
REGISTER AND REGISTER LABELING IN DICTIONARIES

by

Tiphaine Crenn

**School of Translation and Interpretation
University of Ottawa**

Supervised by

**Roda P. Roberts, Ph.D.
School of Translation and Interpretation**

**Thesis submitted to
the School of Graduate Studies and Research
of the University of Ottawa
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of M.A. in Translation**

**Tiphaine Crenn
University of Ottawa
1996.**



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-19940-1

Canada



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Roberts for her just patience, boundless knowledge and unshakeable determination. Without her wisdom and competence, this thesis might have had the gestation period of an elephant's. Words can never express my deepest gratitude to her for the concern she has shown for my progress, a concern she shows for all her students, as well as for the time she is willing to spend with all of us.

I would also like to publicly thank all my colleagues at the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary*. I am forever indebted to Michael Toope for answering all my questions about the intricacies of WordPerfect and for his welcome encouragement throughout the months. I am very grateful, also, to Béatrice Baffert who has kindly helped with all things French and who, most importantly, likes to laugh. Thanks also to Sandy Hamilton, comrade-in-arms, for generously sharing tips and helpful hints.

And though they may never read this, I am very indebted to my mother Renée Ward, my friends Michelle Brattain, Andrew Milne and Gina Cox for all their emotional and material support, without which this thesis would not have been done in the first place and without which I might never have come to Canada.

ABSTRACT

Dictionaries employ usage labels to warn the user of restrictions on the use of a word. Register labels are just one of several types of usage labels. Differentiating between various usages has been a practice since the very beginnings of monolingual French and English lexicography in the seventeenth century. In fact, the notion of "correct" usage was in part promulgated by these early lexicographers and their followers. This tradition of prescriptive lexicography is still alive today.

However, the advent of sociolinguistics in the latter half of this century, and the concept of language varieties, which has emerged from sociolinguistic studies, has had an impact on lexicography. In theory, dictionaries now generally recognize that register, or use-related varieties of language (i.e. tied to the situation in which the speaker uses language), is not a question of right and wrong, only one of appropriateness. In practice, however, there are discrepancies from dictionary to dictionary in the treatment of register and register labeling.

An in-depth look at the front matter of a few dictionaries, monolingual and bilingual, reveals both the lack of a clear notion of register in lexicography and inadequate explanation of the basis on which words are labeled for register. An extensive examination of the actual entries found within these dictionaries, however, reveals a certain common thread in register labeling since some labels can be found in all dictionaries, and certain words are always labeled.

Although some consistency in register labeling does exist, marking words for register is always problematic since it is subjective. An examination of a few entries prepared at the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary* project shows the difficulty of labeling register consistently even when specific guidelines are proposed to lexicographers.

The usefulness of consulting on-line corpora as a more objective basis for labeling is examined, and certain recommendations are made to improve the consistency of register labeling in bilingual lexicography in general, and especially in the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary*.

RÉSUMÉ

Les dictionnaires utilisent les marques d'usage afin de mettre en garde l'utilisateur contre des restrictions d'emploi s'appliquant à un mot. Les marques de registre ne constituent qu'une marque d'usage parmi d'autres. Depuis ses débuts au 17^e siècle, la lexicographie monolingue française et anglaise différencie les nombreux usages. En effet, ce sont en partie les premiers lexicographes (et leurs disciples) qui ont répandu l'idée du "bon" usage. Cette tradition prescriptive en lexicographie existe encore de nos jours.

Cependant, l'apparition de la sociolinguistique dans la seconde moitié de ce siècle, et la notion des variétés de langue issue des études sociolinguistiques, a influencé la lexicographie. En théorie, les dictionnaires reconnaissent maintenant que le registre, ou la langue reliée aux conditions d'emploi, n'est pas une question de bon ou de mauvais usage, mais d'usage approprié à la situation. Dans la pratique, néanmoins, les dictionnaires ne traitent pas tous le registre et les marques de registre de la même façon.

Une étude approfondie des préfaces de plusieurs dictionnaires monolingues et bilingues démontre à la fois l'absence de consensus sur la notion même de registre et un manque d'explications du processus de marquage. Cependant, l'étude d'un certain nombre d'entrées de ces dictionnaires fait apparaître des points communs en matière de marquage: tous les dictionnaires utilisent certaines marques, et certains mots ont toujours une marque.

En dépit d'une certaine uniformité dans le marquage de registre, la subjectivité des marques de registre reste un problème. L'étude de quelques entrées préparées pour le *Dictionnaire canadien bilingue* démontre combien il est difficile d'apposer des marques de registre de façon uniforme, même lorsque des directives ont été établies.

Nous étudions les possibilités offertes par l'utilisation des corpus informatisés comme base plus objective que les dictionnaires pour le marquage et nous faisons certaines recommandations afin d'améliorer l'uniformité du marquage de registre en lexicographie bilingue, et plus précisément dans le *Dictionnaire canadien bilingue*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Introduction</u>	1
0.1 <i>Presentation of the topic</i>	1
0.2 <i>Choice of topic</i>	2
0.3 <i>Complexity of the subject</i>	2
0.4 <i>Scope of the topic</i>	3
0.5 <i>Objectives</i>	4
0.6 <i>Methodology</i>	4
0.7 <i>Outline</i>	4
<u>Chapter 1 The origins of register labeling in dictionaries</u>	7
1.1 <i>Usage</i>	7
1.2 <i>Role of early dictionaries in establishing usage</i>	8
1.2.1 <i>Early French dictionaries</i>	9
1.2.1.1 <i>The sixteenth century</i>	9
1.2.1.2 <i>The seventeenth century</i>	10
1.2.1.3 <i>The eighteenth century</i>	13
1.2.2 <i>Early English dictionaries</i>	15
1.2.2.1 <i>The seventeenth century</i>	15
1.2.2.2 <i>The eighteenth century</i>	17
1.2.3 <i>Early bilingual English/French dictionaries</i>	20
1.2.3.1 <i>The sixteenth century</i>	20
1.2.3.2 <i>The seventeenth century</i>	21
1.2.3.3 <i>The eighteenth century</i>	22
1.3 <i>Conclusion</i>	23
<u>Chapter 2 From language variation to register studies</u>	26
2.1 <i>Language Variation</i>	26
2.2 <i>Register</i>	30
2.3 <i>Conclusion</i>	40
<u>Chapter 3 Register and Lexicography</u>	42
3.1 <i>Register and theoretical lexicography</i>	43
3.2 <i>Register and dictionary front matter</i>	49
3.2.1 <i>Monolingual English Dictionaries</i>	50
3.2.2 <i>Comparison of Monolingual English Dictionaries</i>	54
3.2.3 <i>Monolingual French Dictionaries</i>	56
3.2.4 <i>Comparison of Monolingual French Dictionaries</i>	60
3.2.5 <i>Bilingual English/French Dictionaries</i>	62
3.2.6 <i>Comparison of Bilingual English/French Dictionaries</i>	66
3.2.7 <i>Conclusions on register labeling as presented in the front matter</i>	67

Chapter 4	<u>Register labeling within dictionary entries</u>	70
4.1	<i>Method of selection and analysis of entries</i>	70
4.2	<i>Comparison of monolingual English non-Canadian dictionaries</i>	75
4.3	<i>Comparison of monolingual English non-Canadian dictionaries with an English Canadian dictionary</i>	79
4.4	<i>Comparison of monolingual French non-Canadian dictionaries</i>	82
4.5	<i>Comparison of monolingual French non-Canadian dictionaries with a French Canadian dictionary</i>	87
4.6	<i>Comparison of headwords in bilingual non-Canadian English/French dictionaries</i>	90
4.7	<i>Comparison of headwords in bilingual non-Canadian dictionaries and a bilingual Canadian dictionary</i>	94
4.8	<i>Comparison of headwords in monolingual and bilingual non-Canadian dictionaries</i>	97
4.9	<i>Comparison of headwords in monolingual and bilingual Canadian and non-Canadian dictionaries</i>	103
4.9.1	<i>Monolingual and bilingual Canadian dictionaries</i>	103
4.9.2	<i>Monolingual and bilingual non-Canadian and Canadian dictionaries</i>	106
4.10	<i>General conclusions on headword labeling in dictionaries</i>	106
4.11	<i>Study of the register of equivalents in bilingual dictionaries</i>	110
4.12	<i>General conclusions on equivalent labeling in bilingual dictionaries</i>	121
4.13	<i>General conclusions on labeling practices</i>	121
Chapter 5	<u>Register Labeling in the Bilingual Canadian Dictionary</u>	123
5.1	<i>General information on register labels in the BCD</i>	124
5.1.1	<i>Types of register labels</i>	124
5.1.2	<i>Elements labeled for register</i>	125
5.1.3	<i>Placement of register labels</i>	126
5.1.4	<i>Determining register labels</i>	126
5.2	<i>Register labeling within entries prepared for the BCD</i>	127
5.3	<i>Analysis of specific BCD entries</i>	130
5.4	<i>General Conclusions</i>	149
5.4.1	<i>Initial choices of labels</i>	149
5.4.2	<i>Reviser changes to labels</i>	150
5.4.3	<i>Comparison with monolingual dictionaries</i>	150
5.4.4	<i>Comparison with bilingual dictionaries</i>	151
5.4.5	<i>Consistency within the BCD</i>	154
Chapter 6	<u>Corpus use in register analysis</u>	156
6.1	<i>The BCD corpus</i>	157
6.2	<i>Corpus analysis for determining register</i>	158
6.3	<i>Conclusion on corpus use for register labeling</i>	176
Chapter 7	<u>Conclusion</u>	179
7.1	<i>Main points of the thesis</i>	179
7.2	<i>Recommendations for register labeling in the BCD</i>	181
7.2.1	<i>What levels of register should the BCD label?</i>	181
7.2.2	<i>How many labels should the BCD use?</i>	182
7.2.3	<i>On what basis should words be labeled?</i>	183

7.3	<i>General Conclusion</i>	189
<u>Appendices</u>		190
	<i>Appendix 1</i>	190
	<i>Appendix 2.a</i>	193
	<i>Appendix 2.b</i>	199
	<i>Appendix 2.c</i>	205
	<i>Appendix 2.d</i>	214
<u>Glossary</u>		223
<u>Bibliography</u>		225
	<i>Theoretical works</i>	225
	<i>Dictionaries</i>	230
<u>Index</u>		232
	<i>Dictionary index</i>	232
	<i>Word index</i>	234

Introduction

0.1 *Presentation of the topic*

General dictionaries provide the user with information about the meaning, the grammatical category, the pronunciation, and the spelling of words. Some also provide etymological information or equivalents and include examples to help the user employ the word in combination with other words. Furthermore, most dictionaries indicate in what social or pragmatic situation a word is appropriate: in other words, they contain information about the association of a word outside its purely linguistic context. This is because competent language use entails not only knowing how to combine words (grammar) and what the words denote (meaning) but also developing an instinct about the situations in which words can be used. Bilingual and learners' dictionaries bear a heavier responsibility than general monolingual dictionaries in cautioning users when a word may be inappropriate since the users of such dictionaries are generally not in full command of the language or one of the languages covered.

To indicate information about use and situation, most dictionaries resort to what are often called "register" labels or symbols. The words "vehicle", "car" and "wheels" all designate the same concept and belong to the same grammatical category, but they are not interchangeable in all social situations, and dictionaries have traditionally pointed out differences of situational association by a conventionalized system of labels or symbols. These labels and the underlying concept of register constitute the topic of this thesis.

0.2 *Choice of topic*

As a research assistant at the Bilingual Canadian Dictionary (BCD) project, it soon became apparent to me that, though register labels are used widely, their use is not at all consistent and the same word will not bear the same label from one dictionary to the next. Very frequently, one dictionary labels one sense of a word "slang" while the next labels the same sense "informal". I became interested in the notion of register in lexicography both because of these discrepancies between dictionaries and because the labels assigned by dictionaries sometimes went against my own intuitions. For instance, the *Dictionnaire du français contemporain* uses the label *populaire* for the verb **faucher** in the sense of "voler", though I have used the word in situations which had nothing to do with the working class, the usual economic class associated with the word "populaire." Moreover, the *Nouveau Petit Robert* assigns to the same sense of **faucher** the label *familier*. If dictionaries can agree that "faucher" is a transitive verb which follows a certain conjugation pattern, that it is spelled with "au" rather than "o", and that one of its senses is "voler", why can they not agree on the sorts of situations in which it might be used, or the kind of people who might be prone to use it?

0.3 *Complexity of the subject*

Few dictionaries provide justification for their register labels, though they sometimes give many details about other facets of their methodology. Questions that may arise from examining register labels in the microstructure of a dictionary can rarely be answered by a

brief consultation of that dictionary's front matter. In fact, most dictionaries do not even explain what they mean by "register", taking it for granted that the dictionary user will understand what the word covers.

Although register is an obvious and real concept that can be grasped intuitively, it is hard to pin down when one tries to study it in a logical, methodical way. There are several reasons for this. First, this concept, which I have chosen to term "register", is also called "style" or "status" in English, while in French, it is sometimes dubbed "niveaux de langue" or "marques stylistiques": the variety of designations leads to inevitable confusion. Secondly, the concept of register often overlaps with the concepts of usage, of linguistic norms and language varieties; yet, these four concepts are not synonymous. Thirdly, there are several approaches to the study of the concept, notably the sociolinguistic approach and the lexicographic approach, the quantitative and the non-quantitative approaches, and each of these general approaches lends itself to further sub-divisions. These factors, in addition to the dictionaries' relative silence on the subject, make register a complex topic of investigation.

0.4 *Scope of the topic*

Although register, or style as it is sometimes called, is an integral aspect of almost all applied language disciplines and cannot be examined without some recourse to sociolinguistics, this study will focus primarily on register in lexicography. The scope will be further reduced to an analysis of register in monolingual and bilingual general dictionaries in French and English; though register is also a feature of specialized dictionaries and usage

dictionaries, these more "limited" types of dictionaries, which do not try to describe the whole of language, have different methods and problems in dealing with register than do general language dictionaries.

0.5 *Objectives*

This thesis has four main objectives:

- 1) to trace the origin of register labeling in general dictionaries;
- 2) to examine theoretical ideas on register;
- 3) to assess register labeling practices in modern monolingual and bilingual general dictionaries; and
- 4) to suggest improvements in register labeling practices for commercial dictionaries in general, and more specifically in the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary*.

0.6 *Methodology*

This study of register is based on the analysis of three types of documentation:

- a) theoretical literature on register and related concepts in both lexicography and sociolinguistics;
- b) the front matters of several monolingual and bilingual dictionaries; and
- c) actual dictionary entries.

0.7 *Outline*

The thesis is divided into seven chapters.

Chapter 1: The origins of register labeling in dictionaries. This chapter discusses the

treatment of usage in lexicography. Usage labeling has existed since the very first monolingual French and English dictionaries and the traditions developed in the first two centuries of monolingual lexicography still have an influence today on both monolingual and bilingual lexicography.

Chapter 2: From language variation to register studies. In this chapter, the concept of language varieties in sociolinguistics is examined. Different approaches to language variety, in particular, variety linked to register, are discussed. Various sociolinguistic theories of register are briefly explained and compared.

Chapter 3: Register and lexicography. In contrast with sociolinguistics, lexicography has contributed very little to the analysis of register. Even the front matters of the dictionaries, which will be studied here, lack clear information about register and register labels. In this chapter, the information that does exist is analyzed and compared to sociolinguistic theory, and a working definition of register is established.

Chapter 4: Register labeling within dictionary entries. This chapter turns from theory to practice and analyzes actual labeling practices in five monolingual dictionaries of both French and English and five bilingual dictionaries. Consistencies and discrepancies between dictionaries are revealed and discussed.

Chapter 5: Register labeling in the Bilingual Canadian Dictionary. In this chapter, entries in preparation for the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary* are analyzed, particularly for changes in labels from version to version.

Chapter 6: Corpus use in register labeling. The BCD corpus is examined to help determine the usefulness of corpus analysis for register labeling.

Chapter 7: Conclusion. On the basis of the information gleaned from previous chapters as well as the conclusions derived from the analysis of the BCD entries, recommendations are made to help improve the consistency of register labeling.

Chapter 1

The origins of register labeling in dictionaries

Register labels in dictionaries are often listed under the broader category of "usage labels," which indicate "usage restrictions." Besides register labels, labels included under usage labels present restrictions of a temporal, regional, social, or technical nature. In each case, the labels are a caution to the user on the part of the lexicographer and warn that this word or this sense of a word is different in some way from the "general" or neutral part of the language whose presence is revealed by an absence of such labels. The concept of register is thus tied to the concept of usage since it seems to represent one aspect of usage.

In this chapter, the concept of usage in lexicography, which preceded that of register, will be examined. The perspective adopted is primarily historical: we will examine monolingual and bilingual dictionaries of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to identify changing views on usage as manifested by word selection and labeling.

1.1 Usage

The concept of usage is rather ambiguous. The word "usage" has been used in a linguistic sense since at least the seventeenth century.¹ David Crystal, in *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages* (1992:330), defines usage as "the collective speech and writing habits of a community." He adds, however, that "one person's usage will always be different from another's in certain respects." So usage is both communal and individual language habits. In fact, usage varies not only from one individual to another, but

¹ See the Oxford English Dictionary [CD-ROM], 2nd edition, 1994.

from one region to another, from one social group to another, and from one language situation to another: "les 'usages' peuvent être définis comme habitudes de discours à décrire et à circonscrire dans un lieu et un temps concrets...on parlera ainsi d'usages d'école,...de milieu,...de classe,...régionaux, scientifiques et techniques...Le langage se réalise diffracté dans des situations plus ou moins typées." (Tournier, 1992: 56)

The concept of usage also includes "the study of good, correct or standard uses of language as distinguished from bad, incorrect and non-standard uses." (Landau, 1989:174) A standard can be defined as "a prestige variety [of language], used as an institutional norm in a community." (Crystal, 1987:430) In France and England, efforts to impose a standard usage have been around since the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and this view of one standard usage was carried over to the New World and prospered.

1.2 Role of early dictionaries in establishing usage

From the sixteenth century onwards, dictionaries have played an important role in establishing usage, which the Oxford English Dictionary defines as "the established and customary use of language." Lexicographers have two methods at their disposal to express their views on usage: first, they select the words to be included in the dictionary, and second, they comment on certain words by assigning labels to them. A brief survey of the monolingual and bilingual lexicographic efforts in France and England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries reveals how the idea of usage came to be closely linked to the notion of a right and wrong usage. These early dictionaries used both word selection and labeling as a way to promulgate their vision of usage, which arose from a widespread desire to

promote a national linguistic standard. Though dictionaries have perhaps been most influential in matters of spelling, pronunciation and assigning meaning, this historical overview will concentrate on "usage restrictions."

1.2.1 *Early French dictionaries*

1.2.1.1 *The sixteenth century*

It is important to begin with Robert Estienne (1503-1559), although he produced no monolingual dictionaries, since his lexicographic achievements were important enough to influence the French dictionaries written 150 years later. He first published a Latin-French dictionary, the *Thesaurus* (1531). Then, in 1539, he published *Le Dictionnaire français-latin*, the first dictionary to put French in first place. Estienne's dictionaries were remarkable for the labor and research he devoted to them: he read widely in the classics and examined other lexicographic works. Unlike his predecessors, he made no attempt to develop fantastical etymologies and consistently labeled archaic words as such. He used idiomatic, everyday words as equivalents of the Latin words. For instance, the word *congerro* was defined as "compagnon en chose legiere & de nulle valleur, comme a jaser, babiller, railler, passer le temps en parolles joyeuses." (quoted in Brandon, 1967: 52) It must be noted, however, that he included very few vulgar ("populaire") words in the French explanations, and Brandon goes so far as to conclude that "Estienne fut ainsi, bien qu'inconsciemment, un instigateur de la malheureuse théorie de mots bas et nobles." (Brandon, 1967: 94)

After Estienne's death, Jean Nicot revised the *Dictionnaire françois-latin* and worked on his own dictionary, *Thrésor de la langue française*, which was published only after his own death in 1606. Some hail the *Thrésor* as the first French dictionary but, since it included some Latin, it cannot really be considered a truly monolingual dictionary. While Nicot was less careful than Estienne about including archaic words and labeling them as such, he was one of the first to use quotes from French authors to illustrate usage.

As a general rule, the more general dictionaries of the sixteenth and the early seventeenth excluded vulgar and taboo words, although they did not always shy away from informal ("familier") ones. If vulgar and taboo words were kept out of general dictionaries, they did surface occasionally in works such as Antoine Oudin's *Curiosités françoises pour servir de supplément aux dictionnaires...* which appeared in 1640 and included such words as "dadais" and "poétastre." (Matoré, 1968: 65)

1.2.1.2 *The seventeenth century*

As the seventeenth century progressed, people became more aware and critical of language use. The idea of a proper language which showed "good taste", as exemplified by the nobles and the Court, and the preoccupation with intellectual order and clarity led Cardinal Richelieu to create the Académie française in 1635, just as the Italians had created the Accademia della Crusca in 1582. The Académie took upon itself the task of producing a dictionary from the first days of its existence, although it was not actually finished until nearly sixty years later. However, linguistic purity became an obsession propounded by the reigning intellectuals. François de Malherbe urged writers to purge their language of

latinisms, provincialisms, technical terms, archaisms, and of course, vulgar and "low" words like "barbier" and "poitrine." (Matoré, 1968: 69) Claude Vaugelas, a member of the Académie who participated in the dictionary efforts, admitted, nevertheless, that "il sera toujours vrai qu'il y aura un bon et un mauvais Usage, que le mauvais sera composé de la pluralité des voix, et le bon de la plus saine partie de la Cour, et des Ecrivains du temps." (quoted in Matoré, 1968: 71)

In 1680, César Pierre Richelet published his *Dictionnaire français, contenant les mots et les matières, et plusieurs nouvelles remarques sur la langue française, ses expressions propres, figurées et burlesques, la prononciation des mots les plus difficiles, le genre des noms, le régime des verbes avec : les termes les plus connus des Arts, des Sciences, le tout tiré de l'usage et des bons auteurs de la langue française.*² Obviously influenced by the Académie and the spirit of the time, he omitted neologisms and could be considered a purist. He was, however, not as restrictive in his word choice as the Académie and holds the distinguished position of including the word "con", which then promptly disappeared from dictionaries until the 1960s.

Antoine Furetière, who was a member of the Académie until 1685 when he was kicked out for supposedly having absconded with parts of the Académie's dictionary, published his own in 1690: *Dictionnaire universel, contenant généralement tous les mots français tant vieux que modernes et les termes des sciences et des arts.* His work was more comprehensive than either Richelet's or the Académie's. Although he toed the line of purism, he saw himself in the role of a witness rather than an arbiter. He used the labels

² Since the Académie had secured exclusive rights to publish the French dictionary in 1674, Richelet was forced to have his dictionary published in Geneva.

rare, familier and *vulgaire*, but he was accused of not being thorough enough when it came to labeling archaisms or "low" words.

When the Académie finally published its dictionary in 1694, it outdid both Richelet's and Furetière's in terms of purity. It earned the praise of Dominique Bouhours because "[le vocabulaire] de l'Académie Française nous présente des richesses d'autant plus réelles qu'on y voit aucune trace des défauts que notre Langue avoit contractés dans la bouche du Peuple et des courtisans ignorans ou peu exacts." (quoted in Quémada, 1967: 213) In the introduction, the Académie had specified the sorts of words it would omit. Archaisms and "low" words were for the most part left out, although "on a pas laissé d'y en conserver quelques-uns, surtout quand ils ont encore quelque usage, en les qualifiant de vieux... On a eu soin aussi de marquer ceux qui commencent à vieillir et ceux qui ne sont pas du bel usage, et que l'on a qualifiés de bas ou de style familier." (quoted in Matoré, 1968: 83) Neologisms were avoided since the Académie "n'a pas même voulu se charger de plusieurs mots nouvellement inventés ni de certaines façons de parler affectées, que la licence et le caprice de la mode ont voulu introduire depuis peu." (quoted in Matoré, 1968: 83) The Académie left aside "les termes d'emportement ou qui blessent la pudeur : on ne les a pas mis dans le Dictionnaire, parce que les Honnestes gens évitent de les employer dans leurs discours." (quoted in Quémada, 1967: 211) Through these omissions, the dictionary gives a very skewed portrait of French at the end of the seventeenth century.

Nonetheless, some critics felt that *le Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was not pure enough³ and went so far as to compile a *Dictionnaire des Halles* (1696), based on words

³ It seems that the Academicians had strayed so far as to include the expressions "s'embrener dans une affaire" and "il a chié dans ma malle."

found in *le Dictionnaire de l'Académie* since the Académie "a emprunté sagement des Halles tous les proverbes qui y sont en usage et elle a consulté apparemment les Harangeres qui excellent dans ce langage." (quoted in Quémada, 1967: 212)

1.2.1.3 *The eighteenth century*

Although classicism was rather short-lived, it continued to influence writers and lexicographers well into the following century. Rather than judge usage by the Court, lexicographers came to depend on the classical authors of the previous century as arbiters of good taste. This reactionary stance on language was espoused even by such otherwise freethinking men as François Voltaire and the idea of creating a fixed language grew.

There was a counter tendency, however, which gathered steam as the century progressed. The influence of Cartesian rationalism had helped produce *la Grammaire générale et raisonnée* of Port-Royal in 1660. This work introduced the idea of language norms based not on some arbitrary standard but on reason and logic. At the same time, it had become fashionable under Louis XV to affect the speech of the lower classes. In terms of lexicography, this interest was reflected by a variety of lexicons such as P. Leroux's popular *Dictionnaire comique, satirique, critique, burlesque, libre et proverbial* published in 1735.

However, general dictionaries did not give in to the trend to include "low words". In fact, *le Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, which was re-published in 1718 and 1740, differed very little from the original in terms of its inclusion of "low" words.

But even general dictionaries could not hold on forever to their purist view of usage.

Furetière's dictionary, which had been re-edited in 1704 and renamed the *Dictionnaire de Trévoux* (after the Jesuit academy that saw to its revision), had several volumes added to it until 1771. And, in its fourth edition in 1743, it became remarkable for its inclusion of technical terms, archaisms and words from the vernacular. It came under attack for also listing foreign words.

Denis Diderot, under the entry of *Dictionnaire* in *l'Encyclopédie* gave his own prescription as to what a dictionary should be and the importance of distinguishing between different kinds of words:

ceux qui ne sont d'usage que dans la conversation, d'avec ceux qu'on emploie en écrivant; ceux que la prose et la poésie admettent également, d'avec ceux qui ne sont propres qu'à l'une ou à l'autre; les mots qui sont employés dans le langage des honnêtes gens, d'avec ceux qui ne le sont que dans le langage du peuple; les mots qu'on admet dans le style noble, d'avec ceux qui sont réservés au style familier...(quoted in Matoré, 1968:103)

Diderot did not really hold by the reigning credo of "le bon goût" and the omission of any word below that standard. Although *l'Encyclopédie* was not a general dictionary and is not discussed as such here, it is important to note that Diderot encouraged thoroughness in the labeling of words, a practice that was no longer new.

The last important dictionary before the start of the French Revolution, *le Dictionnaire critique de la langue française* published by J. Féraud in 1787-1788, is often called the best dictionary of the last part of the eighteenth century. Influenced perhaps by Diderot, this work includes "low" words. It was also the first to include abbreviations for usage labels in the front matter.

The general tendencies of eighteenth century lexicography were to continue in the purist vein. Taboo words were not included. Although the Revolution changed political

reality for a while, the nineteenth century returned to a very conservative approach towards lexicography. Authority on usage was passed on to writers and other well-regarded intellectuals but purity was still a reigning concern in general dictionaries.

1.2.2 *Early English dictionaries*

The obsession with pure usage and the reflection of this obsession in monolingual dictionaries in France was found only to a limited degree in England and English lexicography.

1.2.2.1 *The seventeenth century*

English, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was greatly expanded by an influx of foreign words, from Latin and more modern Romance languages. In addition, writers and translators made it a point to coin new words to enrich what they felt to be a feeble tongue. As the reading public grew, however, these new words caused great difficulties of understanding. Some rebelled over these "inkhorn" terms⁴ from the outset, but years would pass before the idea of a pure language took hold. As a result, the majority of the first monolingual dictionaries, including Thomas Blount's *Glossographia* (1656), dedicated themselves to explaining "hard words."⁵

In 1658, Edward Phillips published *The New World of English Words*, a close copy of Blount's *Glossographia*. He did nonetheless add symbols to indicate hard words, and in later

⁴ Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines inkhorn as "affectedly learned and pedantic".

⁵ Cawdrey's *A Table Alphabeticall* (1604), Bullokar's *An English Expositor* (1616) and Cockeram's *The English Dictionarie: or an Interpreter of Hard Words* (1623) are other dictionaries of this kind.

editions of his dictionary, he listed words "to be used warily, and upon occasion only, or totally to be rejected as Barbarous, and illegally compounded or derived; the most notorious of which last are noted with an Obelisk." (quoted in Landau, 1989: 195) Although the concept of "barbarous" is not explained, the use of this term does show that he was conscious of the idea of proper usage.

Last in the tradition of the pure "hard words" dictionaries comes Elisha Coles's *English Dictionary*, published in 1676. Coles showed innovation since he included cant (thieves's slang) and dialectal terms. He defended this choice in his preface: " 'Tis no disparagement to understand the Canting Terms: it may chance to save your throat from being cut, or, at least, your pocket from being pickt." (quoted in Matthews, 1966: 26) While the interest in cant and slang was not new and several cant and slang lexicons had already appeared, it was the first time such words had been included in a general dictionary.

It was possible for English lexicographers like Coles to cover such words since the British did not have an Academy like the Italian and the French did, which would condemn his work. However, even in the sixteenth century, some had expressed concern about the state of impurity in their tongue and, as the evident success of the Italian and French academies reached their ears, writers like Jonathan Swift and Daniel Defoe took up the cause of establishing some sort of regulatory body to oversee the English language. In his *Essay on Projects*, published in 1697, Defoe described the mission of such an assembly:

The work of this society should be to encourage polite learning, to polish and refine the English tongue, and advance the so much neglected faculty of correct language, to establish purity and propriety of stile, and to purge it from all the irregular additions that ignorance and affectation have introduced.
(quoted in Wells, 1973: 34)

Swift even went so far as to write "that some Method should be thought on for Ascertaining and Fixing our Language for ever." (quoted in Wells, 1973: 36) There were thus some among the British, too, who were obsessed with the idea of a pure and fixed language, much like the French. The fact that an English Academy never came into being is attributable to political and social causes. The Académie française was established by the decree of Richelieu, who never had a counterpart in Britain. In 1714, the German Hanovers came to the royal throne and it is unlikely that the new king had any strong feelings about what was, after all, his second language. Samuel Johnson also remarked that "the edicts of an English academy would, probably, be read by many, only that they may be sure to disobey them. The present manners of our nation would deride authority." (quoted in Wells, 1973: 37) Johnson, in his preface to his dictionary, himself derided the idea of ever fixing the language permanently. It is perhaps ironic that it was Johnson who, in the end, had the most effect in preserving and codifying the English language, thanks to his landmark dictionary.

1.2.2.2 *The eighteenth century*

With the turn of the century came a change in lexicography. In 1702, a certain "J.K." published *A New English Dictionary*, the first to veer away from the hard words tradition. "J.K." is widely believed to be John Kersey, who also revised Phillip's *New World of English Words* in 1706. In the preface to his own dictionary, he explained that the work

is intended only to explain such English Words as are genuine, and used by Persons of clear Judgment and good Style...[and] is a Collection of all the most proper and significant English Words, that are now commonly us'd either in Speech, or in the familiar way of Writing Letters, &c.; omitting at the same time, such as are obsolete, barbarous, foreign or peculiar... (quoted in Wells, 1973: 19).

The *New English Dictionary*, which contained about 28,000 words, was the first to include common words and their definitions.

An Universal Etymological English Dictionary by Nathan Bailey (1721) was another milestone in English lexicography. This most comprehensive English dictionary to date (40,000 words) was expanded by a second volume in 1727 in which Bailey listed many vulgar and taboo words (like "shite", for instance) and gave usage guidance for some by marking them with a symbol to indicate that they should be used with caution.⁶

This comparative freedom to include vulgar and taboo words was soon checked by Samuel Johnson who established the standard of lexicography with his 1755 *Dictionary of the English Language*. Although he necessarily consulted other dictionaries, he thoroughly scoured the works of famous writers to arrive at clear and logical definitions and was the first to select illustrations for the words from his readings. Modern lexicographers still follow Johnson's method.

In his *Plan of A Dictionary*, he outlined his purpose "to preserve the purity and ascertain the meaning of our English idiom." (quoted in Wells, 1973: 41) It is interesting to note that, to begin with, Johnson believed that the lexicographer's mission was not to "form, but register the language...; not to teach men how they should think, but relate how they have hitherto expressed their thoughts." (quoted in Landau, 1989:53) However, ultimately, the men whose thoughts were included in the dictionary were ones "whom we commonly stile polite writers." (quoted in Wells, 1973: 41) Johnson's conversion to the purist viewpoint was influenced by Lord Chesterfield, Johnson's patron at the beginning of the

⁶ Many of the taboo words were to be expunged later and have only recently reappeared in English dictionaries.

project, who had enjoined him to purify English and establish himself as an authority on proper usage. Johnson's early goal to simply record the language gave way to this view: "With regard to questions of purity and propriety, I was once in doubt whether I should not attribute too much to myself in attempting to decide them...; but I have been since determined by your Lordship's opinion, to interpose my own judgment." (quoted in Landau, 1989: 51) He did indeed impose a certain judgment of purity in his word selection since "every language has... its improprieties and absurdities, which it is the duty of the lexicographer to correct or proscribe." (quoted in Wells, 1973: 43) He did careful etymological studies to winnow out cant words and avoided archaisms and foreign words. In his *Plan*, he had decided to use symbols to give usage indications, but in the actual dictionary he preferred to use labels such as "barbarous", "ludicrous", "mean", "familiar" or "coarse", even for such words as "bloody", "bounce" or "cudden." In comparison to Bailey, he included few vulgar or taboo words and therefore passed the most telling judgment on them.

