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1. Introduction

Since 2005 I have been working as a student assistant at the Centre for Lexicography at the Aarhus School of Business, where I provide some of the grammatical information for the electronic versions of the Danish-English and English-Danish Dictionaries of Accounting. This has opened up a whole new world to me and created a sudden awareness of the work involved in producing a dictionary, especially in regards to making certain choices on the inclusion of grammatical information. I have become aware of the problems one is faced with when trying to provide the correct and the most relevant grammatical information for the dictionary user. Because who is the dictionary user? What does he or she expect from this dictionary? And will they even make use of the grammatical information provided? In other words, do they even need this information?

Working as a student assistant has also made me more aware of another significant problem which I have also often encountered in connection with my studies, namely the lack of grammatical information in Language for Special Purposes (LSP) dictionaries – in the following called LSP dictionaries. During the last couple of years, as a part of my studies, I’ve produced several financial, legal and technical translations with the aid of, amongst other things, LSP dictionaries. I soon discovered that the grammatical information in these LSP dictionaries was very sparse or even non-existent. Even though such information would have been extremely useful in most situations, I began to take it almost for granted that it was not included, since this was the case for practically all the LSP dictionaries I came across. However, while working as a student assistant, I started to wonder why so little grammatical information could be found in LSP dictionaries, and most importantly, if this could be changed, especially since the lexicographers that I worked for had decided that grammatical information was to be included in the electronic versions of the accounting dictionaries.

In the following, I intend to establish what the norm is – and has been – for the inclusion of grammatical information in LSP dictionaries, why this is, and whether or not there is room for improvement in that respect. In that connection, I am going to present and elaborate on some theoretical contributions on grammar in dictionaries in chapter 2. The user functions of dictionaries and their importance for what grammatical information ought to be included in a LSP dictionary will be explained in the chapter on theory, along with why is it important to include

---

grammatical information in LSP dictionaries; what has been said about the current practice in LSP dictionaries and how it should be changed so that the LSP dictionaries will become more user-friendly.

A number of selected dictionaries LSP dictionaries will be examined in chapter 3. The main focus will be on English-Danish and Danish-English LSP dictionaries, but a few English monolingual general dictionaries will also be examined and then compared to the bilingual LSP dictionaries in order to determine the differences and similarities of the grammatical information in – and user needs of – the two dictionary types. Seeing as there is more grammar included in general dictionaries than in LSP dictionaries, I will conclude the chapter by discussing why this is and if indeed, from a user perspective, it can be deemed reasonable.

In the final chapter, I will answer the question: what grammatical information should LSP dictionaries contain? In that connection some of the theoretical observations presented in chapter 2 and the discoveries made in connection with the dictionary analyses in chapter 3 will be repeated and discussed.

Grammar in general dictionaries will not be treated as a separate issue in this thesis, but will only be compared with grammar in LSP dictionaries. This means that in order to put the practice in LSP dictionaries into perspective when discussing e.g. current practice on grammar in LSP dictionaries in chapter 2, grammar in general dictionaries will be mentioned as well, despite it not being the main topic. It is worth noting, though, that many aspects of language for general purposes (LGP) grammar in dictionaries will not be touched upon here, since the main focus is on LSP grammar.

The amount of literature on grammar in LSP dictionaries is very limited. Besides, much of the existing literature dates a few years back. Consequently, in the chapter on theory, references will frequently be made to a few central articles or books, some of which date back to 1989. It would have been desirable to have had more literature, as well as more recent literature, to support the theory presented on grammar in LSP dictionaries, but the analyses of various fairly recent LSP dictionaries in chapter 3 should compensate somewhat for that. In any case, current practice in LSP dictionaries, as explained above, is identical to the practice described in the literature applied in chapter 2, so in that sense the literature is not outdated. However, the lack of discussion in the literature on the new possibilities that have arisen in connection with the creation of electronic dictionaries is a strong reminder that new literature on grammar in LSP dictionaries is needed.
2. Theory on grammar in dictionaries

“...while the user can be expected to come to the Dictionary with a knowledge of the general rules of Grammar, the place of an individual lexical item within those rules (e.g. which of them apply to that item) is part of the idiosyncratic information about the item” (Jackson 1985:56)

This chapter deals with theory on grammar in dictionaries. First some general information is provided about grammar in dictionaries. Subsequently, some theory specifically related to LSP dictionaries will be explained.

It should be noted that surprisingly little has been written about grammar in LSP dictionaries, especially when considering the amount of attention given to grammar in general dictionaries since the 1980s and onwards. This means that the few existing sources will be mentioned quite frequently in connection with grammar in LSP dictionaries.

2.1 General information on grammar in dictionaries

2.1.1 What is grammatical information in dictionaries and where can it be found?

What exactly is meant by grammatical information in dictionaries? Grammatical information in dictionaries is sometimes equated with syntactic information\(^2\). Jackson (1985:54), however, lists four kinds of grammatical information in dictionary entries: inflection, word class, syntax and illustrative examples. Since illustrative examples are defined by Jackson as implicit (and often syntactic) grammatical information, Mugdan (1989a:126) chooses to distinguish between inflection, syntax, and word class.

\(^2\) See e.g. *Grammar in English Learner’s Dictionaries* (Lemmens & Wekker 1986)
word class and syntax when defining grammatical information. Mugdan also adds another area of grammar, namely word formation, so in other words Mugdan distinguishes between morphological (including inflectional) and syntactic information and information on word class.

Grammatical information may – as we have seen – be found in dictionary entries, but it can also be found in the outside matter of the dictionary, for example in the user’s guide, dictionary grammar (if any) or in an appendix, e.g. a list of inflectional paradigms. Grammatical information may also be provided in the form of specific lemmas, e.g. irregular inflections, derivational affixes and parts of compounds. Linguistic terms and even grammar codes can be lemmatised\(^3\) and thereby constitute grammatical information (Mugdan 1989a:128).

Grammatical information of a more general nature is often given in the outside matter. Still, it is usually related to the grammar in the entries, as it frequently elaborates on and explains the grammar in the entries, e.g. how it can be applied and how grammar codes – such as syntactic codes – should be interpreted. The outside matter can, however, also contain grammatical information that is not related to the grammar in the entries, but only lists or explains certain grammatical phenomena. An example of this could be a dictionary grammar or elements of a dictionary grammar with no cross-references to the entries\(^4\). This practice of including a dictionary grammar with no references to the entries is usually not recommended, though. Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994:358) recommend a separate dictionary grammar of technical English “to which a system for facilitating cross-referencing from the individual entries should be developed”. Also Mugdan states that an ideal dictionary grammar “…should form an integral part of the dictionary” (1989a:128; my emphasis). This view is shared by Lemmens & Wekker (1991) and Andersen (2007).

In contrast, Mogensen (1995) argues that a dictionary grammar does not necessarily have to be integrated into the word list and that the user could just as well use an independent grammar component in the dictionary as an elementary grammar book. Besides, he argues, it is impossible to integrate all the grammatical information of relevance to a specific lexeme into the dictionary’s distribution structure. However, Mogensen also states that as much grammatical information as possible should be shown in the dictionary entries, because people expect to find all the information they require in the entries, without having to look it up somewhere else.

---

\(^3\) This practice has been used in COBUILD

\(^4\) See e.g. the discussion of the dictionary grammars in Dansk-engelsk erhvervsordbog and Engelsk-Dansk Erhvervsordbog in chapters 3.1 and 3.2
Lemmens & Wekker (1991) also argue that as much specific grammatical information as possible, related to the headword, should be conveyed in the entries, while the dictionary grammar should contain a more general description of the grammar. As stated above, this corresponds well to current practice in those dictionaries that contain grammatical information in the outside matter, for example in the form of a dictionary grammar or elements of a dictionary grammar.

### 2.1.2 What is the purpose of grammatical information in dictionaries?

There could be many reasons why someone would consult a dictionary. For instance, some dictionary users need the equivalent of a certain term, others need a definition of a term and yet others want to know how a term can be applied in a text and therefore they also need to know how it is inflected and which words it can be used together with to form a meaningful sentence. In any case, most lexicographers seem to agree that grammatical information in dictionaries is to be considered an aid to these various users, thereby making the dictionary a more useful tool. Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006a:577) state that modern lexicography “considers dictionaries to be tools that are, or should be, conceived to assist a specific group of users in solving problems related to specific types of extra-lexicographic user situations”. The grammatical information can then be said to be part of the information that is included in dictionaries in order for them to provide this assistance to the users.

But do dictionary users look up grammatical information in dictionaries? Are they not just interested in the encyclopedic information found in the dictionaries? According to user surveys conducted by Béjoint (1981), Hartmann (Lemmens & Wekker 1986:10) and Tomaszczyk (1979), dictionary users do look up grammatical information in their dictionaries. Of Tomaszczyk’s 449 informants (foreign students, language instructors and translators), 70% answered that they used their dictionaries to solve grammatical problems (Tomaszczyk 1979:112). Béjoint’s survey included 122 students of English. 53% answered that they looked for grammatical information in their dictionaries (Béjoint 1981:215). According to Lemmens & Wekker (1986:10), 61.6% of Hartmann’s informants (185 English learners and teachers of German) answered that they often looked up grammatical points in their bilingual dictionaries. Despite the differences between the questionnaires and the groups of informants, the results are strikingly similar.
According to Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:78) a survey was also carried out in connection with the planning of the New Oxford English Dictionary to ascertain how the existing OED was used “and which demands in terms of form and function users made on the forthcoming electronic version”. 1,000 people participated in the survey and it showed, among other things, that 65% used OED to look up grammatical information.

Another survey, with the purpose of illustrating the efficiency of dictionaries in connection with foreign-language learning in France, showed that 53% of the users often looked for syntactic information in the dictionaries while 70% answered that they used the examples and quotations in the dictionaries (Bergenholtz & Tarp 1995:79). This again illustrates the importance of and the need for grammar in dictionaries.

According to Mugdan (1989a:129), dictionaries are normally consulted in the course of either text reception or text production, and he defines translation as a user function involving both text reception and text production. In Manual of Specialized Lexicography (MOSL), Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995) list the production, reception and translation of texts as communicative dictionary functions which must be considered when deciding which linguistic information to include in a dictionary. In a recent article Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006a) distinguish between the following four user situations: text reception, text production, translation and language study. In the user’s guide for the English-Danish dictionary of accounting⁵, it is similarly stated that dictionaries can be used in connection with specific communication problems, defined as text production, text reception and translation, but language study is replaced here with the function of needing to gain knowledge on accounting. Generally speaking, though, regarding discussions from a user perspective on what grammatical information should be included in a dictionary, in most cases, the main focus seems to be on text production, text reception and translation, as is the case in MOSL.

In connection with text reception, Mugdan (1989a:129) says that grammatical information can help the user find what he/she is interested in. For instance, users who are not so familiar with English and who come across the inflected forms tried or took would no doubt appreciate dictionary entries for irregular forms. In relation to text production, Mugdan claims that a problem for especially non-native speakers is “the choice of the correct inflected forms and the appropriate syntactic constructions” (Mugdan 1989a:129). Therefore, according to Mugdan, morphological and syntactic information would be important in relation to text production.

⁵ See chapter 3.4
Bergenholtz & Tarp agree with Mugdan on the importance of lemmatisation of irregular forms in connection with text reception, stating (about bilingual dictionaries) that

“Particularly in connection with L2-reception and L2-L1 translation, users are bound to benefit from the lemmatisation of irregular grammatical words, especially where the lemmatised base form is not immediately evident” (Bergenholtz & Tarp 1995:114).

However, Bergenholtz and Tarp (1995) also imply that the same amount of linguistic information may not be needed in dictionaries intended for text reception, as in dictionaries intended for text production – including translation, when stating that

“…there is no doubt that LSP lexicographers should make it their concern to consider at least some of their intended users’ needs for grammatical information, especially in connection with text production, including translation, as well as, perhaps to a lesser extent, text reception” (Bergenholtz & Tarp 1995:115).

The different user functions mentioned above imply that some dictionary users require more grammatical information than others and different kinds of grammatical information is needed by the various users, since they would not all have the same encyclopedic and linguistic knowledge. According to Bergenholtz and Tarp (1995 and 2006b), it is therefore important to establish the user functions of the dictionaries before determining what grammatical information is to be included in them.

**2.1.3 Conclusion**

Grammatical information in dictionary entries can, according to Mugdan, be divided into morphological (including inflectional) and syntactic information and information on word class. Grammatical information is found both in the entries as well in the dictionary outside matter. The information in the outside matter tends to be of a more general nature, although it is still in most

---

6 See appendix 1 for an overview of four main types of dictionary users
cases related to the grammar in the entries. An exception could be dictionary grammars or elements of a dictionary grammar that are isolated components of the dictionary, in terms of not being integrated into the word list. Mostly such isolated components are not recommended, though.

Various surveys have shown that people do indeed use the grammatical information provided in dictionaries. However, it is not unimportant what kind of grammatical information is provided. The dictionary user and the function/s of the dictionary must be taken into account. Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995) distinguish between production, reception and translation of texts as dictionary functions that must be considered when deciding which linguistic information is to be included in a dictionary.
2.2 Current practice in LSP dictionaries

In the introduction to ODE it says that “In recent years grammar has begun to enjoy greater prominence than in previous decades” (ODE, 2003: [Introduction] xi). Back in 1989, Mugdan seemed to think the same about grammar in general dictionaries, stating that “In general monolingual and bilingual dictionaries and in the lexicographical literature on them, grammatical information is given a growing amount of attention” (Mugdan, 1989a:125). However, this does not seem to apply to bilingual LSP dictionaries, as Mugdan goes on to say that “By contrast, grammar plays a rather minor role in LSP dictionaries although many users need a good deal of grammatical guidance in the production and reception of LSP texts” (Mugdan, 1989a:125).

According to Mugdan (1989a), “user-friendliness” has in recent years become a favourite word of linguists and lexicographers, with the result that steps have been taken to remedy the lack of grammatical information in general monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. Again, this does not apply to LSP dictionaries that are still lagging behind in terms of grammatical information.

Bergenholtz & Pedersen have this to say about grammar in LSP dictionaries:

“According to Sealfield (1980:101), such LSP dictionaries which, like their best general-language equivalents, give extensive grammatical information are not available. A decade later, his observation is still valid. Rather, even the comparatively modest amount of grammatical information, such as indication of word class and verb transitivity, are the exception rather than the rule. By far the greatest number of LSP dictionaries contain no grammatical information at all...” (Bergenholtz & Pedersen 1994:351).

Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:111) also state that monolingual LSP dictionaries only sporadically provide linguistic information, while bilingual LSP dictionaries which – unlike monolingual LSP dictionaries – do not intend to provide encyclopedic information but linguistic information, in reality provide neither. They do mention that “a moderate number of dictionaries of commerce and law provide information on syntax” but then go on to say that in most cases no information is provided on inflection, morphology or syntax, while the information on word class is only rudimentary (Bergenholtz & Tarp 1995:115).
According to Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:111) the lack of grammatical information means that bilingual LSP dictionaries, which are mainly intended for text production, including translation, “…can only to a very limited extent be used for their intended purpose…”.

Four Danish-English technical dictionaries examined by Pedersen (1995)\textsuperscript{7} are examples of LSP dictionaries containing hardly any grammar. Three of the dictionaries examined contain no morphological information while one gives information on irregular inflections. One of the dictionaries contains syntactic information in the form of indication of the valency of verbs if the verb can be both transitive and intransitive and as a consequence has different translations. In other words, the four dictionaries contain hardly any information on grammar.

