HENRIK BROCKDORFF. Diccionari Català-Danes. Text revisat per John Kok Petersen. Barcelona: Enciclopèdia Catalana; Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1996. Pp. LIX + 792.

Reviewed by ANNETTE GRINDSTED

The first Catalan-Danish dictionary has seen the light of day. This is another linguistic victory for Calatuña which, during the whole Franco era, suffered severely from the Fascist regime's endless and systematic attempts to exterminate the Catalan language and culture. From the brief account of Catalan history that one can read on the very first pages of the dictionary, it is told that not only did Franco forbid the Catalans to use their own language in school, in church, in local authorities, in public life, in the press, in radio and TV but, at the same time, he encouraged Spaniards living in the poor and underdeveloped parts of Spain to move to Cataluña, which was and still is one of the richest and most industrialized parts of the country. In this way, Cataluña was invaded by enormous numbers of poor Spanish, non-Catalan speakers. Both at that time and today, Cata-luña is a genuinely bilingual area, however, with an increasing number of Catalan speakers. Since Franco's death in 1975, Cataluña has been self-governing and great efforts have been made to revive Catalan language and culture. Visible evidence of the Catalan authorities' aspirations to disseminate knowledge of the Catalan language is the publication of the present dictionary, which has been financially supported by the 'Generalitat de Catalunya'.

What are the merits and weaknesses of the dictionary? The lay-out and print quality are excellent, and the entries well-arranged. As far as the overall structure of the dictionary is concerned, there are about 30,000 entries and 13,000 fixed phrases, idioms and examples of usage, covering modern standard Catalan. To a certain extent, colloquial words and phrases, archaisms and regionalisms have also been included. We are thus talking about a medium-sized dictionary directed towards users that have some competence in the foreign language.

Before commenting in detail on the structure of the dictionary entries, I would like to make it clear what the functions are and who are the users of bilingual dictionaries. Bilingual dictionaries are used for translation in one of two possible directions: either to produce (L1>L2) or receive (L2>L1) texts in a foreign language. In the vast

majority of cases, they are used by native speakers of either L1 or L2.

Dictionary users

Translation needs	L1 speakers	L2 speakers
Text production	L1>L2	L2>L1
Text reception	L2>L1	L1>L2

Fig. 1. Dictionary users' translation needs

It therefore seems as if the ideal set of bilingual dictionaries that a given language pair, e.g. Catalan and Danish, should consist of is one going from Danish into Catalan and another going from Catalan into Danish. This view is identical with that held by the editors of the present dictionary who in their guide to the use of the dictionary state that it has been compiled with the twofold aim of serving as an aid for Catalan and Danish speakers. One gets the impression that, in some cases, the Danish user is favoured, since the dictionary includes a short Catalan grammar, both in Danish and Catalan, as well as a list of Catalan irregular verbs. The Catalan user, however, does not find a short Danish grammar, nor a list of Danish irregular verbs. Concerning the dictionary entries themselves, users and uses appear from fig. 2., in which it can be seen that they should be used by Catalan speakers for translating texts from their native language into Danish and by Danish speakers to translate from Catalan into their native language.

Dictionary users

Catalan speakers	Danish speakers
Text production	Text reception

Fig. 2. Users and uses of the dictionary.

It has been amply demonstrated in lexicographical research that any attempt to cover the needs of both L1 and L2 native speakers in one L1>L2 and one L2>L1 dictionary is made at the cost of both user groups, because their needs are different. One group has L1 as their native language and L2 as a foreign language, and in the other it is the opposite. In this way their needs for information are completely different: L1 users need information about L2 and L2 users need information about L1.

Below I will demonstrate by way of examples what happens to the microstructure of bilingual dictionaries when the editors fall between two stools.

As far as the lexicographical lay-out is concerned, one of the first decisions to be made focuses on the metalanguage to be used. If Catalan is employed, the Danish user is expected to possess some competence in Catalan. If Danish is employed, on the other hand, the Catalan users are expected to know some Danish. If both languages are used, the dictionary entries would be overloaded with information that is of no use to one of the user groups. In other words, L1 users need metainformation about L2 in L1, and, conversely, L2 users need metainformation about L1 in L2.

One of the basic principles in bilingual lexicography is that, when consulting a dictionary, the user can reasonably claim that he is able to extract from the metalinguistic lexicographical information the details he needs, neither more nor less, to be able to choose the right equivalent to insert into a given context.