The English finally had the authoritative dictionary they had desired. Single-handedly, Johnson had accomplished what had taken many men in the academies of Italy and France years to do. Though one critic wrote that he could not help wishing Johnson "had oftener passed his own censure upon those words which are not of approved use" (quoted in Wells, 1973: 45), Johnson showed a strong moralistic streak in his work. His dictionary remained the most authoritative guide to the English language, both in England and the United States, for the next hundred years and was widely plundered by subsequent lexicographers.

1.2.3 *Early bilingual English/French dictionaries*

Although material on the monolingual lexicography of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is abundant, much less research has been carried out on the bilingual lexicography of this period. The following survey of usage in early bilingual dictionaries is therefore fairly limited in scope.

1.2.3.1 *The sixteenth century*

Several bilingual French and English dictionaries were published during the sixteenth century. The first, John Palsgrave's *Lesclairssiment de la langue francoyse* (1530), was in fact a word list of about 20,000 entries included within a grammar book: it provides French equivalents for English words. Claudius Hollyband's *Treasure of the French Tong* (1580), a French to English dictionary, seems to have been heavily plagiarized from Lucas Harrison's *Dictionarie French and English*, published in 1571. In any case, each dictionary is a blend of both specialized and common conversational words. (Stein 1984: 249) They both include interjections, sometimes specifying by whom they are used and words used jocularly (i.e. "spoken in mockerie"). Hollyband also labels some words "Pedlers French" (Stein, 1984: 252) and employs regional labels. Seemingly, conversational words were not marked as being different from written or formal ones. Hollyband and Harrison, for example, define a "badault" as "a dolt, a foole" and thus, give the idea of conversational use through the equivalents rather than by means of labeling.

1.2.3.2 *The seventeenth century*

Most English/French bilingual lexicographers of the seventeenth century were either English or Swiss and French Protestants who had fled to England to avoid religious persecution. Their dictionaries were all published in London, a fact which reveals the lack of interest on the part of the French for the English language. Educated English people, on the other hand, wanted to read French authors while English merchants wanted to improve their business abroad.

Randle Cotgrave published his *Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* in 1611. As was common with bilingual dictionaries of this period, it was unidirectional and went from French to English. He used Rabelais and Du Bartas as his sources and also availed himself of Estienne's and Nicot's dictionaries. His translations of the source words were often witty and conversational in tone; he included many popular expressions, proverbs and neologisms. He also had recourse to labels such as "Rusticall", "Barbarous", "Villageois" and "Pedlar's French" and marked archaic, dialectal and foreign words. (Smalley, 1948: 22) Robert Sherwood added an English to French part to the second edition in 1632.

In 1677, Guy Miège published *A New Dictionary of French and English, With Another English and French*. Very much in favor of the Académie française's prescriptive attitudes, he discriminated between common spoken language and choice words, an area where he felt Cotgrave to be lacking. He included neologisms which would not be found in Richelet's dictionary, three years later, and he indicated neologisms and obsolete words by an asterisk.

By the time Abel Boyer's *Royal Dictionary In Two Parts. First French and English. Secondly, English and French* appeared in 1699, the dictionaries of Richelet, Furetière and the Académie were already in existence. Just as Miège had criticized Cotgrave for not discriminating enough, so too did Boyer accuse Miège of not showing enough rigour in distinguishing between proper and improper words, i.e. vulgar and colloquial language. He was the first of the bilingual lexicographers to include a comprehensive table of symbols and abbreviations in his front matter. The items to be marked were vulgarisms, "mean" words and obsolete words, among others. If his omission of the sense of "prostitution" for the word "abandonnement" is any indication, his selection of words and senses tended to be even more restrictive than that of the Académie or Furetière.

1.2.3.3 *The eighteenth century*

So successful was Boyer's *Royal Dictionary* that few new English/French bilingual dictionaries were published in the eighteenth century. Indeed, according to Hausmann (1989), the next important bilingual dictionary to follow Boyer's was the *Harrap's Standard*, which was not published until 1934.

James Anderson (1972), however, finds two eighteenth century dictionaries interesting enough to mention. The first is *A New Pocket Dictionary of the French and English Language* (1767) by Thomas Nugent. The lexicographer firmly reassures the public that his efforts are based on the "Best Dictionaries", though he has at times included words which were "not adopted by that learned body [l'Académie] where the particular energy or force of expression seemed to justify their use." (Anderson, 1972: 58) In 1776, Louis Chambaud

published his *Nouveau Dictionnaire François-Anglois et Anglois-François*. In his preface, he explains that he has sometimes used proverbs, conversational language, common or vulgar expressions and poetic ones in his translations. He has, however, included only "the best French authors." (Anderson, 1972: 63)

1.3 Conclusion

Although this survey offers only a brief look at the first two centuries of French and English monolingual and bilingual lexicography, there are several general conclusions to be drawn. As lexicography progressed, so too did the normative function of the dictionary come to the forefront. The general dictionary became more confident of its role as an authority on proper usage and left the task of collecting vernacular words to specialized lexicons. Both the Académie and Samuel Johnson made it a point to declare their opinions on proper style and the importance of promoting the purity of their respective languages, though Johnson's first instinct had been to describe rather than to prescribe. They both made their disapprobation clear by omitting taboo and vulgar words and hierarchized language into proper and improper usage, a vision of language which bilingual lexicographers also adopted.

Yet, not all lexicographers agreed on the words to be left out or shared the same vision of the role of the general dictionary. In France, Furetière and his successors, the Trévoux academy, included many vernacular words, just as Bailey did in England. In bilingual lexicography, the problem of labeling seems to have been a point of contention; thus, Boyer accused Miège of sloppiness in this regard, just as Miège had accused Cotgrave of the same.

The usage labels employed in these dictionaries mark geographical, temporal, foreign and social class restrictions and restrictions which concern what we now call register. The Académie praises itself for having clearly marked "[les mots] bas ou de style familier", for example. Although there was no broad consensus as to when usage labels should be used or even which ones should be included, the very fact that these lexicographers included words which required such labels indicates that they were aware that there are a variety of usages. At the same time, however, many were promoting one "correct" usage. After all, they increasingly turned to the "Best Writers" and thus, promulgated the usage of one particular segment of society. As Alain Rey notes, " le choix des textes dépouillés est déjà une manifestation de sélectivité normative." (1983: 562)

Both Rey and Michel Tournier speak of usages in their 1980s articles about norms and lexicography, thus showing that the questions of "whose usage?" and "what usage?" are still pertinent. Rey (1983: 546), for instance, comments that "tout dictionnaire puise dans une pluralité d'usages et prétend fournir une image de la «langue»; en fait, il construit une proposition d'usage fondée sur la hiérarchie." Indeed, while dictionaries are interested in usage in the general sense of any or all uses of language, spoken or written, they all single out certain aspects of usage "as being limited to some part of the universe of speakers or writers, past or present, either by special notes or labels or by qualification with definitions." (Landau, 1989: 174) Sidney Landau lists the technical or taboo nature of some words as well as their frequency as limitations on their usage. Ali Al-Kasimi defines usage as "socially-graded synonyms" (1977: 83), but other factors besides social standing influence variations in usage. R.R.K. Hartmann (1981: 266) comments on Al-Kasimi's definition in

the following terms: "this definition is representative if we concede that 'synonyms' may include message forms beyond the word level, that 'socially graded' may involve pragmatic factors other than social role, and that 'study' may imply prescriptive opinion as well as descriptive documentation." Ladislav Zgusta speaks, for his part, about the presence of "functional" and "restricted" languages within standard national languages. "Restricted" languages are "restricted to small parts of the whole society...[and] only restricted parts of the whole lexicon belong to them" (1971: 172) and are therefore tied to social group membership, while "functional languages" are "poetic" and "scientific" and are determined by situation. This indicates an awareness of the importance of situation in language variety, although Tournier warns that "le problème sera ... de définir les sites d'emploi où ces usages sont visibles." (1992: 56)

Both Tournier and Rey, in any case, want to change the concept of usage from the "study of good, correct or standard uses " to the idea of the descriptive study of "language habits." Rey concludes that "le dictionnaire, après avoir contribué à l'édification d'une norme en partie fictive... peut se permettre aujourd'hui d'accepter la pluralité des usages." (1983: 567)

Nonetheless, it would be idealistic to deny the existence of a standard usage in French and English. The problem lies in the common confusion between "standard" and "correct" language, a confusion which the early dictionaries described above helped spread. It is now recognized, however, that "standard" language is "an intersection of didactical and functional usages. Its definition depends on a theory of language variation." (Stubbs, 1990: 561)

Chapter 2

From language variation to register studies

Although lexicographers have always been interested in different usages, i.e. language variation, and while older schools of linguistics and dialectological scholars have shown some interest in the subject, the systematic study of variation in social context is seen as a relatively "new" subject which has received special attention with the advent of sociolinguistics in the second part of the twentieth century.

Unlike linguistics proper, which concerns itself with language as an abstract system, sociolinguistics can be said to be "the study of language as it is used by real speakers in social and situational contexts of use."¹ (Milroy, 1990: 485) Social dialectology, or the "study of language variation in speech communities" (Milroy, 1990: 485) is one of the important branches of sociolinguistics, and one in which much work has been done, especially on variation associated with social or demographic characteristics of speakers.

This chapter begins by examining sociolinguistic studies on language variation in order to establish the role of register in them, and then analyzes sociolinguistic and other applied linguistic studies that focus more directly on register.

2.1 *Language Variation*

While scholars of the nineteenth century studied mostly regional language varieties, often seeking out remote areas in order to find "untainted" dialects, sociolinguists of the

¹ This definition of sociolinguistics, which is just one among many, has been chosen to fit in with the purposes of this thesis.

latter half of the twentieth century have shown great interest in language varieties within heterogeneous urban centers. William Labov, for instance, carried out his first language variation study in New York in the 1960s and others have concentrated on Chicago, Boston and even Montreal. Labov was not only one of the first to choose an urban center but he also developed an extensive methodology to measure variations, called quantitative sociolinguistics. Inspired by the structuralists and the reigning spirit of empiricism, he sought a method which would measure rather than evaluate, and be more objective than the rather subjective analyses of his predecessors.

Quantitative sociolinguistics "has discerned three principal kinds of variation in linguistic form: variation associated with constraints in the linguistic environment, variation associated with the social or demographic characteristics of speakers, and variation associated with situations of use." (Finegan and Biber, 1994: 316) The first sort of variation is governed by structural or physiological constraints and efforts have been made to tie it in with grammar theory and linguistics. The second and third kinds of variation, however, are determined by social and situational constraints and are more relevant here.

Labov studied variation according to the socio-economic class of the speakers. He compared "populations who use the *same* linguistic variants but in *different quantities*" (Milroy, 1990:490), measuring the results on a continuum rather than trying to establish absolute categories. His method helped to better measure the correlation between socio-economic class and linguistic variation. Not only did he record the social class of his participants, but he designed his interviews in such a way as to elicit different styles from the speakers, and he arranged these styles, or registers, on a scale of formality. Others have

carried out similar studies using gender, education or region instead of socio-economic class as a focus, but most researchers seem to also take style into consideration to a certain extent.

Most of these studies have restricted themselves to phonological variation since "in quantifying realisations of the *variable*, we have to be sure that the *meaning* of the variants remains constant" (Milroy, 1990: 491); in other words, saying **eating** rather than **eatin'** means the same denotatively. Thus, we have studies of the use of the post-vocalic /r/ in New York City or the glottalisation of the voiceless stops /p,t,h/ in Newcastle. Some studies have also been carried out on morphological variables, such as the variants **he go/ he goes**; others have been done on the use of contractions (called "economy" variants) and of prepositional phrases (called "explicit and elaborated" variants). Unfortunately, as Finegan and Biber point out, "too few studies have systematically investigated lexical variety across socio-economic groups to allow clear patterns to be identified." (1994: 333)

Quantitative sociolinguistic studies have uncovered patterns which tend to be true in a variety of urban, mostly Western, speech communities. Researchers have discovered that the same linguistic features mark both social group and social situation, and more specifically, that "the distribution across social dialects and registers is parallel, with the variants that are more frequent in less formal situations also being more frequent among lower-ranked social groups and variants that are more frequent in more formal situations being more frequent among higher-ranked groups." (Finegan and Biber, 1994: 317) In studies that measured economy variants and explicit and elaborated variants, a pattern has also emerged: "the distribution across situation is itself systematic, with more formal, more 'literate' situations typically exhibiting a more frequent use of explicit and elaborated variants, and less formal,

more 'oral' situations exhibit a more frequent use of economy variants"; at the same time "the distribution of these features across social dialects within a community is systematic, with higher-ranked social groups exhibiting more frequent use of the elaborated and explicit variants and lower-ranked groups exhibiting more frequent use of the economy variants." (Finegan and Biber, 1994: 317) Edward Finegan and Douglas Biber do caution that these patterns may not be true for non-urban, non-Western communities.

Faced with these findings, various sociolinguists have tried to explain this correlation between styles, or registers, and socio-economic class. To Labov, it was logical that the formal style of the lower-ranked class would emulate the speech of the higher-ranked group or groups. Anthony Kroch approaches the findings from the opposite perspective and surmises that the higher-ranked social groups mark themselves off by their language habits and resist variants used by non-elite speakers. Alan Bell prefers to explain these correlations as being the result of what he calls "audience design"; a speaker's style is determined by his or her audience.

Finegan and Biber, however, reject these various theories since they do not sufficiently explain the patterns of the relationship between social group and social situation. They, and others, take a functional position and believe that these patterns of distribution across registers and social dialects are a result of the "differential access among social groups to the communicative situations and activities that promote register variation." (Finegan and Biber, 1994: 337) In other words, while all social groups use a number of registers, some social groups have more opportunity to use some registers than other social groups. A given variety of register is marked by the same linguistic characteristics, regardless of the social

group of the speaker: all speakers use less contractions, for instance, in 'literate' situations. However, register markers which indicate greater formality occur more frequently in the speech of speakers from higher-ranked social groups because speakers from this group find themselves more frequently in formal situations.

Register, or style, as it is often called, which is related to communicative situations, plays a large role in the concept of language variety. As quantitative sociolinguistic studies have shown, dialect studies must take the situation of communication into account. All socio-economic groups use variants whose distribution changes on the continuum of formality; i.e. all speech communities make use of different registers. Register here is thus linked to the theoretical notion of language variety but is a narrower concept.

2.2 *Register*

However, the term "register" has no consistent definition from linguist to linguist. In fact, the concept it covers is designated by different terms: "functional varieties in usage", "style", in addition to "register" in English, "niveaux de langue", "marques stylistiques" and "registre" in French.

Moreover, the term "register" in the linguistic sense is very new, in comparison to words like "usage" or "style". According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, this sense of the word is a twentieth century development. In the first half of this century, anthropological linguists like Franz Boas, Edward Sapir, Bronisław Malinowski and Benjamin Whorf spurred an interest in situational variation with their studies of non-Western speech communities and their analyses of the social uses of language. From these generally non-quantitative studies,

and others that followed, has come the realization, as the ethnolinguist Dell Hymes, writes, that "one must think of a community in terms, not [of] a single language, but of *repertoire*. A repertoire comprises a set of *ways of speaking*. Ways of speaking, in turn, comprise speech styles, on the one hand, and contexts of discourse, on the other, together with the relations of appropriateness obtaining between styles and contexts." (1974a: 53)

Scholars have thus turned their attention to describing and analyzing the interplay between registers and their contexts (or situations) of use. Unlike dialectal studies which deal with "the nature of linguistic variation *between* speakers", register studies have focussed on "the language styles used by the *same* speaker on different occasions" (Milroy, 1990: 501), or the same individual's or speech community's repertoire. Many scholars have also constructed theories of register which we will now briefly examine.

One of the first major studies on the subject of what we term "register" was John Kenyon's 1948 article differentiating functional varieties in usage and "cultural levels." While cultural levels imply the idea of a standard/non-standard usage, functional varieties are varieties in use, or situation-dependent varieties. While the standard/non-standard dichotomy implies a right and a wrong in language, functional varieties can only be judged according to the situation in which a word or an expression is used. While categories like standard/non-standard obviously center around a norm (which regional variation is considered standard, what social class or educational background is the arbiter or the authority on usage), use-related varieties, in theory, cannot have a norm: in some situations, the use of a certain word is appropriate while, in others, it is not. Although Kenyon admits that "the two groupings *cultural levels* and *functional varieties* are not mutually exclusive categories," he

points out that they "are based on entirely separate principles of classification: *culture* and *function*." (Kenyon, 1948: 31) He thus started a trend to separate usage variations that depend on the innate characteristics of the user (region, age, social class) from the characteristics of the situation in which the user finds him or herself.

The user/use distinction was further developed by M.A.K. Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens in *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching* (1968), an important work which describes a method to study language in its social and cultural context as part of a communicative event rather than as an abstract system. Halliday *et al.* elaborated a precise theoretical framework for register, differentiating strictly between user-related varieties of language, which they called dialects, and use-related varieties, which they termed register. The latter varieties mark "the differences in the type of language selected as appropriate to different types of situation." (Halliday *et al.*, 1968: 87) They further divide the notion of register into three categories -- field, tenor and mode -- because "types of linguistic situation differ from one another, broadly speaking, in three respects: first, what is actually taking place; secondly, who is taking part; and thirdly what part the language is playing." (Halliday, 1978: 31) Field tends to determine the content of what is being said, which includes but is not restricted to subject matter; tenor refers to the relation between the addresser and the addressee; and mode alludes to the way it is said. Although Halliday separates these three categories, he acknowledges that field, tenor and mode make their impact together, not separately. B. Hatim and I. Mason, linguists who also worked on register, add that "the values accruing from the three dimensions of language use help us define and identify registers." (Hatim and Mason, 1990: 51)

Halliday's work on register, particularly his strict separation of the user- and use-based varieties outlined by Kenyon, has influenced many subsequent linguists who have researched functional varieties. We will first look at the refinements added to Halliday's model by other linguists, and then examine the writings of others who differ in varying degrees with Halliday.

Michael Gregory and Susanne Carroll (1978: 64) comment that "register...is a useful abstraction linking variations of language to variations of social context...Register is an instance of language-in-action...Register is as well the realization of the semantic possibilities of language." In other words, register reflects the use of language and has meaning only in a situation or social context. Register-based variation is not determined by the language system itself because "register...is culturally determined since it is the culture of a society which determines the patterns of environments in which language can occur." (1978: 64) These patterns are acquired by the speaker through his or her own experience, which means that a certain predictability of register exists "which can...be described in terms of phonological, lexical and grammatical indexical markers (peculiar to a text) and common-core features (shared by texts)." (1978: 64) Gregory and Carroll point out, however, that there is a constant interaction between speakers and the situation in which they find themselves : "let us not forget that what we say is an indication of who we are as individuals, although even as unique persons our habits are neither fixed nor stable but mirror the constant variability of environment and attitude which makes up our lives." (1978: 27) According to these linguists, a typology of register can be established -- indeed it is established intuitively by each of us as a competent language user -- but there can be no

absolute rigidity to such a classification.

Gregory and Carroll's patterns of environment are further explained by Paul Chilton, who calls them situation types. Like Gregory and Carroll, he believes that situations can be classified into types: "a person in the social process makes a generalization about any particular situation, which enables him to see it as different, the same, or rather, in some other way related to other 'situations' he has experienced." (Chilton, 1978: 114) Chilton (1978: 115) adds that "a situation type, then, is recognized as a result of a process of generalization facilitated by the existence of both linguistic and non-linguistic codes"² in situation. A combination of features from the different codes "'means' that the situation is of one type rather than another." Chilton then makes the link between situation types and language varieties. In fact he uses the term "register"³ to describe "variation in language use, and in particular that variation which can be distinguished from accent and dialect variation." (Chilton, 1978: 113) He points out very firmly that the situation does not determine the register but rather that the two interact or cooperate to form a relationship because humans are "creative situation-producing agents." (Chilton, 1978: 116) He concludes that "language is thus an intrinsic part of the situation, not a vehicle for it." (Chilton, 1978: 117) Like Halliday as well as Gregory and Carroll, Chilton believes that register is closely linked to meaning, "social meaning." (Chilton, 1978: 123) He uses the notions of field, tenor and mode as well, though he calls tenor "role relationships" and defines field in a very specific way to mean social role. He is most interested in labeling the

² Non-linguistic codes include ways of dressing, the space between people, etc.

³ Although Chilton uses the term "register", he believes that it is not an established technical term as some linguists would have it.

features, both linguistic and non-linguistic, that signal types of situations and he concludes his article by suggesting that "it is necessary (...) to see register as the product of an interaction between language and independent semiotic faculties." (Chilton, 1978: 128)

Chilton's concept of situation types and their relationship to register is echoed in the introduction of *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register* (1994) by Biber and Finegan, where they state that the underlying assumption implicit in the sociolinguistic study of register variation is that "a communication situation that recurs regularly in a society (in terms of participants, setting, communicative functions, and so forth) will tend over time to develop identifying markers of language structure and language use, different from the language of other communication situations." (Biber and Finegan, 1994: 20) They separate register from dialect and genre (a message type, like a news broadcast or repair manual), yet they point out that "every utterance (in speaking or writing) simultaneously exemplifies dialect, register [and] genre." (Biber and Finegan, 1994: 25)

Biber examines the theoretical frameworks of Halliday (i.e. field, tenor and mode) and Hymes (whose framework consists of sixteen components of the speech situation: message form, message content, setting, scene, speaker, addressor, hearer, addressee, purposes-outcomes, purposes-goals, key (tone or manner), channels, forms of speech, norms of interaction, norms of interpretation and genres) (Hymes, 1974b: 54-62). Biber then proceeds to create his own framework which includes elements from Halliday, Hymes and others, and which tries to incorporate "analysis of the linguistic characteristics of registers, analysis of the situational characteristics of registers, and analysis of the functional and conventional associations between linguistic and situational characteristics." (Biber, 1994: 33)

It includes communicative characteristics of participants, relations between addressor and addressee, setting, channel, relation of participants to the text, purposes, intents and goals, and topic/subject. Though this framework describes the speech situation, Biber cautions, like Chilton, that the relation between situation and linguistic form is not a deterministic one; rather, linguistic forms and situational features influence one another: "positing a functional association does not entail a one-to-one mapping between form and function. Rather, the mapping across form-function-situation often comprises complex many-to-many kinds of relations." (Biber, 1994: 33)

Luc Ostiguy and Claude Tousignant, two of the few francophones to use the term "registre" in their study of the norms and usages of Québec French, define "registre", as do their English-speaking counterparts, as "les variétés identifiées à des situations de communication" (Ostiguy and Tousignant, 1993: 20) since "tout locuteur, quelle que soit son appartenance à un groupe social, modifie plus ou moins sa façon de s'exprimer suivant les situations de communication dans lesquelles il se trouve." (Ostiguy and Tousignant, 1993: 19) Their list of factors involved in situational variation resembles, to some extent, Halliday's field, tenor and mode: "mentionnons à titre de facteurs potentiels le statut social de l'interlocuteur, le degré d'attention porté à son discours...le thème ou sujet de la conversation." (Ostiguy and Tousignant, 1993: 19) They also point out that "il existe un lien étroit entre la variation sociale et la variation situationnelle" (Ostiguy and Tousignant, 1993: 20), a statement reminiscent of both Kenyon's explanation that culture and function are not mutually exclusive categories but different methods of classification and of the dialectal studies of Labov and others.

According to Hartmann, who traces the different connotations of style, "[the] notion of 'register' as elaborated by Halliday, Gregory and others offers the basis for one promising approach to style as functional language variety..." (Hartmann, 1981: 265) since "it is a deliberate attempt to link up some of the loose ends of situational context, participant's role relationships and communication channel into a wider ambit of variety theory as a legitimate linguistic discipline." He comments, however, that "unfortunately, these classifications are not always backed up by empirical evidence which only large-scale investigations of representative text samples from different genres can provide." (Hartmann, 1981: 266) While Hartmann recognizes, much like Gregory and Carroll, that register is a "useful abstraction", he is aware of the limitations of the Halliday classification when it is applied to the concrete.

Indeed, some linguists, especially applied linguists like Hartmann, have approached the notion of register from a different point of view from that of Halliday and his followers.

Martin Joos, in his 1961 book *The Five Clocks* (reprinted in 1967), outlines four "usage-scales" based on age, style, breadth (which runs the gamut from popular to genteel, with standard in the middle) and responsibility (how much of the burden of ensuring cooperation within the community the speakers are shouldering, measured from bad to best). Each scale consists of five points, but "these four scales are essentially independent; relations among them are not identities." (Joos, 1967: 11) The "style" scale is the closest one to register: Joos lists the features of each "clock" or "style", which could certainly be included under Halliday's field, tenor and mode categories. "Casual", for instance, "is for friends, acquaintances, insiders...Negatively, there is absence of background information and no

reliance on listeners' participation...On the positive side, we have two devices which do the same job directly: (1) ellipsis, and (2) slang, the defining features of casual style." (Joos, 1967: 23) Thus Joos discusses the relationship between participants (tenor), the level of informativity (one aspect of field) and the level of participation (one aspect of mode), as well as the linguistic features which characterize the style. Though Joos does not explicitly link situation to style, this link can be inferred from a metaphor he draws between style and the different sorts of clothes one wears throughout the day to fit the occasion.

Fred Peng adapts Joos's five clocks to arrive at his own theory of register. First, he differentiates between style and register: "there are two aspects to each language, the dynamic aspect in which case the language concerned is an institution, and the static aspect in which case the language concerned is a self-contained system without recourse to language users and the context of situation where it is used." (Peng, 1987: 261) The dynamic aspect is register, "a functional notion dependent on contexts of situation" (Peng, 1987: 279); the static aspect is style, "a structural notion... that indicates the existence of variations in the linguistic code." (Peng, 1987: 279) Peng uses Joos's five styles to form five styles of his own (elaborate, deliberative, consultative, casual and intimate) and constructs five types of contexts of situation (frozen, formal, average, informal and private) which are based on situational elements such as group size, relationship between speaker and hearer, the physical setting and the topic, the relative difference in social status and class.⁴ It is the correlation between these two groupings which constitutes registers: there are five "appropriate" registers, or perfect matches between style and context of situation (e.g,

⁴ The inclusion of this last feature, "relative differences in social status and class," seems to indicate that Peng includes some user characteristics within situational elements.

elaborate style in a frozen context of situation) and twenty "inappropriate" registers. Peng, then, does not use style and register as interchangeable concepts, but rather sees style as an established set of choices in the linguistic system while register is what Hymes described as "the relation of appropriateness obtaining between styles and contexts", or the realization of both the possibilities of the linguistic system and the pragmatic situation in which the user finds himself or herself.

The confusion that exists between the terms "register" and "style" is explained as follows by Jenny Cheschire (1992). Scholars interested in sociolinguistics tend to use the term "register" to refer "to situational variation which occurs when certain topics are discussed by people with shared background knowledge and assumptions about those topics, particularly when this stems from their occupation or profession." (Cheschire, 1992: 325) According to Cheschire, it is mostly people involved in language teaching and learning who use the word register to mean what is otherwise termed "style", or "the variation that occurs in the speech of a single speaker in different situational contexts." (Cheschire, 1992: 324)

Cheschire's views seem to be borne out by the fact that sociolinguists studying register, such as Halliday, Gregory and Carroll, Chilton, Biber *et al.*, do indeed attribute a great deal of importance to "what is being said." Ferguson (1994), for example, cites studies concerning the register of aviation hydraulics, cookbook recipes, regional weather forecasts and stock market reports. Paradoxically, however, many sociolinguistic studies of register focus on grammatical features (relative clauses, passive verbs, compound nouns), although registers which emphasize content are typically characterized by vocabulary (legalese, for example, will use certain words rarely found in other registers).

While all the scholars mentioned above seem to agree to a basic definition of register as a variation in language according to the situation in which the speaker finds himself or herself, many aspects of the concept of register remain controversial. First, a clear-cut distinction between user-related varieties and use-related varieties is not universally accepted. Peng, for instance, seems to include some user-related characteristics in his typology of contexts of situation. Chilton finds the path to reconciliation by asserting that it is a combination of the situation and the speaker which is responsible for register. Second, although scholars interested in norms and usages have, since Kenyon, made efforts to separate cultural features from functional features, this is hard to do since, as Gregory and Carroll explain, "register is culturally determined" (1978: 64) -- an idea taken up again by Ostiguy and Tousignant. However, there is little agreement on the part that the speaker as a member of a culture plays in determining the register. What emerges from a detailed study of the scholars cited above is that, although they may disagree on the overall methods of classifying register, there is some consensus on the features which help determine register. Whether the situation types outlined by various scholars are analyzed according to three or sixteen components, the notions of field, tenor and mode are included in all the typologies.

2.3 *Conclusion*

However, all these studies, whether quantitative or non-quantitative, whether they discuss content-based registers (i.e. personal ads) or situational parameters (i.e. formality,

opportunity for careful production)⁵ focus on texts:⁶ "what unites the work of linguists working on register is the centrality of text viewed in its context of social situation. Register *entails* text and implies a relationship between text and context... only a text suffices as an object of register analysis." (Finegan and Biber, 1994: 7) In other words, in sociolinguistics, "register" is a language variety largely defined by its content and only discernible in texts, and it is determined by conventionalized situations of use. What is the relationship between the text-oriented approach to register and register in lexicography, which deals with words and not with full text? That is one of the aspects that will be explored in the following chapter.

⁵ Biber and Finegan choose three situational parameters – opportunity for careful production, purpose of communication and degree of shared context – to measure features of economy and elaboration in such types of speech production as public speeches and academic prose.

⁶ As David Crystal clearly points out (1992b: 350), "texts may refer to collections of written *or* spoken material (the latter having been transcribed in some way)."

Chapter 3

Register and Lexicography

Despite the fact that language variation, and more specifically register, has been the object of a number of linguistic and sociolinguistic studies, the focus has been on linguistic elements other than the lexicon. In addition, Halliday and his followers have concentrated on larger textual or conversational analyses, generally working from a concrete situation towards a description of the characteristics of that situation and its corresponding linguistic features in order to establish a typology of the relation between situation and register. Though some scholars like Tournier believe that computerized databases will make it possible to empirically describe lexical variations in usage,¹ so far lexicographers have not studied register scientifically.²

Nevertheless, lexicographers have had to broach the question of register, since register labeling is an integral part of dictionary entries. In this chapter, we will first examine how register has been discussed by the theoretical literature on lexicography. We will then analyze dictionary front matter to see how practicing lexicographers view and classify register.

¹ Indeed, Edward Finegan writes that "recent computational work with standardized corpora indicates that quantitative variations in lexical and syntactic co-occurrence patterns are especially significant." (1992: 415) Once again, however, he is speaking of "registers" like legalese, telephone conversations and science fiction.

² In fact, lexicography is still not considered a science, but rather, as Gove put it (1967a: 7), "an intricate and subtle and sometimes overpowering art, requiring subjective analysis, arbitrary decisions and intuitive reasoning." Rey adds that "son discours [du dictionnaire] n'est absolument pas scientifique et ceci n'est ni une faiblesse ni une décision perverse. Il est, par nature, didactique." (Rey, 1983: 566)

3.1 *Register and theoretical lexicography*

Kenyon's separation of cultural levels and functional varieties has had some impact on theoretical lexicography and most scholars in this domain now take into consideration different language varieties. However, they seem divided on the issue of following Halliday's distinction of user- and use-based variation. What Bo Svensén, for example, considers "register" includes several user- and use-related dimensions: "style level" (with labels such as "poet.", "literary"...), time register (with labels such as "archaic"), geographical register, metaphor, abstract/concrete, speaker's attitude and frequency. And even among those scholars such as Landau and Rey, who seem to have taken into consideration Halliday's model, there is little consensus on how to name these varieties, on how to define them and what attitude to adopt towards them.

Landau, for instance, lists style, functional varieties and register as synonyms. As examples of register labels, he gives "informal, colloquial, literary, poetic, humorous." (Landau, 1989: 175) Register, to him then, depends at least partly on the function of language in a given communicative situation. "Poetic" or "literary" does not describe an innate linguistic characteristic of a speaker; he or she may at times use poetic language, just as he or she may speak informally at other times. According to Landau, variations based on register have no right and wrong: in certain situations, a word may be appropriate while in others, it may be inappropriate.

Rey, lexicographe extraordinaire, in his 1983 article "Norme et dictionnaires", says surprisingly little about register and when he does, he mentions it under technolèct, a restricted language since it does not include "la totalité des situations de communication."

(Rey, 1983: 556) He does, however, make a point of differentiating between "sociolecte" and "niveaux de langue": "...le premier concept est pragmatique, mais basé sur l'appartenance des locuteurs-auditeurs, des communicants, à une taxinomie sociale stable, le second est fondé sur l'attitude momentanée de communication, sur l'acte de parole, sur la production et la stratégie discursive." (Rey, 1983: 564) Thus, it would appear that Rey does make a user/use distinction here.

A panel of the Office de la langue française, under the direction of L.- J. Rousseau, proposes that dictionary labels be divided into two axes: "la situation de communication" and "la hiérarchie sociale". Under situations of communication, it lists four types of situations: "la situation de spécialisation ou de technicité", "la situation d'officialité", "la situation de vulgarisation" and "la situation de quotidienneté." (Rousseau: 19) In this categorization, the first two types of situations are linked to the labels "littéraire" and "soutenu" while the latter two are linked to "familier" and "très familier." In its explanation of the different types of situations, the OLF panel lists features which can be regrouped under Halliday's categories of field, tenor and mode. "Situation de spécialisation et de technicité", for instance, is characterized by "[des] locuteurs [qui] se reconnaissent comme appartenant à un même domaine socio-professionnel ou technique" (Rousseau: 19); "domaine" can be placed under the notion of field, while "les locuteurs se reconnaissent" can be placed under the notion of tenor. While the OLF's typology of situations can be criticized for being both too vague and too narrow since it shows a definite slant towards institutional varieties of language, it does at least reveal a theoretical framework for making decisions about register labels.

