The Microstructural Treatment of Sublexical Lemmas in Afrikaans Descriptive Dictionaries

Ilse Feinauer, *Department of Afrikaans and Dutch,
University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, South Africa*

Abstract: Arguments in metalexicographic literature on the status of subword and multiword lexical items resulted in a more comprehensive lemmatic treatment of these lexical items in the latest editions of Afrikaans descriptive dictionaries, e.g. *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal* Volume IX (WAT), *Verklarende Handwoordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal* (HAT), *Nasionale Woordeboek* (NW), *Verklarende Afrikaanse Woordeboek* (VA), and *Basiswoordeboek van Afrikaans* (BA).

This article seeks to investigate whether sublexical lemmas are microstructurally treated the same as lexical lemmas, or whether lexicographers still distinguish between these various types of lemmas in some way or other. If differences exist in the treatment of the various types of lemmas, Afrikaans lexicographers are still word-biased: although subword lexical items are sometimes microstructurally treated in the same way as lexical items in that they are given lemmatic status, they are nevertheless distinguished microstructurally. For example, in WAT IX and HAT, sublexical lemmas are treated in almost the same manner as word lemmas in that their pronunciation is consistently given. However, in most of the dictionaries mentioned, grammatical information on sublexical lemmas is found as part of the definiens. Except for BA, no Afrikaans dictionary illustrates the contextual use of sublexical lemmas by means of examples or quotations; only their formation products are provided. More labels, and even etymological information, should also be provided more frequently as part of the microstructure of sublexical lemmas.

On the basis of the preceding it can already be concluded that Afrikaans lexicographers have not nearly done enough in removing traces of word-bias in descriptive dictionaries. In addition to macrostucturally treating subword lexical items as lemmas, these items should, where possible, be dealt with on a microstructural level in exactly the same way as lexical lemmas.

Keywords: AFFIXES, AFRIKAANS DESCRIPTIVE DICTIONARY, DEFINIENS, ETYMOLOGY, EXAMPLES, HOMONYMY, LABELS, LEXICAL CATEGORIES, LEXICAL LEMMA, LEXICOGRAPHY, MACROSTRUCTURE, MICROSTRUCTURE, OPPOSITION, POLYSEMY, PRONUNCIATION, QUOTATIONS, STEMS, SUBLEXICAL LEMMA, SYNONYMY, TECHNO-STEMS, WORD BIAS

Opsomming: Die mikrostrukturele hantering van subleksikale lemmas in verklarende woordeboeke van Afrikaans. Argumente in die metaleksikografiese literatuur oor die status van subwoordelike en meerwoordelike leksikale items het aanleiding gegee tot 'n meer omvattende lemmatiese hantering van hierdie leksikale items in die jongste uitgawes van verklarende woordeboeke van Afrikaans, soos *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal*

Deel IX (WAT), *Verklarende Handwoordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal* (HAT), *Nasionale Woordeboek* (NW), *Verklarende Afrikaanse Woordeboek* (VA), en *Basiswoordeboek van Afrikaans* (BA).

Hierdie artikel wil vasstel of subleksikale lemmas mikrostruktureel dieselfde as woordlemmas gehanteer word, en of leksikograwe steeds op die een of ander manier tussen hierdie verskillende tipes lemmas onderskei. Indien verskille bestaan in die hantering van die onderskeie tipes lemmas, bevoordeel leksikograwe van Afrikaans steeds die woord: alhoewel subwoordelike leksikale items makrostruktureel soms wel dieselfde as leksikale items gehanteer word deurdat hulle ook lemmastatus het, word hulle nogtans mikrostruktureel onderskei. In WAT IX en HAT byvoorbeeld, word subleksikale lemmas op byna dieselfde manier gehanteer as woordlemmas deurdat hul uitspraak konsekwent verskaf word. Daarenteen word grammatikale inligting vir subleksikale lemmas in die meeste van die genoemde woordeboeke as deel van die definiens aangetref. Afgesien van BA, illustreer geen woordeboek van Afrikaans die kontekstuele gebruik van subleksikale lemmas deur middel van voorbeelde of sitate nie; slegs hulle vormingsprodukte word verskaf. Meer etikette, en selfs etimologiese inligting, behoort ook meer dikwels as deel van die mikrostruktuur van subleksikale lemmas voorsien te word.

Op grond van die voorafgaande kan reeds gesê word dat die leksikograwe van Afrikaans nie naastenby genoeg gedoen het om tekens van woordvoorkeur in verklarende woordeboeke te verwyder nie. Benewens die makrostrukturele hantering van subwoordelike leksikale items op 'n soortgelyke manier as lemmas, behoort hierdie lemmas, waar moontlik, op 'n mikrostrukturele vlak op presies dieselfde wyse as leksikale lemmas behandel te word.

Sleutelwoorde: AFFIKSE, DEFINIENS, ETIKETTE, ETIMOLOGIE, HOMONIMIE, LEKSI-KALE KATEGORIEË, LEKSIKALE LEMMA, LEKSIKOGRAFIE, MAKROSTRUKTUUR, MIKRO-STRUKTUUR, POLISEMIE, SINONIMIE, SITATE, STAMME, SUBLEKSIKALE LEMMA, TEEN-STELLING, TEGNOSTAM, UITSPRAAK, VERKLARENDE WOORDEBOEK VAN AFRIKAANS, VOORBEELDMATERIAAL, WOORDVOORKEUR

Introduction

Arguments in metalexicographic literature (e.g. Gouws 1989, 1990, 1991, Rettig 1989, Stein 1985, Zgusta 1971) on the status of subword and multiword lexical items resulted in a more comprehensive lemmatic treatment of these lexical items, especially subword lexical items, in the latest editions of Afrikaans descriptive dictionaries, e.g. *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal* Volume IX (WAT), *Verklarende Handwoordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal* (HAT), *Nasionale Woordeboek* (NW), *Verklarende Afrikaanse Woordeboek* (VA), and *Basiswoordeboek van Afrikaans* (BA). Gouws (1991: 75) states: "To ensure a sound treatment of all these lexical items the *traditional word-based lexicography* should be replaced by a broader lexicon-based approach that offers a more comprehensive reflection of the lexicon by listing and treating multilexical and sublexical lemmas" (own italics). This article seeks to examine whether this broader lexicon-based approach in more recent Afrikaans descriptive dictionaries has indeed resulted in a more sound treatment of sublexical lemmas, or whether the macrostruc-

tural changes merely ascribed to them the same lemmatic status as that of lexi-
cal items, while still distinguishing between them on a microstructural level.

