

**THE APPLICATION OF REVERSIBILITY PRINCIPLE IN NORTHERN
SOTHO-ENGLISH BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES: A LEXICOGRAPHIC
ANALYSIS**

By

MOTHIBA T.I.



MINI-DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

TRANSLATION STUDIES AND LINGUISTICS

in the

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

(SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES AND COMMUNICATION STUDIES)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO

SUPERVISOR: PROF R.N MAᄒADZHE

CO-SUPERVISOR: Ms M.J. MOTHIBA

2012

(i)

DECLARATION

I, **TEBOGO INNOCENT MOTHIBA**, declare that the “**THE APPLICATION OF REVERSIBILITY PRINCIPLE IN NORTHERN SOTHO-ENGLISH BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES: A LEXICOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS**” (mini-dissertation) hereby submitted to the University of Limpopo, for the degree of Master of Arts in Translation Studies and Linguistics, has not been submitted by me for a degree at this or any other university; that it is my work in design and execution, and that all material contained herein has been duly acknowledged.

.....

Mothiba T.I (Ms)

.....

Date

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the following important people in my life:

1. My husband : KhanghelaMathebula
2. My mother : Rebecca Mothiba
3. My mother in-law : MphephuMathebula
4. My daughter : TumeloMathebula
5. My brothers : Fannie, Lesiba and Joel Mothiba
6. My sister : MelidahMothiba
7. My friends : OumaSepuru, Charity Makgoale and NtangedzeniNgwana

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere acknowledgments go to the following people:

- My supervisor, Prof R.N Mağadzhe, thank you very much for taking time in your tight schedule to assist and point me in the right direction. You believed in me and told me that I can do it.
- My co-supervisor, Ms M.J Mothiba, a person like you is hard to find. The support you gave me throughout this project will never be forgotten.
- My mother, sister and brothers, I know today that family is the real pillar of strength. Your support and encouragement made me have more faith even when things were tough. My little sister, thank you for the time you took to submit and collect my documents when I was not around.
- My in-laws, I am very thankful and feel lucky to have found a supporting family. My mother-in-law, a special thank you for the role you played throughout my studies.
- My daughter, my little angel, I did this to make a mark for you. Let this be an encouragement and challenge for you to achieve more than I did.
- My husband, the whole work is done because of you. Your passion, love, support, confidence and advice gave me strength to push till the end.
- My friends, thank you very much for the role you played in this project. I feel blessed to have friends like you.

(iv)

- My classmate Ms M.A.Letsoalo, you are a true fellow student one can find. We walked through this journey together till the end. Keep being a good person.

To all the people mentioned above, I say, thank you very much. May the almighty God bless you all. My most dedication goes to the One above us all, He is the One who knew before I did that I will get this far. THANK YOU LORD.

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on aspects that form part of the reasons of not having complete bidirectional bilingual dictionaries and to find solutions to those problems. The following dictionaries have been evaluated in this study: *Oxford Pukuntšu ya Sekolo School Dictionary* (2010), *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2007 & 2009) and *Sesotho sa Leboa/English Pukuntšu Dictionary* (2006). Most African bilingual dictionaries which are supposed to be bidirectional are not because reversibility is not applied thoroughly. This study focuses on checking how Northern Sotho-English bilingual dictionaries apply the reversibility principle. When evaluating bilingual dictionaries it comes to light that there are a lot of errors that lexicographers commit and these errors negatively affect the process of compiling complete user-friendly bidirectional dictionaries. Having user-friendly bidirectional bilingual dictionaries is very important because dictionaries help different language speakers to learn each other's language.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Declaration	i
Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii

CHAPTER ONE: OVERALL INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.2	BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY.....	1
1.3	AIM OF THE STUDY	4
1.3.1	Research questions	4
1.4	OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	4
1.5	METHODOLOGY	5
1.5.1	Collection of Data	5
1.5.1.1	Primary research method	5
1.5.1.2	Secondary research method	5

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	INTRODUCTION	7
2.2	GOUWS AND PRINSLOO (2005)	7
2.2.1	A brief historical perspective of lexicography	7
2.2.2	Bilingual dictionaries	8
2.3	MPHAHLELE (2001)	10
2.3.1	Principle: A balanced.1 The Reversibility lexicographic function	11
2.4	MONGWE (2006)	11
2.4.1	Bilingual dictionaries	11
2.4.2	The frame structure of bilingual dictionaries	12
2.5	LANDAU (2001)	15
2.6	JACKSON (2002)	15
2.6.1	Bilingual Beginnings	15
2.6.2	Dictionaries, not ‘the dictionary’	16
2.6.3	What is in a dictionary?	16
2.7	GOUWS (1986)	18
2.7.1	Bilingual dictionaries	18
2.8	PIOTROWSKI (1994)	18
2.8.1	Functions of bilingual dictionaries	18
2.8.2	Directionality and skill-specificity	19
2.8.3	The user aspect in bilingual lexicography	19
2.9	JONG and PENG (2007)	20
2.9.1	Previous studies in bilingual lexicography: a brief survey	20
2.9.2	The present study	20
2.9.3	Bidirectionality and reversibility	20

	Page
2.9.3 Structural description	21
2.10 TOMASZCZYK (1988)	23
2.10.1 Equivalents	23
2.10.2 Directionality and reversibility	23
2.11 CORREARD (2006)	23
2.12 MASHAMAITE (2001)	25
2.12.1 The hub-and-spoke model	26
2.13 CON CLUSION	27
 CHAPTER THREE: STRUCTURAL MARKERS	
3.1 INTRODUCTION	28
3.2 BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES	28
3.2.1 From bilingual dictionaries to a dictionary of synonyms	29
3.3 PRESENTATION OF TRANSLATION EQUIVALENTS	30
3.4 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN LEMMAS AND TRANSLATION EQUIVALENTS	34
3.5 TYPES OF EQUIVALENTS	35
3.5.1 Synonym translation equivalents	36
3.5.2 Polysemous translation equivalents	42
3.6 DIVERGENCE	44
3.6.1 Lexical divergence	44
3.6.2 Semantic divergence	45
3.6.3 Homogenous divergence	46
3.6.4 Heterogeneous divergence	47
3.7 COMMAS AND SEMICOLONS AS STRUCTURAL MARKERS IN BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES	47
3.8 CONCLUSION	51

	Page
CHAPTER FOUR: EQUIVALENCE	
4.1 INTRODUCTION	52
4.2 WHAT IS EQUIVALENCE?	52
4.3 PROBLEMS IN BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES	55
4.3.1 Zero-equivalence	59
4.3.2 Culture and language	62
4.4 CULTURE AND BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES	58
4.5 TREATMENT OF CULTURE-BOUND WORDS IN BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES	63
4.5.1 Strategies commonly used in monodirectional dictionaries	66
4.5.2 Surrogate equivalents	68
4.5.3 Borrowed words	73
4.6 CONCLUSION	75
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
5.1 INTRODUCTION	76
5.2 SUMMARY.....	76
5.3 FINDINGS	77
5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS	78
5.5 CONCLUSION	79
REFERENCES.....	80

CHAPTER ONE

OVERALL INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 INTRODUCTION

During the process of compiling a bilingual dictionary, different strategies are used to compile user-friendly dictionaries. Some of the strategies used in the process are, namely: using a definition and examples in the case of zero-equivalence; the use of commas and semi-colons to separate synonyms and polysemous sense; and using the Reversibility Principle to make sure that the equivalences are correct. This research focuses only on the Reversibility Principle in the Northern Sotho-English bilingual dictionaries.

1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

This research focuses on the Reversibility Principle which is found in bidirectional bilingual dictionaries. The principle allows dictionary users of both languages (the first or second languages) to be sure that the equivalent they are searching for is correct or not. A dictionary article must enable a user to understand equivalents and make it easy for the user to test the translation equivalents by translating them to the original source language (Mphahlele, 2001).

According to Jackson (2002), a dictionary “is a reference book about words. People consult dictionaries to find out information about words. It is assumed that compilers of dictionaries lexicographers include information that they know or expect people will want to look up”. According to de Schryver, Reversibility Principle “is a condition whereby all lexical items presented as lemma signs or translation equivalents in the X-Y section of a dictionary are respectively translation equivalents and lemma signs in the Y-X section of the dictionary”.

The Reversibility Principle is found in a compulsory list of a bilingual dictionary that is called the central list. According to Benjoint (2004), a bilingual dictionary uses two languages, viz., one as the object of description and the other as the instrument of description. The central list is the most salient component of a dictionary displaying a frame structure (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005). The comparing of the equivalent happens in two different structures of a dictionary. In the first section, the headword is a term found in the macrostructure while in the second section the equivalent is found in the microstructure of a dictionary. Macrostructures are the selection of lexical items to be included in the dictionary as lemma signs (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005) whereas microstructure is the selection of data categories given as part of the treatment of the lemma signs (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005).

The problem is that not all Northern Sotho-English bidirectional dictionaries follow the Reversibility Principle and even the dictionaries that follow this principle do not have all their articles using the principle. The examples below, which have been extracted from the *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2007), illustrate this point:

English-Northern Sotho

- (1) a. **jingle-** *lla, tsirinya, tsikirimanya* (2007:254)
- b. **sprig-** *lehlogedi, thupana, lehlare, motšilo* (2007:309)
- c. **vile-** *mpe, bolotšana* (2007:328)

The example below was extracted from *Oxford: Pukuntšu ya Sekolo School Dictionary* (2010) to support this point:

English-Northern Sotho

- (2) a. **charge-** *lefiša, tefo* (2010:295)

As it is evident, the lexical items: *lla*; *lehlogedi*; *mpe* and *tefo* are used as one of the translation equivalents in four articles. This means that, if the Reversibility Principle is applied correctly, one should find the terms **jingle**; **sprig** and **vile** as one of the equivalents of the mentioned terms.

The same dictionaries give the following explanation:

Northern Sotho- English

(3) a. *lla*- cry, weep, yelp, howl, whine (2007:78)

b. *lehlogedi*- sprout, shoot, sucker (2007:71)

c. *mpe*: bad, wicked (2007:113)

(4) a. *tefo*- salary, pay; price (2010:221)

The articles given above do not follow the Reversibility Principle as none of the lexical items used as lemmas in the first section appear as translation equivalents in the second section. As a result, these articles will not allow the dictionary user to use both languages in a communicatively functional way. But, on the other hand, in the same dictionary (*Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary*), there are some articles that do follow the Reversibility Principle in their two sections.

English-Northern Sotho

(5) a. kiss- *katlo*, *atla* (2007:255)

b. impudence- *mereba*, *kgang* (2007:247)

c. bladder- *senye*, *sebudula* (2007:194)

Northern Sotho-English

(6) a. *atla*-kiss, make prosperous, ~ *na* kiss each other (2007:5)

b. *mereba*- insolence, impudence, cheek (2007:92)

c. *senye*-bladder (2007:147)

From this brief discussion, it is clear that the Reversibility Principle poses a challenge to dictionary compilers. It is therefore necessary to conduct a study on this issue so that one can suggest ways and means of resolving the problem.

1.3 AIM OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study is to examine how the Reversibility Principle is used in the Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries. There are some questions that were asked to achieve the aim:

1.3.1 Research questions

- How has reversibility been applied in the Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries?
- What are the advantages of reversibility?
- What are the disadvantages of reversibility?
- What should the user do if there is no reversibility in the dictionary that she/he is using?
- Which ways are used to check if there is reversibility in a bilingual dictionary?

1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study are as follows:

- 1.4.1 To find out how reversibility has been applied in Northern Sotho-English bilingual dictionaries;
- 1.4.2 To determine the advantages of reversibility;
- 1.4.3 To determine the disadvantages of reversibility;
- 1.4.4 To explore the steps that the user should utilize to mitigate against the lack of reversibility in the dictionary; and

1.4.5 To identify ways that can be employed to check if there is reversibility in a bilingual dictionary.

1.5 METHODOLOGY

The descriptive method was used in this proposed study. This method is relevant in that it assisted the researcher to find out how the Reversibility Principle has been applied in Northern Sotho-English bilingual dictionaries.

1.6.1 COLLECTION OF DATA

1.6.1.1 Primary research method

The following people were interviewed due to the fact that they use the Northern Sotho-English bilingual dictionaries on a regular basis:

- Five university students who registered Northern Sotho and another five who have registered Translation and Linguistics Studies;
- Lecturers of both the fields above; and
- Five language practitioners and lexicographers.

1.6.1.2 Secondary research method

- Relevant books from the library, dissertations, articles and the Internet were used as secondary method to support this study.
- Existing Northern Sotho bilingual dictionaries were also utilised.

1.7 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The findings of this study will be of a great importance because it will show that the Reversibility Principle is crucial in bilingual dictionaries in terms of providing the correct meaning. This will encourage the production of more bilingual dictionaries in

order to achieve multilingualism. It will also be used as a source for other researchers of lexicography.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In order to understand the importance of reversibility in bilingual dictionaries, one should first know and understand what reversibility is and how it makes bidirectional dictionaries different from ordinary bilingual dictionaries. Works of other scholars who conducted the study on the similar theme are reviewed in this chapter.

2.2 GOUWS AND PRINSLOO (2005)

2.2.1 A brief historical perspective of lexicography

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) are of the view that, even in this modern age, dictionaries are still seen as important tools and their users view them as correct sources of knowledge. Although dictionaries were not invented in the 21st century, they are still viewed as household products that play their role as practical sources as they always did. Presently, lexicography has twofold natures, which are the theoretical and practical components. The theoretical component focuses only on research (the form, contents and function) whereas the practical component focuses only on the actual compilation of a dictionary.

Originally, lexicography focused only on the actual compilation of dictionaries. One of the old features of dictionaries is their function to enable users to overcome real problems. An example of the tradition of lexicography as a practical tool is dictionaries compiled on clay tablets by the Assyrians to assist children in understanding Sumerian writings. This practical component of lexicography only developed well during the second half of the twentieth century just before the theoretical component was introduced. The first major publication that developed

theoretical lexicography was the book: *Manual of Lexicography* written by Zgusta in 1971.

