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Abstract
The present study is concerned with the need to compile English law dictionaries addressing the law student from different legal systems, national and disciplinary cultures. To this purpose, we concentrate on three English law dictionaries currently available on the market: *The Law Student’s Dictionary* 2008 (LSD), *Oxford Dictionary of Law* 2006 (ODL), and *The Longman Dictionary of Law* 2007 (LDL). Whereas they target native speakers with various expertise (cf. Prefaces and/or informative blurb), in the absence of a pedagogical law dictionary for English learners they are most often recommended to non-native students.

The investigation is carried out against the background of current debate on the genuine purpose of the dictionary (Wiegand 1977 ff.) on the one hand and its knowledge- and communication-orientated functions on the other (cf. e.g. Bergenholtz/Tarp 1995, 2003). Specifically, we adapt Wiegand’s (1977 ff.) actional-semantic theory of dictionary form in order to compare features of the meaning description of a restricted but highly representative number of entries across LSD, ODL and LDL. The lexicographical practices they adopt at the microstructural level are evaluated in terms of the specific needs of the non-native law student in the ESP classroom and of the translator alike. Since the analysis suggests that LSD, ODL and LDL are encyclopaedic dictionaries which assist specific target user groups with reception and knowledge-orientated tasks, we conclude giving some final thoughts to the future development of English law dictionaries into pedagogically-oriented multifunctional products addressing multiple target user groups.

1. Introduction
Legal language is strongly culture-dependent, specific, and most often polysemous (cf. Lerat 1995, Cornu 2000). As is well known, this makes learning and translating meanings across languages and cultural barriers an especially daunting task. The main emphasis of this paper lies precisely on the need to compile law dictionaries for the English law student from other legal systems, national and disciplinary cultures. Since data-driven learning, corpora and databases have not become part of mainstream practice in the Italian ESP classroom, monolingual dictionaries come to play a crucial role in helping the Italian law student (and his/her Italian lecturer) solve problems concerning knowledge-orientated and communication-orientated situations (cf. e.g. Bergenholtz/Tarp 1995, 2003). Broadly speaking, they should grant the L2 student (and the translator) discursive autonomy (Temmerman 2003:132), or the ability to grasp the subject matter to the point of being able to explain it in his/her own words, while also catering for his/her language reception, production and, in the case of the translator, translation needs.

In the absence of a law dictionary for English learners, the three monolingual dictionaries currently available on the market and most often recommended to the Italian law student are:
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Far from being a review of good or bad lexicographical practice, the present paper is an attempt to evaluate LDL, LSD and ODL against the background of current debate on the **genuine purpose** of the dictionary (Wiegand 1977 ff.) and its **communication- and knowledge-orientated functions** (cf. e.g. Bergenholz/Tarp 1995, 2003). To this purpose, in Section 2 we shall briefly outline the basic tenets of the **modern theory of dictionary functions** as developed by Bergenholz and associates at the Aarhus Center for Lexicography, Aarhus School of Business, since the early 1990s (cf. e.g. Bergenholz/Tarp 1995, 2003). After dealing with the notion of dictionary functions as related to specific user’s situations, we shall provide a sketchy outline of users’ needs and functions of the dictionaries under investigation as described in their Prefaces and back-cover blurbs. With these observations in mind, in Section 3 we turn to Wiegand’s (1977 ff.) **actional-semantic theory of dictionary form**, which we adapt in order to provide a simplified partial abstract representation of a restricted number of entries across the three dictionaries, with the main emphasis lying on type and amount of (encyclopaedic and non-encyclopaedic) information provided (Sections 3.1.1 to 3.1.4). Although the study is based on a larger sample of entries taken from LSD, ODL and LDL, we restrict the discussion to the entries for fème covert, fème sole, abatement, es-toppel and copyright, which seem to better illustrate the lexicographical practices they adopt at the microstructural level. As is often the case with the products of specialized lexicography which are not corpus-based, do not use dictionary management systems (e.g. TLex or TIterm), and do not rely on a preliminary classification and systematic structuring of the underlying knowledge system, LSD, ODL and LDL are consistently inconsistent and highly disorganized reference tools which draw on the expertise of professionals in the field and seem to do without the know-how of lexicographers and/or terminographers. This, however, does not detract from our investigation and from our ability to identify some general preferences in the lexicographical practices adopted by each dictionary mainly at the microstructural level. In Section 4 we therefore conclude evaluating the observed lexicographic practices against the needs of the law student in the ESP classroom and the translator, and give some thoughts to the future development of English law dictionaries into pedagogically-oriented products.

### 2. Lexicographic functions

Wiegand (1977 ff.) defines language dictionaries as **utility products**, or tools produced to satisfy specific human needs. Each and every dictionary fulfills one single **genuine purpose** via a set of partial lexicographic texts with external reference structure. This enables the user to access and infer information on the linguistic and/or extralinguistic features given for the relevant designative expression and thus also gain access to language use and/or encyclopaedic knowledge in order to solve problems (Wiegand 2001).

This definition has been repeatedly criticized as too general in the **modern theory of lexicographic functions** developed by researchers from the Center for Lexicography at the Aarhus School of Business (cf. Bergenholz/Tarp 2003 in particular). Specifically, in Wiegand’s (1977 ff.) terms, fulfilling the genuine purpose of the dictionary seems to amount to successful consultation (which is the purpose of any lexicographic or encyclopaedic reference work). The extent to which the user can obtain the information he needs to solve a concrete problem, however, depends on his or her cultural habits, personal experience, general and encyclopaedic knowledge, mastery of mother tongue or foreign language, efficient dictionary use, etc, in short, on his/her

---

1 In principle, bi- and multilingual law dictionaries are useful tools for learning and adequately translating systemspecific legal terminology across different languages and systems. Their dubious quality, however, has been extensively exposed by De Groot/Van Laer (2008) among others. This is an assessment of 170 bi- and multilingual legal dictionaries published in the European Union according to type and amount of useful information to the professional translator (also including explanations, examples and quotations, legal references). We therefore set aside English/Italian and Italian/English law dictionaries and focus on the English law dictionaries currently available on the market.