Other lexicographers have set up more elaborate frameworks of measurable features of usage labeling. Frederic Cassidy lists eight such features which can be judged on a continuum: extent (of use), quantity (of use), currency, recency, restrictedness, level, register and figuration. Each feature corresponds to one or more labels and gives rise to a scale. "Register", for instance, runs the gamut from familiar/intimate to frozen/formal, terms which are borrowed from Joos, though Cassidy admits that the number of divisions is "a matter of convenience". This scale "represent[s] variants within the control of most people-- even those with little or no schooling -- who can switch register according to the requirements of the occasion." (Cassidy, 1972: 52) Cassidy's work is interesting because he places traditional labels on these scales and recognizes that several scales can apply to a label (slang, for instance, can be a function of quantity, recency and register). Although Cassidy does not really define "register", it is obvious that he means language variation according to situation and he separates it from user-based scales like restrictedness and level.

William Card, Raven and Virginia McDavid, consultants to the *Random House Dictionary of the English Language* (1966), also present usage scales but include nine dimensions as opposed to Cassidy's eight features, adding that "the number of dimensions in which usage varies is not agreed upon." (Card *et al*, 1984: 59) The nine dimensions are history, maturity, association, relationship to reader or hearer, medium, attitude, territory, social position and responsibility. Although two of these dimensions, medium (i.e. mode or channel) and "relationship to reader or hearer" (i.e. tenor) seem related to register as defined by Halliday, the two are completely separated here. The dimension of "relationship to reader or hearer" seems to be the closest to the concept of register: "[there] are several

shades of formality, depending on the subject matter, the number of people participating, and the degree to which the participants know each other." (Card *et al*, 1984: 63) Like Cassidy, Card *et al* caution that labels have different dimensions and that the label "slang", for instance, is at once both dependent on the scale of association and the scale of relationship to reader or hearer.

Dennis Preston, who is interested in the labeling of the features which help classify language varieties, establishes a system of forty features, based somewhat on Cassidy's scales. He groups them into four main categories: speaker, interaction, code and realization. His system "ignores the familiar dialect-register, or user-use dichotomy on the grounds that inherent, ascribed and acquired characteristics of individuals are a part of the linguistic repertoire of users (not use) and should not be classified apart from one another." (Preston, 1977: 83) In other words, Preston shifts the emphasis from the situation to the speaker and places both use- and user- based characteristics into three speaker-based categories of his own: inherent, ascribed and acquired. The forty features which are linked to these three categories can be accentuated or attenuated according to the situation. His features include some of the sub-categories of Halliday's field, mode and tenor (e.g. domain, topic, role of speaker, delivery). However, unlike most writers on the subject, Preston consciously rejects Halliday's system of classification.

In his chapter on usage in lexicography, Landau concludes that a discussion of style (i.e. register) must encompass a discussion of our attitudes towards usage and the notion of status: "for although Kenyon's distinction between functional varieties and cultural levels is accepted today by virtually all dictionaries, the public and some well-known critics still argue

that style and status are related, and some recent linguistic studies suggest that they are not wholly wrong." (Landau, 1989: 194) In his argument, Landau traces this difficulty of separating style and status to the historical practices of lexicography; until the latter half of this century, dictionaries felt duty-bound to prescribe "correct" usage. While Rey (1983: 567) and Tournier (1992: 55) emphasize the importance of describing rather than prescribing, Landau questions the idea that usage can, in fact, ever be objectively described: "the question of usage in dictionaries...involves the more fundamental question of whether the description of attitudes toward usage is or can be factual. One group may read a particular usage as informal or nonstandard, whereas others may use it and regard it as entirely natural for any conceivable circumstance." (Landau, 1989: 205) In Landau's view, then, dictionaries "...cannot in good faith mark out some usages as informal without saying to whom they are informal. Informal actually means 'informal for those of the higher social classes, especially older, well-educated authors and professors in the humanities.'" (Landau, 1989: 207) Thus, according to Landau, use-based varieties cannot be completely separated from user-based varieties.

The OLF, Rey, Cassidy and Card *et al.* separate social hierarchy-based differences in language variation from "la situation de communication" or "niveaux de langue", as Kenyon suggests, but Landau and Preston do not since they believe it is impossible to do so. This irreconcilable divergence of opinion is perhaps not as fundamental as it might seem: Kenyon specified that the separation of user and use was a question of classification and, as Biber *et al* point out, all utterances show elements of dialect, register and genre so that it is often

difficult to separate out each element.³

The overview of lexicographic literature on register presented above shows that there are, in fact, several noticeable differences between the sociolinguistic view of register and the lexicographic one. First, sociolinguistic theories are text-based while lexicographic approaches are word-based. Second, the former generally define register as being determined by the combination of content (field), relationship between addressee/addresser (tenor), and channel (mode), while in the latter, "register" or "style" is most often linked to tenor and sometimes to mode -- the concept of field, especially scientific or professional field, is treated separately. In sociolinguistics, cookbook recipes can be considered a register while, in lexicography, the concept of "register" is less one of a discrete language variety largely governed by content than one of levels of usage within possible dimensions of usage, more determined by the relationship between addressee and addressor (tenor) and, occasionally, channel (mode). Last but not least, much has been written about register in sociolinguistics but discussions of register in lexicography are few or absorbed into larger discussions about usage and norms.

Some common ground can be found in both sociolinguistics and lexicography, however, and a tentative definition of register can be made as follows: register is a variation in language (a variation in lexical items, in the case of lexicography) chosen by the speaker according to the situation (which can be described and analyzed according to several dimensions, including those of field, tenor and mode) in which he or she finds himself or herself. This tentative definition of register will serve as the basis of our study of register labeling in dictionaries.

³ Indeed, Labov's studies showed the correlation between dialect and register.

3.2 Register and dictionary front matter

The few claims concerning register made by scholars in lexicography are not always borne out in dictionaries. For example, although Landau states that most dictionaries today accept Kenyon's division of cultural levels and functional varieties, a close look at the front matter of a few well-known dictionaries reveals that the distinction between the two is not always clearly made.⁴ Some lexicographers seem to bear a Halliday-like distinction in mind when they define their labeling system; others continue to incorporate both use- and user-based variations under one name. On the other hand, despite Landau's implied statement that few dictionaries are honest enough to state what class of readership their work is aimed at, some dictionaries do direct their work to a specific audience. The *Lexis*,⁵ for instance, talks of "la situation de communication" in which words are used but at the same time specifies that words taken from "le vocabulaire courant font partie du stock disponible du locuteur moyennement cultivé." (p.vii) The *American Heritage Dictionary*, in both the second and third editions, begins its definition of the label "informal" with "those whose speech is standard."

In order to fully understand how dictionaries deal with variations in usage, it is necessary to look at the way they group their labels and their explanations of these labels, since few, in fact, explicitly address the theoretical underpinnings behind their labeling practices. Since the general designations of usage labels are inconsistent from dictionary to dictionary, the following section, which examines the front matter of five monolingual

⁴ For the sake of concision and because Halliday was one of the first to provide a clear-cut distinction between register (use-based varieties) and dialect (user-based varieties), Halliday's terms "user-based varieties" and "use-based varieties" will be used henceforth instead of Kenyon's distinction.

⁵ A complete list of the dictionaries and their abbreviations, which are used in this thesis, is included in Appendix 1.

English dictionaries, five French monolingual dictionaries and five bilingual English/French dictionaries,⁶ takes into consideration not only what is specifically called "register" but also what is referred to as "style", "status", "niveaux de langue", "marques d'usage" and "marques stylistiques".

3.2.1 Monolingual English Dictionaries

The American Heritage Dictionary, 2nd ed., 1976 (AH2)

The AH2, a college dictionary, aims to be descriptive and, as in the first edition, has enlisted the aid of a Usage Panel, composed of "outstanding writers, speakers and thinkers", to decide what labels to give certain words. The labels are divided between field and stylistic ones, also called usage-context labels. Field labels cover specialized and technical words or senses, while stylistic labels mark lexical items as *nonstandard*, *informal*, *slang*, *vulgar*, and also indicate temporal and regional restrictions on their use.

The label *nonstandard* "implies the existence of Standard American English. While it cannot be claimed that there is a uniform standard language throughout America, nevertheless there is widespread agreement as to those forms and usages not acceptable to educated speakers." (1976: 48) Further specification of the term *nonstandard* is implicit in the definition of *informal*, where the editors write that "among those whose speech is standard, there are at least two levels of language, the language of formal discourse and the

⁶ Of the five monolingual English and French dictionaries, three are general dictionaries aimed at the general public, one is a learner's dictionary and one is a general Canadian dictionary. With the exception of the Canadian dictionaries, which are always presented last, the dictionaries are presented in chronological order, regardless of their type.

language of conversation." (1976: 48) In other words, there are people whose speech is standard, which means that there are others whose speech is not.

The above citation provides an indirect definition of *informal* as the language of conversation. This definition and the inclusion of temporal and regional elements under the heading of "stylistic label" show that, in the minds of the editors of the dictionary, language varieties are linked to both the communicative situation (use-related varieties) and to the user; the two are not separated.

The American Heritage Dictionary, 3rd edition, 1992 (AH3)

In the third edition, the AH changes both its designation and its definition of stylistic labels. The restrictive labels that were called "stylistic labels" in the second edition are termed "status labels" in the third. These status labels "indicate that an entry word or a definition is limited to a particular level or style of usage." (p.xxxvii) While in this statement it is not clear whether level and style designate the same or different concepts, status labels are now clearly separated from temporal and regional labels.

Both the *informal* and *non-standard* labels found in the second edition have slightly different definitions in this edition. The explanation of *non-standard* has been shortened to "This, the most restrictive label in the Dictionary, is applied to forms and usages that educated speakers or writers consider unacceptable" (p.xxxvii) and bypasses the discussion of Standard American English found in the earlier edition. Nonetheless, in both editions, the "educated speaker" is used as the arbiter of a standard variety of language. The definition of *informal*, on the other hand, is greatly expanded, mostly by examples of formal and informal

language situations. The definition in the third edition still begins, however, with "those whose speech is standard", therefore still placing use and user-related restrictions into the same category.

It is also interesting to note that in the list of labels, neither edition of the AH lists *formal* or *literary*, which are generally linked to "style".

The Random House Webster, 1992 (RHWEB)

The RHWEB, a college dictionary, distinguishes between "labels of style or status" and regional, temporal and field labels. The preface explains that style labels "are given to aid in making useful judgments about the setting in which a term is appropriate, the kind of speaker who might use it, the kind of communication intended, and the likely effect on the listener or reader" for "entries not part of the standard vocabulary." (1992: xxiii)

Unfortunately, the editors do not clarify whether style labels fulfill all these functions at the same time and what specific function is covered by the labels *informal*, *nonstandard*, *slang*, *vulgar*, *disparaging*, *offensive*, *facetious*, *baby talk*, *literary*, *eye dialect* and *pron. spelling*. To take a few examples, does the label *literary* mark only the "effect on the listener or reader" since it is defined as "used in contemporary speech or writing to create a poetic, evocative effect", although logically the use of literary language depends also on the setting and the "kind of communication intended?" Similarly, *nonstandard* seems to indicate only "the kind of speaker who might use it" since it is defined as "not conforming to the speech or grammar of educated persons and often regarded as a marker of low social status." However, can someone not adopt *nonstandard* words in certain settings to be *facetious*?

The RHWEB seems to skirt around the whole issue of the user-use distinction by being deliberately vague: although the heading is "labels of style or status", the definitions of the labels themselves do not make explicit the difference between the two.

The Collins COBUILD, 2nd edition, 1995 (COCO)

The COCO, a British learner's dictionary, distinguishes between geographical labels and style labels and explains both types by saying: "some words or meanings are used mainly by particular groups of people, or in particular social contexts" (1995:xx).

"Particular groups of people" seems to refer to geographical differences (British versus American). Style is categorized by the labels *formal, informal, journalism, legal, literary, medical, offensive, old-fashioned, spoken, technical* and *written*.

None of these labels are defined according to a language standard; in fact, the COCO does not use *nonstandard* as a label, at least not in the front matter, and unlike the other dictionaries, no mention is made of the word "standard" when discussing style labels. Nor do the labels indicate anything about the social status of the speaker. Also, unlike both editions of the AH and the RHWEB, the COCO does not include the label *slang*.

On the other hand, the COCO groups professional varieties of language under style and therefore links them to "the type of social situation in which [they are] used" (1995: xx); this inclusion of field within register is reminiscent of the register analysis of Halliday and his successors.

The Gage Canadian Dictionary, 1983 (GAGE)

The Gage Canadian Dictionary (1983) does not separate register labels from other labels in the section in the preface entitled "Restrictions of use." Thus, *dialect*, *archaic*, *historical*, *obsolete*, *trademark*, *Cdn* (Canadianism) are mixed in with the labels, *informal*, *poetic*, *slang*, *derogatory*, *offensive* and *vulgar*.

3.2.2 Comparison of Monolingual English Dictionaries

Presented below is a chart which allows a comparison of the register-related labels in the five dictionaries discussed individually in the previous section.

AH2	AH3	RHWEB	COCO	GAGE
register labels separated from - field labels	register labels separated from - subject labels (i.e. field labels) - temporal labels - English Language labels (i.e. geographical labels) - dialect labels	register labels separated from - labels of time - labels of place - field labels	register labels separated from - geographical labels	register labels not separated from other labels
Stylistic and Geographic labels: - nonstandard - informal - slang - vulgar - obscene - offensive - obsolete - archaic - regional - chiefly British	Status labels: - non-standard - Usage Problems - offensive - vulgar - obscene - slang - informal	Labels of Style and Status: - informal - nonstandard - slang - vulgar - disparaging - offensive - facetious - baby talk - literary - eye dialect - pron. spelling	Style labels: - formal - informal - journalism - legal - literary - medical - offensive - old-fashioned - spoken - technical - written	(All) labels - dialect - obsolete - trademark - Canadianism - informal - slang - derogatory - offensive - vulgar - poetic - archaic - historical
no other register labels listed elsewhere	no other register labels listed elsewhere	no other register labels listed elsewhere	no other register labels listed elsewhere	no other register labels listed elsewhere

Four dictionaries out of the five compared (the exception being the GAGE) use the word "style" as an element in describing varieties of language but all four have a slightly different concept of the word. For the AH2, style includes the idea of a standard based on educated speakers and therefore of user-related characteristics; style also specifically excludes the concept of field labels. In the AH3, the term "stylistic label", now called "status label", is presented as indicating the "level or style of usage", but it still implies a standard variety of language and can still be applied to either user-related varieties or use-related ones. In the RHWEB, the "style or status" distinction is not clearly made in the definitions of the labels themselves and it is impossible to tell whether the editors mean to separate user and use. For the COCO, field labels fall under style, and there seems to be a clear division between user ("particular groups of people", i.e. geographical distinctions) and use ("particular social contexts", i.e. differences in style).

Among the four dictionaries that do make some effort to separate register labels from others, the AH2 and the COCO are the most inclusive in their concept of register: the AH2 only separates out field labels from style labels and the COCO only excludes geographical labels. While both editions of the AH omit *literary* or *formal*, and while the COCO does not list *slang* or *non-standard*, all four dictionaries (as well as the GAGE) do use the labels *informal* and *offensive*. Thus, while the general heading of style may be unclear, there is some agreement as to what subcategories of style should be labeled.

3.2.3 Monolingual French Dictionaries

Le Dictionnaire du français contemporain, 1966 (DFC)

The DFC is a dictionary conceived as a teaching tool. The preface explains that "[le dictionnaire]... donnera les moyens d'exprimer la pensée... au niveau de la communication où [les étudiants] désirent se situer ou du style dans lequel ils veulent s'exprimer." (1966: v)

The explanation of the labels themselves is very brief and the terms used are not clarified. A distinction is made between "niveaux de langue" which include the labels *familier, très familier, populaire, argot*, and "marques stylistiques" which include *langue écrite, soignée, soutenue, littéraire, vieillie*. Although the difference between these two overall categories is not indicated, it seems that "marques stylistiques" refers mostly to written language, the kind one encounters in school-type situations, while "niveaux de langue" seems to refer to spoken varieties of language, all below the neutral level. The inclusion of both *populaire* and *familier* under the same heading implies that no distinction is made between user and use-related varieties of language. The preface includes all the labels listed in the table of abbreviations.

Le Lexis, 2nd edition, 1988 (LEX)

The LEX is a college dictionary, with a didactic purpose, which sets out to include the words that are most frequent and likely to be used by the "locuteur moyennement cultivé." (1988: vii) The editors go on to say that "ces termes sont éventuellement pourvus

d'une indication de niveau de langue précisant la situation de communication où ils sont employés (langue familière, populaire, ou, au contraire, langue soutenue, littéraire)." This seems to imply that the situation of communication is related to the "niveaux de langue", but the relationship between user-related characteristics and use-related ones is not made clear. Everyone presumably experiences situations in which they use "la langue familière" but does everyone make use of "la langue populaire"? Unlike the DFC, the LEX does not make a distinction between "niveaux de langue" and "marques stylistiques", placing *soutenu* and *littéraire* on the same axis as *familier* and *populaire*.

In the table of abbreviations, the LEX also lists *arg*, *péj*, *poét* and *vulg* as well as the labels previously mentioned.

Le Petit Robert, 1991 (PR)

The "marques d'usage" of the PR seem to be used to mark both user-related and use-related varieties of language, for, although in the preface, the editors mention "[les] conditions d'emploi selon les situations" (1991: xvii), these conditions seem to apply only to a certain type of "marque d'usage" (technical and professional labels). The PR distinguishes the different types of "marques d'usage" according to temporal, regional, frequency-related, societal and field-specific characteristics.

The grouping together of *familier* and *populaire* as societal labels reinforces the idea that user- and use-related varieties of language are not distinguished by the PR. And yet, their definitions do seem to distinguish between the two: the first is defined as "courant dans la langue parlée ordinaire et dans la langue écrite un peu libre", while the latter is defined as

"courant dans les milieux populaires des villes, mais réprouvé ou évité par l'ensemble de la bourgeoisie cultivée". It is interesting to note the tone of censure in the definition of *populaire* which seems to imply that this variety of language is substandard. Surprisingly, no mention is made of the labels *littéraire* or *soutenu* found in the LEX in the preface of the PR. In the table of abbreviations, however, the PR does list *littér* and *poét* as well as *arg*, *vulg* and *péj*.

Le Nouveau Petit Robert, 1993 (NPR)

Only two years separate the publication of the 1991 edition of the PR and the NPR but the analysis of restricted language varieties has undergone an important change. Ten years after the publication of Rey's article, *Norme et dictionnaires (domaine du français)*, Rey and the other editors of the NPR make a point in the general discussion of "niveaux de langue" of differentiating between "l'emploi réservé à la langue écrite et à des discours 'soutenus'... aux emplois 'familiers'" (i.e. use-related varieties) and "les usages qui constituent de véritables signaux d'appartenance sociale comme ARG...ou POP" (1993: xiv) (i.e. user-related varieties).

Indeed, within the definitions of *familier* and *populaire*, great care is taken to explain that the first describes "la situation de discours" while the latter describes "l'appartenance sociale" (1993: xxv), and the two are not to be confused. The label *populaire*, in fact, gets two definitions, one in the general preface and one in the table of abbreviations also included in the front matter. The one in the general preface shows a definite departure from the PR: "réservé aux emplois qui dénotent une scolarisation insuffisante dans certains milieux sociaux

défavorisés" (1993: xiv) -- no mention is made of "réprouvé ou évité par l'ensemble de la bourgeoisie cultivée." (1991: xvii) In the table of abbreviations, *pop* is defined as a label "[qui] qualifie un mot ou un sens courant dans la langue parlée des milieux populaires...qui ne s'emploierait pas dans un milieu social élevé." (1993: xxviii) Although this second definition is not as sensitive or as carefully worded as the one in the general preface, the tone of reproof is not as flagrant as in the PR.

The NPR not only distinguishes between style and social group within "niveaux de langue", but also mentions effect on hearer (tied to the label *vulg*) and attitude (tied to the label *péj*) separately.

Also, the NPR, unlike the PR, does include and explain the literary label within the preface. In the table of abbreviations, the NPR also lists *poét*.

Dictionnaire québécois d'aujourd'hui, 2^e ed., 1993 (RQ2)

The preface of the second edition of the *Dictionnaire québécois d'aujourd'hui* lists *fam*, *très fam*, *vulg*, *péj* and *littér* as labels that indicate "[les] valeurs d'emploi." (1993: xix) These labels are separated from temporal and field labels in a general section entitled "Les jugements sociaux et les marques d'usage", which is itself separated from "Le marquage géographique." The terms "valeurs d'emploi" and "marques d'usage" are not explained. Unlike the dictionaries from France, the RQ2 does not mention the label *pop* in the preface. It is, however, included in the table of abbreviations, along with the labels *arg* and *poét*.

3.2.4 Comparison of Monolingual French Dictionaries

Presented below is a chart which allows a comparison of the register-related labels in the five dictionaries discussed individually in the previous section.

DFC	LEX	PR	NPR	RQ2
	register labels separated from - vocabulaire des sciences et techniques - la partie classique et littéraire (i.e. vocabulaire limité dans le temps) - le français "marginal"	register labels separated from - dans l'espace - dans le temps - dans la fréquence - les conditions d'emploi (technique)	register labels separated from - les variations - dans le temps - dans l'espace - les domaines du savoir	register labels separated from - termes techniques et scientifiques - mots vieux et vieillie - le marquage géographique
niveaux de langue: - <i>familiier</i> - <i>très familier</i> - <i>populaire</i> - <i>argot</i> marques stylistiques: - <i>langue écrite</i> - <i>soutenue</i> - <i>littéraire</i> - <i>vieillie</i>	niveaux de langue: - <i>langue familière</i> - <i>populaire</i> - <i>langue soutenue</i> - <i>littéraire</i>	marques d'usage dans la société: - <i>familiier</i> - <i>populaire</i>	niveaux de langue: - <i>littéraire</i> - <i>familiier</i> ----- distinguished from - <i>populaire</i> - <i>argot</i> ----- distinguished from - <i>vulgaire</i> - <i>péjoratif</i>	valeurs d'emploi: - <i>familiier</i> - <i>très familier</i> - <i>vulgaire</i> - <i>péjoratif</i> - <i>littéraire</i>
	other labels in table of abbrev.: - <i>arg</i> - <i>vulg</i> - <i>poét</i> - <i>péj</i>	other labels in table of abbrev.: - <i>vulg</i> - <i>poét</i> - <i>péj</i> - <i>littér</i> - <i>arg</i>	other labels in table of abbrev.: - <i>poét</i>	other labels in table of abbrev.: - <i>arg</i> - <i>poét</i> - <i>pop</i>

All five dictionaries use different words to describe register-related labels: the LEX and the NPR both use "niveaux de langue"; the PR uses "une marque d'usage qui précise la valeur de l'emploi... dans la société"; the RQ2 uses "valeurs d'emploi" within the more

general category "marques d'usage"; and the DFC uses both "niveaux de langue" and "marques stylistiques." The four terms "niveaux de langue", "marques stylistiques", "marques d'usages" and "valeur d'emploi" are used to designate slightly different concepts, and even when the same term "niveau de langue" is used in three dictionaries, its semantic extension, as indicated by the labels it covers, varies. Although the terms used to subcategorize these concepts coincide to some degree (e.g. *familier* and *populaire* are found in all five dictionaries), they are often defined differently, if they are defined at all (only the PR and the NPR bother to define *populaire*, for instance). All the dictionaries, however, do separate field from the concept of register. But the DFC makes a distinction between "niveaux", which cover *familier*, *populaire*, *argot* and "style", which covers *langue écrite*, *soutenue*. Only the NPR clearly differentiates between situations of communication and the social status of the speaker as well as between situations of communication and the attitude of the speaker or effect on the listener.

Like the AH2 and the COCO among the English monolingual dictionaries, the DFC is the most inclusive of the French monolingual dictionaries in its concept of register since it does not exclude temporal labels. It is also the only monolingual French dictionary to present all its labels in the preface: the four others rely on tables of abbreviations to complete their list of labels.

In the case of both the English and the French dictionaries, true correspondence between the five examined can be found only at the level of individual labels. In English, all the dictionaries employ the label *informal* and *offensive*, and many *non-standard*, though they are classed either under "style" or "usage". In French, although the difference between

"niveaux de langue" and "marques stylistiques" remains ambiguous, yet, in each dictionary, we find the labels *familier* and *populaire*.

In conclusion, only one dictionary out of each language group (the COCO in English and the NPR in French) makes an attempt at clarifying the distinction between use-related and user-related varieties of language. As both the COCO and the NPR are the most recent dictionaries in each group, this is perhaps an indication of a new lexicographic trend to make such a distinction clearer.

3.2.5 *Bilingual English/French Dictionaries*

Harrap's Shorter Dictionary, 1991 (HASH)

The HASH separates "style labels" ("niveaux de langue") from field and regional labels. The editors do not, however, define either "style" or "niveaux de langue" or the labels contained within these categories. All that the dictionary user is told is that "style labels" indicate whether a word is "familiar, slang, old-fashioned, literary, vulgar etc" ("familier, argotique, vieilli, littéraire ou vulgaire etc") (1991: xi/xv). The inclusion of "old-fashioned" ("vieilli") in this list indicates, however, that user-related characteristics of language are included within style, although the most obvious user-related variety label, *non-standard (populaire)*, is not mentioned in the front matter.

In the table of abbreviations, the HASH also lists *fml* and *pej*.

Le Grand Dictionnaire Larousse, 1993 (LAR2)

In the front matter of the LAR2, there is a general section entitled "Symbols", in which various symbols are listed, including two related to restrictive varieties of language. An upside-down white triangle "warns the user that a lexical item or particular meaning is very colloquial and thus should be used with caution by non-native speakers." (1993: xi) The equivalent of "very colloquial" in French is "très familier" but neither of these terms is explained. The second symbol, an upside-down black triangle, "warns the user that a lexical item or particular meaning is either vulgar or racist." (1993: xi) In the table of abbreviations, the LAR2 also lists *arg crime*, *arg drogue*, *arg mil*, *arg scol*, *arg univ*, *fam*, *lit*, *péj* and *sl* (meaning *slang* and *argot*). It is impossible to draw any conclusions about the LAR2's treatment of restricted language varieties from such cursory information in the front matter.

The Oxford Hachette, 1994 (OXHA)

Like the LAR2, the OXHA merely lists a few symbols. Under the heading "register symbols" ("niveaux de langue"), a white circle means "informal" ("familier"), a half-white, half-black circle, "very informal" ("populaire") and a black circle, "vulgar or taboo" ("vulgaire ou tabou") (1994: xlviii/li). No explanation is provided. However, the translation of "very informal" by "populaire" seems to indicate that, in the minds of the editors, there is an overlap between register and social class.

Register symbols are separated from field labels, from labels indicating pejorative and figurative use and from a puzzling category called "level of language", which is not

mentioned in the French part of the preface, for the example of *lang enfantin*.

In the table of abbreviations, more labels are given, including *fml* (formal/soutenu), *lang enfantin* (baby talk/langage enfantin), *injur* (offensive/injurieux), *lit/littér* and *péj*.

The Robert Collins Super Senior, 1995 (RCSS)

The front matter of the latest Robert Collins Dictionary is identical to that of the 1993 *Robert Collins Senior*, which is in turn only slightly changed from the front matter of the 1987 *Robert Collins*. The RCSS devotes a page and a half to the explanation of "style labels" ("niveaux de langue") and the various symbols and labels contained within that heading: *fml* ("formel"), * ("familier"), ** (très familier), *** ("injurieux"), † ("démodé"), †† ("archaïque"), *liter, littér* ("littéraire") and *arg, sl* ("argot"). These symbols and labels are "indicators of register [which] are used to mark non-neutral words and expressions." (1995: xxvii) In the parallel French explanation "non-neutral" is rendered as "qui présente[nt] un écart par rapport à la langue courante." (1995: xxi) However, "langue courante" is not really an equivalent for "neutral words" since "courante" seems more of an indication of frequency of use while "neutral" implies a qualitative judgment.

The RCSS does explain each indicator of register in both French and English, although some of these explanations are not particularly insightful: for example, the labels "liter, littér denote an expression which belongs to literary or poetic language." (1995: xx) There are also inconsistencies between the French and English explanations of the symbols, most notably for the "familier" and "très familier" symbols (represented by one star and two stars, respectively). The French explanation of "familier" is "[qui] marque la majeure partie

des expressions familières et les incorrections de langage employées dans la langue de tous les jours. Ce signe conseille au lecteur d'être prudent" (1995: xxi) while the parallel English explanation reads "indicates that the expression, 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." (1995: xx). Thus, the English is a great deal more explicit about the sort of situation which justifies the use of this register and the person liable to use it, while the French simply uses the term "expressions familières" as a self-evident explanation. Despite the mention of "standard language" in the English explanation, the latter is descriptive overall, whereas the French one tends towards the prescriptive despite its use of the more neutral "langue de tous les jours."⁷

Despite these few inconsistencies and ambiguities, the RCSS does, at least, offer a very comprehensive list of labels as well as an explanation of these labels. Unlike the other three dictionaries, the table of abbreviations in the RCSS does not contain any labels not mentioned in the preface.

Dictionnaire canadien français-anglais, anglais-français, 1962 (DC)

The *Dictionnaire canadien français-anglais, anglais-français* is, in fact, the only general bilingual dictionary published in Canada to date and it is rather small and fairly old. In a section entitled "Explanation of Symbols" found in the front matter, only one symbol listed is tied to register: "a dagger indicates a form or meaning which is archaic or purely literary" (1962: xii), thus integrating a temporal label with a register label. No further

⁷ Notice too how "la langue de tous les jours" seems to be opposed to "la langue courante", above.

explanation or mention of register labels is given.

3.2.6 Comparison of Bilingual English/French Dictionaries

Presented below is a chart which allows a comparison of the register-related labels in the five dictionaries discussed individually in the previous section.

HASH	LAR2	OXHA	RCS/RCSs	DC
register labels separated from - field labels - regional labels (i.e. geographical labels)		register labels separated from - pejorative use - figurative use - field label - temporal label - level of language (e.g. baby talk) - regional labels	register labels separated from - field labels/ domaines	no separation of any labels, no mention of register
Style labels/ indications de niveaux de langue: - <i>fam.</i> - <i>slang</i> - <i>old-fashioned</i> - <i>literary</i> - <i>vulgar</i> - <i>archaic</i>	Symbols: - <i>colloq/fam</i> - <i>vulgar, racist</i>	register symbol/ indicateur de niveau de langue: - <i>inf/fam</i> - <i>very inf/pop</i> - <i>vulgar/ taboo</i>	niveaux de langue/ style labels: - <i>frm</i> - <i>(inf)/fam</i> - <i>(very inf)/ très fam</i> - <i>offensive/ indécent, injurieux</i> - <i>old-fashioned/ démodé</i> - <i>obsolete/ archaic</i> - <i>littér/ liter</i> - <i>arg/ sl</i>	Symbols: - <i>archaic or literary</i>
other labels in table of abbrev.: - <i>fml</i> - <i>péj</i>	other labels in table of abbrev.: - <i>arg crime</i> - <i>arg drogue</i> - <i>arg mil</i> - <i>arg scol</i> - <i>arg univ</i> - <i>fam</i> - <i>littér</i> - <i>péj</i> - <i>sl</i>	other labels in table of abbrev.: - <i>fml</i> - <i>injur</i> - <i>l. enfantin</i> - <i>littér</i> - <i>péj</i>	no other register labels listed elsewhere	no other register labels listed elsewhere

As was the case for the monolingual dictionaries, the bilingual dictionaries do not all agree on a generic designation for register-related labels: the HASH and the RCSS call them "style labels" ("niveaux de langue"), the RCSS also refers to them as "indicators of register", while the OXHA calls them "register symbols" ("indicateur de niveau de langue"). The LAR2 and the DC avoid the issue altogether, by placing the restrictive symbols in the very general category of symbols, along with other various symbols.

Of the five bilingual dictionaries, only the RCSS takes the trouble to define its register labels and what they mean by "style label" or "niveaux de langue", even if these explanations are not always very helpful and some contain inconsistencies between the French and English. The other four dictionaries leave it to the reader to make sense of their register-related labels. With the exception of the DC (which does not even list field), all the dictionaries seem to exclude field from style or register, though this distinction is not always clearly stated.

Once again, however, the labels themselves, especially the label *familier/informal*, point to the fact that the generic category is the same in all of the dictionaries except the DC, which does not list any register label or symbol except *literary*. It is also interesting to note that only the OXHA lists *populaire* as a label, and none of the five lists *non-standard* as a label, although these are found in the monolingual dictionaries.

3.2.7 Conclusions on register labeling as presented in the front matter

Several observations on register labeling can be drawn from the tables above:

- 1) With the exception of the COCO, field labels are explicitly or implicitly excluded.

- 2) With the exception of the AH2 and the GAGE, geographical labels are excluded.
- 3) Temporal labels are included by about half the dictionaries: the AH2, COCO, GAGE, DFC, HASH, RCSS and DC. Among the temporal labels, *old-fashioned* (*démodé*) could be considered a style or status label while *archaic* or *obsolete* cannot, but both types will be excluded from the analysis of dictionary entries which follows, unless they are used in combination with more generally accepted register labels or if there is a disagreement between dictionaries as to whether a word is restricted by time or by register.
- 4) The labels *slang* and *argot*, in their true sense, should fall under "field", but these labels are often used to mean *very informal* and can be considered as register labels when they seem to mean the latter.
- 5) The remaining labels can be further divided into sub-categories:
 - linguistic/social status: *non-standard*, *populaire*;
 - "style" : *informal/ familier*, *literary/ littéraire*, *formal*, *langue soutenue*, *langue soutenue, très familier*, *eye dialect* (literary but its purpose is to show lack of education), *pronounced spelling* (literary but its purpose is to imitate speech) and *baby talk* (simple, informal language generally used to address a child or to get attention);
 - attitude: *offensive*, *disparaging*, *facetious*, *péjoratif/pejorative*;
 - taboo: *vulgar*, *vulgaire*, *obscene*, *taboo*, *indécent*;
 - channel: *written*, *langue écrite*, *spoken*;

Other general trends between dictionaries can be observed. With the exception of the NPR and the RQ2, the French monolingual dictionaries do not include labels tied to attitude/taboo within register, but they all do include labels tied to formality and, with the

exception of the RQ2, labels related to social group. The English monolingual dictionaries, on the other hand, all include labels tied to attitude/taboo as well as formality under register or style, and, with the exception of the COCO and the GAGE, also include labels tied to social group (*non-standard* is explicitly defined as the language not used by educated people). The bilingual dictionaries all include labels tied to formality and, with the exception of the DC, also those tied to attitude/taboo, but only the OXHA includes a label tied to social status.

