Jolly and Less Jolly Challenges in Working on the *Norwegian-Lithuanian Dictionary*

Aurelija Griškevičienė
Vilnius University

Abstract. The *Norwegian-Lithuanian Dictionary* is a joint project of lexicographers from the universities of Vilnius and Oslo. The dictionary consists of approximately 48,000 entries. It is initially intended as a paper dictionary, but as it is compiled in XML, an electronic version is also planned for the future. The dictionary is bidirectional: that is, it is intended for native speakers of both Norwegian and Lithuanian, and it provides information on both the source language (Norwegian) and the target language (Lithuanian).

The aim of the article is to give a presentation of the project, point out innovative aspects of the project, and analyse the jolly (expected) and less jolly (unexpected) challenges we faced in the two main stages of compiling the dictionary. In the first stage we adapted a base from another bilingual dictionary (the *Large Norwegian-Russian Dictionary*), reusing its lemma list and information on the source language, Norwegian. In the second stage we created a conception and a system for information on the target language, Lithuanian, and (perhaps for the first time in Lithuanian bilingual lexicography) included several types of information for non-native users of Lithuanian.

1. Introduction and general remarks

An obvious demand for bilingual dictionaries between Norwegian and Lithuanian arose when, in the wake of Lithuania becoming an independent state, many new cultural and business contacts were established, and wide cooperation between the two states began. Scandinavian studies became very popular in Lithuania in the 1990s, and interest in Lithuania increased in Norway.

In 1996 lexicographers at the Universities of Oslo and Vilnius started compiling a Lithuanian-Norwegian and Norwegian-Lithuanian dictionary,

but due to a lack of resources only the first (Lithuanian-Norwegian) part was finished and published in 2001 (Jakaitienė and Berg-Olsen 2001). The Norwegian-Lithuanian part was still missing, and in 2005 the new project *Norwegian-Lithuanian Dictionary* (henceforth NLD) was started.

The NLD working group consists of ten lexicographers. Seven translators did the translation of the lemmas and the examples. The translators also supplied the Lithuanian equivalents with additional (semantic, grammatical, stylistic, etc.) information and made necessary corrections in the placement of various kinds of information in the electronic schema (DTD) of the NLD after the automatic transfer of the dictionary content to XML. One lexicographer transformed the dictionary base (lemmas and illustrations) from Microsoft Word to XML, developed the electronic schema, and is mainly responsible for the technical tasks which concern the electronic version of the dictionary. The editorial board consists of four editors responsible for different aspects of the work: control of translation and of other information on the Norwegian lemmas and the Lithuanian equivalents, stress marking of the Lithuanian equivalents, and editing of various technical details in the electronic schema.

2. Base for the *Norwegian-Lithuanian Dictionary* (the lemma list and information about the lemmas)

The project initiators wished to obtain a complete medium-sized base (lemma list and examples) for the Norwegian part of the dictionary and subsequently translate it to Lithuanian. There was no funding to buy one from publishing houses, but we got two proposals from lexicographers at the University of Oslo. We could get and reuse material from *Stor norsk-russisk ordbok* (*The Large Norwegian-Russian Dictionary*, Berkov et al. 2003; henceforth LNRD) or from *Bokmålsordboka* (Wangensteen 2005).[1] It was obvious that in both of them several changes had to be made, and either of the two dictionary bases would have to be reduced in size and adapted. The LNRD was chosen because it is generally considered to be a very professional piece of lexicography (Nesset and Trosterud 2005), and we saw several advantages in choosing it: it is bilingual, the grammatical structure of Russian is similar to that of Lithuanian, and the LNRD provides a large amount of different types

---

1 *Bokmålsordboka* is a big monolingual dictionary of the Norwegian language which has been reused in several bilingual dictionary projects.

of information on the Norwegian lemmas, such as stress marking and information on pronunciation, grammar, stylistics, and semantics, as well as a lot of usage examples. It was also important that this dictionary base could be transferred from Word to XML.

