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A dictionary, in the same way as any other text, is written with a specific user group in mind. At the function level dictionaries implicitly define their user groups by making choices regarding the amount and types of information provided in each lexical entry. Primary considerations in this respect are the user profile and the special needs of the user group (Bergenholz and Nielson 2006).

In specialized lexicography user needs are inevitably linked to the knowledge level of potential readers. These dictionary users have a situational context, and engage in activities, which can be facilitated by lexicographic data. Such information significantly affects both the micro and macrostructural design of the lexical resource, which should be tailored to what the dictionary will specifically be used for. This is directly related to Wiegand’s conception of genuine purpose (Wiegand 1998:52), which is defined by Bergenholz and Tarp (2003: 176) as the totality of functions of a given dictionary and the subject field(s) that it covers. This paper focuses on the dictionary functions and design characteristic of a specialized learners’ dictionary on wine terminology.

1. INTRODUCTION

A dictionary, in the same way as any other text, is written with a specific user group in mind. Specialized (LSP) dictionaries focus on a specific subject field, and can be classified in three types: a multi–field dictionary broadly covering several knowledge areas, a single–field dictionary narrowly covering one particular subject field (e.g., law), and a sub–field dictionary covering a subfield within a broader knowledge domain (e.g., constitutional law) (Bergenholz, H, and S. Tarp. (eds.) 1995: 58).
At the function level, dictionaries implicitly define their user groups by making choices regarding the amount and types of information provided both inside and outside each lexical entry. Primary considerations in this respect are user profile and the special needs of the user group (Bergenholz and Nielsen 2006).

In specialized lexicography user needs are inevitably linked to the knowledge level of potential readers, who have a situational context, and engage in activities, which can be facilitated by lexicographic data. Such information significantly affects both the micro and macrostructural design of the lexical resource, which should be tailored to what the dictionary will be used for. This is directly related to Wiegand’s conception of *genuine purpose* (Wiegand 1998:52), which is defined by Bergenholz and Tarp (2003: 176) as the totality of functions of a given dictionary and the subject field(s) that it covers.

2. **PRAGMATIC CONTEXT**

As suggested by Abel and Ralli (2006), the description of pragmatic context can be approached by combining the concepts of *use situation* (Wiegand 1998) and *user situation* (Bergenholtz and Tarp, 2003; Bergenholz and Nielsen, 2006 *inter alia*) so as to enjoy the best of both worlds.

LSP dictionaries are generally written by experts for other experts. The authors of the dictionary may be experts in their technical or scientific field, but are rarely experts in specialized lexicography. They do not make allowances for the fact that such dictionaries are often consulted by lay or semi–specialized users, who do not possess their same mastery of the subject field. An important issue in specialized lexicography is how technical and scientific concepts should be represented so as to provide a non–expert user with an adequate understanding of their meaning as well as sufficient knowledge of their location within the general knowledge structure of a scientific or technical domain. One of the ways to help users to do this is to reconsider the scope of user guides (Nielsen 2006), and relate them to the communication and/or cognitive functions of the dictionary.

2.1. **The genuine purpose of an LSP dictionary**

Dictionaries have been defined as *utility products* (Weigand 1998). As such, they must be designed and compiled to provide assistance to a specific user, who faces complex needs that arise in a specific type of use situation. This
is known as their lexicographic functions\(^1\) which, together with the subject field they cover, make up their genuine purpose.

2.1.1. User group and use situation

In order to create a profile of a specific user group, relevant characteristics need to be taken into account (native and foreign language, level of proficiency, level of general and/or subject–field knowledge, etc.). This is particularly relevant in the case of LSP dictionaries, since, contrary to what one might think, the group of potential users can be very heterogeneous, and may include translators with very little or no previous subject field knowledge or even a lay readers who wish to find out the meaning of a term that they have come across, for instance, in a newspaper article. However, this user profile must also be related to specific situations in which users interact with a particular lexicographical resource.

According to the functional theory of lexicography, there are two main groups of use situations: cognition and communication–oriented situations (Bergenholtz and Tarp, 2003; Bergenholtz and Nielsen, 2006)\(^2\). In cognition–oriented situations, users seek additional information to widen their knowledge about the conceptual structure of a particular subject–field (biology, geology, engineering, etc.). Bergenholtz and Nielsen (2006: 286) explain that in these situations, the only communicative act taking place is between the lexicographer and the users of the dictionary. The users want knowledge and the lexicographers provide it at a cognitive level, nothing more. The most difficult task for the lexicographer is to decide how much information should be included in the dictionary, and how to design its underlying structure to make the dictionary suitable for users’ needs.

