Hans-Dieter Kreuder. *Metasprachliche Lexikographie: Untersuchungen zur Kodifizierung der linguistischen Terminologie*. 2003, X + 271pp. Lexicographica. Series Maior 114. ISBN 3-484-39114-6. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. Price: €78.

This publication, which results from Kreuder's "Habilitationsschrift" of 2001 at the University of Marburg, investigates the development of terminological reference works in Germany within the field of linguistics, and approaches in the compilation of these works. Kreuder (2003: 3) defines "special-field terms in linguistics" or "linguistic terminology" as those terms belonging to a special class of lexical items on a metalinguistic level by means of which information about language can be conveyed. His main aim is to determine how linguists and lexicographers presented special-field linguistic terms up to the late 1990s, and to establish the usability of a wide range of especially German linguistic dictionaries with regard to the needs of the intended users. In this investigation, the conceptual strong points and weak points of the dictionaries under discussion are specifically mentioned.

Kreuder's study specifically describes the history and development of linguistic terminological dictionaries aimed at German-speaking users. It is therefore of primary importance to German-speaking readers who want to follow the history of this particular dictionary genre. Terminologists, lexicographers and linguists especially who regularly work with this type of terminology will benefit from taking note of this publication. For other users who do not work within the realm of German linguistic terminography, Kreuder's work may also be valuable, because it discusses specific problems of terminological dictionaries, notably with regard to linguistic terminology, which might also be valid for dictionaries of this nature in other languages. His findings and recommendations at the end of the book are of special interest.

In addition, the book gives the reader a good idea of the field of dictionary criticism, one of the components within the greater field of dictionary research (cf. Wiegand 1984). The second part of this book is particularly helpful in this regard, when Kreuder for instance investigates whether the titles and prefaces of the dictionaries correspond with the needs of the intended users, and with the resulting contents. In addition, he compares the lemma collections of selected dictionaries, as well as their way of presentation.

Kreuder also gives the reader an idea of how difficult it is to establish the terminology in a special field; the situation of German linguistic terminology can therefore serve as example for all those special fields in other languages where terminology has to be established. He sketches the debates, the problems, the failures of some projects, and finally the results of others, whether they were successful or not, and, if not successful, the reasons for their failure. One lesson that can be learnt from Kreuder's book is that work on a terminological dictionary, and especially a linguistic one, is never concluded. He describes many instances of dictionary projects which started out with great enthusiasm, but which were abandoned after some time, or others which only came into being very slowly.

The book is divided into two parts; the first part gives an overview of the development of some European and mostly German linguistic terminological reference works. Kreuder (2003: 169) aims to present a step-by-step description of the development of linguistic terminological dictionaries in Germany, in which he also takes into account the social-historical circumstances and the relationships between the various dictionaries.

Chapter 1 surveys the use of linguistic terminology in the nineteenth century, specifically with reference to the then current linguistic approaches such as the comparative-historical method (Kreuder 2003: 2, 5), which strove towards establishing grammatical research as a scientific discipline. The main problem of this period was the coining of numerous new terms in Germany (and elsewhere), and the question was hotly debated whether one should use the new German terminology, or adhere to the Latin, or even use both alongside each other. This debate reminds one of contemporary debates about the all-pervasiveness of world languages such as English in comparison with smaller, marginalised languages which have not established their own terminology, but wish to do so. Kreuder sketches the endless discussions about the pros and cons of using either Latin or German which took place among linguists (2003: 9-15), educators (2003: 15-22), and within the language society the Allgemeiner Deutscher Sprachverein (2003: 23-27).

