ALI AHMAD

A Study of the Microstructure of Monolingual Urdu Dictionaries

Abstract

THE MICROSTRUCTURE of a dictionary is the organization of information in each dictionary entry (Landau 2001). The present study is aimed at investigating the microstructure of monolingual Urdu dictionaries. To achieve this objective, the documentary analysis approach has been adopted. Two representative monolingual Urdu dictionaries, namely, *Fīrōzu'l-Lughāt Jāmiʿ* (Comprehensive Fīrōz Dictionary) and *Urdū ʿIlmī Lughat Jāmiʿ* (Comprehensive Educational Urdu Dictionary) were used as examples. A checklist was adapted from Abu-Risha (2003) to analyze the microstructure of these dictionaries. This checklist included semantic, grammatical and morphological information and information on etymology, spelling and pronunciation. A list of headwords for the study was selected randomly by choosing one headword from each letter of the Urdu alphabet. It was found that in most cases only synonymic definitions were given. Lexical relations such as synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms and co-hyponyms were rarely given. Information about the formality of lexical items was not given. Collocations and idioms were not included in the main entries but were given as individual entries. The grammatical information given was limited, and examples showing different aspects of grammar were not given. The origin of the lexemes was included in the microstructure but derivational and inflectional information was not. No verbal illustrations were included to elaborate the meaning. Standard spellings and pronunciations of the headwords were given. The study reports that there is considerable room for improvement in monolingual Urdu dictionaries to make them more comprehensive and user-friendly.

1.1 Introduction

The selection and organization of information included within one entry of a dictionary is called microstructure. According to Jackson (2002), microstructure refers to the information within entries. Hartman and James suggest it is "the design of a reference unit" (1998, 94). Landau (2001) calls it the organization of information within each dictionary article. Mbokou regards it as "a place where the user should find all the data concerning the lemma sign" (2006, 184). Hausmann and Weigand define it as "an ordered structure made up of classes of items which have the same function" (qtd. in Hartmann 2001, 64).

The microstructure can be divided into the formal comment on the left core and the semantic comment on the right core (Hartmann 2001, 59).

Headword		Right core (semantic comment)
Left core (formal comment)		

Figure 1: Microstructure of dictionaries (adapted from *ibid*.)

The left core includes the comment on form, so the spelling, pronunciation and grammar of the headword are detailed there. The comment on meaning is given in the right core. This includes definition, etymology and usage information (Hartmann and James 1998, 30). Jackson has included "spellings, pronunciations, inflection, word class, senses, definitions, examples, usage, run-ons (undefined derivatives (with a word class label), idioms, and phrasal verbs (if they are not included as headwords)) and etymology" in the microstructure (2002, 26–27). Haensch and Omenaca include the following things in the microstructure that are common in monolingual and bilingual dictionaries:

> a. statement of the lemma; b. indication of orthographical variants; c. indication of the part of speech; d. indications about the pronunciation and accentuation; e. indications about gender, formation of the feminine or neuter, irregular plural forms, characteristics of verbs as transitive, intransitive, reflexive, impersonal and defective and, in the ideal case, about verbal valences, etc.; f. lexicographical marks; g. remarks about usage restrictions; h. examples of application (much less frequent in bilingual dictionaries than in monolingual ones); in very few cases: illustrations.
>
> (qtd. in Klapicova 2005, 61)

Dictionary writing in Urdu dates back to the fourteenth century. Amīr Khusrau (1253–1325), who wrote *Khāliq-e Bārī* (The Creator), is reported to be the first Urdu lexicographer (Akhtar 1995, 153). However it was the modest beginning of an unending journey. Urdu lexicographers have

compiled many dictionaries of every type and size. Urdu dictionaries currently in use vary from mini pocket to multi-volume historical dictionaries and from monolingual to multilingual. The present study attempts to explore the microstructure of monolingual Urdu dictionaries. The study should be helpful to lexicographers, editors and publishers and should help to improve the standard of Urdu lexicography.

