

The influence of the user needs paradigm in specialised lexicography: Some reflections in connection with two South African wine dictionaries

Michele van der Merwe and Pedro A. Fuertes-Olivera

University of Stellenbosch (South Africa) & University of Valladolid (Spain)

michelevdm@sun.ac.za & pedro@tita.emp.uva.es

Abstract

This article describes the influence of the user needs paradigm in the construction of specialised dictionaries. It shows that this paradigm coincides with the main tenets of the function theory of lexicography, a theoretical construction that offers theoretical and practical solutions for improving the quality of specialised dictionaries. This theoretical stance is illustrated with reference to how encyclopaedic information is dealt with in two wine dictionaries that are separated by almost 40 years, and which are, therefore, ideal candidates for investigating the influence of the user paradigm on their compilation. More specifically, this article considers the lexicographic treatment accorded to subject field labels, which are presented as essential lexicographic data for helping non-experts and interested laypeople. These labels assist users more in communication functions in a foreign language than in their native language, and are consequently needed in trilingual dictionaries such as the *South African Trilingual Wine Dictionary*, a free access Internet dictionary that targets experts, semi-experts and interested laypeople.

Keywords: specialised lexicography, user needs, wine dictionary, encyclopaedic data, subject field labels.

Resumen

La influencia del paradigma de utilidad en la lexicografía especializada: Algunas reflexiones en relación con dos diccionarios del vino publicados en Sudáfrica

En este artículo se describe la influencia del paradigma lexicográfico relacionado con las necesidades de los usuarios. Este paradigma coincide con la base teórica de la teoría funcional de la lexicografía y su aplicación práctica a la construcción de diccionarios especializados. En concreto, se analiza el tratamiento de la información enciclopédica presente en dos diccionarios dedicados a la misma materia (el vino) y separados por casi 40 años de diferencia. Los dos diccionarios analizados se compilaron en Sudáfrica, uno de ellos en el año 1973 y el otro en el año 2012. El estudio se centra en las etiquetas temáticas, es decir en una estructura lexicográfica muy importante en la lexicografía especializada ya que sin ellas la mayoría de los usuarios tendrían muchas dificultades para acceder a la información que necesitan cuando consultan un diccionario de este tipo. Estas estructuras ayudan más en las

diferentes situaciones comunicativas en una lengua extranjera que en la lengua propia del usuario; aparecen en el diccionario de 2012, el *South African Trilingual Wine Dictionary*, que es un diccionario de acceso libre que puede consultarse en Internet y que tiene como objetivo ayudar a los tres tipos de usuarios descritos hasta la fecha en la literatura lexicográfica: expertos, semi-expertos; legos interesados.

Palabras clave: lexicografía especializada; necesidades del usuario; diccionario de vino; datos enciclopédicos; etiquetas temáticas

1. Introduction

Tarp's (2012) discussion of the development of specialised lexicography during the past twenty years offers mixed results. On the one hand, the number of published specialised reference works has increased substantially. On the other hand, the lexicographic quality of most of these works is deficient:

Specialised lexicography has produced a big and growing quantity of practical products during the past two decades; however, when it comes to the quality of these products and the underlying theory that has to support and guarantee this quality, specialised lexicography – including terminography – has more than anything else been characterised by twenty years in slow motion. (Tarp, 2012: 125)

There are several factors that might have contributed to this situation, a lack of adequate theoretical framework representing the factor discussed in this paper. We aim to show that the so-called “user needs paradigm” introduced in Householder & Saporta's (1967) seminal work offers theoretical and practical solutions for improving the lexicographic quality of specialised dictionaries (Section 2). This approach is illustrated by our reference to two South African wine dictionaries, which were published in 1973 and 2012 (Section 3). In particular, this paper will argue that the inclusion of subject labels in the dictionary published in 2012 responds to the influence of the user needs paradigm, and therefore illustrates the way ahead for enhancing the lexicographic quality of specialised dictionaries, namely, to take into consideration the theories developed in the field of Lexicography (Section 4). A final conclusion summarizes the main points discussed and offers some reflections on future developments.

2. The user needs paradigm

The user needs paradigm refers to the academic discussions that focus on users consulting a dictionary in specific usage situations. These discussions are widespread in specialised lexicography and have been one of the central issues in the development of the Function Theory of Lexicography, which is a theoretical

construction initially advocated by Bergenholtz & Tarp (2002, 2003 & 2004; Tarp, 2008).

The Function Theory of Lexicography is being used in the construction of several specialised dictionaries, for example, the accounting dictionaries (Fuertes-Olivera, 2009 & 2011; Fuertes-Olivera & Nielsen, 2011 & 2012; Fuertes-Olivera & Tarp, 2011; Nielsen & Almind, 2011; Bergenholtz, 2012; Fuertes-Olivera et al., 2012). It maintains that the genuine purpose of any information tool is satisfying the specific needs a particular user has in a specific usage situation. Tarp (2008: 56-57) has shown that user needs can be divided into two main groups: “primary user needs” and “secondary user needs”. Primary user needs are those leading to a dictionary usage context, for example, a communicative-oriented situation such as translating a specialised text. Primary user needs are those requiring information and typically include data about the mother tongue, the foreign language, specialised language in both the mother tongue and the foreign language, comparative information about the mother tongue and foreign language, comparative data about specialised language in the mother tongue and foreign language, general cultural information, that relating to culture in a specific language area, information concerning a specific subject or science, and comparative data on a subject in national and foreign culture (see Tarp, 2008: 56-57 for a review).

