H.A. Welker and Pedagogical Lexicography

Sven Tarp, *Department of Afrikaans and Dutch, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, South Africa,* and *Centre for Lexicography, Aarhus School of Business, University of Aarhus, Aarhus, Denmark (st@asb.dk)*

Abstract: The lexicographer Herbert Andreas Welker's book of more than 500 pages about pedagogical lexicography provides a panoramic overview of the various types of pedagogical dictionaries as well as the corresponding theoretical literature. Welker's method is descriptive, with himself mainly an observer of lexicographical practice and a "collector" of — frequently opposed — opinions and ideas expressed by a large number of scholars. This method allows the reader to become acquainted with an important part of the most relevant literature on pedagogical lexicography which is presented in a systematic and condensed form. Written in Portuguese, the book might perhaps not be so easily accessible to many readers. This review article provides a guided tour through the main contents of this highly recommendable book and discusses some of the most important ideas reproduced in it.

Keywords: PEDAGOGICAL LEXICOGRAPHY, PEDAGOGICAL DICTIONARIES, LEARNERS' LEXICOGRAPHY, LEARNERS' DICTIONARIES, SCHOOL DICTIONARIES, CHILDREN'S DICTIONARIES, DESK DICTIONARIES, COLLEGE DICTIONARIES, DICTIONARIES FOR FOREIGN-LANGUAGE LEARNERS, DICTIONARIES FOR MOTHER-TONGUE LEARNERS, DICTIONARIES FOR LEARNERS OF SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINES

Opsomming: H.A. Welker en die pedagogiese leksikografie. Die leksikograaf Herbert Andreas Welker se boek van meer as 500 bladsye oor die pedagogiese leksikografie verskaf 'n panoramiese oorsig oor die verskillende soorte pedagogiese woordeboeke sowel as die ooreenstemmende teoretiese literatuur. Welker se metode is beskrywend, met homself hoofsaaklik 'n waarnemer van die leksikografiese praktyk en 'n "versamelaar" van — dikwels teenstellende — menings en opvattings uitgespreek deur 'n groot aantal vakkundiges. Hierdie metode laat die leser toe om kennis te maak met 'n belangrike deel van die tersaaklike literatuur oor die pedagogiese leksikografie wat in 'n sistematiese en saamgevatte vorm aangebied word. Omdat dit in Portugees geskryf is, kan die boek miskien nie so maklik toeganklik wees vir baie lesers nie. Hierdie resensie-artikel verskaf 'n begeleide reis deur die hoofinhoude van hierdie hoogs aanbevelenswaardige boek en bespreek 'n aantal van die belangrikste opvattings wat daarin weergegee word.

Sleutelwoorde: PEDAGOGIESE LEKSIKOGRAFIE, PEDAGOGIESE WOORDEBOEKE, AANLEERDERSLEKSIKOGRAFIE, AANLEERDERSWOORDEBOEKE, SKOOLWOORDEBOEKE, KINDERWOORDEBOEKE, HANDWOORDEBOEKE, WOORDEBOEKE VIR VREEMDETAAL-AANLEERDERS, WOORDEBOEKE VIR MOEDERTAALLEERDERS, WOORDEBOEKE VIR LEERDERS VAN WETENSKAPLIKE DISSIPLINES

1.   Introduction

Herbert Andreas Welker is a German lexicographer with residence in Brasília, Brazil. He has produced three books and several articles with reflections on various aspects of lexicography. An important part of this production is written in Portuguese, a fact that reflects his interest in contributing to the theoretical and practical development of lexicography in Brazil where, on the one hand, still relatively few researchers master English or German at an academic level and where, on the other hand, the last decade has seen an increase in the production of dictionaries, especially for school purposes, owing to government policy and priorities. Unfortunately, this also impedes most lexicographers outside the Portuguese-speaking and -reading community from becoming acquainted with his work, especially the three important books written during the last few years: Welker (2004) which is a short introduction to lexicography; Welker (2006) which is the first and most ambitious panoramic work on lexicographical user research ever published (see reviews by Lew 2007 and Tarp 2008a), and Welker (2008) which, like its predecessor, provides a comprehensive, and so far unprecedented, view of an important and relevant part of lexicography, i.e. pedagogical lexicography.

Like the previous works, this last book — the *Panorama geral da lexicografia pedagógica* (General Survey of Pedagogical Lexicography) — is mainly descriptive. Welker provides an extensive panorama of current lexicographical practice as well as of theoretical reflections by a large number of scholars, with himself in the role of an observer and a "collector" without contributing many new ideas. This modest approach is justified when it comes to informing the Brazilian lexicographical community about the international state-of-the-art of lexicography. However, for an "outsider" — who is not part of the main target group of readers — it would also have been useful to receive more theoretical input from the author himself. This, however, cannot really detract from a meritorious work which in all respects is worth reading.

The book consists of seven main chapters with the following titles:

(1)   What is pedagogical lexicography?

(2)   A short history of pedagogical lexicography

(3)   On language learners' use of dictionaries

(4)   Dictionaries for learners of foreign languages

(5)   Native-language pedagogical dictionaries

(6)   Special pedagogical dictionaries

(7)   Electronic dictionaries

In the following sections, the contents of these chapters will be discussed consecutively. All quotations are English translations of the original Portuguese text.

2.   What is pedagogical lexicography?

This chapter, probably the most interesting from a typological point of view, is also the chapter where the author's personal opinion is expressed more distinctly. Welker starts with a brief overview of the different positions regarding the academic status of lexicography (see Welker 2004: 11 and Tarp 2010), making it clear that he himself, contrary to Wiegand (1984), uses the terms *theoretical lexicography* (or metalexicography) and *practical lexicography* to denote the theoretical and practical aspects of *lexicography*, a term which he accepts as a hyperonym of the two other terms. In this respect Welker reveals a point of view which may not be surprising for those who are well-acquainted with lexicographical literature, but which is nevertheless averse to a discipline trying to gain academic status, i.e. that these terms are used by the various scholars with a lot of different meanings and frequently without providing any definition.

