NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

THE ARRANGEMENT OF INFORMATION IN THE GENERAL BILINGUAL DICTIONARY ENTRY

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF M.A. (TRANSLATION)

by

Daniel van Scherrenburg

University of Ottawa

School of Translators and Interpreters

ISBN 0-315-62335-7

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

PREFACE

One topic that has not been dealt with extensively in the literature on bilingual lexicography and in the front matter of general bilingual dictionaries (GBDs) is the arrangement of information within the GBD entry. Thus, I have endeavoured to present in one work various arrangement techniques for seven important GBD entry elements: the equivalent, the meaning, the context, the meaning discrimination device, the example, the idiom and the compound. It is hoped that by providing a clear description of possible arrangement techniques for these elements, this thesis will not only provide lexicographers with further insight into bilingual dictionary methodology, but also help dictionary-users to better appreciate some of the problems faced by bilingual lexicographers.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to my thesis supervisor, Roda Roberts, for her helpful suggestions and criticisms during the preparation of this thesis. I would also like to thank Geraldine Sharpe.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 2

Chapter 3

Chapter 4

Chapter 5

Chapter 6

Conclusion

Bibliography

INTRODUCTION

1. General Objective of the Thesis

One has only to read through a few general bilingual dictionary (GBD) reviews to realize that most GBDs are far from being perfect reference tools. Typical GBD weaknesses that have been pointed out include inadequate lexical coverage, inadequate meaning discrimination and poor use of typographical features. In her Ph.D. thesis "Towards a New Type of General Bilingual Dictionary", Ingrid Meyer divides weaknesses found in two GBDs (the *Collins/Robert French-English English-French Dictionary* and *Harrap's New Standard French and English Dictionary*) into two main categories: weaknesses affecting selection of a target language (TL) item and weaknesses affecting combination of TL items in context.[1] She presents a detailed study showing that weaknesses affecting selection of a TL item can often be related to the absence of source language (SL) items and of TL equivalents as well as to inadequate discrimination between TL equivalents. Her study also shows that weaknesses affecting combination of the TL word in context are due largely to inadequate morphological, syntactic and collocational specifications. For the most part, discussion of both types of weaknesses focusses on the absence of material in the two bilingual dictionaries studied.

Ingrid Meyer does point out that weaknesses affecting selection and combination can also be caused by poor arrangement of material in the two bilingual dictionaries. For instance, she indicates that "actually *finding* the equivalent within the entry can be time-consuming, since collocations are given in more or less random order, and furthermore, are not labeled in any particular way..."[2] And when discussing syntactic information, she says that there is "inconsistency

---

[1] For a detailed description of these weaknesses, see Ingrid Meyer, "Towards a New Type of General Bilingual Dictionary," (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Montreal, 1986) 77-141.

[2] Meyer 1986, 136.

with regard to the way in which it is supplied."[3] However, she does not treat weaknesses stemming from poor arrangement of material as extensively as she does weaknesses caused by absence of material: she does not provide examples and does not suggest general solutions. This thesis is intended to fill that gap.

My overall objective is to undertake a detailed study of the arrangement of material in GBDs. More specifically, I intend to describe various arrangement techniques for seven important elements of the GBD entry: the equivalent, the meaning, the context, the meaning discrimination device, the example, the idiom and the compound. This thesis will thus focus on one of the lexicographer's three main tasks, which include selection of lexical items to be included, compilation of material on each of the selected items, and organization of the material in suitable form. While the organization of material is the last of these tasks, it is by no means the least important for, however good the material compiled may be, its value is diminished if it is not properly presented.

2. Sources of Information

The arrangement of material within GBD entries has received little attention from lexicographers. For example, in Ali Al-Kasimi's *Linguistics and Bilingual Dictionaries*, one of the few books devoted entirely to bilingual lexicography and which covers many aspects of the GBD entry, practically nothing is mentioned regarding the arrangement of items within dictionary entries.[4] Instead, questions such as the language used for meaning discrimination, the choice of equivalents and the roles of examples are broached. And in Ladislav Zgusta's *Manual of*

---

[3] Meyer 1986, 154.

[4] In *Linguistics and Bilingual Dictionaries* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977), Al-Kasimi does, however, briefly discuss Iannucci's proposal that unilingual sense divisions be used as a basis for those in bilingual dictionaries (p. 73-74) and on p. 94, he gives a brief answer to the question "Should the presentation of the several citations illustrating one word follow a certain order?"

Lexicography, in which a whole chapter is devoted to bilingual lexicography, discussion on the arrangement of material in GBD entries is very limited. In fact, the arrangement of one element, meaning, is discussed in the chapter on monolingual lexicography, but not in the chapter on bilingual lexicography.[5] Articles on the arrangement of material in GBD entries are also in short supply.[6] For example, the above-mentioned subject of arrangement of meanings is found in several articles, but almost always in the context of unilingual lexicography. And in the many papers on bilingual lexicography that appear in the *Lexeter'83 Proceedings*, arrangement of material within the entry is discussed only briefly in one article.[7]

While it is clear that many authors have preferred not to delve into methodological issues regarding the arrangement of material in GBD entries, the reasons why this is so are much less obvious. For example, Viggo Pedersen states that "the arrangement of information within [short and medium-sized GBD entries] is of minor importance,"[8] but he does not support this statement in any way. Does he mean to imply that shorter entries could have a totally different arrangement of information from that found in longer ones? Would that not be confusing to the dictionary-user, who would normally expect to find a similar pattern of

---

[5] Ladislav Zgusta, *Manual of Lexicography* (Prague: Academia, Publishing House of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, 1971).

[6] Even in bilingual dictionary reviews, arrangement of material within the entry is rarely discussed. The only articles I have found that are devoted strictly to this topic are a series of articles on the arrangement of material in the *Van Dale* dictionaries.

[7] The article "Reflections on the Treatment of Prepositions in Bilingual Dictionaries, and Suggestions for a Statistical Approach" discusses, albeit briefly, the arrangement of meanings for prepositions. In an article entitled "'Active' and 'Passive' Bilingual Dictionaries: the Ščerba Concept Reconsidered", Hans-Peder Kromann *et al.* state that "we wish to discuss the organization of dictionaries for the large class of users who translate from their native language into a foreign language and vice versa" (p. 207) but limit discussion to when to use meaning discrimination devices and grammatical information, for example, and not the arrangement of such information.

[8] Viggo Hjørnager Pedersen, "Reflections on the Treatment of Prepositions in Bilingual Dictionaries, and Suggestions for a Statistical Approach," *Lexeter '83 Proceedings*, ed. R.R.K. Hartmann (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984) 258.

arrangement throughout a dictionary? While Pedersen considers the arrangement of all information of minor importance in shorter entries, James Iannucci feels that the placement of one type of information, the meaning discrimination device, is of secondary importance in all entries because "it is more a matter of style than of efficiency."[9] But even if Iannucci's statement is accurate, this does not mean that the topic should not be broached. The fact remains that the arrangement of all parts of the GBD entry is of great importance in entries of all sizes as arrangement influences ease of reference, and ease of reference is an important consideration in evaluating GBDs, which invariably involve the user's second and therefore less familiar language.

Given the fact that literature on the GBD has not been a significant source of information, I have relied heavily for my material on analysis of the GBD itself. The following dictionaries were used (shortened titles that are used in this thesis are given after the full references):

Collins/Robert French-English English-French Dictionary (*Robert/Collins Dictionnaire français-anglais anglais-français*). Ed. Beryl T. Atkins *et al.* 2nd ed. Glasgow: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd; Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 1987. (The *Robert/Collins*--"RC" is used after examples)

Collins Spanish-English English-Spanish Dictionary (*Diccionario Español-Inglés Inglés-Español*). Ed. Colin Smith, Manuel Bermejo, and Eugenio Chang-Rodríguez. London: William Collins & Co. Ltd., 1971. (The *Collins*)

Dictionnaire français anglais. Ed. Marguerite-Marie Dubois *et al.* Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1981. (The *Larousse*--"LA" is used after examples)

The Follett/Zanichelli Italian Dictionary English-Italian/Italian-English. Ed. Giuseppe Ragazzini, Adele Biagi and Camilla Roatta. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1967. (The *Ragazzini*)

---

[9] James E. Iannucci, "Meaning Discrimination in Bilingual Dictionaries: A New Lexicographical Technique," *Modern Language Journal* XLI (1957): 278.

Harrap's New Standard French and English Dictionary. Ed. R.P.L. Ledésert and Margaret Ledésert. Rev. ed. 4 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972-1980. (The *Harrap's*--"HA" is used after examples)

Robert & Signorelli Dictionnaire français-italien italien-français (*Robert & Signorelli Dizionario francese-italiano italiano-francese*). Ed. Paul Robert and Augusto Arizzi *et al.* Paris: SNL Dictionnaire Le Robert; Milano: Casa Editrice Carlo Signorelli S.p.A., 1981. (The *Robert & Signorelli*)

Van Dale Groot Woordenboek Engels-Nederlands. Ed. W. Martin, *et al.* Utrecht/Antwerpen: Van Dale Lexicografie bv, 1984. (The *Van Dale*)

Van Dale Groot Woordenboek Nederlands-Engels. Ed. W. Martin, *et al.* Utrecht/Antwerpen: Van Dale Lexicografie bv, 1986. (The *Van Dale*)[10]

Unfortunately, most GBD prefaces have little to say on the arrangement of material within the entry, and observation of entries does not always reveal the pattern of arrangement of certain items. For example, it was difficult to discern an overall ordering technique for examples in the *Robert/Collins*. In such cases, the few elements of information found in works on bilingual lexicography, combined with arrangement techniques occasionally suggested for unilingual dictionaries, helped to determine ordering techniques for parts of GBD entries. In the case of the *Robert/Collins*, I was fortunate enough to be able to discuss the basis of the ordering of examples therein with Beryl T. Atkins, one of its chief editors.

Using all of the above sources of information, this thesis examines the arrangement of the seven elements of the GBD entry identified above: the equivalent, the meaning, the context, the meaning discrimination device, the example, the idiom and the compound. These items will be discussed and, where necessary, clearly defined before their arrangement is examined as there is no overall consensus on exactly what each item covers. To ensure clarity of presentation in this thesis, single words, compounds, idioms, equivalents and examples will be

---

[10] When arrangement techniques used in the *Van Dale* dictionaries are described in this thesis, the abbreviated title "*Van Dale*" refers to both dictionaries listed here as arrangement techniques are the same in both of them. The exact dictionary is not specified for examples illustrating arrangement techniques either as it is obvious from the examples provided whether the Dutch-English or English-Dutch dictionary is being cited.

underlined while meanings, contexts and meaning discrimination devices will be put in quotation marks.

3. Discussion of Elements

The Equivalent

In this thesis, an **equivalent** is seen as "a lexical unit of the target language which has the same lexical meaning as the respective lexical unit of the source language."[11] "Lexical unit" here is taken to include single words, compounds and idioms. Although sample entries provided in the chapter on equivalents illustrate the ordering of equivalents for single words only, whatever is said regarding their ordering applies to equivalents for compounds and idioms as well.

The term "equivalent" is reserved here for the translation of a specific SL item presented out of context despite the fact that it may later appear in the translation of examples. Equivalents may be either translational equivalents, which are readily inserted into contexts of the target language, or explanatory or descriptive equivalents, which cannot always be inserted into a sentence in the target language but which are "chosen in order to give more information about the lexical unit of the target language".[12] While all the sample entries I have included contain only translational equivalents, what is said regarding their ordering also applies to the less commonly used explanatory equivalents.

---

[11] Zgusta 1971, 312.

[12] Zgusta 1971, 319.

Meaning

While all dictionaries, both unilingual and bilingual, deal primarily with **meaning**, clear separation of meanings of the headword, which has long been a part of unilingual lexicography, is only slowly making its way into bilingual lexicography. As Zgusta points out, when an SL item can be translated by the same equivalent(s) in several of its senses, bilingual dictionaries (especially smaller ones) tend to join the senses of the SL item together.[13] And even prominent French-English GBDs such as the *Robert/Collins* and the *Harrap's*, which often clearly separate meanings through the use of typographical devices such as letters and numbers, sometimes group several meanings of SL items together, presumably to save space.[14] However, several of the GBDs I examined, including the *Robert/Collins* and the *Harrap's*, often clearly separate senses of SL items as well. As a result, I was able to discern ordering techniques in the GBDs I examined. Thus, one chapter of this thesis will be devoted to the ordering of meanings.

The Context

Recently, it has also been recognized that different **contexts** in which an SL item is used in a given meaning should be provided as the context may determine the TL equivalent to be used. Since some of the GBDs I examined often provide several contexts, their ordering is of interest and will be discussed in a separate chapter.

It should be pointed out that the term "context" covers both linguistic context and situational context. While the linguistic context consists of "the sounds, words or phrases preceding and following a particular linguistic item in an utterance or text", the situational

---

[13] Zgusta 1971, 327.

[14] For example, in the *Robert/Collins*, the indication "all senses" precedes the French equivalent moral given for the English adjective moral.

context consists of "those features of the external world in relation to which an utterance or text has meaning."[15] Both may be indicated simultaneously in a GBD, as the following example clearly reveals:

> **run**...*vt*...(e) *(organize, manage) business, company, organization, school* diriger, administrer (RC)

In this example, the words "business", "company", "organization" and "school" can be seen, on the one hand, as indicating situational contexts in which run can be used and, on the other hand, as representing typical nouns that it can combine with in linguistic contexts. In illustrating linguistic contexts, they tell the user that when the verb run is used in a sentence with "business", "company", "organization" or "school" as objects, the two verbs diriger and administrer are possible equivalents for the headword.

The Meaning Discrimination Device

The actual devices that are used to indicate the meanings and contexts of words are known as **meaning discrimination devices**. According to Al-Kasimi, the role of such devices is to "enable the user to select the appropriate equivalent or the proper sense of an equivalent."[16] Meaning discrimination devices fulfil this role by indicating either the meaning of SL items (as do "organize" and "manage" in the above example) or the contexts in which they are used (as do "business", "company", "organization" and "school"). The three most commonly used meaning discrimination devices in GBDs are definitions, context words or phrases, and field labels.

---

[15] Both definitions are taken from R.R.K. Hartmann and F.C. Stork, *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972).

[16] Al-Kasimi 1977, 68.

Definitions include the long formal kind found in unilingual dictionaries, partial definitions, "which are merely intended to suggest the complete definition",[17] and synonyms used as defining devices. **Context words** or phrases (henceforth simply called "context words"), which consist of subjects of verbs and adjectives that modify nouns, for example, discriminate meaning by "giving just enough of the context or kind of context in which a word occurs to determine the meaning in question."[18] **Field labels** present the subject area in which a given equivalent is used and thus indirectly suggest its meaning. Examples of two types of definitions (a synonym and a partial definition), a context word and a field label are as follows:

free...*adj* (a) (*at liberty, unrestricted*)...autonome, libre (RC) **(synonym)**

abuse *vt*...(*use improperly or to excess*) abuser de... (The *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary*: preliminary entry) **(partial definition)**

foul...*adj food, meal, taste* infect (RC) **(context word)**

heart...*n* (a) (*Anat*) coeur *m.* (RC) **(field label)**

Definitions in GBDs are normally of the synonym variety, although partial definitions, such as the one presented above, are planned for the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary* in preparation. Nevertheless, definitions of any kind are still rare in most bilingual dictionaries, which seem to prefer to use field labels and context words for meaning discrimination, whose role, as indicated above, is to help the GBD-user to select the appropriate TL equivalent or the proper sense of an equivalent. The placement of two of these devices (the definition and the context word) with respect to the equivalent has received much attention and will be discussed in a separate chapter.

While definitions, field labels and context words help the dictionary-user to select TL

---

[17] Iannucci 1957, 276.

[18] Iannucci 1957, 275.

equivalents by identifying meanings of SL items, context words and field labels also perform the same function by pinpointing contexts within a meaning of the headword. While field labels identify only situational contexts, context words generally illustrate both situational and linguistic contexts. Given the fact that context words provide linguistic contexts in addition to situational contexts, they play an additional role in bilingual lexicography, which is that of exemplifying "a case of a typical combination of words in which the...equivalent can occur."[19] A good example of this function is seen in the example above for the adjective foul, which contains three nouns with which foul can collocate: "food", "meal" and "taste". In the chapter on the placement of meaning discrimination devices, it will be seen how this additional role of context words influences their placement.

The Example

In this thesis, an **example** is any phrase or sentence in the SL that illustrates the use of a single word, compound or idiom, along with its translation. Below are cases of each of these three items respectively found in examples. While fraught is a headword, the compound heartfelt is found in the entry for heart, and the examples illustrating the idiom few and far between are found in the entry for few:

> **fraught**...*adj* plein, chargé, lourd (*with* de)...**situation fraught with danger** situation pleine de danger *or* dangereuse (RC)
>
> **heartfelt** sincère, senti, qui vient du fond du coeur; **to make a heartfelt appeal** faire un appel bien senti; **heartfelt sympathy** condoléances *fpl* sincères (RC)
>
> **such occasions are few (and far between)**, de telles occasions sont rares, rarissimes; **his visits are few and far between**, ses visites sont rarissimes, rares et espacées; il vient nous voir (si) peu souvent; **areas where the houses are few and far between**, région *f* où les maisons sont rares et espacées (HA)

[19] Zgusta 1971, 336.

Among the examples presented above, there are those that show the SL item used in **free combinations** (e.g. the three examples for the idiom few and far between) and those which present the SL item in **collocations** (e.g. heartfelt sympathy is a collocation involving the compound heartfelt).

Morton Benson *et al.* indicate that **free combinations** "consist of elements that are joined in accordance with the general rules of English syntax and freely allow substitution. For example, in English a verb may be followed by adverbials (of time, place, and manner). The resultant number of possible combinations is limitless."[20] Some examples they give are they decided after lunch, they decided in the library and they decided with a heavy heart. Other free combinations involve other structures, including simple two-word combinations such as a verb followed by a noun and an adjective followed by a noun. For example, Anthony Cowie indicates that "the list of semantically related nouns which can co-occur as direct objects with a verb such as *run* (in the sense of 'direct' or 'manage') is virtually open-ended"[21] and that "verbs have a similarly wide privilege of occurrence with *business*."[22] Thus, run a business is a free combination as both the verb "run" and the noun "business" freely allow substitution. Another example of a free combination is fill/empty/drain etc. the sink/basin/bucket etc.[23] since both elements are freely combinable.

The elements of a **collocation**, on the other hand, do not freely allow substitution. As Esther Aisenstadt puts it, "the restricted commutability of one of the constituents is sufficient to

---

[20] Morton Benson, Evelyn Benson, and Robert Ilson, "Introduction," *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English: A Guide to Word Combinations* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1986) ix.

[21] A.P. Cowie, "The Treatment of Collocations and Idioms in Learners' Dictionaries," *Applied Linguistics* II (1981): 223.

[22] Cowie 1981, 226.

[23] A.P. Cowie, R. Mackin, and I.R. McCaig, "General Introduction," *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English Volume 2: Phrase, Clause & Sentence Idioms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983) xiii.

create a [collocation] (although in many [collocations] both constituents are restricted in their commutability)."[24] For example, entertain an idea/ notion/ suggestion/ proposal/ doubt/ suspicion are all collocations since the number of words entertain can collocate with in this sense ("to maintain in the mind") is restricted. And the examples to make a heartfelt appeal and heartfelt sympathy found on page 10 are collocations since heartfelt collocates with a restricted number of nouns, two of which are given in the *Robert/Collins* entry for heartfelt.

While free combinations and collocations are different in that substitutability of elements is more restricted in the latter, it is important to note that there is no clear dividing line between them as far as the range of collocability is concerned. As Cowie puts it, "openness and restrictedness of co-occurrence can be represented as the end-points of a scale or continuum."[25] At one end of the scale, Cowie would place free combinations such as run a business, in which the range of collocability of both items would not only be virtually open-ended, but also semantically diversified. He states that "around a central point...one finds combinations of the type...canvass a theory, etc., in which the meaning of element A restricts the number and diversity of items which can occur as element B".[26] And finally, according to Cowie, "below the point on the scale at which are grouped collocations in which a small set of items is associated with a particular sub-sense of another item..., one finds combinations in which a given meaning of one item is uniquely accompanied by another item..."[27] An example he gives is foot the bill: in the specialized sense of "settle", foot occurs only with bill. This last group of items is considered not as collocations in this thesis, but as idioms, due to a total absence of lexical variability. The

---

[24] E. Aisenstadt, "Collocability Restrictions in Dictionaries," *Review of Applied Linguistics* 45-46 (1979): 73.

[25] Anthony P. Cowie, "The Place of Illustrative Material and Collocations in the Design of a Learner's Dictionary," *In Honour of A.S. Hornby*, ed. Peter Strevens (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978) 133.

[26] Cowie 1978, 133.

[27] Cowie 1978, 134.

term "collocation" as used in this thesis then applies to combinations in which one or both of the elements in the collocation combine with a restricted set of words.

Benson *et al.* provide useful categories for collocations by dividing them into grammatical and lexical collocations. They define a **grammatical collocation** as "a phrase consisting of a dominant word (noun, adjective, verb) and a preposition or grammatical structure such as an infinitive or clause."[28] Examples are abide by and continue to + infinitive. It is interesting to note that some grammatical collocations have the same structure as **free combinations**. For instance, decide on a boat is a free combination if it means "decide while on a boat" but is a grammatical collocation if it means "choose a boat". While grammatical collocations always contain one subordinate element, **lexical collocations** do not; they generally consist of two "equal" lexical components,[29] such as an adjective and a noun (e.g. grave concern), a noun and a verb (e.g. bells ring) or a verb and a noun (e.g. pose a question). The distinction made by Benson *et al.* between grammatical and lexical collocations has been adopted in this thesis.

The Idiom

If the dividing line between collocations and free combinations is not clearly demarcated, nor is that between collocations and **idioms**. For instance, some idioms are like collocations in that they show a degree of lexical variability. Thus, in the idiom to keep one's eyes peeled, peeled can be replaced by open. However, idioms differ from collocations in other ways. These differences will be described in this section.

Morton Benson defines an idiom as "a relatively frozen expression whose meaning does

---

[28] Benson *et al.* 1986, ix.

[29] Morton Benson, "Collocations and Idioms," *Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning*, ed. Robert Ilson (Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd. and The British Council, 1985) 62.

not reflect the meanings of its component parts".[30] Two points in this definition merit discussion.

First, Benson indicates that, contrary to the meanings of free combinations and collocations, the meaning of an idiom is not predictable from the meanings of the words that make it up. Thus, kick the bucket is an idiom if it is used to mean "to die" since this interpretation of the phrase cannot be arrived at based on the meanings of the individual words. However, kick the bucket is not an idiom if it is used to mean "to strike a round vessel used for carrying liquids or solids with one's foot", since this interpretation of the phrase is based on the meanings of the individual components that make it up.

The opacity of the meaning of idioms is, however, relative, for it is easier to guess the meaning of some idioms than that of others. Thus, Cowie makes a distinction between "idioms proper" and "figurative idioms". For him, idioms proper are idioms "whose meaning is no longer analysable (and) seems completely unmotivated and petrified...(Gläser 1980)";[31] thus idioms proper have meanings that are difficult, if not impossible, to determine based on the meanings of the words in the idiom. A good example is the idiom sow (one's) wild oats, which does not have a current literal interpretation that provides a clue as to the meaning of the idiom. Figurative idioms, on the other hand, have a current literal interpretation which makes the idiom easier to understand.[32] As a result, their meanings are more easily determined than those of idioms proper. Cowie gives the example of do a U-turn ("to make a complete change in policy, plans, actions or beliefs") which also has a commonly-used literal meaning ("to drive or cycle in a half circle so that you are going in the opposite direction") that gives some indication of the meaning of the idiom.

If similes are included in the category of idioms, as is the case in the *Longman*

---

[30] Benson 1985, 66.

[31] Cowie 1981, 229.

[32] Cowie 1981, 229.

Dictionary of Contemporary English, then the meaning of some idioms at least becomes even less opaque. For, as Benson points out, similes are "transitional between collocations and idioms, that is, the meanings of the component parts are reflected partially in the meaning of the whole."[33] And if proverbs and sayings are also considered as idioms, as Benson suggests, the meaning of such idioms is almost transparent, since many of them (for example, the proverb an apple a day keeps the doctor away) have a literal or nearly literal interpretation.[34] Thus, while idioms are commonly considered to be expressions whose meaning does not reflect the meaning of its component parts, this point is not as clear-cut as it may seem at first sight.

Second, the term "expression" itself merits discussion, for it can cover a variety of items. According to many authors, the structure of an idiom can range from a compound right up to a sentence. The wide range of linguistic items that can be covered by the term "idiom" is clearly revealed by Adam Makkai in his book *Idiom Structure in English*, which provides an exhaustive classification of idioms. He first distinguishes between lexemic idioms and sememic idioms and then enumerates the various elements that enter into each category. Lexemic idioms include phrasal verb idioms (e.g. give in), tournure idioms (e.g. have it in for, to rain cats and dogs), irreversible binomial idioms (e.g. assault and battery), phrasal compound idioms (White House, redcap), incorporating verb idioms (e.g. eavesdrop, sight-see) and pseudo-idioms (e.g. spic and span). Sememic idioms include "first-base" idioms (e.g. to have two strikes against one), idioms of institutionalized politeness (e.g. do you mind if I X?), idioms of institutionalized detachment or indirectness (e.g. it seems that...), idioms of proposals encoded as questions (e.g. how about a drink?), idioms of institutionalized greeting (e.g. How do you do?), proverbial idioms with a "moral" (e.g. Birds of a feather flock together), familiar quotations as idioms (e.g. Brevity is the soul of wit), idiomaticity in institutionalized understatement (e.g. I wasn't too crazy about him)

---

[33] Benson *et al.* 1986, xxix.