Theoretical lexicographers like Cassidy, Card *et al* and Preston all point out that a label can include elements belonging to different dimensions, though the number and the names of their dimensions vary. In the front matter of the dictionaries reviewed here, this possibility is not mentioned in the general explanation of usage labels except in the RHWEB, which lists several dimensions (the kind of speaker, the appropriateness for the setting, the intention of communication and the effect on the hearer). However, even in the RHWEB, much less in the other dictionaries, some of Cassidy's and Card's dimensions are not addressed (quantity or responsibility, for example). And the RHWEB, which as indicated above, is the only dictionary to specifically address the question of dimensions, does not specify whether a label can apply to several dimensions at once. Thus, there seems to be a gap between register viewed by theoretical lexicography and register presented by dictionary-makers. And as we have already noted in our analysis of dictionary front matter, there is a fair amount of discrepancy in the treatment of register from one dictionary to another.

Chapter 4

Register labeling within dictionary entries

The examination of dictionary front matters has indicated that there is little similarity between dictionaries in the treatment of register labels. However, the front matter reveals little in comparison to the actual body of the dictionary itself. It is therefore important to examine and analyze a number of entries to draw any definitive conclusion about register labeling.

4.1 *Method of selection and analysis of entries*

The entries chosen for analysis were taken from the letter F. We examined the entire letter F in both the French and English monolingual dictionaries whose front matter we have already discussed. While we did not make note of every word with a register label that began with the letter F, we chose a fairly representative sample of words from the English dictionaries, the AH2, AH3, RHWEB and COCO, and from the French dictionaries, the DFC, LEX, PR and NPR.¹ We ensured that the final list of words provided at least one example of every register label encountered. Presented below are the words selected for analysis.

¹ The reasons why the Canadian dictionaries examined in the previous chapter were not studied at this point are presented later in this section.

English

fab	fast lane	fink	to forswear
fabulous	fast track	to fire	forthcoming
to face the music	fat chance	firearms	fount
factotum	fat cat	firewater	frame
to fade	fathead	firmament	frame-up
faeces	fatuous	to have a	to frazzle
fag ¹	faux pas	fit	to freak
fag ²	to faze	fix	freaking
faggot	feckless	to fix	freaky
to fail to see	fecund	fixity	freebie
fair (weather)	fed(s)	flagellation	free lunch
fair sex	fed up	flak	French kiss
fair shake	feed	flake	fridge
fairy	to feel up	flaky	to frig
fait accompli	feelgood	flappable	frog
eyes fall on	to feign	to flash	fruit
smthg	felicitous	to flash s.o. a	fruity
to fall for	felicity	smile	to fuck
fall guy	femme, fem	to flaunt	fulcrum
fallacious	fence	flick	to fulminate
falsehood	on the fence	flip	fun
falsie	fence sitter	to flip out	funk ¹
familial	fender bender	flivver	funk ²
famished	to fess	floozy	funky
fanatic	fetid	flu	funny farm
a fancy	fiat	fluke	fuzz
fancy (house)	fiddlesticks	to flunk	
fanfare	field day	fly	
fanny	fifty-fifty	foe	
fantabulous	to figure on	Foggy Bottom	
fantastic	to figure out	footfall	
farewell	to filch	footsie	
far-out	fin du siècle	forbear	
to fart	fine	forefather	
to fart around	to finger	foreign (object)	

French

fabricateur	faucher	fixer	foudre¹
fabuleusement	faute à	flag	foudre²
fabuleux	fayot¹	flagada	foutu
façade	fayot²	flambé	frangin
face de rat	fécond	flambeur	franglais
face	femelle	en rester comme	frappe
facétieux	fendard	deux ronds de	frerot
faconde	se fendre	flan	fric
fada	la gueule	flanquer	fric-frac
fadasse	sans coup férir	flemme	fricoter
fadé	fermer la bouche	perdre sa fleur	fridolin
fafiot	la fermer	fleurir	fringues
fagoter	fermer	fiic	frisson
sexe faible	féru	flicard	froc
faignant/	poser ses fesses	flingue	from(e)gi/
feignant	botter les fesses	flop	from(e)ton
faire un enfant	feu	flotte	frotteur
faire pipi, caca	feu (adj)	flouse	frousse
s'en faire	dur de la feuille	faire du foin	frusques
faisan	feuj	foire	fumiste
faiseur	fi!	faire la foire	furax
fait	fiasco	foireux¹	fusiller
fallacieux	ficelé	foireux²	fustiger
falot	ficelle	des fois	futuriste
falzar	ficher	foison	
famélique	ficher le camp	foncer	
fameusement	fichtre	for	
fan	fichtrement	formidable	
fana	fifty-fifty	formide	
fange	figurez vous	fort (adv)	
faramineux	filer¹	fossile	
se farcir qch	filer²	coup de foudre	
se farcir qn	fillasse	fouetter	
farfelu	fil de ses	fouille	
fat	oeuvres	fouillis	
fathma	fini	fouler	
fatiguer (salade)	fiole	fourbe	
fauché	firamment	fourbi	
	fistot	fourguer	
	fiston	foudre (n)	

The chosen words were then entered into charts and the labels assigned to them, if any, in each of the monolingual dictionaries indicated above was noted. This made it possible to compare labeling between dictionaries of the same language.

The same words, in both languages, were then put into separate charts and their labels examined in the bilingual dictionaries, the HASH, LAR2, OXHA, RCSS. Equivalents given, as well as the labels of those equivalents when applicable, were duly entered as well.

The initial list of dictionaries examined did not include any of the Canadian dictionaries, although the selected words were later examined separately in Canadian monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. The discussion of register labeling in Canadian dictionaries has been deliberately separated for two reasons. The first is to better analyze the differences between Canadian dictionaries and the dictionaries of other countries, to see, in essence, if Canadian lexicography has its own particular traits. The second is to better direct our attention to Canadian dictionaries, in the hopes of making recommendations relevant to Canadian bilingual lexicographers, especially those working on the Bilingual Canadian Dictionary project.

Though the method of analysis outlined above may not be completely objective, the resultant charts, which are included in Appendix 2, do reveal a great deal about the treatment of register labels in dictionaries. The following analysis is divided into eight sections:

- 1 - comparison of monolingual English non-Canadian dictionaries
- 2 - comparison of monolingual English non-Canadian dictionaries with an English Canadian dictionary

- 3 - comparison of monolingual French non-Canadian dictionaries
- 4 - comparison of monolingual French non-Canadian dictionaries
with a French Canadian dictionary
- 5 - comparison of headwords in bilingual non-Canadian English/French dictionaries
- 6 - comparison of headwords in bilingual non-Canadian dictionaries and a Canadian bilingual
dictionary
- 7 - comparison of headwords in monolingual and bilingual non-Canadian dictionaries
- 8 - comparison of headwords in monolingual and bilingual Canadian and non-Canadian
dictionaries

Each of these sections contains five common criteria of comparison, although additional criteria have been added where necessary:

- 1 - consistency across all dictionaries
- 2 - consistency across all dictionaries that label or list the word
- 3 - number of labels and use of labels
- 4 - combination of labels
- 5 - words that have the greatest discrepancy in their labels

These eight sections are followed by general conclusions on headword labeling in dictionaries, after which the register of equivalents in bilingual dictionaries is examined.

4.2 Comparison of monolingual English non-Canadian dictionaries

1) Consistency across all dictionaries:

Only four words found in all four dictionaries are more or less consistently labeled.

faggot: AH2, *slang*; AH3, *offensive slang*; RHWB, *slang (disparaging and offensive)*;

COCO, *very inf and offensive*.

fairy: AH2, *slang*; AH3, *offensive slang*; RHWB, *slang (disparaging and offensive)*;

COCO, *offensive*.

frog: AH2, *offensive slang*; AH3, *offensive slang*; RHWB, *slang (disparaging and offensive)*; COCO, *informal use which some find offensive*.

fuck: AH2, *obscene*; AH3, *obscene*; RHWB, *vulgar*; COCO, *rude and offensive word*

It is worth noting that not a single headword examined is labeled identically in all four dictionaries. While the labels for the word **fuck**, for example, all have more or less the same meaning, the actual label used is different from dictionary to dictionary (*obscene*, *vulgar*, *offensive*).

2) Consistency across dictionaries that label or list the word

If we examine words which are not listed or labeled by all the dictionaries but are listed and labeled by at least two dictionaries, greater consistency can be noted in the labeling of words.

fabulous, fantastic, fifty-fifty (*inf*, AH2+COCO)

falsie, fanfare, feed, on the fence, field day, to fire, flatfoot¹, flu, frazzle (*inf*,

AH2+AH3)

fat cat, fink. flatfoot², fly, fruity (*slang*, AH2+AH3+RHWEB)

fathead, firewater, flake, French kiss, funky (*slang*, AH2+AH3)

feds, footsie, fun (*inf*, AH3+RHWEB+COCO)

feel up (*vulg slang* AH2+AH3+RHWEB)

fender bender, fess (*inf* AH3+RHWEB)

figure on, to flunk (*inf*, AH3+COCO)

figure out, to fix, flak, frame-up (*inf*, AH2+AH3+COCO)

fine, fridge (*inf*, AH2+AH3+RHWEB)

to flash (*slang*, AH3+RHWEB)

3) Number of labels and use of labels

The COCO has the greatest number and variety of register labels since it includes *formal, written English* and *literary*, and it also makes the most use of labels (out of 100 entries included, only 11 words are not labeled). It is interesting to note that only the COCO uses labels within the dictionary itself that are not listed in the front matter (*very informal* and also *rude word*, which is, however, similar to *offensive*).

The other three dictionaries all have about the same number of labels they use but the RHWEB labels the least number of entries (out of 127 entries included, 78 are not labeled).

4) Combination of labels²

The COCO also uses the widest variety of combined labels, with the charts revealing eleven different combinations (e.g. *inf and offensive*, *inf and used in spoken English*, *old-fashioned or literary*), while the AH2 and the AH3 use only two combinations, *vulg slang* and *offensive slang*.

5) Words that have the greatest discrepancy in their labels:

Only four words exhibited a fairly great discrepancy in their labels:

fanny (AH2+AH3, *slang*; RHWEB, *inf*; COCO, *rude word*)

fart around (AH2, *vulg slang*; AH3, not listed; RHWEB, *slang*; COCO, *very inf*)

flaunt (AH2, *non-standard*; AH3, *usage problem*; RHWEB, no label; COCO, not listed)

to freak (AH2+AH3, *slang*; RHWEB, no label; COCO, *inf*)

6) Differences in labeling between the American dictionaries and the British COCO

There are many instances among the words analyzed where the general American dictionaries use the same label but the COCO gives a different label. The two cases in which this phenomenon is the most prevalent are the following: a) where the COCO gives a formal or literary label but the other dictionaries do not label the word at all (**fulminate**, **forbear**, **forswear**, **forefather**, **fount**, **fixity**, **fetid**, **fecund**, etc); and b) where the three American dictionaries use the label *slang* and the COCO uses the *informal* label (**fall-guy**,

² By combination of labels, we mean two or more labels used together to mark a word. When counting the number of different combinations used by the various dictionaries in the analyses that follow, we included only those which had at least one register label. In other words, combinations like *arch or hum* were not taken into account since neither label is a register label according to our definition of "register" in Chapter 2.

far-out, to finger, fix (noun), fuzz). These differences between the COCO and the American dictionaries seem to be due to the fact that the COCO uses more labels than the American dictionaries and that it does not include the label *slang*.

In the following cases, however, the differences in labeling seemed at first sight to be due to the geographical origin of the dictionary. Since the COCO was the only British dictionary included in this study, in order to verify this impression, we consulted the labels for these words in the *Collins Dictionary of the English Language* (COLL), a British collegiate dictionary.

fag¹ (in the American sense of "homosexual") (AH2+AH3+RHWB, *slang*; COCO *inf*); in the COLL, also labeled *slang*;

fanny (in the American sense of "buttocks") (AH2+AH3+RHWB, *slang*; COCO *rude word*); in the COLL, this sense is labeled *slang*;

flaky (in the American sense of "eccentric") (AH2+AH3+RHWB, *slang*; COCO, *shows disapproval*); in the COLL, labeled *U.S. slang*;

flaunt (in the American sense of "disobey") (AH2, *non-standard*; AH3, *usage problem*; RHWB, no label; COCO, not listed); the COLL is in agreement with the COCO here and does not list this sense.

In fact, the COLL agrees more often with the American dictionaries than with the COCO -- only **flaunt** receives similar treatment in the two British dictionaries. Hence the differences noted in the above list do not seem to be due to the geographical origin of the original dictionaries.

7) Changes in the labels of the AH2 and the AH3 that indicate the passage of time

It is interesting to note differences in the labeling of the same words in two different editions of the same basic dictionary.

fantastic (AH2, *inf*; AH3, no label)

frame (AH2, *slang*; AH3, *inf*)

funk (AH2, *slang*; AH3, *Mus*)

fag², faggot (AH2, *slang*; AH3, *offensive slang*)

Overall, for words already labeled in the AH2, the AH3 is less extreme: a word that is labeled *slang* in the AH2 is labeled *inf* in the AH3; a headword labeled *inf* receives no label in the subsequent edition. The exceptions represented by **fag** and **faggot** can be explained by the growing acceptance of different sexual orientations and therefore a corresponding aversion for sexually derogatory words. The replacement of a register label by a field label for the word **funk** shows how non-traditional artforms gain legitimacy with time.

In addition, we found some words that had not been listed in the AH2, but are included with labels in the AH3.

to flash, fab, fantabulous, free lunch (AH2, not listed; AH3, *slang*)

fender-bender, fess (AH2, not listed; AH3, *inf*)

4.3 *Comparison of monolingual English non-Canadian dictionaries with an English Canadian dictionary*

It must be pointed out that the GAGE does not list 38 of the 134 words examined.

It therefore covers even fewer of these words than does the COCO. In terms of the labels used in the entries examined, there are no register labels in the GAGE which were not listed in the front matter.

1) Consistency with other English monolingual dictionaries

Only three words found in all five dictionaries are labeled more or less consistently in both the GAGE and the English non-Canadian dictionaries.

faggot: AH2, *slang*; AH3, *offensive slang*; RHWEB, *slang (disparaging and offensive)*; COCO, *very inf and offensive*; GAGE, *slang*.

fairy: AH2, *slang*; AH3, *offensive slang*; RHWEB, *slang (disparaging and offensive)*; COCO, *offensive*; GAGE, *slang*.

frog: AH2, *offensive slang*; AH3, *offensive slang*; RHWEB, *slang (disparaging and offensive)*; COCO, *informal use which some find offensive*; GAGE, *derogatory slang*.

2) Consistency with other English monolingual dictionaries that label or list the word

If we examine words which are not listed or labeled by all the dictionaries but are listed and labeled by at least two dictionaries, greater consistency can be noted in the labeling of words.

fabulous, falsie, famished, fantastic, to faze, feed, on the fence, fifty-fifty, figure on, figure out, fine, to fire, to fix, flak, flu, to flunk, footsie, to frazzle, fridge, fun, funk
(*inf*)

fat cat, fathead, fink, flatfoot² (*slang*)

3) Number of labels and use of labels

If we count the different register labels used for the words within the chart, the GAGE only uses two, *inf* and *slang*. It therefore shows the least variety out of the five monolingual English dictionaries.

The GAGE does not label 43 of the 96 words it includes; it therefore uses a label less often than any of the other dictionaries except the RHWB.

4) Combination of labels

In the chart, the GAGE uses a combination of labels only once: *frog* is labeled *derogatory slang*.

5) Words that have the greatest discrepancies in their labels when the first four English dictionaries are compared to the Gage

Five words exhibited a fairly great discrepancy in their labels:

far-out (AH2+AH3+RHWB, *slang*; COCO, *inf*; GAGE, no label)

fed up (AH2+AH3+RHWB, no label; COCO, *inf*; GAGE, *slang*)

firewater (AH2+AH3, *slang*; RHWB, no label; GAGE, *humorous*)

frame-up (AH2+AH3+COCO, *inf*; RHWB, no label; GAGE, *slang*)

funky (AH2+AH3, *slang*; RHWB+COCO, no label; GAGE, *inf*)

The GAGE uses no label at all or a less extreme label than the other dictionaries in half of the cases listed above.

Overall, however, when there is a disagreement between the first four dictionaries, the GAGE has a tendency to agree with the more extreme label. For instance, the words **fab**, **fag¹**, **fall for**, **fall guy**, **fanny**, **fat chance**, **to finger**, **freaky**, **freebie** and **fuzz** are labeled *inf* by the COCO and/or one of the American dictionaries but labeled *slang* by other American dictionaries (since the COCO does not use *slang* as a label) and the GAGE. When the GAGE does agree with the COCO, it is generally to label a word *inf* while the American dictionaries do not use a label at all (**fluke**, **famished**). In a few cases, however, the GAGE chooses a less extreme label than some of the other dictionaries, as in the following: **fair shake** (AH2, *slang*; AH3, *inf*; RHWEB, no label; GAGE, *inf*); **fence** (AH2+AH3+RHWEB, no label; COCO, *inf*; GAGE, no label); **fix** (noun) (AH2+AH3+RHWEB, *slang*; COCO, *inf*; GAGE, *inf*); **funky** (AH2+AH3, *slang*; RHWEB+COCO, no label; GAGE, *inf*).

In essence, the GAGE is closer to the American dictionaries than to the COCO in its choice of labels and it shows, on the whole, a fairly conservative approach to choosing and labeling words (it is the only dictionary of the five to exclude the word **fuck**, for instance).

4.4 *Comparison of monolingual French non-Canadian dictionaries*

1) Consistency across all dictionaries

In comparison to the English monolingual dictionaries, the French dictionaries show a great deal more consistency. The following words were labeled similarly in all four dictionaries:

fabuleux, **fange**, **firmanent**, **fleurer**, **fustiger** (*littér*)

fadasse, s'en faire, fameusement, fana, faramineux, fauché, ficelé, flambé, flanquer,
fossile, fourbi, frerot (*fam*)
feu ma tante (*littér ou humoristique/plaisant*)
fort (*langue écrite/rare dans la langue parlée*)

2) Consistency across dictionaries that label or list the word

If we examine words which are not listed or labeled by all the dictionaries but are listed and labeled by at least two dictionaries, even greater consistency can be noted in the labeling of words.

fabriquer, ficher (*fam, DFC+LEX+NPR*)

farfelu, fatiguer, fumiste (*fam, PR+NPR*)

fermer la bouche, foncer, futuriste (*fam, DFC+LEX*)

fichtre, foire (*fam, LEX+PR+NPR*)

faconde, for (*littér, LEX+PR+NPR*;

fat (*littér, DFC+LEX*)

fécond (*littér, PR+NPR*)

falot (*arg mil, LEX+PR+NPR*)

fistot (*arg mil, LEX+PR*)

faute à qn, fermer, (*pop, PR+NPR*)

perdre sa fleur (*pop, DFC+LEX*)

flouze, fouille (*pop, LEX+PR+NPR*)

femelle (*pop et péj, LEX+PR+NPR*)

fendard, (*arg*, PR+NPR)

flambeur (*arg*, LEX+PR+NPR)

flop (*arg des spectacles*, PR+NPR)

foutre (noun) (*vulg*, PR+NPR)

frisson (*poét*, PR+NPR)

3) Number of labels and use of labels

The NPR has the greatest variety of register labels. Unlike the monolingual English dictionaries, the French monolingual dictionaries are fairly close in terms of the number of words they label. Proportionately, the DFC labels the least (out of 94 words listed, 10 are not labeled) while the LEX labels the most (out of 123 words listed, 8 are not labeled) but the results are too close to clearly distinguish among the dictionaries in terms of their use of labels.

4) Combination of labels

The PR and the NPR both make the greatest use of combination of labels while the DFC makes the least. In the entries examined, both the PR and NPR used 15 different combinations, though these are not the same in both dictionaries; these include, among others, *fam et l. enfantine, littér ou plaisant* and *arg scol et fam*.

5) Words that have the greatest discrepancy in their labels

Only four words exhibit considerable discrepancy in labeling and none of them is

listed in the DFC.

fadé (DFC, not listed; LEX, *arg*; PR, *pop et iron*; NPR, *fam et iron*)

fichtrement (DFC, not listed; LEX, *fam*; PR, no label; NPR, *fam, vieilli*)

from(e)gi/ from(e)ton (DFC, not listed; LEX *arg*; PR, *pop*; NPR, *var fam*)

frotteur (DFC, not listed; LEX, *psychopathol*; PR, *pop*; NPR, *fam*)

The fact that all the words listed above are not included in the DFC may be an indication of their more marginal status, or of their rarity. The words **from(e)gi/from(e)ton** illustrate the acceptance of lexical items over time as they steadily make their way from dictionary to dictionary and from label to label, beginning with complete exclusion and ending with the benign *fam*. The word **frotteur** deserves mention since the difference in labeling between the LEX on the one hand and the PR and NPR on the other illustrates how different dictionaries emphasize different contexts of use (why, for instance, can the field label and the register label not be used together?)

6) Changes in the labels of the PR and the NPR that indicate the passage of time

It is interesting to note differences in the labeling of the same words in the different editions of the same basic dictionary.

fafiot (PR, *pop*; NPR, *fam, vieilli*)

faiseur (PR, *péj*; NPR, *vx ou littér*)

fiolle (PR, *fam*; NPR, *fam et vieilli*)

fourbe (PR, no label; NPR, *vieilli*)

The NPR shows a tendency to pay more attention to labeling words that are less current

now. It also includes one word from the *argot* which the PR did not list: **flag** (PR, not listed; NPR, *arg*).

7) Words labeled *fam* in the NPR and *pop* in the other three dictionaries

Since the NPR makes a strict separation between language variety based on situation and language variety marked by social group, many words which are labeled *pop* in the three other dictionaries are labeled *fam* in the NPR:

façade, fafiot, faire un enfant à une femme, se farcir, fayot, dur de la feuille, filer, flic, flingue, faire du foin, fouetter, foutu, frangin, frappe, fric, froc, frusques.

The NPR retains the *pop* label for only five words: **la faute à qn**, **fermer** (not listed in the DFC+LEX, *pop* in the PR); **flouze** (not listed in the DFC; *pop* in the LEX+PR); **des fois** (*fam* in the DFC+LEX, *pop* in the PR); **fusiller** (*fam* in the DFC+LEX, *pop* in the PR, *pop et vieilli* in the NPR).

8) Differences in labeling between the Larousse and Robert dictionaries

Since the DFC and the LEX are both published by Larousse and the PR and NPR are both Robert products, there are many instances where the difference in labels seem to be attributable to publishing house practices.

fada (DFC+LEX, *fam*; PR+NPR, *région*)

fagoter (DFC+LEX, *fam et péj*; PR+NPR, *fig et cour*)

fait, faucher, flemme, fouler, fricoter, fringues (DFC+LEX, *pop*; PR+NPR, *fam*)

des fois (DFC+LEX, *fam*; PR+NPR, *pop*)

fallacieux (DFC+LEX, *l. soutenue*; PR+NPR, *vx ou littér*)

sans coup férir (DFC+LEX, 1 *sense, l. soignée*; PR+NPR, 2 *sens: 1) vx et 2) mod*)

fi! (DFC+LEX, *littér*; PR+NPR, *vx ou plaisant*)

ficelle (DFC+LEX, *arg mil*; PR+NPR, *fam*)

foireux¹ (DFC+LEX, *pop*; PR+NPR, *vulg*)

foison (DFC+LEX, *littér*; PR+NPR, *vieilli*)

fourguer (DFC+LEX, *pop* ; PR+NPR, *arg*)

4.5 *Comparison of monolingual French non-Canadian dictionaries with a French Canadian dictionary*

The RQ2 does not list 48 of the 137 words examined. In other words, this dictionary includes the fewest words in the chart (not a surprising result since some of the senses or words chosen are specifically French from France.)

1) Consistency of the RQ2 with the other French monolingual dictionaries

The RQ2 shows a fair amount of consistency in labeling with the other French monolingual dictionaries.

fabuleux, fange, fleurir, fustiger (*littér*)

fadasse, fana, faramineux, fauché, ficelé, flanquer, fossile, fourbi, frerot (*fam*)

fort (*rare dans la l. parlée/ surtout dans la l. écrite*)

Once again, the French monolingual dictionaries, including the Canadian one, are in complete agreement more often than the English monolinguals.

2) Consistency with other French monolingual dictionaries that label or list a word

If we examine words which are not listed or labeled by all the dictionaries but are listed and labeled by at least two dictionaries, the following show consistency in labeling words.

fabriquer, ficher (*fam*, DFC+LEX+NPR+RQ2)

farfelu, fumiste (*fam*, PR+NPR+RQ2)

foncer (*fam*, DFC+LEX+RQ2)

fichtre, foire (*fam*, LEX+PR+NPR+RQ2)

faconde (*littér*, LEX+PR+NPR+RQ2)

frisson (*poét*, PR+NPR+RQ2)

3) Number of labels and use of labels

The RQ2 uses only five different register labels; it therefore uses less labels than any of the other four French dictionaries. While it labels 75 of the 90 words it does list, it still labels less than the non-Canadian French dictionaries.

4) Combination of labels

There is only example in the chart where the RQ2 combines labels: the word **frappe** is labeled *fam et péj*. It therefore combines labels much less than the non-Canadian French dictionaries.

5) Words that have the greatest discrepancies in their labels when the first four French dictionaries are compared to the RQ2

While the number of words labeled similarly in all French dictionaries is much greater than the number in English dictionaries, the number of words showing the greatest discrepancies in all the French dictionaries is similar to that noted for the English dictionaries.

fat (DFC+LEX, *littér*; PR+NPR, no label; RQ2, *vieilli*)

fayot¹ (DFC+LEX+PR, *pop*; NPR, *fam*; RQ2, *en Acadie*)

femelle (LEX+PR+NPR, *pop et péj*; RQ2, *injurieux*)

fini (DFC, *littér*; LEX+PR+NPR, *philos*; RQ2, no label)

firmament (the others, *littér*; RQ2, *poét*)

s'en faire, fameusement, flambé (the others, *fam*; RQ2, no label)

flambeur (LEX+PR+NPR, *arg*; RQ2, *fam*)

The RQ2 often does not label what the others dictionaries do label. The only case where the RQ2's label is stronger than the others' is for **femelle** which can be explained by a greater sensitivity to women's status in North America than in France. The word **fayot** is interesting since it illustrates how the register of words is geographically and culturally bound and also provides an insight into the history of French settlement in Canada.

Overall, the RQ2 tends to be less extreme in its labeling and, for the most part, if there is a disagreement among the dictionaries from France, it follows the more moderate labels of the NPR (*se farcir qch, la fermer, poser ses fesses, botter les fesses à qn, feu,*

être dur de la **feuille**, **filer**, en rester comme deux ronds de **flan**, **flic**, **flotte**, faire du foin, **foutre**, **foutu**, **fric**, **froc**, **frusques** are labeled *fam* by the NPR and the RQ2, while they are labeled *pop* by the other dictionaries, when they are listed.)

4.6 *Comparison of headwords in bilingual non-Canadian English/French dictionaries*

In this section, as well as in Sections 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9, the originally selected English and French words will be analyzed as headwords in bilingual dictionaries. Their equivalents will be examined in Section 4.10.

1) Consistency across all dictionaries

The labeling of both English and French words seems more consistent in bilingual non-Canadian dictionaries than in the monolingual non-Canadian dictionaries. The following similarities have been noted.

a) E→F

fabulous, **far-out** , **fat chance**, **fathead**, **feds**, **fed up**, **feed**, **firewater**, **flak**, **to flunk** (*inf*)
foe, **fount** (*lit*)

b) F→E

fabriquer, **fada**, **fana**, **faramineux**, **farfelu**, **fauché**, **faucher**, **ficher**, **ficher le camp**,
fiston, **flagada**, **flanquer**, **flemme**, **flic**, **flotte**, **faire la foire**, **foncer**, **formidable**, **fouler**,
fourbi, **frangin**, **frérot**, **fricoter**, **frousses** (*fam*)

2) Consistency across dictionaries that label or list the word

If we examine words which are not listed or labeled by all the dictionaries but are listed and labeled by at least two dictionaries, similar labeling consistency can be noted.

a) E→F

fall for (*inf*, HASH+RCSS)

fanished, a fit (*inf*, HASH+OXHA+RCSS)

fantastic, fat cat, figure on (*inf*, HASH+LAR2+OXHA)

field day (*inf*, LAR2+RCSS)

to filch, to fix, frazzle, freaky (*inf*, LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

to fire (*inf*, HASH+LAR2+RCSS),

flip, fluke (*inf*, HASH+LAR2)

felicity (*fml*, HASH+LAR2+OXHA)

felicitous (*fml*, LAR2+OXHA)

forswear (*fml*, LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

b) F→E

faire un enfant à une femme (*fam*, HASH+RCSS)

filer¹, foire (*fam*, HASH+OXHA+RCSS)

en rester comme deux ronds de flan, flop (*fam*, LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

fange, firmament, fleurir, fustiger (*littér*, HASH+LAR2+RCSS)

fécond (*littér*, LAR2+RCSS)

fendard (*très fam*, OXHA+RCSS)

fouille (**fam/coll* in LAR2) (*très fam*, LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

feu ma tante (*fml*, LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

ficelle (*arg mil*, LAR2+RCSS)

foutre (noun) (*vulg*, LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

3) Number of labels and use of labels

The LAR2 and the RCSS have the greatest variety in their register labels and the OXHA and the HASH have the least.³ In addition, the LAR2 and the RCSS also differentiate between different kinds of *argot*, which the HASH and the OXHA do not. The LAR2, however, does not explain the difference, if any, between the symbol for *fam/coll* (the upside down blank triangle) and the actual label *inf* or *fam*, both used within the dictionary. Judging from the words that are marked by the symbol, rather than the label, the symbol seems to mean *very inf* or *offensive* (in the English to French, *fag*, the person, is marked with the symbol, while *fag*, the cigarette, receives the label, for instance; other words marked by the symbol include *to fart*, *fart around*, *fence*, *to finger*, *to freak*, *frog*, *fruit* and *fuzz*, words which, for the most part, receive some combination of *slang*, *very inf*, *pej* or *pop* in the other dictionaries).

The HASH labels the least (out of 209 words listed, 65 are not labeled) and the LAR2 the most (out of 231 words listed, 67 are not labeled) but the differences between the bilingual English/French dictionaries are not important enough to be conclusive.

³ The label *pej* is not included in the tally since it is not a register label, in the true sense of "register."

4) Combination of labels

The HASH makes the most use of combinations of labels while the RCSS makes the least. The HASH uses eleven such combinations (*fam and old-fashioned*, *offensive slang* and *fam and hum*, for instance) while the RCSS uses only five (*fam et dial*, *très fam et vieilli*, for example).

5) Words that have the greatest discrepancy in their labels

The number of words that have the greatest discrepancy in their labels in the bilingual non-Canadian dictionaries is approximately the same as those found in the monolingual non-Canadian dictionaries.

a) E→F

fair sex (HASH, *lit*, *arch*; LAR2, not listed; OXHA, *hum*; RCSS, no label)

fanny (HASH, *slang*; LAR2+OXHA, *inf*; RCSS, *offensive*)

floozy (HASH, *slang*; LAR2, *inf*; OXHA, *fam*, *péj*; RCSS, *very inf*)

frog (HASH, *offensive slang*; LAR2, **coll/fam*; OXHA, *fam*, *inj*; RCSS, *very inf*, *pej*);

funny farm (HASH, *slang*; LAR2, *inf euph*; OXHA, *fam*; RCSS *very inf*)

b) F→E

faisan (HASH, *arg*; LAR2, *fam*, *péj*; OXHA, not listed; RCSS, *vieilli*)

se farcir qch (HASH, *arg*; LAR2+OXHA, *fam*; RCSS, *très fam*)

se farcir qn (HASH, not listed; LAR2, ***vulg*; OXHA, *very inf*; RCSS *injurieux*, *indécent*)

flingue (HASH, *fam*; LAR2, **fam/coll*; OXHA, *very inf*; RCSS, no label)

frappe (HASH, *arg*; LAR2, **fam/coll*; OXHA, *very inf*; RCSS *péj*)

On closer examination of the English to French list, only **fair sex** seems to have a definite discrepancy between its labels in the four dictionaries. In the French to English, the word **flingue** seems to show the biggest discrepancy since the labels run the gamut from no label at all to *very inf*.

The label *slang* in the HASH seems to be equivalent to *very inf* in the RCSS and the symbol for **coll/fam* in the LAR2: of the English words with this symbol in the LAR2, **fag²**, **finger**, **fruit** and **fuzz** are marked *slang* in the HASH and *very inf* in RCSS. In the French to English, words like **falzar**, **la fermer**, **flouze**, **fouetter** labeled *arg* in the HASH, are marked by the symbol for **coll/fam* in the LAR2 and *very inf* in the RCSS, which seems to indicate that there is some equivalence between these labels and symbols. It must be pointed out, however, that many words marked *arg* in the HASH are given a *fam* label by the other three dictionaries, so that in fact, we can only speak of a tendency rather than a direct correspondence.

