
Situating *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles* within a More Comprehensive Lexicographic Process

Rufus H. Gouws, *Department of Afrikaans and Dutch, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, Republic of South Africa*

Abstract: South African English can be regarded as a fully-fledged variety of English which qualifies for comprehensive lexicographic treatment. This paper focuses on the presentation and treatment of South African English in *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles*. The structure of this dictionary as a carrier of texts and the way in which the editors adhere to current metalexigraphic guidelines are discussed. This paper also situates the dictionary and its contribution within the broader South African lexicographic endeavour. Reference is made to other South African dictionaries in order to identify the position of this dictionary within the South African dictionary family.

Keywords: BACK MATTER, CARRIER OF TEXTS, CENTRAL LIST, FRAME STRUCTURE, FRONT MATTER, HISTORICAL DICTIONARY, LEXICOGRAPHY, SOUTH AFRICAN ENGLISH, STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS

Opsomming: Die situering van *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles* binne 'n omvattender leksikografiese proses. Suid-Afrikaanse Engels kan beskou word as 'n volwaardige variëteit van Engels wat kwalifiseer vir 'n uitvoerige leksikografiese behandeling. Hierdie artikel fokus op die aanbieding en bewerking van Suid-Afrikaanse Engels in *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles*. Die struktuur van hierdie woordeboek as 'n draer van teksoorte en die manier waarop die redaksie bestaande metaleksikografiese riglyne nagevolg het, word bespreek. Dié artikel plaas die woordeboek asook sy bydrae binne die breër Suid-Afrikaanse leksikografiese bestel. Daar word na ander Suid-Afrikaanse woordeboeke verwys ten einde die posisie van hierdie woordeboek binne die Suid-Afrikaanse woordeboekfamilie te bepaal.

Sleutelwoorde: AGTERWERK, HISTORIESE WOORDEBOEK, LEKSIKOGRAFIE, RAAMSTRUKTUUR, SENTRALE TEKS, STRUKTUURKOMPONENTE, SUID-AFRIKAANSE ENGELS, TEKSSOORTDRAER, VOORWERK

1. South African English: a general background

The history of lexicographic reference works in South Africa emphasises the dominating role of Afrikaans descriptive and translation dictionaries. How-

ever, the position of English, and more specifically South African English, in the development of South African dictionaries may never be underestimated. Changuion (1844) and Mansvelt (1884) compiled two of the most important forerunners in the domain of descriptive dictionaries focusing on Afrikaans. Although both these dictionaries played a key role in establishing Afrikaans lexicography, the respective lexicographers had opposing objectives. Changuion's dictionary was an attempt to impede the development of Afrikaans and to maintain the continued use of Dutch in the Cape. Contrary to this approach Mansvelt focused on the uniqueness of the developing Afrikaans lexicon by including those words and expressions not known in standard Dutch. Although the macrostructure of his dictionary has to be seen as one of the first lexicographic accounts of Afrikaans, it included many items commonly known and used in the South African English of that time. In this regard the Mansvelt dictionary should also be seen as an asset to the development of South African lexicography in general as well as the lexicography of South African English. The lemma selection did not only represent the lexicon of Afrikaans but also focused on numerous lexical items coined in South Africa and used in different South African languages. Many of these lexical items can rightly be classified as being South African.

In 1902/1904, shortly after the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902), the bilingual *Patriot Woordeboek/Patriot Dictionary* was published. The primary objective of this dictionary was not to be a linguistic instrument but rather to fulfil a socio-political function. In the preface the anonymous editor (S.J. du Toit) stated it quite emphatically that the principal aim of this dictionary was to promote co-operation between the English and the Dutch in South Africa, for which purpose it was indispensable that they should mutually know each other's language in so far that they could understand each other. The first part of this dictionary (Afrikaans-English) was published in 1902 and the second part (English-"Cape Dutch") in 1904. The macrostructure of the first part consisted of approximately 16 500 lemmata which included about 1 100 words which were, according to the editor, *pure Cape Dutch*, in so far that they were not found in Dutch dictionaries or had a different meaning in Dutch. These forms were presented in italics to differentiate them from the other lemmata.

