

Multi-disciplinary Lexicography:
Traditions and Challenges of the XXIst Century

Edited by

Olga M. Karpova and Faina I. Kartashkova

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Multi-disciplinary Lexicography: Traditions and Challenges of the XXIst Century,
Edited by Olga M. Karpova and Faina I. Kartashkova

This book first published 2013

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2013 by Olga M. Karpova and Faina I. Kartashkova and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system,
or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or
otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4256-7, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4256-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Illustrations	ix
List of Tables.....	x
Editors' Preface	xi
Olga M. Karpova and Faina I. Kartashkova	
Ivanovo Lexicographic School.....	xvii
Ekaterina A. Shilova	
Part I: Dictionary as a Cross-road of Language and Culture	
Chapter One.....	2
Language Globalization through the Prism of Lexicography Galina M. Vishnevskaya	
Chapter Two	11
Paradigms of English Lexicography: International Paradigm Valentyna Skybina	
Chapter Three	27
Linguistic Cultural Dictionaries with Special Reference to Russian Culture Olga A. Uzhova	
Chapter Four.....	34
Lexicographic Activity of the XXIst c.: Following the Linguistic Fashion or Challenge of the New Time? (Based on the Russian Language) Natalia V. Yudina	
Chapter Five	53
The First Systematic Treatment of English Vocabulary: Phillips's <i>New World of English Words</i> (1658) Kusujiro Miyoshi	

Chapter Six	67
Ritual and Etiquette as a Lexicographic Problem: Describing Clichés in Historical Perspective Tatyana P. Tretyakova	
Chapter Seven.....	77
Chaucer and Shakespeare Glossaries: Do Modern Users Still Need Them Today? Olga M. Karpova and Olga A. Melentyeva	
Chapter Eight.....	96
Somatic Phraseological Units as Viewed Lexicographically Faina I. Kartashkova	
Chapter Nine.....	103
New Words in Contemporary Dictionaries of the English Language: Are Words Invented by the Society or is the Society Changed by Words? Tatyana A. Taganova	
Part II: Dictionary Use and Dictionary Criticism	
Chapter Ten	116
Lexicography as the Pivot of English Language Teaching Svetlana G. Ter-Minasova	
Chapter Eleven	124
On the Experience of Compiling Russian-English and English-Russian Cognitive Learners' Dictionaries Marina R. Kaul	
Chapter Twelve	134
Towards a System of Integrated Dictionary Use Rufus H. Gouws	
Chapter Thirteen.....	145
A General Framework for Reviewing Dictionaries Sandro Nielsen	

Chapter Fourteen	158
Overview of Hand-held Electronic Dictionaries in Japan: Functions, Usage, and Impact on Print Dictionary Industry Shigeru Yamada	

Part III: Terminology and LSP Studies

Chapter Fifteen	168
Development of LSP and Terminology in Russia Larissa M. Alekseeva	

Chapter Sixteen	178
Lexicography of Professional Subcode in Russia: State of Affairs and Problems Marina I. Solnyshkina	

Chapter Seventeen	196
Universal and Specific Features of an LSP Dictionary Konstantin M. Denisov	

Chapter Eighteen	216
Methods of the LSP Dictionary Analysis Tamara G. Petrashova	

Chapter Nineteen	231
Evaluation Component within the Semantic Structure of Socio-Political Words Svetlana A. Manik	

Part IV: Projects of New Dictionaries

Chapter Twenty	246
Cultural Heritage for Intercultural Dialogue with <i>Life Beyond Tourism</i> ® Paolo Del Bianco	

Chapter Twenty One	256
A New Type of a Cultural Dictionary with Special Reference to Florence Olga M. Karpova	

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

METHODS OF THE LSP DICTIONARY ANALYSIS

TAMARA G. PETRASHOVA,
NATIONAL RESEARCH TOMSK POLYTECHNIC
UNIVERSITY, RUSSIA

Theoretical Background and Rationale

Just as continuous and rapid enlargement of international contacts has had a major impact on the development of communication in an international context, particularly in business and science, is its impact beginning to be seen in the increasing use of dictionaries for the speech encoding and decoding, since it is difficult to underestimate the importance which understanding of linguistic differences plays in international communication. Difficulties with language in a specific context might fall basically into three categories: gross translation problems, the problems of conveying subtle distinctions from language to language, and culturally-based variations among speakers of the same language. Thus, the communicative function of a dictionary is specified to meet specific needs and to help the user cope with the incipient problems, namely in production, reception or translation of specialized texts. Due to the increased demand for a good specialized dictionary, a lot of attention is being paid these days to the dictionary design.