Secondary user needs are those that arise when users seek assistance in a dictionary. These are needs for information as well as for instruction and education, for example, users who “have very little knowledge about a specific discipline need simple lexicographical data about this discipline – otherwise they will find it hard to extract information out of complex data” (Tarp, 2008: 57-58). Similarly, users who have a poor command of a foreign language need dictionaries containing the relevant lexicographical data in their mother tongue. To put it another way, users with no formal training in grammar, for example, Spanish students of Science, will find dictionary articles such as that in example (1) useless, even if *PDEV* is a fundamental resource for use in computational linguistics, language teaching, and cognitive science.” (URL: <http://nlp.fi.muni.cz/projekty/cpa/>)

| No. | % | Pattern / Implicature | |
|-----|-----|---|---|
| 1 | 66% | {[[Dog]] {fox seal ...}} bark [NO OBJ] {[[Dog]] {fox seal baboon}} utters a sharp, loud cry or a series of such cries Typically, [[Dog]] does this as a warning Such cries are characteristic of adult large dogs | conc. exploit. |
| 2 | 25% | [[Human]] bark [[Speech Act]] {QUOTE = } [[Human]] utters {[[Speech Act]] [QUOTE]} in a loud, harsh voice | conc. exploit. |
| 3 | 5% | idiom [[Human]] bark [NO OBJ] {up {the wrong tree}} [[Human]] is pursuing an erroneous line of inquiry | conc. exploit. |
| 4 | 2% | [[Human]] bark {(shin)} [[Human]] accidentally knocks {shin} against a hard object, causing pain | conc. exploit. |

Example (1). Patterns of the verb “to bark” extracted from Hanks’ *PDEV*.

A review of the literature on specialised information tools reveals that the term “user needs” is frequently repeated, although for most scholars it is a kind of “catch phrase” with no real meaning. This is currently occurring in Spanish terminographical circles, in which “user needs” are taken for granted, perhaps because most Spanish scholars approach the construction of specialised dictionaries by making use of Linguistics, typically the main tenets of Corpus Linguistics, Cognitive Linguistics, and Functionalism. This approach can be observed in some publications – for example, Alonso, Millon and Williams (2011), Fernández and Faber (2011) – devoted to presenting the theoretical bases underpinning the construction of on-going specialised information tools.

Alonso, Millon and Williams’ (2011) *DicSci*, for example, is a specialised dictionary prototype that is being compiled by replicating Hanks’ *PDEV* (see example 1) and using Williams’s (1998) collocational network, and Williams and Millon’s (2009) collocational resonance. According to the authors, the *DisSci* project aims to build an “organic online dictionary of verb uses in sciences which will reflect usage and assist non-native speakers of English with production” (Alonso, Millon & Williams, 2011: 19). By “organic” the authors refer to “a living dictionary that will organised (sic) itself in a natural way thanks to the links between words shown by means of collocational networks” (Alonso, Millon & Williams, 2011: 16). In addition, the authors are confident that the *DicSci* will provide a way to explain the terminological and phraseological tendency of words used in science.

Fernández and Faber (2011: 204) claim that specialised dictionaries “describe relationships between terms and concepts”, and therefore propose the use of prototype theory and several other cognitive mechanisms with the aim of representing the conceptual structures underlying terms in the domain. This can be achieved by writing definitions that signal the existence of relations, for example, a part-whole relation, among concepts. For instance, using the tenets of prototype theory can shed light on several vertical and horizontal relations that are expected to be used when writing the lexicographical data needed for assisting users. They show the working of such an approach in the entry “window” that is characterised in several dimensions. Fernández and Faber defend this approach in their discussion of *BEST*, which is an online dictionary prototype for learners in the architecture and building construction domain.

To the best of our knowledge, *DicSci* and *BEST* are still on the drawing board and, therefore, cannot be evaluated. However, our experience as metalexigraphers and lexicographers leads us to make the claim that the above theoretical bases will not result in dictionaries directed at satisfying their users’ needs. For instance, users of specialised dictionaries are interested in neither the horizontal nor vertical relations of terms. Instead, we propose an analysis of the term “user needs” in relation to the Function Theory of Lexicography, which argues that users “always” need a specific type of information that depends both

on the specific type of user and on the specific type of situation in which the need occurs. Within this framework, we believe that the intended user of wine dictionaries in South Africa is now more varied than 40 years ago. For instance, the wine sector is growing and wine dictionaries are also sought by interested laypeople, for example, consumers of wine that need some knowledge about it. This extra-lexicographical situation was considered and affected the way in which wine terminology was dealt with in a recently-published South African wine dictionary. Contrary to what was common in South African specialised dictionaries, the new dictionary incorporates encyclopaedic data that targets the needs of the new user types identified: semi-experts and interested laypersons.

