

The treatment of equivalent relations in English-Kwanyama Dictionary

Edward Shikesho
Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture

Petrus Mbenzi
University of Namibia

Abstract

This paper investigates the treatment of equivalent relations in English-Kwanyama Dictionary (*EKD*) by G. W. R. Tobias and B. H. C. Turvey compiled in 1954. For any bilingual dictionary to satisfy the needs of the target users, it should treat the equivalent relations effectively (Gouws, 2002; Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005 & Svensén, 2009). Although *EKD* was compiled 65 years ago, it seems no comprehensive study has been conducted to evaluate its effectiveness. Hence this paper is an attempt to evaluate its treatment and the effectiveness of equivalent relations. The paper is couched on the text theory of Herbert Ernst Wiegand which deals with dictionary textual structures, function theory developed by Sven Tarp, and Henning Bergenholtz that focuses on dictionary functions as well as the user needs. In addition, lexicographic theory of communication developed by Beyer (2014) is employed to analyse *EKD* purposes. The findings reveal that full equivalence is treated well in *EKD*, but partial equivalence and zero equivalence have not been presented effectively in *EKD*. This paper recommends that *EKD* be revised extensively to present all types of equivalent relations adequately.

Introduction

This study is based in the field of theoretical lexicography, also known as dictionary research. The purpose is to critically evaluate the treatment of the types of equivalent relations in *English-Kwanyama Dictionary* (hereafter *EKD*) compiled by G. W. R. Tobias and B. H. C. Turvey in 1954. According to Gouws and Prinsloo's (2005) seminal work, bilingual dictionaries are regarded as the types of dictionaries that are mostly used by different members of a particular speech community. Mongwe (2006) adds that, members of a particular community regard bilingual dictionaries as the most important source of linguistic information.

Wiegand (1984) describes the components comprising dictionary research, namely: user research, dictionary criticism, history of

lexicography, and the general theory of lexicography. Hartmann (2013) identifies “perspectives” in metalexicographic research, namely: dictionary history, dictionary criticism, dictionary typology, dictionary structure, dictionary use and the dictionary IT. This study falls under the component of “dictionary criticism” in that it aims to evaluate the treatment of equivalent relations types in *EKD*.

So far there is only a small number of bilingual dictionaries in the lexicography of Oshiwambo. Most of them were compiled during the colonial era and one of their major purposes was to facilitate communication between missionaries and the local ordinary people. These dictionaries were compiled as part of an externally motivated lexicographic process as opposed to an internally motivated process, and with aims that included more than just a mere linguistic description of the language (Gouws, 2007). An externally motivated process, according to Gouws (2007), deals with lexicographical products that have been produced in meeting the needs that are encountered by external members in a certain linguistic community in their religious, socio-economic, as well as political dealings with the local inhabitants of that community. On the other hand, an internally motivated process deals with lexicographical products that are produced in satisfying the needs encountered by local members of a certain linguistic community in dealing with all community activities among themselves.

A very small body of literature in Oshikwanyama lexicography is observed. A little has been done in Oshiwambo theoretical lexicography in general, and in Oshikwanyama lexicography in particular by Mbenzi (199) in which he evaluates the dictionary in the present study (*EKD*) to a certain extent. He investigates the weaknesses of the structure of the dictionary and concludes that much needs to be improved, especially when it comes to the dictionary’s microstructure. It is concluded that much needs to be improved in the lexicography of Oshikwanyama. Therefore, this present study critically evaluates *EKD* based on the types of equivalent relations. By carrying out this salient study, future scholars and researchers will be assisted in compiling and establishing higher quality bilingual dictionaries that will help to develop not only the Oshiwambo lexicography but also the Oshiwambo language in general and the Oshikwanyama dialect in particular.

Literature Review

Equivalent relations in bilingual dictionaries

Gouws (2002) clarifies that “equivalent relation means the relation between source and target language items” (p. 195). Given the

explanation above, it is therefore worth pointing out that there are different types of equivalent relations that can be clearly identified in bilingual dictionaries. Gouws (2002), Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) and Svensén (2009) have given clear distinctions between the three main types of equivalence. These types of equivalence are *full equivalence*, *partial equivalence*, and *zero equivalence*.

