P.A. Joubert. *Bilingual phrase dictionary / Tweetalige frasewoordeboek (E-A)*[1], 1st edition 1992, xiii + 331 pp. ISBN 0 624 03149 7 hard-cover; ISBN 0 624 03080 6 soft-cover. Cape Town: Tafelberg. Prices: R39,95 hard-cover; R24,95 soft-cover.

Rarely can a first-rate dictionary be written for anyone and everyone who might be interested in the language or languages with which it deals. Generally, good dictionaries are tailored to specific audiences: an all-Xhosa dictionary for primary-school pupils who are native speakers of Xhosa, an English-Afrikaans dictionary for adult native speakers of English, an Afrikaans-English medical dictionary for medical personnel who are native speakers of Afrikaans, etc. If a dictionary is adequate for anyone and everyone, its potential usership is inevitably small and well defined. A Sumerian-English dictionary, for example, would be of interest to only a small number of people: no one now speaks Sumerian, hence no Sumerian-using audience, who might want to learn English, need be served; only a small group of highly specialized researchers are interested in Sumerian, hence the potential audience for such a dictionary is a well defined group; and all of those needing a Sumerian dictionary can, presumably, read English. In contrast, a general Spanish-English dictionary suitable for everyone and anyone interested in those two languages cannot be written because diverse groups of people need such a work.

Thus, at one extreme, we have Sumerian — a language which no one uses today, a language in which few people are interested, and a language which attracts only a small, homogeneous group — and, at the other extreme, English and Spanish — two widely used languages with diverse groups of people interested in them. Afrikaans lies somewhere between those two extremes: much more used than Sumerian, but much less used than English or Spanish.

The different status of English and Afrikaans in the world today must therefore be considered when a dictionary involving both of those languages is being planned, though that is not necessarily a final consideration. If the compiler of such a work decides to write it for all English-speakers and all Afrikaans-speakers, the two languages indeed continue to be on an unequal footing (a fact which will entail certain further decisions), but if the dictionary is planned only for South Africans, then the two languages will be on an equal footing, for in South Africa the two are used more or less to the same extent.

An example will illustrate the different approaches. At *cater*, the dictionary under review here contains three subentries: *cater for, cater for all tastes,* and *cater to s.b.* Those are South African usages (of British English origin). In American English, *cater* always takes the preposition *to*, hence only the third subentry will be familiar to speakers of American English. If this dictionary is intended for speakers of South African English, British English, or both varieties, all is well so far, but if it is intended for speakers of American English (or, for speakers of that variety too), an adjustment would be needed to cater *to* the needs of speakers of American English.

Given the fact that Afrikaans-speakers learning English learn the South African variety (and only specialists go on to study non-South-African varieties of English), it is natural that South African English would be the variety of English used in this dictionary. And in view of the fact that contemporary written Afrikaans is quite uniform, the question of what kind of Afrikaans to use in this dictionary should probably hardly ever come up. The only serious question facing the compilers of a dictionary involving English and Afrikaans is, therefore, what kind of English to use. Since most anglophones interested in Afrikaans are speakers of South African English, it seems reasonable to pick that variety. Both of those expectations are met here: the Afrikaans is Contemporary Afrikaans and the English is Contemporary South African English (in both cases, including slangisms and other informalisms). In effect, then, this is a dictionary of two languages used in South Africa written for South Africans.[2]

Another consideration for the compiler of such a dictionary is the function which Afrikaans and English may each have as a path to learning the other language. Say a speaker of Greek wants to learn Afrikaans. Afrikaans teaching materials for Greek-speakers are presumably non-existent, hence a third language must serve as a path to Afrikaans. Most Afrikaans teaching materials are written either in English or in Dutch. Since Greek-speakers would be much likelier to know English than Dutch, English is for most Greek-speakers the only path to Afrikaans (unless the direct method, without any path language, is used). In contrast, Greek-speakers wanting to learn English have a wide range of materials at their disposal, with many different path languages, including Greek, available to them (as well as material following the direct method). Hence it is improbable that any Greek-speaker would choose Afrikaans as a path to English. The compiler of a bilingual dictionary should therefore give thought not only to the considerations discussed in the first five paragraphs of this review, but also to the possibility that such a work might help speakers of third languages.[3]

A dictionary should not only be tailored to a specific audience or audiences. The compiler ought to consider what the dictionary can do for that audience or audiences. Will a dictionary involving English and Afrikaans allow English-speakers to use Afrikaans passively; allow English-speakers to use Afrikaans actively; allow Afrikaans-speakers to use English passively; allow Afrikaans-speakers to use English actively? Will it try to achieve just one of those goals or two, three, or all four? Naturally, the more goals, the larger the dictionary must be and the harder it will be to put together.

