

**The treatment of culture-bound lexical items in bilingual
dictionaries intended for a multilingual environment**

Karen Hendriks



Thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Philosophy in Lexicography at the University of Stellenbosch

Professor R.H. Gouws

December 2003

Declaration:

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it at any university for a degree.

Summary

Bilingual dictionaries play an extremely important role in a multilingual society; they can be perceived as the key instruments in the communication between different groups and speech communities. Efficient and active communication between different cultural groups is essential in the South African environment. Culture-bound lexical items and the way they are treated in bilingual dictionaries can have a great influence on this process of communication. It is evident that the misrepresentation of culture-bound lexical items in bilingual dictionaries could seriously impede communication rather than enhance it. It is of great importance that lexicographers should provide users of the dictionary with adequate guidance in their treatment of these items. In order to equip the user with the necessary skills and knowledge, the treatment of culture-bound items should go beyond the mere provision of a translation equivalent. Translation equivalents should be supplemented and supported by illustrative markers, labels, glosses, usage notes and pictorial illustrations could be of use.

The particular needs of a multilingual society imply certain adaptations to the structure and nature of a bilingual dictionary. The bilingual dictionary should be adapted in terms of form, content as well as structure in order to be able to present and treat a representative amount of cultural data in a comprehensive manner. The material used for the dictionary basis should be representative of the culture of the speakers; the linguistic and cultural reality that confronts the speakers daily should be reflected in the dictionary, language contact and change should be acknowledged. Many South African languages still have a strong tradition of oral literature and the relation of oral and written texts should be represented realistically in the dictionary basis.

Opsomming

Vertalende woordeboeke speel 'n sleutelrol in die veeltalige omgewing. Hulle is naamlik van kardinale belang in die kommunikasie tussen verskillende taalgemeenskappe. In die Suid-Afrikaanse konteks is effektiewe kommunikasie en oop kanale tussen verskillende groepe van kardinale belang. Kultuurspesifieke leksikale items en die opname en hantering van hierdie items in vertalende woordeboeke kan 'n groot invloed uitoefen op die proses van kommunikasie tussen verskillende taalgemeenskappe. Onakkurate of onvoldoende hantering van hierdie items kan ernstige misverstande tot gevolg hê en sodoende skade doen aan die proses van kommunikasie.

Leksikografe moet die gebruiker van die woordeboek voldoende leiding gee rakende die betekenis en gebruik van kultuurspesifieke leksikale items. Die gebruiker moet ook in 'n woordeboek leiding kry om die kulturele konteks van 'n gespreksituasie te kan begryp. Die hantering van kultuurspesifieke leksikale items in vertalende woordeboeke moet meer behels as die voorsiening van vertaalekwivalente. Dit moet vir die gebruiker van die woordeboek moontlik wees om kennis van die kultuur van 'n ander taalgemeenskap op te doen, asook om sy of haar kommunikasievaardighede te ontwikkel deur die gebruik van die woordeboek. Om dit te bewerkstellig, is dit nodig dat die vertaalekwivalente wat vir kultuurspesifieke leksikale items voorsien word, aangevul word deur onder andere merkers, etikette, glosse, gebruiksnotas en illustrasies.

Die behoeftes van die gebruiker van die vertalende woordeboek in die veeltalige omgewing impliseer dat daar sekere aanpassings gemaak moet word aan die aard en struktuur van die vertalende woordeboek. Die vertalende woordeboek wat gemik is op 'n gebruiker in 'n veeltalige en multikulturele omgewing, moet in terme van die vorm, inhoud en struktuur aangepas word om sodoende 'n verteenwoordigende hoeveelheid van kulturele data op 'n omvattende, sinvolle wyse te kan aanbied. Die materiaal wat vir die basis van die woordeboek gebruik word, moet verteenwoordigend wees van die kultuur van die sprekers. Die woordeboek moet die werklikheid waarmee die gebruiker daagliks gekonfronteer word, in die aanbieding van data en die samestelling van die sentrale woordelys reflekteer. Die tradisie van

orale letterkunde speel vandag nog `n daadwerklike rol in die lewe van baie Suid Afrikaners en dit moet ook in die woordeboek verreken word.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summery

Opsomming

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER ONE

BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES IN A MULTILINGUAL ENVIRONMENT

1.1 Introduction	9
1.2 The needs of users	11
1.3 The functions of a bilingual dictionary	12
1.4 The qualities of the learner's dictionary	14
1.5 The representation of cultural data	19
1.6 In conclusion	22

CHAPTER TWO

CULTURE-BOUND LEXICAL ITEMS

2.1 What is culture?	24
2.2 What is a culture-bound lexical item?	26
2.3 Representing cultural data in dictionaries	33

CHAPTER THREE

SELECTING THE LEMMA CANDIDATES

3.1 Introduction	39
3.2 Selecting material for the dictionary basis	42
3.3 Working with a corpus	44
3.4 Accommodating the oral tradition of a language	46
3.5 The role of other dictionaries	49
3.6 Formulating a policy	50
3.7 Frequency counts	52
3.8 The situation of language contact and its influence	55
3.8.1 Language change	55
3.8.2 Cultural contact and the implications for the selection of lemma candidates	56
3.9 In conclusion	57

CHAPTER FOUR

MICROSTRUCTURAL TREATMENT OF CULTURE SPECIFIC LEXICAL ITEMS

4.1 Introduction	59
4.1.1 Data types to be found in the microstructure	59
4.1.2 Data distribution	63
4.1.3 The presentation of cultural data in the microstructure	64
4.2 The translation equivalent	64

4.3 Equivalent relations	70
4.3.1 Full equivalence	70
4.3.2 Partial equivalence	73
4.3.2.1 Lexical divergence	74
4.3.2.2 Semantic divergence	74
4.3.2.3 Differentiating between translation equivalents	76
4.3.3 Surrogate Equivalence	78
4.4 Additional data	80
4.5 Illustrative examples	86
4.6 Encyclopedic data	88
4.7 Pictorial illustrations	91
4.8 Structural markers, labels, glosses and usage notes	100
4.8.1 Structural markers	101
4.8.2 Labels	103
4.8.3 Glosses	107
4.8.4 Usage notes	109
4.9 In conclusion	110

CHAPTER FIVE

THE TREATMENT OF IDIOMS AS CULTURE-BOUND LEXICAL ITEMS

5.1 Introduction	112
-------------------------	------------

5.2 Idioms and Culture	112
5.3 The placement of idioms	113
5.4 Providing translation equivalents for idioms	116

CHAPTER SIX

USING A FRAME STRUCTURE FOR THE PRESENTATION OF CULTURAL

DATA	122
-------------	------------

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION	133
-------------------	------------

REFERENCES

Dictionaries	138
Other sources	139

INTRODUCTION

There can be no doubt of the potential value and power of a dictionary. This has already been proven many times over in many countries and cultures worldwide. However, it cannot be denied that the potential of dictionaries are not always fully realized, both by writers and users. In order for a dictionary to be valuable to the user, the purpose and functions of a dictionary should be determined by the needs of the users and the linguistic and cultural environment that the dictionary is intended for. If one looks at the history of lexicography, it is evident that culture and society have throughout the ages dictated the development of dictionaries and on the grounds of the needs of users prescribed certain purposes for dictionaries to serve. According to Al-Kasimi “each culture fosters the development of dictionaries appropriate to its characteristic demands” (1977:1). In *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography* (Hausmann, Reichmann, Wiegand and Zgusta (eds.), 1989-1991:2712), (henceforth abbreviated as WDD) it is written that in recent times bilingual lexicography has served a variety of purposes determined by the development of society. Dictionaries originally developed not as theoretical instruments, but as practical tools. The motives behind the rise of lexicography differ from one culture to another: dictionaries developed in different parts of the world for (amongst others) practical, religious, educational and political reasons.

In the preface of WDD the editors write that the main reason for the existence of lexicographic sources of information has been the need for mutual comprehension in spite of the multiplicity of

languages, the existence of many variants of one language, and the constant changeability of language.

The purpose of this study is to determine the potential value of a dictionary within an environment where there is a multiplicity of languages and cultures and the need for mutual comprehension. I intend to focus on how the potential value of a bilingual dictionary can be realized within such a diverse environment. In particular, the role of bilingual dictionaries in a multilingual environment, such as South Africa, and the involvement of culture in language and dictionaries will be investigated. The way culture-bound lexical items are treated in bilingual dictionaries has a substantial effect on the value of the dictionary for the user; misrepresentation of these items could seriously impede mutual comprehension rather than enhance it. I will mainly work with dictionaries treating Afrikaans and English along with other South African languages.

The term “multiplicity of languages” is certainly applicable to South Africa. Since 1994 South Africa has eleven official languages, including nine African languages. From approximately 1926 until 1994 Afrikaans and English were the only official languages. The decision to promote only Afrikaans and English as official languages during that period of time had strong political as well as linguistic motivations. Both languages were in use throughout the country, whilst the official usage of African languages were geographically restricted. Afrikaans and English were consequently used on a national basis and the African languages on a regional basis, yet the African languages were kept alive and developing due to active use in their respective speech communities (Gouws 1995:297, 298).

On the one hand, this situation resulted in constant language contact and dynamic language change, which makes the South African lexicographer's task very exiting and challenging. On the other hand, the fact that two non-African¹ languages were established as official languages and that the nine African languages were restricted to regional usage for such a long period of time, meant that whilst Afrikaans was given the opportunity to develop and to standardize up to the point of being equal to English, none of the African languages had the support and opportunity to develop linguistically and lexicographically in the way Afrikaans had.

The above-mentioned results have implications for the compilation of dictionaries treating African languages. For instance: many of the African languages do not have a well developed corpus of written texts and still have a large and active tradition of oral literature. As a matter of fact, orature (oral literature) is central to the culture of the African people. A large amount of oral texts would thus have to be represented in the dictionary basis, which takes much more time and resources than using a corpus of written texts. Yet, the lexicographer has to keep in mind the fact that the use of language in orature differs vastly from the way the language is used in, for example, colloquial speech. Often the language used in orature is more lyrical and sometimes archaic forms, idioms and expressions are used that are no longer in active use in the everyday speech of the speaker.

Dictionaries should present a realistic account of language and when a language mainly exists in the spoken form with an oral, rather than written, literature for reference, the lexicographer should adapt the process of selecting entries to this reality, and should inform the user of

¹ I realize that it can be problematic to label Afrikaans as a non-African language, since it developed on African soil, even if its basis is European. I will not attempt to resolve this issue here and I refer to Afrikaans as non-African in

alterations to the selection process. Another factor that would have to be considered by the lexicographer is that most of the African languages have not yet developed a sophisticated and comprehensive body of technical terms. On the other hand, Afrikaans, and English even more so, does have a wide-ranging collection of technical terminology, of which at least a reasonable amount would have to be included in the central wordlist of a standard or general bilingual dictionary. The lexicographer would have to determine how this problem could be addressed in the planning of a bilingual dictionary treating an African language alongside Afrikaans or English. This problem is especially relevant in the case of learners' dictionaries intended for the classroom situation. Pupils are greatly disadvantaged by having no mother tongue terms to learn when it comes to the technical side of matters. This is one of the important needs of the user that the lexicographer of such a dictionary would have to deal with.

South Africa is a country with a complicated political history, which cannot be severed from sensitive issues concerning language and communication. The policy of *apartheid* was formulated by the National Party, a predominantly Afrikaans speaking political party. Apartheid had a far-reaching influence on the South African people as well as their languages, especially Afrikaans. Afrikaans has for a long time been perceived as the language of the oppressor, which caused the occurrence of lexical stigmatization (Gouws 1993:33). Another result of the apartheid ideology is that it severely influenced the attitude of speakers towards the culture and even language of other speech communities. Many of the prejudices that were formed in that era are still relevant today and have to be addressed by the lexicographer of a South African bilingual dictionary, who has the opportunity to act as a mediator between language systems as well as communities and cultures.

order to distinguish Afrikaans from the African languages that I am referring to.

The process of acknowledging the truth of the past and working towards reconciliation between different groups and between individuals in South Africa has been on its way for several years. Nevertheless, the people of South Africa still have a long way to go in order to be able to genuinely celebrate their diversity rather than being threatened by it. Dictionaries, particularly bilingual dictionaries, have the potential power to take linguistic affirmative action and to become cultural and depoliticizing instruments. Bilingual dictionaries can make a vital contribution to the process of building a nation out of diverse speech communities and cultures in South Africa.

The Pan South African Language Board (PanSALB) was established in 1995. Some of its aims are: the creation of conditions for the development and for the promotion of the equal use and enjoyment of all the official South African languages; the extension of those rights relating to language and the status of languages which before 27 April 1994 were restricted to certain regions and the promotion of multilingualism. PanSALB was also responsible for the establishment of National Lexicography Units (NLUs) for all the official languages. It would seem that the work of PanSALB has already gone a long way towards the recognition of the wrongs of the past in terms of language and lexicography. The aims PanSALB has set as well as the work of the NLUs can work towards making a future possible in which all the South African official languages will have the opportunity to grow and develop equally.

It is of great importance that the lexicographers that are trained at the NLUs take the responsibility to fulfill the aims that PanSALB has set, and develop a sensitivity towards the extent of the impact of the past on the present day lexicographic situation. These lexicographers

should be aware of the responsibility that they have towards their users and of the huge consequence of the treatment of cultural issues in the dictionaries that they write. Gouws (1995:296, 1996a:55) writes that dictionaries are employed as linguistic instruments within any speech community. He also states that the dictionary that is to be used in a multilingual and multicultural environment cannot only be a container of linguistic knowledge but should also be a source of pragmatic and cultural data - such a dictionary cannot function only as a linguistic instrument, but it must also function as a cultural instrument. Dictionaries are not merely instruments in the hands of users, they also have a certain status as authoritative sources of information. Due to the fact that users regard a dictionary as an authoritative voice, lexicography is in the ideal position to play an important role in the process of communication. The status and 'authority' of the dictionary emphasizes the lexicographer's responsibility towards the user and the language to present a realistic account of the target language and to serve the needs of the user.

The complicated political history and the multicultural society makes mutual comprehension and effective communication one of the most important needs of the potential user of a bilingual dictionary in South Africa. And it makes the bilingual dictionary one of the most important lexicographic instruments. In order for the process of communication between speakers of different language groups to be successful there should be mutual comprehension of the different cultures. This sense of understanding should be one of the greatest aims of the lexicographer, especially considering the political background and the prejudices that probably still, to a certain degree, prevails between different cultural groups in South Africa. The dictionary has the potential to be the ideal medium to represent the culture of the speaker in an impartial and informative way. Unfortunately, in South Africa lexicographers often do not give a realistic and

representative account of the cultural reality in their treatment of the lexicon, thus they cannot really serve or aid the user in forming an understanding of the culture of the speakers of the target language.

To summarize: A dictionary can potentially be of great value when it answers to the needs and demands of the target user, culture and the environment that it is intended for. In South Africa the multilingual environment demands good bilingual dictionaries that can be used in the process of day to day communication. The potential users of a bilingual dictionary need the dictionary to help them understand the culture and language of other speakers, need the dictionary to help them communicate with speakers from other cultures though possibly from the same community or region. In such a diverse and multilingual environment, many users of bilingual dictionaries will be learners, and the lexicographer has to foresee that and adapt his dictionary to the skills and needs of these learners as well.

Bilingual dictionaries can furthermore be of great value to the community if they can help to correct some of the wrongs of the past and to foster understanding and acceptance of cultural and political differences through the way they present the language and its speakers. In order for a bilingual dictionary to perform all these tasks, the structure, form, content and general appearance of the traditional bilingual dictionary might need to be altered. Throughout the course of this study the possible changes and improvements that could be made to the traditional bilingual dictionary in order to create a better dictionary intended for the South African user will be considered. The aim is to indicate how lexicographers can represent the culture of the speakers realistically and how the traditional bilingual dictionary can become an essential and valuable practical tool for the user.

In Chapter One the role of bilingual dictionaries in a multilingual environment will be discussed in general terms. The following chapter will give an introduction to the concept of culture-bound lexical items and culture and lexicography. After the first two preliminary chapters there will follow more detailed discussions of the treatment of culture-bound lexical items and the adaptations that could be made to bilingual dictionaries in order to satisfy the needs and demands of a multilingual and multicultural environment sufficiently. The examples used to support the arguments will mostly be from Afrikaans and English bilingual dictionaries. Eventually I would hope that the statements and suggestions made during the course of this thesis could be of some help to lexicographers facing the challenge of dealing with culture in their dictionaries.

CHAPTER ONE

BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES IN A MULTILINGUAL ENVIRONMENT

1.1 Introduction

Dictionaries are sources of information. The kind of data that a dictionary presents should depend on the type and size of the dictionary, on the needs of the users, their dictionary skills, the dictionary culture of the speech community and the environment that the dictionary is intended for. Hartmann (1989:103) states that an analysis of users' needs should precede dictionary design. Speakers living in a multilingual environment such as South Africa have "the need for mutual comprehension in spite of the multiplicity of languages". Mutual comprehension is in actual fact imperative for a linguistically and culturally diverse society to function with reasonable success. Bilingual dictionaries could, and should be very valuable tools in the process of communication and enhancing mutual comprehension.

Before we can discuss the role of the bilingual dictionary in a multilingual and multicultural environment it is important to establish what exactly is meant when one refers to a bilingual dictionary. Hausmann et al. (1991:2712) writes: "Normally the term bilingual dictionary is applied to dictionaries of two national languages, where the source language lemmas of the dictionary are supplied with equivalents in the target language. Such a dictionary may be general, specialized or a mixture of the two." The term "bilingual dictionary" belongs to the category of translation dictionaries. Translation dictionaries deal with two or more languages and provide target language translation equivalents of source language lexical items, rather than statements about the meaning of source language items like users and even some lexicographers

commonly assume. In the *English-Zulu Dictionary* (1982) the lexicographer states in the “Prefatory Note to Part One”: “In regard to the meanings of words, as far as possible Zulu equivalents or nearest equivalents are given.” This statement could easily confuse readers and bring them under the impression that translation equivalents are statements about the meaning of words.

There are several subtypological categories of translation dictionaries, there are different relationships of equivalence and there is a multitude of options for the lexicographer wanting to compile a bilingual dictionary. Hausmann et al (1991:2713) writes: “There can thus be extremely varied bilingual dictionary concepts and consequently widely differing editorial principles for the actual dictionaries.” Dictionaries may perhaps be much more effective in achieving the objectives set for them by lexicographers and in satisfying the user’s needs and expectations, if lexicographers and users were more specific in the choices they make when writing and buying a dictionary. Yet, the reality, in South Africa at least, is that publishers and lexicographers alike do not always have the luxury to indulge in the compilation of a dictionary for an exclusive and specialized purpose and even less to create four or six or even eight dictionaries for a language pair although this might be the ideal as suggested by some lexicographers, and the user mostly doesn’t have the luxury or inclination to buy a dictionary of every kind for every need. According to certain scholars the average user would not question the authority of the dictionary, nor would he/she pause to consider whether the dictionary would be able to provide all the information required. Thus, the average user would probably not realize or comprehend the importance of choosing the specific type of dictionary that would be the most suitable for the task that it is going to be used for. Educating the users and developing dictionary skills, for example

in schools, colleges or at university, could solve this problem. However, this is a separate issue that will not be discussed here.

1.2 The needs of users

Hartmann (1989:104) claims that it must be questioned whether a single dictionary could satisfy all the possible reference needs. He writes:

“Different groups (or even individuals performing different social roles or activities) are likely to have different information requirements [...] it is also very likely that users’ needs may change from place to place and from time to time.”

This is definitely true. When you are dealing with a multicultural society where you have such a diversity of speech communities, there will without doubt be a vast variety of information requirements to fulfill. Gouws (1996:18) writes: “One bilingual dictionary cannot be everything to everyone.”

Considering the situation in South Africa, it seems that, on the one hand, a single dictionary cannot endeavor complying with the needs of a heterogeneous group of users and, on the other hand, many South African users cannot afford several dictionaries or they just might not see the need to acquire several dictionaries. Gouws states that the majority of one-dictionary owners in a multilingual society possess bilingual dictionaries rather than monolingual dictionaries. Bilingual dictionaries are often the only instruments used to meet the lexicographic needs of the speaker, thus they become polyfunctional instruments (Gouws, 1996:15). It would therefore seem that a reasonable compromise could be to research the real needs of the potential group of users of dictionaries, as diverse as the group and the needs might be, and then to strive for a

combination of a variety of functions as dictated by the needs of users, in a general polyfunctional bilingual dictionary. The lexicographer would have to state these functions that the dictionary is supposed to be able to perform, clearly in the introduction of the dictionary, in order for the user not to be under the wrong impression when buying the dictionary.

Hausmann et al (1991:2714) is of the opinion that it is important to see translation dictionaries from three points of view: the user aspect, the linguistic aspect and the empirical aspect. He defines the user aspect as the consideration on the part of the lexicographer for the dictionary's target group, its needs and competence and the types of user situations that can occur. According to Hausmann the user aspect should be examined in more detail: "We need to know more about the way people use bilingual dictionaries, and especially about their linguistic competence in the areas of pronunciation, grammar, semantics, style and their general or specialized knowledge of the foreign language and its culture." Lexicographers of bilingual dictionaries intended for a diverse society, such as the South African environment, cannot proceed to write dictionaries that are supposed to cater to the needs of the diverse groups of users if they do not research the aspects that Hausmann indicates before they even start the planning of the dictionary. In my opinion one of the reasons for the fact that there is not a widespread culture of dictionary usage in South Africa is that lexicographers do not really understand the users that the dictionaries are intended for, and consequently the dictionaries do not accommodate the competence and knowledge of users, thus leaving dictionaries much less useful than they could be.

1.3 The functions of a bilingual dictionary

Thus far we have established that a bilingual dictionary is part of a larger class of dictionaries, which generally deals with two or more languages and provides among other data entries also translation equivalents. A bilingual dictionary quite often has to be an instrument that can fulfill more than one function. There has to be a correlation between the needs of users and the functions the dictionary can fulfill. According to Hausmann et al bilingual dictionaries are “useful aids to travel abroad and communication in foreign languages, necessary tools in the commercial world and public administration, and indispensable for secretaries dealing with foreign-language correspondence, translators and interpreters” (1991:2712). He furthermore states that regardless of the diversity of translation purposes they can serve, bilingual dictionaries have the common function that they are involved as tools in the action where the user makes a translation from a foreign language to his mother tongue, or from his native language to a foreign one (1991:2712).

Hausmann et al defines the term translation as a “language-pair-related unidirectional activity where the translator uses his or her native language as one of the two languages, translating to or from the native language” (1991:2717). He then concludes that the main function of a translation dictionary is to aid the translator either in decoding a foreign-language text to an equivalent text in the native language or encoding a native-language text as an equivalent text in the foreign language (1991:2717). The dictionary that aids the user in the translation from the native to the foreign language can be called an active dictionary and the one meant for translation from the foreign language to the native language a passive dictionary (Hausmann et al 1991:2715).

Another dimension which is of importance when discussing the purpose of dictionaries is the distinction between the communication-directed functions and knowledge-directed functions of

dictionaries. According to Gouws (2003) “communication-directed functions should assist the user in solving problems in the sphere of communication whereas knowledge-directed functions aim to increase the user’s knowledge regarding a specific topic”. In order to be able to comprehend the speaker of another language or to communicate in another language, one would need a bilingual dictionary containing information regarding linguistic aspects of the other¹ or target language, but also information concerning the culture of the speaker of the other language. The bilingual dictionary should thus contain a combination of communication-directed and knowledge-directed functions.

1.4 The qualities of the learner’s dictionary

There are some very striking similarities between the qualities of the learner’s dictionary and the ideal qualities of the bilingual dictionary intended for a multilingual and multicultural environment. The bilingual dictionary is an important tool in language-learning (Hausmann, 1991:2712), and should therefore share some of the characteristics of the learner’s dictionary. The purpose of this section is to identify some of these qualities and functions of the learner’s dictionary that would be valuable to the bilingual dictionary.

¹ Tomaszczyk (1984:293) explains the terms second and foreign language in the following way: a second language is meant for internal communication, where there is some sharing of sociocultural realities between the speakers. A foreign language is meant for communication with the outside world, for cross-cultural communication. The use of these terms is complicated when referring to circumstances in South Africa, since the target language (as I will refer to it), though primarily meant for internal communication also in many cases implies cross-cultural communication, since South Africa is a multilingual as well as a multicultural country. I will thus refer to the “other” or the target language rather than to the second or foreign language. Considering the political history the term “the other” is probably very appropriate since there has for a long time been a strong sense of estrangement between different cultural groups speaking different languages. It is exactly this estrangement that can be abridged by the sensible compilation and use of bilingual dictionaries.

