др.; под общей ред. О. Д. Вишняковой, А. А. Липгарта; 2-е изд., испр. и доп. М.: Изд-во «Наука», 2023. 506 с.
2. Kirkpatrick A. *World Englishes. Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 257 p.
3. Ахренова Н. А., Зарипов Р. И. Лингвопрагматические характеристики современных медиатекстов (Linguopragmatic Scopes of Modern Media Texts) // *Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика*. 2023. Т. 14. № 3. С. 801–817. DOI: 10.22363/2313-2299-2023-14-3-801-817.
4. McKay S. L. *Teaching English as an International Language: rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. 150 p.
5. Lee J. J. The Native Speaker: An Achievable Model? // *Asian EFL Journal*. 2005. No. 7 (2). P. 152–163.
6. Седых А. П., Эмануэль В., Куган Е. И. Языковая и культурная идентичность: эпистемологический обзор (Linguistic and cultural identity: epistemological review) // *Научный результат. Вопросы теоретической и прикладной лингвистики*. 2022. Т. 8. № 3. С. 20–37. DOI: 10.18413/2313-8912-2022-8-3-0-2.
7. Карасик В. И. Социально-языковая идентичность: динамика, виртуализация, моделирование // *Русский язык за рубежом*. 2020. № 1 (278). С. 31–37. DOI: 10.37632/pi.2020.278.1.006.
8. Crystal D. *Language death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 209 p.
9. Hamidi S. The Relationship between Language, Culture, and Identity and their Influence on One Another // *Teaching Foreign Languages and Linguistic Studies : Referred Research Papers of 4th International Conference (Marmara University, Turkey, December 14th & 15th, 2023)*. Ankara: UZUN DİJİTAL MATBAA, 2023. P. 40–59.
10. Маремукова Э. В. Лингвистическая проекция лингвистической информации в разноструктурных языках // *Вопросы современной лингвистики*. 2024. № 3. С. 43–53. DOI: 10.18384/2949-5075-2024-3-43-53.
11. Тер-Минасова С. Г. *Язык и межкультурная коммуникация*. М.: Изд-во Московского университета, 2008. 352 с.
12. Wierzbicka A. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*; 2nd ed. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. 502 p.
13. Вишнякова О. Д., Иванова О. А. Сравнение в авторских сказках Ф. Тегеттгоффа в составе языковой картины мира немецкоговорящего социума // *Вопросы современной лингвистики*. 2025. № S1. С. 79–92. DOI: 10.18384/2949-5075-2025-S1-79-92.
14. Александрова О. В. Окружающий мир: его кодирование и декодирование в языке // *Когнитивные исследования языка*. 2023. № 5 (56). С. 15–18.
15. Гвишиани Н. Б. *Современный английский язык: лексикология: учебник для вузов; 4-е изд., перераб. и доп.* М.: Юрайт, 2025. 266 с.
16. Ахманова О. С. *Очерки по общей и русской лексикологии*. М.: Учпедгиз, 1957. 295 с.
17. Александрова О. В., Вишнякова О. Д. Проблема значения в трудах О. С. Ахмановой в терминах расширения исследовательских границ // *Теоретические основы современной англистики: коллективная монография / под общей ред. О. В. Александровой, О. Д. Вишняковой, Т. Б. Назаровой*. М.: Издательство «Наука», 2025. 290 с.
18. Вишнякова О. Д., Липгарт А. А., Лебедева И. Л. Взаимодействие языкового и культурного знания как основа создания лингвострановедческого словаря // *Вопросы журналистики, педагогики, языкознания*. 2025. Т. 44. № 2. С. 336–346. DOI: 10.52575/2712-7451-2025-44-2-336-346.

19. Crystal D. My priority for the next 50 years: An online cultural dictionary // *Training, Language and Culture*. 2017. Vol. 1. Iss. 1. P. 14–27. DOI: 10.29366/2017tlc.1.1.1.
20. Заботкина В. И. Слово и смысл. М.: РГГУ, 2012. 428 с.
21. Fillmore Ch. J. Frames and the semantics of understanding // *Quaderni di Semantica*. 1985. Vol. 6. No. 2. P. 222–254.
22. Fillmore C. J., Atkins B. T. S. Starting where the dictionaries stop: The challenge for computational lexicography // *Computational Approaches to the Lexicon* / eds. B. T. S. Atkins, A. Zampolli. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. P. 349–393.
23. *Lexicography: Principles and Practice* / ed. by R. R. K. Hartmann. London: Academic press, 1983. 228 p.
24. Lew R. Dictionaries and Their Users // *International Handbook of Modern Lexis and Lexicography*. Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2015. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-45369-4\\_11-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-45369-4_11-2).
25. Вишнякова О. Д., Липгарт А. А. Транслируемость и концептуальный анализ как лингвокогнитивные составляющие переводческого процесса // *Когнитивные исследования языка*. 2024. № 2-2 (58). С. 276–279.
26. Вежбицкая А. «Семантические примитивы», пятьдесят лет спустя (“Semantic Primitives”, fifty years later) // *Russian Journal of Linguistics*. 2021. № 25 (2). С. 317–342. DOI: 10.22363/2687-0088-2021-25-2-317-342.
27. Вишнякова О. Д. Языковой знак в референциальном поле культурной памяти социума // *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 19: Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация*. 2015. № 4. С. 50–66.

---

#### INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS

*Svetlana G. Ter-Minasova* (Moscow) – Dr. Sci. (Philology), Prof., Founding President, Faculty of Foreign Languages and Area Studies, Lomonosov Moscow State University;  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4274-6674>; e-mail: [president@fl.msu.ru](mailto:president@fl.msu.ru)

*Olga D. Vishnyakova* (Moscow) – Dr. Sci. (Philology), Prof., Department of English Linguistics, Faculty of Philology, Lomonosov Moscow State University;  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1617-051X>; e-mail: [ol-vish@mail.ru](mailto:ol-vish@mail.ru)

*Elizaveta A. Vishnyakova* (Tula) – Cand. Sci. (Philology), Assoc. Prof., Departmental Head, Department of English Language, Tula State Lev Tolstoy Pedagogical University;  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3133-9587>

#### ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРАХ

*Тер-Минасова Светлана Григорьевна* (г. Москва) – доктор филологических наук, профессор, президент-основатель факультета иностранных языков и регионоведения Московского государственного университета имени М. В. Ломоносова;  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4274-6674>; e-mail: [president@fl.msu.ru](mailto:president@fl.msu.ru)

*Вишнякова Ольга Дмитриевна* (г. Москва) – доктор филологических наук, профессор кафедры английского языкознания филологического факультета Московского государственного университета имени М. В. Ломоносова;  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1617-051X>; e-mail: [ol-vish@mail.ru](mailto:ol-vish@mail.ru)

*Вишнякова Елизавета Александровна* (г. Тула) – кандидат филологических наук, доцент, заведующий кафедрой английского языка Тульского государственного педагогического университета им. Л. Н. Толстого;  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3133-9587>