[34] Benson 1985, 66.

and idiomaticity in institutionalized hyperbole (e.g. he won't even lift a finger [said of someone who is lazy]).[35] These examples show that his concept of idiom is very vast and includes items such as compounds and phrasal verbs, which could be classified merely as complex words.

Following the latter trend, I have eliminated compounds, as well as phrasal verbs, from my conception of idiom. However, the term "idiom" as used in this thesis remains fairly broad since it covers all the other structures enumerated by Makkai, as well as similes.

The Compound

For the purposes of this thesis, a **compound** will be seen as the result of putting two or more words together to form a third as in paperclip, oil-paper and paper thin regardless of the part of speech of the new word, the number of elements it is made up of, and whether it is written as one word, two words or is hyphenated.[36]

Some authors, such as Makkai, consider "opaque" compounds, i.e. compounds whose meaning is not decodable from the literal meanings of their constituent parts,[37] as **idioms.**[38] For example, he includes eavesdrop, baby-sit[39] and big shot[40] as idioms. Jennifer Seidl and W. McMordie apparently share Makkai's point of view that some compounds can be considered as

---

[35] See Adam Makkai, *Idiom Structure in English* (The Hague: Mouton & Co. N.V., Publishers, 1972) 135-179 for full descriptions.

[36] Laurie Bauer, *English Word-Formation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) 11.

[37] M.J. Wallace, "What is an Idiom? An Applied Linguistic Approach," *Review of Applied Linguistics* 45-46 (1979): 68.

[38] Makkai gives the compound man-hunt as an example of a compound that is not an idiom since the literal meaning of hunt ("systematically to search for capture without killing") is the meaning used in the compound.

[39] Makkai 1972, 168.

[40] Makkai 1972, 321.

idioms whether the elements are agglutinated, hyphenated or are separated by a space: their examples of idioms include compounds such as underpass, happy-go-lucky and cold war.[41] However, it is interesting to note that most of the compounds included in their dictionary of idioms are ones whose elements are separated by a space. For Michael Wallace, on the other hand, it seems that only compounds consisting of two words separated by a space should be considered as idioms. He believes that "whereas most learners and teachers would regard, say, *blackmail* as simply a new word to be learned, they would tend to regard expressions like *black market* and *black sheep* ('disgrace to the family') as idioms".[42] However, despite this argument that he himself proposes, Wallace considers it unwise to regard some compounds as idioms and others as non-idioms simply based on their spelling because a given compound may be written as one or two words depending on arbitrary rules. And since "learners (and teachers) of a language make a distinction between learning a 'word' however complex its structure, and learning an 'idiom'",[43] Wallace prefers to give compounds their own category. Terence Mitchell echoes Wallace's conclusion and states that compounds "belong essentially to the level of words and must be distinguished from both idioms and collocations".[44] Thus, while some authors regard opaque compounds as idioms since their meanings cannot be arrived at from the meanings of the constituent members, other authors on the subject prefer to treat all compounds separately from idioms. In keeping with the latter trend, opaque compounds will be considered as compounds and not as idioms in this thesis.

Such a clear-cut distinction, however, is more difficult to make between some compounds

---

[41] These examples are taken from Jennifer Seidl and W. McMordie, *English Idioms and How to Use Them* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978) 210, 45, 48.

[42] Wallace 1979, 66.

[43] Wallace 1979, 69.

[44] T.F. Mitchell, "Linguistic 'Goings On': Collocations and Other Lexical Matters Arising on the Syntagmatic Record," *Archivum Linguisticum: A Review of Comparative Philology and General Linguistics* ns II (1971): 60.

and **lexical collocations**. For example, Cowie *et al.* see certain modifying noun + head noun combinations as collocations and cite the composite blind alley, which is an adjective-noun combination, as a collocation.[45] Furthermore, Benson *et al.* state that the noun-noun combinations house arrest, jet engine, land reform and aptitude test are all collocations.[46] Other authors, on the other hand, such as Wallace, would view many of the above combinations as compounds.

Despite this lack of agreement on whether some adjective-noun and noun-noun combinations should be considered as lexical collocations or as compounds, some practical ways of distinguishing between the two have been put forward by linguists. For instance, Hans Marchand indicates that, in many cases, stress can determine if one is dealing with a compound or a lexical collocation.[47] He quotes Leonard Bloomfield as saying that "wherever we hear lesser or least stress upon a word which would always show high stress in a phrase, we describe it as a compound member..."[48] To illustrate this, Marchand indicates that blackbird is a compound since bird loses the stress it has when used as part of the syntactic group black bird, while black market is not a compound since market does not lose its stress. Of the five items provided in the preceding paragraph then, house arrest, land reform and aptitude test, like blackbird, should be considered as compounds as their first elements have primary stress and their second elements have secondary stress, according to *The Random House Dictionary of The English Language*. On the other hand, jet engine and blind alley (in both its literal and figurative sense), like black market, should not be considered as compounds according to this criterion

---

[45] Cowie *et al.* 1983, xiii.

[46] Benson *et al.* 1986, xxvi-xxvii.

[47] Hans Marchand, *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation: A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach*, 2nd ed. (München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1969) 21-22.

[48] Marchand 1969, 21.

since both the first word and the first syllable of the second word have primary stress. However, Marchand indicates that there are some exceptions to this rule. For instance, he says that some combinations which have participles as second words, such as easy-going and man-made, are considered as compounds even though they have double stress.

Other authors provide a second method of distinguishing lexical collocations from compounds. For instance, Charles Bally says that contrary to syntactic groups, compounds express a single idea.[49] Similarly, Etsko Kruisinga thinks the meaning of a compound is not the same as the combined meanings of the individual words that make it up.[50] Therefore, according to this criterion, house arrest, jet engine, land reform, aptitude test and blind alley in the figurative sense ("a position or situation offering no hope of progress or improvement") can be considered as compounds since they express a single idea: their meanings are not derived from those of the words that make them up. A simple, if not infallible, way of telling if the meaning of the combination of words is different from that of the combined meanings of its elements is to look it up in a large unilingual dictionary to see if the combination is defined therein as a separate unit. For instance, both *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* and *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* present individual definitions for house arrest, jet engine, land reform, aptitude test, black market and blind alley (in the figurative sense).

A third way of differentiating between lexical collocations and compounds is to see how the word combination is listed in comprehensive unilingual dictionaries. If it is listed as a headword, it will likely be a compound, since collocations are normally not treated as headwords. According to this criterion, house arrest, jet engine, land reform, aptitude test, black market and blind alley in the figurative sense would be compounds since they are all presented as headwords in *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* and *Webster's*

---

[49] Charles Bally, *Linguistique générale et linguistique française*, 2nd ed. (Bern: A. Francke S.A., 1944) 94.

[50] Marchand 1969, 21.

Third New International Dictionary. However, blind alley in the concrete sense could be considered as a collocation or as a compound using the dictionary criterion since *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* presents this combination as an example in one of the meanings of blind ("having but one opening or outlet: closed at one end: not permitting passage or flow all the way through") and provides other examples in which blind can collocate with nouns in this meaning while *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* presents it as a headword.

In this thesis, all three criteria presented above will be used to distinguish adjective-noun and noun-noun lexical collocations from compounds made up of the same elements. Dictionaries, such as the two cited above, are very useful for this purpose: while *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* indicates stress patterns for compounds, both it and *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* make a clear distinction between compounds, which appear as headwords, and lexical collocations, which appear as examples under one of the words that make them up. Thus, a combination of words will be considered as a compound if lesser or least stress is heard on a word which receives high stress when it is used in a phrase, if it is separately defined or if it is found only as a headword in unilingual dictionaries.

4. User Orientation

For each of the seven elements discussed above, this thesis suggests several possible arrangement techniques, for not all techniques may benefit all types of users. The fact that the organization (as well as the scope and meta-language) of dictionaries "should more closely reflect the reference needs (and levels of sophistication) of the classes of user [*sic*] for whom they are intended..."[51] was clearly brought out at the *Lexeter '83* conference. Thus, since specific

[51] Hans-Peder Kromann, Theis Riiber, and Poul Rosbach, "'Active' and 'Passive' Bilingual Dictionaries: The Ščerba Concept Reconsidered," *Lexeter '83 Proceedings*, ed. R.R.K. Hartmann (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984) 207.

techniques for arranging elements within GBD entries often benefit certain categories of users more specifically, the arrangement techniques proposed in this thesis will be accompanied, wherever applicable, by general remarks on the type of user who would benefit the most from particular techniques.

The two types of users most commonly referred to in the literature on bilingual lexicography are the L2-L1 user, whose dominant language is the target language in the GBD, and the L1-L2 user, whose dominant language is the source language. While the L1-L2 user uses a GBD primarily to produce texts in his foreign language, the L2-L1 user can use a GBD either to understand foreign language items or to produce texts (generally translations) in his dominant language. This distinction, which is based on language dominance and language direction, will be adopted in this thesis.

Another important distinction made by many lexicographers has to do with the dictionary-user's level of proficiency in his foreign language. Although these lexicographers generally make no hard-and-fast divisions in language proficiency, Jerzy Tomaszczyk does distinguish between two levels of foreign language users. He calls the first foreign language learners and the second foreign language speakers. He describes the members of the first group as having from several months to 24 years of instruction in their foreign language, the average being five years of instruction. The second group, on the other hand, is more advanced: it consists of translators and language instructors who have spoken their foreign language for an average of thirty years, and have no doubt achieved near-native competence in their foreign language.[52] One may well quibble over Tomaszczyk's characterization of each of the groups. Can one really be considered a "learner" after 24 years of instruction? And does one really have to have spoken one's foreign language for 30 full years to graduate to the level of "speaker"? Despite these reservations, however, the two levels of proficiency identified by

---

[52] Jerzy Tomaszczyk, "Dictionaries: Users and Uses," *Glottodidactica: An International Journal of Applied Linguistics* XII (1979): 104-05.

Tomaszczyk have the advantage of simplicity and they will be adopted here, although with a change in terminology.

Thus, using both directionality and foreign language proficiency as a basis, I will distinguish between four types of GBD-users: L2-L1 BISs (L2-L1 users who are beginning or intermediate foreign language students), L2-L1 AUs (L2-L1 advanced users, who have near-native competence in their foreign language), L1-L2 BISs (L1-L2 users who are beginning or intermediate foreign language students) and L1-L2 AUs (L1-L2 advanced users). Moreover, a distinction will be made between L2-L1 users using a GBD to understand foreign language items and those using a GBD to produce texts (translations) in their dominant language.

5. Plan of the Thesis

As indicated previously, seven elements of the GBD entry will be discussed in this thesis: the equivalent, the meaning, the context, the meaning discrimination device, the example, the idiom and the compound. The arrangement of equivalents will be discussed first as they seem to be the most important feature of the entry: they are what GBD-users look up most often when consulting GBDs. The second, third and fourth chapters will deal with the arrangement of meanings, contexts and meaning discrimination devices, all of which help the GBD-user to select the proper equivalent. In the second chapter the ordering of meanings, which are usually identified by definitions, context words and field labels, will be discussed. The third chapter will deal with the ordering of contexts, which are commonly represented by context words and field labels. And in the fourth chapter, the placement of two meaning discrimination devices with respect to the equivalent--the definition and the context word--will be the topic of discussion. Finally, the fifth and sixth chapters will deal with the arrangement of items that come after the equivalent in the GBD entry: the fifth chapter will deal with the arrangement of examples and the sixth with the arrangement of idioms and compounds.

Arrangement of entry elements can be looked at from two points of view: their placement with regard to other elements within the entry and their ordering among themselves. While both the placement and ordering of idioms and compounds is discussed, only the ordering of equivalents, meanings, contexts and examples and only the placement of meaning discrimination devices are discussed.

CHAPTER ONE

THE ORDERING OF EQUIVALENTS

Most dictionary-users consult GBDs primarily to find equivalents for SL single words, compounds and idioms. Thus, it is important that lexicographers include as many equivalents as possible in their GBDs. In fact, Al-Kasimi and Zgusta believe that finding equivalents for SL lexical items is the bilingual lexicographer's most important task.[1] While providing equivalents is doubtless of primary importance, it is also important for the lexicographer to order them in a user-friendly way so that the GBD-user can quickly and easily find the ones he is looking for. This chapter will focus on this second important task of the bilingual lexicographer.

1. Categories of Equivalents

There are basically two categories of equivalents that need to be dealt with: synonymous equivalents and non-synonymous equivalents. Synonymous equivalents, which in fact are normally quasi-synonymous rather than completely synonymous, are those that can be used more or less interchangeably, from the point of view of meaning and the context in which they are used. For example, according to the *Robert/Collins*, foi in the sense of "confiance" has two synonymous equivalents: faith and trust. Non-synonymous equivalents, on the other hand, cover different senses of a polysemous headword or, even if they cover the same sense, they are used in different contexts; they are therefore not interchangeable. Thus, course and tour, although both possible equivalents of run, have totally different meanings: run in the sense of "act of running" = course; run in the sense of "outing" = tour; they are therefore never

[1] Al-Kasimi 1977, 58 and Zgusta 1971, 312.

interchangeable. Likewise, parcours and trajet, both equivalents of run in the sense of "distance travelled", are also not interchangeable, since the first is used in the context of bus, train, boat and plane travel, whereas the second is used in the context of car travel. The first part of this chapter will deal with the ordering of non-synonymous equivalents for the different meanings of an SL item; the second, with the ordering of non-synonymous equivalents which cover the same overall meaning of the SL item but which are used in different contexts; and the third, with the ordering of synonymous equivalents.

2. Ordering Techniques for Non-Synonymous Equivalents for Different Meanings of SL Items

In the GBDs that I have studied, non-synonymous equivalents for the different meanings of SL items are usually preceded by typographical features such as letters or numerals.[2] For example, the following entry taken from the *Robert/Collins* makes use of letters to set off twelve different meanings of the headword run:

run...*n* **(a)** (*act of running*) action *f* de courir, course *f*...
(b) (*outing*) tour *m*, promenade *f*, excursion *f*...
(c) (*distance travelled*) [*bus, train, boat, plane*] parcours *m*;
[*car*] trajet *m*...
(d) (*series*) succession *f*, série *f*, suite *f*; (*Cards*) séquence *f*...
(e) (*rush, great demand*) ruée *f*...
(f) [*tide*] poussée *f*, flux *m*.
(g) (*fig: trend*) [*market*] tendance *f*; [*events*] direction *f*, tendance;
[*opinion*] tendance, courant *m*...
(h) (*track for sledging, skiing etc*) piste *f*, descente *f*;
(*animal enclosure*) enclos *m*...
(i) (*in stocking*) échelle *f*, maille filée.
(j) (*Mus*) roulade *f*.
(k) (*Typ*) tirage *m*...
(l) (*Cricket, Baseball*) point *m*. (RC)

[2] However, the semi-colon is also often used to separate such non-synonymous equivalents.

A perusal of this entry reveals that the way in which the meanings of the headword are ordered dictates the way in which the non-synonymous equivalents for the different meanings are ordered. For instance, the equivalents action de courir and course are placed first simply because the editors of the *Robert/Collins* have placed first the meaning of run represented by the meaning discrimination device "act of running". Likewise, the equivalent point comes last because the meaning of run related to cricket and baseball is placed last. Thus, it can be seen that in GBDs the ordering of equivalents depends first and foremost on the ordering of the meanings of the headword. For a discussion of the ordering of meanings in GBDs, see chapter two, which is entitled The Ordering of Senses.

3. Ordering Techniques for Non-Synonymous Equivalents Used in Different Contexts

While non-synonymous equivalents for different meanings of SL items are generally preceded by typographical features such as numbers and letters, non-synonymous equivalents which cover the same meanings of SL items but which are used in different contexts are generally separated by semi-colons[3] and are often accompanied by context words. For example, in sense division (g) of the above entry for run, three non-synonymous equivalents, tendance, direction and courant, each used in different contexts but all covering the overall meaning of "trend", are separated by a semi-colon and are preceded by the context words "market", "events" and "opinion" respectively. The ordering of such non-synonymous equivalents is determined by the ordering of the contexts in which the headword occurs. For instance, in the above example, the French equivalent tendance is placed first simply because the editors of the *Robert/Collins* have decided to place the context word "market" first. Thus any discussion of the ordering of non-synonymous equivalents covering different contexts of SL items necessarily involves a

[3] However, the *Van Dale* often separates such equivalents by commas.

discussion of the ordering of contexts of SL items. The ordering of contexts is discussed in detail in the chapter entitled The Ordering of Contexts (chapter three).

4. Ordering Techniques for Synonymous Equivalents

While lexicographers do not consciously set out to order non-synonymous equivalents, but rather to order meanings of SL items and contexts in which SL items in a particular meaning are used, they may deliberately establish a particular order for synonymous equivalents.[4]

Samuel Martin suggests that the first such equivalent listed should be the one that is the most broadly applicable.[5] While this suggestion is not further developed by Martin, it can be interpreted generally as meaning that those synonymous equivalents that work in the greatest number of contexts, in other words, those that occur most frequently as translations of the headword, should be placed first. This reasoning might underlie the ordering of the three synonymous equivalents given in English (point, place and spot) for the French noun point in the meaning of "endroit" in the *Robert/Collins*. All three equivalents are used in one example provided (**pour aller d'un point à un autre** to go from one point *ou* place *ou* spot to another), but point appears in other examples where the other two equivalents are not used. This might explain why it is placed first.

Although Martin's suggestion seems, at first sight, to make sense, there are problems with it. First, he takes it for granted that the lexicographer has at his disposal a substantial corpus that he can analyze, which is not necessarily the case. Second, he supposes that the

---

[4] Such equivalents are generally separated by commas in the GBDs I studied.

[5] Samuel E. Martin, "Selection and Presentation of Ready Equivalents in a Translation Dictionary," *Problems in Lexicography*, ed. Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta (Bloomington: Indiana University; The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967) 156.

lexicographer has the time to translate all the examples in his corpus to find the most frequently used synonymous equivalent (i.e. the one that is used in the most contexts) which, while highly desirable, is not generally the case. Ideally a lexicographer would have at his disposal frequency lists for TL equivalents which he could use as a guide and as a complement to his partial translations. However, such lists are generally too incomplete to be completely reliable. Thus, lexicographers often cannot establish with any certainty which synonymous equivalents occur more frequently than others and, as a result, most GBDs do not claim to present them in order of frequency.

However, a few GBDs, such as the *Van Dale* dictionaries, do claim to make a distinction between synonymous equivalents according to the frequency of their occurrence. In these dictionaries, basic translation equivalents (presumably more common ones) are found in bold type before a double arrow while synonyms are placed in plain type after the arrow.[6] For example, in the *Van Dale* Dutch-English dictionary entry for druk, two synonyms are given for the basic translation equivalent busy:

druk...O.7 [bezet, gevuld] ***busy*** = > *full, active* (*Van Dale*)

Full and active are clearly synonyms of busy as is revealed by two examples using the basic translation equivalent and the synonyms interchangeably in the same entry: lead a busy/an active life and a busy/full schedule/programme. While the distinction established between basic equivalents and synonyms is a first and important step towards the ordering of synonymous equivalents, the ordering of basic equivalents on the one hand and synonyms on the other remains nevertheless erratic in the *Van Dale* dictionaries: sometimes, they are listed

[6] P. Van Sterkenburg, W. Martin, and B. Al, "A New Van Dale Project: Bilingual Dictionaries on One and the Same Monolingual Basis," *Lexicography in the Electronic Age*, ed. J. Goetschalckx and L. Rolling (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1982) 234.

alphabetically, sometimes, only some of the equivalents are in alphabetical order, while at other times, they are in no discernible order whatsoever. Thus, although the editors of the *Van Dale* claim to distinguish between more frequently used and less frequently used synonymous equivalents by separating them with a double arrow, it seems that they often cannot establish with any certainty an order for synonymous equivalents on either side of the double arrow.

It would seem that the *Robert/Collins* also attempts to order synonymous equivalents by frequency. Although the editors do not claim to order equivalents in this way, an observation of entries reveals that, in some cases, an attempt has been made to establish such an order. For instance, in the entry for the adjective loud, the equivalent sonore is placed in between two synonymous equivalents in the first set of equivalents, after two synonymous equivalents in the second set and before a synonymous equivalent in the third set:

> **loud**...*adj* **(a)** *(noisy) voice* fort, sonore, grand; *laugh* grand, bruyant, sonore; *noise, cry* sonore, grand (RC)

The only possible explanation for the placing of sonore in three different positions within three different sets of synonymous equivalents would be that it occurs in different frequencies of use in the different sets.

In many cases, the placement towards the end of the list of less generally applicable and thus less frequently used equivalents is complemented by field and usage labels or other indications which indicate the limited contexts in which these equivalents can be used. This can be seen in the following examples:

> **feu**...*nm*...**(f)** (*arg Crime: revolver*) gun, gat**, rod** (RC) (the *Robert/Collins* places the stars one above the other)

> **oui**...*adv* **(a)** (*réponse affirmative*) yes, aye (*Naut, régional*), yea (++ *ou littér*) (RC)

In the first example, gun is placed before gat and rod because the latter two equivalents are used only in very relaxed contexts,[7] while the former is used in a larger number of contexts; and in the second example, yes is placed first because it is used in many contexts, while aye and yea are restricted in their contexts of use: aye is used only in nautical contexts and in certain regions, while yea is used in very relaxed situations or in literary contexts. Thus, synonymous equivalents which occur less frequently as translations of the headword can be identified not only by placement but also by usage and field labels.[8]

While synonymous equivalents seem to be ordered by frequency to a certain extent in GBDs, despite the fact that few actually make such a claim, it is obvious that they can also be placed in alphabetical order. This technique seems to be used occasionally in the *Robert/Collins* and the *Harrap's*, in which synonymous equivalents for a given meaning of an SL item are sometimes listed in alphabetical order:

> **glittering**...*adj* brillant, étincelant, scintillant; *(fig)* éclatant, resplendissant (RC)
>
> **brisure**...*s.f.* **1.** break, crack, fissure, flaw (HA)

---

[7] Beryl T. Atkins, *et al.*, eds., "Introduction," *Collins/Robert French-English English-French Dictionary* (*Robert/Collins Dictionnaire français-anglais anglais-français*) 2nd ed. (Glasgow: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd; Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 1987) xx.

[8] It should be noted that in the *Robert/Collins* less generally applicable equivalents are normally placed before more generally applicable ones when the meaning of the SL item itself is not generally applicable:

> **front**...*nm* (a)...*(littér: visage)* brow (*littér*), face (RC)

In this example, brow is placed before face since it has the same applicability as the headword front.

However, since the ordering of equivalents is generally not explained in the prefaces of GBDs, it is difficult to know for sure if alphabetical ordering is deliberate in such cases or if it is merely coincidental.

A third method of ordering synonymous equivalents is by degree of intensity, which, according to Stephen Ullmann, is one of nine ways in which synonyms can differ.[9] This technique is obviously used less often than ordering by frequency and alphabetical ordering since more intense equivalents are not automatically provided in every entry. However, it is illustrated in the following example taken from the *Robert/Collins*, in which the more intense equivalent, accompanied by the indicator "stronger", is placed after other proposed equivalents:

> **gloomy**...*adj* (a) *person, character* sombre, triste, mélancolique, *(stronger)* lugubre (RC)

It would seem that the label "stronger" here indicates that the equivalent lugubre is more intense than the headword gloomy and correspondingly more intense than the other equivalents provided for this word. According to Ullmann, difference in intensity combines both objective and emotive factors.[10] In the above example for gloomy, it would seem that at least an objective, or denotative, meaning difference can be made between sombre, triste and mélancolique on the one hand and lugubre on the other by examining the definitions for these words in *Le Petit Robert*. This dictionary defines the four above words as follows:

---

[9] Stephen Ullmann, *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell and Mott Ltd., 1962) 142. In this work, Ullmann discusses nine ways tabulated by W.E. Collinson in which synonyms can differ, one of which is intensity. He gives the example of the synonyms repudiate and refuse, the former being more intense than the latter.

[10] Ullmann 1962, 143.

sombre: "dont les pensées, les sentiments sont empreints de tristesse, d'abattement, de douleur ou d'inquiétude"

triste: "qui est dans un état de tristesse"; tristesse: "état affectif pénible, calme et durable;..."

mélancolique: "en qui domine la mélancolie"; mélancolie: "état d'abattement, de tristesse, accompagné de rêverie"

lugubre: "qui marque ou inspire une profonde tristesse, un sombre accablement"

It would seem that the definition for lugubre contains an element of meaning not present in the other three words: the word "profonde" seems to suggest that lugubre consists of a deeper, more intense sadness than sombre, triste and mélancolique.

Stronger synonymous equivalents, such as lugubre, are generally placed after other equivalents in GBDs. However, this method of arrangement has its limits since it does not provide a means of ordering several equivalents with the same intensity, such as sombre, triste and mélancolique.

5. Ordering of Synonymous Equivalents and User Orientation

Despite the limitations of several of the methods examined above for the ordering of equivalents, it is clearly a preoccupation in contemporary bilingual lexicography. On what basis can a lexicographer choose one method rather than another? The obvious answer seems to be in terms of user orientation and user needs. In this section, I will evaluate the three ordering techniques for synonymous equivalents discussed above (ordering equivalents by frequency, ordering them alphabetically and placing more intense equivalents last) in terms of the types of users who would most benefit from each. However, since the ordering of non-synonymous equivalents, which depends to a large extent on the ordering of senses and contexts, is discussed in more detail in chapters two and three, the issue of which dictionary-users benefit from the

different ways of ordering non-synonymous equivalents will not be treated here.