1.2 Research Methodology
The documentary analysis approach has been adopted. The detailed method employed follows.

1.2.1 Population and Sample
Monolingual Urdu dictionaries were chosen as the population of the study. *Fīrōzu'l-Lughāt Jāmiʿ* (2007) (FL hereafter) and *ʿIlmī Urdū Lughat Jāmiʿ* (2007) (IU hereafter) were selected for detailed study because both are easily available in the market, both have recent editions, and major libraries (such as the Library of the Urdu Dictionary Board in Karachi, the Bahauddin Zakariya University Library in Multan, and the Punjab University Library and the Punjab Public Library in Lahore) have these dictionaries.

1.2.2 Checklist
A checklist was developed to investigate the items included in the microstructure of the monolingual Urdu dictionaries using Abu-Risha (2003) and Klapicova (2005) as sources. The features of the *New Oxford Dictionary of English* (2005) were also considered.

   The Information included is as follows: (a) Semantic and Usage (headwords, meaning, lexical relations (synonyms, antonyms, semantic fields, and co-hyponyms)), usage comprised of formality and technicality (formal, informal, slang, colloquial, and register), collocations and idioms, and verbal or pictorial illustrative examples); (b) Grammatical (parts of speech, classification of non-verb headwords (i.e., countable and uncountable nouns; gradable, attributive and predicative adjectives; gender, number, etc.)); (c) Morphological (derivational and inflectional forms of headwords); (d) Etymology; and (e) Spelling and Pronunciation.

1.2.3 List of Headwords for Analysis
Thirty-three headwords were randomly selected. One headword was included in the list for each letter of the Urdu alphabet. The following lexemes were selected:

atālīq (n) tutor; *barasnā* (v) rain; *pālnā* (v) rear; *tōtlā* (adj) lisping; *ṭōpī* (n) cap; *ṡamar* (adj) fruit; *jānā* (v) go; *čāl* (n) gait; *ḥusn* (n) beauty; *khudā* (n) God; *dar* (n) door; *ḍasnā* (v) bite; *ẕari'a* (n) means; *ragaṛnā* (v) rub; *zubān* (n) tongue, language; *sāḥil* (n) beach; *sharābōr* (adj) wet, dripping wet; *ṣadā* (n) sound; *ẕamīma* (n) appendix, *ṭūl* (n) length; *ẓulm* (n) oppression; *'ām* (n) common; *ghalat* (n) wrong, incorrect; *fāṣla* (n) distance; *qad* (n) height; *kuttā* (n) dog; *gānā* (v) sing; *lādnā* (v) load; *murgh* (n) rooster/cock; *nāčnā* (v) dance; *vajah* (n) cause, reason; *hāth* (n) hand; *yatīm* (n) orphan.

These words were selected to analyze the features of Urdu dictionaries. In the discussion there are many analyses made against the items included in the checklist given in 1.2.2. Each analysis is made by using the list of headwords given above.

1.2.4 Methodology

After the selection of the list of words, the English equivalents of the lexemes were found in the *Gem Practical Urdu into English Dictionary* (Badakhshāni, Rasūl & Bhaṭṭī, 2007). These were used to compare the microstructures of the Urdu and English dictionaries. The information included in the microstructure of the two Urdu dictionaries selected was compared with the information included in the microstructure of a standard English language dictionary (*New Oxford Dictionary of English*, 2005) to determine the style and structure as well as the density of information in the microstructure of these monolingual Urdu dictionaries. The headwords in the list were analyzed on the basis of the checklist described in 1.2.2. Table 1 shows the overall result of the analysis. The presence of a given feature in a specific dictionary was marked by "1" and its absence was marked by "0." All ones were counted for each feature. The total number of ones represented the number of inclusions of a certain feature for the thirty-three headwords. Simple percentages were calculated on the basis of the total number of ones and the total number of headwords.