Equivalence plays a crucial role in the field of bilingual dictionary design and formation. To find translation equivalents is actually a hard task to achieve. According to Wang (2012), many users, especially the beginners, may have an idea that they can replace any lexical unit they have knowledge of, in one language, for a given concept with a lexical unit for a similar concept in foreign language, for the aim of coming up with the right and understandable translation. On the contrary, equivalence as a concept is much more complex than that.

Svensén (2009) emphasises the purpose of bilingual dictionaries as “to provide lexical items in one language with counterparts (equivalents) in another language (target language) that are as near as possible with regard to meaning and usage” (p. 253). Given this definition, equivalence is therefore divided into different categories. Firstly, there is what is called equivalence of meaning. This category of equivalence is referred to as semantic equivalence. Apart from equivalence of meaning, there is also equivalence of usage which is known as pragmatic equivalence.

It is also important to point out the difference between translational equivalence and explanatory equivalence. Gouws (2002) defines a translation equivalent as “a target language item, which can be used to substitute the source language item in a special occurrence, depending on specific co-textual and contextual restrictions” (p. 195). Svensén (2009, p. 257) agrees with Gouws (2002) in that, “a translational equivalent is one that can be inserted in running target language text.” Furthermore, it can be emphasised here that translation equivalents “have a higher degree of insertability, but a lesser degree of explanatory power.” In contrast, explanatory equivalents are believed to have a higher degree of explanatory power but a lesser degree of insertability (Svensén, 2009, p. 257). A brief distinction between the types of equivalent relations will be given separately in the following subsections.

Full equivalence (Congruence)

Full equivalence, also known as *congruence*, is a one-to-one equivalent relation whereby the source language and the target language items on

semantic level are exactly equivalent. This simply means that both source and target language forms have exactly the same meaning. The translation equivalent can substitute the source language item in all its uses (Gouws, 2002).

Svensén (2009) explains that full equivalence mainly takes place in certain types of words and expressions, particularly in science and technology, where concepts are primarily established on an international basis and usually they are even standardised. Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) express a similar view in that both the source language and the target language items have identical meanings, function on the same stylistic level and represent the same register, therefore, the target language item can be used as a translation equivalent of the source language item without any limitations. Compare the following example:

book, n., *embo*

With regard to the example given above, the English lexical item *book*, which is the source language item, can be translated with the Oshiwambo lexical item *embo*, which is the target language item in all its occurrences. For lexicographers, this type of equivalent relation does not have many problems as it is regarded as the simplest type.

Partial equivalence (divergence)

Partial equivalence, also known as *divergence*, is regarded as the most typical equivalent relation when it comes to translation dictionaries. Gouws (2002) and Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) define partial equivalence or divergence as a type of equivalence which is characterised by a one to more than one relation between source and target language forms. This simply means that translation equivalent paradigm should at least be made up of more than one translation equivalent in a certain lemma.

According to Gouws (2002), partial equivalence can be distinguished into different subtypes, namely: lexical divergence, semantic divergence and poly-divergence. When a monosemous lexical item, which functions as a lemma is believed to have more than one translation equivalent, lexical divergence occurs. These equivalents are believed to be synonyms or partial synonyms in the target language. For example. The lexical item *bush* in *EKD* has more than one translation equivalent that are all target language partial synonyms, as follows:

bush, n., (shrub) *osixwa*; (scrub) *ofuka*, (bushveld, thickly wooded) *omufitu*.

It can be seen in the above article that the lexical item (the lemma) *bush* has three translation equivalents of which *osixwa* is partial synonymous with *ofuka* and *omufitu*, while *ofuka* and *omufitu* are synonyms. In this article the target language synonyms are separated by semicolons. Therefore, partial equivalence prevails. Wang (2012) emphasises that supporting information on the synonyms is salient, otherwise the user will have a problem when choosing the correct translation equivalent to use. This is important for *EKD* users to have an understanding of how to use synonyms, otherwise they will use them wrongly, and therefore, it is important that supporting information, such as examples, may be used on synonyms for the user to understand and use them correctly.