2.2.2 Bilingual dictionaries

a. Sub-typological diversity

The primary function of bilingual dictionaries is to give the target language equivalents for source language headwords. Although bilingual dictionaries are most commonly used lexicographic sources in multilingual societies, they do not resolve all the lexicographic problems. A variety of organizations and institutions in South Africa that deal with lexicography issues, such as the Department of Arts and Culture and the Pan South African Language Board, could set a very good example in terms of planning and compiling bilingual dictionaries. The advantage of a good bilingual dictionary is that it provides information on both the source and target languages. This assists the user to learn another language.

b. Poly-functional dictionaries

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) indicate that some theoreticians in the dictionary field believe that at least four or even eight bilingual dictionaries should be compiled to meet the expectations of the users from both languages that are treated. One author (i.e., Wiegand) suggests that there should be different functions in one dictionary. A poly-functional dictionary must follow some structural norms, it should be poly-accessible and should have a well-devised microstructure. A poly-functional dictionary is a dictionary that has more than one function, for example, a bidirectional dictionary.

Another theoretician (viz., Haussmann), referred to by Gouws and Prinsloo, has a view that a typical bilingual dictionary will not be seen as functional by speakers of both languages that are treated in the dictionary. This is because every user is influenced

by the way his mother-tongue is positioned in terms of the source versus the target language status.

There is a distinction of dictionaries of different types: mono-scopal/biscopal, mono-directional/bidirectional, mono-functional/bi-functional. Bidirectional dictionaries are biscopal dictionaries because they are bi-functional. A bi-scopal dictionary uses this method: Biscopal= A>B and B>A. The examples below were extracted from *Sesotho sa Leboa/English Pukuntšu Dictionary* (2006):

Sesotho sa Leboa-English

- (1) a. *fapana* v- differ; clash; go opposite directions (2006:20)
- b. *gosasa* n- tomorrow; in future (2006:24)
- c. *hlahuna* v- chew (2006:25)
- d. *kolobe* n- pig (2006:37)
- e. *maitshwaro* n- behavior; conduct; character (2006:52)

English-Sesotho sa Leboa

- (2) a. **differ** adv- *fapafapana; fapana* (2006:141)
- b. **tomorrow** adv- *bosasa; gosasa; kamoswane; kamoso* (2006:197)
- c. **chew** v- *hlahuna; hlosa* (2006:132)
- d. **pig** n- *kolobe; otši* (2006:178)
- e. **behavior** n- *maitshwaro; boitshwaro* (2006:127)

As it is evident from the examples in (1-2) above, this method indicates that a biscopal dictionary has two sections. One section with language A as the source language and language B as the target language, whereas in the second section language B is the source language and language A as the target language, while a mono-scopal dictionary has one language as the source another as the target language throughout the dictionary.

2.3 MPHAHLELE (2001)

Mphahlele's view is that different types of dictionaries are compiled focusing solely on the needs of their target users because a single dictionary cannot serve all the requirements of the users. Every dictionary user can choose to use any dictionary, sometimes even more than one. So dictionary compilers are obliged to compile dictionaries that are user friendly. Only bidirectional dictionaries can be used by the speakers of the two languages in the dictionary because it treats the languages equally, this makes these dictionaries to be bifunctional. A user-friendly bidirectional dictionary must enable the user to understand the translation equivalents and be able to translate the same translation equivalents back to their source language.

The primary duty of lexicographers compiling a bidirectional dictionary is to make sure that they apply reversibility correctly. This means that all lexical items used as translation equivalents should be used as headwords in one section and headwords as translations equivalents in the other section. The main aim of reversibility is to allow the user to be confident about the semantic resemblance that happens between the two languages featured in the dictionary.

Mphahlele (2001) says that this principle enables the user of a translation dictionary do the retesting in terms of the meaning of the lemma. For example, if a lemma in the Northern Sotho-English has a translation equivalent **employee**, the same lexical item **employee** must be used as a lemma in the English-Northern Sotho section. The translation equivalent for the lemma **employee** should have the same case and be used as a lemma in the Northern Sotho section of the same dictionary. The examples below, extracted from *Oxford Pukuntšu ya Sekolo/School Dictionary* (2010), illustrate this point:

Northern Sotho-English

- (3) a. *mošomedil/mošomêdil noun (pl.bašomedi)- employee; worker*
(2010:158)

English-Northern Sotho

- (4) a. **employee noun(pl. employees)-** *mošomedi; mošomi; modiredi*
(2010:339)

2.3.1 Principle: A balanced.1 The Reversibility lexicographic function

Since bidirectional dictionaries treat their two languages equally, it makes them to have a balanced macro-structural presentation. The balanced lexicographic macrostructural presentation enables a bidirectional dictionary to be used as a primary source by speakers of both languages. Mphahlele further gives an example that “in a Northern Sotho-English/English-Northern Sotho bi-directional dictionary, the native speakers of either Northern Sotho will primarily use the dictionary”.

2.4 MONGWE (2006)

2.4.1 Bilingual dictionaries

According to Mongwe (2006), South Africa, as a multilingual country, needs bilingual dictionaries, especially bidirectional learner’s dictionaries, so that speakers of those languages can learn each other’s language. He says it is high time that the African population be encouraged to regard lexicography as a field of study because in a multilingual society like ours, the use of bilingual dictionaries forms an integral part of the daily communication process. This is because there is a shortage of well-trained African lexicographers.

Mongwe (2006) observes that the South African lexicographic practice has also been dominated by a few dictionaries and dictionary types, especially bilingual dictionaries. Dictionaries are of social importance because they are the source of information that is regularly consulted by users to solve their uncertainties about certain lemmata. They are essential for efficient and active communication between different cultural groups and speech communities and, they can be viewed as agents of unifying South Africans and other countries regardless of their geographical areas.

Mongwe (2006) has also commented on the relevance of bidirectional dictionaries in South Africa. In bidirectional dictionaries, there are two alphabetically-ordered textual components with each member of the language pair, functioning as source language in one component and target language in the other component. Bidirectional dictionaries are in demand in the South African market as they are able to cater for the needs of both the speech communities and those interested in learning the diversity of languages of the country. This will promote the dream of multilingualism in South Africa.

2.4.2 The frame structure of bilingual dictionaries

According to Mongwe (2006), a frame structure of bilingual dictionaries similar to monolingual dictionaries has three main components which are: the front matter, central list and back matter.

a. Front matter

This component is found in the beginning of most dictionaries, though some compilers may decide to omit this component which is important as it assists the user as a guide on how to use the dictionary. The front matter also has its components which are:

- **Table of contents**

It contains a list of titles and page numbers of all the information that is included in the dictionary. This will assist the user to go to know specifically which page to find information.

- **Foreword**

According to Mongwe, it is a short introductory essay preceding the text of a book.

- **Acknowledgement**

Mongwe says in this area the compiler acknowledges the good work done by consulted people.

- **Users' guidelines**

According to Mongwe, this section ensures the successful use of a dictionary since it gives usage information which guides the users in finding information. The information given in this section should be explained very clearly to the user.

- b. Central list**

Mongwe illustrates that the central list is the most major component of any dictionary and it assists the user depending on the main function of the kind of dictionary that is used. This component consists of articles which are called the main information that the user looks for when a dictionary is consulted. In a monolingual dictionary, the central list gives the explanations of terms in the same language while in a bilingual dictionary translation equivalents of lemmas are given in the target language. In terms

of a bidirectional dictionary the main testing of reversibility takes place in this component as it has two sections. It is divided into two components: the macrostructure and microstructure.

- **Macrostructure**

According to Mongwe, this section consists of lemmata that are always written in bold and are in the source language in a bilingual dictionary. The lemmata that are arranged in alphabetical letters are not written in capital letters in the beginning except for proper names. The main role of a macrostructure is to contain the lemmata. The following examples taken from *Sesotho sa Leboa Pukuntšu Dictionary* (2006) show the macrostructure of a bilingual dictionary:

Sesotho sa Leboa-English

- (5) a. *babja* v- sick; ill; mad (2006:3)
- b. *dipaki* n- witnesses (2006:15)
- c. *hlabolla* v- develop; promote (2006:25)

- **Microstructure**

The microstructure of a bilingual dictionary consists of translation equivalents paradigms, which include translation equivalent and examples. It is found on the right-hand side of each article. Mongwe adds that the translation equivalents and its context belong to the comment on semantics. The examples below taken from the similar dictionary as above show the microstructure of a bilingual dictionary:

English-Sesotho sa Leboa

- (6) a. **attract** v- *bitša*; kgahla; *gogela*; tanyašedi (2006:125)
- b. **crime** n- *bosenyi*; *bonokwane* (2006:137)
- c. **entrance** n- *kgoro*; *botseno*; *lesoro* (2006:145)

2.5 LANDAU (2001)

According to Landau (2001), a dictionary is a text that describes the meaning of words and it illustrates how they are used in a context, and usually indicates how they are pronounced. Dictionaries are distinguished by three categories, namely: range, perspective and presentation. Range focuses on the size and scope, perspective is based on how the compiler views the work and the approach to be taken and presentation on how material of a given perspective is presented.

Landau (2001) adds that bilingual dictionaries do fall in all the categories because they have two languages and are arranged in an alphabetic way. Bilingual dictionaries have a purpose of providing the user who understands one language to be able to express himself/herself in the other language that sometimes can be called a foreign language. A bidirectional dictionary can really be deemed to consist of two dictionaries because it has two sections that handle the two languages in different directions.

2.6 JACKSON (2002)

2.6.1 Bilingual Beginnings

Jackson's view is that bilingual dictionaries started when English priests had to learn Latin to be able to conduct services, read the Bible and other theological texts. This was because the Roman church was using Latin as their medium language. During their study, English monks would write the English translation above (or below) a Latin word. This method was used to help them in their learning process and to guide other subsequent readers.

Another scholar (Hullen) referred to by Jackson says, this one word translations are called 'interlinear glosses' and they are seen as the starting point of bilingual lexicography. In due course, these glosses were collected to form a separate manuscript that was regarded as a prototype dictionary which was used to help in the

teaching and learning of Latin. Jackson adds that “One of the best known topical glossaries was compiled by Aelfric, who was the Abbot of the monastery at Eynsham near Oxford, during the first decade of the eleventh century”.

2.6.2 Dictionaries, not ‘the dictionary’

According to Jackson (2002), bilingual dictionaries have the larger pedigree when compared with monolingual dictionaries, even though some parts of them have similar information. Monolingual and bilingual dictionaries differ in terms of their function, the number of sections and the number of languages. The other difference is that monolingual dictionaries give the explanations of their headwords while bilingual dictionaries give translation equivalents in the other language. He also adds that “All dictionaries present a selection from contemporary vocabulary. They vary according to size (desk-size, pocket, etc.) and the intended audience or user group (age group, second language or foreign language).

2.6.3 What is in a dictionary?

According to Jackson, a dictionary has three basic parts: the front matter, the body and the appendices. The front matter usually contains an introduction or preface, giving explanation of the innovations of the concerned edition and also guiding the user on how to use the dictionary. Even though the front matter is important some dictionaries do not contain it, for example, the *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary*.

The appendices most of the times contain abbreviations, foreign words, maps and other that may even be non-lexical. The body of dictionary has two main structures that are written in an alphabetic manner, namely: the macrostructure and the microstructure. The macrostructure consists of headwords which are written in bold and are on the left-hand side of a dictionary. The microstructure consists of various other entries including the translation equivalents, for example, spelling, pronunciation, examples and others.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the comparing of the two sections of a bidirectional dictionary takes place in two different structures of a dictionary. The translation equivalents, which are found in the microstructure in the first section of the dictionary, must be used as headwords that are found in the macrostructure in the second section of the same dictionary, and the same thing should apply to the headwords. The examples below, taken from *Oxford Pukuntšú ya Sekolo School Dictionary (2010)*, validate this point:

Northern Sotho- English

- (7) a. *bjala* noun (pl *mabjala*)- beer; alcohol (2010:16)
 b. *hlaola* verb- select; distinguish (2010:67)
 c. *nengad* verb- when (2010:166)
 d. *popo/popô*/ noun (pl *dipopo*)- formation; structure (2010:188)
 e. *morwa* noun (pl *barwa*)- son (2010:156)

As it is evident from the examples in (7) above, the three lexical items **beer; select; when; formation and son** are found in the microstructure of the Northern Sotho-English section, they should be found in the macrostructure in the English-Northern Sotho section. The same dictionary gives the following explanation:

English- Northern Sotho

- (8) a. **beer** noun (pl beers)- *bjala; bjalwa; madila* (2010:276)
 b. **select** verb (**select, selecting, selected**)- *hlaola* (2010:484)
 c. **when** adverb, conjunction- *ge; neng; erilege; erile* (2010:544)
 d. **formation** noun (pl **formations**)- *popo* (2010:358)
 e. **son** noun (pl **sons**)- *morwa*(2010:495)

The articles above do follow the reversibility principle as the comparing can take place in the structures of the two sections of a dictionary.

2.7 GOUWS (1986)

2.7.1 Bilingual dictionaries

Another theoretician Al-Kasimi says “dictionaries have developed not as theoretical instruments but as practical tools. And each culture fosters the development of dictionaries appropriate to its characteristic demands”. Gouws says that in South Africa bilingual dictionaries can be divided into two main types: monodirectional and bidirectional. Monodirectional dictionaries only serve the speakers of the source language. They cannot be speakers of both the languages in the dictionary because it goes only to one direction.

Al-Kasimi continues to be referred to by Gouws with the view that every lexicographer must decide on the users of the dictionary as this will help determine the manner in which he/she will compile the dictionary. The Reversibility Principle is utilized in bilingual dictionaries in order for one dictionary to be used by both speakers because there was a time when translation equivalents were not used as lemmas in the second section of a dictionary. Gouws says that “The application of the Reversibility Principle has significance where there is no direct equivalent for a lemma. The correct application reversibility is one of the reasons the South African lexicography is given attention”.