L2-L1 users, and more particularly the L2-L1 BIS, can benefit from the ordering of equivalents by frequency if they use the GBD primarily to understand the meaning of SL items in their foreign language. For instance, in the following entry for figurant, the first equivalent, puppet, coupled with the label "fig", helps the L2-L1 user to understand immediately the meaning of the headword:

figurant,e...*nm,f*...*(fig) (pantin)* puppet, cipher (RC)

Since the meaning discrimination device "pantin" is in the user's foreign language, the L2-L1 BIS in particular, who is more likely than an L2-L1 AU to use a GBD for comprehension purposes, would probably jump to the first equivalent to understand the meaning of figurant. It therefore makes sense to provide him with the most frequently occurring equivalent first (which he has probably run across and thus can be expected to know). Given the fact that the word cipher (the second equivalent provided for figurant) is more difficult to understand than puppet, the placing of the more frequently used puppet first becomes even more important if the BIS is to grasp the headword's meaning quickly and easily. Although placing equivalents that clarify the meaning of SL items last does not present a really serious problem in short lists of synonyms, as in the above example, the placing of such equivalents at the end of longer lists may cause problems for the L2-L1 BIS as he may have to read several equivalents before coming to the one he needs. Thus, placing the most frequently used synonymous equivalents first helps the L2-L1 user, and more particularly the L2-L1 BIS, to grasp an SL item's meaning more easily.

L1-L2 AUs and BISs, who use GBDs to produce texts in their foreign language, would also both benefit from the ordering of synonymous equivalents by frequency. However, since BISs are less proficient in their second language than AUs are, ordering by frequency becomes even more important for them since they have more difficulty deciding which synonymous

equivalent to use in their foreign language. For instance, in the above example for figurant, if cipher were placed before puppet, the L1-L2 BIS, might assume that cipher is the equivalent he should use as it comes first, when, in fact, puppet is more commonly used in English in the meaning of "one whose acts are controlled by an outside force or influence". Thus, it would be dangerous lexicographical practice to place less commonly used synonymous equivalents before more commonly used ones.

While ordering synonymous equivalents by frequency can benefit L2-L1 users using a GBD to understand foreign language items and L1-L2 users using it to produce texts in their foreign language, alphabetical ordering of synonymous equivalents can benefit only the L2-L1 AU, such as a translator, producing texts in his dominant language, who may wish simply to check if the GBD includes a certain equivalent that he already has in mind. For instance, if he knows that, say, cipher is the equivalent he wants for figurant, he may simply wish to confirm his instinctive choice by checking a GBD's list of possible equivalents. In such a case, alphabetical ordering of equivalents would enable him to find it more quickly than ordering by frequency would. However, placing synonymous equivalents in alphabetical order is impractical in a GBD attempting to reach a wide audience as such an arrangement would not be helpful to L2-L1 users wishing to understand foreign language items or L1-L2 users producing texts in their foreign language as both do not generally have an equivalent in mind before looking up a headword.

The last method of ordering synonymous equivalents, that of placing more intense equivalents last, is useful to all types of users but is especially useful to the L1-L2 BIS who uses a GBD to produce texts in his foreign language and who is not likely to know the difference between several equivalents of varying intensities in his foreign language. While the placement of such equivalents is not as important as actually including a label indicating stronger equivalents, it is nonetheless better to place them after other equivalents so that dictionary-users see equivalents with the same intensity as the headword first.

6. Conclusion

Thus, it is important that the bilingual lexicographer order equivalents in such a way that the dictionary-user can fully benefit from them. In this chapter, it was seen that there are basically three ways of ordering synonymous equivalents: they can be placed in decreasing order of frequency, in alphabetical order or in order of increasing intensity. Despite the fact that ordering equivalents by frequency is made difficult not only by the lack of a substantial corpus and lack of time to examine all the examples in the corpus, but also by a lack of reliable frequency lists for synonymous equivalents, this seems to be the most frequently used method. The two other methods, ordering equivalents alphabetically and placing more intense equivalents last, on the other hand, are not commonly used in the GBDs I examined, perhaps because the former benefits only one type of user, the L2-L1 AU in one specific case (verification of an equivalent he already has in mind), and the latter seemingly because equivalents that are more intense than the headword are not often given in GBDs.

At the beginning of this chapter it was stated that while the bilingual lexicographer deliberately sets out to order synonymous equivalents, he does not intentionally order non-synonymous equivalents. Rather, the order of such equivalents is determined indirectly by the ordering of the meanings and contexts of SL items. These will be the topics of discussion in the following two chapters. The ordering of the senses of SL items will be discussed in chapter two while the ordering of contexts will be examined in the third chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

THE ORDERING OF SENSES

In the previous chapter, it was seen that the ordering of non-synonymous equivalents depended on the ordering of the different senses of SL items. These different senses are often identified in modern GBDs by meaning discrimination devices such as definitions, context words and field labels, which enable the GBD-user to choose quickly and easily from among several non-synonymous equivalents. This is clearly seen in the entry for the noun run on page 25, in which all three devices are used to identify senses. Thus, discussion of the ordering of senses inevitably covers the use and ordering of meaning discrimination devices that indicate the different senses of SL items, although the focus in this chapter will be on the former.

The ordering of senses has long been a preoccupation, especially of unilingual lexicographers, who have identified four basic methods of ordering senses in unilingual dictionaries: chronological or historical ordering, ordering by frequency (also known as usage ordering[1] and statistical ordering[2]), logical ordering and ordering in order of sense dominance. Some bilingual lexicographers, such as Iannucci, avoid the problem of the ordering of senses in bilingual dictionaries by advocating the use of unilingual sense divisions as a basis for those in GBDs. His advice has been followed in at least one GBD, the *Robert & Signorelli*, whose ordering of senses is based on those of *Le Petit Robert*. However, William Gedney wonders "if the best organization and arrangement of definitions in a monolingual English dictionary would

---

[1] Barbara A. Kipfer, "Methods of Ordering Senses within Entries," *Lexeter '83 Proceedings*, ed. R.R.K. Hartmann, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984) 101.

[2] Murray Thomas Wilton, "Bilingual Lexicography: Theoretical Foundations and Practical Methodology, with Special Reference to Canandian French and English" (Ph.D. Thesis, Simon Fraser University, 1978) 105.

always turn out to be the best arrangement for speakers of another language."[3] Bernard Al shares the latter's hesitation with respect to bilingual dictionaries intended for L2-L1 users and believes that the ordering of senses used in *Le Petit Robert*, for instance, would not be desirable in version-oriented bilingual dictionaries for Dutch speakers in which French is the source language.[4]

In spite of these reservations voiced by Gedney and Al, the fact remains that most of the methods of ordering senses used in unilingual dictionaries are also used in GBDs. According to Murray Wilton, many twentieth century GBDs order senses in three of the four ways mentioned above: some arrange them chronologically, others order them by frequency,[5] and still others order them on a logical basis, placing concrete senses before abstract ones.[6] Wilton points out that there are still other possibilities for the arrangement of senses in GBDs. For example, he indicates that senses have even been ordered according to the alphabetical order of the field labels for each sense.[7] Moreover, according to Wilton, some GBDs combine ordering techniques such as the historical and frequency methods, for example.[8]

It is thus clear that a variety of sense ordering techniques (most of them taken from unilingual lexicography) are used in GBDs and should be discussed here. However, given the fact that ordering techniques have seldom been discussed in the context of bilingual lexicography, the starting point for my description of several techniques is unilingual

---

[3] William Gedney, "Comments," *Problems in Lexicography*, ed. Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta (Bloomington: Indiana University; The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967) 233.

[4] B. Al, "Dictionnaire de thème et dictionnaire de version," *Revue de phonétique appliquée* 66-67-68 (1983): 209.

[5] Wilton 1978, 105.

[6] Wilton 1978, 101.

[7] Wilton 1978, 101.

[8] Wilton 1978, 100. Wilton also points out that in some GBDs, senses are presented in no particular order whatsoever, or are only partially and inconsistently ordered (101-102).

lexicography, which is followed by an analysis of the techniques and their application to GBDs.

1. Different Sense Ordering Techniques

Chronological or historical ordering of senses, which is used in such respected unilingual dictionaries as *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* and the *Oxford English Dictionary*, consists of the ordering of senses from the earliest recorded use of a sense to the most current use. However, Barbara Kipfer points out that in chronologically-ordered dictionaries "the main divisions of the semantic description are ordered historically, but senses closely related are grouped within them in a sort of semantic geneological tree."[9] Thus, in *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*, the first sense in the entry for the noun job contains four sub-senses which are ordered chronologically, the last three being linked semantically to the first by the idea of work. However, the second and third senses, even though they date back to before these three subsenses, are placed after them in the entry because they are not as closely related semantically to the first sense.[10] According to Kipfer, real historical sequence cannot be shown since "the presentation would be rather chaotic. The editors must very often present their material in logical groups or by semantic connections"[11] within a historical framework. Therefore, in chronologically-ordered dictionaries such as *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*, ordering of senses consists of a combination of historical ordering and semantic ordering.

There are two main problems with historical ordering. First, frequently used meanings often come after less common ones. As a result, the unsophisticated user (e.g. an L2 user), who is more likely to need common senses, must often read definitions that he does not want before

---

[9] Kipfer 1984, 104.

[10] Frederick C. Mish, *et al.*, eds., "Explanatory Notes," *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary* (Springfield, Mass.: Merriam-Webster Inc., 1984) 19-20.

[11] Kipfer 1984, 104.

finding the one he is looking for. Second, due to insufficient data, it is sometimes impossible to determine the exact chronological order of senses.[12]

In the English/French GBDs I examined, chronological ordering did not seem to be used at all, despite Wilton's claim that this method of ordering is found in GBDs. Reasons for this seem obvious. First, many older, outdated senses are completely eliminated from GBDs since the typical bilingual dictionary user, the foreign language learner, is normally interested in current usage. Second, the chronological presentation of SL senses is of little or no benefit to GBD-users since the L2-L1 BIS is normally not interested in the evolution of senses in his foreign language and the rare L2-L1 AU who may be interested is likely to use a unilingual dictionary for this purpose.

A second way of ordering senses is to place them in descending order of frequency. In this type of ordering, general meanings usually come first, followed by specific, technical senses.[13]

Several problems with this type of ordering have been brought out by Kipfer. First, she points out that "some linguists believe it is not usually the most common meaning that is being sought"[14] and that ordering by frequency is therefore not always desirable. It is certainly true that educated L1 users would use the unilingual dictionary mainly for identifying uncommon meanings. But it must be remembered that younger L1 speakers--those still learning their mother tongue--and advanced L2 speakers, who also use unilingual dictionaries, have other

---

[12] Finngeir Hiorth, "Arrangement of Meanings in Lexicography," *Lingua* IV (1954-55): 418. This view is shared by the editors of *The American Heritage Dictionary* (see p. xlvi of the preface to the 1975 edition), as well as by Kipfer (see Kipfer 1984, 105), who says that "documentation may seldom be sufficient to enable the lexicographer to make more than an educated guess as to the ordering [of senses] and, also, the history of many languages is still unknown."

[13] Walter S. Avis, *et al.*, eds., "Guide to the Dictionary," *Gage Canadian Dictionary* (Toronto: Gage Publishing Limited, 1983) xxiv. However, it is possible for a more specialized sense to be more frequently used than one with wider applicability, in which case the specialized sense would come first in this type of ordering.

[14] Kipfer 1984, 102.

needs, as has been noted above. Moreover, typical GBD-users, L2-L1 and L1-L2 BISs, constantly seek common meanings.

Second, she states that it is not always possible to determine which senses of a word are more frequent as there is often "not enough citational evidence or not enough testimony from a variety of sources."[15] Alain Rey shares this view, stating bluntly that it is an impossible task: "C'est, en fait, une tâche impossible, faute de données précises sur la fréquence respective des emplois, la fréquence n'ayant d'ailleurs de valeur que dans un 'univers de discours' donné."[16] And Finngeir Hiorth points out that the use of a corpus does not guarantee the lexicographer an adequate indication of frequency for the corpus may not be representative of frequency,[17] and that "in some cases one may not be able to conclude which meaning is the most frequent."[18] In any case, even if the frequency of senses can be established with some certainty, Hiorth points out that "several meanings may occur with about the same frequency in the available excerpts."[19]

Despite these problems, ordering by frequency seems to be commonly used in GBDs. In the *Robert/Collins*, the *Harrap's* and the *Larousse*, for instance, frequently used general senses generally precede more rarely used specialized senses. For example, all three dictionaries place the general meaning of the noun lock ("a fastening (as for a door) operated by a key or a combination") before less commonly used specialized senses limited to such fields as automobiles and wrestling.

---

[15] Kipfer 1984, 101.

[16] Alain Rey, "Présentation du dictionnaire," *Le Petit Robert 1* (Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 1984) xiii.

[17] Hiorth 1954-55, 420.

[18] Hiorth 1954-55, 421.

[19] Hiorth 1954-55, 421.

In some of the GBDs I examined, such as the *Robert/Collins* and the *Larousse*, less commonly used specialized senses, which are generally placed towards the end of the entry, are often marked by field labels. Also, in both of these GBDs, especially the *Robert/Collins*, more frequently used senses are often identified by definitions and context words rather than field labels. This is clearly seen in the entry for the noun run found on page 25: the first nine senses are identified by definitions and context words while the last three are identified by field labels. Furthermore, the label "gen" is sometimes used in the *Robert/Collins* to identify more common meanings that are used in a large number of contexts, such as the principal meaning for the adjective petit.

A third type of ordering is logical ordering, in which ordering of senses is achieved, according to Kipfer, by "clustering the various definitions around several core or basic uses, such as the original use and major metaphorical uses--as in logical ordering and psychologically-meaningful ordering."[20] Kipfer seems to make a distinction between the latter. However, since she does not indicate clearly the difference between them, the two will be considered together here. This type of ordering, the basis of which is semantic, is followed in several unilingual dictionaries, including *The American Heritage Dictionary*. For example, the preface of this dictionary indicates that senses in the dictionary "are ordered analytically, according to central meaning clusters from which related subsenses and additional separate senses may evolve."[21]

But Kipfer rejects this type of ordering, in part because "the user does not garner either semantic or historical knowledge about words and the ordering is not easy for the lexicographer to prepare without a great deal of subjective judgment. There is nothing scientific about it,

---

[20] Kipfer 1984, 101.

[21] Margery S. Berube, *et al.*, eds., "Guide to the Dictionary," *The American Heritage Dictionary*, Second College Edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1982) 49.

unless you qualify what the lexicographer may know from his own studies."[22] Hiorth also considers this type of ordering as unscientific and states that "most lexicographers have only vague notions concerning the meaning of the phrase 'logical order'. They have arranged meanings according to their alleged logical order, without being able to state *what* they did when they arranged meanings in that order."[23] As a result, he says, "the application of the concept of logical order will vary from lexicographer to lexicographer.... The lexicographer may be said to base his assertion of logical order on his intuition."[24]

A study of entries taken from dictionaries clearly using the logical ordering technique, such as the *Collins Dictionary of the English Language*, *The American Heritage Dictionary* and the *Gage Canadian Dictionary*, reveals that there is indeed a good deal of subjectivity involved in ordering senses logically. For instance, lexicographers do not always agree on which semantic field to place a given sense in. For example, the *Gage Canadian Dictionary* places the sense of bar meaning "a band of color; stripe" alongside those senses relating to music ("a unit of rhythm; measure" and "the vertical line between two such units on a staff; bar line") because it sees all three senses as being related semantically. *The American Heritage Dictionary*, on the other hand, clearly separates bar in the sense of "stripe" from the meanings related to music, seeing the latter meanings as being quite unrelated to the meaning of "stripe". Thus, it can be seen that

---

[22] Kipfer 1984, 104. While I agree with Kipfer that logical ordering is largely unscientific, I do not agree with her when she says the dictionary-user does not garner *any* (my italics) semantic knowledge about words when logical ordering is used. I think what she means is that the user does not see the historical development of senses, and thus the actual semantic links between them, in logical ordering. Semantic groups are established in logical ordering, just as in historical ordering, but they are not based on the chronological appearance of senses. For example, *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, which presents senses in chronological order, separates bar meaning "a straight stripe, band, or line much longer than it is wide" from the meanings related to music ("a vertical line across the musical staff before the initial measure accent" and "measure") because the first sense came into use before the latter two senses. The *Gage Canadian Dictionary*, on the other hand, places all three meanings together because it sees a similarity between bar in the sense of "stripe" and "a vertical line across the musical staff".

[23] Hiorth 1954-55, 414.

[24] Hiorth 1954-55, 417.

semantic or logical relationships between senses are sometimes viewed differently by different lexicographers and that semantic fields are thus ordered differently as well.

Other authors bring out other characteristics of the logical ordering of senses. For Wilton, logical ordering entails placing concrete senses before abstract and figurative senses.[25] The *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary* takes this factor into account and places concrete senses before abstract ones wherever possible "because the concrete meaning is often easier to grasp, and abstract meanings can often be seen as variations on the concrete."[26] Since this criterion does not provide a means of ordering concrete or abstract senses among themselves, this dictionary takes into consideration other factors as well. For instance, it also groups senses around central, core meanings. According to Wilton and Jean Dubois, logical ordering also develops senses from the general to the particular,[27] and Dubois adds that going from the particular to the general is also possible.[28]

Only certain aspects of logical ordering are used in GBDs. For instance, the *Robert/Collins*, the *Harrap's* and the *Larousse* generally place literal senses before figurative ones. For example, in these three GBDs, the literal meanings for the noun bedrock ("the solid rock underlying unconsolidated surface materials") and the verb hamstring ("to cripple by cutting the leg tendons") precede the figurative meanings of these words ("basis" for bedrock and "to make ineffective or powerless" for hamstring), even though the latter are more common meanings.

In the GBDs I studied, it seems that only definitions and context words are used to

---

[25] Wilton 1978, 352.

[26] John Sinclair, "Introduction," *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary* (London: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd, 1987) xix.

[27] Wilton 1978, 352.

[28] Jean Dubois, "Models of the Dictionary: Evolution in Dictionary Design," *Applied Linguistics* II (1981): 238.

identify figurative meanings; field labels are normally used to identify concrete, specialized meanings of words. The label "fig" is used to identify figurative meanings as well. The *Larousse* seems to use this label the most, placing senses identified by it towards the end of entries.

A fourth technique of ordering senses is that of placing dominant senses before less dominant ones. According to Zgusta, the dominant sense is "the one which is the first to be thought of by the majority of the speakers of a language if presented with the word in isolation, without any context."[29] For example, he points out that when given the word table, most people would probably automatically think of the piece of furniture,[30] which should therefore be considered the dominant sense. Thus, in any entry for table, the sense of "piece of furniture" would be placed before other senses, since that seems the obvious one to most people.

Zgusta is quick to point out that although there is a connection between the notion of a dominant sense and notions concerning the frequency of occurrence of senses, the relationship between the two is practically unexplored.[31] Therefore, he considers the placing of dominant senses before less dominant ones as an ordering technique in itself.

There is no doubt that this type of ordering is not as objective as ordering by frequency. Zgusta himself admits that it is impressionistic[32] in that the dominant sense of words will vary depending on the person questioned. He gives the example of the mathematician who, upon seeing the word table, might think first of the list of numbers instead of the piece of furniture. However, he feels that the lexicographer can obtain fairly objective results by conducting a survey among members of his staff and informants to determine which are the dominant senses.

---

[29] Zgusta 1971, 64.

[30] Zgusta 1971, 65.

[31] Zgusta 1971, 65.

[32] Zgusta 1971, 64.

Another more practical weakness of this type of ordering is that there may be several senses for a word, none of which is clearly dominant. According to Zgusta, this often occurs when a word has several rarely used or several frequently used senses. He gives a good example of the latter case, indicating that the noun work has several frequently used senses, none of which may be considered as the dominant one: "application of effort to some purpose", "task undertaken", "thing done" and "employment, esp. the opportunity to earn money by labour, etc."[33] In such cases, another ordering technique must be found to order dominant senses.

It is difficult to tell if ordering in order of dominant senses is used in the GBDs I examined. For instance, the sense of table meaning "piece of furniture" comes first in the *Robert/Collins* and the *Collins*. However, it is unclear whether this is so because the editors deemed it to be the dominant sense as they do not indicate in their prefaces which ordering techniques they have used. However, it is clear that ordering by sense dominance is not used in the *Larousse* since the ordering of senses is described in the preface as being a combination of ordering by frequency and logical ordering.

Since it is difficult to tell in the first place if ordering by sense dominance is used in the GBDs I studied, it is equally difficult to know if specific meaning discrimination devices are used more than others to identify dominant and less dominant senses. However, one might presume that since dominant senses tend to be generally applicable senses rather than specialized senses, field labels, which are often used to identify specialized senses, would be used less often than definitions and context words to identify dominant senses.

One last method of ordering senses, according to the alphabetical order of field labels--which has not been discussed in the context of unilingual lexicography but which Wilton has discovered in bilingual lexicography--was not apparent in the GBDs studied. Of course this

---

[33] Zgusta 1971, 65.

method cannot be widely used since such labels cannot always be used to identify senses. However, when several field labels are used, this method can prove to be useful. For instance, in the *Robert/Collins* entry for the English noun foliation, this technique could have been used since most of the senses are identified by field labels:

> **foliation**...*n (Bot)* foliation *f*, feuillaison *f*; *[book]* foliotage *m*; *(Geol)* foliation; *(Archit)* rinceaux *mpl* (RC)

In this entry, the three labels "Archit", "Bot", and "Geol" could conceivably be placed in alphabetical order and a label could even be found to replace the context word "book". However, as was pointed out earlier, this ordering technique is limited in its use, which may explain the fact that it is often ignored in GBDs.

2. Combination of Sense Ordering Techniques

Given the fact that each ordering method presented above has limitations, many unilingual dictionaries make a habit of combining ordering techniques. For instance, the *Collins Dictionary of the English Language* combines the frequency and logical/psychologically-meaningful techniques. In fact, Kipfer advocates using more than one ordering technique, suggesting that "it would probably be best if some words were presented in chronological order, others were presented in decreasing order of frequency, and still others presented by grouping basic meanings together into sub-categories."[34] And Zgusta advocates combining the placing of dominant senses before less dominant ones with a facet of logical ordering: he proposes that when there is more than one dominant sense for a given word, that each dominant sense be followed by those senses that are semantically related to it.

---

[34] Kipfer 1984, 108.

A combination of ordering techniques is what seems to be most usual in the GBDs I examined. Ordering by frequency and logical ordering are commonly used in the English/French GBDs I looked at. For example, as was seen earlier, the *Robert/Collins*, the *Harrap's* and the *Larousse* all place the general meaning of the noun lock before less commonly used specialized senses. And all three GBDs also place the literal meanings of the noun bedrock and the verb hamstring before their more commonly used figurative meanings. Thus, different ordering techniques are used in each of these GBDs. The combination of sense ordering techniques is an important principle of the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary*, which is now in preparation. In this dictionary the following four criteria will be used to order senses:

a) More common usage before less common usage

b) Standard and widely used senses before more specific Canadian senses

c) Canadian senses before senses restricted to continental French or British English

d) Modern usage before old usage[35]

These four criteria seem to boil down either directly or indirectly to a question of frequency. Frequency is therefore a predominant ordering factor.[36] However, as Roda P. Roberts points out, all of the above criteria "have to be used intelligently."[37] Not only is it possible, for example, for a Canadian sense to be less frequent than one used in Continental France, but a Canadian sense may be used more frequently than one that is used internationally. Thus, far more than

---

[35] Roda P. Roberts *et al.*, "Bilingual Dictionary Methodology," Version 3 (May 7, 1990) 4.

[36] In the four criteria presented, criterion a) obviously refers to freqency. Criterion b) also refers to frequency in that senses that are international in extent will tend to be more frequently used than senses that are current only in Canada. As for criterion c), Canadian senses will generally be considered as having a higher frequency than British English and Continental French senses if the corpus consists of Canadian texts. Lastly, criterion d) refers to currency: modern senses are more likely to have higher frequencies than obsolete ones.

[37] Roda P. Roberts, "The Bilingual Canadian Dictionary Project", (1989) 19.

mere frequency has to be taken into account for each entry. This complicates the lexicographer's task, for he constantly has to consider a number of different and at times contradictory factors and decide on the best method of ordering each article on the basis of the four general criteria proposed.

3. Discussion of Ordering Techniques Used in the *Robert/Collins*, the *Harrap's* and the *Larousse*

While there are some similarities in the ordering of senses in the *Robert/Collins*, the *Harrap's* and the *Larousse*, the ordering of senses often differs considerably in these three GBDs. More specifically, many differences were noted between the *Robert/Collins* and the *Harrap's* on the one hand and the *Larousse* on the other. One reason for this is that the *Larousse* prefers to place all figurative meanings after all literal ones (except colloquial and vulgar meanings) even though there may be semantic connections between a given literal meaning and a given figurative meaning, while the *Robert/Collins* and *Harrap's* often place figurative meanings directly after the literal meanings they are semantically related to. A good example is seen in the entry for the noun bar. The *Robert/Collins* places the figurative meaning of "obstacle" in the middle of the entry, right after that of "a submerged or partly submerged bank (as of sand) along a shore or in a river often obstructing navigation", apparently because it sees a semantic link between the two. And the *Harrap's* places the judicial meaning of bar in the same sense division as the meaning of "obstacle" in the second of six sense divisions. However, the *Larousse*, in keeping with its practice of placing all figurative senses after most literal meanings, prefers to separate the figurative meanings of bar from both literal ones given above and places them at the end of the entry. Thus, it can be seen that the *Larousse*, in keeping with one aspect of logical ordering, places all figurative senses after literal ones while the *Robert/Collins* and *Harrap's* sometimes employ another component of logical ordering and group semantically related literal and figurative senses together.

