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An overview of Wiegand’s metalexicographic works

1. Introduction

In 1977, Denisov (2003: 70)\(^1\) stated:

The founder of lexicographic theory is Lev Vladimirovich Shcherba, who [...] in 1940, published an extensive essay, “Towards a general theory of lexicography”. [...] The first version of this essay was devoted to the basic types of dictionaries, an issue that was considered by Shcherba to be the focal point of lexicographic theory. Unfortunately, other studies he had planned never appeared in print. Leontij V. Kopetskij writes that Shcherba intended to devote other essays to the nature of the word, its meaning and usage and its collocations, as well as the structure of the dictionary entry together with the semantic, grammatical and stylistic analysis of words.

As can be seen, Shcherba (or Sčerba) published only one essay, and even in his planned papers just one topic – i.e. the structure of the dictionary entry – is a metalexicographic issue.


Of course there are many other authors who wrote long general introductions or numerous papers on specific topics, but no metalexicographer has published so much as Herbert Ernst Wiegand.

Smit (2002: 295) claims: “Nowadays Wiegand’s terms are widely used in dictionary research.” However, in reality, despite his immense production, Wiegand is not much cited and not even widely known internationally.\(^3\) The reasons may be the following:

a) Most of his works are written in German.
b) Those few that were translated into English (mostly new versions of German papers) were published in books or journals not easily available worldwide.\(^4\)
c) Many of his papers are very long, complex, extremely detailed and even complicated.
d) Wiegand introduces a great number of new terms and often refers to terms which he had defined in earlier articles. The same is true for abbreviations and acronyms.

---

\(^1\) His paper, written in Russian, was translated into English by Victoria Panchuk. I quote from this English version published in 2003.

\(^2\) Hausmann (1989a) is the shorter French version of Hausmann (1989). In both papers the author gives a brief but comprehensive survey on the history of metalexicography since the 17th century.

\(^3\) For example, although Wiegand wrote several articles on research into dictionary use, and more than 800 pages of Wiegand (1998) are devoted to this theme, he is quoted in relatively few of the more than 200 existing empirical studies.

\(^4\) Apart from the book *Semantics and Lexicography. Selected Studies* (Wiegand 1999) approximatey 12 of his papers have been published in an English version. In recent years appeared one article in French, two in Italian, one in Slovene, and two in Spanish.
Smit (ibid.: 292) remarks:

One of Wiegand’s favourite approaches is to construct his arguments by looking critically at the work of other scholars, using citations from their work, in many cases to refute or correct their arguments. [...] He then usually engages in complicated reasoning, finding solutions and making suggestions on which he can build his comprehensive theory of lexicography.

As to the fact that he mostly wrote in German, Wiegand himself, in a lecture given in English, explained:

The written version [...] will be published in German. The reason for this is that I do not regard it to be my task to develop a metalexicographic technical language for the English language. In my opinion, this seems rather to be the task of those colleagues whose native language is English.

And in that German version he revealed that he had had some painful experiences in the case of the translations of ten of his papers (Wiegand 1998a: 1).

This paper aims to make Wiegand better known among (meta)lexicographers worldwide because it is unthinkable that the most important theorist of lexicography be ignored.

2. Some facts and figures

When, in 2006 at the University of Stellenbosch, South Africa, he was awarded the third title of Doctor Honoris Causa (the other ones had been conferred on him in Denmark and Bulgaria), the commendatio, published in Lexikos 16, p. 290-292, began with the following considerations:

Herbert Ernst Wiegand, professor emeritus at the University of Heidelberg in Germany, has made an immense contribution over the years to theoretical lexicography, Germanic studies and linguistics.

In lexicographic research, he has played a leading role in the establishment of a comprehensive and complex theory that offers lexicographers from all language groups a model for the compilation of dictionaries.

As a scientist, Wiegand has made a contribution of unparalleled scope. His impressive list of publications bears testimony to this contribution, particularly his magnum opus, the book Wörterbuchforschung, and the most comprehensive contribution to the broader field of linguistics, the authoritative reference series, Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft, which was established by him.

As research manager he initiated the journal Lexicographica and the book series Lexicographica Series Maior, which contains more than a a hundred books for the subject specialist. He compiled the book series Studien zur neuhochdeutschen Lexikographie, Wörterbücher in der Diskussion and Studien zur zweisprachigen Lexikographie mit Deutsch, and is a founding member of the book series Reihe Germanistische Linguistik, a series in which more than 260 books have already been published.

This quotation shows that Wiegand’s activity, for instance as founder and/or editor or co-editor of book series and journals (all of them published in Germany), has been extraordinary. And Wiegand has been co-editor of two more journals not mentioned in the above quotation: Germanistische Linguistik („Germanic Linguistics“) and Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik („Journal of Germanic Linguistics“).
In 2003 he began to plan – together with Stefan J. Schierholz – the publication of a series of specialized dictionaries: *Wörterbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft* (“Dictionaries of linguistics and communication science”). These will be organized according to the general conception of “learning and consultation dictionaries”.\(^5\)

So far I mentioned Wiegand’s activity as a co-editor (or sole editor) of journals and book series. But he has been as well the co-editor or editor of a great amount (about 40) of single books or of single volumes of some of the mentioned series.