2.8 PIOTROWSKI (1994)

2.8.1 Functions of bilingual dictionaries

According to Piotrowski (1994), bilingual dictionaries have many functions because they are used for many tasks and by different groups of users depending on the need, for example, learners, translators and others. A typical user of a bilingual dictionary maybe someone who is bilingual but does not have enough knowledge on some things of the two languages in his/her command (e.g., a translator), and needs this knowledge

to achieve a communication, or an individual who desires to learn another language in order to communicate with the speakers of that language. It can also be used by someone who just desires to be bilingual or someone to communicate on the level of comprehension. If the three cases are generalized, one can simply say bilingual dictionaries are used to achieve communication between people who speak different languages.

2.8.2 Directionality and skill-specificity

Piotrowski's (1994) view is that "directionality is related to the need of the speaker of a particular language". Monodirectional dictionaries are intended for the speakers of one language whereas bidirectional dictionaries are intended for the speakers of both languages that are featured in the dictionary. For example, a Northern Sotho-English bidirectional is intended for the native speakers of both Northern Sotho and English.

According to Piotrowski (1994), skill-specificity "is related to the use of a bilingual dictionary in a particular skill". These skills were traditionally divided into two, which are: receptive (passive) skills which involve all the details of a piece of discourse and productive (active) skills which involve the generation of a piece of discourse. Even though they are treated together, these skills are independent.

2.8.3 The user aspect in bilingual lexicography

The user is valued as important in bilingual lexicography because the conventions of a dictionary are interpreted by the user. Piotrowski illustrates that "[a] highly skilled dictionary user can extract quite a lot of information even from primitive and inadequate dictionaries". To make a dictionary more user friendly, the compiler should know who users are and for what purpose will they be using the dictionary.

2.9 JONG and PENG (2007)

2.9.1 Previous studies in bilingual lexicography: a brief survey

Jong and Peng (2007) say even though the systematic study of bilingual dictionaries only started in the nineteenth century in the Western world, their fragmentary research started earlier. During this century, bilingual lexicography research focused mainly on English and Latin because Latin was regarded as the most prestige language in the European languages. A much earlier research on this field was done by Albert Way, who studied the earliest known English-Latin dictionary ‘*Promptorium Parvulorum*’ in 1843.

2.9.2 The present study

According to Jong and Peng (2007), present study of bilingual lexicography attempts to form a triangular model of communication and views it as a strategy of intercultural communication between the compiler and the dictionary users. Communicative frameworks for lexicography are set on the basis of researching on the nature of the dictionary, followed by relative study of monolingual and bilingual dictionaries focusing on the lexicographic choice. Practical analysis of modern linguistics is made in order to find out the influence it will have on the development of bilingual lexicography.

2.9.3 Bidirectionality and reversibility

Jong and Peng (2007) are of the view that even though the idea of “double dictionary” also called bidirectional dictionary was more recognized in the seventeenth century it was first expressed in “*Ad Lectorem*” which was appended to *Promptorium Parvulorum, Sive Clericorum*. Bidirectionality and reversibility comes into focus during the comparison of structural aspects of monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. Monolingual dictionaries generally serve the needs of the native speakers and deal

only with the lexicon of only that language, while bilingual dictionaries serve the needs of either one of the two languages or both languages it contains.

According to Jong and Peng (2007), a bilingual dictionary is monodirectional if it consists of only one part which is from the source to the target language, and it is bidirectional if it consists of two parts in which the first part has L1 as the source and L2 as target language and part two has L2 as the source and L1 as the target language. When everything that is presented as translation equivalence in the first part of a bidirectional dictionary is presented as lemmas in the second part, then it is called reversibility.

2.9.3 Structural description

According to Jong and Peng (2007), the dictionary can be described as “a system of communication between the compiler and the user”. Bilingual dictionaries are compiled to bridge the gap between those whose language and culture are different, even though sometimes related to a certain extent. The types of communication intended may differ but the lexicographic message transmitted from the compiler to the dictionary user is introduced to the information item is expected to be found. This requires dictionaries to have an introductory part to be present before the body to guide the user on how to use the dictionary, and more optionally more information could be added at end of the dictionary.

The general megastructures of the dictionary both monolingual and bilingual somehow follow the same structural method. The dictionary is usually composed of three parts: front matter (the beginning), the dictionary text (the main body) and the back matter (the end). The main difference of a monolingual and a bilingual dictionary takes places in the dictionary text. The scheme below will show the differences in the structures of a monolingual and bilingual dictionary:

**Northern Sotho Monolingual
Dictionary**

Front matter

Dictionary text: Northern Sotho-Northern-
Sotho

Back matter

**Northern Sotho Bilingual
Dictionary**

Front matter

Dictionary text: Northern Sotho-
English

Back matter

When bi-directionality and reversibility, which are unique structural features found only in bilingual dictionaries, are taken into consideration the differences in megastructure become essential. Supposing the Northern Sotho bilingual dictionary is bidirectional, this means it consists not only of the Northern Sotho-English part, but also the English-Northern Sotho part, then the structural difference of the dictionary text would appear as follows:

**Northern Sotho Monolingual Dictionary Northern Sotho Bilingual
Dictionary**

Front matter

Front matter

Dictionary text: Northern Sotho-English Dictionary text: Northern Sotho-English

English-Northern Sotho

Back matter

Back matter

Peng and Yong (2007) are of the view that a megastructural configuration of a bidirectional bilingual dictionary has four levels: Before the dictionary (front matter), after the dictionary (back matter), inside the dictionary text (macrostructure and microstructure) and beyond the dictionary text. Other types of dictionaries have only three levels.

2.10 TOMASZCZYK (1988)

2.10.1 Equivalents

According to Tomaszczyk (1988), the main task of bilingual dictionaries is to give equivalents in L2 of L1 headword in the L1-L2 part and equivalent in L1 of L2 headwords in the L2-L1 part. Tomaszczyk adds that “[t]he equivalents to should be of an insertable kind, that is, capable of being used in actual sentences preferably monolexicmic”. These equivalents should be selected carefully meaning that only the closest possible must be used instead of cross-linguistic synonyms.

2.10.2 Directionality and reversibility

Tomaszczyk (1988) is of the view that a dictionary with two languages is monodirectional if it serves the needs of only the native speakers of one of the two languages, is bidirectional if it serves the needs of the speaker of both languages treated in the dictionary. The L1-L2 part of a bidirectional dictionary will be used as a reading dictionary (for decoding) for the native speakers of L2 and be used as a writing dictionary (for encoding) by the native speakers of L1.

This will be vice versa in the L2-L1 part. This dictionary will be following the reversibility principle if there is an equal lexicographic treatment of the two languages. This means that everything appearing on the right-hand side of the L1-L2 part must reappear on the left-hand side of the L2-L1 as far as the structure of the two lexicons allows.

2.11 CORREARD (2006)

According to Correard (2006), a bilingual dictionary is “a dictionary that presents the lexicon and phraseology of one language called the source language and translates these components into a second language called the target language”. This dictionary

can be arranged in two ways it can either be alphabetical or thematic. A bilingual dictionary is a practical tool that invariably consists of a single volume which is most often divided into two parts. In the two parts, the source language of the first part becomes the target language of the second part and vice versa, this is called reversibility.

The main aim of a bilingual dictionary is to cater for the needs of the source and target language speakers which are not identical. This is said because the native speakers of the source language are trying to write or speak the target language while native speakers of the target language are trying to understand the source language. The target users who are decoding expect the translation equivalents to enable to construct meaningful paraphrases.

Correard (2006) is of the view that bidirectional dictionaries are called large bilingual dictionaries because they serve both the source and the target native speakers with their conflicting interest. However, the presence of two sections does not make a dictionary bidirectional. This means that a bilingual dictionary that has two sections (L1-L2 and L2-L1) but does not follow the Reversibility Principle cannot be acknowledged as a bidirectional dictionary. The following articles were extracted from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2009) to validate this point:

Northern Sotho-English

- (9) a. *mmapale*- good (2009:94)
- b. *letši*- forest, wood (2009:78)
- c. *kgotla*- court (2009:60)
- d. *thalabanya*- cycle, travel (2009:158)
- e. *monô*- finger, digit (2009:106)

According to Correard (2006), the above mentioned bilingual dictionary will be recognized as a bidirectional dictionary only if the lemmas *mmapale*; *letši*; *kgotla*; *thalabanya* and *monô* appear as one of the translation equivalents in the English-

Northern Sotho section. The articles below were taken from the same dictionary to support the point:

English-Northern Sotho

- (10) a. **good-** *loka, botse, lokile (go)* (2009:238)
- b. **forest-** *sethokgwa, sekgwa* (2009:233)
- c. **court-** *lekgotla, khôtô, v, loša, ferea, bêka*; ~ **case** *tshekô*; ~ **room** *kgôrô* (2009:210)
- d. **cycle-** *leboyô, sedikô, nthekelele* (2009:212)
- e. **finger-** *monwana*; ~ **nail** *lenala* (2009:231)

Examining the articles above, in Correard's view, it can be concluded that the *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2009) cannot be called a bidirectional dictionary because it does not reverse its articles though it has two sections.

2.12 MASHAMAITE(2001)

Mashamaite (2001) recognizes Smit who says bilingual dictionaries between South African languages has been there for more than three centuries. Only bidirectional dictionaries started using African languages as source language contrary to the tradition of having English and Afrikaans as source languages in ordinary bilingual dictionaries. Examples of bidirectional dictionaries that use an African language as a source language are *Sesotho sa Leboa Pukuntšu Dictionary* and *Oxford Pukuntšu ya Sekolo School Dictionary* amongst others.

However, even presently, there are no existing bilingual dictionaries between African languages due to shortage of trained African lexicographers. However, the Pan South African Language Board and African Association for Lexicography are trying to overcome this problem. Because South Africa is a multilingual country more bilingual dictionaries, especially bidirectional learners' dictionaries need to be compiled to assist the speakers to learn each other's language. In South Africa, one of the main

functions of bilingual dictionaries is to assist speakers of different languages to learn each other's language in order to achieve multilingualism.

Mashamaite (2001) adds that bilingual dictionaries can be described as “dictionaries in which lexical items of native language are given translation equivalents in a foreign language”. These dictionaries have different purposes depending more on the communicative needs of the target users than the amount of information that the compiler gives.

Another scholar (viz., Mdee, 1997) argues that “bilingual dictionaries have two functions, the first being that of comprehension, that is, reading and listening, and the second that of production, which means writing and speaking”. Mashamaite (2001) adds the third function which is translation. A bilingual dictionary becomes bidirectional dictionary only if it is useful to the speakers of both languages. This dictionary can be used for encoding, decoding or any other functions also for translation.

2.12.1 The hub-and-spoke model

This model was introduced by Martin and Mashamaite (1995) with the purpose of the parameter to ensure that reversibility is applied in translation dictionaries. In these dictionaries, compilers must provide the meaning in terms of translation equivalents rather than just providing word equivalents. This point is supported by Martin who says “it is not words translated into other words, but rather words in specific meaning”.

Martins use the terms *form unit* which refers to a word form and *lexical unit* which refers to word-specific meaning in his argument. A compiler cannot give a translation equivalent of a form unit due to the fact that a form unit has more than one meaning, but only equivalents of lexical units can be given in the target language.

2.13 CONCLUSION

Even though the scholars have ways and use different terms to discuss the reversibility principle and how it makes bidirectional dictionaries different to other types of dictionaries, they all come to a similar point that this principle is very important and useful in a multilingual society. They have a similar idea that the reversibility principle is a tool that makes bidirectional dictionaries to serve two languages at the same time. This is because it enables speakers of different languages to use one dictionary which will encourage people to learn others languages.

CHAPTER THREE

STRUCTURAL MARKERS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In a bilingual dictionary, there are many aspects that work together to make a complete user friendly dictionary. The aspect of the correct application of structural makers is also important in terms of helping the user to choose the correct translation equivalent depending on the situation of a particular context. This chapter discusses the aspect of structural markers and how it affects the reversibility principle if not applied correctly.

According to Mphahlele (2001:2), structural markers “are features or makers that ensure communicative equivalence between the source and the target language”. The markers are used to separate synonyms and polysemous senses in bilingual dictionaries. Synonymy and polysemy will be discussed to understand the main reason of separating them with different structural markers. This chapter examines how the use of structural markers in bilingual dictionaries can affect reversibility.

3.2 BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES

When the users consult the bilingual dictionaries, they want to find target language items for a certain source language form and they also want to find guides on how and where to use items they find. Mongwe (2006:62) acknowledges Hendricks who writes that “bilingual dictionaries can bridge the gap between communities which in the end can empower and educate the new generation, and enable us to appreciate languages and cultures of others in our country”. This means that compilers of bilingual dictionaries must make sure that the dictionaries are user-friendly because they play a very important in uniting people of different communities in terms of both language and culture.

According to Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:151), bilingual dictionaries are regarded as one of the typological categories that are most regularly used by the average member of a speech community. This is truly happening in multilingual societies. Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:151) add that “in general monolingual and bilingual dictionaries the article structure is one of the typical features shared by both these dictionary types. The lemma sign functions as guiding element and main treatment unit of the article and all the data entries in the article have been positioned in either the comment on form or the comment on semantics”.

This means that both dictionaries are similar because they have the same structure of articles that have two features, namely, the macrostructure and the microstructure. In these articles, the headwords that are the main guiding features to the users are regarded as the main features because without them there would not be any need to have the equivalents, meaning that there would not be any article.

One of the main differences between the monolingual and bilingual dictionaries is that the treatment of headwords is more detailed in monolingual dictionaries than in bilingual dictionaries. This means that it is easier to see if the microstructure contains polysemous senses or synonyms in monolingual dictionaries because more than just one paraphrase is given. When consulting a bilingual dictionary, a user has the assumption that the equivalents given are the meaning of headwords in the target language. This obliges lexicographers to make sure that equivalents are presented in the correct manner.