From a linguistic point of view it is noteworthy that the treatment of these *pure Cape Dutch* items does not reflect the dynamics of language contact and the consequential and frequent occurrence of borrowings in South African English. One of the objectives of a translation dictionary should be to achieve communicative equivalence. This can only be done if the co-ordination of source and target language items is dominated by a functional approach. Rather than to list translation equivalents with the same meaning as the lemmata, the lexicographer should attempt to present target language items representing the same style and register of the source language items. In general the lexicographic procedures applied in the *Patriot Woordeboek/Patriot Dictionary* creates a low density of information because the treatment is usually restricted to the pres-

entation of translation equivalents. In the Afrikaans-English section the existence of a relation of zero equivalence, due to the lack of an established English equivalent, leads to the inclusion of surrogate equivalents. However, these surrogate equivalents do not reflect the real linguistic situation regarding the lexicon of South African English. Instead of co-ordinating unique South African English equivalents with the Afrikaans lemmata, the lexicographer opted for the use of brief meaning descriptions. This has resulted in *Patriot Woordeboek/Patriot Dictionary* being a translation dictionary with the focus primarily on the lexicon of Afrikaans and not on the lexicon of South African English. Many of the *pure Cape Dutch* items included as lemmata in the *Patriot Woordeboek/Patriot Dictionary* could just as well have been co-ordinated with the same item as a target language form because of the occurrence of these forms in both languages. This would have established *Patriot Woordeboek/Patriot Dictionary* as an innovative instrument in the recording of South African English.

In spite of the fact that *Patriot Woordeboek/Patriot Dictionary* did not give a true account of the development of English in South Africa, it has to be regarded as an important contribution to the development of South African lexicography because of the co-ordination of languages which were destined to become two official languages of South Africa, as well as the fact that this was one of the first efforts to establish lexicographic links between these two languages.

A second contribution to and probably the most important breakthrough in the early development of the lexicography of South African English (henceforth abbreviated as SAE) was the publication in 1913 of Charles Pettman's *Africanderisms*. In this "glossary of South African colloquial words and phrases", the compiler reflects on the lexical expansion in South Africa. Although he does not refer to South African English but rather to *South African*, it is quite apparent that he is dealing with the lexicon of SAE. In the preface of this dictionary Pettman says: "When, by some strange oversight, the great 'Oxford Dictionary' not only omits to notice such recognised English words as African and Africanism ..., to say nothing of such well-known South African words as *Africander*, *Africanderism*, and *Africanderdom*, there does appear to be an excuse, if not a reason, for the publication of a Glossary of South African Words and Phrases." The macrostructure of this dictionary deals extensively with typical "South African" words, and the treatment usually includes an explanation of the meaning of the lemma. It is interesting to note how many of these "South African" lexical items also occur as Afrikaans lemmata in the dictionary of Mansvelt and in the *Patriot Woordeboek/Patriot Dictionary*.

From an historical perspective the importance of Pettman's work is the emphasis it places on SAE as a new and developing variety of English. This dictionary should not only be regarded as a direct forerunner of Penny Silva's *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles*, but it also has to be seen as one of the most important cornerstones of the lexicographic representation of South African English and the relevant lexicographic process. This is

acknowledged in the front matter of *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles*, where the editors express with gratitude "the considerable debt owed to this dictionary's predecessors, particularly *Africanderisms*".

2. A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles and the Dictionary Unit for South African English

When attempting to situate *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles* (henceforth abbreviated as DSAE) within a more comprehensive South African lexicographic process one also has to focus on the institution responsible for this publication. This is necessary to evaluate the status of DSAE within the broader South African lexicographic family. In this regard DSAE offers enough assistance. The front matter of this dictionary contains a variety of texts, among others a short report on the Dictionary Unit of South African English. What was later to be established as the Dictionary Unit of South African English was started in 1968 as a pilot project on South African English. In an early report of the project (*Towards a Dictionary of South African English*, September 1971), Prof. William Branford, who was to be the first editor-in-chief, described the aim of the project as being "to provide an historical record of the South African element in the English vocabulary from its first appearances in the language down to the present day". In a later text (1976) Branford described the aims of the Unit as being first the production of a dictionary containing South Africanisms in English (once again the Pettman influence can be detected). This was to be an independent project. The second aim was the publication of a dictionary of South African English on historical principles, which was to be a much more comprehensive project.