3. Background information on two wine dictionaries

The *Wine Dictionary* (WD) of the South African Department of National Education was published in 1973 by the Terminology Section of the Language Services Bureau in collaboration with the Oenological and Viticultural Research Institute. According to the preface,

The object of the Wine Dictionary (pviii) was to assemble in a comprehensive bilingual lexicon the essential terminology of the wine industry in general and the South African wine industry in particular. This book (pviii) therefore, covers all aspects of this most important industry, from the preparation of the soil for the vines to the label on the wine bottle, from the cultivation of new cultivars for our special conditions to the serving of the final product on the table. For this reason the terms covering the specialised fields such as cellar technology, grafting, pruning methods, vine diseases and Wine Chemistry were augmented by terms of a more general nature from related fields such as Soil Science, Horticulture, Agricultural Engineering, Genetics and Botany. Excursions into related fields were limited to those terms intimately connected with viticulture.

The *South African Trilingual Wine Industry Dictionary* (WID) was published in 2012 by Winetech and Sawis as an internet dictionary with free access for users. Two subject committees worked on the compilation of the dictionary, namely, one for “oenology” and another for “viticulture”. According to the introduction, the dictionary deals with terms on “oenology” and “viticulture”:

The subject field viticulture includes for example terms relating to organic cultivation and production, soil science, plant biotechnology, vine viruses, plant protection and plant improvement. The subject field oenology makes provision for the terminology on production technology, bottling, packaging, as well as microbiology. In a nutshell, the dictionary supplies information on the physiology of the vine, the fruit of the vine and the winemaking process. (WID, page vii)

A list of target users for whom the WID is intended is supplied, and these users include viticulturists and oenologists, producers and winemakers, viticulture and oenology students and lecturers, public relations officers and information officers, wine marketers, writers in the field of wine and wine lovers. When the

list of target users is analysed, it is evident that the dictionary is intended for a whole range of users, from experts such as viticulturists to oenologists, and semi-experts like public relations officers to laypeople such as wine lovers. It is important to note that a person who might be viewed as an expert, for example, a viticulturist, does not necessarily have the expert knowledge on oenology, and that such a user would also need subject guidance from the dictionary.

To sum up, both dictionaries are separated by 40 years and are ideal candidates for investigating the influence of the user paradigm on their compilation. This approach is illustrated below with an analysis of the way in which subject labels are treated in both dictionaries.

4. Encyclopaedic information in specialised dictionaries

Encyclopaedic information is concerned with describing factual knowledge and extra-linguistic reality. In specialised dictionaries encyclopaedic information is usually provided in the form of encyclopaedic notes in the dictionary articles, independent external components, known as “systematic introductions”, “subject-field components”, “encyclopaedic sections”, or “subject field term systems” (Bergenholtz & Nielsen, 2006: 284; Fuertes-Olivera, 2009; Svensén, 2009), and encyclopaedic labels addressing the individual lemmata or equivalents.

Encyclopaedic notes in specialised lexicography are regarded as key dictionary structures for fulfilling dictionary functions and satisfying the intended users’ needs. They are similar to definitions for non-specialists. Systematic introductions are separate dictionary components, situated either at the front or the back (usually following the user’s guide), which aim at furnishing cognition-oriented and communication-oriented functions. The former, which represent the primary function, consist in providing an introduction to or a systematic, detailed exposition of the subject field covered by the dictionary. The latter supplement the encyclopaedic information offered with language information in the form of collocations, auxiliary words, and examples of standard LSP usage (Bergenholtz & Tarp 1995: 154-159 and 176-178; Bergenholtz & Nielsen 2006: 290-293; Fuertes-Olivera, 2009: 161-178). Encyclopaedic labels typically consist of special symbols or abbreviated terms used in reference works to help the user find a particular lemma, choose the correct equivalent, or indicate the association of a term with a particular subject field.

In the discussion below, we will be basically concerned with subject (field) labels. In well-conceived specialised dictionaries (that is, dictionaries which have been prepared by taking into account dictionary functions and users’ needs), subject labels will assist users more in communication-oriented functions in a foreign language than in their native language, provided that the expected user has, at least, a working knowledge of the subject-field (or sub-field) considered,

particularly in culture-dependent domains. They are also useful for cognitive-oriented functions, although they cannot replace encyclopaedic notes or systematic introductions (Bergenholtz & Tarp 1995). In the next section we illustrate the workings of subject labels for assisting users, especially interested laypeople, to “read” wine texts – that is, our analysis will highlight the “reception function”.

4.1. Subject labels in WD and WID

A way to transfer subject information in a dictionary is to make use of subject field labels. Subject labels could be used to assist users in the transfer of subject and semantic information. Experts, semi-experts and laypeople might require considerable guidance from a specialist language dictionary to understand terms fully and completely.

4.1.1. Articles in the wine dictionary, with reference to subject field labels

Due to the nature of a specialised language dictionary, it is a pre-requisite for a term to belong to a specialised field in order to qualify for inclusion in such a dictionary as a lemma. The assumption follows that a word needs to be classified as belonging to the field of “viticulture” and “winemaking”. From the preface of the WD it is clear that terms from different specialised fields like cellar technology, as well as those from related fields like soil science, were included in the dictionary. However, no reference is made in the preface to any kind of subject label system in the dictionary. There is no list of subject labels supplied and no introductory comments are made on the subject fields used in the microstructure of the dictionary.