1.3 Results and Discussion

The following abbreviations are used:

> FL = *Fīrōzu'l-Lughāt Jāmi'* (Comprehensive Fīrōz
>   Dictionary)
> IU = *'Ilmī Urdū Lughat Jāmi'* (Comprehensive Educational
>   Urdu Dictionary)
> NOD = *New Oxford Dictionary of English*
> Mean = meaning

Lex = lexical relations
FT = formality and technicality
Col = collocation
Idm = idioms
V+ Ill = verbal illustrations
P+ Ill = pictorial illustrations
PS = part of speech
Class = classification of non-verb lexeme
Use = grammatical use
Inf = inflection
Der = derivation of lexemes

Table 1

Overall Results, drawn on the basis of checklist
(The Number given in the table shows the number of headwords
for which mentioned information is given in the dictionary)

Feature	FL	IU	NOD
Mean	33	31	33
Lex	03	04	21
FT	00	00	15
Col	00	00	19
Idm	24	26	26
V+ Ill	00	00	33
P+ Ill	00	00	00
PS	33	31	33
Class	22	19	15
Use	00	00	33
Infl	00	00	20
Der	05	06	24
Etymology	33	31	33
Spellings	33	31	33
Pronunciation	33	31	33

The table shows that these Urdu dictionaries include information about limited aspects of microstructure. They mostly focus on spelling, pronunciation, meaning, idioms, parts of speech, classification of headwords and the etymology of headwords. Other information is not included in the dictionaries or is only touched upon in some cases like lexical relations or derivatives. The detailed discussion below will make these facts more clear.

Table 2-a: Description of Meaning in Dictionaries

	FL	IU	NOD
Total no. of headwords	33	33	33
No. of headwords with Meaning given	33	31	33
Percentage with Meaning given	100	93.93	100

A dictionary is mostly consulted to find the meaning of a word. Hartman (1999) reports that frequency of dictionary consultation for meaning is highest among university students. Both Urdu dictionaries studied here include headword meanings (except for two headwords that have not been included in the macrostructure in IU (i.e., *gānā* and *nāčnā*, see Table 1). Since the meaning is the most looked-up information in the dictionary, it should be clear and simple so that the user understands it easily. This study has revealed that the meanings given in Urdu dictionaries are confusing. The following examples (Table 2-b) illustrate this.

Table 2-b: Meaning in dictionaries (i)

Headwords	Meanings
atālīq/tutor	i. FL includes four meaning under this entry, i.e., *ustād* (teacher), *adab sikhānē vālā* (instructor of respect/discipline), *tarbiyat sikhānē vālā* (instructor of education), *sidhānē vālā* (tamer). ii. IU includes six meanings of this headword, i.e. *adab sikhānē vālā* (instructor of respect/discipline), *mu'allim* (teacher), *ustād* (teacher), *nigrān kār* (supervisor of work), *khair gīr* (caretaker), *sač kā ustād* (teacher of truth). iii. NOD gives its meanings as both noun and verb. As noun: a private teacher, typically one who teaches a single pupil or a small group; as verb, a tutor to (a single pupil or a very small group). It shows that the Urdu dictionaries have included not meanings but many synonyms. In FL, *sidhānē vālā* is not a teacher of humans but a tamer of animals. But the dictionary includes it in the list of meanings. All four meanings are in varied senses and need the support of examples to bring clarity, but examples are not given. IU includes synonyms that are even more difficult than the lexeme itself. *Mu'allim* is the Arabic equivalent of the main entry. This does not define the meaning, rather it confuses the user. While looking up *atālīq* in the dictionary, the user has no choice but to look up the

	meaning of *muʿallim* also and as a result an endless chain of look-ups start which makes the process of dictionary use tiresome. The *Khair gīr* (caretaker) is also included as another synonym, which seems absurd. Can a tutor be a caretaker? It should be clarified by the use of examples. The meaning in the NOD is quite clear which tells in a short phrase that a tutor is a person who teaches privately to a single or a group of pupils on a small scale.