The LNRD includes about 90,000 entries, about 1,600 pages, and several appendixes containing very different kinds of information. The lexicographical principle of "a maximum of information by a minimum of means" is very clearly upheld here. Many types of information are presented in the entries by different means: codes, abbreviations, and different marks and symbols. It was clear to us that we had to make it smaller by selecting lemmas and reducing the number of examples and the amount of other information. We expected challenges, and we were ready for some obvious changes while adopting the LNRD, but it turned out that the process of adaptation and creating our own conception was more complicated, and it was decided to make a large number of essential as well as smaller changes. To make the work easier, a handbook with instructions for compiling the NLD (about 70 pages) was written.

The information reused in the NLD included lemmas and illustrations, the structure of articles, grammatical, stylistic, and semantic information, and information on pronunciation.

2.1. *Selection of lemmas.* The first stage of the project amounted to reducing the lemma list from the LNRD. This was done by inspecting the lemma selection made in other bilingual and monolingual dictionaries and was later revised on the basis of frequency data of lemmas in the Norwegian corpus *Leksikografisk bokmålskorpus* (2012). We rejected almost all proper nouns, all non-normative forms, and all morphemes that were presented as separate lemmas. Some (derivative) grammatical forms were moved to the article of the headword from which they were derived (e.g. the information from the headword *fint* was moved to the entry of the headword *fin*).

2.2. *The structure of the entries in the NLD.* The structure of the entries in the NLD was mainly adopted from the LNRD.

2.2.1. Information on pronunciation. All the headwords are provided with diacritics marking stress and toneme. Information on irregular or alternative pronunciation is also presented next to the headword (e.g. **jòrdisk** *a2* [jùr] *i ulike bet.* žēmiškas; žēmės; and **japánsk** ɪ *-en/n ubøy* <[já]> japònų kalbà).

2.2.2. Grammatical information. All the headwords are provided with a grammatical code which shows the part of speech and the inflectional pattern (e.g. **dag** *m1*; **ùnḍerordne** *v1*; **distré** *a2/a3*; **dit** *adv*; and **òppimellom** *prep*). The irregular forms and forms that deviate from the most common patterns are presented next to the headwords (e.g. **hògge** *v hogg/hògde, hogd*; **vàffel** *-en, vàfler*; and **vàktsom** *adj -t, -me*). Some additional grammatical information may also be presented in illustrations, such as the adjectival use of the participle of the headword *eksistere*: únder eksistérende fòrhold (*adj i ppres*) *esančiomis aplinkybėmis*.

2.2.3. Semantic information. All the meanings are provided with semantic paraphrases, as, for example, in the entry for *elektronikk*: **elektroníkk** *-en* 1. (*lære*) elektrònika 2. (*teknologi*) elektrònikos technològija 3. (*elektronisk system*) elektròninė sistemà {įranga}.

2.2.4. Illustrations. Most meanings are illustrated with a fair number of examples. (Several examples of entries in the NLD are presented below).

2.2.5. Homographs are mainly presented in two entries,[2] as is the case with *ball*:

> **ball I** *m1* 1. (*til å leke med*) kamuolŷs, sviedinŷs → *spìlle ball* žaisti su kamuoliu 2. (*pasning*) (kamuolio) pérdavimas; (*slag*) smū̃gis (kamuoliu) → *en lang ball inn i mídten* tolimas perdavimas į aikštės vidurį; *kéeperen tok en vànskelig ball* vartininkas atrėmė sudėtingą smūgį 3. (*rund klump*) kamuolŷs, gniùžulas, gùmulas, tùmulas; (*snø-*) sniẽgo gniū́žtė • **ha mànge bàller i lúfta** turėti daug reikalų vienu metu.
>
> **ball II** *n3* (dansetilstelning) pókylis, puotà, (šōkių) bālius → *gå på ball* eitį į pokylį {puotą, balių}; *ǻpne bállet* pradėti pokylį; *šnek., prk.* pradėti pirmam.

