

Where Verb Entries Fail: The Case of *A Dictionary of South African English*

ANNA DZIEMIANKO

School of English, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland

Instytut Filologii Angielskiej, Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza
al. Niepodległości 4, 61-874 Poznań, Poland

danna@ifa.amu.edu.pl

Abstract. Functional labels, analytical definitions and examples in verb entries in *A Dictionary of South African English* are analyzed from the point of view of their capacity for conveying syntactic information. While labels provide explicit information on verb transitivity and examples illustrate the use of verbs, analytical definitions need to be carefully framed in keeping with lexicographic conventions to explain meaning and reflect the syntactic behavior of the words being defined, using not only appropriately chosen genus terms, but also the so-called 'hole'-convention and defining formulas based on semantic primitives. A study of 90 verb entries from the dictionary shows that they are far from complete repositories of congruent syntactic information; some sources of verb syntax are missing from the entries and those present more often than not give contradictory information. Therefore, the dictionary does not seem to offer real assistance in encoding.

Keywords: verb, verb entries, syntax, dictionary, definitions, lexicography, labels

1. Introduction

The aim of this article is to find out whether verb entries in *A Dictionary of South African English* (henceforth DSAE) convey consistent information on the most fundamental property of verbs, i.e. transitivity.¹ The study is divided into two parts. The first, theoretical half provides an overview of basic sources of syntactic information in verb entries, focussing specifically on defining standards which apply to verbs. The second part of the paper presents findings from an analysis of the treatment of verb syntax in DSAE.

¹ This paper refers to the second edition of the dictionary, first published in 1978. Republished in 1980 by OUP in Cape Town, it offers approximately 4,000 entries for headwords which belong to the "unconventional part of the English vocabulary" which originated in, or is specific to, South Africa (DSAE: vii).

2. Sources of verb syntax in entries – an overview

The three most prominent sources of syntactic information in verb entries are discussed below: functional labels, definitions and examples.

2. 1. Functional labels

As Burkhanov points out, functional labels provide grammatical information about lexemes, and stand in stark contrast to usage labels, which represent geographic, social, temporal, stylistic and other limitations on the use of lexical items (1998: 89). There are three functional labels in DSAE, i.e., *vb trans*, *vb intrans* and *vb*. The functional label *vb* is reduced to a part of speech label, as it informs the dictionary user only about the fact that the word looked up is a verb. The first two labels, by contrast, additionally point out the subdivision within the verb category, or the grammatical class to which the verb belongs; that is, they indicate that the verb is transitive or intransitive, respectively. This corroborates Burkhanov's (1998: 89) view that *functional label* is a broader notion than *part of speech label*, because it gives information not only about the part of speech, but also about the grammatical subcategorization of a given lexical item.

2. 2. Definitions

In addition to functional labels, definitions convey syntactic information in DSAE. Two methods of defining are used: defining by synonyms, or – to use Svensén's (1993: 117) words – paraphrases, and analytical definitions, also known as "Aristotelian" (Béjoint 1994: 198) or "true" (Svensén 1993: 120) definitions.² In the former case, the choice of a word closest possible in meaning to the definiendum, or the word being defined, should be such that the syntactic property of the definiendum is shared by the paraphrase. Thus, any verb used as the paraphrase of a transitive verb should be transitive, and of an intransitive verb intransitive (Landau 1989: 141).

Analytical definitions consist of two parts: a genus proximum and differentia specifica. While the former is a hyperonym designating the superordinate class to which the definiendum belongs, the latter specifies the distinctive semantic features of the word being defined which make it semantically different from other lexical items in the same category (Ayto 1983: 89; MacFarquhar, Richards 1983: 113). The basic principle on which the formulation of analytical definitions rests is that they must be substitutable for the words being defined (Jackson 2002: 94,

² Svensén's reference to paraphrases, rather than synonyms, follows from the fact that true synonyms are virtually nonexistent in non-technical language (1993: 117).

