The publication of Herbert Ernst Wiegand's collection *Semantics and Lexicography* offers scholars of lexicology and lexicography whose native language is not German (as the editors of the volume delicately put it) an important survey of his carefully developed research. Wiegand worked towards a theory of definition (or, more precisely, in his terms, "so-called definition") by questioning the conventional practice and theoretical premises of linguists and lexicographers. While this present publication does not provide a full exposition of his work and ideas, the selection of work in the volume reveals the evolution of his systematic approach to dictionary research and will most likely leave the reader with a desire to take the time to look at other articles that are not included. Anglophone readers — especially those interested in lexicographical practice — will find detailed accounts and descriptions and explanations based on close readings of German monolingual dictionaries which should prove illuminating; the use of notational systems intended to provide semasiological and onomasiological information provides models for monolingual dictionaries in any language.

The book under review includes a preface by its editors, Antje Immken and Werner Wolski, an introduction by Wolski, twelve articles and an epilogue by Wiegand, and a thirty-one page bibliography. We are told by the editors that this English translation of articles covering twenty years of research on semantics and lexicography was motivated by a call to make Wiegand's work available to a larger readership. The editors take on the daunting task of translating terminology coined by Wiegand and a myriad of linguistic examples; perhaps most daunting was the challenge of translating Wiegand's use of his own terminology, since he uses it in a "highly creative way" (1), a reference to his deft and literary German. With that in mind, one could easily find examples to criticize for a stylistic or even translational shortcoming, but it is not within the scope of this review to quibble with their choices, nor with their poesy. However, in this day of desktop publishing, the absence of an index is a serious shortcoming; for example, when I found references to, say, Rosch on prototypes and Wittgenstein on use and ordinary language, I wanted to be able to find all the citations of their names throughout the collection. In a book with such far-ranging comprehension, it is frustrating not being able to look for instances of this dictionary or that lexicographer.

In Wolski's introduction we find a brief, but very useful, discussion of the rationale behind Wiegand's methods and theories; there is an insightful discussion of what constitutes "dictionary research" from the perspective of this collection that places these shorter pieces in their broader international
context. The remarks on the relationship of semantics to lexicography bring to our attention the perspective of lexicography and lexicology as distinct sets "related to each other by a mutual relationship of give and take" (4). By no means is lexicography a sub-branch of lexicology: such a classification would indeed be too restrictive since lexicography, which is empirically given "entweder in abgeschlossen lexikographischen Prozessen oder in solchen, die derzeit noch im Gange sind" (= 'either in concluded lexicographic processes or processes still in operation'; 215), takes into consideration, apart from lexicology, "Methoden und Ergebnisse aus ganz verschieden akademischen Disziplinen" (= 'methods and results of very different academic disciplines; 263). Wolski also makes the salient point that semantic theories that explain particular lexicographical practice are generally inferred through a process of reconstructing theory based on representation of meaning. Here, he rightfully emphasizes, is where the strength of Wiegand's methods and theory are derived: his critique and subsequent formulation of a lexicology is not predicated upon defending a prevailing semantic theory or upon explaining the hidden syntacticity of scientific lexicography. Nothing short of an independent method of semantic analysis is proposed (and accomplished) that will then become the frame to test the validity of lexical explanations (definitions) and to help reveal to the user a systematic representation of a language.