2 An XML representation of sample entries from LSD, ODL and LDL would bring to the fore consistent inconsistencies at the micro and medio-structural levels.
Another problem with Wiegand’s (1977 ff.) theory, Bergenholtz/Tarp’s (2003) argument goes on, is its main emphasis on dictionary form rather than dictionary functions, while the starting point for the so-called modern theory of lexicographic functions is not so much dictionary form as user needs and user situations. Turning to specific users and user needs and profiles as a first step, the Aarhus School of Lexicography shifts the interest from dictionary use to specific dictionary users. Identifying the user profile amounts to determining his/her needs in concrete situations of use (Bergenholtz/Tarp 1995, 2003) and envisaging matching dictionary functions. The lexicographic function of a given dictionary is to assist specific target user groups with specific characteristics in order to cover the totality of needs that arise in a specific type of user situations (Bergenholtz/Tarp 2003: 176). The following functions (Bergenholtz/Tarp 1995, 2003) can be identified:

a. **Knowledge-orientated functions** such as:
   - providing general cultural encyclopaedic information;
   - providing specialist information about the subject field;
   - providing information about the language.

b. **Communication-orientated functions** such as:
   - to assist the users in solving problems related to text reception in the native and/or foreign language;
   - to assist the users in solving problems related to text production in the native and/or foreign language;
   - to assist the users in solving problems related to direct and/or inverse translation of texts.

### 2.1. LDL, ODL, LSD: Prefaces and back-cover blurbs

Dictionary prefaces and informative back-cover blurbs refer, among other things, to user situations and dictionary functions. Table 1 briefly outlines function(s), target user(s) and some features of dictionary structure (outside matter and entries) of LSD, ODL and LDL as described in their preface and/or back-cover blurb.

---

3 Bergenholtz/Tarp’s (1995, 2003) user profile(s) is approximately equivalent to Wiegand’s (2001) user type. Together with parameters such as type of act of use, dictionary type, causes and motivations, Wiegand’s (2001) user type characterizes dictionary use situations, which, however, seem to emphasize the features of the dictionary and not the specific user’s profile(s) (Bergenholtz/Tarp 2003).

4 In the modern theory of lexicographic functions, the genuine purpose of the dictionary comprises the totality of functions of the dictionary and the subject field it covers (Bergenholtz/Tarp 2003: 176).

5 In line with Bergenholtz/Tarp (1995), by outside matter we mean dictionary components occurring before the word list (front matter), dictionary components following the word list (back matter), and “independent insertions in the word list that are not part of the lemma file” (middle matter) (Bergenholtz/Tarp 1995: 212).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function/user</th>
<th>1. Outside matter</th>
<th>2. Entry</th>
<th>1+2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSD</td>
<td>to introduce law students to a specialised body of knowledge</td>
<td>comments on the law associated with entry terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODL</td>
<td>quick reference for legal professionals clear explanations of concepts and terminology for law students at all levels reference material for professionals in other fields reference material for laypeople to understand various aspects of life</td>
<td>introduction to online legal resources / Writing and Citation Guide introduction to online legal resources</td>
<td>legal reference to key cases (+ full citations) jargon avoided if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL</td>
<td>legal practitioners Students those who wish to make an intensive study of the subject matter of the entries</td>
<td>link to Companion Website update</td>
<td>Legal references Legal references jargon avoided if possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Function(s), target user(s) and structure of LSD, ODL, LDL (cf. Preface, back-cover blurb)

All three dictionaries serve reception and knowledge-orientated functions. We therefore expect a micro- and mediostructure which explicitate the semantic relations between terms (via cross-references). Although this cannot be done systematically in lexicographic products which are not corpus-based and do not rely on a preliminary classification and structuring of the knowledge system, medio- and macro-structure are expected to grant the semi-expert in particular (say, students and translators) discursive autonomy (Temmerman 2003:132).

Whereas LSD specifically targets law students, ODL and LDL specify multiple target groups, with different expertise. Addressing the needs of multiple target groups within a utilitarian, commercial paper dictionary which adapts to size constraints is expected to translate into the following features:

- in line with the reception-oriented function of the dictionaries, a semasiological structure in which alphabetical word lists together with sublemmas grouped under the superordinate lemma assist layman and semi-expert with dictionary look up to the detriment of coherent representation of the conceptual relations in the subject field;
- modularity and a graded structure with increasing degrees of detail and technicality at the microstructural level. This should go hand in glove with a parallel system of more generic and more technical definitions, explanations and cross-references which point to the logical relations (on numerous planes of reference) between the underlying concepts in the subject field;
- special to limited attention to meaning discrimination devices within the entry along a continuum from LSD (which targets undergraduate students) through ODL to LDL.

3. Lexicographical practices in LSD, ODL and LDL

This section deals with the lexicographical practices adopted in LSD, ODL and LDL at the microstructural level. Specifically, Section 3.1 provides a brief outline of the basic tenets of Wiegand’s (1977 ff.) actional-semantic theory of dictionary form, which we adapt in order to partially analyse the microstructural features of the dictionary entries selected. The study is based on a pre-
liminary qualitative analysis by kind of meaning description of a sample of 100 entries per dictionary for lemmas from national and international legislation. Detailed investigation was then restricted to 15 entries across the three dictionaries, of which the more representative are discussed in sections 3.1.1 to 3.1.4.

3.1. Wiegand’s (1977 ff.) actional-semantic theory of dictionary form
Within the framework of Wiegand’s (1977 ff.) actional-semantic theory of dictionary form, the dictionary is seen as hierarchically structured into text segments which answer potential users’ questions. The key terms are as follows:

a. Lexicographical definition: a text made up of definiendum (LZGA), definator (definition copula (LA) or absent relational expression ([…])) and definiens or meaning paraphrase (BPA).

b. Functional text segment\(^6\) within the dictionary entry (Wiegand 1992) or (basic) reference unit: it is possible to identify discrete segments within the entry on the basis of their function (and position). They are organised hierarchically and can be divided into items (A), sentences (AnT), or functional additions (ZuA), which are not separable in a functional-positional way from the item they add on (e.g. usage glosses or specifications of the reference domain in the BPA). Next to a main genuine function, secondary functions may be identified.

c. The lexicographic meaning description answers potential user’s questions (Wiegand 1985: user prerequisite principle) in order to solve specific problems in actual situations of use. A hierarchically organized, frame-based article structure can be built accordingly, answering questions about a number of basic descriptors for the definiendum, which fit into categories such as knowledge of categories (A-KatW), knowledge of functions (A-FunkW), knowledge of forms and components (A-FBTW) (Konerding 1992, as quoted in Wiegand 1992: 259-261)\(^7\).

d. Hierarchical microstructure and abstract representation/structural graphs: the hierarchical structure of the entry (WA) can be outlined in abstract representations, both strings and structural graphs, via comments on forms (FK), comprising word formation and grammatical items, comments on semantics (SK), etc. Examples for the hierarchical structure of comments on semantics are:
- SK – [item giving polysemy (PA1) - subcomment on semantics (SSK)] > [item giving polysemy (PA2) – subcomment on semantics (SSK)].
- SK – [subcomment on semantics (SSK) – pragmatic-semantic item (PragsemA), e.g. an item on style (StilA) – item on meaning (BA), e.g. a synonym (SynA) – item giving the meaning paraphrase (BPA)] – [item giving the competence example (KBeiA)].