3.2.1 From bilingual dictionaries to a dictionary of synonyms

Bogaards (1994:613) writes that “Al (1983) has convincingly argued in favour of a distinction between two types of bilingual dictionaries, one from the mother tongue into the foreign language and one the other way round. This distinction, which is also known as the Scerba concept, leads to different structures of articles in the productive dictionary (‘dictionnaire de thème’) and in the receptive dictionary (‘dictionnaire de

version')". The treatment of these dictionaries is different in the treatment of articles because the dictionary of synonyms must separate the equivalents clearly to assist the users in terms of choosing the correct one depending on the context.

According to Bogaards (1994:613), there are three reasons why the dictionary of synonyms has to give as much translation equivalents as possible, namely:

- The receptive dictionary should give as complete an image as possible of the semantic riches of foreign element. This is done because a single translation does not suffice to do that job.
- The receptive dictionary is mostly meant as an aid to translation. It should list as many acceptable translations as possible so that the user can choose from as large a set of mother tongue as possible the one element that best fits the context.
- Synonyms are attractive and effective means to disambiguate translation equivalents in the mother tongue.

If all the synonyms in the bilingual dictionaries are treated correctly, then users will be able to consult dictionaries without any doubt of finding inconsistencies. It will also enable dictionary users to see if translation equivalents are incorrect. Dictionaries of synonyms are used to improve both the productive and the receptive bilingual dictionaries.

3.3 PRESENTATION OF TRANSLATION EQUIVALENTS

According to Hosana (2009:54), translation dictionaries have two types of translation equivalents, that is: synonym translation equivalents and polysemous translation equivalents. Synonym translation equivalents are translation equivalents that have the same meaning to each other and can replace each other in any context. This means that

the equivalents are semantically related. Polysemous translation equivalents are equivalents that are nearly related to each other and cannot replace each other in any context.

The synonym and polysemous translation equivalents that are found in the translation equivalent paradigm are usually separated by commas and semicolons. The dictionary compilers (lexicographers) should not choose the commas and semicolons haphazardly in order to ensure communicative equivalence. The articles below were extracted from the *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2007) to see where the compilers of this dictionary use structural makers correctly:

Northern Sotho-English

- (1) a. *semelô*- character, nature, instinct (2007:146)
- b. *hlakantše*- mixed, united, added to (2007:40)
- c. *gomaretše*- stuck, pasted (2007:38)
- d. *ditlakala*- leaves, rubbish (2007:27)

The structural makers in the translation equivalents paradigm above in (1) are not separated correctly because they are all separated by means of commas while they are not synonyms. Commas can only be used if the translation equivalents are synonyms. In article (1a), the translation equivalents **character**, **nature** and **instinct** are separated by commas but they are not synonyms. This means that one cannot replace **character** with **instinct** without affecting the meaning of a particular sentence.

The article in (1b) also has the same mistake as the translation equivalents are separated by commas while they are not synonyms. The sentences below support this view:

- (2) a. *They were **mixed** during their campaign of fighting against crime.
- b. They were **united** during their campaign of fighting against crime.

- c. *They were **added to** during their campaign of fighting against crime.

This means that each of these translation equivalents has its own meaning and they cannot therefore be separated by a comma. In example (1c), the translation equivalent **stuck** cannot replace **pasted** in any context because they are not synonyms. If the user replaces one with the other then she or he will lose the meaning of the context completely. The same thing applies to example (1d) where **leaves** and **rubbish** are separated by a comma. This means that the users will not reach a communicative equivalent since they can assume that the equivalents are synonyms because of the separation.

The correct separation of these translation equivalents of the above articles should be as follows:

Northern Sotho- English

- (3) a. *semelô*- character; nature; instinct
b. *lekase*- coffin; box
c. *kgôrôtô*- champion; leader
d. *hlakantše*-mixed; united; added to
e. *gomaretše*- stuck; pasted
f. *ditlakala*- leaves; rubbish

Even though the headwords given above are single with two related translation equivalents, they also have two different meanings. This means that each headword has different meanings in Northern Sotho. The difference is shown below, where *lekase* and *hlakantše* appear:

- (4) a. (i) *O bolokilwe ka **lekase** la go bitša mašelang a godimo.*
He was buried in an expensive **coffin**.
(ii) *O šomišitše **lekase** go ntšha phahla ya gagwe.*
She used a **box** to carry her belongings.

- b. (i) *Ba **hlakantše** mehlobohlobo ya batho kopanong ya maabane.*
There were **mixed** races at their meeting yesterday.
- (ii) *Morena Mandela o **hlakantše** setšhaba sa Afrika-Borwa.*
Mr Mandela **united** the South African society.
- (iii) *O **hlakantše** mašelang ao a filwego gore a kgone go tšea leeto la gagwe.*
He **added** some more money to be able to take the trip

The sentences above in (3a) both have the word *lekase*. Even though the two are spelt and pronounced the same, each has a different meaning. The first *lekase* refers to the **coffin** whereas the second one (*lekase*) refers to a **box**. The same situation applies to sentences in (3b). The first *hlakantše* refers to **mixed**, second (*hlakantše*) refers to **united** and the third *hlakantše* refers to **addedto**.

If the translation equivalents paradigm were separated in this manner, then dictionary users would be aware that the translation equivalents are polysemous senses and that they cannot replace each other at any context. Hosanna (2009:55) adds that:

[A]consistent use of commas and semicolons as structural makers in the translation dictionary ensures communicative equivalence because a user will be able to know whether a particular paradigm consists of synonyms because in that paradigm commas will have been used in the separation of translation equivalents.

This means that if structural makers are used correctly, the user will carefully choose a translation equivalent by checking the context first and the makers used to separate the equivalents of that lemma.

Hosana (2009:55) says that structural makers are important because they indicate a certain semantic relation and also ensure an easy and clear transfer of meaning in the translation equivalents paradigm. However, the dictionary compilers should not just apply these structural makers in bilingual dictionaries and assume that users know their functions. There must be a way of assisting the users on how to choose the correct equivalent because if they are not assisted, the transfer of semantic information will be impeded. To help users to be aware of the use of structural makers, the dictionary compilers of every bilingual dictionary should state very clearly in the front matter that translation equivalents that represent polysemous senses will be separated by means of semicolons (;) and synonyms by a comma (,).

This method of using structural makers is also emphasized by Al-Kasimi (1977:70) as he states that “synonyms or near synonyms are separated by commas and different meaning by semicolons. If this is clearly stated in the front matter of the translation dictionary, lexicographers have a challenge to follow this rule when presenting translation equivalent paradigms in their dictionaries”.

3.4 RELATIONS BETWEEN LEMMAS AND TRANSLATION EQUIVALENTS

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:153) say that part of treatments of the lemma, which is translation equivalents, functions as guiding elements of a particular article in a dictionary. One lemmatic addressing is the most dominant addressing procedure in the articles of bilingual dictionaries. The relation between translation equivalents and lemmas is shown in the translation equivalent paradigm and different types of translation equivalents can be found in one article. Structural markers are used to show in detail the differences in the translation equivalents.

Translation equivalents are considered as the most important aspects in bilingual dictionaries because they are the main reason that users consult translation dictionaries. Mphahlele (2001:2) says that “translation equivalents are words or

phrases in a target language that represents or carry the same meaning as the original or source language form”. This means that translation equivalents can be considered as the meaning of lemma in a different language. Most lemmas are found to have more than one translation equivalents which are caused by the reason that a lemma has more than one meaning in the target language.

The following are examples extracted from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2007) that show lemmas that have more than one translation equivalent:

- (5) a. *bohodu*- theft, robbery (2007:11)
- b. *goma*- turn back; adhere to, adorn (2007:38)
- c. *gonyane*- little, slightly (2007:38)
- d. *hlakodiša*- redeem, save (2007:40)
- e. *mona*- suck, lick, taste (2007:46)
- f. *kgobola*- scold, cut off (hair) (2007:58)
- g. *lekêkê*- termite; slant (2007:72)
- h. *mmêtli*- carpenter, mason, stonecutter (2007:94)

The examples in (5) above show lemmas that have more than one equivalent. This means that they have more than one meaning in the target language. However, this does not mean that the translation equivalents always have the same meaning. That is, the translation equivalents have the same meaning only if they are synonyms, while at other times they are polysemous senses and this makes them different. Structural markers and guides included by lexicographers must be used to assist the user to know which translation equivalents have the same meaning and which ones do not.

3.5 TYPES OF EQUIVALENTS

Traditionally, bilingual dictionary compilers did not give the concept of synonymy attention because they were concentrating more on equivalents. Bogaards (1994:612) says that synonymy and equivalents are not different because they both have to do with ‘having (approximately) the same meaning. This means that bilingual dictionaries

were just compiled with the aim of giving translation equivalents without checking whether those translation equivalents were related or having the same meaning.

According to Mphahlele (2001), there are two types of translation equivalents, namely: synonym translation equivalents and polysemous translation equivalents. The discussion that follows concentrates on these two types of equivalents.

3.5.1 Synonym translation equivalents

Mphahlele (2001) says that “the synonym translation equivalents are translation equivalents that have the same meaning to each other”. This means that synonym translation equivalents can be used without worrying that they will have a different meaning. The examples below, taken from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2009), support this point:

- (6) a. *bangwadi*- writers, authors (2009:7)
- b. *diopedi*- singers, vocalists (of fame), (2009:23)
- c. *diota*- fools, idiots (2009:23)
- d. *gararo*- three times, thrice (2009: 36)
- e. *hlahlama*- follow, come after (2009: 40)
- f. *hwa*- die, pass away (2009:44)
- g. *ipolaile*- killed oneself, committed suicide (2009:47)
- h. *kukile*- lifted, picked up (2009: 65)

In the examples above in (6), synonym translation equivalents given can replace each other in many contexts without affecting the meaning of that context. Synonym translation equivalents are semantically related.

According to Palmer (1971), synonymy is used to mean ‘sameness of meaning’. In bilingual dictionaries, synonyms that are translation equivalents must be entered depending on the frequency. This means that the ones that are used more frequently

are more familiar to the users and they should be entered first in the translation equivalent with the others following. Mongwe (2006:57) says that: “the degree of synonymy that exists between two or more lexical items may not determine whether the lexicographer will indicate synonymy”.

To make it easier for the users when consulting bilingual dictionaries, the semantic relation of synonymy must be clearly shown throughout the dictionary. This means that all the synonyms will be treated the same way and show the scope of each synonymic relation in a clear unambiguous manner. If there is more than one member of the synonym in one translation equivalent paradigm, then the frequency of usage will be more important than the alphabetical order use.

According to Mongwe (2006), the treatment of lexical divergence and semantic divergence must be done properly in dictionary compilation by lexicographers. The use of commas in the synonym translation equivalents paradigm is used to indicate lexical divergence. Translation equivalents that are synonyms are separated by commas and these synonyms differ because some are partial synonyms while others are complete or absolute synonyms. This is also supported by Hosana (2009:77) who holds that partial synonyms and absolute synonyms should be treated properly because partial synonyms do not replace each other in all contexts.

a. Treatment of partial synonyms

According to Hosana (2009:77), partial synonyms are “synonyms with nearly identical meaning and can replace each other in some context”. This means that this kind of synonyms have the meanings that are nearly the same, so they can only replace each other in some context. Partial synonyms occur in two ways: first in a case where the translation equivalents are synonyms and second in a case where the headwords are synonyms which are written differently but have the same translation equivalents.

In a case where the translation equivalents are synonyms, contextual guidance can be used to show that the equivalents cannot replace each other in all contexts. According to Machimana (2009:17), contextual guidance will guide the users in knowing how the translation equivalent can be used in a specific context. The examples below, extracted from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2007), show partial synonyms that are found in the translation equivalent paradigm:

- (7) a. *kgôrôtô*-champion, leader (2007:60)
 b. *lekase*- coffin, box (2007:72)

The presentation above in (7) is correct in terms of using commas to separate the translation equivalents but just giving only the equivalents is wrong. When consulting the dictionary, the user will not be aware that the translation equivalents are partial synonyms because nothing else is included as a way to guide the user. For example, looking specifically at article (7) the items **champion** and **leader** can only replace each other in some cases depending on the meaning of the communication that will be transferred to the target reader. The definitions below extracted from *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2010) support this view as illustrated in the following examples:

Champion *noun* **1.** a person, team, etc. that has won a competition, especially in a sport: *the world basketball champions* ◇ **a champion jockey/ boxer/swimmer** ◇ *the reigning champion* (= the person who is a champion now) **2.** ~ (of sth) a person who fights for, or speaks in support of, a group of people or a belief: *she was a champion of the poor all her life* (2010:231)

leader *noun* **1.** a person who leads a group of people, especially the head of a country, an organization, etc: **a political/ spiritual, etc. leader** ◇ *the leader of the party* ◇ *union leaders* ◇ *he was not a natural leader* ◇ *She's a born leader* **2.** a person or thing that is the best, in first place in a race, business, etc. *she was among the leaders of the*

race from the start. ◇ *the company is a **world leader** in electrical goods* (2010:844).

The above definitions show that the items **champion** and **leader** are partial synonyms, so the lexicographer of the bilingual dictionary should have contextual guidance. The correct treatment of these translation equivalents is shown below:

(8) *kgôrôtô*- champion (compete), leader (leads)

The above article shows that the translation equivalents are partial synonyms, so the user can know in which context they will replace each other. The same applies to the translation equivalents in **coffin** and **box**. The definitions below extracted from *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2005) support this view as illustrated in the following examples:

box *noun, verb* CONTAINER **1.** [c] (especially in compounds) a container made of wood, cardboard, metal, etc. with a flat stiff base and often a lid, used especially for holding solid things: *she kept all her letters in a box.* ◇ *a money box* ◇ *cardboard boxes* ◇ *a toolbox* ◇ *a matchbox*- picture → PACKAGING**2.** [c] a small box and its contents: **a box of chocolate/ matches** (2005:167)

coffin (*especially BrE*) (*NAmE usually casket*) *noun* a box in which a box in a dead body is buried or CREMATED (2005:275)

The articles above show that even though **coffin** and **box** are synonyms they cannot replace each other in all contexts. The correct presentation of this article is shown below.