According to Mdee (1984:237) a learner's dictionary is intended to help a person acquiring a new language, to master the use of words, compounds and idioms, together with their pronunciation, spelling and meaning. He furthermore states that a learner's dictionary should give examples of usage that will guide the learner to the production of correct sentences. An article in the learner's dictionary should be comprehensive and self-contained, it should present information that would be, in every aspect, useful to the learner (1984:240, 241).

Even though the user of a bilingual dictionary might not be acquiring a new language with the help of the bilingual dictionary, the user is still employing the dictionary to help him/her to be able to produce sentences or texts in the target language or to understand texts in the target language of the dictionary. In order to be able to help the user in this sense, the bilingual dictionary has to present data that would, in every aspect, be useful to the user. The characteristics of any dictionary, though especially the learner's dictionary, should be determined by who the target user will be, what his needs, competence and knowledge are and by the environment with which the target user is confronted daily. In the multicultural environment the user of a bilingual dictionary would need to be able to find some information of a cultural nature in the dictionary in order to be able to understand target language texts, speakers and to express him- or herself in the target language with confidence.

According to Gouws (1993:33) it is of great importance that the ordering of data in a learner's dictionary should be done in such a way that the user can retrieve information in the quickest possible time. Gouws states that in order to achieve maximum retrievability the lexicographer has to include access structures in the macrostructure of the dictionary, as well as a microstructural display relevant to the needs of the user in order to enhance an "unbiased and

neutral representation of cultural and ideological values". He states that this is especially important when the target user comes from a linguistically and culturally diverse environment.

Gouws (2003) states:

"South African lexicographers, as well as lexicographers compiling dictionaries to be used in many other parts of the world, need to work with the assumption that, due to the lack of a well-established dictionary culture, many of their target users will have an unsophisticated approach to the cultural practice of dictionary use."

A lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary intended for the South African environment should accommodate these so-called unsophisticated skills of the target user. In this regard it would be very valuable if bilingual dictionaries could aim at the quality of maximum retrievability that is to be found (or at least aimed for) in learner's dictionaries.

The construction of access structures that can enhance the retrievability of information is something that any lexicographer should make a priority. The lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary intended for a culturally diverse society should with reference to the presentation of cultural data, and the use of a frame structure, pay particular attention to the access structures that are constructed to aid the user. The result of an insufficient access structure to deal with the cultural data presented in the outer texts could be seen in the example of the *The Great Dictionary of Xhosa* (1989) (hereafter referred to as GDX). Even though the dictionary has great value and employs a well-developed frame-structure, the value for the user could have been even higher if the access structure were more sophisticated.

It is furthermore essential for lexicographers of e.g. South African bilingual dictionaries to provide a microstructural treatment of lexical items that is relevant to the needs of the user. In the learner's dictionary this might mean that the lexicographer would have to simplify some of the data, or only provide that which is essential to the learner². On the other hand the microstructural treatment should, according to Gouws, enhance an unbiased and neutral representation of cultural and ideological values. He states that the lexicographer of an Afrikaans learner's dictionary has to negotiate the reality of target users with opposing cultural and ideological views, and thus have to stay neutral and exercise the necessary sensitivity in the treatment of culture and ideology specific items (Gouws, 1993:33). This is not only valid for the learner's dictionary, but is certainly true for any South African bilingual dictionary.

Another fact that the lexicographer of an Afrikaans learner's dictionary has to deal with is that the target group of the language is diverse and that teaching a foreign language to such a group would imply that the lexicographer would often have to answer to conflicting needs (Gouws, 1993:34). Gouws suggests clarity, a user-friendly access structure and a restricted central list with frequency as one of the main selection criteria for lemmas. A user-friendly access structure is probably one of the most important qualities that the bilingual dictionary should work towards.

The lexicographer of a South African bilingual dictionary would also have to deal with a diverse target group with conflicting needs. In South Africa, a country with eleven official languages, the chance is good that the user of a bilingual dictionary dealing with an African language along with either Afrikaans or English is unfamiliar with at least one of the languages treated in the dictionary. Furthermore, Gouws (1996:15) states that the bilingual dictionary forms an integral

² This relates to the proscriptive approach suggested by Bergenholtz, which will be discussed later on.

part of the daily communication process in a multilingual society. He states that the majority of one-dictionary owners in a multilingual society will rather possess a bilingual dictionary than any other kind of dictionary. One could infer from such a statement that a large percentage of learners who are not formally involved in the learning of a language will rather consult a bilingual dictionary than a monolingual learner's dictionary. There is in any case not a large variety of bilingual learner's dictionaries, or even monolingual learner's dictionaries available in Afrikaans or the African languages. Thus, on the one hand, the target user of a standard bilingual dictionary could be a learner, whilst on the other hand the target user could be a professional translator that is competent in both languages. Whatever the case may be, the lexicographer would have to answer to a wide range of needs and could never rely on the intuition of the target user.

Greater simplicity and the decreasing of the density of data in the article are two further qualities of the learner's dictionary that the bilingual dictionary intended for a multilingual and multicultural environment could benefit from. Gouws (1993:35) states: "A notion of greater simplicity should be a governing principle in learner's dictionaries and should not only apply to the definition but to every entry in the article." Gouws makes it clear that since the lexicographer may not rely on the intuition or presumed dictionary skills of the user, the achievement of simplicity depends on the structure and contents of an article. He suggests the introduction of a variety of clearly defined access structures in the article, and in terms of microstructural access the inclusion of additional entries aimed at guiding the user to the given information. The bilingual dictionary could also benefit from the use of specific entries that can guide the user to the information that is needed. An example of such an entry can be the structural markers that

can be used to indicate the cultural data contained in the article, or the reference entry that will guide the user to the treatment of the culture-bound item in e.g. the back matter of the dictionary.

1.5 The representation of cultural data

There are different types of cultural data that can and should be treated in a bilingual dictionary intended for a multilingual environment. The following represents a selection of candidate entries to give an account of cultural aspects: idioms and proverbs, culture bound lexical items and the treatment afforded to them in the dictionary, pictorial illustrations depicting aspects of daily life, such as e.g. the kitchen accompanied by a target and source language word list, a list of names of important people in the history and culture of a speech community, maps, geographical data, a list of famous quotations, authors and names of important literary works, etc.. Another useful type of cultural data that could be included would be a text dealing with cultural etiquette. In such a text the lexicographer could for instance explain the difference between the etiquette of greeting or of e.g. a telephone conversation in the different speech communities. This type of text would aid the user in the process of communication and would help to prevent some very common yet very impeding misunderstandings. When planning a dictionary the lexicographer should identify the different types of cultural data that would be relevant to the needs of the intended target users of the dictionary, and where these data types would best be included.

It is not only important that the dictionary should include some non-linguistic or cultural data, but the way in which the data is represented in a dictionary is imperative. In the preface of WDD, the editors write the following:

“Users of dictionaries can gather from them not only linguistic information, but also at least some non-linguistic information, including the cultural context obtaining within the community speaking a given language or one of its varieties. Such cultural context is always implied; usually it is intended and accepted as mere information, but a normative or prescriptive dictionary can aim at fostering a cultural program, be it the fostering of a certain variety of a language as the *acrolect*, be it in an extreme case an attempt at the indoctrination of a whole nation in the ideology propagated by the state” (1989-1991: xvi).

In South Africa during the colonial era as well as during the era of apartheid, dictionaries were often prescriptive in the extreme sense of the word. One could argue that in some cases dictionaries were used as instruments of indoctrination, especially concerning the way cultural data relating to other languages and speech communities than Afrikaans and English were presented. In for example *A Zulu-Kafir Dictionary etymologically explained with copious illustrations and examples, preceded by an introduction on the Zulu-Kafir language.*, compiled by Döhne in 1857, the prescriptive nature of the treatment of culture-bound concepts is evident in the treatment of the lemma **nyanga**. This lexical item is defined in the following terms:

Properly: a combination of power; skill, cunning; in fact, the only resource for all the evils met with, *commonly*; a doctor in the widest sense; a diviner, mediator, prophet, priest, etc; a professional person. [...]

The *inyanga yokwelaps*, i.e.: the master for administering medicine (*see Elapa*), attains to his profession in the usual simple way of staying for some time with an older person of

that class, by whom he is taught some knowledge of botany, and the mode of applying herbs. Both the knowledge and practice are hardly worthy to be called by a scientific name, and are made up, more of superstition than real knowledge.

Furthermore Döhne describes the training and tasks of the inyanga yokubula, the diviner, as “a whole system of superstition”. He writes:

“It is easily perceived that, from such a course as described, no inyanga can have obtained the least knowledge for curing diseases, and that the sole object of his profession is nothing else but a combination of the most superstitious falsehoods. Moreover, it can be no wonder if he, in that state, comes under the influence of a diabolical power, and happens to perform actions which startle and deceive his fellow men! It is striking to observe how these benighted people allow themselves to be lulled, cheated, and destroyed without suspecting the false actors and their abominable system, or, if they suspect that they do not oppose, nor do away with such things! (1857: 253-254).

In this treatment of a concept or practice, which is central and of great importance in the African culture, the lexicographer merely displays his and his contemporaries’ own superstitions and gross misunderstanding of the profession of healing and divining as it is practiced in the African culture. This type of treatment is unacceptably prescriptive, and in itself is unworthy of being called a scientific lexicographic treatment of a culture-bound lexical item. It is obvious that the presentation of such a negative and prejudiced viewpoint by the lexicographer can in no way aid the user in coming to a clear and objective understanding of the culture of the source language speech community.

It was not only in the presentation of cultural data that dictionaries were prescriptive, it was also in the way that the attitudes of the lexicographers or the compilers of the dictionaries were reflected in the treatment of particularly political, derogatory and cultural items. One should mention that in many cases lexicographers were probably merely reflecting the attitudes of a certain group at the time. Yet, this reflection or representation of the reality of the time, the reality of the speakers of e.g. Afrikaans, in the case of the WAT, and their political and ideological viewpoint was not dealt with in an objective and scientific manner (cf. the discussion of the treatment of the term *kaffer* in chapter two, section 2.3 of this thesis).

The way in which culture³ was represented in these dictionaries can be viewed as damaging to the process of communication and the establishment of an understanding between different groups. The misrepresentation of certain cultural concepts and practices, as well as certain speech communities and cultural groups, could strengthen a prejudiced mindset that, in the case of Afrikaans, was already being supported and built up by the apartheid regime of the time.

1.6 In conclusion

Today, South African dictionaries have to try and repair some of the damage done in dictionaries of the past. In WDD it is said that under normal circumstances the cultural context is implied in the dictionary. In a bilingual dictionary intended for the diverse multicultural South African environment, the data regarding culture has to be more than implied. A bilingual dictionary can play an enormous role in the enhancement of mutual comprehension of culture and the political history; this should be one of the most important aims of present-day bilingual dictionaries in

South Africa. Nkabinde (2002) writes: “The challenge confronting the lexicographer is how to deal with cultural material in an organized and consistent manner in the compilation of a dictionary.”

The scope of bilingual dictionaries in such a diverse society exceeds the limits of linguistic lexicography; the dictionary has to become a depoliticizing instrument. This specific function is a direct result of the sociolinguistic, cultural and political profile of the South African target user (Gouws, 1993:33, 34). It is evident that the specific needs and circumstances of the target users will define the function of the dictionary, and that the treatment of culture-bound lexical items is of extreme importance in order for the dictionary to serve its purpose.

Any present-day lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary in South Africa has a responsibility to be aware of the ideological and symbolic values of the entries in his/her dictionary and has to exercise the necessary sensitivity and affirmative action in the treatment of especially culture-bound lexical items. The lexicographer should also be especially aware of the danger of his or her views and interpretation of certain culture-bound lexical items and cultural or ideological issues dominating the treatment of these items in the dictionary.

³ cf. chapter two, section 2.1 of this thesis for a discussion of the meaning of the term culture.

CHAPTER TWO

CULTURE-BOUND LEXICAL ITEMS

2.1 What is culture?

There is not one all encompassing definition of the term “culture-bound lexical item”. One could assume that it merely refers to lexical items that specifically denote some object or idea grounded in the culture of a given speech community. However, the identification of culture-bound lexical items and the definition of the term is much more complicated than merely referring to the broad and diverse concept of culture. It is firstly necessary to establish what is meant by the term “culture” before the exact meaning of the term “culture-bound lexical item” can be decided.

Nkabinde (2002) writes:

A speech community’s origin, history, mythology, exploits, legends, wisdom lore and worldview are reflected in its language. Similarly the arts, crafts, and other activities together with phenomena in nature and the environment are expressed or described by means of language. Language is inextricably bound with the culture of a people.

Che Wai Lam uses the following definition of culture by Edward Burnett Tylor in his study of the culture-oriented approach used by Robert Morrison in *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language*:

“Culture...is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society”.

Culture can signify the way people live, their living quarters and eating habits, ways of greeting, of communicating and interacting. The concept “culture” does not necessarily refer to something abstract or unique, it can refer to anything from the way parents discipline children to the games

that children play. After all, parents all over the world discipline their children at some stage, and children all over the world play games.

Culture does not relate specifically to *what* is done in a society but rather to *how* it is done. Both in the rural areas of Kwazulu Natal and in the suburbs of Johannesburg, people live in “houses”, but the way the houses are built and the way they look are poles apart. Think about the different ways in which women in different cultures, especially African culture, dress to indicate their marital status. There is a vast variety of ways to dress that would show whether a woman is single, married or widowed. This is an issue that has to be addressed in a bilingual dictionary, in e.g. the treatment of the English lemma wedding ring, as opposed to a present day Zulu practice of rural married women wearing a coloured piece of cloth tied around their shoulders to indicate that they are married. Another example is the practice of greeting which is universal, but the way in which it is done differs from culture to culture. The way in which people greet each other in, for example African and British culture, is different. Bergenholtz (1994) even includes a section in the back matter of his *Deutsch-Madagassisches* (German-Madagascan) dictionary in which he indicates the different forms of greeting used by German and Madagascan people through the use of illustrative examples as well as pictorial illustrations. If something as universal as a house can be culture-bound, then the boundary between culture-bound and universal is not easy to determine, that is if there is a definite boundary at all.

For the purpose of this study, Tylor’s definition of culture will be used, with the understanding that culture-bound words do not only refer to things specific to a speech community or its extra linguistic reality, but to any capabilities, habits and practices of a particular speech community. The focus in this study will fall on items that are not truly unique to the culture of a specific

speech community, but that are presented different enough in different communities and culture to be able to cause real communicational problems.

Kavanagh (2000:102) explains that culture is a word with different senses. On the one hand, culture can refer to the arts, e.g. the theatre, literature, music, painting, etc. This type of culture can be called “culture with a capital C” or “achievement culture”. On the other hand, culture can refer to the “whole gamut of traditional beliefs and practices, activities and way of life, of a particular group of people”. This type of culture is “behavioral culture” or “little c” culture. Kavanagh (2000:103) furthermore writes:

“This sense of culture is more about ordinary people and their daily life, how they live, the places they go to, the institutions they have contact with, their social interactions, their attitudes towards the issues and situations that confront them, their beliefs and perceptions, and their priorities, i.e. ‘what makes them tick’ [...] Knowledge of this type of culture is more relevant to language users in terms of communication, but it is also more difficult to pin down...”

It is on this type of culture, “little c” culture, concerned with how people live and what they believe, that the focus of this thesis will be.

2.2 What is a culture-bound lexical item?

When illustrating the meaning of culture-bound words, Zgusta (1971:294) writes about e.g. plants that only exist in the area where the source language is spoken, but not at all in the area of

the target language. Zgusta continues explaining the anisomorphism of languages by stating that the differences in the organisation of designate in languages does not only occur if two cultures are vastly different. He states that it can occur in any two pairs of languages. He furthermore writes that the anisomorphism of languages are not only related to the difference in the material extra-linguistic world: it is not the absence of the denotatum, e.g. the particular indigenous plant species, which is of basic importance; it is the designatum which has the fundamental role. The material extra-linguistic worlds in which the speakers of the treated language pair live may be more or less identical, “but the same ‘things’ are conceived as parts of an designatum in one language but not in another” (1971:294). Zgusta (1971:294) uses the following example to explain the statement:

For example, the Ossetic word *agawyghd* has the meaning “hearth + cauldron + chain”: there is no unified designatum in English which would cover all the three components; there are only designations of the single segments of the extra linguistic world.

Examples of the above-mentioned kind can also be found in the difference between e.g. English and Setswana. In the *Setswana English Setswana Dictionary* the word **nyantsê** is provided with the English translation equivalent: *has come or gone softly*. In English there is no unified designatum that covers the action of coming and going softly (coming + going + softly), there are only designations of the single segments. Zgusta (1971:294) argues that it can be extremely difficult to coordinate the lexical units of two languages when there are such differences in the organization of designata in the individual languages. Mostly there are no translation equivalents to be found in the target language for the culture-bound lexical items, and the lexicographer has to find a way of dealing with this problem. It also happens frequently that when a translation equivalent can be found for the culture-bound lexical item, the translation equivalent will only be

partially equivalent to the source language item. Communicative equivalence can be seriously impeded if such a relation of partial equivalence is presented without a proper explanation of the restrictions of usage.

According to Al-Kasimi, culture-bound lexical items denote objects and practices peculiar to the culture of a speech community (1977:59). He also states that there is a close relationship between language and culture, and that words are symbols for the dynamic and explicit features of culture (1977:62). For the purpose of this study, culture-bound lexical items will denote things in the culture, society and environment of the source language speech community that are lexicalised differently, or that is not presented or perceived in the same way in the target language. I am approaching this study from the perspective that lexical items¹ can be symbols of culture. The treatment of culture-bound lexical items in bilingual dictionaries should convey information to the target user concerning the culture of the community in which each member of the treated language pair is spoken, in order to enhance understanding and communication between the two groups. Kavanagh states that communication requires a degree of lexical, syntactic as well as cultural competence. She also writes:

“Successful communication involves background knowledge, shared information about contexts, traditions, and attitudes, and shared images in the mind’s eye. Problems of cross-cultural communication are not necessarily a misunderstanding of words, but a lack of understanding of the concepts behind the words” (2000:101).

It is the responsibility of the lexicographer compiling a bilingual dictionary for the multilingual and multicultural environment to accommodate the needs and demands of the target user in an

intended environment. The effective inclusion and treatment of a representative amount of culture-bound lexical items is of extreme importance. The dictionary should be planned and structured in such a way that users can retrieve linguistic as well as cultural information in the quickest and most effective way.

Tomaszczyk (1984:289) writes that by strict definition culture-bound lexical units should only include those items that represent objects, ideas, and other phenomena that are truly unique to a given speech community. He acknowledges that it could easily be argued that the boundary between culture-bound and universal is very difficult if at all possible to determine, and that culture-specificity could merely be a matter of degree. He does not focus on the truly unique items, but rather on the ones that are not really singular to the speech community, but still different enough to create communicative problems for the user of a bilingual dictionary.

Tomaszczyk (1984:289) states that truly unique culture-bound lexical items may be “comparatively easy to handle both in cross-cultural communication and in bilingual lexicography”. This is also applicable to lexical items denoting ideas or objects grounded in “achievement culture” or culture with a capital C. How difficult can it after all be to explain who Beethoven or Van Gogh was, or why Nelson Mandela is an eminent icon in South African culture? These items, because of being so distinctive, will be easily noticed by encoders as well as decoders and the problems they might present could, according to Tomaszczyk, be dealt with through communicative tactics or lexicographic techniques.

Consider for a moment the plant that Zgusta (1971:294) refers to as an example, the one that only exists in the material extra linguistic world of the source language speech community. It ought

¹ I prefer to use the term “lexical items” rather than “words” because quite often multiword lexical items or even sublexical lexical items are deeply rooted in the culture of a speech community, and using the term ‘word’ excludes

not be too difficult to create a translation equivalent for the name of such a plant, and a short explanation or rendering of the biological facts concerning the plant would probably solve all problems the user of the dictionary might have with using or understanding the word. Still, I do not find that even these apparently truly unique culture-bound lexical items are always that easy to identify or notice and to understand and use in South African bilingual dictionaries.

In the *Setswana English Setswana Dictionary*²(1993) (hereafter abbreviated as the SESD) there is a number of items that denote e.g. practices that are unique to Setswana culture, or at least not known or lexicalised in a similar way in English culture, that are apparently problematic for the lexicographer to treat. In many cases in the Setswana-English section of the dictionary, there are no English translation equivalents to be found for the items and the lexicographer treats them with surrogate equivalents in the form of explanatory equivalents or basically mere English definitions. This is problematic since the user cannot insert the definitions or explanatory equivalents into sentences³. The lexicographer does not provide any illustrative examples or contextual information in this section of the dictionary, which problemizes the treatment even more. Illustrative examples could have recontextualised the lexical items, and could have illustrated the use of these items in real contexts. Without an indication of the context of the lexical item, it is not clear to the user how these items could be used, or should be understood.

these items.

² This dictionary was compiled and published in Botswana, and deals with the variant or dialect of Setswana that is spoken there. There are some differences between the versions of Setswana spoken in Botswana and South Africa. There is at this stage no bilingual dictionary dealing with the South African version of the language in such a comprehensive manner.

³ cf. chapter 4 of this study for a more detailed discussion of the requirements for translation equivalence and for suggestions for the proper microstructural treatment of culture-bound lexical items.

Gouws (1996:16) states that lexicographers often make the mistake of restricting their attempts to ensure translation equivalence, to the mere listing of a number of target language items, in this case a number of surrogate equivalents. He writes:

Although these items represent the semantic value of the lemma and create a relation of semantic equivalence, the dictionary user receives no assistance in choosing the correct equivalent for a specific context. This lack of additional information impedes the possibility to reach communicative equivalence; the form of equivalence that should be the lexicographer's first priority.

This is true of the treatment of (amongst others) the following items in the SESD:

nyala v.s. SIMP., marry, espouse

nyadisa v.s. CAUS., officiate at a marriage ceremony; cause to marry; arrange the marriage of an offspring to a fiancé or fiancée.

nyalaka v.s. EXT., marry and divorce at an unprecedented rate; marry too many wives.

nyalana v.s. CAUS., marry each other; intermarry; reconcile matters, points, etc.

nyalanya v.s. CAUS., < *nyala*, bring about a reconciliation, agreement or mutual understanding, make a couple get married.

nyalanye v.s. PFT. < *nyalana*, have married each other; have reconciled.

The above-mentioned examples are only some of the lexical items related to this subject of marriage.

It is evident that the surrogate equivalents offered, even though effective in bringing across the meaning of the polysemous senses of the lexical items, do not aid the user at all in the process of translation, decoding or encoding. Even if a user would have an idea of the meaning of the lexical item if he/she is to come across it in a Setswana text, it would not necessarily be clear to the user which meaning of the lexical item is relevant in the given context, since the lexicographer does not provide any discriminatory treatment. The treatment of these items would greatly benefit from the application of equivalent discrimination. This is a concept introduced by Hausmann and Werner, which imply the inclusion of entries that will enable the user to choose the correct equivalent where divergence⁴ exists (c.f. Gouws 1996a: 71).

In the English-Setswana section of the SESD the same problem prevails. The entry **wedding** is provided with the following treatment:

wedding N., *tsêô; tsaanô; nyalô*; a ___ ceremony, *kemô; kemisô*.

The semi-colons that are placed between the translation equivalents imply that the equivalents are not synonyms, but that they represent different polysemous senses of the lemma. However, the lexicographer provides the user with no additional information that can guide him/her to choose the correct equivalent for the given context or situation. Equivalent discrimination should be applied by lexicographers of bilingual dictionaries in order to assist the user in a more effective way and to establish communicative equivalence.

To conclude, in this study a culture-bound lexical item is understood as being lexical items that denotes things in the culture, society and the environment of the source language speech community that are lexicalised differently, or that is not presented or perceived in the same way

⁴ The different relations of equivalence will be discussed later in section 4.2 of this study.

in the target language. There are mostly no translation equivalents to be found in the target language for the culture-bound lexical items. For the purpose of this study, culture-bound lexical items will be seen as symbols of culture and the correct representation and treatment of these items could help to expand the user's knowledge of the culture involved and to further the process of communication between different speech communities.