Items giving meaning (BA) constitute the integrate core, which may be followed by an optional front integrate and an optional back integrate (e.g. notes on etymology, grammar or morphology). Items giving the meaning paraphrase play a crucial role in lexicographic meaning description. Pre-comment (PräK), expanding to the left, and postcomment (PostK), expanding to the right, provide other types of information (respectively, information on form or etymology, and encyclopaedic information).

e. (Non-natural) condensation can be achieved via lexicographic conventions for shifting, substituting, summarizing, abbreviations and ellipses. To take one example, consider

---

\(^6\) Note that in Wiegand’s (1977 ff.) model the function of the dictionary has to do not so much with finding a word in the dictionary as with answering potential user’s questions within a variously segmented and hierarchically structured dictionary entry.

\(^7\) Konerding (1992) also devises a category for items giving knowledge of materials (A-MaW), which, however, is peripheral to legal language. Provided further investigation is carried out, other categories and labels might be used in law dictionaries to account for participant relations in compliance with norms and regulations.
“grammar [...] (the study of) the rules used to form words and to combine words in sentences”, a condensed (v.) meaning paraphrase from which two meaning paraphrases can be inferred (v.BP3A) (Wiegand 1992: 205).

As suggested above, we adapt Wiegand’s theory to our purposes. In section 3.1.1 to 3.1.4 we restrict the analysis to a limited number of entries which seem to better illustrate the lexicographical practices of LSD, ODL and LDL. The main emphasis lies on ODL,8 which, as will be seen, takes an intermediate position between LSD and LDL. First, a simplified abstract representation of the ODL entry is given along with the relevant notation. Second, it is contrasted with entries from LSD and LDL, for which we provide comments on type and amount of (encyclopaedic and non-encyclopaedic) information within the meaning description. We use the following conventions throughout in order to highlight features relevant to our argument:

- Ash key: precedes a term or word with specialised meaning that is also a lemma in the word list but is not cross-referred to it. Items in blue, instead, are cross-references and cross-reference indicators.
- Red: used of a) knowledge patterns (KPs, see Auger and Barrière 2008 for an overview) which point to semantic relations between words/terms, and b) segments which help structure meaning description while pointing to the cultural script for the relevant concept in the relevant (sub)field.
- Single underlining: signals redundant information, easily recoverable from the linguistic context.
- Green: used of a) paraphrases which replace technical detail or terms, b) general terms (which apply to multiple subfields), c) everyday vocabulary with specialised meaning in the specialist (sub)field, and d) broad descriptors (e.g. thing, process, etc), where terms are available whose meaning is described under separate entries in the dictionary. As will be seen, the more the single underlining and the green items (i.e. the more redundant information and unnecessarily lengthy definitional strategies), the less specialist and detailed the information and the fewer the relevant collocations.

### 3.1.1. Feme covert/feme sole

**Feme covert/feme sole** are borrowings from French now integrated into English. **LDL** does not provide any information for **feme covert**, **feme sole** and **coverture**. One reason for their exclusion might be that the legislation they referred to has been modified and as a consequence the notion of *coverture* is no longer part of the British legal system. **ODL** includes both lemmas in the word list. **LDL** gives three separate entries: **feme**, **feme covert** and **feme sole**. Although they are very simple, they have been selected in order to illustrate choices and solutions which are regularly adopted in **ODL** and **LSD**.

(1a - LSD) **Feme (Fr Femme)** A woman.

(1b - LSD) **Feme covert (Lat Femina viro co-operta)**. A married woman; as opposed to **feme sole**, which means a single woman. See **feme sole**.

(1c - LSD) **Feme sole** A single woman, including those who have been married, but whose #marriage has been dissolved by death or #divorce, and (for most purposes) those women who are judicially separated from their husbands.

(1a - ODL) **Feme covert** [Anglo-French] A #married woman, under the *coverture* of her husband.

---

8 The simplified structural graphs given under Sections 3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 differ from Cacchiani/Preite (2009) in that they provide more detailed simplified abstract representations for the relevant dictionary entries.
(1b - ODL) **Feme sole** [Anglo-French] An unmarried woman. The term includes a widow or divorcée or a woman whose marriage has been annulled.

Figures 1a and 1b provide a simplified abstract representation for *feme covert* (1a - ODL) and *feme sole* (1b - ODL).

Both entries provide condensed items on etymology, which is highly infrequent in ODL. When present, the item on source language (*Anglo-French*) activates knowledge about the relevant subfield (Common Law) via inference. There follows condensation in an extended meaning paraphrase which gives the classical definition *per genus et differentiam*: the definiendum equals a genus word (everyday vocabulary with specialised meaning: *woman*) plus differentiae (*married ... under the coverture of her husband*). A dislocated article-external cross-reference to the relevant notion at Common Law provides additional information (*coverture*).

**Feme sole** (1b – ODL) (Figure 1b) illustrates other distinctive features of ODL entries, most notably: a) extended meaning paraphrases which substitute or combine with synonyms and cross-references to synonyms, and b) explicitation of the relator outside the BPA (*The term includes*, a KP which instantiates the part-whole relation). This is an unmarked choice outside the initial meaning paraphrase and is most often used in or across additional sentences which introduce non-condensed (encyclopaedic) information.

A comparison with LSD (1a – LSD, 1b – LSD, 1c – LSD) brings to the fore other crucial features of ODL. Redundant information within and across subsequent and related entries (single underlining), is a feature of LSD versus ODL. One such example is “as opposed to *feme sole*, [...]”, followed by a separate entry-external cross-reference preceded by an indicator (1b – LSD: *See FEME SOLE*), which assists dictionary look-up more effectively than a dislocated cross-reference within the meaning description (1a – ODL: *coverture*).