Svensén 1993: 118). This, in fact, has immense consequences for their wording: the genus should represent the grammatical category to which the definiendum belongs and share its syntactic properties, i.e. reflect its transitivity. Thus, in the case of intransitive verbs, the genus should be either intransitive, or transitive but then followed by its object, so that the whole chunk can replace the intransitive definiendum in an actual context (Landau 1989: 142). A transitive verb, in turn, requires a transitive genus but without its object, since otherwise the definition could not replace the definiendum in a context where the transitive definiendum already has an object. Alternatively, such a definition can contain a preposition without its object so that the definition is still incomplete (Ilson 1985: 165).³ Either way, in the definition of a transitive verb a 'hole' is needed after a transitive genus or preposition to make room for the object of the definiendum. That is why the convention of the incomplete definition of a transitive verb is known as the 'hole'-convention (Ilson 1985: 165). The following examples, taken from Ilson (1985: 164-166), illustrate this defining technique:

- | | | |
|----------------|---|----------------------------|
| 1) kink | – to form a kink | (intransitive definiendum) |
| 2) kink | – to make a kink in | (transitive definiendum) |
| 3) put | – to place in a specified
position or relationship | (transitive definiendum) |

Clearly, in 1), there is no hole in the definition, and the transitive genus *form* is followed by its object *a kink*. In 2), there is a hole after the transitive preposition *in*, and the hole needs to be filled by the object of the transitive verb *kink* when the definition is inserted into a context. Finally, in 3), the hole for the object of the transitive *put* is present after the transitive genus *place*.

In contrast to the situation where there are no semantic restrictions on the object, illustrated in definitions 2) and 3) above, the typical or only objects of a transitive verb which imposes such restrictions should be allowed for in an analytical definition. More precisely, they should be enclosed in brackets in the hole after the transitive genus to indicate that they do not constitute an integral part of the definition, but just give dictionary users a hint about the (kind of) objects that are necessary, as in the following definition of *draw*:

³ Reference to the objects of prepositions is justified in view of the similarity between the transitivity of verbs and the transitivity of prepositions. In the crudest of terms, transitive prepositions are seen as those which select noun phrases or prepositional phrases as their complements, but cannot have an infinitive or a *that*-clause as a complement. In the valence-conditioned classification of English prepositions, the bare term *preposition* is seen as valence-underspecified (Bannard, Baldwin nd; Kim 2001: 5). In fact, it is even possible to talk of ditransitive prepositions (Kim 2001: 8), a term which is used with reference to verbs (Quirk et al. 1985)

4) **draw** – to play (a cricket ball) with an inclined bat (Ilson 1985: 168).

The use of analytical definitions seems to pose problems in the case of ergative verbs and verbs which allow indefinite object deletion, or, in crude terms, verbs which can be transitive and intransitive in the same meaning. The true nature of these alternations can be properly explained only with reference to semantic and syntactic roles (Fontenelle, Vanandroye 1989: 13). These are juxtaposed in table 1.

Table 1. Relationship between semantic and syntactic roles –
ergativity and indefinite object deletion ⁴

Ergativity	Transitive construction	Surface structure	John	opened	the door
		Syntactic roles	subject	verb	object
		Semantic roles	agent	verb	patient
	Intransitive construction	Surface structure	The door	opened	–
		Syntactic roles	subject	verb	–
		Semantic roles	patient	verb	–
Indefinite object deletion	Transitive construction	Surface structure	He	is eating	an apple
		Syntactic roles	subject	verb	object
		Semantic roles	agent	verb	patient
	Intransitive construction	Surface structure	He	is eating	–
		Syntactic roles	subject	verb	–
		Semantic roles	agent	verb	–

As can be seen from the table, in the ergative alternation, the semantic relationship between the subject and the verb is different for the transitive and the intransitive constructions (Quirk et al. 1985: 1168). In the transitive construction, the agent is the subject, and in the intransitive one the patient. By contrast, in the case of indefinite object deletion, there is no change in the subject-verb relationship, and the subjects in both constructions are agents.