Both these aims have been realised. The first aim resulted in the publication *A Dictionary of South African English* (1978). The fourth edition of this dictionary was published in 1991. The front matter of DSAE contains the following comment on this dictionary: "This general readers' dictionary, which, in addition to the standard vocabulary, includes colourful colloquial and slang expressions, and often quirky or humorous illustrative citations, is, in the compiler's own words in the preface, 'intended to be useful; but ... intended also to give pleasure and amusement'." Although this dictionary focuses on South African English, it also compares the use and meaning of words in SAE with other varieties of English. Extremely helpful in this dictionary is the inclusion of notes on the usage of SAE. The first aim was not only realised by the publication of this dictionary, but also by the *South African Pocket Oxford Dictionary* (1987).

A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles represents the realisation of the second but main aim of the Dictionary Unit for South African English. The Dictionary Unit was formally established in 1991. In the front matter of DSAE the initial task of the Unit is described as: "the continuous and comprehensive collecting, arranging and storing in a lexicographically workable form of the vocabulary of the English language as used in Southern Africa

and the editing and publication of the collected materials in the form of a Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles, as well as periodical revision and updating of the text thereof and other research and publications associated therewith". The publication of DSAE is the fulfilment of the first phase of this task.

3. The need for a dictionary of South African English

Since 1994 South Africa has eleven official languages. Although the constitution guarantees the official status of all these languages, practical demands play an important role in determining the choice of languages in communication situations. In spite of the fact that the number of native speakers of English in South Africa is smaller than that of e.g. Zulu, Xhosa and Afrikaans as well as some of the other indigenous languages, English has a dominating position as language of documentation and as a general *lingua franca*. For too long South Africans had to rely exclusively on English dictionaries from British and American publishers to solve problems they experience in South African English (cf. Gouws 1995). The traditional link between South African and British English has been advantageous for British dictionaries and this has resulted in South Africa being a good dictionary market for British publishers. The increasing influence of American English, mainly due to television and film productions, has resulted in a more productive use of American dictionaries. As part of their endeavour to achieve an international character some of these dictionaries have included a limited number of lemmata to represent SAE as one of the varieties of English. These attempts also indicate that SAE has made a certain contribution to international English. Due to the growing need for a well-documented account of SAE the publication of a dictionary like the DSAE as part of the South African lexicographic process has been long overdue.

Within the South African language situation SAE has a central position. SAE has a standard form but also numerous varieties. Language dynamics and the daily contact with the other official South African languages have a constant influence on an ever-changing SAE. No dictionary not primarily aimed at SAE, can give a valid account of these changes and of all the registers of this variety of English. Local lexicographers who are able to make a valid and representative selection and a sound lexicographic treatment of items from the lexicon of SAE can achieve this ideal. DSAE does this in an exemplary way. The objectives of the editors to achieve this are signalled by the following remark in the preface: "the editors have made a conscious attempt to give voice not only to the documented utterances of powerful men, but also to the daily speech of ordinary people". Another remark in the preface which gives a good perspective on the function and the assignment of this dictionary is a reference to the fact that SAE is not only the property of South Africa's relatively small number of English-speakers (about 10% of the population), but it is also the property of those people, a much greater number, who use English as a second or third language.