4.7 Comparison of headwords in bilingual non-Canadian dictionaries and a bilingual Canadian dictionary

In the English to French direction, the DC does not list 99 of the 134 words selected and, in the French to English, it does not list 99 of the 137 chosen words. Hence, few definite conclusions can be drawn from a comparison between the DC and the non-Canadian dictionaries.

1) Consistency with other bilingual dictionaries

There are few cases of complete agreement in either direction. However, it is interesting to note that, once again, there is greater consistency in the labeling of the French headwords than of the English ones.

E→F

feed (*inf*)

F→E

fauché, flic, flotte, formidable, fourbi (*fam*)

2) Consistency with other bilingual dictionaries that label or list the word

If we examine words which are not listed or labeled by all the dictionaries but are listed and labeled by at least two dictionaries, greater consistency can be noted in the labeling of English words.

E→F

fall for (*inf*, HASH+RCSS+DC)

finger (HASH, *slang*; LAR2 **inf/coll*; RCSS, *very inf*; DC, *pop*)

flu, fridge (HASH, *fam*; DC, *fam*)

F→E

foire (HASH+OXHA+RCSS, *fam*; DC, *fam*)

3) Number of labels and use of labels

The DC basically uses only four register markers in the charts: the labels *fam*, *pop*,

*slang*⁴ and the symbol which means *arch or lit*, thus it uses less labels than the other bilingual dictionaries. The three labels are not listed anywhere in the DC's front matter.

This Canadian dictionary also does not label very many of the words it does list; in the English to French, 22 of the 35 words listed are not labeled, and in the opposite direction, 23 of the 39 listed words are not labeled. Although the paucity of the DC's nomenclature greatly limits the value of a comparison with the other bilingual dictionaries studied here, it can be said that the DC proportionally labels less than any of the other bilingual dictionaries.

4) Combination of labels

As far as using combinations of labels is concerned, the DC, once again, lags behind the other bilingual dictionaries. Neither chart contains an example of label combination of labels, if one excludes *arch or lit* for *forbear* which is signaled by a symbol which already combines two different labels. It should be pointed out, however, that the DC is the only bilingual dictionary to include a commentary to differentiate between the register of two synonyms: the headword *foutre* bears the comment "in slang expressions, more *inf* than *ficher*."

5) Words that have the greatest discrepancies in their labels when the first four bilingual dictionaries are compared to the DC

The greatest discrepancies between the other four dictionaries and the DC arise

⁴ It should also be pointed out that the DC mixes its labels since it uses both the French *pop* and the English *slang* within the English to French section, an inconsistency not found in any of the other bilingual dictionaries.

because the DC labels so little.

a) E→F

fence (HASH, *slang*; LAR2, * *coll/fam*, OXHA+RCSS, *inf*; DC, no label)

foe (HASH+OXHA+RCSS, *lit*; LAR2, *lit or fml*; DC, no label)

firewater (all others, *inf*; DC, *hist*)

b) F→E

fi! (HASH, *vieilli et hum*; LAR2, *hum*; OXHA, *old-fashioned*; RCSS, *archaic, hum*; DC, no label)

fichtre (HASH, *fam, vieilli*; LAR2, *vieilli*; OXHA, *inf*; RCSS, *vieilli*; DC, no label)

flanquer, foncer, fouler, frousse (all others, *fam*; DC, no label)

foireux¹ (HASH, *vulg*; LAR2, ** *vulg*; OXHA+RCSS, not listed; DC, no label)

foireux² (HASH+LAR2, *fam*; OXHA+RCSS, *très fam*; DC, no label)

fumiste (HASH+RCSS, *fam*; LAR2, *péj*; OXHA, *inf, péj*; DC, no label)

Since the DC uses the *lit* label sparingly (only once in both charts), this explains the dearth of labels for words of a more formal register. What is perhaps more surprising is the apparent reluctance of the DC lexicographers to mark even informal or vulgar words.

4.8 *Comparison of headwords in monolingual and bilingual non-Canadian dictionaries*

It is obvious from the results of 4.2 1), 4.3 1), 4.4 1), 4.5 1), 4.6 1) and 4.7 1) that only a few words will be labeled consistently across the monolingual and bilingual dictionaries compared here.

1) Consistency across all dictionaries:

a) E→(F)

Since the English monolingual dictionaries showed little absolute consistency for any word, there is obviously no consistency across the English monolinguals and the bilinguals, except for the word **fuck**, which is marked as *vulg*, *obscene*, *rude* or *offensive* by all the dictionaries.

Since the COCO is the only English monolingual dictionary to use the *lit* or *fml* label, no English word is consistently labeled in this register across monolingual and bilingual dictionaries (though **foe** is labeled *lit* not only in the COCO but also in the bilinguals)

b) F→(E)

There is more consistency in the French to English direction since lexicographers tend to base themselves on other dictionaries and the French monolingual dictionaries are more consistent than their English counterparts. The following five words were identically labeled:

fana, **faramineux**, **fauché**, **fourbi**, **frérot** (*fam*)

2) Consistency across dictionaries that label or list the word

If we examine words which are not listed or labeled by all the dictionaries but are listed and labeled by at least two dictionaries, much greater consistency can be noted in the labeling of words.

a) E→(F)

fabulous (*inf*, AH2+COCO+HASH+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

famished, to have a fit (*inf*, COCO+HASH+OXHA+RCSS)

fantastic (*inf*, AH2+COCO+HASH+LAR2+OXHA)

feds (*inf*, AH3+RHWEB+COCO+HASH+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

fed up (*inf*, COCO+HASH+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

feed (*inf*, AH2+AH3+HASH+LAR2+OXHA)

fender bender (*inf*, AH3+RHWEB+HASH+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

field day (*inf*, AH2+AH3+LAR2+RCSS)

figure on (*inf*, AH3+COCO+HASH+LAR2+OXHA)

figure out (*inf*, AH2+AH3+COCO+HASH)

to filch (*inf*, COCO+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

to fire (*inf*, AH2+AH3+HASH+LAR2+RCSS),

to fix (*inf*, AH2+AH3+COCO+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS),

flak (*inf*, AH2+AH3+COCO+HASH+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

flashy (*inf*, COCO+LAR2+OXHA)

fluke (*inf*, COCO+HASH+LAR2)

to flunk (*inf*, AH3+COCO+HASH+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

to frazzle (*inf*, AH2+AH3+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

The only label that is consistently used is *inf* since *slang* is not used by the bilinguals, with the exception of the HASH, and since the labels *fml/sout* or *lit*, used by the bilinguals, are found in only one monolingual dictionary, the COCO. It must be pointed out, however, that the bilinguals do not label words *fml/sout* and *lit* as often as does the COCO (*factotum*, I fail to see, fair weather, fait accompli, eyes fall on something, fallacious, fatuous, to

flash s.o. a smile and footfall are not labeled by any bilingual dictionary) and many words are given these higher register labels only by one or two of the bilingual dictionaries (only the OXHA labels **faux pas**, **fecund**, **to feign**, **fiat** and **fulcrum**, for example).

b) F→(E)

fabriquer, ficher (*fam*, DFC+LEX+NPR+HASH+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

farfelu (*fam*, PR+NPR+HASH+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

fermer la bouche à qn (*fam*, DFC+LEX+LAR2)

foire (*fam*, LEX+PR+NPR+HASH+OXHA+RCSS)

foncer (*fam*, DFC+LEX+HASH+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

formidable (*fam*, DFC+LEX+PR+HASH+LAR2+OXHA+RCSS)

fossile (*fam*, DFC+LEX+PR+NPR+HASH)

franglais (*fam*, LEX+HASH)

fange, firmament, fleurir, fustiger (*littér*,

DFC+LEX+PR+NPR+HASH+LAR2+RCSS)

fécond (*littér*, PR+NPR+LAR2+RCSS)

foutre (noun) (*vulg/indécent*, PR+NPR+LAR2+OXHA+NPR)

être féru de qch, fils de ses oeuvres (*fml/l. soignée*, DFC+LEX+RCSS)

Approximately the same number of French words as English words are labeled consistently across the monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. However, there is more variety in the consistently used labels: in addition to *fam*, *littér* and *vulg/indécent* are repeated by all dictionaries.

3) Number of labels and use of labels

Of all the dictionaries, English, French and bilingual, the NPR uses the most labels, but this result is not particularly significant since the PR, the COCO and the LAR2 include almost the same number. The AH3 includes the least of all three categories of dictionaries.

In terms of the number of entries labeled, we have already seen that the French monolingual dictionaries and the bilingual dictionaries are fairly similar among themselves and only the English dictionaries show a gap wide enough to be noteworthy.

If we compare the numbers of words labeled in the English to French sections of the bilingual dictionaries to those in the monolingual English dictionaries, we find that the bilinguals fall in the middle between the copious labeling of the COCO and the sparse labeling of the RHWEB, and label only slightly more than the AH2 and AH3.

If we compare the numbers of words labeled in the French to English section of the bilingual dictionaries to those in the French monolingual dictionaries, we find that the bilingual dictionaries label less than the monolingual dictionaries (the LEX, for instance, lists 124 words and labels 116 of these, while the RCSS lists 120 words of which 95 are labeled).

In effect, the bilingual dictionaries label slightly more than the English monolingual dictionaries in general and significantly less than the French monolingual dictionaries.

4) Combination of labels

Both the monolingual English dictionaries and the monolingual French dictionaries differed considerably in terms of the use of label combinations. Among the English dictionaries, the COCO combines labels the most (11 different combinations) while the AH2

and AH3 only use two different label combinations. Among the French dictionaries, the PR and NPR use fifteen different combinations of labels while the DFC uses only two such combinations. If the bilingual dictionaries are compared to the monolingual French and English dictionaries, they show more similarity among themselves than either the French or the English dictionaries: the HASH uses eleven different combinations and the RCSS uses five.

5) Words that have the greatest discrepancy in their labels

As can be expected from the previous analyses, the number of words showing the greatest discrepancy in their labels is slightly higher in English than in French.

a) E→(F)

fanny (AH2+AH3, *slang*; RHWB, *inf*; COCO *rude word* / HASH, *slang*; LAR2+OXHA, *inf*; RCSS, *offensive*)

fair sex (AH2+AH3, not listed; RHWB, *often offensive*; COCO, *old-fashioned or humorous* / HASH, *lit, arch*; LAR2, not listed; OXHA, *hum*; RCSS, no label)

fart around (AH2, *vulg slang*; AH3, not listed; RHWB, *slang*; COCO, *very infl* HASH, *slang*; LAR2, **fam/coll*; OXHA, *pop*; RCSS, *offensive*)

to freak (AH2+AH3, *slang*; RHWB, no label; COCO, *infl* HASH, no label; LAR2, **fam/coll*; OXHA, *fam*; RCSS, not listed)

b) F→(E)

fadé (DFC, not listed; LEX, *arg*; PR, *pop et iron*; NPR, *fam et iron* / HASH, *fam*;

LAR2+OXHA, not listed; RCSS, *très fam, iron*)

faisan (DFC+LEX, *pop*; PR, *fam, arg*; NPR, *arg* / HASH, *arg*; LAR2, *fam, péj*; OXHA, not listed; RCSS, *vieilli*)

se farcir qch (DFC+LEX+PR, *pop*; NPR, *fam* / HASH, *arg*; LAR2+OXHA *fam*; RCSS, *très fam*)

While these words show the most obvious inconsistencies, even they reveal some agreement between monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. The word **fanny**, for example, is labeled *slang* by the AH2, AH3 and HASH, *inf* by the RHWB, LAR2 and OXHA, and *offensive/ rude* by the COCO and RCSS. **Fair sex** seems to bear the most discrepancy but this seems to be the result of the fact that it is an expression which is both temporally bound and used for a certain effect in modern situations.

4.9 *Comparison of headwords in monolingual and bilingual Canadian and non-Canadian dictionaries*

We shall first examine just the monolingual and bilingual Canadian dictionaries and then compare them to the other dictionaries.

4.9.1 *Monolingual and bilingual Canadian dictionaries*

1) Consistency across dictionaries

There is more consistency in the labeling of English words if only Canadian dictionaries are considered.

a) E→(F)

feed, flu, to flunk, fridge, funk (GAGE, *inf*; DC, *fam*)

frame-up (*slang*)

b) F→(E)

fauché, faucher, ficher, fichtrement, flic, flotte, foire, formidable, fourbi (*fam*)

Although, again, the French dictionaries or sections are more often in agreement, the difference between the English and French ones is slight.

2) Consistency across dictionaries that label or list the word

This criterion is not applicable since only two Canadian dictionaries have been analyzed for each language.

3) Number of labels and use of labels

Of the three Canadian dictionaries studied here, the GAGE uses the least number of labels since it uses only two while the RQ2 uses five and the DC uses four.

The RQ2 labels the most frequently (75 of the 90 headwords it lists are labeled) while the DC labels the least (if we combine the bilingual dictionary charts, it labels only 29 of the 74 headwords it lists).

4) Combination of labels

The DC does not combine labels while the GAGE and the RQ2 both use one combination each in the entries examined.

5) Words that have the greatest discrepancy in their labels

1) E→(F)

fag¹, fall for (GAGE, *slang*; DC, *fam*)

famished, on the fence, fifty-fifty, figure out, fine, to fire, fluke (GAGE, *inf*; DC, no label)

firewater (GAGE, *humourous*; DC, *hist*)

forbear (GAGE, no label; DC, *arch or lit*)

2) F→(E)

fabuleux, famélique, fange, feu (ma tante) (RQ2, *littér*; DC, no label)

fat, fi! (RQ2, *vieilli*; DC, no label)

fichtre, flanquer, foncer, fouillis, fouler, frousse, fumiste (RQ2, *fam*; DC, no label)

firmament (RQ2, *poét*; DC, no label)

The DC tends to use less extreme labels than the GAGE, if it labels the word at all. When the Canadian dictionaries do label words, they are more often in disagreement with each other than in agreement. It must be pointed out, however, that they sometimes agree not to label words. In the English, for example, **fair** (weather), **falsehood**, **a fancy**, **farewell**, **to feign**, **fence**, **fetid**, **field day**, **firearms**, **firmament**, **flashy**, **foe**, **forefather**, **forthcoming**, **fulcrum** are not labeled, which is not surprising since the GAGE does not use the *fml* or *lit* label and the DC uses it very seldom. In the French, only the words **s'en faire**, **fiasco**, **figurez-vous** are not labeled by either Canadian dictionary.

4.9.2 *Monolingual and bilingual non-Canadian and Canadian dictionaries*

The English monolingual dictionaries and the English-French section of the bilingual dictionaries do not agree on the label of any of the words analyzed. The French monolingual dictionaries and the French-English section of the bilingual dictionaries agree on only two, **fauché** and **fourbi** (*fam*).

If we look for English words which are labeled in Canadian dictionaries and examine them in other dictionaries in which they are also found and labeled (i.e. not taking into account their absence or the absence of labeling in other dictionaries), we find only **feed** (*inf*, but not listed by the COCO and not labeled by the RHWB), **flu** (*inf* in all, but not labeled in the RHWB, COCO, LAR2, OXHA and RCSS) and **fridge** (*inf* in all but not labeled in the COCO, LAR2, OXHA and RCSS). Following the same process in French, we find **foire** (*fam* in all, but not listed in the DFC and the LAR2).

However, the discrepancies are not related to the origins of the dictionaries. Based on our comparison of Canadian dictionaries, we can conclude that they are no more likely to agree with one another than with the non-Canadian dictionaries; in fact, in the case of the RQ2, it agrees more often with its counterparts from France, the PR and NPR, than with the DC.

4.10 *General conclusions on headword labeling in dictionaries*

Some conclusions can be drawn from the analysis above. The French monolingual dictionaries have the greatest incidence of complete agreement on register labels and the English monolingual dictionaries have the smallest; the bilingual dictionaries fall somewhere

in the middle. We have already pointed out that there is little difference in the amount of labeling and the numbers of labels used by the French monolingual dictionaries and that this is also the case for the bilingual dictionaries (except the DC). Since our survey of dictionaries is limited, we cannot definitely conclude that all French dictionaries are more consistent in their labeling than their English counterparts, especially since the French dictionaries we chose are the work of two publishers, while the English dictionaries are the work of four different publishers. Register labeling, however, is always determined in opposition to the neutral and unmarked register, which, in French lexicography seems to be fairly consistent from dictionary to dictionary. In English, on the other hand, lexicographers do not share the same view of a neutral register since the RHWEB labels so little and the COCO so much. It is perhaps true that the institution of lexicography is more centralized and tradition-bound in France than in the U.S., Canada and Britain, a claim which is not altogether unfounded when the historical beginnings of lexicography in those countries are kept in mind.

Perhaps the most interesting observation is, however, that there is relatively little complete discrepancy between dictionaries. The monolingual English dictionaries are seldom in complete agreement but nor are they often in complete disagreement, and the French monolingual and the bilingual dictionaries are comparatively more frequently completely in agreement, although they have about the same number of words as the English where there seems to be considerable disagreement. Furthermore, if we can presume that the labels *slang* (and *arg* in the HASH), and *pop* (as used by the DFC, the LEX and the PR) are often synonymous with the label *very inf* or *très fam* found in the more recent dictionaries like the

COCO and the RCSS, the amount of discrepancy is significantly lowered.

There is also considerable consistency in what words are labeled, even if the labels used are not completely identical. The English monolingual dictionaries show the greatest discrepancy in this regard because the COCO labels so much and includes the labels of more formal or literary registers, which the other dictionaries do not, and the RHWEB labels so much less. If we put aside those words which only the COCO labels and those which only the RHWEB does not label, there are only a few left where there is a disagreement on labeling or not labeling. The words **fabulous, fantastic, fifty-fifty, to fire, flu and to flunk** are the only ones where the dictionaries differ on whether to label, but when they are labeled, they are marked *inf*. In the French monolingual dictionaries, the decision on whether to label or not seems to be linked primarily to the higher registers⁵: words labeled *littér* (**facétieux, famélique, fécond, fils de ses oeuvres, fourbe**), *l. soignée* (**sans coup férir, être féru de qch**), *l. soutenue* (**fils de ses oeuvres**) and *poét* (**frisson**) in some dictionaries are not labeled in others. The same pattern is repeated in the bilingual dictionaries where once again words labeled *lit/littér* by some dictionaries are not labeled by other dictionaries. In the English to French sections of these dictionaries, the words **falsehood, faux pas, fecund, to feign, felicitous, fiat, firmament, forbear, forswear, fulcrum** and **fulminate** are sometimes labeled *lit/littér* and sometimes not. In the French to English direction, **faconde, fat, fécond, sans coup férir, feu (ma tante), fils de ses oeuvres, firmament, fleurir, foison, fort, fourbe et frisson** are marked *littér/lit* by some of the dictionaries and not marked by others.

⁵ There are, nevertheless a few words of a lower register that are marked *fam* by some dictionaries but not by others: **farfelu, fiasco, franglais, fumiste** and **futuriste**.

However, in the bilingual dictionaries, there is also considerable disagreement on whether to label words *inf/fam*. In the English to French section, the lexical items **face the music**, **fall for**, **famished**, **fantastic**, **field day**, **figure on**, **figure out**, **to filch**, **to fire**, **to have a fit**, **to flash**, **flashy**, **flip**, **flu**, **fluke**, **Foggy Bottom**, **to freak**, **fridge** and **fruity** are labeled *inf/fam* by some dictionaries and not labeled at all by others. In the French to English section, **faignant**, **faire un enfant à un femme**, **fameusement**, **fifty-fifty**, **filer**⁴, **rester comme deux ronds de flan** and **franglais** are labeled *fam/inf* by some and not labeled by others. The word **flambeur** is the only word in the charts where one dictionary labels it *arg* (the HASH) and the other dictionaries do not label it at all.

Since register labels seem to lie on a continuum, the greatest discrepancies arise where labels are next to one another on the scale; in other words, a word is not likely to be labeled *lit* by one dictionary and *slang* by the next or not to be marked at all by one dictionary and marked *vulg* by another⁶, although, as we have already seen, there are words in the higher registers which are labeled by one dictionary and not by another .

There are also a few occurrences of words bearing temporal or regional labels in one dictionary and bearing a register label in another (**fada**, for instance, is *fam* in the DFC and the LEX and *région* in the PR and NPR; **fayot** is *fam* or *pop* in most dictionaries but *en Acadie* in the RQ2). There is also the case of **formidable** labeled *fam* in all except in the NPR which labels it *cour*).

⁴ The one notable exception is **foireux**¹ which the DC does not label but all the other dictionaries who list this sense mark *pop* or *vulg*.

4.11 *Study of the register of equivalents in bilingual dictionaries*

Bilingual dictionaries provide not only headwords in different senses but also equivalents for those headwords. These equivalents obviously have the same general meaning as the headword but dictionaries also make an effort to provide an equivalent that matches the register of the headword; in other words, a true equivalent, if it exists, matches not only the sense of the headword but is used in the same kinds of situations as that word. Thus, in the case of bilingual dictionaries, register labels must be examined not only for headwords but also for equivalents. Several aspects of equivalents and register need to be studied. First, do the bilingual dictionaries provide labels for their equivalents? Second, do the labels of the headwords and their corresponding equivalents match? Third, is there consistency in the labels of these equivalents across all the bilingual dictionaries? Fourth, do monolingual dictionaries support the labels given to these equivalents?

1) Labeling of equivalents

Of the four bilingual dictionaries, only two, the OXHA and the RCSS, consistently label the equivalents. The HASH and the LAR2 do not label the equivalents at all and the DC, inconsistent yet again, only labels two equivalents in the entries examined.

2) Consistency of labeling between headwords and equivalents

The OXHA and the RCSS do, for the most part, include equivalents of the same register as the headword, which are suitably labeled. It must be noted, however, that they often provide several equivalents, some of which are of a neutral register: for **fall guy**

(OXHA, *fam*; RCSS, *very inf*, for instance, the OXHA and the RCSS both give "bouc émissaire" (no register label) and "pigeon" (*inf* in the OXHA and RCSS).

A) Labeled headwords with unlabeled equivalents

There are, however, many entries with a register label none of whose equivalents are labeled:

OXHA

E→F

falsie (faux seins), **fanny** (fesses), **fantastic** (formidable), **far-out** (avant-garde), **faze** (dérouter), **fence** (receleur), **fender bender** (accrochage), **figure on** (s'attendre à), **to fix** (régler son compte), **flak** (critique), **flash** (faire l'exhibitionnisme), **flashy** (tape-à-l'oeil), **fly** (chic), **footsie** (faire du pied), **frazzle** (calciner), **freaky** (bizarre), **freebie** (cadeau) (*fam*/no label);

faux pas (impair), **feign** (feindre), **felicitous** (heureux), **felicity** (félicité), **forswear** (renoncer), **fulcrum** (pivot) (*sout*/no label)

fecund (fécond), **foe** (ennemi), **fount** (source) (*littér*/no label)

F→E

fabriquer (to do), **fadasse** (dull), **fait** (done for), **falzar** (pants), **fana** (fanatic), **faramineux** (staggering), **fayot** (bean), **fendard** (pants), **fichtre** (goodness me), **filer**¹ (to rush), **filer**² (to give), **en rester comme deux ronds de flan** (to be dumbfounded), **flanquer** (to throw), **flemme** (laziness), **flop** (flop), **flotte** (rain, water), **foire** (bedlam), **des fois** (sometimes), **fouille** (pocket), **frangin** (brother), **fric-frac** (break-in), **fringues** (gear), **froc** (pants),

la **faute** à qn (tr. of ex. with "fault") (*very inf*/no label);

faconde (loquacity) (*lit*/no label);

feu (ma tante) (late) (*fml*/no label)

RCSS

E→F

fall for (tomber amoureux), **falsie** (soutien gorge rembourré), (to be) **famished** (mourir de faim), **fence** (receleur, fourgue), (to have a) **field day** (s'en donner à cœur joie), **to fix** (régler son compte), **flak** (critique), **freaky** (bizarre) (*fam*/no label);

to faze (déconcerter), **flaky** (bizarre), **to flash** (s'exhiber), **footsie** (faire du pied), **frame-up** (coup monté), **freebie** (faveur, extra) (*très fam*/no label);

forswear (renoncer à) (*fml*/no label)

fount (source) (*littér*/no label)

F→E

fabriquer (to do, to be up to), **fameusement** (remarkably, really), **fan** (fan), **farfelu** (cranky, eccentric), **fayot** (bean), **dur de la feuille** (to be hard of hearing), **fiston** (son, lad), **flanquer** (to fling), **flemme** (laziness), **flotte** (rain, water), **des fois** (sometimes), **fouler** (overtax, strain o.s.), **frangin** (brother), **fric-frac** (break-in), **from(e)gi** (cheese), **frousse** (scared), **fumiste** (shirker) (*fam*/no label);

fadé (priceless, first-class), **fafiot** ((bank)notes), **falzar** (pants), **fendard** (pants), **filer**² (tr. of ex. "to slip smthg to s.o."), **flambé** (finished), **fouille** (pocket), **froc** (pants) (*très fam*/ no

label);

faconde (volubility, loquaciousness), **fleurer** (to have the scent of), **fort** (greatly), **fustiger** (to flay, denounce, censure) (*littér*/ no label);

féru (to be passionately interested in), **feu** (ma tante) (late), **fil** de ses oeuvres (self-made man) (*fml*/no label).

The lists above also reveal that the OXHA and the RCSS are often in agreement on not labeling the equivalents for labeled headwords. There is one major reason that can justify unlabeled equivalents for register-labeled headwords: words in one language of a certain register may have no equivalent of the same register in the target language (there does not seem to be a less formal way of saying "pants" in English to correspond to words like **falzar** and **fendard**, for instance). However, there are other instances where the OXHA and the RCSS seem to ignore equivalents of corresponding register which are listed by one of the other bilingual dictionaries: the LAR2, for instance, lists "bro" as an equivalent for **frangin**, which is more appropriate than the neutral "brother" listed by both the OXHA and the RCSS. And there are other instances where either the OXHA or the RCSS includes a suitably labeled equivalent but the other dictionary does not (the OXHA gives "j'ai la fringale" for I am **famished** while the RCSS translates an example with the neutral "je meurs de faim").

B) Unlabeled headwords with labeled equivalents

There are also a few instances in both the OXHA and the RCSS where a neutral and therefore unlabeled headword is translated by a marked and labeled equivalent.

OXHA

E→F

fast lane (la vie à cent à l'heure), **fifty-fifty** (fifty-fifty), **to fire** (flanquer à la porte, vider),
fluke (coup de veine), **fridge** (frigo), **fun** (marrant, rigolo) (no label/ *fam*);

F→E

no examples

RCSS

E→F

fast lane (vivre à cent à l'heure), **fat cat** (gros richard), **fluke** (coup de veine), **fridge** (frigo)
(no label/*fam*);

French kiss (patin) (no label/*très fam*);

forefather (aïeux) (no label/*littér*)

F→E

ficelé (got up) (no label/*inf*)

On the whole, however, it is less likely for an unlabeled headword to receive a labeled equivalent than it is for a headword to be labeled and be given an equivalent without a label.

2) Correspondence of labels for headword and equivalent

When a headword is labeled, the OXHA and the RCSS do, for the most part, choose equivalents of the same register (or at least, mark the equivalent with the same register label

as the headword). The OXHA has a perfect match of headword and equivalent labels for 36 of the words or senses in the English to French direction, and has 33 such matches in the French to English direction. The RCSS has 28 perfect matches of headword/ equivalent labels in the English to French, and 32 perfect matches in the French to English direction. Although these numbers may seem low, it must be remembered that many of the headwords selected for analysis bear no label at all or are not listed in these two dictionaries.

There are, however, several cases in both dictionaries where the label for the headword and the label for the equivalent do not match.

OXHA

E→F

fairy (*pop, inf*): tapette (*offensive*)

floozy (*fam, péj*): poufiasse (*very inf*)

French kiss (*fam*): patin (*very inf*)

F→E

se fendre la gueule (*very inf*): to split one's sides (*fam*)

flingue (*very inf*): piece (*fam*)

flouse (*very inf*): dough (*fam*)

folreux² (*very inf*): chicken (*fam*)

fouetter (*very inf*): to stink (*fam*), to be scared stiff (*fam*)

fourguer (*very inf*): to flog (*fam*)

frappe (*very inf*): hoodlum (*fam*)

RCSS

E→F

fall guy (*very inf*): pigeon (*fam*)

fantabulous (*very inf*): super-chouette (*fam*)

feel up (*very inf*): peloter qn (*fam*)

flake (*very inf*): drôle d'oiseau (*fam*)

flatfoot² (*very inf*): flic (*fam*)

flip out (*very inf*): se mettre en rogne (*fam*)

flivver (*very inf*): tacot (*fam*)

fun (*very inf*): marrant (*fam*)

funk¹ (*inf, old fashioned*): trouille (*very inf*)

funny farm (*very inf*): asile de fous (*fam*)

F→E

se farcir qch (*très fam*): to get landed with (*inf*)

faucher (*très fam*): to pinch (*inf*)

se fendre la gueule (*très fam*): to split one's sides (*inf*)

fiole (*fam*): mug (*very inf*)

flicard (*très fam*): cop (*fam*)

fouetter (*très fam*): to be scared stiff (*inf*)

furax (*très fam*): hopping mad (*inf*)

fusiller (*fam*): to blow (*very inf*)

Where there is a discrepancy between the labels of the headword and the equivalent, the label of the equivalent is generally higher up the register scale than the label of the headword. Since this is true for both the OXHA and the RCSS, in both directions, we can safely conclude that for the lower registers, dictionaries have a tendency to give equivalents of equal or "higher" register than the headword.

3) Consistency of labels for identical equivalents between dictionaries

If one examines the 79 headwords whose labels are identical in the OXHA and the RCSS and considers their equivalents, one notes 15 instances in the French to English chart and 8 in the English to French charts where the two dictionaries give the same label to an equivalent they have both used. If we include the instances where the two dictionaries give different equivalents that are nonetheless of the same register, the number rises to 21 for the English to French section and 17 for the French to English section.

However, we have noted below the cases where the RCSS and the OXHA disagree on the register label of an equivalent given by both dictionaries, and have verified in monolingual dictionaries in these cases the register label for the equivalent.

E→F

fag¹ (OXHA, *fam, inj*; RCSS, *very inf, péj*) **pédé** (OXHA, *fam*; RCSS, *very inf*; LEX, *pop*; NPR, *fam*)

fairy (OXHA, *pop, inj*; RCSS, *very inf and péj*) **tapette** (OXHA, *offensive*; RCSS, *very inf*; LEX, *arg*; NPR, *fam, vulg*)

fanny (OXHA, *fam*; RCSS, *offensive*) **fesses** (OXHA, no label; RCSS, *inf*; LEX, no label;

NPR, no label)

fart (OXHA, *pop*; RCSS, *offensive*) pet (OXHA, *very inf*; RCSS, *offensive*; LEX, *pop*, NPR, *fam*)

firmament (OXHA, *littér*; RCSS, no label) firmament (OXHA, *lit*; RCSS, no label; LEX, *littér*; NPR, *littér*)

funk¹ (OXHA, *fam*, *vieilli*; RCSS, *inf*, *old-fashioned*) trouille (OXHA, *inf*; RCSS, *very inf*; LEX, *fam*; NPR, *fam*)

F→E

face de rat (OXHA, *inf*; RCSS, *très fam*) rat face (OXHA, *fam*; RCSS, *très fam*; not listed in COCO, AH3, RHWEB)

fange (OXHA, no label; RCSS, *littér*) mire (OXHA, no label; RCSS, *littér*; AH3, no label; COCO, *lit*)

faramineux (OXHA, *inf*; RCSS, *fam*) staggering (OXHA, no label; RCSS, *inf*; AH3, no label; COCO, *inf*)

la fermer (OXHA, *very inf*; RCSS, *très fam*) to shut up (OXHA, *fam*; RCSS *very inf*; AH3, no label; COCO, *inf*)

firmament (OXHA, no label; RCSS, *littér*) firmament (OXHA, no label; RCSS, *lit*; AH3, no label; COCO, *lit*)

flop (OXHA, *inf*; RCSS, *fam*) flop (OXHA, no label; RCSS, *inf*; AH3, *inf*; COCO, no label)

flouse (OXHA, *very inf*; RCSS, *très fam*) dough (OXHA, *fam*; RCSS, *very inf*; AH3, *slang*; COCO, *inf*)

foireux² (OXHA, *very inf*; RCSS, *très fam*) chicken (OXHA, *fam*; RCSS, *very inf*; AH3, *slang*; COCO, *inf*)

formidable (OXHA, *inf*; RCSS, *fam*) great (OXHA, no label; RCSS, *inf*; AH3, *inf*; COCO, *inf*)

fouetter (OXHA, *very inf*; RCSS, *très fam*) to stink (OXHA, *fam*; RCSS, no label; AH3, no label; COCO, no label)

foutre (noun) (OXHA, *vulg*; RCSS, *indécent, injurieux*) come (OXHA, *vulg*; RCSS, *very inf*; AH3, *vulg slang*; COCO, not listed)

The list above reveals certain tendencies on the parts of the OXHA and the RCSS. First, when the two dictionaries disagree about the label of the equivalent, they are often in disagreement about the label of the headword as well (**fag**², **fanny**, **fart**, **firmament** in English, **face de rat**, **fange**, **firmament**, **foutre** in French).

Second, both the OXHA and the RCSS tend to be consistent within their own entry; in other words, the labels of the headword and the equivalent are the same in one dictionary, and the labels of the headword and the equivalent are the same in the second, though the labels are not the same from the first to the second dictionary (with the exception of **fanny** in English and **foutre** in French, the list is identical to the one above, on the preceding pages).

Third, there are many cases where the two bilinguals are in disagreement about the label of the equivalent but their conflicting labels also reflect a discrepancy between the monolingual dictionaries. In the English to French section, the equivalent for **fag**² has an exact match of label with one of the French monolingual dictionaries, while in the French to English section, the equivalents for **fange**, **famineux**, **firmament**, **flop**, **flouse**, **foireux**²

have exact matches of labels with one of the monolingual English dictionaries; the French equivalents for **fairy** and **fart** reflect a conflict between the French monolingual dictionaries, and the English equivalents for **la fermer** show a conflict between the English monolingual dictionaries, although the labels found in the monolinguals are not the same as those in the bilingual dictionaries.