There could be several reasons why grammar traditionally has been neglected in LSP dictionaries. Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994:352) suggest that LSP dictionaries are made by not very linguistically minded lexicographers who believe that users only require the equivalent of the lemma. They also suggest that dictionary publishing houses try and keep costs down by omitting grammatical information. In any case, grammar has not been a priority in LSP dictionaries and must by lexicographers and/or publishing houses have been regarded as unnecessary information.

Due to the lack of grammatical information in bilingual LSP dictionaries, some lexicographers, according to Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:111), advice users to use a general dictionary together with the LSP dictionary. However, as Pedersen (1995:123) and Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:111) also point out, this would not be very useful seeing as these seldom contain more than a few LSP lemmas. Besides, as also stated by Bergenholtz & Tarp, general dictionaries provide no information about special register characteristics and no, or hardly any, information about word-combination possibilities in the individual LSP varieties.

\subsection{Grammar in dictionary entries}

Mugdan (1989a:129) states that indication of word class is a common feature in the dictionary entries of general monolingual dictionaries. However, there are quite a few general bilingual dictionaries that do not indicate the word class of the lemma. In bilingual dictionaries, word class is

\textsuperscript{7} Hansen & Hinrichten: \textit{Dansk-engelsk teknisk ordbog} (1945); Warrern: \textit{Dansk-engelsk teknisk ordbog} (1981); Clausen: \textit{Dansk-engelsk teknisk ordbog} (1990) and \textit{L&H Teknisk Ordbog dansk-engelsk} (1990)
rarely indicated on the target-language side, even when the lemma and the equivalent do not belong to the same word class. Regarding LSP dictionaries Mugdan says that word class labels are rare in all kinds of LSP dictionaries (Mugdan 1989a:130).

Of the four technical dictionaries examined by Pedersen (1995) none contains consistent word class labelling, while all the dictionaries contain inconsistent word class indications, in terms of the indication of verbs only or the indication of homographs belonging to different word classes. Of the four English law dictionaries discussed by Nielsen (1989) only one contains word class labels, again confirming that word class indications in LSP dictionaries are indeed rare.

Concerning information on inflection, Mugdan (1989b:519) points out that in older dictionaries it was common policy not to include inflectional information. However, this has changed so that now only the smallest and cheapest general dictionaries contain no information on inflection. Mugdan also states that the majority of general contemporary dictionaries contain information on irregular inflections, meaning that the user is expected to know the regular patterns of inflection or be able to look them up in a grammar. Still, some dictionaries, in particular learner’s dictionaries, provide information on both irregular and regular patterns of inflections. In regards to monolingual LSP dictionaries, Mugdan (1989a:133) states that in most cases information on inflection is only given sporadically or not at all. In addition, irregular forms are hardly ever lemmatised. Mugdan goes on to say that the reason why so few bilingual LSP dictionaries provide any information on inflection could be that they are expected, by the authors, to be used in conjunction with a general dictionary⁸ (Mugdan 1989a:133).

Of the four technical dictionaries examined by Pedersen (1995), one provides information on irregular plurals while none contains information on the conjugation of irregular verbs, confirming Mugdan’s statements on the lack of information on inflection in LSP dictionaries.

Concerning word formation, Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006b:581) state that in modern dictionaries hyphenated lemmas – meaning parts of words, stems and affixes – can be found. They go on to say that such hyphenated lemmas are rarely found in bilingual dictionaries, though they mention a bilingual Malagasy-German dictionary⁹ as an example of a dictionary containing hyphenated lemmas.

Mugdan (1989a:135) states that regarding entries for affixes and combining forms, current practice in general dictionaries varies considerably. Furthermore, he claims that if affixes

⁸ See also chapter 2.2.1
⁹ Bergenholtz et al. Rakibolana Malagasy-Alema, 1991
and combining forms are included as lemmas it is often difficult to see on which grounds they were selected. The situation in LSP dictionaries is practically the same, and according to Mugdan “the elements most likely to be listed are, of course, the building blocks of highly systematic nomenclatures, such as that of medicine” (Mugdan 1989a:135).

In regards to syntactic information, Mugdan (1989a:136) points out that the amount of syntactic information in general monolingual dictionaries depends on whether the intended user is a native speaker or a foreign learner. In the latter case more syntactic information is included, for instance there is a strong emphasis on syntax in learner’s dictionaries. Native speakers, on the other hand, are believed not to need much help – an erroneous assumption according to Mugdan. Even though native speakers require less syntactic information, they do also need syntactic information in the form of example sentences and collocations.

According to Bergenholtz & Tarp, English tradition emphasises information on syntax in general dictionaries “by means of codes referring to rudimentary information in the outside matter” (Bergenholtz & Tarp 1995:112). However, the codes providing syntactic information are not always particularly user-friendly. As an example Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:112) list the following entry:

\textbf{flush} \textit{<vt/I, VP1, 21>}

In order to discover the meaning of the codes in the entry, the user will have to look them up in a list of abbreviations and in a grammar fragment. Bergenholtz & Tarp claim that few users would take the time to make these references and therefore surface-syntactic information made as transparent as possible would be preferable\textsuperscript{10}; an example of that being the following entry containing German grammar:

\textbf{befreien} \textit{<+Akk/+Akk+aus+Dat>}

Such codes, Bergenholtz & Tarp point out, would require some basic grammatical knowledge and would also need to be explained in the dictionary’s user’s guide, since there could be some confusion as to their exact meaning.

\textsuperscript{10} See the discussion of Engelsk-Dansk Erhversordbog and Dansk-engelsk erhversordbog in chapters 3.1 and 3.2. These dictionaries provide surface-syntactic information
However, Bergenholtz (1995:11) also states that complex syntactic codes as the one shown above in the entry *flush* are not used very much any more due to all the criticism they have received. This would then mean that either simpler codes, as the one above, are used, or all the information is provided in the dictionary entry, making it unnecessary for the user to look it up anywhere else in the dictionary.

Regarding syntactic information in LSP dictionaries, Mugdan claims that syntax has been neglected in the majority of LSP dictionaries (Mugdan, 1989a:136). This view is shared by Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:117): “…almost all specialised mono- and bilingual dictionaries, as well as most bilingual dictionaries, are characterised by a lack of explicit information on word combination possibilities”. The LSP dictionaries that contain syntactic information most commonly provide example sentences and sometimes even collocations.

All of the above mentioned observations only apply to printed dictionaries. Electronic dictionaries create new possibilities by for instance allowing the user to move the mouse over a word or click on a word and thereby get grammatical information about it. This means that the user would not have to look up information elsewhere in the dictionary, since all the information would be located in the dictionary entries.

### 2.2.2 Dictionary grammars

Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:114) state that although there are a few examples, not many dictionary grammars can be found that provide a brief introduction to the entire grammar, and many of those that do should not be used as models, since there is no interaction between the dictionary grammar and the grammar in the entries, or in other words, there are no cross-references between the entries and the dictionary grammar. In addition, the terminology used in those dictionary grammars and the terminology used in the dictionary entries is often found to be different or even contradictory. Therefore, these dictionary grammars are of little value to dictionary users. In addition, Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:115) claim that “Register-specific dictionary grammars are non-existent”.

There are, however, a few examples of grammars in mono- and bilingual general dictionaries which are non-fragmentary and functional and, according to Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995),
“…give a brief introduction, of between twenty and thirty pages, to the most regular grammatical phenomena, such as word class, inflection, word formation, sentence members, concord, sentence types and word order” (Bergenholtz & Tarp 1995:114).

Bergenholtz (1995:13-14) mentions a Malagasy-German and a German-Malagasy\(^{11}\) dictionary as examples of dictionaries containing dictionary grammars in both languages with cross-references to the word list.

Andersen (2007:125-126) refers to COBUILD-SD2 as an example of a dictionary containing a so-called traditional reference grammar. This dictionary grammar is more than 200 pages long and includes information about basic sentence structure, types of sentences, word classes, different types of clauses and modals. However, Andersen criticizes the dictionary grammar in COBOUILD-SD2 for being “a relatively isolated component of the dictionary” (Andersen 2007:126), meaning that it does not contain cross-references to other components of the dictionary. This would therefore be one of the dictionaries referred to above by Bergenholtz & Tarp which should not be used as models. Because of this lack of integration into the dictionary, Andersen questions whether the dictionary grammar can be called a dictionary grammar after all. He also states that the lack of connection between the dictionary grammar and other components of the dictionary makes it hard to believe that it will be used in connection with the other dictionary components (Andersen 2007:126).

Mugdan (1989a:128) claims that instead of dictionary grammars, dictionaries quite frequently contain grammatical sketches which are unrelated to the body of the dictionary or mere fragments of a dictionary grammar – “notably lists of inflectional paradigms or sentence patterns that are referred to by numbers or other codes in the entries…” Bergenholtz (1995:11) also mentions that the most common type of existing dictionary grammars are grammar fragments. This is echoed by Andersen (2007) who refers to the three English learner’s dictionaries CALD1, LDOCE4 and MEDAL1 as examples of dictionaries containing fragments of grammar.

---

2.2.3 Conclusion

In recent years, a growing amount of attention has been given to grammar in general monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. The same can, however, not be said about grammar in LSP dictionaries which is the exception rather than the rule. The lack of grammatical information in LSP dictionaries means that LSP dictionaries, which are mainly intended for text production, including translation, can only be used for their intended purpose to a very limited extent.

Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994) discuss why LSP dictionaries contain no or hardly any grammatical information. For instance they suggest that the dictionaries are made by not very linguistically minded lexicographers who believe that users only require the equivalent of the lemma.

Concerning the current practice on the inclusion of grammar in the entries of LSP dictionaries, word class indications are rare in all kinds of LSP dictionaries, while only few LSP dictionaries provide any information on inflection. As to syntactic information in LSP dictionaries, Mugdan (1989a) claims that syntax has been neglected in the majority of LSP dictionaries. This view is shared by Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995).

Regarding information on word formation, Mugdan (1989a) states that current practice varies considerably concerning entries for affixes and combining forms, though the building blocks of highly systematic nomenclatures, such as that of medicine, are most likely to be included. Finally, in regards to dictionary grammars, Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995) state that register-specific dictionary grammars are non-existent, while Andersen (2007) and others claim that grammar fragments which have not been integrated into the word list are most common in general dictionaries.
2.3 Recommended grammatical information in LSP dictionaries

According to Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006a:577) “…a discussion of any particular lexicographic problem…should take its users’ needs as its point of departure”. Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:20) also claim that what needs to be considered in connection with what kind of grammatical information should be included in dictionaries is: the native language of the intended users, seeing as a non-native speaker will need more grammatical information than the native speaker, and – as mentioned above – the dictionary functions: text reception, text production and translation. Mugdan practically repeats this assertion when saying that the user’s “…native language and the purposes for which he uses the dictionary are the criteria that determine what information should be given and where” (Mugdan 1989a:139). However, Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:25) also suggest that different priorities be attached to the individual dictionary functions, seeing as it is hardly financially viable to produce dictionaries for each function as well as each user type\(^\text{12}\). Again, this only applies to printed dictionaries. Individual user choice could be implemented in electronic dictionaries, so that the user could decide what kind of information should be displayed. The creation of extra user functions in electronic dictionaries would of course also require more time being spent on the dictionaries, which would make them more costly. The inclusion of such information would therefore also be a matter of priority.

In his article on grammar in LSP dictionaries, Mugdan (1989a) discusses what grammatical information should, as a minimum, be included in a LSP dictionary. In their article on grammar in bilingual LSP dictionaries with a special view to technical English, Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994:357) state that the recommendations made by Mugdan (1989a) are to a great extent in line with their own recommendations of what grammatical information as a minimum would be required in a technical dictionary, with the exception that their recommendations are made with a special view to a specific LSP variety, namely technical English, while Mugdan refers to LSP grammar in general, not to a certain variety. The observations of Jackson (1985), Mugdan (1989a and 1989b), Bergenholtz & Petersen (1994), Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995) and others on grammar in dictionaries will be presented below, divided into observations on word class, inflectional morphology, word formation and syntax, since these are the kinds of grammatical information that

\(^{12}\) See also the discussion on the English-Danish and Danish-English business dictionaries in chapters 3.1 and 3.2. The stated main function for both dictionaries is text production, while other functions (with a lower priority) are also mentioned
are required, as a minimum, in LSP dictionaries according to Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994) and Mugdan (1989a)\(^\text{13}\). Finally, the views of Andersen (2007) and others on dictionary grammars will be explained, since a grammar is a dictionary component that has been recommended by many, e.g. by Mugdan (1989a), Lemmens & Wekker (1991) and Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994).

### 2.3.1 Word class

Jackson (1985:55) says the following about word class (or parts of speech): “If a Dictionary gives no other information of a grammatical nature, it is expected to indicate which part-of-speech or word-class a lexical item belongs to…”. Jackson goes on to say that the word class label is not irrelevant to the user, since it provides basic information about the syntactic operation of a lexical item and is an instruction about the kinds of inflection that are appropriate to the lexical item (Jackson 1985: 55). However, Jackson emphasizes that word class labels do not provide sufficient information of a grammatical kind, especially in regards to syntactic information. Mugdan (1989a:136) also states that “Part-of-speech labels are admittedly not very informative, but their value increases if the word classes are defined in a clear and comprehensible fashion”. In addition, Mugdan advises the lexicographer to explain the system behind the word class labels in the dictionary, so the user will get a better understanding of them.

According to Mugdan, in bilingual dictionaries for languages with similar word class systems, “it is sufficient to indicate the word class of the lemma unless the equivalent does not belong to the corresponding class” (Mugdan 1989a:137). However, Mugdan goes on to say that if there are considerable discrepancies between the systems, different sets of labels should be used on the two sides.

Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994:357) argue that word class should be indicated for all lemmas and their foreign-language equivalents in a bilingual dictionary facilitating technical English language production and translation.

However, in connection with the three communicative functions: production, reception and translation, Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:24) list only native-language reception,

---

\(^{13}\) Mugdan (1989a) also mentions gender in his grammar proposals. However, that will not be discussed here, as it is not relevant for English dictionaries.
foreign-language reception, translation into the foreign language and finally translation from the foreign language as functions requiring information on word class. In other words, according to Bergenholtz & Tarp, word class labelling would always be required, unless the intended user function is text production – either in the native language or a foreign language! This does not correspond to the view stated above by Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994). Besides, Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995) do not explicate why information on word class should be given in connection with e.g. native-language text reception, but not in connection with native-language text production. Seeing as text production is a function that requires at least as much grammatical information as text reception, there is no obvious reason why word class should not be included for both functions.

2.3.2 Inflectional morphology

Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:113) and Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994:353) clearly state that there is no need to include regular inflectional forms in the dictionary entries, as that would imply that a language is full of irregularities. Besides, the dictionary user would be expected to be familiar with the regular grammatical rules. Likewise, Mugdan (1989a:127) claims that there is no need to mention regular “cases” in the entries. Jackson (1985:54) repeats that assertion.

All of the above mentioned authors instead recommend a dictionary grammar in which the regular cases are explained. Only irregular inflectional forms ought to be indicated in the entries, while regular inflections should only appear in the dictionary grammar14.

It is worth noting that Bergenholtz & Pedersen and the others only refer to printed dictionaries, while no one mentions electronic dictionaries and the new possibilities they bring in terms of the inclusion of information on inflection in the entries. This is no doubt a consequence of the fact that the articles/books date back to the eighties or mid-nineties. Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006a:579), however, do state that, in connection with inflectional information, space restrictions are not an issue in electronic dictionaries in the same way as in printed dictionaries. Therefore, they say, it would be possible to include all lexicographic data on inflectional morphology in an electronic dictionary – presumably it should be shown in the dictionary entries, though they do not state that explicitly.