4. The structure of the DSAE

4.1 Taking cognisance of advances in metalexigraphy

Linguists and lexicographers hold different views regarding the status of lexicography. Whether it is a science, a craft, a special technique or an art is not clear. According to Wiegand (1989: 248) lexicography is not a science but a scientific practice. Where scientific activities are aimed at producing theories, this is not true of lexicographic activities. The one common feature of all lexicographic activities is their aim to produce dictionaries that can be used as practical instruments. Lexicography is a practice aimed at the production of dictionaries. This forms the basis of another practice, i.e. the cultural practice of dictionary use. Although linguistic theories influence the lexicographic practice, these theories are not primarily aimed at lexicography. For decades lexicographers had to analyse and interpret existing linguistic theories in order to find something applicable to lexicography. This situation has emphasised the need for a general theory of lexicography that can assist lexicographers with the necessary theoretical input. One of the exciting developments of the last two decades has been the establishment of metalexigraphy as a fully-fledged discipline, and the inclusion of a general theory of lexicography as one of the important components of metalexigraphy. This has had numerous implications for the lexicographic practice.

Innovative and profound developments in metalexigraphy have compelled lexicographers not only to take cognisance of the relevant theoretical issues but also of the practical implications thereof. Today there is no reason why any practising lexicographer should fail to comply with the criteria laid down by a general theory of lexicography for the specific dictionary being compiled. In this regard lexicographers should not only adhere to the demands directed at the nature, extent and presentation of information categories in the microstructure, but also to the selection of a representative macrostructure. This is important, but the user-perspective, so prevalent in modern-day metalexigraphy, which compels the lexicographer to identify the target user of the dictionary and to compile the dictionary with the needs and reference skills of that target user in mind, has to dominate lexicographic procedures. Likewise lexicographers have to take cognisance of the emphasis on the structure of dictionaries and the different structural components identified in the textual approach to dictionaries.

4.2 Structural components

4.2.1 The front matter

Within the metalexigraphy dictionaries are regarded as *carriers of texts*. Provision is made for a three-way structural division in a dictionary, i.e. the front

matter, the back matter and the central list. The back matter is an optional component where texts dealing with issues like units of measure, country names, capitals, encyclopaedic information, etc. can be accommodated. The front matter contains a variety of optional texts like the title page, the table of contents, etc. There is one obligatory text to be included in the front matter, i.e. the *user's guide*. The central list contains the dictionary proper. It is a functional component of the dictionary and is constituted by a collection of subtexts: the *articles*. Each article contains a lemma, the element from the lexicon to be treated which functions as the guiding element of the article, and a lexicographic treatment of the lemma (cf. Hausmann and Wiegand 1989: 330-333).

As an obligatory text the user's guide explains the system adhered to in the dictionary. Any good dictionary is characterised by the consistent application of a well-developed system, and this system has to be explained in the front matter. One of the components of metalexigraphy, viz. the organisation theory, makes provision for various aspects of the planning of dictionary projects. The planning of the compilation of a dictionary starts with the planning of the system to be utilised in the specific dictionary as well as the data distribution structure which determines the position and presentation of the different data categories (cf. Bergenholtz, Tarp and Wiegand 1999). Before putting one word onto paper in the compilation process, the lexicographer has to be well aware of the precise structure each article should display so that the system can be applied with meticulous care from *aardvark* to *zebra*.

Only a quick glance at DSAE is needed to convince one that the editors have made an effort to compile a well-structured dictionary, displaying a typical frame structure (cf. Kammerer and Wiegand 1998), which assists the user not only by means of the central list but also by including a selection of texts in the front and back matter. The front matter of a dictionary is not as a whole a functional part because it contains an arbitrary set of functional text parts. The central list of DSAE is preceded by a front matter which consists of a variety of functional text parts. These front matter texts include the title page, a text containing various acknowledgements, a preface, table of contents, a brief history of the Dictionary Unit for South African English, a text with the title "English in South Africa", and two maps (South Africa 1910–March 1994 and South Africa April 1994–). These texts are followed by further texts focusing on linguistic and lexicographic information and conventions, i.e. a discussion of the pronunciation of South African English, a key to the pronunciation given as part of the treatment in DSAE and the styling conventions as well as a list of the abbreviations used in this dictionary.