Chapters 2 and 3 deal with the planning of linguistic terminological dictionaries in the first three decades of the twentieth century in Germany and within a wider European context. This period signifies the first attempts to codify linguistic terminology, in order to establish a unified terminology for use in schools and universities. This process started in 1906 in France, at a conference where several national committees were formed to work together on a "terminology which will suit all languages", but each committee concentrated only on the terms in its own language (Kreuder 2003: 29). A Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology, formed in England in 1908 after a conference of the Classical Association, was explicitly commissioned for finding terms in five languages, namely English, German, French, Latin and Greek (Kreuder 2003: 31). These large-scale efforts faced resistance in several countries. German-speaking countries were, however, inspired to deal with terminological issues more intensively, as can for instance be seen in the formation of the Neuphilologischer Verein in Vienna (Kreuder 2003: 33). There were plans for a *Wörterbuch der sprachwissenschaftlichen Terminologie* (WST) in Germany and a *Léxique de la terminologie linguistique* in France. It seems, however, that in the German-speaking world, the debate for or against the use of German instead of Latin terms became a big, and even political, issue during the years between the two World Wars (cf., for example, Kreuder's description of Krüger's plea for "real German", and against "gibberish" which "poisons the German nation, its nature as well as its language" (Kreuder 2003: 39)).

In the 1920s, differences in the aims of linguists versus philological scholars in general came to the fore, when the former group wanted to make allow-

ance for the entire special field of their discipline, while the latter group was more interested in the nomenclature of school grammar (Kreuder 2003: 53). At the First International Linguistic Conference in The Hague in 1928, this effort of linguists to avoid parochialism was stressed, and it was explicitly mentioned that terminological problems could never be solved if researchers from all the countries did not cooperate. Each country had to work on its own terms, which would then be scrutinised by a central committee. All these plans took a very long time to be realised. In September 1932, however, the central committee had its first session in Frankfurt, where the first specimen articles were scrutinised. It became clear that this enterprise was a very difficult one, because the semantic delineations of the terms in the different languages were so different. After this Frankfurt conference, the chairperson of the commission, Schrijnen, circulated a questionnaire in which different equivalents had to be evaluated. Interesting facts became evident from the outcomes of this questionnaire. It was revealed that many languages, amongst which Afrikaans, lacked a large number of these terms or their terminology was based on completely different systems of approach (Kreuder 2003: 54-61). Later, in the 1930s, the political situation in Germany made international cooperation too difficult, and the commission dissolved after Schrijnen's death and Jakobson's exile in America.

The first comprehensive work on linguistic terminology appeared in 1933 from the hand of the French linguist and Latinist Marouzeau under the title *Léxique de la terminologie linguistique* (Kreuder 2003: 65-69). He already started working on this dictionary before the outbreak of the First World War. Schmitt compiled some specimen articles for the planned WST and published them in an addendum to the 51st volume of the journal *Indogermanistischen Forschungen* (Kreuder 2003: 70-73).

Chapter 4 treats linguistic terminological dictionaries from 1940–1960, specifically within German-speaking countries. By the beginning of the 1940s, the influence of the comparative-historical method in linguistic studies had waned, and structuralism became popular, which meant that there were various national schools in the different countries, each with its own conceptual tools. Because of the political circumstances, Germany was isolated, and this also had its impact on German linguistics (or "Sprachwissenschaft" as it was mostly called) — an isolation which was only broken in the 1960s. During this period, however, many linguistic terminological dictionaries appeared in Germany (Kreuder 2003: 74).

The long-awaited WST, for which the plans had already started before the First World War, never came into being, even though several scholars worked on it, and in spite of several efforts to revive it (Kreuder 2003: 75-78). The first German terminological dictionary of linguistics by Hofmann and Rubenhauer appeared in 1950 in Heidelberg under the title *Wörterbuch der grammatischen und metrischen Terminologie*, which contained very short explanations (according to Kreuder 2003: 81, "in telegram style", therefore often leading to misinterpretation). After this dictionary, preparations were made by Wissmann in Ber-

lin to undertake the compilation of the *Historisches Wörterbuch der sprachwissenschaftlichen Terminologie* (HWST). His concept included all European languages with regard to their grammar; to its descriptive-definitorial function, he also added a historical one (Kreuder 2003: 85). He realised that this would be a very scholarly publication, and therefore also aimed at publishing an additional "smaller one for students". This effort, however, got stuck in methodological problems related to the historical basis of the project, so that by 1967 it was abandoned (Kreuder 2003: 85-89).