As to his own publications, there is a list in the internet – updated until 2005 – of 424 (!), which are divided into various types, such as: essay, monograph, handbook article, review, dictionary introduction, preface, bibliography, discussion, protocol. Some of these 424 publications are short, but many of them have an extension of more than 50 pages, and several essays occupy more than 100 pages (cf. http://www.gs.uni-heidelberg.de/sprache2/hew_publ.htm).

Wiegand is a linguist who began his career as lexicologist and semanticist. Thus quite a few of the cited publications do not belong to metalexicography. However, Werner Wolski elaborated a special list of Wiegand’s publications on “lexicography and dictionary research”, from 1973 to 2007, and these amount to 242 items (cf. Wiegand 2006). His original papers are slightly less numerous, since translations and republications of them were included in the list, too. Anyway, if one summed up the number of pages of all his original metalexicographic publications, the result would show that no one else wrote so much about dictionaries.

In 1999 was published the book *Semantics and Lexicography. Selected Studies (1976-1996)*, in which the translations of nine of Wiegand’s articles were gathered. The title makes clear the author’s interest in semantics, but all papers deal with dictionaries.

In 2000, Matthias Kammerer and Werner Wolski joined, in a two-volume publication, “37 of Wiegand’s articles written over a span of 30 years” (Smit 2002: 291) and gave a 21-page introduction (cf. Wiegand 2000). The papers in this collection are mostly, but not only about metalexicographic issues.\(^6\)

The following quotation once more shows the extension and diversity of Wiegand’s interests and work:

[Kammerer and Wolski] strive to disclose Wiegand’s connections with research traditions in linguistics by selecting articles that demonstrate the developments which took place in dictionary research and Wiegand’s positioning of himself within the wider field of linguistics (Kammerer and Wolski 2000: X-XII). For example, during the 1970s he developed arguments with regard to the use of semantic features and theories about the so-called “lexicographic definition”, in the process making use of many references to the work of other linguists. Kammerer and Wolski (2000: XXX) also remind the reader that Wiegand’s most recent works link up with newer conceptions in the philosophy of linguistics, the cognitive sciences and cognitive psychology (frames, scripts, scenarios, prototypes, stereotypes, etc.). (Smit ibid.: 291 et seq.)

---

\(^5\) One of these works will be the *Wörterbuch zur Lexikographie und Wörterbuchforschung* (“Dictionary of lexicography and dictionary research”), which had begun to be planned in 1999 and will contain about 8,000 lemmas (cf. http://www.fabulex.de/), many of them terms introduced by Wiegand.

\(^6\) The German title means “Small Writings”, but most of the articles comprise more than 30 pages, some of them more than 50, 70, 90 and even 100 pages.
3. Brief “summaries” of Wiegand’s early metalexicographic works

The word *summaries* is in quotation marks because it is impossible to summarize long essays in one or two paragraphs. I must limit myself to briefly indicate the general contents of Wiegand’s longer metalexicographic essays, citing very few of the numerous terms he mostly introduces. I chose his earlier works to show that he has been constructing his theory for a long time. In order to facilitate the comprehension (for those who do not understand German), an English translation of the German titles will be given, mostly in footnotes. In three of those cases in which I did not read the cited article, I will quote Smit (2002). In the case of very long essays (more than 100 pages) the number of pages will be indicated.

In the first of his works on dictionaries (Wiegand 1976):

Wiegand argues that a dictionary user will not be able to use a word in a dictionary without some extra-linguistic knowledge (or encyclopedic knowledge) of the entity to which the word refers. That is why lexical paraphrases in monolingual dictionaries should not be based solely on the analysis of semantic. Lexical paraphrases should also inform dictionary users of the “extension” (p. 133, note 22), or encyclopedic aspects, of a word to enable them to use the particular word appropriately and in the right context(s), according to the usual semantic rules.

(Smit ibid: 296)

His preoccupation with the user continued in his next two articles (Wiegand 19778, Wiegand 1977a9), which again dealt only with monolingual (German) dictionaries. In both of them he called for a “sociology of the dictionary user” and thus for empirical studies, because in order to write better entries/articles, lexicographers must know who consults which dictionary in what kinds of situations of use (cf. Wiegand 1977a: 61). He enumerated some questions that should be asked in user surveys and then subdivided some possible situations of use – which all are caused by some kind of “conflict”. For instance, one conflict type is “disturbance in the reading of a text due to the unknown sense of a word”. Finally he made recommendations for the writing of “lexical paraphrases” or “semantic comments” (terms which Wiegand prefers to “definition”) and gave some examples. Everything is very detailed, and he introduced – as he would do very often – symbols and terms. The two articles deal with the same topics but are quite different from one another.