On the other hand, semantic divergence is believed to prevail at instances “where the lemma sign represents a polysemous lexical item” (Gouws, 2002, p. 198). If there are no complementing entries, the dictionary user will find it very difficult to choose the correct translation equivalent. The following dictionary article from the *EKD* serves as an example:

buttock, n., *olupanda*; *omatako*.

The English word *buttock* above has presented different senses or polysemic values in Oshikwanyama, which the first translation equivalent is *olupanda* and the second translation equivalent is *omatako*. The difference between these two translation equivalents is that *Omatako* are the two round parts of the human body that form up the bottom while *olupanda* is either part of the human face which is below the eye. It cannot be assumed by any lexicographer that the users of any dictionaries will have a knowledge on which translation equivalent to use or select for a situation given, therefore, lexicographers should use extra approaches or strategies to help the target users to retrieve information (Gouws, 2002).

Zero equivalence (Surrogate equivalence)

Lexical gaps in any given language are believed to exist, and they are believed to be common. When the target language is believed not to have lexical items or expressions as equivalents for the item of the source language, then zero equivalence, also known as surrogate equivalence, prevails. Surrogate equivalence belongs to different categories and the nature of a particular lexical gap determines their choice (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005; Gouws & Prinsloo, 2008).

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) and Wang (2012) identify two lexical gap types, namely, *linguistic gaps* as well as *referential gaps*. According to

Gouws and Prinsloo (2008), linguistic gaps refer to a situation that arises when “the speakers of the two languages are both familiar with a certain concept but one language, especially the target language, does not have a word to refer to it, but the other language, that is the source language has such word” (p. 20). For example, there is no translation equivalent in Oshikwanyama for the name *HIV/AIDS*, but a phrase can help in translation, for instance, *Omukifi omudipai hau tandavele okudilila moixulo* [a deadly infectious disease that spreads through sexual intercourse]. Therefore, for the user to accurately understand lexical items such as *HIV/AIDS*, a short explanation or phrase is needed.

On the other hand, according to Wang (2012), referential gaps do occur when the equivalent meaning or referent in the target language does not exist. This simply means that the target language users do not have an idea to which the source language item is referring, because the referent does not exist in their language. The majority of these words are believed to be culturally bound, therefore, a short explanation of meanings is given as a surrogate equivalent.

Furthermore, language changes are treated differently when it comes to lexical gaps, for instance the use of loan words, such as *computer* as provided in the preceding paragraph. The lexical gap is filled with a loan word which is functioning as a surrogate equivalent when language contact occurs (Wang, 2012). This simply means that lexicographers do not necessarily initiate these loan words but when they do exist in a language, then the lexicographer has to treat them as part of the lexicon of the language given. Furthermore, Gouws (2002) explains that the existence of loan words do not cause any serious problems to lexicographers, but “when a loan word is not that well established in the target language of a translation dictionary, the lexicographer often complements this translation equivalent with a paraphrase of meaning” (p. 202). For example:

Internet: ointaneta [exwata lokuyandja omakwatafano nomauyelele opakompiuta mewangadjo mounyuni] (It is a global computer network that provides a variety of information and communication facilities).

The English lexical item *internet* is given the translation equivalent *ointaneta* (a loan word) and a brief explanation accompanies it. Gouws and Prinsloo (2008) suggest some methods of treating zero equivalence. The methods that can be used by compilers of dictionaries are, among

others, glosses, paraphrases of meaning, pictorial illustrations or text boxes which are accompanied by lexicographic comments.

Dictionary purposes

Function theory, text theory and communication theory focus on the concept *genuine purpose* of any dictionary in describing the intended dictionary's purposes. In addition, Beyer and Augart (2017) identify three very essential types of dictionary purposes, based on the *Communication Theory* proposed by Beyer (2014). These purposes are *macro-contextual purposes*, *meso-contextual purposes* and *micro-contextual purposes*.

The first class of purposes, according to Beyer and Augart (2017), is called the *macro-contextual purposes*, which, in fact, deals with the socio-cultural contributions that any dictionary compiled would provide in the general public in which it is functioning. For example, by documenting the lexical stock of a language to help in the standardisation of a language and to assist in language and teaching. Further, Beyer and Augart (2017) emphasise that the macro-contextual purposes could aim, for example, for the improvement of the status of a language.