Kreuder furthermore discusses the *Sprachwissenschaftliches Wörterbuch*, of which a first group of lemmata was published in 1961 by Knobloch from Innsbruck. It was intended as a type of textbook, with useful information on the origins and usage of terminology. In the last forty years, additional sections had appeared from time to time, and the first complete volume was published in 1986. By 1998, however, this work had only treated terms up to G in the alphabet (Kreuder 2003: 89-94, 154-155).

Chapter 5 discusses the changes in approach to linguistic terminological dictionaries during the 1960s and 1970s, and the rapid development of linguistic terminography in Germany. While by the mid-1960s in the United States of America the phrase-structure grammar had already been replaced by a standard model of the transformational grammar, structural linguistics was vehemently gaining ground in Germany. This brought about the coining of many new terms, and a different approach in defining these. Kreuder (2003: 96-131) discusses various works which were published during this period.

Dictionaries which appeared in the German Democratic Republic range from, e.g Lang (1967) who took the terminology of the transformational generative grammar into account, via Helbig (1969) who included terms from all linguistic areas, to Conrad with his *Kleines Wörterbuch sprachwissenschaftlicher Termini* (1975), which had second and third editions in 1978 and 1981 respectively, and his *Lexikon sprachwissenschaftlicher Termini* (1985), and its second edition of 1988. In the Federal Republic of Germany, there were dictionaries such as the ones by Ludewig (1969) that was much criticised; Bohusch (1972) who included a wider range of terms than Ludewig, but whose dictionary was not very informative; Rucktäschel (1971ff) who, over a period of time, published terms in consecutive volumes of the journal *Linguistik und Didaktik*; Ulrich (1972) whose dictionary had a second edition in 1975, a third in 1981, and a fourth in 1987; Heupel (1973) that had a second edition in 1975, and a third in 1978; Lewandowski (1973–1975) who gave detailed references to literature, including that of Eastern Europe, making it the best dictionary with regard to the richness of information it provides, so that the second edition of 1976 was followed by a third in 1979–1980, a fourth in 1984–85, and a fifth edition in 1990; Welte (1974); Abraham (1974) with a second edition in 1988; and Stammerjohan (1975).

Chapter 6 presents an overview of linguistic terminological dictionaries published in the 1980s and up to the 1990s. New dictionaries which were added

to the wide range of further revised editions of the existing ones, were those by Spiewok et al., one in 1976 with the title *Wörterbuch grammatischer Termini*, and one in 1977 with the title *Wörterbuch stilistischer Termini*. Others were compiled by Bräuer and Bartels (1979) and by Bußmann (1983), the latter having had a second edition in 1990.

Kreuder concludes the first part of his book by stating that all these efforts resulted in a wide range of dictionaries differing from each other with regard to their lemma selection, way of presentation, and the quality of the information given. A comprehensive dictionary which would be informative to all students and scholars of German linguistics does not yet exist (Kreuder 2003: 164). Most of the discussed dictionaries not only exhibit conceptual flaws, because of the individualistic selection principles on which they are based, but also show many tendencies towards experimentation with regard to the textual presentation of data.

According to Kreuder (2003: 167), German linguistic terminology is still in its infancy in spite of the many publications on lexicography which tried to lay the foundation for this type of dictionary. To illustrate this claim, the second part of Kreuder's book presents an analysis of certain features of selected dictionaries published between 1967 and 1990. For example, in Chapter 7, viewpoints are discussed on what exactly is understood by the terms *lemma* and *dictionary article* in the different dictionaries. Here, Kreuder also refers to scholarly works dealing with lexicographic terminology, such as Zgusta (1971) (cf. Kreuder 2003: 173-174 and 177-179), and Wiegand (1983), who especially aims to provide a conceptual framework within which lexicographers can plan their dictionaries better by using the terminological tools he introduces. Wiegand identifies an entire network of terms relating to the notions *lemma* and *dictionary article* (Kreuder 2003: 174-175).