14 See also chapter 2.3.5
Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006a:577) claim that “Problems in terms of inflectional morphology arise when users don’t recognize a specific inflectional form, and also if they don’t understand it…”. According to them, the problem of the user not recognising an inflectional form can be solved by including irregular and unexpected inflectional forms in the word list as reference lemmas which refer the user to “the basic word form or entry, where all the relevant data on the word is given” (Bergenholtz & Tarp 2006a:577). Mugdan (1989b) shares this view and when discussing information on inflectional morphology in the entries of general dictionaries, he concludes “For the user, it is most convenient if he can find the word-forms of a lexeme in the dictionary entry itself without having to decipher codes or follow cross-references” (Mugdan 1989b:521).

Concerning the problem of users not understanding a specific inflectional form, Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006a:577-578) claim that, in addition to providing the reference lemmas mentioned above, it is necessary to explain the meaning of the specific inflectional forms. They then go on to suggest that this explanation could also be contained in a special dictionary grammar, since including it in the dictionary entries would mean “an unnecessary repetition of the explanatory data and a very complex dictionary structure” (Bergenholtz & Tarp 2006a:578).

Mugdan states that “LSP dictionaries should provide comprehensive information on inflection if the language in question is not the user’s native tongue; he should not be forced to consult a general dictionary in addition” (Mugdan 1989a:137). Mugdan also claims that native speakers will primarily need information on the inflection of borrowing and neo-classical terms, and therefore he suggests that a brief sketch of Latin – and possibly also Greek – morphology should be included if there are many neo-classical terms in the dictionary (Mugdan 1989a:138). Although – as Bergenholtz & Pedersen also point out – Mugdan does not refer to any specific LSP variety in his articles, he acknowledges that the scope of such a sketch would have to depend on the characteristics of the LSP variety in question.

### 2.3.3 Word formation

Regarding information about word formation, Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994:357) state that patterns of word formation, including entries for suffixes and combining forms, should be included in a dictionary for technical English language production and translation. Mugdan (1989a:138) also
insists that entries for affixes and combining forms are important in LSP dictionaries. However, he claims that this is particularly the case in connection with text reception. Moreover, Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006b:581) state that the selection of word formations for the lemma list is the most important and best way of solving reception problems both in paper and electronic dictionaries. They go on to say that hyphenated lemmas are useful for solving production problems as well.

With regards to translation problems, Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006b:581) claim that “The most important lexicographic help for translation problems is of course to select many word formations as lemmas”. Furthermore, they claim that this is most important in a bilingual dictionary with lemmas in the native language, seeing as the user is more likely to guess the equivalent in his/her own language (Bergenholtz & Tarp 2006b:582). Finally, Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006b:580) state that it is important to have an integrated dictionary grammar that contains a chapter about word formation.

According to Mugdan, another argument for the inclusion of information on word formation is that “various languages for special purposes show strong preferences for patterns of word formation that are quite rare in the standard language” (Mugdan 1989a:139).

2.3.4 Syntax

Although, as mentioned before, Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:117) claim that there is a lack of explicit information on word combination possibilities in LSP dictionaries, they do mention encyclopedic information and sentence examples as potential sources of implicit information on word combinations. Cowie (1978:129) also argues that the illustrative examples in OALD have three functions: “indicate the syntactic distribution of words in their various senses”; “throw light on the meaning of the words” and “encourage the learner to compose sentences which are lexically, as well as syntactically, new”. Thus he claims that illustrative examples can be defined as syntactic information. Jackson (1985) also states that

“It is in the illustrative examples also that the convergence between grammar, meaning and usage takes place: carefully chosen examples can illustrate what is typical of the lexical and grammatical usage of a lexical item” (Jackson 1985:58)
According to Jackson (1985:56) information on verb complementation is important for the second-language user of English monolingual dictionaries, “especially if one regards the verb as the element which determines to a large extent which other elements may be present in its clause”. Jackson also mentions the general monolingual dictionaries OALD\textsuperscript{15} and LDOCE as examples of dictionaries recognising that the traditional specification of verbs as either transitive or intransitive provides insufficient information to enable a learner to construct clauses.

Mugdan (1989a:139) states that information on word combinations is relevant for text production in a language the user is not sufficiently familiar with. He goes on to say that this is not necessarily a foreign language, since LSP varieties are also perceived as “foreign” to non-experts within the technical fields in question. Since Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:117) also claim that the special-language user “with insufficient linguistic and encyclopedic knowledge” would be in the same situation as a student of language in many ways, seeing as both are unsure of the language norms restricting combination possibilities, then Jackson’s recommendation for what syntactic information should be included in the entries of English learner’s dictionaries ought to apply also to LSP dictionaries. Jackson recommends that

“The dictionary entry needs to specify in detail which clause patterns a verb may enter, what complementation a verb may take, which items are obligatory or optional or deletable. Additionally, the dictionary entry needs to specify whether a verb cannot undergo a particular rule of the Grammar, e.g. if it is unable to form “progressive” tenses or to enter the “passive” construction” (Jackson 1985:56).

Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994:357) say that in technical dictionaries for English language production and translation information on e.g. the valency of verbs should be provided in the microstructure. They also recommend that syntagmatic information should be given as collocations and that examples should be included as, together with the collocations, “…they play an important part in enabling the user to make the correct syntactic choices” (Bergenholtz & Pedersen 1994:357). In addition, Bergenholtz & Pedersen suggest that “active technical dictionaries should also serve as a guide to such syntactic rules as go beyond the treatment of the individual lemmata as separate units, including register-specific rules” (Bergenholtz & Pedersen 1994:358). They suggest that these syntactic rules are given in a separate dictionary grammar.

\textsuperscript{15}Jackson uses the abbreviation ALD for the \textit{Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English}. Here OALD is used
Mugdan (1989a:139), like Bergenholtz & Pedersen, acknowledges that the amount of information given ought to depend on the characteristics of the particular LSP variety, seeing as some languages for special purposes have more syntactic peculiarities than others. He goes on to explain that even though languages for special purposes make use of the same syntactic patterns as the standard language then “the frequency of certain constructions may be quite different” (Mugdan 1989a:139). Furthermore, Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:121) state that collocations “belonging in the intersection between LSP and LGP may be considered irrelevant” in a LSP dictionary.

2.3.5 Dictionary grammar

Jackson (1985:53) has the following definition of grammar and dictionary: ”a Grammar is concerned with the general rules affecting the classes of items in a language. A Dictionary is concerned with the operation of individual lexical items”.

In the previous chapters, we have seen quite a few recommendations as to which elements should be included in a specific dictionary grammar and which elements ought to be shown in the entries. These recommendations are pretty much in line with the above definition of a grammar and a dictionary16, namely that the dictionary grammar should include the general rules of grammar, while the rules applying to the specific lexical items ought to be stated in the dictionary (entries).

As mentioned before, some of the general rules that ought to be included in the dictionary grammar are – according to Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994:353), Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:114), Mugdan (1989a:127) and Jackson (1985:54) – the rules for regular inflections, since, according to Mugdan (1989a:127) “…one cannot determine whether a form is irregular without first specifying a set of rules that covers the ‘regular’ items”. Also, as mentioned before, according to e.g. Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994) regular inflections should be indicated in the dictionary grammar, since it would seem like the language in question would be full of irregularities if all the regular cases were to be shown in the entries. Other recommended elements in a dictionary grammar are chapters on word formation (Bergenholtz & Tarp 2006b:580) and syntactic rules, including register-specific rules (Bergenholtz & Pedersen 1994:358).

---

16 The dictionary here corresponding to the word list, or more specifically, the dictionary entries
In regards to LSP dictionaries in particular, Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994:354) suggest a so-called differential (also called contrastive) grammar, defined by Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:116) as “a grammar describing the special grammatical features whereby a certain LSP variety differs from general-language usage”. Bergenholtz & Pedersen thereby recommend a grammar that explains the grammatical features that are characteristic of the LSP variety in question, in terms of how they differ from the general language\textsuperscript{17}.

Andersen (2007:132) mentions other possible contrasts in a dictionary grammar for a bilingual LSP dictionary, e.g. a contrastive account of the general language grammars of the two languages of the bilingual dictionary or a contrastive account of the grammatical peculiarities of the L\textsubscript{1} LSP variety and the L\textsubscript{2} LSP variety. The latter could mean comparing the grammatical features that are characteristic of e.g. technical English and technical Danish or legal English and legal Danish (Andersen 2007:131-132).

Andersen (2007) also emphasises the importance of the dictionary functions for what ought to be included in a dictionary grammar, stating that

“The decision about what to include in a dictionary grammar for a specific dictionary, and how to structure and present what is included, will depend, first of all, on the function of the dictionary, that is whether it is for text reception, text production, translation or some other function” (Andersen 2007:132).

Andersen (2007:133) then goes on to make some specific recommendations for what a dictionary grammar for a bilingual LSP dictionary for L\textsubscript{2} production, as a minimum, should contain. He mentions the following elements: a user’s manual; an account of the grammatical model of description and the grammatical terminology used; an explanation of the grammatical codes in the entries; a contrastive account of differences between some selected general language syntactic structures (with L\textsubscript{1} as the point of departure); a contrastive account of possible register-and/or genre-specific differences in frequencies of occurrence of (selected) syntactic structures (with L\textsubscript{1} as the point of departure) and finally explicit references from the dictionary entries to relevant sections of the dictionary grammar. Andersen (2007:133) then claims that depending on “the general linguistic knowledge of the dictionary users and their knowledge of the L\textsubscript{2} LSP variety in question” the dictionary grammar could also contain the following elements: a general syntactic description of

\textsuperscript{17}See chapters 3.1 and 3.2 for a description of the differential dictionary grammars in the business dictionaries \textit{Dansk-engelsk erhvervsordbog} and \textit{Engelsk-Dansk Erhvervsordbog}
the L₂ variety in question; relevant aspects of the general language characteristics of L₂ and finally a contrastive account of genre conventions in the relevant LSP variety apart from the purely syntactic conventions.

In relation to bilingual dictionaries, Mugdan – according to Andersen (2007:129) – recommends that they, as a minimum, should contain a dictionary grammar for each language written in the other language, and he also recommends that these dictionary grammars should be contrastive. Moreover, Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995:114) argue that it is important in bilingual dictionaries to provide grammatical information on the native language of the intended user. They argue that a user cannot be presumed to fully master the grammar of his/her own language and, furthermore, some bilingual dictionaries are polyfunctional and therefore aimed at native speakers of both languages involved and possibly also at third-language users. However, Bergenholtz (1995:14) states that if a bilingual dictionary for a Nordic and non-Nordic language is only aimed at Nordic users then it would be sufficient to include a dictionary grammar in the Nordic language. In other cases, Bergenholtz claims, it would be necessary to include a dictionary grammar in both languages. Consequently, Bergenholtz presumes that for example Danes would like to read a dictionary grammar written in Swedish when using e.g. a Swedish-English dictionary. Considering the differences between the Nordic languages and the fact that many Nordic people are proficient in English, many Nordic users would probably prefer a grammar written in their own language or in English, or in another foreign language they are familiar with, rather than in one of the other Nordic languages.

An example of a bilingual dictionary containing dictionary grammars for both languages are the Malagasy-German and German-Malagasy dictionaries Rakibolana Alema-Malagasy (1994) and Rakibolana Malagasy-Alema (1991).

As mentioned in chapter 2.2.3, the integration of the dictionary grammar into the word list – or rather the lack thereof in current dictionaries – has been discussed by e.g. Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995) and Andersen (2007) who recommend cross-references between the dictionary grammar and the entries. Lemmens & Wekker (1991) also recommend a separate dictionary grammar which would describe the grammar of English and in which “It should be possible for the user to go from the level of the (head)word to a general description of a phenomenon in one and the same reference book”. They go on to say that
“The advantage of such an approach is that the dictionary user moves from a concrete problem, which is not necessarily a grammatical one, to a more general explanation (and probably back to the specific case). The advantage of the combination of dictionary and grammar is that such a volume will become a fully-fledged language tool....” (Lemmens & Wekker 1991:5)

Referring to the dictionary grammar in the above mentioned bilingual Malagasy-German dictionary, Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006b:582) state that

“This use of a dictionary grammar as an integrated part of the dictionary with references from the dictionary entries to the grammar is rarely found. It would be a good idea if future dictionaries used this kind of lexicographic practice” (Bergenholtz & Tarp 2006b:582).

As a final point, Lemmens and Wekker (1991) – referring to English learner’s dictionaries aimed at students – claim that it is difficult to get the students to use the outside matter, including the grammar component. In that connection they mention the results of Béjoint’s frequently cited questionnaire (1981)¹⁸ which showed that “anything that does not directly relate to decoding meaning is only seldom referred to by students: syntactic codes are hardly used and introductory matter is studied by few” (Lemmens & Wekker 1991:12). They also mention the verb patterns in OALD (1989) and the tables of codes in LDOCE (1987) as examples of grammar fragments in the outside matter that often go unnoticed by the users. Lemmens and Wekker therefore go on to recommend that attention could be attracted to the dictionary grammar by e.g. using coloured pages and making cross-references from the entries.

¹⁸ See also chapter 2.1.2
2.3.6 Conclusion

In regards to which information should be provided in LSP dictionaries, Mugdan (1989a) states that the user’s “…native language and the purposes for which he uses the dictionary are the criteria that determine what information should be given and where”.

Jackson (1985) recommends that indication of word class is included in dictionaries, while Mugdan (1989a) adds that it is sufficient to indicate the word class of the lemma in bilingual dictionaries with similar word class systems, unless the equivalent does not belong to the corresponding class.

Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995) and Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994) state that there is no need to include regular inflectional forms in the dictionary entries, as that would imply that a language is full of irregularities. Instead they recommend a dictionary grammar in which the regular cases are explained while the irregular forms are shown in the entries. Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006a) also recommend the inclusion of irregular and unexpected inflectional forms in the word list as reference lemmas. This view is shared by Mugdan (1989a).

Mugdan (1989a) insists that entries for affixes and combining forms are important in LSP dictionaries, arguing also that “various languages for special purposes show strong preferences for patterns of word formation that are quite rare in the standard language”. Moreover, Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006b) state that it is important to have an integrated dictionary grammar that contains a chapter about word formation.

In regards to syntax, Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995) mention encyclopedic information and sentence examples as potential sources of implicit information on word combinations. According to Jackson (1985) information on verb complementation is important for the second-language user of English monolingual dictionaries. Jackson (1985) also recommends that it is specified in the dictionary entry which clause patterns a verb may enter, what complementation a verb may take and which items are obligatory, optional or deletable. In addition, it should be specified in the entry whether a verb cannot undergo a particular rule of the grammar, e.g. if it is unable to form “progressive” tenses or to enter the “passive” construction. Furthermore, Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994) suggest that syntactic rules are given in a separate dictionary grammar.
Mugdan (1989) and Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994) acknowledge that the amount of information given ought to depend on the characteristics of the particular LSP variety, seeing as some languages for special purposes have more syntactic peculiarities than others.

