

i. Table of Contents

		Page
i.	Table of contents	5
ii.	Foreword and Dedication	13
iii.	Abbreviations used in this Dissertation	15
1.	Introduction: The aims and structure of this research	17
2.	Monolingual Learner's Dictionaries – from print to electronic and general EFL to legal ESP classes	19
2.0.	Introduction	19
2.1.	Monolingual Learner's Dictionary or Bilingual Dictionary in EFL teaching?	20
2.2.	The skills of the users and teachers	24
2.3.	A survey regarding the ownership and use of print MLDs among the law students in EFL/ESP classes at the FAU Erlangen-Nürnberg	25
2.4.	Bringing MLD print versions along to legal ESP classes	26
2.5.	<i>Vorsprung durch Technik</i> – electronic dictionaries	26
2.6.	Electronic Dictionaries – Types, Development and Use in Class	27
2.6.1.	Pocket Electronic Dictionaries (PEDs)	28
2.6.2.	CD-ROM Versions of the Printed Dictionary	30
2.6.3.	Online Dictionaries	31
2.7.	Using the online-MLDs in EFL classes	32
2.7.1.	The failure of the relevant hardware devices (smartphones, tablets etc.) to fulfil the task due to their inability to connect to the available Internet connection	33
2.7.2.	Possession of or access to the requisite hardware among the students	34
2.7.2.1.	The test group	35
2.7.2.2.	The execution of the questionnaire	35
2.7.3.	The lack of the necessary Internet access within the teaching environment	36
2.8.	Further classifications of online dictionaries	38
2.9.	Are the online-MLDs fit for this particular purpose?	39
2.10.	A lexicographical <i>Zweckentfremdung</i> ?	40
2.11.	Conclusion to Chapter 2	41

3.	Specialised and legal language and the lexicographic label denoting diatechnical markedness in the subject field of law in the online and print versions of the five selected monolingual learner's dictionaries (MLDs)	45
3.1.	Specialised Language and Legal Language – What are they?	45
3.2.	The full extent of the subject field of law	47
3.3.	Legal terminology for the purposes of this study – lexicographic labelling	48
3.4.	Diasystematic lexicographic labelling in the MLDs	50
3.5.	Diatechnical labels	51
3.5.1.	The form of the diatechnical usage label in the field of law (LAW/LEGAL label) in the 5 MLDs (online and print versions)	52
3.5.2.	CALD4: online v. print version – labelling incongruities	54
3.6.	The description of markedness of the diatechnical usage label in the field of law provided in the five MLDs (online and print versions)	60
3.7.	The scope of the law diatechnical label in the subject field of law based upon the MLDs descriptors	64
3.8.	Proposal – The addition of a supplementary access structure for usage label explanations via hyperlinked usage labels	64
3.9.	The positioning of the LAW label in the five online-MLDs	65
3.10.	The extraction from the five online-MLDs of items marked with the LAW label	66
3.11.	CALD4 – a labelling anomaly	68
3.11.1.	http://dictionary.cambridge.org/ - CALD4, CBED, CLD, CACD et al.: one website, numerous dictionaries	69
3.12.	Number of LAW labels in the five MLDs as a whole (print and online versions)	71
3.13.	Number of LAW labels in each respective dictionary of the five MLDs (print and online versions)	72
3.14.	The LAW label: online version versus print version of each individual MLD	74
3.15.	Conclusion to Chapter 3	75