---

7 “Synonymy and its role in monolingual lexicography”
8 “Some fundamental semantic-pragmatic aspects of dictionary articles. A contribution to practical lexicology”. In German, the term used for (dictionary) *entry* is (Wörterbuch) *Artikel*, so that in some English translations and papers the word *article* is used. And since this will be the translation of *Artikel* in the “Dictionary of Lexicography and Dictionary Research”, I will employ the term from now on.
9 “Thinking about dictionaries: Current problems”.
10 In Wiegand (1976: 162) he had already made a similar remark in a note (cf. Wiegand 1984: 23).
In Wiegand (1981)\textsuperscript{11} – one of the very long articles – the author discussed and explained the term \textit{pragmatic information}, gave examples of such information in German dictionaries and critically commented these examples. He also wrote again about the term \textit{lexicographic definition}, which he considered inadequate (p. 157-164). According to Wiegand, pragmatic information in dictionaries include all those kinds of information that are not semantic or grammatical, e.g. encyclopedic information (p. 144). But the major part of the essay deals with the "pragmatic marking" of lexemes (a term which he preferred to others, like \textit{connotaton} or \textit{socio-stylistic characteristic}), i.e. with the fact that lexemes are situation-specific. The information about this fact may be prescriptive or descriptive, it may be given not only in the form of symbols ("diacritical signs") or indications of use (which in English are mostly called \textit{labels}) – both types belonging to a closed list – but also in "open pragmatic comments". The author discussed these in more detail, analysing examples in German dictionaries and making suggestions for improvements (p. 184ss.). Finally he mentioned that information about pragmatic marking may appear in lexicographic examples and that, to a certain extent, it may even be hidden in the indication of the source of examples (e.g. if the source is the Bible).

In Wiegand (1983)\textsuperscript{12} the author, stating that 40 years after Sčerba a general theory of lexicography was still lacking, expressed his ideas about it, giving some general answers to the following questions: 1) Is lexicography a science? 2) What is the scientific object of a general theory of lexicography. 3) How is its structure and what are its central contents? 4) How can one proceed when wishing to construct such a theory? 5) What is its utility? (p. 92) The author distinguished practical lexicography (the elaboration of dictionaries) from a general theory of lexicography, which can contribute to the production of better dictionaries (p. 98). He divided that general theory into four parts: a general part, a theory of organization, a theory of lexicographic research on language, and a theory of the lexicographic description of language. (p. 99) In the first part, the general theory will deal with the relation between lexicography and society, with other theories and with the history of lexicography. In the second part, the organization of lexicographic work should be discussed. The third part would be a theory of how lexicographic data are to be obtained and prepared. The fourth part should enable the lexicographer to write articles\textsuperscript{13} with an adequate text structure. It would consist of a typology of dictionaries and a textual theory for lexicographic texts (different types of dictionaries ask for different kinds of texts). Wiegand then enumerated some questions which such a text theory would have to answer. (p. 106) He introduced the terms \textit{lexicographic text element} and \textit{lexicographic building stone} and defined \textit{dictionary article} as “an ordered set of lexicographic text elements and/or building stones, in which the building stone ‘lemma’ is obligatory” (p. 109).

The contents of Wiegand (1983a)\textsuperscript{14} is very similar to that of Wiegand (1983), but the author discussed in more detail the question “What is lexicography?” (p. 36-42). He did not agree with those for whom exist a practical and a theoretical lexicography, and he

\textsuperscript{11} “Pragmatic information in dictionaries of contemporary German. A contribution to practical lexicology”; 133 pages.
\textsuperscript{12} “First steps to a general theory of lexicography”.
\textsuperscript{13} Cf. the remark on the term \textit{article} in note 8.
\textsuperscript{14} “Reflections on a theory of the lexicographic description of language”
concluded: “Lexicography is a scientific praxis which pursues the aim that dictionaries come into being” (p. 42). In the second part of the article he expressed again his ideas on a theory of lexicography, as in Wiegand 1983.

In Wiegand (1983b) he distinguished between “dictionary article” (Artikel) and “dictionary entry” (Eintrag). According to his definition, an entry is “any lexicographic text segment which is either part of the article or – when the dictionary does not contain articles, but only lemmas – part of a lemma”. Thus, entry may refer to a (lexicographic) text element, text building stone, a chain of text elements, a chain of text building stones or a chain of text elements and text building stones (p. 403 et seq.). Then he discussed the definitions of lemma (or its equivalents in various languages) given by several authors, differentiated five ways in which the language in the dictionary is used (in his opinion the distinction between object language and metalanguage is insufficient), and introduced and/or defined more than fifty (!) terms referring to facts that have to do with the lemma.

Wiegand (1984) is his first essay written in English. As the title suggests, it deals with the same topic as Wiegand (1983, 1983a). In his opinion the term lexicography refers only to the elaboration of dictionaries, whereas “writing on lexicography is part of metalexicography” (p. 13), which comprises four areas: the history of lexicography, a general theory of lexicography, research on dictionary use, and criticism of dictionaries (p. 15). By lexicography he meant “linguistic lexicography” about which he stated:

All types of works made with the aim of providing not only, but above all, information on linguistic expressions should be classified as linguistic lexicography. They would include at least the following types: dictionaries of language, glossaries, concordances and word indexes [...]. (p. 13 et seq.)

After repeating what he had said earlier about a general theory of lexicography, he discussed in more detail than in 1977 the “so-called lexicographic definition” (p. 17 et seq.). His main argument against the use of the term definition was:

At all events the activities of the lexicographer when explaining the meaning of a lemma-sign, and in particular the results of these activities, show a greater similarity to the explanations of meaning given by speakers in everyday dialogue than to the procedures and definitions of natural and social scientists defining expressions belonging to academic and scientific usage and thereby creating technical terms. (p. 17)

Another argument was that a definition should consist of definiendum and definiens, whereas many metalexicographers consider – erroneously – only the definiens as the definition (p. 19).