(9) *lekase*- coffin (bury), box (carry)

The above presentation will help users to know that even though the translation equivalents are separated with a comma, they cannot replace each other in all contexts. Hosana (2009:79) says COMPARE can also be used as references in cases where headwords are partial synonyms. This treatment is called lexicographic treatment which is applied when the meaning of synonyms is not totally the same. Only synonyms that are used frequently should be given full treatment in this case and the ones that are not used frequently receive cross-referencing. This is user-friendly because it assists the user to identify partial synonyms easily.

b. Treatment of absolute synonyms

Absolute synonyms are synonyms that can replace each other in any context without the meaning being compromised. They are also called complete synonyms. The absolute synonyms are also separated by a comma though they are treated differently from partial synonyms in terms of cross-referencing. Hosana (2009:84) writes that “according to theory of lexicography, synonym lexical item should be included in a dictionary as lemmata”. Similar to partial synonyms, the absolute synonym that is used frequently receives full treatment while the ones that are not used frequently receive cross-referencing.

The reference marker “SEE”, which must always be written in capital letters, is used to treat the absolute synonyms. The capital letter assists the user not to confuse the reference marker with the elements presenting meaning in the article. Hosanna (2009:84) adds that “if a lexical item functions in a dictionary as part of a lexicon, this would then enable users of a dictionary to learn more words in a short space of time”. This means that users will be able to see that two or more lemmata share the same translation equivalent.

However, not all dictionaries use cross-referencing in terms of treating the absolute synonyms. This is wrong because it confuses the dictionary user on which approach is correct because the headwords are different. Lexicographers will take more time when

compiling dictionaries because more articles with the same meaning are repeated and this is also taking more space in the dictionary. Examples below extracted from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2009) support this view.

Northern Sotho-English

- a. *setlaêla*- fool (2009:150)
setlatla- fool (2009:150)

- b. *mabe*- bad, evil (2009:80)
bobe- evil, badness, wickedness (2009:10)

- c. *boelela*- repeat (2009:10)
boeletša- repeat (2009:10)

- d. *dulela*- always (2009:29)
duletše- always (2009:29)

The treatment of the articles above in (10) is incorrect because the lemmatass*setlaêla* and *setlatla*; *mabe* and *bobe*; *boelela* and *boeletša*; *dulela* and ***duletše*** are absolute synonyms but are all given full comprehension and this will confuse the users of the translation dictionary. Only the lemmatas used frequently with *setlaêla*; *bobe*; *boeletša* and *duletše* should have been given full comprehension and the others should have received cross-referencing. The correct manner in which the articles should have received treatment will be shown below:

- a. *setlaêla*- fool.
setlatla- SEE *setlaela*.

- b. *bobe*- bad, evil.
mabe- SEE *bobe*.

- c. *boeletša*- repeat.
boelela- SEE *boeletša*.

- d. *duletše*- always
dulela- SEE *duletše*

If lexicographers were giving treatment of absolute synonyms like in (11) above, then the users will confidently use translation equivalents. Cross-referencing should be done throughout the dictionary in order to achieve user-friendliness.

3.5.2 Polysemous translation equivalents

Mphahlele (2001) is of the view that “these are translation equivalents that are polysemous sense of the lemma”. This means that polysemous translation equivalents do not have the same meaning. The examples below, taken from *Oxford PukuntšuyaSekolo School Dictionary* (2010), support this point:

- a. *kgokagano/kgokagano*/ noun (*pldikgokagano*)
1 communication **2** contact (2010:90)

- b. *laodiš* a verb + causative (iš) **1** describe **2** explain (2010:102)

In the above examples, polysemous translation equivalents **communication** and **contact** are related. However, they do not have the same meaning because they cannot replace each other in any context. This means that the user cannot use one instead of the other because it will affect the meaning of the context. Comparing the examples above, there is one difference that can be noticed. In this dictionary, the lexicographers used numbers to separate these polysemous senses.

According to Ullman (1967:63), polysemy is “a word that possesses ‘several meanings’, the interrelatedness of which is fully grasped, but which are unserviceable in isolation”. This means that polysemy occurs when one word has various semantic

distinctions related to each other. In the paradigms that contain polysemous senses, lexicographers should not treat the translation equivalents haphazardly.

The equivalents should be arranged in a systematic order. That is, the polysemic senses that are closer to each other should be placed closer to each other. Lexicographers must also use a more simple and understandable approach when treating the polysemous senses in articles. Mongwe (2006:58) states that the situation where there are polysemous senses in the translation equivalents paradigm is called semantic divergence. Semicolons are used to separate these polysemous senses in the paradigm. The correct separation of these senses will make a bilingual dictionary user-friendly because the user will be aware that she or he cannot choose any translation equivalent in that paradigm since they are not having the same meaning but are only related.

The examples below extracted from *Sesotho sa Leboa/English Pukuntšu Dictionary* (2006) support this view:

- (10) a. **agent** *n modiredi; mmoleledi* (2006:123)
- b. **battery** *n lelahla; peteri* (2006:126)
- c. **catch** *n swara; hwetša* (2006:131)
- d. **deposit** *v tsenya; beeletša* (2006: 140)
- e. **environment** *n tikologo; tlhago* (2006: 145)
- f. **holder** *n moswari; mong* (2006:155)
- g. **leaf** *n lehlare; letlakala* (2006:163)
- h. **note** *n molaetša; lengwalo* (2006:173)
- i. **prize** *n sefoka; mpho* (2006:180)
- j. **soldier** *n lešole; ledira* (2006:190)

The articles in (13) above are acceptable because their translation equivalent paradigms are separated by semicolons to show that they are polysemous senses. If this approach is carried out throughout the dictionary and also having clear guides to

assist the user to know which translation equivalents are separated by which structural makers, the main aim of a bilingual dictionary will be reached.

3.6 DIVERGENCE

According to Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:156), “divergence is characterized by a one to more than one relation between the source and the target language form. For a given lemma, the translation equivalent paradigm will contain more than one translation equivalents”. This means that divergence takes place where the source and the target language form has more than one relation and in that relation there will be more than one translation equivalent with the same or different meanings. There are two different subtypes in divergence: lexical divergence and semantic divergence.

3.6.1 Lexical divergence

Lexical divergence occurs when a monosemous lexical item functioning as a headword has more than one translation equivalent and those translation equivalents are synonyms. This divergence is indicated by means of a comma which is a structural maker used to separate synonyms in bilingual dictionaries.

Gouws (2002:196) writes that:

[W]here lexical divergence prevails, the lexicographer has to ascertain whether the translation equivalents are full or partial synonyms. More often equivalent relation of lexical divergence displays equivalents which are partial synonyms. Consequently, the lexicographer should enter some kind of either contextual or contextual guidance to indicate the typical environment where the commas semantic value of translation equivalents is activated.

The examples below extracted from *Pharos Popular Northern-Sotho Dictionary* (2009) will support this point:

Northern Sotho- English

- (11) a. *babolai*- murderers, killers (2009:5)
- b. *difela*- hymns, songs (2009:19)
- c. *kgoparara*- big, huge (2009:59)
- d. *khunyane*- small dog, puppy (2009:62)

The articles given in (14) above correctly show lexical divergence relation because they are separated by a comma which indicates that they are synonyms. This means that if the user, for example, consults the article in (14a), the user will freely use either **murderers** or **killers** in any context without the main meaning being compromised. The same thing applies to the rest of the articles above because the translation equivalents are synonyms.

3.6.2 Semantic divergence

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:157) are of a view that semantic divergence occurs when a source language headword has more than one translation equivalents with polysemous senses. These translation equivalents are separated by a means of semicolon because they do not carry the same meaning. Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:157) add that “in planning a dictionary a lexicographer should endeavour to employ a system which would be most beneficial for the intended target user”.

The examples below extracted from *Sesotho sa Leboa/English Pukuntšu Dictionary* (2006) show semantic divergence:

- (12) a. *amologana* v separate; divide (2006:2)
- b. *anega* v narrate; tell (2006:2)
- c. *bahlanka* v servants; young men (2006:4)
- d. *ema* v stop; stand (2006:19)
- e. *gafa* v renounce; give; deliver (2006:22)
- f. *hlabolla* n develop; deliver (2006:25)

- g. *ja* v eat; cost (2006:29)
- h. *kakaretšo* n summary; general (2006: 29)
- i. *metse* n villages; townships (2006:59)
- j. *nyakega* v wanted; needed (2006:78)

The articles above are correct and user-friendly because their presentation is well done. This means that they clearly show a semantic divergence.

3.6.3 Homogenous divergence

This is a type of divergence proposed by Mphahlele (2002). This occurs when translation equivalent paradigm of a lemma consists of either lexical or semantic divergence. This means that the paradigms will either consist of only synonyms or only polysemous senses. The example of homogenous divergence can be seen in the examples below extracted from *Sesotho sa Leboa/English Pukuntšu Dictionary* (2006) and *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2009):

- (13) a. *baagi* n builders; constructors; civilians (2006:3)
- b. *babapatši* n sellers; marketers (2006:3)
- c. *fihla* v hide; bury (2006:21)
- d. *goka* v cause to delay; entice; fool; deceive; fasten (2006:23)
- e. *mabjala* n beer, liquor (2009:80)
- f. *nyêlêla* v vanish, disappear (2009:122)
- g. *pônya* v wink, blink (2009:132)
- h. *seaparô* n dress, clothing (2009:138)
- i. *sekotlelo* n dish; basin (2006:95)
- j. *temogo* n observation; recognition (2006:106)

The articles in (16) above show well-presented homogenous divergence articles. This is because from (a-d, i and j) translation equivalents that are polysemous senses are

separated correctly and from (e-h) translation equivalents that are synonyms are separated correctly.

3.6.4 Heterogeneous divergence

This type of divergence is also seen in Mphahlele (2002). Heterogeneous divergence occurs when a translation equivalent paradigm consists of partial synonyms and polysemous senses. In this case, one paradigm consists of both lexical and semantic divergence. Both commas and semicolons are used in this kind of divergence. The examples below extracted from *Sesotho sa Leboa/English Pukuntšu Dictionary* (2006) and *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2009) support this view:

- (14) a. *amana* *v* regarding; in connection with, with regard to (2006:2)
b. *bohloko* *n* pain; grief; suffering; poison, venom (2006:9)
c. *kôpêla* *v* plant in between, plant for the second time; lock;
encircle (2009:64)
d. *kutu* *v* trunk, stump; noise; stem (of a word); principal clause
(2009:65)

The articles in (14) above show a heterogeneous divergence because each article contains both synonyms and polysemous senses in the translation equivalent paradigm. In case where both synonyms and polysemous senses are found in one article, lexicographers use both commas and semicolons to separate the translation equivalents.

3.7 COMMAS AND SEMICOLONS AS STRUCTURAL MARKERS IN BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES

According to Mphahlele (2001), commas and semicolons are very important structural markers in bilingual dictionaries because they ensure a very easy and clear way of transferring linguistic meaning. Gouws (1999:12) as quoted by Mphahlele writes “the

choice of commas and semicolons is not done arbitrarily. They are structural makers which make a definite contribution on microstructural level to ensure the transfer of semantic information. That is, polysemy and synonymy”.

This means that the use of commas and semicolons should be done carefully because the wrong use of these markers will affect the meaning of a context. In bilingual dictionaries commas are used to separate synonyms and semicolons used to separate polysemous senses. The structural markers should not be used haphazardly in bilingual dictionaries, especially bidirectional bilingual dictionaries because users will end up taking the wrong equivalents.

Mphahlele (2001) adds that:

[I]t is important to note here that if translation equivalents in an article of a dictionary are separated by commas, this does not necessarily mean such an article consists of translation equivalents that are synonyms. In many cases, lexicographers or dictionary compilers just use commas or semicolons in a haphazard way; that is one will find that commas have been used to separate polysemous senses whilst a semicolon has been used in the separation of synonyms. This is a lexicographic problem because users will often fail to get or retrieve the required information.

The wrong use of structural markers causes problems because the users may end up choosing the incorrect equivalent. These markers confuse users because even though there is reversibility in a dictionary, the wrong use of structural markers result in the user using the wrong equivalent. The examples below, extracted from *Oxford Pukuntšu ya Sekolo School Dictionary (2010)*, show structural makers that have been used wrongly:

15. a. *phethe/phethe, phethe/ verb-* (must) finish; (must) complete; (must) finalise (2010:184)
- b. *mobjalo adjective yo mobjalo-* such person; a person like that (2010:42)

- c. *kgaotša verb + causative (iš)-* cease; stop (2010: 87)
- d. *kgangwa verb + passive (w)-* be strangled; be choked (2010:86)
- e. *ikana reflective verb-* swear; take an oath (2010:74)
- f. *hlwela/hlwela/ auxiliary verb + applicative (el)-* continue; keep on (2010:72)

The articles in (18) above show translation equivalents that are separated by semicolons, which mean that they are polysemous senses. But the translation equivalents in these articles are not polysemous senses. So this means that the structural marker was not used correctly. Below, the correct way that was supposed to be shown in these articles is shown:

- (19) a. *phethe/phethe, phethe/ verb-* (must), (must) complete; (must) finalize.
- b. *mobjalo adjective yo mobjalo-* such person, a person like that.
- c. *kgaotšaverb + causative (is)-* cease, stop.
- d. *kgangwaverb + passive (w)-* be strangled, be choked.
- e. *ikanareflective verb-* swear, take an oath.
- f. *hlwela /hlwela/ auxiliary verb + applicative (el)-* continue, keep on.