2.3 Representing cultural data in dictionaries

Culture-bound lexical items, and the way they are treated in bilingual dictionaries can have a great influence on the process of communication. In the past South African dictionaries have displayed a strong cultural bias in the treatment of these items. In, for example the WAT (Volume 5, 1968), an overall-descriptive monolingual dictionary treating the Afrikaans language, the Afrikaner nationalist sentiments and predominantly racist attitudes are to be detected in the treatment of derogatory terms such as *kaffer* (kaffir). In the first place the term *kaffer* is not marked in any way as derogatory, though some of its derivatives are marked as pejorative. In the primary definition of the word *kaffer*, it is stated though that the word has a negative value and that the term *naturel* or *Bantoe* can replace it. Today, both these terms are labeled as derogatory, and would not suffice as a positive replacement of the term *kaffer*. The primary definition reads as follows:

Kaffer, Kaffers; Kaffertjie. **1.a.** Algemene benaming vir 'n lid v/d Bantoeras in S.A.; by uitbr., enige Bantoe of ook enige lid van 'n swart inboorlingras van (uit) Afrika – weens die ongunstige waarde wat dit veelal het, dikw., ook in samestellings, vervang deur

naturel of tans by voorkeur *Bantoe* (of *Neger*, veral wanneer verwys word na 'n lid van bepaalde Midde-Afrikaanse bevolkingsgroepe of enigeen v/d slawefstammeling in Amerikan en Wes-Indië); swartmens, -man, swarte [...]

The dictionary offers seven polysemous senses of the word. The rest of the definitions will be quoted in brief:

2. Manlike naturel
3. Manlike naturellebediende, -werkjong, -werker, [...]
4. Verkorting van *Kaffertaal*
5. Met beklemtoning van aspekte soos ruheid, vreesaanjaendheid (veral teenoor kinders) of onderhorigheid:
 - a. Soms m/d bepaling *wit*. Onbeskaafde, onopgevoede, ongemanierde, ruwe persoon –neerhalende gebruik veral m.b.t. blankes [...]
 - b. Denkbeeldige persoon met wie kinders bang gemaak word [...]
 - c. Onderhorige, weinig gerekende persoon [...]
6. I/d Kompanjestyd, swart handlanger of helper v/d geweldiger (onderskout) of v/d beul –dikw. 'n bandiet, slaaf of Indiese balling [...]
7. Verkorting van *kafferkrul* [...]

In the above-mentioned polysemous senses of the lemma it is evident that it is especially the fifth definition of the word that has the most derogatory value. It is in the compounds of particularly the fifth meaning of the word along with another lexical item, and the derivatives that the term *kaffer* has the most damaging value. I briefly want to refer to some of these compounds.

In the treatment of the word *kafferkrul* (with reference to a specific breed of sheep) the underlying implications in the definition and the associating of the term *kaffer* (a name for a black person) with the description of the type of hair of the sheep, indicates the racial prejudice of the speakers of the language. *Kafferkrul* is defined as being a hard, oily, woolly, untidy type of curly hair of a poor quality, this hair curl stands isolated, like peppercorns on the skin of the sheep because of a hybridization of the breeds. This is one of several compounds in which the inclusion of *kaffer* implies that the object or item is of a poor quality or lesser value, e.g. *kafferlekker*:

Kafferlekker¹. Goedkoop lekker van swak gehalte, veral dié wat vir die Kaffers vervaardig word [...] (cheap sweets of a poor quality, especially those manufactured for black people)

Kafferlekker². Persoon wat op selfvernederende wyse b/d Kaffers i/d guns probeer kom of met mooipraat probeer om hul tot ander insigte te bring [...] (A person that humiliates himself to gain the approval of black people through talking to them to bring them to other insights).

In the first definition of this term, the sweets are also (like the hair of the sheep) referred to as of a poor quality, the *kaffer* in the compound indicates that the object has a lesser value. In the second definition it is suggested that a *kaffer* is not a person, yet if you are white you are a person; that in order to associate with black people in a friendly way, a white person has to degrade himself and that black people need to be brought to other, better insights than their own by white people. This type of lexicographic treatment of a culture-bound item speaks of a prejudiced attitude, either on behalf of the speaker, target user of the dictionary or the lexicographer. This approach can do considerable damage to the process of communication or

the establishment of an understanding between cultural groups. Other examples of this kind in the WAT is e.g. *kafferskaap*, that is a sheep of poor quality and lesser value; *kaffersleg* in which the term *kaffer* acts as an reinforcement of the word bad (*sleg*), basically the definition states that being *kaffersleg* is being as bad as possible; the term *kafferstadig* is identified as being a pejorative reinforcement of slow (*stadig*). Furthermore there is the treatment of *kaia*, in which the following illustrative example is cited:

Vir 'n Zoeloe is ikaya 'n huis, maar vir die delwer is kaia 'n huisie wat swak vergelyk met 'n gewone woning. (For a Zulu a kaia is a house, but for the miner a kaia is a little house that compares badly with his standard living quarters.)

The implication is that it is fine for a Zulu to live in a shack, but that it not good enough for a white mine worker. This can especially be noted in the diminutive of house that is used when referring to the *kaia* with regard to the white person.

The treatment of these items is something that would be revised as soon as possible, and it must be said that in the parts of the dictionary that has been published more recently, it is obvious that the lexicographers are very professional and scientifically correct in the treatment of items with such complicated political and emotional baggage. For example, in the recent parts 10 (1996) and 11 (2000) of the WAT there are a discussion of the policy for the treatment of pejorative and sensitive lexical items, in the user's guide in the front matter of the dictionary. The WAT has a new editorial policy concerning the treatment of sensitive lexical items and this is an issue that is specifically dealt with in the front matter⁵. Lexicographers of bilingual dictionaries should also discuss their policy concerning the treatment of sensitive lexical items in the front matter of their dictionaries (cf. chapter 6 of this thesis).

⁵ cf. Van Niekerk, A. 1995 "Beleid vir die hantering van sensitiewe materiaal in die WAT" *Lexikos* 5, p. 232-248.

A problem that Tomaszczyk (1984) identifies in Polish-English bilingual dictionaries is the fact that culture-bound lexical items are noticeably underrepresented; this is something that has also been mentioned by critics of South African bilingual dictionaries. In the course of my research I consulted a wide range of South African bilingual dictionaries and had found it very difficult to find any direct treatment or presentation of cultural data. Where culture-bound items were included in the central list of the dictionary, the treatment was brief and focused on linguistic issues, and the cultural background of the items was merely implied, if mentioned at all. If a dictionary is supposed to represent the reality of the speech community and the language in the treatment of the lexicon of the language, it should not underrepresent something as important as the lexical items that symbolize the culture of the speaker.

Gouws (2003) writes that the traditional approach to dictionaries, “i.e. a treatment characterised by a strong linguistic bias often impeded a proper transfer of cultural information”. To include encyclopedic information “was a sure way to invite the wrath of linguists criticizing the dictionary” (Gouws, 2003). According to Gouws the shift towards a more user-orientated approach, and the emphasis on planning dictionaries implies that the specific environment and circumstances of the intended target user should be considered by the lexicographer and it should somehow be represented in the dictionary, even if some type of encyclopedic data is necessary to accomplish this. Dictionaries should reflect the reality with which the target users are confronted, thus in a multilingual and multicultural environment the dictionary should reflect the linguistic as well as the cultural diversity. And in order to aid communication between different groups of speakers and users of dictionaries, lexicographers should attempt to present the cultural data in an user-friendly way.

The inclusion of cultural data is according to Gouws (2003) relevant to both the communication-directed and the knowledge-directed functions:

Where the target users of a bilingual dictionary, aimed at text production, are unfamiliar with the culture of the language in which they have to produce texts, it is important that the way in which cultural data is presented and treated should enhance the quality of communication in that language. However, the presentation of cultural data should also assist the user in expanding his/her knowledge of the specific topic. Both these main functions are of the utmost relevance in the lexicographic treatment of cultural data.

With regard to Afrikaans learner's dictionaries for the South African environment, Gouws (1993:33) writes that the lexicographer has to negotiate the reality of target users with opposing cultural and ideological views. He states that the dictionary should maintain a neutral attitude towards culture and ideology specific items. The biased way in which the culture of other speech communities was represented in South African dictionaries did a tremendous amount of damage, and today it is of extreme importance that lexicographers treat all culture-bound lexical items with care and sensitivity.

CHAPTER THREE

SELECTING THE LEMMA CANDIDATES

3.1 Introduction

In a bilingual dictionary culture-specific lexical items would most likely be included in the central word list of the dictionary as lemmas and they would be part of the macrostructure of the dictionary. Before lexical items can become lemma signs and part of the macrostructure, they have to undergo several lexicographic treatment procedures (Hausmann and Wiegand, 1989:337).

Firstly lexical items have to be selected from the dictionary basis in a process called the outer selection. The dictionary basis is the set of all the dictionary sources. The lexicographer's "native-speaker competence" is, for example, a special type of source for the dictionary basis. Other examples of the different types of sources that make up the dictionary basis could be a variety of fiction and non-fiction texts, publications such as newspapers and magazines and even examples from the language used by e.g. television presenters or disc jockeys on radio. On the other hand, the lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary could use a good monolingual dictionary as a major source for the dictionary basis. If the lexicographer uses such a monolingual dictionary as a primary source for the bilingual dictionary, the selection of lemmata that is presented in the monolingual dictionary should be approached with an attitude of scientific criticism. The selection of lemmas, as well as other decisions that the lexicographer of the monolingual dictionary made concerning the treatment of lexical items cannot be accepted as correct and necessarily applicable to the bilingual dictionary that is being created. It is of great importance that the dictionary sources should be selected with care and should be representative of the culture of the speakers and the reality that the speaker is confronted with daily.

According to Hausmann and Wiegand (1989:337) the outer selection has a qualitative and quantitative dimension, which means the lexicographer has to decide which classes of linguistic units and how many units in the various classes should be selected. These choices would once again depend on the type of dictionary and the users and environment it is intended for. For example, the size of the planned dictionary would influence the quantitative dimension of the outer selection. If it is a small dictionary that is intended to aid users in the process of encoding a native language text as an equivalent text in the foreign language, the basis of the central word list would be the lexicon of the native or source language. In such a case it would be possible to leave out less known or used synonyms of source language items; only a small selection of colloquialisms, slang and taboo items would have to be presented if it is at all necessary (this type of items need extensive treatment for the user to be able to understand and use them without making a mistake, and a small dictionary cannot afford the space that such a treatment requires); and if the target or foreign language treated in this type of dictionary is spoken in a different cultural environment from the source language, it is necessary to take the target language into consideration when the selection of lemmas is being done (cf. Zgusta, 1971:309). It would e.g. not be necessary to include source language lemmas denoting cultural objects or concepts that are unknown to the target language speech community.

If the dictionary that is being compiled is a small dictionary treating two very closely related languages, the lexicographer could omit items that have the same form and meaning in both languages. Zgusta (1971:311) writes that this results in a so-called differential dictionary. He cautions the lexicographer of such a dictionary to take careful notice of all the differences in all

the different senses of the items before an omission is made. Such a dictionary could e.g. be created for two of the closely related Nguni languages.

In terms of the qualitative aspect of the outer selection the lexicographer would for instance have to decide whether e.g. christian names would be included as lemmata or not, or whether e.g. multiword lexical items such as idioms would be lemmatized. In this instance the lexicographer would also have to decide where to treat the different data types that would be included. The lexicographer could for example choose to include a selection of idioms representative of the culture of the speakers, but to treat this selection in an outer text rather than in the central word list. This relates to the discussion of the frame structure, as well as data distribution that will follow in subsequent chapters.

After the process of outer selection lexical items have to go through lemmatization and then alphabetization. Hausmann and Wiegand (1989:329) explain this process as follows: Lemmatization refers to the selection of one single morphological form whose function in the macrostructure is to represent the total set of grammatical and morphological forms of the linguistic sign treated in the microstructure. Zgusta (1971:240) writes that the most usual lexical units are the words, as they are constituted both by the facts of the respective languages and by their linguistic traditions. He states that “the lexicographer is fully entitled to accept the traditions, with eventual minor modifications, as it is manifested in those texts which are the basis of the dictionary”(1971:241). Zgusta continues by stating that multiword lexical units are of the same standing and function as single words and that they should thus as a matter of course and necessity be selected and treated as wholes. Smaller units than the word, sublexical items, should also be considered for lemmatization.

The focus of this chapter will be on the process of selecting material for the dictionary basis and the selection of lexical items to be included in the macrostructure.

3.2 Selecting material for the dictionary basis

When the work on the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) started, James Murray published an appeal for volunteers to work on the new dictionary. In April 1879 he had two thousand copies of the appeal printed to be circulated by booksellers. Murray requested volunteers to literally read through centuries of English literature (he provided lists of books that the editorial staff considered compulsory reading) and to note, on slips of paper, words of interest or ordinary words used in an interesting way, and quotations that illustrated the use of these words by the recommended authors (Winchester 1999:127). The WAT used a similar method in the early stages of collecting material for the dictionary.

In the pre-computer era, Zgusta (1971:225) states his opinion that the basic form of the collection of material is the excerption of texts. This means that the lexicographer takes lexical units that are of interest out of a text and puts them on single slips of paper, along with a quote that indicates the context. Zgusta indicates that when a dictionary is compiled for a language with at least some written literature it is primarily written texts that are excerpted. When there are no or few written texts in the language, one generally begins with those oral texts which can be called “oral literature”, i.e. narrations, but it should be kept in mind that the language used in “oral literature” is frequently different from the real spoken language. Therefore, Zgusta (1971:225) writes, it is important for the lexicographer also to collect colloquial material – not only

monologues, but also elicited answers and preferably also dialogues, talks, discussions, negotiations of affairs in business and office, etc. Zgusta (1971:226) continues by stating:

“The decision as to what texts should be excerpted is a consequence of the lexicographer’s two basic decisions concerning the scope and type of the dictionary: if it is to be an overall-descriptive dictionary, the repertory of the excerpted texts must be broader, in the different dimensions of the variation of language, than if we decide to prepare a standard-descriptive dictionary.”

This implies that the choice of texts and lexical items firstly depends on the decisions that the lexicographer makes regarding the type and scope of the dictionary. Magay writes: “Dictionary-making is an endless string of decision-making”. He emphasizes the fact that the process of the selection of vocabulary, as he calls it, cannot merely be a process of leaving out what is unnecessary. Magay furthermore states that the “selection of lexical units has always been a highly subjective matter, depending first and foremost on the personal inclinations of the lexicographer, his qualifications and social outlook”. Later on in his argument he states that it is evident that a selection policy based on “some tangible principles must be put to work to support the dictionary maker’s intuition” (cf. Magay 1984:221-224).

In the process of selecting lexical units, especially culture-bound items, it is of the utmost importance that there is some form of interaction between the given speech community and the lexicographer. Even if the lexicographer is a mother tongue speaker of the source language to be treated in the dictionary it is necessary for him or her to interact with the community in some way, if only for the sake of the collection of material to be used as sources in the dictionary basis. Interaction can be achieved if the lexicographer actually goes out into the community to research

the needs of the intended target users and furthermore to study some cultural practices in order to come to an understanding of the culture and to collect material for the dictionary basis. The dictionary is supposed to reflect the reality that confronts the speaker and in order to be able to do this, the circumstances of the speaker, the traditions and history and culture and perspectives of the given speech community have to be researched and noted by the lexicographer of a dictionary before a representative selection of lexical items can be made. Besides the actual interaction between the lexicographer and the community, literature and cultural texts could inform the lexicographer of the history, traditions and culture of a speech community. A principle for the selection of culture-bound items could be to identify terms and concepts in these texts that are representative of the culture of the speakers and then to select these terms to be lemmatized and treated in the dictionary. A lexicographer could use a selection process similar to a frequency count, with the understanding that the criteria of the usage frequency alone would not be sufficient to select a representative variety of items.

3.3 Working with a corpus

Gouws (2003) writes that when selecting lexical items from the dictionary basis to be included in the macrostructure of a bilingual dictionary intended for a multilingual and multicultural environment, it is imperative that the lexical items selected should be representative of the linguistic and cultural reality that the target users of the dictionary have to face from day to day. The lexicographer should ideally choose texts and material for the dictionary basis with specific reference to the intended target user and the particular nature of the dictionary. Today most dictionary projects prefer to work with a scientifically constructed corpus, which means that the

lexicographer is not necessarily directly involved in the selection of material for the dictionary basis and that the basic selection of lemma candidates is done by the computer software. In South Africa the present-day reality is that some of the African languages do not yet have a well-developed body of written texts to work with in the compilation of a corpus, and that for some languages a corpus has not yet been constructed. This places a greater emphasis on the role of the lexicographer in the compilation of a dictionary basis and the selection of lemma candidates.

At the 7th International Conference of the *African Association for Lexicography* (Afrilex), hosted in July 2002 at the Rhodes University, Grahamstown, the theme was *Culture and Dictionaries*. A lot of attention was given to a corpus-based approach to dictionary-making. One issue that kept resurfacing in discussions was that no lexicographer could leave the creation of a central word list totally up to frequency lists and computer programs. The lexicographer has to take the intended target user, the scope and type of the dictionary and the environment that the dictionary is intended for, into consideration when selecting entries for the macrostructure of his/her dictionary. A computer program cannot consider all these factors, especially not the human, cultural dimension of things.

The lexicographer furthermore needs to question the material that was used to construct the corpus in order to determine whether the selection of lemma candidates are representative and relevant to the intended target user. It is important to determine whether predominantly written texts (as opposed to 'oral' texts) were used, what the ratio of for instance 'high culture' literature, scientific texts, newspapers and magazines was or how many texts were taken from the popular media, for instance television? The lexicographer should establish whether the material used was representative of the culture or circumstances of the speakers. He or she could ask if, for example, only scientific medical terms were included, or if the researchers compiling the corpus

included data regarding traditional healing as well? The lexicographer should ask whether the authors of the written texts are representative of the speech community or whether they are outsiders who were educated in another language, and it could be asked if they live in or outside the speech community and whether they really comprehend the day-to-day living conditions of the speakers.

When working with a corpus it would probably be advisable for lexicographers writing a bilingual dictionary for the multilingual, multicultural environment, to list the above mentioned factors, to consider the amount and nature of the cultural data that the target user would need in order to be able to comprehend the target language and to use it in a way that will enhance communication and understanding between different speech communities. The lexicographer would have to evaluate the way the corpus was constructed, the process of selecting lexical items from it and the eventual central word list that would constitute the macrostructure of the dictionary, and determine whether it will sufficiently answer the needs of the user, and whether it will provide a representative and informative enough reflection of the sociolinguistic reality of the target user.

3.4 Accommodating the oral tradition of a language

When a dictionary reflects the reality of the language and its speakers, it has to account for the relation between oral and written 'texts' in the language as well. The reality in South Africa, with its particular linguistic and political history, is that the tradition of orature features very strongly in the culture of many of the African speech communities, whilst they do not have a strong written tradition at this point. Lexicographers dealing with these languages have to take

the oral dimension of the language into account when selecting texts for excerption, entries for the central list and illustrative examples.

At the mentioned Afrilex conference Van Keymeulen delivered a paper on “Making a Dictionary of an Oral Tradition”. In this paper he argues that since the dialects that he is working with in the regional dialect dictionaries in the southern parts of the Dutch language area, do not have a written tradition the dictionaries cannot be based on a text corpus. The system that is being used for data collection by Van Keymeulen (as one of the editors of the *Dictionary of Flemish Dialects*) and his co-workers, could be very useful to South African lexicographers working with languages without a substantial written tradition.

Van Keymeulen (2002) writes that oral language can be collected through the use of several methods: self-observation, if the lexicographer is investigating his/her own language; observation and noting down of spontaneous speech that is overheard; recording and transcribing ‘free speech’; purposive oral investigation through interviews and questionnaires and investigation by correspondence (written questionnaires). The material for the dictionary basis of the dialect dictionaries is collected by means of interviews or correspondence. Volunteers and respondents play a significant role in the data collection. The choice of these respondents is of great importance, since the quality of the data depends so much on the person answering the questions. According to Van Keymeulen a profile for the respondents was determined by metalexicographical considerations. The lexicographers are making use of two types of volunteers: intermediaries and dialect respondents.

The intermediary should have an interest in the dictionary project, should be highly respected in the local community and should know a large number of people at all levels of society. As stated

by Van Keymeulen, the intermediaries are in practice the clergy, (school) teachers, chairpersons of organizations, etc. The task of the intermediary is to look for suitable dialect respondents for a specific subject and to facilitate the fieldwork by introducing the researcher to potential collaborators within the local community. At this stage it must be mentioned that the dialect dictionaries are divided into three separate parts: 1. Agricultural vocabulary; 2. Technical vocabularies; 3. General Vocabulary (it is not restricted to professional activities). The collection of the data is carried out subject by subject.

The dialect respondent should meet the following requirements: he/she should have interest in the dictionary project; should be intelligent and talkative; should have grown up or stayed all his/her life in the same area, his or her occupation or trade should have been exercised in the same area; both parents should be of the same area; he/she should have been born before 1930 and should have a low level of schooling. The above-mentioned particular requirements for the intermediaries and dialect respondents were determined by the type and aim of the specific dictionary project.

South African lexicographers should in the same way keep the type and aim of their own dictionaries in mind when determining what the profile of intermediaries and respondents for such a collection of oral material should be. In the first place, in the South African situation it would also be important that the respondents should be interested in the dictionary project, should be intelligent and talkative, and be aware of his or her contribution to the project. In terms of the collection of material relevant to the culture of a speech community it would not suffice to limit the respondents to a certain age group if the aim is to create a general bilingual dictionary aimed at the multilingual and multicultural South African environment. The presentation of culture in a dictionary should represent the present-day reality that the speakers are confronted

with on a day-to-day basis. For the sake of representing certain important historical aspects of culture and for collecting information on unique culture-specific concepts it would be good to include older persons in the group of respondents, however it is also necessary to include younger people and to gain insight into their understanding of the present-day reality of their language and living conditions.

For the same reason that it is important to include respondents of different ages, it would be important to include respondents that live in the rural as well as urban areas where the language is spoken. The culture of speakers living in a city would be less traditional than the speakers living in the rural areas. However, it does not mean that the culture of speakers in the urban areas is less relevant. On the contrary, in a bilingual dictionary it is at least as important to reflect on the more traditional culture of the rural areas, if one considers the aim of representing the way people live and the “little c” culture. One could furthermore argue that the majority of users of such a dictionary would probably live in cities or towns and that the majority of respondents should be from this group. Such a decision would have to be based on a scientific, sociological user survey in order to be valid.

3.5 The role of other dictionaries

Another important dictionary source, which should not be left out of consideration, is other dictionaries. More often than not, lexicographers refer to other dictionaries of the same kind, dealing with the same language, when they are selecting entries for their own dictionary. Zgusta states that “sometimes, one dictionary is the basis for the compilation of another” (1971:239). He also suggests that the lexicographer confronting his own material with other dictionaries should

have an attitude of scientific criticism – “nothing is to be accepted from another source without a constant checking up of every detail” (1971:239). The history of Afrikaans lexicography proves why such “checking up” is really necessary. Some of the first bilingual dictionaries, e.g. *Tweetalige Woordeboek / Bilingual Dictionary* (TW) relied so strongly on Standard Dutch-English bilingual dictionaries, that the dictionaries displayed an extensive Standard Dutch influence (Gouws and Ponelis 1992:96). A more critical attitude from the editors of TW would probably have been beneficial for the dictionary and its users¹.

In South Africa, referring to other dictionaries in the compilation of dictionaries dealing with the African languages, is a complicated matter. Missionaries compiled many of the early bilingual dictionaries, dealing with the African languages along with English or Afrikaans. Many of these missionaries approach their task with a biased attitude towards the culture of the speakers of the African language. Even more recent dictionaries, compiled before 1994, display a distinctly prejudiced outlook. Lexicographers would have to be careful and “scientifically critical”(cf. Zgusta, 1971:239) when referring to those dictionaries. But the fact remains, it would be useful for a lexicographer to take notice of such dictionaries. Even if only for the purpose of identifying some wrongs of the past in order to be able to correct them rather than repeat them in present day dictionaries.

3.6 Formulating a policy

When selecting entries for the central list of a dictionary, the one factor that is essential is planning and the establishment of a policy to deal with all the possible complications of selecting material and entries for the dictionary. It is vital that the lexicographer or the team of editors that are involved in a dictionary project, formulate a policy for the management of problems during

¹ Cf.: F. Schoonheim, 1998

the course of the compilation of the dictionary. This policy should then be included and explained in detail in the styleguide of the dictionary. A styleguide is a text of reference compiled for the sake of guiding the lexicographer throughout the process of compiling the dictionary. Magay (1984:223) states, the lexicographer cannot only rely on his/her intuition when deciding what elements of the lexicon to include and what to leave out, some kind of policy based on tangible principles has to be formulated. Even more important than thorough planning and the formulation of a policy is that the policy be applied in a consistent way throughout the dictionary.

Zgusta (1971:243) states that all decisions made should be fully stated in the foreword to the dictionary. This is absolutely essential in all dictionaries, but especially so in a dictionary intended for a linguistic and culturally diverse society where it is very possible that the user will be a learner and where there is not a strong culture of dictionary usage. The user should be aided by the foreword or user's guidelines to use the dictionary as quickly and efficiently as possible, but he/she should also be aware of the policy fundamental to the choice of material and selection of entries. This kind of transparency from the lexicographer's side will be constructive in the process of establishing a culture of dictionary use and in "training" or "educating" of dictionary users in the principles of lexicography and the aim of the dictionary.