According to Welker, the term *pedagogical lexicography* is seldom used; for instance, it is not included in any of the titles in the *International Encyclopedia of Lexicography* (Hausmann et al. 1989–1991), in the *Diccionario de lexicografía práctico* (Martínez de Sousa 1995) or in various well-known introductions to lexicography, e.g. Landau (2001). Welker is surprised that various books and articles, which do include the terms *pedagogical lexicography* or *pedagogical dictionaries* in their respective titles, only deal with dictionaries for foreign-language learning. This is, for instance, the case with Bogaards (1991), Rundell (1998), Wiegand (1998, 2002), Dziemianko (2006), and Xatara and Humblé (2006). On the other hand, Welker quotes various authors like Hartmann and James (1998), Dolezal and McCreary (1999) and Hernandez (1998) who also include dictionaries for native-language learners within the concept of pedagogical lexicography. He therefore writes (p. 18):

> It seems that pedagogical lexicography is more embracing than what many of the contributions quoted above let you think; in fact, it could be said that pedagogical lexicography includes dictionaries conceived for learners of both foreign languages and the mother tongue.

We will later discuss whether this definition is sufficiently broad. Before doing so, however, it is relevant to introduce other elements which Welker uses to encompass the concept of pedagogical lexicography. In this respect, he rejects the idea that teaching dictionary usage is part of pedagogical lexicography (p. 19):

> Some people say that teaching the usage of dictionaries is pedagogical lexicography but the latter should not be confused with the pedagogy — or didactics — of dictionary usage.

For Welker (p. 19), a dictionary is a tool produced with a specific purpose in mind:

> Sometimes it is claimed that pedagogical dictionaries 'teach' languages, but this is an imprecise statement. Obviously, pedagogical dictionaries do not teach languages … What they do — or try to do — is to assist the learning of a (foreign or native) language … As a conclusion, you can say that theoretical pedagogical lexicography (or pedagogical metalexicography) studies problems related to pedagogical dictionaries and that practical pedagogical lexicography produces such dictionaries.

In this vein Welker proceeds to define what is meant by the term *pedagogical* in relation to lexicography and dictionaries. Initially he notes that some authors, among them Hernandez (1998), prefer the term *didactic* instead of *pedagogical*. Welker rejects this idea. In his understanding (p. 21), pedagogy is the "theory and science of teaching and education", whereas:

> Didactics is a part of pedagogy, but not the same. Didactics is a set of methods and techniques used in order to obtain an efficient teaching.

On this basis, he concludes (p. 21-22):

> Pedagogical dictionaries aim at being more didactic. In lexicography, the adjective *pedagogic* refers to a specific *type* of dictionaries (dictionaries conceived to language learners), whereas *didactics* should only be used in order to qualify the *way* in which the information is provided: more or less didactic, more or less clear, more or less adapted to the users' skills. In this respect, even pedagogical dictionaries may vary in their didactic quality.

Welker then continues the discussion on lexicographical terminology. He proceeds from the sphere of theory to that of practice when he discusses the various terms used to denominate pedagogical dictionaries in various languages (Portuguese, Spanish, English, German and French). Without going into detail regarding the various more or less successful translations, there are two fundamental terms used as titles in a large number of pedagogical dictionaries: *school dictionaries* and *learners' dictionaries*. Welker relates these two terms to two different types of pedagogical dictionaries, i.e. those for learners of a native language and those for learners of a foreign language. He writes (p. 22-24):

> It seems to me that the term *dicionário escolar* is broadly accepted, both in Portuguese and Spanish. And the same applies to German (*Schulwörterbücher*), French (*dictionnaires scolaires*) and English (*school dictionaries*) … As to the term *learners' dictionaries*, it is so deep-rooted that everybody knows that it is not used for native-language learners.

Previously, Welker has criticized Hartmann and James (1998: 107) who — in their *Dictionary of Lexicography* — writes that the "distinction usually made between a dictionary for native speakers (school dictionary) and the one for non-native learners (learner's dictionary) is not helpful". Welker (p. 19) disagrees:

> On the contrary, I think that this distinction is very useful and necessary.

The problem here is that there seems to be two parallel discussions. The first is whether a distinction should be made between a pedagogical dictionary for native speakers and one for foreign-language learners. It is obvious that the two types of potential users have different types of lexicographical needs. Welker is therefore quite right when he opposes Hartmann and James' statement in this regard. However, another discussion concerns which terms should be used to determine the two types of dictionaries. In this respect a distinction should be made between the precise scientific terms needed in lexicographical theory and the commercial terms used to sell the dictionaries.

The terms *school dictionary* and *learners' dictionary* are not precise terms. The term *school dictionary* implicitly refers to all dictionaries conceived to be used in the school system. This is the way the term is used commercially in a number of countries, e.g. South Africa, where one can buy bilingual school dictionaries, such as the *Tweetalige Skoolwoordeboek Afrikaans–Engels/Engels–Afrikaans*, which are obviously not produced to assist the learning of a mother tongue, and even specialized school dictionaries such as Longman's *Multilingual Science Dictionary for South African Schools* and *Illustrated Dictionary of Natural Sciences and Technology Today* whose purpose is basically to assist the learning of science, not of language. On the back cover of the latter it is explicitly stated:

> It enhances conceptual understanding of key concepts and will help learners succeed in Natural Sciences and Technology.

And the same applies to the term *learners' dictionary*, where it is necessary to take into consideration that the word *learner* today is widely used in a much broader way than just to refer to learners of a foreign language (or even of a native language). In fact, an article by Cowie (1996), to which Welker also briefly refers on page 340, has the title "*The 'Dizionario Scolastico': a Learner's Dictionary for Native Speakers*". Likewise, the subtitle of another South African pedagogical dictionary clearly states that it is designed for "*learners, students and trainees in science and technology*" (cf. Hartmann-Petersen et al. 2001), a fact showing that neither the term *pedagogical dictionary* nor the term *learners' dictionary* can be restricted to dictionaries aimed at assisting language learning, whether foreign or native.

The commercial publishing houses cannot be expected to provide scientifically correct titles to all their lexicographical products, especially not when specific terms have already taken root among the public in specific countries. But when it comes to theoretical work, it is necessary to build upon well-defined concepts and use terms with a logical linguistic relation to their content. In this respect, the state-of-the-art of practical lexicography shows that dictionaries are produced to assist not only language learning but also learning of scientific disciplines.

