

*Pedro A. Fuertes-Olivera\**

## **Specialised Lexicography for Learners: Specific Proposals for the Construction of Pedagogically-oriented Printed Business Dictionaries**

### **Abstract**

The *function theory of lexicography* argues that specialised lexicographical products must help learners to transform their information needs into aspects of knowledge of the discipline, and of its discursive properties. Lexicographers, then, must combine information and data access with the user's need for information and knowledge. To achieve this aim they need to devise theories providing solutions to different lexicographical problems. One such theory has recently been proposed by Tarp (2008), who claims that there are four categories which are central to a general theory of learner's lexicography: users, user situation, user needs, and dictionary assistance. This paper focuses on *dictionary assistance* and addresses several lexicographical issues connected with polysemy: the selection of the lemmata of some printed English-Spanish/Spanish-English business dictionaries, their entry structures, sense differentiation, and sense ordering. The analysis leads the author to discuss some proposals with the aim of making business dictionaries more pedagogically oriented, and to include a set of principles pedagogically-oriented business dictionaries must have. They are illustrated in a model entry which has been compiled by rearranging one of the entries studied according to the proposals and principles previously discussed.

### **1. The Function Theory of Lexicography**

Over the course of a number of years Bergenholtz/Tarp (2003, 2004) have defended a transformative view of lexicography, and have presented lexicography as an area of social practice and independent science concerned with analysing and building dictionaries which can satisfy the needs of a specific type of user with specific types of problems related to a specific type of user situation (see Tarp 2008, for a review).

---

\* *Pedro A. Fuertes-Olivera*  
*University of Valladolid*  
*Escuela Universitaria de Estudios Empresariales*  
*Paseo del Prado de la Magdalena s/n*  
*47005 Valladolid (Spain)*  
*pedro@tita.emp.uva.es*

This functional approach to lexicography, called the *function theory of lexicography* or the *theory of lexicographical functions*, “shifts the focus from actual dictionary users and dictionary usage situations to potential users and the social situation in which they participate.” (Tarp 2008: 40) Consequently, understanding the lexicographical implications of different extra-lexicographical social situations is a necessary metalexicographical exercise which may shed light on the changing needs of potential users.

Within this general theoretical framework this paper focuses on business dictionaries. It presents the prototypical characteristics of printed business dictionaries (section 2), discusses some basic principles of pedagogical lexicography (section 3), and offers some specific proposals connected with *dictionary assistance*, which is one of the four categories Tarp (2008) considers central to a general theory of learner’s lexicography (section 4). The paper concludes by summarising a set of principles pedagogically-oriented business dictionaries must have. These principles are based on the proposals previously discussed and illustrated in a model entry which has been compiled by rearranging the data offered in one of the entries previously analysed.

## **2. Prototypical Characteristics of Printed Business Dictionaries**

Researchers on printed business dictionaries (see Bergenholtz/Tarp 1995; Fuertes-Olivera/Velasco-Sacristán 2001; Fuertes-Olivera/Arribas-Baño 2005, 2008; Fuertes-Olivera/Nielsen, 2008; Fuertes Olivera/Tarp, 2008; Andersen/Fuertes-Olivera, 2009) assume that *business* is different from other specialised languages because we all have a working knowledge of core business activities such as selling and buying, and because business does not have clear boundaries, as it includes activities learnt by practice or through formal education (for example, selling a house or understanding a balance sheet). In addition, they also add that the number of users and would-be users of business texts is so large (Nickerson (2005), for example, comments that teaching materials devoted to teaching/learning Business English exceed those published for other specialities), that business discourse is not restricted to a limited number of users.

The above researchers also describe printed business dictionaries according to a set of prototypical characteristics. First, expertise in business/economics covers various fields, which means that many of these dictionaries deal with terms belonging to more than one field, while others are limited to just one, or maybe even to a particular aspect of a given field. Second, business dictionaries also include terms which are not strictly related to the field of business/economics (thus, the dictionaries which cover the lexis employed in business language include legal terms), while others cover lexical units belonging to the general language (the typical case is the *commercial dictionary*). Third, the term *business dictionary* typically refers to a reference work which includes the lexical units occurring in the area of business in one or more language(s). Fourth, in most business dictionaries lemmata are arranged alphabetically and are provided with factual and linguistic information demanded by the following users: experts; semi-experts; laypeople.

The above assumptions have some lexicographical implications. On the one hand, the very concept of the *business dictionary* is being discarded in some lexicographical projects which are constructing, say, *accounting dictionaries* instead of business dictionaries (Nielsen/Mournier 2005, 2007). On the other hand, the process of meaning discrimination is becoming subject to a deep scrutiny in order to address three specific characteristics of business discourse (Fuertes-Olivera/Arribas-Baño 2008):

- (i) The vocabulary of most business texts also consists of a large proportion of popularised terms which demand the use of very precise lexicographical systems for discriminating meaning and use. For example, the English word *repossess* still means what it does to specialists together with a popularised meaning in connection with *credit crunch* and *house bubble*.
- (ii) The selection and description of data are being influenced by two opposing forces: cultural traditions and globalisation. Hence, lexicographers are expected to guide their users towards this distinction. For example, *Noche de Reyes* and *Boxing Day* are synonymous Spanish and English terms, although they occur on different dates: *Noche de Reyes* is the 5<sup>th</sup> of January whereas *Boxing Day* is the day after Christmas Day in the United Kingdom, i.e. 26<sup>th</sup> of December. On both days, Spanish and English people

receive and give presents from and to relatives and friends.

