Sandro Nielsen

Lexicographic Macrostructures

Abstract

The lexicographic macrostructure is not merely the arrangement of lemmata, but a structure which applies to the dictionary as a whole. For descriptive purposes, one distinction between the macrostructure of dictionaries is simple and complex macrostructures. On the basis of empirical evidence, suggestions are made in respect of the degree of complexity of lexicographic macrostructures and the interrelationship between or among the macrostructural components.

1. Introduction

It is usual to define a dictionary as a reference book containing a number of words or lexical units which are arranged in a systematic way with some kind of information related to such words or lexical units (cf. for instance Bergenholtz/Mugdan 1985, 9, Landau 1984, 5, Mugdan 1989, 125, Robinson 1984, 175-176 and Schaeder 1987, 23-24). This may well be the traditional way of defining a dictionary, but it is clearly insufficient. One only has to select a dictionary at random and browse through it in order to realise that the traditional definition of a dictionary only refers to one part of the entire work. For the purpose of lexicography, it is possible to distinguish between three separate structures, viz. the macrostructure, the mediostructure and the microstructure. However, some of the definitions of these structures found in the existing metalexicographic literature suffer from a similar   shortcoming. Below, we shall look at the macrostructure of dictionaries and try to identify different kinds of macrostructure which may serve as an appropriate means of describing the macrostructure of any given dictionary within a metalexicographic framework.

2. Problems of Defining the Macrostructure

If we take a dictionary, and in this context almost any dictionary will do, and then open it, browsing through it in order to study its contents, it is possible to identify different and separate components of the   dictionary. These individual components collectively make up the dictionary as a whole, whether it be a dictionary consisting of one volume (a one-volume dictionary) or a dictionary consisting of more than one volume (a multi-volume dictionary). In other words, the arrangement or organisation of any dictionary may be analysed and broken down into separate

parts in their own right. The subject of this paper is the **lexicographic macrostructure**, i.e. the macrostructure of any given dictionary, realised by the arrangement of the separate parts, or components, which collectively make up the entire dictionary. However, for the sake of exposition (and convenience), the focus will particularly be on dictionaries designed for the treatment of LSP communication (in the following called "special-purpose dictionaries" or "LSP dictionaries") but, by analogy, some of the ideas expressed may also be applied to dictionaries designed for the treatment of general language (in the following called "general-purpose dictionaries" or "LGP dictionaries").

In attempting to define the macrostructure of any given dictionary with particular reference to special-purpose dictionaries, we shall have recourse to a number of the existing definitions found in the metalexicographic literature. It turns out, however, that the existing metalexicographic literature, almost without exception, describes the macrostructures of general-purpose dictionaries, but irrespective of this fact, the existing definitions have been chosen as an appropriate point of departure. First, the following definition is found in Hartmann 1983, where the definition of the macrostructure of a dictionary reads as follows:

> Def. 1: "..total number of entries in the dictionary."
> (Hartmann 1983, 225).

It is hereby suggested, however, that this definition, which is found in the terminological index of Hartmann 1983, is not the correct definition of the macrostructure in respect of dictionaries (lexicographic macrostructures). Furthermore, the definition of macrostructure quoted in Def. 1 is inconsistent with the use of the term "macrostructure" in the same book, cf. Hartmann 1983, 70, where macrostructure is described as a structure for the arrangement of entries. It is, however, the definition of another lexicographic concept, viz. the **lemma stock**, or **lemma aggregate**, of any given dictionary (for a definition of the lemma stock [German: Lemmabestand] see Wiegand 1983, 431, 451). For the present purpose, the lemma stock may be defined as the aggregate number of individual lemmata incorporated in any given dictionary and consequently, Def. 1 cannot be applied to the lexicographic macrostructure. It is true, however, that the lemma as a lexicographic component, or entity, may be considered part of the macrostructure (cf. Wiegand 1983, 432), but it should be appreciated that, according to our definition, the lemma stock is not identical with the lexicographic macrostructure. In Wiegand 1983, 432, it is claimed that

"das Lemma ist ein Element des Lemmabestandes, gehört weder zur Makro-
noch zur Mikrostruktur und muss von dem Leitelement unterschieden werden."

This statement expresses an innominate concept rather than a conclu-
sively defined concept with its various implications on the lexicographic
structures. Therefore, it is tentatively suggested that the lemma should be
the basis of the lexicographic mediostructure (and not the macrostruc-
ture), which should then be concerned with the overall arrangement of
the lemma stock of any given dictionary and not merely the arrange-
ments of lemmata in respect of polysemy (cf. Agricola 1983). However,
this line of thought is not pursued any further in this paper.