Meaning in dictionaries (ii)

ṭōpī/cap	i.	FL includes eight different meaning senses. The meanings are synonymic words which do not help in understanding but rather confuse the meaning. The meanings here include *sar ki poshāk* (dress of head), *kullāh* (crown), *tāj* (crown), *bandūq kā paṭākha* (fire of gun), *phal kay ūper kā khol* (cover of fruit), *dūrbīn kay muñh kā dhaknā* (cover of binoculars lenses), *ḥashfa* (head of penis), *ẕakar kā sar* (head of penis).
	ii.	IU includes five different meanings of the headword *ṭopī*. The first four are similar to FL. One new meaning *Europe kī mukhtalif qaumēñ* (different nations of Europe) is also included. This seems absurd without an explanation. But the dictionary does not give any information to explain how the meaning of *ṭopī* can be a nation in Europe. All other meanings are synonyms and are more difficult than the main entry.
	iii.	NOD includes six meanings as a noun, i.e., a kind of soft, flat hat without a brim and typically with a peak; a protective lid or cover for an object such as a bottle, the point of a pen, or a camera lens; an upper limit imposed on spending or borrowing, etc. It includes five meanings of the headword as a verb, i.e., put a lid or a cover on; provide a fitting climax or fitting climax to; place a limit or restriction on.
		It is clear that Urdu dictionaries give synonyms which are more difficult than the main entry, like *poshāk, kullāh, ḥashfa, ẕakar*, etc. The user is confused and it becomes difficult and time consuming to look up the difficult words given as meanings. *Kullāh* is one meaning of *ṭopī* which is not even included in the macrostructure(!) of the same dictionaries. NOD gives easy definitions which are self explanatory and do not confuse the user.

Meaning in dictionaries (iii)

čāl/gait		
	i.	FL includes ten different meanings, which are more difficult than the main entry, and some even seem absurd. The meanings include *raftār* (speed), *ḥarkat* (movement), *čalnē kā andāz* (style of walking), *g̲ẖōṛē kī raftār* (speed of horse), *g̲ẖōṛē kā qadam* (step of horse), *ravish* (style), *ravaiya* (attitude), *ʿādat* (habit), *farēb* (cheating), *tajvīz* (suggestion), *rivāj* (tradition), etc. All the meanings included contain only one or two words.
	ii.	IU lists most of the meanings found in FL but adds a strange new one: *rōshan* (bright/lighted).
	iii.	NOD has explained gait in two different senses, i.e., a person's manner of walking, the patterns of steps of a horse or dog at a particular speed.
		It shows that the NOD has very precisely defined the word leaving no confusion, but the FL and the IU cluster a lot of words that are more difficult than the entry and sometimes conflict with each other.

Meaning in dictionaries (iv)

*ragaṛnā/*rub		
	i.	FL clusters many words around the entry, among them *g̲ẖisnā* (rub, abrade), *pīsnā* (grind), *g̲ẖōṭnā* (shake, grind), *mānjnā* (clean), *jẖēnā* (bear), *satānā* (irritate), *ḥairān karnā* (surprise), *ḥarkat dēnā* (move). These words do not support each other; rather they contradict the main meaning. "To surprise" or "to bear" do not seem to be the meaning of the entry and have been listed without explanation leaving the user confused.
	ii.	IU includes the same meanings as FL but surprisingly it has included an extra entry, *zinā karnā* (adultery/illicit intercourse), which is confusing for the users as a meaning of *ragaṛnā*.
	iii.	NOD gives two meaning for "rub" as a verb and three as a noun. Here, all the meanings are quite clear and self-explanatory, e.g., "apply firm pressure to the surface of (something) using a repeated back and forth motion," "move or cause to move to and fro against each other with a certain amount of friction," "the central problem or difficulty in a situation," etc.
		It is evident that the definitions in NOD are quite clear and unambiguous. Such is not the case with the Urdu dictionaries sampled here.