The types of information to be discussed follow the system of Hausmann
and Wiegand (1991: 343) for the specification of microstructural information in
monolingual descriptive dictionaries. It includes **synchronic identification**
dealing with the form of the lemma, e.g. pronunciation and lexical category,
diachronic identification that provides the etymology, **labelling, descriptive
information** such as the definiens, **syntagmatic information** that covers collo-
cations and examples, and **paradigmatic information** on the semantic relation-
ship between the lemma and other lexical items, e.g. synonymy, opposition,
homonymy and polysemy.

Dictionaries generally treat subword lexical items more satisfactorily than
multiword lexical lemmas, since in form subword lexical items resemble words
more closely than multiword lexical items. For example, some stems are used
both lexically and sublexically, the only difference being the hyphen attached to
the sublexical stem. This inevitably leads to a freer inclusion of subword lexical
items in the macrostructure, but does this necessarily mean the same micro-
structural treatment as that of lexical items?

In this paper the only distinction regarding sublexical lemmas will be the
distinction between affixes and stems. Stems here also include techno-stems.

1.   Affixes

According to Müller (1989: 876), suffixes in German dictionaries generally show
an inconsistent lemmatization. The same applies to Afrikaans dictionaries in
that suffixes are lemmatized even more inconsistently than prefixes. The reason
for the more frequent lemmatization of prefixes is that they are easier to alpha-
betize, and at first sight also appear more word-like than suffixes. In German
dictionaries lexicographic treatment of suffixes is less intensive than that of
prefixes. Müller adds that this is also true for French and English dictionaries.
This is not the case with Afrikaans dictionaries. When affixes are lemmatized,
the microstructural treatment of prefixes and suffixes is very similar. See **-in**[4]
and **in-**[5] in HAT:

> **-in**[4] Onproduktiewe agtervoegsel — tans in die baie gevalle ongebruiklik
> — waarmee vroulike persoons- en diername gevorm is van manlike per-
> soons- en diername, bv. in *Jodin, koningin, gemalin, vriendin, waardin,
> eselin, leeuin.*
>
> **in-**[5] Voorvoegsel vir 'n beperkte aantal b.nwe. en s.nwe. met verster-
> kende waarde, bv. in *ingoed, ingierig; ingat, inskottel, inkoejawel, inkokke-
> wiet.*

Consequently, no distinction will be made between prefixes and suffixes in the following discussion.

2.   Stems

Sublexical stems, especially techno-stems, are more consistently lemmatized than affixes, and in particular suffixes (see Carstens 1995: 148-149). This could be ascribed to two factors: stems resemble words more closely than affixes, and since many of the techno-stems are of Latin or Greek origin, they require elucidation. As a result of the closer resemblance between words and stems, one would expect that if discrepancies in the microstructural treatment of words and suffixes occur, the inconsistencies between that of words and stems would be less.

3.   Synchronic Identification

3.1   Pronunciation

Although it is sometimes provided inconsistently, pronunciation is one type of information seldom neglected in sublexical lemmas. WAT IX is the only descriptive dictionary to provide phonetic transcriptions, and all sublexical items are consistently transcribed. However, they consistently lack an indication of main stress. Compare the information for word lemmas and sublexical lemmas:

> **ligtekop** [ləx'təkɔp] vs **ligtekop-** [ləxtəkɔp]
> **-logie** [loxi / lugi] vs **logies** [lo:'xis]

Stress guidance is in fact required for sublexical **-logie**, since the main stress differs from that of **logies**.

   In HAT, where main stress and syllabic divisions are given for lexical lemmas, the same applies mostly to the sublexical items:

> **gal.va'no-, -i.seer' , i.o'ne-**

Carstens (1995: 151), however, identifies the following inconsistencies in HAT: for some techno-stems neither main stress nor syllabic division is given:

> **chiro-, filo-, fono-, hidro-, intro-, mega-, meta-, tele-,**

while for others no main stress is given, although the syllabic division still occurs:

> **e.lek.tro-, ga.mo-, he.te.ro-, ho.mo-, xe.no-**

In VA, where only the main stress is given, inconsistencies are also found: for **in'tra-, io'ne-, he'tero-** and **me'de-** stress is given, but not for **iso-** and **kouewa-ter-, kouwater-**.

In NW too, stress patterns for sublexical lemmas occur inconsistently, but the main difference between NW and the other dictionaries is that stress patterns are shown for the products of sublexical lemmas. This information is more valuable since the sublexical lemma as such is seldom pronounced:

> **il-, im-, in-:** *on-, nie.* Il'logies, imper'feksie, inakku'raat, ...
> **bio-:** *met betrekking to lewende organismes, tot wat lewe.* Bioche'mie, -'fisika, -morfolo'gie.
> **kuns-:** *kunsmatige, nagemaakte.* 'Kunsaas, -arm, ...

Unfortunately, some products in articles of the same lemma sometimes show stress patterns, while others do not:

> **in-:** ... Inadekwaat, -akkuraat, -ak'tief, -effek'tief, -essensi'eel, ...
> **by-:** 1. Bybaantjie, -figuur, -gebou, ... 2. ... 'Bygooi, -kry, -las, ... 3. (krieket) ... 'Byglip. Diep-, half-, reg-, vlakby.

In other articles no stress pattern is given for any product, while the sublexical lemma itself shows the main stress:

> **'anti-:** 1. ... anti-Christelik, anti-republikeins, ... anti-militarisme, ... 2. ... anti-kritiek, ...
> **'hetero-:** ... Heteroseksueel, -sentries.

These inconsistencies do not point to an underestimation of sublexical lemmas; they merely show lexicographic carelessness. The complete omission of information such as the indication of the main stress in WAT IX seems to reveal a more fundamental problem: sublexical lemmas are treated differently than lexical lemmas, which could indicate a negation of their lemma status.

3.2   Lexical Category

One of the most noticeable anomalies in the treatment of sublexical lemmas is the statement of the lexical category both with regard to the slot in which it occurs and the terms used for this classification. In every Afrikaans dictionary except BA, the lexical classification for all types of sublexical lemmas is presented as part of the definiens, while the lexical categories for lexical lemmas occur in a specific slot, namely directly after the lemma (HAT and VA), or after

the phonetic transcription of the lemma (WAT IX). BA is the only descriptive
Afrikaans dictionary to consistently categorize sublexical lemmas in the same
slot as lexical lemmas, namely directly after the lemma (henceforth the appro-
priate part in the various articles used as examples will be underlined):

> -toe *agtervoegsel.* **1 -toe** is 'n rigtingaanduidende agtervoegsel. ...
> **aand-** *eerste deel van samestelling.* **1** Wanneer **aand-** saam met 'n naam-
> woord gebruik word, het dit betrekking ...