Secondly, in Hausmann 1977, the following definition of the macro-
structure in respect of dictionaries generally is found:

Def. 2: "..einer geordneten Folge von Wörtern; man spricht von 'Wörterbuch-
einträgen' oder 'Lemmata' [...], zu denen das Wörterbuch etwass sagt."
(Hausmann 1977, 3).

From this definition it appears that Hausmann does not put particular
emphasis on the total number of lemmata (the lemma stock), but rather
on the specific order in which such lemmata are arranged. In keeping
with this, Svensén 1985 defines the macrostructure as follows:

Def. 3: "..det sätt på vilket de olika ordboksartiklarna placeras i förhållande till
varandra."
(Svensén 1985, 215).

From definitions 2 and 3 it is evident that they take a somewhat diffe-
rent approach in their attempt to identify the lexicographic macrostruc-
ture than does Hartmann 1983. In contrast to the definition given in Hart-
mann 1983 (cf. Def. 1), which lays emphasis on the total number of lem-
mata, or the lemma aggregate, both Hausmann 1977 and Svensén 1985
put emphasis on the arrangement and organistaion of dictionary articles,
and in the present attempt to define the lexicographic macrostructure,
definitions 2 and 3 will be the starting point. The reason for this is that,
as distinct from Def. 1, both definitions focus on the lexicographic
macrostructure as an organisational structure (cf. also Wiegand 1983,
453). However, we shall not be content with placing particular emphasis
on the arrangement of dictionary articles, or lemmata - a characteristic
feature of both Def. 2 and Def. 3 - but the arrangement and incorporation
of other macrostructural components will also be included in the lexico-
graphic macrostructure. This means that the different parts of what is cal-
led the **front matter** and the **back matter** such as the preface, the user's
guide, and the various appendices which may be incorporated in a dictio-

nary will be considered parts of the lexicographic macrostructure and thus be described as macrostructural components.

Having said that, in our opinion, the lexicographic macrostructure deals with more than the arrangement of lemmata, it may perhaps be appropriate to compare the word **macrostructure** with the word **macrocosm**. In the same way as the term **macrocosm** applies to the world, or universe, as a whole, the macrostructure of any given dictionary may conveniently be regarded as a fair parallel to a macrocosm, and thus it may be said that the lexicographic macrostructure is the dictionary as a whole and not merely the arrangement of lemmata. In other words: the macrostructure of a dictionary may be described as that part of the dictionary which is concerned with the sequential relationship between or among the macrostructural components (cf. for instance Schaeder 1987, 83-94). By way of comparison, the lexicographic mediostructure, as generally defined, deals with the position, or arrangement, of lemmata, especially the sequence of the different meanings of polysemous lemmata, whereas the lexicographic microstructure deals with the internal structure of the individual dictionary articles (cf. for instance Hausmann 1977, 4, and Wiegand 1983, 453).

2.1 Classification of Macrostructures

An examination of some of the available empirical evidence, i.e. the existing dictionaries with special reference to special-purpose dictionaries, reveals that their macrostructures are not very homogeneous. Some of these LSP dictionaries have rather poor macrostructures whereas other LSP dictionaries have (relatively) rich macrostructures (cf. Nielsen 1989, 57-58). This noticeable difference in respect of macrostructures leads - more or less automatically - to a distinction between two different types of lexicographic macrostructures. One kind of macrostructure may be called a **simple macrostructure**, and for the purpose of this description, the following definition of a simple macrostruture is suggested:

> Def. 4: A simple macrostructure is a lexicographic macrostructure which is composed of only two macrostructural components.

By way of illustration, a simple macrostructure is typically made up of a preface and the (alphabetical) arrangement of the lemmata, the dictionary proper in the most restricted sense of this word, alternatively called the body of the dictionary (cf. for instance Al-Kasimi 1977, 110). In order to avoid unnecessary confusion, the adjective *simple* is here used to describe a lexicographic macrostructure (which is a single whole) consis-

ting of not more than two separate macrostructural components. The basic reason for limiting the maximum number of macrostructural components to two is that it makes it easy (simple) to identify the interrelationship existing between only two separate components, but as soon as another macrostructural component (or several macrostructural components) is included in the lexicographic macrostructure, the interrelationship immediately becomes (relatively) more complex - this, of course, presupposes the existence of a clearly identifiable relationship between or among the macrostructural components of a dictionary . The simple lexicographic macrostructure may be illustrated by way of the following diagrammatic representation:

GRAF 1

Fig. 1: Simple macrostructure.