**LSD** makes extensive recurrence to non-specialist vocabulary (highlighted in green). Contrast, in this respect, **ODL** and **LSD**. Although this might help the layman get an approximation to the correct meaning of the lemma, it stretches the relevant entry, and space is at a premium in dictionaries. Related to this, LSD opts for paraphrases (1c - LSD: *A single woman, including those who have been married, but whose marriage has been dissolved by death or divorce*) while ODL gives the relevant word with specialist meaning or term (1b - ODL: *a widow or divorcée*). Setting aside issues of entry size and look-up strategies, the question is whether the undergraduate student, i.e. the intended target user of LSD, benefits from choices and solutions which restrict encounters with words with specialist meaning (*widow*), with specialist vocabulary (*divorcee*), and with morphological features which can be held to be distinctive of legal language (the French affix –ee.
in *divorcee*). Note that recurrence to *divorcee* in the meaning description would be a reasonable option in view of the fact that *LSD* gives a separate entry for the lemma *divorce* (though not for *–ee/ée*). The question is whether following the standard practice in general learner’s dictionaries, a pedagogical specialist dictionary with production concerns would go as far as giving explicit information on suffixes such as *–ee/ée, -ant* (as in *claimant*) and *–or* (as in *lessor*) in separate entries and/or as part of the middle matter.

One last point is in order: paraphrases and extensive recurrence to non-specialist words and words with both a general and a specialist meaning in *LSD* work towards diminishing the processing effort of the layman. Signalling hierarchical relations between lemmas (e.g. antonymy in *as opposed to*) and using multiple indicators for cross-references to the lemmas entering such relations also assist the user (e.g. font type and style for cross-reference indicator and cross-reference itself in *See FEME SOLE*). These are all features that work towards clarity and simplification (which, however, go against specialist detail). Although this seems to be a main concern of *LSD*, we observe the inclusion of text segments that point to the contrary, e.g. the item on source language and form *Lat Femina viro co-operta*” (1b - *LSD*), which does not cross-refer to the relevant principle at Common law (*couverte*) and, consequently, does not assist the layman and the undergraduate student build the knowledge base for the field. Although understanding and learning legal Latin maxims and phrases is part of the complex task of learning disciplinary knowledge and entering the legal discourse community of practice (in the sense of Wenger 1998), we may wonder why a dictionary targeting non-experts entering the discourse community gives an item on etymology without cross-referring to the related lemma and underlying concept.

### 3.1.2. Abatement

*LSD, ODL* and *LDL* provide separate entries for the lemma *abatement*. Recall that we use red for items instantiating semantic relations and segments structuring meaning descriptions, single underlining for redundant information, green for broad descriptors, words and paraphrases replacing items instantiating semantic relations and segments structuring meaning descriptions, single underlining for redundant information, green for broad descriptors, words and paraphrases replacing items instantiating semantic relations and segments structuring meaning descriptions, single underlining for redundant information, green for broad descriptors, words and paraphrases replacing items instantiating semantic relations and segments structuring meaning descriptions, single underlining for redundant information, green for broad descriptors, words and paraphrases replacing items instantiating semantic relations and segments structuring meaning descriptions, single underlining for redundant information, green for broad descriptors, words and paraphrases replacing items instantiating semantic relations and segments structuring meaning descriptions, single underlining for redundant information, green for broad descriptors, words and paraphrases replacing items instantiating semantic relations and segments structuring meaning descriptions, single underlining for redundant information, green for broad descriptors, words and paraphrases replacing items instantiating semantic relations and segments structuring meaning descriptions.

(2 - *LSD*) Abatement. 1 *In commerce* it means a deduction made from payments due, and it is also used to denote the allowance sometimes made at the custom-house for *#damages* received by goods in warehousing or during importation.

2 *Abatement amongst #creditors* takes place where the #assets of a #debtor are not sufficient to pay his creditors in full, so that they are compelled to share the assets in proportion to their debts.

3 *Abatement amongst #legatees* in like manner is enforced where there are not sufficient assets to pay the legacies in full. But pecuniary or general legacies abate proportionally before specific legacies and before demonstrative legacies until the fund out of which the latter are payable is exhausted; and *‘in addition’* a legacy may be expressly preferred to another of the same class.

*See legacy.*

4 *Abatement of an #action or #suit* takes place when, from some supervenient cause, one of the parties is no longer before the Court; so that, unless his place is supplied, there is no one to proceed in it. Where a party dies or becomes bankrupt, but the action survives, e.g. such as an action for damages for breach of *contract*, it does not abate by reason of the death or bankruptcy, and the action may be maintained by the party’s *PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE* or *TRUSTEE* in *BANKRUPTCY*.

5 *Abatement of #nuisances*, i.e., their removal. A *SELF-HELP* remedy allowed to one #injured by a nuisance. The abatement must be done peaceably and without causing unnecessary #damage.

(2 - *ODL*) *Abatement* n. 1. (of #debts) The proportionate reduction in the payments that take place if a person’s #assets are insufficient to settle with his creditors in full. 2. (of #legacies) The reduction or cancellation of legacies when a solvent estate is insufficient to cover all the legacies provided for
in the #will or on intestacy after payment of the deceased’s debt. The Administration of Estates Act 1925 (sch 1 pt II) provides that general legacies, unless given to satisfy a debt, abate in proportion to the amounts of those legacies; specific and demonstrative legacies then abate if the estate is still insufficient to pay all debts, and a demonstrative legacy also abates if the specified fund is insufficient to cover it. For example, A’s estate may comprise a painting, £3000 in his savings account, and £7000 in other money; there are debts of £1000 but his will leaves the painting to B, £5000 from the savings account to C, £8000 to D, and £2000 to E. B will receive the painting, C’s demonstrative legacy abates to £3000, and after the debts are paid from the remaining £7000, D’s and E’s general legacies abate proportionately, to £4800 and £1200 respectively. When annuities are given by the will, the general rule is that they are valued at the date of the testator’s death, then abate proportionately in accordance with that valuation, and each annuitant receives the abated sum. All these rules are subject to any contrary intention being expressed in the will. 3. (in land law) Any reduction or cancellation of money payable. For example a #lease may provide for an abatement of rent in certain circumstances, e.g. if the building is destroyed by fire, and a purchaser of land may #claim an abatement of the price if the seller can prove his ownership of only part of the land he contracted to sell. 4. (of nuisances) The termination, removal, or destruction of a *nuisance. A person injured by a nuisance has a right to abate it. In doing so, he must not do more damage than is necessary and, if removal of the nuisance requires entry on to the property from which it emanates, he may have to give notice to the wrongdoer. A local authority can issue an abatement notice to control statutory nuisances. 5. (of proceedings) The termination of civil proceedings by operation of law, caused by a change of interest or status (e.g. bankruptcy or death) of one of the parties after the start but before the completion of the proceedings. An abatement did not prevent either of the parties from bringing fresh proceedings in respect of the same cause of action. #Pleas in abatement have been abolished; in modern practice any change of interest or status of the parties does not affect the validity of the proceedings, provided that the cause of action survives.