Obviously, transitivity alternations are bound to pose problems to lexicographers, who, using traditional definitions, need to reflect the syntactic subcategorization of the definienda which allow such alternations. In the case of ergative verbs, atomic predicates, or semantic primitives, offer a solution, namely the atomic predicate CAUSE on the one hand, and BECOME, BE or COME on

⁴ Adapted from Fontenelle and Vanandroye (1989: 13) and Quirk et al. (1972: 344).

the other. The semantic primitive CAUSE, representing transitivity, is optional in the case of ergative verbs (Fontenelle, Vanandroye 1989: 19). This implies that the semantic structure of such verbs can be described as follows:

Table 2. Semantic primitives and ergative verbs—an example of *break*⁵

Transitive	Surface structure	<i>He broke the cup</i>
	Semantic composition	CAUSE to BECOME broken
Intransitive	Surface structure	<i>The cup broke</i>
	Semantic composition	BECOME broken
Ergative	Semantic primitives	(CAUSE to) BECOME broken

This relationship is used by lexicographers, who employ lexical representations of semantic primitives in analytical definitions of ergative verbs, and, with their help, indicate the optionality of CAUSE. A number of the lexical representations in question have become standard defining formulas for ergative verbs, e.g., *to (cause to)*, *to (allow to)*, *to (help to)*, *make or become*, *come or bring*. In these formulas, the bracketed verbs as well as *make* and *bring* are lexical representations of CAUSE, and their optionality is signaled by the brackets and the disjunctive conjunction *or*. The following definitions, taken from Fontenelle and Vanandroye (1989), illustrate the application of this defining convention:

5) **change** – to (cause to) become different,

6) **lull** – to come or bring to an end; make or become less active.

Besides, a transitive verb and the passive form of this verb can be used to indicate ergativity, as in:

7) **burn down** – to destroy (a building) or be destroyed by fire (Fontenelle, Vanandroye 1989: 28-29).

Unfortunately, analysis of defining techniques is virtually impossible in the case of verbs which allow indefinite object deletion. While it is stressed that distinct codes or examples should be used to represent transitivity alternation in learners' dictionaries (Cowie 1984: 161-162), no adequate defining policy, applicable to learners' dictionaries or otherwise, seems to have been developed. It appears that putting the object of the definiendum in brackets might offer a solution, as in:

8) **cook** – to prepare (food) for eating by using heat (Svensén 1993: 130).

⁵ Adapted from Fontenelle and Vanandroye (1989: 19).

However, doubts may arise over the syntactic properties of the verb thus defined; it is worth noting that a structurally similar definition in 4) was used to define a transitive verb with restricted objects.⁶

By and large, however, the conventions of defining verbs do allow lexicographers to indicate the transitivity of headwords. Yet it may be doubted if all of them are lucid enough to dictionary users.

2.3. Examples

In addition to functional labels and definitions, examples provide information on verb syntax in dictionaries. Suffice it to say that concrete examples flesh out the constructions coded in functional labels and conveyed more or less abstractly in definitions. Thus, they seem to be the most useful and straightforward sources of verb syntax, as they show, rather than just symbolize or encode, transitive or intransitive patterns.⁷ It appears that even in the case of transitivity alternations, examples can clearly explain their complex nature by showing transitive and intransitive constructions. Indeed, they cannot be underestimated in the case of verbs, since they show in a practical way if and how the structural selection comes to life, and thus provide models to be followed (Bogaards 1996: 309).

This is what Branford herself says about examples in DSAE:

In preparing the dictionary I [...] had access to what must surely be a uniquely varied body of source material. From this have been chosen for their utility, validity, or pure pleasure, the quotations which are the spirit of this text. They have been chosen with love, care, and also laughter; some of them with sorrow or dismay [...] with the two purposes of making the text both useful and readable. (DSAE: vii, xix)

It transpires, then, that not only the usefulness of examples, but many other factors underlay the selection of verbal illustration from what would today be called a *corpus*. It may thus be worthwhile to see whether examples in verb entries in DSAE are indeed reliable as sources of verb syntax. An attempt to answer this question is made in the next section, where the corresponding reliability of the dictionary's functional labels and definitions is studied as well.

⁶ In the analysis of verb entries in DSAE, such definitions were seen as representing a restricted object of a transitive verb. This decision is justified by the discussion in the literature on the subject cited in this section, especially in view of the lack of any extensive account of the methodology of dealing with indefinite object deletion in dictionary definitions.

⁷ This claim has been proved empirically by Bogaards and Van der Kloot (2001, 2002) and Dziemianko (2006).