If one consults the dictionary, no subject labels referring to specialised fields or related fields could be identified in the microstructure of the dictionary. The microstructure of a typical article in the WD consists of a lemma in the source language supplied with a translation in the target language, as example (2) shows:

Example (2). The term “arm” in the *Wine Dictionary*.
arm: arm

During a dictionary consultation process the following scenario could be described. If a subject expert consulted the dictionary and the purpose of consultation was translation from Afrikaans to English, then the dictionary consultation process would be a successful one. If, however, a layperson or a semi-expert consulted the dictionary, the article would offer no assistance to the user at all, except for the fact that the translation equivalent of the Afrikaans term is supplied. Apart from no definition being offered, no further assistance is given as regards clarifying the meaning of the term, for example, by indicating that it belonged to a specific specialised field or a related field. It might have been of great benefit to the user if a subject label like “grapevine morphology” had been used to indicate that the term “arm” refers to a part of the grapevine.

When the microstructure of the WD is analysed closely, more information on a few terms could be found in the target language. (The information provided in brackets is translated into English and given in italics for the reader of this article). Information is supplied in brackets, as shown in example (3):

Example (3). Semantic/encyclopaedic information in some entries in the *Wine Dictionary*
amertune; bitterwording (wynsiekte) *wine disease*
apoplexy: apopleksie (wingersiekte) *wine disease*
appellation of origin: oorsprongsbenaming (wyn) *wine*

In the above entries, the information provided in brackets could be interpreted as labels, although they are not identified or explained as labels. The word “wine disease” is used four times and the word “vine disease” twice in the dictionary. As a result of their scant occurrence in the dictionary, they could not be interpreted as part of its labelling system. Neither are they employed consistently, as the lemmas “bitter rot”, “black knot”, “black measles”, “black rot” and “black spot” all refer to grapevine diseases and have not been indicated as such. The user of the dictionary has been provided with insufficient information and information transfer has not taken place. If semi-experts and laypeople consulted the dictionary, the result would be unsuccessful, as subject specific information has not been supplied.

When considering the previous examples discussed and the following ones taken from the dictionary, no system according to which information is supplied in brackets was apparent, as may be seen in the following examples from WD (example 4):

Example (4). Lack of systematic labelling system used in the *Wine Dictionary*.
Bloom: waas, waslaag (op korrels) *on berries*
chemical sterilization: chemiese sterilisasie (van mos) *of must*
cooking (baking): bak (van sjerie en ander wyntipes) *of sherry and other types of wine*
measles: masels (swamsiekte by wingerd) *fungus disease in vines*
neck: nek (van bottel) *of bottle*

In the above-mentioned examples the information supplied in brackets seems to contextualise terms by explaining to the user the semantic fields to which the terms belong, and which could provide a better understanding of their meaning. In the case of “neck”, it would be appropriate to contextualise the word so that when most users read the information they would be able to understand the meaning of the “neck of bottle”. The term “measles” is contextualised by the fact that it is a fungus disease, and for the expert and semi-expert consulting the dictionary this would be useful information. For the semi-expert the information would perhaps cause confusion as to what the exact meaning of the term is. In the case of the word “bloom”, the user might understand the term better if it were mentioned that it occurs on berries, although it is still not likely that a layperson would grasp the exact meaning of “bloom”. It would even be more difficult for a layperson to understand to what the “chemical sterilization of must” refers, or the reference of “cooking of sherry and other types of wine”. It is doubtful that

consultation of the WD would assist the user in the consultation process, as no successful transfer of information has occurred.

The following items (example 5) from the WD demonstrate a very fragmented and inconsistent use of information in brackets, which could add to confusion on the part of the user. In the case of the lemma “fundatrix”, the translation equivalent is “fundatrix” and another translation equivalent, *stammoeder*, is supplied. Apart from the fact that the user is not informed as regards whether these terms are absolute or partial synonyms, more information is provided in brackets. Transfer of information is not complete, since the user is not told whether *filloksera* is a further explanation of the word (as in the previous examples), a synonym or a hyponym. The same problem arises for the user in the lemma “wine robber”. It is not clear if *monsternemer* is synonymous with *wyndief* or if there is a semantic relation of hyponymy between the words.

Example (5). Fragmented system of labelling in the *Wine Dictionary*.

fundatrix: fundatrix, stammoeder (filloksera) *phylloxera*
 wine robber (wine thief): wyndief (monsternemer) *sampler*

The semantic relations between the terms described above are unclear and not explained to the user. It is very unlikely that the semi-expert and layperson could rely on their intuition to find the correct answer to their query. These examples demonstrate very poor guidance for the user, especially the semi-expert and layperson.

In the example of “greenish coloured wine” (example 6), a comment is made in brackets by the lexicographer. It could be considered pragmatic information, as it informs the user that the colour is the desired colour for white wine. It is the only example of such a comment found in the WD. This is good subject information and could be very useful to the user, but unfortunately it is not conveyed in either the correct or a consistent manner.