The functional value of the front matter texts in DSAE may never be underestimated. By means of the information displayed in several unintegrated outer texts (cf. Bergenholtz, Tarp and Wiegand 1999), the user is orientated with regard to the institution responsible for the compilation of this dictionary as well as the target language of the dictionary, viz. South African English. These front matter texts assist the user in situating this dictionary within the

general South African lexicographic process. The question may be put why it has been deemed necessary to compile a dictionary of SAE. People asking such a question will most probably not use this dictionary. However, the front matter texts provide the intended target user of this dictionary with enough answers to this question. In this regard the text "English in South Africa" offers a brief but intriguing account of SAE. In this text the focus is on topics such as *The coming of the English; Language status; The influence of English; Varieties of English; Influences on English* and *The future of English*. This text also includes a list of references on the relevant topics. The inclusion of a text like this increases the added value of the DSAE because it offers the target user bonus information. The lexicographers have to be commended on the aptness of this text in a dictionary based on historical principles. For the non-South African who might be interested in SAE, this text enhances the access to SAE as a variety of English.

The uniqueness of SAE is not restricted to those lexical items used exclusively in this variety of English. In the front matter texts it is also emphasised that many words from the standard variety of SAE are used in senses which are perplexing to English-speakers elsewhere. In this regard the contribution of Afrikaans and Dutch is discussed. Attention is also drawn to the SAE borrowings from the indigenous languages. In addition to this information transfer, the text on the pronunciation of SAE gives evidence of one of the most salient differences between South African English and other varieties of English. The key to the pronunciation offered in the articles as well as the text on the styling conventions applied in DSAE are texts which assist the user in his endeavour to achieve an optimal retrieval of information.

From a user's perspective, however, one has to argue that the front matter of DSAE contains too little help for the user. Although this dictionary is aimed at a sophisticated user group, no lexicographer may rely on the intuition of the intended target users of the dictionary. A dictionary is a system and the way in which the various components fit into the pattern needs to be explained in order to enhance the retrieval of information. When consulting a dictionary the average user seldom utilises the information given in the front matter. This lack of a dictionary culture on the part of the user may not seduce the lexicographer to abstain from including sufficient guidelines for the target user in the front matter texts. It is important that the front matter should include a text focusing on user's guidelines in which an analysis of a typical article is presented. This will give the user an opportunity to become familiar with the search zones of the articles and with the specific article slot allocated to each information category. The user of DSAE has to guess that the front matter text "Styling conventions" contains the user's guidelines. In this text the different elements of an article (DSAE does not refer to "article" but rather to "entry") are discussed in the order in which they appear in the articles. The user would have had a clearer and more direct and immediate understanding of the article structure if DSAE could have included an example of an article in this text. This would

have been in line with a well-established pattern which has been applied in many dictionaries.

Typical users of dictionaries are not aware of the typological criteria of a dictionary based on historical principles and the way in which such a dictionary fits into the broader typological frame. It is the responsibility of the lexicographer to explain this to the target users and to give an explicit account of the way in which an historical approach influences the structure of articles as well as the collection of macrostructural and microstructural entries. The text on styling conventions includes a paragraph on the ordering of senses. In this paragraph the editors do refer to the fact that each "entry" is chronologically arranged. In the paragraph on citations it is also mentioned that for each sense the citations are arranged in chronological order. It would, however, have been better to make an explicit statement on the microstructural implications of the typological category of DSAE. This would have enhanced the user-friendliness of this dictionary and would also have increased the ease of information retrieval.

4.2.2 The back matter

The back matter is an optional component of a dictionary and each text presented in this component can be regarded as a bonus. DSAE has one text included in the back matter, i.e. a select bibliography. This text contains a list of those works most commonly used in compiling the dictionary. The short preface to the bibliography, acting as a secondary level front matter text (cf. Gouws forthcoming), states it clearly that the list also includes works "about which it may be difficult to find information elsewhere". This functional value of the bibliography as an unintegrated outer text becomes apparent if one takes a look at the diverse nature of the cited texts and other sources. It gives access to old documents, unpublished titles as well as many other books and articles. From the perspective of a user consulting DSAE on account of its historical approach, this bibliography offers an added value. The preface of the back matter text explicates this added value by stating: "It is hoped that the bibliography will prove a useful tool for readers interested in South African texts." This is truly the case, and the bibliography can rightfully be regarded as an important collection of sources for researchers focusing on texts which are relevant to a study of the development of South African English.