In the planning of the dictionary the lexicographer has to take the dictionary project, evaluate all the given factors, such as the size, purpose and scope and the intended target user's needs and then decide how the lexical items to be included in the macrostructure will be selected. The lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary intended for a multilingual and multicultural environment should consider the fact that enhancing and aiding the user's ability to communicate in another language with a speaker from a very different cultural background is probably one of the most

prominent needs of the user. If the dictionary is intended for a South African user, the lexicographer should also consider the implications of the complicated political history. The material that he selects as part of the dictionary basis and the lexical items that are to be included in the dictionary should be representative and informative of the cultural reality of the speakers and intended users of the dictionary. All the decisions made during the planning of the dictionary should be recorded in the styleguide. The styleguide makes it possible for the lexicographer to apply the policy decided on in a consistent fashion throughout the dictionary.

3.7 Frequency counts

Even with a good policy in hand to combat problems, the lexicographer can never completely encompass the lexicon of a language in a dictionary. "In reality, only a dictionary of a dead language can be complete as far as the repertory of the lexical units recorded in the preserved texts goes" (Zgusta 1971:246). A selection has to be made. Thus far we have established that the material selected to serve as sources of texts and data for the dictionaries should reflect the reality, should be representative of the culture of the speaker and should be selected in accordance with a predetermined policy that should be explained to the user of the dictionary.

Frequency counts are very useful in the selection of entries for the central wordlist of a dictionary. With the use of a computerized database and electronic corpus it is much less of an effort than it was in the time before user-friendly and accessible computer programs to determine the most frequently used lexical items. Usage frequency should also be a dominating factor in the lemma selection for a learner's dictionary, where the lexicographer has to adhere to fixed selection criteria and aim at a presentation of the core vocabulary of a language. However, the lexicographer cannot leave the task of selecting entries completely to the principle of frequent

use. A certain word, expression or collocation may be very frequently used in the popular publications of the time such as newspapers and magazines (e.g. the reference to “big brother”), yet that does not mean it is stabilized in the lexicon of the language and not merely a short-lived trend. On the other hand, frequency lists can easily fail to show certain words that, though not frequently used, are still essentially part of the language. Such words can represent an important concept or idea in the history or culture of the speakers.

Lexical items with taboo² status can be a good illustration of this – even though in some cultures words that are taboo are not frequently used by speakers and even less in written texts, it does not mean that a lexicographer should refrain from selecting these lexical items for entries in the macrostructure. Van Huysteen (2002) writes that in the African languages of South Africa the concept of taboo is very important for lexicographers who have to devise and lemmatize new terms for sex education, specifically in relation to HIV/AIDS. She explains that for instance in the Zulu culture, taboo refers to sexual connotation in a direct fashion. The taboo term is then described through the use of an inoffensive expression, an *Ihlonipho*, in order to show respect through avoidance. Frequency lists might pick up on some of the euphemistic expressions used to deal with taboo words, but as Van Huysteen states, lexicographers have to deal with the taboo as well when devising and lemmatizing terms dealing with sex education or HIV/AIDS.

Considering that the taboo status of lexical items is culture specific, it is very likely that the lexicographer will have to provide translation equivalents for terms that are deemed as taboo in for instance the target language, but not at all in the source language. The lexicographer would have to clearly indicate whether a term or expression is deemed as taboo by the speakers of the given language and some additional treatment might be necessary to explain the taboo status and

subsequent use of the term to the user. The taboo status of lexical items are also bound to time. At a certain time in the history of a language certain items may be viewed as taboo, whilst at a later time these same items may have lost all taboo status. For example, if one looks at the Afrikaans language and the terms and even ideas that were given taboo status by a large group of the speakers in the late eighties and early nineties as opposed to the taboo status of those terms today, it is evident that the boundaries have shifted considerably. Before the eighties/nineties it was as unacceptable in the greatest part of the Afrikaans speech community to talk about sexual issues in a direct fashion as in some of the African speech communities. Today many of the terms that would have been classified as taboo then are not necessarily considered inappropriate for use in most situations. It is evident that the boundaries of what is considered as taboo shifts with time and with regard to groups of users. Context is another important factor that contributes to the taboo value of items, and the lexicographer should address this by at least providing adequate contextual information and illustrative examples when treating items with a potential taboo-status.

Another instance where frequency counts are not necessarily a sufficient way of selecting items is when specialized or technical terms are at play. Magay (1984) performed a number of tests in which he investigated the value of frequency counts in the selection of specialized terms for admission to the macrostructure of a medium-size bilingual dictionary. He checked several frequency counts for the inclusion of the names of diseases and came to the conclusion that word-frequency counts are of little use when specialized terms are to be integrated into the general vocabulary. It should be mentioned that Magay's research and findings are today considered as dated, and the work that he has done should be seen within context. The tests that he performed

² Taboo refers to terms that are inappropriate for use in a certain social context or register.

was done in an era before sophisticated computer programmes and scientific corpora. Yet, even with the sophisticated technology available to perform frequency counts, I still believe that the lexicographer should be directly involved in the selection of entries and that he/she should question or at least re-evaluate the entries selected on the grounds of frequency before the selection of entries for the central word list is finalised.

3.8 The situation of language contact and its influence

3.8.1 Language change

It has already been stated several times that a good dictionary should give a realistic account of the target language and of the reality confronting the speakers of this language everyday. This means that a South African dictionary has to account for the situation of language contact that leads to dynamic language change. According to Gouws (1995:297) the situation in the past where Afrikaans and English were afforded official status and the African languages were restricted to use in specific geographical regions, led to a linguistic constellation that provided a “vibrant and productive language contact situation influencing all the languages concerned”. Gouws states that this situation led to the frequent occurrence of loan words in all South African languages, and in the case of Afrikaans and English it led to lexical changes as well as changes in phonology, syntax and morphology. This situation has caused severe prescriptive attitudes regarding puristic language usage, especially in Afrikaans. The reality of the language contact situation has for a long time been ignored, and there have been great attempts at the neutralization and minimization of the influence of English on Afrikaans.

According to Gouws (1995:298) dictionaries have to present data regarding the linguistic reality and the dynamics of language change. He states that lexicographers have to be aware of the

relation between linguistic and cultural contact in a multilingual and multicultural society. This awareness has to be reflected in the selection of lemma candidates for the central list of a dictionary. The lexicographer cannot still adhere to the purist ideals that refused to acknowledge the reality of language contact and change. If he does, this type of attitude will suffocate the language in question and prevent the language from developing and growing. In the past Afrikaans dictionaries sometimes displayed the lexicon of the ideal speaker rather than that of the typical user of Afrikaans (Gouws, 1995:305). This cannot be allowed to continue. Loan words, for instance, should be included as lemmas in a dictionary once they have acquired an established use in a language. The lexicographer should explain the policy concerning the inclusion of loan words in the user's guide in the front matter of the dictionary.

3.8.2 Cultural contact and the implications for the selection of lemma candidates

In the same way that the situation of linguistic contact and language change should influence the selection of lemma candidates, the situation of cultural contact should also be considered by the lexicographer. The linguistic and cultural environment in South Africa has always been diverse. After 1994, a date which marks the official end of the apartheid regime, there has been a deliberate effort to bring the vastly different cultural and ethnic groups together and to form a sense of nationhood. There have been several different approaches to this issue. One campaign focused on celebrating the diversity of cultures in order to form a sense of solidarity and to redefine the concept of being a South African. This campaign used the image of the rainbow nation, a term that is still familiar to many South Africans in many different speech communities. The result of such attempts at creating or encouraging the development of a sense of nationhood in all the different groups of South Africans led to a new situation of cultural contact. There has always been contact between different cultures, yet after 1994 there was deliberate attempts to

familiarise different cultural groups with each other and these undertakings made use of the television and popular media, in ways that was not possible before then. This new type of cultural contact has implications for the selection of lemmas for a dictionary. Certain cultural concepts that originated in the culture of a specific speech community have been appropriated by a number of other groups of speakers, and in a sense some cultural concepts now have the same status as loan words, and has to be treated as such. For instance, in the *Verklarende Handwoordeboek van die Afrikaanse taal* (2000) (henceforth referred to as the HAT) the lemma “lobolo” which is originally a Zulu term and a cultural concept foreign to the culture of the average first language speaker of Afrikaans, is treated in the central wordlist.

3.9 In conclusion

The lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary has to take the culture and environment of both speakers of the source and target language into consideration when he/she selects material for the dictionary basis. The dictionary basis should be compiled from a variety of texts, written and oral texts as well as spoken language. It is of great importance that there is some kind of interaction between the lexicographer and the speech communities. The lexicographer has to come to an understanding of the profile of the target user and his or her needs, competence and knowledge and of the culture and circumstances of the speakers through this process of interaction. On the ground of this understanding and of what the lexicographer has learned through the interaction, he/she should select a variety of texts that represent all the important components of the speech community, in order to be able to select a representative collection of

culture bound lexical items for treatment in the dictionary. These items should then be selected for inclusion in the dictionary on the grounds of them representing important cultural issues or concepts, or on the other hand because they represent certain practices or a specific way of living. These items should thus not only be selected because they represent unique cultural concepts, but because they represent a way of life – little ‘c’ culture.

The lexicographer should formulate a policy for the selection of lemmas during the planning of the dictionary and this policy should be explained and motivated in the styleguide. This guide should assist the lexicographer throughout the compilation of the dictionary. The lexicographer should also explain the policy to the user of the dictionary in the user’s guide.

CHAPTER FOUR

MICROSTRUCTURAL TREATMENT OF CULTURE-SPECIFIC LEXICAL ITEMS

4.1 Introduction

According to Hausmann and Wiegand (1989:328) the ordered set of all lemmata forms the macrostructure; the lemma and the whole set of data items addressed to the lemma form the dictionary article and the structure of data within the article is called the microstructure. Hausmann and Wiegand state that the microstructure is the most important order structure within the whole structure of the article. The microstructure entails an extensive sequence of linguistic data types and each of these data types forms a dictionary entry that covers the most important subdisciplines within Linguistics either explicitly, or less explicitly and sometimes implicitly (Feinauer 2002:4). Different types of data, the distribution of data and the presentation of cultural data in the dictionary article will be discussed in the rest of this introductory section. Thereafter, the translation equivalent, equivalent relations, additional data, illustrative examples, encyclopedic data, pictorial illustrations, structural markers, labels, glosses, and usage notes will be discussed.

4.1.1 Data types to be found in the microstructure

The order structure of the microstructure can be described as linear or hierarchical. One could also say that the microstructure of a dictionary article is the total set of linearly ordered data following the lemma (Hausmann and Wiegand, 1989:340).

Hausmann and Wiegand (1989:341) identify twelve of the most important data types that should appear in the abstract linear microstructure in a monolingual dictionary which will be presented here in a slightly adapted form. The sequence of the data types might differ from one dictionary to another, and the lexicographer should use his/her own discretion in the application of this to his/her dictionary.

1. **Synchronic identifying data:** this data type helps to identify the form of the lemma sign and its morphological paradigm. Features such as the spelling, pronunciation, accentuation, part of speech and inflexion are identified here.
2. **Diachronic identifying data:** this refers to etymological data concerning the lemma.
3. **Labeling:** the restriction of usage indicated by a label or mark. Labels can indicate usage restriction regarding time, region, borrowing, style and situation, special fields of activity, frequency, attitude, connotation, taboo-status and cultural value. This type of labeling is of great importance in the bilingual dictionary as well, especially in the treatment of culture-bound items.
4. **Explanatory data:** the definition, which would be replaced by the translation equivalent in the bilingual dictionary; if necessary further explanatory texts such as linguistic or encyclopedic descriptions could be presented, such explanatory texts would probably be necessary in the case of culture-bound lexical items in a bilingual dictionary.
5. **Syntagmatic data:** the syntactic performance of the lexical item represented by the lemma is presented here, collocations and examples, which may be given in the form of any type of example, including citations. Illustrative examples, which fall under

this category, is of the greatest importance to the user of the bilingual dictionary, and it is essential in the treatment of culture-bound items.

6. **Paradigmatic data:** the relation of the given lexical item to other lexical items is presented, e.g. the following types of relations: synonymy, antonymy, analogues, homonyms and paronyms as well as word formation.
7. **Different kinds of semantic data:** data that are used to complete the definition, e.g. *figuratively, metaphorically*, whether the lemma appears in a proverb or idioms would be indicated here.
8. **Notes:** for example usage notes – “texts of normal readability, contrasting markedly with the characteristic density of the lexicographical text”. Notes are sometimes presented in boxes or frames and are separated from other microstructural data. The use of these notes can increase the user-friendly value of a dictionary and bilingual dictionaries intended for a multilingual and multicultural environment could benefit from the use of notes, these notes are an ideal location for providing additional data concerning cultural issues.
9. **Pictorial illustrations:** can be used to supplement the definition or example material.
10. **Ordering devices:** “signposting the organization of the article in the form of figures, letters, brackets, punctuation marks, symbols. Although they help to make the structure of the article clear, ordering devices, especially in the form of symbols, are largely responsible for the impression of textual density which the dictionary article conveys”. Lexicographers of bilingual dictionaries intended for a culturally and linguistically diverse environment should heed against high textual density since this will make the article less accessible to the probable user. The density of the article should correspond with the dictionary skills and knowledge of the user.

11. **Cross-references:** these are open search paths that possibly end inside the dictionary. Cross-references can be used in bilingual dictionaries to lead the user to the further treatment of culture-bound items in the outer texts of the dictionary.
12. **Representation or repetition symbols:** normally the tilde (“~”), these symbols are substitution instructions. (cf. Feinauer, 2002:5-70)

These data types identified by Hausmann and Wiegand, even though intended for the monolingual dictionary, are mostly relevant to the construction of articles for bilingual dictionaries. However, lexicographers of bilingual dictionaries should bear the difference in the intention of the dictionary in mind when deciding on the specific structure and ordering of data types within the dictionary article. If the lexicographer is compiling a bilingual dictionary intended to aid native speakers of Setswana to decode English texts into equivalent texts in Setswana, the lexicographer would have to e.g. provide more detailed and explicit grammatical indications or synchronic identifying data for the treatment of the English lemmata than would be necessary in the treatment of the Setswana translation equivalents. The treatment of translation equivalents will be discussed in section 4.2 of this chapter.

Hausmann (1991:2714) indicates that the lexicographer of the bilingual dictionary cannot be empirically dependent on national monolingual dictionaries. He states that this dependence entails the direct taking over of a wordlist as well as the taking over of explanations and descriptions of lexical units. It is also evident in the presentation of lexicographical data in the articles. Lexicographical data cannot be taken from a monolingual dictionary and used in a bilingual dictionary without a critical evaluation of the relevance of the specific data to the user of the bilingual dictionary and the role it can play in serving the purpose of the dictionary.

The most important difference between the types of data that will be presented in the article in a monolingual and bilingual dictionary is the fact that the bilingual dictionary will present the translation equivalent and its treatment instead of the definition that is provided in the monolingual dictionary. Hansen (1990:3) states that the lemma and the translation equivalent as well as the data allocated to the translation equivalent are compulsory elements of the dictionary article of a bilingual dictionary.

4.1.2 Data distribution

When a lexicographer is planning a dictionary he or she should decide what type of information should be included in the dictionary. A lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary intended for the multilingual and multicultural South African environment might decide to include certain types of cultural data, such as illustrations and explanations of some cultural issues. Some lexicographers decide to include maps in their dictionaries, some dictionaries even have lists of frequently used quotations in other languages or proverbs and idioms. The lexicographer should determine the way in which these data types would be distributed in the structure of the dictionary when planning the dictionary. In this regard the use of a frame structure could be invaluable to the lexicographer.

The way in which data is distributed within the article is of great significance to the level of retrievability of the data. The lexicographer should decide which of the data types are most important to his users and the data should be distributed accordingly within the hierarchical order of the microstructure. With regard to this Gouws writes:

“Due to the hierarchical character of the microstructure the prominence of the first entries gives them a position of major focus while the last entries receive far less focus. This should influence the organization of data in the dictionary. Being familiar with the specific typological criteria a lexicographer knows what the priority of his dictionary is and which entry should receive the most emphasis” (1993:37).

In the bilingual dictionary intended for a linguistically and culturally diverse environment, where the comprehensive and sensitive treatment of culture-bound items are of a high priority, the lexicographer would strive to achieve maximum retrievability and accessibility of the data, especially data concerning the translation equivalent and the cultural background.

4.1.3 The presentation of cultural data in the microstructure

Cultural data could and should be presented in a variety of positions within the structure of the article. In the first place, the etymological data provided could have cultural significance. Secondly, the lexicographer has to provide labels to indicate the usage restrictions applicable to culture-bound items. This will be discussed later on in this chapter in section 4.8.2. In some cases it would be necessary for the lexicographer to provide encyclopedic data concerning the translation equivalent, especially if the given item is culture-bound. This will be discussed in section 4.6 of this chapter. Cultural data would also be provided in the syntagmatic data and the presentation of examples. Usage notes and pictorial illustrations are ideal data types to present cultural data; this will also be discussed later on in this chapter.

4.2 The translation equivalent

In a bilingual dictionary, especially one intended for a linguistic and culturally diverse environment where the furthering of communication between speech communities is of high priority, the data type that ought to have the highest placement (equal to the definition in the monolingual dictionary) in the hierarchy of the microstructure is the translation equivalent. In this chapter I am only going to discuss some of the aspects of the microstructure relevant to the treatment of culture-bound lexical items.

Zgusta (1971:312) writes that the bilingual lexicographer's most important duty is to find lexical units in the target language that are equivalent to the lexical units of the source language and to co-ordinate the two sets. Gouws (1989:160) states that the way in which the two sets are coordinated in a bilingual dictionary should guide the user so that he/she can know when to use what lexical items in the target language in order to get the same transfer of meaning. Al-Kasimi (1977:58) refers to three types of translation as identified by Roman Jacobsen. The type of translation that we are dealing with in bilingual dictionaries is interlingual translation, when verbal signs are interpreted by means of another language.

Al-Kasimi (1977:59) defines translation in terms of the following concepts:

- (a) The transference of meaning from one text to another language [...] the transference of meaning from one set of patterned symbols...into another set of patterned symbols.
- (b) Transcoding or the transformation of symbols [...] the process of transforming signs or representation into other signs or representation.

(c) Finding equivalent lexical items [...] the replacement of elements of one language, the domain of translation, by equivalent elements of another language, the range.

Al-Kasimi states that even though the bilingual dictionary deals mainly with (c), the other two concepts are also relevant “as in the translation of illustrative sentences and in transliteration of proper nouns of the source language for which there is no possible translation in the target language”.

According to Gouws (1989:160) bilingual dictionaries coordinate meaning by providing each lemma with one or more translation equivalents. It is important that both the lexicographer and user of the dictionary are aware that the translation equivalent is not a description of the meaning of the lemma; it is merely a target language form that can replace the lemma in certain contexts and situations in the target language. Al-Kasimi (1977:61) writes that a lexicographer cannot always find the required target language equivalents, especially in the case of culture-bound lexical items that denote objects or ideas particular to the culture of the source language speech community. Another case in which it is difficult to find translation equivalents is for scientific, technological terminology, which does not exist, in the vernacular languages of developing countries.

Al-Kasimi refers to five ways, suggested by the UNESCO committee, through which the lexicon of the target language can be expanded or extended, in order for the lexicographer to coordinate lexical units of the source and target language, and to achieve some sort of equivalence in say, the treatment of culture specific lexical items. Firstly the lexicographer can borrow a word from another language, secondly a new term could be coined. According to Al-Kasimi (1977:61) these methods should preferably be avoided and the lexicographer should rather try to give a new

meaning to an existing lexical item in the lexicon of the language; extend the existing meaning of a lexical item, or compound a new lexical item out of existing elements. He furthermore suggests that borrowed words should be adapted to the sound system and grammar of the language. He mentions that the borrowing of lexical items from other languages is a method that purists in developing countries resist. This can for example be seen in South Africa in the case of Afrikaans purists fervently resisting the borrowing of English words or expressions for a long time (cf. Gouws 1993a).

Al-Kasimi (1977:60) provides some requirements for translation equivalents: according to him a translation must represent the customary usage of the receptor language, it must make sense and it must conform to the meaning of the original. Ideally the translation equivalent should be able to stand by itself and adaptations, comments and explanations should only be added to avoid ambiguity, to point out that the equivalent is partial and to indicate linguistic and cultural differences between the lemma and translation equivalent (Al-Kasimi 1977:67).

Zgusta (1971:314) states that the translation equivalent should be a real lexical unit of the target language that occurs in real sentences. In order to be sure that the lexicographer indicates real lexical units he can make use of a scientific database and corpus. A text can be extracted from the database to illustrate the “whole multiple meaning” (Zgusta 1971:314) of the lexical item in the source language and the variety of contexts in which it can be used. According to Zgusta the lexicographer should then translate these contexts into the target language and see whether the “shortest possible equivalent can be used in all the translations” (1971:315). If it can be used in all the contexts and only in those, then the equivalent can be called an absolute equivalent; if it can only be used in some of the contexts it is a partial equivalent and another equivalent must be

sought for the rest of the translated contexts. This method is problematic if the context is culture specific. Merely translating the context into the target language would not make sense if the target language speakers were unfamiliar with the object or idea denoted by the lexical item.

Zgusta (1987:1) states very clearly that the main requirement for translation equivalents is that the bilingual dictionary should offer real lexical units of the target language that can produce a smooth translation when inserted into the text, and not only explanatory paraphrases or definitions. Al-Kasimi (1977:59) distinguishes between translation equivalents which can be inserted into a target language sentence and explanatory equivalents which cannot be inserted into a sentence and make sense. An example of an explanatory equivalent of a culture-bound item that cannot be inserted into a target language sentence is the English equivalent provided for the lemma **pheko** in the *English-Zulu Dictionary* (henceforth abbreviated as EZD). The following treatment is afforded to this lemma:

-pheko (isipheko,izi-) n. beast given to bridal party to cook before wedding. 2. (pl.) food for a feast.

The first explanatory equivalent serves as a surrogate equivalent since there is no translation equivalent to be found for this lexical item in the English lexicon. This explanatory equivalent cannot be inserted, as it is formulated in the microstructural treatment of the lemma, into a target language sentence, and thus would not make it possible to produce a smooth translation. It is furthermore unfortunate that the lexicographer does not supplement the treatment of lemmas with illustrative examples to guide the user towards a better understanding of the context in which the

source language item is used, or to guide the user towards using the lexical item in the correct way.

The Zulu-English section of this dictionary is an abridged version of another dictionary and the lexicographer clearly indicates that some deletions were made for the sake of space, and that this section is not a dictionary but rather a word list or vocabulary. It is very positive that the lexicographer explains this in the prefatory note to this section, and that the user can understand what he/she can expect from this section. Yet, the fact that there are not even illustrative phrases or examples provided, subtracts from the value of the dictionary.

Another example of a non-insertable translation equivalent can be found in the *Tweetalige Woordeboek / Bilingual Dictionary* (hereafter abbreviated as TW) under the lemma **ploeg** (plough). The sublemma **-breker** (ploegbreker) is merely supplied with the Latin name *Erythrina zeyheri* as a translation equivalent. This type of translation equivalent cannot be inserted into a target language sentence, the lexicographer should have provided at least an additional explanatory equivalent or a label or gloss to supplement this treatment. As it stands here it is basically useless to the user. This is one of many such examples where the lexicographer provides a Latin term as a translation equivalent, without any additional information to guide the user. This practice is not explained in the user's guide in the front matter of the dictionary. In this user's guide there are several examples in which Latin terms are provided, yet in these examples they are never provided as the sole treatment of the lemma or sublemma. For example:

Baar =s,n. (4) sea-barbel, bag(g)er, barger, catfish (*Tachysurus feliceps*).

In this instance the Latin name is provided in brackets after the translation equivalent *catfish*, which is an insertable translation equivalent. It is regrettable that the lexicographers were not consistent in the application of this system of treatment.

Zgusta explains that the equivalent indicated in a bilingual dictionary has two different properties – translationality (insertibility) and explanatory power. He states that it is favorable if both of these properties are present in the article and that they can be distributed in various ways, depending on the possibilities available to the lexicographer (1987:4,5).