The substance of the nine articles shows such breadth and depth of analysis of linguistic and lexicographical data that this review will necessarily be selective in its presentation; I will discuss items in order to show the range of thought found in this collection. The following passages from the Epilogue provide us with some broad conclusions that are worth noting here as a way to help tie together the seemingly disparate parts. The general ideas given here cannot be fully appreciated without a reading of the twenty-year process that supports them:

Semantics interpret the lexicographic meaning descriptions in the light of a theory of semantics, for example from the perspective of the definatory componential analysis, of prototype semantics, of stereotype semantics and of frame semantics. In doing so, they are typically led by the intention to fit meaning descriptions more accurately into semantic thinking, and/or by the intention to criticize them. (317)

The value of Wiegand's conclusions are directly related to his unflinching investigations of semantics that does not limit itself to serving the needs of one or another theory, but that questions notions of "meaning" and attempts to provide answers based on an expanded understanding of lexical meaning and propositions; because the project anticipates issues of "meaning" and representation in dictionaries, Wiegand devotes special attention to the synonymy. His approach is empirical, and his explanations come with discretely organized and analyzed data. For those lexicographers who are wary of the usefulness of linguistic analysis for solving problems in the day to day process of dic-
tionary making, Wiegand sympathizes but also sets forth the grounds upon which any scientific lexicography must proceed:

When formulating a lexicographic text segment or a lexicographic text for the linguistic expression which is being processed lexicographically with respect to its meaning(s), a lexicographer must always adhere to a set of criteria determined above all by the dictionary type and the targeted potential users. The formulation has to be such that a user-in-actu is able to infer the meaning or one of several meanings of the linguistic expression. (318)

This advice shows Wiegand's continuing interest in the dictionary as text and the dictionary user; the other general condition that applies concerns the establishing of authoritative lexicographic formulations: “The text which is intended to enable the user the successful semanticization of an expression in question has to be formulated on the basis of the lexicographer's own competence and by consulting other texts” (318). These two conditions are necessary for the development of a theory for lexicographic research; the conditions were a guide to Wiegand as he developed his research. His emphasis is always on formulating what he calls “meaning descriptions” that are falsifiable and that acknowledge the connection between semantics and lexicography. At this point, it might be obvious that he eschews the use of “definition” as a term. This is a wise decision, given all the ways in which the term is used in technical and ordinary language.

In regards to “definition,” Wiegand is as concerned with matters of content as with terminology; he points out that the term arose in theories of definition that addressed concepts associated with a variety of scientific languages (from Aristotelian to ordinary language philosophy): “The transfer of these theories to the domain of linguistic analysis of non-scientific languages, as well as the unquestioned adoption of the terms derived from those theories is highly problematic” (177). In “A New Theory of the So-called Lexicographic Definition,” Wiegand's ideas are supported by almost twenty years of empirical studies in which he points out the problems associated with “lexicographic definitions”; his goal, of course, is to supplant the old terminology with a more “useful and justifiable” terminology. The difficulty of his task is compounded by lack of correspondence of technical terms across languages; thus, his terminology faces its own language barrier. Nevertheless, the journey through his argumentation is rewarded by drawing one's attention to matters of theory, pragmatics, and history; his challenge to lexicography demands that lexicographers and linguists answer his analysis concerning old terminology and the concepts upon which the terminology is founded. His empirical work rests on (1) “different tests on the so-called lexicographic definition of the nouns denoting natural kinds” (for example, lemon — an analysis that he presented at the first meeting of Euralex, which those who were there may
remember as provoking a contentious disquisition concerning the “true” color of a lemon, a discussion that basically ignored the larger point he was making, a not uncommon situation during conferences); (2) “tests on the so-called lexicographic definition of the nouns denoting artifacts” (for example, chair and saw); (3) “studies employing protocols on a dictionary look-up”; and (4) studies “on the comprehension of excerpts in the form of LEMMA ... in dictionary look-up situations” (153).