- (iii) The taxonomy of users' types developed by authors such as Bergenholtz/Kaufman (1997) does not agree with the fact that business is different from other specialised fields, not only because of its local anchoring but also because some of its core activities are carried out by everyone on a daily basis: we all buy and sell; we all make presentations; we all take part in meetings; we all negotiate. In other words, we all have a working knowledge of business no matter what our interest or our training in it, and, therefore, for the sake of clarity it seems we should be more precise regarding the three types of users proposed by Bergenholtz/Kaufman (1997). For example, students attending business courses or translators and/or interpreters of business texts will find conceptual and linguistic similarities between the information contained in the text they are working with and their own life experiences. This can also happen in other specialised domains, although on a much more limited scale.

Regarding business dictionaries for Spanish users, for example, Fuertes-Olivera/Arribas-Baño (2008: 3) claim that this previous familiarity with business leads them to put students of business and translators into a different group from *semi-experts*, assuming that translators do need more specific conceptual information in L1 than students of Business/Economics, who usually come to Business English courses in the second or third year of their degrees, after passing different specific subjects which should have given them enough conceptual and linguistic information to carry out receptive and productive tasks in their L1. Hence, printed business dictionaries aimed at Spanish students have to consider two different types of users with specific types of problems related to a specific type of situation, i.e. the Spanish education system: translators and interpreters; students of Business/Economics (Table 1).

User Type	Conceptual information in L1	Conceptual information in L2	Communicative information in L1	Communicative information in L2
Expert (bilingual dimension)				•
Semi-expert (monolingual and bilingual dimension)	•	•	•	•
Layman (monolingual dimension)	•			
Translator and interpreter (monolingual and bilingual dimension)	•	•	•	•
Students of Business/Economics (bilingual dimension)		•		•

Source: Fuertes-Olivera/Arribas-Baño: (2008: 3)

Table 1. User Typology with its communicative and conceptual information needs

The fact that students can be considered an identifiable user group reinforces the claim made in this paper for offering specific proposals for making specialised (for example, business) dictionaries more pedagogically-oriented.

### 3. Pedagogically-oriented Specialised Lexicography

After reviewing the main tenets of the *function theory of lexicography*, Tarp (2008) focuses on learner's lexicography and argues that the *function theory of lexicography* should constitute the basis of any learner's lexicography. His ideas stem from the fact that dictionaries provide assistance on two levels: directly, by communicating knowledge about a language (grammar, vocabulary, cultural information, etc.); indirectly, by providing information that can be used to solve specific communication problems during the process of communication. He comments (2008: 140) that central "to a general theory for learner lexicography are four lexicographical categories: *potential users*, *user situations*, *user need* and *dictionary assistance*". The first three categories determine the various types of data that such dictionaries contain. They allow us to ask a number of questions on which specific functions the

learner's dictionary should aim at. Tarp identifies 12 of them, each subject to more specific data and thus to more focused information:

1. What is the mother tongue of the learner?
2. To what extent does the learner master their mother tongue?
3. To what extent does the learner master the foreign language in question?
4. How great is the learner's general cultural knowledge?
5. How great is the learner's knowledge of culture in the foreign-language area in question?
6. Why does the learner wish to learn the foreign language in question?
7. Does the foreign-language learning process take place spontaneously or consciously?
8. Is the foreign language being learned within or outside the foreign-language area concerned?
9. Is the learner exposed to their mother tongue during the learning process?
10. Does the learner use a specific textbook or didactic system?
11. Does the learner use a specific didactic method?
12. Is the learning process related to a specific subject?

(Tarp: 2008: 168)

The fourth category – *dictionary assistance* – can be illustrated by analysing current lexicographical practice aimed at Spanish students of business English. This will allow us to compare specific theories for learner's dictionaries (i.e., those used in specific dictionaries) with the theoretical framework adopted for the purpose of compiling dictionaries. Below I will refer to some findings regarding *polysemy* in selected English and/or Spanish business dictionaries: BUSINESS SPANISH DICTIONARY; OXFORD BUSINESS SPANISH DICTIONARY ; PETER COLLIN BUSINESS DICTIONARY; and PIRÁMIDE ECONOMÍA DICTIONARY.

#### 4. Polysemy

Modern approaches in the lexicographical literature pay considerable attention to semantic relationships in the dictionary (Fuertes-Olivera/

Arribas-Baño 2008). One of these relationships is that of *polysemy*, which can be studied either in relation to the microstructure or to the arrangement and presentation of the contents of the dictionary. As a microstructural component, polysemy tends to be analysed in terms of linguistic theories, whereas as a component of the *access structure* (Wiegand 1988) it refers to information and data access, that is, to the concept of *access route* (Bergenholtz/Gouws 2007) which is specifically connected with four key aspects analysed below: (i) lemmatisation; (ii) the structure of the entry, (iii) sense differentiation, and (iv) sense ordering.