4.3 Equivalent relations

An equivalent relation is not something that exists between the sum of the semantic value of a lemma with all its polysemous senses and the whole semantic value of the translation equivalent paradigm. According to Gouws (1989:163) equivalence is a semantic relation between a single sense of the lemma and a target language translation equivalent that has the same semantic value. There is a variety of equivalent relations for the lexicographer to consider. These different types of equivalence can mainly be divided into full, partial and zero equivalence. However, besides these types of equivalent relations it should also be established whether the relation of equivalence between the lemma and its translation equivalents is merely a relation of semantic equivalence or whether a relation of communicational equivalence is created. In a bilingual dictionary intended for a multilingual environment communicative equivalence is as important as semantic equivalence.

4.3.1 Full Equivalence

Full equivalence or a relation of congruence exists when there is a one-to-one relation between the source and target language lexical items. This type of equivalent relation can often be found amongst specialized and technological terminology and from time to time it can be found in the everyday language of speakers. Examples of full equivalence in the case of scientific or specialized terms can be found in the Afrikaans-English section of TW:

propileen propylene.

prosenchiem prosenchyma

protallus prothallus.

Gouws (1989:164) states that because of the fact that many items from the specialized or technical terminology in Afrikaans belongs to the loan word component of the Afrikaans lexicon, there often is a resemblance in terms of form, between the Afrikaans and English terms, like in the above-mentioned examples.

A relation of absolute equivalence between the lemma and translation equivalent can also exist when there is more than one translation equivalent that is absolutely equivalent to the source language lemma (the translation equivalents have to be absolute synonyms of each other), this type of equivalent relation cannot be called congruence. An example from TW is:

proposisie =s proposition, proposal.

Congruence, a more limited type of absolute equivalence, does not require that the lemma and its translation equivalent should be the same type of lexical item. One of the most important criteria for congruence is that the lemma has to be monosemous. Examples of congruence from the *Groot Woordeboek/Major Dictionary* (hereafter abbreviated as GW) is:

bovenster, upper window.

bovermeld, above-mentioned.

braking, vomiting.

A relation of one-way congruence is possible when the monosemous lemma is provided with only one translation equivalent, but when that translation equivalent is not a monosemous lexical item. The principle of reversibility would indicate that the relation of congruence is something that has only one-way value. In GW the monosemous lemma **uninspired** is only provided with the Afrikaans translation equivalent *onbesield*, suggesting a relation of absolute equivalence. In the Afrikaans/English section of the dictionary it is evident that the lemma **onbesield** is polysemous - it is provided with the translation equivalents: *inanimate; lifeless; un-inspired; insentient*. This is a clear example of one-way congruence.

Absolute equivalence is not an equivalent relation that one would often find between culture specific lexical items, unless the speakers of the treated languages share the same cultural environment. In a sense this is true of the present-day relation between South African Afrikaans and English speech communities. Lexical items that denote objects or ideas that are not necessarily unique to the culture, but which indicate the little 'c' culture of the speakers, the way of life, will probably refer to more or less the same objects, ideas or customs in the case of these two languages. On the other hand, one can find enormous cultural differences within the speech community or different groups of speakers of one language. For example, one could argue that there would not be much difference between what the word "funeral" means to the Afrikaans and English speaker. Yet, there is in some cases a marked difference between the way white and coloured Afrikaans speakers see or understand a funeral. This type of cultural differences within

a speech community should be considered by the lexicographer. In the case of the lemma **funeral** the user could benefit from some additional data concerning the practices or customs and etiquette related to funerals. This could be presented in the form of illustrative material or in a usage note. TAW presents grammatical data in usage notes at the end of an article. Cultural data could be effectively presented in the same way.

4.3.2 Partial Equivalence

Gouws (1989:166) makes it very clear that the lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary should aim to provide a translation equivalent paradigm that is as extensive as possible (of course with reference to the type and nature of the dictionary that is being compiled). In the case of a general bilingual dictionary intended for the multilingual and multicultural South African environment, the nature of the dictionary requires the lexicographer to provide a comprehensive translation equivalent paradigm, in order to satisfy the needs of the intended target users and to serve the purpose of the dictionary. The lexicographer may not limit the paradigm of translation equivalents to the most frequently used items, he or she should attempt to provide the user with translation equivalents for the different relevant polysemous senses of the source language item. This requires the lexicographer to thoroughly analyze the semantic value of a source language item and to determine all the possible polysemous senses of the lemma in order to be able to provide a complete translation equivalent paradigm.

Divergence is, as indicated by Gouws (1989:167), an equivalent relation where the given lemma has more than one translation equivalent (though it does not necessarily imply that either the lemma or the translation equivalent is polysemous). Thus, where congruence is a one-to-one

equivalent relation, divergence is a one-to-more-than-one equivalent relation. There are two types of divergence that can be identified: lexical and semantic divergence.

4.3.2.1 Lexical divergence

Lexical divergence implies a relation of equivalence where the lemma as well as the translation equivalent is monosemous, and it is relevant where the target language has more than one synonymous lexical items that are equal to the source language item. This type of equivalence relation has a one-way application value. Lexical divergence can, according to Gouws, only exist when there is a relation of absolute synonymy between the different translation equivalents of a monosemous lemma. This relation of absolute synonymy also applies to translation equivalents in different styles and registers. It is of great importance that the stylistic and register limitations applicable to the translation equivalent paradigm should be marked in order to guide the user to choose the correct equivalent for the given situation or context. Gouws (1996a:76) writes the following:

“The establishment of partial equivalence may not be regarded as a lexicographical mistake. But it is a mistake if the user is not informed about the degree of equivalence or lack thereof. Where partial equivalence holds between source and target language items the lexicographer is compelled to present the user with enough complementary data to ensure the correct interpretation of the established relation.”

4.3.2.2 Semantic divergence

Semantic divergence exists when the source language lemma has more than one target language translation equivalent because of the polysemous nature of the source language lemma. One could say that this type of equivalent relation is determined by the semantic nature of the lemma (Gouws, 1989:168). This type of equivalent relation does not require the translation equivalents to be synonyms of one another because of the polysemous nature of the lemma. The different translation equivalents should represent the different polysemous senses of the lemma.

An example of semantic divergence can be found in the article of the culture bound Afrikaans lemma **vry** in GW:

vry, (w) (ge-), woo, make love, keep company, court, spoon, flirt

This lemma is clearly a polysemous lemma. Unfortunately, the translation equivalents provided do not, in my opinion, represent the different polysemous senses of the Afrikaans lemma accurately. This is partly due to the way in which the translation equivalents are presented. The translation equivalents are merely separated through the use of commas, this implies that the given translation equivalents are synonyms, which they most certainly are not. Furthermore, even though the translation equivalents can be used in specific situations to create a relation of semantic equivalence it often does not constitute a relation of communicative equivalence. For instance, look at the first illustrative example cited in GW:

na 'n BETREKKING vry, solicit one's appointment to a post

In this example there might be a relation of semantic equivalence between the lemma **vry** and the given translation equivalent *solicit* (which is not even presented as part of the translation equivalent paradigm), yet there is not any relation of communicational equivalence since the example and the given translation are not in the same register. The word **vry** is mostly used in

informal language and more often in spoken language than in written language. The expression “solicit one’s appointment to a post” is much more formal than the type of language in which the Afrikaans speaker would normally use the term *vry*. Obviously the action to which this lexical item refers has a different value in English than in Afrikaans. In this specific example, I would say that the choice of the word “betrekking” is also inaccurate, since this word is also in a more formal style than the style in which the lemma would usually be used.

Another illustrative example cited in this article is:

met 'n meisie vry, make love to a girl

In this case there is not, in my opinion, even a relation of semantic equivalence between the example and its translation. I consulted several monolingual English dictionaries and in all of them the expression *make love* was defined as having only one meaning and that is to have sexual intercourse. In none of the Afrikaans dictionaries I consulted, mono- and bilingual, the lemma *vry* was defined in the same way. This is the type of guidance that the user of a bilingual dictionary cannot afford to follow in the delicate process of communication, the treatment of this lemma can cause serious, and embarrassing, misunderstandings!

Gouws (1989:168) states that lexical as well as semantic divergence can often be found in one article, which implies a relation of polydivergence. This requires thorough guidance from the lexicographer to prevent confusion on the side of the user. Different relations of equivalence should be marked in order to avoid confusion and misunderstanding.

4.3.2.3 Differentiating between translation equivalents

Many South African dictionaries mark the different polysemous senses of the lexical item represented by the lemma merely by using a semi-colon to separate the translation equivalents for the different senses. Considering the probable profile of the target user of this type of bilingual dictionary, it is not a sufficient way of marking different polysemous senses, since this method can cause confusion and can impair the transfer of information. Another great problem is that lexicographers are not always consequent in the application of this method, often translation equivalents representing target language equivalents of different polysemous senses of the source language lemma are grouped together, without even a semi-colon to distinguish them from each other.

For example the treatment of the Afrikaans lemma **vrot**, in GW:

vrot, (w) (ge-) rot, putrefy, decay; (b) rotten, decayed, bad, putrid, putrescent

This dictionary does not provide any kind of user's guide, except for a brief explanation of the use of some structural markers and abbreviations, thus the user have to rely on his/her own conclusions concerning the use of commas and semi-colons to distinguish between the given translation equivalents. This treatment of the lemma **vrot** suggests that the translation equivalents presenting the source language item as an adjective in the target language are absolute synonyms, since they are merely separated by commas. Unfortunately the treatment of this lemma consists only of the translation equivalents listed and there are no illustrative material to illustrate the use of the translation equivalents or the meaning. If, for example, an English speaking user of the dictionary would want to translate the Afrikaans sentence "dis 'n vrot fliiek, moet dit nie gaan kyk nie!", he/she would not receive adequate guidance in the treatment of the translation equivalents in order to know that the following possible translation of the given sentence would not be correct: "that is a *putrescent* movie, do not go and see it!". The translation equivalents 'bad' or

'rotten' could have been used in this sentence, but the user who is unfamiliar with the meaning of the word **vrot** and its usage, would not be able to know this without guidance from the lexicographer. Furthermore, I cannot see how the translation equivalents *rotten*, *decayed*, *bad*, *putrid* and *putrescent* can be presented as synonyms, given the fact that they cannot be used to replace each other in all sentences or circumstances.

In TAW the different polysemous senses of the lemma are numbered, the same system is used in the HAT and in the more recent editions of the WAT. It is a much more userfriendly way of informing and guiding the user. The lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary intended for a user that might be unfamiliar with one or even both of the treated languages, as is often the case in a multilingual environment, and with limited dictionary usage skills, should rather opt for the more transparent and user-friendly way of presenting data, and should avoid the use of methods (such as the use of semi-colons and commas to distinguish between translation equivalents) that could confuse the user and could hinder the transfer of crucial data.

Semantic divergence do not only occur when the source language item is polysemous, but it can also occur when the lemma is monosemous and one of the translation equivalents of the source language item is polysemous. Gouws suggests that the lexicographer should mark the polysemous translation equivalent in order to ensure an unambiguous transfer of semantic guidance (1989:169).

4.3.3 Surrogate equivalence

According to Gouws (1996a:80) the absence of target language items to be coordinated with source language items makes it necessary for the lexicographer to employ alternative means to establish semantic and communicative equivalence between the source and target language. He states that the coordination of surrogate equivalents with the lemma is one of the possible strategies that the lexicographer can use. This implies that the lexicographer has to create a replacement item for the conventional translation equivalent. The relation of equivalence that exists between the source language lemma and target language replacement entry is a relation of surrogate equivalence.

Gouws states that the type or nature of the surrogate equivalent would depend on the type of lexical gap that exists in the target language. A surrogate equivalent could be a single lexical item, but mostly a single lexical item is not available to translate the source language item and the lexicographer has to supply a paraphrase or explanation. At times the lexicographer might use a combination of a single lexical item and a paraphrase. (cf. Gouws, 1989:174-179).

Surrogate equivalence is a type of equivalent relation that is often constituted between a culture-bound lemma and its translation equivalents, since it is often very difficult to find suitable translation equivalents for culture-bound items. In the SESD the lexicographer once again, as in the EZD, provides target language “meanings” of the Setswana lemmas, thus the translation equivalents that are provided are often not insertable items. As the compiler rightly states in the introduction, there are no one-to-one correspondence of meaning between English and Setswana. If one takes Zgusta’s viewpoint (1971:312) into consideration, it is evident that there is no one-to-one correspondence of meaning between any two languages, and that the lexicographer should do his best to coordinate lexical items from the source and target language with more or less the

same semantic value. In the case of culture-bound items, the lexicographer mostly supplies explanatory phrases in the Setswana-English section of the SESD:

tsabo POSS.PHR. lit., of they or them; belonging to (them); *dikgomo tsa bomalomê*, the cattle of my uncles, or the cattle of my uncle and company.

In African culture the possession of cattle was central to the way of life of the people. Today this is still true in rural areas, and probably still true in Botswana, where this dictionary was compiled. English does not have a lexical item that expresses the same semantic value as **tsabo**, and thus the lexicographer provides a surrogate equivalent in the form of an explanatory phrase.

4.4 Additional data

Zgusta recognizes that there are some lemmata that cannot be merely treated with a translation equivalent due to: “(a) the nonexistence of the translation equivalent; (b) its polysemy; (c) its low intelligibility to someone not already fully familiar with it” (1987:4). He suggests the use of an additional explanation or data in the form of an added gloss in parentheses or of an explanatory paraphrase similar to a non-translational equivalent. Explanatory equivalents, which are less terminological and less precise, could also be used when an extra explanation of the translation equivalent is required.

When setting out to write a bilingual dictionary and to find translation equivalents it is important that the lexicographer keep the basic aims and intended users of his dictionary in mind. Gouws (1996:16) writes that even though bilingual dictionaries are employed as polyfunctional sources

of semantic data, their main function is not a transfer of meaning but that they should be aids in interlingual translations. Bilingual dictionaries should focus on a treatment that enables the user to render a good and sound translation. Gouws suggests that the main aim of the lexicographer should be to reach communicative equivalence rather than merely the establishment of a relation of semantic equivalence between source and target language.

The lexicographic treatment of culture-bound lexical items, and especially the provision of translation equivalents and the establishment of a relation of semantic as well as communicative equivalence is of the most important and possibly most difficult tasks of the lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary intended for a multilingual environment. In the multilingual and multicultural environment that the South African lexicographer is confronted with, the lexicographer cannot assume the user of the dictionary to be familiar with both the languages treated in the dictionary. Dictionary users need more guidance to ensure a successful retrieval of information (Gouws, 1996:20). This is most definitely not only true of learner's dictionaries as many lexicographers apparently are inclined to believe, but also of any dictionary intended for a linguistically and culturally diverse environment. Unfortunately the perception still exists that only users of learner's dictionaries need detailed guidance from the lexicographer and that cultural data is an optional encyclopedic entry to be indulged in only if the lexicographer has some free space that needs to be filled up.

Gouws (1996:16) stresses the fact that lexicographers cannot rely on the "presumed intuition" of their users but that they have to be as explicit as possible to ensure an optimal transfer of data. He writes that this implies the inclusion of additional entries, not aimed directly at the transfer of meaning of the lemma but rather at supporting and supplementing the given translation

equivalents. These additional entries can take the form of the added gloss in parenthesis or explanatory paraphrase that Zgusta (1987:4) writes about.

Lexicographers have to be very clear, from the first steps in the planning of the dictionary, about when and where additional entries are necessary and about the types of additional data that should be included. When a relation of equivalence is being established between the lemma and the translation equivalent paradigm a semantic co-ordination is established between the lemma and its translation equivalent(s). Gouws states that regrettably attempts to ensure translation equivalence are often restricted to the mere listing of a number of target language items. He writes that even though the lexicographer creates a relation of semantic equivalence, the user receives no guidance in choosing the correct equivalent for a specific context (1996:16). For instance, in GW the following treatment is afforded to the lemma **bemiddeling**:

bemiddeling, medium; intercession, procurement, (inter)mediation, good offices, interposition, intervention, intermediary; agency; *deur ~ van*, by the agency (mediation, kind offices) of; *internasionale ~*, international mediation.

In this article, apart from the two unmarked collocations given at the end, the user receives no guidance whatsoever to aid him/her in choosing the correct translation equivalent for a given context. On the other hand, in the English-Setswana section of the SESD the lexicographer provides the user with an English example sentence or explanatory phrase to indicate in which context each translation equivalent, representing a polysemous sense of the lemma, should be used:

wear V.T., ___ a garment, *apara*; ___ anything on head or foot, *rwala*. ___, V.I. ___ out, or become old, of things, *ônala*; be worse for ___, *goberêga*; ___ away, *fêla*; ___ away, of the day, *fêfa*; these clothes are the worse for ___, *diaparô tse di goberegile*.

Regrettably this system of the provision of the English context for the target language translation equivalents are not applied consistently throughout the dictionary. It is of great importance that lexicographers are consistent in the application of methods such as the above-mentioned.

What makes the choice of a translation equivalent out of a list of target language items even more complicated is that there are different relations of equivalence that are indicated in different ways, and often lexicographers are not very consistent in their indication of the different relations or they are not very clear in their explanation of this in the user's guide. This is a situation where the user would need further assistance in the form of additional data or possibly structural markers. The lexicographer could explain the concept of different relations of equivalence in the user's guide and indicate structural markers that will be used, consistently, throughout the dictionary to indicate the type of equivalent relation to the reader. For instance, the symbol **O** can be used to indicate full equivalence between the source and target language item; the symbol **Ø** can be used to indicate partial equivalence and the symbol **X** can indicate a relation of zero equivalence. These symbols could be inserted before the translation equivalent, so that the user could have no doubt as to the status of each translation equivalent provided:

Lemma: **O** translation equivalent¹ (te), **O** te²; **Ø** te³

If the lexicographer devises such a system of structural markers to indicate for example equivalent relations it is essential that this system and its exact scope are explained in the user's guide. The use of such structural markers along with a detailed practical explanation in the user's

guide could ensure that users would be aware of the restrictions of usage entailed by the given target language items.

On the other hand, one could argue that the way in which translation equivalents are presented should be sufficient to indicate the type of equivalent relation. This system usually comes down to a semi-colon separating translation equivalents representing different polysemous senses of the lemma and commas separating synonymous translation equivalents. This system might be effective to a certain degree, but this type of system is rarely applied in a satisfactory and consistent manner and it requires more sophisticated dictionary skills from the user than the mere identification of a structural marker.

When a translation equivalent has to be provided for a lemma that is a culture-bound lexical item, the users would probably need additional data to guide them in the choice and usage of such a translation equivalent. It is important to note that additional data, in the form of an explanation or a paraphrase may never be confused with a translation equivalent. In the SED the following translation equivalents are provided for the lemma **nyamuka**:

nyamuka: satiate; make soft or supple by smearing; smear with much fat.

In the first instance a translation equivalent is provided that can be inserted into an English text, thereafter and additional explanation is provided as well as a paraphrase that could also be inserted into a text. In the following example the lexicographer once again uses a translation equivalent along with an explanation, this type of treatment provides the user with an insertable translation equivalent as well as with additional data that enhances the user's understanding of the lemma.

nyaôga: rebound, as a bullet; melt, as frozen fat when being heated.

The lexicographer's most important task is to provide the user with a target language equivalent that can preferably be inserted into a target language text. Gouws (1996:27) uses the example of the Nguni word *hlonipa*, that "refers to a system of reverence and taboos observed by the Nguni woman towards her male relatives-in-law, involving a whole substitute vocabulary of (*hlonipa*) words to avoid speaking the radical syllable of any one of their names..." (*Dictionary of South African English*). This concept does not exist in the same way in for example the culture of English speakers and thus a referential gap exists. The word *hlonipa* is used as a loan word in South African English and Afrikaans, and the treatment of this lexical item would require some additional data in order for the user of a dictionary to fully comprehend and to be able to use the term accurately. It would be necessary to provide an explanation or paraphrase of the meaning of the word, or a usage note.

Zgusta (1987:4) suggests that additional data take the form of an added gloss in parenthesis or an explanatory equivalent. Additional data, especially concerning culture-bound lexical items can be presented in usage notes, labels, pictorial illustrations, illustrative examples and a vast variety of other forms. In the case of culture-bound lexical items, additional data for the purpose of supplementing and supporting the translation equivalent, could in my opinion be successfully included in the form of an encyclopedic microstructural entry or in a usage note. For example, in the treatment of the lexical item "lobolo" in the HAT (2000:660) the lexicographers could include an additional usage note that indicates how many cattle the prospective groom would have to pay or whether this is something that is still commonly practiced. More about encyclopedic data and usage notes can be found later in this chapter. Additional data can also be presented in other places than the microstructural treatment of lemmas, it could be presented in

outer texts and be referred to from the central list through a system of cross-referencing. Lexicographers should, with reference to their intended target users and the specific type of dictionary, decide how such culture-bound lexical items should be treated and what kind of additional data would be acceptable.

4.5 Illustrative examples

In the bilingual dictionary the translation equivalent is not a statement about the meaning of the lemma. The translation equivalent does have a semantic function in the sense that it indicates the meaning of a given lemma in a specific context through suggesting how that specific meaning or semantic value is lexicalized in the target language (Gouws 1989:161). In this sense translation equivalents are context-dependant entries in a dictionary. This is especially true of culture-bound lexical items. In order for the user of a dictionary to fully understand how these items are to be used, it is necessary for the user to understand the context in which they can be used. Cultural data concerning the context of the lemma can be provided through the use of carefully chosen examples. For instance, the illustrative examples used in the treatment of the Afrikaans lemma “nooi” (sweetheart, girl) in the *Reader's Digest Afrikaans-Engels Woordeboek / English-Afrikaans Dictionary* (1988) provides the user with an idea of the context withing which the term can be used, the lexicographer also provides the user with some additional data in a usage note that indicate the difference between the lemmas “noi” and “nooi”. These examples can aid the user in his/her understanding of the culture of the speech community and it will ultimately enhance the process of communication.

Gouws (1992) writes that whilst the translator is the mediator between two concrete language systems and is interested only in conveying the data from one language to another, the lexicographer is a mediator between an abstract language system and the demands of the active language user. He continues to explain the importance of illustrative examples by stating that they have to recontextualize the lemma. When a lexical item is lemmatized it is taken out of the concrete context and it is arranged within an abstract ordering system. Gouws (1992:41) states that “the translation equivalents that are given should be supported by contextual evidence, enabling the dictionary user to utilize the dictionary in an encoding way”.

Al-Kasimi (1977:91) explains that the function of the illustrative example is to show the lexical item (lemma / translation equivalent) in a live context and to enhance the understanding of the grammatical and semantic rules governing the usage of the lexical item, thus it shows the rules in action. He also states that examples can be selected purposefully to give the user some notion of the foreign culture. Examples can have a variety of functions, one of them being to enhance the user’s understanding of the culture of the target language speech community, other functions can be to illustrate the specific semantic value of a lexical item, or to indicate the syntactic presentation of the item, to indicate the collocations of the lexical item or to illustrate possible contexts in which the item could be used. It is important that the function of the example should be clear to the user of the dictionary and that the chosen example should be adequate for serving the purpose that it is supposed to, e.g. an example that indicates some aspect of the culture of the speech community would not necessarily be sufficient to indicate a typical collocation or the relevant context of the lexical item.

According to Al-Kasimi culture can, to a great extent, be illustrated by the quotations cited in a bilingual dictionary. He prescribes four principles, which should guide the lexicographer in the compilation or citing of illustrative examples (1977:97). Firstly, illustrative examples should be used systematically and consistently. Secondly, they should be translated into the user's native language. Thirdly, illustrative examples should reflect the culture of the target language speech community. Fourthly, illustrative examples should be brief and informative.

Illustrative examples are also of great importance in the treatment of polysemous lemmas. Examples can illustrate the specific context in which a specific sense of a translation equivalent is relevant for use. The example can disambiguate or specify the meaning of a translation equivalent in order for the user of the dictionary to know when and how to use which of the translation equivalents provided for a polysemous lemma. Gouws (1993:42) formulates it as follows:

Examples can have a variety of functions in a dictionary ... The utilization of this lexicographical category can be aimed at any of these functions; also the pragmatic function. Examples play an important role, both in textreception and textproduction, to illuminate and distinguish different polysemous senses of a lemma."

4.6 Encyclopedic data

The aim of a bilingual dictionary intended for a multilingual and multicultural environment is, amongst other things, to assist the user in achieving communicative equivalence. In order to aid the user to achieve an understanding of the use of the target language item, especially if this item is culture-bound, the lexicographer might have to provide the item with more than linguistic treatment. There has long been a debate in the lexicography about the encyclopedic vs linguistic

/ semantic or non-encyclopedic treatment of a lemma, or the relation between encyclopedic and linguistic data. Yet, the boundary between encyclopedic and linguistic data is not a clear or absolute differentiation. Zgusta (1971:198) writes that encyclopedic dictionaries give information about the extralinguistic world, physical or non-physical, and they are only arranged in the order of the words by which the segments of this extralinguistic world are referred to when spoken about. However, Zgusta (1971:199) also states that the division between encyclopedic and linguistic dictionaries is not necessarily an either-or matter and that there are elements of encyclopedic character in almost all dictionaries.