While both the *Robert/Collins* and the *Harrap's* seem to have the same overall approach to the ordering of senses, the actual application in individual entries often differs quite considerably as the editors often choose different ordering techniques for the senses of a given word. The *Robert/Collins* seems to give preference to placing senses in decreasing order of frequency while the *Harrap's* often opts for a form of logical ordering--placing literal senses before figurative ones. For instance, in the entry for the noun bias, the *Robert/Collins* places the commonly used figurative meaning of "inclination" before the more rarely used specialized senses relating to sewing and sports. However, the *Harrap's* places the senses relating to sewing and sports first, followed by the meaning of "inclination".

Another reason for differences in the ordering of senses in these two GBDs is that the *Harrap's* seems to group semantically related senses together more often than the *Robert/Collins* while the latter seems to emphasize ordering by frequency. For example, the *Harrap's* places the sense of the noun run used in the sport of cricket in the first semantic subdivision along with the sense of "the act of moving quickly with springing steps", apparently because it sees a semantic connection between the two. The *Robert/Collins*, on the other hand, quite clearly separates the two senses and places the sense of "the act of moving quickly" first and the sense of "point" last, presumably because the latter sense is rarely used. The fact that the *Harrap's* often groups semantically related senses together is further evidenced by the fact that it has two levels of sense divisions with senses introduced by letters subsumed under senses introduced by numbers. The *Robert/Collins*, on the other hand, uses only one level of sense divisions.

Just how much the ordering of senses differs in the *Robert/Collins*, the *Harrap's* and the *Larousse* becomes even more apparent when the ordering of senses for longer entries is compared in these three GBDs. For instance, presenting the ordering of senses in tabular form for the entry for feu is quite revealing:

feu	RC	HA	LAR
source de chaleur	(a)	1. (a) 2. (a) - (c)	1., 4.
incendie	(b)	1. (a)	2.
signal lumineux	(c)	4. (a) - (c)	6, 12, 13, 14
Culin	(d)	2. (d)	16
Mil	(e)	3.	11
arg Crime: revolver	(f)	--	--
++: maison	(g)	2. (e)	7
ardeur	(h)	1. (b)	17
sensation de brûlure	(i)	--	10
éclairage	(j)	--	15
littér: éclat	(k)	4. (d)	8
littér: lumière	(l)	--	--

Clearly, there are several differences in the way these three GBDs order the senses in this entry. One difference is that senses in the *Harrap's* and all but one of the senses in the *Larousse* corresponding to the *Robert/Collins* sense of "signal lumineux" (sense (c)) are placed near the end: perhaps the *Robert/Collins* considers it to be more commonly used than the *Harrap's* does; the *Larousse* places the senses corresponding to "signal lumineux" near the end since it sees them as belonging to specialized fields (aviation, navy and automobiles). Another difference between all three GBDs is that the sense of "ardeur" (sense (h) in the *Robert/Collins*) is placed in the first major sense division in *Harrap's*, near the middle in the *Robert/Collins* and last in the *Larousse*. The *Larousse* sees this sense as figurative and therefore places it at the very end; the *Harrap's* seems to see it as being related to "source de chaleur" and places it in the

same major sense division as this sense; and the *Robert/Collins* places it in the middle of the entry, perhaps using frequency as a criterion. Thus, it is clear that there is little correspondence in the ordering of senses in these three entries for the same word.

Not only do these three dictionaries differ in their arrangement of senses, but they are also very dissimilar in their use of meaning discrimination devices. For instance, although the *Harrap's*, the *Larousse* and the *Robert/Collins* all separate meanings clearly by means of typographical devices, the *Robert/Collins* identifies most meanings in some way, usually by definitions, field labels or context words while the *Harrap's* and the *Larousse* often do not include such devices. As a result, in the latter two GBDs, the dictionary-user has to read equivalents in order to identify meanings of the headword.

It is interesting that in the *Harrap's* and the *Larousse*, specialized meanings, which are generally identified by field labels, are identified more often than general meanings. In the *Robert/Collins*, on the other hand, specific types of meanings are not identified more than others.

Another difference between the *Robert/Collins* on the one hand and the *Harrap's* and the *Larousse* on the other is that the former seems to use definitions more often than the latter. Instead, the *Harrap's* and the *Larousse* seem to rely more heavily on field labels and context words to identify meanings.

4. Ordering of Senses and User Orientation

Of all the sense ordering techniques described in this chapter (chronological ordering, ordering by frequency, logical ordering, placing dominant senses first and placing senses according to the alphabetical order of field labels), only ordering of senses by frequency and the placing of dominant senses first will be discussed in this section in terms of the special needs of different types of GBD-users. Chronological ordering, used frequently in unilingual dictionaries,

is not treated here since its application to GBDs is questionable, given the elimination of many outdated senses in such dictionaries. Moreover, logical ordering and the ordering of senses according to the alphabetical order of field labels do not seem to benefit one type of GBD-user any more than another type. As James S. Mdee has indicated, one component of logical ordering, that of grouping together semantically related senses in unilingual dictionaries, gives the foreign language learner a better understanding of the meanings of words in his foreign language by showing him how secondary senses are transferred from primary ones.[38] However, such an ordering technique does not seem relevant in GBDs since the foreign language learner using a GBD is provided with equivalents in his mother tongue to help him understand foreign language items. Unlike the language learner using a foreign language unilingual dictionary, he does not have to rely on definitions in his foreign language for sense comprehension. Therefore, it is not necessary for senses to be grouped together semantically for him to understand the meanings of foreign language items.

Placing senses in decreasing order of frequency can be particularly helpful for the L2-L1 BIS wishing to understand an SL item in his foreign language or to translate it into his mother tongue because he is likely to encounter, in the foreign language, words in frequently used senses that he does not understand. Thus, such a user would want broadly used meanings placed first, followed by restricted senses, which are more limited in use. The L2-L1 AU, on the other hand, whether he is using the GBD to understand the meaning of an SL item or to help him translate it into his mother tongue, might appreciate having senses in increasing order of frequency as he likely already knows frequently used meanings of SL items and their translations. Therefore, unlike the L2-L1 BIS, he would perhaps prefer to have restricted senses placed before broadly used ones.

The same type of arrangement would no doubt suit the L1-L2 AU, who uses GBDs for

---

[38] James S. Mdee, "Constructing an Entry in a Learner's Dictionary of Standard Kiswahili," *Lexeter '83 Proceedings*, ed. R.R.K. Hartmann (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984) 239.

the production of texts in his foreign language. Since the L2 AU generally has a good grasp of his foreign language and therefore knows the translations of commonly used SL items, he is likely to look up less commonly used senses, such as specialized ones. For example, he is less likely to know the equivalent for bedrock in the geological sense than in the figurative sense in his foreign language as the geological sense is less commonly used.

Zgusta states that the possibility of a connection between ordering senses by frequency and ordering them according to sense dominance is still unexplored.[39] However, if these two ordering techniques do indeed produce the same results, then ordering senses according to sense dominance obviously presents the same advantages as ordering by frequency. For example, Zgusta states that the noun crane has two dominant senses, one ornithological and one mechanical.[40] It seems that for this word, the two dominant senses are also the most frequently used ones. Thus, it would seem that, as with ordering by frequency, placing dominant senses first (or last) for this word would benefit specific types of users as both techniques produce the same results.

If ordering senses according to sense dominance does not produce the same results as ordering them by frequency, it seems that the L2-L1 BIS using a GBD to understand words in a foreign language would still benefit from dominant senses being placed first. It would seem that senses that come to mind first for the majority of the speakers of a language would be the same senses they use in everyday conversation and writing. And since L2-L1 BISs naturally want to learn those senses which are used in everyday situations by the majority of speakers of a language, then the senses they require are the dominant ones. Therefore, placing dominant senses first can be of use to L2-L1 BISs.

---

[39] Zgusta 1971, 65.

[40] Zgusta 1971, 280.

5. Conclusion

In this chapter, it has been seen that there are several ways of ordering senses in dictionaries: chronological ordering, ordering by frequency, logical ordering, placing dominant senses first and ordering senses according to the alphabetical order of field labels. While chronological ordering is seldom used and is inappropriate for bilingual dictionaries, ordering senses by frequency and logical ordering seem to be the most useful techniques. Thus, it is not surprising that they are the most commonly used methods in the GBDs I examined. In fact, the *Robert/Collins*, the *Harrap's* and the *Larousse* use both of these ordering techniques. However, regardless of which method bilingual lexicographers decide to use, it is important that senses be ordered in such a way that the GBD-user can quickly and easily find appropriate equivalents for SL items.

CHAPTER THREE

THE ORDERING OF CONTEXTS

Meaning discrimination devices help the GBD-user to choose from among several non-synonymous equivalents not only by identifying meanings of SL items, but also by identifying contexts within which SL items in a given meaning can be used. The latter is normally the role of context words and field labels. For instance, in sense division (b) of the *Robert/Collins* entry for the adjective popular, context words are given for the headword, each identifying different contexts it can be used in:

> **popular**...*adj*...(b) *(of, for, by the people) music, concert* populaire; *lecture, journal* de vulgarisation (RC)

In this example, the context words tell the GBD-user that popular can be translated by populaire when it is used in contexts with "music" or "concert" and by de vulgarisation when it is used in contexts with "lecture" or "journal".

While context words are often used to identify various general contexts, field labels are usually used to identify specialized contexts. This is the case in the following example, where the context words "custom" and "ceremony" identify the general contexts in which revival in the sense of "bringing back" is used, while the field label "Jur" indicates the legal context of use:

> **revival**...*n* (a) *(bringing back) [custom, ceremony]* reprise *f*; *(Jur)* remise *f* en vigueur (RC)

To enable the dictionary-user to easily find such contexts and to find equivalents of the headword used in these contexts, it is important that they be ordered logically. The first part of

this chapter will deal with the ordering of contexts given for the headword when the latter is translated by different equivalents. The second part will deal with the ordering of series of contexts for which the headword has one equivalent or a series of synonymous equivalents.

It was mentioned in the introduction that while field labels can identify only situational contexts, context words usually identify both situational and linguistic contexts. When context words are described as collocates in this chapter, it is to emphasize their role of illustrating linguistic contexts.

1. Context Ordering Techniques

Basically, the only way to order the different contexts of an SL item when the SL item used in these different contexts is translated by different equivalents is to arrange them in decreasing order of frequency. For instance, an SL item may be used in both a general and a specialized context, in which case the general context, which is usually more common than the specialized one, is placed first:

> **depressed**...*adj* (a) *person* déprimé, abattu, découragé (*about* à cause de); (*Med*) déprimé (RC)

In this example, the context of medicine, which is represented by the field label "Med", is placed after the general context represented by the context word "person" because the headword depressed is used less frequently in the context of medicine.

In other cases, the label "gen" may be used to indicate that a certain equivalent, or a series of synonymous equivalents, is used in a broad range of general contexts:

> **instruire**...*vt* (a) (*former*) (*gén*) to teach, educate; *recrue* to train (RC)

Here, "gén" is placed before the context word "recrue" because instruire appears more often in general contexts than in contexts represented by the context word "recrue". As a result, to teach and to educate are placed first since they are the equivalents for the headword instruire used in these general contexts. The editors of the *Robert/Collins* were able to determine the frequency of occurrence of the contexts in which instruire and depressed appeared by examining their corpus.

In the case of both depressed and instruire, the contexts are either so general that they can easily be grouped together under the label "gén" or "person", or so specialized that they can be identified individually, for example by the field label "Med". And the equivalents used in one type of context cannot be used in the other. Thus, it is possible to order equivalents according to the frequency of occurrence of contexts. However, there are many cases where contexts are not so neatly separated in a bilingual dictionary since the same equivalent(s) can be used in all of them. For example, in sense division (c) for run (see page 25 in the chapter on the ordering of equivalents), which covers the overall meaning of "distance travelled", the contexts of bus, train, boat and plane travel are grouped together since the equivalent parcours can be used in each of them, while that of car travel is separated since it requires a different equivalent (trajet). The grouping together of contexts here to avoid repetition of an equivalent seems to be done at the expense of strict ordering of contexts by frequency.

However, one has to question the validity of even attempting to order contexts by frequency as lexicographers do not necessarily have at their disposal a sufficiently substantial corpus. In fact, the first edition of the *Robert/Collins* was compiled without a proper corpus and while a computerized corpus was available for the revised version, it was only used for verification purposes. Also, lexicographers do not necessarily have the time to examine all the examples in their corpus to find the most frequently used contexts. Thus, lexicographers often cannot establish with any certainty which contexts occur more frequently than others. As a

result, most GBDs do not claim to present them in order of frequency.

Even in the *Robert/Collins*, where contexts often seem to be placed in decreasing order of frequency, the strict ordering of contexts by frequency of occurrence often seems to be sacrificed for reasons of space. This has already been noted in the case of sense division (c) for run, which covers the overall meaning of "distance travelled". Of the five different contexts identified here (those of bus travel, train travel, boat travel, plane travel and car travel), the first four are grouped together, presumably because they share the same equivalent, and are placed first, while the last context is kept separate and placed second. The fact that the group of four contexts is placed before the fifth context can perhaps nevertheless be justified by the argument that, taken together, the contexts of bus, train, boat and plane travel occur more frequently than that of car travel.

2. The Ordering of Groups of Context Words or Field Labels

While there seems to be only one way of ordering contexts in which SL items are used when the latter are translated by different equivalents, there are several possibilities for ordering a group of context words or field labels corresponding to the same equivalent or set of synonymous equivalents. And as several context words or field labels are often given in a row in GBDs,[1] it seems desirable to establish an ordering for them as well.

In this section, I will discuss five ways of ordering context words given for the same equivalent or the same set of synonymous equivalents: semantic ordering, ordering by frequency, placing general context words before particular ones, placing concrete nouns before abstract nouns and alphabetical ordering. Since one of these ordering techniques, alphabetical ordering, can also be applied to field labels, I will discuss the ordering of field labels as well.

---

[1] One GBD that is notable in this respect is the *Robert/Collins*, which generally gives more contexts than other GBDs.

The first possibility for ordering context words corresponding to the same equivalent or the same set of synonymous equivalents is to arrange them semantically, grouping together those belonging to the same semantic field. This method of arrangement is sometimes used in the *Robert/Collins*, as can be seen in the following example taken from this GBD:

battre...*vt*...(c) (*frapper*) *tapis, linge, fer, or* to beat; *blé* to thresh (RC)

In this example, "tapis" and "linge" come first, both of which have to do with cloth. They are followed by "fer" and "or", both of which are metallic elements. Both volumes 1 and 2 of the *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English* (*ODCIE*) also place collocates of the headword belonging to the same semantic field together, separating them by commas. However, unlike context words in the *Robert/Collins*, collocates belonging to different semantic fields in the *ODCIE* are clearly distinguished by a separating semi-colon. For example, in the entry for shoot up, possible subjects are listed as follows:

shoot up...S: price, cost, rent; temperature, pressure; applications, attendance[2]

Such a practice can also be used in a GBD, particularly when there are large numbers of collocates attached to a given equivalent. However, as both examples above show, semantic ordering is not sufficient since each semantic field still includes at least a couple of collocates that need further arrangement using another ordering technique.

Ordering context words in decreasing order of frequency is another possibility. As Cowie indicates, "while *voice* and *accent* both collocate with *put on* (in the sense "assume, in

[2] A.P. Cowie and R. Mackin, *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English Volume 1: Verbs with Prepositions and Particles* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975).

order to impress, deceive")...*act, façade and airs* are the choices that more readily suggest themselves to many native speakers. The most straightforward means of indicating such preferences is to put them first..."[3] While ordering by frequency of use becomes a subjective decision because of a lack of collocational frequency lists, this technique can be used as a secondary device in GBDs to order collocates that have already been ordered in the first place by semantic grouping.

It is difficult to tell for certain if frequency of occurrence is an important factor in the ordering of context words in the GBDs I have examined: not only do prefaces fail to indicate how they are ordered but an observation of entries does not permit anything more than an intelligent guess. For instance, an observation of the entries for fresh and freshness in the *Robert/Collins* suggests that frequency may be a determining factor for the ordering of context words in these entries:

> **fresh**...*adj* (a)...*(not stale) air, milk, eggs, butter, food* (RC)
>
> **freshness**...*n [air, food, fruit, milk, wind etc]* (RC)

One wonders why the context word "food" is placed after the context word "milk" in the first entry but before it in the second entry. It is possible that "milk" collocates more often with fresh than "food" does but that "food" collocates more often with freshness than "milk" does in the corpora used by the editors of the *Robert/Collins*. Thus, it may be that context words are listed in decreasing order of frequency here.

A third way of ordering several context words that are placed in a row is to put general, or inclusive, context words before particular, or included, ones. For instance, in the following

---

[3] Cowie 1978, 137.

example, the more general "vehicle" precedes the more particular "plane":

> **try**...*vt*...(c) *(test, put strain on)...vehicle, plane* tester (RC)

However, this method, which is used in the *ODCIE*, is rarely used in the GBDs I have examined since general and particular context words are rarely given for the same equivalent or set of synonymous equivalents.

A fourth method of ordering context words, one which can be used only for context words that are nouns, is to place different sub-classes of nouns separately. This technique, which is commonly used in the unilingual *ODCIE*, is used only sparingly in the GBDs I consulted. For instance, in sense division (b) of the entry for the adjective impossible in the *Robert/Collins*, concrete nouns are placed before abstract ones:

> **impossible**...*adj*...(b) *person, child, condition, situation* impossible, insupportable (RC)

There seems to be no reason why this technique could not be used more often in GBDs. For instance, in the *Robert/Collins* entry for the adjective old, both concrete and abstract nouns are provided:

> **old**...*adj*...(d) *(not new) gold, clothes, custom, carrots, bread, moon* vieux (RC)

If ordering by noun sub-classes were adopted, the abstract noun "custom" would be placed either before or after the other context words, which are concrete nouns. However, use of this technique still leaves the problem of ordering concrete or abstract nouns among themselves.

A fifth method of ordering context words--which is also the only method applicable to field labels--is alphabetical ordering. This method, which is used consistently in the *Larousse*, is the most obvious method and is the easiest to implement. For instance, in the second sense division of the adjective heavy in the *Larousse*, three context words are listed in alphabetical order:

> **heavy**...adj...Gros (rain, sea, weather) (LA)

The *Robert/Collins* only rarely uses this method for context words, but it does so regularly for field labels, as in the following example:[4]

> **primary**...*adj (first: gen, also Astron, Chem, Econ, Elec, Geol, Med etc)* primaire (RC)

3. Ordering of Contexts and User Orientation

This chapter has shown that there is only one way to order contexts for a headword when the latter is translated by different equivalents. On the other hand, five ordering techniques were found for groups of contexts for which the headword has one equivalent or

---

[4] Thus, it is surprising to find that for one group of context words in sense division (a) of the verb make in the *Robert/Collins*, context words are ordered alphabetically:

> **make**...*vt* **(a)** *(gen: create, produce, form) bed, bread, clothes, coffee, fire, noise, peace, remark, one's will etc* faire (RC)

It is not clear why context words are ordered alphabetically in this set but are not ordered alphabetically in other groups of context words within the same sense division, or even in other entries. The number of context words does not seem to have any bearing, for there are often cases where as many, if not more, context words are not alphabetically ordered.

series of synonymous equivalents. However, the ordering of contexts by frequency of occurrence, which applies in both of the above-mentioned cases, seems to be the only method which benefits some users more than others for specific uses.

First, let us consider the use of a GBD to translate into the foreign language or to produce texts in the foreign language. The L1-L2 BIS using a GBD to translate SL items into his foreign language is unlikely to know the translations for SL items in commonly used contexts and would thus prefer to have them placed first. Thus, he would want to have the commonly used context of depressed, as represented by the context word "person", placed before the medical context, represented by the field label "Med" (see page 56). However, since the L1-L2 AU using context words to find equivalents in his foreign language is less likely to know equivalents for SL items appearing in rarely used contexts than those used in frequently used contexts, he would probably appreciate having more rarely used contexts placed first. For instance, in the following example, run...*vt*...(e) *(organize, manage)*...*shop, mine* diriger, faire marcher (RC), he might want the order of the context words to be reversed. The L1-L2 AU likely already knows that run is translated by diriger or faire marcher when used with "shop". However, he may have doubts over how to translate run when it is used with the less frequent "mine". Thus, he would appreciate having "mine" placed before "shop".

When using a GBD to understand a text in the foreign language, the L2-L1 BIS, who would use contextual indications to understand SL items in his foreign language, would want the first context word given to be a common one, if there are several in a row, as he is more likely to know the meaning of frequently used context words. If it is not a common one, however, he will have to continue reading the list of context words until he sees one that he understands. For instance, in sense division (a) for the adjective rude in the *Robert/Collins*, several context words are listed in a row at the beginning of the sense division:

rude...*adj*...(a) *person, speech, behaviour, reply, gesture (impolite)* impoli, mal élevé, *(stronger)* insolent (RC)

In this sense division, it is important for the L2-L1 BIS that a frequently used context word, such as "person", be placed first as this word is easier to understand than, say, "gesture". Thus, upon seeing the context word "person", the L2-L1 BIS will know right away, without having to read more context words, which meaning of rude he is dealing with.

It should be noted, however, that placing groups of context words in decreasing order of frequency for the L2-L1 BIS using a GBD to understand foreign language items or for the L1-L2 BIS to produce texts in the foreign language, or in increasing order of frequency for the L1-L2 AU using a GBD to produce texts in his foreign language, is not of vital importance because it is uncommon to find both frequently and rarely used contexts within one and the same group of contexts.

4. Conclusion

In this chapter, it has been seen that several contexts, identified either by context words or field labels, are often provided for SL items used in individual senses. As a result, it is important that they be ordered logically so that the GBD-user can quickly and easily find equivalents for SL items used in those contexts. It is clear that there are more possibilities for ordering context words than for ordering field labels. Moreover, it is interesting that while the only technique found for the ordering of context words related to the headword when the latter is translated by different equivalents is ordering by frequency, several ordering techniques are possible for context words when the headword is translated by the same equivalent or the same set of synonymous equivalents: semantic ordering, in which context words from the same semantic field are grouped together; ordering of context words by frequency, which is tricky

since collocational frequency lists are not readily available; placing general context words before particular ones; placing concrete nouns separately from abstract nouns; and finally, ordering context words alphabetically, which is the simplest method. While all of these methods may be of use to a greater or lesser extent to bilingual lexicographers, only three are used in the GBDs I examined. Semantic ordering is sometimes used for context words in the *Robert/Collins*, ordering by frequency seems to be used for context words to some extent in the same GBD, and alphabetical ordering is used for context words in the *Larousse*. Regardless of which means of contextual indication the lexicographer decides to use or which ordering technique he uses, it is important that he order contexts in such a way that the dictionary-user can find them and the equivalents that work in them quickly and easily.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE PLACEMENT OF MEANING DISCRIMINATION DEVICES

In the two previous chapters, it was seen that senses and contexts can be ordered in various ways. However, while it is important for the lexicographer to order meanings and contexts logically, he must also decide whether to place the devices used to illustrate them before or after the equivalent, or both before and after it. While possibilities for the placement of meaning discrimination devices are limited, lexicographers are nevertheless at odds over which placement technique is best. In this chapter, I will discuss the placement of the two devices used expressly and primarily for meaning discrimination in GBDs: the definition and the context word.[1]

Consideration of the placement of definitions and context words inevitably involves two other issues which at first sight seem unrelated to the topic of arrangement of information: the language used for meaning discrimination and the precise role of the meaning discrimination device. A decision to use both the SL (i.e. the language of the headword) and the TL (i.e. the language of the equivalent) for meaning discrimination devices complicates their placement. Moreover, their placement can vary depending on whether they are used to specify the meaning of the SL item or the meaning of the TL equivalent.

---

[1] As mentioned in the introduction, field labels can also be used as meaning discrimination devices. However, unlike definitions and context words, their primary function is not to disambiguate meaning, but rather to "inform the user about a descriptive fact of language" (Zgusta 1971, 332). Therefore, they will not be treated in this chapter.

1. Placement of Definitions

Both the role of the meaning discrimination device, as he sees it, and the language used to present it have been taken into consideration to some extent by Iannucci in his article "Meaning Discrimination in Bilingual Dictionaries: A New Lexicographical Technique". In this article, he shows that definitions can be placed either before or after the TL equivalent in the SL, after the equivalent in the TL and even before the equivalent in both the SL and TL. He provides the following examples to illustrate the arrangement patterns he foresees:

lapse...*s.*I. (*a*) (*Mistake*) Erreur

rag...*n.* Chiffon (piece of cloth torn off)

rapport...n.m...7....*report* (official statement of facts)[2]

nice...*adj.*,... (delightful--*charmant*) joli[3]

Still other patterns of arrangement are presented by Zgusta and Roger Steiner. While Zgusta provides an example in which a definition in the TL is placed before the equivalent, Steiner gives an example in which a definition in the SL is placed before the equivalent and a definition in the TL after it:

[2] Iannucci 1957, 276.