3. Verb transitivity and DSAE

3.1. A few words about DSAE

DSAE was compiled with the intention of satisfying the needs of “South Africans of all racial groups, including the English speaker with an interest in how much and in what way his language has permeated that of his English-speaking countryman. Secondly, it is for the stranger within our gates, tourist or immigrant [. . .] Thirdly, [. . .] for the overseas student of South African literature” (DSAE: xvii). Judging by the users at whom the book is targeted, it seems that the dictionary is supposed to be useful not only in decoding, although this appears to be its primary function. After all, incomers, as opposed to students of literature, not only need to understand the language, but also to be able to communicate in it. Thus, they might wish to use the dictionary also as an aid in encoding. Importantly, information on how to use verbs, or the knowledge of their syntax, is essential in language production; verbs are the crucial words in sentences as their complementation properties determine the structure of any sentences in which they occur.

Manfred Görlach considers DSAE to be compiled with “exemplary care: the selection of headwords, their pronunciation, meaning and usage labels, provenance and alternative expressions are accompanied by skillfully chosen quotations, with source and date” (1990: 1488). The front matter points out that apart from the thorough macro- and microstructure that the dictionary offers, this work of reference, “like all dictionaries, is intended to be useful; but unlike many, it is intended also to give pleasure and amusement” (DSAE: vii). Apart from the element of humor, which no doubt adds some variety to the book, DSAE contains notes on the usage of words, which are said to be extremely helpful.⁸ The fact that it provides comparison of the use and meaning of words in South African English with other languages and their varieties is seen as praiseworthy as well (Gouws 1999: 273). Interestingly, the dictionary was based on the linguistic material sampled in an attempt to document and define South African English (Prinsloo, Pienaar 2006: 543). One of the aims of the project, pioneered in 1968 by William Branford, was the compilation of a dictionary containing South Africanisms in English (Gouws 1999: 273). Still, DSAE, whose publication meant the achievement of this goal, is also said to have been the forerunner of a larger dictionary of the OED type, i.e. *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles* (1989), edited by William Branford (Görlach 1990: 1488).

In what follows, an attempt is made to see whether the microstructures in DSAE give consistent information about verb transitivity. Thus, the correspondence

⁸ The mere presence of usage notes implies that the dictionary does not serve receptive purposes only.

between the three sources of syntactic information discussed above is subjected to scrutiny.

3.2. Procedure and methodology

To achieve the aim of this paper, the dictionary was carefully read twice, and all verbs found were analyzed, excepting those which were components of fixed phrases, sayings or idioms, as well as verbs, verb senses and phrasal verbs which were not given a separate entry. Altogether, 90 verb entries were analyzed.⁹ Functional labels, definitions and examples found in the entries were studied from the point of view of the transitivity information they convey. As a result, 24 patterns emerged. Detailed findings are collated in table 4 in the appendix. Each pattern consists of three parts separated by forward slashes, and can be represented symbolically as: (1)/(2)/(3). The first part indicates what information on transitivity is given by the functional label in a given verb entry. The second part of the pattern, placed between the forward slashes, shows whether the definition in the entry implies that the verb is transitive or intransitive. Finally, the last component of the pattern reveals the verb sub-categorization as shown in the example(s) found further in the entry. As for the symbols used in the patterns, the letters *f*, *d* and *e* in lower case stand for *functional label*, *definition* and *examples*, respectively. Transitivity and intransitivity, in turn, are designated by the letters *T* and *I* in upper case. Additionally, some patterns include a question mark (?) and/or an ampersand (&). The former is used when the functional label does not provide information on transitivity, but only on part of speech. The latter is added to any source of information within a given entry – (1), (2) or (3) – which indicates that the verb in question is both transitive and intransitive in the same meaning. When a particular source of syntactic information is not present in an entry, the absence is represented by the word *NO*.¹⁰

The symbolic value of the patterns can be best shown by means of specific verb entries from DSAE. These are given below together with the patterns assigned to them in the course of the analysis:

bell *vb trans. colloq.* To ring someone up on the telephone ... OK so we'll fix it for Saturday night then. I'll bell some of the chicks meanwhile and organize the graze. *Darling* 1.9.76 [**fT/dI/eT**]

⁹ The fact that not all verbs or verb senses in the dictionary were considered here accounts for the difference between the number of verbs referred to in the present paper and estimated by Dziemianko (in press). For example, if a noun and a homographic verb were given one (sub)entry, the (sub)entry was ignored for the present analysis, but counted in Dziemianko (in press).