The second class of dictionary purposes is called the *meso-contextual purposes* which are related to the user situation, the situation, for instance, in which the target user experiences specific information needs that result in user questions and user consultation objectives. These purposes according to the function theory are also referred to as dictionary functions (Beyer & Augart, 2017). Therefore, meso-contextual purposes are described as the user situation for which it is designed.

The third class of purposes is called the *micro-contextual purposes* which Beyer and Augart (2017) define as the dictionary purposes that relate to the usage situation. This is "the immediate situation in which the target user is in the process of consulting a dictionary in order to achieve a user consultation objective, which is usually to find an answer to a set of user questions as they arise in a particular user situation" (Beyer & Augart, 2017, p. 11). The micro contextual purposes of a dictionary can therefore be described as to produce accessible and decodable lexicographic messages (data) in answering various user questions as they develop in a certain user situation; therefore, the majority of the dictionary structures described in the text theory focus on the dictionaries' micro-contextual purposes which could also be referred to as immediate purposes or usage situation purposes.

EKD Purposes

The following purposes could be assumed for *EKD* in lieu of the statement of any purposes in the front matter outer texts:

Macro-contextual purposes

- MaP-1 = *EKD* serves to improve the status of Oshikwanyama as a Namibian national language by documenting a section of its vocabulary.
MaP-2 = The functional use of *EKD* contributes to facilitating communication between speakers of English and speakers of Oshikwanyama.
MaP-3 = The functional use of *EKD* contributes to insight into Oshikwanyama as an element of Namibia's multicultural setup.
MaP-4 = The functional use of *EKD* contributes to the teaching and learning of Oshikwanyama and English.

Meso-contextual purposes (dictionary functions)

Meso-contextual purposes (dictionary functions) are formulated for each of the two target user groups respectively, that is a set of meso-contextual purposes for E(UG) and a set for O(UG).

Dictionary functions for E(UG) are indicated as MeP_E.

- MeP_E-1 = A member of E(UG) translates a text from English to Oshikwanyama.
MeP_E-2 = A member of E(UG) is producing a text in Oshikwanyama.
MeP_E-3 = A member of E(UG) is learning Oshikwanyama and is acquiring vocabulary.

Dictionary functions for O(UG) are indicated as MeP_O.

- MeP_O-1 = A member of O(UG) is learning English and is acquiring vocabulary.
MeP_O-2 = A member of O(UG) is reading a general English text.

Micro-contextual purposes

As is the case with meso-contextual purposes, micro-contextual purposes are formulated for each of the two target user groups, respectively. Each micro-contextual purpose is linked to a meso-contextual purpose. They are formulated in the form of user questions that the functional use of *EKD* would answer.

Micro-contextual purposes for E(UG) are indicated as MiP_E.

- MiP_E-1 = What is an Oshikwanyama translation equivalent for an English lexical item X used in pragmatic context Y? (< MeP_E-1, 2, 3)

MiP_E-2 = How does Oshikwanyama translation equivalent X change morphologically in expression Y? (< MeP_E-1, 2, 3)

MiP_E-3 = How does Oshikwanyama translation equivalent X function in a sentence? (<MeP_E-1, 2)

MiP_E-4 = How is Oshikwanyama translation equivalent X pronounced?

Micro-contextual purposes for O(UG) are indicated as MiP_O.

MiP_O-1 = What is the spelling of a lexical item X in English? (< MeP_O-1, 2)

MiP_O-2 = How does the English lexical item X change morphologically in expression Y? (< MeP_O-1, 2)

MiP_O-3 = How does the English lexical item X function in a sentence? (<MeP_O-1, 2)

MiP_O-4 = How is the English lexical item X pronounced? (<MeP_O-1, 2)

The above are the presumed purposes that are formulated for *EKD*. Some of them such as MaP-1 and MaP-3 might not have been valid in 1954, but given that there is no other Oshikwanyama dictionary that pairs with English, *EKD* could have assumed some of the more contemporary purposes, at least for its users. The other important fact is that not all user questions have to be answered in the microstructure. Outer texts can also provide answers.