Example (6). Pragmatic labelling in the *Wine Dictionary*.

greenish coloured wine: groenerige wyn (gewenste witwynkleur) *desired white wine colour*

To sum up, there is no labelling system in the WD to assist the user to understand subject terms. The use of information in brackets provided by the WD is not very successful. Brackets are seen as a place to “dump different kinds of information”. It confuses users and is of little benefit to them.

4.1.2. Subject labelling system in the SA wine industry dictionary

A list of subject labels is supplied in the WID (see Table 1).

| Oenology | Viticulture | Related fields |
|--------------|----------------------|----------------|
| bacteriology | cultivation practice | biochemistry |
| barrel type | fertilization | biodiversity |
| bottle size | grapevine anatomy | biology |

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| bottle type | grapevine development | biotechnology |
| bottling | grapevine disease | botany |
| cooperage | grapevine morphology | chemistry |
| crushing and destemming | grapevine pest | climate |
| distillation | grapevine physiology | commerce |
| enzyme | growth regulator | genetics |
| mouth-feel wheel | irrigation | microbiology |
| packaging | propagation | plant pathology |
| oenology | pruning | soil science |
| regulatory | training | |
| waste and waste management | trellising | |
| wine fault | viticulture | |
| wine style | | |
| wine tasting | | |
| wine type | | |
| winemaking | | |
| yeast refer to oenology | | |

Table 1. Diagram indicating the labelling system used in the WID.

The subject field labels are supplied in alphabetical order and the user can click on the list in order to view it. There are 54 subject labels used in the dictionary and they form part of an intricate system. Since the WID is a specialised dictionary for terms in “oenology” and “viticulture”, most of the labels refer to either “oenology” or “viticulture”. Subject labels, such as “bacteriology”, “barrel type”, “bottle size”, “bottle type”, “bottling”, “cooperage”, “crushing” and “destemming”, “distillation”, “enzyme”, “mouth-feel wheel”, “packaging”, “oenology”, “regulatory”, “waste and waste management”, “wine fault”, “wine style”, “wine tasting”, “wine type”, “winemaking” and “yeast”, refer to “oenology”. These subject labels represent a subfield of “oenology” as a whole, as they refer to its specialised fields.

Subject labels, such as “cultivation practice”, “fertilization”, “grapevine anatomy”, “grapevine development”, “grapevine disease”, “grapevine morphology”, “grapevine pest”, “grapevine physiology”, “growth regulator”, “irrigation”, “propagation”, “pruning”, “training”, “trellising” and “viticulture”, refer to “viticulture”. These subject labels represent a subfield of the area of “viticulture”, referring to specialised fields of “viticulture”.

The subject labels mentioned above have an exclusion effect, in the sense that a label such as bottle type would only be used in connection with the specialised field of “winemaking”, or a label like cultivation practice would be found only when referring to the specialised field of “viticulture”. There are, however, labels in the WID that could refer to either the field of “oenology” or the field of “viticulture”. These labels are “analysis”, “equipment”, “implement”, “instrument” and “machinery”.

Subject labels in the WID do not refer uniquely to subfields of “oenology” and “viticulture”, but also to related fields such as “biochemistry”, “biodiversity”, “biology”, “biotechnology”, “botany”, “chemistry”, “climate”, “commerce”,

“genetics”, “microbiology”, “plant pathology” and “soil science”. Labels on related fields have been chosen since these subject fields have an impact on “oenology” and “viticulture”.

The user can search according to the list of subjects. A specific subject can be clicked on/activated and all the terms belonging to the specific subject field will be shown. When the term is clicked on again, the user will be linked to the article of the terms. A subject field like “regulatory” could be chosen and the user will then find the term “wine ward” in the subject field, together with other terms relating to the field.

4.1.3. Articles in the SA wine industry dictionary, with reference to subject field labels

According to its introduction, most of the terms in the dictionary have subject fields, and when the microstructure of the dictionary articles is analysed, it is evident that all the lemmas in the dictionary have been supplied with subject labels. The microstructure of a typical article in the WID would consist of the lemma, a reference to the part of speech, subject label(s), a definition of the term and a translation equivalent in Afrikaans and isiXhosa. Examples (7) to (16) show the main functions of these subject labels.

In the article on the lemma “bloom”, the subject label “viticulture” is used and the term is linked to the specialised field of “viticulture”. When a user refers to the term, before reading the definition, they would know that the term belongs to the specialised field.

Example (7). A label for signaling the specialised field of the term in the *WID*.

bloom *noun*
Subject Viticulture
 the delicate waxy coating on the surface of mature grape berries.
Afrikaans **waslaag, waas**
Xhosa **incindi (ephuma kwiidiliya ezivuthiweyo)**

In the article on the lemma “peripheral vascular network”, the subject label “grapevine morphology” is used and the term is linked to the specialised field of grapevine morphology, which is a subfield of “viticulture”. This is useful to the user and subject information is conveyed successfully.