The articles in (19) above show the correct use of the structural markers. This means that when the user is using a dictionary which has the articles which are separated with a comma, he or she will be aware that the translation equivalents are synonyms. Sometimes lexicographers use commas to separate translation equivalents that have polysemous sense and this is wrong. The examples below, extracted from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2009), support this view:

- (20) a. *boagô*- residence, art of building (2009:10)
 b. *dihlare*- trees, medicine (2009:19)
 c. *dilefa*- payment, offering (2009:22)
 d. *feafea*- active, hard-working, industrious (2009:31)
 e. *fêkêmêla*- go under, disappear (2009:32)
 f. *golola*- deliver, unbind (2009:38)
 g. *hlakane*- meet, mixed (2009:40)
 h. *hlakola*- rob, wipe (2009:40)
 i. *imilê*- pregnant, burden, loaded (2009:46)
 j. *koša*- song, dance, troupe (2009:64)

The articles in (20) above are separated by commas while they are not synonyms. This will result in a case where the user may take the wrong equivalent assuming that since they are separated by commas, they are synonyms. The correct separation is shown below:

- (20) a. *boagô*- residence; art of building
 b. *dihlare*- trees; medicine
 c. *dilefa*- payment; offering
 d. *feafea*- active; hard-working; industrious
 e. *fêkêmêla*- go under; disappear
 f. *golola*- deliver; unbind
 g. *hlakane*- meet; mixed
 h. *hlakola*- rob; wipe
 i. *imilê*- pregnant; burden; loaded
 j. *koša*- song; dance; troupe

The articles in (21) above are separated well and can be easily seen that they do not have the same meaning but only related to each other. However, the use of only structural makers alone will not completely assist the users because some of the synonyms are partial synonyms. Lexicographers have to find other strategies like using examples as additional aspects to make a complete article that will not give the users any complications.

3.8 CONCLUSION

The structural markers play a vital role in every bilingual dictionary, whether bidirectional or monodirectional. The chapter has clearly shown that commas should be used to indicate absolute or complete synonyms. On the other hand, semicolons should be utilized to show polysemous words. If this is not adhered to, users may wrongly use the equivalents. This will cause misunderstanding and miscommunication - a situation that a dictionary is supposed to avoid at all costs.

CHAPTER FOUR

EQUIVALENCE

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on equivalence and the problems that lexicographers come across when compiling bilingual dictionaries, especially bidirectional ones. Zero equivalence, surrogate equivalence, adoptive (borrowed words) and culture bound terms are discussed.

4.2 WHAT IS EQUIVALENCE?

Mphahlele (1999:1) defines equivalence as a one to one relationship between the lexical items of two languages (source and target language) in the translation dictionary. This means that equivalence is a result of the relationship that occurs between lexical items of two different languages, that is, the source and the target language, taking place in a translation dictionary. Gouws (2002:195) gives a more complete definition by saying that a translation equivalent is a target language item which can be used to substitute the source language item in a specific occurrence, depending on specific contextual and contextual restriction.

In bidirectional dictionaries, lexicographers are expected to apply reversibility in order to ensure the satisfaction of the users even though they may meet some challenges during the process of compiling translation dictionaries. Reversibility is when translation equivalents in the first section are provided as headwords in the section and headwords provided as translation equivalent. Though reaching complete reversibility in translation dictionaries is difficult and is regarded as impossible by some scholars (for example, Gouws), it can be achieved if lexicographers know effective strategies to bring it about. This means that lexicographers should not choose equivalents randomly

but research thoroughly which equivalents are used frequently and are accepted in the target language.

Mongwe (2006:75) says that “there is no doubt that there is shortage of equivalents, especially in African languages, which came as a result of lack of development in these languages”. This is because during the apartheid era only English and Afrikaans were regarded as prestigious languages. However, by using strategies of overcoming translation equivalents problem and by having more lexicographers of indigenous languages this problem can be solved. African terminologists, lexicographers, subjects’ specialists and linguists can work together in creating accurate new term equivalents in their mother tongue.

According to Malange (2010:16), equivalence can be distinguished into two categories, namely: complete and adoptive equivalence. On the one hand, complete equivalence occurs when the source language has a target language item with the same meaning to each other. On the other hand, adoptive equivalence occurs when the source language items do not have target language item that has the same meaning. This forces the lexicographer to borrow that particular item from the source language. The examples from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2009) below support this view:

- (1) a. **buy-** *rêka* (2009:198)
- b. **cell-** *sêlê* (2009:200)
- c. **chocolate-** *tšhokôlêtê* (2009:201)
- d. **Christmas-** *Krisemose* (2009:201)
- e. **irrigation-** *nošetšo*(2009:253)
- f. **lorry-***lori* (2009:260)
- g. **manner-** *mokgwa* (2009:262)
- h. **lounge-** *lôntšê* (2009:260)
- j. **Lutheran-** *ya Lutêre* (2009:260)
- k. **macaroni-** *makaroni* (2009:261)

- l. **murderer**- *mmolai* (2009:268)
- m. **needs**- *dinyakwa* (2009:270)
- n. **oneness**- *botee* (2009:273)

From the articles in (1) above, all the headwords have achieved translation equivalence. However, the equivalents are not the same because some are complete while others are adoptive equivalents. From the examples in (1) above, the following articles show the presentation of complete equivalents:

- (2) a. **buy**- *rêka*
- b. **irrigation**-*nošetšo*
- c. **manner**- *mokgwa*
- d. **murderer**-*mmolai*
- e. **needs**- *dinyakwa*
- f. **oneness**- *botee*

The translation equivalents in (2) above are regarded as complete equivalents because they are regarded as direct equivalents. This means that they have the exact same meaning in both source and target languages. On the other hand, from the same examples in (1), the following articles are adoptive equivalents:

- (3) a. **cell**- *sêlé*
- b. **chocolate**- *tšhokôlêtê*
- c. **Christmas**- *Krisemose*
- d. **lorry**- *lori*
- e. **lounge**- *lôntše*
- f. **Lutheran**- *ya Lutêre*
- g. **macaroni**- *makaroni*

The articles in (3) show translation equivalents that are adoptive. Adoptive equivalence, which is also called borrowed equivalents, is a result of differences in

language and cultures. These difficulties are experienced more when translating from English or Afrikaans into indigenous languages and vice versa. Giving just a single word that is borrowed does not help the user in any way because, if he or she is not familiar with such particular terms, then there will be problems since the meaning of that equivalent would not be known.

Before entering a translation equivalent in a bilingual dictionary, the lexicographer has to make sure that it is not going to require the user to consult other resources in order to understand the meaning of the items. In this regard, Podolej (2009:29) writes “in order to establish the equivalence relation between words, one needs to choose the so called *tertium comparationis*, that is, the entity against which the source language and target language will be compared, something that the two have in common”. Only functional items that the user will understand should be used as equivalents.

4.3 PROBLEMS IN BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES

Writers of bilingual dictionaries face a plethora of challenges to achieve equivalence. This study focuses on the challenges such as zero-equivalence, cultural-bound words, culture and language. In this regard, Mpofu (2001:243) writes that “in monolingual dictionaries, only one language is used for both the lemma and glosses. On the other hand, in bilingual dictionaries, the meaning of lexical item is derived through the process of translation of the source language word into that of the target language”.

4.3.1 Zero-equivalence

Mphahlele (2001:53) says zero-equivalence is a case where a lemma or source language form does not have an appropriate or a direct equivalent in the target language. This means that zero-equivalence takes place when a given headword which is supposed to be translated does not have an equivalent in the target language. The words below form part of terms that are non-translatable:

- (4) a. Book
- b. Clinic
- c. Magazine
- e. Pluck
- f. Trumpet

These are some of the most challenging problems that confront lexicographers during the process of compiling bilingual dictionaries. Zero- equivalence is caused by untranslatable aspects such as scientific and culture-bound features which are found in different languages, as will be shown below in this discussion.

a. Cultural-bound words

According to Hartmann and James (1998:33), cultural-bound words are words and phrases associated with the “way of life” of a language community. This means that cultural-bound words are words and phrases which are mainly connected with the way a particular language community lives and behaves. These cultural-bound words are formed by a specific community looking at the naming of food, places, clothing, beliefs and other things that are only present in their culture.

The following examples show different types of food, clothing and places that are found in Northern Sotho:

- (5) **Food**
- a. *Kgodu*
- b. *Dikokoro*
- c. *Sepšarane*
- d. *Sekgotho*
- e. *Bogoko*

- (6) **Clothing**
- a. *Lethebe*
 - b. *Mose*
 - c. *Legabe*
 - d. *Ntepana*

- (7) **Places**
- a. *Kgorong*
 - b. *Komeng*
 - c. *Sebešong*

The terms given above form part of things that are found in the Northern Sotho culture and can be problematic when are supposed to be translated into English. When a lexicographer comes across these words during the process of dictionary making, then a thorough definition, together with a loan word, must be provided. This will help a foreign language speaker consulting that particular dictionary to understand the meaning of the words.

Since only the first speakers of that particular language knows the words and phrases and their meanings, it is problematic in bilingual dictionaries because the target language users do not know and understand them if they are just given as transliteration or borrowed without any explanation. Lexicographers should include additional or extra linguistic information in bilingual dictionaries when treating cultural bound words so that foreign users can understand them. The cultural-bound words in (5) can be translated as follows:

- (8) a. *Kgodu*- pumpkin-porridge (a porridge that is cooked using pumpkin, sugar and maize meal).
- b. *Dikokoro*- cooked mealies (mealies that are dried and then cooked and adding some salt for taste).

- c. *Sepšarane*- pumpkin seeds-porridge (a porridge cooked using fried pumpkin seeds and maize meal).
- d. *Sekgotho*- beans-porridge (porridge cooked using beans and maize meal).
- e. *Bogoko*- fried sour-milk (a food that is prepared by leaving fresh milk to turn sour and then fry).

b. Cultural factors and successful communication

According to Kavanagh (2000:100), words are the main factors that are used during communication and for the success of that communication each one of the communicators has to know accepted words and their meanings in that particular language. This will help the communicator to be able to construct accepted and meaningful phrases and sentences in that language. Without the knowledge of words that are accepted in a language and what they mean, then one cannot be able to communicate in that language.

Cultural factors are mostly constrained by linguistic interaction such as age seniority or gender. This means that before trying to communicate in a particular language, one has to know which words to speak and when depending on the age and gender. For example, in the Northern Sotho culture a girl cannot speak with her father about boyfriends or about her menstruation cycle and sanitary pads. She must either speak to her mother or sister.

Even though most of our cultures are similar in South Africa, there is still a challenge of non-equivalence when translating into another culture because there are some things that are different and only the speakers of that particular community know their origin. Lexicographers need to do more research in terms of the two cultures involved in an aspiring bilingual dictionary, especially if a bidirectional dictionary is to be compiled. If there are bidirectional bilingual dictionaries, communication can be easier and successful.

It is easier for one to communicate in the mother-tongue, but when trying to communicate in a different language it is hard, as there are principles followed and used in every language before communicating. Kavanagh (2000:101) says that “correctness and intelligibility may rest on purely linguistic factors, but successful communication depends on an adequate knowledge of language and understanding of what it is appropriate to say in particular situation”.

Before communicating, there are some requirements such as a degree of lexical and syntactic competence, and cultural competence. This means that before communicating one has to know the grammar of that language together with culture. The researcher agree with this because without these aspects one can end up saying words or phrases that are not accepted in that language. This difficulty is experienced more in South Africa because it has eleven official languages that are different.

Kavanagh (2000:101) says that the problems that are found in cross-cultural communication are not specifically caused by ‘not understanding the words’ but by ‘not understanding the concepts behind words’. This is made more complex by their source of information, which is bilingual dictionaries, because due to the difficulty of finding “semantic equivalents” authors and editors do not make any extra information to help foreign users. During the process of dictionary compilation, the lexicographers must consider the implications for dictionary compilation. This is because bilingual dictionaries have, as their main responsibility, the enhancement of knowledge of a language.

4.3.2 Culture and language

According to Kavanagh (2000:102):

[C]ulture is a word with various different senses. In one sense, it may include the arts- the theatre, literature, music and painting- which are products of human intellectual achievement. While in another sense it may refer to the whole gamut of traditional beliefs and practices, activities and way of life, of a particular group of people.

This means that culture can be described in terms of the way a particular community does arts like the music or can be described in terms of its traditional beliefs and practices. For example, in the Northern Sotho culture *kiba*, *hlakela* and *serobalela* are used as a form of music.

In a country like South Africa, there are many cultures that are all important due to most of them being official and there are many things that are unique to those cultures. The examples below show some of the things that are specifically known to the Northern Sotho speaking community:

- *Setsiba*- which is made of animal skin and is worn by males to cover their private parts.
- *Morala*- is a house used for cooking, they use soil to make bricks to build this house.
- *Lethebe*- is a mat used for sleeping and it is made of a washed cow skin.
- *Lešoboro*- is a boy who did not go to an initiation school.
- *Leitšibulo*- is the first born child in the family.
- *Morutlo*- is used to drink water, sometimes traditional beer.
- *Phejana*- is the last born child in the family.

If a lexicographer were to come across these words while compiling a dictionary, it will be a challenge to translate them into English because it does not exist. So there has to be a strategy used to make sure that when finding an equivalent for this word, then the same equivalent should be used as a headword in the English-Northern Sotho section. Because of the difference in terms of cultures and languages it becomes very difficult to translate items in bilingual dictionaries, especially in South Africa. This is because one cannot separate the two aspects and though some of our indigenous languages are related it is still a challenge to translate their cultural based terms. According to Mpofu (2001), the problem where functionality relevant feature in a source language does not exist in the target language is known as cultural untranslatability.

Kavanagh (2000:103) says “modern language-learning strategies promote familiarization with the culture of users of the language”. This should apply to lexicographers before they compile bilingual dictionaries. Even though course books include cultural information of all kinds (that is social, artistic and institutional), bilingual dictionaries, especially African ones, do not feature them. Most of our bilingual dictionaries only have a headword and a single equivalent even in the case of cultural bound terms, which become a problem to the target users because they are not familiar with that term.

Lexicographers must research and have enough knowledge about the languages that will be included in a bilingual dictionary before starting the process of compiling. Kavanagh (2000:105) says that “language is inextricably bound to culture, but yet we often separate them and try to avoid including cultural information in dictionaries”. This becomes a problem since it is difficult for users to understand the meaning of the equivalents of lemmas that they are not familiar with.

The problem of finding equivalence for cultural-bound words is mostly met when translating scientific and technological words because they were recently introduced. This is not only met when compiling a bilingual dictionaries but throughout the field of translation. Different cultures have their unique foods, clothes, fixed words, idioms and other things that are not known to the second language speaker.