Responsible dictionary-compilers are expected not only to give careful thought to those questions, take explicit decisions, and give effect to their decisions, but also to tell potential users of their works precisely what they can expect from them. Accuracy in advertizing is no less important than accuracy in the dictionary itself. Unfortunately, however, exaggeration, half-truths, and worse are the hallmarks of Madison Avenue and few are the dictionaries which actually deliver everything they promise. Furthermore, users of dictionaries

rarely speak up if they find they have been shortchanged. Whereas consumers in advanced countries are by now accustomed to complain if the toaster or refrigerator they have bought does not do what the manufacturer claims it can do, few people who buy dictionaries ever think of complaining to publishers (except to protest the inclusion of "dirty words" and other "illiteracies," which is a different issue).

The cover of the book under review is fully bilingual (and both languages are given equal prominence) except for the fact that it contains the words *English-Afrikaans* but not *Engels-Afrikaans*. That suggests that the dictionary is aimed more at the English-speaker than at the Afrikaans-speaker, but let us not come to that conclusion on the basis of a single minor inequality in the wording.

The spine of the book is fully bilingual (here, we find only *E-A*, which can be interpreted as both English and Afrikaans). The back cover is fully bilingual.

. The title page (given in the heading of this review) is fully bilingual, but it should have been fleshed out, with *(English-Afrikaans)* added in the English part and *(E-A)* fleshed out to *(Engels-Afrikaans)* in the Afrikaans part.

Turning to the preliminaries, we find that the preface (*Preface* and *Voorwoord*) and list of abbreviations (*Abbreviations/Afkortings*) are in both languages, but the *Guide to the use of the dictionary* is in English only, as is the half title (*Bilingual phrase dictionary*) appearing on the page before the first page of the dictionary.[4] That slights Afrikaans.

At the end of the dictionary, we find a *Toeligting by die gebruik van die woordeboek* (= the Afrikaans equivalent of the *Guide to the use of the dictionary*) and seven blank pages headed *Notes/Aantekenings*. The location of the Afrikaans guide appears to strengthen our feeling that this dictionary was planned more for English- than for Afrikaans-speakers, but, again, let us reserve final judgment, for it is also possible that the *Toeligting* was put there in order to be more easily accessible (the user wanting the *Guide* will know that it is at the beginning of the book and the user wanting the *Toeligting* will know that it is at the end). If so, ALL PARTS of the Afrikaans preliminaries should have been EITHER at the beginning OR at the end of the dictionary and ALL PARTS of the English preliminaries at the other end. Another possibility would have been to place all of the Afrikaans and all of the English preliminaries at the beginning, either first in one language and then in the other (with, preferably, differently colored pages for each language so that the user could quickly flip to the desired language) or with English on one page and Afrikaans on the facing page.

All in all, then, we seem to be getting three subtle hints that this dictionary is geared a bit more to the English-speaker than to the Afrikaans-speaker.

This is an English-Afrikaans dictionary, hence a one-way bilingual dictionary.[5] Such a work can be useful to speakers of both languages, but in different ways: English-speakers can use it to speak and write Afrikaans; and Afrikaans-speakers can use it to understand spoken and written English. The

English-speaker CANNOT use such a dictionary to understand Afrikaans (for that purpose, an Afrikaans-English dictionary is needed) nor can the Afrikaans-speaker, except in a limited way, use it to speak or write English (for that purpose, an Afrikaans-English dictionary is needed).[6]

