

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CROSS-REFERENCING WITH SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO NORTHERN SOTHO MONOLINGUAL DICTIONARY AND
NORTHERN SOTHO – ENGLISH BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES**

by

MANTSHA CECILIA MODIBA

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTERS OF ARTS

in

AFRICAN LANGUAGES

in the

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

(School of Languages and Communication Studies)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO

TURFLOOP, SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: PROF RN MADADZHE

2011

(i)

DECLARATION

I declare that the dissertation hereby submitted to the University of Limpopo for the degree MASTER OF ARTS IN AFRICAN LANGUAGES has not previously 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 therein has been duly acknowledged.

.....

MC Modiba



.....

Date

(ii)

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the following people:

- My parents: Victor Lukas and Vuli Liena Modiba;
- My children: Tebogo, Karabo and Kamogelo;
- My sisters: Morongwe, Makgomo, Maite and Khomotšo; and
- My brothers: Masilo, Modibe and Setlabo.

(iii)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the lengthy period of this study I have had the benefit of valuable assistance, advices, criticism and support from friends and colleagues. I would like to thank God for guiding me since birth until today, for giving me perseverance, strength and power in writing this work.

My special thanks go to Professor RN Madadzhe, my supervisor and mentor. He deserves the special 'thank you' for taking his time by guiding, correcting and commenting on my study as well as encouraging me when I was struggling.

Ms Mahlaku Mothiba and Mr MC Mphahlele who introduced me to the study of Lexicography in African Languages, I thank you for making this study so interesting to me.

I cannot forget Mrs Annah Seabi, my daughter, Tebogo and my sister, Rosina Mahlangu, for helping me in typing this study.

The support I got from my cousin, Maite Moreroa, cannot be forgotten. Thank you, "Motho ke motho ka batho".

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates the comparative analysis of cross-referencing in Northern Sotho monolingual dictionary and Northern Sotho-English bilingual dictionaries. The study argues that Northern Sotho-English Lexicographers do not treat cross-referencing in accordance with the lexicographic theories and principles. Since in this study cross-referencing is treated with regard to synonyms and antonyms only, the study has discovered that there are many problems in relation to the application of cross-referencing in these dictionaries. This enables dictionary users to follow it with ease, because if theories are not adhered to, then the motive for using dictionaries becomes null and void.

The other thing is that lexicographers mix the translation equivalents of partial synonyms and complete synonyms, that is, partial synonyms are paired with complete synonyms, thus leading to orthographic errors.

Moreover, the study discovered that some emerging lexicographers are attempting to apply cross-referencing in their dictionaries, something which is a very good attempt. Therefore, the study recommends that major theories and principles of lexicography should be indicated in the front matter of the dictionaries. This will be to make sure that lexicographers themselves know about those theories, as that will make their dictionaries very useful to their readers.

| TABLE OF CONTENTS | PAGE |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND | |
| 1.1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM | 2-4 |
| 1.3 AIM OF THE STUDY | 4 |
| 1.4 OBJECTIVES ON THE STUDY | 4 |
| 1.5 RATIONALE | 5 |
| 1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY | 5 |
| 1.7 METHODOLOGY | 5 |
| 1.8 DATA COLLECTION | 5 |
| 1.8.1 Primary research method | 5 |
| 1.8.2 Secondary research method | 6 |
| 1.9 SCOPE OF DELIMINATION | 6 |
| 1.10 LITERATURE REVIEW | 6 |
| 1.10.1 Atkins (1974) | 7-9 |
| 1.10.2 Gouws (1999) | 9 |
| 1.10.3 Kaplan (2010) | 9 |
| 1.10.4 Mojapelo (2004) | 10 |
| 1.10.5 Mphahlele (2001) | 10-11 |
| 1.10.6 Neilsen (1999) | 11 |
| 1.10.7 Steele (2010) | 12 |
| 1.11 ORGANIZATION OF STUDY | 12-13 |
| CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW | |
| 2.1 INTRODUCTION | 14 |
| 2.2 ATKINS (1974) | 14-16 |
| 2.3 GOUWS (1999) | 16-17 |
| 2.4 KAPLAN (2010) | 17 |
| 2.5 MPHAHLELE (2001) | 17-18 |
| 2.6 MOJAPELO (2004) | 18-19 |
| 2.7 NEILSEN (1999) | 19-20 |

| | | |
|-----|---------------------|-------|
| 2.8 | STEELE (2010) | 20 |
| 2.9 | CONCLUSION | 20-21 |

**CHAPTER 3 CROSS-REFERENCING: SYNONYMS AND ANTONYMS,
AN EXPOSITION**

| | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 3.1 | INTRODUCTION | 21 |
| 3.1.1 | What is a synonym? | 21-23 |
| 3.1.2 | What is an antonym? | 24 |
| 3.2 | CROSS-REFERENCING WITH REGARD TO COMPLETE SYNONYMS | 24 |
| 3.2.1 | NEW SEPEDI DICTIONARY (1996) | 25-27 |
| 3.2.2 | PUKUNTŠU/DICTIONARY (2006) | 27-30 |
| 3.2.3 | PUKUNTŠUTLHALOŠI YA SESOTHO SA LEBOA (2006) | 30-33 |
| 3.3 | CROSS-REFERENCING WITH REGARD TO PARTIAL SYNONYMS | 33 |
| 3.3.1 | NEW SEPEDI/DICTIONARY (1996) | 33-35 |
| 3.3.2 | PUKUNTŠUTLHALOŠI YA SESOTHO SA LEBOA (2006) | 35-39 |
| 3.4 | CROSS-REFERENCING WITH REGARD TO ANTONYM | 40-41 |
| 3.4.1 | NEW SEPEDI DICTIONARY (1996) | 41 |
| 3.4.2 | PUKUNTŠU/DICTIONARY (2006) | 41-42 |
| 3.4.3 | PUKUNTŠUTLHALOŠI YA SESOTHO SA LEBOA (2006) | 42-43 |
| 3.5 | CONCLUSION | 43 |

**CHAPTER 4: CROSS-REFERENCING, SYNONYMS AND ANTONYMS: AN
EXPOSITION**

| | | |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 4.1 | INTRODUCTION | 44 |
| 4.2 | EVALUATION OF CROSS-REFERENCING WITH REGARD TO COMPLETE SYNONYMS | 44 |
| 4.2.1 | NEW SEPEDI DICTIONARY (1996) | 40-48 |
| 4.2.2 | PUKUNTŠU/DICTIONARY (1996) | 48-51 |
| 4.2.3 | PUKUNTŠU/DICTIONARY (2006) | 51-53 |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 4.3 | EVALUATION OF CROSS-REFERENCING WITH REGARD TO PARTIAL SYNONYMS | 53-54 |
| 4.3.1 | NEW SEPEDI DICTIONARY (1996) | 54-56 |
| 4.3.2 | PUKUNTŠU/DICTIONARY (2006) | 57-59 |
| 4.3.3 | PUKUNTŠUTLHALOŠI YA SESOTHO SA LEBOA | 59-62 |
| 4.4 | EVALUATION OF CROSS-REFERENCING WITH REGARD TO ANTONYMS | 62-63 |
| 4.4.1 | NEW SEPEDI DICTIONARY (1996) | 63 |
| 4.4.2 | PUKUNTŠU/DICTIONARY (2006) | 64 |
| 4.4.3 | PUKUNTŠUTLHALOŠI YA SESOTHO SA LEBOA (2006) | 64-65 |
| 4.5 | CONCLUSION | 65-66 |
| CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | | |
| 5.1 | Summary | 67-71 |
| | REFERENCES | 72-73 |

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The role of dictionaries is to present the contents to readers in such a way that the readers will gain understanding of the words that they are looking up. That is why Pei (1996:69) describes a dictionary as “a list of the words of a language usually in alphabetical order with their meaning, often their derivations, and occasionally their histories”.

The importance and quality of dictionaries cannot be overemphasised as Gouws and Prinsloo (1999:46) indicate:

The first step towards the improvement of the lexicographic standard of dictionaries for African languages must be to do the groundwork right. Dictionaries are instruments of linguistic and communicative empowerment therefore lexicographers have to make sure that their intended target users receive an optimal linguistic presentation and aimed at the specific needs and reference skills of well defined users.

There are many types of dictionaries, such as monolingual, bilingual and trilingual dictionaries. What is of interest here is that cross-referencing is applied to all the above mentioned types of dictionaries. Cross-referencing in dictionaries is only applied to synonyms in order to avoid the repetition of translation equivalents. Crystal (1987:111) states that: “In twenty questions to ask when you buy a dictionary, question number 17 reads: Does it contain a list of synonyms? Question number 18 reads: Does it give useful cross-references to other related meaning?”

Cross-referencing is explained by Mphahlele (2001:26) as:

A lexicographer procedure is where a lexicographer refers the user from a reference position to a reference address. This is done by means of a reference entry and gives the user access to additional relevant lexicographer data.

From the above definition, it is evident that when synonyms are treated in a macrostructure of a dictionary, not all synonym pairs should be given comprehensive treatment. That is, only the lemma that has a high usage frequency should receive full lexicographic treatment. Crystal (1997:367) defines synonyms as follows:

A term used in semantics to refer to a major type sense relation between lexical items which have the same meanings are synonyms, and the relationship between them is one of synonymy. For two items to be synonyms it does not mean that they should be identical in meaning, that is, interchangeable in all contexts.

There are two types of synonyms: partial synonyms and complete synonyms. Partial synonyms are words that cannot replace each other in many contexts. For example, **respect** and **honour**. On the other hand complete synonyms are words which can replace each other in many contexts. For example, **speak** and **talk**.

This study focuses on how cross-referencing is treated in the monolingual dictionary, Pukuntšuthlaloši ya Sesotho sa Leboa (Mojela, Mphahlele, Mogodi, and Selokela, 2007) and the Northern Sotho/English Bilingual dictionaries, *New Sepedi Dictionary* (Prinsloo and Sathekge, 1996), *Sesotho sa Leboa/English Pukuntšu Dictionary* (Mojela, Mphahlele, Mogodi and Selokela, 2006) and *Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (Kriel, Prinsloo, and Sathekge, 1997).

1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

Cross-referencing in many Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries has not been treated in a satisfactory manner. This seems to be the case because cross-referencing is not considered to be a crucial item by many lexicographers, as synonyms are all given full lexicographic treatment, whereas this type of treatment should only be given to the most frequently used lexicon. For example:

(1) **Borotho** – *bread* (Prinsloo, 1996:10)

Senkgwa – *bread* (Prinsloo, 1996:34)

The example in (1) above confirms the unsatisfactory treatment of synonyms because the explanation should only be given to **borotho** as it is more frequently used than **senkgwa**.

A proper presentation should have been as follows:

(2) **Borotho** – *bread*

Senkgwa – **SEE** *borotho*

This is the most effective way of treating lexical items which are in synonymous sense as Gouws (1999:24) confirms that:

Lemma receive a very limited treatment where the two variants or synonyms have to be included in a dictionary, the full lexicographic treatment will only be given in the article of one of those lemmata and textual cohesion between the articles should be displaced.

The same lexicographic shortcoming, as indicated in example (1), is also reflected in Mojela *et al*, (2006):

(3) a. **happiness** – **lethabo**

joy – *lethabo*

b. **honour** – *hlompho*

respect – *hlompho*

In this case as well, cross-referencing has not been considered. The lexical items, that is, **honour** and **respect** (**joy** and **happiness**) have been treated in isolation, whereas they are synonymously related. Even though they cannot be used interchangeably, they are in a synonymous relationship. Therefore, the articles in example (3a-b) should have been respectively handled in this way:

(4) a. **happiness** – *hlompho*

joy – **BONA** *happiness*

- b. **respect** - *hlompho*
honour – **BAPETŠA** *respect*

On the other hand, Mojela *et al*, (2007, 33 & 64) have treated lexical items in a more satisfactory manner. This is attested to by, among others, the fact that synonyms have not only been given translation equivalents, but have also received comprehensive treatment as indicated below:

- (5) a. **gagola** – *go ntšha selo ka diripanaripana ka mokgwa wa go šomiša maatla*
(*to cut something into smaller pieces by using force*)
 - b. **kgeila** – **BONA** *gogola* 1

This is an acceptable way of treating synonyms in a dictionary because cross-referencing has been well established. The problem is that other dictionaries do not apply cross-referencing when treating synonyms.

1.3 AIM OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study is to analyse the use of cross-referencing in *monolingual dictionary (Northern Sotho)* and *bilingual dictionaries (English/Northern Sotho)*.

In order to achieve this aim, the study answers the following questions:

- 1.3.1 What is the role of cross-referencing in dictionaries?
- 1.3.2 What is the effect of cross-referencing in dictionaries?
- 1.3.3 How has cross-referencing been applied in monolingual (*Northern Sotho*) and bilingual (*English/Northern Sotho*) Dictionaries?

1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study are the following:

- 1.4.1 To identify the role of cross-referencing in Northern Sotho dictionaries.
- 1.4.2 To highlight to the lexicographers the advantages of cross-referencing in dictionaries.