Gouws (1993:43) states that the discussion of the lexicographical representation of encyclopedic data has primarily been focussed on monolingual dictionaries, and that although a lot of attention has been paid to the issue, there has been no definite solution or clearly definable distinction between encyclopedic and linguistic data. Even though the focus of the debate has been on monolingual dictionaries, the inclusion of encyclopedic data in learner's and bilingual dictionaries is as relevant as it is in monolingual dictionaries. Gouws (1993:44) is of the opinion that "to improve the pedagogical scope of the learner's dictionary, lexicographers should evaluate different types of microstructural entries in order to ascertain the most efficient ways of conveying information relevant to the learner's needs in his mastering of the foreign language". He furthermore states that this might lead to the reappraisal of the desirability of encyclopedic data in learner's dictionaries and to an embarkation on a more encyclopedic-based approach. These statements concerning the learner's dictionary, is very much applicable to the bilingual dictionary intended for a culturally and linguistically diverse environment, where the profile of the target user would in some ways be quite similar to the profile of the user of a learner's dictionary in terms of needs, knowledge and dictionary skills. Lexicographers should seriously

consider the potential value of including encyclopedic data as a type of microstructural entry in order to convey information relevant to the user's needs in aiming to achieve communicative equivalence and an understanding of the life and culture of the target language speaker. The inclusion of encyclopedic data would not only be valuable, but could also be essential in the case of certain culture-bound lexical items, where the user would need additional data in order to be able to comprehend the use of such an item. Gouws (1993:44) suggests that encyclopedic data be viewed as a separate microstructural category and that the lexicographer has to decide how and where to accommodate it in the dictionary article.

Kavanagh (2000:105) states that traditionally dictionaries are supposed to deal with "What does *x* mean?", and an encyclopedia should ask "What, who or where is *x*?". She writes that so-called encyclopedic dictionaries rarely include data about the way of life of the speakers, such as cultural terms like family, manners, drinking or birthdays, nor do they include entries for locally based items such as famous people, places, events, etc. Taking Kavanagh's opinion into consideration, it would seem that South African lexicographers should seriously consider not only whether their users could benefit from the inclusion of encyclopedic data as a microstructural entry, but they should furthermore consider what kind of encyclopedic or "cultural" data their users would need, and how to present the data in the best way. It is important for the lexicographer already in the planning stage of the dictionary compilation to identify the acceptable extent of encyclopedic infiltration in the definition. In the case of bilingual dictionaries, especially those intended for a culturally and linguistically diverse society, I would think that the user could greatly benefit from the inclusion of such a data category in the microstructural treatment of, at least, culture-bound lexical items. In such a diverse society, the user of the bilingual dictionary is more likely than not unfamiliar with at least one of the treated

languages and probably unfamiliar with certain aspects of the extralingual world of the speakers of the other language, and thus in more than one sense a learner. The inclusion of encyclopedic data in the microstructure of the dictionary could answer the user's need to understand the world and way of life of the speakers of the target language, in order to be able to use the language in an encoding or decoding way.

The bilingual dictionary intended for a diverse society could probably furthermore benefit from taking on some of the characteristics of an ethnographical dictionary. According to Zgusta, this is a type of bilingual dictionary that tries to describe a culture in the entries of the single relevant words (1987:14). Zgusta (1971) uses the term "ethnolinguistic dictionary" to refer to a dictionary that is compiled for languages that have little or no really important literature and that are spoken in societies with cultures widely different from most of the centers of lexicographic activity. This definition would apply to some of the African languages (that do not yet have a strongly developed written literature) in South Africa where the lexicographic activity was, due to the political situation, primarily centered on Afrikaans and English until 1994.

Zgusta suggests that this type of bilingual dictionary assumes the descriptive tasks of the monolingual dictionary and that the proclivity to explanations that verge on the encyclopedic is also caused by the existence of designata, which have no equivalents in the target language. I am absolutely convinced that bilingual dictionaries in South Africa can benefit from taking on some of these characteristics, since it would serve the purpose of enhancing understanding and communication between different cultural groups by providing useful and necessary data concerning the cultures of the speech communities.

4.7 Pictorial illustrations

Illustrative material in a dictionary can be verbal or non-verbal. The illustrative examples that were discussed in section 4.3 of this chapter are verbal examples indicating the use of a lemma. Pictorial illustrations have long been neglected and regarded as ornamental components of a dictionary article adding unnecessary encyclopedic elements (cf. Gouws, 1993:45; Gouws, 1991:274). This is true if the pictorial illustrations are aimed at the presentation of data that is not relevant or necessary for the transfer of meaning or the achievement of communicative equivalence. It is also true when the pictorial illustrations present data that is already contained in the verbal definition or treatment of the translation equivalent (Gouws, 1994:69). Gouws (1994) however points out that apart from their encyclopedic function, pictorial illustrations can have great semantic importance in translation dictionaries and that the explicitness that can be achieved through the use of pictorial illustrations enhances the retrieval of information. In WDD pictorial illustrations are treated as fully-fledged components of dictionary articles and it is brought into the domain of linguistic data as an entry type. The aim of this section of this chapter is to view pictorial illustrations as a valuable microstructural entry type and to evaluate the way it can contribute to communicative equivalence and the way it can be used as an entry to convey cultural data.

Gouws (1993:46) states that the lexicographical validity of the use of pictorial illustrations is unquestionable when these entries enhance the comprehension of the target user. Gouws (1994:63) states that according to the user-perspective, the target user should determine the type of data presented in a dictionary and the way in which the data is presented. In a dictionary intended for a user with less sophisticated dictionary skills the data presentation should be much

more explicit and one of the ways in which this explicit presentation of data can take place is through using a method of ostensive addressing and thus presenting the lexicographic treatment in the form of a pictorial illustration (cf. Gouws, 1994; Ilson 1987).

Al-Kasimi states that pictorial illustrations can be used to illustrate the cultural items which no longer exist and, which the user cannot easily conceive without the aid of an illustration. He also states that pictorial illustrations should be systematically and consistently employed in bilingual dictionaries as an essential lexicographic device (1977:98). Pictorial illustrations can serve two functions according to Al-Kasimi:

- (a) They cue and reinforce verbal equivalents, especially when the dictionary user can identify, attend to, and respond differentially to the picture.
- (b) They serve as generalizing examples when several different but relevant pictures are given in order to establish the concept they are intended to illustrate.

Al-Kasimi (1977:98) quotes Smith, stating that pictorial illustrations help the user to understand and remember the content of the accompanying verbal equivalent because they motivate him, reinforce what is read, and symbolically enhance and deepen the meaning of the verbal equivalent. According to Al-Kasimi pictorial illustrations should be used whenever they have more discerning properties and more control over the desired concept than the verbal equivalent. Thus, a pictorial illustration should be used when it can get a specific response from the user, and establish a concept more efficiently than a verbal equivalent alone. Furthermore, pictorial illustrations should be used when the verbal equivalent requires the use of too many words or a too long explanation. Al-Kasimi states that in such cases a brief definition or short explanatory equivalent should be supplemented by a pictorial illustration, which gives the user a fuller

understanding of the given concept. Pictorial illustrations should also be used when the verbal equivalents cannot give a clear indication of sequential or spatial relationships, where graphic aid such as charts, maps and diagrams may prove more efficient than words. Al-Kasimi (1977:100-102) provides some criteria for pictorial illustrations: they should be compact, realistic, and interpretable – the user should be able to understand the message, they should be relevant, simple, precise, complete and clear.

I believe that pictorial illustrations can be used to explain not only cultural items that do not exist any more, but also any cultural items that will probably be unfamiliar to the user of the dictionary. Pictorial illustrations would thus be valuable to complement surrogate equivalents and to illustrate the semantic value of a lexical item for which there is no translation equivalent in the target language, whether it be due to a referential or a lexical gap. For instance, pictorial illustrations are probably the most useful for explaining the semantic value of objects or ideas that are familiar to the user, but that take on a totally different appearance or value in the culture of the target language. For example, in the article of the lemma *wedding dress* in an English – Xhosa / Xhosa – English dictionary, the English user would probably be relatively unfamiliar with how the traditional Xhosa wedding dress looks, a pictorial illustration would be ideal to portray the difference between the two culture-bound items.

In his *Deutsche-Madagassisches Wörterbuch* (1994) (German-Madagascan Dictionary), Bergholtz makes frequent use of pictorial illustrations. The dictionary is intended for Madagascan speakers in Madagascar who are learning German. Gouws (2003) comments that the target users of this dictionary are well familiar with Madagascan culture but that they are not as familiar with German cultural practices. Pictorial illustrations are for instance employed to

exemplify the interior of a bakery or the appearance of a house or palace in Germany. Using pictorial illustrations is an ideal way of supplementing the treatment of culture specific lexical items in the microstructure as well as in the outer texts of the dictionary. Bergholtz has two major sections in the back matter of the dictionary, one dealing with weights and measures and a text presenting so called routine formulae in German and Madagascan. The value of using such a system of outer texts to convey useful cultural data and enhance the user's understanding and knowledge of the foreign culture will be discussed in chapter 7 of this study. For now, I only want to comment on the use of pictorial illustrations.

I am going to refer to the "routine formulae" text in the back matter of the dictionary in which Bergholtz lists several culture specific customs, concepts and images. In this section he, for example, takes different ways of greeting and divides the act of greeting into categories of formal and informal, written and oral greetings. Typographically he works in two columns, with the German text on the left and Madagascan text on the right. He indicates the lemma in bold print, in the center position at the top of a paragraph in each column dealing with the lemma. He uses short explanations, examples, sentences and expressions to indicate the context and use of the lemma. In many cases he makes use of pictorial illustrations to indicate the semantic value of the lemma. For instance, considering the target user of the dictionary is a learner of German, it is much more effective to show the way two German gentleman would formally greet each other through the means of a pictorial illustration, than through a long and possibly complicated explanation. This could also be said of some of the African ways of greeting that even involves the clapping of hands and complicated gestures of eye contact or handshakes.

Gouws (1993:45) states that dictionary critics have the full right to regard pictorial illustrations as redundant entries if they perform no distinctive function. In Bergenholtz's dictionary the illustrations have a very distinctive function and they most certainly enhance the comprehension of the target user. In some of the illustrations there are text bubbles included in which some of the requests, greetings, exclamations etc. are written in order for the user to understand the context along with the appropriate expression. This type of treatment would be very useful to illustrate different ways of greeting different people like friends, colleagues or different family members in an African language, as opposed to the English way of greeting.

Another dictionary that uses pictorial illustrations in the back matter is the *Reader's Digest Afrikaans-Engelse Woordeboek / English-Afrikaans Dictionary* (henceforth abbreviated as RD).

In the back matter of RD there is a text "See and Say" that includes amongst others a detailed, numbered illustration of a house, a kitchen and a garden, under the heading "Where you live".

In these illustrations there are altogether about 150 items marked and provided with names in English and Afrikaans. Because of the proximity of English and Afrikaans behavioural culture in South Africa it is necessary only to provide one illustration that would be applicable to the appearance of a house that Afrikaans and English people live in. When the cultures of the speakers of the treated languages differ, the lexicographer could provide two illustrations, one indicating the appearance of a house in western terms for the English speaker, and one indicating the appearance of a rural house, or hut in e.g. Zulu culture. The inclusion of such illustrations does not imply that all English speakers, and all Zulu speakers live in the houses as illustrated, it is merely a starting point for indicating the differences of the culture-bound items.

In the *Oxford Advanced Learner's English-Spanish Dictionary*, pictorial illustrations are used in the same way as in Bergenholtz's dictionary, especially in the middle text of the dictionary. They, for example, also have illustrations (less detailed than in the RD) to indicate how a house, a bungalow or an apartment building looks. In a bilingual dictionary intended for the diverse South African environment and the English speaking user attempting to learn for instance IsiNdebele, e.g. in an English-IsiNdebele dictionary, the way the Ndebele people decorate their homes on the outside could be presented much more effectively through the use of pictorial illustrations that indicate the patterns of decorations and what they signify.

The use of pictorial illustrations is especially of value when the lexicographer has to deal with words or concepts that are not truly unique to a speech community. It would of course be very valuable to use a pictorial illustration to indicate to the user the appearance of a specific cultural object, that does not really exist anymore or which is rare and only familiar to the speakers of a specific language, for example different parts of an ox wagon or perhaps an assegai. These items that are truly unique could be relatively easy to treat because they stand out and are easy to notice and to explain. On the other hand, items which are less unique but still different enough could potentially create communicative problems and deserve some kind of special treatment, like the Oxford dictionary and Bergenholtz's treatment of the lemma **house** (cf. Tomaszczyk, 1984).

It would, for example also be more effective to indicate the difference between the European or American taxi, and the South African taxi with an illustration to support the translation equivalent; to indicate the difference between a typical meal or the staple food of a suburban Johannesburg family and the staple food or typical meal of a rural Zulu family with an illustration or to indicate different ways of cooking used by different groups of people. Another example is

different ways in which South African people come by water. Many South Africans still have to walk quite a distance to collect water and they have to carry the water home themselves, whilst other South Africans only have to open a tap. Illustrations of water pumps where people collect water in rural areas and the objects that are used to carry the water, would do a lot for the prevention of misunderstandings.

Pictorial illustrations can be very effective support for the translation equivalents provided in articles of 'little c' cultural lemmas concerned with how people live. The use of pictorial illustrations can be extremely valuable for the treatment of culture specific lexical items in a bilingual dictionary intended for a multilingual and multicultural environment, especially when the lexicographer is dealing with a user with less sophisticated dictionary skills, and where there are considerable differences in culture. Once again a lexicographer could argue that the user's skills should be developed through education. The reality is that this is not happening at the moment and that lexicographers have to be realistic about how to present data in such a way that the user, with his/her skills as it is, can find what he is looking for in the easiest possible way. But the use of pictorial illustrations is not a simplistic endeavor to be attempted without careful planning, thorough research and skillful illustrators.

Kavanagh (2000) states that illustrations are "an important means of presenting cultural data", but she warns the lexicographer about the high costs involved in using illustrations. She also reminds her reader that users unfamiliar with certain techniques and conventions, such as cross-sections, for instance, could easily misunderstand line drawings. (cf. Kavanagh, 2000:114). The misuse of pictorial illustrations could do more harm than good. It is important for lexicographers to be very sure of the effect that the illustrations would have before going on the expense to include them.

In the *Learner's English-Tswana Dictionary* (1986) (hereafter abbreviated as the LETD) the compilers made use of an average of three full colour photographs per page to illustrate some of the lemmas that are included in the dictionary. The photographs have the lemmas they are supposed to depict as captions. This dictionary is, according to the introduction, intended for Setswana learners of a school going age, and the aim, as formulated by the compilers, is to make the English that the learner's are confronted with in school more accessible to them. In actual fact the "dictionary" consists of a word list with English as source language and Setswana lexical items as target language translation equivalents. In the microstructural treatment of the lemmas, there is an indication of the word class to which the lemma belongs, e.g. *adj.* or *n.* The translation equivalents are provided, without any indication of what word class they belong to, without any illustrative examples, and without any additional guidance to the user. It could be argued that because of the fact that the target language is the native language of the users, it is unnecessary to provide any additional information, and that the photographic illustrations should serve in the place of illustrative examples.

The problem with the photographic illustrations is that they mostly show European renderings of the objects, rather than depicting the type of objects that the learner's would be familiar with, and that would be able to aid them in their understanding of the English lemmas. For example, the photograph with the caption *jetty* shows a view of a typical Greek fishing village, with an avenue between two whitewashed houses in the foreground, the blue Mediterranean sea in the middle, with some brightly coloured fishing boats, and an old stone jetty, and a wonderful frontal view of another typical Greek village across the water in the background. Firstly, the jetty depicted in this illustrations doesn't resemble any typical South African jetty; secondly there are so many

things in the picture that it is difficult to identify what they want you to focus on. This illustration is in my opinion not relevant to the object that it is suppose to illustrate, it is not precise, clear and simple and would not aid the user in understanding the English lemma anymore than the translation equivalent provided can help.

Another example from the LETD is the following treatment of the lemma **junk**:

junk (1) *adj.* matlakala. (2) seketswana.

The first translation equivalent provided is given the following English translation equivalents in the SESD: “refuse; domestic rubbish; sweepings.”. The second translation equivalent – *seketswana* – is not included in the Setswana-English section of the SESD. In the LETD *seketswana* is provided as a translation equivalent for the lemma **yacht**. In the SESD *seketswana* is not provided as a translation equivalent of **yacht**, they provide *sekêpê se se bofelo* and *sekêpana* as translation equivalents. One would expect that the illustration provided for **junk** would depict the first translation equivalent or most common meaning of the word. The illustration is a photograph of an old fashioned sailboat, not even resembling a present-day yacht. This type of use of pictorial illustrations can do as much harm as the maltreatment of culture-bound items. There are a great many other examples similar to the treatment and illustration of **junk**. In many cases the illustrations provided depict the second, and more unfamiliar polysemous sense of the lemma, and almost all the illustrations show either old fashioned objects (even for 1986) from an European heritage that does not resemble the objects that the Setswana learners would be able to recognize.

Still, I absolutely believe that the benefit of including pictorial illustrations in the treatment of culture-bound lexical items could by far exceed the costs involved, if the compilers make sensible

choices in regard to the appearance and use of the illustrations. If not, why would a well renowned lexicographer like Bergenholtz spend so much of his precious space on illustrations, or why would such an experienced dictionary publishing house such as Oxford use such a considerable amount of illustrations in their bilingual dictionaries?

4.8 Structural markers, labels, glosses and usage notes

One of the greatest challenges when learning a new language or when using a second or foreign language is to know when to use which word or expression, without making an embarrassing mistake or jeopardizing the communication process before it even started. Most bilingual dictionaries provide adequately when it comes to translation equivalents, but not all bilingual dictionaries have a consistent system in place that indicate the usage restrictions of the given translation equivalents. The usage restrictions relevant to a translation equivalent can be indicated in several ways. A lexicographer can use e.g. labels, glosses, usage notes and structural markers for this purpose.

4.8.1 Structural markers

Culture-bound lexical items and cultural data should, in my opinion, be marked clearly in bilingual dictionaries intended for a culturally and linguistically diverse environment. In a linguistically diverse environment the user of a bilingual dictionary would often be unfamiliar with at least one of the treated languages, which gives the user the profile of a learner (as opposed to e.g. the probable first language target user of a monolingual dictionary). In order for the bilingual dictionary to be able to aid the user sufficiently in the process of communication and in

coming to an understanding of the culture of the speakers of the other language, it is necessary to provide adequate cultural data and to mark this data in a clear way.

I would suggest that cultural items as well as the additional treatment afforded to these items, e.g. usage notes, be marked with structural markers. It has already been stated that because of the fact that the average user of a bilingual dictionary in a multilingual and multicultural environment can be expected to be a learner on some level, and because there is not a well developed culture of dictionary usage in many South African speech communities, the user cannot be expected to have sophisticated dictionary usage skills. The lexicographer on the other hand may not rely on the presumed dictionary skills or the linguistic intuition of the target user (Gouws, 1993:35). The correct understanding of structural markers should not depend on the user's level of competence but rather on the lexicographer's skill in explaining the use of the structural marker in the user's guide of the dictionary.

The lexicographer should determine what type of structural marker would suite the data category best, and then include the structural marker in the list of symbols, markers and labels that should be explained in the user's guide of the dictionary. One could for example use \diamond or \dagger , or one could even appropriate the copyright symbol: ©, to indicate that the use of the specific culture-bound item is subject to an understanding of the relevant cultural data concerning the given cultural object, idea or practice. This would immediately alert the user to the fact that he/she is dealing with an item with some cultural "baggage" as a matter of speaking, and that he/she should be aware of the cultural data accompanying the item in order to be able to use it correctly.

Identifying culture-bound items in the first place is not a simple process, and thus selecting entries that should be marked or indicated as such would take some time and work on behalf of the lexicographer. The criteria for items to be marked as “cultural” should, in my opinion, be the following: When the use of the lexical item could be problematic and cause communication problems or misunderstandings (if the user is not aware of the cultural context of the item), it should be marked and supplemented with the necessary additional treatment to prevent any possible misunderstandings.

4.8.2 Labels

According to Gouws (1989:200) labels are used to indicate the appropriateness of using a lemma in a given context, and are aimed at the insurance of communicative success when using the specific lexical item. Gouws (1989:200) also suggests that the use of labels is greatly influenced by the specific type of dictionary. In his opinion the labels in a prescriptive dictionary will be more focused on censoring the use of lemmas than in a descriptive dictionary. Bergenholtz (forthcoming) proposes an alternative to an exclusively prescriptive or descriptive approach. According to him a combination of the two approaches would be ideal for use in a bilingual dictionary. He calls this combination a proscriptive approach. Bergenholtz states that a lexicographer should be selectively descriptive in the sense that he/she should not indicate the whole range of available options, but rather only those that would serve the aim of the dictionary, whether for text-production or text-reception. The lexicographer should thus attempt to influence the user, but not as strongly as in a purely prescriptive approach when the lexicographer often only mentions a single variant or option and where the user is given no choice in the matter. In a proscriptive approach labels could play a substantial role.

The use of labels is usually restricted to non-standard varieties, and the absence of a label implies that the entry belongs to the standard variety of a language. Gouws (1989:201) states that labels should be selected so that they indicate some kind of deviation from the standard form and thus restrict the communicative usage of the lemma. Even though culture-bound lexical items are often not deviations of the standard form of the language, the use of labels should be considered. Using labels to identify culture-bound lexical items will indicate to the user that the lexical item can only or also be used in restricted contexts and will thus aid the process of communication. According to Gouws illustrative examples are responsible for an implicit transfer of data whereas labels provide an explicit and immediate transfer of data. The user of a dictionary can only benefit from knowing immediately and without doubt whether he/she is dealing with a culture-bound lexical item and what the restrictions of usage are that should be kept in mind. If a structural marker is used to indicate that the given lemma is culture-bound, it would also immediately and explicitly indicate the data-type and the additional use of a label could indicate the usage restrictions that apply to the lexical item represented by the lemma. In the following example from GW the absence of a label in the treatment of the Afrikaans lemma has the effect that the user would not be aware of the restrictions of usage, and that there is no sense of communicative equivalence, due to the insufficient treatment and the lack of the use of a label.

naai: stitch, sew; have sexual intercourse.

In TW this same lemma is treated with the label *vulgar* applied to the translation equivalent “have sexual intercourse with.”. The label *vulgar* indicates that the use of the lexical item is restricted to vulgar language and it is not suitable for use in other situations or contexts. The given lexical item also has a certain taboo status. It is for example not a term that would be used

in a classroom situation. Unfortunately this taboo status is not indicated or explained to the user in either of the mentioned bilingual dictionaries.

In the treatment of the Afrikaans culture-bound item **Rooinek** in GW the lexicographer once again neglects to make use of a label to indicate that the term is mostly used in either a humorous or mocking way or even in a derogatory way. The lemma is merely provided with the translation equivalents: “pommy, limey, Englishman”. The first two translation equivalents are not even included in the English/Afrikaans section of the dictionary and the item “rooinek” is not provided as a translation equivalent for the lemma “Englishman” in the English/Afrikaans section of GW. The user of this dictionary would definitely have benefitted from a more comprehensive treatment of this type of culture-bound item. The use of a label indicating the usage restrictions and an usage note explaining the cultural background of the term would have led the user to a greater understanding of the specific lemma as well as the culture of the Afrikaans speech community and its historical background.

The lexicographer should determine what kind of treatment is required by each individual item and should use a combination of structural markers, labels, glosses and usage notes as necessary.

Labels can only really be employed successfully if the use of the different labels is explained in the user’s guide in the front matter of the dictionary and if the labels are used in a consistent manner. In both TW and GW the lexicographer provides the user with a list of all the editorial abbreviations in the front matter of the dictionary. Unfortunately the labels are not differentiated from the abbreviations used for e.g. grammatical terms, common nouns or place names. The

negative aspect of this is that the reason for the use of labels is not explained to the user, and the user would not necessarily be aware of the restrictions implied by the use of the label.

A label can be directed at the lemma or at a specific entry in the dictionary article, e.g. at one translation equivalent of the source language lemma. The use of labels is always part of the microstructural treatment of the lemma. When the label is directed at the lemma, the usage restrictions indicated by the label would apply to all the entries in the article, thus in the bilingual dictionary to all the given translation equivalents. If the label is directed at a specific entry in the article, e.g. one of the polysemous senses of the lemma, the usage restrictions indicated by the use of the label would only apply to the specific entry, and not to the rest of the article. This also means that there can be more than one label attributed to the dictionary article of a given lemma. A lemma can have different uses, and the same lemma can even be used in different specialized fields. In the microstructural treatment of the lemma **plooi** the label (*biol.*) (biological) is inserted after the translation equivalent “ruga”, one of the polysemous senses of the lemma. The label (*anat.*) (anatomical) is insert after the translation equivalent “plica”, which represents another polysemous sense of the same lemma. This implies that these labels are only applicable to the specific polysemous sense of the lemma **plooi**, and not to the whole lemma (TW, p. 415).