The only logical conclusion is therefore that all these dictionaries — i.e. dictionaries assisting native and foreign language learning as well as scientific

learning — should be considered *pedagogical dictionaries* and that *pedagogical lexicography* should be defined as that part of lexicography dealing with these dictionaries. As the word *learner* is broadly used to denominate not only foreign-language learners, but also mother-tongue learners and learners of scientific disciplines, i.e. the potential users of pedagogical dictionaries as they have just been defined, the terms *learners' lexicography* and *learners' dictionary* should therefore be considered as synonymous with the terms *pedagogical lexicography* and *pedagogical dictionary*.

This conclusion may seem strange after so many years of terminological confusion, but it is, as mentioned, the only logical one. Correspondingly, the term *school dictionary* should be assigned to all types of dictionaries designed for use in the school system to assist in the learning of the mother tongue, a foreign language, or a scientific discipline. In this way, *school dictionary*, like *children's dictionary, desk dictionary*, etc., should be used as a subcategory of the category *pedagogical dictionaries* (learners' dictionaries). When this reasoning is followed, the pedagogical dictionary types which Welker calls "school dictionary" and "learners' dictionary" should therefore — at least in the theoretical literature — be renamed and given much more scientifically correct names like *dictionary for mother-tongue learners* and *dictionary for foreign-language learners*, to which should be added *dictionary for learners of scientific disciplines*. Except for the last term, these terms are in fact the ones Welker himself uses in the titles of various chapters in his book. As such, he has taken a big step in the right direction. To this should be added that Welker in a later chapter (p. 113) also recognizes that pedagogical dictionaries may be used for learners of scientific disciplines although he includes this cognitive function in the dictionaries for language learners without considering that it may also give rise to a separate type of pedagogical dictionaries, i.e. dictionaries for learners of scientific disciplines, in cases where it is the only or the main function of these dictionaries.

3.   A short history of pedagogical lexicography

This short chapter of only 12 pages consists of two parts, the first dealing with "ancient dictionaries used by language learners" and the second treating the "history of theoretical pedagogical lexicography". In the first part, Welker refers to studies carried out by other scholars and quotes contributions containing the words *learner*, *pupil* and *student*. In this way, an interesting picture is taking shape as it seems that pedagogical dictionaries, especially for language learning, have existed since the very dawn of lexicography. This is, for instance, the case with the several thousand years old Sumerian dictionaries — or "proto-dictionaries" — which were carved in clay and apparently invented as tools to support the training and teaching of future scribes and also with the Sumerian–Assyrian dictionaries which were used to assist Babylonian students who had reception problems when reading Sumerian texts almost 3 000 years ago. In fact, Zöfgen (1994: 289) claims that:

> From the beginning, the history of bilingual dictionaries reveals a strong didactic orientation where 'the main motive behind lexicography until 1600 was to help learners of foreign languages'.

Welker then briefly discusses some pedagogical dictionaries produced in Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries. Two of these dictionaries are of special interest. The first one is a bilingual dictionary produced in 1521 to assist Englishmen who wanted to learn French. To those who today oppose the production of monofunctional dictionaries — and even deny their existence — the title of this dictionary tells its own story: *The Introductory to Wryte and to Pronounce French*. The second dictionary worth mentioning is the *Orbis sensualium pictus*, published by Johann Amos Comenius in 1658 and later translated into more than 20 languages. This interesting dictionary does not have access to the relevant data through a central word list, but provides on the left side of the pages a series of pictures with numbers placed in several parts and followed by two text columns where the numbers are repeated: the first column contains Latin words, collocations and even phrases, and the second column their translations into German. The major merit of this 350 years old dictionary was that students could use it to discover hitherto unknown phenomena and assist in the learning of the corresponding vocabulary, in one language or the other. In this way, the *Orbis sensualium pictus* contradicts the frequent linguistic claim that the function of dictionaries is always to define words.

In the second part of the chapter, Welker briefly deals with some of the most important scholars and their main contributions in the field of pedagogical lexicography. Not without reason, he begins in 1899 with the English philologist Henry Sweet who many researchers consider the father of modern pedagogical lexicography. He then continues with the North American linguist and educator Edward L. Thorndike, the British lexicographers, Harold Palmer, Michael West and A.S. Hornby, the Russian Lev Ščerba, the Czech Ladislav Zgusta, the Germans Franz Josef Hausmann and Herbert Ernst Wiegand, the Frenchmen Jean Dubois and Robert Galisson, the Spaniards Humberto Hernandez Hernandez and Maria del Carmen Avila Martin, the Danes Hans-Peder Kromann, Theis Riiber and Poul Rosbach, the Belgians Jean Binon, Thierry Selva and Serge Verlinde, ending with Sven Tarp.

This panoramic overview seems relevant and justified, showing that pedagogical lexicography, in its various expressions, is common to different cultures and epochs. In this respect, Welker could perfectly well have mentioned other scholars from other language communities who in one way or another have contributed to the development of pedagogical lexicography, e.g. the Swede Martin Gellerstam, the architect behind the LEXIN project for immigrant learners of Swedish (cf. Pálfi and Tarp 2009). However, it is interesting that Welker does not mention any Portuguese or Brazilian lexicographers in this chapter, although they are frequently quoted in the remaining part of the book. This fact alone seems to justify the publication of his book in Portuguese.

4.   On language learners' use of dictionaries

This chapter is one of the most interesting in the book. The first part reflects the opinions a large number of researchers express about the usage of dictionaries for language learning. Although mainly descriptive, it furnishes a condensed and highly informative panorama of the various opinions and tendencies within pedagogical lexicography since 1955, i.e. during more than half a century. Many present-day lexicographers will be surprised to see that the theoretical and practical problems they are trying to solve today have already been raised and discussed several decades ago. It is impossible to reflect all these ideas in this review article, but at least some of them deserve to be mentioned, for instance Mathews (1955: 187) who appears surprisingly "modern" when he writes:

> Dictionaries are tools, and they are much more complicated, and capable of many more uses than students suspect. All of us know students need encouragement and guidance in the use of dictionaries, and perhaps there are few teachers of freshman composition but that devote a part of their program to an effort to help students form the habit of consulting dictionaries.

Other researchers, especially from the 1970s onwards, are much more hesitant when it comes to recommend the use of dictionaries in language learning. Beattie (1973: 163), for instance, writes:

> Dictionaries and glossaries ought to be resorted to only *after* 'intelligent guessing' has failed. The reason why dictionaries are harmful is that learners use them *before* attempting an intelligent guess, and consequently never learn how to guess intelligently.