The other kind of macrostructure may be called a **complex macrostructure**. It should be noted that the adjectives *simple* and *complex* in respect of lexicographic macrostructures have been chosen because they represent concepts which may be described as antipodal. For the purpose of this description, the following definition of a complex macrostructure is suggested:

> Def. 5: A complex macrostructure is a lexicographic macrostructure which is composed of more than two macrostructural components.

From this definition it may be gathered that a typical complex macrostructure is composed of the preface, the (alphabetical) arrangement of lemmata, and at least one additional macrostructural component (for instance an appendix). The adjective *complex* is here used to describe a lexicographic macrostructure (which is a single whole) consisting of many more or less closely related, or connected, macrostructural com-

ponents, where the determiner *many* is used in the sense *more than two* (cf. the discussion of the adjective *simple* above). The complex lexicographic macrostructure may be illustrated by way of the following diagrammatic representation:

GRAF 2

Fig. 2: complex macrostructure.

At this point it is relevant to give a few examples of dictionaries which may be classified as having either a simple macrostructure or a complex macrostructure. SAU is a monolingual multi-volume dictionary, and it has a simple lexicographic macrostructure consisting of only two individual, or separate, macrostructural components, viz. the preface and the alphabetical arrangement of lemmata (the body of the dictionary). The main problem with a macrostructure like this is that all the information that should guide the user in his search for information is contained, or perhaps rather concealed, in the (in casu three-page) preface. It should be a mandatory rule to separate the different kinds of information given to the dictionary user in the front matter so that all the information in respect of the use of the dictionary in question is contained in a separate macrostructural component (cf. the discussion under **4.** below). This would be a great help to the dictionary user as it will be possible for him quickly to locate the kind of information he needs. In a multi-volume dictionary, it is desirable to include an easy-to-understand user's guide so that the dictionary user will have no difficulty in finding the information he needs - provided, of course, that such information is incorporated in the dictionary.

In contrast to this, OSB is an example of a complex lexicographic macrostructure. OSB is a monolingual, single-volume dictionary, and its

macrostructure may be divided into five separate components, viz. the preface, the list of contents, the alphabetical arrangement of lemmata, an appendix listing English monarchs, and a list of English law reports. Ideally, every dictionary should contain a complex macrostructure which should be made up of (at least) a list of contents, a preface, a user's guide, and the (alphabetical) arrangement of lemmata. Dividing the macrostructure into these separate components will facilitate the user's search for relevant information in connection with the use of the dictionary and also in connection with the interpretation of the information contained in the dictionary. Incidentally, it is surprising to note that OSB does not contain any information whatsoever on the use of the dictionary.

2.2 Macrostructural Interrelationship

A closer study of some of the special-purpose dictionaries discussed in Nielsen 1989 reveals that the macrostructures of some of these law dictionaries reflect what may be called random sequences of macrostructural components without structural systems and thus leave much to be desired from the user's point of view as well as from a lexicographic point of view. By this is meant that the separate macrostructural components should be clearly and directly related to each other, because a macrostructural component which has no relation to any of the other macrostructural components in a dictionary adds nothing whatsoever to the function and scope of the dictionary in question. In this connection, it may be appropriate to quote Landau 1984 when, with particular reference to college dictionaries, he says the following about the inclusion of certain back-matter articles (i.e. macrostructural components):

> "There is no more reason why a dictionary should inform a reader that Allegheny College of Meadville, Pensylvania, was founded in 1815 than it should quote the price of gold in 1934 or list the twelve longest-running musical comedies on Broadway." (Landau 1984, 117).

It is hereby argued that if this can be said about an entire macrostructural component, then there is no compelling reason why this component should be included at all, because it has no relation to the remainder information in the dictionary, and its inclusion merely takes up valuable space and thus prevents otherwise relevant information from being included in the dictionary. On the basis of this, it is tentatively suggested that the greater the interrelationship, or perhaps even interdependence, between the macrostructural components in a dictionary, the greater the justification for incorporating such components in the dictionary. Below, the importance of **macrostructural interrelationship**, i.e. the need for

a relation between or among the individual macrostructural components, will be discussed.