Meaning in dictionaries (v)

kuttā/dog	i. FL gives quite a few meanings for the word. For example, *sag* (dog), *kalb* (dog), *mashhūr jānvar* (well known animal)(!), *ghulām* (slave), *bandūq kā ghōṛā* (trigger of a gun), *pājī* (idiot), *ẕalīl* (vile, abased). The meanings are once again more difficult than the entry word. *Sag* is the Persian and *kalb* the Arabic equivalent of *kuttā*. Clearly "*mashhūr jānvar*" and "slave" and "idiot" are crying for some kind of explanation. ii. IU has treated the entry in the same way as FL. Only two interesting meanings are added here, i.e., *daftar kā čaprasī* (office boy, peon) and *lālčī* (greedy). But without proper explanation an unsuspecting user can get into trouble, at least as far as the former is concerned. iii. NOD defines dog as: "a domestic carnivorous mammal that typically has a long snout, an acute sense of smell, non-retractile claws and a barking, howling, or whining voice. The informal use of the word dog is for an unpleasant, contemptible, or wicked man." The difference between NOD and the Urdu dictionaries is obvious.

It is obvious from the above discussion that these two Urdu diction-aries do not really include definitions or explanations of a word, rather, they include its synonyms. This is confusing because a user most often consults a dictionary to find the meaning of a specific word. Instead he encounters many new words which are its synonymic equivalents. Some synonyms seem quite out of place, such as *kutttā* for a peon or for greedy. It is possible that these synonyms are given for a specific context, but without contextual examples they appear absurd. In contrast to these Urdu dictionaries, the NOD gives clear definitions. A user with an average knowledge of the English language can fully understand the meanings given. For the two Urdu dictionaries examined in this study, users would need to be scholars with a strong background in Urdu literature or the dictionary would not be useful to them.

Table 3: Lexical Relations

(synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, co-hyponyms, etc.)

	FL	IU	NOD
Total no. of headwords	33	33	33

No. of headwords with Lexical relation given	03	04	21
Percentage with Lexical relations given	0.09	12.12	63.63

Table 3 shows that the Urdu dictionaries examined have a tendency not to provide lexical relations. The figures in Table 2-b and the discussion indicate that these Urdu dictionaries mostly include synonyms as meanings, even though it creates ambiguities. This may be the reason these dictionaries avoid giving importance to synonymy as an additional element. The NOD gives considerable attention (63.63%) to lexical relations. For example, "rear" has been defined as the back part of something, especially a building or a vehicle, and bringing up and caring for (a child) until they are fully grown for a noun and verb respectively. Two different senses are given for the noun "cap" (i.e., a kind of soft, flat hat without a brim and typically with a peak, and an abbreviation for "capitalization"). This makes it easy for a user to know the different senses of the one entry if they are separated. In Urdu dictionaries all the synonymic words are clustered together without any discrimination regarding the sense or usage.

Table 4: Formality and Technicality of Lexemes

	FL	IU	NOD
Total no. of headwords	33	33	33
No. of headwords with Formality/technicality information given	00	00	15
Percentage with formality/ technicality given	00	00	45.45

Table 4 shows that these Urdu dictionaries do not include notes about formality, slang, register, etc. They only give synonyms indicating the meaning of the words. On the other hand, the NOD includes notes about formality, obsoleteness, slang usage, and so on. According to Abu-Risha,

> Any use of a word in an inappropriate context may lead the learner to an embarrassing situation or may cause him to utter an odd, even awkward, utterance […] It is an advantage for a dictionary, therefore, to provide where necessary, in what situation the item could be used, such as in "informal," "formal," "frozen" or other situations.
>
> (2003, 14)

This suggests the importance of including formality notes in diction-

aries. Nevertheless, they are neglected completely in the Urdu dictionaries under review.