Wiegand pointed to “similarities between contextual paraphrases of meaning in everyday dialogues and so-called dictionary definitions” and, as he had done earlier already, substituted the term lexicographic definition by lexicographic explanation of meaning. Such explanations may consist of simple synonyms or of lexical paraphrases, like

---

15 “What is a lemma? A contribution to a theory of the lexicographic description of language”.

16 It is obvious – but should be emphasized – that this sense of entry is quite different from that in which the term generally is used in English metalexicographic texts and dictionaries.

17 “On the structure and contents of a general theory of lexicography”.

8
“yellow, oval citrus fruit tapering at both ends [...]” for lemon (p. 20). Of course the explanations refer to the usual meaning, i.e. the meaning a lexical unit has in “usual texts” or “usual contexts” (p. 24). As to the lexical paraphrases, the question is what predicates belong in them. Wiegand reported a kind of test in which he had asked 100 students to choose among 21 expressions those which they thought most appropriate for using in a lexical paraphrase of lemon. The predicates chosen by 75% of the informants were considered “candidates for identifying a class of objects”, in that case, lemons (p. 27).

I already mentioned the author’s preoccupation with the dictionary user. In Wiegand (1985) he began to deal with the issue empirical studies on dictionary use. In the main part of his long essay he first (p. 42-58) introduced and defined terms concerning the aim of dictionary use (e.g. appropriate use), the user (e.g. potential user, well-informed user, learned user) and situations of use (which occur when there is either a “specific conflict of communication” or another kind of situation; both types are subdivided). Then he distinguished two types of (written) user protocols (in one type the protocol is made after the situation of use, the other one, which he called partial protocol, is made during the situation of use), reported on an empirical study he had made, and concentrated on the results concerning grammatical questions. Since his 45 subjects had consulted different dictionaries, the number of successful look-ups might be considered as an indication of the “use value” of each of the reference works. But Wiegand admitted that the sample (number of subjects and look-ups) was too small to allow a final evaluation of the dictionaries and that the study should be seen as the demonstration of a part of a procedure by which it is possible to reach “judgments that are intersubjectively verifiable” (p. 93). He finished with some remarks on the presentation of grammar in monolingual dictionaries.

In Wiegand (1985a) he returned to the issue indicated in the title, but dealt with it in more detail than in earlier papers. He started out (p. 18ss.) discussing predication and referentiation (e.g. “Peter is a pilot” is a predication, with pilot as predicator, whereas in “I don’t trust this pilot” there is a referentiation to somebody designated by the word pilot, and pilot is an expression of referentiation). Predications are used in lexicographic explanations of meaning and it is important to choose adequate predicators. The author then distinguished between explanations of objects, facts etc. (e.g. “A crime is an illegal activity or action”) and explanations of lemma-signs (e.g. “The meaning of crime is ‘illegal activity or action’” or “Crime means illegal activity or action”). Wiegand stated that there are – in German – several relational expressions, or relational predicates: in common language they are verbs like bedeutet (“means”) or expressions like ist ein Name für (“is a name for”), whereas in the specialized language of linguistics there are verbs or expressions like designiert (“designates”) or ist synonym mit (“is synonymous with”). In both cases the

---

18 Lexical paraphrases occur in dictionaries – where the lemma-sign represented by the lemma is out of context – whereas when explanations or paraphrases are given in everyday dialogues the lemma-signs are in context.
19 “Questions about grammar in protocols of dictionary use. A contribution to empirical research into the use of monolingual dictionaries”.
20 He stated (p. 22) that already in 1974 – when he had not yet heard of Quirk’s (1973) investigation – he had undertaken a questionnaire study which he only mentioned in a note in Wiegand (1977) and which had led him to think about types of situations of use.
21 “A new conception of the so-called lexicographic definition”.
author distinguished relational predicates which relate language to the world (e.g. “Chair is a word for a piece of furniture....”) from those which relate one linguistic expression (the lemma-sign) to another one, as in “X has the same meaning as Y” (p. 44s.). Wiegand reported two empirical studies in which he had asked students how they understand a dictionary article like “Chair: piece of furniture for one person...” and which of several relational predicates they would prefer. The results showed that the subjects tended to interpret such an article as the expression of a relation between the lemma-sign and the extralinguistic world. After reporting another study – with two groups of four students – that aimed at verifying which types of relational predicates would be better for the learning of unknown words (p. 49-52), the author discussed in detail facts and problems related to the “so-called lexicographic definition”, i.e. the lexicographic explanation of meaning, and reported another study, very similar to that mentioned in Wiegand (1984), about the most adequate predicates for the lemma-sign orange. Based on the results he made suggestions for the writing of lexical paraphrases for concrete nouns.

About Wiegand (1986) Smit (2002: 302) remarks the following:

In his article “Metalexicography. A Data Bank for Contemporary German” (1986) [...], Wiegand writes about computer lexicography. But he also deals with important aspects regarding text theory for lexicographical texts. He lists text type segments [...] which can be used in dictionaries, and makes suggestions on how one could proceed in compiling an electronic database, based on different text types. This article in English is a good directive to illustrate Wiegand’s line of thought.