Lexicographically, the first three sublexical lemmas in HAT are treated cor-
rectly, with the lexical category in a separate slot and not part of the following
definiens:

> **a-**[4] voorv. (*an-* voor vokale) Aanduiding van neutraliteit, houdingloos-
> heid, ...
> **-a**[5] agterv. Meestal by verkorte manlike persoonsname, ...
> **-aan**[2], ook **-iaan** agterv. **1** Aanduiding van herkoms indien aan 'n plek-
> naam gevoeg: ...

Forty-six pages later, the fourth sublexical lemma is found. For **ante-**, and the
rest of the sublexical lemmas in HAT, the unbiased treatment of these lemmas
is, strangely enough, replaced by the lexicographically less correct method of
including lexical categories in the definientia:

> **ante-** Voorv. met die bet. "voor" in posisie, ...
> **-ie**[2] Substantiefvormende agtervoegsel, afgelei van L. *-ium* en aandui-
> dende 'n geval van ...
> **ko'le-** Eerste lid van ss. met die bet. "steenkool" ...

As for WAT IX and VA, there is no justification for devaluating the semantic
status of the sublexical lemma by including grammatical and functional infor-
mation in its definiens. The definientia of sublexical lemmas should and could
be reserved mainly for semantic information. Compare:

> **-loos** ... Agterv. waarmee byv. afl. gevorm word, m.d. bet. "sonder" of "met
> 'n minimum van", ... (WAT)
> **-logie** ... **1** Slotkomponent van selfst. komposita m.d. bet. "leerstelling, teo-
> rie of wetenskap", ... (WAT)
> **laeweerstands-** ... Selde ook *laagweerstand-* en *laeweerstand-*. Aanvangs-
> komponent van selfst. komposita, wat aandui dat dit wat m.d. tweede
> komponent benoem word, 'n lae weerstand besit of bied, ... (WAT)
> **-isme.** Agtervoegsel om abstrakte begrippe te benoem ... (VA)
> **kouewater-, kouwater-.** Eerste deel van -ss, wat slaan op koue water.
> (VA)

> **kwasi-.** Asof, kamtig, kastig, <u>veral gebruik as voorvoegsel (woorddeel)</u> wat aan die grondwoord die betekeniswaarde gee van: ... (VA)

In considering the embedded lexical category of **kwasi-** (VA) in its definiens, Carstens (1994: 259) stresses that the user would be able to retrieve the correct grammatical information far more easily if only the lexicographer used the expected slot more consistently. However, VA treats its sublexical lemmas in more detail than it does its lexical lemmas, since no lexical categories are given for lexical lemmas, except when they are multifunctional.

In some instances the lexical categories of sublexical lemmas are completely omitted. No attempt is made to categorize sublexical lemmas in NW:

> **aan-:** 1. vorentoe, verder. ...
> **tuin-:** gekweekte. ...

In HAT, sometimes no lexical category is given:

> **bio-** Met betrekking tot wat lewe, ...
> **tus'sen-**[2] *Tussen* vorm talryke ss. waarvan slegs die vernaamste opgeneem word; die bet. kom gewoonlik ooreen met dié van die voorsetsel.

According to Stein (1985: 43), a well-argued theoretical distinction is needed between the different types of sublexical lemmas, e.g. prefixes, suffixes, technostems, and other bound stems (see also Gouws (1989: 85-96) for a classification of sublexical lemmas). Unfortunately, such a well-argued theoretical distinction does not exist in Afrikaans descriptive dictionaries. The most appropriately termed, with the least deviations, are the affixes. Interestingly enough, all the lexicographers, except those of BA, use the Germanic terminology **voorvoegsel** and **agtervoegsel** for the Latin-derived **prefix** and **suffix** respectively. This in itself creates problems in the distinction, since the Germanic terms are usually more vague than their counterparts of Latin origin. BA terms the lemma **-toe** (as in *agtertoe* and *huis toe*) an **agtervoegsel**, but it is not a **suffix**. Sometimes affixes are termed more descriptively, but this is usually the exception to the rule. See HAT for:

> **-ies**[2], ook **-etjies, -jies, -kies, -tjies** <u>Affektiewe verkleiningsuitgang</u> ... wat meestal voorkom by (a) adjektiewe en bywoorde waarin dit die betekenis het van ...

Further inconsistencies are found in the designation of more foreign sublexical items. Van Niekerk (1991: 289) shows the variety of terms used for technostems in the 1979[2] HAT. Nothing much has changed in the 1994 edition of HAT, since, according to Carstens (1995: 150-151), 38 of the 55 techno-stems used as initial components are described as **woordelement(e)** (word ele-

ment(s)), 5 are termed **voorvoegsel(s)** (prefix(es)), and 6 are described as **eerste lid van samestellings / woorde** (first part of compounds / words). This does not, however, occur in HAT alone. BA also terms **hiper-** and **super-** respectively as **prefiks** (prefix) and **eerste deel van samestelling** (first part of compound). The compilers of VA, in their turn, give two possible terms, leaving it to the user to choose the more appropriate one:

> **iso-:** Voorvoegsel (woorddeel) ... (prefix (word part))
> **kwasi-:** ... voorvoegsel (woorddeel) ... (prefix (word part))
> **kuif-:** ... voorvoegsel (woorddeel) ... (prefix (word part))

VA is one of the few dictionaries to term a sublexical stem **kuif-** a prefix. If inconsistencies are ignored, terms for the designation of sublexical stems are generally more descriptive.

> **kuns-²** Eerste lid van ss. met die bet. "nagemaak ...", bv. ... (HAT)
> **lede-** ... 4 Aanvangskomponent van komposita m.d. bet. "van 'n lid (lede)", bv. ... (WAT)
> **Knysna-.** Eerste deel (voorvoegsel) van samestellings wat die gebied of streek Knysna in die Suidoos-Kaap aandui, ... (VA)
> **aand-** *eerste deel van samestelling*. 1 Wanneer **aand-** saam met 'n naamwoord gebruik word, het dit ... (BA)

BA is the only dictionary to record the particles of particle verbs as sublexical lemmas, and to term them categorically correctly as particles:

> **aan-** *deeltjie*. 1 Wanneer **aan-** saam met 'n werkwoord optree, ...
> **in-** *deeltjie*. In- tree as deeltjie in baie werkwoorde op, ...
> **uit-** *deeltjie*. Uit- word as deeltjie gebruik in baie werkwoorde, bv. ...