Beattie therefore recommends that learners should not possess dictionaries during the first two or three years, but that they may sometimes consult them in school to become acquainted with their use. Several other authors express similar critical ideas concerning the use of dictionaries in language learning.

On the other hand, Herbst (1985) shows that maybe 30 or 40 percent of all mistakes made by German secondary-school students in English text production could have been avoided if they had consulted bilingual or monolingual dictionaries. He provides three reasons to explain this problem: The students do not consult dictionaries, because (a) they do not know that they can find the needed information in them, (b) they do not know how to interpret the information provided, and (c) they do not realise that they have made a mistake. Herbst therefore recommends the use of dictionaries. This is also the case with Gu (2003) who distances himself from the widespread guessing and mnemonics of the previous decades and seems to come close to the opinion expressed by Mathews almost fifty years earlier:

> It is alarming to see how much time and effort we have spent in areas such as contextual guessing or mnemonics and yet how little energy is dedicated to an area such as dictionary strategies that can be just as illuminating.

Welker himself (p. 77-80) also seems to share this position:

> There are situations where inference impedes the comprehension — maybe not of the general idea of the text but, for instance, of a whole paragraph — and guessing frequently does not permit an exact understanding of the sentence where the word appears. (…) The conclusion is that it is often not possible to infer the meaning of an unknown word and that it is necessary to consult a dictionary.

As already indicated, these quotations, however interesting, do not do justice to a text which is rich in — frequently opposing — ideas and inspiring for any pedagogical lexicographer interested in improving his/her work, whether theoretical or practical. Other important discussions are also reflected in this chapter through a number of quotations and references, e.g. whether to use monolingual or bilingual dictionaries in foreign-language learning, how to study and assimilate vocabulary and grammar by means of dictionaries, etc. In the rest of the chapter, the observant reader may also find relevant information about lexicographical user research, consultation skills, the teaching of dictionary use, and "the dictionary as didactic material used to acquire non-linguistic knowledge".

5.   Dictionaries for learners of foreign languages

This chapter of 178 pages is by far the longest in the book. It discusses already published dictionaries for learners of foreign languages and is divided into two sections, one about monolingual dictionaries and the other about bilingual ones. The *first section*, the longer of the two, is further subdivided into four parts: (a) dictionaries for non-native learners of English, (b) dictionaries for non-native learners of other languages (specifically French, Portuguese, German, Spanish and Italian), (c) characteristics and components of pedagogical dictionaries, and (d) empirical research into the usage of these dictionaries.

In the first part, Welker provides a condensed story of well-known British learners' dictionaries for non-native learners of English, starting with the very first attempts in the early 20th century and ending up with the current Big Five (Oxford, Longman, Collins Cobuild, Cambridge and Macmillan) and the sharp competition between them. In this respect, he also analyzes the three fundamental ideas behind this tradition, i.e. the *controlled vocabulary*, the *verb patterns*, and the *collocations*, as well as the various levels in which the Big Five have been published so far: *advanced*, *intermediate* and *elementary*. Those who have read Cowie (1999) will find few surprises in this chapter, but it is nevertheless informative and recommendable as a short introduction to the subject owing to its condensed, well-written and didactic character.

In the second part, Welker looks at the dictionaries for non-native learners of French, Portuguese, German, Spanish and Italian. Surprisingly, this part is a little shorter than the previous one, a fact which may reflect the number of

contributions published on learners' dictionaries for each of these languages, but which is nevertheless not completely justified, because these language communities, also have a long and interesting history of pedagogical dictionaries for foreign-language learners which, in some respects, provide pedagogical solutions different from those of their English counterparts. Welker's treatment of the dictionaries in these five languages is inspiring, because it provides a wider dimension to an academic field which in many respects is constrained by the not always justified British predominance.

The third part provides a 30 pages long systematic introduction to the most important characteristics and components of monolingual dictionaries for foreign-language learners: *size, outside matter, macrostructure, lemma selection, access, layout, pronunciation, hyphenation, definitions, grammatical information, labels, collocations, examples, idiomatic expressions, illustrations, usage notes*, etc. Although many of these phenomena can be found in other types of dictionaries, there is little doubt that this section constitutes an easy introduction to some of the most important components, data types and characteristics of dictionaries for foreign-language learners. The only problem is that the various phenomena are not presented and discussed in the light of the different lexicographical functions, a common problem in much of the theoretical literature about this type of dictionaries — and other dictionaries as well. This deficiency is probably due to Welker's descriptive approach but it is nevertheless a pity because the author may be one of the few lexicographers who could have combined lexicographical functions and dictionary characteristics and components in a convincing way. Welker himself (p. 26) writes:

> It is well-known that publishing houses and authors of dictionaries generally strive to make their products useful in any user situation. However, the ideal would be that every pedagogical dictionary clarifies its main function or functions (reception, production, vocabulary learning) …

The last part of this section contains references to a number of research projects conducted to analyze the use of dictionaries for foreign-language learners. The 40 pages long text furnishes much interesting material which, regretfully, shares a general problem with the majority of the lexicographical user-research projects carried out so far, i.e. that it does not live up to the standards required by modern sociology and statistics (cf. Tarp 2009). The inevitable result is that the material provided by this sort of research may be interesting and even thought-provoking, but in no way statistically significant, for it cannot be generalized and used for solid theory-building. Of course this cannot be blamed on Welker, but it would have been more convincing if he had accompanied the material with more critical comments regarding its scientific and statistic value.

The *second section* of the chapter on dictionaries for foreign-language learners is dedicated to bilingual dictionaries. It is generally accepted that most bilingual dictionaries are of a lower quality than their monolingual counterparts. A careful reading of Welker's text does not change this negative opinion,

but it is to his merit that he once again is able to present the material in such a way that it becomes interesting and worth reading. He first deals with bilingual dictionaries in general and then with bilingual dictionaries for foreign-language learners. In the first part, he discusses and provides examples of some specific problems related to bilingual lexicography such as *typology*, *equivalents*, *metalanguage*, *meaning differentiation* as well as *lemma selection, separation of homographs*, and *differentiation and arrangement of senses*.