Example (8). A label for signaling the subfield of “peripheral vascular network” in the *WID*.

peripheral vascular network *noun*
Subject Grapevine morphology
 conductive tissue vein network in the skin of the berry.
Afrikaans **dopvaatbundelnetwerk**
Xhosa **ubume bemithambo yesiqhamo**

When the articles for “gravity vacuum filling machine” and “spray pump” are analyzed, it may be deduced that two labels could be used for one term when a term belongs to more than one specialised field. In the case of “gravity vacuum

filling machine”, the term belongs to the specialised fields of “machinery” and “packaging”, whereas “spray pump” is to be found in the specialised fields of “equipment” and “viticulture”. This is good information for the user, who is directed to the subject spheres of the terms.

Example (9). Terms with two labels in the *WID*.

gravity vacuum filling machine *noun*
Subject Machinery, Packaging
a filling process utilising gravity and vacuum.
Afrikaans **gravitasievakuumvuller**
Xhosa **umatshini wokuvala**
spray pump *noun*
Subject Equipment, Viticulture
equipment used to spray the vineyard.
Afrikaans **spuitpomp**
Xhosa **impompo yokutshiza**

In the case of the lemma “ammonium sulphate”, even more than two subject fields are mentioned – namely, “chemistry”, “winemaking” and “viticulture”. The user would then know that the term could be used in the related field of “chemistry”, as well as in the specialised fields of “winemaking” and “viticulture”. This represents an inclusive relationship between fields, as the term could be used in both.

| Example (10). Labels for signaling an inclusive relationship.

ammonium sulphate *noun*
Subject Chemistry, Winemaking, Viticulture
an inorganic compound used to encourage the growth of yeasts in wine making and to encourage the growth of vines.
Afrikaans **ammoniumsulfaat**
Xhosa **i-amoniyam salifeyithi**

When homonyms are presented in the *WID*, the use of subject field labels is also important and it is essential that specific labels are used, as, due to the very nature of homonyms, the lexicographer is describing two different words that do not have any semantic resemblance to each other. In the two articles describing “breed”, two different subject field labels were used, one referring to the specialised field of “wine tasting” and the other to the specialised field of “viticulture”, representing in this case an exclusion of fields. The user receives valuable information transfer.

| Example (11). Labels for signaling homonyms.

breed (1) *noun*
Subject Wine tasting
a characteristic which makes the wine distinctive, distinguished and which puts it in a class of its own.
Afrikaans **statuur**
Xhosa **uhlobo**
breed (2) *noun*
Subject Viticulture

new variety obtained by deliberate cross-pollination.

Afrikaans **kruising**

Xhosa **uhlobo olutsha lokufuya izityalo**

In the two articles describing “radiation”, two different subject field labels were used, one referring to the specialised field of “winemaking” and the other to the specialised field of “viticulture”. This is an indication to the user that the term could have two very different semantic values and belong to two different subject fields. Labels are used to indicate an either/or relationship – that is, an excluding relationship between the two terms.

Example (12). Labels for signaling polysemy.

radiation (1) *noun*

Subject Winemaking

radiation process used for sterilising equipment.

Afrikaans **bestraling**

Xhosa **ukukhupha imitha, ukusasaza imitha**

radiation (2) *noun*

Subject Viticulture

the total amount of sunlight energy received.

Afrikaans **straling**

Xhosa **amandla elanga afunyenweyo**

The terms “dense” and “sulphuring” are examples of lemmas with polysemous senses, but two subject field labels are displayed in the articles. In the article for “dense” two subject field labels, referring to the specialised fields “wine tasting” and “viticulture”, are used. The label Wine tasting focuses on the first polysemous sense whereas the second label “viticulture” focuses on the second polysemous sense of “dense”. The two polysemous senses of “sulphuring” are marked with the two subject field labels “winemaking” and “viticulture”. In the label “winemaking” the first focus is on the first polysemous sense whilst and the second label “viticulture” considers the second polysemous sense of “sulphuring”. It is left to the intuition of the dictionary user to discover this, as it is not explained in the introduction to the dictionary.

Example (12). labels for signaling related subject fields.

dense *adjective*

Subject Wine tasting, Viticulture

1. a wine tasting term describing a wine that has concentrated aromas on the nose and palate. 2. describing the physical qualities of the canopy or soil.

Afrikaans **gekonsentreerd, dig**

Xhosa **mfiliba, ukujiya, ukuxinana**

sulphuring *noun*

Subject Winemaking, Viticulture

1. burning a sulphur wick to disinfect an empty barrel before filling it with new wine. 2. applying sulphur dust or liquid to the vineyard as a fungicide.

Afrikaans **swa(w)eling**

Xhosa **ukufakwa kwesibabile, kwifaty, kwisitya sediliya**

Subject field labels in the WID do not refer only to specialised fields of “oenology” and “viticulture”, but also to other subject fields relating to them. The articles for the terms “paper chromatography” and “soil profile” have subject labels referring to other related subject fields, for example, “chemistry” and “soil science”.

Example (13). labels referring to other related subject fields

paper chromatography *noun*

Subject Chemistry

procedure for analysis of complex chemical mixtures by the progressive absorption of the components of the unknown sample (in a solvent) on a special grade of paper.