In Wiegand (1987)22 he first made some general remarks on research into dictionary use and stated that only few studies had been undertaken. Since dictionary use is a kind of action, he then discussed the concept action in general and the action “using a dictionary”. He distinguished several characteristics of actions (which can be formulated as questions: who acts, what is the wished result, how is the action done, under which circumstances, when, how long, where, what for, why, what is the immediate cause, what are the consequences?), referred to his discussion – in Wiegand (1985) – of the concept of situation of use and differentiated various types of use: “usual use of dictionaries as reference works”, “usual use of dictionaries as books for reading about language”, “unusual use of dictionaries in order to get to know something about the used dictionaries” (e.g. when they are analysed by metalexicographers), “unusual use of dictionaries when they are not used as dictionaries” (e.g. when they are utilized as weight), “use of dictionaries with the aim to learn how to use dictionaries” (p. 197). Then he defined the “genuine purpose of a dictionary” and the action “using a dictionary” (which is a “usual action of use [...] when a dictionary is used according to its genuine purpose”). Finally he described in detail several of such actions – usual and unusual ones – and distinguished various types of users (cf. Wiegand 1985).

His interest in dictionary use is manifest again in Ripfel & Wiegand (1988)23 where the authors summarized 20 empirical studies and discussed the methods employed.

---

22 “On the action-theoretical foundation of research into dictionary use”.
23 “Research into dictionary use. A critical report”.
The title of Wiegand (1988)\textsuperscript{24} clearly indicates the issue of this essay. Citing Van Dijk and other text linguists, the author treated dictionary articles as a special kind of text, more exactly a partial text of the whole text which is the dictionary. Although there are unstandardized articles (in which the lexicographer expresses himself freely), most are more or less standardized. Standardization is necessary for the elaboration (by a team) and for the ease of understanding of the information contained in the article. Dictionary articles consist of “functional lexicographic text segments” whose main classes are “information items”\textsuperscript{25} (Angaben) and “structure indicators”. Segments with one “genuine purpose” are called “text elements”, those with more than one purpose are “text building stones”. The whole article may be segmented down to the “functional text elements” (p. 41). After discussing Rey-Debove’s (1971) definitions of macrostructure (which refers only to alphabetical dictionaries so that Wiegand preferred the more general term access structure) and microstructure, he presented his ideas about the structure of standardized articles of alphabetical dictionaries (p. 54ss.), proceeding to segment several articles. The results of this segmentation were represented in “partitive structure graphs” (which are like constituent structure trees). For every segment Wiegand employed a term to characterize it (e.g. orthography item, accent item, plural form item).

Citing 26 metalexicographic works in which types of dictionaries were one of the topics or dictionary typologies had been established, Wiegand (1988a)\textsuperscript{26} stated that frequently the terms used are not defined or are not clear (p. 4). Therefore he introduced a great number of terms (e.g. dictionary predicate), with which types of dictionaries may be characterized (e.g. dictionary of quotations or alphabetical dictionary) and, frequently referring to several German dictionaries and using a set-theoretical language, dealt in great detail and in a very complex manner with numerous characteristics in order to obtain a scientifically based typology.

Most of Wiegand’s writings are about monolingual dictionaries, but in Wiegand (1988b)\textsuperscript{27} he began to deal with bilingual lexicography, too. He had been invited to assist a Chinese team of lexicographers in their efforts to elaborate the dictionary mentioned in the title (which is a polyfunctional dictionary), and, during a four-week stay in China wrote a diary containing his reflections. In the article, a revised version of extracts from the diary and some added parts, he analysed and commented (with suggestions for improvements) the structure and all article segments of the planned dictionary (e.g. article head, lemma position, equivalents, examples, idioms, compound words). Whereas several authors had called for monofunctional bilingual dictionaries (four for each language pair), he recognized that a polyfunctional dictionary is a good expedient, when, due to insufficient material and lexicographic capacities, neither four nor even two dictionaries can be published. He warned, however, that such a reference work will necessarily privilege one of the four functions, i.e. the planned dictionary would primarily be helpful to Chinese users

\textsuperscript{24} “The dictionary article as text”.

\textsuperscript{25} The English word item - used in Wiegand (1990) - does not seem to be a good translation of Angabe because it is too general. A better translation is information item, as in Hausmann & Wiegand (1989). But of course the word item may be used in the sense of information item.

\textsuperscript{26} “Preliminary reflections on dictionary typology. Part 1”; 103 pages.

\textsuperscript{27} “Shanghai by night’. Extracts from a metalexicographic diary about the work at the Great German-Chinese Dictionary”; 105 pages.
for decoding (or translation into Chinese), and least helpful to Germans when translating from Chinese into German (p. 529).

In Wiegand (1988c)\textsuperscript{28} the author began to explore – in his usual precise manner – a new issue, i.e. special-field lexicography. Smit (2002: 296s.) makes the following comments:

\[\ldots\] Wiegand not only structures special-field lexicography, but also develops important theoretical assumptions on action theory and text theory, and lexicographical concepts such as “genuine purposes of dictionaries”. Although the main focus of the article is to classify special-field dictionaries into distinct types (“fachliches Sprachwörterbuch” (special-field language dictionary), “fachliches Sachwörterbuch” (special-field encyclopedia), and “fachliches Allbuch” (a combination of the first two)), Wiegand sheds further light on the issue that was investigated in the article “Pragmatische Informationen ...” (1981), namely types of knowledge.