1.5 RATIONALE

The comparative analysis of the Northern Sotho dictionaries, that is, monolingual and bilingual dictionaries, aims at assisting both dictionary users and lexicographers of Northern Sotho language to realise the importance of cross-referencing in dictionaries, and which lexicons (words) should be awarded cross-referencing. It is also important to know what full lexicographic treatment is because dictionary users will have to apply it when treating synonyms.

1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The comparative analysis of the Northern Sotho dictionaries shall assist both Northern Sotho dictionary users and lexicographers to understand and realise the role and importance of cross-referencing and be able to interpret synonyms in Northern Sotho dictionaries with ease.

Dictionary users will also be assisted to see textual cohesion between lexicons that are in synonymous relationship.

1.7 METHODOLOGY

Since in many Northern Sotho dictionaries cross-referencing is dealt with in an unsatisfactory manner, it is thus vital that critical discourse be utilized in this study. The qualitative research method was used in this study as it gives clearer understanding of the topic under discussion.

1.8 DATA COLLECTION

The researcher used the following methods to gather relevant information about cross-referencing in dictionaries.

1.8.1 Primary research method

The researcher consulted the following respondents:

- Four (4) lexicographers from the University of Limpopo who are attached to the Pan South African Language Board.
- Nine (9) students (with a Masters degree in African Languages), that is 3 from the University of South Africa, 3 from the University of Limpopo and 3 from the University of Venda.
- Two (2) lexicography lecturers (1 from the University of Limpopo and the other from the University of Venda).
- Four (4) language practitioners (2 from the Department of Sports, Arts and Culture-Limpopo Province and the other two (2) from the Legislature-Limpopo Province).

This enabled the researcher to gather first-hand information as it came from people who are directly concerned with the problem at hand. The researcher used open-ended and unstructured questions. Examples of such questions are the following:

- a. What is cross-referencing?
- b. What is the role of cross-referencing in dictionaries?

1.8.2 Secondary research method

This research method provided the researcher with second-hand information as it had been gathered by other people. The researcher selected the information needed in order to validate this study. The information was obtained from works of earlier researchers, journals, theses, dissertations, books and the internet.

1.9 SCOPE OF DELIMITATION

Despite the fact that cross-referencing is a general problem in dictionaries, this study is only be limited to one monolingual dictionary (Northern Sotho) and three bilingual dictionaries (Northern Sotho/English) only.

1.10 LITERATURE REVIEW

There are a few scholars who attempted to study cross-referencing. Their works play an important role in this study as they form the basis thereof. As far as the study of cross-referencing is concerned, little has been done pertaining to its use in dictionaries. Many studies deal with synonyms and not cross-referencing per se. However there are some authors whose works are useful to this study, namely: Mphahlele (2001), Mojapelo (2004), Neilsen (1999), Gouws (1999 and Atkins (1974).

1.10.1 Atkins (1974)

Atkins looks at cross-referencing as a practical guide for library retrieval that will indicate Cross Reference Index subject to headings drawn from six (6) sources. Each subject heading designates the terms used by each of the six sources, or directs the reader to the most appropriate headings. The six sources are (Atkins, 1974:v), namely:

- L C – The Library Congress subject headings that are generally used in catalogues of college, university and research library.
- SEARS – Sears subject headings are generally used in the catalogues of schools and public libraries.
- R G – The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature is an index listing by subject and often by the author and title, of periodical articles from a selected list of popular, non-technical and a few scholarly magazines.
- N Y T – the New York Times Index, described as a "Condensed classified history of the word as recorded daily in the newspaper" is useful for current events, comments and up-to-date statistical information.
- P A I S – The Public Affairs Information Service Bulletin indexes by subject, and sometimes by author, current books, pamphlets, periodical articles, government documents, and other material in the field of economic and public affairs.
- B P I – The Business Periodical Index lists by subject articles from selected periodicals in the field of accounting, advertising, automation, banking,

communication, finance and investments, insurance labour, management, marketing, public relations, and taxation.

All the subject headings are arranged alphabetically. The subject is in the form of (1) SEE reference, and (2) a USE reference.

A SEE reference directs the researcher to look under equivalent's main term because the chosen subject heading is not ordinarily used by the six sources examined above. For example Atkins (1974:vii):

Apartheid – SEE *segregation*

A USE reference means that the chosen heading is used by one of the six sources and the researcher is directed to one or more main terms which identify other comparable and related subject headings and indicate their appearance in particular sources. For example, Atkins, (1974:viii):

Anti-semitice - USE *discrimination*

The following is an example of the above-mentioned six sources as quoted from Atkins (1974:118):

Insanity

- L C – Depression, mental; Hysteria; Idiocy; Insane; criminal and Dangerous; Killing of, mentally ill, Paranoia, Psychoses.
- SEARS – Hallucinations and illusions, personality disorders; Psychology, Pathological suicide.
- R G – Psychiatry, Schizophrenia.
- P A I S – Mental illness; mental institutions, Psychiatry.
- B P I – Mental illness; Schizophrenia.

idiocy – USE *insanity*

In the above given examples, cross-referencing has been given to the lemma **idiocy** as it is not frequently used and the full lexicographic treatment to **insanity**. Even though Atkins deals with the subject heading in libraries, this work helps the present researcher as it treats cross-referencing in subject headings which are related in meanings.

1.10.2 Gouws (1999)

According to Gouws, the difference between the lemmata with a limited lexicographic treatment and lemmata with a complex lexicographic treatment must be made. Orthographic variants and synonym lemmata receive a limited lexicographic treatment. This means that lemmata with a limited lexicographic treatment does not receive a comprehensive lexicographic treatment but receives cross-referencing entry, thus guiding the user to refer to another lemma in the same dictionary.

Gouws also mentions that when two variants of a lexical item exist, both forms have to be included in the dictionary while the full treatment will only be given in the article of one of these lemmata. This work serves as useful material for the current study.

1.10.3 Kaplan (2010)

According to online technical writing, cross-referencing consists of several elements, that is, “the name of the sourced reference which can either be the title or a general subject reference”. It states that, if it is a chapter title or a heading, it should be within quotation marks.

If it is the subject of the cross-reference, you need to state what is in the cross-referenced material and the reader should check it out. In that way it may necessitate indicating the subject matter of the cross-referenced material. However, this article has been of little help to this study.

1.10.4 Mojapelo (2004)

Mojapelo's work concentrates mostly on synonyms in *Northern Sotho/English bilingual Dictionaries*. Regarding cross-referencing (Mojapelo 2004:16) states that:

Meaning relationship between the lemmata should always be indicated or displayed by means of a system of cross-referencing, assist dictionary users to use a dictionary as a text, and a dictionary applies cross-referencing to assist the user to know more about the related lexical items in a shorter space of time.

When treating cross-referencing, Mojapelo quotes Kriel's (1971) bilingual *English/Northern Sotho Dictionary* thus:

Kefa – *hat*

Kuane – *hat*

Mojapelo proceeds by saying the lexical items **kefa** and **kuane** are complete synonyms and can therefore replace each other in many contexts. The lexicographer did not use cross-referencing method to show that the two articles are related to each other. The above articles should have looked as follows:

Kefa – *hat*

Kuane – **SEE** *kefa*

This treatment indicates that the two lemmata, that is, **kefa** and **kunane**, are closely related.

Mojapelo's evaluation is linked to the current study as she has also treated cross-referencing in bilingual dictionaries.

10.5 Mphahlele (2001)

Mphahlele indicates that a dictionary contains different lexical items, which represent the entire lexicon of a language. He further states that lemmata and translation

equivalent are part of the whole dictionary and function in coherence with each other. According to Mphahlele, cross-referencing is a procedure where a lexicographer refers the user from a reference position to a reference address. Mphahlele gives the following example quoted from Bosman's (1984) *Tweetalige Woordeboek-Bilingual Dictionary*:

Begin – *begin, aanvang*

Mphahlele indicates that the synonyms for the lemma, **begin** are **start** and **commence**. Since the three words are synonyms, the articles of **start** and **commence** must look as follows:

Start – **SIEN** *begin*

Commence – **SIEN** *begin*

Mphahlele states that a lemma that has a high usage frequently often receives full lexicographic treatment, whilst the related lemmata receive cross-referencing to a lemma that has a comprehensive treatment.

As Mphahlele's study treats the application of cross-referencing of bilingual dictionaries in general, it therefore serves as useful material to the current study.

1.10.6 Neilsen (1999)

Neilsen has also treated the importance of cross-referencing in dictionaries. According to Neilsen, cross-referencing should not be taken for granted because it has many uses in a dictionary, for instance, cross-referencing helps in the formation of a network structure of relations existing between different parts of data. As a result of cross-referencing, it is impossible to show hierarchical relationships between terms as well as sequential relations.

Neilsen's work assisted the researcher in determining the advantages and roles of cross-referencing in dictionaries.

1.10.7 Steele (2005)

Steele looked on how cross-reference can help you to learn Microsoft Office Word 2003 in 24 hours. He gave an example of writing a manual or another reference document, he says you may include cross-references within those texts to refer the reader from one part of your document to another, and the cross-reference should be typed manually. He is of the idea that, if you type manually section headings, figure numbers will change and they will require you to update all of your cross-references that will need updating field and, in that way, word can update them for you as needed.

One will realise that there is still a gap to be filled in for Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries as cross-referencing is not properly treated. Even in the front matter, where structural markers and other signs are explained, cross-referencing is not even mentioned in all the dictionaries; something which was treated in this study. The researcher makes lexicographers aware of these shortcomings.

1.11 ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1: deals with the general introduction of the study. It gives the problem of the statement, aims, rationale, significance, methodology, planning of the research paper and literature review. Some concepts like 'dictionary' and 'cross-referencing' are defined.

Chapter 2 deals with the literature review in details, how other scholars have treated cross-referencing. Examples are often given.

Chapter 3 focuses on the exposition of the dictionaries, on how synonyms and antonyms are given in their dictionaries.

Chapter 4 presents a comparative evaluation of cross-referencing and acknowledgements where correct applications were made, and critical evaluation is done where theories were not applied.

Chapter 5 gives the conclusion, the findings and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

There are a variety of scholars who attempted to study cross-referencing. Their work is relevant to this study, as therefore plays an important role in this study. As far as the study of cross-referencing is concerned, little has been done pertaining to its use in dictionaries. Many studies deal with synonyms and not cross-referencing per se. However, there are some authors whose works were useful to his study, namely Mphahlele (2001), Mojapelo (2004), Neilsen (1999), Gouws (1999), and Atkins (1974), Hartman (2003) and Kaplan (2010).

2.2 ATKINS (1974)

Atkins looks at cross-referencing as a practical guide for library retrieval that will indicate Cross Reference Index lists of subject headings drawn from six (6) sources. Each subject heading designates the terms used by each of the six sources, or it directs the reader to the most appropriate heading. The six sources are appropriate headings. The six sources are, namely (Atkins, 1974):

- LC – The Library Congress subject headings are generally used in catalogues of college, university and research libraries.
- SEARS – Subject headings are generally used in the catalogue of college, university and research libraries.
- RG – The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature is an index listing by subject.
- NYT – The New York Times Index, described as a “condensed classified history of the word as recorded daily in the newspaper” is useful for current events and comments an up to date statistical information.
- PAIS – The Public Affairs Information Service Bulletin indexes by subject, and sometimes by author, current books, pamphlets, Periodicals articles,

government documents and other material in the field of economic and public affairs.

- BPI – The Business Periodical Index lists by subject articles from selected periodicals in the field of accounting, advertising, automation, banking, communication, finance and investments.

All the subject headings are supposed to be arranged alphabetically. The subject heading should be in the form of (1) a SEE reference, and (2) a USE reference.

Atkins (1974:vii) emphasises the point that a SEE reference directs the reader to look under equivalent term because the chosen subject heading is not ordinarily used by the six sources examined above. Apartheid – SEE segregation.

Atkins (1974:vii) continues to state that “a USE reference means that the chosen heading is used by one of the six sources and the researcher is directed to one or more main terms which identifies other comparable and related subject headings and indicates their appearance in particular sources”.

Anti-semitism – Use discrimination

The following is an example of the above-mentioned six sources as quoted from Atkins (1974:118):

Insanity

- LC – Depression, mental, Hysteria, idiocy. Insane, criminal and dangerous, killing of mentally ill paranoia, psychoses
- SEARS – Hallucinations and illusions, personality disorder, psychology pathology suicide.
- RG – Psychiatry, Schizophrenia
- NYT – Mental Health Disorders, Crime and Criminals, Insanity, legal defines of, Mental deficiency and defectives
- PAIS – Mental illness, mental institutions, psychiatry
- BPI – Mental illness, Schizophrenia

- Idiocy – USE insanity

2.3 GOUWS (1999)

Gouws states that, in the theory of mediostructures, a lexicographer cross-refers the dictionary user from a cross-reference position to a cross-reference address. This is done by means of cross-reference entry in which a cross reference marker is used, and it gives the user access to additional relevant lexicographic data.