#### 4.1. Lemmata

Tarp (2008: 173-184) claims that the question of lemma selection in learner's dictionaries remains unresolved, and that lexicographers elaborate on three main questions. First, they ask how extensive the lemma stock should be. Second, they want to know which criteria and principles should guide lemma selection. Finally, they ask which empirical foundation lemma selection should be based on. The *function theory* (see section 1, above) states that lexicographers should select their lemmata as a consequence of an initial analysis on the specific types of user needs. This selection should be the result of a systematic procedure which aims at finding information regarding the intended user's primary and secondary needs, as well as the main characteristics of the user's profile and situations. A systematic method of identifying selection principles and final lemma stock requires the following steps:

1. identifying the predicted type(s) of user situation(s)
2. identifying the predicted user group's characteristics
3. identifying the user group's primary (function-related) needs
4. identifying the user group's secondary (usage-related) needs
5. identifying the scope of the lexicographically relevant vocabulary
6. identifying selection criteria related to primary needs
7. identifying selection criteria related to secondary needs
8. identifying the final lemma stock

(Tarp 2008: 177)

Some business English and/or Spanish printed dictionaries tend to ignore some (or even all) of the above procedures. On most occasions

they resort to combining three specific methods of lemma selection: (1) introspection; (2) available dictionaries and reference works; (3) corpora. If adequately combined, the three methods may produce suitable lexicographical results. However, if applied uncritically, such methods of lemma selection prove inadequate and should be discarded as they lead to another problem: publishing houses produce ‘sequels’ of dictionaries without adapting the new dictionary to a different (extra)-lexicographical reality. An analysis of the sequence “**pr-**“ in PETER COLLIN BUSINESS and the BUSINESS SPANISH – a monolingual English dictionary and a bilingual English-Spanish/Spanish-English dictionary published by Peter Collin – shows that the wordlist is identical in both dictionaries, and that the data included in each entry is also the same. The only difference between them is that the monolingual dictionary employs definitions, whereas the bilingual one uses translation equivalences (see examples (1) and (2) of **premium**). This practice indicates that analysis previous to lemma and equivalent selection and sense disambiguation may have been absent and, consequently, the chances of including wrong data are higher. For example, **traspaso** – sense (c) in the English-Spanish side of the BUSINESS SPANISH – is a colloquial word in this context, and therefore cannot be considered an equivalent of **premium** (a formal term), usually translated by **prima** or **recargo**. Neither of them is given in BUSINESS SPANISH. Consequently, translating **premium** for **traspaso** in an official document, for example a contract, would be wrong and could lead to legal claims:

Example (1): **premium** in PETER COLLIN BUSINESS:

**premium** [ə pri:mjəm] *noun* (a) payment to encourage someone; **premium offer** = free gift offered to attract more customers (b) **insurance premium** = annual payment made by a person or a company to an insurance company; **additional premium** = payment made to cover extra items in an existing insurance; *you pay either an annual premium of £360 or twelve monthly premiums of £32* (c) amount to be paid to a landlord or a tenant for the right to take over a lease; *flat to let with a premium of £10,000; annual rent: £8,500, premium: £25,000* (d) extra charge; **exchange premium** = extra cost above the normal rate for buying foreign currency; *the dollar is at a premium, shares sold at a premium* = shares whose price is higher than their face value; *new shares whose market price is higher than their issue price* (NOTE: the opposite is **shares at a discount**) (e) **GB premium bonds** = government bonds, part of the national savings scheme, which pay

no interest, but give the owner the chance to win a monthly prize (f)  
**premium quality** = top quality

Example (2): **Premium** in BUSINESS SPANISH:

**premium** [pri:mjəm] *noun* (a) **premium offer** = obsequio *m* publicitario *or* oferta *f* especial (b) **insurance premium** = prima *f* de seguros; **you pay either an annual premium of £360 or twelve monthly premiums of £32** = se paga o bien una prima anual de £360 o bien doce primas mensuales de £32; **additional premium** = sobreprima *f*; **risk premium** = prima de riesgo (c) (*lease*) **traspaso** *m*; **flat to let with a premium of £10,000** = piso para alquilar con un traspaso de £10.000; **annual rent: £8,500, premium: £25,000** = alquiler anual: £8.500, traspaso: £25.000 (d) (*extra charge*) **agio** *m*; **exchange premium** = agio del cambio; **the dollar is at a premium** = el dólar está por encima de la par; **shares sold at a premium** = acciones vendidas por encima de la par (NOTE: the opposite is **shares at a discount**) (e) GB **premium bonds** = bonos del gobierno con prima (f) **premium quality** = alta calidad

Instead of resorting to previous dictionaries, compilers of pedagogical specialised dictionaries must pay attention to the criterion of relevance, together with identifying the predicted type(s) of user situation(s), user group's characteristics and users' needs (Tarp 2008: 177). The OXFORD BUSINESS SPANISH DICTIONARY explains in its front matter the process of lemma selection followed, which agrees basically with the aforementioned procedures. The result is a shorter wordlist but with a better description of each entry, as example (3) shows:

Example (3): Articles with **premium** in the OXFORD BUSINESS SPANISH DICTIONARY:

**premium**<sup>1</sup> *n* (*bonus, insurance premium*) prima *f*; (*surcharge*) recargo *m*; **be at a** ~ (Stock) estar sobre la par; (*be scarce*) escasear; **the shares are at a 20%** ~ las acciones están a un 20% sobre la par; **when time is at a** ~ cuando el tiempo apremia; **put a** ~ **on sth/sb** concederle mucha importancia a algo/alguien; ~ **bond** *n* bono de prima *m*; ~ **loan** *n* préstamos con primas *m*; ~ **price** *n* precio de incentivo *m*; ~ **payment** *n* pago de prima *m*; ~ **pricing** *n* fijación de precios de incentivo<sup>1</sup> *f*; ~ **quotations** *n pl* cotizaciones con prima *f nl*; ~ **reserve** *n* reserva de primas *f*  
**premium**<sup>2</sup> *adj* (product) de calidad superior; ~ **offer** *n* super oferta *f*

<sup>1</sup> This translation is poor. The concept refers to "prestige pricing" and the Spanish tend to use "precios de prestigio" instead of "precios de incentivo".