By way of illustration, we shall now take a closer look at one of the special-purpose dictionaries referred to above, and for this examination it has been found appropriate to revert to SAU. As has already been noted, the macrostructure of this particular law dictionary consists of only two macrostructural components - even despite the fact that it is a multi-volume dictionary. This is an instance where it may be said that there is a sequence of macrostructural components without there being any apparent system which is responsible for, or governs, the arrangement of the information in more than one macrostructural component, viz. the body of the dictionary. The remainder macrostructural component, i.e. the preface, is a mixed bag of information which, when classified correctly, belongs to a not insignificant number of other macrostructral components, for instance, a guide to the use of the dictionary (the how-to-use-this-dictionary section). Such a user's guide is especially valuable to the user in a dictionary consisting of more than one volume as is, for instance, a table of contents and consequently, it is therefore suggested that any given dictionary should have a complex macrostructure which gives the user information about the **use** of the dictionary, its overall **organisation**, and the **arrangement** of lemmata in a precise and clear way. Furthermore, these different kinds of information should be contained in separate and clearly identifiable macrostructural components as this will be a user-friendly way of arranging the different kinds of information. In a dictionary which consists of five volumes (to take SAU as an example), it is important for the user to know whether a lemma such as *criminal proceeding* is to be found in volume one (under the letter C) or in volume four (under the letter P). It is interesting to note that in SAU the lemma *criminal proceeding* is found under the letter C, whereas the lemma *civil proceedings* is found under the letter P, a practice which only adds to the confusion.

It is important for the lexicographic macrostructure as a system that each macrostructural component is - in one way or another - related to one or more of the other macrostructural components in the dictionary, in that all these individual components are to constitute a single and cohesive whole, viz. the dictionary. In this connection, the opposite principle, i.e. where there is no interrelationship between macrostructural components, may be illustrated by way of the following quotation from Landau 1984:

"Thus, front-matter articles are often written by prominent scholars or educators
in an attempt to establish the authority of the work and lend it prestige."
(Landau 1984, 116).

There is of course nothing wrong in itself in having front-matter articles, or other macrostructural components, written by prominent - or perhaps even famous - scholars, but these articles should always bear a clear relation to other macrostructural components and not be mere commendatory statements containing no valuable information at all to the dictionary user in respect of the use of the dictionary. In other words: all the macrostructural components of any given dictionary should form a "working relationship" with each other. It is this kind of "working relationship" between or among the macrostructural components which justifies the inclusion of the individual components. The reason for this is that where a macrostructural component has no relation whatsoever to any of the other macrostructural components, then it does not add any necessary information and consequently, this particular macrostructural component can be left out without any resulting loss of information in respect of the function, scope and application of the dictionary in question (cf. the discussion under **4.** below). It is interesting to see, however, how seldom this particular kind of front-matter article conveys any useful information to the dictionary user about the use and organisational structure of the dictionary in question, and in these cases they are better left out as their eulogistic commendations do nothing but take up valuable space.

Having said this, it is interesting to note that Landau thinks that the front matter of a children's dictionary and an ESL (i.e. English as a second language) dictionary is more important than that of what he calls an adult dictionary (cf. Landau 1984, 115-118, who equates front matter with a user's guide). Why this should be the case is difficult to see. It is hereby submitted that it is wrong to say that the front matter is more important in some dictionaries than in others; it is more correct - or so it is hereby submitted - to say that some kinds of information in the macrostructure are more relevant in some dictionaries than in others. If, for instance, there is no guide to the use of the dictionary concerned, it is irrelevant whether it is an adult dictionary or a children's dictionary, and it is equally irrelevant which language the user speaks (for the purpose of lexicography generally, the principle that all metalexicographic information should ideally be given in the intended user's native language is concurred with, cf. Kromann/Riiber/ Rosbach 1984 and Grindsted 1988).

However, it is true that some children cannot be expected to be familiar with the use of a dictionary, but the same is generally the case with adults. Regardless of age, dictionary use is - to a large extent - dependent on experience, and it is surprising to see how many "adults" are apparently unable to use a dictionary properly or optimally. In my own experience of teaching English as a foreign language with particular reference to translation, the relatively high frequency of misinterpretation of the information in the dictionary is probably due to inexperience with the use of dictionaries rather than the user's age (the quality of the dictionary itself in relation to misinterpretation of information will not be discussed in this paper). Another problem would be to ascertain when precisely a dictionary user is an adult, and when he or she is a child, and whether or not there is a clear-cut dividing line between these two categories of users; and if not, what to do in respect of the intermediate users. It is hereby suggested that it is not a proper criterion to distinguish between adult and children's dictionaries in respect of the lexicographic macrostructure, but the macrostructure, and its individual components, should be valued with due regard to the specific purpose of the dictionary (translation, reception or production) combined with due regard to its target group, i.e. the skill and field knowledge of the members of the target group of each dictionary. This would ensure the compilation of a dictionary containing information which is relevant to a particular purpose as well as to a relatively homogeneous group of dictionary users.