Wiegand’s work on the so-called lexicographic definition is based on his critical study of synonymy. Understanding synonymy is fundamental to lexicographic practice, and, one might add, to linguistic analysis of meaning; the core concepts in linguistics of “identity” and “difference” are at the root of defining by means of lexical paraphrase or lexical substitution. Appropriately, the first article in the book under review is “Synonymy and its Role in Monolingual Lexicography”; succeeding articles in the book depend on many of the insights and arguments put forth in this article, first published in 1976. From the very beginning of this article we see the importance of the study of linguistic and lexicographic historiography; throughout the book, Wiegand integrates probing commentaries on lexical description and its complementary philosophical issues drawn from his extensive reading of canonical authors who have treated theories of meaning and knowing. He continually makes the point, and given the tenor of the times, it is necessary to make the point continuously, that (a) the history of semantics is a legitimate concern to linguists and lexicographers alike and that (b) the history does not begin somewhere in the twentieth century. The article is focused on the “role of synonymy relations in the semantic explanation of lemmata” and “the comprehension process on the part of the dictionary user” (11). In order to get to these items, Wiegand takes us through a history and commentary on synonymy. The following is a selection of section headings from this chapter:

1.1 Explanation of word meaning as a historically constant process of monolingual lexicography
1.2 Lexicographic practice and monolingual dictionaries as reflected by a structural conception of language
1.3 The formulation of dictionary excerpts as language acts
1.4 On the relationship of content similarity relations between linguistic expressions and theoretical concepts of synonymy
2.1 On the comprehension of meaning explanations in dictionary excerpts
2.3 Readings of the relational expression is synonymous with
3.1 Lexical paraphrases in the form of syntagma or sentence as abbreviated rule formulations.

Within the article, Wiegand uses data from existing German monolingual dictionaries, as well as examples he constructs for the purpose of explanation. The topic of synonyms is also considered in “Synonyms Appearing in
Major Alphabetical Dictionaries of Contemporary German.” The section that discusses explanation by synonym and explanation by a lexical paraphrase further illuminates much of Wiegand’s theoretical agenda, through close analysis of lexicographic texts. The supplementary benefit of these careful formulations can be reaped when considering the history of lexicography. Here we have a heuristic that might usefully bring a linguistic frame of discourse to the analysis of early monolingual dictionaries. For example, the one-word paraphrase, as it is called in some of the historiographic literature, represents one of the most frequently used methods of lexical description; obviously, the coinage of the term one-word paraphrase implies a contrast with synonym. Much of dictionary criticism is pre-theoretical; the phenomenon called the one-word paraphrase, as well as all similar descriptors, requires a detailed formulation as a kind of meaning paraphrase, if not exactly as presented by Wiegand, at least inspired by his example. Wiegand’s most appreciative audience may likely be historiographers of lexicography, in particular, and of linguistics in general, who need analytical methods that can be applied across texts and dates of publication. On the other hand, contemporary practitioners may find it very valuable to consider how discussion of earlier dictionaries can show the evolution (or stasis) of lexicographic practice and theory; for instance, on page 238 we find four precursors from 1758 to 1989, dictionaries in which meaning paraphrases are mostly written in sentences. In the article “Elements of a Theory towards a So-called Lexicographic Definition” Wiegand weaves criticism of dictionaries (including Chambers’ Universal, COBUILD, Handwörterbuch der deutschen Gegenwartssprache, and Brockhaus-Wahrig), critiques of various dictionary critics (for example, Rey-Debove, Fillmore, Landau, Weinreich, Ilson, and Hausmann), and historical commentary throughout an article that is built upon formal analysis and predicate logic. The article on synonyms in German dictionaries offers a more focused study, but is notable for presenting the “onomasiological principle.” The idea of configuring synonymy outside of the locus of semasiological applications and placing it within the “onomasiological part” as a hierarchy of cross-references intends to alter radically the dictionary as text.

In Semantics and Lexicography we are treated to nine articles:

1) “Synonymy and its Role in Monolingual Lexicography” (11);

2) “Thinking about Dictionaries: Current Problems” (55);

3) “Languages for Special Purposes in the Monolingual Dictionary: Criticism, Provocations, and Practical and Pragmatic-oriented Suggestions” (95);

4) “On the Meaning Explanation of Sentence Adverbs in Monolingual Dictionaries: A Contribution to Practical Lexicography” (113);

5) “Synonyms Appearing in Major Alphabetical Dictionaries of Contemporary German” (139);
6) “A New Theory of the So-called Lexicographic Definition” (153);
7) “Elements of a So-called Lexicographic Definition” (203);
8) “Are Most of the Cumulative Dictionaries of Synonyms really useless Best Sellers?” (283);
9) “On the Distinction between Semantic and Encyclopedic Data in Domain-specific Dictionaries” (297).