Apart from labels indicating the restricted use of a lemma in a specific field, labels can also be temporal, geographic and stylistic (cf. Gouws 1989:203, 204). Lexicographers of bilingual dictionaries intended for a multilingual and multicultural environment could use cultural labels. These labels could be used to indicate culture-bound lexical items that are restricted to use in a specific context, on the one hand because the object or idea denoted by the lexical item only

exists within the particular culture or context, on the other hand because the semantic value of the lexical items within the given context or culture differs decidedly from the semantic value of the lexical item in another context or culture. *Hlonipa* words would for example be good candidates for labeling. In *A new concise Xhosa-English Dictionary* (1984) *hlonipa* is presented as a sublemma in the article of the lemma *hlona*. It is provided with the following English explanations: “pay or show respect to; avoid using words resembling their names, through reverence”. In this instance the English user of the dictionary would have greatly benefitted from the use of a label. The lexicographer should provide the explanatory equivalent: “avoid using words resembling their names” with a label indicating that this is a cultural practice, and the label should be supplemented with a usage note (or a cross-reference to further treatment of the issue in the outer texts of the dictionary), at least explaining who the “their” is that is being referred to in the explanatory equivalent.

4.8.3 Glosses

According to Zgusta (1971:332) there are two basic differences between labels and glosses: Firstly, they differ in terms of form – the form of glosses can vary from one entry to the next, on the other hand the form of the labels to be used in a dictionary must be decided on by the lexicographer before the work on the dictionary itself can begin. A lexicographer should provide a list of all the possible labels to be used in the dictionary in the user’s guide and he has to be consistent in the application of the labels. The second difference relates to purpose: semantic glosses always disambiguate, labels only sometimes disambiguate, very frequently labels merely inform the user about a descriptive fact of the language.

Zgusta (1971:329) writes that even though translation equivalents are the most important entries in the dictionary article, it mostly does not suffice to indicate them alone because most of them have multiple meanings and because translation equivalents are more often than not only partial equivalents of the lemma. We have already seen that labels can be used to indicate the usage restrictions applicable to lexical items that deviate from the standard variety. A gloss can be used to disambiguate the multiple meaning of a translation equivalent. Zgusta (1971:329) uses the following example to illustrate this: “Eng. *daughter* – Ossetic *čyzg* (“one’s own child”)”. He furthermore states that the gloss disambiguates the multiple meaning of the Ossetic word because it eliminates the other sense (*girl*). Zgusta writes that the gloss should not be seen as an explanation, since the gloss does not attempt more than to indicate the relevant difference and sphere of application. An explanation would, according to Zgusta need a statement of other critical features. Glosses can be used in the same way to specify the partial equivalents: “they specify to which part of the entry-word’s multiple meaning the respective partial equivalent belongs, and thereby also disambiguate its own multiple meaning” (Zgusta, 1971:329).

Zgusta makes it clear that a gloss is something that have varying forms and can overlap with an assortment of other lexicographic devices, e.g. explanations, explanatory equivalents, disambiguating synonyms, etc. For instance, an example of a gloss that is an explanatory phrase is the underlined section of the following:

uitgly, (-ge-), slip (e.g. on banana skin); skid (GW).

An example of a gloss that acts as an disambiguating synonym is:

honkie-tonk (klavier), honky-tonk (piano) (GW).

Zgusta explicitly states that the lexicographer should not bother too much with the form of a gloss, as long as he/she does not write “uncalled-for encyclopedic explanations in their place”, but that the lexicographer should rather focus on finding the really critical feature or the limited range of application (1971:330).

The treatment of the lemma **uitgifte** in GW includes two disambiguating glosses (underlined) as well as a label:

uitgifte (-s), issue (stamps); flotation (of loan); issuance (*mil.*) [...]

In each case the gloss indicates that the translation equivalent is only partially equivalent to the lemma. The gloss used indicates that *issue* can be used to translate **uitgifte** with regard to stamps, whilst *flotation* can be the target language equivalent of the lemma in the case of a loan.

4.8.4 Usage notes

Wiegand (Hausmann and Wiegand, 1991:342) states that various data types may be classed under the term note. According to him, usage notes are texts of normal readability, contrasting markedly with the characteristic density of the lexicographical text. In recent years there has been a distinctive attempt to make dictionaries more user-friendly. Including more usage notes that are readable and easy accessible for the user, is part of this tendency.

Usage notes are part of the inner access structure of a dictionary and they can refer to the lemma or a specific microstructural entry. According to Gouws (1993:36) the position of these notes in the article should give a clear indication of their scope. Quite often usage notes are placed in a

square frame that sets it apart from the other entries. Gouws writes that the square frame serves as an access structure that indicates the specific type of entry.

The lexicographers of GW makes limited use of usage notes, for example after the treatment of the lemma **nigger**, which is given the Afrikaans translation equivalent *Afrika-Amerikaner*:

Today in the U.S. the expression African American has come into vogue.

The usage notes in GW are employed to provide data concerning the meaning and usage of lexical items. In the *Tweetalige Aanleederswoordeboek/ Bilingual Learner's Dictionary* (hereafter abbreviated as TAW), usage notes are only used for linguistic and grammatical data. Especially in this learner's dictionary the user would have greatly benefited from usage notes providing cultural data, in order to aid the user in understanding the culture and lives of the target language speech community, and to equip him/her better to communicate in the target language. Kavanagh states that a short note after the lexical entry, is an attractive way of including more detailed cultural data.

Gouws (1996) discusses *inserted inner texts*. According to Gouws inserted inner texts are also presented in a different manner than the rest of the lexicographic text, e.g. in separate frames or tables. This type of text is also part of the inner access structure, and serves as an effective way for the lexicographer to draw the user's attention to a certain piece of data. Wiegand (Hausmann and Wiegand, 1991) states that inserted inner texts are particularly appropriate for use in a learner's dictionary. As we have already established, most users of bilingual dictionaries in such a diverse environment such as South Africa would probably be unfamiliar with at least one of the languages treated in the dictionary, which would make a majority of the dictionary users learners

and, which would make usage notes, or inserted inner texts particularly appropriate for the presentation of e.g. cultural data.

4.9 In conclusion

Since the central list still remains the “primary target venue for dictionary consultation procedures” (Gouws, 2003), lexicographers should make optimal use of devices such as labels, glosses, usage notes and structural markers to treat cultural data in the central list. Gouws (2003) writes:

“When arguing for an expanded treatment of cultural data it is imperative that, no matter where in the dictionary the data is presented, the central list should be a focal point: either for the full treatment of the relevant items or to present an accessible slot which provides the needed reference position to accommodate the relevant reference entry.”

The use of structural markers, labels, glosses and usage notes gives the lexicographer the opportunity to present the relevant and necessary cultural data. This type of direct presentation of data makes the article and data more accessible to the user and it decreases the density of data in the article. These devices thus play a significant role in the process of aiding the user in the process of communication and preventing unnecessary misunderstandings.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE TREATMENT OF IDIOMS AS CULTURE-BOUND LEXICAL ITEMS

5.1 Introduction

Idioms are strongly rooted in the culture of a speech community. When considering the culture-bound lexical items of a language, idioms would constitute a substantial part of this type of lexical item, and thus the treatment of idioms in the bilingual dictionary intended for a culturally and linguistically diverse society is of great importance. Unfortunately idioms as a type of lexical item are often neglected and maltreated in dictionaries, even though the correct treatment of idioms could substantially aid the dictionary in enhancing the user's communication skills.

Gouws (1996a:75) writes:

“The ability to use idioms in a fluent and stylistic correct manner is one of the ways in which L¹ speakers distinguish themselves from L² speakers. The lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary should endeavor to equip his users with typical L¹ skills. This includes the mastering of idiomatic language.”

5.2 Idioms and culture

It has already been stated that idioms are strongly rooted in the culture of a speech community. Idioms reflect the life style and behavioural culture of a speech community. It should also be recognized that there are strong temporal dimension to idioms. Idioms reflect the life and culture of a specific group of speakers at a specific point in time. Sometimes speakers are not aware of

the roots or etymology of an idiom, yet it does not make the idiom less meaningful nor does it necessarily cause the idiom to be used less frequently.

5.3 The placement of idioms

Idioms are part of the category of multiword items, a group of lexical items that are insufficiently represented in the macrostructures of most bilingual Afrikaans/English dictionaries because of the strong word bias that exists. Ideally, all multiword lexical items should have macrostructural status as multiword lexical items, which means these items should be lemmatized and treated in the macrostructure of the dictionary (Gouws, 1996a:56).

One of the problems with the lemmatization and inclusion of idioms and other multiword lexical items in the macrostructure is the alphabetical placement of those items without a fixed word in the first position (Gouws, 1996a:56). The solution that most lexicographers opt for is to place idioms, alphabetically, in the article of a key word. This key word is typically the first noun or the first verb in the idiom. According to Gouws (1996a:56) this system of treating idioms in the article of a so-called key word, even if it might be a systematic way of treatment, misrepresents the lexical item status of idioms and other multiword lexical items. Gouws furthermore states that this approach often also incorrectly implies a semantic relation between the lemma and the multiword lexical item treated in the article of the lexical lemma.

When idioms are treated in the article of a key word, they are often included in a microstructural search area alongside other multiword items such as collocations and illustrative examples, without structural markers that differentiate them from the other entries in that article position (Gouws, 1996a:68). Gouws also points out that the undifferentiated presentation of source language idioms is followed by an equally undifferentiated presentation of translation

equivalents: “For example, the users of these dictionaries receive no assistance in ascertaining whether an entry given as translation equivalent for a source language idiom has idiom status in the target language or not” (Gouws, 1996a:68).

In the treatment of the lemma **hond** (dog) in GW, this undifferentiated treatment of idioms alongside other multiword items is evident:

hond, (-e), dog; hound; *elke ~ is BAAS op sy eie werf*, every cock crows best on his own dunghill; *twee ~e veg om een BEEN, die derde loop daarmee heen*, while two dogs are fighting, a third takes the spoil; *iem. soos 'n ~ BEHANDEL*, treat someone like a dog; *'n ~ BLAF tog*, even a dog will bark; *die ~e BLAF nie meer vir hom nie*, the dogs no longer bark at him; [...]

In this segment of the article the first two entries after the translation equivalents are idioms that are translated quite accurately with target language idioms. Even though there are no semantic relation between the lemma and the idioms, the Afrikaans idioms indicate that having a dog is part of the culture of the speech community. Because this is a common occurrence, speakers come to draw parallels between things in their life experience and for instance the behaviour of dogs, that also make out a part of their everyday life. The third and fourth entries could be called fixed expressions and the last entry is no more than an illustrative example. There are no structural markers, labels or glosses to indicate the status of each entry, and the dictionary user has no way of knowing what kind of multiword lexical item he/she is dealing with. It is extremely important for the user to know the status of the lexical item in the target language, e.g. whether it is an idiom, proverb, illustrative example, citation etc. In this type of treatment of idioms the user will have no chance of acquiring L¹ skills or to master idiomatic language if the

user have no way of knowing when the idioms are being treated, and when it is e.g. illustrative examples that are being presented.

It is evident that the inclusion of idioms in the macrostructure of bilingual dictionaries is problematic and the treatment of idioms in the microstructure, in the articles of so-called key words is, at least linguistically, problematic. In my opinion, the lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary intended for a multilingual and multicultural environment where the treatment of culture-bound lexical items are of great importance, has two options for the treatment of idioms and it does not have to be an either or situation. Firstly, since the central list stays the main focus in a dictionary, it is important to include references to idioms in the central list of a dictionary. I believe this could still be done in the articles of key words, if the lexicographer can devise a clear and consistent system of using structural markers or labels that can differentiate idioms from other multiword items; that can differentiate different types of translation equivalents that are provided for the idioms; and that can differentiate the idioms semantically from the lemma of the article in which the idiom is treated. Secondly, the lexicographer could opt to deal with idioms in the outer texts of the dictionary. In the back matter of the *Groot Noord-Sotho Woordeboek* (1975) (Great North-Sotho Dictionary) there is an appendix in which Northern Sotho idiomatic expressions are ordered alphabetically according to keywords. The idioms are provided with Afrikaans and English translation equivalents, mostly these translation equivalents are idiomatic expression themselves. This treatment of idioms in a separate text in the back matter of the dictionary is a step in the right direction, regrettably the only treatment these items are afforded is the provision of translation equivalents. There are no reference to the idiomatic expression in the central list of the dictionary.

If the lexicographer chooses to use a combination of the two options, it would be best if the treatment of the idiom in the article of the key word is brief, consisting mainly of the structural markers identifying and differentiating the idiom from other entries, and referring to the text in the front, middle or back matter of the dictionary that is treating the idioms more comprehensively. It is important that the lexicographer explains the system that he/she is using in the user's guide, and that the structural markers that are used are also indicated and explained thoroughly in the user's guide. In the outer text dealing with the idioms, the lexicographer would have to provide a variety of microstructural data types in the treatment, similar to the treatment of any other lexical item in the macrostructure. This includes ample contextual information, illustrative examples and usage notes explaining the cultural context of the idiom. I believe that lexicographers would find that treating idioms in such a comprehensive manner would only be beneficial to their users, especially users confronted with a complex and diverse cultural environment in which they have to be able to communicate, rather than be a waste of precious space.

5.4 Providing translation equivalents for idioms

In a bilingual dictionary one of the most important tasks of the lexicographer is to provide target language translation equivalents that can be employed by the user to replace or translate source language items in specific contexts. When the lexicographer has to decide on translation equivalents for idioms, one of the things he has to determine is whether he will always attempt to translate idioms with idioms. Gouws writes that such a co-ordination is not always possible and when it is, the idiom and translation equivalent would probably differ in style and/or register. He states that the translation equivalent will sometimes have to be a surrogate equivalent, or that lexicographers would at times have to be satisfied with restricting the treatment to a target

language explanation of the source language idiom (1996a:57). The formation of idioms is after all a language specific process: “The existence of an idiom in one language does not imply the existence of an idiom with a similar meaning in another language” (Gouws 1996a:68).

One of the disadvantages of treating idioms in the microstructure, as an entry in the article of the lemma coinciding with the keyword, besides the fact that the idioms don't have lemma status, is that there is little space for proper treatment. Gouws states that even though idioms are, in some Afrikaans-English / English-Afrikaans bilingual dictionaries, regarded as treatment units and provided with target language translation equivalents, the treatment is very limited. Usually there is no indication given of the nature of the equivalent relation between the idiom and translation equivalent (1996a:70). This problem could be solved if idioms were treated in a text separate from the central word list, where there would be more space to deal with issues like the type of equivalent relationship between the idiom and its translation equivalents.

When considering the types of equivalent relations possible between an idiom and its translation equivalents the lexicographer should, according to Gouws, focus mainly on the categories of congruence, a form of full equivalence, divergence, a type of partial equivalence, and surrogate equivalence, the result of zero equivalence (1996a:70). When the lexicographer provides an idiom with a translation equivalent, it is of great importance to the user that the lexicographer indicates the type of equivalent relationship between the idiom and translation equivalents. A mistake that is frequently made is that lexicographers do not give any additional information or any indication that the list of translation equivalents that they provide, contains only partial equivalents of the source language item. The lexicographer has to apply equivalent discrimination, which means that he/she should include entries that will enable the user to choose the correct equivalent, where a relation of divergence exists (Gouws, 1996a:71).

The intended target user of the dictionary should be considered here. If the lexicographer is compiling a bilingual dictionary intended for, for example the South African environment, and the dictionary is intended for speakers of a language without a well developed dictionary culture, and without sophisticated dictionary using skills, it is unacceptable if the lexicographer does not provide adequate information about such strong culturally rooted items like idioms. It should also be indicated (through the use of labels and glosses) whether the translation equivalent could be used in the same register and context as the source language idiom, and whether the translation equivalent itself is also an idiom. This type of transfer of additional information can be done through the use of labels, glosses and structural markers. Unfortunately the use of labels and glosses are often restricted to items with lemma status. This is something lexicographers have to pay attention to.

When the lexicographer is searching for possible translation equivalents, it is advisable to look beyond the lexical lemma at the head of the article in which the idiom is treated, and to focus on the meaning of the source language idiom. Gouws (1996a:72) calls this method where the meaning of the idiom is the point of departure, a semantic approach. The lexicographers of GW apparently followed such an approach, this can be deduced from the fact that the translation equivalents provided for the source language idioms often do not even contain an equivalent given for the keyword under which the source language idiom is treated. For example:

cat¹, (n) kat; kats (straf); ankerkraan; kennetjie; *he let the ~ out of the BAG*, hy het die aap uit die mou laat kom (gelaat) [...]

In this example the translation equivalent provided for the idiom *he let the cat out of the bag* is an Afrikaans idiom with the same meaning, yet the translation equivalent does not include an

equivalent given for the keyword under which the source language idiom is treated. One could say that the translation equivalent is an absolute equivalent of the source language item, since the target language idiom is in the same register and style as the source language item, and could thus be used to replace the source language item in any context. In this example one can also see that the lexicographer does not even distinguish the translation equivalents from the idioms through the use of at least a full stop. Another cultural aspect to which the lexicographer should pay attention is the issue of gender. Lexicographers should be sensitive towards this complex issue, and it does not suffice to only refer to the masculine gender in the way that the lexicographers of GW does in the above-mentioned example. Gender-sensitivity should show in the use of proper names and illustratory examples.

Gouws explains that idioms have a “semantic plus value” which cannot always be explained by a definition, and which is rooted in the specific cultural background or cultural reference. The translation equivalents can seldom account for this plus value. For example, in the article of the lemma **pruim** (plum) in TW, the idiom *hoe pruim daardie twak vir jou?* is given the translation equivalents “how do you like that?” and “what do you say to that?”. Firstly, there are no indication of the fact that the source language item is an idiom and that the translation equivalents are not. Secondly, the translation equivalent can in no way account for the semantic plus value of the source language idiom. This idiom cannot be fully understood without knowledge concerning the specific cultural context in which it is rooted. The cultural context of the language gives idioms a certain nuance that is hard, even impossible, to capture in a mere translation equivalent. He states that this has implications for the type of translation equivalence that can be achieved. A relation of full equivalence or congruence is unusual because of the restrictions implied by the cultural context, register or stylistic differences. The above-mentioned idiom and

the given translation equivalents are at most in a relation of partial equivalence because of great difference in register, style and context. This type of lack of communicative equivalence cannot go unmarked in a bilingual dictionary, the lexicographer has to give the user some indication of the differences and restrictions of usage that are at play.

According to Gouws (1996a), a relation of partial equivalence can occur due to a difference in registers and as a result of the polysemous nature of either the source or target language idiom. When partial equivalence occurs, it is of great importance that the lexicographer provides the user with enough information to be able to interpret the relation of partial equivalence accurately. In the case of partial equivalence because of differences in register, Gouws points out that it often happens that these differences go unmarked and that the user is the one that is disadvantaged by the negligence of the lexicographer.

There are different ways in which a relation of full equivalence between source and target language idioms can be achieved. Gouws states that, due to the ongoing process of language contact, Afrikaans has many idioms which are direct translations from English, and which still has exactly the same semantic value (1996a:72). Gouws cites the idiom “give the devil his due” with the translation equivalent “gee die duivel wat hom toekom” as an example. This type of direct translations is made possible because of the fact that South African Afrikaans and English speech communities to a great extent share a cultural basis. Since these source and target language idioms have the same meaning and are without usage restrictions, the type of equivalence relation can be called full equivalence. This is also true when the Afrikaans translation equivalent, even if not a direct translation, has the same semantic, pragmatic and usage values as the source language item.

Gouws (1996a:74) writes that full semantic and communicative equivalence should be regarded as the neutral or unmarked relation between source and target language items. This means that the absence of labels, glosses, style or semantic indicators suggests that the translation equivalent can be used in all contexts to replace the source language item. Yet, even if it is an unmarked relation, it does not mean that the lexicographer can stop the treatment of such an item at the provision of a translation equivalent. The treatment of an idiom in a relation of full equivalence to the translation equivalent should furthermore be supported by illustrative material to recontextualize the idiom. And the source as well as target language idioms should be marked with labels or glosses, indicating whether they belong to the informal, colloquial, formal or any other register in their respective lexicons.

As it has already been pointed out, it is not always possible, in fact it is in many cases impossible to find target language idioms to serve as translation equivalents for source language idioms. When the lexicographer cannot find an idiom to serve as a translation equivalent and he uses a non-idiomatic target language item to substitute for a target language idiom, it can be regarded as a relation of surrogate equivalence.

CHAPTER SIX

USING A FRAME STRUCTURE FOR THE PRESENTATION OF CULTURAL DATA

Thus far it has been established that it is of extreme importance for lexicographers of bilingual dictionaries, intended for a multicultural and multilingual environment, to present cultural data and to treat culture-bound lexical items comprehensively. The extent to which cultural data is to be included in a dictionary depends on the type and scope of the dictionary. The bilingual dictionary has to cater for communication-directed as well as knowledge-directed functions when the intended target user is part of a multilingual and multicultural society.

Communication-directed functions aid and guide the user in the process of communication, whilst knowledge-directed functions should work towards making the user more knowledgeable about a specific topic. Gouws (2003) states that dictionaries in a multilingual environment do not merely function as linguistic instruments but that they also have to function as cultural instruments. In the multilingual and multicultural society the user of a bilingual dictionary, aiming at textproduction in the target language, would need to be able to extract information and increase his/her knowledge about the culture of the target language speech community in order to be able to communicate successfully. On the other hand, the user needing a dictionary for text-reception would also have to gain some knowledge and insight into the culture of the target language speech community in order to comprehend a given text in the target language, and ultimately for the communication process to succeed. Thus, the presentation of cultural data is relevant to both of these functions, which are in turn relevant to any bilingual dictionary in a culturally and linguistically diverse environment.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that it is essential to include and treat a representative variety of culture-bound items and cultural data in any bilingual dictionary intended for such a diverse society such as South Africa. At this stage the treatment and presentation of what can be called cultural data or items is something that is sorely neglected in most South African dictionaries. Kavanagh (2000:101) states:

“Dictionaries clearly have a responsibility for imparting or enhancing knowledge of a language. They provide lists of words with definitions and other very specific categories of information. Generally, they do not provide explanations of cultural behaviour.”

If South African lexicographers want to answer their user’s needs, and want their dictionaries to aid users in the intricate process of communication between different speech communities and cultural groups, they have to pay more attention to the inclusion and treatment of cultural data. In this regard, Gouws (2003) writes: “The inclusion of cultural data should be regarded as compulsory and lexicographers should negotiate various options to present it in the best possible manner.” During the course of this discussion several strategies for a more satisfactory and comprehensive treatment of cultural data have been discussed. One such strategy has only been referred to briefly, with reference to a back matter text in Bergenholtz’s *Deutsch-Madagassisches Wörterbuch* and on a few other occasions. This so-called strategy encompasses the use of a frame structure that makes the systematic utilization of outer texts possible, in order to treat and present cultural data more successfully in a dictionary.

A dictionary with a frame structure has a central list accompanied by outer texts presented in both front and back matter sections (Gouws, 2003). Gouws (2003) states that even though the

central list stays a compulsory text and focal point in any dictionary, it is no longer the only venue for the presentation of data or the occurrence of lexicographic texts. There should exist a complementary relation between the central list and the outer texts of the dictionary. The central list and outer texts cannot exist independently from one another. In this regard Gouws comments on Bergenholtz's dictionary by stating that the routine formulae in the outer text are not presented as isolated entries. This back matter text can be considered an integrated outer text because users are referred to the text from the central list. The references in the central list are given to direct the user to retrieve additional information (Gouws, 2003). Gouws furthermore states:

[...] when arguing for an expanded treatment of cultural data it is imperative that, no matter where in the dictionary the data is presented, the central list should be a focal point: either for the full treatment of the relevant items or to present an accessible slot which provides the needed reference position to accommodate the relevant reference entry.

According to Gouws this leaves the lexicographer with two options: either to afford a more comprehensive treatment of articles in the central list, or to reduce this treatment and to increase the treatment of these items and issues in the outer texts. He is of the opinion that it does not have to be an either - or situation. He suggests a combination presenting a thorough treatment of cultural data in both the central list and outer texts of a dictionary.