In the second part, he starts with a "short history" of what he calls "preoccupations about bilingual dictionaries for foreign-languages learners" and then discusses "the characteristics of good dictionaries" of this type. Here he applies the same methodology as in some of the previous chapters and refers to a large number of scholars such as the Russian Ščerba, the Pole Tomaszczyk, the Brazilians Gomes de Matos, Amaral and Schmitz, the North Americans Iannucci and Lindstrom, the Arab Al-Kasimi, the Germans Hausmann, Herbst, Werner and Zöphen, the Spaniard Alvar Ezquerra, the Frenchman Dubois, the Briton Atkins, the Italian Celotti, the Belgian Humblé, etc. In this way — apart from discussing some of the most important bilingual dictionaries for foreign-languages learners — he succeeds in showing the development of theoretical thinking about this type of dictionaries as well as the most relevant ideas presented by scholars from various traditions and language communities. The result of this guided tour through the world of bilingual learners' lexicography is that the reader, even when disagreeing with many of the ideas expressed, becomes inspired to formulate new ideas that may eventually lead to an improved lexicographical practice.

In this manner, the whole chapter on monolingual and bilingual dictionaries for foreign-language learners turns into a must-read for anybody who wishes to work theoretically and practically within this field.

6.   Native-language pedagogical dictionaries

Welker himself writes that the major part of the existing theoretical literature about pedagogical lexicography is dedicated to dictionaries for learners of foreign languages. This disparity may be the reason why the previous chapter on such dictionaries is almost three times as long as the one on dictionaries for native-language learners. But this does not mean that it is less interesting. Welker divides these dictionaries into *children's dictionaries*, *school dictionaries* and *desk dictionaries* (*college dictionaries*).

The *section about children's dictionaries* begins with a quotation from Hausmann (1990: 1365) which is reproduced here because of its relevance for the most important characteristics of this type of dictionary:

> a) The layout is especially clear. Space is not saved. The letters are bigger than in general dictionaries. Colours are generally used. The dictionaries have frequently a big format. b) All lemmata, or a considerable part of them, are illustrated. c) There are no definitions; or when there are, they are not conventional.

d) Narrative texts (lexicographic story-telling) substitute the traditional macro-structure. e) There is no information about the lemma, or when it is provided, it is only very little. f) Abbreviations are not used. g) Exercises are given. h) The macrostructure is very selective, never with more than 5,000 lemmata. Generally it is between 200 and 2,000 lemmata. i) In most cases, the lemmata refer to concrete things. j) The foreseen users are children below 10 years.

According to Hausmann, there are two types of children's dictionaries, the *visual dictionaries* organized thematically and the *alphabetic dictionaries*. Hausmann also notes that there is no clear division between children's dictionaries and school dictionaries and that their titles often do not reveal their real content. This claim is supported by Welker who subsequently refers to the observations made by various scholars — mainly Brazilians — who describe a number of children's dictionaries designed for children up to 14 years of age, with much more lemmata (up to 30 000), and with some other characteristics different from the ones Hausmann emphasized.

The problem here seems to be that some of these scholars confuse commercial titles and scientific categories, that some of the dictionaries treated are not adequate for the expected user group, and that *children's dictionary* and *school dictionary* are imprecise and misleading terms. In most countries, children start school between the ages of 5 and 7, are considered children at least up to the ages of 12 or 14, and continue in school up to the age of 15 or 16. This means that they, for a long period, are *school children*. Consequently, if a school dictionary is defined as a dictionary conceived to be used by the pupils in school, most school dictionaries are at the same time "children's dictionaries". The real distinction that should be made is therefore between *preschool dictionaries* and *school dictionaries* whereas the latter should be graduated and subdivided into various categories according to the pupils' mental and linguistic development and their growing knowledge about the world. In this respect, the characteristics described by Hausmann in the above quotation should therefore be viewed as the necessary characteristics of both preschool dictionaries (especially the visual ones) and school dictionaries for children (pupils) below the age of 10. Although Welker himself does not discuss these complex questions related to typology, his treatment of the field does nevertheless allow observant readers to draw conclusions of their own.

In the *section about school dictionaries for mother-tongue learners*, Welker (p. 302) starts by noting that — surprisingly — such dictionaries are not found in all countries and that, even in countries where they have been published, the following distinction should be made:

> It is necessary to distinguish the genuine dictionaries from the ones that are only smaller versions — with less lemmata, senses and information — of general dictionaries. "Genuine" means "really pedagogical" and especially prepared for the pupils of primary or secondary school.

He then, once again, provides a large number of reflections on English, French, German, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese school dictionaries as well as some of

the results of the investigation conducted in Brazil into the use of Portuguese school dictionaries. The main topics discussed in this section is the type of school dictionary, the number of lemmata, the formulation of the definitions, and the type of additional lexicographical data assigned to the lemmata. Welker starts by referring to Hausmann (1989) who considers the fathers of the modern pedagogical dictionary both for foreign-language and mother-tongue learners to be Harold Palmer, Michael West and especially Edward Thorndike who published the *Junior Dictionary* (1935), the *Senior Dictionary* (1941) and the *Beginning Dictionary* (1945).

However, this opinion is somehow opposed by Pruvost (2001) who counts 64 French school dictionaries since the publication of Pierre Larousse's *Nouveau Dictionnaire de la Langue Française* in 1856, i.e. several decades before Palmer, West and Thorndike marked the era of English pedagogical lexicography. Pruvost (2001: 74) also makes an important distinction between "reductionist dictionaristics" and "heuristic lexicography". In the first case, the school dictionary is produced by means of a simple reduction of a "more important dictionary" for adult users, whereas "heuristic lexicography" presupposes an original work with a macro- and microstructure "linguistically and psychologically adapted to the learner". In this respect, Welker himself (p. 303) writes:

> Hence, it is clear that it is necessary to write the definitions or explications very carefully in order to improve the comprehension, not only for foreign-language learners but also for native-language pupils.

The whole section about school dictionaries for mother-tongue learners contains much interesting and useful information, not least about dictionaries produced in Brazil which are discussed with many details allowing the reader to form an idea of the impressive work done by practical and theoretical lexicographers in Brazil during the last few years.

In the *section about desk dictionaries* (which are called "usage dictionaries" in Portuguese), Welker initially discusses the two terms *desk dictionary* and *college dictionary* (also called *collegiate dictionary*) and observes that some lexicographers distinguish between them, whereas others consider them to be synonymous. Welker (p. 332), who does not have this terminological problem in Portuguese, observes that these dictionaries are not always regarded as pedagogical dictionaries, "because they are not specifically designed for language learners", but he himself considers them as such, describing them as follows:

> Generally speaking, desk dictionaries are monolingual dictionaries designed for native speakers, with a minor macrostructure than the big general monolingual dictionaries and different from these in the sense that they present certain important components for text production.