Consider now, a Catalan speaker who is going to translate the monoseme **alambí**. In the dictionary he finds the following entry:

alambí *m quím* destillationsapparat.

Does this entry contain the information he needs? In the first place, it is absolutely unnecessary to inform him of the fact that **alambí** is a masculine term belonging to the domain of chemistry. As far as the gender mark is concerned, owing to his native language competence, he must be expected to hold the information that the headword is a noun in the masculine. Supposing that he did not know, does he in this case need the information to be able to translate the word into Danish? The answer is no. The same kind of reasoning applies to the gloss *quím* informing the Catalan user of the fact that the word belongs to a specific register. Because of his native language

competence, he is supposed to know already and, moreover, he is operating in a Catalan context that probably supplies him with this information. The next question to be answered is whether the entry contains all the information he needs? It could be argued that if the Catalan user consults the dictionary, it is due to his lack of Danish competence, and that the Danish equivalent for this reason should be furnished with a grammatical gloss informing the Catalan user of gender and inflection.

alambí *m quím* destillationsapparat *(-et, -er)*.

However, this suggestion raises other questions concerning lexicographical principles in general. How do we delimit the functions of monolingual from bilingual dictionaries? How much foreign language competence is the user expected to possess? As it was stated above, the user of a medium-sized dictionary is expected to possess some foreign language competence. Consequently he can be expected to possess some grammatical knowledge as e.g. regular inflection patterns of Danish nouns and verbs. When it comes to irregular patterns, however, they should be included, particularly in the case of learners' dictionaries, but not in the present dictionary which has a different scope. Consider, for example, the following entry for the Danish equivalent 'hånd'

mà [*pl: mans*] *f anat* hånd.

This seems to correspond to the principles laid down, whereas a learner's bilingual dictionary for Catalan users translating into Danish ought to inform them of the irregular plural of the Danish equivalent:

mà hånd *(pl: hænder)*.

If, however, we look at the entry below

nuviances *f pl (noces)* bryllup *sing*.

we see that the Catalan user is informed of the fact that the Danish equivalent is in the singular. It thus seems as if the selection of metainformation does not follow the dichotomy in which you

distinguish between learners' dictionaries and advanced learners' dictionaries, since the Catalan user possessing some knowledge of Danish is supposed to know that 'bryllup' is not in the plural in contrast with the Catalan headword.

Let us now examine the entries of *alambí, mà* and *nuviances* from the Danish user's point of view. If he consults the dictionary to find out how these words could be translated into Danish, does the entry supply him with exactly the information he needs? They are all redundant. It is not necessary for the Danish user to know the gender, nor the number of the headwords to be able to translate them correctly into his native language, nor does he need to know the register they belong to. The question of whether the entries lack information can be answered in the negative.

The semantic glosses of e.g. *quím* and *anat* discussed so far gives rise to another problem concerning the function of bilingual versus monolingual dictionaries. It is argued that in bilingual dictionary entries concerning monosemes these glosses are redundant since both Catalan and Danish users, as a result of their language competence, can be expected to know the fields of application of the headwords and their corresponding equivalents. For this reason it is debatable whether this kind of information belongs to the functions of bilingual dictionaries in the first place. It could be argued that they take over one of the obvious functions of monolingual dictionaries, and that the Catalan or Danish user who, contrary to expectation, does not know, must seek that kind of information in monolingual dictionaries.

One aspect is the presentation of monosemes, another is the selection of their corresponding equivalents. Again, we find some mixing together of bilingual and monolingual dicionaries' functions. Consider, for instance, these entries:

arítmia *f med* arrhytmi, uregelmæssighed i hjerteslag.

pragmatista *m f* pragmatiker, person der lægger vægt på det nyttige og det praktisk gennemførlige.

Both present two equivalents, of which the first are LSP words, and the second definitions explaining their meanings. One of the main functions of monolingual dictionaries is precisely to define meanings of words, a function that should be kept out of the domain of

bilingual dictionaries. One reason is that both Catalan and Danish dictionary users, again owing to their native language competence, can be expected to know the meanings already. Another reason for omitting the second equivalents is that, from the Catalan users' point of view, they are presented as if they are synonymous, entailing that both of them, without distinction, can be inserted into the same Danish contexts. It is obvious that this is not the case. Word explanations can be accepted as equivalents only in those instances where there is no equivalent in the target language, as in the following entry:

> catequisme *m (sistema d'ensenyament)* undervisning ved spørgsmål og svar.

It is suggested, however, that zero-equivalents carry a special mark to inform the users of their status, as e.g.