There are a number of strategies that are used to overcome this problem of cultural-bound words. However, before taking a particular strategy, the lexicographer or translator has to make sure that the strategy will not confuse the user more. These strategies need to be studied carefully depending on what kind of terms need to be translated. Before choosing a strategy, the translator has to be sure that the strategy will not affect the main meaning of the message that the source language item is trying to convey.

4.4 CULTURE AND BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES

As one cannot separate culture and language, the same applies with culture and bilingual dictionaries because every bilingual dictionary consists of two languages. A language is a tool that is used to express and present a culture, so through bilingual dictionaries those languages are given a relationship. When compiling bilingual dictionaries, lexicographers have to know both cultures thoroughly to avoid any errors.

Robert (2007) who is acknowledged by Podolej (2009:36) writes that “dictionaries present not only language but also culture. Language represents culture because words refer to a culture. Therefore, dictionaries, which constitute an archive of the words of a language, present, *defacto*, the culture underlying the language”. This is supported by Piotrowski (1994:127) who says that “on the surface the bilingual dictionary deals with linguistic forms, while in fact it has to do with cultural factors”.

Since a bilingual dictionary is the main source that establishes correspondence between two languages, it also establishes correspondence between two cultures. So, lexicographers must keep this in mind as they compile a bilingual dictionary because it is a combination of two cultures that need to be treated equally, especially in bidirectional bilingual dictionaries.

Piotrowski (1994:128) says that: “the left-hand side of a bilingual dictionary is thought to correspond to a list of cultural facts encoded by the lexemes of L2, and the right-hand side has a parallel list of equivalent cultural facts from the other language”. This means that, in a bidirectional bilingual dictionary, each section represents a culture and these cultures are treated in an equal manner. Bilingual dictionaries are compiled to ensure an understanding between two cultures.

4.5 TREATMENT OF CULTURE-BOUND WORDS IN BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES

Even though achieving full equivalence from culture-bound words in bilingual dictionaries is challenging because it involves the overcoming of both partial and complete zero-equivalence, there are strategies that one can use to resolve this problem. Podolej (2009:46) states that: “Bilingual lexicographers, trying to provide target language equivalents of lexical item specific to the source culture, have developed certain techniques have been inspired by correspond to the techniques arrived at in translation studies”.

As the problem of not having lexical items in the target language is also experienced in translation, there are a number of strategies that are used to overcome these problems at the word level. The following strategies are used to overcome the problem of culture-bound terms at the word level in translation:

a. Accepted standard (or recognized translation)

According to Podolej (2009:46-47), the problem of lack of equivalents can be solved by providing an “*accepted standard (or recognized) translation*” of the source language item. This means that a source language item that does not have a direct equivalent in the target language can be standardized depending on the basis of a number of previous translators. The table below supports this view:

Northern Sotho	English
<i>Enke</i>	Ink
<i>Pene</i>	Pen
<i>Lori</i>	Lorry
<i>Ketlele</i>	Kettle
<i>Sekolo</i>	School
<i>Bene</i>	Van

The table above shows English words that are now used in Northern Sotho but were not existing originally in Northern Sotho.

b. Loan words

According to Podolej (2009:47), translation using a loan word “is a strategy in which a source language item is imported into the target language in an unchanged form”. This means that a particular item is loaned into the target language and this brings in a sense of foreign and exoticism to the target language translation. This strategy is also called **transference**. The examples below, extracted from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2009), support this view:

- (9) a. **machine**- *motšhene* (2009:261)
- b. **magistrate**- *masetrata, magistrata* (2009:261)
- c. **mattress**- *matrase* (2009:263)
- d. **oasis**- *owasese* (2009:271)
- e. **oboe**- *oboi* (2009:272)

The translation equivalents in (9) above have been borrowed from English by Northern Sotho language due to zero-equivalence.

c. Explanation

Explanation which is also called paraphrasing is when the translator gives an explanation of the source language item in the target language using the target language vocabulary. Podolej (2009:47) has a view that through “this way its meaning is fully conveyed, with the longer form to the original, that is, it is no longer a single word but a multi-word expression”. The articles below extracted from *Sesotho sa Leboa/English Pukuntšu Dictionary* (2006) illustrate this point:

- (10) a. *agiša* v make someone build; build with, encourage someone to have good life (2006:1)
- b. *badikana* n the first initiates/young boys at a circumcision school (2006:3)
- c. *bakgomana* n chiefs second advisors who usually report to bakgoma (2006:4)
- d. *binamalopo* v to be taught how to become a traditional healer through dancing to the African drum (2006:7)
- e. *dikgaba* n a concept of misfortune caused by hostility and unfriendliness in the family (2006:13)
- f. *dikomana* n secrets revealed to the female initiates during their initiation school that are named *mašupšane*, *masara*, *sesame* (most common) and *pšheregehle* (2006:13)
- g. *etiša* v remain together at night to make time, while out time (2006:13)
- h. *hlahlela* v drive animals into the kraal; come with girlfriend in the house; load gun (2006:25)

The examples in (10) above illustrate Northern Sotho terms not found in English and the lexicographers used explanation. Though this strategy is good, it becomes a problem if the dictionary is bidirectional because on the English-Northern Sotho section there will not be a headword to enter.

d. Cultural equivalents

Podolej (2009:48) suggests that cultural equivalents “consist in substituting a source language culture-bound word with a target language which is most closely corresponds to it”. This strategy is the one used mostly by translators though it becomes a problem if the text has to be translated back into the original language. The examples below support this point:

- (11) a. *Motepa*- soft-porridge
b. *Ting*- sour- porridge
c. *Lebikiri*- mug
d. *Ramogolo*- uncle

The examples above in (11) show terms that are given translation equivalents in the English culture. Some of the strategies mentioned above are also used in monolingual dictionaries because a bilingual dictionary is considered as an outcome of a special kind of translation. These strategies must be chosen carefully to ensure their functionality in the target language. The strategies used in bilingual dictionaries are discussed below.

4.5.1 Strategies commonly used in monodirectional dictionaries

a. Definition and phrases

Due to the problem of zero-equivalence most lexicographers choose the definition and phrases strategy as a solution. This strategy can also be seen above in the strategies of overcoming the same problem at the word level. In this strategy, a definition or a phrase is used instead of using a single word as an equivalent. This strategy helps to overcome zero-equivalence in bilingual dictionaries. However, it does not completely solve the problem when it comes to bidirectional bilingual dictionaries.

This is because according to bidirectional dictionaries if a definition is given as an equivalent of headword, then the definition must be used as a headword word in the Z-Y section of the same dictionary and this is not possible. However, if it is applied in a monodirectional dictionary, the strategy is one of the most useful ones.

The following articles extracted from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2009) show headwords with definitions:

- (12) a. **twinkling**- *go ponya ga leihlo* (2009:324)
 b. **typography**- *tsebo (thuto) ya kgatišo* (2009:324)
 c. **unimaginative**- *se se nang kgopolo* (2009:326)
 d. **untimely**- *e sego kanako* (2009:326)
 e. **untiring**- *go se lapišege* (2009:326)
 f. **useless**- *se se nang (mohola) thušo* (2009:327)
 g. **vandalism**- *go senya (fela) ka boomo* (2009:328)
 h. **venison**- *nama ya phoofolo* (2009:328)

Another strategy used by lexicographers is transliteration and it is used in almost all bilingual dictionaries that one can consult. According to Mongwe (2006:75), this strategy is applied by many dictionary compilers without looking at the needs of the target users. Mphahlele (2004:340) writes that “the (lexicographers) often regard transliteration as the quickest lexicographical and terminological procedure without taking into consideration the practical demands of the target users”.

Transliteration can work as a way to solve zero-equivalence. However, in cases where the target users are not familiar with the headword, this strategy does not solve this problem completely. This applies mostly in scientific and technological terms because not all people are familiar with them.

The examples below extracted from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2007) illustrate this view:

- (13) a. **abyssinia**- *abesinia* (2007:181)
 b. **adrenalin**- *atrenaline* (2007:183)
 c. **bacteria**- *pakteria* (2007:190)
 d. **silk**- *silika* (2007:304)
 e. **sonnet**- *sonetê* (2007:307)
 f. **uranium**- *uraniamo* (2007:327)
 g. **valve**- *belefe* (2007:328)
 h. **Voortrekker**- *Leforotrekere* (2007:330)

The articles in (13) above show the scientific and technological headwords which were just transliterated into Northern Sotho without giving any extra information to support them. This does not solve anything because most of the terms above are not used in daily life, so one cannot assume that all users who consult this bilingual dictionary are familiar with them. However, if the two strategies were to be used together to solve this problem, they can make a complete user-friendly articles.

Using transliteration without first checking if it will be suitable for that particular term is very damaging to both monodirectional and bidirectional dictionaries. This is because when the user consults that bilingual dictionary he/she will not be able to understand what the terms means. This means that the main aim of a bilingual dictionary, which is to help users to find meaning of an item that they do not know and understand, will not be reached. So, South Africa as a country that is striving to develop having more user-friendly bilingual dictionaries should give more attention on making sure that the strategies are checked thoroughly before being used.

4.5.2 Surrogate equivalents

According to Mphahlele (1999:2-3), surrogate equivalents refers to the provided solution, that is, a definition whereby translation dictionary users are confronted with the problem of zero-equivalence. This takes place when a presented source and target headwords show linguistic and referential gaps between themselves. Is it a solution to the problem of lexical gap.

Gouws (2002:199) writes that “the existence of lexical gaps in any given language is not uncommon. What would be uncommon for a lexicographer, however, would be to enter no translation equivalent at all for a particular source language”. This meaning that lexical gaps is a situation that occurs regularly in field translation, however, it is not all that time that a lexicographer decides to enter a headword that does not have an equivalent as it is a problem.

During the process of compiling bilingual dictionaries, lexicographers are using surrogate equivalents due to the difficulty of finding semantically correct equivalents for the lemmata. Gouws (2002:199-200) says “ due to the fact that database of the dictionary determine the inclusion of a specific lexical item as lemma sign in a dictionary, the lexicographer is compelled to treat that item by entering a target language order to establish some kind of an equivalent relation”.

The nature of a source language item used in bilingual dictionaries is determined by the type of lexical gap that is occurring in that particular source language item. There are two types of lexical gaps, namely: linguistic gap and referential gap.

a. Linguistic gap

According to Gouws (2002:200), linguistic gap prevails when a given referent is known to the speakers of both languages (that is, source and target languages), but a lexical item exists in one language but in the other language the meaning has not been lexicalized. In situations of linguistic gap it is acceptable for the lexicographer to give a borrowed word with a brief definition since it means those words are mainly used on a daily basis. The examples below extracted from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2007) show linguistic gap articles:

- (14) a. **stove-** *setofô* (2007:311)
- b. **television-** *thêlêbišênê* (2007:317)
- c. **tent-** *tente* (2007:318)
- d. **tomato-** *tamati* (2007:320)
- e. **volume-** *bolumô* (2007:329)
- f. **university-** *yunibêsithi* (2007:326)

The articles shown in (14) above are not acceptable because even though many speakers of Northern Sotho are familiar with them, none of them may not understand them. The same thing can apply to a foreign user of this dictionary because most of the

headwords above are having equivalents in our indigenous languages. The correct way of treating the headwords in the above articles in (14) is shown below:

- (15) a. **stove**- *setofô, sedirišwasa go apea* (an equipment for cooking)
b. **television**- *thêlêbišênê, sedirišwasa go bona dipapatšo, ditaba le tše dingwe* (an equipment for watching sport, news, etc)
c. **tent**- *tente, sedirišwasa go swarelameletlo* (an equipment used for holding events)
d. **tomato**- *tamati, mohutawamorogo* (a type of vegetable)
e. **volume**- *bolumô, seoketšasealemoya le mmino* an equipment used to increase music sound, radio, etc)
f. **university**- *yunibêsithi, lefelo la dithutotšagodimo* (a place for higher education studies)

The examples in (15) above show a complete treatment of headwords **stove**; **television**; **tent**; **tomato**; **volume** and **university**. If a bilingual dictionary article is given in this manner, then there will not be any problems even for foreign language speakers.

b. Referential gap

Gouws (2002:200) has the view that referential gap prevails where the speakers of one of the languages treated in a translation dictionary are with a specific referent and their language has a word to refer to the subject. This means the particular source language item that is to be treated is only known by the source language speakers and has a referent only in that language. This kind of gap is caused mainly by culturally-bound terms because they are originated from a specific language and only known to that community.

The examples below, extracted from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2007), show articles of referential gap:

- (16) a. **sulphates**- *salefate* (2007:314)
- b. **synod**- *senote* (2007:315)
- c. **tram**- *terempe* (2007:321)
- d. **trowel**- *torofolo* (2007:323)

The articles in (16) above contain headwords that many Northern Sotho speakers are not familiar with. In this case, the lexicographer used borrowing to solve the problem. However, this is not user-friendly because if the target language users are not familiar with the given headwords then they will not know what the equivalent means. The same confusion will be experienced if a foreign language learner were to consult these articles.

Looking at the articles above in (16), the lexicographer should have accompanied the transliterated equivalents with a more comprehensive definition to ensure the understanding of the meaning of equivalents by the target users. The articles below focusing on the headwords **sulphates**; **tram**; **synod** and **trowel** show the correct way of treating transliterated equivalents:

- (17) a. **sulphates**- *salefate, mehuta ya diesiti tšeo di dirišwago ge go dirwa diteko tša saense* (types of acids used to do scientific experiments).
- b. **tram**- *terempe, sefatanaga sago diriša mohlagase se sepelago tselaneng ya sona* (a vehicle using electricity, which has its own track road).
- c. **synod**- *senote, kopanoya semmušo ya maloko a kereke moo go yona batlogo lekola go tša bodumedi le go tšea diphetho tše amago kereke ya bona* (a meeting held by church members to discuss their religion and decide on important matters about their church).

- d. **trowel-** *torofolo, mohuta wa sedirišwa saka serapeng se ntšhang mehlare le go epa melete ge go bjalwa* (an equipment used in the garden).