3. Typological Reflections

Having established the distinction between simple and complex macrostructures and the need for interrelationship between or among macrostructural components, we shall go on to make a further sub-classification, or rather establish a typology in respect of lexicographic macrostructures. In this connection, it is interesting - and also surprising - to note that a monolingual, two-volume law dictionary such as JOW (to mention but one example) contains functional elements within the articles which are not explained or defined in a user's guide (the dictionary does not contain a user's guide at all). A functional element is used to indicate a characteristic feature of the lemma (and the translation equivalent where appropriate) and to refer to other places in the dictionary (cf. Wiegand 1988, 764-765). In the articles contained in JOW, functional elements such as the following can be found:

(Hob. 336)
(Co.Litt. 11a)
(q.v.)

and the user is not told anywhere what these functional elements mean or refer to. These functional elements - together with the remainder of the functional elements found in JOW - should have been explained in order to facilitate the use of the dictionary, particularly in the case where the dictionary user looks in volume one of JOW and encounters, for instance, the functional element *(Co.Litt. 11a)* as there is no indication whatsoever in this volume that there is a bibliographic appendix in volume two to which this particular functional element refers. Furthermore, the dictionary user may find the following functional elements (to mention a few) in the articles of JOW, and none of these are explained anywhere in the macrostructure (or anywhere else in the dictionary for that matter):

Syr.
Gk.
et.seq.
e.g.
i.e.

A similar criticism can be raised against OSB and JUR, two other monolingual law dictionaries, though it is important to note that the macrostructures of the three dictionaries are not identical. An insufficient lexicographic macrostructure as the one found in JOW and described above may be called an **underdeveloped macrostructure**. Consequently, an underdeveloped macrostructure is definable as follows:

> Def. 6: An underdeveloped macrostructure is a complex lexicographic macrostructure in which one or more of the functional elements which are incorporated in one or more of the macrostructural components is/are not defined or explained in the lexicographic macrostructure in question.

It should be noted that the adjective *underdeveloped* is here used in the sense *not fully developed*. From the dictionary user's point of view, it is extremely important that all the functional elements contained in a dictionary are explained in a user's guide or any other appropriate place (i.e. macrostructural component). If the functional elements are not explained, the dictionary user may often be unable to guess the meaning of these elements - or what is worse, his guess may be wrong - and thus the particular piece of information contained in the functional element is lost. This does not mean, however, that each and every bibliographic reference (being one kind of functional element) should be shown and explained

in a separate list, so that the dictionary in question contains a long list of abbreviations and a long bibliography, but one or a few of these functional elements should be illustrated and explained in the appropriate macrostructural component, so that the user will know what this type of functional element refers to. This will place the user in a position where he can use the functional elements - and the dictionary as such -in an optimal way.

As a consequence of the foregoing, the other constituent of this typology is a lexicographic macrostructure which is not insufficient, in the sense that there is no lack of macrostructural interrelationship in the dictionary concerned. Therefore, a complex lexicographic macrostructure displaying no insufficiencies in respect of the interrelationship between or among its macrostructural components may be called a **fully developed macrostructure**. This type of macrostructure is thus definable as follows:

> Def. 7: A fully developed macrostructure is a complex lexicographic macrostructure in which all the functional elements which are incorporated in all the macrostructural components are defined or explained in the lexicographic macrostructure in question.

It should be noted that in defining the underdeveloped macrostructure and the fully developed macrostructure respectively, the functional elements in any given dictionary which are not defined or explained due to mere oversights in the printing process of the dictionary concerned are disregarded. It is furthermore suggested that any dictionary, whether it be a general-purpose dictionary or a special-purpose dictionary, and whether it be a monolingual or a bilingual dictionary, should have a fully developed macrostructure as this type of macrostructure offers the best possible help to the dictionary user who is not left to himself to guess the meaning of, for instance, various abbreviations and other functional elements. If pure guesswork on the part of the dictionary user is eliminated in respect of the meaning of the information given in a dictionary, the risk of misinterpretation of such information will be minimised.