**Premium Bond** BrE *n* bono del Estado que permite ganar dinero participando en sorteos mensuales

In a comparison with examples (1) and (2), (3) shows that the data contained are more *relevant*, perhaps as a consequence of a better understanding of how specialised languages work. Example (3) is more adequate than example (2) because the lemma and equivalent selection, together with the data included, are based on satisfying the specific needs of learners:

- only two equivalents are included (*prima* and *recargo*);
- each equivalent is previously contextualised by means of encyclopaedic labels (*bonus*, *insurance premium*; *subcharge*);
- the word list pays attention to the principle of homonymy and differentiates between the word classes ‘noun’ and ‘adjective’;
- the dictionary uses an analytical macrostructure which facilitates the process of consultation. This selection is of great help to learners because differentiating between homonyms leads compilers to make a clear distinction between the common noun **premium bond** and the proper name **Premium Bond**;
- the usage examples contain more *systematic* information: they also offer grammatical information on each equivalent;
- it also contains pragmatic labels (for example, ‘BrE’ in **Premium Bond**);
- the entries are more precise with respect to the *word classes* of the lemma and its equivalents, their *word components*, e.g. the ‘number’ and ‘gender’ of the Spanish equivalents, and their *word combinations*, such as the Spanish collocation *super oferta* (**premium offer**).

To sum up, the wordlist of OXFORD BUSINESS SPANISH DICTIONARY is the result of an acceptable process of lemmatisation, as both lemmas and equivalents were selected by taking into consideration a criterion of *relevance* which implies identifying potential users and their needs. Consequently, the process of lemmatisation of a pedagogically-oriented specialised dictionary must restrict its lemma and translation equivalents to the relevant ones, with particular attention being paid to avoiding the practice of producing ‘sequels, which are prone to include wrong data.

#### 4.2. The Overall Structure of the Entry

This is a basic issue as it implies that the structure of the entry should permit the most simple and direct access to the information contained in the dictionary. Lexicographers can opt for presenting the information in an explicit or implicit manner at various levels. Having to observe the limitations of space, they need to manage great quantities of diverse information, which they must present in a way which suits the expected use of the data the user is going to make when consulting the dictionary. This requires a great deal of practical sense on the part of the lexicographer. As regards the lexicographic concept of organisation, we can differentiate two especially difficult aspects: i) the placement of a particular type of information with respect to other types of information (for example, whether explicit information should precede implicit information), and ii) the arrangement of the diverse categories of information related to the same type of information.

From the learner's perspective, I think that the second issue, i.e., the arrangement of the diverse categories of information related to the same type of information, plays a fundamental role in helping users to consult the dictionary. Here lexicographers invariably face two problems, one more general and the other more specific. The former refers to the way of managing a large amount of varied information in a lexicographical work. Example (4) shows that the editors of OXFORD BUSINESS SPANISH DICTIONARY opted for an approach to the (re)presentation of the information which is typical in learner's dictionaries: explicit information precedes implicit information (for example, the equivalent goes before usage examples; the editors do not highlight typographically the primary or explicit information (i.e., the equivalent is in normal font); instead, they highlight typographically the secondary or implicit information in the source language (i.e., it uses bold for Spanish phrases); meaning discriminators are enclosed in brackets (i.e., *tasa*); the number of equivalents is limited and is precisely discriminated:

Example (4): **índice** in the OXFORD BUSINESS SPANISH DICTIONARY

**índice** *m* index; (*tasa, coeficiente*) rate; (de audiencia) rating; ~ **de absorción** absorption rate; ~ **de audiencia televisiva** audience ratings; ~ **bursátil** stock market index; ~ **bursátil del Financiacional Times** Financial Times Stock-Exchange Index; ~ **de capitalización bursátil** market capitalization index; ~ **compuesto** composite index; ~ **de conversión publicitaria** adver-

tising conversion rate; ~ **del coste** Esp or **costo** AmL **de la vida** cost-of-living index; ~ **de cotización de acciones** share index; ~ **de cotización de valores** stock price index; ~ **de crecimiento** growth index, growth rate; ~ **de decadencia** rate of decay; ~ **de desempleo** unemployment rate; ~ **Dow Jones** Dow Jones index; ~ **del Financial Times** Financial Times Index, FT Index; ~ **Footsie** Footsie, FTSE 100; ~ **Hang Seng** Hang Seng Index; ~ **de indicadores anticipados** index of leading indicators; ~ **de indicadores coincidentes** index of coincident indicators; ~ **de indicadores retardados** index of lagging indicators; ~ **de materias** subject index; (*en libro*) table of contents; ~ **del mercado monetario** money market rate; ~ **del mercado de valores** stock market index; ~ **Nikkei** Nikkei Index; ~ **de penetración** penetration rate; ~ **de popularidad** popularity rating; ~ **de precios** price index; ~ **de precios al detalle or al por menor** retail price index BrE, consumer price index AmE; ~ **de rendimiento** rate of return; ~ **de repetición** repeat rate; ~ **de rotación de existencias** stock turnover rate; ~ **salarial** salary rate; ~ **superior** (*tipografía*) superscript; ~ **de utilidad bruta** gross profit ratio