The inclusion of a dictionary grammar is recommended by many, e.g. Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994), Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995) and Jackson (1985:54). It has been recommended by some that the dictionary grammar should be contrastive and contain chapters on e.g. regular inflections, word formations and syntactic rules. Andersen (2007) also has some specific proposals for the contents of the dictionary grammar of a bilingual LSP dictionary for L2 production. For instance he recommends the inclusion of a contrastive account of possible register-and/or genre-specific differences in frequencies of occurrence of (selected) syntactic structures (with L1 as point of departure). Finally, cross-references between the dictionary grammar and the entries are also recommended by Andersen (2007) and others in order to integrate the dictionary grammar into the dictionary and prevent it from being an isolated dictionary component.
2.4 Conclusion

Grammar in dictionary entries has been defined by Mugdan (1989a) as morphological and syntactic information as well as information on word class. Grammatical information can, however, also be found in the dictionary’s outside matter, e.g. in the form of an explanation of the grammar codes used in the entries, fragments of a dictionary grammar – for instance a list of inflectional paradigms – or an actual grammar component.

Grammar in dictionaries helps the dictionary user solve various problems in connection with text production, text reception or translation. According to Bergenholtz and Tarp (1995), it must be taken into account that dictionary users have different encyclopedic and linguistic competences19 and will therefore require various types and amounts of information.

Mugdan (1989a) claims that in general monolingual and bilingual dictionaries grammar has been given a growing amount of attention. However, he goes on to say that this is not the case with grammar in LSP dictionaries. Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994) also state that most LSP dictionaries contain no grammatical information at all. According to Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995), the lack of grammatical information in LSP dictionaries means that bilingual LSP dictionaries, which are mainly intended for text production, including translation, can only be used for their intended purpose to a very limited extent.


As to what grammatical information ought to be included in LSP dictionaries, Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995) state that the native language of the intended users and the dictionary functions will need to be considered. They also suggest that different priorities be attached to the individual dictionary functions.

Mugdan (1989a) recommends the inclusion of information on word class, inflection, word formation and syntax in the dictionary entries in LSP dictionaries. In addition, Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994) recommend that a dictionary grammar contains a chapter on regular inflections, since it would seem like the language in question would be full of irregularities if all the regular cases were to be shown in the entries. Other recommended elements in a dictionary grammar are

---

19 See appendix 1 for an overview of four main types of dictionary users
chapters on word formation (Bergenholtz & Tarp 2006b) and syntactic rules, including register-specific rules. Furthermore, Andersen (2007) and others suggest a so-called contrastive dictionary grammar for bilingual LSP dictionaries, i.e. a grammar describing the special grammatical features whereby a certain LSP variety differs from general language usage.

In chapter 4 some proposals will be made for the inclusion of grammatical information in LSP dictionaries, but first the grammatical contents in a number of selected dictionaries will be examined and discussed.
3. Dictionary Analyses

“The value of a work must be estimated by its use; it is not enough that a dictionary delights the critick, unless, at the same time, it instructs the learner; as it is to little purpose that an engine amuses the philosopher by the subtilty of its mechanism, if it requires so much knowledge in its application as to be of no advantage to the common workman” (Johnson 1747)\(^20\)

In the following, some dictionaries will be examined with the purpose of establishing what grammatical information has been included and how well it corresponds to the needs of the stated user groups. The results of these analyses, and the previously presented theory, will constitute the basis for the next section, namely my proposals for grammar in LSP dictionaries.

**Dictionary 1:**

Andersen, Birger; Balsgart, Karin; Tarp, Sven: *Engelsk-Dansk Erhvervsordbog*, 1. udgave, Gyldendal, 2006

### 3.1 Analysis of *Engelsk-Dansk Erhvervsordbog*

#### 3.1.1 Preface and user’s guide

In this English-Danish business dictionary, it is stated in the preface that the primary purpose – or the main function – of the dictionary is to aid Danish dictionary users in the production of English

texts. Other purposes of the dictionary are to aid the user in the reception and translation of English texts. Thus, the dictionary is polyfunctional, but with the primary function of text production. The authors go on to say that people use a Danish-English or an English dictionary as an aid when producing English texts and that a dictionary user with only a limited knowledge of English business language would normally use the former option while users who are more familiar with English would choose the latter alternative – there is no mention of English-Danish dictionaries! This is a somewhat surprising assertion seen in the light of the previous statement on the dictionary’s primary function. The user is advised, though, to use the Danish-English business dictionary in the same series in combination with the English-Danish business dictionary. This, however, does not account for the conflicting statements in the preface – on the one hand its primary function is the production of English texts, on the other hand users would consult a Danish-English or an English dictionary when producing English texts –, since one must also be able to use the dictionary on its own. In addition, a prerequisite for benefiting from the combined use of these dictionaries would obviously be that each dictionary provides relevant information for its intended primary user function.

The intended users of the dictionary are also mentioned in the preface. They have Danish as a native language and are: students at Commercial and Business Schools and other advanced students of English business communication, business people and other employees within the private and public sector who communicate in English. This must be considered to be a diverse group of people with various language skills and various educational backgrounds. In fact, all four main user types that Bergen Holtz & Tarp (1995: 21) distinguish between in MOSL seem to be accounted for here; the division of those four user types being based on a low or a high level of encyclopaedic and/or foreign-language competence.21 Bearing in mind this diverse user group, the primary function of the dictionary would especially appeal to users who are more familiar with English and already have an idea of which lexical item they need to employ in the text, while the user whose knowledge of English is limited, and who, as we have seen, is also included in the dictionary user group, would probably prefer a Danish-English dictionary.

Besides the preface, the front matter of the dictionary also comprises a user’s guide which contains, amongst other things, some information about the grammatical codes in the dictionary entries. Another interesting section in the user’s guide – from a grammatical point of

21 See appendix 1
view – is section 1.2 where we are told that a number of word combinations like phrasal and prepositional verbs are headwords in the dictionary.

3.1.2 Dictionary grammar

At the back of the dictionary, in the outside matter, a contrastive dictionary grammar can be found. In its introduction, it is defined as a grammar that does not deal with all areas of English grammar, but only with the areas that usually cause problems for dictionary users (in this case Danes). It is also stated in the grammar introduction that the use of this dictionary grammar presupposes a basic general knowledge about English grammar.

The placement of the dictionary grammar does not seem very rational. In my own experience, a user perhaps glances at the front matter of the dictionary before starting to look up certain words. The back matter may very well go unnoticed. Kirkpatrick (1989: 760) also has this to say about where information in a dictionary should be placed:

“If the information is essential, do not put it at the back of the book. If at all possible put it in the text. But at least make sure anything that cannot be dispensed with screams at the user from the front matter. Otherwise it may go unnoticed” (Kirkpatrick 1989:760).

The dictionary grammar is contrastive, seeing as it covers grammatical areas where structural and other differences between Danish and English can be found. Additionally, other areas which the authors deemed important for someone producing business English are also included in the grammar.

The Latin names used in the dictionary grammar and their Danish equivalents are listed in the grammar introduction (and inside the dictionary’s front cover and in the user’s guide) and the grammatical codes – e.g. <SING V> – used in the dictionary entries are also explained in the first section of the dictionary grammar. Here we are also told that irregular plural forms of nouns are indicated in the dictionary, with the exception of nouns with the endings -y, -o and -f(e).

The dictionary grammar is divided into six sections, not including the introduction. These sections are called: Grammatical codes for nouns and verbs; The grammar of nouns; The
grammar of verbs; Punctuation; Abbreviations and acronyms; and the final section is called British and American English.\(^{22}\)

The section on the grammar of nouns deals with countable and uncountable nouns, the use of the definite/indefinite article and cases of singular and plural, while the section on the grammar of verbs deals with – for example – some Danish mono-transitive/intransitive/double-transitive verbs and the differences between them and their English counterparts, especially when translating from Danish into English.

It seems a bit out of place that a grammatical terminology derived from Latin should be used in an otherwise user-friendly Danish dictionary grammar. A lot of the grammatical expressions are bound to scare off the inexperienced dictionary user, or the user with only a basic grammatical knowledge. However, since the section on the grammar of verbs contains references to translation,\(^{23}\) it seems plausible that the grammar is not primarily aimed at the user with a basic knowledge on English grammar (something many people would claim to have), but especially at the user who is proficient in English, but needs to made aware of certain differences between e.g. certain Danish and English verb patterns and their usage in business English. This user would typically be a linguist, for example a translator, hence the before mentioned references to translation. In this connection, it should be mentioned that the grammatical terms in the grammar section in the user’s guide have Danish names. This indicates that the user’s guide is aimed at the diverse user group mentioned in the preface, while the same cannot be said about the dictionary grammar.

The examples in the dictionary grammar showing the differences between American English and British English are interesting for translators and those who produce English texts, and so is the information provided on punctuation – a tricky area for most people.

A great drawback of the dictionary grammar is that it has not been integrated into the dictionary entries – although there is a reference from a component of the front matter, namely the user’s guide, to a section in the grammar – or more specifically, there are no cross-references from the word list to the grammar. This could have been done by making a reference in the dictionary entries to a number in the grammar that would lead the user to a specific grammar section of relevance to that particular lemma – see e.g. the Malagasy-German dictionary Rakibolana Malagasy-Alema (Bergenholtz et al.1991). As it is now, the grammar seems to be an independent

---

\(^{22}\) My own translation of the Danish titles

\(^{23}\) See p. 637 and p. 639 in the dictionary grammar
component of the dictionary which could lead the dictionary user to the conclusion that the grammar does not have any particular relevance to the dictionary usage.

One of the dictionary authors, Birger Andersen, has also written the following about the lack of connection between the dictionary grammar and other components of the *Collins COBUILD New Student’s Dictionary* (2002):

> “This lack of connections between the dictionary grammar and other components of the dictionary makes it difficult to imagine that it will be used to any appreciable extent in connection with the use of other components of the dictionary. For that reason, it seems reasonable to question whether we can call it a dictionary grammar at all” (Andersen 2007:126).

Indeed a very appropriate description of the issue discussed above.

### 3.1.3 Grammatical information in the dictionary entries

The grammatical information on the lemmas in the dictionary entries comprises indication of: word class; if the nouns are uncountable and if the verbs they take can be in the singular and/or plural form; the use of the definite article together with the noun; when the plural form of the noun is more common than the singular form; irregular inflections; the transitivity of the verbs and which types of objects and predicates they take. Several entries also contain collocations for the headword. In entries where the headword is not a noun or a verb, but e.g. an adjective or an adverb, the only grammatical information provided is indication of word class and, in some cases, collocations.

There is no grammatical information stated for the Danish equivalent – ostensibly because the user group is defined as Danes who then presumably are familiar with the grammar of their native language, or maybe it was a matter of economy for the dictionary authors. Either way, the reasons for not including grammar for the equivalents are not stated in the dictionary.

As is the case with all grammatical codes in dictionary entries, the codes used in the entries in this dictionary also require the user to spend some time trying to interpret their meaning. Especially the codes provided for verbs would require many users to look up in the user’s guide.
For instance, the entry back² contains the following grammatical information: VB <Ø; N>. This would perhaps seem pretty straight forward for linguists, but most users would have to look this code up in the user’s guide in order to make any sense of it. Another option would be to look up the codes in section 1 of the dictionary grammar, but – as mentioned before – here the grammatical terms carry Latin names, also when appearing in the explanations for the grammar codes (which contain such colourful words as *kopulaverbum* and *kompleks-transitivt verbum*) so the majority of users would probably benefit most from the explanations of the grammar codes in the user’s guide.

However, the question remains if the user bothers to look up these codes at all. Another debatable topic is if possible references made to the dictionary grammar in the entries ought to stand alone or appear together with grammar codes. Though, as so far word class definitions in the entries would be classified as codes, these must generally be considered a basic constituent of grammar in a dictionary. These issues will be discussed further in chapter 4.

### 3.1.4 Conclusion

It is a pity that the dictionary grammar was not integrated into the entries, since it contains useful information on the grammar in the dictionary entries. It would therefore only seem natural to link the grammar to the entries. The placing of the grammar can also be discussed, but since there is a mention of the grammar in the user’s guide, the interested user ought to become aware of its existence. The grammar itself gives a good insight into some important elements in and issues of English grammar in relation to business English, but it is mostly the user who is already quite competent in the English language and grammar who will benefit from it. Hence, most of the dictionary’s intended users would probably benefit more from the user’s guide when looking up for example an explanation of the grammatical codes in the entries.

The primary function of English text production in this English-Danish business dictionary is perhaps a bit surprising considering the assertion in the preface that people would use either a Danish-English dictionary or an English dictionary when producing English texts.
Dictionary 2:

Andersen, Birger; Balsgart, Karin; Pilegaard, Morten; Tarp, Sven: *Dansk-engelsk erhvervsordbog*, 1. udgave, Systime 1999

### 3.2 Analysis of *Dansk-engelsk erhvervsordbog*

#### 3.2.1 Preface and user’s guide

Like in the English-Danish business dictionary *Engelsk-dansk Erhvervsordbog* – in the same series – it is stated in the preface of this Danish-English business dictionary that the dictionary function is to aid the user in the production of English texts. This is the primary function while another function is to assist the user in the translation of Danish texts into English.

The user group for this dictionary is the same as for the English-Danish business dictionary, namely Danish students at Commercial and Business Schools and other advanced Danish students of English business communication, Danish business people and other Danish employees within the private and public sector who communicate in English. According to the authors, these different users should all be able to find the dictionary useful in connection with Business English communication. Also English-speaking users should apparently be able to use the dictionary when reading and trying to understand Danish texts. The latter assertion is questionable, though, seeing as e.g. the explanations in the entries are in Danish. As an example we can take the entry *eftergøre*, which looks like this

*eftergøre* vb

1. repeat
2. (imitere) imitate
3. (ulovligt) fake, counterfeit
4. (om dokument, underskrift, mv) forge
How would an English-speaking person know which word to choose here? Unless he or she understands Danish well enough to understand the explanations in the brackets, it would not be easy. That is not to say that English-speaking users would not benefit at all from the dictionary. They would just need to have a basic understanding of Danish to do so.

There is also a user’s guide in this dictionary. It contains almost all the same elements as the user’s guide in the English-Danish business dictionary. One exception is that the section called word combinations as headwords is not included in this dictionary, implying that word combinations are not used as lemmas here. It also appears from the user’s guide that some of the entries in this dictionary include references to English synonyms, like the following entry (the arrow here representing a reference to synonyms):

**grosserer** sub **wholesaler**

- wholesale trader, merchant

In the user’s guide we are informed that there is rarely any indication of word class for the equivalent of the headword, which then means that the word class is the same as for the headword. Only in cases where it was deemed important by the authors, it has been indicated that the word class for the equivalent differs from the one for the headword. It is, of course, debatable when a differing word class is important enough to be included and when it is not. I will elaborate on that in section 3.2.3.

The user’s guide also has a section about the grammatical codes used in the dictionary entries, and it is worth noting that the codes for the verbs differ from those used in the English-Danish business dictionary. In the Danish-English business dictionary, no code is listed for mono-transitive verbs taking only pronouns and nouns as a direct object. In the English-Danish dictionary, the code for this type of mono-transitive verbs is: <N>. The code <IO + DO> in the Danish-English business dictionary indicates that it is a double-transitive verb taking a noun (phrase) or a pronoun as both indirect object and direct object. The code for double-transitive verbs in the English-Danish business dictionary is <N + N>.

The codes in the English-Danish business dictionary – which is also the newer dictionary – are clearly designed to be more simple and user-friendly. The letter N replaces IO and DO in some places, but there are also more codes listed in the English-Danish business dictionary than in the Danish-English dictionary.
3.2.2 Dictionary grammar

There is a dictionary grammar at the back of the dictionary, identical to the one in the English-Danish business dictionary, though with the noticeable exception that there is no section on the grammar of the verb. Since complementation and transitivity of the verbs are included in the entries, it would seem fairly obvious to have a section about verbs, but since – just like in the English-Danish business dictionary – the dictionary grammar has not been integrated into the entries, it perhaps seemed unnecessary to include such a section.