Table 5: Idioms and Collocations

	FL	IU	NOD
Total no. of headwords	33	33	33
No. of headwords with Idioms given	24	26	26
Percentage with Idioms given	72.72	78.78	78.78
No. of headwords with Collocations given	00	00	19
Percentage with Collocations given	00	00	57.57

Table 5 shows that all of the dictionaries studied include idioms/ phrases or proverbs in the entries, but their approach regarding the inclusion of collocations is not positive. They ignore it completely. FL includes idioms as run-on entries that are given within the main entry in bold face. IU includes them as main entries so that they become part of the macro-structure of the dictionary. The NOD includes idioms and the like under the category of phrases.

Table 6: Use of Verbal Illustrations

	FL	IU	NOD
Total no. of headwords	33	33	33
No. of headwords with Verbal illustration given	00	00	33
Percentage with Verbal illustration given	00	00	100

A verbal illustration or example is "a word or a phrase used in a reference work to illustrate a particular form of meaning in a wider context, such as a sentence" (Hartman and James 1998, 53). The present study found that the Urdu dictionaries do not use illustrations to explain the meaning in context (Table 6). This is why confusion arises. The NOD, on the other hand, always provides illustrations to explain the word in different contexts. For example, for the word "tutor" the NOD provides "his children were privately tutored" and "work as a tutor"; for the word "rain" it has "the rain had not stopped for days," "it was beginning to rain" and "the match was rained off." This shows that the NOD uses verbal illustrations to clarify the different senses in which a word may be used.

Table 7: Parts of Speech

	FL	IU	NOD
Total no. of headwords	33	33	33
No. of headwords with Parts of Speech given	33	31	33
Percentage with Parts of Speech given	100	93.93	100

Table 7 shows that both Urdu dictionaries studied include information about the grammar of the word. However, the information is limited. For example, FL only indicates the categories of noun, verb, pronoun and adjective; IU indicates noun, adjective and verb. The NOD includes all aspects of the grammar. By way of example, for the entry of *ṭōpī*/cap, FL and IU indicate it is a noun, but the NOD gives illustrations using cap as a noun and as a verb. It also indicates the changes in meaning which occur when it is used with adjective or noun modifiers or is used as an adjective. *Ragaṛnā*/rub is listed as a verb in the Urdu dictionaries without any elaboration. The NOD indicates that the word "rub" is a verb and then illustrates the changes that occur when "rub" occurs with an object or when it does not have an object, etc.

Table 8: Classification of Non-Verb Headwords

	FL	IU	NOD
Total no of headwords	24	24	25
No. of headwords with Classifications given	22	19	15
Percentage with Classifications given	91.66	79.16	60

In the list of thirty-three headwords, nine are verbs. The remaining twenty-four are non-verbs, i.e., nouns or adjectives. Twenty-five of the English equivalents of the headwords in the list are non-verbs. The treatment of the Urdu dictionaries with these words is very limited. These dictionaries only tell whether a headword is a noun or an adjective, or they tell about the gender or number of the headword. We have considered this surface information from Urdu dictionaries as classifying information. Otherwise the percentage of classifying headwords might have been zero. NOD classifies headwords more completely. For example, for adjectives it gives the positive, comparative, and superlative forms, e.g., wetter, wettest for wet, and commoner, commonest for common. The NOD also includes the classification of nouns as mass noun, count noun, etc.