It must be pointed out that, where there is a discrepancy in the labels for equivalents between the bilingual and monolingual dictionaries, the bilingual dictionaries tend to be more extreme in their labels than the monolingual dictionaries. There is the one exception of "great" as an equivalent for **formidable**, which the OXHA does not label but which is labeled *inf* by both the AH3 and the COCO. The RCSS is particularly prone to using a "lower" label than either the LEX or the NPR: the equivalent "fesses" (for **fanny**) is *inf* in the bilingual dictionary but is not labeled by the monolinguals; the equivalent "trouille" (for **funk**) is marked *very inf* in the bilingual dictionary but is labeled *fam* by both the LEX and the NPR; "to shut up" (for **la fermer**) is marked *very inf* in the RCSS but is not labeled in the AH3 and marked *inf* in the COCO. Overall, the RCSS tends to assign more extreme labels for both headword and equivalent than does the OXHA.

4) Equivalent labeling in the DC

The DC includes so few of the words analyzed and labels so few of the words it does include that it needs to be briefly analyzed separately. It labels only two equivalents and these are both found in the French to English direction. The headword **fiasco** is given the equivalent "flop" which bears the label *fam* and **flanquer**'s equivalent "to chuck" is also

labeled *fam*; both of the labels for these two equivalents agree with either the AH3 or the COCO. Neither of these equivalents is matched to a headword which is also labeled.

4.12 *General conclusions on equivalent labeling in bilingual dictionaries*

The two bilingual dictionaries that consistently label their equivalents, the OXHA and the RCSS, do, generally, give at least one equivalent with the same label as the headword. If there is a discrepancy between the labels of identical equivalents between the OXHA and the RCSS, there is also frequently a discrepancy between the labels of the headword.

Another interesting observation deserves to be made, though it is not necessarily limited to the labeling of equivalents. In the English to French list above, the OXHA labels **firmament** *littér* and its equivalent, "firmament", *lit*, while the RCSS labels neither the headword nor the equivalent; on the French to English side, however, the OXHA is the one who does not label either **firmament** or its equivalent, "firmament", while the RCSS labels both the headword and the equivalent *littér/lit*. In other words, both dictionaries are inconsistent when they change language direction. The RCSS provides another example of inconsistency from one language direction to the other. The French headword **formidable** is labeled *fam* and one of its equivalents, "fantastic", is labeled *inf*; in the English to French direction, however, **fantastic** is not labeled, nor is its equivalent "formidable."

4.13 *General conclusions on labeling practices*

Certain major points are revealed by the preceding analyses of headwords and equivalents:

- 1) The French monolingual dictionaries have the greatest incidence of agreement while the English monolingual dictionaries have the least; the bilingual dictionaries are between the two.
- 2) The French monolingual dictionaries and the bilingual dictionaries, with the exception of the DC, show little difference in the amount of labeling and in the number of labels they use.
- 3) While the English dictionaries show more discrepancy than either the French monolingual dictionaries and the bilingual dictionaries, most of this discrepancy is attributable to the great differences in the labeling practices of only two dictionaries, the RHWEB and the COCO.
- 4) Overall, there tends to be little complete discrepancy in labeling between dictionaries and there is also a general consensus as to which words need to be labeled.
- 5) The greatest discrepancies in labeling tend to be in the "higher" registers (*fml* or *lit*) since some dictionaries do not label words above the neutral register while other dictionaries label them consistently.
- 6) In the lower registers, discrepancies are most frequent where the various labels used for the same word in the different dictionaries are next to one another on the continuum of register (*pop* and *fam*, for instance).
- 7) Of the five bilingual dictionaries examined here, only two, the OXHA and the RCSS, consistently label the equivalents they give.
- 8) As a rule, these two dictionaries give equivalents of the same register as the headword. If there are exceptions for words with "lower" registers, they tend to give equivalents of a "higher" register.

Chapter 5

Register Labeling in the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary*

This study on register and register labeling was, as indicated in the introduction, inspired by my work on the *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary* Project. This inter-university, pan-Canadian project, launched in 1989, has as one of its main objectives the preparation of a bilingual Canadian dictionary.

The *Bilingual Canadian Dictionary* (BCD) will be the first Canadian bilingual dictionary since the DC. Unlike the DC, however, it aims to be much more inclusive in its nomenclature and it will certainly be much bigger. Although it will pay special attention to lexical items and senses particular to Canadian French and Canadian English, it will nonetheless include lexical items common to standard French and English.

In the proposal for the BCD project (1990: 4), Roda P. Roberts explains that

The BCD is intended to serve specific types of users: **translators and bilingual editors, other bilingual individuals using their second language in their daily work (civil servants, journalists, administrative officers, second-language teachers) and advanced second-language learners at the university level.** In other words, the BCD, in contrast with the majority of bilingual dictionaries which are geared either towards the general public or towards beginning foreign-language learners, is designed for **sophisticated users of the second language functioning in a bilingual environment.**

Like the LEX and the AH2, the BCD is, therefore, intended for a specific user category.

Roberts also explains, in the same proposal, that the focus of the dictionary will be on the written language, both because the type of user outlined above works mostly with written language and also because written documentation is more readily available for lexicographic

analysis. In any case, there already exist a few glossaries and dictionaries of oral Canadian French.¹

One of the goals of the BCD project is to improve a number of elements of the bilingual dictionary entry by undertaking and encouraging research on specific aspects; for instance, examples have already been studied in depth. This and other studies on elements such as usage labels (including this one on register labeling) are intended to help refine the preliminary decisions taken on various aspects of the dictionary entry.

5.1 *General information on register labels in the BCD*

Three different documents produced by the BCD project deal with usage labeling in general or with register labeling in particular.

- a) the initial grant proposal for the project (1990)
- b) the BCD methodology (version 7) (1996)
- c) an article "Marques de registre dans les dictionnaires bilingues" (in press) by Roberts.

A survey of these three works brings out the following policies and practices.

5.1.1 *Types of register labels*

In terms of usage labels, the BCD differentiates between field labels, geographical labels, currency labels, commentary labels and register labels.

According to the BCD methodology, register labels "limit the use of a given word or sense...to a specific situation of communication." (1996: 60) and are indicated by a set of

¹ There are, for instance, *J' parle en termes* by A. Clas & E. Seutin (Montréal: Sodilis, 1989) and *Dictionnaire de la langue québécoise* by L. Bergeron (Montréal: vlb, 1980).

symbols which are the following: ++ (literary), + (formal), · (informal), ~ (colloquial/very informal), - (extremely informal). In the article, "Marques de registre dans les dictionnaires bilingues" (12-13), the symbols are further defined in the following manner:

++ (très formel) = mot ou expression qui s'emploie entre locuteurs qui ne se connaissent pas, et même entre locuteurs qui se connaissent, dans la langue écrite élégante et dans les situations solennelles; + (formel) = mot ou expression qui s'emploie entre personnes qui se connaissent peu ou pas et parfois entre personnes qui se connaissent, surtout dans la langue écrite, dans des contextes administratifs ou officiels; neutre (non marqué) = mot ou expression qui s'emploie entre locuteurs qui se connaissent ou ne se connaissent pas, généralement dans la langue écrite et parfois dans la langue parlée de la vie courante; · (familier) = mot ou expression qui s'emploie en famille ou avec des amis, dans la langue parlée et dans certains genres de communication écrite (ex. lettre personnelle), et dans les situations informelles; ~ (très familier) = mot ou expression qui s'emploie seulement en famille ou avec des amis et seulement dans la langue parlée dans les situations informelles.²

It is interesting to note that these definitions include aspects of both tenor (relationship between the participants) and mode (writing versus speech).

Unlike some of the other dictionaries examined in Chapter 3, the BCD does not include labels such as *iro* (irony), *pej* (pejorative) and *vulg* (vulgar)³ among the register labels. It considers them commentary labels, which are used to indicate other types of usage restrictions.

5.1.2 Elements labeled for register

Like the OXHA and the RCSS, the BCD will give labels for both the headword and

² In this paper, there is no mention of the symbol - (extremely informal) listed in the methodology.

³ "Vulgaire" is defined as "mot ou expression dont l'emploi est ressenti comme fortement indécent" in the paper "Marques de registre dans les dictionnaires bilingues." (13)

the equivalents.

In the methodology, the lexicographer is specifically instructed to find at least one equivalent of the same register as the source language word or sense and to also include one equivalent of a neutral register if the headword is not of neutral register.

Besides the headword (or a sense of the headword) and its equivalent, the methodology also indicates that collocations, compounds and fixed expressions, as well as their equivalents, should be labeled if necessary.

5.1.3 *Placement of register labels*

The BCD methodology instructs the lexicographer to place the register symbol after the sense division number if it applies only to that one sense and immediately after the headword if it applies to all senses of the word. Labels for equivalents, collocations, compounds and fixed expressions are placed immediately after the word or phrase in question.

5.1.4 *Determining register labels*

According to the grant proposal (1990: 15), register labels will be determined on the basis of the following two criteria: "(a) usage labels provided by reliable unilingual dictionaries; (b) the type of source documentation in which the word occurs." The methodology even specifies what monolingual dictionaries to use as sources for register labeling. For the French, the GR (*Le Grand Robert*), the LEX and one other dictionary should be used as sources and for the English, the RHWB, the COLL and one other

dictionary should be used.

No instructions are given, however, as to how to proceed if the dictionaries differ, except in the case of *vulg*, which is not always clearly separable from register labels. The methodology advises the lexicographer that if dictionaries do not all agree whether a word or a sense should be labeled *vulg* "choose the most extreme label, i.e. if one dictionary labels the sense *pop* and another *vulg*, choose vulgar." (1996: 62) This kind of clarification is, however, not made for other potential discrepancies between dictionaries; there is no directive for the treatment of words labeled *pop* or *slang*, labels found in other dictionaries but not listed among the symbols used in the BCD.

The proposal also adds that "labels will be carefully checked at the various revision stages." (1990: 15)

5.2 *Register labeling within entries prepared for the BCD*

Unlike the other dictionaries we examined in Chapter 4, the analysis of register labeling in the BCD allows us to see the process of register labeling rather than the final result. The register label found in a first draft of an entry may be changed as it goes from reviser to reviser. Since the BCD project is experimental, in so far as lexicographic methods are devised and reviewed as the project advances, the analysis of entries from different years allows us to see trends in the changes made over time. At its beginning, the BCD had fewer resources, both in terms of the number of dictionaries available for consultation and also in its lack of textual databases. Now, lexicographers have access to over fifty dictionaries, monolingual and bilingual, terminology banks on compact disks, and two huge online

databases of both English and French language texts. One of these databases (or "corpora") will be analysed as a tool for determining register in a separate chapter.

The following analysis of a few BCD entries will, we hope, illustrate the inherent difficulties of register labeling. The number of entries examined has been limited to nine words in all and twelve different senses altogether. As a matter of course, we first looked for words and their senses analysed in Chapter 4; unfortunately, only two words (four senses), *feu* and *se farcir*, have been started by the BCD. We then searched for words or senses treated by the BCD which were not Canadianisms per se,⁴ since register labeling of Canadian French words is an issue complicated by the linguistic politics of Québec and the history of lexicography in the province. We also looked for examples of each register label found in the BCD methodology and for words or senses which had changed labels from the initial versions to the later ones. Finally, we chose words from two different stages of the project, from the period at the very beginning (1989-1993) and from the current period (1994-1996), in order to see how register labeling practices have changed. In general, entries from the earlier years have undergone more revisions while the newer ones have had fewer, a factor which may play a role in the register labels recorded here. Once all these requirements were met, the number of BCD entries suitable for the analysis was greatly reduced. Because the project in Ottawa concentrates mostly on entries from French to English, there are fewer English to French entries examined here.

⁴ A great deal of emphasis has been placed on doing Canadianisms first. So, as we wanted to avoid Canadianisms, our choice was limited. We finally decided to include the word *Anglo*, which does have a Canadian sense.

Each word selected has been entered into a chart where the left-hand column indicates the version number and where the right-hand column is a copy of the actual sense division. Where a word is analyzed for more than one sense, each sense division is numbered to facilitate the analysis but these numbers do not necessarily reflect the position of that sense division in the actual entry (*fleuve*¹, for instance, is actually the fourth sense division in the dummy). Each version of an entry is separated from the other by a thick line. For the most part, the headword is included only once at the top of the chart but when the register label has changed position, i.e. when the label is made to apply to the whole word rather than one sense, the headword is repeated.

A list of the dictionaries (and the labels these dictionaries assign) used to compile the entry follows each chart.⁵ In the case of the entries done at the beginning of the project, we have not supplemented these lists with all the dictionaries available now, since this information obviously has no bearing on the reasons why the entry was labeled to begin with. For the sake of comparison with other bilingual dictionaries, however, we will include the labels used by the OXHA, the LAR2 and the RCSS for the earlier entries which did not have these dictionaries to consult; these dictionaries will be in parentheses.

For many of the earlier entries, corpus examples were limited, if they were available at all. We have not added new corpus examples in this chapter, but we do indicate if the corpus was used at the end of the dictionary list, and we indicate, in our discerning of the entry labeling what corpus examples used seem significant from the point of view of register.

⁵ See Appendix 1 for a list of abbreviations and the full titles of the dictionaries.

5.3 Analysis of specific BCD entries

F→E

FLEUVE.NM

7 versions in all (1989-1990)

Status: featured in the dummy

fleuve nm

1-4	1 (<i>ce qui coule abondamment et semble ne pas devoir tarir LAR7</i>) river; [larmes] flood; [sang] river, torrent. ~ de sang LAR7 torrents of blood; ~s de vin LAR7 rivers of wine KB.
	2 (<i>FIG et POET</i>) (<i>ce qui a un cours continu comme un ~ LAR7</i>) * le ~ de la vie LAR7 the course, current of life HARR; le ~ du temps GR the tide of time ROG
5	1 (<i>ce qui coule abondamment et semble ne pas pouvoir tarir GL7</i>) river; [larmes] flood; [sang] river, torrent. ~ de sang GL7 torrents of blood; ~s de vin GL7 rivers of wine.
	2 ++ (<i>ce qui a un cours continu comme un fleuve GL7</i>) *le ~ de la vie GL7 the course, current of life HA; le ~ du temps GR the tide of time ROG.
6	1 ++ (<i>ce qui coule, ce qui est répandu en abondance GR</i>) flow, stream; [larmes] flood; [sang] river. * un ~ de sang GL7 torrents of blood; un ~ de voitures a flow of cars.
	2 ++ (<i>ce qui a un cours continu comme un fleuve GL7</i>) *le ~ de la vie GL7 the course, current of life HA; le ~ du temps GR the tide of time ROG.
7	1 + (<i>ce qui coule, ce qui est répandu en abondance</i>) [boue, lave, glace] river.
	2 ++ (<i>ce qui a un cours continu</i>) *le ~ de la vie the course, current of life; le ~ du temps the tide of time.

Monolingual dictionaries:

1 (*ce qui coule, ce qui est répandu en abondance*)

GR: *littér*

GL7: par éxag.

BELN: *fig*

2 (*ce qui a un cours continu*)

GR: no label

GL7: *fig & poét*

PLUS: *fig*

BELN: "le fleuve de la vie": *poét*

Bilingual dictionaries:

HA: no label for either sense

RC: no label for 1st sense, 2nd sense not listed

(LAR2: 1 no label

2 not included

OXHA: 1 no label

2 not included

RCSS: whole word *lit*, but 2 not included)

Corpus examples: none

There are no indications in the file to explain register label additions or changes.

Examination of the other dictionaries leads us to suppose that the GR was used to assign the ++ for the first sense in the sixth version, but there is no justification in any dictionary for the change to + in the seventh version. The GL7 and the BELN seem to have been the source of the register label ++ for the second sense. The change in labels for the first sense may have been due to the fact that the second sense is marked *poét*, which is a higher register than *littér*, since the BCD does not have a symbol for *poét*, the less formal sense seems to have been labeled with only one + to show the contrast in levels of formality.

CABANE.NF

5 versions (1990-1995)

Status: waiting to go to Laval

cabane nf

1&2	(prison TERM) (-) jail HA, cooler GAGE, slammer GAGE, clink RC+GAGE, hoosegow TERM+GAGE. * 3 ans de ~ RC 3 years in (the) clink RC; se faire mettre en ~ GR to get thrown in the slammer MEB; se trouver en ~ GR to land in the cooler MEB ** sortir de ~ LOC.
3	~ (FR) (prison TERM) cooler GAGE, slammer GAGE, clink RC+GAGE. * 3 ans de ~ RC 3 years in (the) clink RC; se faire mettre en ~ GR to get thrown in the slammer MEB; se trouver en ~ GR to land in the cooler MEB; sortir de ~ LOC; faire de la ~ RM to do time KB.
4	~ (FR) (prison TERM) cooler~ GAGE, slammer~ GAGE, clink~ RC+GAGE. * 3 ans de ~~ RC 3 years in (the) clink~ RC; se faire mettre en ~~ GR to get thrown in the slammer~ MEB; se trouver en ~~ GR to land in the cooler MEB; sortir de ~~ LOC to get out of jail MEB; faire de la ~~ RM to do time KB.
5	~ (FR) (prison TERM) cooler~ GAGE, slammer~ GAGE, clink~ RC+GAGE. * 3 ans de ~~ RC 3 years in (the) clink~ RC; se faire mettre en ~~ GR to get thrown in the slammer~ MEB; sortir de ~~ LOC to get out of jail MEB; faire de la ~~ RM to do time KB. SENSE NOT IN CORPUS. AJ

Monolingual dictionaries:

GL7+GL5+LEX+PR: *pop*

GR+RM: *fam*

Bilingual dictionaries:

RC: *fam/inf*

HA+LOC: *pop*

(LAR2: *fam*
OXHA: *very inf/pop*
RCSS: *fam*)

Corpus examples: none

Again there are no indications in this entry to explain the change in labeling. Since the dictionaries offer both the *fam* and *pop* labels for the sense of "prison", it would seem that the lexicographer chose to add *fam* while the reviser of the third version opted for *pop*, interpreted as *very inf* (-).

All the BCD equivalents, "cooler", "slammer" and "clink" are labeled - in the fourth version, on the basis of the dictionaries consulted: the GAGE labels "cooler" and "slammer" *slang*, which has been interpreted as *very inf*; however, while the GAGE labels "clink" *inf*, the RC marks it as *very inf*, and the lexicographer has chosen the more extreme label for this equivalent.

The free combination, "3 ans de cabane", taken from the RC, is labeled - in the BCD and the source for the label is given as the RC. But the RC actually labels only the translation "3 years in the clink/in the nick" as *very inf*. In fact, overall, this dictionary considers the "prison" sense of *cabane* as *fam/inf*.

DÉCROCHAGE. NM

4 versions (1990-1992)

Status: waiting for fourth revision

décrochage *nm*

1&2	˘ (<i>fin de la dépendance à l'égard d'une drogue GL5</i>) drying out jc? kicking the habit jc? getting off a drug jc.
3&4	˘ (<i>fin de la dépendance à l'égard d'une drogue GL5</i>) JAMAIS ENTENDU FB kicking the habit jc?, getting off a drug jc, going clean KB.

Dictionaries:

GL5: *fam*

(only dictionary to list this sense)

not listed in bilinguals

(not listed in LAR2, OXHA or RCSS)

Corpus examples: none

The reviser does not explain why she chose to change the label ˘ in version 2 to ˘ in version 3. This change is obviously not based on the dictionaries.

FARCIR.VPR

3 versions (1995-1996)

Status: waiting for third revision

se farcir vpr

1	se farcir vpr 1 - PLUS LEX SAYS POP. PLUS SAYS POP. AND FAM (supporter difficilement qc; faire une chose désagréable) DFC to get stuck with -^{RC} RC + RCS + OXHA, to (have to) put up with s.o./sth. HA + LAR + OXHA, to go through sth SH + OPV, to have to take s.o. HA/sth LAR2, to get landed with -^{RC} RC + RCS NO OCCURRENCES IN THE CORPUS. * les Montréalais devaient ~ une trentaine de centimètres de neige LAPR they had to put up with around thirty centimetres of snow SH ; les délégués auront à ~ près de 800 propositions LAPR the delegates will have to go through close to 800 proposals SH.
	2 (vulgar) GR (posséder qn sexuellement) GL5 to make it with -^{RC} RC + RCS, to screw sb -^{COCO} (vulgar) COCO LAR2, to have it off with -^{RC} LAR2 SAYS VULGAR (GB) RC + RCS + LAR2 + OXHA + COCO, to ball (US) OXHA + COLL. NO CORPUS EXAMPLES RETAIN?
2	se farcir - PLUS + LEX vpr 1 LEX SAYS POP. PLUS SAYS POP. AND FAM (supporter, endurer) PLUS to be/get stuck with -^{RC} RC + RCS + OXHA, to (have to) put up with HA + LAR + OXHA, <to get through> OXPV + CM. * les Montréalais ont dû ~ une trentaine de centimètres de neige LAPR Montrealers had to put up with around thirty centimetres of snow SH ; ils ont dû ~ tout le travail MULTI + JB they were stuck with all the work CM; les délégués auront à ~ près de 800 propositions LAPR the delegates will have to get through close to 800 proposals SH.
	2 (vulgar) GR + PR (posséder qn sexuellement) GL5 + GL7 + GR + PR to make it with sb -^{RC} RC + RCS, to screw sb -^{COCO} (vulgar) COCO LAR2, to ball -^{GAGE} (US) OXHA + COLL + GAGE. NO CORPUS EXAMPLES RETAIN?

3	se farcir - PLUS + LEX <i>vpr</i> 1 LEX SAYS POP. PLUS SAYS POP. AND FAM. (<i>supporter, endurer</i>) PLUS to be/get stuck with ^{-RC} RC + RCS + OXHA, to (have to) put up with HA + LAR + OXHA, <to get through> OXPV + CM. * les Montréalais ont dû ~ une trentaine de centimètres de neige LAPR Montrealers had to put up with around thirty centimetres of snow SH ; ils ont dû ~ tout le travail MULTI + JB they were stuck with all the work CM; les délégués auront à ~ près de 800 propositions LAPR the delegates will have to get through close to 800 proposals SH.
	2 (<i>vulg</i>) GR + PR (<i>posséder qn sexuellement</i>) GL5 + GL7 + GR + PR to make it with sb ^{-RC} RC + RCS, to screw sb (<i>vulg</i>) RHWEB + LAR2. NO CORPUS EXAMPLES. RETAIN?

Monolingual dictionaries:

1 (*supporter, endurer*)

GL5+GL7+LEX+DFC+MULTI: *pop*

GR+PL+PR+RM+RQ+EXL: *fam*

PLUS: *pop, fam*

2 (*posséder sexuellement*)

GL5+GL7: *pop*

GR+PR: *vulg*

not listed in others

Bilingual dictionaries:

1 (*supporter, endurer*)

RC+RCS: *very inf/très fam*

HA+OXF: *pop*

LAR2: *fam*

OXHA: (*accomplir*) *inf/fam*; (*supporter*) *very inf/pop*

2 (*posséder sexuellement*)

LAR2: *vulg*

OXHA: *very inf/pop*

RCS: *vulg/indécent*

Corpus examples: for sense 1

The *inf* label (*informal*) found in version 1 for the first sense is supported by the label *fam* found in the PLUS as well as in many other monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. The corpus examples covering this sense seem to corroborate the *inf* label since a few of the contexts are direct speech or have subjects in the first or second person:

198848507, ..tor/Warner) Le petit Charlie Baty a eu la géniale idée de se farcir Joe Louis Walker comm..
 170640548, ..sous du seuil de la pauvreté? [...] Eh bien décroche et va te farcir le marché du travail...
 222113689, ..total. Outre le Québec qu'il doit ratisser, Marchand doit se farcir quelques missions spé..
 255048266, ..bel est bien lancé. Le hockey, qui n'a pas les moyens pour se farcir des salaires astronom..
 266317235, ..enes québécoises. Ferré avait alors déclaré: %Le temps de se farcir l'Atlantique, de se r..
 166878058, ..préparez-vous à faire la queue. Jessye Norman a accepté de se farcir deux heures de "signa..
 283303650, ..sées. Avant de planter le moindre clou, un promoteur doit se farcir les 78 modifications ..

What is interesting is that the *inf* label (*inf*), attached to the first sense in version 1, has changed position in version 2. In essence, instead of labeling each sense separately, the reviser has decided to apply the label to the whole word in all its senses. This decision was probably taken because the PLUS places the label *pop*, *fam* at the beginning of the pronominal verb entry, although it only lists one sense. The LEX is also noted as a justification for the use and positioning of this label, although the LEX labels this sense *pop* and labels another sense (not discussed here) *fam*.

In the first sense division, the only labeled equivalents "to get stuck with" and "to get landed with" are taken from the RC, along with the labels proposed by this dictionary. The first expression is not listed in the monolingual dictionaries (with the exception of the COCO, which includes "to be stuck with", not "to get stuck with" and does not label it), while the second, according to the COCO, is "used mostly in informal British English". This second expression has been deleted from the later versions, presumably because it is British.

For the second sense discussed here, the label *vulg*, taken from the GR and the PR and also found in most bilingual dictionaries, remains constant from version to version. The BCD methodology clearly states that the label *vulg* should be chosen instead of *pop*, if the two labels are used for the same sense by the monolingual dictionaries, which is the case here. There are no corpus examples illustrating this sense which can be used to confirm the label selected.

The number of equivalents is reduced from one version to the next and the only difference in terms of labeling is the change from a *vulg* for "to screw sb" to just the commentary label *vulg*, which matches the commentary label attached to the sense. Although the source code changes from the COCO to the RHWEB, the COCO does label this "*an informal word which some find rude and offensive*", so that there is no real discrepancy between the monolingual dictionaries.

FEU.N

2 versions (1996)

Status: waiting for second revision

feu *nm*

1	- PL (FR) RQ (<i>pistolet</i>) PL shooter · OXHA, piece · (US) OXHA, gun RCS + OXHA ++, revolver OXF, pistol OXF, gat -^{RCS} RC + RCS + (??SH), rod -^{RC} (US LAR2) RC + RCS + LAR2 + (??SH) DROP GAT & ROD? THESE ARE LABELLED VERY INFORMAL BY THE BILINGUAL DICOS, BUT THE HEADWORD IS ONLY INFORMAL. THERE WAS ONLY ONE EXAMPLE OF "GAT" IN THE ECP, NONE IN ANY OF THE OTHER CORPORA. NO EXAMPLES OF "ROD" IN THIS SENSE IN ANY OF THE CORPORA. * sortir son ~ GL5 to take out his shooter/piece SH. NO CORPUS EXAMPLES. RETAIN THIS SENSE?
2	- PL (FR) RQ (<i>pistolet</i>) PL rod · ^{GAGE} RC + RCS + LAR2 + GAGE, shooter · OXHA OXHA + WEB + ECP, piece · ^{OXHA} OXHA + GAGE, gun RCS + OXHA ++ . * sortir son ~ GL5 to take out one's piece/gun SH + NO + AJ. NO CORPUS EXAMPLES. RETAIN THIS SENSE?

Monolingual dictionaries:

LEX+GL5+PR+RM: *pop*

PL+GL7: *arg*

NPR: *fam*

GR: no label

Bilingual dictionaries:

RC+RCS+RCSS: *arg crime*

LAR2+OXHA: *fam*

OXF: *pop*

Corpus examples: none

There have been no major changes from version 1 to version 2. It is interesting to note, however, that the lexicographer chose the less extreme label · (*fam*), even though most

of the dictionaries labeled the sense either *pop* or *arg*. The source of the register label is, however, wrongly cited: the NPR and not the PL is the dictionary which gives *fam* as a label. The label *fam* is also found in the LAR2 and the OXHA. Moreover, since there are no corpus examples of this sense in the file, the validity of the label *ˈ*, taken from dictionaries, cannot be confirmed by corpus analysis.

The number and the ordering of the equivalents have changed from version to version. Some have been dropped since, as the reviser points out, "gat" is labeled *obsolete slang* in the GAGE, while "revolver" and "pistol" are both neutral terms and only one neutral equivalent is needed for a marked headword. The label for "rod" has changed from *ˈ* (*very inf*) to *ˈ* (*inf*): the RC gives the label *very inf* for this equivalent while the GAGE (used to justify the label in the second version) labels it *slang*; the reviser has decided to transform *slang*, a label not used by the BCD, into *ˈ* (*inf*). Overall, the lexicographer and the reviser have chosen the less extreme labels indicated by the dictionaries for both this sense of the headword and for the equivalents.

FEU.ADJ

2 versions

Status: waiting for second revision

feu adj

1	(Litt.) GL5 (<i>défunct depuis peu</i>) PL (<i>personne</i>) SH late HA + LAR + LAR2 + DC + OXF + OXHA, deceased LAR + DC + OXF; (<i>pacte, plan, période</i>) SH defunct SH. * ~ ma tante/ma ~e tante RCS my late aunt SH ; ~ le rideau de fer PCF#344527963 the defunct iron curtain SH. FOUND EXAMPLE OF THIS KIND IN PCF AND THREE IN MON.
2	(Litt.) GL5 (<i>mort depuis peu de temps</i>) GR (<i>personne</i>) SH late HA + LAR + LAR2 + DC + OXF + OXHA + GAGE, deceased LAR + DC + OXF + GAGE; (<i>organisme, accord, plan, etc.</i>) SH+PCF defunct GAGE + COCO. * ~ ma tante=ma ~e tante RCS my late aunt RCS ; ~ le rideau de fer PCF#344527963 the (now-)defunct Iron Curtain SH + ECP.

It should be noted that a partial source language revision has been done on version 2 and the reviser has crossed out the (*Litt*) and replaced this label with ++.

Monolingual dictionaries:

GL5+PLUS+PL+RM+RQ: *littér*

GL7: no label

GR+PR: *droit, littér ou plaisant*

DFC+LEX: *littér, humour*

Bilingual dictionaries:

RC+RCS+OXHA: *fml*

HA+LAR+DC+OXF: no label

LAR2: *sout*

Corpus examples: yes

The BCD methodology does not include the *humour* or *plaisant* commentary labels found in some monolingual dictionaries. Therefore only the register label *littér* (or ++)

found in four monolingual dictionaries has been retained. However, the bilingual dictionaries LAR2, OXHA and RCSS all give this sense the *fml/sout* label (rather than *littér*). The corpus seems to justify at least a *formal* label and perhaps even a field label but there are certainly instances where the word seems to be also used in jest:

103021176, ..sicaux épurés. Hourra. Disons cependant que le soliste de feu l'imposante formation Octo..
 130372100, ..ers le CHRO Au nom de la famille Légaré et des enfants de feu Monique Légaré, décédée d'..
 142161992, ..aut ce qu'il vaut. Encore faudra-t-il interpréter celui de feu Ida Pelletier. C'est un j..
 142162333, ..ne familial) pourrait s'appliquer, partageant les biens de feu Ida Pelletier entre son ve..
 142164705, ..ue %il est clair du testament olographe du 22 août 1987 de feu Ida Pelletier que le défen..
 143906291, ..ois, maître charpentier, fils de feu François Benoit et de feu Dimanche Chapelain, de Cha..
 221885190, ..u d'une dotation de 500 000\$ faite au Conseil des arts par feu Jean A. Chalmers de Toront..

The equivalents listed do not have the same register as the headword but there do not seem to be any equivalents of this register in English (there are no formal synonyms for "dead" in the thesaurus).

E→F

ANGLO.N

4 versions (1990-1991)

Status: early drafts; will be updated

Anglo n

1	Anglo n 1 (CD) (English-speaking person GAGE) Anglais m PLUS, anglophone mf LC, Canadien m anglais PLUS, Anglo mf LC+QD+BER (OK. JBA)
	2(selon RC) (US) (white American of non-Hispanic descent RH) Américain m blanc (d'origine non hispanique) RC.
2&3	Anglo n 1 (CD) (English-speaking person GAGE) Anglais m PLUS, anglophone mf LC, Canadien m anglais PLUS, Anglo mf LC+QD+BER (OK. JBA).

	2(selon RC) (US) (white American of non-Hispanic descent RH) Américain m blanc/Américaine f blanche (d'origine non hispanique) RC.
4	Anglo n 1 (CD) (English-speaking Canadian GAGE+RHWEB) Anglais m PLUS, anglophone mf LC, Canadien m anglais PLUS, Anglo mf LC+QD+BER (OK. JBA).
	2 (US) (white American of non-Hispanic descent RH) Américain m blanc/Américaine f blanche (d'origine non hispanique) RC.

Monolingual dictionaries:

1 *English-speaking*

RHWEB+GAGE+PEN: no label

2 *white American*

RHWEB+RH+COLL+WEB3+COD: no label

Bilingual dictionary:

2 *white American*

RC: *very inf/très fam*

(LAR2: 1&2 no label

OXHA: only 2 no label

RCSS: 1&2 *very inf*)

Corpus examples: for first sense

The first sense is not labeled for register in any dictionary. However, there are a few corpus examples which illustrate the first sense and these all point to a slightly informal register since some contexts are obviously taken from conversations or are in the first person and the context word "cranked up" is rather informal itself:

23438703 ..He's a rich anglo./ illustration shows Robert Bourassa </47>..
17991834..or she was an anglo. "I'm a Quebecois writer," they'd say...
2342867 ..wardice as an anglo, one must understand just one thing...He's a..
32142127 ..new breed of anglo The original idea in 1965, according..
30217474 ..ow, we Quebec anglos are supposed to get all cranked up again ov..
24884375 ..ter to baffle anglos. But no, it seems that someone just woke up..
4527475 ..e, "If angry anglos don't vote...Parizeau," reminds us that..

The RC, the only bilingual dictionary to list either of these two senses, labels the second sense *very inf* but the lexicographer changed the RC's label to the symbol for *inf*.

The change from labeling each of the two senses to the labeling of the whole word is not justified by any monolingual dictionary, and the reviser does not explain her choice.