The difficulties which Afrikaans lexicographers experience in finding first of all appropriate slots in articles for the lexical categories of the various sublexical lemmas, and secondly the correct metalinguistic expressions for consistent terming of the same type of sublexical lemma, could all be related to the unfortunate grammatical terminology of Afrikaans for the designation of lexical categories. The cardinal term in this terminology is **woord** (*word*) as in: **woordsoort** (*word class*), selfstandige naam**woord** (*noun*), voornaam**woord** (*pronoun*), werk**woord** (*verb*), by**woord** (*adverb*), byvoeglike naam**woord** (*adjective*), voeg**woord** (*conjunction*), and lid**woord** (*article*). According to Ponelis (1989: 53) there are, except for *adjektief* and *substantief*, no adequate alternative neutral terms derived from Latin in Afrikaans for the **woord**-constructions (see Ponelis (1989) for a full discussion on this). Since sublexical lemmas are not words in the true sense, their classification cannot fill the slot reserved for word-based

categorizations. The same applies to other lemmas which cannot immediately be categorized according to the pattern:

> is. Gesegdevorm van **wees** as selfstandige werkwoord, koppelwerkwoord en as hulpwerkwoord; ... (VA)

As was argued above, this might also be the reason for the difficulty in finding the correct terminology to describe sublexical lemmas. It varies from **first / second part / segment of compound, initial / final (word) element, initial / final component of compound,** to **word part / element.** Afrikaans grammarians, and subsequently lexicographers, find it difficult to create and establish new classificatory terms for lexical items smaller or larger than words unless **woord** forms part of the terms.

4.   Diachronic Identification

4.1   Etymology

Etymology is the type of microstructural information generally neglected in Afrikaans descriptive dictionaries. Obviously, it will be almost nonexistent in the articles of sublexical lemmas. No examples could be found in VA, BA and NW. In NW, the omission is more noticeable, since the lexical lemma **pro** has an etymological specification, while the sublexical **pre-**, for instance, does not:

> **pro** L. *vir*. ...
> **pre-:** *voor-*. ...

In WAT IX, some sublexical lemmas, e.g. those derived from names, have quite comprehensive etymological information and it actually occurs in the correct slot, separate from the definiens:

> **lilliput-** ... *(na Lilliput, denkbeeldige land in J. Swift se Gulliver's Travels, waarin alles, ook die inwoners, baie klein is)* ...

HAT frequently provides etymological information in the articles of sublexical lemmas. Most of the foreign techno-stems are provided with etymological information such as:

> **super-** ... *(L.)* Eerste lid van ss. met die bet. ...
> **bio-** Met betrekking tot wat lewe ... [G. *bios* lewe]
> **meta-** Woordelement met die bet. ... [G. *meta*].

In the above examples, the treatment is identical to that of lexical lemmas, i.e. with the etymological information separate from the actual definiens. Unfortunately these examples are less common: for most of these sublexical lemmas etymological references are incorporated in the definientia. Stein (1985: 40) criticizes this deficiency in the articles of sublexical lemmas, where etymological or diachronic criteria apply instead of the required synchronic criteria such as functional and semantic aspects.

> **ideo-** Woordelement afgelei van <u>G. *idea*</u> idee.
> **hiper-** Voorvoegsel uit <u>G. *huper*,</u> met die betekenis ...
> **hidro-** ... Woordelement afgelei van <u>G. *hudor* water</u>, vloeistof, vog.

It can be added in HAT's favour that the etymology is also given for those sublexical lemmas which the average user would not consider foreign:

> **-isme**[1] Taamlik produktiewe agtervoegsel ontleen aan <u>F.< G. *-ismos*,</u> en gebruik om benamings te vorm ...
> **-ier**[2], ook **-enier, -nier, -r** Agtervoegsel ontleen aan <u>F. *-ier* < L. *-arius*</u> met die betekenis ...
> **-ies**[1/] soms ook **-iek, -ities, -ties** Adjektief- en bywoordvormende agtervoegsel, afgelei van <u>F. *-ique* < L. *-icus*</u> met die betekenisse ...

HAT seems to be the only Afrikaans descriptive dictionary to recognize the important encoding function of etymological information, especially in sublexical lemmas (see also Van Niekerk 1991: 288). For example, the lexical **isme** does not have etymological information, but as can be seen above, the sublexical **-isme** has. The etymology enables the user to interpret unexplained lemmas or lexical items not included in the dictionary. The user can also create his or her own lexical items accurately and correctly if he or she knows the original meaning obtained from the etymology.

4.2   Labelling

According to Stein (1985: 39), restrictive usage labels are not applied as consistently in sublexical as in lexical lemmas. This is definitely the case in Afrikaans dictionaries. Where the user would expect a label, there is none, and where there are labels, their application is inconsistent and differs from that of lexical lemmas. Compare the following entries in HAT:

> **lui**[1] mv. *(w.g.; veroud.)* Mense: ...
> **-lui**[2] Agtervoegsel by 'n aantal s.nw. om die mv. aan te dui, ...

The sublexical **-lui** is nowadays used just as infrequently, and is therefore becoming equally archaic as the lexical **lui,** but only the latter is labelled. In WAT IX, however, **³-lui** is microstructurally correctly labelled:

> **³-lui** ... *(soms verhewe en verouderend, behalwe in 'n aantal gevestigde ss.)* Slot-komponent van selfst. komposita ...

Other WAT IX examples where the labelling of sublexical lemmas corresponds to that of lexical lemmas, are:

> **-liede** ... *(verhewe; verouderend, behalwe in 'n aantal gevestigde ss.; minder gebruiklik)* Slotkomponent van selfst. komposita ...
> **laeweerstand-** ... *(ongewoon)* Sien LAEWEERSTANDS- ...

In NW, the label for **by-** is also included in the slot reserved for labels in the articles of lexical lemmas:

> **by-:** ... 3. <u>(krieket)</u> een van verskillende posisies van veldwerkers aan ...
> **bybreekbal** <u>(krieket)</u> bal wat so geboul word dat dit ...