4. A Descriptive Example

Within the field of lexicography as a science sui generis, the concept of macrostructure as an organisational system is a universal concept, i.e. it is universally valid in respect of any dictionary. Having said this, it is important to note that there is an infinite number of instantiations of lexicographic macrostructures, or in other words - there is a universally valid

system which is realised by way of an infinite number of sequences in the sense suggested above (cf. the discussion under **2.2** above). The cardinal principle, or purpose, of the macrostructure is to provide relationships between or among the macrostructural components of which the most widely known is the A to Z section of the dictionary (Landau 1984, 115 - a somewhat ambiguous term), alternatively called the body of the dictionary. In the following, we shall have a closer look at the **prefaces** of some special-purpose dictionaries and show that there is a considerable need for more elaborate macrostructures in LSP dictionaries generally. The purpose of this exemplification is to emphasise the point that it is important to have a complex macrostructure, and that some of the existing special-purpose dictionaries can gain in value by increasing the degree of complexity in respect of their respective macrostructures. The dictionaries concerned are AND, BAI, COL, FEO, IFF, JOW, JUR, OSB and SAU.

The preface of the dictionary should ideally be found after the table of contents as the second macrostructural component. The reason for this is that the table of contents is the only macrostructural component which contains references to all other macrostructural components without exception and therefore, it should be the first component. Where the table of contents has this initial position, it facilitates the use of the dictionary, in that it is easy to locate, and if this principle is followed universally, the dictionary user will know where to find this macrostructural component no matter which dictionary he is using. However, empirical evidence shows that it is not always the case that the table of contents is the first macrostructural component in a dictionary, in that a surprisingly high number of LSP dictionaries have no table of contents, cf. BAI, COL, FEO, IFF, JOW, JUR and SAU; and in OSB the preface is placed before the table of contents. For the present purpose, the lexicographic preface may be defined as follows:

> Def. 8: A lexicographic preface is a macrostructural component, being part of the front matter, and which presents the author's explanatory remarks whose primary purpose is to make the reader (i.e. the dictionary user) appreciate the function, scope and application of the dictionary in question.

This definition of the preface of a dictionary is clearly in line with the principle enunciated by Svensén 1985, who says as follows:

> "När den tilltänkte användaren funderar på att köpa en viss ordbok, behöver han en sammanhängande redogörelse för ordbokens egenskaper i allmänhet."
> (Svensén 1985, 222).

What kind of information should be included in the preface depends

on the dictionary itself. In monolingual special-purpose dictionaries some kinds of information are relevant which may not be relevant in bilingual dictionaries, and vice versa. For instance, in a monolingual law dictionary it is usual to mention that the law is stated as at a particular date, cf. OSB, SAU and JOW; this information is not relevant in a bilingual law dictionary designed for translation purposes. However, there are various other kinds of information in the prefaces of the dictionaries examined which are not relevant in the preface either, or in other words: the information is in itself relevant, but it should not be relegated to the preface, but be contained in its own macrostructural component. The following is a list of the different kinds of information which it is possible to identify in the prefaces of the above-mentioned nine LSP dictionaries:

1. The purpose of the dictionary (translation/comprehension).
2. The field(s) covered by the dictionary.
3. Sources of lemmata/definitions/quotations ("corpus").
4. Sources of illustrative examples ("corpus").
5. Acknowledgements.
6. Comments on theneed for the dictionary.
7. Limited defining vocabulary.
8. The history of the dictionary.
9. The law stated at + date.
10. The composition of the articles.
11. Arrangement of lemmata.
12. Reorganisation of the court system/government.
13. Developments within the field of law.
14. Comments on stylistic levels of language.
15. Guide to the use of the dictionary.
16. Commendatory statements about the dictionary.
17. Commendatory statements about the lemmata (up-to-date).
18. Commendatory statements about the publishers.
19. Hopes of improved international relationships.

A brief look at these nineteen items, which represent different kinds of information, reveals that some kinds of information are more relevant to the purpose, use and scope of the dictionary than are other kinds of information.

Firstly, it is suggested that the information contained in items 1-4 above is both necessary and relevant to the function, scope and application of any given dictionary and therefore, it should be contained in the prefa-

ce. The information contained in item 5 should also be included in the preface, preferably at the end. These different kinds of information do not extend the macrostructure of a dictionary as such, in that they are all placed in the relevant macrostructural component (cf. Def. 8).