The study of the literature on dictionary making reveals that much has happened in this respect. Lexicographers, for example B. Svensén (1993), C. Fillmore and B.T.S. Atkins (1994), H. Bergenholtz and S. Tarp (1995), W. Hüllen (1999), H. Béjoint (2010), H. Jackson (2002), M. East (2008) and others, actively demonstrate considerable developments and achievements of practical lexicography, both general and specialized, connected with such major advances as use of “computer corpus” in compilation of the dictionary, appearance of the dictionary in electronic format, opening up new possibilities both in dictionaries use and utilization and in how dictionary material can be organized and

Chapter Eighteen

introduced. Advances are seen in learners' dictionary development demonstrating that learner dictionaries are getting better all the time and becoming more user-friendly. They contain much more information and have clearer layouts that make them easier to use. Native speaker dictionaries have also endured a significant progress. In addition, dictionaries have become widely accessible online through Internet, enabling the users to view their continuous revision.

At the same time, nobody could deny the fact that lexicography is not exclusively limited to dictionary making. According to the opinion of H. Bergenholtz and S. Tarp (1995), it also comprises theoretical studies of the issues involved, including existing dictionaries. The authors distinguish in dictionary research, or metalexicography three different, as they call, "pillars", such as systematic dictionary research, user research, and dictionary criticism, justifying the view that lexicography as a theoretical discipline guides contemporary lexicographical practice.

Accordingly, their point of view is that systematic dictionary research deals with formulation of updated and improved theories, supposing their incorporation into the development of future dictionaries. This "pillar" also focuses on historiographical research, revisiting the theories that have formed the basis of earlier dictionaries. User research formulates theories and methods for examining dictionary use and makes observations concerning general models for improving the use of dictionaries, for instance, by means of users' guides. Research on the needs of dictionary users determines the aims of dictionaries as basis for ascertaining what they should be like in order to meet these needs. And finally, it is dictionary criticism that is concerned with dictionary review, examination or analysis, as well as with general models for assessment of existing dictionaries. As for dictionary criticism, the authors think that dictionary study may be undertaken without practical lexicography in mind "since many metalexicographers have never prepared a dictionary and never will, whereas lexicographers will benefit from the study of metalexicography, both prior to designing a dictionary as well as during the process of its compiling" (Bergenholtz, Tarp, 1995, 31).

Consequently, if dictionary making is called "lexicographical practice", or "lexicographical technique" lexicography can be called a theory which "describes, pervades, and guides" this practice, and "it is the purpose of dictionaries to provide linguistic knowledge of any kind for the sake of correct and successful performance (of which there are many kinds). In pursuing this aim, dictionaries rely on one of the most essential properties of natural languages, namely, not only to refer to material and

Methods of the LSP Dictionary Analysis

to mental reality on the object level but also to refer to themselves on a metalevel” (Hüllen, 1999, 4–5).

It is not surprising that in scholarly works, different terms are used with regard to the description of dictionary studies results. For example, lexicographers, such as H. Jackson (2002), S. Nielsen (2009), H. Béjoint (2010) and others, operate with such concepts as *dictionary criticism* and *dictionary reviews*, pointing out that “dictionary reviews can be either scholarly or non-scholarly depending on the actors and media involved, and that dictionary reviewing is regarded as essentially a lexicographic exercise which may relate to cultural, factual and linguistic aspects as the case may be”. However, in Russian lexicographic tradition, namely Ivanovo School of Lexicography led by Professor O.M. Karpova, researchers exploit the term *dictionary analysis*. In her work, O.M. Karpova (2004) gives the most precise account of lexicographic terminology and the basis of the lexicographic analysis with special reference to the *Collins* dictionaries. The author underlines that the interest towards dictionary analysis in Russia has become apparent in the 1970s mostly due to a big growth of the importance of the English language as international.