[3] Iannucci 1957, 277.

dîlo...(*profession*) job[4]

bachelier...(*titulaire d'un grade*) bachelor (*holder of a degree*); (*jeune chevalier*) bachelor (*young knight*)[5]

2. Placement of Context Words

The same flexibility exists in the placement of context words, which also act as meaning discrimination devices. Iannucci provides examples in which they too can be found both before and after the equivalent in either the SL or TL or both. Here are four examples that he gives to illustrate the two possibilities of their placement when they are given in only one language (either the SL or TL):

dim...*a*...(Of light) Faible, pâle; (of colour) effacé (context word in source language, before equivalent)

éclater...**2.** *v.i.* (Of boiler, shell, gun) To burst, explode; (of mine) to blow up (context word in target language, before equivalent)

rare...*a*. Rare; clairsemé; fameux; à moitié cru (of meat)... (context word in source language, after equivalent)

brocher...*v.a.* to stitch (a book); to figure (stuffs) (context word in target language, after equivalent)[6]

Iannucci also illustrates the use of context words in both the SL and TL. In one example they are placed side by side after the TL equivalent, with the target language context word placed first:

---

[4] Zgusta 1971, 334.

[5] Roger J. Steiner, "Guidelines for Reviewers of Bilingual Dictionaries," *Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America* 6 (1984): 173.

[6] Iannucci 1957, 275.

s'abattre, v.r.,...to break down (of horses--*des chevaux*)[7]

In another example, the context word in the source language is placed before the equivalent while the context phrase in the target language is placed after the equivalent:

ball, *s*....(of the thumb) yema (del pulgar), *f.*[8]

And finally, Iannucci provides an example in which the source language context word is placed right after the headword and is separated from the TL equivalent by a part of speech label and a comma, while the target language context word is placed right after the equivalent:

ouverture (d'un objectif) (*n.f.*), aperture (of a lens)[9]

3. Variation in the Placement of Definitions and Context Words

Given the variety of ways of presenting meaning discrimination devices, it would be natural to find differences from one dictionary to another. However, what is more disconcerting to the user is the fact that some dictionaries use more than one of the placement possibilities outlined above for both definitions and context words. For example, Iannucci points out that *Dizionario Scolastico Italiano-Inglese Inglese-Italiano* places definitions in the SL before equivalents in some entries and after equivalents in other entries:

---

[7] Iannucci 1957, 275.

[8] Iannucci 1957, 276.

[9] Iannucci 1957, 275.

sport (*s*)...(*plaything*) giuocattolo (*m.*)

fedele (*m.*) *true believer* (vero credente)[10]

He also notes that *McKay's Modern Spanish-English & English-Spanish Dictionary* has a definition in the SL before the equivalent in one entry and a definition in the TL after the equivalent in another:

ball, s. globo, *m.*, esfera, *f.*; (plaything) pelota

ginebra, *f.* gin (drink)[11]

For variation in the placement of context words, he cites *Mansion's Shorter French & English Dictionary* (1940), where some source and target language context words are placed before the equivalent while some target language context words are placed after the equivalent.[12] This same type of variation can also be seen in the *Harrap's*, which places context words in the target language both before and after the equivalent:

rifle...*v.tr.*...piller (un endroit) (HA)

s'égrener...(*of corn, grapes, etc.*) to fall, drop, from the ear, from the bunch (HA)

However, there is an obvious reason for such variation in the placement of context words. Context words, unlike definitions, can be used to show collocations involving the headword or

---

[10] Iannucci 1957, 276.

[11] Iannucci 1957, 276.

[12] Iannucci 1957, 276.

equivalents. In the two above examples, they show collocations involving the latter: the context words "corn" and "grapes" are possible subjects of the verbs fall and drop while the context word "endroit" is a possible object of the verb piller. The context words are placed before or after the equivalents to reflect their positions in real linguistic contexts.

4. Placement of Definitions and Context Words, Their Roles and User Orientation

While Iannucci clearly shows the various possibilities for placement of definitions and context words, he opts for only one placement possibility. He feels that definitions and context words should be placed only before the equivalent and should be given only in the source language. This is because, for him, their only role is to allow the L1-L2 user to choose from among a list of equivalents in his foreign language by indicating meanings of the SL headword in his native tongue. He says that "since explanatory matter in dictionaries conventionally refers to what precedes, and these discriminations refer to different meanings of the entry word rather than to different meanings of the target word,"[13] such devices are placed properly only when they precede the equivalent and are given in the source language. Therefore, according to him, their role is to provide meaning discrimination for SL items.

Other theoreticians, however, think meaning discrimination devices have other roles as well and consequently disagree with Iannucci's rigid stance on the question of placement. For instance, Edwin Williams gives an example in which he thinks a definition is used to specify a meaning of a polysemous TL equivalent and is therefore placed after it:

---

[13] James E. Iannucci, "Meaning Discrimination in Bilingual Dictionaries," *Problems in Lexicography*, ed. Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta (Bloomington: Indiana University; The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967) 204.

suicidio *m* suicide (act)[14]

In this example, the monosemous headword suicidio, ("the act of committing suicide") has a polysemous English equivalent (it can mean "the act of committing suicide" or "the person who commits suicide"). According to Williams, if the meaning of suicidio cannot be determined from the context in which it appears, the L2-L1 English user needs a meaning discrimination device in his native language to tell him that the equivalent suicide means the act and not the person in order to understand the Spanish headword. Therefore, "act" is placed after the TL equivalent because the distinction between "act" and "person" is required for the TL equivalent and not for the SL headword. Thus, Williams sees a use for target language meaning discrimination devices placed after the equivalent.

Williams also points out that definitions can be placed after the equivalent when the headword has two or more meanings for each of which the TL has polysemous equivalents:

carrera *f* run (running pace); race (contest of speed)[15]

He points out that, in this example, the meaning discrimination devices have two functions for the L2-L1 user. Not only do they enable him to understand the polysemous headword in cases where the context does not clarify its meaning, but they also make it easy for him to choose the proper equivalent by indicating the precise meanings of the polysemous equivalents covered by the polysemous headword.[16] Thus, Williams sees two roles of meaning discrimination devices for the L2-L1 user.

---

[14] Edwin B. Williams, "Analysis of the Problem of Meaning Discrimination in Spanish and English Bilingual Lexicography," *Babel* VI (1960): 122.

[15] Williams 1960, 122-23.

[16] Williams 1960, 122.

Al-Kasimi also thinks that, given the fact that the context does not always clearly reveal the meaning of a headword, it is necessary to provide meaning discrimination devices when either the headword or the TL equivalent or both are polysemous. When the headword is monosemous, but the TL equivalent is polysemous, the meaning discrimination device would be used to specify the meaning of the TL equivalent; when the headword is polysemous and there are separate monosemous equivalents for each of its meanings, the meaning discrimination device would specify the meaning of each of the TL equivalents; and when both the headword and the TL equivalent are polysemous, the device would specify both the meaning of the SL headword and that of the TL equivalent.[17] However, instead of placing the meaning discrimination devices after the equivalents as Williams does, Al-Kasimi places them before the equivalents:

suicidio m (act) suicide

carrera f (running pace) run; (contest of speed) race[18]

Since the definitions provided in the entry for carrera serve the double purpose of indicating both the meaning of the polysemous headword and a meaning of the polysemous TL equivalent, it makes sense to place them before the TL equivalent (i.e. in a way, between the headword and the equivalent). However, it is unclear why Al-Kasimi chooses to place the definition before the equivalent in the entry for suicidio since the definition serves mainly to specify the meaning of the TL equivalent.

When meaning discrimination devices are provided in both languages, they are normally placed before and after the equivalent, as in the following example:

---

[17] Al-Kasimi 1977, 69.

[18] Al-Kasimi 1977, 75.

carrera *f* (paso del que corre) run (running pace); (pugna de velocidad) race (contest of speed)[19]

Such "bilingual" meaning discrimination is provided in certain cases by Williams "since he believes that meaning discrimination is necessary for both production and (sometimes) comprehension, and that each side of the dictionary serves these two purposes at the same time".[20] However, Al-Kasimi feels that entries containing meaning discrimination devices both before and after the equivalent "are confusing and tiring to the user's eyes" and "make the dictionary bulky and expensive."[21] Since the reproach of bulk and expense would apply equally to all "bilingual" meaning discrimination devices no matter what their placement, one may well conclude that he would also reject cases in which both meaning discrimination devices are placed side by side before the equivalent and cases where both are placed after the equivalent.

5. Conclusion

It becomes clear from what has been said above that there is little consensus on the placement of definitions and context words, for their placement depends on several factors: the precise meaning discrimination role attributed to them by the lexicographer, the number of languages used for meaning discrimination and, to a lesser extent, user orientation.

There is even less agreement on the placement of context words for not only do they provide meaning discrimination for SL items or TL equivalents, as do definitions, but they also show the headword or equivalents used in lexical collocation. Target language context words are placed in different positions in the same dictionary depending on whether they precede or

---

[19] Williams 1960, 124.

[20] Al-Kasimi 1977, 72-73.

[21] Al-Kasimi 1977, 74.

follow the headword in sentences. Thus, the placement of context words may depend not only on the precise element for which they provide meaning discrimination and on the number of languages in which they are presented, but also on their collocational role. To ensure more uniform placement of context words, it might be desirable to limit their role primarily to meaning discrimination and present collocations in the form of examples, as discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE ORDERING OF EXAMPLES

Examples play a number of important roles in GBDs. For instance, they show uses of the headword in context, they show the headword used in grammatical and lexical collocations, which often do not correspond from one language to another, and they show transformations that sentences or parts of sentences containing the headword undergo in the target language such as transpositions and modulations. The importance of examples in GBDs is reflected in dictionaries such as the *Robert/Collins* and the *Harrap's* by the number of examples they provide for headwords. Thus, given the importance of examples in GBDs, it seems desirable to order them in a logical, user-friendly way so that the GBD-user can fully benefit from them. In this chapter several possible ordering techniques for examples will be described and both their merits and limitations will be pointed out.

As mentioned in the introduction, idioms and compounds do not fall under the definition of example used in this thesis. However, they are often mixed in with examples in the GBDs I have examined. Thus, when series of examples taken from GBDs are reproduced in this chapter in order to illustrate ordering techniques, any idioms or compounds contained in such series will be placed at the very end so that ordering techniques for examples per se are easier to see.

1. Ordering Techniques for Examples

A first way of ordering examples is to separate those illustrating different meanings of the headword. Different meanings of headwords, and thus examples illustrating headwords in different meanings, are often clearly set off by typographical devices such as letters and

numbers. For instance, in the *Robert/Collins* entry for the noun earth, there is one sense division for the meaning "the world" (sense division (a)) and one for the meaning "ground" (sense division (b)). Examples illustrating the headword in these two meanings are listed in the respective sense divisions and are clearly separated from one another. However, it is not uncommon in GBDs to find examples illustrating the headword in different meanings listed consecutively within one and the same paragraph without any typographical devices to set them off. For instance, in the *Robert/Collins* entry for the transitive verb eat, all examples are grouped together in one paragraph but are nevertheless ordered according to the meanings of the headword: examples illustrating the meaning of "to take in through the mouth as food" such as to eat (one's) breakfast and to eat a meal are placed first, followed by the example what's eating you?,[1] which illustrates the verb eat used in the meaning of "to consume with vexation". However, ordering examples according to the different senses of the headword, whether they are separated by typographical devices or not, is far from being a comprehensive ordering technique: the problem of ordering examples illustrating the headword used in the same meaning, such as the first two given above for eat, still remains.

A second technique is that of placing examples illustrating the headword in literal uses before examples showing it in figurative uses. For instance, in sense division (a) for the intransitive verb pour in the *Robert/Collins*, examples such as water came pouring into the room and the sweat poured off him, which illustrate a literal use of the headword pour in the sense of "to move with a continuous flow", precede the example goods are pouring out of the factories, in which the verb pour is used figuratively. In the *Robert/Collins*, the label "fig" is often used to identify such examples, which are normally placed towards the end of sense divisions. However,

[1] In this chapter, only the source language parts of examples are usually given. The target language parts of examples are provided only to illustrate how final versions of entries might actually appear in a GBD.

like the previous ordering technique, this method has its limitations as the problem of ordering examples illustrating the headword in literal or figurative uses among themselves still remains.

A third technique used in some of the GBDs I examined is to separate examples showing the headword used in specialized contexts from those illustrating the headword used in general ones. For instance, in sense division (b) of the *Robert/Collins* entry for the adverb down, covering the meaning of "indicating position at lower level", an example illustrating the headword in a specialized use is placed after examples illustrating it in general contexts. In this sense division, examples such as down there, I shall stay down here and the sun is down precede the example to be down for the count, which is preceded by the field label "boxing".

Ordering techniques for examples described so far focus on the meaning of the headword: examples in which the headword is used in different meanings are placed apart, examples which illustrate figurative extensions of the headword follow those showing the headword in literal uses, and examples in which the headword is used in general contexts are separated from those illustrating the headword's use in specialized contexts. However, these three techniques only constitute a starting point since they do not provide a means of ordering, among themselves, several examples illustrating the headword in the same meaning, in a literal or figurative use or in a general or specialized context. A partial solution to this problem can be found in a fourth ordering technique: grouping examples according to the semantic relationship that exists between the words with which the headword combines to form free combinations or collocations.

This method is used in the entry for the verb run in the sense of "to operate" in the *Robert/Collins*, in which the headword run combines with various objects to form free combinations:

to ~ a radio off the mains
to ~ a machine by compressed air
to ~ an engine on gas
to ~ a lorry on diesel
I can't afford to ~ a car
he ~s a Rolls
this car is very cheap to ~
to ~ the car into/out of the garage
to ~ a boat ashore (RC)

Here, examples in which objects of the verb run designate kinds of vehicles, such as a lorry, car or boat, are placed together. Furthermore, examples in which similar kinds of vehicles are objects of the verb run are placed together (car, lorry) and three examples containing the word car and one containing the word Rolls, a type of car, are placed together.

Although this ordering technique seems to work for most of the examples in the above entry, many examples do not lend themselves to this type of ordering because the headword often co-occurs with many words that are not semantically related. Most of the examples in the sense of "organize, manage" of the transitive verb run in the *Robert/Collins* clearly illustrate the limits of this type of ordering. The examples in this sense division are ordered as follows:

they ~ trains to London every hour
the company ~s extra buses at rush hours
the school is ~ning courses for foreign students
he is ~ning the courses for them
to ~ a house
a house which is easy to ~
who will ~ your house now?
I want to ~ my own life
she's the one who really ~s everything (RC)

In this sense division, only the first two examples are ordered according to co-occurring nouns that are semantically related to one another: in both these examples the object of the verb is a vehicle (train, bus). This first semantically related group of examples is followed by two examples in which the noun course is the object, then by three examples in which house is the

object, and finally by an example in which life is the object. However, the objects of the verb run in these four separate groups of examples are not semantically related to one another in any way. A second problem with this ordering technique is that it does not work when a given sense division contains several examples that do not have words that fall into any particular semantic field to begin with. For instance, in the above sense division for run, the headword in the example she's the one who really runs everything does not co-occur with any nouns, as in the other examples. Instead, it is followed by an indefinite pronoun, and thus cannot be readily classified according to this type of ordering.[2] Entries in GBDs commonly contain several such examples. Thus, another ordering technique must be sought to order examples in a logical way.

This brings us to a fifth way of ordering examples which can be used to solve both problems described in the preceding paragraph. In this type of ordering, examples are not ordered according to the semantic characteristics of words with which the headword combines, but rather according to the formal characteristics of words in the headword's linguistic environment. This method, which is used systematically in the *Van Dale* dictionaries, a series of Dutch GBDs designed for native speakers of Dutch, differs from techniques used in most other GBDs in one very important way. In most GBDs, examples are first ordered according to the sense of the headword and are then further ordered according to other criteria. In the *Van Dale* dictionaries, on the other hand, this arrangement is reversed: examples are ordered primarily according to the part of speech of the words with which the headword co-occurs and then according to the sense of the headword. Here is part of an entry taken from the English/Dutch *Van Dale* that illustrates how this arrangement technique works:

---

[2] The best that can be done is to extrapolate that "the one" equals the person in this example and place the latter along with other examples containing the element "person".

> **heart**...0.1 *hart(spier)* 0.2 *boezem* => *borst* 0.3 *geest* => *verstand, gedachten, herinnering* 0.4 *hart* => *binnensten*...* **1.1** my ~ was in/leapt into my mouth...**1.3** a change of ~...**1.4** from/to the bottom of my ~...; to his ~'s content; a ~ of gold...**1.7** the ~ of a cabbage...; the ~ of the matter...**2.1** my ~ stood still...**3.2** she pressed her son to her ~...**3.4** bare one's ~...; cut to the ~...; give one's ~ to...**6.4** **after** my own ~...; **at** ~...; **from** the/one's ~...[3] (*Van Dale*)

In *Van Dale* entries, equivalents are found before the star while examples are placed after it. The first digit in the numbers in the examples section refers to the part of speech of the word with which the headword combines and the second digit refers to the sense division found before the star. Thus, in the above entry for heart, in category 1.1 immediately after the star, the first digit means that in the examples that follow, the headword combines with a noun,[4] and the second digit refers to the first sense division before the star. As a result of this type of ordering, examples corresponding to one sense are often separated from one another. For instance, examples illustrating the headword in the fourth sense of heart above (0.4 in the section before the star) are divided into three separate sections (1.4, 3.4 and 6.4) because heart combines with three parts of speech (nouns, verbs and prepositions) in the examples for this sense. And examples illustrating this sense in sections 1.4 and 3.4 are separated from one another by examples illustrating the headword in other senses. Thus, it can be seen that examples illustrating the headword in the same sense are separated from one another because they are grouped primarily according to the part of speech with which the headword combines.

Not only are examples ordered according to the grammatical category of words with which the headword combines in context in the *Van Dale* dictionaries, but in each grammatical category, the words with which the headword combines are ordered alphabetically. Thus, in the entry for heart in the English-Dutch *Van Dale*, one finds several examples in which heart combines with a noun, the latter being in alphabetical order: from/to the bottom of my heart is

---

[3] I have used a star instead of a black diamond, which the *Van Dale* uses, to separate the equivalents from the examples.

[4] The number 2 is used for adjectives, 3 for verbs, 4 for pronouns, and so on.

placed first, followed by to his heart's content, a heart of gold etc. Thus, it can be seen that there are three important aspects of the *Van Dale* ordering technique: examples are ordered according to the grammatical category of words with which the headword co-occurs, ordering examples by senses is subordinated to this ordering, and words with which the headword co-occurs in each grammatical category are ordered alphabetically.

Aspects of this ordering technique can be applied even while retaining sense divisions. This can be seen in the reordering below of examples in the problematic sense division of the verb run at the bottom of page 79. By ordering examples according to the grammatical category of the words with which the headword co-occurs within a given sense division, and further ordering them according to the alphabetical order of these co-occurring words in individual grammatical categories, the following format is obtained:

1. the company ~s extra buses at rush hours
   the school is ~ning courses for foreign students
   he is ~ning the courses for them
   to ~ a house
   a house which is easy to ~
   who will ~ your house now?
   I want to ~ my own life
   they ~ trains to London every hour
4. she's the one who really ~s everything

If the dictionary-user wants to find an example in which run appears with the noun life, for instance, he can quickly find it if he knows that the group of examples in which the headword co-occurs with a noun is preceded by a 1 and that such nouns are in alphabetical order. The last example is placed in section 4, which identifies examples in which the headword co-occurs with pronouns.

While this method of arranging examples is both simple and logical, an observation of entries in the *Van Dale* reveals that examples do not always lend themselves to easy ordering according to the grammatical category of the word with which the headword co-occurs: many

examples often fit into more than one category. For instance, in the *Van Dale* entry for heart, the very first example (my heart was in/leapt into my mouth) is placed along with examples in which the headword co-occurs with nouns, such as a change of heart and a heart of gold because of the noun mouth. However, this example could just as easily have been placed in the verb section since the verbs was and leapt also appear in the example. And the example she had his health at heart is placed in section three because of the verb had, but could also have been placed in section six because this example also contains the preposition at.

A variation of the *Van Dale* ordering technique is sometimes used in the *Collins*, in which examples are often ordered according to the grammatical category of co-occurring words, which are then alphabetized. However, the ordering of examples in this GBD differs from that employed in the *Van Dale* in two important ways: first, examples are ordered first according to the meaning of the headword and then according to words with which the headword co-occurs, and second, this dictionary does not use typographical devices such as numbers to set off and identify different types of examples. Thus, in the entry for the adjective heavy, examples are ordered first according to two senses of the headword and are then grouped in sense division (b) according to the grammatical category of words with which the headword co-occurs. Examples in which the headword is followed by a preposition are placed first, followed by examples in which it is followed by a noun, the latter being in alphabetical order:

eyes ~ with sleep
the air was ~ with scent
I've had a ~ day
to be a ~ drinker
to be a ~ sleeper (*Collins*)

It seems that the two facets of the *Van Dale* technique found in the *Collins*--the grammatical categorization of co-occurring words and the alphabetical ordering of co-occurring

words in the same grammatical category--seem to work for more examples than any of the other methods examined in this chapter. In fact, it is surprising that both these facets are not used more often in the *Robert/Collins* and the *Harrap's*. These prominent English/French GBDs include large numbers of examples, whose ordering often leaves a lot to be desired. As a result, the dictionary-user has to wade through examples that are of no use to him before finding one that is useful. This problem could be rectified in many cases by applying the two above-mentioned aspects of the *Van Dale* method to entries in the *Robert/Collins* and the *Harrap's*. To illustrate just how these two aspects of the *Van Dale* ordering technique can be used to make examples more accessible to the dictionary-user, examples that are not ordered in any systematic way in three entries in the *Robert/Collins*--the adjectives moral and afraid and the noun excuse--will be rearranged using these criteria. Also, it will be seen how yet another ordering technique, that of separating examples of the headword used in free combinations from those showing the headword used in collocations, can be used to complement this ordering technique.

First of all, I will examine the ordering of examples in the *Robert/Collins* entry for the adjective moral, which contains examples illustrating the headword used in lexical collocations as well as compounds. In this entry, the examples and compounds are presented as follows (I have included the abbreviation "cpd" after the compounds):[5]

1. it is a ~ certainty
2. to be under *or* have a ~ obligation to do
3. ~ support
4. I'm going along as ~ support for him
5. *(US Pol)* the Moral Majority (cpd)
6. ~ philosopher (cpd)
7. ~ philosophy (cpd)
8. *(Rel)* Moral Rearmament (cpd)
9. to raise ~ standards
10. ~ standards are falling
11. ~ suasion (RC)

[5] Henceforth, where necessary, I will number examples to make it easier for the reader to understand the various ordering methods that are described.

This entry contains seven adjective-noun collocations, the first four of which are in alphabetical order according to nouns with which the headword collocates. The last three examples are separated from the first four by compounds and are not in their place alphabetically. While compounds can be, and often are, mixed in with examples, the pros and cons of this kind of arrangement are discussed in the following chapter; for the time being, attention will be focused on the ordering of examples only, with compounds being isolated at the end.

The examples in the *Robert/Collins* entry for moral can be reordered using one facet of the *Van Dale* ordering technique, that of arranging them according to the alphabetical order of the nouns with which the headword collocates:

it is a ~ certainty
to be under *or* have a ~ obligation to do
to raise ~ standards
~ standards are falling
~ suasion
~ support
I'm going along as ~ support for him
(US Pol) the Moral Majority (cpd)
~ philosopher (cpd)
~ philosophy (cpd)
(Rel) Moral Rearmament (cpd)

The above entry is like the *Van Dale* entry for heart (see page 81) in that it contains examples, such as moral standards are falling and to raise moral standards, which contain elements other than the collocate of the headword. Therefore, ordering examples by the alphabetical order of collocates may not be obvious. To ensure that the dictionary-user is not distracted by the additional elements and thus prevented from quickly finding the lexical collocate that he needs, it might be a good idea to highlight collocates of the headword in these examples.

It is also possible to use the same facet of the *Van Dale* ordering technique that was used for the adjective moral to order examples of grammatical collocations that the headword

enters into. However, it seems that for grammatical collocations, the *Van Dale* uses yet another criterion: examples are ordered not only according to the alphabetical order of prepositions that co-occur with the headword, but simple prepositional uses precede sentence patterns. An entry in which examples can be usefully ordered according to this technique is the one for the adjective afraid in the sense of "frightened" in the *Robert/Collins*, in which the examples are presented as follows:

1. to be ~
2. to be ~ of sb/sth
3. don't be ~!
4. I am ~ of hurting him *or* that I might hurt him
5. I am ~ he will *or* might hurt me, *(liter)* I am ~ lest he (might) hurt me
6. I am ~ to go *or* of going
7. he is ~ of work
8. he is not ~ of work (RC)

In this sense division, it seems that only four of the examples are grouped in any way that helps the dictionary-user: the fourth and fifth examples contain that-clauses while the last two contain the grammatical collocation afraid of followed by a noun. However, the rest of the examples are in no logical order: the first and third examples illustrate free combinations while the grammatical collocation afraid of is found in the second, seventh and eighth examples and the sentence pattern afraid of v-ing is found in the fourth and sixth examples. One way to improve the ordering of examples in this entry is to separate those in which the headword is used in free combinations from those in which it is used in grammatical collocations and to order the latter in a logical way, placing adjective-preposition combinations before sentence patterns. The following format is one possible way of rearranging the examples so that both free combinations and grammatical collocations are logically ordered and are thus easy to find:

1. to be ~
2. don't be ~!
3. to be ~ of sb/sth
4. he is ~ of work
5. he is not ~ of work
6. I am ~ of hurting him
7. I am ~ of going *or* to go
8. I am ~ that I might hurt him
9. I am ~ he will *or* might hurt me, *(liter)* I am ~ lest he (might) hurt me

Notice that there are nine examples instead of eight in the reordered entry. This is because the example I am afraid of hurting him *or* that I might hurt him has been made into two examples so that grammatical collocations with similar structures can be placed together. Therefore, there is expansion in this arrangement, which of course is a definite problem faced by the lexicographer as more space is required. In this rearrangement, examples 1 and 2 present simple free combinations while the rest of the examples show grammatical collocations, with examples 3 to 5 showing the structure afraid of followed by a pronoun or a noun, examples 6 and 7 showing the sentence pattern afraid of v-ing and afraid + to-inf and examples 8 and 9 showing the sentence pattern afraid + that-clause. My proposed format is a definite improvement on the ordering of examples in the *Robert/Collins* entry for afraid in that free combinations and grammatical collocations are separated and the latter are logically ordered.[6] If the same method of ordering examples is used throughout the dictionary for examples illustrating the headword used in grammatical collocations--separating free combinations and grammatical collocations and ordering grammatical collocations logically--then the dictionary-user will have no trouble finding these items.