This kind of treatment will be more useful in a case where a language learner uses a bidirectional bilingual dictionary as a source of learning the second language because the articles are given complete treatment. There will be no need for the user to consult a monolingual dictionary to be able to have clear meaning of that particular headword.

In case of referential gap, surrogate equivalents are used as an extended solution to the problem of zero-equivalence. Lexicographers can use either contextual guidance or give brief definition together with the loan words. Gouws (2002:200) writes that “where a loan word is not all that well established in the target language of a translation dictionary, the lexicographer often complements this translation equivalent with a brief paraphrase of meaning”.

Even though this solution is suggested by most of lexicography scholars, most lexicographers of African language dictionaries seem to not apply it. Looking at the bilingual dictionaries that already compiled and are supposed to be used there are only borrowed words given as translation equivalents without any additional information. This becomes a problem to users of bilingual dictionaries because they end up using an equivalent that they do not know and are also not sure if it is correct.

Lexicographers are faced with a problem of zero-equivalence regularly, so they have to find solutions. However, this solution must be used carefully, not just to use it randomly. Gouws (2002:201) says “the nature of the lexical gap will determine the extent of the explanation”. This means that surrogate equivalence will be used depending on the type of lexical gap. In terms of linguistic gap, a brief paraphrase of meaning will be sufficient and in terms of referential gap a more comprehensive means must be given.

4.5.3 Borrowed words

In many African bilingual dictionaries, lexicographers turn to borrowing as their solution in terms of zero-equivalence. This is done because it is seen as the easiest and quickest way of solving the problem of zero-equivalence since other strategies seek research and more knowledge in that language. Borrowing is a strategy whereby a lexicographer borrows a word from a source language into the target language as a result of that particular headword not having a specific direct equivalent in the target language.

Most of indigenous African languages are not developed enough, so they do not have enough words that can be used as equivalents of headwords found in English and Afrikaans. This is caused by some factors like not being given the prestige and development during the apartheid era. The other factors are that even though there are organizations trying to bridge that gap, African people still regard it as not worth it to learn their indigenous languages and that there is still not enough language terminologists in African languages. As a result, borrowing is still taken as the most immediate available solution to zero-equivalence.

Podolej (2009:34-35) recognizes Salaciak (2004) who differentiates between two types of borrowing: lexical and semantic borrowing. “Lexical borrowing involves the transfer to the target language of both the meaning and the form of borrowed word. Semantic borrowing involves borrowing the meaning of a respective source language word and attaching it to an already-existing form in the target language as a new sense”.

This means that lexical borrowing is done in a case where the term is not present and the borrowing is done in both meaning and form in the target language. Semantic borrowing is a case where a term is present in the target language but the lexicographer still decides to borrow a source language term and attaches it as a new

sense. When deciding to use borrowing, the lexicographer has to choose wisely the type of borrowing that will be suitable.

The second borrowing (semantic borrowing) can be very damaging to a language because when doing borrowing while the target language already has an equivalent for that particular term, it can result in the killing of the term that was present in that language. This is because users will consider the borrowed word more as it is the one used in a bilingual dictionary. This is one of the major mistakes that lexicographers do in bilingual dictionaries. Most lexicographers tend to use borrowing even in unnecessary cases.

Though sometimes lexicographers also include the original equivalent found in the target language the borrowed ones take over the original term. This occurs mostly in the language used by the youth. As users of bilingual dictionaries, the youth mostly assume the first equivalent as the correct one. The following articles extracted from *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2009) and *Sesotho sa Leboa/English Pukuntšu Dictionary* (2006) confirm this view:

- (18) a. **address** *n atrese; tšhupabodulo* (2006:122)
- b. **bank** *n pankā; bobolokelaletlotlo* (2006:126)
- c. **December-** *Disemere, Manthole* (2009:214)
- d. **document** *n tokumente, sengwalwa* (2006:142)
- e. **donkey-** *esele, tonki, pokolo* (2009:220)
- f. **radio-** *radio, seyalemoya* (2009:290)
- g. **September-** *Setemere, Lewedi* (2009:302)
- h. **sweet-** *bose, lekere, monamonane, tsefa* (2009:315)

The articles in (18) above show head words that have equivalents in the target language but yet the lexicographers of this bilingual dictionary also decided to use borrowing. In this case, borrowing was not necessary as Northern Sotho does have equivalents. Though borrowing is the most used strategy to solve the problem of zero-

equivalence, it is not always used correctly as mentioned above. Lexicographers mostly use this strategy randomly, that is, they do not check whether that particular headword has an equivalent or whether the user will be able to understand this equivalent if applied in a bilingual dictionary.

In the case of bidirectional dictionaries, the use of surrogate equivalents is a best solution of zero-equivalence as it does not use borrowing alone, but also include either a brief or detailed definition to accompany that borrowed equivalent. If this is used correctly and throughout the dictionary then the user can be able to freely use that dictionary and understand it as well. On the section of the dictionary, referencing can be used so that the user can be able to see the full meaning of the borrowed word.

4.6 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, finding the correct and user-friendly equivalent in a bilingual dictionary is the most challenging work that lexicographers are faced with. This is due to zero-equivalence which is caused by the difference in languages and cultures. However, taking enough time to conduct a research and be more careful during the process of dictionary compilation of these bilingual dictionaries can result in having good dictionaries.

In terms of finding solutions for cultural-bound terms, lexicographers have to be careful when choosing strategies as this problem is even more confusing if not well treated. Borrowing must be used carefully and only where necessary and be combined with definitions as this will make a complete, understandable and reversible bilingual dictionaries.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter serves as a conclusion to the study entitled: “The Application of Reversibility Principle in the Northern Sotho-English Bilingual Dictionaries: A lexicographic Analysis”. Each of the chapters that were discussed in the study will be summarized. The findings and recommendations of the study are included in this chapter.

5.2 SUMMARY

Chapter One functions as an introduction to the study. This chapter includes introduction, background to the study, aim of the study, objectives, methodology and significance of the study. It serves as a guideline to the reader as to the main reason to conduct the study.

Chapter Two deals with literature review. The chapter introduces discussion of the application of reversibility principle in Northern Sotho-English bilingual dictionaries, by thoroughly giving views of different scholars. The following scholars were included: Gouws and Prinsloo (2005), Mphahlele (2001), Mongwe (2006), Landau (2001), Jackson (2002), Gouws (1986), Piotrowski (1994), Jong and Peng (2007), Tomaszczyk (1988), Correard (2006) and Mashamaite (2001).

Chapter Three focuses on the application of structural makers in bilingual dictionaries. The following dictionaries were used: *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2009), *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* (2010) and *Oxford Pukuntšu ya Sekolo* (2010). The chapter discusses bilingual dictionaries, presentation of translation equivalents, relations between lemmas and translation equivalents, types

of equivalents, divergence and commas and semicolons as structural markers in bilingual dictionaries.

Chapter Four concentrates generally on equivalence. The chapter outlines the problems that are met by lexicographers and how they affect the process of compiling proper bidirectional bilingual dictionaries. The following were discussed: what is equivalence, the problems in bilingual dictionaries, culture and bilingual dictionaries and treatment of cultural-bound words in bilingual dictionaries.

Chapter Five serves as summary and conclusion of the study. All four chapters are briefly summarized, followed by findings and recommendations of the study.

5.3 FINDINGS

The findings of this study are as follows:

- It is difficult for target users to be confident about the translation equivalents that they find in translation dictionaries because there is no complete and reliable reversibility in dictionaries that are supposed to be bidirectional. It becomes more of a challenge to target users of foreign languages trying to learn a second language. In South Africa, more complete, reliable, fully treated and user friendly bidirectional bilingual dictionaries are needed in order to achieve and promote multilingualism;
- Structural markers are not used wisely and correctly and these affect the users in terms of differentiating translation equivalents that are synonyms and the ones that are polysemous senses;
- Contextual guidance is not given to guide users on which kind of context each translation equivalent can be used;

- Cross-referencing is not used constantly and this results in having too many repetitions of terms that are complete synonyms;
- Lexicographers tend to use definitions alone even in bidirectional dictionaries and this affects the second section in which there must be an exchange of languages (in terms of headwords and translation equivalents); and
- Lexicographers of *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2007 & 2009) and *Sesotho sa Leboa/English Pukuntšu Dictionary* (2006) tend to use borrowed words even in cases where Northern Sotho has an equivalent and this kills Northern Sotho terms because users settle for borrowed words more.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends the following:

- As there are too many mistakes in the current bilingual dictionaries that are supposed to be bidirectional, new complete and user-friendly bidirectional dictionaries need to be compiled;
- Structural markers must be used correctly and carefully so that the user can be able to clearly see translation equivalents that are synonyms and the ones that are polysemous senses;
- Contextual guidance must be used constantly as a guide for the users to know the kind of contexts the equivalents are suitable for;
- Cross-referencing should be used correctly and constantly throughout the dictionary to avoid repetition and misusing of space that can be used for other useful things;

- Extra linguistic information and examples must be used together with borrowed words in order give the users more clearance in terms of the meaning of that borrowed words;
- Borrowing must be used only in cases where Northern Sotho does not have an equivalent completely;
- Definitions and phrases must not be given alone as equivalents, as this becomes a challenge when reversibility has to be applied on the second section of the dictionary; and
- Cultural-bound words must be treated carefully as the target users may not be familiar with them.

5.4 CONCLUSION

Dictionaries play an important role in education and in life in general. Their treatments, therefore, cannot be taken for granted. Should the above-mentioned recommendations be adhered to, there is hardly any doubt, the Northern Sotho lexicography will process dictionaries that will be worth consulting.

REFERENCES

- Al-Kasimi, 1977. *Linguistic and Bilingual Dictionaries*. Leiden: E.J Brill Publisher.
- Bejoint, H. 2004. *Modern Lexicography: An Introduction*. United States: Oxford University Press.
- Bogaards, P. 1994. *Synonymy and Bilingual Lexicography*. Dissertation: Leiden University.
- Corread, M.H. 2006. *Applied Linguistics*. Britain: Elsevier.
- De Schryver, G.M. 2006. *Compiling Modern Bilingual Dictionaries for Bantu Language: Case Studies for Northern Sotho and Zulu*. Unpublished Dissertation. Ghent University.
- De Schryver, G.M. 2010. *Oxford:Pukuntšu ya Sekolo- School Dictionary*. Southern Africa: Oxford University Press.
- Gouws, R.H. 1986. *The History of Lexicography*. United States: University of Exeter.
- Gouws, R.H. 2002. *Equivalent Relations, Context and Context in Bilingual Dictionaries*. Unpublished Article: University of Stellenbosch.
- Gouws, R.H. &Prinsloo, D.J. 2005. *Principles and Practice of South African Lexicography*. Stellenbosch: Sun Press.
- Gouws, R.H. 1999. *Equivalent Relation in Translation Dictionaries*. Cape Town: University of Stellenbosch.
- Hartmann, R.R.K. & James, G. 1998. *Communicative Equivalence in Translation Dictionaries*. M.Phil. Assignment. Cape Town: University of Stellenbosch.

- Hornby, A.S. 2005.*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hornby, A.S. 2010.*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hosana, N.A. 2009. *The Primary of Semantic Comments in Xitsonga/English dictionary*. Unpublished Master's Dissertation. University of Limpopo.
- Jackson, H. 2002. *Lexicography: An Introduction*. London: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Jong, H. & Peng, J. 2007. *Bilingual Lexicography from a Communicative Perspective*. Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kavanagh, K. 2000. *Words in a Cultural Context*. Lexikos 10.
- Kriel, T.J. 2007. *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary*. Pretoria: Pharos Dictionaries.
- Kriel, T.J. 2009. *Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary*. Pretoria : Pharos Dictionaries.
- Landau, S.I. 2001. *Dictionaries the Art and Craft of Lexicography*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Machimana, A.S. 2009.*The Ordering of Senses in English-Xitsonga Bilingual Dictionaries: Towards Logical Meaning Arrangement in the Microstructure*. Unpublished Dissertation: University of Limpopo.
- Malange, S.A. 2005. *Ostensive Addressing as an Approach in Tshivenda. Translation Dictionary: An analysis*. Masters Dissertation. University of Limpopo

- Mashamaite, K.J. 2001.*The Compilation of Bilingual Dictionaries between African Languages in South Africa: The Case of Northern Sotho and Tshivenda*. Lexikos 11.
- Mojela, V., Mphahlele M., Mogodi, P. & Selokela, R. 2006.*Sesotho sa Leboa/English Pukuntšū Dctionary*. South Africa: Phumelela Books.
- Mongwe, M.J. 2006.*The Role of the South African National Lexicography Unit in the Planning and Compilation of Multifunctional Bilingual Dictionaries*. Unpublished Master's Dissertation. University of Stellenbosch.
- Mphahlele, M.C. 1999. *Communicative Equivalence in Translation Dictionaries*. M.Phil. Assignment. Cape Town: University of Stellenbosch.
- Mphahlele, M.C. 2001. *A model to Achieve Equivalence in Translation Dictionaries*. Unpublished Master's Dissertation. University of Stellenbosch.
- Mphahlele, M.C. 2002. *Dictionary of Lexicographic Terms*. Unpublished Articles: University of Stellenbosch.
- Mphahlele, M.L. 2004. *The Transliteration Principle: Is this the Best Procedure in African Lexicography and Terminology?* Lexikos 14.
- Mpofu, N. 2001.*Problem of Equivalence in Shona-English Bilingual Dictionaries*. Lexikos 11.
- Palmer, F. 1971. *Grammar*. New York: Penguin Book Ltd.

Piotrowski, T. 1994. *Problems in Bilingual Lexicography*. Unpublished Dissertation. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Podolej, M. 2009. *Culture in Bilingual Dictionaries: Analysis of Cultural Content and Culture-specific Vocabulary in E-P-E Dictionaries*. Unpublished Dissertation: Uniwersytetuim. Adama Mickiewicza.

Tomaszczyk, J.K. 1984. *The Culture-bound Element in Bilingual Dictionaries*. Unpublished dissertation: Euralex.

Ullman, S.1967. *Principles of Semantics*. Blackwell Oxford.