(2 - LDL) Abatement. 1. Termination, decline, reduction. 2. Abatement of #debts refers to proportionate reduction of payments where a fund cannot meet #claims. 3. Abatement of legacies (q.v.) refers to receipt by legatees of only a fraction, or none, of their legacies when assets are insufficient to pay legacies in full. Pecuniary or general legacies abate proportionately before specific legacies. 4. Abatement of nuisances (q.v.) refers to their removal. Abatement #notices may be served by a local authority in respect of a statutory nuisance. En.P.A. 1990, s. 80(1); Lowe v S. Somerset DC [1997] EGCS 113; R v Knightsbridge Crown Court ex p Cataldi [1999] Env LR 62; Hewlings v McLean Homes Ltd (2000) The Times, 31 August (service of notice under s 160).

We start with a brief discussion of the main features of abatement in ODL and then move on to a comparison across dictionaries. Figure 2 provides a highly simplified and very partial abstract representation for abatement (2 - ODL).

---

**Figure 2. abatement (ODL)**

- **SKK**: subcomment on semantics
- **FK**: comment on form
- **MorA**: item on morphology/part of speech
- **PA**: polysemy item
- **PragmasemA**: item on pragma-semantic information
- **FGA**: item on specialist (sub)domain
- **DiatechA**: item on domain
As can be seen, *abatement* (2 - ODL) provides information on form (part of speech: *n*) followed by a detailed meaning description across subsenses (*PAs*) and matching specifications of the domain of application via relevant referent (e.g. *(of debts)*) or diatechnical item (2 – ODL: *(in land law)*). This results in enlarged meaning paraphrases which substitute or complement synonyms restricting the domain of application of the relevant genus (type of process/action: *reduction, termination, removal or destruction*) across subsenses (e.g. 2 - ODL: *1. (of debts) a proportionate reduction in the payments* [...]). When needed, detailed specialist explanatory sentences follow as a way of an illustration also referring to encyclopaedic information in the form of legal references (item on literary titles (*LitA*): *The Administration of Estates Act* (sch 1 pt II) 1925 provides that [...]) and illustrative examples (sentences giving specialist explanations (*AnT-FE*): *For example, A’s estate may comprise a painting*, [...]). In other words, for each subentry we get a graded structure and increasing degrees of detail and technicality, which address multiple information needs and the types of searches.

At the micro-structural level, some cues to the relatively more knowledge-orientated concerns of a given entry are:

a. specification of subentries within a given entry;
b. type and amount of detail and encyclopaedic information⁹ given within entry and subentry (specifically, specialist explanations and examples of legal cases or legal references and cross-references to the relevant doctrine or related notions, which clearly address the semi-expert, and legal references and references to relevant cases in particular, which provide specialist detail for intensive study);
c. extensive recurrence to terms and words with specialist meaning that are also part of our everyday life. We expect them to enter the word list and not be cross-referred in a dictionary which has semi-experts and experts as its main target user groups. Of course, an increase in entry size which results from the inclusion of specialist explanatory and exemplificatory sections correlates with an increase in their occurrence.

Table 2 gives an outline of the subsenses and kinds of meaning description for abatement in LSD, ODL and LDL.

---

⁹ Wiegand (1977 ff.) draws a distinction between linguistic-semantic information and semantic-encyclopaedic information. Given the highly culture-dependent nature of legal language, deciding what counts or does not count as encyclopaedic information is not always straightforward. Consider, in this respect, legal references: references to specific cases represent encyclopaedic information. And yet, references to the relevant legislation and/or (sub-)domain might be part of the semantic definition while pointing to the encyclopaedia. One such example is (a – ODL) CIF contract, in which CIF-contract enters a part-whole semantic relation with Incoterms 2000 (encyclopaedic legal reference to regulations) and a generic-specific relation with incoterm, which cross-refers to the relevant synoptic entry in the dictionary: (a - ODL) CIF contract: *(cost, insurance, freight contract)* A type of contract [...]. [...]CIF is a defined *incoterm under Incoterms 2000.*

In this connection, by encyclopaedic information we mean specialist explanations, examples (also in the form of short case summaries) and other kinds of specialist detail (e.g. legal references or cross-references).
Table 2. Abatement (LSD, ODL, LDL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subentries/subsenses</th>
<th>Encyclopaedic information</th>
<th>Lemmas (types)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2 - LSD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1: X</td>
<td>12;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>2: X</td>
<td>cross-references: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:3</td>
<td>3: example (is a relation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>4: X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 - ODL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1: X</td>
<td>20;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>2: legal reference; illustrative example</td>
<td>cross-references: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:3</td>
<td>3: illustrative example</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>4: illustrative example</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>5: illustrative example</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 - LDL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: generic syn</td>
<td>1: X</td>
<td>4;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>2: X</td>
<td>cross-references: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:2</td>
<td>3: X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:3</td>
<td>4: list of legal references</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LSD provides a general meaning followed by four different subsenses under four separate subentries and one single case study. ODL gives five separate subsenses/subentries, with four examples of legal cases and one legal reference. LDL, instead, gives a list of synonyms followed by three separate subentries and a list of legal references, no explanations and no illustrative legal cases. Punctuation as a meaning discrimination device is more prominently used in LSD, in which separate lines are used for separate senses.

Ample and detailed coverage of the cultural script underlying the notion of abatement within the relevant (sub)discipline is only given by ODL. The meaning description unfolds through absent relational expression (is-a) in the BPA and inclusion of relational expressions (e.g. [part-whole] comprise) and chunks with semantic values which seem to be distinctive of legal language in the meaning description at large (e.g. segments pointing to participant relations, authority and compliance with norms and regulations such as provides that, has a right to, must, the general rule is).

In all three dictionaries reduction, termination, removal, decline, deduction, or destruction are variously taken to be synonyms which receive specification under the relevant subentry. Somewhat tentatively, we can identify a) broad descriptors which refer to processes (e.g. reduction, destruction or decline) and specialist terms serving the same function (removal, deduction), and b) non-specialist words with specialist meanings in a subdomain of legal language (e.g. wife, cf. feme covert, feme sole) or qualifying as general terms (cf. debts, assets, creditors, legacies, lease). Whereas they are reasonably understandable to the layman and to the competent L2 speaker alike, they enter the wordlist in the interest of precision. Since they recur in the meaning descriptions of more complex notions, it is crucial to specify their legal (as against non-specialist) meaning within separate entries. Occasional cross-references to such lemmas are only given in LSD (e.g. contract, personal representative, or bankruptcy) on the assumption that undergraduates (its main target user group) might not be entirely aware of their specialist meaning.