¹⁰ In the case of examples, *NO* was also used when examples were not altogether absent from an entry, but, surprisingly, do not illustrate the use of the verbs defined.

call *vb. trans. Afr. E and Ind. E.* To invite ... Why will people go to shebeens to buy liquor at inflated prices for cash even when bottle stores are open? Why not buy it and call friends if they need company and drink at their homes. *Daily Dispatch* 21.10.71 [fT/dT/eT]

kurvey *vb. intrans. obs.* To convey goods by oxwagon, usu. over long distances, from the coast up country ... according to local legend a kar-weier of the early days, an English transport rider nicknamed John Bull, drove his horse too hard up that hill, so that it died. Green *These Wonders* 1959 [fI/dI/eNO]

offsaddle *vb. trans. and intrans.* To unsaddle a horse, also to break a journey ... At the foot of the garden Jan Botha offsaddled his horse, knee-haltering it and allowing it to stumble away in search of grazing. Brett Young *Seek a Country* 1937

... here, there, and everywhere, riding, fighting, retiring, advancing, saddling up and offsaddling. Cloete *Rags of Glory* 1963 [fT&I/dI/eT&I]

normalize *vb.* To make non-racial ... Now Rhodes normalizes rugby ... the club's officers would not enter into any discussions ... about the colour issue ... the decision to normalize rugby at Rhodes is merely in accordance with the spirit of the present policy of the South African Rugby Board ... Commenting on the decision to go non-racial, Rhodes rugby coach ... said 'I'm very excited about the latest developments.' *Oppidan* Mar. 1977 [f?/dT/eT]

skrik *n and vb ... 2.* To frighten or be frightened ... The Britstown Era comes out with ... 'THE DREAD MESSENGER' ... The Era should be more careful about 'schrikking' folks. *Grahamstown Journ.* 10.9.1892 [f?/dT&I/eT]

smokkel *vb slang prob. reg. Cape.* To deal in illicit liquor ... 'We know that you smokkel here!' the cop snapped ... Muller Whitey 1977 [f?/dI/eI]

As can be seen from the entries, identification of the grammatical subcategory of the verbs is quite easy on the basis of the functional labels that follow the headwords. Yet, sometimes, they are not detailed enough and fail to supply basic information on verb transitivity, as in the case of *normalize*, *skrik* or *smokkel*. Definitions were analyzed from the point of view of the defining conventions outlined above. Thus, a transitive genus accompanied by its object as well as a preposition followed by its object were taken to indicate that the verbs being defined are intransitive (*bell*, *kurvey*, *offsaddle*, *smokkel*). The definitions of *call* and *normalize* include transitive genus terms (*invite* and *make*, respectively), which are not followed by any objects. The holes in the definitions thus make room for the objects of the verbs, which implies that the headwords are transitive. The definition of *skrik*, in turn, shows the use of one of the formulas mentioned in

section 2.2, which suggests the ergativity of the definiendum. While the grammatical sub-categorization of verbs was usually easy to recognize from the examples given in entries, they had to be read very carefully as some of them illustrate the uses of other semantically related parts of speech, but not verbs. The example in the entry for *kurvey* instantiates this inconsistency.

3.3. Findings

The analysis of verb entries in DSAE makes it possible to draw conclusions as to the congruence between functional labels, definitions and examples as sources of syntactic information. To make the picture clearer, table 3 offers the patterns identified in the analysis along with their frequency, sorted separately by the patterns themselves and frequency. The cells referring to patterns where all three sources indicate the same verb subcategorization are highlighted in bold.