---

[6] This method of arrangement is similar to that used in the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. On page F40 of its preface, this dictionary provides the entry of the verb "remember" and states that the examples "show FIRST simple intransitive and transitive uses, THEN a sentence that shows how the verb can be used with the preposition **as**, and LASTLY some sentences that show the four different sentence patterns [+ that, + wh-, + v-ing, and obj. + v-ing] which can be used with **remember**."

Notice that, just as in the entry for moral and heart, the examples for afraid contain elements other than the headword and the collocate (which in the case of afraid consists of a preposition or a relative pronoun). In all the examples, the verb to be that precedes the adjective is given and information after the preposition or relative pronoun is always provided in the *Robert/Collins* entry (see page 86): sb/sth in example 2, work in the last 2 examples, hurting him in example 4, going and go in example 6, and the clauses I might hurt him, he will *or* might hurt me and he (might) hurt me in examples 4 and 5. This is so because these other elements are also important parts of the examples: they provide a context for the headword. Examples are rarely used to illustrate only grammatical collocations. Since these other elements can be distracting for the dictionary-user looking for a particular preposition or sentence pattern in the examples, it might be a good idea to highlight prepositions and relative pronouns in some way--by underlining them, for instance--so that grammatical collocations are easy to find. A final version of sense division (a) for afraid might appear as follows:

> **afraid**...*adj* **(a)** *(frightened)* **to be ~** avoir peur; **don't be ~!** n'ayez pas peur!, ne craignez rien!; **to be ~ of sb/sth** avoir peur de qn/qch, craindre qn/qch; **he is ~ of work** il n'aime pas beaucoup travailler; **he is not ~ of work** le travail ne lui fait pas peur *or* ne le rebute pas; **I am ~ of hurting him** j'ai peur *or* je crains de lui faire mal; **I am ~ of going** *or* **to go** je n'ose pas y aller, j'ai peur d'y aller; **I am ~ that I might hurt him** j'ai peur *or* je crains de lui faire mal; **I am ~ he will** *or* **might hurt me, (liter) I am ~ lest he (might) hurt me** je crains *or* j'ai peur qu'il (ne) me fasse mal.

While the above entry for afraid contains only grammatical collocations, and that for moral only lexical collocations, many entries contain examples in which the headword appears in both grammatical and lexical collocations, which further complicates their ordering. Such is the case in the *Robert/Collins* entry for the noun excuse in the sense of "pretext". In this sense division, examples are presented as follows:

1. lame ~
2. to find an ~ for sth
3. I have a good ~ for not going
4. to make an ~ for sth/for doing
5. he is only making ~s
6. he is always making ~s to get away
7. what's your ~ this time?
8. he gave the bad weather as his ~ for not coming
9. it's only an ~
10. his success was a good ~ for a family party (RC)

In this sense division there are ten examples. The seventh and ninth show the headword used in free combinations while the rest present a number of different collocations, both grammatical and lexical. The second, third, fourth, eighth and tenth examples show the grammatical collocation excuse for while the sixth example shows the grammatical collocation excuse to + infinitive. Examples 1, 3 and 10 illustrate adjective-noun lexical collocations, and verb-noun lexical collocations are found in examples 2, 4, 5 and 6. Thus, examples 2, 3, 4, 6 and 10 illustrate both grammatical and lexical collocations at the same time. As a result, in order to have a logical ordering of examples, the dictionary compiler must necessarily choose to give priority to one over the other.

To make grammatical collocations easier to find, the examples in the above entry could be reordered in the following way:

1. what's your ~ this time?
2. it's only an ~
3. to find an ~ for sth
4. to make an ~ for sth
5. his success was a good ~ for a family party
6. to make an ~ for doing
7. I have a good ~ for not going
8. he gave the bad weather as his ~ for not coming
9. he is always making ~s to get away
10. lame ~
11. he is only making ~s

Notice that there are eleven examples instead of ten in the reordered entry. This is because the example to make an excuse for sth/for doing contains two varieties of grammatical collocation which need to be separated if grammatical collocations are to be logically ordered. Therefore, as in the example for afraid, there is expansion. In my proposed format, free combinations (examples 1 and 2) come first, followed by examples showing grammatical collocations (although some may also present lexical collocations as well). Among the grammatical collocations, the simple prepositional use excuse for followed by a noun or pronoun comes first (examples 3 to 5), followed by sentence patterns (examples 6 to 9), with the sentence pattern excuse for v-ing preceding excuse to + infinitive. Examples illustrating only lexical collocations come last.

It is clear that if examples were ordered in this way, the dictionary-user would have no trouble finding any of the grammatical collocations in the entry for excuse. This is not the case in the *Robert/Collins* entry. For example, if the dictionary-user were searching for the grammatical collocation excuse for followed by a noun in sense division (b) of the *Robert/Collins* entry of excuse (see page 89), upon seeing the second example (to find an excuse for sth), he might not search any further for grammatical collocations of the type excuse for followed by a noun as the next example is a different type of grammatical collocation (I have a good excuse for not going). Thus, he might miss the fourth and tenth examples (to make an excuse for sth and his success was a good excuse for a family party), which have an identical structure and which might be of assistance to him. And even if he did decide to go on searching for a grammatical collocation similar to the one found in the second example, he would have to wade through numerous examples that are useless to him in order to find the ones he needs. Thus, my revised format is a clear improvement on the one used in the *Robert/Collins* in that it orders grammatical collocations logically by placing them all together and including simple prepositional uses and sentence patterns in the category of grammatical collocations. This arrangement not only enables the dictionary-user to find quickly the grammatical collocation he is looking for but also minimizes the risk of his overlooking

potentially important examples containing grammatical collocations.

Ordering of examples according to the grammatical collocations into which the headword enters would be ideal if all dictionary-users ever looked up were grammatical collocations. However, they often want to look up examples in which the headword is used in lexical collocations as well. As a result of my rearrangement of examples according to grammatical collocations containing the noun excuse, lexical collocations are randomly ordered since, as mentioned above, many examples in this entry illustrate the headword used in both grammatical and lexical collocations at the same time: in my proposed format, examples 3, 4, 9 and 11 contain verb-noun collocations and examples 5, 7 and 10 contain adjective-noun collocations. What happens if the dictionary-user wants to find one of these items instead? One possible solution to this problem is to highlight the item with which the headword enters into a lexical collocation in some way so that it is easily identified. Thus, find, make, making, good and lame in the examples could be highlighted. In this way, the lexicographer kills two birds with one stone, allowing the dictionary-user to conveniently find two types of information: grammatical collocations (presented by order) and lexical collocations (emphasized by highlighting).

If, however, the editors deem lexical collocations more important than grammatical collocations, they can always order examples according to lexical collocations and highlight prepositions in these examples instead. The final version of sense division (b) for the noun excuse would look something like this if such an ordering of examples were established:

> **excuse**...*n*...**(b)** *(pretext)* excuse *f*, prétexte *m*. **to find an ~ for sth** trouver une excuse à qch; **he is only making ~s** il cherche tout simplement des prétextes *or* de bonnes raisons; **to make an ~ for sth/for doing** *(gen)* trouver une *or* des excuse(s) à qch/pour faire; **he is always making ~s to get away** il trouve *or* invente toujours des excuses pour s'absenter; **his success was a good ~ for a family party** sa réussite a servi de prétexte à une fête de famille; **I have a good ~ for not going** j'ai une bonne excuse pour ne pas y aller; **lame ~** faible excuse, excuse boiteuse; **he gave the bad weather as his ~ for not coming** il a pretexté *or* allegué le mauvais temps pour ne pas venir; **what's your ~ this time?** qu'avez-vous comme excuse cette fois-ci?; **it's only an ~** ce n'est qu'un prétexte.

In this rearrangement, the first seven examples illustrate lexical collocations, the first four being verb-noun collocations in alphabetical order by collocate and the last three being adjective-noun collocations in alphabetical order by collocate. Notice that the prepositions showing the headword used in grammatical collocations are highlighted so that they are easily identifiable. The eighth example contains the headword used in a grammatical collocation while the last two illustrate the headword used in free combinations.

One last ordering technique for examples is that used in the *Explanatory and Combinatorial Dictionary* (*ECD*), a dictionary geared more towards researchers than lay users. What sets it apart from most other dictionaries is that it is both fully comprehensive and highly formalized. While most of the entries completed so far are unilingual, a few bilingual entries based on the *ECD* method have also been completed.[7] An *ECD* entry is divided into six zones: the Introductory Zone, the Semantic Zone, the Syntactic Zone, the Lexical Functions Zone, the Examples Zone and the Phraseology Zone.[8] What I term examples are in fact found in three of these zones: the Syntactic Zone, the Lexical Functions Zone and the Examples Zone.[9]

The Syntactic Zone indicates what is known as an SL item's government pattern. Its main role is to "make explicit the correspondence between the semantic and syntactic actants... of a lexeme, and to illustrate the various ways in which these actants are realized on the surface level."[10] Below a table illustrating the headword's government pattern, one finds examples illustrating the government pattern. Generally, examples in this section illustrate the headword

---

[7] For instance, Ingrid Meyer, in her Ph.D. thesis "Towards a New Type of General Bilingual Dictionary," discusses the feasibility of applying the *ECD* model to bilingual lexicography and provides a sample entry for the noun tête to illustrate how it works.

[8] Meyer 1986, 180.

[9] See Meyer 1986, 177-194 for a description of all the zones of the *ECD* entry.

[10] Meyer 1986, 187.

used in free combinations, such as I punished John and grammatical collocations, such as I punished John for breaking the window.[11]

The Lexical Functions Zone contains a list of about 50 lexical functions.[12] A lexical function is "a very general sort of meaning, whose lexical realization varies depending on the lexical item with which it is associated in a text."[13] Most of them indicate lexical collocations into which the headword can enter.[14] For instance, the lexical function "Magn", which corresponds roughly to the sense of "very", can be used to identify examples in which the French noun mémoire (in the sense of "memory") co-occurs with adjectives and nouns, as in the following example:

Magn*(mémoire)* = *prodigieuse, excellente, étonnante, d'éléphant*[15]

In this example, "Magn" is the lexical function, mémoire is its argument and the words after the equal sign are the values of the lexical function.[16] Lexical functions are ordered according to their part of speech: nouns come first, followed by adjectives, adverbs and then verbs. And as a general rule, more abstract lexical functions precede more concrete ones.[17] Also, when there are

---

[11] Meyer 1986, 130.

[12] Meyer 1986, 191.

[13] Meyer 1986, 10.

[14] Meyer 1986, 189. However, this section sometimes contains free combinations as well. For instance, in Ingrid Meyer's entry for tête, grosse tête is given in the lexical functions zone for sense I.1a.

[15] Igor Mel'čuk, "Un nouveau type de dictionnaire: le Dictionnaire explicatif et combinatoire du français contemporain," *Dictionnaire explicatif et combinatoire du français contemporain*, ed. Igor Mel'čuk, *et al.* (Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1984) 8.

[16] Mel'čuk 1984, 6.

[17] Mel'čuk 1984, 7. For a complete description of all lexical functions used in the *ECD*, see pages 7-13.

large numbers of examples, lexical functions are grouped into broad semantic categories. For instance, there are six categories for sense I.1a of Ingrid Meyer's entry for tête, including "Mouvements et positions de la tête" and "Gestes faits avec la tête".[18]

Finally, the Examples Zone provides examples, generally in sentence form, in no systematic order. The function of examples in this section is to illustrate the meaning and collocations of the headword.[19] While the *ECD* is like most other GBDs in that it places examples within sense divisions, it is different from them in that examples are found in different areas within the sense divisions.

While one aspect of this model, the ordering of examples according to lexical functions, is very systematic and provides a means of classifying large numbers of examples, it has two major drawbacks for the average GBD-user.

First, because many of the lexical functions are intricate, finding the correct one can be painstaking for the average dictionary-user. For instance, if he wants to find the verb-noun lexical collocation attract attention,[20] he has to know that attract as it is used in this collocation is a semantically empty verb and must remember that the lexical function "Oper" is used for such verbs. However, if he wants to find the lexical collocation keep s.o.'s attention, which is also a verb-noun collocation, he has to look under a different lexical function since keep includes the idea of "to continue" and is thus listed under the lexical function "ContOper".[21] The dictionary-user's problems are further compounded by the fact that the Latin names used to designate lexical functions are difficult to remember. The average GBD-user might prefer to have the two collocations above placed together as they are of the same type (verb-noun), rather

---

[18] Meyer 1986, 265.

[19] Meyer 1986, 191.

[20] Meyer 1986, 255.

[21] Meyer 1986, 248.

than having them listed separately under abstract lexical functions. Thus, overall, the classification of examples according to lexical functions seems too intricate for the average GBD-user, who wants to find a particular example as quickly and as easily as possible.

Finding lexical collocations is further complicated by the fact that, in the bilingual *ECD* model, the dictionary-user has to look in two places in order to find collocations and their translations. First, he has to go to a bilingual index to find the correct meaning of the headword. He is then directed to the bilingual entry, which is found on another page and where he can find lexical collocations. Moreover, the bilingual entry itself is divided into three sections--the Introductory Zone, which gives a mini-definition of the headword, a short example and TL equivalents,[22] the Warning Zone, which indicates any potential translation pitfalls[23] and the Lexical Functions Zone, where he will find lexical collocations. Therefore, once he has reached the bilingual entry, the dictionary-user may still have to flip to the Lexical Functions Zone to find examples of the headword used in lexical collocations and their translations.

Given these complications, which are an inevitable part of the *ECD* method, it would seem that one of the other methods outlined in this chapter (e.g. ordering examples according to the grammatical category of the headword's co-occurrents) would be much better for the average GBD-user since they do not oblige him to think in terms of abstract lexical functions or to flip back and forth between different sections of the dictionary.

In defence of the *ECD* method, it should be pointed out that Ingrid Meyer admits that there are limitations to a book-bound *ECD*. She says that her proposed dictionary segment "is not intended to serve as a "real" dictionary"[24] and that while the tiered structure in the bilingual model "should alleviate somewhat the problem of finding the desired information in a fully

---

[22] Meyer 1986, 203.

[23] Meyer 1986, 204.

[24] Meyer 1986, 235.

comprehensive dictionary..., it cannot claim to solve it fully as long as the actual dictionary entries are book-bound."[25] She adds that if it were computerized, on the other hand, the *ECD* model would be more effective.[26]

So far, individual ordering techniques have been looked at separately. However, it is possible to find more than one of the ordering techniques described in this chapter used for a number of examples. For instance, in sense division (a) of the *Robert/Collins* entry for the noun option, two examples used in legal contexts and preceded by the label "Jur" are placed together (the buyer shall have the option to decide and 6 months with/without the option of a fine). Also, in this sense division, three examples in which option is object of the verb have are placed together (I have no option, he had no option but to come and you have the option of remaining here). Thus, in this entry, examples are ordered not only according to general and specialized contexts but also according to co-occurring words, which is a facet of the *Van Dale* ordering technique.

2. Ordering of Examples and User Orientation

Out of all the ordering techniques described in this chapter only two seem to benefit some types of dictionary-users more than others. First, ordering examples according to the headword's meaning seems to be of particular benefit to GBD-users who have a good command of the SL. Second, one facet of the *Van Dale* ordering technique--ordering examples first according to the grammatical category of words with which the headword combines and only then according to senses of the headword--seems to favor the L2-L1 beginning student looking

---

[25] Meyer 1986, 168.

[26] Meyer 1986, 168.

up a word in his foreign language.

According to B. Al, the *Van Dale* method favors this particular user because it is based on formal and contextual criteria, which the L2 learner can identify, rather than on semantic divisions with which he is not familiar.[27] He gives the example of a foreign language learner who comes across dans le sens des aiguilles in a French text and does not know what this group of words means.[28] Al claims that, in such a case, the L2-L1 user can find the expression's meaning quickly if all examples in which aiguille co-occurs with nouns are placed together, rather than being separated and placed in sense divisions, as he may have difficulty knowing the sense of aiguille (or, in fact, of sens) as used in dans le sens des aiguilles on the basis of the context it is used in.

In my opinion, Al exaggerates when he suggests that no L2-L1 users know their foreign language well enough to be able to look up a word's sense in order to find it used in an example. L2-L1 AUs, who have a good command of their foreign language, and more advanced L2-L1 BISs, should be able to find examples by looking up senses of words, especially if the latter are identified by meaning discrimination devices. For example, the dictionary-user trying to find the meaning of dans le sens des aiguilles by going to the entry for sens in the *Robert/Collins* is faced with six senses for sens identified by the following meaning discrimination devices: "vue, goût etc", "instinct", "raison, avis", "signification", "direction", and "ligne directrice". The advanced L2-L1 user, who likely already knows the meaning of sens as it is used in dans le sens des aiguilles, will know immediately that he should go to the sense of "direction" in order to find the example dans le sens des aiguilles. Sure enough, in the *Robert/Collins*, the example dans le sens des aiguilles d'une montre is found in this sense division. Therefore, it seems that the *Van Dale* technique is of particular benefit only to the L2-

---

[27] Al 1983, 204-05.

[28] Al 1983, 210.

L1 BIS who knows very little of his foreign language and not to all L2-L1 users, as Al suggests. Conversely, L2-L1 users with a poor command of their foreign language who wish to understand foreign language items stand to benefit the least from ordering examples first according to the meaning of the headword and then according to other criteria because they cannot identify meanings of words in their foreign language as readily as L2-L1 AUs and L2-L1 BISs with a better command of their foreign language.

There are, however, two drawbacks to the subordination of senses to the grammatical categorization of co-occurring words for the L2-L1 BIS. First, in this type of ordering, examples of the headword used in one given sense are often separated from one another. As a result, the user often has to look through several categories before finding the example he wants. For example, there are four divisions in the noun heart in which the headword co-occurs with nouns, each corresponding to different senses of heart: 1.1, 1.3, 1.4 and 1.7 (see page 81). If the beginning user wants to find an example in which heart co-occurs with the noun cabbage, for instance, he will have to check in sections 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4 before discovering it in section 1.7. Thus, finding a particular example in the *Van Dale* may be time-consuming for the L2-L1 BIS.

A second problem with this aspect of the *Van Dale* ordering technique is that it assumes the L2-L1 user can readily identify the grammatical category of words in the first place. However, this is not always the case. For instance, it may be difficult for the L2-L1 user to identify the grammatical category of words that have different grammatical categories depending on how they are used. A good example is the word that, which can be an adjective, an adverb, a pronoun or a conjunction. And with the decreasing emphasis on the learning of grammar, fewer and fewer language students seem able to identify the grammatical category of even more obvious words, and this even in their mother tongue. Hence the effectiveness of the *Van Dale* technique, based as it is on grammatical categorization, is placed in doubt.

3. Conclusion

It is clear, then, that there are several ways of ordering examples in GBD entries. What is most important is that the bilingual lexicographer use a method that makes it easy for the GBD-user to find the particular examples he is looking for. All too often, the GBD-user looking for an example in the *Robert/Collins* or the *Harrap's*, for instance, wastes time reading examples that are of no use to him before finding the one he wants. Some of the methods described in this chapter are clearly of limited use and provide only partial solutions, such as ordering examples according to those illustrating literal and figurative uses of SL items and ordering examples according to the semantic characteristics of words with which the headword co-occurs. Other techniques, however, such as ordering examples according to the grammatical category of words with which the headword co-occurs within sense divisions and alphabetizing these words, and the overall *Van Dale* ordering method, are more useful as they account for larger numbers of examples. It is hoped that, in the future, lexicographers will give more thought to the ordering of examples as they are an important facet of the GBD entry.

CHAPTER SIX

THE ARRANGEMENT OF IDIOMS AND COMPOUNDS

Idioms and compounds have been specifically omitted from the definition of examples as used in this thesis. Although, as pointed out in the introduction, the line of demarcation between collocations on the one hand and idioms and compounds on the other is not clearcut, I have decided to treat idioms and compounds as a separate category, since they are even more like single words. According to Zgusta, idioms, compounds and single words are alike in that they carry lexical meaning in much the same way.[1] However, while single words appear mainly as headwords in GBDs, idioms and compounds are regularly found within entries. As a result, the lexicographer must find ways of presenting them so that they are easy to find within the entry. In this chapter, I will discuss the arrangement of idioms and compounds within the GBD entry, or more precisely their placement with respect to other elements of the entry and their ordering among themselves.

The arrangement of idioms and compounds will be treated in the same chapter for two reasons. First, as Zgusta points out, there are many similarities between idioms and compounds. Not only do they carry lexical meaning as wholes (i.e. their meanings cannot usually be derived from the meanings of their constituent parts[2]) but neither generally allows substitution of its parts.[3] Second, many GBDs arrange idioms and compounds similarly within entries. Thus, the arrangement of both of these linguistic items will be discussed in the same chapter. The placement and ordering of idioms will be discussed first, followed by the

---

[1] Zgusta 1971, 154.

[2] Zgusta 1971, 146.

[3] Zgusta 1971, 144.

placement and ordering of compounds.

1. The Placement of Idioms

There are five possibilities for the placement of idioms within GBD entries. First, they can be placed in a separate division of the entry on their own. An example of this type of placement can be seen in the *Robert/Collins* entry for cat, in which idioms such as to let the cat out of the bag and to fight like cat and dog are all grouped together in a separate division entitled "phrases". Second, they can be mixed in with compounds in a separate division. This method is used consistently in the *Ragazzini*. For instance, in the entry for devil, a black diamond sets off a special section at the end of the entry containing idioms such as to be between the devil and the deep (sea) and compounds such as devil-fish. Third, idioms can be mixed in with examples (and sometimes compounds as well) in sense divisions. This technique is used in the *Collins*, where no distinction is made between examples and idioms. An example of this type of placement is seen in sense division (a) of the noun end: it consists of one long paragraph in which idioms such as to be at the end of one's tether and to go off the deep end are mixed in with examples such as at the end of and to read a book to the very end. Fourth, idioms can be placed within sense divisions, but after examples and compounds. This is consistently done in the *Robert & Signorelli*, where a diamond sets off idioms placed at the end of sense divisions. In the fifth method, which is used in the *Van Dale*, idioms, like examples, are placed in different divisions according to words with which the headword co-occurs. For instance, examples in which the headword co-occurs with a noun are followed by idioms in which the headword co-occurs with a noun; then come examples in which the headword co-occurs with an adjective, followed by idioms in which the headword co-occurs with an adjective, and so on. Thus, in this type of placement, idioms are found in different parts of the entry and are separated by examples.

2. Limitations of Idiom Placement Techniques

Each of the five ways of placing idioms has its drawbacks. For instance, it may be difficult to find idioms if they are mixed in with examples. An example of this problem is found in the presentation of examples and idioms in sense division (a) of the transitive verb break in the *Robert/Collins* (where necessary, I have numbered examples and idioms to make consultation easier):

1. to break sth in two
2. the child has broken all his toys
3. to break one's neck
4. I'll break his neck if I catch him doing that again
5. to break one's leg
6. break a leg!
7. the bone is not broken
8. his skin is not broken
9. to break open
10. to break new *ou* fresh ground
11. to break the sound barrier
12. to break a record
13. to break one's back
14. he almost broke his back trying to lift the stone
15. to break the back of a task

etc. (RC)

In this sense division, idioms are hidden among the examples: numbers 4, 6, 10 and 15 are idioms while the rest are examples. As a result, the dictionary-user has to take time to read examples in order to find the idioms. Another danger is that the dictionay-user may completely overlook the idiom to break the back of a task since it is not among the other examples and idioms in which objects of the verb are body parts (numbers 3 to 8).

However, such a practice does not pose any serious problems if both examples and idioms are ordered in such a way that they are both easy to find. Thus, in sense division (a) of the noun end in the *Collins*, phrases consisting of adjective-noun combinations are placed first,

followed by preposition-noun combinations and verb-noun combinations. Alphabetical order is established within each of these categories. Thus, if the dictionary-user wants to find the idiom to make both ends meet, for example, he merely has to go to the section of the sense division where verb-noun combinations are found and look for the word make in one of the phrases.

A problem with placing idioms in sense divisions, whether they are mixed in with examples or are grouped together after them, is that it is not always easy for dictionary-users to determine which sense division to go to in order to find them: it may not be clear to the user which sense of the headword a given idiom is derived from. For instance, in the *Robert/Collins* entry for the noun message, there are four sense divisions: "communication: by speech, writing, signals etc, also Comput", "official or diplomatic etc communication", "prophet, writer, artist, book etc" and "Scot: errand". Based on these meaning indications, it would seem the idiom to get the message could be placed in any of the first three sense divisions. However, the *Robert/Collins* places it under the third sense for a reason that is not readily apparent to the average user. In such cases, it seems preferable not to place idioms in sense divisions but rather to group them together in one section of the entry so that the dictionary-user can find them as quickly as possible.