> catequisme *m (sistema d'ensenyament)* [undervisning ved spørgsmål og svar].

Any translator will know the problems of translating words to which there are no equivalents. According to the context it may be more appropiate to follow one strategy than another, and it is impossible to cover them all in a dictionary of this type.

Turning from translational equivalents to polysemeous headwords, a problem arises if the aim of the dictionary is to satisfy the needs of both Catalan and Danish users. For years bilingual dictionaries have been severely critizised for having presented a whole series of equivalents of one and the same headword without adding any kind of semantic or grammatical information that could help the user to separate meanings. This has forced users to refer to monolingual dictionaries to access the required definition or to make a selection entirely at random. In this dictionary, the editors have made considerable efforts to supply equivalents with meaning separators, indicating differences both at the denotative level and terms of stylistic values. The contents of these glosses are precise and well-chosen and are an invaluable aid to Catalan users.

> bengala *f (canya)* spanskrør.*//* (bastó) stok.*// mil (insignia)* kommandostav.*// (llum de bengala)* bengalsk lys.
> mona *f zool* abe.*// fig fam (persona que imita)* efteraber. *//(embriaguesa)* brandert, kæfert.*// gastr* påskekage, kage der serveres ved påsketid*//.*

The information contained in the entry is well-arranged and the Catalan user is supplied with plenty of information to help him choose the right equivalent. On the other hand, from the Danish user's perspective, all glosses are redundant. Owing to his native language competence he will be able to judge whether he should choose 'spanskrør', 'stok', 'kommandostav' or 'bengalsk lys' as the equivalent to insert into the context he is working with. If, on the other hand, we put ourselves in the place of the Catalan user, and refer, for example, to the following entries

> embargar *v tr* beslaglægge, gøre arrest i, gøre udlæg i.
> càtedra *f crist* paveembede, bispeembede.

it appears that we can choose freely between one of the equivalents, since they are presented as being synonymous. Imagine the mistakes Catalan users can make. The Danish users, however, must be expected to be able to distinguish one equivalent from the other. In a few cases it is true that a polysemeous equivalent carries exactly the same meanings as the polysemous headword:

> martell *m (eina)* hammer. *//* (esport) hammer.

In such instances, it could be argued that the needs of both Catalan and Danish users would be better met if the entry were reduced to

> martell hammer.

One of the most complex fields within bilingual lexicography is the presentation of equivalent pairs at the syntagmatic level of semantics. If a Danish equivalent is subject to any kind of selection restrictions that are distinct from the headword's, the Catalan user should be informed of them. As far as the Danish user is concerned, however, it could be argued that, due to the context he is working with, their

meaning is transparent, and there is therefore no need for their inclusion in the entry.

> **aixecar (o alcar) el campament** bryde op fra lejren.//
> **parar el campament** slå lejr.

In the case of idioms or proverbs, both Catalan and Danish users must be informed of their meaning:

> **sentir tocar campanes i no saber on** *fig fam* vide at byen hedder Snerpe men ikke vide hvor den snerper hen.

In the following entry, it could be argued that the example is redundant, since a word-to-word- translation into Danish would be totally idiomatic.

> **zero** *m mat* nul. // *fig* ingenting, nul. *Reduire una cosa a zero,* reducere en ting til ingenting.

The entry below, however, seems to belong more to some kind of phrase book for Catalan learners of Danish.

> **dilluns** *m inv* mandag. *Vine dilluns,* kom på mandag. *Va venir dilluns,* han kom i mandags. Cada dilluns, hver mandag. *Avui som dilluns,* i dag er det mandag. *El museu tanca els dilluns,* museet er lukket om mandagen.

To a high degree, different dictionary typologies supply the criteria that ought to be used when compiling and presenting headwords and equivalents. It seems as if Danish editors prefer to follow a policy according to which medium-sized bilingual dictionaries should cover the functions of all of them, and the present dictionary is no exception. My main point is that if in the compilation of one and the same bilingual dictionary you try to cover the needs of both L1 and L2 users, both user groups will either be introduced to a lot of information they do not need, or they will miss the information that enables them to choose the right equivalent to use in a given context. Secondly, and as already mentioned, bilingual dictionaries should not be based on principles used in monolingual dictionaries. It leads to the inclusion of vast amounts of redundant and distracting information.

If it is possible for the publisher to change these general editorial principles, their bilingual dictionaries would be of even higher quality.

Institute of Language and Communication
Odense University
DK-5230 Odense M