LSD, ODL and LDL are a repository of legal (i.e. specialised) knowledge and help create shared knowledge within the discourse community. Next to the relevant body of knowledge, however, the non-expert and semi-expert entering the discourse community also need master the appropriate language and, therefore, use the appropriate collocations, within the relevant genres. ODL provides the highest amount of incidental encounters thanks to the inclusion of (condensed) enlarged meaning paraphrases and subsequent specialist explanations and short case summaries. However, none of the dictionaries provide separate collocational information, which would assist production.

10 The extent to which words with specialist meaning and/or general terms can be viewed as part of a domain-specific Natural Semantic Metalanguage (in the sense of Wierzbicka 1996) remains a matter for future research.
3.1.3. Estoppel

Estoppel illustrates the case of subentries for co-hyponyms and underlying concept specification.

(3 – LSD) Estoppel, The law in some cases estops or prevents a person from alleging certain facts, which then cannot be proved by him. ‘An estoppel’ says Blackstone, ‘happens where a man hath done some act or executed some deed which estops or precludes him from averring anything to the contrary.’

Estoppels may be divided into four kinds:

1 Estoppel by record. The rule that a person may not deny the fact of a judgment of a court which has previously been decided against him, appears to be based on two maxims – Interest reipublicae ut sit finis litium and Nemo debet bis vexari pro eadem causa. It applies generally to all civil and criminal courts.

See interest reipublicae ut sit finis litium; nemo debet bis vexari pro eadem causa.

2 Estoppel by deed. The rule that a party to a deed is not permitted to deny facts stated in it affords an illustration of the importance of a seal in English law. There is no such estoppel in the case of ordinary signed documents, unless it comes with the definition of estoppel by conduct.

3 Estoppel by conduct. A person who, by his words or conduct, wilfully causes another person to believe in the existence of a certain state of things, and induces him to act in that belief, so as to alter his position for the worse, is estopped from setting up against the other person a different state of things as existing at the time in question.

See proprietary estoppel.

4. Estoppel in pais. A tenant of land is estopped from disputing the title of the landlord by whom he was let into possession of whom he has acknowledged by the payment of rent.

(3 – ODL) Estoppel n. [from Norman French estouper, to stop up] A rule of evidence or a rule of law that prevents a person from denying the truth of a statement he has made or from denying the existence of facts that he has alleged to exist. The denial must have been acted upon (probably to his disadvantage) by the person who wishes to take advantage of the estoppel or his position must have been altered as a result. There are several varieties of estoppel.

• Estoppel by conduct (or in pais) arises when the party estopped has made a statement or has led the other party to believe in a certain fact.

• Estoppel by deed prevents a person who has executed a deed saying that the facts stated in the deed are not true.

• Estoppel by record (or per rem judicatam) prevents a person from reopening questions that are res judicata (i.e., that have been adjudicated upon by a court of competent jurisdiction). See also issue estoppel.

There are two forms of equitable estoppel - promissory and proprietary. The doctrine of promissory estoppel applies when one party to a contract promises the other (by words or conduct) that he will not enforce his rights under the contract in whole or in part. Provided that the other party has acted in reliance on that promise, it will, though unsupported by consideration, bind the person making it: he will not be allowed subsequently to sue on the contract. When applicable, the doctrine thus modifies the common-law rules relating to accord and satisfaction. Under the doctrine of proprietary estoppel, the courts can grant a discretionary remedy in circumstances where an owner of land has implicitly or explicitly led another to act detrimentally in the belief that rights in or over land would be acquired. The remedy may take the form of the grant of a fee simple in the property (Pascoe v Turner [1979] 1 WLR 431), the grant of a short-term occupational licence, or even a monetary sum equivalent to the value of the detriment suffered by the claimant in reliance upon the expectation...
The court will always seek to do the minimum necessary to satisfy the equity.

3. Estoppel. A rule of evidence (and not a cause of action) preventing a person from denying the truth of a statement he has made previously, or the existence of facts in which he has led another to believe. It is intended to prevent relitigation.

1. Estoppel in pais (or by conduct). Thus, a tenant who has accepted a lease (q.v.) cannot dispute the lessor’s title.

2. Estoppel by deed. A party to a deed ‘is estopped in a court of law from saying that the facts stated in the deed are not truly stated': Baker v Dewey (1823) 1 B & C 704. 3. Estoppel by record. A person cannot deny the facts upon which the judgement against him has been given.

3. Equitable estoppel. (i) under the doctrine of promissory estoppel, where X, by words or conduct, makes to Y an unambiguous representation by promise or assurance concerning his (X’s) future actions, intended to affect the legal relationship between X and Y, and Y alters his position in reliance on it, X will not be allowed to act inconsistently with that representation. (ii) Proprietary estoppel. Essentially related to the law of evidence. X may be stopped from denying Y’s rights in X’s property, e.g. where Y has incurred expenditure in property to his detriment. See Taylor v Dickens [1998] 1 FLR 806; Yaxley v Goits [2000] Ch 162. It has been described as involving ‘an assurance, a reliance and a resulting detriment’. For ‘estoppel by convention’, see Troop v Gibson (1986) 277 EG 1134. See ER Ives Investments Ltd v High [1967] 2 QB 379; Gillet v Holt [2000] 2 All ER 289. See S.G.A. 1979, s. 21(1). See RES JUDICATA.

Under sense 1, ODL (3 – ODL) identifies grammatical category for estoppel (part of speech: n., versus to estoppel, its verbal homonym), possibly on the assumption that the user might not be familiar with a word borrowed from French and still perceived as not integrated into English. There follows information on etymology ([from Norman French estouper, to stop up]), a marked option in ODL, which activates knowledge of a specific (sub)domain, Common Law, via inference. Turning to the meaning description proper, the entire entry comes close to a synopsis which proceeds through the inclusion of a more general meaning description under sense 1 and of its hyponyms (the modified specifications of estoppel: estoppel by conduct, estoppel by deed, estoppel by record, and promissory and proprietary estoppel, the two forms of equitable estoppel). In line with the observed practice in ODL, initial (enlarged) meaning paraphrases specify genus (catego-
ry), differentia (distinctive features) and function, and are followed by additional specialist explanations in or across separate sentences. Thus, detailed specialist explanatory items can be found, both within and across sentences. Consider, in this respect, the meaning description for the hyponyms *equitable estoppel – promissory and proprietary* (specifications via modifiers), in which encyclopaedic knowledge is amply covered via short case summaries and items on legal references (3 – ODL: […] (Pascoe v Turner [1979] 1 WLR 431)).

Turning now to the role of legal Latin maxims in the dictionary, *estoppel by record (3 – ODL: .3. Estoppel by record (or per rem judicatam))* is a case in point. Figure 3b gives its simplified abstract representation.