Table 9: Grammatical Use of Headwords

	FL	IU	NOD
Total no. of headwords	33	33	33
No. of headwords with Grammatical use given	00	00	33
Percentage with Grammatical use given	00	00	100

Table 9 shows that neither of the Urdu dictionaries gives examples of the grammatical usage restrictions for a certain headword. Conversely, the NOD always provides examples to illustrate grammatical use. For instance, under the entry "rain" the following grammatical usages are included:

> As a mass noun: "the rain has not stopped for days" and "it is pouring with rain"
> As a mass noun (rains): "the plants were washed away by unusually heavy rains" and a singular "he fell under the rain of blows"
> As a verb with no object: "it is beginning to rain"
> As a verb with object: "the match was rained off"
> With adverbial of direction and no object: "bombs rained down"
> With adverbial of direction and with object: "she rained blows on to him"

This shows that the NOD provides many examples of grammatical use to facilitate a user's understanding. The Urdu dictionaries only indicate whether the headwords are nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc., and the reader is left to use them according to his own thinking and background knowledge of the language. This practice makes Urdu dictionaries less useful.

Table 10: Inflections

	FL	IU	NOD
Total no. of headwords	33	33	33
No. of headwords with Inflections given	00	00	20
Percentage with Inflections given	00	00	60.60

The Urdu dictionaries examined do not give the inflected forms of the headwords, but the NOD has used this method where necessary. For example: rains, raining or rained for the word "rain"; caps or capped for "cap"; and rubs, rubbing, rubbed for "rub."

Table 11: Derivatives

	FL	IU	NOD
Total no. of headwords	33	33	33
No. of headwords with Derivatives given	05	06	24
Percentage with Derivations given	15.15	18.18	72.72

In these Urdu dictionaries, derivatives are rarely included. (15.15% in FL and 18.18% in IU). For example, *atālīqī* is included as a derivative of *atālīq* in both FL and IU, and *pālan* for *pālnā* in IU. The problem is that the derivatives are given as individual entries and are not given within the main entry. That is, *atālīqī* is not given as a derivative under *atālīq* but is listed separately. In the NOD, derivatives of a headword are normally gathered within the entry under the heading of "derivatives."

Table 12: Etymology of Headwords

	FL	IU	NOD
Total no. of headwords	33	33	33
No. of headwords with Etymology given	33	31	33
Percentage with Etymologies given	100	93.93	100

All three dictionaries make full use of the practice of giving the etymology of headwords. The limitation with the Urdu dictionaries examined is that they only tell the language a given word comes from. For example, *barasnā* (Urdu), *pālnā* (Urdu), *totlā* (Hindi), *s̄amar* (Arabic), and so on. The NOD gives the complete history of the word. For example the origin of "tutor": "late Middle English: from old French *tutour* or Latin tutor, from *tueri* 'to watch, to guard'."

Table 13: Spelling and Pronunciation

	FL	IU	NOD
Total no. of headwords	33	33	33
No. of headwords with Spelling and pronunciation given	33	31	33
Percentage with Spelling and pronunciation given	100	93.93	100

Table 13 shows that both Urdu dictionaries studied include information about the pronunciation of words. The standard spelling is entered as

the headword and any variation in spelling is ignored. The same is the case for pronunciation, where no variant is given. The NOD includes the standard spelling and pronunciation as well as variants, for example American variants.

1.4 Conclusions

On the basis of the above discussion, the following conclusions can be made:

The information in the microstructure of monolingual Urdu dictionaries is limited to spelling, pronunciation, meaning, idioms, description of parts of speech and the etymology of the headwords.

The meanings are not given to aid the user; rather, all synonymic equivalents are included in the entry regardless of their intelligibility. In contrast to the NOD, no definitions are given in these two Urdu dictionaries. Most of the time, the meanings given also need to be looked up because they are confusing. Meanings are mostly one-word equivalents. All of the different senses of meaning for one headword are given without any usage notes or any explanation. This makes these Urdu dictionaries difficult to use and understand.

No lexical relations are given in the Urdu dictionaries. Instead, all synonyms are given as meanings.

No notes on the formality or technicality of the lexemes are included in the list. Informal words, colloquial expressions, slang, and even vulgar slang are given without any note.

Though Urdu contains numerous frequently used collocations, they are not included in the dictionary microstructure as run-ons but are given as individual entries.