A cross-reference relation is established between the cross-reference entry and cross reference address. In order to illustrate this, Gouws used an article that he obtained from *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*. The article in question deals with the lemma **frog**:

1: any various smooth-skinned we-footed largely aquatic tailless agile leaping mphibians. COMPARE **toad**

From the example given above, the lemma **toad** is in the cross-reference position to the lemma **frog**.

Gouws further says that a variety of cross-reference markers are used in different dictionaries and often also in one dictionary. The lexicographer has to deal with three important types of cross-reference addresses namely: internal, external and dictionary external cross-reference addresses. These are explained below as follows:

The internal cross-reference address

An article that reflects an internal mediostructural relation assists the user to relate various micro structural entries employed in the same article with an internal cross-reference address. In such a case the mediostructural relation does not exceed the boundaries of the article. This type of cross-referencing is used to ascertain coherence between different microstructural entries in one article.

The external cross-reference address

The external cross-reference address exceeds the boundaries of the article. Two search domains can be identified for external cross-reference addresses. The external address can be located after elsewhere in the central list. Gouws highlights the fact that this mediostructural procedure links a text segment in a dictionary to a source outside a dictionary.

Another aspect that has received attention in Gouws's analysis, is the 'back matter'. The 'back matter' of the dictionary contains a bibliography of sources where more information regarding the terminology treated in the dictionary can be found. Many articles contain condensed bibliographical references. This is a useful strategy because the user is guided by means of a complete reference to the specific source. The condensed bibliographical reference in the article is clearly indicated by the cross-reference marker "Bibl".

2.4 KAPLAN (2010)

Kaplan indicates that cross-referencing consists of several elements, that is: the name of the reference which can either be the title or a general subject reference. He states that, if it is a chapter title or a heading, it should be in quotation marks. If it is the subject matter of the cross-referenced material, the reader should check it out. In that way, it may necessitate indicating the subject matter of the cross-referenced material. This article was of great help to this study.

2.5 MPHAHLELE (2001)

Mphahlele indicates that cross-referencing is a lexicographic procedure whereby a lexicographer refers the user from a reference position to a reference address. This is done by means of reference entry, and gives the user access to additional relevant lexicographic data. According to Mphahlele, lexicographers should bear in mind that lexical items are part of the entire lexicon of a language. That is, the lemma should not be treated in isolation from other lexical items in the dictionary.

To make sure that these lemmata are treated in co-ordination with each other, cross-referencing should be applied in dictionaries. He further states that the treatment of synonym lemmata shows the interaction between the related lemmata.

Mphahlele has used examples from Tsolwana's dictionary (1996:50&69):

cry – **ukulila, ukukhala**
lament - **ukulila, ukukhala**

Mphahlele is of the view that these articles create a serious problem because usage information does not have paradigm, and there is also duplication in these articles. Mphahlele corrected it as follows:

cry – ukulila (umundwan) akukhala (sizwe)
lament – BONA (see) cry

A co-ordination between these articles is displayed and this can make a user to realise that those words of a language do not function in isolation. Mphahlele's study is closely linked to the current study and it serves as a good reference.

2.6 MOJAPELO (2004)

Mojapelo's work concentrates mostly on synonyms in Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries. When treating cross-referencing, Mojapelo has used Kriel's (1997) bilingual English/Northern Sotho dictionary:

kefa – hat
kuane - hat

Mojapelo proceeds by stating that lexical items **kefa** and **kuane** are complete synonyms and can therefore replace each other in many contexts. The lexicographer did not use cross-referencing method to show that the two articles are related to each other. The above articles should have looked as follows:

kefa – hat

kuane - SEE **kefa**

The above treatment indicates that the two lemmata (that is, **kefa** and **kuane**) are in a synonymous sense. Mojapelo's evaluation is linked to the current study as she has also treated synonyms in bilingual dictionaries.

2.7 NEILSEN (1999)

According to Neilsen, Cross-reference is the usage of synonymous or related information in a document from elsewhere, which is usually within the same work. In making such connections between related or synonyms, this connection or cross-reference is often abbreviated as X-ref, xref and, in computer science, XR. It is used to verify claims made by an author or to link the claim to a related piece of work. SEE also denotes a cross-reference in an index.

Reference numbers and footnote marks are traditionally examples of in-context cross-referencing, whereas index and reference lists are examples of out-of-context cross-referencing. Out-of-context in particular relies on the traditional, manually-produced indexes utilizing citation or subject. This was the mainstream text retrieval procedure until the advent of CD-ROM in 1985.

Anyhow, Neilsen is credited to have objected to the wide spectrum of text retrieval or cross-reference and preferred to narrow it to the idea of transclusion, or simply quotation, aiming for text patchwork rather than retrieval.

Xref can be used as a prefix to indicate a cross-reference that joins two tables together via a primary key. Cross-reference can also be important for several reasons, particularly in printed and online dictionaries. They form a network structure of relations existing between dictionary internal as well as external and different parts of data. A distinction can be observed between use-related and function-related cross-references. Cross-references also assist in showing hierarchical relationships between terms as well as sequential relations.

Therefore, dictionary compilers are advised to take a broader approach to cross-references in dictionaries as they directly link with other structures in dictionaries. Neilsen's work is related to the current research even though it focuses much on the online dictionaries.

2.8 STEELE (2005)

Steele looked on how cross-reference can help you to learn Microsoft Office Word 2003 in 24 hours. He gave an example of writing a manual or another reference document says you may want to include cross-references within those texts to refer the reader from one part of your document to another, and the cross-reference should be typed manually. He is of the idea that if you type manually section headings, figure numbers, will change and they will require you to update all of your cross-references. That will need updating field and, in that way. Word can update them for you as needed. The guide to cross refer is stated as follows by Steele (2005):

Word by default inserts cross-reference fields as hyperlinks, so if you are editing a document that contains cross-reference fields you can Ctrl+click them to jump to their targets. NOTE: if you want to insert cross-references headings, you need to format your headings, with heading style or outlines levels first.

1. Click the spot where you want the cross-reference to go
2. Choose insert, reference, cross-reference to display cross-reference dialogue box.

Even though this work deals with the cross-reference in Microsoft Word 2003, a reference from a certain position to a reference address is shown, it may serve as a guide to this study.

2.9 CONCLUSION

Many authors have attempted to write about cross-referencing but not in dictionaries. They have treated mostly computer studies which is a bit different to the current studies. The four authors whose works were of great importance to the current study are namely, Neilsen, Mphahlele Mojapelo and Gouws, because they have treated

cross-referencing in dictionaries. Mojapelo and Mphahlele' work is closely related to the current research and helped to complete this research.

CHAPTER 3

3. CROSS-REFERENCING: SYNONYMS AND ANTONYMS, AN EXPOSITION

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to discuss how cross-referencing can be used to indicate synonyms and antonyms. In order to achieve this aim, the chapter analyses three dictionaries, namely Prinsloo and Sathekgese's *New Sepedi Dictionary* 1996; Mojela, Selokela, Mphahlele and Mogodi's *Pukuntšu Dictionary* 2006, and Mojela, Selokela, Mphahlele and Mogodi's (Monolingual) *Pukuntšutlhaloši ya Sesotho sa Leboa* (2006).

Given that synonyms are words that have the same meaning, and this meaning relation should be indicated in dictionaries and they have to be treated in relation to one another, the exposition based on cross-referencing regarding complete synonyms, partial synonyms and antonyms. This chapter discusses how cross-referencing can be achieved to indicate synonyms and antonyms in Northern Sotho bilingual and monolingual dictionaries.

3.1.1 What is a synonym?

Synonyms are words that have the same meaning and this meaning relation should be indicated in dictionaries. According to Crystal (1991:20) synonym is:

A term used in semantics to refer to a major type of sense relation between lexical items which have the same meanings are synonyms, and the relationship between them is synonymy. For two items to be synonyms, it does not mean that they should be identical in meaning i.e. interchangeable in all contexts, and with identical connotations, this unlikely possibility is sometimes referred to as total synonymy.

There are types of synonyms but, in this study, only complete and partial synonyms are dealt with.

Complete synonyms are lemmata that can replace each other in many contexts. In this regard, Crystal (1999:340) states that "it does not mean that they should be

identical in meaning, or interchangeable in all context, - this unlikely possibility is sometimes referred to as 'total synonymy'. One agrees with Crystal because most of the synonyms are close enough in their meaning to allow a choice to be made between them in some contexts, without there being any difference in the meaning of the sentence as a whole. Hereunder follows few examples of complete synonyms:

- (1) a. **kefa – kuane**
(hat)

- b. **mmalegogwana – kobaobane**
(prostitute)

- c. **patetše – mošwang wa matuba**
(dagga)

According to the lexicographic theory, with special reference to complete synonyms, synonyms that can replace each other in many contexts, and the lemmata that are most frequently used should be given full lexicographic treatment, while the less frequently used ones receive cross-reference to the most frequently used, by means of the **SEE/BONA** reference marker.

Partial synonyms are synonyms that cannot replace each other in many contexts. According to Mojapelo (2006:58), partial synonyms are: "The synonyms with partial identical meaning and can replace each other in some contexts". Partial synonyms do not share every aspect of their respective meanings, therefore, they cannot be treated like complete synonyms.

Some Northern Sotho examples of partial synonyms are as follows:

- (2) a. **rapela – kgopela**
(pray)

- b. **hwilego – mohu**
(deseased) – (dead)

3.1.2 What is an antonym?

According to Dictionary.com ((2011), antonyms are “words which have opposite meaning”. The same website elaborated this point succinctly thus:

A word can have more than one antonym, depending on which meaning you use for the word. There are four types of antonyms, namely: **Gradable antonyms**, are opposites at either end of the spectrum, as in **slow** and **fast**.

Complementary antonyms are absolute opposites, like **mortal** and **immortal**.

Rational antonyms are opposites where one word describes a relationship between two objectives ... for example **parent** and **child**.

Auto antonyms are the same two words that mean the opposite, for example **fast** (moving quickly and **fast** (stuck in place).

Some Northern Sotho examples of antonyms are as follows:

- (3) a. **tla – tloga**
(come – go)

- b. **dula – ema**
(sit – stand)

- c. **monna – mosadi**
(sit – stand)

Our focal point here is not the types of antonyms, but to investigate if there is cross-referencing in antonyms, and this is dealt with later in this chapter.

3.2 Cross-reference with regard to complete synonyms

As indicated above, this research investigates the presentation of complete synonyms in the above-mentioned dictionaries. The aim is to see whether or not cross-referencing in the aforementioned dictionaries has been used to show the existence of complete synonyms in Sepedi/English.

3.2.1 NEW SEPEDI DICTIONARY (1996)

Let's consider the following synonym pairs:

- (4) a. **assegai** – lerumo (1996:06)
b. **spear** – lerumo (1996:54)
- (5) a. **beer** – bjalwa (1996:08)
b. **liquor** – bjalwa (1996:35)
- a. **testify** – hlatsela (1996:58)
b. **witness** – hlatsela (1996:64)
- a. **defeat** – fencya (1996:17)
b. **win** – fencya (1996:64)

In example (1), **assegai** and **spear** are regarded as complete synonyms because they refer to exactly the same referent. Let us consider the following sentences to prove that they are indeed complete or absolute synonyms:

- (4) a. He killed a lion with an **assegai**.
*O bolaile tau ka **lerumo**.*
- b. He killed a lion with a **spear**.
*(O bolaile tau ka **lerumo**.)*

The above sentences are similar and the two lemmata **assegai** and **spear** can be used interchangeable without changing the meaning. As a result, a reference entry was supposed to have been given to the less frequently used lemma, which is **assegai**, and the full lexicographic treatment be given to the lemma **spear**, the reference marker for complete synonyms is **SEE/BONA**.

Example (2) **beer** and **liquor** are not complete synonyms. But they have been treated as complete synonyms because they were given the same reference **bjalwa**.

The following sentences illustrate the point:

- (5) a. Too much **liquor** was stolen in the **bottlestore**.
(*Bjalwa bjo bontši bo utsitšwe borekišetšong mabjalwa*).
- b. Too much **beer** was stolen in the **bottlestore**.
(*Bjalwa (bja go hlotlwa) bjo bontši bo utswitšwe borekišetšong mabjalwa*).

According to Dictionary.com.2011, liquor is “alcoholic beverage” whereas beer is “fermented beverage made from malt and hops”. Therefore **beer** cannot be sold in a bottle store, only liquor can be sold there, therefore **beer** and **liquor** should not be treated as complete synonyms and should not be given similar translation equivalents. The above article should have been treated as follows:

beer-hlotlwa, maphoroma **BAPETŠA LIQUOR**
liquor-bjalwa

BAPETŠA reference is for partial synonyms, which will be treated later.