This fact is supported by S.G. Ter-Minasova (2011), who certifies that in “new Russia, under completely changed circumstances, the question ‘Where can I obtain a good dictionary?’ has become very urgent. Indeed, the main tool of the trade, an absolute must, the indispensable aid in learning English, is a good dictionary: bilingual at the initial stage and monolingual from an intermediate level upwards. This little adjective ‘good’ implies a lot of things, because, ideally, users of a dictionary want all their various needs to be satisfied” (Ter-Minasova, 2011, 251).

Thus, the dictionary study has become very much important at the present juncture of things. Therefore, in order to match the concept of what constitute the words *criticism*, *review*, *analysis*, one should consult the dictionary, which is appeared to be “the repository of words” by right. *Webster’s Dictionary*, which, according to H. Béjoint’s study (2010, 130), “made heavy use of preceding dictionaries”, provides the following information:

Analysis n, pl **analyses** [fr. Gk, fr. *Analyein* to dissolve (fr. *ana+lyein* to loosen, dissolve)+*sis*-more at LOSE] **1**: separation or breaking up of a whole into its fundamental elements or component parts <his problem defied ~> **2 a**: a detailed examination of anything complex (as a novel, an organization, a race) made in order to understand its nature or to determine

Chapter Eighteen

its essential feature: a thorough study <the ~... of the structure of a poem can be a form of literary criticism – James Thorpe>.

Criticism n **1a**: the act of criticizing usu. unfavorably: faultfinding disapproval and objection **b**: CRITIQUE **2** *obs*: a subtle point or fine distinction: NICETY, SUBTLETY **3**: the art of evaluating or analyzing with knowledge and propriety works of art or literature <the first principle of ~, which is, to consider the nature of the piece, and the intent of its author – Alexander Pope>; *broadly*: similar consideration of other than literary matters (as moral values or the soundness of scientific hypotheses and procedures) **4**: the scientific investigation of literary documents (as the bible) in regard to such matters as origin, text, composition character, or history. (538).

Review n [MF *rvue*, fr. fem. of *revu*, past part. of *revoir* to look over, fr. *re-* + *voir* to look, see – more at VIEW] **1**: a looking over or examination with a view to amendment or improvement: REVISION <an author's ~ of his naval force> by a high officer (as for the purpose of ascertaining the state of discipline and equipment); *specif*: a march past a reviewing officer usu. Following an inspection **3**: a general survey or view (as of the events of a period) <take ~ of the war><pass one's life in ~> **4**: an act of inspecting or examining: REVIEWING **5**: judicial reexamination (as of the proceedings of a lower tribunal by a higher) **6 a**: an explanatory and critical account of an artistic production or performance (as a book, Play, Exhibition, or concert) usu. In a periodical: CRITICISM, CRITIQUE **b**: a periodical containing primarily critical articles **7a**: a second or repeated view: REEXAMINATION **b**: a retrospective view or survey (as of one's life) **c** (1): renewed study (as at the end of a course or before an examination) of material previously studied (2): an exercise designed to facilitate such study **8**: REVUE.

Having generalized information presented in the dictionary articles, it seems possible to recognize the correspondence of the terms to their usage setting, and in addition, to formulate what dictionary study is. Thus, this lexicographic exercise might be regarded as a detailed examination of a lexicographic product in complex, including dictionaries, which is carried out in order to understand its nature, the intent of its author or to determine its essential assets that distinguish the current edition from previous ones. The evaluation of works of lexicography is carried out with knowledge and propriety either for faultfinding disapproval and objection or noting out a subtle point or fine distinction of a lexicographic product, or looking over with a view to its amendment or improvement.

The objectives of such study are going to be discussed further in this paper.