4.2.3 The central list

For the average dictionary user the term "dictionary" refers primarily to the central list of this carrier of texts. Although the structure of the central list in DSAE is not explained sufficiently in the front matter texts, this component of DSAE has to be regarded as one of the most important texts in the collection of

South African lexicographic works. This can be motivated on various grounds of which the most significant is the fact that DSAE reflects the reality, extent and use of SAE like no other lexicographic, reference or research source has done.

The central list does not only offer a macrostructural selection representing SAE as a well-defined variety of English, but the microstructural treatment contextualises these lexical items in their respective historical, stylistic, linguistic and pragmatic environment.

4.2.4 The macrostructure

Dictionaries are more often than not judged by the contents of their macrostructure. Typical remarks often made in this regard refer to the number of (new) words in a dictionary or the representativeness of the selection of words included in the macrostructure. Although being a single volume dictionary, DSAE presents a quite comprehensive selection of items from the lexicon of SAE. However, this dictionary is not directed at an account of that very large segment of SAE, which overlaps with other varieties of English. Therefore DSAE is not a dictionary presenting the full lexicon of SAE but primarily those words which are particular to South Africans. This includes, as is stated in the preface, "words borrowed from the many languages of South Africa, English words that have required particular senses here, and words coined for local phenomena". Some of the words in DSAE are not South African in origin, but have a particular significance for South Africans. This feature gives an added value to DSAE. It is not a dictionary to consult if you are looking for the ordinary lexical items of English. It is a dictionary aimed at the unique character of SAE. This implies that DSAE cannot be utilised as the only English lexicographic source for the average South African dictionary user. This user will still need a dictionary focusing on "general" English. However, for those persons interested in the differences between SAE and other varieties of English, DSAE is a source well worth obtaining.

Language borrowing is a universal phenomenon and owing to the status of English as an international language, the lexicon of English has to be regarded as one of the prime targets for language borrowing. The influence of borrowing on English, however, is not always realised by the average language user. The macrostructure of DSAE not only gives evidence of the massive influence borrowings have had on SAE, but it once again emphasises the aptness of Pettman's reference to *South African words*. DSAE makes pleasant and familiar reading for South Africans of different speech communities. This is due to the fact that SAE accommodates so many items from the lexicons of the other South African languages. One of the most significant features of the DSAE, is the lack of a purist bias. The consistent endeavour of the editors to present the full spectrum of the lexicon of SAE enhances the credibility of this dictionary. This endeavour is often in opposition to the prescriptive nature

users attribute to dictionaries. Fortunately the editors of DSAE did not allow this prescriptive tradition to impede their selection of lexical items for lemmatisation. The following remark in the preface indicates their attitude to include both standard and non-standard forms: "Time and time again the Dictionary Unit has been accused of 'writing a dictionary of slang'. This dictionary does, of course, include colloquialisms, slang, and vulgarisms; however, it is hoped that readers will be presently surprised by the age, creativity, and variety of the standard variety recorded here."

From a thematic point of view the macrostructure, although alphabetically ordered, offers an interesting perspective on the lexicon of SAE as well as on that of the languages from which SAE has borrowed. So many borrowed SAE lexical items are informal names. In this regard the names can be directed to a wide variety of subfields, e.g. the names of animals, trees and plants, food and drinks, etc. These thematic borrowings give a clear indication of, besides the role of other indigenous languages, the extent of the influence of Afrikaans on SAE. The Afrikaans linguist, student and researcher will benefit from the inclusion and treatment of numerous items from the Afrikaans lexicon in DSAE.

Given the political history of South Africa it is not surprising to find numerous political terms included in DSAE's macrostructure. Also in this regard the emphasis is not only on unique words but also on words with a unique South African meaning. Examples are:

comrades (usually in the plural as a collective term) Young, usually left-wing activists, particularly militant supporters of the African National Congress.

necklace A method of lynching or unofficial execution by placing a tyre doused or filled with petrol round a person's shoulders or neck and setting it alight.