We therefore question the claim made on the back cover that this dictionary is designed for those who want to "speak and write idiomatically correct English and Afrikaans." Afrikaans, yes, but English, only in minor ways. Furthermore, the dictionary will help English-speakers, not Afrikaans-speakers, who want to speak and write Afrikaans. Afrikaans-speakers wanting to speak and write their language will consult MONOLINGUAL Afrikaans works. Speakers of language *x* wanting to use that language have no need to use *y* as a path language, unless monolingual dictionaries of language *x* are not available (which is not the case for Afrikaans). Thus, the claim (again from the back cover) that this dictionary will help people to "Praat en skryf idiomaties korrekte Afrikaans en Engels" (which is patently aimed at the Afrikaans-speaker because it is stated in Afrikaans) is ALMOST COMPLETELY FALSE: Afrikaans-speakers cannot use this dictionary for speaking and writing Afrikaans and it will serve them only in a marginal way (see note 5) for speaking and writing English.[7] The wording on the back cover should be: *Speak and write idiomatically correct Afrikaans* and *Verbeter u begrip van gesproke en geskrewe Engels*.

The publisher announces that "an Afrikaans-English version is being planned as well" (p. [vii]). Only when that volume appears will the dictionary help both English- and Afrikaans-speakers to use both languages both passively and actively.[8]

The publisher's leaflet accompanying review copies says that "it has been established that people frequently do not use a dictionary to look up a word they need (or only the word) but to see how it can be used in a sentence — for instance which verb or preposition or adjective, etc. goes with it. Bilingual desk dictionaries do cater for this need to some extent, within the limits of their available space. Since such dictionaries have to give so much other information at the same time, however, there is room for an 'idiomatic dictionary' that concentrates on this one task and can therefore offer more. [....] It does not wish to compete with existing English-Afrikaans dictionaries, but to be a useful supplement to them. Even the outward appearance of the *Bilingual phrase dictionary* shows that Tafelberg wants it to be recognised as belonging to the same family as the *Tweetalige woordeboek/Bilingual dictionary*."

Yes, lexicography is constantly obliging dictionary-makers to supply ever more information (looking at older dictionaries in the light of today's requirements, we see that most of them were nothing more than skeletal word lists). Hence good dictionaries have become ever bigger and ever more specialized. Thus, for example, when lexicographers realized that a dictionary should deal with lexemes larger than the orthographic word and that they should indicate government (what preposition, for example, does this or that noun, verb, or adjective take?), the first impulse was to compile supplemental dictionaries.

Later, it became evident that supplemental dictionaries should be merged with those concentrating on orthographic words (because the user should not have to look in more than one place for information about the same lexeme). Yet here two problems arise, one practical and the other commercial.

The practical problem is that if more information has to be supplied, the entries will be longer. As any habitual user of dictionaries knows, nothing is more forbidding than having to search through a long entry in pursuit of a certain subentry, subsubentry, subsubsubentry, etc. The problem was thus one of organization. Some compilers, especially in the United States, choose to solve that problem by breaking up a long main entry into main entries, that is, by converting subentries, subsubentries, etc. into main entries. For example, instead of listing two-part verbs with *make* (like *make into*, *make out*, and *make over*) as subentries of *make*, they list each of them as a main entry. That helps the user, but the dictionary becomes larger because main entries take up more space than the corresponding number of subentries. Another solution is the menu (Tono 1992). A third solution is more efficient use of typefaces and other visual aids to take users as quickly and efficiently as possible right to the desired (sub...)subentry. A fourth solution is to computerize dictionaries and in that way to pass the task on to the search command.

And the commercial consideration: the larger the dictionary, the more expensive it is, hence fewer people will buy it. Realizing that the average person would rather spend x amount of money on dictionary a and y amount on dictionary b rather than $x+y$ on a dictionary which contained everything in dictionaries a and b, publishers usually prefer to put two dictionaries on the market, one being the larger dictionary, which concentrates on orthographic words, and the other being the smaller dictionary, which concentrates on multiword lexemes and government. Yet having to look in two dictionaries takes more time than looking through a long entry in one dictionary, hence the best solution is to merge both the general and supplemental dictionaries — something which Tafelberg, at least now, prefers not to do.