Reasons for Dictionary Analysis

As it has already been noted above, the study of lexicographic products, including dictionaries, presented in the form of review, criticism or analysis, is one of the fundamental practices of metalexigraphy. However, considering the views of other lexicographers, S. Nielsen (2009) for example, it could be pointed out that not all dictionary study can be characterized as *scientific*, *scholarly* or *academic*, since many of such publications are not written with the intention of “contributing to the development of lexicography”. Moreover, pieces of critical writing in newspapers and linguistic or other scientific journals definitely vary in scope, structure and target group. Here it is possible to distinguish different types of publications related to dictionary review, criticism or analysis. That is, on the one hand, those that are published in newspapers and popular magazines and, on the other hand, scholarly dictionary study, as reviews or reports on investigation that are written and read by scholars in the natural course of their research work which demonstrate the results of their scientific investigation, and consequently are published mostly in academic journals. From this perspective, S. Nielsen strongly believes that these are the “scholarly dictionary reviews which are potential contributors to the development of lexicography as a research discipline” (Nielsen, 2009, 209).

As far as dictionary reviews published in daily and weekly newspapers and popular magazines are concerned, they are primarily aimed at drawing attention of users to a new publication, providing mostly general information about an issue, and their focus thus narrowed down to predominantly one potential review category only. Such reviews are usually written and published “by and for non-academic actors in non-academic media”. H. Bergenholtz and S. Tarp call such reviews as “empty reviews, which are the most common, and which are mere repetitions of the publishers’ own publicity on the dictionary cover or which either merely criticize or praise the lemma stock”. They think that publications related to dictionary review, criticism or analysis “can be characterized in terms of four text functions: descriptions, assessment, motivation for this assessment and recommendation” (Bergenholtz, Tarp, 1995, 232–233). Each function may play a major or minor role in a particular piece of writing, which will also vary with scope and target group.

Therefore S. Nielsen underlines that scholarly reviews that contribute to lexicographic research are at a level above everyday reflection because only they contain analyses, evaluations and findings that can influence research conducted by others. The lexicographer identifies the following

Chapter Eighteen

two major goals of dictionary study, emphasizing, however, that purposes selected depend on the metalexigrapher who is to provide the explanation in each case. These goals are as following:

- (1) “to assist readers in their decision-making in acquiring the best dictionaries for their usage needs by presenting them with a well-sound analysis of the positive and negative qualities of a dictionary/dictionaries under review, and
- (2) to assist lexicographers in optimizing the functionality of their dictionaries” (Nielsen, 2009, 209–211).

It is obvious that these purposes are realized in different types of critical writing related to dictionary review, criticism or analysis. In this connection, it is worth mentioning the fact that “today’s dictionaries are excellent value for money” (Atkins, 1996, 521). Following from this, one more type of critical writing connected with commercial lexicography can be recognized, which mostly can be attributed to a product of advertising. It is not a secret that every new edition of a major dictionary spawns reviews in all kinds of publication, from daily and weekly newspapers to academic journals in order to find its customers. Publications have become an important means by which information about dictionaries is disseminated. The buyers of the product can be found all over the globe and, once found, they are the right customers for the product and so they are likely to be willing to spend more. This type of critical publications generally focuses on “how a dictionary handles, what the dictionary page looks like, how the information is arranged because these are important factors in selling a dictionary, irrespective of the quality of its content” (Jackson, 2002, 171). Undoubtedly, such publications might be questioned in terms of their contribution to the development of lexicographic theory.

Developing the issue further, S. Nielsen introduces “what may be called an overriding objective” of dictionary study. It is provisionally proposed by him that “the overriding objective is to give a faithful representation of the lexicographic elements presented by the dictionary under review”. It is further suggested that it is only possible to attain a faithful representation if the depiction of a dictionary is complete when it takes the whole dictionary into account. This approach complies with generally accepted academic requirements, because the dictionary is no “longer just a product to be used, but a true research object to be analyzed, described and examined” (Nielsen, 2009, 211).