Table 3. Congruence between functional labels, definitions and examples

Pattern	Frequency	Pattern	Frequency
fT/dT/eT	21	fT/dT/eT	21
fT/dI/eT	17	fT/dT/eNO	1
fI/dI/eI	8	fT/dT/eI	1
fT&I/dI/eT	5	fT/dT&I/eT	1
fI/dT/eI	4	fT/dI/eT&I	1
f?/dT/eT	5	fT/dI/eT	17
fT/dI/eNO	3	fT/dI/eNO	3
fI/dI/eNO	3	fT&I/dT/eT	3
fT&I/dT/eT	3	fT&I/dT/eI	1
fT/dT&I/eT	1	fT&I/dI/eT&I	3
fT/dI/eT&I	1	fT&I/dI/eT	5
fI/dT/eNO	2	fT&I/dI/eI	2
fT&I/dI/eT&I	3	fI/dT/eNO	2
fT&I/dI/eI	2	fI/dT/eI	4
f?/dT/eI	2	fI/dT&I/eNO	1
f?/dI/eI	2	fI/dT&I/eI	1
fT/dT/eNO	1	fI/dNO/eI	1
fT/dT/eI	1	fI/dI/eNO	3
fI/dT&I/eNO	1	fI/dI/eI	8
fI/dT&I/eI	1	f?/dT/eT	5
fI/dNO/eI	1	f?/dT/eNO	1
fT&I/dT/eI	1	f?/dT/eI	2
?/dT/eNO	1	f?/dT&I/eT	1
?/dT&I/eT	1	f?/dI/eI	2
TOTAL	90	TOTAL	90

As can be seen from table 3, in only about one fifth of all the verbs analyzed do the three sources in an entry categorize the headwords as transitive verbs.¹¹ In almost as many, however, definitions stand out from the rest, and, unlike labels and examples, imply that the verbs are intransitive. For intransitive verbs, the degree of congruity between all three sources of syntactic information is over two and a half times smaller than for transitive ones. Altogether, only about one third of all entries analyzed are perfectly unequivocal when it comes to the syntactic information on verb transitivity that the three sources within the microstructures supply.

It is also important to note that when labels indicate that a verb can be transitive and intransitive in the same meaning (*T&I*), the verb then tends to be defined intransitively rather than transitively (10 vs. 4 cases). When the label leads dictionary users to expect a transitive verb, the chances of their finding a definition suggesting transitivity are almost equal to those of their dealing with a definition which implies intransitivity (23 vs. 21 instances, respectively). The information on intransitivity suggested by the label tends to be confirmed in the definition, although instances where the definition in such cases supplies only contradictory information are not infrequent, either (11 vs. 6). Verbs whose labels do not betray their subcategory tend to be defined transitively.

When it comes to examples, they, as a rule, concur with their transitive labels and illustrate transitive uses of the verbs thus labeled (39 instances). Also in the case of verbs labeled transitive and intransitive, examples usually show their use as transitive verbs (8 out of 14). Likewise, intransitive labels tend to be supported by examples (14 out of 20). However, when the label does not imply any predictions as to the verb's subcategory, examples offer little help, as they indicate transitivity almost as often as intransitivity (6 vs. 4). When it comes to congruity between the information on verb syntax conveyed by definitions and examples irrespective of the information found in functional labels, it is higher in the case of transitive verbs than intransitive ones (29 vs. 12 cases). Intransitive definitions are more often accompanied by transitive examples than transitive definitions by intransitive examples (22 vs. 8). In 11 instances – that is, in almost one eighth of all the cases analyzed – entries do not offer any adequate examples. Interestingly, there are as many cases (i.e. 11) where functional labels are insufficient sources of rudimentary verb syntax.

3.4. Discussion

It transpires that verb entries in DSAE leave a lot to be desired when it comes to information on transitivity. Their incompleteness, manifested in the absence of

¹¹ In the following discussion, only instances where the sources in question leave no doubt as to the verb category are referred to, unless clearly indicated otherwise. In other words, in the symbolic representation of these examples there is no ampersand or question mark.