On the other hand, in communication–oriented situations, two or more persons are engaged in producing or receiving a piece of language. This is the case of a translator who receives and must subsequently produce a text, as well as the case of scientific writers, proofreaders, etc. Here the lexicographer acts as a kind of mediator who helps to solve communication problems.

In this sense, each potential LSP user who may access a specialized lexicographical resource corresponds to one of these two use situations: a lay user taking part in a cognition–oriented process, and a translator or scientific writer involved in a communication–oriented situation. However, even if this clear–cut

---

1 The concept of lexicographic functions has been developed mainly by researchers from the Center for Lexicography of the Aarhus School of Business since the early 1990s (Bergenholtz and Tarp, 2003; Bergenholtz and Nielsen, 2006).

2 Bergenholtz and Tarp (2003:174) term these functions as “knowledge-orientated”.

distinction is widely accepted and quoted in the literature, both use situations are dialectically related (Tarp 2005:9) and are often found intermingled in a single user–type. This is certainly true of translators, who must simultaneously deal with both situations, since there is no communication without cognition. In order to successful achieve communicative goals, translators need to be provided with knowledge about the conceptual structure underlying the subject field they are working with.

2.1.2. User needs

The description of user needs naturally depends on the characteristics of the user group and types of use situations. In an LSP dictionary with translation equivalents, which are aimed primarily at text producers such as scientific writers and translators, these needs may require the inclusion of information about the special subject field, the comparison between the subject field in the native and foreign culture, and both native and foreign LSP information (Bergenholtz and Nielsen, 2006:286).

Nevertheless, all these theoretical parameters dealing with user profile, use situation and user needs must be translated into practice. They should be reflected in the way information is packed in lexicographical entries, i.e. in the way definitions are organized and structured. That is perhaps the most difficult task for lexicographers.

We shall now examine how LSP dictionaries deal with this issue. The example chosen within the conceptual category of WINEMAKING is the term fining.

In Table (1), we show the definitions of this term from various glossaries and dictionaries classified according to the type of information conveyed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vasse Felix Glossary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A clarification process [genus] involving the addition of a fining agent [result] such as betonite [agent] onto the surface of a wine [location].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinor Wine Glossary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Process [genus] in which solid matter which clouds the wine [patient] is precipitated by dragging [result], using clays, such as bentonite or kaolin, or organic products, such as isinglass or egg white [agent].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epicurious Wine Dictionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. A winemaking process [genus] that removes microscopic elements [result] such as protein particles [patient] that would cloud [cause] the wine [patient2] and phenolic compounds like tannins [patient3] that could cause bitterness and astringency [cause]. The most frequently used fining agents are activated carbon, activated charcoal, bentonite, casein egg whites, gelatin, isinglass, nylon, and polyvinyl poly–pyrrolidone (PVPP) [agent]. In addition to clarifying wines, various fining agents can also be used to remove color from white wines, deodorize wines with an off odor, and reduce acids [function].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A finishing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A clarification process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A traditional winemaker technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A method of clarification of wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A process in which protein is added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A method of improving the clarity of a wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A method for clarifying wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A clarification technique involving adding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A technique for clarifying using agents such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A traditional technique for clarifying wines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Definitions of fining
Generally speaking, FINING is a process concept type, where different substances are added to the wine to remove certain particles. As such, in order to get an overall view of the concept, suitable definitions satisfying both lay and semi–specialized user needs should account, to a certain extent, for the following elements: (1) a genus or generic term that designates its membership in a conceptual category; (2) a description of its differentiae, which are the characteristics that distinguish this concept from other winemaking processes, such as the agents involved and its purpose or function.

As seen in Table 1 nearly all definitions implicitly contain all these attributes, as well as the patient of such a process. However, the values of each attribute can be very different from the conceptual point of view. None of the definitions seem to follow a specific pattern in consonance with the needs of potential users.

No consensus can be found concerning its genus. FINING appears to be defined as a process (definitions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8), a technique (definitions 6, 10, 13, 14, 15) or a method (definitions 7, 11) and definition (9) does not even show any genus. Even though all three options could be used to define any kind of process or step, category membership is not accurately shown in all cases. Certain definitions do not link the concept to any specialized category (definitions 2, 8, 11, 14, 15), whereas others frame it within the global category of winemaking (definitions 3, 6, 10). Only four definitions express the right category membership by respecting the domain’s intrahierarchical organization (definitions 1, 5, 12, 13), where CLARIFICATION is regarded as the superordinate concept of FINING. It seems to be the most appropriate genus for both lay and semi–specialized users, as it frames the concept placing it in a concrete specialized process and constitutes what Rosch et al. (1976) call the basic level (the best example of a category which is related to the best designation of any referent).