4.	The word class, inclusion and labelling in the online-MLDs of the lexical units which are marked with the lexicographic diatechnical label denoting the subject field of law in at least one of these dictionaries	77
4.0.	Introduction	77
4.1.	The identity of the individual entries and the specific lexical units which have been given the lexicographic label denoting diatechnical markedness in the subject field of law in at least one of the online versions of the 'Big Five' MLDs	77
4.2.	The definition of 'inclusion in an MLD' used within this study	79
4.3.	Included in the OAAD-online	84
4.4.	Separate senses in different dictionaries - lumping and splitting issues	84
4.5.	A statistical analysis of the extent of inclusion and diatechnical LAW labelling among the five online-MLDs	86
4.6.	Word class descriptors in lexicographic works	86
4.7.	The 693 legal lexical units from the five online-MLDs and their subsumption under word classes	87
4.7.1.	Nouns	87
4.7.1.1.	Plurals forms which are not necessarily plurals of the morphologically identical non-plural form	89
4.7.1.1.1.	<i>Damages</i>	91
4.7.1.1.2.	<i>Money / Moneys / Monies</i>	96
4.7.1.1.3.	<i>Person / Persons</i>	97
4.7.1.1.4.	<i>Finding / Findings</i>	99
4.7.1.1.5.	<i>Proceeding / Proceedings</i>	99
4.7.1.1.6.	<i>Ground / Grounds</i>	100
4.7.1.1.7.	<i>Premise / Premises</i>	101
4.7.2.	Verbs	102
4.7.3.	Adjectives & adverbs	103
4.7.3.1.	Adjectives	103
4.7.3.1.1.	Latin adjectives/adverbs	103
4.7.3.1.2.	Syntagmatically restricted adjectives	108
4.7.3.1.3.	<i>Commutable</i>	111
4.7.3.1.4.	Adjectives or nouns or both?	112
4.7.3.1.4.1.	<i>(The) accused</i>	112
4.7.3.1.4.2.	<i>(The) deceased</i>	114

4.7.3.1.4.3.	(The) <i>aforementioned/aforsaid/said</i>	114
4.7.3.1.4.4.	(The) <i>foregoing</i>	115
4.7.3.1.4.5.	(The) <i>undersigned</i>	115
4.7.3.1.5.	The adjective <i>several</i> and the corresponding adverb <i>severally</i>	116
4.7.4.	Adverbs	119
4.7.4.1.	Compound adverbs <i>here-</i> , <i>there-</i> and <i>where-</i>	119
4.7.4.2.	<i>Henceforth</i>	120
4.7.4.3.	Other adverbs	121
4.7.5.	Prepositions	121
4.7.6.	Conjunctions	124
4.7.7.	Pronouns	126
4.7.8.	Shortened forms: the treatment of abbreviations and acronyms which are diatechnically labelled with the subject field LAW/LEGAL in the five MLDs	128
4.7.8.1.	The lexicographical portrayal of abbreviations	129
4.7.8.2.	For what purpose does a user require an MLD with regard to abbreviated forms?	130
4.7.8.3.	Are they abbreviations or nouns? Or both?	131
4.7.8.4.	Should the lemmata which are abbreviations be labelled as such or as nouns in the MLDs?	133
4.7.8.5.	The part-of-speech label <i>abbreviation</i> can be advantageous	134
4.7.8.6.	A dearth of example sentences and other syntagmatic information in the entries for the lemmatised abbreviations and the corresponding entries for their full forms	135
4.7.8.7.	Audio files for pronunciation assistance of abbreviations	136
4.7.8.8.	The mandatory use of the definite article for certain abbreviations	138
4.7.8.9.	What information does a user require when looking up an abbreviation?	139
4.7.8.10.	A further analysis of the legal abbreviations from the MLDs	139
4.7.8.11.	A <i>per se</i> analysis of each respective MLD individually	141
4.7.8.12.	Conclusion to Chapter 4	146

5.	A statistical analysis of the extent of inclusion and diatechnical LAW labelling among the five online-MLDs <i>inter se</i>	147
5.0.	Introduction	147
5.1.	The inclusion of the 693 legal lexical items among the five online versions of the monolingual learner's dictionaries	147
5.2.	The overall inclusion of the 693 legal lexical items in each respective online-MLD	149
5.3.	Detailed figures for the 15 permutations: the features of Table 5.3.	150
5.3.1.	Included in all five online-MLDs irrespective of labelling: the entire block 5 (5a-5e)	151
5.3.1.1.	Included and labelled LAW in all five online-MLDs (block 5, sub-block 5e)	151
5.3.1.2.	Included in all five online-MLDs but labelled LAW in only 1 (block 5, sub-block 5a)	153
5.3.1.3.	Block 4: items included in four of the online-MLDs	155
5.3.1.4.	Block 1: Included in only one online-MLD and hence only diatechnically labelled LAW in one	155
5.4.	Further usage labels employed in conjunction with or as a replacement for LAW labels in the MLDs	157
5.4.1.	Diatopic labels	157
5.4.2.	The diaphasic FORMAL label	159
5.4.3.	The diatechnical SPECIALIST (TECHNICAL) label	160
5.4.4.	Other labels which appeared among the 693 legal lexical items	162
5.5.	Conclusion to Chapter 5	164
6.	Identifying what legal lexis is missing from the online-MLDs	165
6.0.	Introduction	165
6.1.	Supplementing the lemma stock among the online-MLDs <i>inter se</i>	170
6.2.	Corpora used in this research	171
6.2.1.	Drawing on an existing corpus for general language	171
6.2.2.	Creating a sub-corpus for legal language based upon the BNC	172
6.2.3.	Compiling a new corpus of legal English	172