To round up the discussion about objectives of the dictionary study, it should be pointed out that there is a close relation between LGP dictionary

Methods of the LSP Dictionary Analysis

study (language for general purposes) and LSP dictionary study (language for special purposes). H. Bergenholtz and S. Tarp (1995) note that “approaches in existing LSP dictionary reviews closely correspond to their LGP counterparts” and for the sake of contribution to the development of specialized lexicography this will involve, first, identification of the research object for dictionary study and its placing in a lexicographic framework; second, treatment of the objective of dictionary study in academic settings; and, finally, the actual approach to studying a dictionary as a complex object focusing on all the aspects, including reviewing the outside matter of the dictionary, since “the more detailed criticism should be based on the objectives as proposed and described by the lexicographer in the dictionary preface or elsewhere in the outside matter” (Bergenholtz, Tarp, 1995, 233).

Techniques for Dictionary Analysis

Though lexicographers consider critical dictionary studies to be important for the development of lexicography, there are still different points of view on the issue.

Thus, H. Béjoint’s main criticism of dictionary reviewing is that, on the one hand, many of those reviews in newspapers and magazines are not of much use due to the fact that the reviewer of a dictionary assumes not to need any particular qualification: “being a user of a dictionary appears to be sufficient qualification sometimes, even though the same publication would not think of asking just a reader to review a novel or a book of poetry”. On the other hand, the author thinks that “when the reviewers are academics, the reviews are usually better informed but they are more malicious and on the whole not much more useful”.

All of this supports the idea that the present theory of lexicography related to dictionary criticism and analysis does not employ already developed traditional methods of such analysis in full making such reviewing “primitive, nondescript or pompous” (Béjoint, 2010, 229).

A surprising lack of interest in general principles, with incidental sniping taking the place of any real exploration of the intentions with which the works being criticized had been set up. Omissions are lamented and superfluties condemned, but the whole basis for determining the nomenclature remains largely undiscussed (N. Osselton quoted in Béjoint, 2010, 229).

Chapter Eighteen

For the sake of greater dictionary study contribution to the development of lexicographic theory, it is necessary, on the one hand, to discuss qualifications of a former involved in creating such a piece of dictionary critical writing, and on the other hand, focus on some guidance on how this lexicographic exercise might be done in order to be of real academic value since a wider discussion of the standards of assessment of dictionaries is still of great demand. Many dictionary review writers never really acquire full competence in the conventional approaches to dealing with this business.

At issue who might create a sound critical dictionary writing to further rapport between practical lexicography and theoretical lexicography. On the understanding the importance of the subject in question, such a person is considered to be knowledgeable or expert in the subject matter or the techniques of whatever it is he/she is reviewing. A reviewer of dictionaries is expected, then, to be knowledgeable in lexicography, a point made by H. Jackson (2002, 175).

H. Bergenholtz and S. Tarp, discussing the worth of the so-called "workshop reports" related to the LSP dictionary study, also point out that "reviewing as part of the preliminary work on a new dictionary will be all the more valuable as it is prepared by users who, besides taking a particular interest in dictionaries, are also well acquainted with the language(s) and subject field(s) in question" (Bergenholtz, Tarp, 1995, 232).

K.A. Meteshkin et al. (2004) and H. Jackson (2002) make, however, one more suggestion that the reviewing of dictionaries should be undertaken by a team of reviewers and the arguments in favor of this approach sound rather persuasive. Their conception of this seems to be that each reviewer would be a specialist in some area of vocabulary and would contribute an assessment of the treatment of the "definitions in their own fields". Team reviews allow a more thorough treatment of each aspect of a dictionary's lexical description, both by enabling more extensive sampling to be undertaken and by tapping into a reviewer's specialist interest.

Thus, H. Bergenholtz and S. Tarp (1995) have provided a list of categories on the basis of which, in their opinion, an objective description of the contents of the dictionary accompanied by an assessment could be given. These categories are the following:

- user group,
- dictionary function,
- price,

Methods of the LSP Dictionary Analysis

- layout,
- the lexicographer,
- comparison with other dictionaries,
- history,
- reference to other reviews,
- empirical basis,
- outside matter,
- lemma selection,
- lemma arrangement,
- standardisation,
- equivalents,
- grammatical information,
- orthography,
- pronunciation,
- encyclopedic information,
- diasystematic information,
- diachronous information,
- sentence examples,
- collocations,
- illustrations,
- synonymy and antonymy,
- overall assessment positive,
- overall assessment negative (Bergenholtz, Tarp, 1995, 234).