Inclusion of Latin source terms (or *per rem judicatam*) is common practice in ODL, which assists the user in grasping information via a specialist explanatory addition and cross-reference to the lemma *res judicata*. Latin terms and maxims usually enter the dictionary with their equivalent and an optional meaning description as lemmas or sublemmas on the assumption that they form a constitutive part of disciplinary knowledge and represent possible obstacles11 for relatively more peripheral and marginal members of the discourse community (in the sense of Wenger 1998).

Let us move on to a comparison across LSD, ODL and LDL. As outlined in Table 3, LSD, ODL and LDL provide different kinds of meaning descriptions for estoppel and its hyponyms.

---

11 Note that Her Majesty’s Courts Service, an executive agency of the UK’s Ministry of Justice, provides an online glossary (available at http://www.hmcourts-service.gov.uk/infoabout/glossary/index.htm) for (a restricted number of) common legal terms used in courts. It comprises two separate wordlists for English and Latin terms which are frequently integrated in legal texts. This suggests that, next to legal terms in general, legal Latin is seen as an additional challenge for the public to access to the system of justice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subentries/subsenses</th>
<th>Encyclopaedic information</th>
<th>Lemmas (types)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3 - LSD) 1: generic meaning; sentences 2:1 3:2 4:3 5:4</td>
<td>1: quotation 2: Latin maxims 3: X 4: X 5: X</td>
<td>9; cross-references: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 - ODL) 1: generic meaning; BPA 2:1 synonym, sentence definition 3:2 sentence definition 4:3 synonyms; sentence definition 5:4</td>
<td>1: illustrative example 2: X 3: X 4: X; Latin term 5: meaning description across sentences; illustrative examples; legal references</td>
<td>22; cross-references: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 - LDL) 1: generic meaning; BPA 2:1 3:2 4:3</td>
<td>1: X 2: X 3: legal reference 4: illustrative example; legal references</td>
<td>10; cross-references: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Estoppel (LSD, ODL, LDL)

All three dictionaries allow for modular representation of meaning within a nested entry. However, extensive recurrence to typographical conventions as meaning discrimination devices is a feature of LSD versus LDL, with ODL taking an intermediate position between the two.

LSD includes redundant information at the expense of specialist detail. However authoritative the source, using quotations for the purposes of meaning description does not seem to be a user-friendly option (3 – LSD: 1. […]: ‘An estoppel’ says Blackstone, ‘happens where a man hath done some act or executed some deed which estops or precludes him from averring anything to the contrary.’). Second, entering Latin maxims as part of the meaning description for a specified sublemma does not work towards precision, adds unmotivated processing difficulties in dictionary use and is made entirely redundant by the immediate cross-reference (3 – LSD: 2. […] See INTEREST REIPUBLICAE UT SIT FINIS LITIUM; NEMO DEBET BIS VEXARI PRO EADEM CAUSA).

The distinctive feature of LDL is inclusion of specialist detail in the form of legal references which replace extensive specialist explanations and therefore, cannot be taken to assist the non-expert and semi-expert develop discoursive autonomy. Instead, ODL provides extensive coverage of estoppel and its specifications within an encyclopaedic entry as a result of choices and solutions adopted. Recall from Figure 3a that ODL gives the initial enlarged meaning paraphrase and subsequent specialist illustrative example for estoppel as a first step, enters its hyponyms and related meaning descriptions in separate sentences, and, third, provides extensive explanations which stretch across sentences in the form of short case summaries. Further specialist detail comes from legal references. As is only natural, this translates into ample (though implicit) coverage of the appropriate collocational information.

3.1.4. Copyright

Copyright epitomises the lexicographical practices already highlighted for LSD, ODL and LDL:

(4 - LSD) Copyright A #property #right subsisting in (i) original literary, dramatic, musical or artistic works; (ii) sound recordings, films, broadcasts; and (iii) the typographical arrangement of published editions: Copyright, Designs and #Patent Act 1988, s 1.

See LITERARY WORK; MUSICAL WORK; ARTISTIC WORK, SOUND RECORDING; PUBLISHED EDITION.

Copyright in literary, dramatic, musical or artistic works expires 70 years from the end of the year in which the author dies: Ø Copyright Designs and Patent Act 1988, s 12, as extended by the European Union Duration of Copyright and Rights of #Performance #Regulations 1995.
The copyright owner has the exclusive right to (i) copy the work; (ii) issue copies of it to the public; (iii) perform, show or play the work in public; (iv) broadcast it; and (v) make an adaptation of it: ibid, ss 16-21.

In an action for infringement of copyright, all such relief by way of damages, injunctions or otherwise is available to him as is available in respect of the infringement of any other property right: ibid, ss 96-110.

Certain acts are permitted in relation to copyright works, eg

(i) when the work is being used for research and private study (ibid, s 29), criticism, reviewing and news reporting (ibid, s 30);

(ii) things done for the purpose of education (ibid, ss 32-36);

(iii) copies made for libraries and archives (ss 37-44)

[...]

See COPYRIGHT TRIBUNAL.

Copyright protection is afforded to performers and to persons having recording right (Ø Copyright, Designs and Patent Act 1988, ss 180-212).

See PERFORMER’S RIGHTS; RECORDING RIGHTS.

[...]

See MORAL RIGHTS.

[...]

See CROWN COPYRIGHT; PARLIAMENTARY COPYRIGHT.

[...]

Copyright extends to protection in those countries which are parties to the Berne Convention.

See BERNE CONVENTION.

[...]

See INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW.

(4 – ODL) Copyright n. The exclusive right to reproduce or authorize others to reproduce artistic, literary, or musical works. It is conferred by the Copyright, Designs and Patent Act 1988, which also extends to sound broadcasting, cinematograph films, and television broadcasts (including cable television). Copyright lasts for the author’s lifetime plus 70 years from the end of the year in which he died; it can be assigned or transmitted on death. EU directive 93/98 requires all EU states to ensure that the duration of copyright is the life of the author plus 70 years. Copyright protection for sound recordings lasts for 50 years from the date of their publication; for broadcasts it is 50 years from the end of the year in which the broadcast took place. Directive 91/250 requires all EU member states to protect computer software by copyright law. The principal remedies for breach of copyright (known as piracy) are an action for damages and an account of profits or an injunction. It is a criminal offence knowingly to make or deal in articles that infringe a copyright. See also BERNE CONVENTION.