Example (3), **testify** and **witness** are also regarded as complete synonyms, let us consider the following sentence to verify if they are indeed complete synonyms:

- (6) a. I will **testify** in court.
(*Ke tla hlatsela kgorongtshoko.*)
- b. I will **witness** in court.
(*Ke tla hlatsela kgorongtshoko.*)

The above lemmata can replace each other in many contexts, therefore, the retranslation methods is unnecessary. Since **witness** is the most frequently used lemma, it should have been given full lexicographic treatment and cross-reference be given to testify.

Example (4) **defeat** and **win** are absolute synonyms and can be used to replace each other, Let us consider the following sentences to illustrate this point:

- (7) a. Iran **defeated** the USA.
(*Iran e **fentše** USA.*)
- b. Iran **won** a war with the USA
(*Iran e **fentše** ntwā kgahlanong le USA.*)

Similarly, **defeat** and **win** are also complete synonyms, and can replace each other in many contexts.

3.2.2 PUKUNTŠU/DICTIONARY (2006)

The following synonym pairs are treated:

- (8) a. **definition** – *tlhalošo* (2006:139)
b. **explanation** – *tlhalošo* 92006:146)
- (9) a. **bodiidi** – poverty (2006:08)
b. **bohloki** – poverty (2006:08)
- (10) a. **predict** – *akanya* (2006:180)
b. **propose** – *akanya* (2006:180)
- (11) a. **action** – *kgato/legato* (2006:122)
b. **step** – *kgato/legato* (2006:192)

According to the theory of lexicography, complete synonyms cannot be all given full lexicographic treatment; only the most frequently used lemma should be awarded full lexicographic treatment and the less frequently used lemma be given cross-referencing.

In example (8), **definition** and **explanation** are having the same referent **tlhalošo**, given that synonyms can replace each other in many contexts, the above articles were not treated fairly. The lexicographers should not have included translation equivalents that are found in the article **definition** in the translation of **explanation**.

Let us consider the following sentences to confirm if they are complete synonyms indeed:

You will have to give me an **explanation** for this behaviour. (*O tla swanelwa ke go mpha mabaka a boitshwaro bjoo.*)

You will have to give me a **definition** for this behaviour. (*O tla swanelwa ke go mpha tlhalošo ya boitshwaro bjoo.*)

The above sentences are not the same. This means that **explanation** and **behaviour** are not complete synonyms as regarded by Mojela et al. The above treatment helps to explicate the relation of synonyms in the source language. This kind of treatment is user-friendly because we are able to see that the article **definition** does not have the same translation equivalents as those of **explanation**, and therefore cannot replace each other in many contexts. In other words, the two items are partial synonyms. Contextually, guidance should always be furnished in the translation equivalent paradigm. In case of cross-referencing, contextual guidance should be supplied in an article of the lemma that receives full lexicographic treatment.

Bodiidi and **bohloki** are also regarded as complete synonyms. Similarly, the same lexicographic shortcoming appears again because the lexicographer gave all the synonym lemmata a comprehensive treatment. This shortcoming cannot assist the user to see co-ordination and cohesion of the articles in a dictionary. This approach can never facilitate a process of language learning.

Mphahele (2006:80) states that the repetition of the same translation equivalents in many articles is nothing but a waste of time and duplication of the presented

information. Let us consider the following sentences to verify if the lemmata are complete synonyms:

*Rakgadi o hlakišwa ke **bodiidi**.*

(Aunty is troubled by **poverty**.)

*Rakgadi o hlakišwa ke **bohloki**.*

(Aunty is troubled by **poverty**.)

The lemma **bodiidi** has the highest usage frequency, it should thus receive complete lexicographic treatment, whilst the article of **bohloki** receives cross-reference to the lemma **bodiidi**.

In example (10), **predict** and **akanya** are treated as complete synonyms, but they cannot replace each other in many contexts. Therefore, it is not going to help dictionary users in any way because they will not be able to differentiate between complete and partial synonyms.

The following examples illustrate this point:

I **propose** closure.

(Ke **akanya** tswalelo.)

I **predict** closure.

(Ke **bonela pele** tswalelo.)

The above sentences are not similar. The first sentence does make sense, and the second one is senseless. Therefore, the present researcher disagrees with Mojela *et al*, when they treat the above articles as complete synonyms they should have treated them as partial synonyms.

The lemmata **propose** and **predict** were mistakenly treated as complete synonyms because they both have the same translation equivalent, which is **akanya**, and it means that the two items can substitute each other in some contexts. This indicates that it is through retranslation method that inaccuracies regarding choice of

translation equivalents is exposed. This means that retranslation method is not a standard procedure in translation dictionaries.

Similar to other examples treated above, the above articles **action** and **step** can replace each other in many contexts as treated by Mojela *et al.* Let us consider the following sentences to illustrate the above point.

I will take further **actions** if you don't pay me. (*Ke tla go tšeela magato a mangwe ge o sa ntefe*). I will take further **steps** if you don't pay me. (*Ke tla go tšeela magato a mangwe ge o sa ntefe*).

The above two sentences are similar, therefore the present researcher agrees with Mojela *et al* when they treat these lemmata **step** and **action** as complete synonyms because they have the same translation equivalents and they can replace each other in many contexts. Mphahlele (2001:81) as quoted Louw (1991:118) saying “without the cross-reference a synonym definition will be acceptable or adequate because a meaning is not another word, another word is translation. A meaning is a set of semantic features”. This means that a mere listing of translation equivalents without usage information can mislead dictionary users.

3.2.3 PUKUNTŠUTLHALOŠI YA SESOTHO SA LEBOA (2006)

The following synonyms pairs are treated from the above monolingual dictionary.

- (11) a. **mmalegogwana – LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE** (synonym)
kobaobane, kgarebe goba mosadi wa maitshwaro a mabe yo a ratago go robala le banna ba bantši (2006:105)
- b. **kobaobane – BONA mmalegogwana** (2006:73)
- (12) a. **mateng 2 – LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE** dikagare, ditho ka moka tšeo di hwetšwago ka dimpeng tša sephedi sefe goba sefe (2006:)
- b. dikagare – **BONA mateng 2** (2006:)

- (13) a. **fora 1 – LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE** – aketša – go botša/goba go bolela maaka, taba ye e se bego nnete (2006:31)
- b. **aketša** – BONA fora 1 (2006:02)
- (14) a. **gotla – LEHLALOSETŠA GO TEE** – bopa, golla ka go rora ga mereba, ka lentšu la fase le lekoto la go tlala makoko (2006:42)
- b. **bopa – BONA** gotla (2006:10)

Let us consider example 11 to confirm if the lemmata **mmalegogwane** and **kobaobane** are complete synonyms.

***Kobaobane** e hlalantšha banna le basadi ba bona.* (A **prostitute** makes men to divorce their wives).

The above sentences are similar and they all make sense. This confirms that the lemmata **mmalegogwana** and **kobaobane** are complete synonyms and they can replace each other in many contexts.

The lexicographers have given the contextual guidance that **mmalegogwana** is a synonym of **kobaobane**. As such, the treatment is user friendly. The lemma **mmalegogwana** has been given full lexicographic treatment because it is most frequently used, and **kobaobane** has been awarded cross-reference to **mmalegogwana**. There is no repetition of translation equivalents or referents.

In example (12), **mateng 2** and **dikagare** are also regarded as complete synonyms. Let us consider the following sentences:

Mateng a a rekega leselageng.

(**Intestines** are cheaper at the butchery.)

Dikagare di a rekega leselageng.

(**Intestines** are cheaper at the butchery.)

Similarly, the article is satisfactory, because **mateng 2** and **dikagare** are complete synonyms and they were given the correct treatment according to lexicographic theory in terms of complete synonyms, because **mateng 2** has a high frequency usage, hence it is given a full lexicographic treatment, whereas **dikagare** is given cross-reference. The presentation is acceptable because translation equivalents are not duplicated.

In example 13, **fora 1** and **aketša** are also regarded as completed synonyms, and that can be checked syntactically to prove the above about.

*(Lehodu le **fora** maphodisa.)*

A thief is lying to the police officers.

*Lehodu le **aketša** maphodisa.*

A thief is lying to the police officers.

The above sentences are similar and they all make sense. Therefore, the lemmata **aketša** and **fora 1** can be used interchangeably, and the lexicographer has done justice to the above articles, because users are referred from a reference position, which is the translation equivalents of the lemma **fora 1**, to the reference, which is **aketša**. This was done by means of a reference entry, which is BONA, and that gives users access to additional relevant lexicographic data.

In example 1, the lemmata **gotla** and **bopa** have been treated as complete synonyms. Let us consider the following sentences to prove the above point:

*Pholo e a **bopa**.*

(A **bull** is roaring.)

*Pholo e a **gotla***

(A bull is roaring)

The above sentences mean the same thing, therefore, **gotla** and **bopa**, are indeed complete synonyms. The lexicographers did well because they did not include the

translation equivalents that are found in the lemma **gotla** in the article of **bopa**. It is good that **gotla** is given full lexicographic treatment whilst **bopa** is given cross-reference. There is a relation of synonymy, which is why cross-referencing was used.

3.3 Cross-referencing with regard to partial synonyms

As indicated, this research also investigates the presentation of partial synonyms in the dictionaries mentioned earlier in this chapter. The aim is to see whether or not cross-referencing in these dictionaries has been used to show the existence of partial synonyms in Sepedi/English.

According to lexicographic theory concerning partial synonyms, a lemma that has more or many translation equivalents should receive cross-referencing from the one with fewer equivalents. They all receive full lexicographic treatment and a semicolon (;) is used with the translation equivalents.

3.3.1 *New Sepedi Dictionary (1996)*

The following partial synonyms are treated:

- (15) a. **deceased** – mohu, hwilego, hlokofetše (1996)
- b. **dead** – mohu, hlokofetše (1996:16)

- (16) a. **degree** – kgato, boemo (1996:16)
- b. **step** – kgato, legato, gata

- (17) a. **worship** – rapela, direla (1996:95)
- b. **pray** – rapela (1996:44)

The articles 12-14 are all regarded as partial synonyms but Prinsloo *et al*, (1996) do not give some lemmata suitable treatment. This is the case because others were treated like complete synonyms, whereas their meanings or translation equivalents cannot replace each other in many contexts. The lemma that have more translation

equivalents should be awarded cross-referencing that is opposite to the complete synonyms.

In example (15) **deceased** and **dead**:

A **dead** animal
(*Phoofolo ye e hwilego*)

A **deceased** animal
(*Phoofolo ye e hlokofetšego*)

The above sentences are not the same, and the second one does not make sense at all. Therefore, the lexical items **dead** and **deceased** have been replaced in the correct synonym pair up partial synonyms. The translation equivalents that maintain a relation of absolute equivalence is **mohu**. In other words, the article of the lemma **deceased** should receive cross-referencing to **dead**, because the lemma **deceased** has more translation equivalents. In other words, both these lemmata should receive full lexicographic treatment.

In example (16) **degree** and **step** let us consider the following sentences:

The **degree** for the temperatures are higher these days.
(*Boemo bja bosu bo godimo matšatši a.*)

The **steps** for the temperature are higher these days.
(*Dikgato tša bosu di godimo matšatši a.*)

The above sentences prove that the lemmata **degree** and **step** are partial synonyms and cannot be used interchangeably. Therefore, **step** should receive cross-referencing to **degree**, because **step** has more referents than **degree**.

In example (17), **worship** and **pray**, let us consider the following sentences:

Gouws (1999:24), distinguished between the lemma with a limited lexicographic treatment and the lemmata with a complete lexicographic treatment. According to

Gouws (1999:24) “orthographic variants and synonyms lemmata received a limited lexicographic treatment in the form of cross-referencing”. Since the above articles, **worship** and **pray** are regarded as partial synonyms, therefore, they should be proven syntactically. Let us consider the following sentences:

God will punish those who worship false gods.

(*Modimo o tla **otla** bao ba rapelelago medimo e šele.*)

In the above sentences, the lemma that maintains a relation of absolute equivalence, that is, **rapela**, makes the above sentences similar. This proves the theory of lexicography in terms of partial synonyms which states that they may replace each other in some contexts. In this context, **worship** can replace pray, hence they are partial synonyms.

3.3.2 PUKUNTŠU/DICTIONARY (2006)

Given that partial synonyms cannot replace each other in many contexts, Mojela et al have also treated partial synonyms in their dictionaries, and they are treated below to check whether or not the lemmata are indeed partially synonymous.

The following synonym pairs are treated:

- (18) a. **betha** – beat, strike (2006)
b. **opa** – strike, clap, slap, knock, ache, throb, paining (2006:79)

- (19) a. **nyatša** – despise, belittle, undermine, treat with disdain (2006:78)
b. **telela** – despise, undermine (2006:105)

- (20) a. **mojako** – doorway, entrance, entry, the door
b. **lebatl** – door

- (21) a. **thato** – will, desire, liking, love (2006)
b. **tumo** – desire, need, lust (2006)

Let us consider example (18) **betha** and **opa**:

*(Ge morutiši a ka **betha** ngwana, a ka rakwa.)*

If a teacher hits a learner, she/he might be fired.