Afrikaans **papierchromatografie**

Xhosa **indlela yokubonisa iikhemikhali ngephepha**

soil profile *noun*

Subject Soil science

the vertical sequence and properties of soil layers (horizons).

Afrikaans **grondprofiel**

Xhosa **umbonakaliso womhlaba**

To summarise, the WID made use of labels for every term included in the dictionary. The purpose of this was to compile a dictionary with the needs of the user that are well highlighted. Hence, a labelling system was planned and applied constantly in the dictionary. The advantages for the user of a labelling system is that a term is placed in a subject field, either in the subfields of “viticulture” or “oenology”, or in one of the related subject fields. With the subfield lexicographers help potential users by narrowing down the meaning of the word to a specific field and/or sub-field. In other words, lexicographers of specialised dictionaries should include dictionary components that offer more focused pictures of terms and thereby help their users, particularly in text reception and text production situations.

In order to fulfil its obligation to users, the labelling system in a dictionary should be explained to them. During the consultation process users would get to know the system, understand it and expect the dictionary to make use of it appropriately and systematically.

5. Conclusion

This article has argued that “nothing is more practical than a good theory” (Nielsen & Tarp, 2009: ix). This reflection is especially necessary in the realm of specialised lexicography, which is mired in three related misunderstandings: an association with Linguistics, a lack of understanding of the true nature of lexicography, and its consideration as an art or craft.

Such misunderstandings are visible in the current debate on the tenets of the Function Theory of Lexicography, especially regarding some of its claims on the user needs paradigm. On the one hand, advocates of lexicography as a sub-

discipline of (Applied) Linguistics describe dictionaries as repositories of language knowledge and, consequently, ideal candidates for evaluating linguistic theories and reproducing them when designing and compiling dictionaries. Scholars such as De Schryver (2012), Kilgarriff (2012), and Rundell (2012), among others, criticise the tenets of the Function Theory, maintaining that the designing and compiling of specialised dictionaries must rest on corpus data and frequencies, and propose methodologies whose final aim is the production of (semi-) automatic word patterns – that is, word sketches, that will help lexicographers and reduce the amount of time and money needed for constructing specialised dictionaries.

On the other hand, proponents of the Function Theory defend the argument that lexicography is an independent academic science concerned with the analysis of data, access routes and users' needs in several user situations (Fuertes-Olivera & Bergenholtz, 2011). These scholars claim that the methods and practices used when compiling general language dictionaries cannot be applied for compiling specialised dictionaries, and illustrate their view with examples taken from real working specialised dictionaries. They have, for instance, shown that frequency, that is, corpus lexicography, can mislead lexicographers in view of the fact that there are no “word sketches” in specialised lexicography and no possibility of constructing dictionary articles (semi-)automatically (Fuertes-Olivera, 2012). To the best of our knowledge, the claim that corpus frequencies can be of much use for compiling specialised dictionaries is still a “dream”.

This paper adds weight to the second approach: it has shown that user needs are in a constant flux, and has proposed ways of coping with them by analysing the lexicographical treatment accorded to a recent South African wine dictionary. This dictionary contains a complete list of subject labels that were included with the aim of assisting semi-experts and interested laypeople, two user groups that were absent from a previous South African wine dictionary. In a word, this article proposes a simple and easy-to-implement option for designing and constructing specialised dictionaries. If properly understood, this methodology can be used for upgrading new editions of well-known and traditionally-conceived specialised dictionaries.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad (grant FFI2011-22885) and Junta de Castilla y León (grant VA067A12-1) for financial support. Thanks also to the Editor of *Ibérica* and to two anonymous reviewers for their comments on the first draft of this paper.

[Paper received 8 October 2012]
[Revised paper accepted 26 June 2013]