Since the dictionary grammar is identical to the one in the English-Danish business dictionary, only lacking a section on the grammar of the verb, nothing more needs to be said about it here.

3.2.3 Grammatical information in the dictionary entries

In this dictionary, unlike the English-Danish business dictionary, the grammatical information in the entries is for the equivalent, with the exception of the word class which, as mentioned before, is for the most part only indicated for the headword. The grammatical information on the English equivalents in the dictionary entries includes: the listing of word class, if the nouns are uncountable and if the verbs they take can be in the singular or/and plural form; the use of the definite article together with the noun; when the plural form of the noun is more common than the singular form; irregular inflections; the transitivity of the verbs and which types of objects they take.

The indication of word class is inconsistent in some cases. For instance, the lemma Landbrugsraadet has been listed as a noun – its English equivalent The (Danish) Agricultural Council has no word class indication, consequently it is also a noun24. Yet many would define both as proper nouns, especially seeing as the Danish lemma starts with a capital letter, something which normally indicates the status of proper noun. The lemmas Landsorganisationen i Danmark and Landbrugets Afsætningsudvalg, however, are listed as proper nouns, so there has been no consistent strategy to list proper nouns as merely nouns, something which perhaps could have been deduced.

24 See the description of the indication of word class in chapter 3.2.1
from the word class indication for Landbrugsraadet. This shows some inconsistency in the word class indications.

Another issue for debate is when it is important to indicate that the word class for the equivalent differs from the one for the lemma. An example could be the lemma landbrugsminister (here in the general sense) which has been listed as a noun and has the English equivalents ministry of agriculture; (DK) The (Danish) Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Fisheries; (UK) The Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food; and (US) The Department of Agriculture.” The equivalent ministry of agriculture is a general term, not referring to any specific ministry – hence the lack of capital letters – and can therefore be defined as a noun, just like the headword. The other equivalents, on the other hand, are all proper nouns which ought to have been listed as such, especially since the dictionary does list proper nouns in some cases. Instead of only indicating a differing word class when it seemed important to so, it would have better if the authors went for consistency and indicated differing word classes in all cases.

3.2.4 Conclusion

Grammatical information in the entries in this dictionary is only indicated for the English equivalent – with the exception of the indication of word class which in most cases is only indicated for the headword. Consequently, if the word class indications in this dictionary are not included, there is only English grammar in both the English-Danish business dictionary and the Danish-English business dictionary. This further underlines that the two dictionaries are aimed at Danish users, and it calls into question the assertion from the authors that the dictionaries are to be complementary. Rather than complimenting the grammar in the Danish-English dictionary, the dictionary grammar and the grammatical information in the entries in the English-Danish dictionary must be considered an update of the older version in the Danish-English business dictionary. Complementary dictionaries – again in grammatical terms – should not contain practically the same dictionary grammar for the same language. A complimentary grammatical aspect could have been a widely extended or a totally different dictionary grammar in the English-Danish business dictionary containing information on other important aspects of Danish versus English grammar within the
context of business communication than those aspects already listed in the Danish-English business dictionary.

Both business dictionaries list a diverse group of Danes – e.g. students and business people – as dictionary users and the production of English texts as their primary function. As is also mentioned in the preface to the English-Danish business dictionary, Danish users who are not familiar with English business language would often be better off using a Danish-English business dictionary.

The claim in the preface of the Danish-English business dictionary that another possible user group, besides Danes, for the dictionary could be people with English as a native language seems rather absurd, since the dictionary grammar, the user’s guide and the explanations in the entries are written in Danish. If this dictionary was truly aimed at both Danish and English users, it ought to contain grammatical information on (and in) both languages, or in the words of Mugdan (1989a:138): “If a [bilingual] dictionary is to be bifunctional, i.e. suitable for speakers of either language…, it must provide grammatical information on both sides”.

As in the English-Danish dictionary, the dictionary grammar in this dictionary has not been integrated into the entries, and it has also been placed at the back of the dictionary, making it easy to overlook.
3.3 Analysis of *Engelsk-dansk juridisk basisordbog*

3.3.1 Preface and user’s guide

In the preface, we are told that the primary purpose of this English-Danish basic legal dictionary is to enable the user to gain a greater understanding of English legal texts, like legal textbooks and documents, i.e. the primary function is text reception. The secondary dictionary function is translation of English legal texts into Danish. The author points out the interconnection between the two functions, and he then goes on to say that the primary target group for this dictionary is students at Business Schools and translators. A secondary dictionary user group consists of users who want information on English law, but who are not part of the primary user group.

Although it is not mentioned in the preface, the dictionary is presumably aimed at Danish users, since the explanations in the entries are in Danish and so is the dictionary outside matter.

The user’s guide informs us that the dictionary is made up of two parts, namely a comparative court overview and an alphabetical word list. The court overview is split up into sections, and there are cross-references from the dictionary entries to relevant sections of the court overview.

The sections in the user’s guide on the grammatical information in the entries are very short. This makes sense, since the only grammatical information provided is word class indications for all the headwords, except for the abbreviations, and word class indications for those equivalents that belong to a different word class than the lemma. When equivalents have a different form than the lemma, e.g. are in the singular form while the lemma appears only in the plural, this is also indicated. The grammatical codes and the collocations appearing in the entries are explained in the user’s guide. The codes and abbreviations have all been collected on the last page of the user’s guide, with references to certain sections in the user’s guide where one can get more information.
3.3.2 Dictionary grammar

There is no dictionary grammar. Considering the amount of grammatical information (or rather the lack of it) in the entries, this is hardly surprising.

3.3.3 Grammatical information in the entries

As stated above, the only grammatical information provided for the headwords is indication of word class. The codes used here are: \( s \) for nouns, \( v \) for verbs, \( adj \) for adjectives and \( praep \) for prepositions. The indication \( s \) is confusing and could in some cases mislead the user, since it can easily be mistaken for the term singular. It would therefore have been better to use the abbreviation \( sb \) for nouns, an abbreviation which is also more common in English-Danish dictionaries.

In cases where the nouns can appear only in the singular or the plural form, one of the following abbreviations replaces the word class indication: \( pl \) for plural, \( sg \) for singular. This omission of word class indication in cases where the headword only appears in the plural or the singular form seems unwise, since it is inconsistent and also means that no distinction will be made between proper nouns and nouns. The latter is not important here, though, since that distinction has not been made in this dictionary. However, omitting the word class indications in some cases will only be confusing, and seeing as there is practically no other grammatical information available to the user it also ought to be an unnecessary omission.

As mentioned before, there are no word class indications for the equivalents, unless they belong to a different word class than the headword. The same goes for indication of plural or singular forms of the equivalents, i.e. the equivalent must differ from the headword by for example appearing in the plural only while the headword is in the singular.

The collocations appear in English with a Danish translation. Sometimes they contain inflections of the headword. Apart from that, no inflections (regular or irregular) are listed in the entries.
3.3.4 Conclusion

Very little grammatical information is included in this dictionary, and it is certainly safe to say that the inclusion of grammatical information was not a top priority when the dictionary was created. However, there are word class indications for the lemmas; that is, when they can only appear in either the singular or the plural form. In that case only the singular or the plural form is indicated for the lemma. The grammatical code $s$ used to indicate that a lemma is a noun may be confused with the term *singular*. Thus it would be more sensible to replace $s$ with the code $sb$, which is also a more common classification for nouns.
Dictionary 4:

Printed edition
Nielsen, Sandro; Mourier, Lise; Bergenholtz, Henning: *Regnskabsordbogen engelsk-dansk*
Forlaget Thomson A/S, København 2007

Electronic edition
Nielsen, Sandro; Mourier, Lise; Bergenholtz, Henning: *Den Engelsk-Danske Regnskabsordbog*,
Center for Leksikografi og forfatterne, 2006-2007

Dictionary 5:

Printed edition
Nielsen, Sandro; Mourier, Lise; Bergenholtz, Henning: *Regnskabsordbogen dansk-engelsk*, 1. udgave, Thomson (Nørhaven Book), København, 2004

Electronic edition
Nielsen, Sandro; Mourier, Lise; Bergenholtz, Henning: *Den Dansk-Engelske Regnskabsordbog*,
Center for Leksikografi og forfatterne, 2003-2007
3.4 Analysis of *Den Engelsk-Danske Regnskabsordbog & Den Dansk-Engelske Regnskabsordbog*

3.4.1 The printed editions

Both printed and electronic editions of these English-Danish and Danish-English accounting dictionaries are available. If we first look at the grammatical information in the printed editions, then, in short, there is practically no such information included in either dictionary. Only in case of homonymy is there some grammatical information in the form of word class indication. Collocations are also included in the entries. Due to space restrictions, no more grammatical information could be included in the printed editions, I was told by one of the authors, Henning Bergenholtz. Although seemingly being a valid and reasonable excuse, it nevertheless is an excuse that could be used by all lexicographers who put more emphasis on the number of lemmas than the grammatical information. If the grammatical information is deemed important, surely it would be chosen over a higher number of lemmas. Though, in the case of these accounting dictionaries it is perhaps not so important that little grammatical information is available in the printed editions, since there are updated electronic editions available on the Internet in which grammatical information is included. I will therefore now turn to the electronic editions for a discussion of their grammatical contents.

3.4.2 The electronic editions

Some might say that I would be biased when examining these electronic accounting dictionaries, as I’m involved in the work on them. However, no comments will be made here on the quality of the grammatical information provided. I will only look at and comment on the system and contents of that information, i.e. what grammatical information has been included and how it has been integrated into the dictionary. In addition, the user functions will be examined.
Since it is explained in the user’s guides in the menu on the left side of the homepage of each accounting dictionary\textsuperscript{25} what grammatical information can be found in each dictionary, the main focus here will be on these user’s guides, in order to see what the authors have to say about the dictionaries and, most importantly, their grammatical contents. The actual grammatical contents of the dictionaries will, of course, also be examined, so as to verify that it corresponds to the contents listed in the user’s guides.

\textbf{3.4.3 User’s guide for the English-Danish Dictionary of Accounting}

The user’s guide is only available in Danish and is therefore presumably aimed at Danish users. The authors distinguish between two main reasons for using a dictionary: specific communication-related problems or wanting to acquire more knowledge or gain more information on something. Communication-related problems cover problems in connection with translation, production and reading of texts. All of these functions are included in this dictionary, and it is therefore a polyfunctional dictionary.

On the first page of the user’s guide, there is an example of how a typical dictionary entry in the English-Danish Dictionary of Accounting is constructed. The entry chosen as an example is the noun \textit{insurance contract}. The headword contains information on word class (even though the word class indication is not included in the guide, it is still indicated in the dictionary) and inflections, including the use of the indefinite article, the definite article and the plural form of the noun. The Danish equivalent \textit{forsikringskontrakt} contains the same grammatical information. In this connection, it is worth noting that especially the indication of the indefinite article in dictionaries is rare, while the definite article is sometimes indicated in case it is obligatory (see e.g. LDOCE, 1978). Here, though, it is indicated for every entry, both for the lemma and the equivalent, when the indefinite and the definite article can be used together with the word and when they cannot.

The entries also contain an English definition, English collocations with a Danish translation, Danish synonyms/antonyms and sometimes one or several example sentences with

\textsuperscript{25} The Danish-English Dictionary of Accounting: \url{http://www.regnskabsordbogen.dk/regn/dkgb/dkgbregn.aspx}. The English-Danish Dictionary of Accounting: \url{http://www.regnskabsordbogen.dk/regn/gbdk/gbdkregn.aspx}
Danish translations. There are often references in the entries to other related lemmas under the headline *see also*. Occasionally a source is listed that contains a link to a webpage.

The grammatical definitions used in the dictionary are: adjective, adverb, noun, proper noun, preposition and verb. A Danish translation of these terms is listed on page 1 and 2 in the user’s guide.

The user’s guide has been divided into small sections according to dictionary function. The sections are called *Help when translating English texts into Danish*, *Help when writing English texts*, *Help when reading English texts* and *Help to acquire knowledge about accounting matters*. Each section exemplifies how the dictionary can be used for the purposes in question. In the section *Help when translating English texts into Danish*, it says that translators who translate into Danish may need information on what the words are called in Danish, their inflection and how they are spelled. This information can be found by looking at the equivalent.

It is also mentioned in this section that in the entries where the headword is a verb, the user can find information on whether and how verbs can be used both in the active and the passive form. Headwords which look the same but differ grammatically are given numbers like ¹ and ². These headwords are also given separate definitions. When there is no grammatical difference in the use of the headword, the various differences are indicated in front of the equivalent by a number, like in the following equivalents for *depreciation*:

1 **afskrivning**
noun <en; -en, -er, -erne>

**Definition**
....

2 **værdiforringelse**
noun <en; -n, -r, -rne>

**Definition**
....

If you want to know more about the equivalent, or if the English definition is hard to grasp, it is possible to click on the Danish equivalent, which takes you to the Danish Dictionary of Accounting – but only if the equivalent is also a headword in the Danish Dictionary of Accounting. The same

---

²⁶ My own translation of the titles
applies to the English headword, so if you click on the headword, you will see the entry in the English Dictionary of Accounting.

Considering the previous statement by Bergenholtz & Tarp (2006a:579) that, in connection with inflectional information, space restrictions are not an issue in electronic dictionaries in the same way as in printed dictionaries, it seems rather odd that the inflections are not written in full in the dictionary entries.

The collocations and examples (all of which are accompanied by Danish translations) seem to have been intended particularly as an aid to translators, seeing as it is mentioned under the headline Help when translating English texts into Danish that the dictionary contains many English collocations due to the fact that collocations often pose problems for translators. Likewise, the English examples are meant to be an aid to the translator.

When it comes to the production of English accounting texts, it says in the user’s guide that there might be some uncertainty over how the English words are spelled and that the English-Danish Dictionary of Accounting can be used to establish the correct spelling.

The abbreviations UK, US and IAS/IFRS indicate if the headword is British English, US English or International English. Sometimes the abbreviation DK is used. This means that the English term is only related to Danish conditions. The collocations and examples are also mentioned as a possible aid in connection with the production of English accounting texts.

The section on the reading and understanding of English texts contains several of the points mentioned in the section on translation of English texts, e.g. the collocations, examples and, of course, definitions are described as information that may give the user a better understanding of a text, as are the listed synonyms and antonyms.

In the final section, Help to acquire knowledge about accounting matters, the possibility of reading the entries and thereby learning something about accounting is mentioned. The sources containing links to the Internet are mentioned as a possible option for the user who wants additional information on accounting.
3.4.4 User’s guide for the Danish-English Dictionary of Accounting

While also being available only in Danish, this user’s guide is quite different from the one for the English-Danish Dictionary of Accounting. It comprises only two pages, while the user’s guide for the English-Danish dictionary is seven pages long, and therefore it obviously does not contain all the sections that can be found in the guide for the English-Danish dictionary. It is stated at the beginning of the guide that the dictionary functions are: translation of Danish accounting texts into English and production of English accounting texts. In that connection, the issue of the correct spelling of English words – also pointed out in the guide for the English-Danish dictionary – is mentioned. The user can discover the correct spelling by looking at the equivalents that contain indications of whether or not they are written in International English, US English or British English.