*(Ge morutiši a ka **opa** ngwana, a ka rakwa.)*

If a teacher strikes a learner, she/he might be fired

The lemmata **betha** and **opa** are indeed partial synonyms, because the above sentences are not similar, **opa** is having more translation equivalents and the translation equivalent which maintains the relation of equivalence is strike. Therefore, **opa** should receive cross-reference to **betha**.

Let us look at example 19, **nyatša** and **telela**

*(Bana ge ba **nyatša** batswadi ga ba tšwelele.)*

Children who undermine their parents will not succeed in life.

*(Bana ge ba **telela** batswadi ga ba tšwelele.)*

Children who undermine their parents will not succeed in life.

Despite the theory that states that the lemmata replace each other in some contexts, the above lemmata, **nyatša** and **telela**, are not partial synonyms, because they can replace each other in many contexts and all their translation equivalents can fit in both lemmata. Therefore, the present researcher disagrees with Mojela *et al*, when they regard the above lemmata as partial synonyms.

The above treatment will not assist the dictionary users to see that the two lemmata are completely synonymous.

Let us consider example (20), **mojako** and **lebati**

The above articles are also regarded as partial synonyms, and the translation equivalent that maintain the relation of absolute equivalence is door.

The following sentences help to detect if they are indeed partially synonymous:

(*Ke rekile **lebati** la theko ya godimo*).

I have bought an expensive door.

(*Ke rekile **mojako** wa theko ya godimo*).

I have bought the expensive entrance.

The second sentence does not make sense at all. Therefore, the above lemmata cannot replace each other and they are indeed partially synonymous. They should all be given full lexicographic treatment, with **mojako** being given cross-referencing to **lebati**, because **lebati** has fewer translation equivalents.

Let us consider example (21) **thato** and **tumo**

(*Ke **thato** ya Modimo ge re hlokofala*).

It is God's will when we die.

(*Ke **tumo** ya Modimo ge re hlokofala*).

It is God's desire when we die.

The second sentence is senseless. Therefore **thato** and **tumo** are indeed partially synonymous, and since **thato** is having more translation equivalents, it should be awarded cross-reference to **tumo**.

3.3.3 PUKUNTŠUTLHALOŠI YA SESOTHO SA LEBOA (2006)

The following synonyms are treated to make sure if they are partially synonyms to each other.

- (22) a. **bahlabani** – **BAPETŠA** – madira, batho bao ba lwago ntweng, gantši ya go šireletša naga ya gabobona ka go šomiša dibetša (2006:04)
(Warriors, people fighting at war using weapons to protect their country).

- b. **madira** – batho bao ba hlokometšego tšhireletšego ya naga ya bobona, ka go phela mellwaneng goba mafelong a mangwe ka gare ga naga (2006:94).
(People who are responsible for protection of their country, staying and working at the borders and other places in the country).
- (23) a. **nagana – BAPETŠA** gopola, ge bjoko bo beakanya le go tšea sephetho mabapi le tiragalo.
(When the brain prepares and takes decisions about events)
- b. **gopola – LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE** *Elelwa ge mogopolo o buša dilo tše di fetilego a ka ba tšeo di dirilwego/goba di bonwego/goba dikwelwego.*
(When the mind recalls past things, it can be those done, seen or heard).
- (24) a. **dipoelo BAPETŠA** ditlamorago tša mošomo goba tiragalo tše itšego, di le ka sebopego seo se sepelelanago le mešomo yeo (2006:19). (The end product of the work or specific activities in the form which relate to those activities.
- b. **ditlamorago – BAPETŠA** Dipoelo/ditiragalo tše di bego gona morago ga go re ye nngwe e hlage. (2006:23)
(Things that happen after actions).

Since this is a monolingual dictionary, and the translation equivalents are definitions and not words, the cross-reference will not be determined by the lemmata with more translation equivalents. Any synonyms pair can be given cross-reference as they are all having definitions as translation equivalent synonyms, and they cannot replace each other in many contexts.

Let us consider example (22) **bahlabani** and **madira**

(**Bahlabani** ba kgoši Mphephu ba šireletša mošate).

The **warriors** of king Mphephu guard the headkraal.

(**Madira** a kgoši Mphephu ba šireletša mošate).

The defence force for king Mphephu guard the headkraal.

The above sentences do not mean the same thing. This confirms that the lemmata **bahlabani** and **madira** are partial synonyms and thus cannot replace each other in all contexts.

Let us consider example (23);

nagana and **gopola** are also regarded as partial synonyms.

The above article has a serious problem because the lemmata **nagana** and **gopola** are partial synonyms, the lemma **nagana** has been given cross-reference to **gopola** which is very acceptable, but **gopola** has also been given cross-reference to another lemma **elelwa** (remember) which is what Gouws (199:184) refers to when he says “One of the basic errors sometimes made by lexicographer is to give cross-reference entry cross-referring the address that does not exist”.

Let us consider example (24):

Dipolelo and **ditlamorago** are also regarded as partial synonyms, the following sentence will illustrate if the above points is correct:

Ditlamorago tša Matriki di kaonafetše lenyaga.

(The consequence of Matric have improved this year.)

The above sentences are not similar; the first sentence makes sense while the second does not. This proves that they cannot replace each other in many context although but they are partially synonymous. The shortcoming that appears in the above treatment is that **dipoelo** and **ditlamorago** have all been awarded cross-referencing against each other. This is something which is not allowed. According to the lexicographic theory concerning partial synonyms (in monolingual dictionaries),

lemmata can only be cross-referred to another because their translation equivalents are sentences. This is a repetition reference entry, and the lexicographers should not have done double-cross-referencing. The article could have been better like this:

Dipoelo – BAPETŠA ditlamorago, ditlamorago tša ditimorago – ditiragalo tše
di bago gona morago

3.4 Cross-reference with regard to antonyms

An example from Hornby (1997:121)

behave – *verb SYN. Act the doctor*
behaved unprofessionally ...OPP misbehave

The above treatment is user friendly because the reader can be able to know the synonym of behave is act and the opposite being misbehave because they are related.

According to Crystal (1991:20), “Antonymy is one of a set of sense relations recognised in some analyses of meaning, along with synonym, hyponym ...”

As indicated above, this research also investigated if there is any cross-referencing in antonyms, as there is no way that one may talk about synonyms and leave antonyms behind because these are linguistically related. This treatment will also analyse how they are if there is any cross-referencing found in antonyms. Antonyms selected randomly from the given dictionaries.

According to the lexicographic theory regarding antonyms, the antonym that is not frequently used should be cross-referred to the most frequently used antonym, for example, Prinsloo *et al.*, (1996)

kgopana – short (1996:94)
telele – tall (1996:130)

In the above articles **kgopana** and **telele** are antonyms and the most frequently used antonym is **telele**, therefore, the article should look like this:

kgopana – short COMPARE telele

telele – tall

3.4.1 *NEW SEPEDI DICTIONARY (1996)*

Since antonyms are defined as words that mean the opposite of other words, few examples are treated from this dictionary.

(25) a. **hloya** – hate (1996:88)

b. **rata** – love (1996:122)

Let us consider example 25, **hloya**-hate

Go **hloya** *ngwaneno ke phošo*.

It's good to love your relative.

The above lemmata, **hloya** and **rata**, are antonyms or opposites. Therefore, the lemma that is not frequently used receives cross-referencing to the most frequently used lemma. In this case, **hloya** is the less frequently used lemma, therefore, the article should look like this:

hloya – hate (COMPARE rata)

rata – love

With the above presentation, the readers will be able to see that antonyms are related to synonyms

3.4.2 *PUKUNTŠU/DICTIONARY (2006)*

Let us consider the following example:

- (26) **tla** – come (2006:164)
tloga – leave (2006:164)

(*Ke tlo **tla** gae gosasa*).

I am coming home tomorrow.

(*Ke a **tloga***).

I am leaving/going.

The above lemmata are indeed antonyms because they are opposites of one another and they both belong to the same part of speech which is a verb. The lexicographer should have shown the relation between the two antonyms, **tla** and **tloga** by cross-reference. The less frequently antonym is **tloga**. Therefore, it has been awarded cross-reference. The article should have been better in the following way.

tla – come

tloga – leave COMPARE tla

3.4.3 **PUKUNTŠU YA SESOTHO SA LEBOA (2006)**

Let us consider the example below:

- (27) a. **fora 1** – LEHLALOSETSAGOTEE aketša go botša/goba go bolela maaka, taba e se bego nnete (2006:116)
- b. **rereša** – LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE – go botša therešo/goba nnete (2006:124)

The above verbs are regarded as antonyms.

Let us consider the following sentences to illustrate the above point:

(*Ngwana o **fora** mmagwe*).

A child is lying to her mother.

(Ge o **rereša** o tla ratega).

If you tell the truth, you will be loved.

The two verbs are indeed antonyms, and the less frequently used antonym is *rereša*, and should accordingly have been awarded cross-reference. The article could have been better like this:

fora 1 – LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE aketša, go bolela/goba go botša maaka, taba yeo e se bego nnete.

rereša – go botša/goba go bolela nnete **BAPETŠA** fora 1

3.5 CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that application of cross-referencing in both bilingual dictionaries need attention. Lexicographers do not take into consideration, translation equivalents are often duplicated, and, in that case, time and space are wasted, the dictionary readers will not be able to see the relationship between lexical items which are related. With the Northern Sotho Monolingual dictionary, *Pukuntšutlhaloši ya Sesotho sa Leboa*, much have been done with the treatment of antonyms. This is not well treated in all dictionaries given above; none of the lexicographers have shown the relationship between synonyms and antonyms, which are related. This will disadvantage the readers who do not know that they are related to one part of speech.

CHAPTER 4

4. CROSS REFERENCING, SYNONYMS AND ANTONYMS, AN EVALUATION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to evaluate how cross-referencing should be applied in Northern Sotho bilingual dictionaries to indicate synonyms and antonyms. All the dictionaries treated in Chapter 3 are looked at. The researcher examines how lexicographers of Northern Sotho bilingual dictionaries treated cross-referencing. This chapter shows how complete synonyms and partial synonyms should be cross-referred differently. Thereafter, the researcher shows how antonyms should be cross-referred in order to show dictionary users the relationship between these words. The lexicographic theory regarding the above items is applied.

4.2 EVALUATION OF CROSS-REFERENCING WITH REGARD TO COMPLETE SYNONYMS

As indicated in the previous chapter, that cross-referencing was not shown in the treatment of synonyms in Northern Sotho bilingual dictionaries, the following examples are used below to indicate how cross-referencing was supposed to have been used with regard to complete synonyms in these dictionaries.

4.2.1 *NEW SEPEDI DICTIONARY* (1996)

(25) **assegai** – *lerumo* (1996:06)

spear – *lerumo* (1996:54)

In the above articles, **assegai** and **spear** are regarded as complete synonyms and they have similar translation equivalents which is **lerumo**. The treatment is totally unacceptable because the lemmata can be used interchangeably. Therefore, the referent **lerumo** was not supposed to have been repeated in both articles because the lexicographic theory regarding complete synonyms says that they should not be given translation equivalents but only the most frequently used synonym should be

given full lexicographic treatment, and the less frequently used be given cross-reference to the one with translation equivalents. In this case, the most frequently used synonym is **spear**, because almost everybody knows what a spear is, and one need not explain it. But with **assegai**, many questions may arise because it is an adopted word from Afrikaans, which means one can find it in Afrikaans dictionaries. The above articles would have been better like this:

(25) (a) **spear** – lerumo
 assegai – **BONA spear**

In the above case, the user of a dictionary when looking for the meaning of **assegai** is been referred to the article of **spear**. At a glance, the user of a dictionary is able to see that the words **spear** and **assegai** are synonyms, and not only just synonyms but complete synonyms.

The reference entry **BONA (SEE)** is used to show cross-referencing, which will help dictionary users notice that the two lemmata are complete synonyms and are synonymously related.

Let us look at the definition of **spear** and **assegai**. Hornby (2010:73) defines **assegai** as 1 “a weapon consisting of a long stick with a sharp metal point on the end, used mainly in Southern Africa” and 2 “a South African tree which produces hard wood”. The point that **assegai** is an adopted Afrikaans word is supported by the definition, hence Afrikaans originated in South Africa.

On the other hand, Hornby (2010:1428) defines **spear** as 1 “a weapon with a long wooden handle and a sharp metal point used for fighting, hunting and fishing in the past and 2 “the long pointed STEM of some plants”. When one is comparing the above definition, it is clear that **assegai** and **spear** are complete synonyms, because they have similar facts.

Another shortcoming seems to have occurred in the treatment of the following articles:

- (26) **beer** – *bjalwa* (1996:08)
liquor – *bjalwa* (1996:35)

The above articles are totally wrong because the lexicographers first committed an orthographic error when writing the translation equivalent, **bjalwa** which is supposed to be **bjala**. In that case, **bjalwa** (planted) will mislead dictionary users who do not know what exactly **beer** and **liquor** are.