No doubt that sorting out and grouping categories in this way has an obvious advantage. However, because these categories do not seem to be presented in the form of any classification, the critical review based on them might fail to reflect the complex nature of a lexicographic product under investigation.

Furthermore, S. Nielsen, outlining the framework for lexicographic reviews which could be of academic value, discusses an approach, used by most critical writers, that places “form over substance” versus “substance over form”. The latter might be considered as a better one since it does not result in the mere description of the separate dictionary sections but provides analysis and critical evaluation of the dictionary as a complex, examining relationship of the sections to each other and the wordlist.

The lexicographer advocates that “each individual type of lexicographic section in the outside matter should be analyzed, described, examined and critically evaluated on the basis of their substance related directly to the surface and underlying features of the dictionary, no matter where the sections are placed” (Nielsen, 2009, 217–220).

Chapter Eighteen

A profound approach to dictionary analysis both quantitative and qualitative is suggested by O.M. Karpova (2004). The lexicographer suggests that the process of dictionary assessment and evaluation should be divided into several stages:

1. Defining the **dictionary type** based on the following parameters:
 - language (monolingual, bilingual, multilingual);
 - object of description (linguistic/encyclopedic);
 - dictionary size (large, average, small);
 - lexicographic form (concordance, index or frequency dictionary, glossary, lexicon, thesaurus);
 - target users.
2. Evaluating the **dictionary sources** which have formed the basis of the information provided in the dictionary (What is the lexicographer's experience? What is said in the dictionary with regard to the sources used? What kind of language usage is represented by the sources? How old are the sources? Which sources are not taken into account? What kind of norm is thus established?).
3. Evaluating **dictionary structure** (front matter, middle matter and back matter).
4. Evaluating the **dictionary lemma list**. For a detailed assessment of the content of a dictionary it is suggested that depending on the size of a dictionary the following sampling of entries should be used. For small and average dictionaries up to 200 pages, all entries on every tenth page are yielded; for large dictionaries more than 200 pages all entries on every hundredth page are managed. All the entries selected should be scrutinized carefully for, first of all, base form, length of entries, word formation, word combination, proper names, etc.
5. Evaluating the **presentation of head words** in a dictionary-microstructure, which refers to the structure of the information addressed to the lemma. Each of the entries is examined for linguistic information such as grammar, collocations, synonyms and antonyms, equivalents, linguistic labelling, pronunciation, examples, encyclopedic notes and labelling, cross references.

The author places an emphasis on the main requirement for conducting dictionary analysis from the perspective suggested. It is to respect the hierarchy of the stages excluding the intersection of parameters of mega-, macro- and microstructure. In other words, the consistency of stages should be observed.

Methods of the LSP Dictionary Analysis

Although the critique can be concentrated on different aspects of the dictionary presentation and content, the discussion of the issue in this paper is aimed at undertaking dictionary criticism from the perspective of the academic linguist or metalexigrapher, and applying lexicological and lexicographical theory and insight to the task.

Practical Application

In this section, a short extraction of the dictionary analysis based on the above main principles is provided. The dictionary under the study is *The Social Work Dictionary* (5th edn., 2003) by R.L. Barker. The aim of the dictionary analysis is to find out the ways the language of social work practice has developed, and its terms have been defined in the dictionary so that the findings of better lexicographic practices might be used in compiling the model of the LSP learners' dictionary based on the material of Social work terminology intending to meet the demands of the Russian user.

The *Dictionary* type is defined as monolingual English dictionary, of large size occupying 493 pages, linguistic encyclopedic, terminology (of narrowly defined special field), alphabetic, printed.