The French equivalent "anglo", for the first sense, which is labeled *·* after the first revision, is not labeled, however, in any of the dictionaries. The reviser provides no justification for the addition of this label. However, this may have been done as condensed words are often informal.

BEAVER.N

3 versions (1990)

Status: early drafts- will be updated

beaver *n*

1	sense not listed
2	-- (woman's pubic area RH) pelote-- <i>f</i> (CD) KB+CB.
3	-- (woman's pubic area RH) pelote-- <i>f</i> (CD) KB+CB.

Dictionaries:

RH: *slang (vulgar)*

not included in any of the other dictionaries (monolingual or bilingual)

(LAR2: not listed

OXHA: *vulg*

RCSS: *vulg/offensive*)

Corpus examples: none

This entry is interesting as it is the only example of the -- symbol (*extremely inf*) we could find in the entries done so far for the BCD. Since the only dictionary to list the sense

among the dictionaries included in this file uses the label *slang (vulgar)*, it would seem that the symbol ~ was used to mean *vulgar* rather than *extremely inf.*

The equivalent "pelote", which is also labeled ~, does not seem to have been checked in any dictionary and seems to have been proposed by the reviser.

CHUM.N

6 versions (1994-1996)

Status: final version

chum *n*

1	(close friend GAGE+HRW+COLL+OALD+OXREF) copain <i>m</i> , copine <i>f</i> RC+HA+LAR+DC, camarade <i>mf</i> HA+DC, ami(e) intime HA, intime DC. * Garry bumped into an old ~ CC+QUEENS Garry a rencontré un vieux copain CC.
2	- GAGE+PEN+COLL (<i>friend</i> GAGE+CM) copain <i>m</i> , copine <i>f</i> RC+HA+LAR+DC, camarade <i>mf</i> HA+DC, ami <i>m</i> / amie <i>f</i> , (CD) chum <i>mf</i> RQ+LAPR. * childhood ~ CH+TS+MCLN+BBI ami <i>m</i> / amie <i>f</i> / camarade <i>mf</i> d'enfance JB+PR; old ~ BBI+GAZ+TS vieux copain <i>m</i> / vieille copine <i>f</i> JB+LAPR, vieil ami <i>m</i> / vieille amie <i>f</i> ; school ~ BBI+OALD+GAZ+QUEENS camarade <i>mf</i> d'école JB+PR / de classe JBA.
3&4&5	- GAGE+PEN+COLL (<i>friend</i> GAGE+CM) chum <i>mf</i> (CD) RQ+LAPR, copain <i>m</i> , copine <i>f</i> RC+HA+LAR+DC, pote <i>m</i> RQ+LAPR+DEV+DROIT, camarade <i>mf</i> HA+DC, ami <i>m</i> / amie <i>f</i> . ** childhood ~ CH+TS+MCLN+BBI ami <i>m</i> / amie <i>f</i> / camarade <i>mf</i> d'enfance JB+PR; old ~ BBI+GAZ+TS vieux chum <i>m</i> / vieille chum <i>f</i> (CD), vieux copain <i>m</i> / vieille copine <i>f</i> JB+LAPR, vieil ami <i>m</i> / vieille amie <i>f</i> ; school ~ BBI+OALD+GAZ+QUEENS camarade <i>mf</i> d'école JB+PR / de classe JBA.

6	· GAGE+PEN+COLL (<i>friend</i> GAGE+CM) chum[·] mf (CD) RQ+LAPR, copain <i>m</i>, copine <i>f</i> RC+HA+LAR+DC, camarade <i>mf</i> HA+DC, ami <i>m</i> / amie <i>f</i>. ** childhood ~ CH+TS+MCLN+BBI ami <i>m</i> / amie <i>f</i> / camarade <i>mf</i> d'enfance JB+PR; old ~ BBI+GAZ+TS vieux chum[·] <i>m</i> / vieille chum[·] <i>f</i> (CD), vieux copain <i>m</i> / vieille copine <i>f</i> JB+LAPR, vieil ami <i>m</i> / vieille amie <i>f</i>, school ~ BBI+OALD+GAZ+QUEENS camarade <i>mf</i> d'école JB+PR / de classe JBA.
---	--

Monolingual dictionaries:

GAGE+PEN+COLL+COCO+LONG: *inf*

FUN+RHWEB+RH+OALD+WEB3+OXR: no label

Bilingual Dictionaries:

RC+HA+LAR+DC+OXF= *fam/inf*

(LAR2: *inf*

OXHA: *vx, inf*

RCSS: *slightly old-fashioned, inf*)

Corpus examples: yes

In the second version, the reviser added the · symbol to the sense of **chum** presented above, after verifying in the GAGE, the PEN and the COLL. In effect, she chose to use the more extreme of the two options presented by the monolingual dictionaries (*inf* or no label) but she follows the example set by all the bilingual dictionaries consulted here. The corpus examples perhaps point to some informality since the topics discussed are related to the movies or politics discussed irreverently; the context words, however, are fairly neutral.

- This film reunites ex-Monty Python chums Eric Idle, who wrote the film, with John Cleese
- "It seems to be a chance for Brian to travel on taxpayers' dollars and see some of his old chums.
- Sometimes she took ailing tenants up there and "made them feel better", she told her drinking chums.
- Others have gone in for the clucking exasperation one reserves for self-destructively naive chums.
- There are beauty tips by celebrity chums, from Joan Rivers ...
- According to her chums, Kristen became more vigilant about her own safety...

The equivalents are labeled from the second version on and are rearranged according to frequency of use. The fifth version has been examined by the revisers at Laval and they

delete "pote" because it is not commonly used in Canada and remove the ~ label for "copain" and "copine " since "[ils] ne devraient pas être marqués: ils sont perçus comme neutres, voire soutenus. "

This entry also illustrates the problem of what should be labeled, since the translations of some of the collocations are labeled ("vieux chum" is labeled) although the equivalents of the headword in these translations have already appeared and been labeled earlier in the entry. The labeling of this translation is perhaps inconsistent since **old chum** is not labeled. Either this inconsistency is the result of an oversight or the revisers have decided to label the translation of this collocation with "chum" in French to better differentiate the register level between the different translations given for the same collocation ("copain", "ami" are neutral).

LEMON.N

2 versions (1995-1996)

Status: waiting for second revision

lemon *n*

1	-GAGE (<i>unsatisfactory or defective thing</i>) OALD citron <i>m</i> RQ (fam.)+ LC (de l'angl) + DCF + EXQ (de l'angl), clou <i>m</i> DC (souvent associé à vieux)+RM+PR+RQ+PLUS, camelote <i>f</i> OXHA. * this car is a ~ , it's always breaking down LC + NO cette voiture est un citron , elle tombe toujours en panne. * This car is a ~ OXHA Cette voiture est de la camelote * He bought a lemon which broke down immediately ml Il a acheté un vieux clou qui est tombé en panne immédiatement.
2	~ (GAGE) (<i>unsatisfactory or defective thing</i>) (OALD) citron <i>m</i> ~ (RQ) (DCF+EXQ+RQ+LC) clou <i>m</i> (DC+RM+PR+RQ+PLUS) NOTE: SOUVENT ASSOCIÉ À VIEUX - ML, camelote <i>f</i> (OXHA). * this car is a ~ (ECP) cette voiture est un citron/de la camelote (ML+OXHA).

Monolingual dictionaries:

GAGE+PEN+FUN+HRW+COLL+LONG+OALD+OXR: *slang*

COD: *colloquial*

COCO+RH: *inf*

Bilingual dictionaries:

RC: *very inf/très fam*

RCS+HA+LAR2+OXHA: *inf/fam*

DC: *slang*

Both the ~ in the first version and the symbol ~ in the second attached to the sense of the headword have the GAGE as their source code. The GAGE, however, uses the label *slang* and it seems that the lexicographer and the reviser have interpreted that label differently. Since most of the bilinguals do assign the *inf* label the second version is closer to these.

Of the six corpus examples we examined, four are in quotes and several examples use contractions, clues which seem to justify at least a ~.

2521563, .. looking at buying a used vehicle, and doesn't want to buy a lemon," she says. "The custom..
86455114, ..tion is fairly obvious. "You don't want to get caught with a lemon." And that means taking..
117824963, ..ion it is, said Armstrong. "It's like buying a car that's a lemon, said Lethbridge. Leth..
261078571, ..in matters of personal style. The Tories are about to pick a lemon. ID NUMBER: 9305200045..
455275833, ..flat tires courtesy of the free trade agreement. The car's a lemon, and all the slick sale..
646612844, ..etect all the hidden problems and never getting stuck with a lemon. However, lately I hav..

The equivalent "citron" is labeled ~ and the source is the RQ, a monolingual dictionary. The other two equivalents, "clou" and "camelote" are not labeled: "clou" has been checked in dictionaries and the majority do not label the word; "camelote", however, does not seem to have been checked for register in a monolingual dictionary since only the OXHA is given as a source.

5.4 *General Conclusions*

5.4.1 *Initial choices of labels*

In the first draft of these entries, the lexicographer's initial choice of label for a given sense is always justified by at least one dictionary, generally monolingual, with the exception of **Anglo**², whose label comes from the RC. With the exception of **feu.adj**, however, the monolingual dictionaries do not agree on the label and the lexicographer must choose between several labels. When such a choice is necessary, the lexicographer chooses the more extreme label for **fleuve**², **feu.adj** and **lemon** and the less extreme label (or no label at all) for **fleuve**¹, **décrochage**, **se farcir**¹, **feu.nm**, **Anglo**¹ and **chum**. The word **se farcir**² is marked by a commentary label (*vulg*) but it cannot be included, though it must be pointed out that the choice of *vulg* does follow the methodology guidelines; **beaver**, in the sense analyzed here, is not included in the first draft. No particular monolingual dictionary is chosen as a basis for labeling by the lexicographers.

The labels for equivalents are also generally checked in dictionaries, although the initial choice is often based on a bilingual dictionary. While, in the entries started earlier in the project (e.g. **cabane**, **Anglo**¹), non-neutral equivalents are not always labeled in the first version, such equivalents in later entries tend, on the whole, to be labeled when necessary.

5.4.2 *Reviser changes to labels*

The changes to labeling by the revisers seems to be most often based on the dictionaries as well. In the earlier entries, the revisers do not provide any explicit explanations for their decisions to change a label but at least one dictionary provides a basis for the change. Only in two cases (*décrochage*, *Anglo*¹) is the change completely unjustified by any dictionary but in both cases, the sense or the word is listed by only a few dictionaries. In the entries compiled and revised since 1994, every change is justified either by the source code or by a comment written on the entry. However, the corpus is not explicitly mentioned as the cause for a label change in any of the files examined here.

The revisers do not change the label assigned to the headword by the lexicographer in the entries *fleuve*² (if ++ is accepted as the equivalent of *poét*), *se farcir*¹, *se farcir*², *feu.nm* and *feu.adj*. When the revisers do change the label, they tend to choose a more extreme label than the lexicographer; in fact, in only one instance, *lemon*, does the reviser change the initial label to one less extreme.

If the revisers make changes to the labels of equivalents, it is often in conjunction with a change to the headword label, so that at least one of the equivalents bears the same label as the headword. With the exception of "pelote" for beaver, these changes are justified by at least one dictionary, although it is not always a monolingual dictionary.

5.4.3 *Comparison with monolingual dictionaries*

Since the BCD relies mostly on dictionaries to determine register labels, the entries examined here are of course often in agreement with some of the dictionaries included in the

entry file. As we have already mentioned there seem to be no particular dictionaries which are used as a basis for labels. Even within the same entry with two different senses, for example **fleuve**¹ (GR) and **fleuve**² (GL7), different monolingual dictionaries can be used as sources for the labels. With the exception of **Anglo**², the monolingual dictionaries seem to serve as the basis for labeling. And in only two cases (**décrochage** and **Anglo**¹) does the reviser assign a label more extreme than any monolingual dictionary.

5.4.4 *Comparison with bilingual dictionaries*

The BCD is also often in agreement with some of the bilingual dictionaries since, as we saw in the previous chapter, the monolinguals as a group and the bilinguals as a group are rarely in complete disagreement. The following list of the BCD entries along with the labels assigned by the other bilingual dictionaries, both those used in the entries themselves, and for the older entries, the verification of those labels in the LAR2, the OXHA and the RCSS (these are marked by a star), may perhaps reveal certain tendencies on the part of the BCD:

fleuve¹ (final version, 1989-1990):

RC+HA: no label

*OXHA+LAR2: no label

*RCSS: *lit*

BCD: +

fleuve²:

RC+HA: no label

*LAR2+OXHA+RCSS: not listed

BCD: ++

cabane (5th version, 1990-1995):

RC: *fam/inf*

HA+LOC: *pop*

*LAR2+RCSS: *inf/fam*

*OXHA: *very inf*

BCD: -

décrochage (5th version, 1990-1992):

not listed in bilinguals

BCD: -

se farcir¹ (3rd version, 1995-1996):

RC+RCS+RCSS: *very inf/très fam*

HA+OXF: *pop*

LAR2: *fam*

OXHA: 2 senses, (accomplir) *inf/fam*; (supporter) *very inf/pop*

BCD: -

se farcir²:

LAR2+RCSS: *vulg/offensive*

OXHA: *very inf/pop*

BCD: -, (*vulg*)

feu.n (2nd version, 1996):

RC+RCS+RCSS: *arg crime*

LAR2+OXHA: *fam*;

OXF: *pop*

BCD: -

feu. adj:

RC+RCS+OXHA+LAR2: *fml/sout*

HA+LAR+DC+OXF: no label

BCD: ++

Anglo¹ (4th version, 1990-1991):

not listed in bilinguals used during entry preparation

*LAR2: no label

*RCSS: *very inf/très fam*

*OXHA: not listed

BCD: -

Anglo²:

RC: *very inf/très fam*

*RCSS: *very inf/très fam*

*LAR2+OXHA: no label

BCD: -

beaver (3rd version, 1990):

not listed in bilingual dictionaries used during entry preparation

*RCSS+OXHA: *vulg/offensive*

*LAR2: not listed

BCD: -

chum (6th version, 1994-1996):

RC+HA+LAR+DC+OXF: *fam/inf*

*LAR2: *inf/fam*

*OXHA: *vx, fam/inf*

*RCSS: *slightly old-fashioned, inf/fam*

BCD: -

lemon (2nd version, 1995-1996):

RCS+HA+LAR2+OXHA: *inf/fam*

RC: *very inf/ très fam*

DC: *slang*

*RCSS: *inf/fam*

BCD: -

For the most part, the BCD agrees with some of the bilinguals but the exceptions, however, are interesting since, in the entries studied here, most of the cases where the BCD disagrees with the majority of the bilingual dictionaries are words or senses assigned the + or ++ symbols. The first sense of *fleuve* is not labeled by the OXHA and the LAR2, while the RCSS labels it *lit*, but it is labeled + in the BCD; for *feu.adj*, the BCD uses the more extreme label ++ while the other bilinguals use the label *fml/sout*. The BCD labels **Anglo²** while the LAR2 and the OXHA do not label this sense and the RCSS labels it *very inf/très fam*. In two of these cases, the BCD, then, chooses the middle ground, while in the third, it chooses the more extreme label. As was the case for the monolingual dictionaries, the BCD

does not seem to follow one particular bilingual dictionary more than any other.

5.4.5 *Consistency within the BCD*

Because our sample includes entries done at different stages of the BCD project, there is no overall consistency. Our sample, however, is small and any conclusions we might draw would therefore be suspect. But we can point out certain tendencies. First, there is a consistent effort by the lexicographers and the revisers alike to find equivalents of the same register as the headword, though the label of the equivalents and the equivalents themselves may change from version to version. Secondly, the largest difference in terms of choosing less extreme or more extreme labels seems to be directly tied to the age of the entry itself. Entries written and revised at the beginning of the project tend to be labeled with the more extreme choice offered by the consulted dictionaries while the labels in later entries tend to either not change at all after revision or to change towards the less extreme label; revisers of later entries also consistently justify their choices. The word *cabane* spans across both the earlier and later periods and the label does not change after the very first revision. This discrepancy between the earlier and the later entries cannot be easily explained since a number of factors may be at its root: first, older entries have been revised more often than the newer ones; secondly, the revisers have changed, and the difference in labeling choices can perhaps be attributed to the personalities of the revisers; thirdly, the number of dictionaries has greatly increased over time; and fourthly, the dictionaries used as sources have themselves changed, and, as we have seen, newer dictionaries, like the NPR and the COCO, tend towards less extreme labeling when it comes to the more informal registers.

Another important factor is the project's greatly enlarged online corpus database, which may have played a role in this trend towards less extreme labeling. The usefulness of this corpus for the purposes of register labeling must, however, be examined more closely.

Chapter 6

Corpus use in register analysis

As the analysis in the previous chapters has shown, register labeling in dictionaries is often fraught with problems. Though, as we saw in Chapter 4, the discrepancies are generally small from dictionary to dictionary, these discrepancies are frequent enough to warrant caution on the part of the BCD lexicographers when they use dictionaries as sources for register labeling.

Furthermore, these dictionaries rarely explain how they arrive at their labels, nor do they divulge the sort of evidence they use to justify the label of a word. Even the AH dictionaries and their much vaunted Usage Panel, which supposedly led to a dictionary "more precisely descriptive, in terms of current usage levels, than heretofore published" (AH2, 1976: 7), do not really address the problems inherent in choosing a register label for a word. The editors may have asked the opinions of "oustanding writers, speakers and thinkers", but this method of arriving at a register label is not in any way more objective than the methods of the Académie or Samuel Johnson. As Anthony Wolk asks, "can the AH be 'descriptive',...when the panel operated by answering set questions on usage instead of having its own usages observed?" (Wolk, 1972: 930)

The increased availability of computer databases has certainly had an impact in lexicography: both the COCO and the OXHA, for instance, discuss corpus analysis as an important component of their lexicographic methods. However, neither one of these dictionaries explains how they use the corpus to determine register labels. Yet, the corpus certainly reveals some clues about the register of a word, and, most importantly, it provides

the lexicographer with a number of contexts so that he or she can observe how writers actually use the word naturally, rather than how writers perceive the word when they are questioned about its register within a group of their peers.

We shall now examine contexts for several words included in the charts used in Chapter 4 to determine how a corpus can be useful. The corpus consulted is the BCD unilingual corpus.

6.1 *The BCD corpus*

The online corpus used at the BCD is a collection of French and English, Canadian and non-Canadian texts. The biggest portion of the corpus is made up of Canadian newspapers (English Canadian Press, i.e. ECP and Presse canadienne française, i.e. PCF) but the lexicographers also have access to the Wall Street Journal (WSJ), Ouest France (OF), Le Monde (MOND), as well as the subcorpus of Leméac and Queens, which include fiction. The BCD corpus also includes more technical and scientific texts. The PCF (77 million words) is made up of the Le Droit, Le Devoir, La Presse, Le Soleil and L'Actualité, while the ECP, the largest subcorpus by far (129 million words), is made up of newspapers like the Ottawa Citizen, the Vancouver Sun, the Montreal Gazette, the Calgary Herald. Both the PCF and the ECP, then, are made up essentially of local newspapers, rather than national papers like the Globe and Mail, or in the U.S., the New York Times. These city newspapers tend to favor sports, entertainment and local politics over international events and are generally aimed at a "regular" reader, with an average education; they could be called "middle-brow" journalism if one compares them to the more "high-brow" Globe and Mail or

Le Monde. Leméac and Queens, the more literary subcorpora, are considerably smaller in size, the first containing 900,000 words, the second 5 million words.

We took several words from the charts in Chapter 4 and also from the list of the BCD entries above, and looked for occurrences of these words in the corpus; for the French words, we used the PCF, Le Monde and Leméac, and for English words, we used the ECP and Queens. There is no English-language equivalent to Le Monde since the WSJ is too specialized in economics to be very useful for most of the words listed here. We shall examine a few contexts from these newspapers and analyze the selected words in context on a scale from the more formal or literary registers to the most informal register. We have used the dictionaries as a basis for this scale.

6.2 *Corpus analysis for determining register*

Formal or literary words

faconde

PCF

25287432, ..se qu'il a donc mis son humour. En personne, il n'a pas la faconde de celle qui prépare un..
 28445552, .. et aliguésées, avec des renforts militants et un chef a la faconde inépuisable. Un duel a ..
 44220993, ..ec un mot). M. Chrétien a réussi par sa simplicité, sa faconde, sa franchise et son st..
 44864424, ..moins sévèrement, de courir un peu trop les jupons. Sa faconde et sa jovialité lui per..
 65266538, .. somme toute fort moral, San-Antonio succombe souvent a sa faconde gauloise. Quelques morc..
 79669867, .. demi-seconde... Du coup, Tomba retrouvait sa verve et sa faconde, en meme temps que la p..
 109174960, ..temps de récession, cela creve davantage les yeux. Avec sa faconde des beaux jours, le mai..
 114004941, .. du voisin américain et que l'on ne soit pas séduit par la faconde de Bill %fresh face » Cl..
 173560548, ..licier de la route qui le soupçonnait d'ébriété, ce fut sa faconde, et non son haleine, qu..
 211686535, .. nulle. Eh bien, c'est un snoreau. D'abord, je dis que la faconde théorisante dix-neuviém..
 227739733, ..laisir a exprimer leurs doutes quand le capitaine plein de faconde se déchainerait au mépris..
 248209116, ..m de ses sujets favoris Les Robinets de la liberté, par sa faconde langagiere et par ses b..
 322945691, ..Quelques pas dans la vie d'Éva, un court récit sorti de la faconde de notre barde national..
 384552987, .. romancier Claude Fournier, avec beaucoup d'habileté et de faconde, pour justifier ses inc..
 392486886, ..ains poètes publient leur recueil a chaque année, avec une faconde parfois heureuse, mais ..
 407508401, ..lé de son érudition, de ses nombreux coups de plume, de sa faconde et de son hédonisme. De..
 420744785, ..ui devient son ami de toujours, et le hasard - et aussi sa faconde sans doute - le met en ..
 443143443, .. débuts, y est toujours a la barre, avec sa bonhomie et sa faconde habituelles. Avec le te..

Certain context words seem to indicate a higher register, "hédonisme", "théorisante" and "ébrété" for instance. There are also several contexts that deal with literature. Few of these contexts are in quotes or in the first or second person, which could denote a degree of informality.

MOND

14453719, ..se de tout ce dont il est lui-meme démuné (" la force, la faconde, la truculence, les jou..
17098755, ..autant dire entre commensaux que M. Sanguy retrouve une faconde subitement animée d'un..
64909546, ..st, l'histoire viendra a la rescousse. Il rappellera avec faconde qu'en juin 40, sa comm..
71818796, ..ler. Pourtant je ne me laisse jamais impressionner par la faconde des hommes publics, pa..
81608001, ..st vrai que la Provence est son pays natal. Exploitant sa faconde méridonale, il raconte..
83772139, ..se ne s'en sortira pas seule. Il faut l'aider, se battre. Faconde des rappeurs du Midi, c..
83912371, ..sus de la soul (le rap) et du reggae (le raggamuffin). La faconde méridionale sied bien,..
97279266, ..lle de dire un monde avalé par la vitesse, étourdi par sa faconde, bousculé par son histo..
102005887, ..rti vendredi soir, se faisait " au nom du gouvernement ". Faconde, humour, cris du coeur..

These contexts do not seem to necessarily indicate that **faconde** is a particularly formal word since they include both first person subjects, direct speech and some deal with contemporary music.

LEMEAC

4068073, ..rale. Chose étonnante, c'est la fluidité, l'aisance et la faconde qui manquent le plus, a..
5141245, ..surtout, en plus disponible. Tout en parlant avec plus de faconde qu'Adakhan, il paraissa..

These contexts are not particularly revealing: the context words are neutral and there do not seem to be examples of direct speech.

sans coup férir

PCF

7485945, .. les sentiers. Le releveur Randy Myers a terminé la manche sans coup férir. Il a cafouillé..
10458688, .. pour eux. On a bien vu, toutefois, que les Canadiens, sans coup férir, pouvaient tres..
26992172, ..n) Descripteurs: *Fraîs bancaires - Canada. </0><60> Sans coup férir, les grandes ba..
31154000, .. ceux qui s'entraînent en aérobie, peuvent vous la réciter sans coup férir: un minimum de ..

37361323, ..f de la ville de New York qu'ils peuvent vendre des sapins sans coup férir. Adoptée juste ..
 52630426, ..lissement de la discipline. La Française s'est imposée sans coup férir, dévalant les 4..
 55064982, ..anks soviétiques viennent de renverser le pouvoir en place sans coup férir... A la maison,..
 82106001, ..saute du passé au présent, du présent au passé de Chaplin, sans coup férir. De l'enfance d..
 113292113, ..du dernier vingt. Le défenseur s'est amené dans l'enclave sans coup férir. Quatre adversa..
 113950365, ..0 du dernier vingt. Le défenseur s'est amené dans l'enclave sans coup férir. Quatre adversa..
 121246752, ..pbell, arrivée avec presque une heure de retard, répondait sans coup férir a toutes les qu..
 126325128, ..lles générales Mardi 23 mars 1993 A12 Casino indien fermé sans coup férir PC Régina TYPE..
 127341282, ..aisser ses concurrents accaparer une grande part du marché sans coup férir. La nouvelle Co..
 132997724, ..urs soucieux de la dimension économique, ne peut s'effacer sans coup férir devant un tel d..
 156896031, ..n des hivers les plus rigoureux depuis plus d'une décennie sans coup férir. La voiture nou..
 157582052, .. la région, passant a chaque fois, du français a l'anglais sans coup férir. Céline Dion in..
 157991379, ..cieuse de la mode, différencier aujourd'hui, a distance et sans coup férir, un sexe d'un a..
 185648143, ..re, bien malin ou bien prétentieux celui ou celle qui dira sans coup férir: %À mon avis, t..
 192223462, ..x élections ne vont pas nécessairement accepter le verdict sans coup férir. La mission de ..
 199597340, ..ne dizaine de jours accepteront-ils de s'y plier désormais sans coup férir? De partir ou d..
 201582268, ..00 manifestants ont marché sur l'usine et s'en sont emparé sans coup férir. Tout s'est pa..
 207289723, ..e la situation, c'est qu'ils savent qu'ils vont s'en tirer sans coup férir, ajoutent les s..
 223682337, ..roite %a montré vendredi qu'elle pouvait s'emparer presque sans coup férir de toute la hau..
 236587147, ..ou mauvais, c'est selon - si la transaction suit son cours sans coup férir. Or cette conv..

These contexts in the PCF offer a few clues about the formality of sans coup férir.

First, a variety of subjects are treated (international politics, sports, business), some of which could give rise to formal situations. In addition, the contexts are, for the most part, reported in the objective third person. In general, however, the other words in the contexts are rather neutral in register.

MOND

8937697, ..nda a appris avec stupéfaction que l'UNITA s'était emparée sans coup férir de Soyo (le Mo..
 9539536, ..ut seul 58 % du marché de la sous-traitance doit absorber, sans coup férir, les baisses d..
 9603528, .., qui accompagne la cérémonie dans le sanctuaire, succède sans coup férir, a la sortie, l..
 15515782, ..che de M. François Léotard, devrait cette fois-ci prendre sans coup férir la circonscrip..
 29320747, ..e par le Conseil d'Etat, l'homme du marketing sera réélu, sans coup férir, des le premier..
 33291661, ..-Est) fraîchement ciselée par Charles Pasqua, il l'enlève sans coup férir. Mis sur orbite..
 35782435, ..ous en ballottage tres favorable et devraient etre réélus sans coup férir. De meme, Jean..
 36325731, .. solidement taillée dans le Cantal et en Haute-Loire, rafle sans coup férir les cinq siege..
 37137812, ..t déjà et ne s'en cachait pas. François Bayrou l'a obtenu sans coup férir, ou presque, ta..
 40162539, ..gement de locataires>au Club des Pins </0><60> Sans coup férir, l'Etat vient d..
 40927476, ..émoises a une droite locale déchirée. Le parachuté enlève sans coup férir son siege au dé..
 43138051, ..n'osait, depuis longtemps, prendre d'assaut, et qui tombe sans coup férir, minée de l'in..
 51211888, ..moignage mériterait d'etre connu. La réponse est lancée sans coup férir, d'une voix dou..
 52919249, .. de leur écrasante majorité, l'UDF et le RPR ont repoussé sans coup férir cette question ..
 53612272, ..a renommée ne cessait de grandir, aurait conquis la ville sans coup férir autour de 1880,..
 55165408, ..uasi-unanimité des voix. Ainsi, se trouvaient approuvées, sans coup férir ou presque, les..
 64892628, ..ette de traverser la Champagne et d'arriver devant Paris sans coup férir. Les contempora..
 71665407, ..artenait pas a la catégorie de celles qui devaient tomber sans coup férir dans l'aumonier..
 77705445, ..artenait pas a la catégorie de celles qui devaient tomber sans coup férir dans l'aumonier..
 78407237, ..de 15,8 milliards l'an prochain. Mme Veil, qui a imposé sans coup férir une réforme des..

As in the PCF, these contexts seem to indicate a certain formality. Politics is the main topic and is discussed in the objective third person.

LEMEAC

There are no examples of *sans coup férir*.

feu.adj

PCF

103021176, ..sicaux épurés. Hourra. Disons cependant que le soliste de feu l'imposante formation Octo..
 130372100, ..ers le CHRO Au nom de la famille Légaré et des enfants de feu Monique Légaré, décédée d'..
 142161992, ..aut ce qu'il vaut. Encore faudra-t-il interpréter celui de feu Ida Pelletier. C'est un j..
 142162333, ..ne familial) pourrait s'appliquer, partageant les biens de feu Ida Pelletier entre son ve..
 142164705, ..ue Wil est clair du testament olographe du 22 août 1987 de feu Ida Pelletier que le défen..
 143906291, ..ois, maître charpentier, fils de feu François Benoit et de feu Dimanche Chapelain, de Cha..
 221885190, ..u d'une dotation de 500 000\$ faite au Conseil des arts par feu Jean A. Chalmers de Toront..
 236554535, ..des fonctions et des titres. On cite par exemple le cas de feu Jeanne Sauvé qui, tout au ..
 279846451, ..t coin Cote-des-Neiges et Queen-Mary, au deuxième étage de feu la pharmacie Thibault (rem..
 362934579, ..e en chef de l'Irlande, Donal Begley. La princesse Grace Feu la princesse Grace de Mona..
 395515818, ..rver l'intégrité des successions de feu Gilbert Timm et de feu Victoire Cossette-Timm ». A..
 51987784, ..a épousé hier Susan Eisenhower, 38 ans, la petite fille de feu le président américain Dwig..
 119632775, ..partis, parfois dotée d'une grande autorité morale, comme feu le président Pertini d'Ital..
 273761187, ..re étoilée de l'Europe ne doit pas devenir un succédané de feu le Rideau de fer, dit un éc..
 289375632, ..99> <99><0> Le Devoir Éditorial Mercredi 25 août 1993 A6 Feu le fair-play Alliance Québe..
 295511701, ..re-Neuve LONGUEUR: Moyen </0><60> Le gros de l'empire de feu le multi-millionnaire K. C..
 301683773, ..textes, émanant du Parti québécois, du Parti libéral ou de feu le Rassemblement pour l'Ind..
 317841090, ..guration ou l'on a présenté des oeuvres de Beethoven et de feu le compositeur québécois Pi..
 344527918, ..créé par le vide idéologique actuel de part et d'autre de feu le rideau de fer. À quoi pe..

These contexts seem to give credence to the three different labels the GR assigned to feu.adj. In the first context, it is certainly used humourously; in the second and others, it is used in a legal context; and, in the last context, it seems to be part of a fairly formal text, though not necessarily a literary text.

MOND

5628033, .. pour Andy Degroat (1986), et de Ernest Pignon-Ernest pour feu la compagnie Doussaint/Du..
 101790425, ..on (1), la commande émane de Pascal Joseph, transfuge de feu La Cinq, et futur conseil..
 103044995, ..usse enregistrée en 1991 devait beaucoup aux commandes de feu la Cinq. Malgré le tasseme..
 103098197, ..ste titre d'être réduits au rôle de gardien du musée de feu la paysannerie française...

4067327, ..e l'Armed Force of Liberia (AFL), autrefois au service de feu le président Samuel Doe. A ..
 34431098, ..Grand Sommeil. Marlowe y retrouve les filles dépravées de feu le général Sternwood, a la r..
 45564128, ..n'en est pas moins extraordinairement contrastée. Comme feu le duc d'Otrante, les deux ..
 71189557, ..e membres du Conseil consultatif national (CCN), créé par feu le président Boudiaf. L'as..
 92327464, .. trois pieces, " un gratte-ciel ! " avait coutume de dire feu le duc Pierre. Et ces maré..
 94975528, ..es gens sans grande expérience du sérail on l'a vu avec feu le président Mohamed Boudia..
 100090763, .. moins. Voici, par exemple, en plein coeur de la capitale, feu le marché Saint-Honoré, na..

Like the PCF contexts, the examples in MOND are both used in a seemingly
 humorous fashion and also in the fairly formal reporting of international politics and
 business. None of these contexts seem to be occurrences of direct speech.

LEMEAC

There are no examples of feu.adj.

fecund

ECP

30561511, ..ughter. On the other side is a best-selling novelist whose fecund wife is about to add twi..
 67980522, .. and settled around Chateau- Richer. They weren't quite as fecund as the Tremblay lads and..
 203335261, .. sunny skies. Sure, I knew the root of all evil had found fecund ground in Whistler's cra..
 271066729, ..urns is lewd dancing, black magic, wild sex, ripe flowers, fecund fruit, running water, mo..
 286230181, ..iled for years on a handful of novels. Flaubert envied his fecund friend, George Sand, for..
 346945990, .. becomes still larger. In Nigeria, to cite one of our more fecund nations, the population ..
 377786697, .. it. He's flushed. He's burning to give Canada the biggest fecund growth it's ever had. o ..
 421410149, ..anish-American War, in 1898, where he eventually meets the fecund, poetic and good-natured..
 503949500, ..r, placed them on a table on my balcony and commanded, "Be fecund. Be fructiferous." I oft..
 511400772, ..n of something long ago and far away." He uses words like fecund and cloven, and will eve..
 552207842, ..n's Symphony No. 88, one of the most ingenious of all this fecund composer's 104 symphonie..
 584606690, ..there is no doubt at all who this bountiful giver is. The fecund soil, the lively seed, t..
 587184217, .., a brilliant orb, a breast dripping milk, glows like some fecund planet in the shifting n..
 598192786, .. in the very second following its creation. One infinitely fecund second that lasts an hou..
 783414924, ..lged themselves in the overwhelming beingness of this most fecund spot on God's green Eart..