2.2.6. The entry may have several structural parts.

2.2.6.1. The entry may be divided into several structural parts in order to group meanings of prepositions (for example, of the preposition *i*, which

2 On the different treatment of homographs in the NLD and the LNRD, see chapter 1.3. in this article.

has several meanings of time and place), or when the headword (verb) has a transitive, intransitive, and/or reflexive form,[3] as *dryppe* does:

drỳppe *v1* // *drỳpte, drypt* A. (*vt*) 1. (*la falle dråpevis*) (į)lāšinti, (į)var̃vinti → *drỳppe nòen dråper rom i téen* įlašinti keletą lašų romo į arbatą; *drỳppe en stek* (pa)láistyti kēpsnį (*kepant*) 2. (*medisin*) (į)lāšinti, sulāšinti → *drỳppe ǿynene* {*nèsa*} (į)lašinti {sulāšinti} (lašų) į akis {nosį} 3. *mar.* išmèsti → *drỳppe ànkeret* išmesti inkarą B. (*vi*) (*falle dråpevis*) lašéti, varvéti → *det drýpper av kránen* laša {varva} iš čiaupo; *kránen* (*står og*) *drýpper* čiaupas laša {varva}…[4]

2.2.6.2. Fixed expressions and various phraseological units are presented in a separate part at the end of the entry, as the following example shows:

jorḍ *-a/-en i ulike bet.* žēmė → *rèise jórda rundt* keliauti aplink Žemę; *dỳrke jórda* dirbti žemę; *god* {*skrinn*} *jord* gera {skurdi} žemė {dirva}; *skỳfte jord på pòtteplantene* pakeisti vazoninių gėlių žemę {žemes}; *kjǿpe et stỳkke jord* nusipirkti gabalą žemės; *på frèmmed jord* svetimoje žemėje ♦ **fàlle i god jord** patekti į gerą dirvą; **forláte dènne jord** palikti šį pasaulį; **gå únder jórda** pasitraukti į pogrindį; **ha bègge béina på jórda**; **hòlde seg på jórda** stovėti (abiem kojom) ant žemės; **kòmme ned på jórda igjén** nusileisti ant žemės, nusileisti iš debesų.

2.2.6.3. Phrasal verbs are presented in a separate part at the end of the entry. The structure of this part is the same as that of the lemmas. It is divided according to the meanings of the phrasal verb, and the meanings are provided with semantic information and illustrated with examples, as can be seen in the entry for *jage*:

jàge *v1/v3* A. (*vt*) 1. (*jakte*) medžióti, gáudyti; výtis, pérsekioti → *jàge stòrvilt* medžioti stambius žvėris; *politíet jàger forbrýterne* policija gaudo nusikaltėlius; 2. (*fordrive*) varýti, giñti, výti → *jàge bùskapen på bèite* ginti {varyti} bandą į ganyklą; *jàge* (*noen*) *fra hus og hjem* išvaryti {išvyti} (*ką*) iš namų; 3. (*pret jog*) (*støte gjennom*) *knyg.* (į)varýti, (į)smeīgti; pérsmeigti, pérdurti, pérverti → *han jog spýdet gjénnom sin mòtstander*

---

3 These structural parts are taken over from the LNRD, but we discovered that this division may cause difficulties when the Norwegian lemmas and the Lithuanian equivalents differ in transitivity (for more on that, see Griškevičienė 2013).

4 Several entries in this article are presented in an abridged version.

jis pervėrė {persmeigė} priešininką ietimi • **jàge bort** nuvarýti, nu-
vyti, nuginti; **jàge ètter** *noe* vaikytis (*ką, ko*) → *jàge ètter rìkdom* vaikytis
turtų; *jàge ètter lỳkke* medžioti laimę; **jàge opp** 1. (*skremme*) pabaidýti →
jàge opp en hàre pabaidyti kiškį 2. (*øke*) padìdinti → *jàge opp témpoet* pa-
didinti tempą; **jàge på** rāginti, skùbinti, varýti → *han jàgde på hésten* jis
varė arklį; **jàge ut** išvaryti, išvyti; **jàge vekk** → **jàge bort**.