In the guide it says that word class is indicated only for headwords that look identical; in all other cases no word class is indicated. This is actually not the case, although it could have been so at the time when the guide was written. The example used in the guide is the lemma *aftale* which is listed both as a noun and as a verb, but when you look up *aftale* in the dictionary, the word classes are only shown for the equivalent, as is the case for all the lemmas. Also the lemma *aktiv* which appears as both a noun and an adjective has no word class indication, but the equivalents do. Apart from the collocations, no grammatical information has been listed for the Danish headwords, but by clicking on the headword you are taken to the Danish Dictionary of Accounting in which the following grammatical information has been included: word class, inflections (including the indication of the use of the indefinite/definite article for the nouns and indication of the passive forms of the verbs), collocations and sometimes example sentences. The assertion in the guide that clicking on the headword in the Danish Dictionary of Accounting will take you take to same headword in the Danish Internet dictionary called *Den Danske Netordbog* is not correct.

There is little else to say about this guide, except that it seems to be outdated, since it says on page one that an English accounting dictionary will be available in 2005. This must mean that the guide has not been updated for years which must also be why it has been erroneously stated in the guide’s last paragraph that if you click on headlines like *kollokationer* and *substantiv* you will get a short explanation of these terms. What actually happens when you click on *kollokationer* is that you’re brought to the top of the page, while clicking on *substantiv* simply is not possible.
Electronic dictionaries offer many advantages. One advantage is that they may be updated so that new information can be added and corrections can be made. However, in order to benefit from this advantage, the entire contents of the dictionaries must actually be updated on a regular basis.

3.4.5 Grammatical information in both accounting dictionaries

To sum it up, here follows a brief description of the grammatical information found in the entries of the two accounting dictionaries.

Beginning with the nouns, it has been indicated for all the English nouns in the Danish-English dictionary and the English and Danish nouns in the English-Danish dictionary when the definite and/or the indefinite article can be used together with the noun. There is word class indication for all word classes, including proper nouns, and both regular and irregular inflections are shown for all nouns and verbs – and for the adjectives in the Danish-English dictionary. The passive forms of the verbs are also indicated. There are English collocations with Danish translations, and Danish collocations with English translations and also some example sentences, making it easier for the user to apply the word in a specific context.

The inclusion of regular forms of inflections does not correspond to what one of the authors, Henning Bergenholtz, has previously stated about what grammatical information is to be included in a LSP dictionary. As also mentioned in chapter 2, Bergenholtz and Pedersen (1994:353) claim that information on regular forms of inflection in the entries “adds to the impression of a language with nothing but irregularities”. Bergenholtz repeats this assertion in LexicoNordica 2 (Bergenholtz 1995: 8), claiming that it is neither advantageous nor necessary to include grammatical information on regular and irregular forms and constructions. In the same article, Bergenholtz concludes that the best solution concerning the indication of regular and irregular forms of inflection is to include the regular forms of inflection in the dictionary grammar, while the irregular forms should be included in the dictionary entries. Mugdan (1989a:127) also writes that “the division of labour between Grammar and Dictionary implies that “regular” cases need not be mentioned in the dictionary entries”. However, since those articles referred to printed dictionaries, they may perhaps be considered to have no relevance for the electronic accounting dictionaries. On the other hand, they most certainly do not make it easier to understand why there is hardly any
grammatical information, including information on inflection, in the printed accounting dictionaries.

3.4.6 Conclusion

The authors of these polyfunctional accounting dictionaries have certainly tried to cater for the needs of the various user groups by paying specific attention to the dictionary functions, as is also apparent from especially the user’s guide for the English-Danish Dictionary of Accounting, which has been divided into sections according to dictionary function. In these sections, it is explained how the dictionary can be used for a specific purpose, for instance text production. The functions mentioned are translation, text production, reception and learning more about accounting.

The entries in the English-Danish Accounting Dictionary contain word class indication for both the headword and the equivalent. Of all the dictionaries that have been analysed so far, these accounting dictionaries are the only ones that contain both regular and irregular inflections for the nouns and verbs – including indication of the use of the indefinite article, the definite article and the plural form of the nouns. The use of the indefinite and the definite article is rarely indicated in any dictionaries.

The entries in the Danish-English Accounting Dictionary only have grammatical information on the equivalent, but by clicking on the Danish headword, the user is taken to the Danish Accounting Dictionary which contains all the same grammatical information on the Danish term as the English headword. The Danish-English Accounting Dictionary is also polyfunctional. According to the user’s guide, the functions are translation and text production, but it should be noted that the guide is clearly outdated and therefore not quite reliable.

All in all, the entries in both electronic accounting dictionaries contain a lot of grammatical information. It could be argued, though, that some of that information would be superfluous or would require too much space in printed dictionaries. Previous statements on the inclusion of regular inflections in dictionary entries by one of the authors of the accounting dictionaries, Henning Bergenholtz (1995), support this claim. Those statements, however, do not make it any easier to understand why the printed accounting dictionaries contain hardly any grammatical information.
Finally, no dictionary grammar accompanies the accounting dictionaries, although it is an element recommended by e.g. Bergenholtz and Pedersen (1994) and Bergenholtz (1995). The authors must have considered the grammatical information found in the entries to be sufficient in this case.
3.5 Analysis of Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture

3.5.1 Preface

In the preface of this English monolingual dictionary, teachers and advanced students of English are listed as the target group. More specifically, the dictionary is aimed at students of English from other cultures who need to understand “references to places, people, events, products and institutions that they meet when they read newspapers or novels, or when they hear spoken language, for example, in films”. Unlike the previously analysed dictionaries, this is an English monolingual general language dictionary – with references to British and American culture.

3.5.2 Explanatory chart

Right after the preface and before the user’s guide, there is an explanatory chart. It explains for instance that compound nouns are listed as entries in the dictionary and that grammatical information is given in square brackets, while word class is shown in italic letters (thereby implying that word class indication is not part of the grammatical information). The examples of grammatical information shown in the chart are [U] for uncountable nouns and [I] for intransitive verbs. We are also told that irregular plurals and inflections are given before the definitions, but it is not stated here if these irregular forms are always provided or only sometimes. However, a quick look at some dictionary headwords with irregular plurals and inflections like drive (verb), mouse (noun), steal (verb) and go (verb) shows the indication of inflection/plural form for all of them. At same time, by looking at headwords with regular plurals and inflections like girl (noun), travel (verb) and trade (noun/verb), it can be established that regular plurals and inflections are not shown in the entries,
leading to the conclusion that the principle of only applying the irregular forms has indeed been followed here.\(^{27}\)

According to the chart, example sentences, idioms and well-known phrases and phrasal verbs are also indicated in the dictionary entries. Derived words and pronunciations are also shown in the entries, as well as usage notes on word use and word choice and cultural notes. There are cross-references to pictures, tables, usage notes and cultural notes in the entries – but not to any dictionary grammar.

### 3.5.3 User’s guide

In the user’s guide terms like homographs, idioms and compound nouns are explained. It is also mentioned in the guide that prefixes and suffixes are listed in a section at the back of the dictionary – we will return to that later. Some of the most common prefixes and suffixes, however, have been lemmatised, these entries containing only a reference to the full list of prefixes and suffixes at the back of the book.

There is a short section called Grammar in the user’s guide. Here word classes are actually included, as well as information on inflections, grammar codes and phrasal verbs. We are informed that proper nouns have no word class label in the dictionary.

It is stated clearly in this section, as the little test above of inflections in the entries also showed, that regular inflections are not included in the entries (with the exception of regular inflections that have difficult pronunciations or could in some way cause confusion), while words with irregular inflections “are always at the main entry, directly after the word class sign…” In addition, irregular inflections that are very different from the citation form have their own separate entries. An example is the entry *flew* where it is stated that it is the past tense of *fly*.

According to the user’s guide there are four main types of information given within the grammar codes. These four types are: the letter codes like [I], [T], [C] and [U] that “give basic grammatical information, such as whether a verb is transitive or intransitive, and whether a noun is countable or uncountable” (p. xiii); the codes for “prepositions or adverbs, like [(to)] or [(with)] that

\(^{27}\)The principle of indication of irregular inflections only (and inflections that may cause difficulty for the user) is also applied by other English monolingual dictionaries like for example “Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary” from 2003 and “Longman Concise English Dictionary” from 1985
can or must be used after a particular word” (p. xiii); the sentence pattern codes like [+to-v] or [+v-ing] which “show the types of clause that can follow a word” (p. xiii); and finally codes that indicate “other limitations on a word’s use, e.g. [usually sing.], [usually in negatives] or [not in progressive forms]”. An explanation of the grammar codes used in the dictionary can also be found inside the front cover.

Phrasal verbs are shown as separate entries following the main verb. Information on the transitivity of the phrasal verbs is also provided in the entries.

Although there are no direct cross-references in the entries to grammatical information, it says in the user’s guide that there are references to usage notes which sometimes contain “difficult points of grammar and style” (p. xv).

### 3.5.4 Grammar in the dictionary entries

To sum up what has already been established in the previous section, the dictionary entries contain the following grammatical information: word class indication in all the entries; indication of irregular inflections and of regular inflections that have difficult pronunciations or may cause confusion. In addition, it is shown in the entries when a noun is uncountable; whether a verb is transitive or intransitive; which types of clause that can follow a word and which prepositions or adverbs that can or must be used after a particular word. Limitations on a word’s use are also listed, e.g. if it can only appear in the singular form.

When the lemma is a noun that can be both countable and uncountable, this is also shown in the entry. An example of this can be seen in the entry below:

*dip*² *n* 1 [C] *infml* a quick swim in the sea, a lake etc: I’m just going for a dip/to have a dip. 2 [C] a slight drop to a lower level: a sudden dip in the road | an unexpected dip in profits 3 [U] a thick liquid mixture into which food, such as vegetable pieces, can be dipped, especially at parties: cheese/avocado dip 4 [C;U] (a special liquid for) the process of dipping animals 5 [C] *AmE slang* a stupid or silly person – see also LUCKY DIP
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The verb *dip* can be used in various senses, three of which are countable, one is uncountable and another is both countable and uncountable. If the headword was a countable noun with no uncountable sense, then this would not have been indicated in the entry. No indication of countable/uncountable in the entry then means that the noun is countable.

### 3.5.5 Word formation

At the back of the dictionary, in the outside matter, there is a section called *Word formation*. This section provides a full list of English prefixes and suffixes. On the first page an overview of the most common prefixes and suffixes is shown, and then the rest is presented in two separate lists called *Word beginnings* and *Word endings*. This is a practical and useful feature, and it also enables the prefixes and suffixes to be included in the dictionary without being lemmatised. Only a few of the most common prefixes and suffixes are headwords and those merely contain a reference to the full list, using the principle that has been recommended by some linguists for a dictionary grammar, i.e. to have a separate section dealing with certain aspects of grammar to which references are made from the entries.

### 3.5.6 A small grammatical contribution

The very last section of the outside matter at the back of the book (with the exception of the list of abbreviations displayed inside the back cover) is a small grammatical input showing the inflection of the verb *be*. When looking at this small grammatical contribution, one cannot help wondering if it would have been a good idea to incorporate some more grammatical information into this section, perhaps going so far as to turn it into a small dictionary grammar, but then again maybe not considering the intended user group for this dictionary. Bearing in mind the user group, this small section might even be deemed unnecessary.
3.5.7 Conclusion

This English monolingual dictionary is aimed at teachers and advanced students of English and contains more grammatical information than the average LSP dictionary, although it does not list regular inflectional forms and does not include a dictionary grammar. Still, considering the intended users and their supposed English skills, it contains quite a lot of information on grammar. All irregular inflections are shown in the dictionary entries, and word class is indicated for every lemma. It has been listed if a noun is uncountable, and the transitivity of the verbs has also been indicated. There is syntactic information accompanying the headwords, and certain limitations on a word’s use, e.g. that it can only appear in the plural form, are also shown in the entries.

Although there is no actual dictionary grammar included in the dictionary, there is what could be considered an element of a dictionary grammar, namely a section at the back of the dictionary containing a list of English affixes. Instead of incorporating all the affixes into the dictionary entries, only a few of the most common ones have been made headwords. These in turn contain references to the full list of affixes at the back of the dictionary.
3.6 Other English monolingual dictionaries

This chapter contains a brief description of the grammatical information in three English monolingual dictionaries, so as to compare it to the information found in the monolingual dictionary and the LSP dictionaries analysed above. The three dictionaries are *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* (OALD) from 2000, *Oxford Dictionary of English* (ODE) from 2003 and *Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary* (MWCD) from 2003.

It is stated in the preface of MWCD that it is meant to “serve the general public as its chief source of information about the words of our language”. MWCD has an explanatory chart accompanied by explanatory notes in which e.g. the inflected forms shown in the entries are described. The plurals of nouns are usually not indicated

> “when the base word is unchanged by suffixation, when the noun is a compound whose second element is readily recognizable as a regular free form entered at its own place, or when the noun is unlikely to occur in the plural” (MWCD, preface).

Otherwise, the plural of the nouns is shown in the entries. Likewise, the principal parts of verbs are usually not shown when the base word is unchanged by suffixation or when the verb is a compound whose second element is readily recognizable as a regular free form entered at its own place. In all other cases, the inflectional forms of the verbs are shown. This means that also some regular inflectional forms are shown in the entries. Furthermore, the comparative and superlative forms of adjectives and adverbs are included in the entries. Inflectional cross-references also appear in the dictionary. An example is the lemma *wound* which contains a reference to *wind*. Combining forms, prefixes and suffixes are entries in the dictionary. Word classes are shown for all headwords and so are labels indicating other functional classifications like *suffix* or *symbol*. At the back of the book, there is a so-called Handbook of Style in which there is information on, for example, punctuation and capitals and italics.

In the preface of OALD no user group is mentioned, but since it is called a learner’s dictionary, it was probably not deemed necessary to elaborate on that. Both less experienced learners and the most advanced learners are, however, mentioned in the preface, so presumably they are included in the target group. There is a section right after the preface, called *Key to dictionary entries*, that corresponds to the explanatory charts found in LDELC and MWCD (with the exception
of the accompanying notes). It appears from this section that word class is indicated for all headwords, and that irregular inflections of verbs and irregular plurals of nouns are listed in the entries. If different types of nouns, i.e. both countable and uncountable, are in one entry this is also indicated by the abbreviations [U] and [C]. Comparatives and superlatives of adjectives are given in the entries as well as information on the usage of adjectives e.g. if they usually appear before a noun. There is extensive information on word usage in OALD, more than in any of the other dictionaries analysed so far. As in most learner’s dictionaries, there is great emphasis on syntax, so naturally the transitivity and complementation of the verbs, example sentences and collocations are also shown in the entries.

At the back of OALD, in appendix 1, there is a list of irregular verbs and their inflections. In appendix 3, called Numbers, prepositions of time are shown. The majority of the dictionary’s grammatical information, though, can be found in the so-called Study pages placed in the middle of the word list. These pages contain syntactic information in the form of examples of complementation and collocations. There is also a section on nouns and adjectives where e.g. countable and uncountable nouns are defined and a section called Verbs where e.g. intransitive verbs and transitive verbs are defined. The next section is called Verbs used with clauses in which verb patterns and the verb codes in the entries are explained. There is also a section on phrasal verbs and one on idioms.