However, separating idioms from examples by placing them either in their own division at the end of the entry or in a special division with compounds at the end of the entry also has a drawback. By separating examples from idioms, the lexicographer assumes the dictionary-user can distinguish between the two and thus knows which section to go to in order to find them. However, it is not always easy, even for lexicographers, to distinguish between examples and idioms. For instance, the *Robert/Collins* places perdre courage in the idiom division along with idioms such as prendre son courage à deux mains. However, perdre courage is not listed in the *Dictionnaire des locutions et expressions*, an authoritative dictionary of French idioms. Therefore, since dictionaries can disagree over what constitutes an idiom, it should not be surprising that GBD-users may also have problems distinguishing between idioms and examples.

Finally, the *Van Dale* method, in which idioms are ordered according to the grammatical category of co-occurring words, has one major drawback: like examples, some idioms can be placed in more than one division. For instance, in the entry for cat, the *Van Dale* places the idiom rain cats and dogs in division 1 because the headword cat co-occurs with the noun dogs. However, this idiom could just as easily have been placed in division 3 because of the presence of the verb rain. Thus, the dictionary-user may have to look in more than one division to find certain idioms.

3. Combination of Idiom Placement Techniques

While there are clearly five distinct possibilities for the placement of idioms within the GBD entry, it seems that some GBDs prefer not to take a firm stand and choose instead to use more than one method. Thus, in the *Robert/Collins*, three methods are used: idioms are found not only in special divisions, as in the example for cat on page 101, but are also found in sense divisions both after examples and mixed in with them. For instance, in the entry for the transitive verb eat, examples illustrating the headword in the meaning of "to take in through the mouth as food" come first, followed by four idioms: she looks good enough to eat, to eat one's words, I'll eat my hat if... and he won't eat you. And in the entry for the transitive verb break (see page 102), idioms are mixed in with examples.

What is more disconcerting is the fact that, in the *Robert/Collins*, more than one placement technique is often used within the same entry. For instance, in the entry for the noun oeil, idioms are found both in two special idioms divisions at the end of the entry (one for oeil and one for yeux) and within sense divisions. The idiom avoir un oeil au beurre noir is in the first sense division, which is identified by the field label "Anat" while the idiom avoir l'oeil à qch is found in a special idiom division. As a result, the dictionary-user may have to look in two places before finding the idiom he is looking for.

4. The Ordering of Idioms

If the lexicographer decides to place all idioms together, whether they are at the end of sense divisions or in a special division at the end of the entry, he must find a logical way of ordering them so that they are easy to find. In some GBDs, however, idioms are often in no particular order whatsoever. For instance, in the *Robert/Collins* entry for cat, idioms are placed in a separate division and are presented as follows:

1. to let the cat out of the bag
2. the cat's out of the bag
3. to wait for the cat to jump, to wait to see which way the cat jumps
4. to fight like cat and dog
5. to lead a cat and dog life
6. a cat may look at a king
7. to be *or* jump around like a cat on hot bricks
8. when the cat's away the mice will play
9. that set the cat among the pigeons
10. he thinks he's the cat's whiskers (RC)

Only the first two idioms, which contain the noun bag and the fourth and fifth idioms, which contain the noun dog, seem to be ordered in a logical way in this division. The rest of the idioms seem to be in no particular order.

In other entries in the *Robert/Collins*, however, idioms are sometimes ordered logically. For instance, in the entry for the noun eye, preposition-noun combinations such as before my very eyes and in the eyes of precede verb-noun combinations such as to be all eyes and to give sb the eye (with a few exceptions) and prepositions and verbs are for the most part in alphabetical order. A few idioms that do not lend themselves to this type of ordering, such as an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth and eyes front!, are placed at the very end.

The *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary* uses a similar method: idioms starting with the headword, except for clichés, are placed first; then come those starting with a verb (when it is

not the headword); next come those starting with a preposition (when it is not the headword); and last come clichés starting with the headword. Within each category, alphabetical order is established.[4] Thus, the idioms for the above entry for cat would be ordered as follows using the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary* method (I have placed the elements that determine ordering in bold):

the **cat's** out of the bag
a **cat may** look at a king
to **be** *or* jump around like a cat on hot bricks
to **fight** like cat and dog
to **lead** a cat and dog life
to **let** the cat out of the bag
that **set** the cat among the pigeons
he **thinks** he's the cat's whiskers
to **wait** for the cat to jump, to wait to see which way the cat jumps

This arrangement is a definite improvement on that used in the *Robert/Collins*. Notice, however, that the idiom when the cat's away the mice will play, whose first word is not the headword, a verb or a preposition, does not lend itself to ordering according to the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary* criteria and has thus not been included in my application of these criteria to idioms involving the headword cat. This is because the criteria being used to order idioms in this dictionary are by no means final and complete: the dictionary is still in progress and many idioms have still not been accounted for. However, such idioms could eventually be placed at the end.

Other ordering methods used by idiom dictionaries can also be applied to GBDs. For instance, the *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English Volume 2* (*ODCIE*) orders idioms according to the alphabetical order of the first word that forms an integral part of them regardless of the word's grammatical category. This method would produce the following

[4] Roberts *et al.* 1990, 15.

ordering of examples for the idioms in the *Robert/Collins* entry for cat (I have placed the elements according to which the idioms are alphabetized in bold):

to **be** or jump around like a cat on hot bricks
the **cat's** out of the bag
a **cat may** look at a king
to **fight** like cat and dog
he thinks he's the cat's whiskers
to **lead** a cat and dog life
to **let** the cat out of the bag
that set the cat among the pigeons
to **wait** for the cat to jump, to wait to see which way the cat jumps
when the cat's away the mice will play

The *ODCIE* provides a number of common sense criteria to alphabetize idioms. For instance, the words a/an, the, and and the particle to (as used in the to-infinitive) are disregarded. However, if articles serve to distinguish two headphrases which are in other respects the same, they are taken into account. Thus, in future precedes in the future in this dictionary. Also, the abbreviations sb, sth, sb's (as well as one's and his when they stand for a possessive adjective) are ignored unless they serve to distinguish two otherwise identical idioms (e.g. heart and soul precedes one's heart and soul).[5]

5. The Placement of Compounds

Much of what has been said above about the placement of idioms applies to compounds as well. Of the five possibilities of placement presented for idioms, four can be used for compounds. First, compounds can be placed on their own in a special division at the end of the entry. For instance, in the *Robert/Collins*, compounds are sometimes placed in separate divisions after both sense divisions and special idiom divisions. Second compounds can be

[5] For more criteria, see Cowie *et al.* 1983, xxv-xxvii.

mixed in with idioms in a special division at the end of the entry. As was seen earlier in the section on the placement of idioms, the *Ragazzini* consistently uses this technique. Third, compounds can be mixed in with examples (and sometimes idioms) in sense divisions. For instance, in sense division 1 (a) in the entry for the noun life in the *Harrap's*, two examples are given first (to have life and everything that has life), followed by a compound (life force), then by more examples (e.g. to come to life etc.), then by more compounds (life support equipment and life support pack), and finally by more examples (e.g. to beg for one's life etc.). Fourth, compounds can be placed within sense divisions, but be separated from examples and idioms. For instance, in the second sense division for the French noun coup, in the *Robert & Signorelli*, ("choc brutal que l'on fair subir à qqn."), a number of examples, such as une avalanche de coups, are given first, followed by compounds, such as coup de poing and coup de bec.

6. Limitations and Combination of Compound Placement Techniques

The drawbacks that were discussed for the first four placement techniques for idioms apply to compounds as well: if they are mixed in with examples and/or idioms, they may be difficult to find unless all three linguistic items are ordered logically; if compounds are placed in sense divisions, it is sometimes difficult to find them as it is not always easy to know which sense division to go to based on the meanings of the words that make up the compound; and separating compounds from examples may cause some users problems as it is not always easy to distinguish between compounds and certain types of examples (collocations).

As is the case with idioms, some GBDs prefer to use more than one placement technique for compounds. For instance, in the *Robert/Collins*, compounds are often found in special divisions at the end of the entry but adjective-noun compounds, such as primary school and primary colour, are often placed with examples in sense divisions.

However, as is the case with idioms, problems arise when compounds are placed both within sense divisions and in a special division within the same entry. For instance, in the *Robert/Collins* entry for the adjective big, many compounds such as big band and big bang are found in a special compound section while some compounds such as big toe and big business are found in sense divisions. This is not good lexicographical practice as the dictionary-user may be forced to look in two divisions of the entry--in a sense division and in a special compound division--in order to find some compounds.

7. The Ordering of Compounds

A logical way of arranging compounds that are placed together is to order them alphabetically. If the headword is the first word in the compound, compounds can be alphabetized either according to the word that comes immediately after it, regardless of its grammatical category, or according to the first content word that comes after it. In the proposed *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary*, the former method is being used: compounds are being placed in strict alphabetical order according to the word that follows the headword even if it is a preposition.[6] However, in the *Robert/Collins*, prepositions are disregarded. Thus, in the *Robert/Collins*, l'âge mûr precedes l'âge d'or while in the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary*, the order is reversed.

Some GBDs include certain compounds whose first element is not the headword in entries for the latter. For instance, in the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary*, compounds whose first element is "weak" (e.g. bel in bel âge) are placed in entries for the main element (âge). These compounds are grouped together alphabetically according to the first word in the compound and

[6] Roberts *et al.* 1990, 16.

are placed after compounds beginning with the headword.[7]

8. Placement and Ordering of Idioms and Compounds and User Orientation

While specific ordering techniques for idioms and compounds do not benefit any particular GBD-users, placement techniques used for idioms and compounds can be divided into two categories based on which types of users they benefit most: those which are of particular benefit to the L1-L2 user, who looks up idioms and compounds in his dominant language, and those which help the L2-L1 user, who looks them up in his foreign language.

Placing idioms or compounds in sense divisions, whether they are mixed in with examples or are placed after them, is likely to be of particular benefit to L1-L2 users. As idioms and compounds are in their dominant language, they are more likely than L2-L1 users, and more particularly L2-L1 BISs, to know the meaning of these items and thus know which meaning of the headword to find them under. For instance, the L1-L2 user is more likely than the L2-L1 BIS to know the meaning of the idiom he's too big for his boots and is thus more likely to know which meaning of big to find it under in the *Robert/Collins*. Upon seeing the sense divisions provided in the *Robert/Collins* for the adjective big ("in height", "in bulk, amount", "in age", "important", "conceited" and "generous"), the L1-L2 user probably knows that the above idiom is found under the sense of "conceited" as he probably knows the meaning of the idiom. Conversely, the L2-L1 BIS using a GBD to understand foreign language items would benefit the most from techniques in which idioms and compounds are placed outside of sense divisions whether they are placed alone after all sense divisions or are mixed in with compounds.

---

[7] Roberts *et al.* 1990, 16.

9. Conclusion

Thus, it can be seen that much thought must go into both the placement and ordering of idioms and compounds. For instance, the lexicographer must decide whether to place them in sense divisions. If he decides to do so, he must then decide whether to mix them in with examples or keep them separate. If he places them outside of sense divisions, he must decide whether to separate the two or place them together. Each of these methods has its drawbacks, which makes it difficult for the lexicographer to decide on one technique. Furthermore, different placement techniques benefit particular types of GBD-users. Perhaps this is why several placement techniques are used in some of the GBDs I examined.

On the face of it, ordering idioms and compounds seems much easier than placing them. Basically, those which start with the headword can be placed first, followed by all others in alphabetical order, or alphabetical order can be established for all of them. However, some problems do arise. For instance, as many idioms and some compounds contain more than two words, a decision must be made about which element to alphabetize them by. Thus, it is clear that both the placement and the ordering of idioms and compounds is no simple matter. The lexicographer must choose techniques that allow his intended readers to find idioms and compounds as quickly and as easily as possible.

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I have endeavoured to clearly show that there are a variety of ways in which several elements of the GBD entry can be arranged. I have proposed several ordering techniques for six entry elements--the synonymous equivalent, the meaning, the context, the example, the idiom and the compound. Moreover, I have demonstrated that a seventh element, the meaning discrimination device, as well as the idiom and the compound, can be placed differently with respect to other elements of the entry. Since a large number of arrangement techniques have been described in this thesis, it would be useful to present all of them together in summary form so that the reader can better appreciate the variety of methods that are possible for the GBD entry elements discussed in this thesis. Thus, the seven above-mentioned entry elements and the arrangement techniques for them are listed below. Both entry elements and arrangement techniques are given in the order they were presented in the body of the thesis, and the latter are presented in point form under entry elements.

1. Summary Presentation of Arrangement Techniques

The Synonymous Equivalent

Ordering Techniques

- descending order of frequency of occurrence
- alphabetical order
- equivalents that are more intense than the headword placed last

The Meaning

Ordering Techniques

- chronological or historical ordering
- descending order of frequency of occurrence
- logical ordering
- dominant senses first
- according to the alphabetical order of field labels

The Context

A. Contexts in Which a Given SL item is Translated by Different Equivalents

Ordering Techniques

- descending order of frequency of occurrence

B. Groups of Contexts in Which a Given SL item is Translated by the Same Equivalent or Same Set of Synonymous Equivalents

(i) Context Words

Ordering Techniques

- semantic ordering
- descending order of frequency of occurrence
- general context words before particular ones
- concrete nouns before abstract nouns
- alphabetical ordering

(ii) Field Labels

Ordering Techniques

- alphabetical ordering

The Meaning Discrimination Device

A. Definitions

Placement Techniques

- in the SL before the equivalent
- in the TL before the equivalent
- in the SL and TL before the equivalent
- in the SL after the equivalent
- in the TL after the equivalent
- in the SL before the equivalent and in the TL after the equivalent

B. Context Words

Placement Techniques

- in the SL before the equivalent
- in the TL before the equivalent
- in the SL after the equivalent
- in the TL after the equivalent
- in the SL and TL after the equivalent, with the TL context word placed first
- in the SL before the equivalent and in the TL after the equivalent
- in the SL between the headword and the part of speech label and in the TL after the equivalent

The Example

Ordering Techniques

- according to the different meanings of the headword
- those illustrating the headword in literal uses placed before those illustrating it in figurative uses within the same meaning
- those illustrating the headword in specialized contexts separated from those illustrating it in general contexts
- according to the semantic relationship existing between words with which the headword co-occurs
- primarily according to the grammatical category of words with which the headword co-occurs and then, within these divisions, according to meanings of the headword; co-occurring words are alphabetized within these divisions (the *Van Dale* ordering technique)
- within meanings, according to the grammatical category of co-occurring words, which are alphabetized
- separating examples illustrating the headword used in free combinations, grammatical collocations and lexical collocations; within those showing grammatical collocations, placing simple prepositional uses first, followed by sentence patterns; within those illustrating lexical collocations, alphabetizing examples according to collocates of the headword
- according to lexical functions (the *ECD* method)

The Idiom

Placement Techniques

- in a separate division of the entry on their own
- in a special division with compounds
- mixed in with examples (and sometimes compounds) in sense divisions
- after examples (and sometimes compounds) in sense divisions
- in different divisions, according to words with which the headword co-occurs in the idiom (the *Van Dale* method)

Ordering Techniques

- according to the grammatical category of co-occurring words, which are then alphabetized
- those starting with the headword come first (except for clichés); then come those starting with a verb (when it is not the headword); then those starting with a preposition (when it is not the headword); then clichés starting with the headword; alphabetical order is established within each category (the *BCD* method)
- according to the alphabetical order of the first word that forms an integral part of the idiom, regardless of this word's grammatical category

The Compound

Placement Techniques

- in a separate division of the entry on their own
- in a special division with idioms
- mixed in with examples (and sometimes idioms) in sense divisions
- after examples (and sometimes idioms) in sense divisions

Ordering Techniques

- according to the alphabetical order of words that immediately follow the headword
- according to the alphabetical order of the first content word that follows the headword
- compounds beginning with the headword placed first and grouped alphabetically according to words that follow the headword; next comes those in which the headword is not the first word in the compound, which are also grouped alphabetically

The arrangement techniques presented above are not exhaustive. A study of other GBDs as well as more experimental work (e.g. entry restructuring) would no doubt reveal other possible techniques. However, those presented above are far greater in number than those suggested in bilingual lexicography literature so far.

2. Entry Arrangement and User Orientation

While a description of arrangement techniques for GBD entry elements has been the focus of this thesis, it has also been pointed out that different arrangement techniques

sometimes benefit specific types of users, depending on directionality (L1-L2 use vs. L2-L1 use) and the level of proficiency of the user in his foreign language. To give the reader a better idea of just how much the types of GBD-users described in this thesis can influence the arrangement of GBD entry elements, one entry taken from the *Robert/Collins* will be restructured to suit the needs of two types of GBD-users: the L1-L2 BIS and the L2-L1 AU. These two types of users were chosen because the arrangement of the seven entry elements discussed in this thesis differs considerably for them. The entry that has been selected for rearrangement is the one for the adjective big, which is reproduced below.

big...**1** *adj* **(a)** *(in height) person, building, tree* grand. **a ~ fellow** un grand gaillard; **a ~ man** un homme grand et fort; **to grow ~** *or* **~ger** grandir; *V also* **1b**.
(b) *(in bulk, amount) fruit, parcel, book* gros (*f* grosse). *(US: $1000)* **a ~ one*** (un billet de) mille dollars; **to grow ~** *or* **~ger** grossir; **a ~ stick** un gros bâton (*V also* **stick**); **~ toe** gros orteil; **~ with child** grosse, enceinte *V* **drum, money** *etc*.
(c) *(in age)* grand, aîné. **my ~ brother** mon grand frère, mon frère aîné; **to be a ~ brother to sb** servir de conseiller à qn (*V also* **3**); **I am ~ enough to know** je suis assez grand pour savoir.
(d) *(important)* grand, important, marquant, remarquable. **a ~ man** un grand homme, un homme marquant *or* remarquable *or* important; **to look ~** faire l'important; **~ bug**, *(Brit)* **~ noise***, **~ shot*** huile** *f*, grosse légume**; **~ business** les grandes entreprises, les grandes firmes; *(fig: fashionable)* **boots are ~ this year*** les bottes sont in** cette année; **a ~ event** un événement marquant; **to have ~ ideas** voir grand; **a ~ lie** un gros mensonge; *(person)* **he's a ~ name in politics** c'est un grand nom de la politique; **the ~ger they are, the harder they fall** plus haut ils sont arrivés, plus dure sera la chute; **to do things in a ~ way** faire les choses en grand; **a tragedy? that's rather a ~ word** une tragédie? c'est un bien grand mot; **to make the ~ time*** arriver, réussir *(V also* **3**).
(e) *(conceited) person* prétentieux; *words* ambitieux. **~ talk** fanfaronnades *fpl*, grands discours; **he's too ~ for his boots** il a des prétentions; **he's got a ~ head*** il est crâneur*; **he's got a ~ mouth*** il ne sait pas se taire; **why can't you keep your ~ mouth shut!*** pas moyen que tu te taises!*, tu aurais mieux fait de la boucler!**; *V also* **3**.
(f) *(generous)* grand, généreux. **a heart as ~ as yours** un coeur aussi grand *or* aussi généreux que le vôtre; *(iro)* **that's ~ of you!*** quelle générosité! *(iro)*; **to be ~ on**** *person* adorer, être un fan* de; *thing* être grand amateur *or* un fana* de.
2 *adv*: **to talk ~*** fanfaronner, se faire mousser*; **to go over ~**** avoir un succès fou *or* monstre*; **his speech went down ~ with his audience**** ses auditeurs ont été emballés* par son discours.
3 *cpd*: *(Mus)* **big band** grand orchestre *(années 40-50)*; *(Phys)* **big bang** big-bang *m*; *(Brit)* **Big Ben** Big Ben *m*; **big-boned** bien *or* fortement charpenté; *(Pol etc)* **Big Brother** l'État omnipresent; **Big Brother is watching you** l'État vous a à l'oeil; *(US Astron)* **the Big Dipper** la Grande Ourse; *[fairground]* **big dipper** montagnes *fpl* russes; *(US Univ)* **the Big Eight/Ten** les huit/dix grandes universités du Centre-Ouest; *(Aut)* **big end** tête *f* de bielle; *(Pol)* **the Big Four** les Quatre (Grands); *(Brit)* **big game** gros gibier; **big game hunter** chasseur *m* de gros gibier; **big game hunting** chasse *f* au gros gibier; **bighead*** crâneur* *m*, -euse* *f*; **bigheaded*** crâneur*; **big-**

hearted au grand coeur; **to be big-hearted** avoir bon coeur, avoir du coeur; **a big-hearted fellow** un homme de coeur; **big-mouth*** gueulard(e)** *m(f)*, hâbleur *m*, -euse *f*; **he is just a big-mouth** il ne sait jamais la boucler**; **big-mouthed*** fort en gueule*; **to be big-mouthed*** avoir une grande gueule*; **big-sounding** *idea, plan etc* prétentieux; *name* ronflant, pompeux; **the Big Ten** *V* **the Big Eight**; **big-time*** *politician, industrialist* de première catégorie; *part, role* de premier plan; *farming* sur une grande échelle; **big-time gambler** flambeur** *m*; **big top** *(circus)* cirque *m*; *(main tent of it)* grand chapiteau; **bigwig**** grosse légume**, huile** *f*.[1]

Using this entry as a basis, elements will first be arranged to suit the needs of the L1-L2 BIS, and then according to the needs of the L2-L1 AU. Comments on the format follow each restructured entry. Apart from rearrangement of the elements mentioned above, the following changes have been introduced in the *Robert/Collins* entry:

A. The sub-entry for the adverb big immediately after the sub-entry for the adjective in the *Robert/Collins* has been eliminated for two reasons. First, since it is a different part of speech, it could be included as a separate entry and is considered as such here. Second, it is short and consequently does not contain elements that require rearrangement for the two types of users identified above.

B. The *Robert/Collins* only sometimes uses a swung dash (~) to replace the headword in what I consider as compounds. To be consistent, I have used the swung dash in all compounds.

C. The *Robert/Collins* uses "cpd" to introduce compounds and "phrases" to introduce idioms in the English-French side of the dictionary. To make each item easier to find, I have used the abbreviation "CPD" to introduce compound sections and "IDM" to introduce idiom sections

---

[1] In this entry, * means that an item, "while not forming part of standard language, is used by all educated speakers in a relaxed situation but would not be used in a formal essay or letter, or on an occasion when the speaker wishes to impress." ** indicates that the item "is used by some but not all educated speakers in a very relaxed situation." (Taken from "Using the Dictionary", the *Robert/Collins*, xx.)

(both abbreviations are in bold).

D. Cross references to different sections of the entry are changed or eliminated in keeping with my restructured formats. For example, in the *Robert/Collins* entry, there is a reference after the idiom to be a big brother to sb in sense division (c) to the compound Big Brother in the compound division. However, in the first restructured entry, this cross reference is removed as both the idiom and the compound are placed in the same sense division.

E. In the *Robert/Collins*, certain items do not seem to fit in the sense divisions they are placed in. For instance, the example a tragedy? that's rather a big word does not seem to fit in sense division (d): big used in this example has nothing to do with "important". Thus, in both restructured entries below, a new sense division has been created to accommodate this example and has been placed last in the first restructured entry and first in the second.

Also, the idioms he's got a big mouth, why can't you keep your big mouth shut! (sense division (e)) and to be big on (sense division (f)) do not seem to fit in the sense divisions in which they are placed in the *Robert/Collins*: the first two idioms seem to have nothing to do with "conceited" and the latter seems to have no relation to the sense of "generous". These items have been placed in a special idiom division in both restructured entries.

2.1 Sample Entry in Which Elements are Arranged to Suit the L1-L2 BIS

Overall Comments

The following entry is much like the *Robert/Collins* entry. The only major difference between the two is that in the *Robert/Collins* entry, most compounds are placed in a separate division while in the restructured entry below, most compounds are placed in sense divisions.

In order to identify compounds in both restructured entries, I used several unilingual dictionaries, including *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* and *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* as well as *The Encyclopedia Britannica* (for proper nouns). A two-word item was deemed a compound if it was found as a headword or was separately defined in these sources and expressed a single idea. Only two items were not listed as headwords or separately defined in any of the sources I consulted: big-sounding and the Big Ten. However, I consider them as compounds as Marchand indicates that some combinations that have participles as second words, such as big-sounding, can be considered as compounds[2] and both items exhibit a single idea. The expression big brother is separately defined in both *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* and *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language*. However I consider it as example illustrating the use of the word big in the sense of "in age".

To help me distinguish idioms from examples, I consulted idiom dictionaries such as the *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English* (volume 2) and the *Longman Dictionary of English Idioms* and several unilingual dictionaries such as the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* and the *Collins Dictionary of the English Language*. However, not all of the expressions listed as idioms in the restructured entries were found listed as idioms. For instance, I could not find to be a big brother to sb listed as an idiom. However, I considered expressions such as this one as idioms as their meanings obviously cannot be derived from the meanings of the words that make them up.

---

[2] Marchand 21.