Analysis of equivalent relations in *EKD*

Full equivalence (congruence)

Description

Full equivalence, also known as congruence, is a one-to-one equivalent relation whereby the source language and the target language items on semantic-pragmatic level are equivalent. This simply means that both source and target language forms have exactly the same meaning. Translation equivalents can substitute the lemma in all its existences (Gouws, 2002). The target language item can be used as a translation equivalent of the source language item without any limitations. The following articles taken from pages 15, 132 and 106 of the sample show how full equivalence is treated. The three source language lexical items *blister*, *peace* and *lees* can be given Oshikwanyama translation equivalents, *epuva*, *ombili* and *ehete*, respectively; which are the target language items.

blister, n., *epuva*.

peace, n., *ombili*.

lees, n., *ehete*.

Example 1: Full equivalence

Evaluation

This type of equivalence has been treated well, because both the source language and the target language items have exactly similar meanings, function on the same stylistic level and represent the same register, as Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) explain in terms of full equivalence features. After having critically analysed Page 130 of *EKD*, it clearly shows that full equivalence between source language and target language lexical items does exist. In fact, many lexical items in Oshikwanyama are borrowed from other languages and they have exactly the same meanings as their base words in the source language. Compare example 2:

pagan, n., *omupaani*. adj., use n., preceded by g.p. Paganism, n., *oupaani* (from Engl.).

pan, n., *osipana* (frying-pan; from Engl.).

paper, n., *ombapila* (from Afrikaans papier).

Example 2: Full equivalence

The three source language items *pagan*, *pan* and *paper* are believed to stand in a relation of full equivalence to their target language equivalents. Therefore, it could be said that borrowed lexical items in Oshikwanyama are generally believed to be fully equivalent with the lexical items in the source language. Furthermore, there are still lexical items with full equivalence in Oshikwanyama apart from the borrowed ones. For example on Page 130, lexical items such as *padlock* (\approx *ekumba*), *paean* (\approx *ekaluko*), *palace* (\approx *ombala*), and *paraffin* (\approx *omahooli*), among others, are believed to be full equivalents. For example, the English lexical item *padlock* can be translated with the Oshiwambo lexical item *ekumba* which is the target language item in all its existences.

Given the above analysis, it could be concluded that both English and Oshikwanyama items have exactly identical meanings, function on the same stylistic level and then represent the same register. This simply means that the Oshikwanyama lexical items as given in examples above can be used as translation equivalents of English lexical items without any limitations. Translation of text from English to Oshikwanyama (MeP_E-1) is one of the *EKD*'s purposes. The mother-tongue speakers of Oshikwanyama are also at liberty of learning and acquiring English vocabulary when this dictionary is assisting with the correct translation equivalents. Therefore MeP_O-1 and MeP_O-2 prevail. The micro-contextual

purpose for *EKD* is MiP_E-1 which is to give an Oshikwanyama translation equivalent for an English lexical item in a specific pragmatic context.

Partial equivalence (Divergence)

The types of divergence (lexical divergence and semantic divergence) have been presented in *EKD* articles.

Lexical divergence

Description

In *EKD* lexical divergence occurs when a monosemous source language lexical item which functions as a lemma, has more than one translation equivalent, and the translation equivalents are believed to be synonyms or partial synonyms in Oshikwanyama, which is the target language (Cf. Gouws, 2002). The following article from Page 132 of *EKD* shows how lexical divergence is presented:

peradventure, adv., *pamwe, simba*.

Example 3: Lexical divergence in EKD

The English lexical item *peradventure* has more than one translation equivalent and they are separated by a comma to indicate lexical divergence as in the above example. The following dictionary article taken from Page 119 also shows how synonyms are presented:

mud, n., *omunoko, oñata*. Muddy, adj.
transl. by v.i., *dongala(a)*, be muddy (of
turbid water).

Example 4: Lexical divergence in EKD

The lemma sign *mud* in *EKD* has more than one translation equivalent, that is, *omunoko* and *oñata*. These two are translation equivalents for the lemma as noun; *dongala* is a translation equivalent for the lemma as adjective. The two translation equivalents for the lemma as noun are separated by commas, therefore, lexical divergence prevails between the lemma as noun and its translation equivalents.

Furthermore, the lemma sign *munitions* (from Page 119) in the following article has more than one translational equivalent, *oiluifo* and *oiti*:

munitions, n., *oiluifo, oiti*.