In his empirical analysis, Kreuder not only investigates the outer form of the dictionaries, the manner of arrangement and the presentation of the special-field contents, but also the lemma selection and the quality of the explanations (Kreuder 2003: 1). He wants to demonstrate the unique characteristics of the lemma collection, of the article structures, of the information presented, and of the relative emphasis of the different dictionaries on certain areas within linguistics (Kreuder 2003: 169). His aim is to show the strong and the weak points of the dictionaries, and contradictions which may present themselves.

Chapter 8 introduces several obligatory and optional building components of dictionary articles which Kreuder considers as important in special-field dictionaries. The lemma is one such obligatory component (2003: 181-182), as is the lexicographic definition (2003: 182-185). Optional components are, for example, items indicating pronunciation, grammatical items, foreign-language equivalents, abbreviations of terms, synonyms, items indicating usage, antonyms, etymological information, examples, and bibliographical details.

In Chapter 9, Kreuder looks at the titles and the prefaces of the above-mentioned dictionaries in order to establish whether the contents in the dic-

tionaries fit their descriptions. It becomes clear that the titles of most of the dictionaries create problems, because in most cases, the compilers do not explicitly state their viewpoints on whether "linguistics" is meant as a generic term, and whether the German term "Sprachwissenschaft" is synonymous with "Linguistik" or rather stands in a hyponymic relationship with it. Kreuder gives a graphic illustration in which the dictionaries under discussion are classified according to their titles (2003: 199). For example, seven of the dictionaries in question used titles indicating the specific area within the special field (e.g. Spiewok et al.'s titles *Wörterbuch grammatischer Termini* (1976) and *Wörterbuch stilistischer Termini* (1977)). The rest of the dictionaries have titles which do not specify the exact special field. In this category, Kreuder distinguishes between the ones which use the term *Sprachwissenschaft/sprachwissenschaftlich* (e.g. Conrad's *Kleines Wörterbuch sprachwissenschaftlicher Termini*) and the ones using the term *Linguistik/linguistisch*. The latter category is divided into those with specifying delimitation of the topic (e.g. Abraham's *Terminologie zur neueren Linguistik* (1975)) and those without a delimitation (e.g. Lewandowski's *Linguistisches Wörterbuch*).

Even when the prefaces to the dictionaries are analysed, it seems that most of the lexicographers did not give explicit specifications about the title and its relationship to the contents of the dictionary or to the potential users. By means of a graphic illustration, Kreuder (2003: 203) classifies selected dictionaries according to the use of *Sprachwissenschaft* or *Linguistik* in their titles, comparing these descriptions with the statements in their prefaces. There are those, for example, which consider *Linguistik* as a synchronic study only (e.g. Heupel 1973), and those which see it as both a synchronic and diachronic study. The latter group can be subdivided into those which present a selective lemma collection (e.g. Stammerjohan (1975), who concentrates on specific themes, and Helbig (1969), who concentrates on certain aspects of terms), and those which strive towards presenting a universal lemma collection. Of the latter class, some are still in progress (e.g. Knobloch 1961ff), and others are already completed. These completed dictionaries can be divided into those with a specific circle of addressees (e.g. Ulrich 1972) and those with a more general circle of addressees. Once again, this category can be subdivided into those concentrating on older linguistic research, newer linguistic research, or the latest linguistic research.

Chapter 10 compares the lemma selection of several closely related dictionaries. When one looks at Kreuder's exposition of lemma list samples (2003: 204-205, 206-208), it is remarkable how many lemma gaps occur in the various dictionaries. This is all the more disturbing when one considers that some of the dictionaries claim to be "comprehensive" with regard to their lemma selection. This becomes even more complex when Kreuder states that most of the lexicographers did not mention their selection criteria at all — seemingly most of them were simply intuitive in their selection (2003: 210). In addition, when they claim that terms in "general use" were included, there is no mentioning of

criteria according to which the frequency of usage was determined (Kreuder 2003: 211). He suggests that, to determine frequency of use, the methods used in contemporary corpus lexicography can also be applied in linguistic terminology.