In 1989 appeared the first volume of the three-volume international encyclopedia of lexicography (Hausmann et al.) in which six articles by Wiegand (one of them with Hausmann as co-author) were published. These articles necessarily had to be shorter than his longer papers. Nevertheless they are among the longest of all three volumes (between 34 and 62 pages) and contain detailed discussions of the various topics. In all of them Wiegand referred to earlier papers, but always presented new reflections and information. I will not summarize the articles but just translate the titles:

Wiegand (1989): “The present status of lexicography and its relation to other disciplines”.


Wiegand (1989c): “Types of microstructures in the general monolingual dictionary”.

Wiegand (1989d): “The lexicographic definition in the general monolingual dictionary”.

The sixth article – Hausmann and Wiegand (1989) – was published in English. It is interesting and important not only because of the contents – a general survey –, but also because Wiegand’s terms are given in English, German and French. The topics dealt with are (according to the chapter titles): “Basic notions”, “The textual book structure”, “The textual word list structure”, “The macrostructure”, “The access structures”, “The microstructure: the classical conception”, “Microstructures in the dictionary: a new conception”, “Addressing”, “Types of microstructures”, “Other lexicographic traditions”.

Another article published in English (a translation of the author’s text) is Wiegand (1990), in which he attended – in 126 pages – again to the issue dictionary parts as texts. Let me quote some few paragraphs:

\[\ldots\] What is special-field lexicography? With hints to the relation between linguistic and encyclopedic knowledge”. In earlier articles the author had already attended to the issue language for special purposes, e.g. in Wiegand (1977b): “Languages for Special Purposes in the Monolingual Dictionary: Criticism, Provocations, and Practical and Pragmatic-oriented Suggestions” (this is the title of the translated version as it was published in Wiegand 1999).
The view that it is fruitful for metalexicographic research on printed language dictionaries, and on their use as well as their planning and production led by theory, to observe all kinds of printed dictionaries as well as certain parts of these explicitly – and this shall mean as much as with recourse to textlinguistic categories – as texts, is increasingly gaining scientific interest within recent European and also partly within the Northern American dictionary research. This point of view can be integrated into a general framework which is to be briefly drawn up now. (p. 1)

In the following I will give an insight into some details of a theory on lexicographic texts which I have worked out during the last years. Parts of the theory have been – as far as they refer to general monolingual dictionaries – published in my more recent papers [...].

The theory has three parts:

(i) production of lexicographic texts
(ii) structure of lexicographic texts
(iii) reception of lexicographic texts

In order that the following insight does not get too superficial, I will restrict myself to part (ii) in the following discussion. This part has been also formally worked out, namely with recourse to the mathematical structure concept of Bourbaki (1968) as well as by using set-theoretic language. [...] Part (ii) of the theory – simply called text theory below – refers to the dictionary form of the most important types of monolingual dictionaries [...]. (p. 18)

In detail the text theory, above all, deals with the following aspects of the dictionary form:

- criteria for the textuality of lexicographic texts and representation forms of textuality
- text condensation, propositional density and expansion of texts
- order structures of lexicographic texts, namely:
  - textual book structure
  - inner and outer access structures including rapid access structures
  - hierarchical and precedential article structures
  - hierarchical and precedential microstructures and item structures
  - kinds of microstructures, namely: simple, expanded, composed, rudimentary, listing, integrated, partially integrated, non-integrated and the possible combinations
  - partial structures of microstructures, item structures and article structures
  - the microstructure program of a dictionary and the grammar for establishing microstructures. (p. 19)

As these quotations give to understand, the essay is very comprehensive and – because of the use of a mathematical structure concept as well as of set-theoretic language – quite complicated. At the end there are more than four pages of German abbreviations of terms employed by the author and the English translations of these terms.

4. Essays on specific topics since 1990

In this section I will group together Wiegand’s most important metalexicographic works since 1990 according to the topics dealt with and say only a few words or even give only the title. Some of the essays belong to more than one topic.

Analysis of German monolingual dictionaries

In a 146-pages article, Wiegand (1990a) cites a great number of German monolingual dictionaries and analyses many of them. In Wiegand (1991) – an essay of 333 pages (!) – again many dictionaries are analysed, especially with reference to the article structures. The textual structures of a 10-volume German dictionary are the topic of Wiegand (2005).

**Special-field dictionaries**


**Bilingual dictionaries**

Wiegand (1988b) had dealt with a bilingual dictionary project. Model articles of the dictionary were presented and commented in Zaiping and Wiegand (1995), a 123-pages paper in which the metalexicographer develops a theory of bilingual dictionaries. Reports of other projects of bilingual dictionaries in which he took part are Wiegand (1992), Wiegand (1994), and Wiegand (1996).