The articles, viz, **beer** and **liquor** are regarded as complete synonyms, because they have similar translation equivalents. This simply means lexicographers treated them as absolute synonyms whereas they are not, because they cannot replace each other in many contexts. Let us look at the definition of **beer** and **liquor**):

Hornby (2010:118) defines **beer** as “an alcoholic drink made from malt and flavoured with hops” whereas **liquor** is defined as (2010:868) “strong alcoholic drink, synonym spirits, hard liquor (she drinks wine and **beer** but no **liquor**)”.

From the above definitions, it is clear that **beer** and **liquor** are not the same thing, and they cannot be used interchangeably, but they are related in senses as they both have alcohol. And the most frequently used synonym is **beer** because it is more familiar than **liquor**. There are also many subheadings labelled under the lemma **beer**, to name a few (2010:118) “beer belly, beer cellar, beer garden, beery”.

The articles should have been like this;

- (26) **beer** – *bjala*
liquor – **BAPETŠA** *beer*

The reference marker **BAPETŠA** (**COMPARE**) is used to cross-refer partial synonyms according to the lexicographic theory regarding partial synonyms. As such, the dictionary users will be able to see that **beer** and **liquor** are related but are not the same thing. If the lexicographer would have complied with the theory, it could have been easier for the users to relate the two synonyms and to have seen that they cannot replace each other.

The following articles have also received unsatisfactory handling:

- (27) **witness** – *hlatsela* (1996:58)
testify – **BONA** *witness* (1996:64)

The above words are regarded as complete synonyms, and this means they can be used interchangeably because the lexicographers have given both articles similar translation equivalents. Let us look at the definition of **testify** and **witness**. Hornby (2010:1544) defines **testify** “to make a statement something happened or that something is true especially as a witness in court” and **witness** is defined as “to see something happen”.

Looking at the above definitions, one will conclude that **testify** and **witness** are indeed synonyms, and not only synonyms but absolute. Similarly, both articles were given full lexicographic treatment. This shortcoming misleads the dictionary users because they will not be able to know the relationship between **testify** and **hlatsela** if the lexicographers do not make them aware of that. The synonym that is most frequently used is **witness**; many people are familiar with this word, it is used in homes, schools and courts, but **testify** is less used. Therefore, the synonym that must be given full lexicographic treatment is **witness** and **testify** be awarded cross-referencing.

The above articles should have been treated like this:

- (27) (a) **witness** – *hlatsela*
testify – **BONA** *witness*

In the above case, dictionary users who look for the meaning of **testify** are referred to the article **witness**, the treatment is user-friendly, and dictionary users will find it easy to relate complete synonyms in the dictionary, and it will also save their time.

- (28) **defeat** – *fenya* (1996:17)
win – *fenya* (1996:64)

The above lemmata are treated as complete synonyms because they have similar translation equivalents. Let us first look at the definition of **defeat** and **fenya**. Hornby (2010:382) defines **defeat** as “to **win** against somebody in a war” and further defines **win** (2010:1702) as “to be the most successful” The researcher agrees with the idea that the above words are complete synonyms, which means they can replace each other in many contexts. In this case, the most frequently used synonym is **win**, and it should be given full lexicographic treatment, and **defeat** be awarded cross-referencing. The following example illustrates this point:

(28) (a) **win** – *fenya*
 defeat – **BONA** *win*

In the above case, dictionary users will be able to see that the synonyms **win** and **defeat** are having similar translation equivalents, because of the reference marker **BONA**. Any reader who looks for the meaning of **defeat** will be referred to the article **win**. The above treatment is in compliance with the lexicographic theory regarding complete synonyms.

4.2.2 PUKUNTŠU/DICTIONARY (2006)

The following synonym pairs are evaluated:

Definition – *tlhalošo* (2006:139)

Explanation – *tlhalošo* (2006:146)

Bodiidi – *poverty* (2006:08)

Bohloki – *poverty* (2006:08)

Predict – *akanya* (2006:180)

Propose – *akanya* (2006:180)

Action – *kgato, legato* (2006:123)

Step – *kgato, legato* (2006:192)

Let us consider the following example:

- (29) **definition** – *tlhološo*
explanation – *tlhološo*

The above words are regarded by Mojela *et al.*, as complete synonyms because they were given similar translation equivalents, but one tends to disagree with the lexicographers when they regard these lemmata as complete synonyms.

Let us look at the definition of **definition** and **explanation**. Hornby (2010:3840) defines **definition** as “an explanation of the meaning of a word”, hence **explanation** is defined as “a situation that tells us why things happen”. The above definitions prove that the words **definition** and **explanation** are synonyms, but not complete synonyms. They are partially synonymous, and they cannot be used interchangeably. And according to the lexicographic theory regarding partial synonyms, all synonyms should be awarded full lexicographic treatment, that is, they should all be given translation equivalents, and only the synonym with many translation equivalents should be awarded cross-referencing. In this case, **definition** was supposed to have been given many referents. The following example illustrates this point:

- (29) (a) **definition** – *tlhalošo, tshekaseko*. **BAPETŠA explanation**
explanation – *tlhalošo*

The above treatment is user-friendly, and the dictionary users will find it easy to relate the two words as partial synonyms and not complete synonyms, as treated in the dictionary. They will be able to use the synonyms in the correct way and know that each synonym stands on its own.

- (30) **bodiidi** – *poverty*
bohloki – *poverty*

The above words were given similar translation equivalents, meaning that they are regarded as complete synonyms. Having seen in the previous chapter that **bodiidi** and **bohloki** can be used interchangeably, this means they can replace each other

in many contexts. The lexicographers gave all article translation equivalents but the articles were incorrectly treated, because the lexicographic theory regarding complete synonym says that, only the most frequently used synonym will receive full lexicographic treatment, which in this case is **bodiidi**, and **bohloki** should be awarded cross-referencing. The above articles could have been better like this:

- (30) (a) **bodiidi** – *poverty*
 bohloki – **SEE** *bodiidi*

In the above case, the treatment is in compliance with the theory and, it is user-friendly. Dictionary users will find the meaning of **bohloki** that refers to the article of **bodiidi**. This will enrich their knowledge because they will find it easy to relate complete synonyms in this dictionary.

- (31) **predict** – *akanya*
 propose – *akanya*

The above words are also regarded as complete synonyms, as they are having similar referents. One seems to disagree with the lexicographer because to **predict** is to **foresee** whereas to **propose** means to **suggest**. Hornby (2010:1172) defines **predict** as “to say something that will happen, synonym forecast”, and **propose** is defined as “to suggest a plan for people to think about and decide, synonym, propound”. To say ‘something that will happen’ and to ‘suggest a plan’ are two different ideas. Therefore, the above- mentioned words are not complete synonyms but rather partial synonyms. The reference marker **BAPETŠA/COMPARE** should be used in this case and not **BONA/SEE**. Since they are not complete synonyms, the lexicographic theory that applies is the one regarding partial synonyms. The synonym with many translation equivalents will receive cross-referencing.

The above article should have been treated like this:

- (31)(a) **predict** – *akanya, bonelapele, dupelela* **BAPETŠA** *propose*
 propose – *akanya*

The above treatment is easy to follow, it will help the dictionary users to know that **propose** and **predict** are partially synonymous, and cannot be used interchangeably, and in the above case the user when looking for the meaning of **predict** will be referred to **propose** by the reference marker which will enable him or her to see that the two synonyms are partially related.

(32) **action** – *plan/legato*
step – *kgato/legato*

The words **action** and **plan** are regarded as complete synonyms, and this means lexicographers treat them as similar in meaning because they were given the same referents. Let us look at the meaning of **action** and **step**. Hornby (2010:13) defines **action** as “the process of doing something in order to make something happen or to deal with a situation”, hence **step** is defined as “one of a series of things that somebody does or that happen which form part of a process” (2010:1462).

The definitions above prove that the words **action** and **step** are indeed completely synonymous, therefore the lexicographic theory should apply, and the most frequently used synonym in this case is **action**. It means **step** will be awarded cross-referencing not translation equivalents.

The following treatment illustrates the above-mentioned point:

(32) (a) **action** – *kgato/legato*
step – **BONA** *action*

In the above case, the users of dictionary when looking for the meaning of **step** is been referred to the article of **action**, and they will see that **action** and **plan** are complete synonyms, and they can use them interchangeably.

4.2.3 PUKUNTŠUTLHALOŠI YA SESOTHO SA LEBOA (2006)

The following synonym pairs are evaluated:

(40) **mmalegogwana** – **LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE**, *kobaobane, kgarebe goba mosadi wa maitshwaro a mabe yo a ratago go robala le banna ba bantši* (2006:105).

kobaobane – **BONA** *mmalegogwana* (2006:73)

(41) **mateng 2** – **LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE** *dikagare, ditho ka moka tšeo di hwetšwago ka dimpeng tša sephedi sefe goba sefe* (2006:81)

dikagare – **BONA** *mateng 2* (2006:19)

(42) **Fora 1** – **LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE** *aketša, go botša gob abo bolela maaka, taba yeo e se bego nnete* (2006:31)

aketša – **BONA** *fora 1* (2006:02)

(43) **gotla** – **LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE** *bopa, go lla ka go rora, ga mereba ka lentšu la fase le lekoto la go tlala makoko* (2006:12)

bopa – **BONA** *gotla* (2006:10)

Let us consider example (40)

mmalegogwana – **LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE** *kobaobane, kgarebe goba mosadi wa maitshwaro a mabe yo a ratago go robala le banna ba bantši*.

kobaobane – **BONA** *mmalegogwana*

The above words **mmalegogwana** and **kobaobane** are regarded as complete synonyms and, as shown in the previous chapter, they can be used interchangeably and that is acceptable to label them as complete synonyms. The lexicographers have complied with the theory regarding complete synonyms, because the above synonyms are not all given translation equivalents, only the most frequently used synonym, which is **mmalegogwana**, has been given full lexicographic treatment, and the less frequently used synonym, **kobaobane**, has been awarded cross-referencing **BONA**. This is a good treatment that the rest of the above-mentioned

lexicographers failed to apply in their dictionaries. This treatment is user-friendly, dictionary users will have no difficulty in relating words which are synonymously related.

Let us consider example (41):

Mateng 2 – LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE *dikagare ditho ka moka tšeo di hwetšwago ka dimpeng tša sephedi sefe goba sefe.*

Dikagare – BONA *mateng 2*

The above words, **mateng 2** and **dikagare** are regarded as complete synonyms because the lexicographers have used the contextual guidance.

LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE (synonym) to show how these words are related, this is a good presentation of synonyms, dictionary users will find it easy to use this dictionary, because it shows that a word does not function in isolation, it is related to other lexicons in the language. This means that, **mateng 2** and **dikagare** can replace each other in many contexts as they are absolute synonyms. **Mateng 2** has been given full lexicographic treatment because it is the most frequently used and **dikagare** is a coined word, as such, it is a less frequently used synonym and it is correct to award it with cross-referencing.

Similarly, examples (42) **fora** and **aketša** and examples (43) **gotla** and **bopa** have also been well treated because the lexicographers indicated that they are synonyms. The lexicographic theory regarding complete synonyms has also been applied because the reference marker for complete synonyms **SEE/BONA** have been used in these synonyms. The most frequently used synonyms have been identified by giving it full lexicographic treatment. Translation equivalents are not repeated in all articles treated above, and this is a good attempt.

4.3 CROSS-REFERENCING WITH REGARD TO PARTIAL SYNONYMS

As indicated in the previous chapter that the lexicographic theory regarding partial synonyms states that the synonym that has more or many translation equivalents

should receive cross-referencing to the synonym with fewer translation equivalents. However, but all the synonyms receive full lexicographic treatment, and if the translation equivalents are more than one, they are separated by the semicolon and the reference marker to cross-refer partial synonyms is:

BAPETŠA/COMPARE.

4.3.1 NEW SEPEDI DICTIONARY (1996)

The following synonym pairs are evaluated:

deceased – *mohu, hwilego, hlokofetše* (1996:16)

dead – *mohu, hlokofetše* (1996:16)

degree – *kgato, boemo* (1996:16)

step – *kgato, legato* (1996:55)

worship – *rapela, direla* (1996:65)

pray – *rapela* (1996:44)

All of the above synonym pairs are regarded as partial synonyms. As shown seen in Chapter Three, they are indeed partially synonymous, and they cannot replace each other in many contexts. Prinsloo *et al.*, did not give these lemmata suitable treatment. Let us consider the following examples:

(44) **deceased** – *mohu, hwilego, hlokofetše*

dead – *mohu, hlokofetše*

According to Hornby (2010:376), **deceased** is defined as “a person who died especially recently” whereas **dead** is defined as ‘no longer alive, dead person, dead leaves, dead language’ etc”.

The above treatment is not correct because dictionary users cannot see that the words **deceased** and **dead** are related. The definitions above support one’s idea

that **deceased** and **dead** cannot replace each other in many contexts, therefore, they are partially synonymous.