Example (4) also shows some specific problems concerned with the presentation of the information: the arrangement of the information is very confusing and unsystematic, and of little help to students<sup>2</sup>:

- the first problem refers to the placement of the encyclopaedic labels used to discriminate meaning: for *index* there is no label, although this would be of great help to the user for discriminating between *subject index* (i.e., 'table of contents'), *inflation index*, and *stock market index*, which are scattered throughout the entry. In the middle of the entry, for example, users are informed that *subject index* and *table of contents* (*en libro* ['in a book']) are synonyms, but they are not given explicit information on *stock market index* and *inflation index*;
- the ordering of the equivalents and their related collocations are very unsystematic. For instance, the expressions referring to differ-

2 In this paper I am not concerned with all possible senses of the lemma. Nonetheless, I think it is remarkable that the sense of 'ratio', typically used in Econometrics, is not included at all. Similarly, I will not refer to the absence of some other semantic fields. For example, the expression 'en bolsa' (stock exchange) should have been included. Neither is it my intention to remark systematically on the poor grammatical information given. For example, the Spanish singular collocation 'índice de audiencia' is translated by the English equivalent 'audience ratings' in the plural. This is unjustified as Spanish often use 'índices de audiencia' (plural) in this context.

ent stock exchange indices (*Financial Times Stock-Exchange Index*, *Nikkei Index*, etc.) are included in different places, although they should be grouped together under the hyperonym *index* or the collocation **índice bursátil**, discriminated with the encyclopaedic label ‘en bolsa’ (on a stock-exchange market), and followed by all the specific stock exchange indices given. This lack of systematisation of the different expressions referring to the same equivalent is typical of this entry and should be avoided in any pedagogically constructed specialised dictionary;

- this lack of systematisation forces users to read through the complete entry in the hope of finding the right equivalent;
- the scattered information also leads users to a fourth problem, which is a lack of assistance for guessing the meaning of similar expressions which have not been included in the entry. For example, learners coming across expressions such as ‘Dax Index’, the “IBEX 35”, the “CAC 40”, etc., will be unsure if they are similar to those included (e.g., *Financial Times Index*), particularly because all the expressions included in the entry, which refer to the same concept (e.g., *Financial Times Index*<sup>3</sup>, *Financial Times Stock-Exchange Index*, *Financial Times Index*, *FT Index*, *Footsie*, *FTSE 100*) are in different places in the entry. Similarly, the synonym expressions **índice bursátil**, and **índice del mercado de valores** are in different places. To sum up, the learner might eventually find out that they are synonyms but only after reading patiently the whole entry, and assuming that his or her memory is good enough to remember that these two expressions have the same English equivalent. A similar problem occurs with **índices de popularidad**, placed at the bottom of the entry, although its hyperonym ‘rating’ is at the very beginning of the entry.

As a conclusion, the structure of the entry is very unsystematic, very confusing, and does not help learners much.

---

<sup>3</sup> It could be asked why all of these are given without any indication of possible differences between them. For example, no mention is made of the journalese use of *Footsie*.

### 4.3. Sense Differentiation and Sense Ordering

The kind of presentation of the lexical units also depends on two related factors: the way in which the headword is divided into senses (*sense differentiation*); and the order in which these senses are placed in the dictionary entry (*sense ordering*).

The particular structure used in printed dictionaries is usually determined by the traditional practice. The structure may be flat or hierarchical and it reflects the use of specific devices to differentiate senses: punctuation signs (full stop, semicolon, and comma); symbols (e.g. 'slash'), numbers and letters. In addition, many dictionaries tend to offer a lot of senses, without any differentiation and ordering, or with very inadequate ones. Example (5) illustrates this practice. This excerpt is taken from *PIRÁMIDE ECONOMÍA*, a dictionary which is now into its seventh edition<sup>4</sup>, and is very much used by Spanish speakers, usually university students enrolled on Business and Translation degrees:

Example (5): Article in *PIRÁMIDE ECONOMÍA*:

**producto** (m.) Article. Good. Commodity. Output. Proceeds. Produce. Product(ion). Turnover. Increase. Make. Issue. Avails. (pl.) Commodities. Fruit Growth. Profit. Rent. (...) *Comercialización de productos*: Marketing. *Curva de producto*: Output curve. *Declaración de un producto exento de derechos*: Entry for duty-free goods. (...) **p. acabado, final**. Final good. Finished good, product. *Costes de acarreo de materias primas y productos acabados*: Transfer costs. *Renta-bilidad del producto acabado*: Finished goods turnover.  
**p. anual de una propiedad**. Year's purchase.  
**p. de deshecho**. Waste product.  
**p. de inversiones**. Investment income (...)  
**p. de la explotación**. Operating income. (...)  
**p. acabados, terminados**. Finished goods. (...)  
**p. finales**. Final products.

Example (5) shows that learners cannot differentiate between senses, as sense differentiation devices are not included in *PIRÁMIDE ECONOMÍA*. In addition, there are three more problems: (i) synonyms such as **p.acabado, final** and **p. acabados, terminados** are included as different run-ons, when they are totally equivalent in Spanish, particularly

---

<sup>4</sup> The last edition was published in 2005, costs 85 € and does not offer any lexicographical modification of the example here quoted. This illustrates the potential market for better lexicographical products.

the singular and plural expressions **p. acabado** and **p. acabados**; (ii) sense ordering is also absent, and consequently the process of consultation takes longer, as users are forced to read through the complete entry in the hope of finding what they are looking up; (iii) there are 17 translation equivalents without encyclopaedic labels or other ways of discriminating meaning and/or sense.