2.3. *Changes to the base of the LNRD.* It turned out that adapting the dic-
tionary base from the LNRD was much more complicated than expected,
requiring more resources and taking as much time as the translation.
Much unexpected work arose in addition to the reduction of the lemma
list: various changes of the dictionary base from the LNRD were made be-
cause it had to be adapted to the needs of the Lithuanian user, and updated
according to the newest norms of the Norwegian language. The structure
of the entries was also simplified, and many changes were made in order
to make the dictionary more systematic and user-friendly (on making
the NLD more user-friendly, see Griškevičienė and Berg-Olsen 2012).

The main changes made to the base of the LNRD were the following:

2.3.1. All the grammatical codes were replaced with grammatical codes
from *Bokmålsordboka*, as the codes in *Bokmålsordboka* are updated ac-
cording to the newest norms of the Norwegian language, and we find
this code system more consistent, simple, and user-friendly.

2.3.2. Although the system for information on pronunciation has been
reused from the LNRD, some minor changes were made in order to
simplify the system and make it more understandable for users. This
was the case, for instance, with èkorn *m1/n3* [èk:] (LNRD: [`ɛk:]); and
hóckey *-en* [hók:i] (LNRD: [ˈhɔk:i]).

2.3.3. Homographs are treated differently in the NLD than in the LNRD.
In the LNRD homographs can be presented either in one entry or in
separate entries. They are grouped according to the origin of the mean-
ings. In the NLD all homographs belonging to different parts of speech
are presented in separate entries.[5]

---

5 In some exceptional cases, such as when a headword is an adjective and an ad-
verb (e.g. *innenlands*) or an adverb and a preposition (e.g. *innenfor*), homographs
are presented within the same entry in the NLD.

2.3.4. The separate structural part of the entry for winged words and literary quotations has been removed in the NLD due to our aim to reduce the amount of illustrations in general and preserve only the most frequent and useful examples. Some selected frequently used expressions from this part were moved to other parts of the entry (examples or phraseology).

2.3.5. There are nine different ways of presenting reflexive verbs in the LNRD. We reduced this to three types. In the NLD reflexive verbs can be presented as separate lemmas, in a separate structural part of the entry or in the examples (for more on this, see Griškevičienė 2012).

2.3.6. The cross-reference system has been simplified in the NLD. In the LNRD cross-references are made on all levels of the entries (meanings, examples, various structural parts, etc.). In the NLD cross-references are made only between synonymous headwords. The more frequent headword is presented in a standard entry, while the less frequent word is presented in a reference entry (e.g. **hatsk** *a2* → **hàtefull**; **jàmne** *v1* → **jèvne**).

Unfortunately, we could not adopt from the LNRD the type of cross-references pointing to other entries in which the headword is used in illustrations. This was due to the fact that the lemma list and illustrations in the NLD sometimes differ from those in the LNRD. To include this type of cross-references would be a separate task for the editors of the NLD and would require much additional work.

We also added a new type of cross-reference at the end of the entries. These cross-references show that some additional information about the headword may be found in other entries: the entry *debatt*, for example, contains a reference to the compounds *avisdebatt* and *fjernsynsdebatt*.

2.3.7. Compounds were moved to separate entries in the NLD, while in the LNRD they are presented in the entry of the first/main component of the compound.

2.3.8. The system and use of stylistic abbreviations was revised to reflect modern use to a greater extent.

2.3.9. Many infrequent and outdated meanings as well as examples were removed because of the smaller size of the NLD.

We also removed meanings which concern just one expression, such as the second meaning of the headword *pakt*: 2. (*overensstemmelse*) →

váre i pakt (*med noe*) atitikti (*ką*). The expressions and examples from such meanings were moved to other parts of the entry.

Meanings which concern just one grammatical form of the headword were also moved to other parts of the entry or to separate entries. This was the case, for example, with the second meaning of the headword *alkoholisere*, which concerns just the participle *alkoholisert*: 2. (*ødelegge ved alkohol*) → *en alkoholisért famíliefar* (*adj i pp*).

We also introduced certain new meanings which were not given in the LNRD; most of them were taken from *Bokmålsordboka*.

2.3.10. In some entries the sequence of the meanings in the entry was changed and presented in the order with the most frequent meaning at the beginning of the entry and less common meanings toward the end of the entry.