Example 5: Lexical divergence

In this case lexical divergence applies, because the translation equivalents are separated by a comma, indicating that they are target language synonyms.

Evaluation

Similar to full equivalence, the meso-contextual purpose for this dictionary is for a member of mother-tongue speakers of English as target users to translate correctly a text from English to Oshikwanyama. All in all, MeP_E-1, 2 and 3 prevail. MeP_O-1 and MeP_O-2 also functions in *EKD*.

Semantic divergence

Description

In *EKD* semantic divergence prevails because many lemma signs represent polysemous source language lexical items. If there are no complementing entries, the dictionary target user will find it very difficult to choose the correct translation equivalent. The following example is taken from Page 80 of *EKD*:

grave, n., *ombila*, *ouii*, *ositumbo*. [...]

Example 6: Semantic divergence

Evaluation

The translation equivalents in example 6 seem to be presented as target language synonyms (lexical divergence), because they are separated by a comma. They should have been separated by a semicolon as they both have different meanings (semantic divergence). If there is a difference in their use, that should be indicated by complementing entries like labels or context indicators. The English lexical item *grave* above has three translation equivalents in Oshikwanyama of which the first translation is *ombila*, the second one is *ouii* and the last one is *ositumbo*. It cannot be assumed by any lexicographer that the users of any dictionaries will infinitely have a knowledge on which translation equivalent to use or select for a situation given, therefore, lexicographers should use extra approaches or strategies to enable the users to retrieve information.

The same case is observed on Page 2 of *EKD* in which the incorrect presentation of semantic divergence is observed:

accusation, n., *epangulifo*, *etokolo*, *epopio*

Example 7: Incorrect presentation of semantic divergence

The above translation equivalents *epangulifo*, *etokolo* and *epopio* should have been separated by a semicolon as they both have different meanings. Complementing entries like labels or context indicators should at least be indicated in order for the target user to use them properly in a given context. Throughout the sample, a good example of contextual guidance is hardly seen, as far as semantic divergence is concerned.

Zero equivalence (Surrogate equivalence)

Description

Compare Section 2.1.3 about zero equivalence. The following example is taken from Page 184 of *EKD* where linguistic gaps prevail:

treasure, n., *emona li nondilo inene, omamona a halua unene*. V.t., *tuvikila(e) naua, kosifa(a) ondilo, hola(e) unene*.

Example 8: Linguistic gaps in EKD

In example 8, the source language lexical item *treasure* is known by speakers of both English and Oshikwanyama, but there is no exact lexical item in Oshikwanyama for it. Therefore, the meaning of that lexical item has not been lexicalised in Oshikwanyama. The meanings *emona li nondilo*, *omamona a halua unene*, *tuvikila naua*, *kosifa ondilo*, and *hola unene* have not been lexicalised. Therefore, the meaning of the lexical item *treasure* is explained by means of a paraphrase of meaning instead of providing a lexical translation equivalent. The paraphrases of meaning that are provided for the lemma *treasure* above are correct and they make the target users understand clearly of what the item *treasure* is referring to. Therefore, lexical gap here has been treated well, and it seems to be the best strategy to use, especially when there is no exact lexical item in Oshikwanyama which is equivalent to the lexical item in English. Therefore, lexical gaps in Oshikwanyama prevail. Referential gaps do not seem to occur in *EKD*.

Language changes have their own treatment when it comes to lexical gaps, especially the use of loan words. The lexical gap is filled with a loan word, and becomes a proper translation equivalent. Lexicographers do not necessarily initiate these loan words but when they do exist in a language, then the lexicographer has to treat them as part of the lexicon of the language given (cf. Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005; 2008). For example, the lexical item *seraph* from Page 159 of *EKD* is given as an example of a lexical gap.

seraph, n., *selafi* (from Engl.).