Chapter 11 presents a comparative study of a specific lemma (the lemma *freie Angabe*) as it was treated in selected dictionaries. The notion *freie Angabe* stems from valency theory. Of the nineteen dictionaries Kreuder investigated, six do not present the lemma *freie Angabe* at all. Six others only have the lemma *Angabe*, but do not use it in the sense it has in valency theory. The remaining nine dictionaries do refer, under the lemma *Angabe*, to the meaning of *freie Angabe*, as determined in valency theory, but only one (Abraham 1974) specifically mentions the expression *freie Angabe* as such. The definitions differ widely, and the semantic content of the term *freie Angabe* is therefore also presented in various ways. This applies not only to the obligatory components of the dictionary articles, but even more so to the optional components. In a graphic illustration, Kreuder (2003: 234) points out that Lewandowski's fourth and fifth editions exhibit the most items with optional components, namely terminological synonyms, antonyms, area of usage, etymology, examples, and bibliographical references which could elucidate the term *freie Angabe*.

Finally, Kreuder draws some conclusions by means of which he hopes to give some guidelines for future dictionaries of linguistic terminology. He fears that the picture is very negative with regard to a systematic presentation of linguistic contents in the dictionaries under consideration (Kreuder 2003: 238). In order to obtain dictionaries which serve their purposes better, and which are compiled according to a more systematic approach, Kreuder suggests the following:

(a)   In the planning of terminographies such as these, the target group has to be specified more explicitly. The wider the intended user group, the more difficult it is to plan the lemma selection and the special-field content of the dictionary articles.

(b)   The title and subtitle should reflect the function of the planned dictionary, and the needs of the intended users. In addition, the preface should explicitly mention the intended user group and the related criteria for the lemma selection and presentation of the special-field data.

(c)   Bibliographical references are important for this type of dictionary. There should not only be a list of authors, but also useful references with dates of publication and page numbers.

(d)   The ways of presenting cross-references should be carefully considered. These should not confuse users.

(e)   In the front matter of such dictionaries, guidelines should be included about the way of using the dictionary and the manner of the data presentation. A glossary of foreign language terms is useful, and a bibliography is necessary.

(f)   For this type of dictionary, teamwork is better than operating as an individual. The field of linguistics is so specialised that no single person has a mastery of all its aspects. Cooperation should be established, with strict rules and good communication to ensure consistent treatment of the data.

(g)   Dictionaries of this type should not be planned to have a very long life. Rather, the possibility should be created to revise them frequently, and for this, the computer is an excellent medium, because dictionaries could be placed on the internet or on CD-ROM. If this is not possible, a card filing system is also acceptable, where cards for newer editions could replace older ones.

(h)   Publishers and lexicographers should be realistic in their planning. They should always take the needs of the potential users into account.

Bibliography

Wiegand, H.E. 1983. Was ist eigentlich ein Lemma? Ein Beitrag zur Theorie der lexikographischen Sprachbeschreibung. Wiegand, H.E. (Ed.). 1983. *Studien zur neuhochdeutschen Lexikographie III. Germanistische Linguistik* 1–4/1982: 401-474. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms.

Wiegand, H.E. 1984. On the Structure and Contents of a General Theory of Lexicography. Hartmann, R.R.K (Ed.). 1984. *LEXeter '83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9–12 September 1983*: 13-30. Lexicographica. Series Maior 1. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Zgusta, L. 1971. *Manual of Lexicography*. Janua Linguarum. Series Maior 39. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.

Maria Smit
Department of Music
University of Stellenbosch
Stellenbosch
Republic of South Africa
(msmit@sun.ac.za)