2.3.11. Some semantic paraphrases of meanings were replaced with shorter, less scientific, and less abstract ones.

We also changed paraphrases which are actually references to other entries or meanings in other entries to more concrete ones. For example, the paraphrase of the first meaning of the headword *identifikasjon*, "*til* identifisere 1," was replaced by the paraphrase "*påvisning av identitet.*"

2.3.12. Some examples were changed or removed, and in some cases additional examples were included. The new examples illustrate more up-to-date uses of the headwords or show some grammatical properties of Norwegian, such as the use of a particular preposition in expressions with the headword: *introdusére nòen for en forsámling, váre idéntisk med nòe/nòen.*

2.3.13. Many headwords in the LNRD are provided with both "live" and "dead" examples.[6] In order to reduce the size of the NLD as compared to the LNRD, we often chose one of them, either the live one or the dead one. There are advantages and disadvantages to using the one or the other type of examples. One type is more useful for a native speaker; the other is more useful for users who want to learn a foreign language (Svensén 2004: 200-204). Our experience is that we prefer the live

---

6 Dead examples are constructed with codes for grammatical information (e.g. **dùndre i vei** *med noe*), while live ones are natural phrases.

ones to the dead ones because there were many dead examples which were difficult to translate into Lithuanian, or that sound very unnatural when translated; in some cases, the translations of dead and live examples differ. This happens mostly because of the different grammatical systems of Norwegian and Lithuanian. Some dead examples have been replaced by live ones in the NLD as we find them more useful: they provide not only grammatical, but also semantic information. Live examples also show which kind of components can be used in the construction presented.

2.3.14. Some changes were also made in order to make the NLD compliant with the newest norms of the Norwegian Language, taking into account changes made since the publication of the LNRD.

2.4. *Adjusting the base from the LNRD to the Lithuanian language.* It is known and often pointed out in lexicographical theory that the target language influences the structure and content of entries in bilingual dictionaries (Jakaitienė 2005: 151-154; Svensén 2004: 336-340). In our case the target language was changed from Russian to Lithuanian, and this adaptation of the dictionary base presented us with several challenges and some additional work. This mainly concerned the division of entries into meanings and the choice of illustrations.

Semantic differences between Lithuanian and Russian equivalents might require the rearrangement of the meanings in the entries in one of several ways: the removal of meanings when, for example, the meaning concerns just a Russian equivalent, and the division of a meaning into several meanings when the Lithuanian equivalents determine a different semantic structure for the entry, such as for **raffinemént** *n3* [áŋ] 1. (*det å være raffinert*) rafinuotùmas, subtilùmas 2. (*utspekulert påfunn*) subtilýbė. (In the LNRD this headword is presented as a monosemous word.) The Lithuanian equivalents may also require the merger of what the LNRD treats as separate meanings.

Changes in the structure of meanings in many cases also required adjustments in the wording of semantic paraphrases or the creation of new paraphrases.

We had to assess the selection of examples and to adjust many examples to accommodate the needs of Lithuanian users, removing some which show properties of the Russian language and adding others which show different properties of Lithuanian equivalents.

We included several new examples which illustrate possible variants of Lithuanian equivalents, such as **ínterskandinavisk** *a2 – àpimantis Skandināvijos šalìs → ínterskandinavisk sàmarbeid* – Skandinavijos šalių bendradarbiavimas; *ínterskandinavisk hjelp* – Skandinavijos šalių tarpusavio pagalba; and **autístisk** *a2* seŕgantis autizmù → *en autístisk persón* autist|as, -ė; *autístiske barn* vaikai autistai.

We also added several examples in order to illustrate all the different Lithuanian equivalents, as, for example, in the entries for **óppblåst** *a2* 1. (*fylt*) prìpūstas, ìšpūstas → *en óppblåst ballóng* pripūstas balionas; *en óppblåst bòble* išpūstas burbulas; and **organisatórisk** *a2* organizācinis, organizātoriaus → *et organisatórisk sàmarbeid* organizacinis bendradarbiavimas; *organisatórisk talént* organizatoriaus talentas.