Example (6) shows the same entry in a different dictionary:

Example (6): **producto** in PETER COLLIN BUSINESS SPANISH:

**producto** *nm* (a) (*cosa producida*) product; **producto acabado** *o* **producto final** = end product *o* final product *o* finished product; **productos acabados** = finished goods; **producto de alta rentabilidad** = cash cow; **producto básico** *o* **de primera necesidad** = basic product *o* staple commodity; **productos en competencia** = competing products; **producto defectuoso** = reject; **productos manufacturados** = manufactured goods; **productos de marca propia** = own brand *o* own label goods; **productos del país** *o* **productos nacionales** = home-produced products; **productos perecederos** = perishable goods *o* perishables *o* non-durables; **producto primario** = commodity *o* primary product; **producto principal** = staple product; **producto secundario** = by-product; **productos semiacabados** = semi-finished products; **producto sensible a los cambios de precio** = price-sensitive product (b) **análisis de productos** = product analysis; **anuncio del producto** = product advertising; **código de un producto** = stock code *o* product code; **conjuntos de productos de una compañía** = product mix; **desarrollo de productos** = product development; **dirección de producto** = product management; **diseño de productos** = product design; **gama** *o* **línea de productos** = product line *o* product range; **no tratamos** *o* **no vendemos esa gama de productos** = we do not stock that line; **ingeniero de productos** = product engineer; **promoción de un producto** = promotion of a product; **tenemos 2.000 productos en almacén** = to hold 2,000 lines in stock; **el producto se anunció en las publicaciones del ramo** = the product was advertised through the medium of the trade press; **enumerar los productos en un catálogo** = to list products in a catalogue; **lanzar un nuevo producto al mercado** = to launch a new article on the market; **estos productos se devolverán en el caso de que no se vendan** = these goods are on sale or return; **los vendedores tienen gran fe en el producto** = the salesmen have great faith in the product; **nuestros productos pueden adquirirse en todas las tiendas de ordenadores** = our products are obtainable in all computer shops (c) (*artículo*) article *o* item (of stock); **este producto se ha agotado** = this item has sold out (d) **productos agrícolas** = (agricultural) produce *o* farm produce; **productos agrícolas nacionales** =

home produce; **muestreo de productos del Mercado Común** = sampling of Common Market produce (**e**) (*economía*) **producto global** = aggregate output; **Producto Interior Bruto (PIB)** = Gross Domestic Product (GDP); **Producto Interior Neto (PIN)** = Net Domestic Product; **Producto Nacional Bruto (PNB)** = Gross National Product (GNP); **Producto Nacional Neto (PNN)** = Net National Product

Compared with (5), the treatment of senses in (6) has improved considerably, considering that the five senses given are differentiated by letter, and, sometimes, *polysemous indices*. However, there is still room for better treatment of the polysemy of the entry **producto** in PETER COLLIN BUSINESS SPANISH:

- the subdivision (**a**), (**b**) (**c**) and (**d**) is not necessary, as the senses refer to the same basic meaning *product*: all the translation equivalents included under (**b**), (**c**), and (**d**) refer to *product*, and consequently can be placed in (**a**);
- it does not use a hierarchical structure, more suitable for learners who might guess that the equivalents listed under, say, **1a**, **1b**, **1c** and **1c**, correspond to the same basic concept, and that they are differentiated not only on the basis of 'meaning', but of grammar, encyclopaedic information, pragmatic information;
- it does not differentiate between the more general sense *goods* and the more specific *raw material*;
- the layout is not user-friendly. As readers, we expect dictionaries, books, reference grammars, Internet portals, etc., to appear in such a way that our brains can more easily process the data we are presented with. Almind (2005: 93) claims that the user's first impression of a dictionary is its spine and therefore the layout of the spine is important; the book "should identify itself by clear and simple typography and with a minimum of words." Also important is the layout of the entry, and, in addition, Almind argues for cooperation between layouters and lexicographers. He illustrates his point with an analysis of different dictionaries and indicates that decisions on the use of different fonts and letter types are important in the layout of any entry. For example, he claims that the miniaturisation of the grammar in the NORSTEDTS TYSK-SVENSKA ORDBOK should be reconsidered as in some cases "it becomes practically impossible to read, especially where one would like to be absolutely certain that a con-

jugation has been understood fully since they are heavily abbreviated.” (Almind 2005: 98).

To sum up, the above analysis on polysemy shows that there is still a lot of room for improving the pedagogical orientation of the English-Spanish/Spanish-English business dictionaries typically used by Spanish students of Business English. Below, I enumerate some ways of improving the dictionaries analysed and illustrate the proposals made by rearranging the data given in example (6).