As for the attribute agent, most definitions are based on extensional values. They enumerate the different subtypes of FINING AGENTS, except in definition (7), where it is expressed as a chemical agent, a excessively generic term for even lay–users. In addition, some of the definitions show a hierarchical structure by including additional information in brackets, which can be very illustrative for lay–users. For instance, definition (11) indicates that egg whites are kinds of proteins and bentonite is a kind of clay.

The patient of such a process is, evidently, common to nearly all definitions (wine). The only exceptions are definitions (1, 3 and 9). In the first case, the value ascribed to the attribute patient can be confusing because it is expressed in terms of location (onto the surface of a wine). In definition (3) there are two patients (protein particles and phenolic compounds, like tannins). They express the exact components of a wine that can be affected by fining agents, but as opposed to the basic level of Rosch et al., they are too specific for lay–
users. Finally, in definition (9), patients are divided into two different kinds of wine (red and white) according to the kind of agent they are affected by, which also offers conceptual information for lay–users.

On the other hand, the purpose of fining seems to be the less uniform attribute among all these definitions. Certain definitions, where clarification is not the genus, show as its function clarifying wines (3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 15), whereas others explain the exact purpose of clarifying a wine in the concrete step of fining.

None of these definitions is adequate for user needs. For a pragmatic perspective, all of them show major deficiencies in regards to information content and structure. In the following section, we show how to arrive at an optimal combination of definitional components for fining, which is in consonance with dictionary user profiles, needs and situations.

3. TERM ENTRY STRUCTURE: THE EXAMPLE OF FINING

Each lexicographic entry in any specialized knowledge resource should meet both cognitive and communication needs. First of all, every concept should be linked to a conceptual network that provides the user with knowledge about its underlying structure. Secondly, the concept can be described in a frame–based microstructure where different pieces of information activate the set of most relevant conceptual relations codified in its definitional statement (Faber et al. 2006, 2007, in press).

3.1 Fining within a conceptual network

Once concepts are ascribed to a particular category within the whole specialized domain, they are organized in a conceptual system in which they are linked by both vertical (hierarchical) and horizontal (non–hierarchical) relations to other concepts belonging to the same network.
3.1.2 Definitional microstructure

According to Strehlow (1993) the representation of concepts by means of definition statements alone is inadequate for many scientific terms. He highlights the fact that the representation of a definitional structure is comparable to a conceptual representation. In consonance with this, we have extracted four definitional elements from existing definitions and elaborated a definition, which is further enhanced with the inclusion of its associated conceptual microstructure:
FINING

**Linguistic definition for both lay and semi-specialized users**

Clarification process where [fining] agents, such as clay, isinglass, proteins or gelatin are added to the wine in order to remove suspended matter [which helps to remove color from white wines, deodorize wines with an off odor and reduce acidity].

**Conceptual microstructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS_A</th>
<th>Clarification process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAS_AGENT</td>
<td>[Fining agents] Clay Bentonite Isinglass Protein Egg white Gelatin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS_PATIENT</td>
<td>Wine Red wine White wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS_FUNCTION</td>
<td>Remove suspended matter [Remove color from white wines Deodorize wines with an off odor Reduce acidity]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Definitional template of fining.

With this type of representation, both communicative and cognitive use situations are again covered. Not only does it facilitate communication, but it also offers new information about the way the concept is related to others in the same field, since it makes explicit category organization.

On the other hand, two different types of information have been included according to our different user needs. The content in italics represents the knowledge a semi-specialized user would need as opposed to a lay user. The two elements fall into different categories. The first one constitutes topicalized information and the second one highlights the functional aspect of the concept. In the first case, lay users will not necessarily recognize *fining agents* as clay, isinglass or protein; whereas semi-specialized users will not need an extensional description of the different agents involved, as the concept will activate all types of possible agents involved in the fining process. This would be in consonance again with the basic level of Rosch et al., which seems to correspond with lay users' needs. In addition, the different subtypes have been hierarchically organized, especially for this kind of user profile, as in the case of the types of wine. In the second case, the three functions in italics are the conse-
quences of removing suspended matter in a wine, which constitutes a subordinate level of focalized information that only semi-specialized users might need.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This article has focused on Wiegand’s conception of genuine purpose (Wiegand 1998:52) in relation to LSP lexicography, more specifically in the domain of Winemaking. We highlight the importance of creating a resource that corresponds to the profile of a specific user group, and which is also related to cognition and communication-oriented situations in which users must interact with a particular lexicographical resource. As has been shown, the characteristics of the user group and types of use situations are directly related to user needs. On a more pragmatic level, we show these theoretical parameters can be translated into practice, more specifically in the way information is structured in lexicographical entries of specialized concepts organized in a constellation of interrelated dynamic knowledge frames.
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