Target users are described in the dictionary *Foreword* as follows:

Students consult *The Social Work Dictionary* during their orientation to the profession and then rely on it throughout their studies to obtain concise and accurate answers to specific practice questions. Essential to researchers and librarians alike, the *Dictionary* also sits on the desks of numerous social work practitioners and other human services professionals seeking information within and outside their own specialties.

Dictionary sources seem very much reliable. The lexicographer has a great experience in dealing with this specific field. To compile a list of entries he has used indexes of the major social work journals and text books of the past three decades as well as journals, manuals, and textbooks of disciplines related to social work, especially psychiatry, law, sociology, economics, anthropology, and psychology. In the dictionary *Preface* the dictionary compiler expresses deep gratitude to those who made significant contribution to the development of the dictionary. The involvement of experts into critiquing, editing, and revising the terms definitions has the most positive effect on the quality of the dictionary content. It is said in the *Preface* that "typically, three different experts reviewed each definition" (Barker, 2003, xii).

Chapter Eighteen

The dictionary structure is comprised of the *front matter* (Contents, Editorial Review Board, Foreword, Preface, Acknowledgments, Acronyms Frequently Used by Social Workers); *middle matter* which contains a word list of over 9,000 defined terms; *back matter* includes an appendix of Milestones in the Development of Social Work and Social Welfare. The main inconvenience in the dictionary structure is absence of the user's guide.

The dictionary lemma list is first studied at the level of its quantitative composition. Arithmetic average of entries on one page is 13.0 (*adulthood, confabulation, conflict, counselling, death dipsomania*), among them word compositions—8.7 (*adult foster care, assisted suicide, battered spouse, confidence crimes, couples group therapy*). Representing the word list statistically, the dictionary entries were classified according to the number of the word components. The balance between one element terms and multiple element terms is presented in the table below:

Number of terms	Number of elements in a term	% ratio to total amount of terms
203	1	33,1 %
218	2	35,5 %
113	3	18,4 %
45	4	7,3 %
34	5	5,5 %
Total 613		100 %

The dictionary word list also includes abbreviations, proper names and nominations. Arithmetic average of proper names per page is 0.6 (4.6 %) (*Beck, Bert (1918–2000), Addams, Jane (1860–1935), Breckinridge, Sophonisba (1866–1948) etc.*). The statistical data also shows that nominations are presented in the dictionary in quite a big amount with arithmetic average per page 2.2 (17 %).

The dictionary entries are located according to the initial-alphabetic arrangement and word-by-word principle (*content validity, contextual theory, contextual variable, contingency*).

The presentation of head words in the dictionary is as following:

- head words are introduced in a canonical form (*family care, family cohesion, family court*);
- transcription is not available;
- no grammar information;
- borrowings from other languages are depicted:

Methods of the LSP Dictionary Analysis

Hilfskassen German for “aid funds”.

tzedakah Hebrew term for justice, including philanthropy and service. In the Jewish tradition, one of the highest forms of tzedakah is to provide poor people with the wherewithal to become productive and self-sufficient. See also *kupah* and *tamhuy*.

- cross references are used:

structured group See *group, structured*.

stressor A *stimulus* that leads to *anxiety* or other mental disorders unless the individual’s *coping skills* are used effectively.

- various stylistic markers are presented (*formerly, informal, commonly used, derisive term, disparaging term, term of derision, obsolete term, pejorative term*):

“**handout**” Disparaging term for welfare payment.

“**granny flats**” The informal name for ECHO housing (elder cottage housing opportunity), they are temporary, mobile-home-style living unites for one or two people usually installed on the grounds of their offspring and connected to the utilities of the main house.

- in term description linguistic encyclopedic definition is used, which is considered to be specific for LSP dictionaries:

structural family therapy An orientation and procedure in *family therapy* based on identifying and changing maladaptive arrangements, interactions, and the internal organization of subsystems and boundaries of a family. Structural family therapy was developed in the 1970s by Salvador Minuchin. The therapy helps families understand the rules and roles they have developed for each member within the family unit and how those rules were developed; it also helps them understand how they have developed the rules and roles between themselves as a unit and the outside world.