One of the words omitted in DSAE is the lexical item *struggle*, which has been central in the political jargon of the past decade or two in referring to the fight against the previous political system.

As a container of linguistic information DSAE confronts the user already on the macrostructural level with the fact that word-formation processes of SAE also reflect the ongoing language contact in South Africa. Items like *now-now* ("in a moment/a moment ago") and *play-play* ("with ease/while playing") are typical results of the influence of reduplication which plays an active role in Afrikaans word-formation. The item *yes-no* (from the Afrikaans *ja-nee*; "sure/that's a fact"), used to qualify a response, is a typical example of two English items combined according to a non-English pattern, but interpreted and used without any problems in SAE.

The macrostructural selection in DSAE has to be regarded as the most comprehensive representation of SAE. Although this collection of items is of

interest to lexicographers and linguists from the other South African languages as well as scholars from other varieties of English, English teachers and the teaching staff in English departments at South African universities should focus their attention on this work. These scholars have not always acknowledged the reality of SAE and its unique composition. Too often students get a distorted picture of the language, which is used as *lingua franca* in South Africa. It is important to become familiar with an international standard variety of English. However, from a communicative perspective it is just as important to master the variety, register and style of the majority of the local speech community. DSAE assists its users in achieving this goal.

4.2.5 The microstructure

The major difference between a word list and a more comprehensive dictionary is the fact that lemmata are presented in the latter source as treatment units, and this treatment implies the inclusion of a variety of comments on the macrostructural item. The typological classification of a dictionary should always play a decisive role in determining the nature, extent and presentation of the microstructure. Therefore it is so important for a lexicographer to utilise one of the front matter texts to give the target users guidance regarding the contents and ordering of the microstructure. In the front matter texts the information on SAE provides users with an indication of the macrostructural selection with which they will be confronted. The text on styling conventions helps the user to recognise the different types of microstructural categories presented in DSAE. This text gives a clear understanding of the density of information presented in the treatment of lemmata. Microstructural entries include pronunciation, part of speech, labels, variant spellings, morphological information, etymology, combinations and collocations, encyclopaedic notes and citations. Lemmata receive a comprehensive treatment and each information category is dealt with in exemplary fashion.

From the perspective of the dictionary user, it is significant to find such a variety of information categories in the articles. Since many of the lexical items included as lemmata will not be found in any other dictionary, it is important that DSAE should offer a comprehensive treatment, especially with regard to pronunciations, meaning and usage, because these are the unique features of this subsection from the lexicon of SAE.

The microstructural treatment presented in DSAE has to be regarded as an extremely valuable contribution to South African lexicography in general. This can be motivated on various grounds. Firstly, as a dictionary of SAE, DSAE fills a gap in the dictionary family and in the scientific account of SAE. Due to the "South African" rather than a restricted SAE approach, the presentation of lemmata is a clear exhibit of the linguistic interaction in a multilingual South Africa. In this regard it is good to know that an international language like English can also be on the receiving end in the process of language borrowing.

The macrostructural selection in DSAE makes it easy for speakers of the other South African languages to identify with this dictionary. DSAE serves more than just a lexicographic, linguistic or communicative function. It also enhances a South African nationalism. A second point in question when evaluating the contribution of DSAE is the historical approach applied in this dictionary. In spite of all the other lexicographic endeavours in South Africa, there has been no successful attempt to publish a dictionary on historical principles. DSAE sets an example from which lexicographers from all the other languages will benefit greatly.

A third reason for a positive evaluation of DSAE's contribution to the South African lexicography can be found in the treatment of items with an Afrikaans origin. An investigation of the South African languages clearly shows that the Afrikaans lexicography is the most sophisticated. This applies to the nature and extent of the dictionary collection, especially the typological variety, as well as the lexicographic treatment. The most impressive Afrikaans lexicographic project is the comprehensive multi-volume *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal* (Dictionary of the Afrikaans Language). For Afrikaans linguists this dictionary, commonly referred to as the WAT, is a valuable source of information. Although it may sound contradictory, the WAT, in spite of being a comprehensive dictionary, is also a synchronic dictionary. Older words are included in the macrostructure and many citations come from older sources. The approach, however, is not historical and the WAT fails to assist the Afrikaans linguist or researcher who is looking for historical information (cf. Gouws and Ponelis 1992). In this regard DSAE fills a noticeable gap in Afrikaans lexicography. The record of so many older lexical items, their diachronic treatment and the accompanying etymological information already serve as a valuable contribution to the study of Afrikaans. DSAE's historical approach in the ordering of senses and especially in the presentation and chronological ordering of citations, gives the Afrikaans linguist a systematic access to information previously restricted to a random collection of sources.