examples and functional labels, as well as the contradictory information they provide, may confuse dictionary users. Surprisingly enough, the three sources of verb syntax examined above supply perfectly congruent information in only one out of three verb entries. Thus, the message on transitivity to be found in the dictionary rarely reflects an objective property of verbs, but is far too often determined by users' reference skills and consultation habits. Unfortunately, it is likely that when faced with the same verb entry, different users will draw contradictory conclusions as to the transitivity of the verb, depending on where they look. It seems that any dictionary, irrespective of its target user group, should not allow for such discrepant information to be inferred from a single micro-structure. It is quite difficult to account for the shortcomings of verb entries in DSAE. They may result from underplaying the potentially productive function of the dictionary, which does not seem to offer very reliable help in encoding. Additionally, definition itself may not have been given enough attention, as verb definitions are largely out of keeping with the requirements that should underpin their formulation. It is obvious that the dictionary was prepared with meticulous and praiseworthy care. Yet the analysis of verb entries suggests that insufficient effort was put into making the details within each entry compatible. While the study may hopefully encourage similar analyses of other dictionaries, it should be borne in mind that DSAE was compiled at a time when the computer was not used in lexicography as much as is the case nowadays. Thus, assuring perfect congruity of all the components of a verb entry was no doubt much more demanding and harder work than it is today.¹²

Finally, it should be stressed that the selection of the material for analysis in the present study, performed conscientiously and without any bias whatsoever, was done manually. Bearing in mind the fallibility of the human senses, a similar analysis should be performed on the basis of a set of verb entries chosen automatically from the dictionary in digital form. Only then would the results of the analysis leave no doubt as to their accuracy. Still, the fact that the material was selected from the whole dictionary makes it possible to expect a great degree of concurrence between the findings yielded by an automated procedure and those presented above.

¹² Still, even today, definitions in learners' dictionaries of English, for example, largely diverge from the standard requirements discussed above (Dziemianko: 2007), and mismatches between codes and examples are by no means a relic of the past either (Dziemianko 2005: 97-100). Such findings tone down the criticism of DSAE, as learners' dictionaries are designed specifically to help their users also with production (Cowie 1983: 136, Huang 1985: 54, Jain 1981: 274).

5. Appendix

Table 4. Verb entries and the congruence of syntactic information given by functional labels, definitions and examples in DSAE

Syntactic features and sources	Verb (senses)	No
fT/dT/eT	abba, ask, assegai, becreep, call, laager, lend, let, make, moera, neuk, offload1, pick out, plak, sjambok, sleep, sluk, toor, tramp, verneuk, worry	21
fT/dT/eNO	sny1	1
fT/dT/eI	bake	1
fT/dT&I/eT	commandeer	1
fT/dI/eT&I	offload2	1
fT/dI/eT	ban, bell, braak, kneehalter, kraal, pack in, pack out, riempie, scare, smaak, smear, smell out, sny2, stellenbosch, stick, vlek, zone	17
fT/dI/eNO	pik, smoor, steek	3
fI/dT/eNO	learn2, scoff	2
fI/dT/eI	maffick, skinder, upsaddle, vry	4
fI/dT&I/eNO	learn1	1
fI/dT&I/eI	kuier	1
fI/dNO/eI	divorce	1
fI/dI/eNO	kurvey, smous(e), waai	3
fI/dI/eI	brom, scandal, sleep1, spog, stay, sukkel, vrek, woel	8
fT&I/dT/eT	hunt, skop, spoor	3
fT&I/dT/eI	skoffel	1
fT&I/dI/eT&I	braai, offsaddle, outspan	3
fT&I/dI/eT	inspan1, inspan3, keer, skel, spook	5
fT&I/dI/eI	inpsan2, trek	2
f?/dT/eT	looi, normalize, ops, slag, skit	5
f?/dT/eNO	zoll2	1
f?/dT/eI	raak, skinder1	2
f?/dT&I/eT	skrik2	1
f?/dI/eI	smokkel, span3	2
TOTAL		90