*****

Coming to the heart of the work, the 325 pages of alphabetically arranged entries, we find it superbly arranged: there are no blind references; there are no hidden entries; there are no cross-references which cite an entry head in a spelling different from the one actually used in the entry head. Several ingenuous typographical devices have been devised to provide a maximum of information in a minimum of space (see pp. x-xiii or 328-331).[9]

This dictionary offers rich material. The choice of English usages is almost always excellent. We may question whether *the fair/gentle sex, the softer/weaker sex*, HE *made an honest woman of her*, and *the little woman* should appear in a dictionary like this one, i.e., in a less than complete record of English. Is any-

one still using those sexist terms? Should their use not be discouraged? If listed, they should at least be labeled as *condescending* or *sexist*.

For the student of South African English who, like the undersigned, may not always have easy access to the latest usages, this dictionary is useful in that it documents the growing influence of American English. It lists, for example, *the bottom line is* (South African English *the bottom line* < general American English < Eastern Ashkenazic American English = translation of Eastern Yiddish *di untershte shure* [Steinmetz 1976 and Gold 1981][10]) and *come to the nitty-gritty* / *get down to the nitty-gritty* (South African English *nitty-gritty* < general American English < Black American English < ?). The dictionary can also be used to document the confluence of British and American English in South Africa: it lists, for instance, both *be affiliated to* (= the older South African usage, of British origin) and *be affiliated with* (= the newer usage, of American origin). Certain verbs, like *agonise* / *agonize* and *organise* / *organized,* are listed in both spellings, a possible example of British and American influence (since -*ize* is not unknown for older British English, it remains to be seen how this spelling came to South Africa; the same may be said of Australian English, where both variants are likewise found).

Since one of the aims of this dictionary is to teach correct Afrikaans, an entry could be added for *more or less*: the Standard Afrikaans equivalent is *min of meer,* but, under English influence, the substandard form *meer of min* is also used.[11] That would encourage English-speakers to use the Standard Afrikaans form. To encourage Afrikaans-speakers to do so, a monolingual Afrikaans work would be the most efficient means.

The translations in this dictionary are in almost every case just as superb as its arrangement. One might entertain a doubt only here and there, for example with respect to *have political/etc. muscle* 'politieke/ens. invloed hê'. Is not *muscle* much more than mere influence (= Afrikaans *invloed*)? Perhaps 'baie politieke/ens. invloed hê' would be better, unless something more graphic could be found.

The only chief fault which this reviewer finds in the *Bilingual phrase dictionary* / *Tweetalige frasewoordeboek (E-A)* is the language of the sense discriminations. Say an English-Afrikaans dictionary has entries for *drive* and *set.* These two English words have so many meanings and so many Afrikaans equivalents that English-speakers need guidance in choosing the appropriate one. In contrast to English-speakers, Afrikaans-speakers require no such guidance because, as speakers of Afrikaans, they will know which equivalent to choose. Thus, an English-speaker wanting to translate into Afrikaans a sentence referring to tennis like "Smith won the first set" will need a sense discrimination (*tennis*) next to the appropriate Afrikaans equivalent. In contrast, Afrikaans-speakers need no help: if they have come across an English sentence like "Smith won the first set," they have most likely not come across it in isolation but in a context where it is clear that *set* is a tennis term. That is, whereas the English-speaker knows the meaning of English *set* in a tennis context and

wants to know its Afrikaans equivalent, the Afrikaans-speaker does not know the meaning of *set* in a tennis context but will presumably recognize its Afrikaans equivalent upon finding it under *set*.

Consequently, sense discriminations are intended for the speaker of the source, not the target, language. If so, they should be in the source, not the target, language. Yet this dictionary does just the opposite: all of the sense discriminations are in Afrikaans.[12]

And often there are fewer than the optimal number of sense discriminations. We see that in the Afrikaans equivalents given for *set up s.t.* (quoted in note 11), where eight meanings of this verb are translated, but only five of them are discriminated. Another example of the lack of meaning discriminations is seen at *take in s.t.*, for which these translations are offered:

'iets inneem; iets verstaan/begryp/volg; iets raak sien; iets insluit/ omvat/inbegryp; iets ontvang; iets laai/inlaai/inneem/opneem; iets glo/ sluk; iets verklein (*klere*); iets aanneem (*wasgoed*); iets (ver)minder (*seil*)'

Thus, eight meanings are translated, but only the last three are discriminated. The Afrikaans-speaker will know whether to pick, for instance, 'raak sien' or 'ontvang' even if no sense discriminations appear, but the English-speaker needs guidance.