Lexicographers did not apply the lexicographic theory regarding partial synonyms. Translation equivalents are separated by a comma (,) not a semicolon (;). The reference marker was supposed to have looked like this:

4.4 (a) **deceased** – *mohu; hwilego*; **hlokofetše BAPETŠA** *dead*.

The above treatment is acceptable and simple to follow because dictionary users can see that the words **deceased** and **dead** are partially synonymous, and they cannot be used interchangeably. The usage of the reference marker **BAPETŠA/COMPARE** is very important when treating partial synonyms. Let us look at the following example:

(45) **degree** – *kgato, boemo*
step – *kgato, legato*

The above words, that is, **degree** and **step** are regarded as partial synonyms. Let us look at the definitions of **degree** and **step** respectively. Hornby (2010:384) defines **degree** as “the amount of level of something” whereas **step** is defined as “one of a series of things that happen to which form part of a process, ... synonym stage”.

The above definitions show clearly that the words **degree** and **step** are partially synonymous because they cannot replace each other in many contexts. The lexicographers did not comply with the theory regarding partial synonyms. The articles could have been treated like this:

(45) (a) **degree** – *kgato; boemo*
step – *kgato; legato; gata BAPETŠA* *degree*

In the above case, dictionary users shall be able to use this dictionary with ease, because

the treatment is user-friendly. In compliance with the lexicographic theory, they can relate that **degree** and **step** are partial synonyms because of the punctuation and reference marker within the translation equivalents.

(46) **worship** – *rapela, direla*
pray – *rapela*

The above-mentioned words, **worship** and **pray**, are also regarded as partial synonyms, and we have seen in Chapter three that they cannot replace each other in many contexts. The synonym that should receive cross-referencing is **worship**, because it has more translation equivalents.

Let us look at the definitions of **worship** and **pray**:

According to Hornby (2010:1719), to **worship** means “to show respect to God” whereas to **pray** means to speak to God especially to thank or ask for help”.

The above definitions support the idea that the above words are partially synonymous, and the lexicographers failed to apply the theory. The same shortcoming appears as they did not use the correct punctuation and the reference marker. The above articles could have been user-friendly were they to be treated like this:

(46) (a) **worship** – *rapela; direla BAPETŠA* *pray*
pray – *rapela*

In the above case, the treatment is correct and acceptable because it is in compliance with the lexicographic theory. The readers will not doubt if the words are partial or complete synonyms. The treatment says it all. They will know that **pray** and **worship** are related in meaning but are not similar.

4.3.2 PUKUNTŠU/DICTIONARY (2006)

Mojela *et al.*, (2006) have also treated partial synonyms in their dictionary. The same synonym pairs that were treated in the previous chapter are evaluated to see if their treatment is in accordance with the lexicographic theory regarding partial synonyms. The following synonyms pairs are evaluated:

betha – *beat; bit; strike* (2006:16)

opa – *strike; clap; slap; knock; ache; throb; paining* (2006:79)

nyatša – *despise; belittle; undermine; treat with disdain* (2006:78)

telelela – *despise; undermine* (2006:105)

mojako – *doorway; entrance; entry; the door* (2006:68)

lebati – *door* (2006:68)

tato – *will; desire; liking; love* (2006:175)

tumo – *desire; need; lust* (2006:175)

All the above synonym pairs are regarded by Mojela *et al.*, as partial synonym. The usage of semicolons (;) between the translation equivalents proves that they are partial synonyms.

That is a good presentation regarding punctuation.

Let us consider the following examples, respectively:

(47) **nyatša** – *despise; belittle; undermine; treat with disdain.*

telelela – *despise; undermine*

Given that the above words are regarded as partial synonyms, and that partial synonyms cannot replace each other in many contexts, the above words, **nyatša** and **telelela**, are indeed partial synonymous. The lexicographers have given all the synonyms translation

equivalents, **nyatša** having more and **telela** having fewer. Therefore, the synonym **nyatša** should have been awarded cross-reference to **telela**. The following treatment illustrates this point:

- (47) (a) **nyatša** – *dispise; belittle; undermine; treat with disdain.* **COMPARE**
telela.
telela – *dispise; undermine.*

In the above case, the dictionary users will be able to see that the synonyms **nyatša** and **telela** are partially synonymous. The lexicographers have treated the punctuation and, translation equivalents correctly because a semicolon was used to separate the referents. Synonyms do not have the same number of translation equivalents, therefore, the reference marker was supposed to have indicated which synonym is having more translation equivalents. But this was not done; the theory was not applied.

- (48) **mojako** – *doorway; entrance; entry; the door*
 lebati – *door*

The above words are also regarded as partial synonyms and, having seen in the previous chapter that these synonyms cannot replace each other in many contexts, therefore they are partial synonyms, the same shortcoming of not using the reference marker still appears in the above articles, **mojako** is having more translation equivalents than **lebati**. Therefore, the synonym **mojako** should be awarded cross-referencing to **lebati**.

The above articles could have been better like this:

- (48) (a) **mojako** – *doorway; entrance; entry; the door* **COMPARE** *lebati.*
 lebati – *door*

In the above case, the readers will use the dictionary with ease, because it will help them to see that **mojako** and **lebati** are not only words but partial synonyms. The punctuation between the translation equivalents has been well treated. The

lexicographic theory has been partially and properly applied because the reference marker was not used. The translation equivalent that maintains the relation of absolute equivalence is **door**. The other good thing is that all synonyms were given full lexicographic treatment, that is, in compliance with the lexicographic theory regarding synonyms.

- (49) **thato** – *will; desire; liking; love*
tumo – *desire; need; lust*

The above words, **thato** and **tumo**, are regarded as partial synonyms, and the usage of semicolons between the translation equivalents supports that idea. The translation equivalent that maintains a relation of absolute equivalence is **desire**, and the synonym which is having more translation equivalents is **thato**. Therefore it should be awarded cross-referencing to **tumo**. What is required in this instance is that both synonyms should be awarded full lexicographic treatment.

The above articles could have been better like this:

- (49) (a) **thato** – *will; desire; liking; love* **COMPARE** *tumo*
tumo – *desire; need; lust*

The above treatment is simple to follow because dictionary users will be able to see that the above synonyms are partially related. The lexicographers used the semicolons, gave all the synonyms translation equivalents, which is in accordance with the lexicographic theory. The only shortcoming in article (49) is cross-referencing. It was supposed to have been used so that those readers can relate two words, **thato** and **tumo**, as partial synonyms.

4.3.3 ***Pukuntšutlhaloši ya Sesotho sa Leboa (2006)***

Partial synonyms were also treated in the above-mentioned dictionary. The very same synonym pairs given in Chapter three are evaluated to see whether they were treated in accordance with the lexicographic theories and principles regarding partial synonyms.

The following synonym pairs are evaluated:

- (50) **bahlabani – BAPETŠA** – *madira, batho bao ba lwago ntweng, gantši ya go šireletša naga ya gabobona ka go šomiša dibetša (2006:04).*

(Warrior – people fighting at war using weapons to protect their country)

Madira – *batho bao ba hlokometšego tšhireletšo ya naga ya bobona, ka go phela mellwaneng goba mafelong a mangwe ka gare ga naga (2006:94)*

(People who are responsible for protection of their country, staying and working at the borders and other place places in the country)

- (51) **nagana – BAPETŠA** *gopola, ge bjoko bo beakanya le go tšea sepheto mabapi le tiragalo.*

(when the brain prepares and takes decisions about events)

gopola – LEHLALOŠETŠAGOTEE *elelwa, ge mogopolo o buša dilo tše di fetilego e ka ba tšeo di dirilwego goba di bonwego goba di kwelego.*

(when the mind recalls past things it can be those done, seen or heard)

- (52) **dipoelo – BAPETŠA** *ditlamorago tša mošomo goba tiragalo tše itšego di le ka sebopego seo se sepelelanago le mešomo yeo (2006:19)*

(The end product of the work or specific activities in the form which relate to those activities.)

ditlamorago – BAPETŠA *dipoelo, ditiragalo tše di bego gona morago ga gore ye nngwe e hlage (2006:23)*

(Things that happen after actions)

Given that the translation equivalents in monolingual dictionaries are not words but definitions, in this case, cross-referencing will not be determined by the synonym with many translation equivalents both synonyms will receive full lexicographic treatment, and each or both synonym pairs may be cross-referred to the other. Let us consider examples that follow:

- (50) (a) **bahlabani** – **BAPETŠA** *madira, batho bao ba lwago ntweng, gantši ya go šireletša naga ya gabobona ka go šomiša dibetša.*
- (b) **madira** – *batho bao ba hlokometšego tšhireletšo ya naga ya bobona, ka go phela mellwaneng goba mafelong a mangwe ka gare ga naga ya gabobona ka go šomiša dibetša.*

The above are partial synonyms, that is **bahlabani** and **madira**. However, although lexicographers treated these words as such, both synonyms have translation equivalents in the form of definitions, and the synonym form of definitions, and the synonym **bahlabani** has been cross-referred to the synonym pair **madira** by means of the reference entry/marker **BAPETŠA**. This treatment is in compliance with the lexicographic theory regarding partial synonyms.

It is easy to follow because principles were applied and, as such, dictionary users will not struggle to relate the two words, which are **bahlabani** and **madira**. They will be able to see that these words are partially synonymous, which means they cannot replace each other in many contexts.

- (51) (a) **nagana** – **BAPETŠA** *gopola, ge bjoko bo beakanya le go tšea sephetho mabapi le tiragalo*
- (b) **gopola** – **LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE**, *elelwa ge mogopolo o buša dilo tše di fetilego e ka ba tšeo di dirilwego goba di bonwego goba di kwelwego.*

The above words, **nagana** and **gopola** are also regarded as partial synonyms because their translation equivalents are related in senses, but they are not meaning

the same thing, therefore **nagana** and **gopola** cannot be used interchangeably. The above treatment is user-friendly, because the above synonyms were treated in accordance with the lexicographic theory regarding partial synonyms. This will help dictionary users to know that the two words **nagana** and **gopola** are related. Knowing that the reference entry **BAPETŠA** is used for partial synonyms will also help dictionary users that the reference entry can also help to identify partial synonyms. This is also a good attempt by lexicographers.

- 52 (a) **dipoelo** – **BAPETŠA** *ditlamorago, tša mošomo goba ditiragalo tše di itšego di le ka sebopego seo se sepelelanago le mešomo yeo.*
- (b) **ditlamorago** – **BAPETŠA** *dipoelo, ditiragalo tše di bego gona morago ga gore ye nngwe e hlage.*

The two words **dipoelo** and **ditlamorago** are also regarded as partial synonyms because their translation equivalents are not similar and therefore they cannot replace each other in many contexts. The above treatment is in compliance with the lexicographic theory regarding partial synonyms. Both synonyms have been cross-referred to each other, which is an easy way to follow, readers will find it easy to use this dictionary because it is communicating with the user. They will also know that, as long as words are cross-referred with the entry **BAPETŠA**, it means they are partially synonymous. This treatment can be followed by most of the dictionary users if not all of them.

4.4 CROSS-REFERENCING WITH REGARD TO ANTONYMS

Antonyms are parts of speech, and are closely related to synonyms. Most, if not all, synonyms have got their antonyms, therefore you cannot talk about synonyms and leave antonyms behind. Like synonyms, when treating antonyms they must be of the same part of speech, for example you cannot pair a verb with a noun, all articles should fall under the same part of the speech.

Antonyms are evaluated to check if the lexicographers of Northern Sotho Bilingual Dictionaries have complied with the theory of lexicography regarding antonyms,

which states that an antonym that is less frequently used should receive cross-referencing to the one most frequently used, and the reference marker used to cross-refer is **Bapetša/Compare**.

4.4.1 **NEW SEPEDI DICTIONARY (1996)**

The following antonym pairs are evaluated:

- (50) **hloya** – *hate* (1996:88)
rata – *love* (1996:122)

The above articles are regarded as antonyms, that is **hloya/rata** and **hate/love**. Given that antonyms are words with opposite meaning, the above articles are antonyms.

The lexicographic theory regarding antonyms states clearly that an antonym that is less frequently used will receive cross-referencing to the most frequently used antonym. In the above case, the most frequently used antonym is **rata (love)**. The lexicographers did not comply with the theory. None of their antonym pair is given cross-referencing. The above articles could have been treated like this:

- (50) (a) **hloya** – *hate* **COMPARE** *rata*
rata – *love*

In the above articles, **hloya** and **rata** are well treated, and this will enable dictionary users to see the relationship between the two antonyms, that their meanings are opposite. The less frequently antonym, which is **hloya**, has been cross-referred to **rata**.

The antonym **rata/love** is frequently used because one can see in many advanced dictionaries, to name but one Hornby (2010:884), “the lemma **love** has got many subheadings than **hate**, e.g., (**love-bird, love child, love-in, lovely, love-life, love letter**” etc. and with the lemma **hate** only fewer subheadings like “**hate** only fewer subheadings like ‘**hate crime, hateful**’ (2010)

4.4.2 PUKUNTŠU/DICTIONARY 2006

Let us consider the following antonym pair:

- (51) **tla** – *come* (2006:164)
tloga – *leave* (2006:164)

The above words **tla/tloga** and **come/leave** are antonyms and they belong to the same part of speech which is a verb. The antonym that is most frequently used is **tla (come)**, therefore, the antonym **tloga** will receive cross-referencing to **tla**.