Bibliography

- Ayto, James. 1983. "On Specifying Meaning." Ed. Reinhard R. K. Hartmann. 89-98.
- Bannard, Baldwin. n.d. "Distributional Models of Preposition Semantics." *Proceedings of the ACL-SIGSEM Workshop on the Linguistic Dimensions of Prepositions and their Use in Computational Linguistics Formalisms and Applications, Toulouse, France*. 4 Dec. 2006 <lingo.stanford.edu/pubs/tbaldwin/sigsemprep2003-prepsem.pdf>.
- Béjoint, Henri. 1994. *Tradition and Innovation in Modern English Dictionaries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bogaards, Paul. 1996. "Dictionaries for Learners of English." *International Journal of Lexicography* 9: 277-320.
- Bogaards, Paul, and Willem. A. Van der Kloot. 2001. "The Use of Grammatical Information in Learners' Dictionaries." *International Journal of Lexicography* 14.2: 97-121.
- . 2002. "Verb Constructions in Learners' Dictionaries." *Proceedings of the Tenth Euralex International Congress, Euralex 2002, Copenhagen, Denmark, August 12-17, 2002*. Eds Anna Braasch, and Claus Povlsen. Vol.2. Copenhagen: Center for Sprogteknologi, Copenhagen University. 747-757.
- Bransford, Jean. 1980. *A Dictionary of South African English: New Enlarged Edition [DSAE]*. 2nd ed. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Burkhanov, Igor. 1998. *Lexicography: A Dictionary of Basic Terminology*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej.
- Cowie, Anthony P. 1983. "The Pedagogical/Learner's Dictionary: English Dictionaries for the Foreign Learner." Ed. Reinhard R. K. Hartmann. 135-144.
- . 1984. "EFL Dictionaries: Past Achievements and Present Needs." *LEXeter'83 Proceedings: Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 1983*. Ed. Reinhard R. K. Hartmann. *Lexicographica Series Maior* 1. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 153-164.
- Dziemianko, Anna. 2005. "Encoded Syntactic Information on Verbs in Monolingual English Learners' Dictionaries: Distribution in the Microstructure and Congruity with Illustrative Material." *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* LII 1/2005: 89-105.
- . 2006. *User-friendliness of Verb Syntax in Pedagogical Dictionaries of English*. *Lexicographica Series Maior* 130. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- . 2007. "The Analytical Definition in Monolingual English Learners' Dictionaries as a Vehicle for Syntactic Information on Verbs: A Diachronic Perspective." *Language and Meaning: Cognitive and Functional Perspectives*. Ed. Małgorzata Fabiszak. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 63-89.
- . In press. "On the non-Africanness of *A Dictionary of South African English*." *Philologica Wratislaviensia* 1.
- Fontenelle, Thierry, and Jocelyne Vanandroye. 1989. "Retrieving Ergative Verbs from a Lexical Database." *Dictionaries* 11: 11-39.
- Görlach, Manfred. 1990. "The Dictionary of Transplanted Varieties of Languages: English." *Wörterbücher, Dictionaries, Dictionnaires: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*. Eds Franz Josef Hausmann, Oskar Reichmann, Herbert Ernst Wiegand, and Ladislav Zgusta. Vol. 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 1475-1499.

- Gouws, Rufus H. 1999. "Situating *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles* within a more Comprehensive Lexicographic Process." *Lexicos* 9: 269-282.
- Hartmann, Reinhard R. K., ed. 1983. *Lexicography: Principles and Practice*. London: Academic Press.
- Huang, G. F. 1985. "The Productive Use of EFL Dictionaries." *Regional English Language Centre Journal* 16: 54-71.
- Ilson, Robert. 1985. "The Linguistic Significance of Some Lexicographic Conventions." *Applied Linguistics* 6: 162-172.
- Jackson, Howard. 2002. *Lexicography: An Introduction*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Jain, Mahavir. 1981. "On Meaning in the Foreign Learner's Dictionary." *Applied Linguistics* 2: 274-286.
- Kim, Jong-Bok. 19 Nov. 2001. "On the Types of Prepositions and Their Projections in Syntax." 4 Dec.2006 <<http://web.khu.ac.kr/~jongbok/research/final-papers/preposition.pdf>>.
- Landau, Sidney. 1989. *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- MacFarquhar, Peter D., and Jack C. Richards. 1983. "On Dictionaries and Definitions." *Regional English Language Centre Journal* 14: 111-124.
- Prinsloo D. J, and L. Pienaar. 2006. "South African Lexicography." *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Ed. Keith Brown. 2nd ed. n. p.: Elsevier. 543-544.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- _____. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, New York: Longman.
- Svensén, Bo. 1993. *Practical Lexicography: Principles and Methods of Dictionary-making*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.