**Learners’ dictionaries**

---

30 “Contemporary German Lexicography”.
31 “On the structures of the entry/article text in dictionaries of Early New High German. At the same time an attempt to further develop a theory of lexicographic texts”.
32 “On the textual structures in the GWDS”.
33 “About the distinction of semantic and encyclopedic data in special-field dictionaries”. In the English translation in Wiegand (1999) the term special-field is substituted by domain-specific.
34 “Data distribution structures. Macro and microstructures in recent special-field dictionaries”.
35 “Reflections on the mediostructure in special-field dictionaries, using as one example among others the Wörterbuch zur Lexikographie und Wörterbuchforschung – Dictionary on Lexicography and Dictionary Research”.
36 “On the differences between lexicography for special purposes and terminography. Using the Dictionary of Lexicography and Dictionary Research as an example”. A shorter version was presented in English at the 2nd International Terminology Conference in 2003 in Lisbon.
39 “The Dictionaries on Linguistics and Communication Science (WSK) and the possibilities of its use in the subject German as Foreign Language”.
40 “About the model articles for the Great German-Chinese Dictionary. At the same time a contribution to a theory of bilingual lexicographic texts”.
41 “German-Hungarian Dictionary. Reflections after the colloquium in Budapest, April 1-2, 1993”. The article was published in a 1992 edition of Lexicographica which appeared only in 1994.
42 “German-Turkmenic Dictionary. Glances at the lexicographic work at the Turkmenic National Magtymguly University in Ashghhabat”.
43 “German-Uzbekian Dictionary. Glances at the lexicographic work at the National Uzbekian University of World Languages in Tashkent”.
In Wiegand (1995)\textsuperscript{44} the author turns to the special type of dictionaries mentioned in the title. Another paper on these reference works is Wiegand (1999\textsuperscript{a})\textsuperscript{45}. In 1998 and 2002 he edits two collections of papers, each about one of two German learners’ dictionaries, and in Wiegand (2002\textsuperscript{c})\textsuperscript{46} and Wiegand (2002\textsuperscript{d})\textsuperscript{47} he himself writes about the structures of the second German learners’ dictionary.

**Semi-integrated and mixed semi-integrated microstructures**

In Wiegand (1996\textsuperscript{a})\textsuperscript{48} he again discusses microstructures in general (integrated, partially integrated, unintegrated, semi-integrated), attends to problems of bilingual lexicography (citing many authors who wrote about them) and deals specifically with semi-integrated microstructures in bilingual dictionaries. Some years later, so-called “mixed semi-integrated” microstructures are the subject of Meyer and Wiegand (2000)\textsuperscript{49}.

**Text condensation**

Dictionary articles are condensed texts, and condensation may occur in other parts of the dictionary, too. This fact had been dealt with briefly in earlier writings. In Wiegand (1996\textsuperscript{b}) – published in English – and Wiegand (1998\textsuperscript{a})\textsuperscript{50} the author theorizes specifically about it.

**Mediostucture**

Wiegand (1996\textsuperscript{c})\textsuperscript{51} “introduces a formalized theory of mediostucture in an informal way” (p. 11). The term mediostucture is used for what Rey-Debove (1989) had called the système de renvois (“reference system”). In the English-written abstract Wiegand shortly explains the terms (in italics) he employs:

> A lexicographer refers to the potential user from a reference position giving the reference item or other reference transmitting items to the reference address, which possibly provides access to the lexicographic data relevant for obtaining the user’s objective. Thus, a reference relation is established either between the reference item or other reference transmitting items to one or more reference address(es).

Referring is a methodological lexicographic action guided implicitly or explicitly by reference conditions related to the dictionary subject or dictionary form. The motive for referencing is that a user infers a reference and follows it, thus fulfilling the condition that he can infer the dictionary-subject-related reference conditions and then possibly obtaining his user objective. \textsuperscript{52} (ibid.)

\textsuperscript{44} “Lexicographic texts in monolingual learners’ dictionaries. Critical reflections on the occasion of the publication of Langenscheidts Großwörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache.”.

\textsuperscript{45} “Articles in learners’ dictionaries. Perception of text form and search area structures. Plaidoyer for clearly arranged print dictionaries in the era of new media”.

\textsuperscript{46} “On the macrostructure and the outer access structures of the de Gruyter Wörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache”.

\textsuperscript{47} “On textual structures of the dictionary articles and article niches in the de Gruyter Wörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache. At the same time a contribution to a further development of a theory of the dictionary form”.

\textsuperscript{48} “The concept of semi-integrated microstructures. A contribution to the theory of bilingual print dictionaries”.

\textsuperscript{49} “Mixed semi-integrated microstructures for German–Spanish print dictionaries”.

\textsuperscript{50} “Lexicographic text condensation. Draft for a complete conception”.

\textsuperscript{51} “On the mediostructures in print dictionaries”.

\textsuperscript{52} Just to give an idea of Wiegand’s terms in German: wörterbuchgegenstandsbedingte Verweisvoraussetzungen (ibid.: 16) can be translated as reference conditions dependent on the dictionary subject.
Two more recent articles about the mediostructure are Wiegand (2002a)\(^{53}\) and the above mentioned Wiegand (2004).

**Addressing**
Hausmann & Wiegand (1989: 328) had explained the term *addressing*: “The way in which a form and information relating to that form are brought together is the *addressing procedure* [...]. Each information *item* [...] is addressed to a form called *address* [...].” In Wiegand (2000a)\(^{54}\), Wiegand (2002)\(^{55}\) and Wiegand (2006c)\(^{56}\) the author goes into more detail about this issue.

**Dictionary functions**
The topic *dictionary functions* is dealt with especially in Wiegand (2001)\(^{57}\) and Wiegand (2005a – see below).

**Access structure**
The term *access structure* had been introduced in Wiegand (1988). It refers to those dictionary elements which allow the user to find (or access) the information he wants. Hausmann and Wiegand (1989: 329) stated: “The access structure of the microstructure is called the inner access structure. All other access structures [...] are called outer access structures.” The outer access structures of one distinct dictionary are analysed in detail in Wiegand (2002c; see above in the section about learners’ dictionaries); so-called access routes are described in Wiegand (2007)\(^{58}\).