- illustrative examples are not presented.

The dictionary analysis resulted in understanding the language structure of the subject field as well as helping to sort out advantages and disadvantages of the edition so that positive features of the dictionary could be used for the benefit of a good new LSP learners’ dictionary.

Conclusion

The paper attempts to consider the methods of dictionary criticism and analysis used by both home and foreign lexicographers. However, the information presented in this article does not give a complete survey of contemporary practice in dictionary study. It has served as an example to present the diversity of such approaches to the matter of dictionary analysis as critical lexicographic research. At the same time, the practice of analysis is shown to be an important lexicographic exercise for researchers, as well as for everyday usage, to enhance a critical use of dictionaries. It underlines the fact that the present theory of lexicography related to dictionary criticism and analysis is defined as inadequate employment of already developed traditional methods of such analysis, particularly when it relates to the development of making new lexicographic products. Therefore, defining main tendencies and suggesting new ideas for developing this area seems to be rather urgent.

References

- Atkins, B.T.S. 2002. "Bilingual Dictionaries Past, Present and Future". In *Lexicography and Natural Language Processing. A Festschrift in Honour of B.T.S. Atkins*, edited by M.-H. Correard, 1–29, http://www.euralex.org/elx_proceedings/Lexicography%20and%20Natural%20Language%20Processing/B.T.S.%20Atkins%20-%20Bilingual%20Dictionaries%20Past,%20Present%20and%20Future.pdf (accessed November 12, 2011).
- Barker, R.L. 2003. *The Social Work Dictionary*, 5th edn. Washington: NASW Press.
- Béjoint, H. 2010. *The Lexicography of English. From Origins to Present*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bergenholtz, H. and S. Tarp. 1995. *Manual of Specialized Lexicography*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- East, M. 2008. *Dictionary Use in Foreign Language Writing Exams. Impact and Implications*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fillmore, C. and B.T.S. Atkins. 1994. "Starting where the Dictionaries Stop: Challenge of Corpus Lexicography." In *Computational Approaches to the Lexicon*, edited by B.T.S. Atkins and A. Zampoli, 349–393. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Methods of the LSP Dictionary Analysis

- Hüllen, W. 1999. *English Dictionaries 800–1700. The Topical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Jackson, H. 2002. *Lexicography. An Introduction*. London and New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Karpova, O.M. 2004. *Leksikograficheskie portrety slovarej sovremennogo anglijskogo jazyka*. (Lexicographic Portraits of Modern English Dictionaries). Ivanovo: Ivanovo State University.
- Kilgarriff, A. 2005. "If Dictionaries are Free, who will Buy them?" *Dictionary News* 13, 17–19.
- Meteshkin, K.A., A.I. Zhadan and L.A. Fedorchenko. 2004. "Zadacha i metod ekspertizy leksikograficheskikh proizvedenii. (Aim and Method of Assessment of Lexicographic Products)." *Vestnik Khar'kovskogo natsional'nogo avtomobil'no-dorozhnogo universiteta*. (Bulletin of Kharkov National Automobile and Highway University. Collection of Scientific Works) 25, 59–65.
- Nielsen, S. 2009. "The Evaluation of the Outside Matter in Dictionary Reviews." *Lexikos* 19 (AFRILEX-reeks/series 19), 207–224.
- . 2010. "Legal Translation Dictionaries for Learners." In *New Trends in Lexicography: Ways of Registrating and Describing Lexis*, edited by O. Karpova and F. Kartashkova, 221–233. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Svensén, B. 1993. *Practical Lexicography. Principles and Methods of Dictionary-Making*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ter-Minasova, S.G. 2011. "Lexicography as the Pivot of FLT and Olga Karpova as the Pivot of Lexicography in Russia." In *Ivanovskaja leksikograficheskaja shkola: traditsii i innovatsii*. (Ivanovo School of Lexicography: Traditions and Innovations. A Festschrift in Honour of Professor Olga Karpova), edited by F. Kartashkova, 249–257. Ivanovo: Ivanovo State University.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged*. 1993. Massachusetts: Merriam-Webster.