In the remainder of this review, I will draw particular attention to problems and concerns associated with dictionary users and questioning situations; these topics draw upon and contribute to the larger scope and range of subjects and ideas in this anthology.

In the forty-page article, “Thinking about Dictionaries: Current Problems,” Wiegand explores issues of the dictionary user and look-up situations, which he calls “situations of questioning” (61). He makes his case that the discipline must be more acquainted with the prospective user” (61), because lexicography has no empirically founded answers to fundamental questions prerequisite to understanding the needs of dictionary users. On page 61 he provides a list of sixteen such questions (for example, “Who owns which monolingual dictionaries?”; “Do semantic questions outweigh grammatical questions?”; “How often are dictionaries used or borrowed in libraries?”). In Wiegand’s analysis, before there are dictionary users there must be questionings, reasons to consult a dictionary; without knowing what questions prospective users ask, or their reasons for consulting a dictionary, lexicographers can only speculate upon the issues of dictionary use and the dictionary user: “We do not know enough about the specific questions which lead a person to consult a dictionary — thus becoming a dictionary user — and we do not know in what kind of situations of questioning a monolingual dictionary is preferred” (61). On the same page, Wiegand writes,

what is needed is an empirically based sociology of the dictionary user, from which it is then possible to define a typology of dictionary look-up situations which, in turn allows to put in concrete form the different purposes to dictionary look-up. Moreover there is need for a theory of lexicographic pragmatics which analyzes what happens when dictionary articles, while being read, become text-in-function.

Here we see some of the issues that motivate the intensive linguistic analysis of meaning as explanation. Wiegand in his earlier work tests a variety of semantic theories against the semantic assertions explicit or implied in “dictionary articles”; through a painstaking analysis of the usefulness or adequacy of the various leading approaches to semantic analysis as it pertains to understanding whether definitions in dictionaries provide meaning, explanation, or usage rules, Wiegand constructs empirically falsifiable hypotheses about the nature
of meaning in dictionaries. His work helps leading him to presuppositions concerning purpose of use and the identity of the dictionary user, which also leads him to construct an acutely defined idea of meaning as a set of usage rules. Wittgenstein’s passages on meaning and use are carefully parsed and discretely cited to assist in making the issues of dictionary use and the dictionary user a primary theoretical concern for forming felicitous and sufficient lexical paraphrases (definitions) by means of rule formulations for semantic use.

Wiegand points out that meanings in a dictionary cannot be developed through predicate logic and other formal modes of semantic analysis, nor can dictionary meanings be adequately explained as belonging to “so-called lexicographic definition.” Formalist approaches to meaning restrict the possible range of uses too narrowly; human languages in regards to generating meaning cannot be adequately explained through these formal methods; this does not mean that the methods employed and the questions posed by such methods are not valuable. Rather, Wiegand wants a theory of dictionary meaning to proceed from a reading of the dictionary text, not to be placed gridlike upon it. Lexicographic definition on the other hand does not seem either a valid description of what is contained in dictionary articles, or a unitary concept; he says, “the intelligent use of monolingual dictionaries requires a user who is more or less language-experienced” (and citing Wittgenstein: “only someone who already knows how to do something with it can significantly ask a name”) (60). The lexicographer needs to know what sort of information a dictionary user seeks, or what information can be presupposed in the prospective reader of any entry, in order to know what to include in any given entry (dictionary article). The information, as a lexical paraphrase within a monolingual dictionary article, must be stated in “the language which they codify” (63).