(4 – LDL) Copyright. A property right (which is transmissible by assignment or will as a personal property), which subsists in original literal, dramatic, musical or artistic works, sounds recording, films, broadcasts or cable programmes, and the typographical arrangement of published editions: Ø Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, s 1(1). ‘Original’ means originating from the author, not
copied: see Interlego v Tyco Industries [1989] 3 WLR 678. ‘Author’ means the person who creates the work; s 9(1); he is first owner of the copyright. For meaning of ‘typographical arrangement’, see Newspaper Licensing Agency v Marks and Spencer plc (2000) 150 NLJ 900. Usually endures for the holder’s lifetime plus 70 years (EC Directive 93/98). An author has the right to be identified as such: s 77. Remedies for infringements include damages and injunctions: s. 96. See Phonographic Performance Ltd v Maitra [1998] 1 WLR 870 (grant of injunction with immediate effect and without express time limit); Hyde Park Residence Ltd v Yelland (2000) The Times, 16 February (inherent jurisdiction of court to refuse to enforce copyright where enforcement would offend against policy of the law); Jones v Tower Hamlets LBC (2000) The Times, 14 November (protection of architectural design by copyright). Given that title to property situated in England is to be determined by English law, title to English copyright may not be removed from England by any degree of a foreign government: Ø Peer International Corporation v Terminator Music Publishers (2003) The Times, 2 January. See author.

As can be seen, LSD, ODL and LDL opt for different strategies in order to address the specific needs of their intended target users. Extensive recurrence to typographical conventions as meaning discrimination devices (e.g. numbered lists, different typeface, separate lines for separate subsenses, explanations and sets of cross-references) is a feature of LSD, which targets the learning demands of law students within educational institutions. The main emphasis lies in helping the user gain disciplinary knowledge and providing the knowledge script for copyright. LSD expands the initial meaning paraphrase (a marked option in LSD) and turns into a synoptic entry which gives the meaning description for copyright while also commenting on the associated legislation (Copyright Designs and Patent Act 1988, s 12, as extended by the European Union Duration of Copyright and Rights of Performance Regulations 1995), providing comments on and cross-references to international conventions (See Berne Convention) and resorting to meaning descriptions and/or a complex system of cross-references for related terms or words with specialist meaning (e.g. literary work, musical work, artistic work, sound recording, copyright tribunal) and terms which are in a paradigmatic relation to copyright (e.g. performer’s rights, recording rights, moral rights, Crown copyright).

As shown in Figures 4 and 5, ODL and LDL provide concise entries with increasing specialist information. More precisely, ODL gives an initial enlarged meaning paraphrase which allows for adding layers of explanatory specialist information and specialist detail in the semantico-encyclopaedic comment.

This is also a main concern of LDL (Figure 5), which, however, seems to concentrate on concise presentation of specialist detail for intensive study.
Although unpacking dense, formulaic definitions (e.g. the extended meaning paraphrases given in *ODL* and *LDL*) while coping with encyclopaedic explanations and specialist details might be too challenging for the L2 law student, full-sentence definitions and long-winded meaning descriptions which stretch across sentences and give redundant information (a feature of *LSD*) might add too much to the reading load of the (unintended) non-native user with (most often) limited linguistic resources. However, typeface and specific typographic conventions can assist the user unpack meaning descriptions and guide him/her bring out particular features of the lemma.

4. Closing remarks and outlook

*LSD*, *ODL* and *LDL* are encyclopaedic dictionaries which assist specific target user groups (cf. Preface and informative blurbs) with reception- and knowledge-orientated tasks. More precisely, the analysis suggests that *LSD* targets the knowledge-orientated, receptive needs of the interested layman and of the undergraduate student. It provides the least condensed and more consistently signalled structure across synonyms and meaning descriptions, frequent explanatory sentences which give redundant information, and general terms and words with specialist meaning. By contrast, the wealth and amount of technical, legal references made available in *LDL* seem to better suit the needs of the expert user. Of all the three, *ODL* is the one that better suits the knowledge-orientated needs of semi-experts (also translators, professionals in related fields and students with some expertise). Next to a preliminary condensed meaning paraphrase that can be seen as also addressing the layman, extensive explanations and illustrations are given in the actual context of use. Though not communication-orientated, *ODL* also provides ample implicit coverage of colloquational information, which, however, might at best give assistance with receptive needs.

Our question is whether a move can be envisaged from the knowledge- and reception-orientated English Law dictionary to the Law dictionary for English learners, a pedagogical specialised dictionary which would have among its target users non-native students in the ESP classroom and, possibly, legal translators. They can be viewed as semi-experts with considerable expertise in another legal system and elementary to high linguistic competence.

As far as we are aware, Lerat’s (2007) *Vocabulaire du juriste debutant (VJD)* represents a major step in this direction. Consider the entry for *copyright* (versus 3 - *LSD*, 3 - *ODL* and 3 – *LDL*):

(4 – *VJD*) *copyright*

*n.m. Droit patrimonial (enregistré) exercé sur des texts, images ou musiques protégés > mettre son copyright sur mod. angl. / symbolisé par ©*
While not intended as an encyclopaedic reference nor a systematic thesaurus (cf. Preface and back-cover blurb), *VJD* concentrates on the reception, production and translation needs of native and non-native law students. As such, it provides simple, short definitions via quasi-synonyms and controlled vocabulary, information on gender and part of speech, and comprises items on form, grammar, complementation, and collocations. Usage notes can also be found.

The linguistically competent and relatively expert (non-native) law student and the legal translator in particular, however, might look up peripheral terms, demand extensive coverage of lexicographic examples and collocational information, and need a user-friendly representation of relations within the (sub)field, as well as detailed specialist information, explanations and legal references for the legal (sub)field. In line with the latest developments in pedagogical specialised lexicography (e.g. Binon et al.’s (2001) *Dictionnaire d’Apprentissage du Français des affaires. Dictionnaire de compréhension et de production de la langue des affaires (DAFA)*), a pedagogical law dictionary aimed at targeting the knowledge-orientated and communication-orientated needs of multiple user groups (non-experts and semi-experts in particular) would be a corpus-based dictionary in electronic format which:

- gives separate conceptual introductions and a word list which links to a set of central concepts for the subfield(s);
- allows for (correct) tiered definitions with controlled vocabulary in restricted entries, and for extended technical definitions with increasing degrees of encyclopaedic information, explanations and specialist detail via subsequent additions in longer entries;
- provides information on form (also cross-references to derivations and compounds);
- provides a separate treatment of collocations (also used in lexicographical examples) and lexicographical examples;
- identifies synonyms and words which are in a paradigmatic relation to the lemma giving collocational information, cross-references to other entries and links to the central concepts for the (sub)field(s).
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