It has already been mentioned that etymological information is given for most of the foreign techno-stems in HAT. However, only a few are provided with labels to show in which scientific or technical field they are the most productive. Labelling would to an even greater degree enhance the encoding facility effected by the etymological information. When HAT does label sublexical lemmas, the method is as follows:

> **in-³ 1** *(w.g.)* Eerste lid van 'n aantal <u>weinig gebruiklike</u> samestellings ...
> **in-⁴** <u>Onproduktiewe agtervoegsel</u> — <u>tans in die baie gevalle ongebruiklik</u> — waarmee ...
> **-iet²** Agtervoegsel ontleen aan F. ... (c) <u>in die chemie</u> — 'n sout van 'n suur met minder as ...
> **by-³** ... 3 <u>In krieket,</u> posisie aan die rugkant van die kolwer; ...

Of these four examples, only the first is labelled in the same way as lexical lemmas. The others all have the restrictive usage indicated as part of the definiens. Even in the lexicographically correctly labelled example (in-³), the information of the label is repeated in the definiens.

5.   Descriptive Information

5.1   Definiens

According to Stein (1985: 39), "(a)ffix definitions ... are usually extremely brief and therefore often unsatisfactory". The definientia of affixes in Afrikaans dic-

tionaries are sometimes apparently quite erudite, but on closer inspection the semantic information is indeed extremely brief and in some instances even completely lacking. See **kwasi-** in VA:

> **kwasi-.** <u>Asof, kamtig, kastig,</u> veral gebruik as voorvoegsel (woorddeel) wat aan die grondwoord die betekeniswaarde gee van: <u>kamtig, soge-</u> <u>naamd, skynbaar,</u> ...

The semantically salient part in the definiens above, as well as in that of many affixes, consists only of a synonym or synonyms. Compare the definientia of **in-** in HAT, NW and VA:

> **in-²** ... met die betekenis (a) "<u>nie, on-, non</u>" ... (HAT)
> **in-:** gew. minder gewone wisselvorm van <u>on-</u> (kyk aldaar) in verskeie woorde. ... (NW)
> **in-⁵.** Voorvoegsel met die betekenis: *<u>nie, non, on-</u>* ... (VA)

on-, **il-** and **im-** are treated more or less in the same way regarding their semantic information. The only dictionary giving more explicit semantic information for affixes in this paradigm, is BA:

> **on-** ... Wanneer **on-** aan 'n adjektief gevoeg word, beteken dit "<u>nie soos die</u> <u>adjektief nie</u>", <u>byvoorbeeld iets wat onaangenaam is, is nie aangenaam</u> <u>nie.</u> ...

Even in the comprehensive WAT IX, the definientia for affixes consist mainly of synonyms:

> **-liks** ... **1** Agterv. van afgeleide bw., m.d. bet. "<u>elke</u>", waarby die stam gew. 'n temporele s.nw. is, ...
> **-logie** ... **1** Slotkomponent van selfst. komposita m.d. bet. "<u>leerstelling,</u> <u>teorie of wetenskap</u>", ...
> **-loos** ... Agterv. waarmee byv. afl. gevorm word, m.d. bet. "<u>sonder</u>" of "<u>met</u> <u>'n minimum van</u>", ...

Since affixes are extremely difficult to define in isolation, compilers often exclusively use synonym definientia for this purpose. Affixes only acquire semantic substance when attached to a stem, therefore many affixes are defined only in relation to their stems, e.g.

> **-lik** ... Agterv. waarmee talle b.nw. gevorm is, maar wat tans byna heel- temal onproduktief in Afr. is en waarby die afl. dikw. <u>'n besondere graad</u> <u>of toepassing v.d. stambetekenis uitdruk of bygekry het</u>, sodat die bet. v.d. afl. <u>nie sonder meer in terme v.d. bet. v.d. stam omskryf kan word</u>

<u>nie</u>. ... **1a** Agterv. waarmee b.nw. van oorganklike ww. gevorm is (word), m.d. bet. "<u>wat ge-(ww.) word of ge-(ww.) kan word, wat (ww.) word of (ww.) kan word, of wat (ww.) of kan (ww.)</u>", ...

With this in mind, HAT must be praised for its definientia of the following suffixes where more extensive semantic content of the suffix itself is found:

-aan² ook **-iaan** ... **1** <u>Aanduiding van herkoms</u> indien aan 'n pleknaam gevoeg: ... **2** <u>Aanduiding van 'n volgeling, aanhanger, e.d.</u> indien aan 'n persoonseienaam gevoeg: ...
-iet² Agtervoegsel ontleen aan F. ... en gebruik ter aanduiding van ... (c) ... <u>'n sout van 'n suur met minder as die normale suurstofatome</u>, ...

HAT should also be complimented on its definitions of *techno-stems*, where much more semantic information is given on the sublexical item:

bio- <u>Met betrekking tot wat lewe</u>, bv. biologie.
-skoop ... met die bet., "<u>middel, instrument om waar te neem of te toon</u>" ...

The techno-stem sublexical lemmas as such have more semantic content than affixes, and consequently more semantic value. Therefore, if the sublexical lemma resembles a lexical item more closely, its definiens will be semantically more extensive. The definientia of nonaffixal sublexical lemmas in the different dictionaries definitely show more variation. The dictionaries also show more inconsistencies in the definitions of the same type of sublexical lemma. For particles, NW sometimes provides synonyms in combination with more extensive definientia, whereas BA's definientia sometimes contain no semantic information at all:

in-: 1. *<u>na binne</u>*. ... 2. *<u>deur die oppervlakte na binne</u>*. ... 3. *<u>bereik, tot by iem. of iets kom</u>*. ... (NW)
uit-: 1. *<u>na buite (weg)</u>*. ... 2. *<u>(iets) weg na buite</u>*. ... 3. *<u>(iets) hard, luid, waarneembaar</u>*. ... 4 *<u>(iets) tot die end toe; tot die voltooiing; klaar</u>*. ... 5. *<u>weg, skoon</u>*. (NW)
in- ... In- tree as deeltjie in baie werkwoorde op bv. **inbreek**, ... **inbring**, ... (BA)
uit- ... Uit- word as deeltjie gebruik in baie werkwoorde, bv. **uitbly**, **uitkom**, ... (BA)

Compared to the definientia of **in-** and **uit-** in BA, the definiens of **oor-** provides detailed semantic, in addition to functional, information:

oor- ... 3 ... Wanneer **oor-** vooraan 'n werkwoord gevoeg word, beteken dit die <u>werkwoord veroorsaak beweging van die een kant na die ander kant</u>

verby of bo-oor iets anders. ... 4   Wanneer **oor-** vooraan 'n werkwoord gevoeg word, beteken dit <u>die werkwoord moet weer gedoen word. Om iets byvoorbeeld oor te doen, beteken om dit weer te doen</u>. ...