6.2.4.	The composition of the <i>Personal Legal English Corpus</i> (PLEC)	174
6.2.4.1.	Legal text books	174
6.2.4.2.	Judgments	175
6.2.4.3.	Statutes	176
6.2.4.4.	The Civil Procedural Rules (CPR)	176
6.2.4.5.	Newspaper and periodical articles	176
6.2.4.6.	Contracts	177
6.3.	Processing the data in the PLEC	177
6.4.	Extracting salient empirical data from the PLEC corpus – two lists of lemmatised items	179
6.5.	Initial findings concerning the PLEC Corpus – grammatical words	180
6.6.	Further findings concerning the PLEC Corpus – lexical words	182
6.7.	Comparison of PLEC lemmata with the lemma stock of the Monolingual Learners' Dictionaries (MLDs)	183
6.7.1.	Category I: loan words from Latin and French which are highly specialised in the field of law	184
6.7.2.	Category II: highly specialised Scottish and US legal terms	187
6.7.3.	Category III: purely legal terms which are not covered by categories I and II above	187
6.7.4.	Category IV: proper nouns which pre-modify other words	188
6.7.5.	Category V: terms affixed with –ee and –or/-er	189
6.7.6.	Category VI: un- and re-, dis-, de- and mis- prefixes	189
6.7.7.	Category VII: affixes -able, -ability	190
6.7.8.	Category VIII: very formal non-legal lexical items	191
6.7.9.	Category IX: specialised items from other subject fields	191
6.7.10.	Category X: archaic/historical terms	192
6.7.11.	Category XI: abbreviations	193
6.7.12.	Category XII: simple compounds	195
6.7.13.	Category XIII: informal terms	196
6.7.14.	Category XIV: derived forms of other words present in the online-MLDs	196
6.7.15.	Category XV: miscellaneous	196
6.8.	Conclusion to Chapter 6	197

7.	The inclusion, exclusion and microstructural portrayal of derived forms in the five online-MLDs with particular reference to those marked with a dtechnical LAW label	199
7.0.	Introduction	199
7.1.	The inclusion of derived forms in the online-MLDs	199
7.2.	A three-way lexicographic comparison of derived forms and their portrayal in the online-MLDs	201
7.2.1.	Approach 1 – an analysis of the derived form of a selected lemma in each individual online-MLD <i>per se</i> without comparison to the other online-MLDs	201
7.2.2.	Approach 2 - an <i>inter se</i> comparative analysis of the derived form of a selected lemma among the online-MLDs	202
7.2.3.	Approach 3 - a comparison in each individual online-MLD <i>per se</i> of the derived forms of the selected item therein compared to other similar entries in the same online-MLD	203
7.3.	The situation with regard to the derived forms of the 693 legal lexical items extracted from the online-MLDs	206
7.3.1.	Adding missing derivatives from the legal lexical items	207
7.3.1.1.	Additional female derived forms of nouns	217
7.3.2.	Restructuring and condensing existing entries to enhance user-friendliness and predictability	218
7.4.	Multiple derived forms for one single lemma	226
7.5.	Summary of the chapter: providing the user with as much salient information on derived forms but in a readily comprehensible, uncluttered data presentation interface	234
8.	Overall conclusion and practical lexicographic application regarding the findings of this research	237
9.	Bibliography	239
Appendix 1.	Questionnaire conducted in legal ESP classes as well as some general EFL classes at the FAU regarding the use of smartphones and internet access as well as on the ownership of English Learner's Dictionaries	251

Appendix 2.	Table displaying the annotated list of all the lexical units which were elicited from the MLDs on the basis of their being diatechnically labelled LAW/LEGAL in at least one of the online-MLDs	253
Appendix 3.	Complete list of all the file numbers identified as being legal texts in the BNC which were then removed in order to create the non-legal BNC sub-corpus BNC-L	283
Appendix 4.	Complete list of all the statutes, judicial opinions and judgments used to compile the PLEC corpus	289