There are references to the dictionary entries in the Study pages, and it is obvious that this dictionary element was meant to give guidance on the usage of the dictionary – as is also stated in the preface. With the exception of the section on letter writing, the sections in the Study pages could very well be said to constitute a dictionary grammar. It is a small dictionary grammar, but it nevertheless contains important information on central grammatical terms and on dictionary usage, especially on the codes in the entries. It contains references to and shows examples of various dictionary entries, meaning that it is not an isolated component but has, to a certain extent, been integrated into the word list. The location of the Study pages may also be considered an attempt of integration into the word list, as it makes them hard to miss, unlike the dictionary grammar of the bilingual business dictionaries analysed above which were located at the back of the dictionary. However, it has not been possible to find any reference from the entries to the Study pages, so they have after all not been properly integrated into the word list.

No user group is mentioned in the preface to ODE, but it does say that an ambition for the dictionary is that it should be “the most accurate and up-to-date description of the language
available”. After the preface there is an introduction which also contains information on grammar. It is stated here that the aim of ODE is to “present information in such a way that it helps to explain the structure of the language itself, not just the meanings of individual senses”. It goes on to say that for this reason special attention has been paid to the grammar of each word, and grammatical structures are given explicitly. “Explaining the structure of the language itself” is hardly the aim of bilingual LSP dictionaries as those analysed above. Most bilingual LSP dictionaries are first and foremost created to help users understand, translate or produce LSP texts. This is perhaps one reason why there is more grammatical (especially syntactic) information in general language dictionaries than in LSP dictionaries where the emphasis is more on the meanings of individual senses rather than on the structure of e.g. the English language as a whole.

Countable and uncountable nouns (called mass nouns and count nouns in ODE) are defined in the introduction to ODE, and we are told that – as in all the other monolingual general language dictionaries examined here – by default all nouns in the dictionary are to be regarded as countable nouns unless stated otherwise. Codes relating to nouns in the entries are also explained in this section. The verbs are mentioned very briefly here, a few codes relating to them being defined, while the codes relating to adjectives and adverbs are also explained briefly. As in the other monolingual general language dictionaries above, word class is indicated for all the headwords in the dictionary and only irregular forms of inflections for verbs and adjectives are shown in the entries. In addition, irregular plurals of nouns are shown in the entries.

At the back of ODE there are fourteen appendixes, the two last ones being of grammatical interest. Appendix 13 provides a list of collective nouns while appendix 14, Guide to Good English, provides a comprehensive description of some grammatical phenomena. There are five main sections in this appendix: Parts of speech, Inflection, Sentences, Agreement and Punctuation. Due to space constraints, it is not possible to explain here the exact contents of these sections; suffice it to say that together they constitute what could be defined as a dictionary grammar, since they contain information on e.g. the basic rules of inflection and definitions of all the word classes.
3.6.1 Conclusion

These English monolingual dictionaries all contain a fair amount of grammatical information. Some even contain some sections on grammar that together could be defined as a small dictionary grammar, even though they have not been defined as such in the dictionaries.

In ODE it is explained quite accurately why monolingual dictionaries must pay special attention to grammatical, and in particular syntactic, information. It says in the preface to ODE that its aim is to “present information in such a way that it helps to explain the structure of the language itself, not just the meanings of individual senses”. This is no doubt the aim of most modern English monolingual general language dictionaries.
3.7 Conclusion

It is obvious that monolingual general language dictionaries contain more grammatical information than the average LSP dictionary, including the LSP dictionaries analysed above which – as should be noted – do not represent the most typical LSP dictionaries, seeing as the LSP dictionaries analysed here all contain some grammatical information 28.

There is quite a lot of grammatical information in the English-Danish and Danish-English business dictionaries, including indication of word class, irregular inflections for verbs and verb complementation. There is also a dictionary grammar explaining some areas of English grammar that often cause problems to dictionary users, in this case Danes producing English texts. The dictionary grammar has not been integrated into the entries and is therefore an isolated dictionary element. The Danish-English business dictionary contains the same English dictionary grammar – the only difference is that the section on verbs is not included – which is also an independent element in the dictionary. The intended users for the Danish-English business dictionary are also Danes and the user function is again text production.

The English-Danish basic legal dictionary does not contain much grammatical information. Word classes are shown in most entries, and if the nouns can only appear in the singular or the plural form, this has been indicated. The function of text reception is realistic enough, but there is too little grammatical information available to translators who are also included in the primary target group.

The electronic accounting dictionaries are those LSP dictionaries analysed here that contain most information on inflection. In the English-Danish Dictionary of Accounting, all inflectional forms of the nouns and the verbs are shown in the entries, including the regular forms. There is less focus on syntactic information. There are no syntactic codes – as is the case in the business dictionaries and, as we have seen, is the norm in the English monolingual dictionaries – but collocations and sometimes also example sentences are included in the entries. The indication of

28 Most of these LSP dictionaries were chosen for analysis because they happened to contain some grammatical information, which then perhaps does not make them as representative as the monolingual dictionaries chosen which are some fairly typical English learner’s dictionaries. Still, it would not be very interesting (neither for the reader nor for myself) to undertake an analysis when there is nothing to analyse, so it was necessary to select some LSP dictionaries that were interesting in grammatical terms rather than typical in general terms.
whether or not a noun can take an indefinite or definite article is quite unique, as it is normally
never included in bilingual dictionaries where English is one of the languages or in monolingual
English dictionaries.

Even though the electronic edition of the English-Danish Dictionary of Accounting
has inflections for all the headwords and equivalents – something none of the above monolingual
dictionaries has – it still does not contain nearly as much usage information (including grammatical
information) as the monolingual dictionaries. However, this in itself does not mean that the
monolingual dictionaries are significantly better or more useful than the accounting dictionaries – or
the other LSP dictionaries for that matter – since the intended user groups of the dictionaries are
very different. Most of the monolingual dictionaries are aimed at advanced students of English, or
they aim to give a comprehensive overview of the English language, and therefore it is necessary to
include, for example, a lot of syntactic information as well as information on irregular inflectional
forms, since that is what these users require. Users of bilingual LSP dictionaries might require
information on what a certain term is called in L2 and what it means, or how to use a specific
technical term in a certain context in connection with other words. In the latter case, a lot of
syntactic information would be required, but since most dictionaries are polyfunctional – and are
not just aimed at e.g. text reception – syntactic and morphological information would be required in
most LSP dictionaries. Still, it is not likely that LSP dictionaries should contain as much general
grammatical (including syntactic) information as monolingual general language dictionaries, seeing
as the focus of LSP dictionaries is not so much on the general language structure as on the structure
and application of the specialised terminology in question. Nevertheless, it is not acceptable to
practically ignore information on syntax and inflection as is the case in for example the basic legal
dictionary above and also in many other LSP dictionaries which contain virtually no grammatical
information. This is especially a problem when the stated user function of the LSP dictionary is text
production and/or translation. On that note, we will proceed to the next chapter where some
proposals for grammar in LSP dictionaries will be presented.
4. Proposals for grammar in LSP dictionaries

“Ultimately all dictionaries are motivated by and judged against the lexical needs of those who consult them” (Hartmann 1983:9)

The quote above pretty much sums up my approach to the topic of this thesis. The inclusion of grammar in a dictionary is to serve a purpose, namely to help the user solve a specific problem in connection with for example the production or translation of a text. The grammatical information is also there to make it easier or even possible to make use of the other information provided by the dictionary. For instance, instead of only the equivalent to the headword being listed, the user can be told how the equivalent is inflected and how it can be used in a specific context or together with other words, enabling the user to apply the term correctly in a text or just get a complete understanding of the term and its usage. Consequently, before any decision can be made on the grammatical contents of a dictionary it must be clear to whom this information is to be conveyed. In other words, the lexicographer must have certain user functions in mind when producing the dictionary and deciding which grammatical information to include. This user perspective forms the basis of the dictionary analyses in chapter 3, and user functions were also featured in the chapter on theory on grammar in dictionaries. Likewise, the user functions in LSP dictionaries will be taken into account in this chapter where some proposals for grammar in LSP dictionaries will be presented. In terms of structure though, the grammar proposals will not be divided into sections according to user function. Seeing as most dictionaries are polyfunctional and therefore not produced for one user function only, the grammar proposals will be aimed at the two functions text production and translation, as these are the functions that require most grammatical information. The proposals will be divided according to the following types of grammatical information: word class, inflection, word formation and syntax\(^{29}\). Lastly, a proposal for the contents of a dictionary grammar in a LSP dictionary for text production and translation will be presented.

In chapter 2, the views of e.g. Mugdan (1989a and 1989b), Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994), Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995), Lemmens & Wekker (1991) and Andersen (2007) on grammatical information in general dictionaries and/or LSP dictionaries were explained. It will be

\(^{29}\) As in chapter 2.3
on the basis of those observations, the dictionary analyses in chapter 3 and my own experience with LSP dictionaries that the proposals for what grammatical information should be incorporated into LSP dictionaries will be set up. Considering the diversity of the dictionaries analysed and discussed so far, the proposals will not relate to a specific LSP variety but will apply to LSP dictionaries in general.

However, before specifying which grammar should be included in LSP dictionaries, some findings and views presented in the previous chapters on grammar in LSP dictionaries will be repeated and elaborated on.
4.1 Findings so far on grammar in LSP dictionaries

In chapter 2 we learned that grammatical information in general dictionaries has been given a growing amount of attention in recent years, and efforts have been made to present it in a more user-friendly manner. Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995) and others have criticised the complicated syntactic codes that used to be common in e.g. English learner’s dictionaries and recommended replacing them with simpler so-called surface-syntactic information or providing the information in full in the entries. However, the same development cannot be seen in LSP dictionaries where grammar has practically been ignored in favour of the inclusion of a high number of lemmas, resulting in some LSP dictionaries being more like word lists than actual dictionaries. An example of such a dictionary is L&H Teknisk Ordbog dansk-engelsk (1990), one of the dictionaries examined by Pedersen (1995). This Danish-English technical dictionary contains neither linguistic nor encyclopedic information and merely lists words and their (various) equivalents. Due to the lack of both encyclopedic and grammatical information, it would be difficult for a non-expert within the technical field, like a translator, to even find the correct equivalent in L&H Teknisk Ordbog dansk-engelsk, not to mention be able to apply it correctly in a translation. The situation would not be much different for a technical expert who might be able to guess the correct equivalent but might still find it difficult to apply it correctly in a specific context. In other words, the lack of grammatical and encyclopedic information makes this dictionary a very unreliable tool for technical experts and non-experts alike.

The LSP dictionaries analysed in chapter 3 are not mere word lists, though. They all contain some grammatical information, and they all have definitions accompanying the headwords. However, the amount and types of grammatical information vary greatly. The Danish-English and English-Danish business dictionaries, Dansk-engelsk erhversvordbog and Engelsk-Dansk Erhversvordbog, contain quite a lot of grammatical information, including word class labelling and morphological and syntactic information. In addition, they contain a dictionary grammar. Though not containing a dictionary grammar, the electronic versions of the Danish-English and the English-Danish accounting dictionaries, Den Dansk-Engelske Regnskabsordbog and Den Engelsk-Danske Regnskabsordbog, also provide information on word class, morphology and syntax in the dictionary entries, including information on regular as well as irregular inflections and indications of when the

30 See chapter 2.2.1
indefinite and the definite article can be used together with the lemma and the equivalent – information which is most unusual in LSP dictionaries. The English-Danish legal dictionary, *Engelsk-dansk juridisk basisordbog*, can be defined as being on the other end of the scale, only providing information on word class (in most cases) and syntax in the form of collocations and example sentences. Still, the English-Danish legal dictionary contains more grammatical information than most LSP dictionaries.

The LSP dictionaries in chapter 3 were chosen because they all contain some grammatical information. It would, however, have been much easier to find some LSP dictionaries containing no or hardly any grammatical information, since they – as mentioned before – constitute the majority of LSP dictionaries. The legal, financial and technical dictionaries used in connection with my studies all have the one thing in common that they contain no grammatical information, except, in some cases, collocations and example sentences and the occasional indication of word class. Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994) suggest that the reason for the lack of grammatical information in LSP dictionaries could be that the dictionaries are made by not very linguistically minded lexicographers or that dictionary publishing houses try to keep costs down by omitting grammatical information. In any case, the lack of grammatical information in LSP dictionaries is a major problem, especially for people who want to use LSP dictionaries in connection with text production and translation. However, also dictionaries that have text reception as an intended user function should contain at least some grammatical information.

All in all, most LSP dictionaries contain hardly any grammar, and the little information found in LSP dictionaries usually seems to have been randomly selected without really considering the user needs.
4.2 Grammar proposals

As stated before, the necessity of grammatical information in LSP dictionaries, like in general dictionaries, is closely related to the dictionary function/s, but also the native language, knowledge and level of competence of the users must be considered when deciding what grammatical information to include in the dictionary. Furthermore, even though the dictionary is polyfunctional, it would be useful to attach different priorities to each function so that the grammatical requirements at least would be fulfilled for the main function/s.

Since translation and text production are the functions that require most grammatical information, the following proposals for grammar in the entries of LSP dictionaries will be aimed at these functions, meaning that some elements would be perceived as superfluous in dictionaries with the main function of text reception.

4.2.1 Word class

As already established in chapter 3, word class labelling must be considered a basic constituent of grammar in a dictionary. This implies that even though no other information on grammar is provided in a dictionary, there ought to be an indication of word class in the dictionary entries. This is especially important in the case of homonymy, but it is also important to list the word classes in all other cases, so that the dictionary user will acquire some basic information about the lemma. For instance, as soon as it is established that a word belongs to the word class of verbs, most users would be aware that it could describe a state, experience or action, and that it would normally follow a certain inflectional pattern and could take nouns as subjects or objects. Similarly, the labelling of a lemma as an adjective would tell the dictionary user that this word can be used to describe a noun or a pronoun. This narrows down the use of the word, but, as also pointed out by e.g. Jackson (1985), word class labelling is far from enough grammatical information, especially in regards to syntactic information.

Some lexicographers choose only to indicate the word class of the lemma in bilingual dictionaries. This could make the dictionary user conclude that the equivalent belongs to the same
word class as the lemma. However, this is far from always the case. Therefore, the word class for both the lemma and the equivalent should be indicated in order to avoid any misunderstandings and so as to communicate the necessary information in a clear and consistent manner. Homonyms should be given separate entries in order to emphasise the distinction between them. Finally, the labels used to indicate both homonymy and word class should be explained in the user’s guide and/or the dictionary grammar along with the syntactic codes.

4.2.2 Inflectional morphology

The amount of information on inflection normally depends on the native language of the dictionary user which is also what Mugdan (1989a) argues. However, non-experts within the technical field in question might need information on inflection even though the language in question is their native language and they are familiar with the general language grammar, since LSP varieties often contain some special characteristics which these users may not be familiar with. Although the most important of these characteristics ought to be explained in the dictionary grammar, in relation to inflection it would be very useful to show all irregular inflections in the dictionary entries, seeing as there are words that appear in e.g. common English with a particular inflectional pattern, but, when used in connection with technical English, follow a different inflectional pattern. This could for example mean that a noun that can be inflected by adding an s to create the plural form in general English cannot be inflected at all in the LSP variety, meaning that it is uncountable when appearing in the LSP variety but countable in general language. Therefore, the use of the indefinite and the definite article together with nouns ought to be indicated in the entries – as is the case in the electronic versions of the accounting dictionaries analysed in chapter 3 – thereby making it perfectly clear if the lemma (and the equivalent, in the case of bilingual dictionaries) is countable and can be inflected. It is quite remarkable that this basic information is not seen more often in dictionaries, since it is obvious that LSP grammar may vary from LGP grammar with the result that if no information is given on, in this case, inflection, the dictionary users who are non-experts in e.g. law, might for example erroneously use the indefinite article together with nouns that are uncountable in legal language. Therefore, when Mugdan (1989a) says that LSP dictionaries should provide comprehensive information on inflection if the language in question is not the user’s
language and that the user should not be forced to consult a general dictionary, I would add that the user of a LSP dictionary should never be forced to use a general dictionary in conjunction with the LSP dictionary and that no matter the native language of the user, information on irregular inflection should always be provided in the entries.