The semantic information in the definientia of sublexical stems is better in most Afrikaans descriptive dictionaries:

hand-: *<u>wat met die hand gebruik, gedra, gedryf of gehou word</u>*. ... (NW)

Knysna-. Eerste deel (voorvoegsel) van samestellings <u>wat die gebied of streek Knysna in die Suidoos-Kaap aandui,</u> bv. ... (VA)

kuns-[2] Eerste lid van ss. met die bet. "<u>nagemaak, nie deur die natuur gemaak nie</u>", bv. ... (HAT)

laevolume- ... Aanvangskomponent van selfst. komposita, wat aandui dat <u>dit wat m.d. tweede komponent benoem word, in klein, beperkte hoeveelhede gemaak word of voorkom</u>; ... (WAT)

linker- ... **Linker-** verwys na <u>die kant of rigting wat ooreenstem met daardie kant van 'n mens se liggaam waar die hart sit</u>. ... (BA)

Unfortunately the definiens for **regter-** in BA is not semantically as explicit as the one for **linker-**. This is easily observed, since these two lemmas are cross-indexed.

regter- ... **Regter-** word gebruik voor naamwoorde wat aan die regterkant van iets is. ...

In WAT IX, for instance, circular definitions are used for some sublexical lemmas. The sublexical lemma is defined with reference to the lexical item:

lede- ... **1a** Aanvangskomponent van komposita waarin *lede-* <u>in bet. parallel is aan *lede*</u> ('LEDE), bv. ...

This is possible only if the user has access to the definiens of the lexical item. For **lede-** this is lexicographically sound, but for **laeweerstands-** this can be confusing, since **lae weerstand** is not referred to the section for specialized expressions of [2]**laag,** where it is defined:

laeweerstands- ... Aanvangskomponent van selfst. komposita, wat aandui dat dit wat m.d. tweede komponent benoem word, <u>'n lae weerstand besit of bied, of vir of van 'n lae weerstand is</u>. ...

Stein (1985: 39) also misses information on collocation restrictions in the definientia of affixes. Collocation restrictions are found in two Afrikaans dictionaries, namely BA and WAT IX, but then only with sublexical stems:

> **aand-** ... 2 **Aand-** beteken vir 'n besonder deftige geleentheid wat gewoon-
> lik in die aand plaasvind. <u>Dit word veral ten opsigte van kleredrag
> gebruik;</u> ... (BA)
>
> **laat-** ... I **1 a** ... Aanvangskomponent van selfst. komposita wat 'n laat of
> latere stadium van 'n <u>geologiese tydperk, 'n tydperk i.d. kultuur- of
> kunsgeskiedenis,</u> e.d. aandui; ... (WAT)

Collocation specifications should be common lexicographic practice, not only
for lexical items, but particularly for all types of sublexical lemmas. This will
provide the user with specific encoding instructions regarding the type of stems
with which a specific sublexical lemma can be combined.

 If lexicographers consistently and adequately define sublexical lemmas,
they would perhaps not feel the need to fill the definiens with nonsemantic
baggage such as grammatical and etymological information.

6.   Syntagmatic Information

6.1   Collocations and Examples

The absence of contextual guidance in the form of either collocations or exam-
ple sentences is one of the greatest lexicographic shortcomings in the articles of
sublexical lemmas, affixal and others. Syntagmatic information takes the form
of lists of one-word citations illustrating formation potentialities of the sublexi-
cal lemmas as initial or final components. According to Rettig (1989: 645), this
is "Information zur Wortbildungslehre" rather than actual syntagmatic informa-
tion. The word-generating processes of sublexical lemmas should be fully re-
corded, since the formation product as such is the environment within which
the full value of the sublexical lemma is realized. The formation product, how-
ever, is not used in isolation. It should be placed in a broader context in order
to demonstrate and complement all the other microstructural information
within the article of the sublexical lemma, e.g. labels, definientia, etc. This
would also lead to greater cohesion within the article.

 BA is the only Afrikaans dictionary to not only record, but also illustrate
word formations by means of collocations or example sentences:

> **on-** *prefiks.* Wanneer **on-** aan 'n adjektief gevoeg word, beteken dit "nie
> soos die adjektief nie" ... **onaangenaam, onaktief, onbeleef(d), ondraag-
> lik,** ... <u>*Sy is 'n uiters onbeleefde persoon, want sy groet niemand nie, en sê vir
> niks dankie of asseblief nie. Laas somer was die hitte soms so ondraaglik dat 'n
> mens net in die swembad kon sit en niks doen nie.*</u> ...
>
> **aand-** ... 1 Wanneer **aand-** saam met 'n naamwoord gebruik word, het dit
> betrekking op iets wat in die aand gebeur. **aanddiens, aandete, aand-
> klas, aandkoerant, aandlug.** <u>*Aandete is van sesuur af beskikbaar. Die aand-
> klasse word nie juis getrou deur die studente bygewoon nie.*</u>

> **regter-** ... **Regter-** word gebruik voor naamwoorde wat aan die regterkant van iets is. **regterarm, regterduim, regterhand, regteroor, regterstuur,** ... *Die karre in Suid-Afrika het almal regterstuur teenoor dié in Europa wat linkerstuur het. Haar regterknie het kwaai opgeswel van die harde stamp.* ...

However, BA is inconsistent, and treats **linker-** in the same way the other dictionaries treat their sublexical lemmas:

> **linker-**   ... **Linker-** verwys na die kant of rigting wat ooreenstem met daardie kant van 'n mens se liggaam waar die hart sit. **linkerarm, linkerbaan, linkerhand, linkerkant, linkervleuel.** ... (BA)
>
> **ont-:** 1. *verwyder.* Ontbas, -been, -blaar, -bos, -jaar, -horing, ... 2. *losmaak.* Ontkoppel, -bind. ... (NW)
>
> **pro-.** Voorvoegsel met die betekenis: ten gunste van, partydig vir, ... bv. ~-Afrikaans, ~-Boer, ~-Duits, ~-Engels. (VA)
>
> **lede-** ... 4   Aanvangskomponent van komposita m.d. bet. "van 'n lid (lede)", bv. *ledemosie, lederegister, ledevoorstel;* **ledebelange** s.nw., **ledefonds** snw., **ledekorps** s.nw. ... (WAT)

In HAT, only one example is given to illustrate the syntagmatic behaviour of the sublexical **bio-**, raising doubts (valid or not) whether **bio-** should ever have been recorded as sublexical lemma:

> **bio-** Met betrekking tot wat lewe, bv. in *biologie.* [G. *bios* lewe]

HAT gives no examples in some other cases, e.g. for **mega-, meta-, -gram**[1] and **-gram**[2]. This lack of examples is also present in VA for **hidro-, hipo-,** and **mega-**.