Whatever sort of definition one can find in monolingual dictionaries, Wiegand points out that we can always ask (and should ask), by what means does a dictionary user infer meaning from the dictionary article, especially the lexical paraphrase, because an appropriate lexical paraphrase is an abbreviated rule formulation of the rules of reference and predication. Lexical paraphrases are at the same time language — referential and thing-referential. He also makes a notable claim that dictionary articles (or, in other terms, entries) are conflict resolving texts; people use dictionaries to settle questions they have about all manner of language use.

One of the more interesting sources of “conflict” may be lexical gaps in a speaker’s own language related to issues of regionalism: here we see possible communication problems among speakers of the same language. By manifesting attention to dictionary typology, text types, dialogic entries and conflict resolution primary issues in writing dictionary articles, Wiegand provides a framework for lexicography.

Actually, this solution strikes at not only lexicographic frameworks, but also at formulating what perceptions “language communities” have about
the scope of their "vocabularies." Ownership questions may start within certain restricted language communities (however we define them), but general monolingual dictionaries need to have a way to answer the questions; a lexical-gap approach to compiling special purpose dictionaries may be quite useful (for example, learners' dictionaries); in fact, we can also see that the tradition of the hard word dictionary has validity from the perspective "for which texts or text types that also contain expressions commonly used in just those texts or text types (a professional, technical or commercial speech community ...) is it most probable that they find distribution throughout the whole speech community?" (70).

In most of the articles, a continual tension between supplying a practical lexicography to practicing lexicographers and commenting upon linguistic theories and methodologies. Wiegand avoids the hand-waving generalizations of much of what passes for trenchant analysis of word meaning, but one wishes that at times he would free himself from his scholarly rigor to expatiate discursively upon the issues and models he explores. Not to say that there are no moments of a more relaxed exposition: the diligent reader is many times rewarded with throw-away lines, tongue-in-cheek remarks, and other species of bon mots (e.g., "This answer presupposes a lion to be present in the speaker's range of perception and leads to the misery of extensionalism" [158].)

There is a rhetorical defensiveness at times that is probably warranted by the author's experience with the questions raised by linguists and language philosophers concerning the validity of his approach from the perspective of semantic theory; thus, we find occasionally an exclamatory reminder that the primary product of Wiegand's lexical and semantic analyses is a series of tools for testing and constructing lexical paraphrases for dictionaries: "What interests us in this context is the clarification and the partial representation of a method suitable for the practice of lexicography. Nothing else!" (79). Wiegand's finely tuned use of an impressive scope of work in linguistics and semantics creates the impression that he is engaging in a direct dialogue with this or that linguist or philosopher (for example, Frege, Wittgenstein, Grice, Bierwisch, Searle, Weinreich, or Putnam). Undoubtedly, one can draw pointed inferences from his analysis of theories and methods that he critiques on the basis of their usefulness in the practice of lexicography; the scholars participating in the community of discourse known as lexicography (or, in some circles, metalexicography) will surely agree with Wiegand that dictionaries provide empirical challenges to linguists and philosophers of language. Questions of dictionary making and dictionary use cannot easily be finessed by appeals to the demand of so-called theory. Not only do the makers of semantic theories have to account for the representation of texts and text types when they are considering what I meant when we speak of defining lexical items, but that literary and bibliographic theorists are also directly challenged to account for the same phenomenon, the dictionary as text.

The collection under review treats an impressive and extensive set of
issues in lexicography, both practical and theoretical, including explorations of languages for special purposes, look-up situations, meaning paraphrases as dialogue, rules of use and formation, reference, onomasiology, and general linguistic theory (to name a few notables). Each of the articles selected for translation deserves the attention of lexicographers and linguists alike (if there is a difference these days). Professor Wiegand has set a standard for dictionary criticism and lexicography that challenges all of those seriously engaged in lexicology and lexicography.
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