Secondly, the position is different in respect of the information contained in items 9, 12, 13 and 15. This information is undoubtedly relevant in respect of a law dictionary, but these kinds of information should not be contained in the preface, but in separate macrostructural components. This means that the information contained in items 9, 12 and 13 should be incorporated in a separate macrostructural component dealing with the substance of law (cf. AND), so that the dictionary user knows exactly where to find this particular kind of information. Consequently, the information contained in item 15 has to be incorporated in its own macrostructural component entitled: Guide to the use of the dictionary (or words to that effect). This kind of information is so important that it should not be hidden or concealed in the text of the preface (cf. BAI). The same applies to the information contained in items 10, 11 and 14 and therefore, this information should also be included in a separate guide to the use of the dictionary.

Thirdly, the information contained in items 6,7 and 8 is not really necessary, but it may be relevant in some circumstances, for instance in dictionaries for lay-people. It may perhaps be appropriate to call these three items "innominate " items of information, in that they may and may not be relevant depending on all the specific circumstances surrounding the dictionary in question; in other words: these items cannot be definitely classified as either relevant or irrelevant, but whether it is one or the other depends on the individual circumstances of the case at hand.

Fourthly, the information contained in items 16-19 is both unnecessary and irrelevant to the function, scope and application of the dictionary and therefore, these kinds of information are best left out as they take up valuable space. With a legal expression, these kinds of information are "mere puffs", and they add no relevant information in respect of the use of the dictionary and the interpretation of the information given in the dictionary in question. In other words: the dictionary user's interpretation of the information contained in the dictionary as such is quite independent of any part of the information contained in items 16-19. To include these kinds of information only prevents otherwise relevant information from being included in the dictionary generally, and more specifically in the preface.

These findings suggest that the macrostructures of the dictionaries examined need to be extended in one way or another and generally by the inclusion of such macrostructural components as a guide to the use of the dictionary and an introduction to the field covered by the dictionary (a field introduction). Other examples of extension potential may be found in other dictionaries, but the general tendency is to include too much and too varied information in too small a number of macrostructural components. Thus the proposal that the degree of complexity in respect of the lexicographic macrostructure should be higher than is the case in the above dictionaries has something to commend it. It should be noted that this weeding-out procedure does not pertain to prefaces exclusively, but is equally applicable to all other macrostructural components - the example of the preface merely serves the purpose of illustrating the necessity for a high degree of complexity. The preface has been chosen for the simple reason that all of the nine LSP dictionaries mentioned above contain a preface.

5. Conclusion

As appears from the above discussion, a dictionary is not merely a list of words arranged according to a particular principle as indicated in the introduction, but it is a much more complex entity which should be described in terms of a lexicographic macrostructure. The lexicographic macrostructure should not be restricted to the mere arrangement of lemmata, but be applied to the dictionary in its entirety. The most insufficient macrostructure is the simple macrostructure in that it does not provide the dictionary user with a clearly organised and easily identifiable string of different kinds of information which can help him optimally when he has recourse to a dictionary. Consequently, any given dictionary should have a highly developed macrostructure realised by way of a complex macrostructure, preferably a fully developed macrostructure, as this particular kind of macrostructure is of considerably more value to the user than is the simple macrostructure. It is not necessarily a disadvantage when a dictionary contains a macrostructure with a high degree of complexity, provided that the individual macrostructural components are arranged in a practical way, so that the interrelationship between or among such macrostructural components is clearly expressed.

6. Literature

6.1 Primary Literature

AND =Anderson, R.J.B.: *Anglo-Scandinavian Law Dictionary of Legal Terms Used in Professional and Commercial Practice*. Oslo [etc.]: Universitetsforlaget 1977.

BAI =Bailey, I.E.: *Dansk-engelsk handels- og fagordbog for erhvervslivet administrationen og forvaltningen*. K¢benhavn: Sch¢nberg 1979.

COL =*English Law Dictionary*. 1st ed. Teddington: Peter Collin Publishing 1987.

FEO =Nielsen, Feodor: *Anglo-amerikansk/dansk retsordbog*. K¢benhavn: Nyt Nordisk Forlag Arnold Busk 1975.

IFF =H¢edt, J¢rgen et al: *IFF fagordbog dansk/engelsk-engelsk/ dansk*, vols. 1-2. K¢benhavn: IFF Ordb¢ger 1988.

JOW =Burke, John: *Jowitt′s Dictionary of English Law*. 2nd ed., vols. 1-2. London: Sweet & Maxwell 1977.

JUR =von Eyben, W.E.: *Juridisk ordbog*. 7th ed. K¢benhavn: Gad 1987.