7.   Paradigmatic Information

7.1   Synonymy

According to Müller (1989: 880), the articles of sublexical lemmas could also include synonyms and semantic oppositions. Since all Afrikaans descriptive dictionaries supply these lexical relations for lexical lemmas, there is no reason why they should be omitted in the articles of sublexical lemmas. Naturally the synonym or antonym for sublexical lemmas need not be sublexical as well, since sublemmas could have lexical or multilexical items as synonyms or oppositions.

Synonyms are frequently used as definientia for sublexical lemmas (see paragraph 5 on descriptive information). In addition to other semantic information in the definientia of sublexical lemmas, synonyms are only found in BA

and WAT IX. In BA, a synonym occurs in the article of **aand-**. In WAT IX, synonyms are found in the articles of **linker-**, **links-**, and **laevet-** in the same slot as that for the lexical lemmas. Usage labels are sometimes given for the synonym in WAT IX, which points to good lexicographical practice.

> **aand-** ... **2** **Aand-** beteken vir 'n besondere deftige geleentheid ...; <u>formeel</u>. **aandklere, aanddrag, aandpak, aandrok.** (BA)
>
> **linker-** ... **1a** Aanvangskomponent van selfst. komposita wat aandui ...; <u>gew. sin. met</u> *linkerkantse* en soms <u>met</u> *hot*-; teenoor *regter*-; bv. *linkerbladsy, linkerbors,* ...
> **b i** Aanvangskomponent van selfst. komposita wat aandui ...; <u>soms sin. met</u> *linkerhand- (*<u>wsk. n.d. Eng.)</u>; teenoor *regter*-; bv. ... (WAT)
>
> **laevet-** ... Aanvangskomponent van selfst. komposita, wat aandui ...; <u>sin.</u> *vetarm*; bv. **laevetdieet** s.nw. ... (WAT)

Lexicographically, WAT IX handles the synonymy of this paradigm very well in that cross-references to e.g. **linker-** are made in the articles of **linkerkantse** and **linkerhand-**. Even **hot-** in WAT IV refers to **links-** in volume IX. Unfortunately there is no reference to **aand-** in the article of **formeel** in BA.

7.2   Opposition

The lexical relation of opposition is provided in most of the Afrikaans descriptive dictionaries, but rather infrequently for sublexical lemmas. One of the biggest shortcomings here is inconsistency, not only regarding the frequency or the slot used, but also, in most cases, regarding the incomplete cross-referencing of the two opposing terms.

Most of the dictionaries except HAT and VA provide the opposite terms for **linker- / links-** and **regter- / regs-**. NW, however, gives the opposite term for **regter-** very explicitly (the opposition relation to **linker-** is used as the definiens), but at **linker-** the opposite term is absent, making it impossible for the user who refers to **linker-** first, to find its opposition:

> **regter-:** <u>teenoorgestelde van linker</u>. Regterarm, -hand, -oog, -voet.
> **linker-:** aan die kant van die liggaam waar die hart is. Linkeragterbeen, -arm, -been, -hou, ...

The same incomplete lexicographical treatment is found in the article of the cricket term **by-**, where **weg-** is indicated as opposition, but for **weg-** no opposition (or label) is given:

> **by-:** ... **3.** (krieket) *een van verskillende posisies van veldwerkers* ...; <u>teenoor</u> <u>weg</u>-. Byglip. Diep-, half-, reg-, vlakby. (NW)
> **weg-:** **4.** *aan die regterkant van 'n regse kolwer*. Wegkant, -paaltjie. (NW)

BA certainly treats **linker-** and **regter-** well regarding opposition, but its treatment of particles shows inconsistencies: for two polysemous distinctions of **onder-**, oppositions are provided. However, for the first one **oor-**, there is no cross-reference in its article to its opposition **onder-**, and for the second one **bo-**, no sublexical lemma is recorded at all.

> **onder-** ... **1.** Wanneer **onder-** vooraan 'n woord staan, ... **ondergewig,** **onderproduksie; onderbelig,** ... *Die dorp is reeds onderbevolk,* ... <u>Teenoor:</u> <u>oor-.</u> ... **3.** Wanneer **onder-** vooraan 'n naamwoord voorkom, beteken dit die laer deel. ... **onderdeur, onderkant, onderlip, onderlyf, ondertande.** ... *Sy het 'n kort onderlyfie met 'n lang bolyf.* <u>Teenoor: **bo-.**</u>
>
> **oor-** ... **1.** Wanneer **oor-** vooraan 'n woord gevoeg word, ... **oorbekend,** **oorbelas,** ... **oorbevolk, oorbewei,** ... *Groot gedeeltes van ons plase is oorbe-* *wei,* ... **2.** Wanneer **oor-** vooraan ...

WAT IX provides quite a few sublexical lemmas with opposition terms, using the same slot as that used for lexical lemmas:

> **laat-** ... **I 1 a** Selde ook los geskryf v.d. daaropvolgende s.nw. Aanvangs-komponent van selfst. komposita wat 'n laat ... ; <u>teenoor *vroeg-* of *vroeë*</u>; bv. **Laat-Barok** s.nw. ...
>
> **laevolume-** ... **1** Aanvangskomponent van selfst. komposita, wat aandui dat dit wat m.d. tweede ...; <u>teenoor *hoëvolume-*</u>; bv. laevolumekomponent s.nw., ...

Inconsistencies are found here as well, since sublexical lemmas on the same page as **laevolume-**, such as **laeweerstand-, laevesel-, laevet-** and **laevlak-** do not have their opposites indicated. The only inconsistency regarding the use of the slot of the opposing term in the articles of sublexical lemmas, compared to that of lexical lemmas, occurs in HAT. In the article for **anti-**, it is incorporated as part of the usage information. Incidentally, **anti-** is the only sublexical lemma found in HAT for which an opposition term is recorded.