Therefore, whereas three peripheral aspects of the dictionary appear to suggest that the compiler planned it more for the English-speaker than for the Afrikaans-speaker, the dictionary itself favors the latter. It would seem, then, that the three subtle hints mentioned above are merely fortuitous and that the compiler's actual intent was to serve the Afrikaans-speaker more than the English-speaker.

All in all, then, we gain the impression that this dictionary could have been better planned, it tries to do too much, it serves the English-speaker more than the Afrikaans-speaker in three extremely minor respects, and it serves the Afrikaans-speaker more than the English-speaker in a major respect.

*·***

To conclude, reviewing a dictionary means not only scrutinizing the lexical material which it provides, but also examining its front matter, back matter, covers, spine, jacket, and title, as well as the publisher's advertizing for it.[13] Most of the present review dealt with those peripheral, yet important, parts of the *Bilingual phrase dictionary / Tweetalige frasewoordeboek (E-A)*, which is to say that most of the criticism expressed here concerns minor details that would be easily correctable in a second edition.[14]

This dictionary has been written essentially for a South African usership. Although it at first seemed to slightly favor the English-speaker over the Afri-

kaans-speaker, an examination of the sense discriminations showed that the Afrikaans-speaker is actually better served than the English-speaker.

The dictionary will be useful to Afrikaans-speakers who want to improve their understanding of spoken and written English (that is, in decoding English) and to English-speakers who want to speak and write better Afrikaans (that is, in encoding Afrikaans). Because, however, meaning discriminations are often lacking and, when they are given, they are always in Afrikaans, this book is more useful to Afrikaans-speakers than to English-speakers. Afrikaans-speakers who want to improve their Afrikaans and English-speakers who want to improve their English will turn to monolingual works in those languages. If they are able to read English, speakers of other languages can use this volume to improve their knowledge of Afrikaans.

Afrikaans-speakers who want to increase their active knowledge of English and English-speakers who want to improve their passive knowledge of Afrikaans will have to await the Afrikaans-English companion volume (where the sense discriminations should be in Afrikaans).[15]

Notes

1   The full title on the title page reads: *Bilingual phrase dictionary / Tweetalige frasewoordeboek* (in both languages with only the first word being capitalized), whereas the full title on the cover of the book reads: *Bilingual Phrase Dictionary / Tweetalige Frasewoordeboek* (with all the words being capitalized). Where such discrepancies occur the form on the title page is usually considered to be the official citation form. This practice has been followed in the present review. (Editor, *Lexikos*)

2   The English title of the dictionary contains a specifically South African English usage which non-South-Africans will not readily understand: *bilingual* in the sense of 'English and Afrikaans'. The definition of this word in Branford and Branford 1992 ('in SA, proficient in both English and Afrikaans') should be expanded to read 'pertaining to Afrikaans and English; in Afrikaans and English; bilingual in Afrikaans and English'. See also Gold 1992: 94.

3   About twenty years ago a publisher asked me to evaluate a proposal for "the first" Occitan-English dictionary. Occitan being a much more esoteric language than French in the English-speaking world, any English-reader who wanted to learn to read Occitan would most likely already be able to read French, which has traditionally been the path to Occitan. Existing Occitan-French dictionaries can therefore serve most if not all English-readers. If so, the market for an Occitan-English dictionary would be tiny. Also, French being the traditional path to Occitan, Occitan-French dictionaries are probably the best of any Occitan bilingual dictionaries available. Rather than start from scratch, the compilers of an Occitan-English dictionary would therefore probably take a published Occitan-French dictionary and merely translate the French into English. That is not scholarship. Plans for an Occitan-English dictionary were fortunately dropped.

4   The list of abbreviations should include *P* 'proverb', *s.o.* 'someone', *s.t.* 'something', and any others used in the dictionary, even if they are explained in the guide.