Subsequently, Welker first analyzes some English, Spanish and Italian desk dictionaries which he calls "atypical" because of their large size, and then some other French, Spanish and Italian dictionaries which are more "normal". The

section ends with a detailed study of a number of Portuguese desk dictionaries in which Welker mainly refers to his own previous publications and comments on this dictionary type. This section as well as the rest of the chapter on dictionaries for mother-tongue learners which is just as inspiring as the previous chapter on dictionaries for foreign-language learners, is another must-read for those who work theoretically and practically with pedagogical dictionaries.

7.   Special pedagogical dictionaries

In this chapter, Welker deals with the types of pedagogical dictionaries which are considered "special", because they are not "normal", i.e. they "are neither normal monolingual pedagogical dictionaries nor normal bilingual pedagogical dictionaries" (p. 357). He discusses ten different types of these special pedagogical dictionaries:

(a)   Hybrid bilingual dictionaries
(b)   Multifunctional monolingual dictionaries for foreign learners
(c)   Encyclopedic dictionaries for foreign learners
(d)   Onomasiological and analogical dictionaries
(e)   Visual dictionaries
(f)   Valency dictionaries
(g)   Dictionaries of collocations
(h)   Dictionaries of idioms
(i)   Dictionaries of false friends
(j)   Pedagogical dictionaries of specialized languages

Of course, this list could easily be extended, e.g. with special dictionaries of common learner errors, as suggested by Frankenberg-Garcia (2010). However, the chapter shows above all the great variety of pedagogical dictionaries commercialized on a market which has to come up with ever new products in order to survive. Some of these dictionaries provide information which the user may find in other dictionaries, and frequently of a higher quality, although some of them are interesting as supplements to already existing dictionaries, especially in the case of printed dictionaries. As usual, Welker takes the reader on a well-guided tour, this time in a new region of the world of pedagogical dictionaries, calling on a number of scholars to express their opinions about the various lexicographical solutions furnished by these dictionaries. As it is impossible to reproduce all these opinions and discuss the various types of special pedagogical dictionaries in the framework of this article, only two of them will be commented on here. The first is the *encyclopedic dictionary for foreign learners* which, among other matters, provides cultural and encyclopedic information needed with regard to the foreign-language learning process. In this respect, Welker quotes Zgusta (1989: 3) for the following opinion:

> However, since language is embedded in culture, cultural data are important to
> the learner not only for steering his linguistic behaviour but frequently for choos-
> ing the correct lexical equivalent. Such cultural information can be understood in
> a broad way, so that it can pertain to political and administrative realities of the
> country or countries whose language is being learned, and so on. Undoubtedly, a
> good part of this information is of encyclopedic character; be this as it may, it
> belongs to what the learner has to learn.

If Zgusta is right, and he most certainly is, and if cultural data are needed to
steer the learner's linguistic behaviour and ability to choose the correct words,
then the question is why lexicographical data of this type should be included in
a separate dictionary type instead of the "normal" dictionary for foreign-lan-
guage learners. Welker himself does not answer this question but refers to
Stark (1999) who distinguishes between "compulsory" and "optional" cultural
and encyclopedic information of which the first type is necessary to define the
lemma appropriately. In this sense, the "normal" dictionary for foreign-lan-
guage learners should furnish the compulsory information, while the optional
information could be provided by special encyclopedic dictionaries.

The second type of special dictionary to be commented on here is the
pedagogical dictionary of specialized languages. In this respect, Welker mainly
goes into details with Jean Binon and Serge Verlinde's *Dictionannaire d'ap-
prentissage du français des affaires* (DAFA) on which he has also commented in a
previous chapter. The very existence of this and other similar dictionaries
reveals a fact which is often forgotten in theoretical discussions, i.e. that lan-
guage learning is learning not only of the so-called general purpose language,
but also of special languages, both in the mother tongue and in foreign lan-
guages. Although this type of specialized dictionary as well as the theoretical
literature accompanying it is still relatively limited in comparison to other
products of pedagogical lexicography, it nevertheless constitutes an area of
growing interest, a fact proved by two theoretical books on this topic, i.e.
Fuertes-Olivera and Arribas-Baño (2008) and Fuertes-Olivera (2010), published
since the appearance of Welker's book. Welker should therefore be praised for
introducing this type of dictionary to a lexicographical community who fre-
quently ignores it in spite of its importance for a large number of language
learners.

8.   Electronic dictionaries

In a tree-diagram on page 27, provided after a short discussion on the typology
of pedagogical dictionaries, Welker makes a primary-level distinction between
printed and electronic dictionaries which are then subdivided into monolin-
gual and bilingual dictionaries, CD-ROM and Internet dictionaries, etc. An-
other possible typology could consist of a primary distinction between peda-
gogical dictionaries for learners of the mother tongue, foreign languages and

science, and a secondary distinction between dictionaries for general purpose language learning and special purpose language learning, etc. The first of these typologies is based on formal criteria (media and number of languages) where-as the second is bound up with the functions of the dictionaries. None of these typologies is better or worse than the other. It all depends on the purpose of the typology. However, what is important is that electronic dictionaries are not fundamentally different from printed dictionaries in terms of their content and functions. As to this, Welker (p. 415) starts the chapter on electronic dictionar-ies with an observation which he has already previously made in the first chapter:

> All types of dictionaries can exist in electronic format. The characteristics which existing electronic dictionaries have in common with printed dictionaries will not be presented here.

Instead, Welker focuses on some of the new aspects of electronic dictionaries. Initially it should be noted that any book on this topic will be more or less obsolete when it finally appears owing to the rapid development and continu-ous flow of new products. This is also, up to a certain degree, the case with Welker's book. According to him, electronic dictionaries can be divided into:

(a)   Dictionaries used in processing of national language;
(b)   CD-ROM dictionaries;
(c)   Online dictionaries (accessible via Internet); and
(d)   Dictionaries on hand-held computers (pocket dictionaries).