Restructured Entry

big...1 *adj* (a) *(in height) person, building, tree* grand. **a ~ fellow** un grand gaillard; **a ~ man** un homme grand et fort; **to grow ~** *or* **~ger** grandir; *V also* **1b**.
(b) *(in bulk, amount) parcel, book, fruit* gros (*f* grosse). **to grow ~** *or* **~er** grossir; **a ~ stick** un gros bâton (*V also* **stick**); **~ with child** grosse, enceinte *V* **drum, money** *etc* **CPD** *(Mus)* **~ band** grand orchestre *(années 40-50)*; *(Phys)* **~ bang** big-bang *m*; *(Brit)* **Big Ben** Big Ben *m*; **~-boned** bien *or* fortement charpenté; *(US Astron)* **the Big Dipper** la Grande Ourse; *[fairground]* **~ dipper** montagnes *fpl* russes; *(Aut)* **~ end** tête *f* de bielle; *(Brit)* **~ game** gros gibier; **~ game hunter** chasseur *m* de gros gibier; **~ game hunting** chasse *f* au gros gibier; *(US: $1000)* **a ~ one**** (un billet de) mille dollars; **~ toe** gros orteil; **~ top** *(circus)* cirque *m*; *(main tent of it)* grand chapiteau.
(c) *(in age)* grand, aîné. **my ~ brother** mon grand frère, mon frère aîné; **I am ~ enough to know** je suis assez grand pour savoir **CPD** *(Pol etc)* **Big Brother** l'État omnipresent; **Big Brother is watching you** l'État vous a à l'oeil **IDM to be a ~ brother to sb** servir de conseiller à qn.
(d) *(important)* grand, important, remarquable, marquant. **a ~ event** un événement marquant; **a ~ lie** un gros mensonge; **a ~ man** un grand homme, un homme marquant *or* remarquable *or* important; **to look ~** faire l'important; *(fig: fashionable)* **boots are ~ this year*** les bottes sont in** cette année **CPD ~ bug****, *(Brit)* **~ noise***, **~ shot*** huile** *f*, grosse légume**; **~ business** les grandes entreprises, les grandes firmes; *(US Univ)* **the Big Eight/Ten** les huit/dix grandes universités du Centre-Ouest; *(Pol)* **the Big Four** les Quatre (Grands); *(person)* **he's a ~ name in politics** c'est un grand nom de la politique; **~-sounding** *idea, plan etc* prétentieux; *name* ronflant, pompeux; **the Big Ten** *V* **the Big Eight**; **~-time*** *politician, industrialist* de première catégorie; *part, role* de premier plan; *farming* sur une grande échelle; **~-time gambler** flambeur** *m*; **to make the ~ time*** arriver, réussir; **~wig**** grosse légume**, huile** *f* **IDM the ~ger they are, the harder they fall** plus haut ils sont arrivés, plus dure sera la chute; **to do things in a ~ way** faire les choses en grand; **to have ~ ideas** voir grand.
(e) *(conceited) person* prétentieux; *words* ambitieux. **CPD ~head*** crâneur* *m*, -euse* *f*; **~headed*** crâneur*; **~ talk** grands discours, fanfaronnades *fpl* **IDM he's too ~ for his boots** il a des prétentions; **he's got a ~ head*** il est crâneur*.
(f) *(generous)* grand, généreux. **CPD ~-hearted** au grand coeur; **to be ~-hearted** avoir bon coeur, avoir du coeur; **a ~-hearted fellow** un homme de coeur **IDM a heart as ~ as yours** un coeur aussi grand *or* aussi généreux que le vôtre; *(iro)* **that's ~ of you!*** quelle générosité! *(iro)*.
(g) *(extreme, inflated)* grand. **a tragedy? that's rather a ~ word** une tragédie? c'est un bien grand mot.
2 IDM to be ~ on** *thing* être grand amateur *or* un fana* de; *person* adorer, être un fan* de; **he's got a ~ mouth*** il ne sait pas se taire; **why can't you keep your ~ mouth shut!*** pas moyen que tu te taises!*, tu aurais mieux fait de la boucler!**.
3 CPD ~-mouth* gueulard(e)** *m(f)*, hâbleur *m*, -euse *f*; **he is just a ~-mouth** il ne sait jamais la boucler**; **~-mouthed*** fort en gueule*; **to be ~-mouthed*** avoir une grande gueule*.[3]

[3] Since these compounds are the only ones that do not fit into any sense divisions, I have simply placed them in a special compound division after all sense divisions instead of creating a new sense division to accommodate them.

Comments on Arrangement Techniques

1. Ordering of Synonymous Equivalents

In the restructured entry, synonymous equivalents are given for the headword in sense divisions (c), (d) and (f), for the compounds big-boned, big bug (big noise, big shot), big business, big-mouth, big-sounding, big talk and bigwig, and for the idioms why can't you keep your big mouth shut!, a heart as big as yours and to be big on. In principle, the L1-L2 BIS would want to have synonymous equivalents given for all of these linguistic items placed in descending order of frequency. To help me determine such an ordering, I conducted a small survey with five francophone informants, asking each to place the equivalents in descending order of frequency.[4] If at least four out of my five informants gave the equivalents in the same order, only then was that order accepted. As a result, I was able to place only some of the synonymous equivalents for the above linguistic items in decreasing order of frequency: all of the equivalents for the headword in sense division (d) except for grand as opposed to important, and those for the compounds big-boned, big business and big talk. The remainder, for lack of a consensus, are kept in the order they are presented in the *Robert/Collins*.[5]

---

[4] They are Geneviève Mareschal, Anne-Sophie Parent, France Boissonneault, Caroline Bouchard and Louise Lanoix. All have an excellent knowledge of both French and English.

[5] In some cases, the fact that three of my informants were Québécois and two used European French may have influenced the results. For instance, my three Québécois informants said they thought the equivalent être un fana de is used less frequently than être grand amateur de because the former is not commonly used in Quebec. Thus, if my informants had all had the same background (Québécois or French), the results may have been different is such cases.

2. **Ordering of Meanings**

The L1-L2 BIS might prefer meanings to be in decreasing order of frequency as he is unlikely to know the equivalents in his foreign language for the adjective big used even in frequently used senses. Since meanings in the *Robert/Collins* entry for the adjective big are roughly in the same order as those in the *Funk & Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary*, which claims to place senses in decreasing order of frequency (the only differences are that the *Funk & Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary* places sense (d) after sense (e) and omits sense (c)), and since frequency seems to be a predominant factor in the ordering of senses in the *Robert/Collins*, the senses in the *Robert/Collins* were assumed to be in decreasing order of frequency of occurrence and were thus retained in this order in the above restructured entry.

3. **Ordering of Contexts**

In the restructured entry, several contexts of the headword appear in sense divisions (a), (b) and (e) while more than one is given for the compounds big-time and big-sounding in sense division (d) and for the idiom to be big on in the idiom division. In principle, they should be arranged in decreasing order of frequency of occurrence, since that seems to be best suited to the needs of the L1-L2 BIS.

To help me place the above contexts in the appropriate order, I asked five anglophone informants to place them in decreasing order of frequency.[6] The *Robert/Collins* ordering of contexts was changed only when at least four out of the five informants came up with the same answer. Thus, only the following contexts are in decreasing order of frequency based on this small survey: the contexts represented by the context words "parcel", "book" and "fruit" in sense

[6] They are Carol Card, Geraldine Sharpe, Katherine Barber, Margaret Bowles and Amanda Saper. All have experience either in translation or lexicography.

division (b), the words "thing" and "person" for the idiom to be big on, the context words "politician" and "industrialist" as opposed to "part", "role" and "farming" for the compound big-time, and finally the context words "idea" and "plan" as opposed to the context word "name" for the compound big-sounding.

4. Placement of Meaning Discrimination Devices

As in the *Robert/Collins*, meaning discrimination devices are given in the SL and are placed before the equivalents, in keeping with Iannucci's belief that the role of such devices is to allow the L1-L2 user to choose from among a list of equivalents in his foreign language by indicating meanings of the SL headword in his native tongue.

5. Ordering of Examples

Examples are ordered according to the meanings of the headword, as in the *Robert/Collins*. Where possible, they are ordered logically within meanings. For example, in sense division (d), a number of adjective-noun collocations (e.g. a big event, a big lie etc.) are grouped together and alphabetized according to collocates.

6. Placement of Idioms and Compounds

Since the L1-L2 BIS generally knows which sense division to look under in order to find idioms and compounds, the latter are placed in sense divisions. I have chosen to place them after examples. However, several of them could just as easily have been mixed in with the examples. For example, in sense division (c), the compound Big Brother and the idiom to be a big brother to sb could have been placed alongside the example my big brother, given that the

elements are the same in the collocation, the compound and the idiom. And in sense division (d), the compound big business could have been placed along with examples such as a big man and a big lie and alphabetized accordingly.

2.2 Sample Entry in Which Elements are Arranged to Suit the L2-L1 AU

Overall Comment

There are two major differences between this entry and the *Robert/Collins* entry: the ordering of the senses is reversed and idioms are given in a separate category in this restructured entry. Furthermore, since I consider more multiword lexical units as compounds than the *Robert/Collins* does, the compound division in this entry is longer than the one in the *Robert/Collins*.

Restructured Entry

big...1 *adj* **(a)** (*extrême*) grand. **a tragedy? that's rather a ~ word** une tragédie? c'est un bien grand mot.
(b) *(noble, désintéressé)* généreux, grand.
(c) *(prétentieux) person* prétentieux; *words* ambitieux.
(d) *(important)* grand, important, marquant, remarquable. **a ~ event** un événement marquant; **a ~ lie** un gros mensonge; **a ~ man** un grand homme, un homme marquant *or* remarquable *or* important; **to look ~** faire l'important; *(fig: fashionable)* **boots are ~ this year*** les bottes sont in** cette année.
(e) *(âgé)* aîné, grand. **my ~ brother** mon grand frère, mon frère aîné *V also* **2,3**; **I am ~ enough to know** je suis assez grand pour savoir.
(f) *(en dimensions, quantité) fruit, book, parcel* gros (*f* grosse). **to grow ~** *or* **~er** grossir *V also* **1g**; **a ~ stick** un gros bâton (*V also* **stick**); **~ with child** grosse, enceinte; *V* **drum, money** *etc.*
(g) *(de haute taille) person, building, tree* grand. **a ~ fellow** un grand gaillard; **a ~ man** un homme grand et fort; **to grow ~** *or* **~ger** grandir.
2 IDM he's too ~ for his boots il a des prétentions; *(iro)* **that's ~ of you!*** quelle générosité! *(iro)*; **to be a ~ brother to sb** servir de conseiller à qn; **to be ~ on**** *person* adorer, être un fan* de; *thing* être un fana* *or* grand amateur de; **to do things in a big way** faire les choses en grand; **he's got a ~ head*** il est crâneur*; **to have ~ ideas** voir grand; **he's got a ~ mouth*** il ne sait pas se taire; **why can't you keep your ~ mouth shut!*** pas moyen que tu te taises!*, tu aurais

mieux fait de la boucler!** *V also* 3; **the ~ger they are, the harder they fall** plus haut ils sont arrivés, plus dure sera la chute; **a heart as ~ as yours** un coeur aussi généreux *or* aussi grand que le vôtre.
3 CPD (Mus) ~ **band** grand orchestre *(années 40-50)*; *(Phys)* ~ **bang** big-bang *m*; *(Brit)* **Big Ben** Big Ben *m*; **~-boned** bien *or* fortement charpenté; *(Pol etc)* **Big Brother** l'État omnipresent; **Big Brother is watching you** l'État vous a à l'oeil; ~ **bug****, *(Brit)* ~ **noise***, ~ **shot*** grosse légume**, huile** *f*; ~ **business** les grandes entreprises, les grandes firmes; *(US Astron)* **the Big Dipper** la Grande Ourse; *[fairground]* ~ **dipper** montagnes *fpl* russes; *(US Univ)* **the Big Eight/Ten** les huit/dix grandes universités du Centre-Ouest; *(Aut)* ~ **end** tête *f* de bielle; *(Pol)* **the Big Four** les Quatre (Grands); (Brit) ~ **game** gros gibier; ~ **game hunter** chasseur *m* de gros gibier; ~ **game hunting** chasse *f* au gros gibier; **~head*** crâneur* *m*, -euse* *f*; **~headed*** crâneur*; **~-hearted** au grand coeur; **to be ~-hearted** avoir bon coeur, avoir du coeur; **a ~-hearted fellow** un homme de coeur; **~-mouth*** gueulard(e)** *m(f)*, hâbleur *m*, -euse *f*; **he is just a ~-mouth** il ne sait jamais la boucler**; **~-mouthed*** fort en gueule*; **to be ~-mouthed*** avoir une grande gueule*; *(person)* **he's a ~ name in politics** c'est un grand nom de la politique; *(US: $1000)* **a ~ one**** (un billet de) mille dollars; **~-sounding** *name* pompeux, ronflant; *idea, plan etc* prétentieux; ~ **talk** fanfaronnades *fpl*, grands discours; **the Big Ten** *V* **the Big Eight**; **~-time*** *farming* sur une grande échelle; *part, role* de premier plan; *politician, industrialist* de première catégorie; **~-time gambler** flambeur** *m*; **to make the ~ time*** arriver, réussir; ~ **toe** gros orteil; ~ **top** *(circus)* cirque *m*; *(main tent of it)* grand chapiteau; **~wig**** grosse légume**, huile** *f*.

Comments on Arrangement Techniques

1. **Ordering of Synonymous Equivalents**

Equivalents are placed in alphabetical order for the L2-L1 AU, who may already have an equivalent in mind before going to the entry.

2. **Ordering of Meanings**

Senses have been placed in increasing order of frequency (as opposed to decreasing order of frequency in the previous restructured entry) as the L2-L1 AU might be inclined to look up less frequently used senses more often than more frequently used ones.

3. Ordering of Contexts

The L2-L1 AU might also prefer to have contexts in increasing order of frequency. Therefore, the order of contexts in the previous restructured entry is reversed, except for those that were not placed in descending order of frequency to begin with.

4. Placement of Meaning Discrimination Devices

In the first restructured entry, the meaning discrimination devices for each of the seven meanings of the adjective big are placed before the equivalent since they identify meanings of the headword. They are in the SL, the L1-L2 BIS's native language, to help him identify meanings easily. In this entry, they are also placed before the equivalent, but for a different reason: as Al-Kasimi states, when they are in this position, they can specify not only the meaning of the headword but also that of the equivalents. Unlike those in the previous entry, they are given in the TL, which is the L2-L1 AU's stronger language.

5. Ordering of Examples

Examples are ordered according to the meanings of the headword, as in both the *Robert/Collins* and the first restructured entry, since, as indicated in the chapter on examples, the L2-L1 AU is normally able to find examples based on the meanings of the headword. Only the L2-L1 BIS might require examples to be ordered according to formal criteria first, as is done in the *Van Dale*.

6. **Placement of Idioms and Compounds**

The greatest difference between the two restructured entries for big is seen in the placement of compounds and idioms. Idioms and compounds are placed on their own, and not within sense divisions, in this entry as the L2-L1 AU generally does not know the meaning of as many idioms and compounds as the L1-L2 BIS does. The size of the sense divisions has shrunk considerably in the second restructured entry because of the large number of idioms and compounds that have been removed from them.

Both compounds and idioms are ordered alphabetically. While the ordering of the compounds is clear, the alphabetization of the idioms is less obvious. Nine idioms are alphabetized according to verbs that precede the headword while the last two do not lend themselves to this ordering technique: the first four idioms begin with the verb be, the fifth with the verb do, the sixth, seventh and eighth with the verb have and the ninth with the verb keep. The idioms the bigger they are the harder they fall and a heart as big as yours come last.

3. General Conclusion

My main goal in writing this thesis was to clearly describe the various arrangement techniques that are possible for a number of GBD entry elements. What comes out most clearly in this thesis is that the bilingual lexicographer often has several options open to him when arranging elements of the GBD entry. The variety of techniques available to the lexicographer was clearly illustrated in the first part of this conclusion, where all the techniques described in this thesis are listed.

Also clear is the fact that the bilingual lexicographer must carefully think out how entry elements should be arranged in terms of his intended user(s), as several of the techniques described herein benefit specific types of GBD-users. The influence of users on the

arrangement of individual entry elements and consequently on the overall structure of the GBD entry was clearly brought out in the second part of this conclusion, where two different versions of the same entry were provided based on the needs of two types of GBD-users.

This thesis has focussed on only one important task of the lexicographer: the arrangement of material within the entry. Other tasks include the selection and compilation of material. It is hoped that this thesis stimulates further discussion and research on all of these subjects. GBDs are far from being perfect reference tools and it is only through further research on all aspects of bilingual dictionary methodology that GBDs of the future will be improved to meet the needs of their users.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Aisenstadt, E. "Collocability Restrictions in Dictionaries." *Review of Applied Linguistics. Dictionaries and Their Users: Papers from the 1978 B.A.A.L. Seminar on Lexicography.* Ed. R.R.K. Hartmann. 45-46 (1979): 71-74.

Al, B. "Dictionnaire de thème et dictionnaire de version." *Revue de Phonétique Appliquée. Colloque de traductologie: Université de l'État à Mons, les 24 et 25 mars 1983.* 66-67-68 (1983): 203-11.

Al-Kasimi, Ali M. *Linguistics and Bilingual Dictionaries.* Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977.

Bally, Charles. *Linguistique générale et linguistique française.* 2nd ed. Bern: A. Francke S.A., 1944.

Bauer, Laurie. *English Word-Formation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Benson, Morton. "Collocations and Idioms." *Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning.* Ed. Robert Ilson. Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd. and The British Council, 1985. 61-68.

Benson, Morton, Evelyn Benson, and Robert Ilson. Introduction. *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English: A Guide to Word Combinations.* Comp. Benson, Benson and Ilson. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1986. ix-xxxvi.

Cowie, Anthony P. "The Place of Illustrative Material and Collocations in the Design of a Learner's Dictionary." *In Honour of A.S. Hornby.* Ed. Peter Strevens. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978. 127-39.

---. "The Treatment of Collocations and Idioms in Learners' Dictionaries." *Applied Linguistics* II (1981): 223-35.

Dubois, Jean. "Models of the Dictionary: Evolution in Dictionary Design." *Applied Linguistics* II (1981): 236-49.

Gedney, William. "Comments." *Problems in Lexicography.* Report of the Conference on Lexicography held at Indiana University, November 11-12, 1960. Ed. Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta. Bloomington: Indiana University; The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967. 229-34.

Hiorth, Finngeir. "Arrangement of Meanings in Lexicography." *Lingua* IV (1954-55): 413-24.

Iannucci, James E. "Meaning Discrimination in Bilingual Dictionaries: A New Lexicographical Technique." *Modern Language Journal* XLI (1957): 272-81.

---. "Meaning Discrimination in Bilingual Dictionaries." *Problems in Lexicography.* Report of the Conference on Lexicography held at Indiana University, November 11-12, 1960. Ed. Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta. Bloomington: Indiana University; The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967. 201-16.

Kipfer, Barbara A. "Methods of Ordering Senses within Entries." *Lexeter '83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9-12 September 1983.* Ed. R.R.K. Hartmann. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984. 101-08.

Kromann, Hans-Peder, Theis Riiber, and Poul Rosbach. "'Active' and 'Passive' Bilingual Dictionaries: The Sčerba Concept Reconsidered." *Lexeter '83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9-12 September 1983.* Ed. R.R.K. Hartmann. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984. 207-15.

Makkai, Adam. *Idiom Structure in English.* The Hague: Mouton & Co. N.V., Publishers, 1972.

Marchand, Hans. *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation: A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach.* 2nd ed. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1969.

Martin, Samuel E. "Selection and Presentation of Ready Equivalents in a Translation Dictionary." *Problems in Lexicography.* Report of the Conference on Lexicography held at Indiana University, November 11-12, 1960. Ed. Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta. Bloomington: Indiana University; The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967. 153-59.

Mdee, James S. "Constructing an Entry in a Learner's Dictionary of Standard Kiswahili." *Lexeter '83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9-12 September 1983.* Ed. R.R.K. Hartmann. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984. 237-41.

Mel'čuk, Igor. "Un nouveau type de dictionnaire: le Dictionnaire explicatif et combinatoire du français contemporain." *Dictionnaire explicatif et combinatoire de français contemporain. Recherches lexico-sémantiques I.* Ed. Igor Mel'čuk *et al.* Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1984. 3-16.

Meyer, Ingrid. "Towards a New Type of General Bilingual Dictionary." Ph.D. Thesis. University of Montreal: 1986.

Mitchell, T.F. "Linguistic 'Goings On': Collocations and Other Lexical Matters Arising on the Syntagmatic Record." *Archivum Linguisticum: A Review of Comparative Philology and General Linguistics* ns II (1971): 35-69.

Pedersen, Viggo Hjørnager. "Reflections on the Treatment of Prepositions in Bilingual Dictionaries, and Suggestions for a Statistical Approach." *Lexeter '83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9-12 September 1983.* Ed. R.R.K. Hartmann. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984. 258-67.

Roberts, Roda P. "The Bilingual Canadian Dictionary Project." 1989.

Roberts, Roda P. *et al.* "Bilingual Dictionary Methodology." Version 3. May 7, 1990.

Steiner, Roger J. "Guidelines for Reviewers of Bilingual Dictionaries." *Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America* 6 (1984): 166-81.

Tomaszczyk, Jerzy. "Dictionaries: Users and Uses." *Glottodidactica: An International Journal of Applied Linguistics* XII (1979): 103-19.

Ullmann, Stephen. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell & Mott Ltd., 1962.

Van Sterkenburg, P., W. Martin, and B. Al. "A New Van Dale Project: Bilingual Dictionaries on One and the Same Monolingual Basis." *Lexicography in the Electronic Age. Proceedings of a Symposium held in Luxembourg, 7-9 July, 1981.* Ed. J. Goetschalckx and L. Rolling. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1982. 221-37.

Wallace, M.J. "What Is an Idiom? An Applied Linguistic Approach." *Review of Applied Linguistics. Dictionaries and Their Users: Papers from the 1978 B.A.A.L. Seminar on Lexicography.* Ed. R.R.K. Hartmann. 45-46 (1979): 63-70.

Williams, Edwin B. "Analysis of the Problem of Meaning Discrimination in Spanish and English Bilingual Lexicography." *Babel* VI (1960): 121-25.

Wilton, Murray Thomas. "Bilingual Lexicography: Theoretical Foundations and Practical Methodology, with Special Reference to Canadian French and English." Ph.D. Thesis. Simon Fraser University: 1978.

Zgusta, Ladislav. *Manual of Lexicography.* Prague: Academia, Publishing House of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, 1971.

2. DICTIONARIES CONSULTED

A. Unilingual Dictionaries

The American Heritage Dictionary. Second College Edition. Ed. Margery S. Berube *et al.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1982.

Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary. Ed. John Sinclair *et al.* London: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd, 1987.

Collins Dictionary of the English Language. Ed. Patrick Hanks *et al.* Glasgow: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., 1979.

A Dictionary of American Idioms. 2nd ed. Comp. M.T. Boatner, J.E. Gates, and Adam Makkai. New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1987.

Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. Ed. R.R.K. Hartmann and F.C. Stork. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972.

Dictionnaire des expressions et locutions: le Trésor des manières de dire anciennes et nouvelles. Comp. Alain Rey and Sophie Chantreau. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 1989.

Dictionnaire explicatif et combinatoire du français contemporain. Recherches lexico-sémantiques I. Ed. Igor Mel'čuk *et al.* Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1984.

English Idioms and How to Use Them. Comp. Jennifer Seidl and W. McMordie. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1978.

Funk & Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary. Canadian Edition. Ed. Walter S. Avis *et al.* Toronto: Fitzhenry & Whiteside Limited, 1978.

Gage Canadian Dictionary. Ed. Walter S. Avis *et al.* Toronto: Gage Publishing Limited, 1983.

Le Petit Robert 1: Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française. Ed. Paul Robert *et al.* Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 1984.

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. 2nd ed. Ed. Randolph Quirk *et al.* Essex, England: Longman Group UK Limited, 1987.

Longman Dictionary of English Idioms. Ed. Thomas Hill Long *et al.* Harlow and London: Longman Group Limited, 1979.

Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English Volume 1: Verbs with Prepositions & Particles. Comp. A.P. Cowie and R. Mackin. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English Volume 2: Phrase, Clause & Sentence Idioms. Comp. A.P. Cowie, R. Mackin, and I.R. McCaig. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

The Random House Dictionary of the English Language. 2nd ed. Ed. Stuart Berg Flexner *et al.* New York: Random House, Inc., 1987.

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. Ed. Frederick C. Mish *et al.* Springfield, Mass.: Merriam-Webster Inc., 1984.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language. Ed. Philip Babcock Gove *et al.* Springfield, Mass.: Merriam-Webster Inc., 1986.

B. Bilingual Dictionaries

Collins/Robert French-English English-French Dictionary (*Robert/Collins Dictionnaire français-anglais anglais-français*). 2nd ed. Ed. Beryl T. Atkins *et al.* Glasgow: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd; Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 1987.

Collins Spanish-English English-Spanish Dictionary (*Diccionario Español-Inglés Inglés-Español*). Ed. Colin Smith, Manuel Bermejo, and Eugenio Chang-Rodríguez. London: William Collins & Co. Ltd., 1971.

Dictionnaire français anglais. Ed. Marguerite-Marie Dubois *et al.* Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1981.

The Follett/Zanichelli Italian Dictionary English-Italian/Italian-English. Ed. Giuseppe Ragazzini, Adele Biagi and Camilla Roatta. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1967.

Harrap's New Standard French and English Dictionary. Rev. ed. 4 vols. Ed. R.P.L. Ledésert and Margaret Ledésert. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972-1980.

Robert & Signorelli Dictionnaire français-italien italien-français (Robert & Signorelli Dizionario francese-italiano italiano-francese). Ed. Paul Robert and Augusto Arizzi *et al.* Paris: SNL Dictionnaire Le Robert; Milano: Casa Editrice Carlo Signorelli S.p.A., 1981.

Van Dale Groot Woordenboek Engels-Nederlands. Ed. W. Martin *et al.* Utrecht/Antwerpen: Van Dale Lexicographie bv, 1984.

Van Dale Groot Woordenboek Nederlands-Engels. Ed. W. Martin *et al.* Utrecht/Antwerpen: Van Dale Lexicographie bv, 1986.