5. In conclusion

DSAE is a dictionary, but it is also more than a dictionary. It contains a lexicographic treatment which is exemplary both on macrostructural and microstructural level. It contributes both to the English and the general South African lexicography and offers valuable information to researchers and linguists of all the South African languages. The historical approach and the comprehensive treatment of lexical items from different varieties of SAE make this dictionary a document worth the attention of scholars interested in historical linguistics, language contact, sociolinguistics and the dynamics of language change.

DSAE is both compact and comprehensive. It focuses exclusively on that subsection of the lexicon of SAE, which represents the uniqueness of this variety of English. It is compact in its treatment of items although the density of

information is high due to a good variety of information categories presented in each article. This is a highly successful lexicographic endeavour which fills a very specific niche in the South African lexicographic process.

Bibliography

- Anonymous (S.J. du Toit).** 1902/1904. *Patriot Woordeboek/Patriot Dictionary*. Paarl: D.F. du Toit.
- Bergenholtz, H., S. Tarp and H.E. Wiegand.** 1999. Datendistributionsstrukturen, Makro- und Mikrostrukturen in neueren Fachwörterbüchern. *Fachsprachen. Languages for Special Purposes. An International Handbook of Special-Language and Terminology Research*. Berlin: De Gruyter: 1762-1832.
- Branford, J. and Branford, W.** 1991⁴. *A Dictionary of South African English*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Branford, W.** 1987. *The South African Pocket Oxford Dictionary*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Changuion, A.N.E.** 1844. Proeve van Kaapsch Taaleigen. Changuion, A.N.E. 1844. *De Nederduitsche Taal in Zuid-Afrika Hersteld*. Cape Town: J.H. Collard.
- Gouws, R.H. and F.A. Ponielis.** 1992. The Development of Afrikaans and the Lexicographical Tradition. Zgusta, L. (Ed.). 1992. *History, Languages and Lexicographers: 77-104*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Gouws, R. H.** 1995. Dictionaries and the Dynamics of Language Change. Kachru, B. B. and H. Kahane (Eds.). 1995. *Cultures, Ideologies, and the Dictionary: 297-313*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Gouws, R.H.** Forthcoming. Mediostructural Representation, Textual Condensation and User-Orientation in the WAT X. *Lexicographica* 15.
- Hausmann, F.J. and H.E. Wiegand.** 1989. Component Parts and Structures of General Monolingual Dictionaries. Hausmann, F.J. et al. (Eds.). 1989-1991. *Wörterbücher/Dictionaries/Dictionnaires: 329-360*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kammerer, M. and Wiegand, H.E.** 1998. Über die textuelle Rahmenstruktur von Wörterbüchern. Präzisierungen und weiterführende Überlegungen. *Lexicographica* 14: 224-238.
- Mansvelt, N.** 1884. *Proeve van een Kaapsch-Hollandsch Idioticon met Toelichtingen en Opmerkingen betreffend Land, Volk en Taal*. Cape Town: Van de Sandt de Villiers.
- Pettman, C.** 1913. *Africanisms*. London: Longmans, Green & Company.
- Van Schalkwyk, D.J. et al. (Eds.).** *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal*. Stellenbosch: Bureau of the WAT.
- Wiegand, H.E.** 1989. Der gegenwärtige Status der Lexikographie und ihr Verhältnis zu anderen Disziplinen. Hausmann, F.J. et al. (Eds.). 1989-1991. *Wörterbücher/Dictionaries/Dictionnaires: 246-280*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.