5   We may note here the distinction between an *Afrikaans-English* dictionary and an *Afrikaans and English* dictionary. The first designates a one-way bilingual dictionary in which Afrikaans material is rendered into English. The second is shorthand for an *Afrikaans-English English-Afrikaans* dictionary, that is, a two-way bilingual dictionary (by convention, the name of the language into which the material is rendered always appears second in hyphenated compounds). This shorthand form is best avoided in the plural because "Afrikaans and English dictionaries," for example would be ambiguous ('Afrikaans dictionaries + English dictionaries' or 'Afrikaans-English English-Afrikaans dictionaries'?).

6   That limited way has to do with government. For example, if Afrikaans-speakers know the English word *aversion* but are not certain which preposition this noun takes, they will find an entry here which shows that it takes *to* and *for*. English-speakers might use this dictionary in that way too, but they would most likely go to an English-English dictionary for such information.

7   Stretching a point, one could argue that it IS possible for Afrikaans-speakers to use this dictionary to improve their knowledge of Afrikaans (if they simply read it entry by entry to see whether they knew all of the Afrikaans translations) and it IS possible for English-speakers to use it to improve their knowledge of English (if they read the entry heads to see whether they knew all of them).

8   The wording on the back cover was presumably drafted in anticipation of that second volume. If so, it is not fair to make that claim until the second volume appears (or, at the very least, the publisher should say that it is the companion volume which will serve those additional purposes).

9   I have not checked the dictionary systematically, but it seems that it not infrequently (and perhaps always) lists collocations consisting of a verb and an object under the object, even if the only unusual part of the collocation is the verb. For instance, *do a museum* "n museum besigtig' and *take (in) a newspaper* 'op 'n koerant inteken' are noteworthy because of the special sense of the verbs and not because of their objects (which are nothing more than dummy objects, standing in the first instance for the name of any place that can be visited and in the second instance for that of any kind of periodical). It would thus occur to no one to look for *do* and *take* / *take in* in these senses under those (or any other) nouns. Such collocations should appear under the verbs. That would have not only the advantage of practicality, but also that of coming closer to the ideal of listing all multiword (sub)entry heads in strictly alphabetical order (Gold 1992: 114-116).

10   Thus, South African use of *the bottom line* is due to American English, not Yiddish, influence. See remarks on South African English *robot* in Gold 1992: 108-109.

11   I owe this information to D.C. Hauptfleisch.

12   The example of *set* as a tennis term is given merely for its theoretical value (this word, like *drive*, happens to be one of the most polysemous words in English). Practically, there is no problem in this instance because the English and Afrikaans words for 'tennis' are spelled identically. An example truly applicable to English and Afrikaans would be *set up s.t.*, for which several Afrikaans equivalents are offered in this dictionary. They are, with their sense discriminations: 'iets begin/oprig/stig; iets opstel (*bv. 'n kamera, 'n rekord*); iets instel; iets monteer; iets stel (*'n masjien*); iets aanhef (*bv. 'n geskree/geskreeu*); iets opwerp (*bv. 'n verdediging*); iets uitlok/veroorsaak (*'n reaksie*)'.

All of the material in parentheses should be in English, not Afrikaans. Actually, no harm is done in giving it in Afrikaans, as long as it is also given in English.

Probably the first to formulate principles for sense discriminations was Edwin B. Williams. James E. Iannucci, his student and, later, colleague, refined the principles.

13   In recent years, as the study of dictionaries has progressed, all aspects of lexicography have been coming under closer and closer scrutiny, it thus being inevitable that dictionary titles would be examined too. Marello 1992 may be the first article on the subject (a footnote to that article: use of *selva* 'forest' in the titles of Italian dictionaries [p. 125] shows the influence of Classical Latin *silva* 'forest', which acquired the transferred meaning of 'plenty, abundance' [e.g., "silva virtutum et vitiorum"], especially with regard to materials for speaking and writing [e.g., "silva rerum" and "omnis ubertas et quasi silva dicendi silva"], hence was suitable for use in dictionary titles. *Foresta* 'forest' in the titles of Italian dictionaries (ibid.) is modeled on *selva*).