> **anti-** Voorv. voor b.nw. en s.nw. met die betekenis "teen", bv. *antikerklik,* *anti-Russies:* .... *antibakteries,* ... Dikwels ook gebruik <u>(teenoor *pro-*)</u> by geleentheidsvorminge, bv. *antialles, antirook,* ...

7.3   Polysemy and Homonymy

Sublexical lemmas are not treated differently from lexical lemmas regarding the indication of polysemous or homonymous relations, either macrostructurally or microstructurally. In WAT IX, HAT and BA, they are treated in detail and comprehensively: polysemous varieties and homonymy are indicated. The

way in which these indications are done, is not always lexicographically equally sound. WAT IX records three separate homonyms for the sublexical -lui, as well as three homonyms for the lexical lui (see Feinauer (1996)). In HAT, however, sublexical -lui is indicated as part of the homonymic paradigm of lexical lui. HAT consistently records sublexical and lexical lemmas incorrectly as homonyms: they cannot be classified as homonyms since the hyphen of the sublexical lemma shows it to be different in form from the lexical lemma.

Stein (1985: 40) mentions that in the case of affixes, the etymological principle often overrides functional and semantic aspects. This leads to the indiscriminate grouping of affixes of the same form. What should synchronically be listed as homonyms are still treated as various polysemous senses on the grounds of diachronic semantic resemblances. WAT IX and HAT, e.g., both record -logie as a polysemous sublexical lemma, whereas their various meanings have drifted so far apart that they should have been recorded as homonyms:

> -logie ... 1 Slotkomponent van selfst. komposita m.d. bet. "leerstelling, teorie of wetenskap", bv. *antropologie, biologie, ekologie, ...*
> 2 Slotkomponent van selfst. komposita m.d. bet. "woord, rede, spraak of gesprek", bv. *doksologie, tetralogie, toutologie, trilogie.* (WAT)
> -logie ... Woordelement met die bet. (a) aard, handeling of afdeling van kennis, bv. in *sosiolgie, teologie*; (b) verhandeling, gesprek, bv. in *trilogie.* (HAT)

This treatment of homonymy in Afrikaans descriptive dictionaries, however, is not unique to sublexical lemmas, but has been criticised often with regard to lexical lemmas as well.

Conclusion

If all these inconsistencies are taken into consideration, it can safely be said that in all Afrikaans dictionaries, sublexical lemmas are still treated with less care than lexical lemmas. The word-bias against sublexical lemmas is unfortunately still alive in Afrikaans lexicography, admittedly less so in some dictionaries. This conclusion is based on the microstructural representation of these lemmas, particularly with regard to all the nonsemantic information included in their definientia and the microstructural information excluded from their articles. Sublexical lemmas are therefore not treated equally, since they are still being distinguished from lexical lemmas on a microstructural level. The wish of Müller (1989: 879) for the future treatment of sublexical lemmas in German dictionaries is equally applicable to Afrikaans dictionaries: "... für die Zukunft einen stärkeren, konsequenten und methodologisch-systematisierten Ausbau der bisherigen Ansätze und intensive Bemühungen um die Kodifizierung der

Wortbildung sowohl als Resultat wie auch als Prozeß ...".   If this could be effected in Afrikaans dictionaries, no more articles of sublexical lemmas will hopefully be found that convey hardly any information such as **tussen-** in HAT:

> **tus'sen-**[2] *Tussen* vorm talryke ss. waarvan slegs die vernaamste opgeneem word: die bet. kom gewoonlik ooreen met dié van die voorsetsel.

References

Botha, T.J.R. (Ed.). 1989. *Leksikografie en leksikologie.* Pretoria: Serva.

Carstens, A. 1994. *Verklarende Afrikaanse Woordeboek*[4] as spieël van normverplasing. *Lexikos* 4: 249-281.

Carstens, A. 1995. 'n Kritiese beskouing van *HAT*[3]. *Lexikos* 5: 138-165.

De Villiers, M., J. Smuts, L.C. Eksteen and R.H. Gouws. 1987[7]. *Nasionale Woordeboek.* Cape Town: Nasou.

Feinauer, I. 1996. Die negende deel van die *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal. Lexikos* 6: 233-271.

Gouws, R., I. Feinauer and F. Ponelis. 1994. *Basiswoordeboek van Afrikaans.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

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

Gouws, R.H. 1990. Vaste uitdrukkings as multileksikale lemmas in verklarende Afrikaanse woordeboeke. *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe* 30(4): 265-283.

Gouws, R.H. 1991. Toward a Lexicon-based Lexicography. *Dictionaries* 13: 75-90.

Hausmann, F.J. and H.E. Wiegand. 1991. Component Parts and Structures of General Monolingual Dictionaries: A Survey. Hausmann, F.J., O. Reichmann, H.E. Wiegand and L. Zgusta (Eds.). 1989-1991: 328-360.

Hausmann, F.J., O. Reichmann, H.E. Wiegand and L. Zgusta (Eds.). 1989-1991. *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Ilson, R. (Ed.). 1985. *Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Labuschagne, F.J. and L.C. Eksteen. 1993[8]. *Verklarende Afrikaanse Woordeboek.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Müller, W. 1989. Theorie der einsprachigen Lexikographie II: Beschreibungsprobleme. Hausmann, F.J., O. Reichmann, H.E. Wiegand and L. Zgusta (Eds.). 1989-1991: 869-882.

Odendal, F.F., P.C. Schoonees, C.J. Swanepoel, S.J. du Toit and C.M. Booysen. 1994. *Verklarende Handwoordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal.* Midrand: Perskor.

Ponelis, F.A. 1989. Leksikale elemente. Botha, T.J.R. (Ed.). 1989: 48-54.

Rettig, W. 1989. Die Wortbildungzusammenhänge im allgemeinen einsprachigen Wörterbuch. Hausmann, F.J., O. Reichmann, H.E. Wiegand and L. Zgusta (Eds.). 1989-1991: 642-649.

Stein, G. 1985. Word-formation in Modern English Dictionaries. Ilson, R. (Ed.). 1985: 35-44.

Van Niekerk, A.E. 1991. Neo-klassieke en pseudo-sintaktiese komposita. *Lexikos* 1: 281-297.

Van Schalkwyk, D.J. (Ed.-in-chief) 1994. *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal, Negende Deel.* Stellenbosch: Bureau of the WAT.

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