When information on irregular inflection is included in the dictionary entries, the rules for regular forms of inflection ought to be stated in the dictionary grammar. As we saw in chapter 3, the electronic versions of the accounting dictionaries and some English monolingual dictionaries contain information on regular inflection in the entries, but this would be impractical in printed LSP dictionaries because such information would require too much space. Besides, regular inflections should not be given such a high priority, since it would no doubt be on the expense of other more useful and necessary kinds of information like information on the irregular cases and syntactic information. Electronic dictionaries, however, have fewer space constraints and information on regular inflections could therefore easily be included in the entries without having to leave out other important kinds of grammatical information. The inclusion of information on regular inflection in the before mentioned accounting dictionaries might perhaps be considered to be superfluous information by some, but since it has not been included at the expense of other kinds of grammatical information, it should be seen as a feature that some users would be able to benefit from and other users with a high level of linguistic knowledge could choose to ignore.

It would be beneficial to include irregular forms as lemmas in LSP dictionaries, because these might help the user find the citation form. These lemmas should therefore only contain a reference to the citation form of the word, merely functioning as an aid to the dictionary user in finding the citation form. The rules for regular inflection would be known to most users – otherwise they could look them up in the dictionary grammar. Consequently, regular forms of inflections like regular plurals should not be included as reference lemmas.

4.2.3 Word formation

As mentioned in chapter 2, Bergenholtz & Pedersen (1994) suggest that suffixes should be lemmatised in a technical dictionary, and Mugdan (1989a) also states that entries for affixes and combining forms are of great importance. In my opinion, combining forms certainly ought to be
included as lemmas, seeing as LSP varieties tend to contain numerous combining forms and the lemmatisation of these would greatly facilitate both text production and translation. However, while the lemmatisation of affixes in theory seems very reasonable, in practice it would often be a better solution to include a list of common prefixes and suffixes in the dictionary grammar, while maybe a few of the most common affixes in the LSP variety in question could be lemmatised, the entries containing only a reference to the relevant section in the dictionary grammar. In addition, instead of only listing the common prefixes and suffixes in the dictionary grammar, some of them could also appear with examples of how they are used in the process of word formation. This procedure has been used in the English learner’s dictionary Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture (LDELC)\textsuperscript{31}, except for the fact that the list of prefixes and suffixes is not part of a dictionary grammar, but an independent grammar element, and there are no cross-references from the entries to the list.

The inclusion of several affixes as lemmas would add to the length and scope of the dictionary, and there is also the question of how many people would look up affixes in for example a financial dictionary? The lemmatisation of affixes in medical dictionaries, on the other hand, would probably be appreciated by many users. Thus, some LSP varieties would require more information on affixes than others, meaning that the need for affixes – and to a certain extent also word combinations – as lemmas would also depend on the LSP variety.

4.2.4 Syntax

As previously established, the complicated syntactic codes used in early editions of English learner’s dictionaries like OALD have now been abandoned by most lexicographers and replaced by so-called surface-syntactic codes. It is, of course, only reasonable that the codes are made as transparent and user-friendly as possible, unless the dictionary is aimed at people who have a special fascination for grammar and the interpretation of codes. In reality probably only linguists would have a special interest in grammar, but not even they could be expected to spend time on the interpretation of complicated codes. In other words, abandoning the complicated grammar codes was undoubtedly the right decision.

\textsuperscript{31} See the analysis of LDELC in chapter 3.5
It has also been recommended to go a step further and write the information in full in the entries so that no codes will be required\textsuperscript{32}. Lemmens & Wekker (1991:4) recommend that the labelling of grammatical information should be “self-explanatory, theory-independent and comprehensive”. This would, however, seem to imply that some labels (or codes) must be maintained, and even though they would seem simple and self-explanatory to some users, users with a low level of linguistic knowledge would still have to take the time to look them up. The alternative of trying to convey all the syntactic information in the entries by writing the information in full is unrealistic, since it would require too much space, and even though collocations and example sentences are very useful – and are therefore often considered constituent parts of dictionary entries – they do not provide sufficient information on the syntactic operation of the word. On the other hand, it would not be enough to include only explicit syntactic information like syntactic codes in the entries, seeing as collocations and example sentences are invaluable pieces of information for users who want to produce or translate a text, as they show certain phrases and expressions that are commonly used within the technical field in question, some of which are even considered practically obligatory in some contexts. This kind of information cannot be deduced from information on syntactic operation, e.g. transitivity and complementation, alone. Besides, as mentioned before, one of the questionnaire surveys discussed by Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995)\textsuperscript{33} showed that 70% of the informants used the examples and quotations in their dictionaries, which further underlines the importance of this kind of information.

To sum it up, simple syntactic codes as those used in the English-Danish business dictionary \textit{Engelsk-Dansk Erhvervsordbog}\textsuperscript{34}, providing information on e.g. verb complementation and whether or not a noun is countable, should be included in the dictionary entries. These codes should be explained in the user’s guide and the dictionary grammar. Moreover, collocations and example sentences should be part of the syntactic information provided in the entries in LSP dictionaries. Grammatical terms, like \textit{direct object}, used in connection with the syntactic codes ought to be explained briefly in the dictionary grammar.

In electronic dictionaries, however, an option would be to write the information in full, or it might be possible to click on the codes or move the mouse over them and thereby see the information in full.

\textsuperscript{32} See e.g. Mogensen (1995)
\textsuperscript{33} See chapter 2.1.2
\textsuperscript{34} See chapter 3.1
As a final point, unlike the information on inflection in the entries which might be shown both for the regular cases and the irregular cases, the regular cases concerning the lemma in question, i.e. typical examples of how the lemma would be used in a sentence, should be demonstrated by the collocations and example sentences in the entries. Thus, the general rules for the syntactic patterns of the language (in particular the syntactic peculiarities of the LSP variety in question) should be explained in the grammar while the syntactic operation of the individual headword should be shown in the entries, or in the words of Lemmens & Wekker:

“...the dictionary gives separate headwords with individual grammatical information (grammar reinforcing lexis), whereas the grammar provides the patterns in which these headwords can be used (lexis reinforcing grammar)” (Lemmens & Wekker, 1991:11).

4.2.5 Dictionary grammars

Much has already been stated above on the contents of a dictionary grammar in a LSP dictionary, some of which will be repeated in the following.

Beginning with the type of grammar, a contrastive dictionary grammar should be included in LSP dictionaries. As also recommended by Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995), this grammar should explain the special grammatical features whereby the LSP variety in question differs from general language, meaning that it should contain e.g. syntactic structures that are typical of the LSP variety in question and differ from general language syntactic structures. This would be a basic requirement for the dictionary grammar. However, as Andersen (2007) also points out, there are other contrastive aspects which could also be included in the grammar, if deemed necessary by the lexicographers. This could for instance be the differences between the general language grammars of the two languages in a bilingual LSP dictionary. How relevant this would be for the user of a LSP dictionary would have to be determined by the lexicographers who would have to bear in mind the user group and the dictionary functions. For instance only a few important differences could be mentioned, while the emphasis would still be on the grammatical peculiarities of the (L2) LSP variety in question in relation to general language grammar. Another contrastive aspect that would be of great interest to some users – e.g. translators – is the differences between the characteristic
features of the L₁ LSP variety and the L₂ LSP variety in a bilingual LSP dictionary. In addition, information on regular inflectional patterns as well as a general syntactic description of the L₂ LSP variety and the L₂ general language could be given in the dictionary grammar of bilingual LSP dictionaries. Other relevant general language characteristics of especially L₂ could also be included, depending on the knowledge of the intended users.

Concerning the terminology used in the dictionary grammar, it should be consistent so that either Latin names are used throughout the dictionary grammar, and in the rest of the dictionary, or not at all, unless the grammar component and the rest of the dictionary’s outside matter are aimed at different user groups which seemed to be the case in the English-Danish business dictionary, Engelsk-Dansk Erhvervsordbog, analysed in chapter 3, where Latin names were used in the grammar component but not in the user’s guide. In addition, the terminology and codes used in the dictionary should be explained in the grammar.

Each entry in the dictionary grammar should be given a number to facilitate cross-references from the dictionary entries to the grammar.

In terms of placement, just as the Study Pages in OALD are located in the middle of the dictionary, the dictionary grammar should be placed in the middle of the word list, seeing as – as pointed out by Béjoint (1981) and others – the user tends to overlook the outside matter and pay sole attention to the word list. Additionally, as suggested by Lemmens & Wekker (1991), coloured pages could be used to try to attract attention to the dictionary grammar.

Ideally, a bilingual LSP dictionary would contain a dictionary grammar in both L₁ and L₂. Otherwise, the language chosen would have to depend on the foreign-language competence of the intended users.
4.3 Conclusion

Some proposals for grammar in LSP dictionaries have been presented in this chapter. These proposals are based on the observations made in chapters 2 and 3 on grammar in LSP dictionaries and my own experience with LSP dictionaries.

It must always be kept in mind that grammar in dictionaries is there to serve a purpose, namely to help the user solve some problems. Therefore the user functions of the dictionary must always be determined prior to making any decisions on what grammatical information to include in a dictionary. In case the dictionary is polyfunctional, it would be useful to attach different priorities to the functions in order to ensure that the grammatical requirements are at least fulfilled for the main function.

The grammar proposals do not apply to one specific LSP variety only, like legal language, but to LSP dictionaries in general. They have been divided according to types of grammatical information i.e. word class, inflection, word formation and syntax. There is also a proposal for the contents of a dictionary grammar for LSP dictionaries.

I have suggested that word class should always be shown in LSP dictionaries, both for the lemma and the equivalent. However, information on word class is not enough. Irregular inflections should be shown in the entries and irregular inflectional forms should also be included as reference lemmas. Regular inflections do not have to be shown in the entries of printed dictionaries, but ought to be shown in electronic dictionaries, since space restrictions are not an issue in electronic dictionaries in the same way as in printed dictionaries. The use of the indefinite and the definite article together with nouns ought to be indicated in the dictionary entries. Regarding information on word formation, word combinations ought to be lemmatised while the lemmatisation of affixes would have to depend on the LSP variety in question. In any case, it would be beneficial to include a list of affixes in the dictionary grammar.

Syntactic information should be conveyed by means of transparent and user-friendly codes. The codes should be explained in the dictionary grammar and in the user’s guide. In electronic dictionaries, the information might be seen in full by moving the mouse over the codes or by clicking on them. Collocations and example sentences should also be included in the entries, since these are an important aid to the user.

A contrastive dictionary grammar explaining the special grammatical features whereby the LSP variety in question differs from general language should be included in LSP
dictionaries. Other contrastive aspects could also be chosen according to the user needs. For instance, some differences between the characteristic features of the $L_1$ LSP variety and the $L_2$ LSP variety in a bilingual LSP dictionary could be explained.
5. Conclusion

In recent years more attention has been given to grammar in general English dictionaries. This means that grammatical information like the indication of word class and inflectional and syntactic patterns has been included in the dictionary entries of several dictionaries, while affixes and combining forms have sometimes been lemmatised. Moreover, grammar fragments, e.g. a list of irregular verbs and their inflections or a section containing syntactic information, are not uncommon in modern general dictionaries.

This development has not taken place in LSP dictionaries, though, where grammatical information is still sparse or non-existent. There could be many reasons for this, but the overall impression is that grammatical information has not been deemed necessary by lexicographers and publishing houses. The ambition of LSP dictionaries is apparently to provide an equivalent (or several equivalents), and sometimes even a short definition, of the headword. Seeing as LSP dictionaries have one of the user functions translation, text production or text reception – or a combination of these – it is rather strange that grammar has not been given more attention, since all of these functions require at least some grammatical information. How much grammatical information is needed also depends on the grammatical and the encyclopedic knowledge of the intended users, but this does not alter the fact that some grammar will always be needed.

In order to make LSP dictionaries more useful and user-friendly, grammatical information in the form of information on word class, inflection and syntax must be included. Ideally, a dictionary grammar should also be incorporated into the dictionary.

The ambition of LSP dictionaries should not be to contain as much grammatical information as general dictionaries, since general dictionaries often aim to give a comprehensive overview of the language (or languages) in question in addition to aiding the user in e.g. the translation of texts. Besides, especially monolingual learner’s dictionaries intended for foreign language students must contain a lot of information on grammar, particularly on syntax. LSP dictionaries, on the other hand, do not need to focus so much on the general language structure as on the structure and application of the LSP variety in question – preferably as opposed to the general language structure. This is why I have suggested that the dictionary grammar in LSP dictionaries should, as a minimum, focus on some special characteristics of the LSP variety as compared to general language grammar.
More research needs to be done into the different LSP varieties, so as to determine what grammatical information needs to be included in dictionaries for these varieties. It would, for example, be interesting to try and establish what grammatical information would be required by the various users of an English-Danish legal dictionary, since there would no doubt be a few grammatical characteristics present in one language but not in the other.

Electronic dictionaries could contain a bit more grammatical information in the entries, like information on regular inflections, since they do not have the same space restrictions as printed dictionaries, while lexicographers would have to include only the most important grammatical information in the entries of printed dictionaries. Considering the lack of literature both on grammar in printed and electronic LSP dictionaries, more research into these subjects is obviously needed. For instance, the grammar in printed dictionaries, electronic dictionaries35 and Internet dictionaries might be compared in order to determine if the opportunities afforded by electronic dictionaries actually have been used to include more grammatical information in the entries. It will be interesting to follow the development in electronic dictionaries in the years to come.

Hopefully, grammar will soon become a prominent feature in LSP dictionaries, thereby enhancing their value and making them even more useful tools for the intended users.

35 Such as the electronic version of OALD
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Abstract

There is a notable lack of grammar in LSP dictionaries. This becomes even more obvious when looking at recent developments in general dictionaries, the result of which has been that modern general dictionaries contain a considerable amount of grammatical information. In LSP dictionaries, on the other hand, it still seems that an equivalent (or several equivalents) and sometimes a short definition of the headword is deemed adequate for the user, no matter who he or she is and for what purpose they use the dictionary.

In this thesis I have argued that grammatical information in LSP dictionaries is indeed necessary, since dictionary users require it in order to make proper use of the dictionary and get the assistance they need. Information on word class, morphology and syntax ought to be included in LSP dictionaries, as well as a dictionary grammar containing cross-references to the word list.

Basically the same “rules” apply to LSP dictionaries and general dictionaries alike, namely that in order for them to be useful they must aid the user in the reception, translation and/or production of texts, with the exception that LSP dictionaries do not need to contain so much information on general language grammar as certain general dictionaries, seeing as LSP dictionaries do not intend to give a comprehensive overview of e.g. the English language, but instead need to focus on the structure and application of the LSP variety in question.
Appendix 1

Four main user types

encyclopedic competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>experts</th>
<th>laypeople</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. high level of encyclopedic and low level of foreign-language competence</td>
<td>1. low level of encyclopedic and foreign language competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. high level of encyclopedic and foreign-language competence</td>
<td>2. low level of encyclopedic and high level of foreign-language competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-competent</td>
<td>competent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3.3.1: Main types in user profile
(Bergenholtz & Tarp, 1995:21)