**Equivalence and equivalents**
I already cited several articles on bilingual dictionaries and their structures. Especially with the problem of equivalence deal Wiegand (2002b)\(^{59}\), Wiegand (2005)\(^{60}\) and Wiegand (2005a)\(^{61}\).

---

\(^{53}\) “Old and new facts about the mediostructure in print dictionaries”.

\(^{54}\) “Addressing in monolingual and bilingual lexicography. An introductory survey on the problem and the situation in research”.

\(^{55}\) “Addressing in bilingual print dictionaries”.

\(^{56}\) “Addressing in printed dictionaries: Precisions and further reflections”.

\(^{57}\) “What are dictionary functions? Critical remarks on recent dictionary research”.

\(^{58}\) “About access routes in printed dictionaries. A contribution towards the intersection of use procedures and dictionary form”. This is the translation of the title given in the abstract. To convey an idea of the contents and the employed terms, I quote the abstract: “Following the introduction of the terminological adcurrent, incurrent, inner-current and excurrent as well as a series of lexicographic-theoretical concepts, access routes are explained, partly by using examples, and a variety of types of access routes are distinguished. A basic distinction is that between outer and inner access routes. Outer access routes are divided into single and complex ones with single access routes being divided into mediostructural and non-mediostructural outer access routes. Mediostructural outer access routes are divided into inner-current, table of contents excurrent and dictionary excurrent outer access routes whilst non-mediostructural access routes are divided into adcurrent, inner-current and dictionary excurrent outer access routes. This article presents conceptual differentiations and a relevant terminology with which the data accessibility of printed dictionaries as well as their mediostructural profile can be evaluated and planned systematically.”

\(^{59}\) “On equivalence in bilingual lexicography. Criticism and suggestions”. An English and a French translation of this article were published in the same year (cf. http://www.gs.uni-heidelberg.de/sprache2/hew_publ2.htm#1998)
Typology of dictionary articles

Onomasiological dictionaries
During many years Wiegand has developed a theory of alphabetical (monolingual and bilingual) dictionaries, but in Wiegand (2004b)62, in the introduction to a new edition of a famous German onomasiological dictionary, he also writes about this type of reference work.

5. Other important works since 1990

Bibliographies
In most of his writings Wiegand cites an enormous quantity of metalexicographic publications and many dictionaries, and since the first years of his academic career he has been engaged in publicizing bibliographic data. Before 1990 he published several bibliographies of Germanic linguistics and lexicography (for example, in Wiegand 1988d63 he gathered 2,200 titles), and then, together with Kammerer, one entitled “Pedagogical lexicography and dictionaries in pedagogical contexts in the 20th century” (Kammerer and Wiegand 1998).

Finally he elaborated the first two volumes (with a total of more than 1,400 pages) of the “International bibliography of Germanic lexicography and dictionary research, taking into consideration metalexicographic research about English as well as North-European, Romance, Slavic and other languages” (Wiegand 2006d).

The “magnum opus”

In the first part two main topics are dealt with: lexicography and metalexicography in general (i.e. as disciplines: their status, differences and subdivisions) and computational lexicography.

In the second part – more than 800 pages – Wiegand attends to the problems of research into dictionary use, returning to his action theory and his reflections on types of users and situations of use. He goes into great detail about the different kinds of research methods and makes proposals for better questionnaires and tests.

6. Final remarks

60 “Equivalence, equivalent differentiation and equivalent presentation. A new homogeneous/uniform conception”.
61 “Presentation of equivalents and dictionary functions in bilingual print dictionaries. With a side-look to the so-called ‘modern theory of lexicographic functions’”.
62 “Lexicographic-historical introduction”.
63 “Bibliography of dictionary research, from 1945 to the present, 2,200 titles chosen from a Germanic perspective”.
64 “Dictionary research. Investigations into dictionary use and into the theory, criticism, history and automatisation of dictionies”; 1,162 pages.
Whereas Smit (ibid.) gave an overview of the articles collected in Wiegand (2000) – some of which deal with linguistic problems in general – I restricted myself to the author’s essays on lexicography and dictionary research. On the other hand, I cited many more works, since I wanted to convey a more comprehensive idea of his outstanding work as metalexicographer and theorist. Of course it was impossible to go into detail, but I think it became clear – for those who know the metalexicographic literature – that no one else wrote more about the subject nor dealt more precisely with all parts and many types of dictionaries. Gouws (2005: 166) speaks of the “era Wiegand” and states that since the early 1980s “metalexicography has been influenced dominantly by the works of Herbert Ernst Wiegand”.

In 2008 or 2009 two outstanding metalexicographic publications will appear: a supplementary volume of the international encyclopedia edited by Hausmann et al. (1989/1990/1991)65 and the above-mentioned Dictionary of Lexicography and Dictionary Research, in which – among others – most of Wiegand’s terms will be lemmatized, explained, exemplified and translated into nine languages. It is to be hoped that these two reference works can be acquired by libraries of those universities around the world in which metalexicography is taught and studied.
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65 It will contain 136 articles – all of them written in English – comprising a total of about 1,300 pages and inform about recent developments in lexicography and dictionary research.