Urdu dictionaries provide some idioms and proverbs, but they are included as individual entries.

Verbal illustrations are not given in these Urdu dictionaries making them unintelligible and difficult. There is confusion about the meaning and use of many synonymic words included in the list of meanings for an entry.

Limited information about the parts of speech is included in the Urdu dictionaries. This creates difficulty when the user is faced with advanced features of Urdu grammar but finds no help in the dictionary.

Non-verb headwords are not further classified into subcategories. These Urdu dictionaries only specify whether a lexeme is a noun or an adjective. Gender and number are given for nouns, but their complete grammatical categorization is not provided. Adjectives are simply listed

without further categorization. Grammatical use is absent.

Inflected forms of the headwords are not given in these Urdu dictionaries. Derivations are also largely absent. Derivatives of some headwords are given, but they are de-nested and are included as individual entries in the macrostructure.

The etymology in Urdu dictionaries is not complete. Only the language from which Urdu has absorbed that headword is mentioned.

1.5 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following changes in the microstructure of monolingual Urdu dictionaries are recommended:

a. Paraphrases should be given to define the headwords instead of one-word synonymic equivalents. Different meanings of one headword should be separated by numbers and each meaning should be paraphrased.

b. Sense relations should be given where needed.

c. Notes on the formality of a lexeme should be provided.

d. Nesting should be incorporated in Urdu dictionaries with all the collocations, idioms, inflections, and derivatives of one lexeme brought together under one entry.

e. To elaborate the meaning, verbal illustrations should be included in the entries. This will help to convey the literal meaning as well as make it easier for the user to understand the metaphorical uses of the word.

f. Grammatical information should be complete. Simply saying that a headword is a noun, verb, etc., is not enough. All senses of a lexeme should be included along with examples of the grammatical use for each. The classification of non-verb lexemes should also be included.

g. The complete etymology of lexemes should be included in the entry. ❑

Works Cited

Abu-Risha, Mohammed Y. 2003. "What Should a Learner's Dictionary Include?" *Zarkā Journal for Studies and Research* 5(1). http://www.translationdirectory.com/article1121.htm (accessed June 16, 2007).

Akhtar, S. 1995. *Urdu Zubān kī Mukhtaṣar Tareen Tārīkh* (The Shortest History of the Urdu Language). Islamabad: Muqtadra Qaumī Zubān.

Badakhshānī, M.R., K.E. Rasūl, and M.S. Bhaṭṭī. 2007. *Gem Practical Urdu into English Dictionary.* Lahore: Azhar Publishers.

Fīrōzu'l-Lughat Jāmiʿ (Comprehensive Fīrōz Dictionary). 2007. Lahore: Fīrōz Sons.

Hartmann, R.R.K., ed. 1999. *Dictionaries in Language Learning: Recommendations, National Reports and Thematic Reports from the TNT Sub-Project 9: Dictionaries* http://www.fuberlin.de/elc/TNPproducts/SP9dossier.doc (accessed November 3, 2007).

_____. 2001. *Teaching and Researching Lexicography.* Harlow, England: Longman.

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

ʿIlmī Urdū Lughat Jāmiʿ (Comprehensive Educational Urdu Dictionary). 2007. Lahore: ʿIlmī Kitāb Khāna.

Jackson, H. 2002. *Lexicography: An Introduction.* London; New York: Routledge.

Klapicova, E.H. 2005. "Composition of the Entry in a Bilingual Dictionary." *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 2(3):57–74. http://www.skase.sk/ (accessed May 2, 2007).

Landau, S.A. 2001. *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mbokou, L.M. 2006. "A Model for the Macro- and Microstructure of a Yipunu-French School Dictionary." D. Lit. Thesis, University of Stellenbosch. http://ir.sun.ac.za/dspace/handle/10019/96.

New Oxford Dictionary of English. 2005. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.