References

- Alonso, A., C. Millon, C. & G. Williams (2011). "Collocational networks and their application to an e-advanced learner's dictionary of verbs in science (DicSci)" in I. Kosem & K. Kosem (eds.), *Electronic Lexicography in the 21st Century: New Applications for New Users. Proceedings of eLex 2011, Bled, 10-12 November 2011*, 12-22. Bled <http://www.trojina.si/elex2011> [10/08/12]
- Bergenholtz, H. (2012). "Concepts for monofunctional accounting dictionaries". *Terminology* 18: 243-263.
- Bergenholtz, H. & S. Nielsen (2006). "Subject-field components as integrated parts of LSP dictionaries." *Terminology* 12: 281-303.
- Bergenholtz, H. & S. Tarp (eds) (1995). *Manual of Specialised Lexicography*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bergenholtz, H. & S. Tarp (2002). "Die moderne lexikographische Funktionslehre. Diskussionsbeitrag zu neuen und alten Paradigmen, die Wörterbücher als Gebrauchsgegenstände verstehen". *Lexicographica* 18: 253-263.
- Bergenholtz, H. & S. Tarp (2003). "Two opposing theories: On H.E. Wiegand's recent discovery of lexicographic functions". *Hermes. Journal of Linguistics* 31: 171-196.
- Bergenholtz, H. & S. Tarp (2004). "The concept of dictionary usage". *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 3: 23-36.
- De Schryver, D-M. (2012). "Trends in twenty-five years of academic lexicography". *International Journal of Lexicography* 25: 464-506.
- Fernández, T. & P. Faber (2011). "The representation of multidimensionality in a bilingualized English-Spanish thesaurus for learners in Architecture and Building Construction." *International Journal of Lexicography* 24: 198-225.
- Fuertes-Olivera, P.A. (2009). "Systematic introductions in specialized dictionaries: Some proposals in relation with the Accounting Dictionaries" in S. Nielsen & S. Tarp (eds), *Lexicography in the 21st Century. In Honour of Henning Bergenholtz*, 161-178. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fuertes-Olivera, P.A. (2011). "Equivalent selection in specialized e-lexicography: A case-study with Spanish accounting terms". *Lexikos* 21: 95-119.
- Fuertes-Olivera, P.A. (2012). "Lexicography and the Internet as a re-(source)". *Lexicographica* 28: 49-70.
- Fuertes-Olivera, P.A. & H. Bergenholtz (eds.) (2011). *E-Lxicography, The Internet and Digital Initiatives*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Fuertes-Olivera, P.A. & S. Nielsen (2011). "The dynamics of terms in accounting: what the construction of the *accounting dictionaries* reveals about metaphorical terms in culture-bound subject fields". *Terminology* 17: 157-180.
- Fuertes-Olivera, P.A. & S. Nielsen (2012). "Online dictionaries for assisting translators of LSP texts: The *Accounting Dictionaries*". *International Journal of Lexicography* 25: 191-215.
- Fuertes-Olivera, P.A. & S. Tarp (2011). "Lexicography for the third millennium: Cognitive-oriented specialised dictionaries for learners". *Ibérica* 21: 141-162.
- Fuertes-Olivera, P.A., H. Bergenholtz, S. Nielsen & M. Niño Amo (2012). "Classification in lexicography: The concept of collocation in the *Accounting Dictionaries*". *Lexicographica* 28: 291-305.

- Hanks, P. (2007). *Pattern Dictionary of English Verbs*. URL: <http://deb.fi.muni.cz/pdev> [20/01/14]
- Householder, F.W. & S. Saporta (eds.) (1967). *Problems in Lexicography*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Kilgarriff, A. (2012). "Book review of P.A. Fuertes-Olivera & H. Bergenholtz, eds. 2011. E-Lexicography, the Internet, Digital Initiatives and Lexicography". *Kernerman Dictionary News* 20: 26-29.
- Nielsen S. & R. Almind (2011). "From data to dictionary" in P.A. Fuertes-Olivera & H. Bergenholtz (eds.), *e-Lexicography. The Internet, Digital Initiatives and Lexicography*, 141-167. London/New York: Continuum.
- Nielsen; S. & S. Tarp (eds) (2009). *Lexicography in the 21st Century. In Honour of Henning Bergenholtz*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Rundell, M. (2012). "It works in practice but will it work in theory? The uneasy relationship between lexicography and matters theoretical" in R.V. Fjeld & J.M. Torjusen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 15th EURALEX International Congress*, 47-92. Oslo: Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies.
- Svensén, B. (2009). "Subject-field classification of lexicography revisited" in S. Nielsen & S. Tarp (eds.), *Lexicography in the 21st Century. In Honour of Henning Bergenholtz*, 147-159. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tarp, S. (2008). *Lexicography in the Borderland between Knowledge and Non-Knowledge. General Lexicographical Theory with Particular Focus on Learner's Lexicography*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Tarp, S. (2012). "Specialised lexicography: 20 years in slow motion". *Ibérica* 24: 117-128.
- Williams, G. (1998). "Collocational networks: Interlocking patterns of lexis in a corpus of plant biology research articles". *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 31: 151-171.
- Williams, G. & C. Millon (2009). "The general and the specific: Collocational resonance of scientific language". *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics Conference CL2009, 20-23 July 2009*. Liverpool: University of Liverpool.
- (1973). *Wine Dictionary (including Viticulture, Winemaking, Wine Chemistry)/Wynwoordeboek (insluitende wingerdbou, wynbereiding, wynkunde)*. Pretoria: Terminology Section, Languages Services Bureau in Collaboration with the Oenological and Viticultural Research Institute. Department of National Education.
- (2012). *South African Trilingual Wine Industry Dictionary*. Winetech and Sawis. URL: www.sawis/dictionary.co.za [10/08/12]

Michele van der Merwe is a lecturer in Curriculum Studies in the Faculty of Education at the University of Stellenbosch. Her fields of interest lie in the pedagogical lexicography, language teaching, as well as LSP dictionaries. Michele has presented various conference papers on lexicography and has published in international journals on lexicography.

Pedro A. Fuertes-Olivera is head of the International Centre for Lexicography, has lectured in more than 20 countries, and has written more than 150 academic contributions. Among others, he is co-author of *Pedagogical Specialised*

M. VAN DER MERWE & PEDRO A. FUERTES-OLIVERA

Lexicography (John Benjamins) and *Theory and Practice of Specialised Online Dictionaries* (de Gruyter), editor of *Specialised Dictionaries for Learners* (de Gruyter), and co-editor of *e-Lexicography: The Internet, Digital Initiatives and Lexicography* (Bloomsbury Academic).