## 5. Conclusion

Within the framework of the *function theory of lexicography*, lexicographers are expected to pay attention to the pre- and extra-lexicographical social situation. Regarding *business*, the argument defended in this article is that the concept of *business*, particularly Business English, is having lexicographical implications which affect the way business dictionaries, usually printed ones, have been constructed up till now. The very concept of *business dictionary* is a commercial label without scientific backing, and the fact that teaching and learning business discourse is popular in universities around the world must force lexicographers to pay more attention to the construction of pedagogically-oriented dictionaries targeting the needs of specific students enrolled on specific courses. For example, Spanish students of Business English usually employ bilingual English-Spanish/Spanish-English business dictionaries whose pedagogical orientation can be improved by focusing on the relevance of the terms included, the predicted type(s) of user situation(s), the predicted user group’s characteristics, and their specific needs (Tarp 2008: 177). To contribute to this endeavour, this article has aimed at fulfilling two research objectives. Firstly, it has studied how some typical English-Spanish/Spanish-English dictionaries select lemmata (in particular, lemmas and equivalentents), and structure, arrange and order entries. Secondly, it has offered some specific proposals regarding the aforementioned issues. These proposals can be enumerated as follows:

- (a) use user-friendly layouts. For example, bold will be reserved for the lemma;
- (b) use analytical entries. This means reserving entries for

homonyms and compound terms;

- (c) use numbers preceding polysemous indices;
- (d) include relevant grammatical information;
- (e) use the principle of basic meaning and one equivalent;
- (f) do not differentiate between similar senses;
- (g) introduce examples preceded by the expression [EX]; they should offer implicit information;
- (h) use symbols (for example ►) for introducing collocations;
- (i) use symbols (for example □) before synonyms;
- (j) use indented entries.

These principles can be illustrated by rearranging the entry quoted in example (6):

(6a): Article in an PEDAGOGICALLY-ORIENTED DICTIONARY FOR SPANISH STUDENTS

**producto** (nm)

1. (*goods*) product (nc) [EX]

el producto se anunció en las publicaciones del ramo *the product was advertised through the medium of the trade press*; enumerar los productos en un catálogo *to list products in a catalogue*; este producto se ha agotado *this item has sold out*; estos productos se devolverán en el caso de que no se vendan *these goods are on sale or return*; lanzar un nuevo producto al mercado *to launch a new article on the market*; los vendedores tienen gran fe en el producto *the salesmen have great faith in the product*; muestreo de productos del Mercado Común *sampling of Common Market produce*<sup>5</sup>; no tratamos / no vendemos esa gama de productos *we do not stock that line*<sup>6</sup>; nuestros productos pueden adquirirse en todas las tiendas de ordenadores *our products are obtainable in all computer shops*; producto sensible a los cambios de precio *price-sensitive product*; tenemos 2.000 productos en almacén *to hold 2,000 lines in stock*<sup>7</sup>

5 I think the translation 'Common Market Products' is totally synonymous.

6 It should be completed by "of products".

7 I am not sure this translation is adequate. It seems better to translate by "we hold 2,000 lines of product in stock."

► análisis de **productos** *product analysis*; anuncio del **producto** *product advertising*; código de un **producto** *stock code / product code*; conjunto de **productos** de una compañía *product mix*; desarrollo de **productos** *product development*; dirección de **producto** *product management*; diseño de **productos** *product design*; gama / línea de **producto** *product line / product range*; ingeniero de **productos** *product engineer*; **productos** en competencia *competing products*; promoción de un **producto** *promotion of a product*;

□ article (nc), item (nc)

2. (*raw materials*) commodity (nc) (*plural commodities*)  
**producto acabado** *end product* (nc)  
**producto defectuoso** *reject* (nc)  
**producto final** *final product* (nc)  
**producto global** *aggregate output*; (nc)  
**Producto Interior Bruto (PIB)** *Gross Domestic Product*  
**Producto Interior Neto (PIN)** *Net Domestic Product*  
**Producto Nacional Bruto (PNB)** *Gross Nacional Product (GNP)*  
**Producto Nacional Neto (PNN)** *Net National Product*<sup>8</sup>  
**producto primario** *commodity / primary product* (nc)  
**producto principal** *staple product* (nc)  
**producto secundario** *by-product*(nc)  
**productos agrícolas** (*agricultural*) *produce* (nc)  
**productos de marca propia** *own brand, own label goods* (nc)  
**productos manufacturados** *manufactured goods* (nc)  
**productos nacionales** *home-produced products* (nc)  
**productos perecederos** *perishable goods / perishables / non-durables*  
(nc)  
**productos semiacabados** *semi-finished products* (nc)  
**productos terminados** *finished product, finished goods* (nc)

Example (6a) is appropriate from a pedagogical point of view due to the following:

1. it uses a user-friendly layout by reserving bold for the lemma, and italics for the translated example (i.e., the example in the target language), and polysemous indices, placed in brackets after the numbers;

---

<sup>8</sup> This dictionary does not make any reference to a similar macroeconomic concept “**valor añadido neto (VAN)** or **valor añadido bruto (VAB)**, typically used in regional economics to refer to the GNP of a particular region. This information is completely necessary in any business Spanish dictionary as the Spanish political autonomous system has contributed to the frequent use of the expression.

2. it uses numbers preceding the polysemous indices *goods* and *raw materials*, thus showing that it has two basic senses;
3. it has an analytical macrostructure, with all the multiterms arranged alphabetically and given as entries, thus favouring the process of consultation;
4. it attaches relevant grammatical information to lemma and equivalent(s); also, it has usage examples with useful implicit information (for example, the use of Spanish *se anunció*, which is very common in Spanish and is used instead of the 'Latin' passive form);
5. it uses the principle of basic meaning and only discriminates between two basic senses; hence, the number of equivalents is very limited;
6. it includes symbols such as ► and □ for separating implicit and explicit information. For example, they indicate explicitly that useful linguistic information (for example, 'collocations', and 'synonyms'), is included in the entry;

### Acknowledgments

A version of this paper was presented at the Centre for Lexicography (Aarhus School of Business) on October 5, 2007. I am indebted to R. Almind, B. Andersen, H. Bergenholtz, P. Leroyer, S. Nielsen, M. Overgaard Ptaszynski, and S. Tarp for their comments; and to the two anonymous reviewers of *Hermes*, who suggested improvements both in content and form of this submission. For all remaining imperfections only I remain to blame.