Because many languages have been used in South Africa, it has a long lexicographical tradition. An article on "The Names of South African Dictionaries" would probably turn up interesting facts. For example, although the titles of *A Dictionary of South African English* (Branford and Branford 1991) and the *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal* are almost identical in form, the two have different goals: the first is a differential dictionary (concentrating on material not found in British English) and the second is a comprehensive dictionary (dealing with Afrikaans in its entirety, not just material absent in Dutch).

14   A few more minor comments concern the English of the *Guide to the use of the dictionary*. Since these comments are written from the viewpoint of American English, perhaps what appear to an American to be errors are in fact acceptable usages in South African English. If so, the following comments may serve, not as suggestions for change, but as a comparison of the two varieties of English:

[a] *The male singular forms* HE, HIS, HIM(SELF).... (p. vii) seems to contain the wrong translation of Afrikaans *manlik* (cf. *die manlike enkelvoudsvorme* HY, SY, HOM.... on the next page). Is not *masculine* the usual word in a grammatical context?

[b] Although English certainly has the word *juridical*, its use as a label (p. ix) seems to be induced by Afrikaans *juridies*. *Legal* appears to be the most frequently used word as a label in dictionaries.

[c] In *Guide to the use of the dictionary* (p. xi), the first occurrence of *the* (induced by Afrikaans? cf. *Toeligting by die gebruik van die woordeboek*) should be deleted.

[d] In *words repeated frequently in the Afrikaans text are sometimes abbreviated to the first letter, as done with the words "skool" and....* (p. xi), *as done* sounds odd to an American ear, which is accustomed to *as is done*.

15   This brief review was written by a student of dictionaries who is not a specialist in Afrikaans. A review by an Afrikaansist might be worthwhile.

References

Branford, Jean, with William Branford. 1991. *A Dictionary of South African English.* Fourth edition. Cape Town: Oxford University Press [rev. Gold 1992].

Gold, David L. 1981. Review of Steinmetz 1976. *Jewish Language Review* 1: 158 [additions in 2: 318-319, 3: 417, 4: 420, 6: 393-394, 7: 614, and *Jewish Linguistic Studies* 2: 507].

Gold, David L. 1992. Review of Branford and Branford 1991. *Lexikos* 2: 85-136.

Marello, Carla. 1992. "I titoli dei dizionari." Cortelazzo, Michele A. (Ed.). 1992. *Il titolo e il testo: Atti del XV Convegno Interuniversitario (Bressanone 1987)*: 121-39. Padua: Editoriale Programma.

Steinmetz, Sol. 1976. "The Bottom Line on *the Bottom Line*." *American Speech* 51: 56 [rev. Gold 1981].

Tono, Y. 1992. "The Effect of Menus on EFL Learners' Look-Up Processes." *Lexikos* 2: 230-253.

David L. Gold
Jewish English Archive
New York NY, USA

M.L.A. Kgasa. *Thanodi ya Setswana ya Dikole*, 4th impression 1991, 134 pp.   ISBN 99912 6600 3.   Gabarone: Longman Botswana. Prys R22,95.

1.   Inleiding

Die woordeboek *Thanodi ya Setswana ya Dikole* wat reeds in 1976 verskyn het, was 'n ware **wegbereider** (mabulatsela). Hierdie hersiene vierde oplaag is dan ook 'n aansienlike verbetering op hierdie intrede in 1976. In hierdie opsig is die voorwoord wat geskryf is deur pres. Seretse Sekgoma-a-Khama 'n ware weergawe van sy gevoel as 'n leier namens alle Tswana-sprekendes: "Ga ke lebale ka lobaka lope, tiro e Setswana, puo ya rona ya setshaba e e dirang mo matshelong a batho ba rona" (Ek vergeet vir geen oomblik die rol wat Setswana, ons volk se taal, speel in die lewe van sy mense nie). "Ke puo e e tshelang" (Dit is 'n lewende taal).

2.   Tipe woordeboek

Die woordeboek kan getipeer word as 'n eentalige verklarende pedagogiese woordeboek. Die teikengroep is skoolkinders. Hierdie afbakening bring mee dat die bestek daarvan nie omvangryk is nie en dat die aanbieding daarvan redelik eenvoudig is. Dit bied ongeveer 4 000 lemmas .