The following treatment illustrates the above point:

- (51) (a) **tla** – *come*
tloga – *leave* **COMPARE tla**

The same lexicographic shortcoming applies in example (51) (a). It will be easy for the dictionary users to see that there is a relationship of oppositeness between the two words. They did not even attempt to apply the lexicographic theory regarding theory on antonyms.

The antonyms **come/rata** is regarded as the most frequently used because it has more than twenty subheadings as reflected in Hornby (2010:284), to name but few, “**come in, come around, come together, come back**” etc. and with the lemma go fewer subheadings than that of **come**, e.g., “**going, go back, go ahead**” (2010:640).

4.4.3 PUKUNTŠUTLHALOŠI YA SESOTHO SA LEBOA

Let us consider the following example below:

- (52) **fora 1 LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE** *aketša go botša/goba go bolela maaka, taba yeo e se bego nnete* (2006:

rereša – *go botša/goba go bolela taba ya nnete* (2006:116)

The above words are regarded as antonyms. Lexicographers failed to comply with the lexicographic theory regarding antonyms. Because the antonyms were treated in isolation, dictionary users will not be able to see that **fora** and **rereša** are antonyms, cross-referencing was not applied in the above articles. The less frequently used antonym in the above case is **rereša (to tell the truth)**. Therefore, it should be awarded cross-referencing to the most frequently used antonym, **fora (lie)**.

According to Hornby (2010:857) lie, which is a synonym of **fora**, has many subheadings, which supports one's idea that it is the most frequently used antonym, namely, "**lies, lying, lied, (idiom) to lie through your teeth, lie detector**" etc., whereas 'telling the truth' is only a subheading of 'truth' (2010:1602).

The above article could have been better like this:

(52) (a) **fora** 1 – **LEHLALOSETŠAGOTEE** *aketša, go botša/goba go bolela maaka, taba yeo e se bego nnete.*

rereša – go botša/goba go bolela taba ya nnete. **BAPETŠA** *fora* 1

The above articles are user-friendly. The users of this dictionary will be able to know that **fora** and **rereša** are antonyms. They also fall under the same part of speech which is a verb, that is why they are treated together. It will also be easier for readers if reference markers are always used where lemmata are related.

4.5 CONCLUSION

In the above evaluation, treatment of cross-referencing was done on synonyms and antonyms, trying to verify the shortcomings done by lexicographers of Northern Sotho bilingual dictionaries. There is still a lot to be done because lexicographers do not comply with lexicographic theories regarding synonyms and antonyms. One may acknowledge Mojela *et al.*, in (*Northern Sotho Monolingual*) *Pukuntšutlhalosi* because synonyms were treated in compliance with the theory; they only failed to apply the theory on antonyms. This is contrary to Prinsloo and Sathekge's *New Sepedi Dictionary*, where nothing was done in compliance with the lexicographic

theories regarding synonyms and antonyms. In that case, dictionary users will lose track and will never be able to know that words of a dictionary do not function in isolation, but whether are related in their senses.

CHAPTER 5

5. CONCLUSION, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 CONCLUSION AND FINDINGS

The aim of this chapter is to give the conclusion of the study as a whole, suggestions and recommendations regarding the findings of this research.

Chapter one dealt with the problem statement whereby investigations showed that the application of cross-referencing in *Northern Sotho – English bilingual dictionary* is not done in the correct manner. Therefore the Northern Sotho *monolingual dictionary*, which was treated in accordance with the lexicographic theories regarding synonyms and antonyms, was compared with these bilingual dictionary to identify the shortcomings made. Translation equivalents for complete synonyms were repeated, but not separated by commas; where they exceed two, the reference markers were not used. If lexicographers of bilingual dictionaries could have applied appropriate theories, repetition of translation equivalents could have not been done, and dictionary users will not be confused by these similar translation equivalents. The role of dictionaries was mentioned, also the definition of concepts important in this study, such as ‘dictionary’, ‘cross-referencing’ and ‘types of synonyms’, namely, complete and partial synonyms.

Chapter two dealt with literature review. Some of the scholars who treated cross-referencing are Atkins (1974), Gouws (1999), Kaplan (2010), Mojapelo (2004), Mphahlele (2001), Neilsen (1999) and Steele (2005). Their work helped a lot in completing this study. All the scholars looked at cross-referencing from different angles but with similar objectives of referring. Facts such as ‘directing readers’, ‘reference markers’, and types of ‘cross-referencing address’ were mentioned and it really helped to shape up this study. All their ideas showed that the co-ordination of words can be brought by the application of cross-referencing.

Chapter three dealt with the exposition. Since you cannot evaluate what you do not know, it was crucial to give the exposition of the dictionaries that were to be evaluated in Chapter four Fewer synonyms and antonyms pairs were randomly

selected from the dictionaries, chosen/mentioned in this study, and they were presented on honours they were given in those dictionaries. The synonyms and antonyms selected were used in sentences to check if they really served the intended purpose by the lexicographers. For example, if two words are paired as synonyms, they were used syntactically to check if they can replace each other in many contexts. Unfortunately, synonyms were found to be wrongly paired since two types of synonyms in this study were treated, namely, partial and complete synonyms. Lexicographers had a tendency of pairing a complete synonymy and a partial synonym; something which is not allowed as such will mislead dictionary users given that lexicographic theories regarding partial synonyms and complete synonyms are not the same. It is evident that most of the lexicographers do not comply with the lexicographic principles and theories regarding synonyms and antonyms. Reference markers were not used, as such dictionary users are at risk of losing words coordination. If lexicographers continue to ignore lexicographic theories and principles, dictionary users will find it difficult to find cohesion between words of a dictionary.

Chapter four dealt with the evaluation of the given dictionaries. Synonyms and antonyms were presented in the previous chapter so that they can be evaluated in this chapter to see if they were presented in accordance with the lexicographic theories and principles related. The same dictionaries presented in Chapter three were also evaluated in this chapter. The evaluation came up with shortcomings that were also corrected. The presentation of complete synonyms that were not cross-referred showed how they were supposed to have been treated. The usage of reference markers, that is, **SEE/BONA** was shown, and the correct treatment of partial synonyms was also shown. The translation equivalents of complete synonyms, if they exceed two, are separated by commas, whereas those of partial synonyms are separated by semicolons. Similarly antonyms were treated in isolation with synonyms, which is a big mistake in language, because antonyms and synonyms cannot be separated, they are all treated in the same way, because antonyms which are most frequently used are given full lexicographic treatment, whereas those that are not are cross-referred. Lexicographers also failed to do that. Only the *Northern Sotho Monolingual dictionary* used the principles and theories

regarding cross-referencing. When evaluating this dictionary, fewer shortcomings were found.

The study revealed cross-referencing is not applied in *Northern Sotho – English bilingual dictionaries*, therefore translation equivalents for synonyms and antonyms become meaningless as they might not have any significance in the target language. It has also identified that, in certain instances complete synonyms and partial synonyms are mixed, that is, you find that referents for complete synonyms and partial synonyms are mixed: you find that complete synonyms are given similar translation equivalents. The problem of lexicographic principles and theories, which are not applied in the *Northern Sotho – English bilingual dictionaries*, is of utmost importance in this study because, if the theories are not adhered to, dictionaries will be of a poor standard as these theories are guiding tools towards the compilation of quality dictionaries.

On the other hand, one would acknowledge developments found in the *Northern Sotho Monolingual dictionary*, which is being compared with the *Northern Sotho – English dictionaries*, because the researcher identified very few problems with the *Northern Sotho Monolingual*, that is, the principles and theories of lexicographic principles were applied in a satisfactory manner.

Since the study compares *Northern Sotho – English bilingual dictionaries* with *Northern Sotho Monolingual dictionaries*, the researcher discovered that the *New Sepedi Dictionary* (2006) is the most poor in the application of cross-referencing, because there is nowhere in the dictionary where cross-referencing was applied. On the other hand, *Pukuntšu/Dictionary* (2006) has applied some of the lexicographic themes regarding synonyms. The above two dictionaries need to be revised, and both theories and principles be well adhered to, because one cannot recommend dictionaries that are full of mistakes. The lexicographers of these dictionaries should consult other dictionaries in order to improve the standard of their dictionaries. Improvement is vital for the above-mentioned dictionaries.

Contrary to the above-mentioned dictionary, *Pukuntšutlhaloši ya Sesotho sa Leboa* seems to be the best amongst all the dictionaries evaluated, because the

lexicographic theories and principles regarding cross-referencing were applied in a satisfactory manner. Therefore one could recommend this dictionary to be used as a guiding tool when dealing with cross-referencing, although some words are still lacking in this dictionary, coinage and borrowing method helped this dictionary to be of a better standard as compared to the other dictionary.

When using the *Northern Sotho Monolingual dictionary* mentioned above, one will find it easy to relate words of a dictionary because (a) theories and principles were applied, (b) partial synonyms are not paired with complete synonyms as done in the other two dictionaries, (c) reference markers for complete synonyms were correctly used, (d) antonyms were clearly shown. Unlike in the other dictionaries, unfamiliar signs were mentioned in the front matter of the dictionaries, to guide the dictionary users with the signs and abbreviations that will appear in their dictionary. This is really a good attempt by the lexicographers of the *Northern Sotho Monolingual dictionary*.

Moreover, it is essential to mention that lexicographers committed orthographic errors, some words are wrongly spelt and this will not help dictionary users in anyway because many readers rely on the dictionaries for every spelling that they do not know. This will also affect the language negatively. Lexicographers should recheck their dictionaries or double check the editing to avoid the orthographic errors that are found in their dictionaries.

The other issue is that many *Northern Sotho – English bilingual dictionaries* have omitted many words in their dictionaries. This omission affects the target language because if you look up a word in a dictionary, you expect to get the meaning of that word. The problem of lacking words should be solved by coinage if the borrowing method does not suffice. Dictionary users cannot afford to lose vocabulary because of words omitted in the dictionaries.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The researcher suggests the following recommendations that could improve the level of dictionaries in Northern Sotho;

- Dictionaries that do not comply with principles and theories of lexicography should not be approved.
- Theories related to synonyms and antonyms are included in the front matter or back matter of the dictionaries to remind lexicographers;
- Cross-referencing is included in school or learners' dictionaries;
- For a dictionary to be approved, there should also be an international standardised number of words to be in the dictionary; and
- Lexicography be taught at high school.

It is evident that the Northern Sotho-English bilingual dictionaries are not treated in a correct and satisfactory manner. Therefore, their dictionaries need to be revised and corrections/ amendments must be done in these dictionaries. Using words to uplift their standards to the next level, this will also improve the correct language usage in our societies.

REFERENCES

Atkins, S.T.V. 1974. *Cross-reference Index*. New York

Crystal, D. 1997. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. London: Blackwell.
Blackwell Publisher.

Dictionary. Com Unabridged. Based on the Random House Unabridged Dictionary,
© Random House, Inc. 2011.

Kriel, T.J., & Prinsloo, D.J. & Sathekge, B.P. 1997. *Popular Northern Sotho
Ditionary*. Cape Town: Pharos.

Gouws, R.H. 1999. Bilingual Dictionaries and Communicative Equivalents for
Multilingual Society. *Lexikos*, 6:14-31.

Hornby, A.S. 2010. *Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary*. New York: Oxford
University Press.

Mojapelo, M.J. 2004. Presentation of Synonyms in the Macrostructure of Northern
Sotho/English Bilingual Dictionaries. Unpublished Master's Dissertation University of
the North: Turfloop.

Mojela, M.V., Mphahlele, M.C. Mogodi, P. & Selokela, R. 2006. *Sesotho sa
Leboa/English Pukuntšu Dictionary*. Cape Town: Phumelela Education.

Mojela, M.V. Mphahlele, M.C. Mogodi, P. & Selokela, R. 2007. *Pukuntšuthaloši ya
Sesotho sa Leboa*. Cape Town: Phumelela Education.

Mphahele, M.C. 2001. *A Model to Achieve Communicative Equivalents in
Translation Dictionaries*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. University of
Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch.

Nelsen, S. 1999. Mediostructures in Bilingual LSP Dictionaries In: *Lexicographica. International Annual for Lexicography* 15, 90-113.

Pei, M. 1996. *Glossary of Linguistic Terminology*. New York: Colombia Press.

Prinsloo, D.J. & Sathekge, B.P. 1996. *New Sepedi Dictionary*. Cape Town: Shuter & Shooter.

Online Technical Writing: Cross Referencing <http://www.io.com/~hcexres/textbook/cross.html> 2010/11/02.

Steele, H. 2003. *Sams Teach Yourself Microsoft Office Word 2003 in 24 Hours*. Chicago. Sam Publishers.