OSB =Bird, Roger: *Osborn′s Concise Law Dictionary*. 7th ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell 1983.

SAU =Saunders, J.B. (ed.): *Words and Phrases, Legally Defined*. 2nd ed., vols. 1-5. London: Butterworths 1969.

6.2 Secondary Literature

Agricola, Erhard (1983):"Mikro-, Medio- und Makrostrukturen als Informationen im Wörterbuch", in J. Schildt/D. Viehweger (eds.): *Die Lexikographie von heute und das Wörterbuch von morgen: Analyse-Probleme-Vorschläge*. Berlin 1983, 1-24 (= *Linguistische Studien. Reihe A. Arbeitsberichte* 109).

Al-Kasimi, Ali M. (1977): *Linguistics and Bilingual Dictionaries*. Leiden: E.J. Brill 1977.

Bergenholtz, Henning (1990): "Lexikographische Instruktionen: Plan und Ausarbeitung eines madagassisch-deutschen Wörterbuchs", in: *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationswissenschaft 43*, 1990, 19-37.

Bergenholtz, Henning/Mugdan, Joachim (1985): *Lexikographie und Grammatik. Akten des Essener Kolloquiums zur Grammatik im Wörterbuch 28.-30.6.1984*. Tübingen: Niemeyer 1985.

Bergenholtz, Henning/Nielsen, Sandro (1988): "Den hidtil st¢rste fagordbog", in: *Hermes 1*, 1988, 251-255.

Crystal, David (1985): *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1985.

Grindsted, Annette (1988): *Principper for præsentation af ækvivalenter i oversættelsesordb¢ger*. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag 1988 (= *Odense University Studies in Linguistics*, vol. 8).

Hartmann, Reinhard R.K. (ed.) (1983): *Lexicography: Principles and Practice*. London [etc.]: Academic Press 1983.

Hausmann, Franz Josef (1977): *Einführung in der neufranzösischen Wörterbücher*. Tübingen: Niemeyer 1977.

Hausmann, Franz Josef (1985): "Lexikographie", in: Christoph Schwarze/Dieter Wunderlich (eds.): *Handbuch der Lexikologie*. Königstein: Athenäum 1985, 367-411.

Kromann, Hans-Peder/Riiber, Theis/Rosbach, Poul (1984): "Überlegungen zu Grundfragen der zweisprachigen Lexikographie", in: Herbert Ernst Wiegand (ed.): *Studien zur neuhochdeutschen Lexikographie V*. Hildesheim/New York: Olms 1984, 159-238 (= *Germanistische Linguistik* 3-6/1984).

Landau, Sidney I. (1984): *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography*. New York: Scribner Press 1984.

Mugdan, Joachim (1989): "Grammar in Dictionaries of Languages for Special Purposes (LSP)", in: *Hermes 3*, 1989, 125-142.

Nielsen, Sandro (1989): "Kritisk oversigt over engelske og danske juridiske ordb¢ger", in: *Hermes 2*, 1989, 55-75.

Robinson, Jennifer (1984): "Part D: Glossary of English Lexicographical Terms, A-Z", in Barbara Ann Kipfer: *Workbook on Lexicography: A Course for Dictionary Users with a Glossary of English Lexicographical Terms*. Exeter: University of Exeter 1984, 173-188 (= *Exeter Linguistic Studies*, 8).

Schaeder, Burkhard (1987): *Germanistische Lexikographie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer 1987.

Svensén, Bo (1985): *Handbok i lexikografi. Principer och metoder i ordboksarbetet*. Stockholm: Esselte 1985.

Wiegand, Herbert Ernst (1983): "Was ist eigentlich ein Lemma? Ein Beitrag zur Theorie der lexikographischen Sprachbeschreibung", in: Herbert Ernst Wiegand (ed.): *Studien zur neuhochdeutschen Lexikographie III*. Hildesheim/New York: Olms 1983, 401-474 (= *Germanistische Linguistik* 1-4/1982).

Wiegand, Herbert Ernst (1988): "Was eigentlich ist Fachlexikographie? Mit Hinweisen zum Verhältnis von sprachligem und enzyklopädishem Wissen", in: Horst Haider Munske/Peter von Polenz/Oskar Reichmann/Reiner Hildebrandt (eds.): *Deutscher Wortschatz. Lexikologische Studien. Ludwig Erich Schmitt zum 80. Geburtstag von seinen Marburger Schülern*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter 1988, 729-790.

Zgusta, Ladislav (1971): *Manual of Lexicography*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton 1971.