Alongside the notion of a frame structure, the notion of a *data distribution structure* (cf. Gouws 2003), should be considered. The *distribution structure* of a dictionary refers to the way in which linguistic and encyclopedic data are distributed across or occurring in different places in the dictionary. The extended notion of the *data distribution structure* determines

how data types are presented and different texts are positioned in the dictionary. This improvement of the structure of dictionaries can be attributed to the more user-driven approach of recent years. The improved presentation of data categories in dictionaries is aimed at the more successful retrieval of information. This implies that changes made to the structure of dictionaries should be accompanied by changes to the selection and presentation of data categories. This has already been discussed in the chapter on the selection of lemma candidates, and should be kept in mind throughout the rest of this discussion.

If the lexicographer has gone through the necessary steps in the process of selecting representative cultural items to be treated in the dictionary, the problem of how to present this data still remains. In the chapter on the microstructural treatment of culture-bound items, several suggestions have been made concerning the presentation or treatment of cultural items, but even there, and in particular in the discussion of the treatment of idioms as culture-bound items, it has become evident that a comprehensive treatment of cultural items in the central list of a dictionary is problematic. This is especially true if the dictionary is intended for a diverse society where it is even more important that the cultural items be represented justly and thoroughly.

The use of front and back matter texts is not something new, in the past many dictionaries have made use of both types of text types to present additional data that could not sufficiently be treated in the central list. In the *Reader's Digest Afrikaans-Engelse Woordeboek / English-Afrikaans Dictionary* (1988) the lexicographers made use of front, middle and back matter texts to present additional data. For example, before the start of the Afrikaans-English part of the dictionary there is an introductory text namely, "A new kind of dictionary" and a table of contents in both English and Afrikaans. A user's guide dealing with the main as well as the

supplementary text; a list of abbreviations in English and an Afrikaans pronunciation guide constitute the front matter of the Afrikaans-Englis dictionary. An Afrikaans list of abbreviations are presented in the back matter of the Afrikaans-English dictionary. In the English-Afrikaans dictionary the same front and back matter texts are presented in the relevant languages. After the English-Afrikaans dictionary there is a comprehensive back matter text dealing with a wide range of issues e.g. writing letters, forms of address, there is a whole section called “See and say” with numbered illustrations and the correct terms in Afrikaans and English.

Al-Kasimi (1977) indicates some criteria for the front and back matter of a bilingual dictionary. According to Al-Kasimi (1977:109-112) the front matter should contain an introduction that has to indicate: the purpose of the dictionary; the sources that were used in the compilation; the method of compilation; the underlying grammatical philosophy; the coverage of the dictionary, that is the range of lexical items and word senses, and the types of information that are provided in the dictionary. Al-Kasimi furthermore states that the front matter should contain a history of the language: “Is there a history of the target language showing its development and its relations to other languages?”. In this regard the cultural and political history of a language could also be relevant to, for example, a learner of Afrikaans or one of the African languages. Al-Kasimi expects that there should be a systematic presentation of the phonemes of the language and the distribution of the allophones; a pronunciation guide illustrating the transcription system adopted in the dictionary and a key to the pronunciation citing two or three familiar words as examples to each symbol. He also requires a comprehensive explanation of the grammar of the language; an outline of the writing system, e.g. spelling rules and exceptions, and finally a guide to the dictionary. There

has to be a guide to the proper use of the dictionary indicating, according to Al-Kasimi, abbreviations, lexicographical conventions and special techniques employed.

These criteria are, in my opinion, still relevant to the front matter of a bilingual dictionary. If this dictionary is intended for a linguistically and culturally diverse environment one could make some additions to his list of criteria, yet it should be remembered that the contents of the outer texts of a dictionary would ultimately depend on the type of dictionary and its intended users' needs. The lexicographer could in the introduction also indicate the method underlying the selection of lemma candidates (to show how they came to a representative selection of lexicon items) and who the intended target user of the dictionary is supposed to be and how the needs of this user were determined. In the user's guide the lexicographer could include an explanation of the way in which, for instance cultural data is presented in the dictionary, e.g. an explanation of the different structural markers and labels that are to be used; when and why usage notes are to be presented and of how idioms and other multiword items are to be treated. The lexicographer may not rely on the presumed skills, knowledge and intuition of the dictionary user. A detailed, comprehensive user's guide is not optional but essential.

With regard to the back matter of a bilingual dictionary Al-Kasimi, who calls these texts appendices, expects the lexicographer to provide commonly sought data concerning the target language culture such as currency, weights and measures, thermometer system, lists of major educational and political institutions and maps. The presentday lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary intended for a culturally diverse environment would have to expand Al-Kasimi's list considerably. Gouws (2003) points out that dictionaries too often adhere to a very limited use of outer texts and that when outer texts are used they often do not really contribute to the value of the dictionary for the user or enhance the transfer of information. Gouws states that

the optimal use of a frame structure, like in *The Greater Dictionary of Xhosa*, allows the lexicographer a much more diverse approach to data distribution. The frame structure offers lexicographers the opportunity to diversify the presentation in their dictionaries, by extending the nature of both the data and text types to be included in the dictionaries.

In this instance the trilingual (Xhosa, English, Afrikaans) *The Greater Dictionary of Xhosa* can be referred to as an excellent example of a dictionary that makes use of the outer texts to present cultural data, and consequently has a well-developed frame structure. Already in the front matter of the dictionary it is evident that the editors of the dictionary realize the importance of presenting cultural data. Some of the issues dealt with in the number of texts contained in the front matter are sections commenting on Xhosa as a dynamic, developing language, some linguistic issues, the dictionary staff, and even a paragraph dealing with *Isihlonipho*. In this section the cultural practice of isiXhosa women avoiding certain syllables or consonantal sounds as a mark of respect is explained briefly.

In the back matter of *The Greater Dictionary of Xhosa* (henceforth abbreviated as GDX) there are thirty-one texts dealing with culture-bound lexical items and concepts, presented in Xhosa, English and Afrikaans. This kind of treatment of culture-bound items are of great value to the user, whether it is a Xhosa, English or Afrikaans user. But, the value could have been advanced if the texts included in the back matter had been identified in a more explicit way through, for example listing them in the primary table of contents. Another problem is the fact that the back matter text is positioned in one of three volumes of the dictionary, which means that all of the items will not have the same accessibility. According to Gouws, there is a degree of interaction between the central list and outer texts. In the articles of some culture-bound items there are entries referring the user to the back matter text where these items are

discussed more thoroughly. However, the system of text-external cross-referencing is not applied consistently. In some of the articles of culture-bound items in the central list, there are no entries to refer the user to the back matter text. This diminishes the value of the outer texts of the GDX.

Gouws comments that the inclusion and treatment of items such as e.g. *tokolosh*, *circumcision*, *abduction of a girl*, *the brewing of Xhosa beer* and *the eating of ritual meat* in the back matter of the dictionary, can be seen as an attempt to adhere to the knowledge-directed function of the dictionary. In terms of the communication-directed function of the dictionary it would have been helpful if the same kind of attention had been paid to the concepts and items that are not truly unique to Xhosa, or at least Nguni culture, but that make out a central part of the way of living of the Xhosa people. As Tomaszczyk (1984:289) points out, it is these items, though not really unique, that can be different enough to potentially create communicative problems and thus deserves rather special treatment. With regard to behavioral culture or “little c” culture, the sense of culture that is more about the everyday lives of ordinary people, Kavanagh (2000:103) states that knowledge regarding this sense of culture is more relevant to language users in terms of communication, but, she states, it is also more difficult to pin down. Yet, the fact that it is more difficult to deal with does not excuse lexicographers from their responsibility towards their users in this regard.

An example of a dictionary that does deal with the way of life of the speakers of the target language and the items that are not truly unique to a speech community such as e.g. greeting or thanksgiving, is Bergenholtz’s *Deutsch-Madagassisches Wörterbuch* (1994) (henceforth abbreviated as DMW). In the back matter of the DMW Bergenholtz includes two main texts: an appendice that deals with measures and weights and a text that presents routine formulae in

German and Madagascan. As it has already been stated that the dictionary is intended for Madagascan speakers in Madagascar who are learning German. The target users of this dictionary are well familiar with Madagascan culture but not with some German cultural practices. This back matter text is intended to familiarize the Madagascan user with German cultural practices. The text contains German formulae expressing condolences, congratulations, commands, greetings, rebukes, thanksgiving, warnings, greetings, etc. with their Madagascan equivalents. Bergenholtz furthermore distinguishes between formal, informal and neutral variants of the expressions. This distinction alone already contributes greatly to the value of the text by making it possible for the user to be able to choose the correct formulae for the given situation and use it with confidence. Bergenholtz also makes frequent use of pictorial illustrations to accompany the descriptions given, the illustrations mostly indicate gestures that are associated with specific formulae. Gouws states that the gestures and treatment of these formulae assists the user to achieve a higher degree of communicative success when conversing in German, and that the illustrations form part of the communication-directed function of the dictionary (cf. Gouws, 2003).

Kavanagh (2000:100) writes that in order for us to be able to communicate successfully, we need, for instance, to have some idea of register and tone of voice: to know when to use formal or informal language, or slang, in appropriate contexts and to be able to understand and appreciate the language level and tone of others. She furthermore states:

Linguistic interaction is regularly constrained by cultural factors, such as age, seniority, or gender. We need to be aware of social conventions: when to speak, how to talk to people older than us, how to be polite. In our own language and in our own cultural setting this comes naturally. In other settings we may feel insecure.

These are skills that Bergenholtz succeeds in equipping his Madagascan user with in the back matter text of his dictionary. In a multilingual environment the lexicographer is challenged with a broad range of behavior patterns and several different frameworks of acceptability (Kavanagh, 2000:100). These are elements that the lexicographers of a bilingual dictionary have to take on, and using a frame structure and outer texts that complement the central list can provide the ideal way of presenting data of this kind.

If I can continue in the same gist as Al-Kasimi's criteria for the outer texts of a bilingual dictionary I would like to suggest that South African lexicographers of bilingual dictionaries should include texts in the back matter of their dictionaries from which users can retrieve information concerning the "little c" culture of the speakers of the languages treated in the dictionary. Kavanagh states that an important function of language is to enable speakers of that language to identify with a group or to separate themselves from it. She calls language a means of ethnic or cultural identity.

Considering the basic purpose or function of a bilingual dictionary in a multilingual and multicultural environment, which should be to aid users in the process of communication and to attempt to help enhance the user's knowledge of the language and culture of the speech community, it is important for lexicographers to include data categories that answer this need. Lexicographers can do this by following Bergenholtz's example, by including texts that inform the user about everyday life in the culture of the target language speaker. These texts can contain data dealing with the daily life of ordinary people, the places they go to, the institutions they have contact with, social interactions, the beliefs and perceptions and priorities of the people, aspects of life such as religious practices, education, employment, leisure activities and sport (cf. Kavanagh, 2000:103). This does not mean that the kind of

cultural data included in the back matter of the GDG is redundant, not in the least. It is of great importance to represent the culture of a speech community in all its dimensions. The data that is presented has to be representative, and not to comment on issues such as e.g. *circumcision* or *Isihlonipho* would come down to gross negligence on the side of the lexicographer. Yet, only to present such truly unique cultural items also does not succeed in answering the communicative needs of the user.

In the Oxford range of bilingual learner's dictionaries e.g. the inclusion of cultural notes, calendars of traditions, festivals and holidays, guides to letter writing and e-mail, wordgames, guides to communication, current idioms, phrases, slang and colloquialisms, technical and scientific, legal and medical terminology are advertised. In some of the bilingual dictionaries for young learners they include illustrations and lists of shapes, colors, numbers, days, months, fruits, animals and insects as well as large labeled pictures of the body, clothes and everyday scenes. These are all data types that could be considered by lexicographers for inclusion in their central list or outer texts.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

Throughout the course of this thesis, it has been indicated that a lexicographer should compile a dictionary in accordance with the needs of the proposed target user and the demands of the environment that the dictionary is intended for. It has furthermore been indicated that the bilingual dictionary compiled for users living in a multilingual and multicultural environment should be adapted in terms of form, content and structure to present and treat a representative amount of cultural data in a comprehensive manner.

When a lexicographer is planning a dictionary the aim and purpose of the dictionary is one of the first things that should be determined, as said in answer to the needs of the users. A bilingual dictionary intended for a linguistically and culturally diverse environment should aim to aid the user in the process of communication. The dictionary should help the user to understand the culture of the target language speech community in order to be able to understand target language texts and speech, and the dictionary should enhance the user's knowledge of the target language culture in order to be able to communicate in the target language. If these are the main functions of such a bilingual dictionary, the way in which cultural data is presented is of great importance to the user.

A variety of ways, in which the bilingual dictionary can be adapted to accommodate cultural data sufficiently, has been suggested. The lexicographer should select material for the dictionary basis that is representative of the culture of the speakers. The linguistic and cultural reality that the

speakers are confronted with daily should be reflected in the dictionary. The reality of language contact and change should be reflected, and loanwords have to be included in the central list once they have acquired an established use in a language. The lexicographer should explain the conditions for the inclusion of loan words to the user in the user's guide. The relation of oral and written texts of a speech community should be represented realistically in the dictionary basis. If the language has a strong tradition of oral literature and not a well-developed body of written texts, then the oral tradition should be accommodated and represented in the dictionary. A corpus should be viewed critically, particularly with reference to the material that was used to compile the corpus. Other dictionaries should be consulted but should also be viewed with a scientific critical attitude. The lexicographer should furthermore be critical of relying merely on frequency counts as a selection criterion for lemma candidates. It is of great importance that the lexicographer formulates a policy according to which lemma candidates will be selected in the early stages of the planning of the dictionary. This policy should be explained to the user in the introduction or user's guide of the dictionary.

The lexicographer of a bilingual dictionary should keep in mind that the bilingual dictionary has to provide the user with target language equivalents that can be used to translate the source language item in a given context. The translation equivalent is not a statement about meaning, and should be presented and treated in such a way that it will help the user in the process of translating and communicating. In order to be able to do this, the lexicographer has to indicate the different relations of equivalence. In the first place, equivalent relations should be explained to the user in the user's guide, and secondly, the lexicographer has to indicate what the relation of equivalence is between the lemma and its translation equivalents. This can be done through the use of structural markers or labels. If the relation of equivalence is not indicated in a consistent,

sufficient manner the user would not be equipped to know when to use what translation equivalent. This would impede communicative equivalence and would deduct from the value of the dictionary.

For the sake of equipping the user with the necessary skills and knowledge it is imperative that the lexicographic treatment, of particularly culture-bound items should go beyond the mere provision of a translation equivalent. Translation equivalents should be supplemented and supported by illustrative examples and the necessary additional data. Lexicographers should make use of structural markers, for instance to indicate a culture-bound item so that the user will know when he/she needs to know about the cultural background before the lexical item can be used with success. Labels and glosses should be employed to indicate the restrictions of usage, and to give the user the needed guidance. Usage notes are ideal for the presentation of cultural data, and even the presentation of encyclopedic data. Another device that can be utilized by lexicographers to deal with culture-bound items is pictorial illustrations. These illustrations can be inserted into the text or can be included in the outer texts of the dictionary.

Idioms are a type of lexical item that is grounded in the culture of a speech community. Idioms are usually treated in the article of a key word from that idiom. Very often lexicographers make no distinction between the presentation or treatment of idioms and other multiword lexical items such as illustrative examples or collocations. In order to be able to help the user understand and use idioms correctly the lexicographer has to differentiate between idioms and other multiword items. The lexicographer could merely treat idioms in the central list through indicating the status of the items as an idiom with a structural marker or a label, and with a cross-reference to a more detailed treatment in the outer texts of the dictionary. As lexical items in their own right,

idioms deserve the same treatment as any other lemma in the central list. Unfortunately, the placement of idioms without a fixed word in the first position is problematic and that is why these items are mostly treated in the article of a lemma coinciding with the keyword. If idioms were to be treated in for instance a back matter text, there would be more space to afford the idiom a comprehensive treatment, with illustrative examples and additional data, even usage notes and the presentation of the relevant cultural data.

When dealing with culture-bound items in the outer texts of the dictionary, the lexicographer is making use of a frame structure to deal with cultural data. A frame structure implies the use of a central list accompanied by texts in the front and back matter of the dictionary. Several suggestions have been made for how the use of front and back matter texts can alter the structure of a bilingual dictionary in order for it to be able to present and treat cultural data in a comprehensive manner.

Finally, the similarities between the bilingual dictionary intended for a multilingual and multicultural environment and the learner's dictionary has been discussed. The requirements of the user living in such a diverse society necessitates it that the bilingual dictionary should take on some of the characteristics of the learner's dictionary, such as accommodating the skills, or lack thereof, of the intended target user, aiming to achieve maximum retrievability and making a notion of greater simplicity a governing principle of the dictionary.

In the end, all the suggestions that were made basically comes down to the fact that the lexicographer has to analyze the needs of the user and consider the environment that the dictionary is intended for, before the planning of the dictionary can start. Lexicographers have to

keep in mind that the dictionary has to be an instrument in the hand of the user and that the functions of the instrument have to be adapted according to the needs of the user. In a multilingual and multicultural environment the bilingual dictionary has to cater for a diversity of needs and demands and the lexicographer should accommodate this in the compilation of a dictionary. Lexicographers may not allow themselves to comply with a tradition of linguistic bias, but should be able to adapt the form, content and structure of the dictionary to include and treat the data that the user needs. In a linguistically and culturally diverse environment the user needs more than a linguistic instrument, it needs a dictionary that can be a cultural instrument as well. In South Africa we need bilingual dictionaries to be depolitisizing instruments that can help unify diverse speech communities, that can bridge the gap that has been made by the past, that can help users communicate across linguistic as well as cultural borders.

REFERENCES

Dictionaries

- Bergenholtz, H. et al.** (eds.) 1994. *Deutsch-Madagassisches Wörterbuch*. Moers: Aragon.
- Bosman, D.B. et al.** 1984. *Tweetalige Woordeboek/Bilingual Dictionary*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Branford, J. and W. Branford.** 1991. *Dictionary of South African English*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Doke, C.M., D. McK. Malcolm and J.M.A. Sikakana.** 1982. *English-Zulu Dictionary*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Döhne, J.L.** 1857. *A Zulu-Kafir Dictionary etymologically explained with copious illustrations and examples, preceded by an introduction on the Zulu-Kafir language*. Cape Town.
- Du Plessis, M.** 1993. *Tweetalige Aanleerderswoordeboek/Bilingual Learner's Dictionary*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Eksteen, L.C.** 1997¹⁴. *Groot Woordeboek/Major Dictionary*. Cape Town: Pharos Dictionaries.
- Grobbelaar, P. et al.** (eds.). 1987. *Reader's Digest Afrikaans- Engelse Woordeboek / English-Afrikaans Dictionary*. Cape Town: The Reader's Digest Association, South Africa (pty) Ltd.
- Kotze, E. and P. Wela.** 1991. *Afrikaans/Zulu Woordeboek met Engelse vertalings*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Kriel, J.J. and E.B. Van Wyk.** 1989. *Pukuntšu Woordeboek*. Cape Town: J.L. van Schaik.
- Learner's English-Tswana Dictionary*. 1986. Johannesburg: Librarius.
- Matumo, Z.I.** 1993. *Setswana English Setswana Dictionary*. Gabarone: Macmillan Botswana.

McLaren, J. 1984. *A new concise Xhosa-English Dictionary*. Cape Town: Mascew Miller Longman.

Odendal, F.F. and Gouws, R.H. (eds). 2000. *HAT. Verklarende Handwoordeboek van die Afrikaanse taal*. Kaapstad: Perskor.

Pahl, H.W. (ed.) 1989. *The Great Dictionary of Xhosa*. Volume 3. Alice: University of Fort Hare.

Snijman, F.J. (ed.) 1968. *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal. Deel V*. Pretoria: Staatsdrukkery.

Ziervogel, D. and P.C. Mokgokong. 1975. *Groot Noord-Sotho Woordeboek*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaick / UNISA.

Other sources

Al-Kasimi, A.-M. 1977. *Linguistics and Bilingual Dictionaries*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Feinauer, A.E. 2002. *The Treatment of Semantic Information in Dictionaries*. Stellenbosch: Department of Afrikaans and Dutch, University of Stellenbosch.

Gouws, R.H. and F.A. Poneis. 1992. The Development of Afrikaans and the Lexicographical Tradition. In: Zgusta, L. (ed.) *History, Languages, and Lexicographers*. Tübingen; Max Niemeyer: 77-194.

Gouws, R.H. 1989. *Leksikografie*. Cape Town: Academica.

Gouws, R.H. 1991. Review: Hausmann, F.J., O. Reichmann, H.E. Wiegand and L. Zgusta (eds.): *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*. *Lexicographica* 7/1991: 268-290.

- Gouws, R.H.** 1992. Kommunikatiewe ekwivalensie in vertalende woordeboeke – ‘n probleem vir die vertaler. *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Taalkunde*. 10(1):37-42.
- Gouws, R.H.** 1993. Afrikaans Learner’s Dictionaries for a Multilingual South Africa. *Lexikos* 3: 29-48.
- Gouws, R.H.** 1993a. Normatiewe inligting in woordeboeke: ‘n nuwe benadering. *Lexikos* 3: 49-66.
- Gouws, R.H.** 1994. Ostensiewe adressering in vertalende woordeboeke. *Lexikos* 4:61-85.
- Gouws, R.H.** 1995. Dictionaries and the Dynamics of Language Change. *Cultures, Ideologies, and the Dictionary*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer: 297-313.
- Gouws, R.H.** 1996. Bilingual Dictionaries and Communicative Equivalence for a Multilingual Society. *Lexikos* 6:14-31.
- Gouws, R.H.** 1996a. Idioms and Collocations in Bilingual Dictionaries and their Afrikaans Translation Equivalents. *Lexicographica* 12/1996: 54-88.
- Gouws, R.H.** 2003. Using a frame structure to accommodate cultural data. In: Emejula, J. du P (ed.) 2003. *Elements de Lexicographie Gabonaise*. New York: Jimacs-Hillman Publishers: 54-69.
- Hartmann, R.R.K.** 1989. Sociology of the Dictionary User: Hypothesis and Empirical Studies. In: Hausmann, F.J. et al (reds.) 1989-1991: 102-111.
- Hausmann, F.J. & Wiegand, H.E.** 1991. Components Parts and Structures of General Monolingual Dictionaries: A survey. In: Hausmann, F.J. et al. (eds.) 1989-1991: 328-360
- Hausmann, F.J., O. Reichmann, H.E. Wiegand , L.Zgusta (red.).** 1989-1991. *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*. Berlyn; Walter de Gruyter.
- Ibson, R.F. (ed.)** 1987. *A Spectrum of Lexicography*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

- Kavanagh, K.** 2000. Words in a Cultural Context. *Lexikos* 10: 99-118.
- Lam, C.W.** A Study of the Culture-Oriented Approach Adopted by Robert Morrison in *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language*. Hong Kong. INTERNET.
- Magay, T.** 1984. Technical or general: problems of vocabulary selection in a medium-size bilingual dictionary. *LEXeter '83 Proceedings*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer: 221-225.
- Mdee, J.S.** 1984. Constructing an entry in a learner's dictionary of Standard Kiswahili. *LEXeter '83 Proceedings*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer: 237-241.
- Nkabinde, A.C.** 2002. Cultural Implications on Lexicography *Programme and Abstracts*, Afrilex 7th International Conference, Grahamstown.
- Schoonheim, F.** 1998. *Een studie naar aspecten van de invloed van die Nederlandse lexicografie of Afrikaanse woordenboeken*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Stellenbosch.
- Tomaszczyk, J.** 1984. The culture-bound element in bilingual dictionaries. *LEXeter '83 Proceedings*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer: 289-298.
- Van Huysteen, L.** 2002. The Value of Culture in the Development of Medical Corpora in Zulu. *Programme and Abstracts*, Afrilex 7th International Conference, Grahamstown.
- Van Keymeulen, J.A.J.** 2002. Making a Dictionary of an Oral Tradition. Unpublished paper delivered at the 7th International Conference of the *African Association for Lexicography*, Grahamstown.
- Van Niekerk, A.** 1995. "Beleid vir die hantering van sensitiewe materiaal in die WAT" *Lexikos* 5, p. 232-248.
- Wiegand, H.E.** 1984. On the Structure and Contents of a General Theory of Lexicography. In: Hartmann, R.R.K. (ed.) 1984. *LEXeter '83 Proceedings*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer: 13-30.
- Wiegand, H.E.** 1996. A theory of lexicographic texts. An overview. In: *SA Journal of Linguistics* 14/4: 134-149.

Winchester, S. 1999. *The Professor and the Madman*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Zgusta, L. (1971). *Manual of Lexicography*. The Hague: Mouton.

Zgusta, L. 1987. Translation Equivalence in a Bilingual Dictionary. *Dictionaries* 9: 1-47.