Example 9: Lexical gap filled by a loan lexical item

Evaluation

The English lexical item *seraph* in Oshikwanyama is translated into *selafi*. Even when this item is translated into Oshikwanyama, it is crucial that an accompanying text such as a context indicator is provided to make it clear to the user in understanding its meaning better because the equivalent word in Oshikwanyama does not exist. It is observed that the compilers of *EKD* have failed to give extra assistance of the meaning of the concerned word either by a paraphrase of meaning or a pictorial indicator. An accompanying text of the English lexical item *seraph* in Oshikwanyama should have been done as follows:

seraph, n., *selafi* (from Engl.). (*Omweengeli womEulu a dja mongudu yovaengeli vakwao e na omavava ahamano. Moinyolwa nomomafano omOmbibeli, omweengeli okwa ulikwa onga okaana ke na omavava. Oshitya serafi osha hala ashike kutya omweengeli*).

[A seraph is an angel, a heavenly, human-like creature with wings. A seraph is a member of a group of angels called the seraphim, who are believed to have six wings. In paintings and sculpture, a *seraph* is often portrayed as a child with wings. Seraphic is a word meaning “angelic”]

Example 10: The correct presentation of lexical gap filled with a loan word

Conclusion

Given the explanations above and after having carefully examined and evaluated equivalence in *EKD*, it is revealed that the majority of lexical items either fall in the category of partial equivalence or that of full equivalence. With regard to zero equivalence, it could be concluded that between the two types, linguistic gaps have been treated fairly compared to referential gaps which do not seem to be treated. Both micro-contextual purposes as well as meso-contextual purposes for the users of non-mother-tongue speakers of Oshikwanyama (MeP_E-1, 2, and 3) as well as the micro-contextual purposes of *EKD* users of mother-tongue speakers of English (MiP_E-1, 2, 3 and 4) can be achieved because the dictionary aims to provide correct translation equivalents and pronunciation to the target users.

For the other target users of *EKD* which are mother-tongue speakers of Oshikwanyama, meso-contextual purposes (MeP_O-1 and 2) apply in the sense that *EKD* assists the target user in learning and acquiring English vocabulary that will also assist in reading a general English text. After that

correct translation equivalents will be used because the user is exposed to English lexical items.

Lastly, it is very important to note here that the inconsistent presentation of lexical and semantic divergence is a serious deficiency in *EKD* because the target users could be confused about the status of offered translation equivalents. This problem seriously compromises the usefulness of the dictionary. Thus, the need arises to employ both text and function theories to update its structure and content in order to satisfy the need of the target users.

References

- Beyer, H. L., & Augart, J. (2017). From user questions to a basic microstructure: Developing a generative communication theory for a Namibian German dictionary. *Journal for Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 1-31.
- Gouws, R. H. (2002). Nicheing as a macrostructural procedure. *Lexikos*, 12, 133-158. Gouws, R. H. (2007). On the development of bilingual dictionaries in South Africa: Aspects of dictionary culture and government policy. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 20(3), 313-327.
- Gouws, R. (2009). *Lexicography: Equivalent relations in bilingual dictionaries*. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.
- Gouws, R. H., & Prinsloo, D. J. (2005). *Principles and practice of South African lexicography*. Stellenbosch: Sun Press.
- Gouws, R. H., & Prinsloo, D. J. (2008). Surrogate equivalence in bilingual dictionaries with special reference to dictionaries Bridging English and African Languages. *AFRILEX-Thirteenth International Conference ON Printed and Electronic Dictionaries and the Future*, 13, 20-22.
- Mbenzi, P. A. (1996). Review of English-Kwanyama dictionary. *Lexikos* 6, 318-319.
- Mongwe, M. J. (2006). *The role of the national South African lexicography units in planning and compilation of multifunctional bilingual dictionaries* (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, South Africa.
- Svensén, B. (2009). *A handbook of lexicography. The theory and practice of dictionary making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tobias, G. W. R., & Turvey, B. H. C. (1954). *English-Kwanyama dictionary*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

- Turvey, B. H. C. (1977). *Kwanyama-English Dictionary* (W. Zimmermann and G. B. Taapopi, Eds.). Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Wang, M. (2012). *A critical evaluation of bilingual Chinese/ English dictionaries for elementary and intermediate Mandarin learners at Stellenbosch* (Unpublished master's thesis). Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa.
- Wiegand, H. E. (1984). On the structure and contents of a general theory of lexicography. In R. R. K. Hartmann (Ed.), *Lexeter '83 Proceedings* (pp. 13-30). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.