Welker observes that the first type mentioned is not regarded by all researchers as an electronic dictionary. However, there is at least one type of electronic dic-tionary which he does not mention, although it had been available in some countries, e.g. South Africa (but maybe not Brazil), when he wrote the book, i.e. dictionaries on mobile phones. Welker then refers to a large number of elec-tronic pedagogical dictionaries as well as to the opinions expressed by other scholars. As to the advantages of electronic dictionaries, he himself comments (p. 419):

> The major advantage of online dictionaries — and electronic dictionaries in gen-eral — is the search facilities.

This judgement may be valid for 99 percent of all electronic dictionaries. It is perfectly true that the use of electronic media optimizes the search facilities but there is another advantage which until now has only been partially explored by a few dictionaries, i.e. the possibility to adapt the dictionary to the specific needs of each user in each user situation (cf. Tarp 2011). Welker himself (p. 420) calls for more "inclusion of multimedia", referring to Lemberg (2001):

> The ideal would be to be able to access the pronunciation of the lexemes, the images of the referents, maybe the sound produced by the verbs *crepitar* (crunch)

and *ranger* (squeak), and even videos showing actions like *torcer* (wrestle) and *driblar* (dribble).

It is evident that these possibilities should be exploited. But the real ideal would be to go beyond the present practice and develop lexicographical pedagogical e-tools which can be adapted to the needs of each student. In such a world, the user, when consulting the dictionary, would not obtain all the lexicographical data assigned to a specific lemma, but only the data needed in each situation. This would, for instance, also make it possible to take the data from each of the special pedagogical dictionaries mentioned in the previous chapter and put them into one and the same data base from which it could be extracted in an individualized form by means of an advanced interface allowing interaction between the student and the dictionary.

However, such a world will not become reality only by observing present-day lexicographical practice. It is necessary not only to learn, but also to "unlearn" and leave behind bad habits as observed by Gouws (2011). What is needed is an advanced lexicographical theory capable of transforming the discipline and creating a new generation of dictionaries that fully adapt to the new technologies. Such a theory will have to be the result of the concentrated intellectual efforts of many lexicographers who, among other matters, will have to base their research on a meticulous study of the practice hitherto. In this sense, neither the chapter about electronic dictionaries nor the rest of Welker's book presents any solution. However, it greatly facilitates the work to be done by providing easy access to a large amount of material produced by generations of practical and theoretical lexicographers.

9.   Conclusions

The *Panorama geral da lexicografia pedagógica* consists of a total of 519 pages, of which the last 65 pages are back matter containing three indexes of authors, dictionaries, and key terms, all of them with references to the specific pages, as well as a list of all the books, articles and other theoretical contributions to which the author refers. Together with the detailed table of contents (an English translation is available at http://vsites.unb.br/il/let/welker/LP_contents (accessed July 6, 2010)), this variety of access options makes it easy not only to read the book from cover to cover, but also to consult it and return to it whenever necessary.

Welker's book is written to satisfy the specific needs of a Brazilian audience desiring lexicographical knowledge but it deserves to be read by many more scholars within the international lexicographical community. The book may be used as a reference work which, in a condensed form, provides easy access to many different opinions and ideas with which it is impossible always to agree because of their contradictory and sometimes even completely opposing character, but which is nevertheless a source of inspiration to anybody

doing theoretical and practical work within the sphere of pedagogical lexico-graphy — and even beyond.

Although it would have been useful to have more theoretical input from Welker himself, it is exactly the descriptive method he applies that gives the book this character of a much needed reference work or encyclopedia on peda-gogical lexicography. Of course, it is always possible to find dictionaries not mentioned, authors not quoted, and ideas not reflected, as indicated by Frankenberg-Garcia (2010) in her review of the book, but it cannot be denied that Welker is an extraordinarily diligent and meticulous author who has pro-duced a comprehensive work far more inspiring than, for instance, Dolezal and McCreary (1999).

Welker's book is highly recommendable and deserves, as already stated, to be read also by lexicographers who are not conversant with Portuguese text reception at an academic level. If translated into English, it would probably become a "best-seller" within a lexicographical community that is becoming ever more aware that theoretical lexicography cannot be constrained to the British and European tradition. Hopefully, a publishing house will come for-ward to accept the challenge.

Literature

Basel, Barbara and Louise Banks (Eds.). 2006. *Illustrated Dictionary of Natural Sciences and Technol-ogy Today*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.

Beattie, Nicholas. 1973. Teaching Dictionary Use. *Modern Language* 54(4): 161-168.

Binon, Jean and Serge Verlinde. 1999. *Dictionnaire d'apprentissage du français des affaires*. Paris: Didier.

Bogaards, Paul. 1991. Dictionnaires pédagogiques et apprentissage du vocabulaire. *Cahiers de Lexi-cologie* 59(2): 93-107.

Bosman, D.B., I.W. van der Merwe and A.S.V. Barnes. 2002. *Tweetalige Skoolwoordeboek Afrikaans–Engels/Engels–Afrikaans*. Cape Town: Pharos.

Cowie, Anthony P. 1996. The 'Dizionario Scolastico': A Learner's Dictionary for Native Speakers. *International Journal of Lexicography* 9(2): 118-131.

Cowie, Anthony P. 1999. *English Dictionaries for Foreign Learners — A History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dolezal, Fredric T. and Don R. McCreary. 1999. *Pedagogical Lexicography Today. A Critical Bibliogra-phy on Learners' Dictionaries with Special Emphasis on Language Learners and Dictionary Users*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Dziemianko, Anna. 2006. *User-friendliness of Verb Syntax in Pedagogical Dictionaries of English.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Frankenberg-Garcia, Ana. 2010. [Review of] Herbert Andreas Welker. *Panorama Geral da Lexico-grafia Pedagógica*. Brasília: Thesaurus. 2006. *International Journal of Lexicography* 23(2): 233–236.

Fuertes-Olivera, Pedro A. and Ascensión Arribas-Baño. 2008. *Pedagogical Specialised Lexicography*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fuertes-Olivera, Pedro A. (Ed.). 2010. *Specialised Dictionaries for Learners.* Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Gouws, Rufus H. To appear. Learning, Unlearning and Innovation in the Planning of Electronic Dictionaries. Fuertes-Olivera, Pedro A. and Henning Bergenholtz (Eds.). To appear. *e-Lexicography. The Construction of Internet Dictionaries.*

Gu, Peter Yongqi. 2003. Vocabulary Learning in a Second Language: Person, Task, Context and Strategies. *TESL-EJ 7-2* [online]. http://tesl-ej.org/ej26/a4.html (Accessed July 6, 2010).