3. Information on the Lithuanian language

The selection of information on the target language Lithuanian was performed and the system for presenting it created by the editors of the NLD. It is always difficult to decide how much information should be presented in a bilingual bidirectional dictionary. On the one hand, one usually wishes to make the dictionary useful for users with different backgrounds and motivation by presenting many types of information on both languages, but on the other hand, there is a danger of overloading it and of diminishing the user-friendliness because additional information takes considerable space, and many additional marks, symbols, and abbreviations can discomfort rather than help the user.

The NLD presents the following information on the Lithuanian equivalents:[7]

3.1. *Phonological information.* All the equivalents are stress marked. We made an attempt to provide the equivalents with the accentuation class as well, but as we did not find a convenient and simple way to present it in the cases where equivalents consist of multi-word phrases, we had to abstain from this idea.

3.2. *Grammatical information.* The Lithuanian equivalents are provided with the following grammatical information:

---

7   For discussions about the selection of information on Lithuanian, see Berg-Olsen and Išganaitytė 2010; Griškevičienė and Berg-Olsen 2012; and Griškevičienė 2013.

- Perfective prefixes are presented in brackets before verbs, as in **ùnḍer-slå** 1. sāvintis, pasisāvinti, (iš)eikvóti, (iš)švaistýti.[8]
- Tags for momentary or iterative action of Lithuanian verbs are given when a Norwegian verb has several Lithuanian equivalents that differ in expressing momentary or iterative action, which is the case with, **útpensle** 1. išrašýti, išrašinéti[iter], išpiẽšti, išpaišinéti[iter]; and **hòste** (su)kósėti, kòstelėti[mom].
- When a Lithuanian verb governs another object case than the accusative, the object case is indicated, as it is in **ùnne** džiaūgtis (*kuo*); linkéti (*ko*).
- For prepositions, the case required by the preposition in question is given, as it is for **ùnna** 1. (*bort fra*) (šaliñ) nuõ (*ko*).
- A tag indicating the number of a noun, *pl* or *sg*, is presented when the number of the Norwegian headword and the Lithuanian equivalent are different, as can be seen in the entry for **hùske** *f1/m1* sūpȳnės[pl], sūpuõklės[pl].
- Both masculine and feminine endings are given for nouns which express professions, nationalities, and the like, as is the case with **úrmaker** laīkrodinink|as, -ė; and **hèdning** 1. (*hedensk person*) pagón|is, -ė, stabmeld|ȳs, -ė 2. (*ateist*) bediēv|is, -ė, laisvamān|is, -ė.
- Feminine nouns ending in *-is* are marked with a superscript F, as, for example, in **òre II** 1. (*høreorgan*) ausìs[F].
- Commonly used diminutives are marked by the abbreviation *dim*, which can be seen in **hårbånd** plaukų̃ júosta {juostēlė[dim]}.
- The part of speech is given when it differs from that of the headword, as is the case in the entry for **halv** *a1* 1. (*halvdel*) pùsė[subst], pus-.
- Grammatical, especially syntactic properties of the equivalents are also shown in the examples.

3.3. *Semantic information* is given on some Lithuanian equivalents in order to specify the meanings of polysemous words, such as **jáckpot** *m1* stambiáusias laimėjimas (*loterijoje ir pan.*); bánkas (*kortų lošime*).

3.4. *Stylistic information* on the Lithuanian equivalents is presented when the Norwegian headword and the Lithuanian equivalent differ in stylistic

---

8 Here and hereafter only the information under discussion is shown in the examples, while information not important for the discussion is deleted.

features, as, for example, with **jòggesko** *m* spòrtbatis, *hverd.* sportùkas, kèdas.

4. Other components of the NLD

In addition to the dictionary, the NLD provides a preface and instructions for the use of the dictionary with lists of abbreviations, and explanations of the grammar codes and pronunciation. Mini-grammars of Norwegian and Lithuanian are presented at the end of the book. None of the ten appendixes from the LNRD (descriptions of the Norwegian state, administrative structure, army, language situation, etc.) have been reused in the NLD.