## 6. References

### Dictionaries

- BUSINESS SPANISH = Collin, P. H./Melcion, L./Díaz-Cintas, J./Echart, M./Sutcliffe, R. (eds.) 1997: *Business Spanish Dictionary (español-inglés/inglés-español)*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: Peter Collin Publishing.
- NORSTEDTS TYSK-SVENSKA ORDBOK = Lindestam, Irmgard et al. 1994. *Norstedts Tysk-Svenska Ordbok*. Stockholm.

- OXFORD BUSINESS SPANISH = López, S. /D. Watt in association with A. Fortin 2002: *The Oxford Business Spanish Dictionary. El Diccionario de Negocios Oxford*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- PETER COLLIN BUSINESS = Collin, P. H./Collin, F./Collin, S. M. H. (eds.) 2001: *Dictionary of Business*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: Peter Collin Publishing Ltd.
- PIRÁMIDE ECONOMÍA = Lozano Irueste, J. M. 2001: *Diccionario bilingüe de Economía y Empresa (inglés-español/español-inglés)*. 6th ed. Madrid: Ediciones Pirámide.

### Other References

- Almind, Richard 2005: First impressions last: layout in dictionaries. In Barz, I./Bergenholtz, H./Korhonen, J. (eds.), *Schreiben, Verstehen, Übersetzen, Lernen. Zu ein- und zweisprachigen Wörterbüchern mit Deutsch*. Frankfurt a.m/Bern/New York/Paris: Peter Lang, 93-102.
- Andersen, Birger/Fuertes-Olivera, Pedro A., to appear: The application of function theory to the classification of English monolingual business dictionaries. In *Lexicographica: International Annual for Lexicography* 25.
- Bergenholtz, Henning/Gouws, Rufus 2007: The access process in dictionaries for fixed expressions. In *Lexicographica* 23, 236-260.
- Bergenholtz, Henning/Kaufmann, Uwe 1997: Terminography and lexicography. A critical survey of dictionaries from a single specialised field. In Tarp, Sven (ed.), *Specialised Lexicography and Terminology*. *Hermes. Journal of Linguistics* 18, 91-125.
- Bergenholtz, Henning/Tarp, Sven (eds.) 1995: *Manual of Specialised Lexicography. The Preparation of Specialised Dictionaries*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. (= Benjamins Translation Library 12).
- Bergenholtz, Henning/Tarp, Sven 2003: Two opposing theories: On H.E. Wiegand's recent discovery of lexicographic functions. In *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics* 31, 171-196
- Bergenholtz, Henning/Tarp, Sven 2004. The concept of dictionary usage. In *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 3, 23-36.
- Fuertes-Olivera, Pedro A./Arriba Baño, Ascensión 2005: Review of Stevenson, Anna/Pilard, Georges (eds.), *Harrap's Business Dictionary English French – Dictionnaire Français Anglais*. In *International Journal of Lexicography* 18, 373-384.
- Fuertes-Olivera, Pedro A./Arriba-Baño, Ascensión 2008: *Pedagogical Specialised Lexicography. The Representation of Meaning in Business English and Spanish Dictionaries*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. (= Terminology and Lexicography Research and Practice 11).
- Fuertes-Olivera, Pedro A./Nielsen, Sandro 2008: Translating politeness in bilingual English-Spanish business correspondence. In *Meta* 53 (3), 667-678.
- Fuertes Olivera, Pedro A./Tarp, Sven, to appear: La Teoría Funcional de la Lexicografía y sus consecuencias para los diccionarios de economía del español. In *Revista de Lexicografía* 14.

- Fuertes-Olivera, Pedro A./Velasco-Sacristán, Marisol 2001: A Critical comparison of the macrostructure and microstructure of two bilingual English-Spanish dictionaries of Economics. In *International Journal of Lexicography* 14, 31-55.
- Nickerson, Catherine 2005: Editorial. English as a *lingua franca* in international business contexts. In *English for Specific Purposes* 24, 367-380.
- Nielsen, Sandro/Mourier, Lise 2005: Internet Accounting Dictionaries: Present Solutions and Future Opportunities. In *Hermes. Journal of Linguistics* 34, 83-116.
- Nielsen, Sandro/Mourier, Lise 2007: Design of a Function-based Internet Accounting Dictionary. In Gottlieb, Henrik/Mogensen, Jens Erik (eds.), *Dictionary Visions, Research and Practice*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 119-135 (= Terminology and Lexicography Research and Practice 10).
- Tarp, Sven 2008: *Lexicography in the Borderland between Knowledge and Non-knowledge. General Lexicographical Theory with Particular Focus on Learner's Lexicography*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. [= Lexicographica Series Maior 134].
- Wiegand, Herbert E. 1988: Was eigentlich ist Fachlexikographie? Mit Hinweisen zum Verhältnis von sprachlichem und enzyklopädischem Wissen. In Munske, H./von Polenz, P./Reichmann, O./Hildebrandt, R (eds.), *Deutscher Wortschatz. Lexikologische Studien. Ludwig Erich Schmitt zum 80. Geburtstag von seinen Marburger Schülern*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 729-790.