Hartmann, R.R.K. and Gregory James. 1998. *Dictionary of Lexicography.* London/New York: Routledge.

Hartmann-Petersen, Preben, Gus Gerrans and Rasmus Hartmann-Petersen. 2001. *Sasol Science & Technology Resource. A Book Resource for Learners, Students and Trainees in Science and Technology.* Observatory/Claremont: Infosource.

Hausmann, Franz Josef. 1989. Kleine Weltgeschichte der Metalexikographie. Wiegand, Herbert Ernst (Ed.). 1989. *Wörterbücher in der Diskussion. Vorträge aus dem Heidelberger Lexikographischen Kolloquium*: 75-109. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Hausmann, Franz Josef. 1990. Das Kinderwörterbuch. Hausmann, Franz Josef, Oskar Reichmann, Herbert Ernst Wiegand and Ladislav Zgusta (Eds.). 1989–1991. *Wörterbücher. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie/Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography/Dictionnaires. Encyclopédie internationale de lexicographie*: 1365-1368. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Herbst, Thomas. 1985. Von Fehlern, die vermeidbar wären. Ein weiteres Argument für mehr Wörterbucharbeit in Englischunterricht. *Bielefelder Beiträge zur Sprachlehrforschung* 14(1–2): 139-165.

Hernández, Humberto Hernández. 1998. La lexicografía didáctica del español: aspectos históricos y críticos. Fuentes Morán, Maria Teresa and Reinhold Werner (Eds.). 1998. *Lexicografías iberorománicas: problemas, propuestos y proyectos*: 49-79. Madrid/Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana and Vervuert.

Landau, S.I. 2001. *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography.* Second Edition. New York: Scribner Press.

Lemberg, Ingrid. 2001. Aspekte der Online-Lexikographie für wissenschaftliche Wörterbücher. Lemberg, Ingrid, Bernhard Schröder and Angelika Storrer (Eds.). 2001. *Chancen und Perspektiven computergestützter Lexikographie*: 71-91. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Lew, Robert. 2007. [Review of] Herbert Andreas Welker: *O Uso de dicionários: Panorama geral das pesquisas empíricas*. Brasília: Thesaurus. 2006. *International Journal of Lexicography* 20(4): 401–403.

Martínez de Sousa, José. 1995. *Diccionario de lexicografía práctica.* Barcelona: Biblograf.

Mathews, Mitford M. 1955. The Freshman and his Dictionary. *College Composition and Communication* 6: 187-190.

Pálfi, Loránd-Levente and Sven Tarp. 2009. Die Lernerlexicographie in Skandinavien. Entwicklung, Kritik und Vorschläge. *Lexicographica. International Annual for Lexicography* 25: 135-154.

Pruvost, Jean. 2001. Les dictionnaires d'apprentissage monolingues de la langue française (1856–1999): Problèmes et méthodes. Pruvost, Jean (Ed*.)*. 2001. *Les dictionnaires de langue française. Dictionnaires d'apprentissage, Dictionnaires spécialisés de la langue, Dictionnaires de spécialité*: 67-95. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Rundell, Michael. 1998. Recent Trends in English Pedagogical Lexicography. *International Journal of Lexicography* 11(4): 315-342.

Stark, Martin. 1999. *Encyclopedic Learners' Dictionaries: A Study of their Design Features from the User Perspective*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Sutton, Kathleen (Ed.). 2007. *Multilingual Science Dictionary for South African Schools*. Cape Town: Longman.

Tarp, Sven. 2008a. Første oversigtsværk over leksikografiske brugerundersøgelser. [Review of] Herbert Andreas Welker: *O Uso de dicionários: Panorama geral das pesquisas empíricas*. Brasília: Thesaurus 2006. *LexicoNordica* 15: 343-345.

Tarp, Sven. 2008b. *Lexicography in the Borderland between Knowledge and Non-knowledge. General Lexicographical Theory with Particular Focus on Learner's Lexicography*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Tarp, Sven. 2009. Reflections on Lexicographic User Research. *Lexikos* 19: 275-296.

Tarp, Sven. 2010. Reflections on the Academic Status of Lexicography. *Lexikos* 20: 450-465.

Tarp, Sven. To appear. Lexicographical and Other e-Tools for Consultation Purposes: Towards the Individualization of Needs Satisfaction. Fuertes-Olivera, Pedro A. and Henning Bergenholtz (Eds.). To appear. *e-Lexicography. The Construction of Internet Dictionaries.*

Welker, Herbert Andreas. 2004. *Dicionários. Uma pequena introdução à lexicografia*. Brasília: Thesaurus.

Welker, Herbert Andreas. 2006. *O Uso de dicionários: Panorama geral das pesquisas empíricas.* Brasília: Thesaurus.

Welker, Herbert Andreas. 2008. *Panorama geral da lexicografia pedagógica*. Brasília: Thesaurus Editora.

Wiegand, Herbert Ernst. 1984. On the Structure and Contents of a General Theory of Lexicography. Hartmann, R.R.K. (Ed.). 1984. *LEXeter '83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9–12 September 1983*: 13-30. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Wiegand, Herbert Ernst (Ed.). 1998. *Perspektiven der pädagogischen Lexikographie des Deutschen. Untersuchungen anhand von* Langenscheidts Großwörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Wiegand, Herbert Ernst (Ed.). 2002. *Perspektiven der pädagogischen Lexikographie des Deutchen II. Untersuchungen anhand des* de Gruyter Wörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Xatara, Claudia and Philippe Humblé (Eds.). 2006. *Tradução e lexicografia pedagógica*. Cadernos de tradução XVIII. Florianópolis: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

Zgusta, Ladislav. 1989. Idle Thoughts of an Idle Fellow; or, Vaticinations on the Learners' Dictionary. Tickoo, Makhan L. (Ed.). 1989. *Learner's Dictionaries: The State of the Art*: 1-9. Singapore: SEAMO Regional Language Centre.

Zöfgen, Ekkehard. 1994. *Lernerwörterbuch in Theorie und Praxis. Ein Beitrag zur Metalexikographie mit besonderer Berücksichtung des Französischen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.