5. The electronic version of the NLD

As mentioned above, the base of the LNRD has been transferred from Word to XML, so an electronic version of the NLD might with comparatively little effort be issued in the future in addition to the paper dictionary. The process of transformation was challenging because of the extremely complicated structure of the entries, the large amount of different types of information, and several technical inadequacies in the LNRD (for more on that, see Berg-Olsen and Hauge 2005). It took a lot of time to develop an electronic schema (DTD) for the NLD and to place all the information from the LNRD in it. The transfer of the material to an electronic schema also helped to achieve a consistent and clear structure for the entries in the NLD, whereas in the LNRD one at times finds variations and cases in which the same information is provided differently in different entries.

6. Final remarks

The editors very much appreciate the opportunity to use material from the LNRD for the NLD, but although the base of the LNRD was very comprehensive and professionally compiled, a number of changes had to be made. The result is that the NLD base differs considerably from the LNRD in both its structure and its ways of presenting information. Several changes were made in meaning differentiation and illustrations, and a number of changes were also made on the initiative of the editors of the NLD with the intention of improving the excellent base provided

by the LNRD and making the dictionary even more user-friendly and modern. That is why, as in many other similar projects, the work of compiling the dictionary took much more time and resources than expected. The project is also valuable and important because the needs of non-Lithuanian users have been taken into consideration to a greater extent in the NLD than in other existing bilingual dictionaries with Lithuanian as the target language. The experience of compiling the NLD as well as the various discussions and decisions which are described and published in several articles by the editors of the NLD could be useful, helpful, and taken into account in other similar projects in the field of bilingual lexicography.

Bibliography

Berg-Olsen, S., and Hauge, Kj. R. 2005. "Konvertirane na rečnik ot Word v XML: Norvežko-litovski rečnik." *Leksikografski Pregled* 8: 41-46.

Berg-Olsen, S., and Išganaitytė, E. 2010. "Grammatisk informasjon i middels store tospråklege ordbøker. Prinsipp og utfordringar på bakgrunn av arbeidet med *Norsk-litauisk ordbok*." *Skrifter/Nordisk Forening for Leksikografi* 11: 103-112.

Berkov, V. P. et al. 2003. *Stor norsk-russisk ordbok*. Oslo: Kunnskapsforlaget.

Griškevičienė, A. 2012. "Sangrąžinių veiksmažodžių teikimas dvikalbiuose žodynuose." Žmogus ir Žodis. Svetimosios Kalbos 14(3): 21-26.

Griškevičienė, A. 2013. "Sintaksinių duomenų laukas dvikalbėje lietuvių leksikografijoje." *Lietuvių Kalba* 7. Web. 20 October 2013. [http://www.lietuviukalba.lt/index.php?id=235].

Griškevičienė, A., and Berg-Olsen, S. 2012. "A golden mean? Compromises between quantity of information and user-friendliness in the bidirectional Norwegian-Lithuanian Dictionary." In R. V. Fjeld and J. M. Torjusen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 15th EURALEX International Congress*, 648-653. Oslo: University of Oslo, Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies.

Jakaitienė, E. 2005. *Leksikografija*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Jakaitienė, E., and Berg-Olsen, S. 2001 (repeated editions 2007, 2008 and 2012). *Lietuvių – norvegų kalbų žodynas/Litauisk – norsk ordbok*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

Leksikografisk bokmålskorpus. 2012. Web. 20 October 2013. [http://
    www.hf.uio.no/iln/tjenester/kunnskap/samlinger/bokmal/
    veiledningkorpus/].

Nesset, T., and Trosterud, T. 2005. "Ny norsk-russisk ordbok: Ei leksiko-
    grafisk storhending." *Lexiconordica* 12: 273-284.

Svensén, B. 2004. *Handbok i lexikografi. Andra, omarbetade og utökade
    upplagan*. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Wangensteen, B. 2005. *Bokmålsordboka*. Oslo: Kunnskapsforlaget. Web.
    20 October 2013. [http://www.nob-ordbok.uio.no].