While some of these contexts are written in the first person, the metalinguistic
 context ("he uses words like fecund and cloven") clearly shows the formality of fecund by
 this apposition with "cloven." Three of the contexts are more metaphoric, and seem to
 indicate a literary style: "glows like some fecund planet", "all evil had found fecund

ground", "the fecund soil, the lively seed." These certainly seem to justify the *lit* label of the OXHA.

QUEENS

13929591, ..elligent boy, he showed few personal manifestations of his fecund imagination. He still do..
25795538, ..g in Canada. Though he has sired thousands of calves, this fecund colossus has not been ne..
25857471, ..was almost defiant this summer. It grew in huge, luscious, fecund bunches, and the honey f..

Once again, the context words reveal some justification for a *lit* label: the use of the word "colossus" to describe a bull in the second sentence and the personification of a plant, which is "defiant," in the third context are signs of a more "literary" or metaphoric style of writing.

felicitous

ECP

2359344, ..., digging deep into my meagre stock of slang. It was not a felicitous choice. The word can..
27839317, ..Britain's reputation for "quality" television was due to a felicitous situation unique to..
44519406, ..'majored in my social life and minored in English,' was a felicitous career move in more..
61622343, ..e result was a reading filled with surprises, some of them felicitous. Pinnock also prodd..
175184969, ..a job' would have been, as Joe Clark would say, much more 'felicitous,' " said O'Connor...
212982532, ..York accent. While the circumstances have been admittedly felicitous for owners and manag..
286807999, ..e credit for thinking it up in advance. "It's one of these felicitous things that happen,"..
293218023, ..hat has been done here often in the past. There were many felicitous details in the balan..
399314076, .. were sticking to the sidewalk (to steal Thornton Wilder's felicitous phrase). I chose Cha..
404166891, .. of Les Journees du Cinema Africain et Creole features the felicitous pairing of music and..
415839626, ..re treated to a tasteful selection of tunes and remarkably felicitous performance from the..
609171159, .. peered down into a car where his wife and a man, in Day's felicitous phrase, 'were submi..
612290785, ..out 20 years, movie maker Norman Jewison often remarked on felicitous changes to the city..
719585812, ..e'' (And the third day He rose again). In an afternoon of felicitous choices, here are a ..

Overall, there do not seem to be any particular clues in the corpus to indicate the register of the word. One of the contexts places *felicitous* in quotes, while another is direct speech. The topic often has to do with the arts. The other words in the contexts are neutral.

QUEENS

6129335, ..d the trustees' final choice set the tone, in a peculiarly felicitous manner, for a decade..
13527027, ..berts happens to be. The prose style is clear and at times felicitous, as when Adams descr..

While literature is one of the topics dealt with, the other words in the contexts are neutral.

foe

ECP

7345013, .. </O><60> STACEY LAIRD Grade 7, Sardis WINTER: FRIEND OR FOE Sniffles and sneezes Coug..
28923697, ..er Junior Seau (55) celebrates beside a Kansas City Chiefs foe after the Chargers' 17-0 fi..
35167451, ..ut against the metric system. Big business, a traditional foe of the metric system in the..
38180774, ..<60> Re the Feb. 18 front-page article about me, Gambling foe lobbied NDP for casino, by ..
43663353, ..mier Bob Rae found some kinder words for his old political foe, as Prime Minister Brian Mu..
62042882, .. new position brought a storm of criticism from friend and foe alike and accusations that ..
69180931, .., which compete with fear and hatred of the common Shi'ite foe. Sensing Saddam's approach..
82532967, ..ify the mystery bugs and let you know if they're friend or foe to your property. The univ..
86131469, ..y February 06, 1993 B9 Gilmour to team up with old junior foe SUN NEWS SERVICES MONTREAL ..
95690080, ..esday February 02, 1993 D2 SNACK FOOD GIANT SWALLOWS CHIP FOE VANSUN Mississauga, Ont. S..
104043728, ..lar side will end in a fistfight or a job loss. "Friend or foe?" is the first question ask..
112460408, ..in's head at any price. ILLUSTRATION Ruslan Khazbulatov. Foe of Yeltsin ID NUMBER: 9303..
117684619, ..March 23, 1993 B8 HIGH-TECH; Dialling device excites Bell foe SouthamStar Network LENGTH..
127638194, .. "I think Mr. Chretien, Mr. Harper, they could get (Meech foe) Deborah Coyne (to run) and..
137200766, ..well as all other communities." DOCTOR SHOT: An abortion foe fatally shot a doctor in th..
147824957, ..Canadian public and have an election." Gerard, an ardent foe of the continental trade pa..
160595458, .. not.'" It is no accident that Rodriguez is a determined foe of both affirmative action ..
165532646, ..e Cardinals' career base-running zephyr helping a division foe. A team in a foreign countr..
174206015, ..ed the former allies "not to be tricked" by their common foe the Serbs. SIGN DISPUTE: P..
196952456, ..ril 17, 1993 A12 Yeltsin idle as corruption ruins Russia, foe charges Olivia Ward TORONTO..
200273949, ..ome his opponents and transform his country from Communist foe to capitalist partner. The..
212678106, .. an honor to be assaulted and battered by such a venerable foe, after dumping two tee shot..

The contexts are for the most part reported in the objective third person and frequently concern national and international politics. But these clues are not sufficient to help pinpoint the register of foe.

QUEENS

1145451, ..assandra, were reprinted in 1750. Thus the most formidable foe of Whig theory came, revive..
1721371, ..ing out there or cut his finger on a sardine can (William, foe of cans, nevertheless has a..
6101103, ... When the Catholic Cardinal Mindszenty, an irreconcilable foe of communism, was tried and..
13180396, ..vote, the party would be reinvigorated. But Devine's key foe is the spry, articulate All..
17807275, ..bia of providing "enormous financial aid" for Iraq, Iran's foe in the 7 1/2-year gulf war..
27356377, ..ies, a people which needs to understand who its friend and foe is, a people which needs to..
27883703, ..ise in order to "defend the "old flag" against an invading foe." The Conservatives harpe..

The contexts deal most often with international and national politics and are mostly reported in the third person, though one example is in quotes. Again, these clues are not sufficient to point to a particular register.

Informal to very informal

faramineux

PCF

14851305, ..x, véritable rendez-vous des cafards, et des repas au coût faramineux ont valu a une quara..
 18137799, ..devenir une dynastie. Par contre, a l'ère des salaires faramineux et des joueurs auton..
 19002676, ..tre profitables pour les commerçants qui paient des loyers faramineux. De plus ils sont tr..
 19190676, .. trop cher , rétorque Nicole Lanctot, en formulant un prix faramineux. La réalisatrice ins..
 26528658, .. La drogue entraîne aussi des coûts sociaux et économiques faramineux, croit le directeur ..
 31242949, ..t ou a la finance et a qui il faisait miroiter des profits faramineux. Ceux qui ont re..
 31666732, ..çon, les institutions n'ont plus le choix: devant les prix faramineux des oeuvres, le mécé..
 36413315, .. du retraité canadien se situe a 1700\$ - ce qui suppose un faramineux magot de 15000\$ a 20..
 63673160, ..e multiplient malgré les frais de scolarité exigés parfois faramineux. %Préparez votre av..
 63936959, ..inué de 11 % ». Pour l'élú de Lévis, %en plus des montants faramineux versés par le minist..
 68441617, ..a leur coûterait 18 millions \$. Mme Drouin parle de "coûts faramineux » et d'impact désast..
 73996634, ..ka, tous ont été relégués aux oubliettes a cause des coûts faramineux, des risques importa..
 77675829, ..contrat. L'action de BioChem a connu des hauts et des bas faramineux dans les deux dernie..
 82036032, ..nsport </0><60> C'est l'opposition populaire et les coûts faramineux du projet qui ont se..
 83499068, ..sommateurs exagérés de médicaments et contribuer aux coûts faramineux de la santé parce q..
 85011243, ..teur Jack Nicholson consacre une bonne partie de ses gains faramineux a l'achat d'oeuvres ..
 86448912, ..ce dans leur établissement. Ils se partagent des bénéfices faramineux - facilement 1000\$ p..
 91896616, .. gourmande Société des Alcools, qui voit ainsi des profits faramineux s'envoler. Bye bye l..
 92355590, ..les transporteurs maritimes, dont les coûts d'exploitation faramineux croissent avec chaqu..
 97653379, ..es. » Les équipes, qui paient de plus de plus des salaires faramineux, accordent également..
 07680906, ..ents en équipements de plus en plus sophistiqués s'averent faramineux, le coût du capital ..
 110838418, ..s Caraïbes) est un des facteurs qui contribuent le plus au faramineux déficit de notre bal..

The presence of quotation marks around one of the occurrences of **faramineux** ("coûts faramineux") indicates that the word is not completely accepted as neutral yet, but there are many more examples where it is not in quotes and in some instances seems to be used as a neutral word. Two context words or phrases, "magot" and "relégués aux oubliettes", indicate a certain informality but on the whole, the context words are fairly neutral.

MOND

1544746, ..e de l'argent. Le ticket d'entrée du sponsoring est devenu faramineux. Des exemples ? Pren..
24020601, ..i aucune sortie des semaines à venir ne promet des scores faramineux, la cérémonie des Cé..
26194835, ..r considère que l'" on trouverait un gisement d'économies faramineux " en " revoyant la ..
26635086, ..se partager la fine fleur des inculpés. Et des honoraires faramineux. Dans un genre di..
28352359, ..r de la caisse d'épargne évoque avec nostalgie les dépôts faramineux de ceux qui avaient ..
43403257, ..ncore enlisés dans un conflit au coût humain et financier faramineux. Les années 70 sont..
82637576, ..rtir de ce dilemme. Comment à la fois échapper aux stocks faramineux du métal et aux stoc..
88579649, ..u terrain et des actions en Bourse a atteint le montant faramineux de 489 000 milliards..
101940138, ..onne partie de l'opinion. Comment expliquer ces bénéfices faramineux à ceux qui doivent s..

As in the PCF, the word seems to be very close to neutral, though the presence of anglicisms ("scores", "sponsoring") as well as the questions ("Comment à la fois échapper aux stocks..." and "Comment expliquer ses bénéfices...") found in two examples may perhaps indicate a more conversational tone.

LEMEAC

4550052, ..ndide planète habitable, promise à un avenir merveilleux, faramineux dicit le prophète, ..

This one context is not enough to make any decision concerning register, but it must be pointed out that the "dicit" certainly indicates both a tongue-in-check attitude and direct speech, clues which reveal a certain informality.

se farcir¹

PCF

51003581, ..éfé s'en tenir au tracé court, 40 km, mais tous devaient se farcir l'incontournable Mont..
85053405, ..i. Excellent pour la copie. Mais pas toujours productif de se farcir quelques joueurs dans..
102967236, ..ient placées en elle. Pendant que les Montréalais devaient se farcir une trentaine de cent..
166878058, ..préparez-vous à faire la queue. Jessye Norman a accepté de se farcir deux heures de "signa..
198848507, ..tor/Warner) Le petit Charlie Baty a eu la géniale idée de se farcir Joe Louis Walker comm..
222113689, ..total. Outre le Québec qu'il doit ratisser, Marchand doit se farcir quelques missions spé..
255048266, ..bel est bien lancé. Le hockey, qui n'a pas les moyens pour se farcir des salaires astronom..
266317235, ..enes québécoises. Ferré avait alors déclaré: %Le temps de se farcir l'Atlantique, de se r..
283303650, ..sées. Avant de planter le moindre clou, un promoteur doit se farcir les 78 modifications ..
301732111, ..preme de cette formation, autour de 1700 délégués auront à se farcir près de 800 propositi..
305644801, ..a paru souverainement ennuyeux. Que de babillements faut-il se farcir pour survivre à cet l..
346138657, ..ence dans des lendemains qui chantent sans même avoir eu à se farcir le grand soir. C'éta..
392792760, ..enne. Un tel changement d'avec tous ces cowboys qu'on doit se farcir régulièrement », ajou..
403088065, ..tro, en 1959, joue aux gros méchants loups. Elle promet de se farcir les touristes et exil..
416020990, .. pour se rendre en Saskatchewan par exemple. Et il fallait se farcir l'aller-retour. » DD..
417886318, ..a tête en parlant du drole de calendrier que l'équipe doit se farcir. Entre le 19 décembre..
427202841, ..hic Magazine, à lire les légendes et autres encadrés, qu'a se farcir le texte principal. E..
427650845, .. Ca veut dire sept matchs sans jouer. Comme les As doivent se farcir trois matchs en autan..

439934396, ..qu'ils ne savent pas jouer autrement, parce qu'ils peuvent se farcir le boogie le plus con..
 120857218, ..té difficile, quand j'ai vu trop de monde, quand j'ai eu a me farcir un avocat, un témoin..
 124663033, ..ait mon effort, pas celui d'écouter Maurice, mais celui de me farcir les autres tribunes t..
 170640548, ..sous du seuil de la pauvreté? [...] Eh bien décroche et va te farcir le marché du travail...

There are several examples of the word used in direct speech ("le temps de se farcir l'Atlantique..", "tous ces cowboys qu'on doit se farcir régulièrement...", for instance). The most common topics are sports, long trips, comments on politics and the weather. Context words or phrases such as "souverainement ennuyeux", "méchants loups", "le petit Charlie Baty a eu la géniale idée" also indicate a certain conversational tone, often tongue-in-cheek.

MOND

There are no examples of this word in this sense.

LEMEAC

There are no examples of this word in this sense.

se farcir²

PCF

436416378, ..luquent et confondent nos femmes avec de la simple chair a se farcir. Elles en ont marre e..

The fact that there is only one example of this sense can indicate either its infrequent use or its vulgar nature. The context is in the first person and is perhaps direct speech.

MOND

There are no examples of this word in this sense.

LEMEAC

There are no examples of this word in this sense.

flanquer

PCF

4644531, .. l'entraîneur Al Raines, l'époux de Nancy Greene, voulait flanquer Peter a la porte de l'..
50678848, .. c'est sans doute le pire fer aux fesses qu'on pouvait lui flanquer. Mais c'est plus q..
77857956, ..tinoire. %C'est inadmissible qu'on ait lais:4 John Cullen flanquer un coup de coude en pl..
102595958, ..ts », se lamente M. Falcon. La situation avait de quoi lui flanquer une bonne migraine. C'..
103609882, ..plaçait par Tom Runnells, surnommé T.R. %David voulait me flanquer a la porte depuis l'au..
130815453, ..llement pris son temps que l'arbitre est passé pres de lui flanquer une punition pour avoi..
185963166, ..taient peut-etre déçus de ne pas voir leur équipe favorite flanquer une bonne raclée aux M..
220063805, .. pour la réalité. D'un commun accord, ils décident de tout flanquer la et d'aller s'établi..
266263754, .., selon Chandler, %sorti le crime du vase vénitien pour le flanquer dans le ruisseau », il..
359422146, ..lore en manque de Muller, Leclair, Keane, venait de lui en flanquer un coup. Sous quel pré..
381170506, ..</0><60> De grandes entreprises montréalaises viennent de flanquer une taloche de 7 milli..
408611157, .. aux fonds qu'il faut trouver d'urgence sous peine de tout flanquer la. Joignant l'anecdo..
419942351, ..référendaire de 1992 a été le test alors qu'on a cherché a flanquer la frouse aux Québéco..

The contexts words are highly revealing here since "taloche", "frouse", "une bonne raclée". "fer aux fesses" are all fairly informal. There are also a few instances of the word occurring as part of a conversation. Some contexts are about sports.

MOND

18665681, .. Le premier est une intimité incroyable. Le second est de flanquer une trouille incroyabl..
31261729, ..la grogne. Un administrateur du Musée de l'armée vient de flanquer sa démission parce qu'..
43531243, ..aire a un seul tour », comme en Grande-Bretagne, quitte a flanquer l'Assemblée nationale..
59514752, .. tsaristes, et ériger la mosquée de 7 000 places qui doit flanquer ce futur monument. ..
88701969, ..care the Pants Off America (Par ici, s'il vous plaît : Je flanquerais la trouille a toute..
95026294, ..vage que vous ayez jamais vu. Mon pere, ajoutait-il, peut flanquer une raclée a n'import..
98509008, ..il fait frais, humide a n'en pouvoir respirer. Un temps a flanquer le blues et des rhuma..
101010984, ..a ligne de fond de court. Le Français en profite pour lui flanquer une volée et une accél..

As in the PCF, the context words in the MOND, "trouille" and "raclée," also point to an informal register. In addition, a few contexts are about sports and others are direct speech.

LEMEAC

1396940, ..u coin de l'oeil les aventures de Superman qui venait de flanquer a la porte douze mill..

Since there is only one context, it is difficult to reach any conclusions. It is interesting, however, that it seems to be talking about a comic book hero.

la faute à

PCF

7903864, ..les brisent, ils en achètent d'autres. Ce n'est pas la faute à Buck si les Expos ont u..
10505543, ..us intéressants. Quant à Francis Sommer c'est quasiment La faute à Eélvis s'il peut maince..
15189111, .. à aucun doute que je suis furieux mais ce n'est pas de ma faute, a dit Smith, mardi. Malh..
26838420, ..es chaque tempête de neige, on remorque 5000 véhicules "en faute" à Montréal. Réf.: 89..
27162220, ..ons: c'est la faute aux stratégies, la faute aux médias, la faute à Broadbent, la faute à c..
27162242, ..x stratégies, la faute aux médias, la faute à Broadbent, la faute à ce que Marx décrivait c..
39782835, ..ur. Ça doit bien nous ressembler un peu non? C'est la faute à la société moderne qui ..
53302450, ..passer son EEG et se battre contre Michele Moffa. La faute à qui tout ça? Les or..
53302607, ..ntransigence de la RSSQ. N'en croyez rien, c'est leur faute à eux. Ils auraient dû pr..
58122530, ..enue Maplewood pour justifier une telle flambée? C'est la faute à Tchang Kaï-chek, m'a ex..
58122741, ..énagé à Taïwan avec la bénédiction des Américains, mais la faute à son petit-fils, Tchang ..
61070453, .. pour choisir nos adversaires. Après tout, ce n'est pas la faute à Sherbrooke ou Chicoutim..
68575459, ..? Pas facile à dire et facile à la fois. C'est parfois la faute à tout le monde et la fau..
68575487, ..le à la fois. C'est parfois la faute à tout le monde et la faute à personne. Chose certai..
69723003, .. de Montréal qui s'écroule avec la fermeture des Fout'. La faute à qui? À tout le monde. À..
70247918, ..l Mercredi 20 janvier 1993 A8 Lettres au Devoir C'est la faute à l'Ontario LONGUEUR: Co..
71466454, ..arpenter, c'est pareil comme avant. Ce n'était donc pas la faute à Clément. Notre problème..
76694139, ..Runner? Le même genre de ville... » Mais tout ça, c'est la faute à qui? À ceux qui, par i..
94587424, ..es aux pieds, quatre touchent des femmes. C'est d'abord la faute à la chaussure, insistent..
95287567, ..s Becker. Stich, qui a perdu le premier set sur une double faute, a fini par disposer de l..
97248341, ..e Pays Samedi 20 février 1993 22 En bref C'est encore la faute à Trudeau! Ottawa LONGUE..
103729470, ..bord examiner chacun des problèmes, puis déterminer si une faute a été commise et par qui ..
114707563, ..a osé dire que le gouvernement fédéral était nul C'est la faute à Jacques Parizeau et à L..
114707627, .. à Jacques Parizeau et à Lucien Bouchard mais c'est pas la faute à Mulroney, à Manning, à ..
116476703, ..uelque part de responsabilité pour leurs membres. C'est la faute à l'incurie du gouverneme..

These contexts are particularly interesting since in almost all cases, *la faute à* is used to make fun of someone, especially politicians. In no case is the tone the objective one of news reporting. There are also several examples where the subject of the sentence is in the first or second person. The "c'est pas" in "c'est pas la faute à Mulroney" also indicates a deliberately relaxed style and points to informality.

MOND

5210032, ..ctoraux (III) Chomage sans issue Point de vue La faute a la crise SERIE ..
 15240646, ..s dossiers électoraux (III) Chomage sans issue La faute a la crise SERIE ..
 18876441, ..ureux car si l'on est fou, a l'époque, c'est toujours la faute a Cupidon. Précise, impe..
 20360178, .. ne supportent pas d'être soumis, comme les autres, " a la faute a pas de chance ", ils e..
 22112898, ..iv-rpool... Si c'est pas malheureux, quand meme ! C'est la faute a qui ? A quo ? On péda..
 24674256, ..teurs d'Occident : le Mal absolu est a l'oeuvre, c'est la faute a Théodose, a quoi bon se..
 28659024, ..ffacées sur le dos de Mgr Lustiger. " Tout cela, c'est la faute a Lustiger, tempete un p..
 28659114, ..aroissien. Lustiger avec le PS, on aura tout vu ! C'est la faute a la juiverie, a la fran..
 28899904, ..alise ses activités de Bourgogne vers l'Ecosse ? C'est la faute a Maastricht, qui autoris..
 34449196, ..ticle: longue Titre: POINT/DÉONTOLOGIE DU JOURNALISME La faute a Emile de Girardin ? ..
 38818615, ..ude dont certains crevent, faute d'avoir su s'entourer ou faute a " pas de chance ". E..
 50085488, ..oindre a tout jamais la leur, celle de ses racines. La faute a la " presse " e" au " s..
 50788405, ..fres parler d'eux-memes ", assura-t-il sur France 2. " La faute a qui, interrogea sans co..
 51096393, ..,90, mais, pour l'instant, le coeur n'y est plus. C'est la faute a la " repentification "..
 55811759, ..divers du XVII siecle est passé dans l'histoire, c'est la faute a Voltaire, mais s'il est..
 55811823, .. a Voltaire, mais s'il est passé a la postérité, c'est la faute a Géricault. Le premier d..
 84470587, ..aire traîné dans la boue fut déclaré innocent. C'était la faute a pas de chance. Mais dan..

Like the PCF, the MOND uses the phrase mostly to make fun of politics or as part of a tongue-in-cheek comment. Again, some examples are indicative of direct speech.

LEMEAC

There are no examples of this phrase.

foutre.v

PCF

4708246, ..leader de cette formation américaine n'a absolument rien a foutre de ceux qui levont le ne..
 6696785, ..t francophone, plus on est Montréalais, plus on n'a rien a foutre de cette élection. M..
 12441624, ..s de la campagne au leadership. Si Meech est adopté, ça va foutre un bordel épouvantable, ..
 22307483, .. travaillé dans une shipyard, et moi aussi je me suis fait foutre a la porte pour avoir es..
 25456474, ..nt musical et aux textes évaluateurs. Allez vous faire foutre... , entonne Arthur Hige..
 27226871, ..des Caraïbes et il me semble qu'ils seraient bien cons d'y foutre le bordel pour les vider..
 30219692, ..draît bientôt obligatoire. Inutile de repeindre alors. Foutre le camp au plus vite? ..
 30861501, .. Et puis aussi, faut le dire, parce qu'ils n'en ont rien a foutre de nos petits murs... ..
 37660685, ..sement. Il gesticule, envoie encore les policiers se faire foutre. L'un d'eux, excédé, lui..
 41749003, .. les intérêts corporatistes des médecins. On n'en a rien a foutre de leurs chasses gardées..
 48580667, .. décision de congédier Martin Madden. Ce n'est pas tout de foutre un directeur général a l..
 51761323, ..verneur général) ridiculisés par ceux qui n'en ont rien a foutre. C'est meme un peu cruel..
 55377882, ..l dans le baseball majeur, Tchden n'en a pas grand-chose a foutre. C'est sûr que j'aurais..
 58775271, ..ophones et des anglophones? Expliquez-moi. Je ne veux pas foutre le bordel, mais c'est te..
 62154957, .. au Festival de Cannes, voila deux ans. Entendez: %Je n'ai foutrement rien compris, je ne ..
 63976928, ..Super Bowl. Tout ce que veux, c'est gagner. Je n'ai rien a foutre avec le patriotisme et..
 66524627, ..aire de la place aux jeunes, alors elle peut commencer par foutre a la porte le porteur de..
 75376647, ..plus belles théories, il y en a toujours un qui vient tout foutre en l'air.N'empeche que l..
 77741768, .. moins de service pour plus cher, alors, je n'en ai rien a foutre! La spécificité québécoi..
 80726738, .., Brian Mulroney aurait déjà démissionné ou se serait fait foutre a la porte. Or, rien de..
 83259701, .. assez de toute une vie pour apprendre ce qu'on est venu y foutre. * * * Si j'ouvre gran..

103502292, ..puisse faire jaser. Mais j'ai fini par le convaincre de se foutre de ce que les gens pense..
 106650365, .. conversion - disposition qui empeche les propriétaires de foutre un locataire dehors pour..
 108086729, ..s ou dénoncer les mauvaises. Mais bon sang, n'en ai rien a foutre, moi, des extases, coler..
 121273552, .. les Suisses, si pacifistes et raisonnables, viennent tout foutre en l'air! La débandade..
 123542311, ..e de l'gues. La mineure était injustifiée. Il aurait dû me foutre a la porte ou me coller..
 132683049, ..passent pas! On me répond que les lecteurs n'en ont rien a foutre, que la francophonie, ce..
 137584145, ..e n'ait rien fait pour recriminaliser l'avortement et pour foutre en prison les médecins e..

There are many clues that point to the informality of *foutre*, such as the frequent use of the first and second person, the many examples of direct speech, and words like "bordel" and "cons".

MOND

13839649, .. Je serai dans une sale affaire, je serai le premier a te foutre dedans. " Dubitative, la..
 15931451, ..Si vous voulez me faire plonger en prison, j'en ai rien a foutre... " </60></99> <99><0..
 28486429, .." la France vue par ses humoristes " : " J'ai de quoi vous foutre le cafard pendant des m..
 29326203, .. ; en fait, ça a permis aux grands de se concentrer et de foutre en l'air le petit paysan..
 31186415, ..nt pas, a-t-il ajouté, ils n'ont qu'a rentrer chez eux et foutre le camp. " " Nous ne..
 39701609, ..mailler toute la soirée, mais je l'adore. Cube a envie de foutre tout le monde en l'air,..
 45080625, ..Gérald Huntz, a Sauvian, lorsqu'ils ont décidé de venir " foutre une raclée a Roseau ",..
 45812103, ..if, une forme verbale ou un syntagme : Diable !, Mince !, Foutre !, Chic !, Merde !, Allo..
 51664789, .. boire un petit coup, ça permet d'oublier, " on va pas se foutre a l'eau ! ". Détresse et..
 53612704, ..illaires, le vieux consul, dont la devise était SFCDT (Se foutre carrément de tout), avai..
 68408475, ..st entrées. Des femmes nous ont jetées : allez vous faire foutre, sales juives !... On a..
 83900657, ..ix rauque de Jean-Paul Sartre) " Je vais enfin pouvoir me foutre la paix ! " L'acteur..
 87334837, ..enaçantes : " Puisque tu l'aimes tant, ton port, on va t'y foutre a l'eau. " Elle a, cett..
 ** 91389642, ..ps, il s'enivre d'une atmosphere qui " sent la rose et le foutre ", apporte a un climat d..
 94278417, .. " Peut-etre que c'est un théâtre de rien, j'en ai rien a foutre, aujourd'hui il vit, mon..
 96545823, .., Pays-Bas...). " Au lieu de me féliciter, il voulait me foutre dehors ! " Jacques Cype..
 100514272, .., Bourget monogamie et Claudel dondon. Flaubert se réserve foutre (" J'ai foutu trois fe..

As in the PCF, the occurrences of this word in the MOND are often in sentences that are direct speech and are in the first or second person; in fact, only two occurrences are not part of a quote. The context words are again revealing of informality: "sale affaire", "me faire plonger en prison", "le cafard", "une raclée", "Diable" and "Merde."

LEMEAC

308636, ..ui arrondit son dos de chat. On n'échappera pas au néant, foutredieu, on va bien savoir..
 1257151, ..me suis habitué sans difficulté. Avait-il appris a se foutre de tout ou réussi, magn..
 1268756, ..illico plutot que d'avoir, par réflexe conditionné, a lui foutre mon poing sur la gueule..
 1330738, ..les memes eaux. » ½ Mettre de l'ordre » lui disait-on ? ½ Foutre le bordel », répondait-i..
 1515451, ..adio, la télé, ce sont justement ceux qui n'en ont rien, a foutre. Rien de plus accablant..
 2778289, ..es crie encore plus fort. ½Espece d'imbécile, va te faire foutre! » ½Ton café est infect. »..
 2791440, ..metres, Paris-Avignon, Montréal-New York... Va te faire foutre avec ton humour a la con..

As in the PCF and the MOND, the examples here are almost all in the first or second person or are direct speech. And again, the context words, "gueule," "bordel" and "infect" indicate that the word is informal.

to fire

ECP

22044385, ..." KING ABOUT NEILSON King on New York Rangers' decision to fire coach Roger Neilson: "I...
 43617771, .. withdrawn some of the money but the flour mill has agreed to fire them if they don't retu..
 55151023, ..errment pressure, his employer, Drexel Burnham, was forced to fire him. Then he was jailed..
 63089597, .. be made. First of all, we need to cut education. We need to fire teachers, cut programs..
 66140268, ..ly defended Tyabji and said he wouldn't cave into pressure to fire her. "There are some w..
 73312526, .. The actor's publicist says Haim has tried unsuccessfully to fire Michael Bass as his man..
 87116889, ..er Bowl played a role in owner Ralph Wilson Jr.'s decision to fire him. He refused to answ..
 134919743, ..nagers should consider when deciding whether, when and how to fire an employee. Some facto..
 148809841, ..ing to work toward a compromise. The seven aldermen tried to fire Murphy, a career city s..
 156812588, .., whittling away at the president's powers and forcing him to fire his reformist prime min..
 176181853, ..to education, health, children and the old. He, too, wants to fire some public servants an..
 185177039, ..s in Friday's editions, said Lakers owner Jerry Buss plans to fire Randy Pfund because he..
 214249093, ..Halifax council meeting Wednesday night aldermen voted 7-5 to fire him if he didn't resign..
 221772948, ..nship with Neilson ultimately led to the Rangers' decision to fire their former coach in m..
 246714167, ..he Georgia labor department ordered the Savannah Cardinals to fire their 14-year-old batbo..
 262900007, ..k bureau chief with The Star, grieved Honderich's decision to fire him in September, 1990, ..

There are few clues that this word is informal. There is only one instance of a first person subject, the word itself is never surrounded by quotes, and the context words are neutral.

QUEENS

7257104, ..y, he said, "Because that motherfucker who owns it told me to fire Philly Joe because he'a..
 7321560, ..When he was with me the first time, people used to tell me to fire him. They said he wasn'..
 13400998, .. believe him. It's said that in his car dealership he used to fire the salesman with the l..
 15095297, .. that Laird was to accompany him to Windy, where Laird was to fire Ole Buckholtz, the trap..
 23459927, ..n to that was, Richard,' Michèle asks. 'Their reaction was to fire enough people so they e..
 27779026, ..at day (and almost unthinkable in this). But Sifton wanted to fire two: not only Burgess b..
 28290017, ..elled. His Liberal friends defeated a motion in Parliament to fire him, but he was obvious..

These examples lean more towards informality than the examples in the ECP because of the presence of "motherfucker", as well as several contracted verb forms and examples of direct speech.

fed up

ECP

10540518, ..position to get "spillover business from customers who are fed up with the major chartered..
27506518, .. with caution until salting trucks can get to their area. Fed up The Department of Trans..
35556742, ..t tonight and that puts us that much closer to spring. I'm fed up with winter and the snow..
46636357, ..ns and sheer boredom, many Canadian soldiers here are just fed up. When two rocks dropped..
58803170, ..verbank," said District 15 Councillor David Merrigan. "I'm fed up with the bull---- from p..
64931402, ..s, she told a fishing buddy of Callis in 1988 that she was fed up with her lover and knew ..
72604049, ..ne is fed up with politics. They want some spice. They are fed up with life." Instead of ..
79387185, ..Western Canada because a lot of people like myself who are fed up with the politicians in ..
88671067, .. TYPE: NEWS LENGTH: Medium (300 - 700) </0><60> Parents fed up with immersion payment ..
97165694, ..ising complaints may be a sign cash-strapped consumers are fed up with sales pitches too g..
101673788, ..> OTTAWA (CP) -- A federal study last August found people fed up about the welfare system..
104046899, .., some are worried about what may be found," says Devine. Fed up with the political quagm..
110412213, ..re. I haven't turned my back on the movement yet - but I'm fed up. Somehow, we have to fi..
113475223, ..but Rae and his inept group in power were the disgruntled, fed up to the teeth, previous s..
118789465, ..t (< 300) SUBJECT: WOMEN POLITICAL PARTIES CDA </0><60> Fed up with Canada's existing f..
126671205, .. first, I am sacred, I am untouchable' and I personally am fed up with it all." QUESTIONS..
137191086, ..isco, couldn't find a job, drove a cab for six months, got fed up, got divorced, and sold ..
147486990, ..t didn't do any good as the problem remained. Eventually, fed up with what was going on, ..
154809094, ..orbie, owner of six Toronto il Fornello restaurants, is so fed up 'with a winter that is ..
160991251, ..itizens for Fair Taxes, who told council, "Our people are fed up. The situation is outrag..

There are a few instances where **fed up** is part of a quote or where the subject is in the first person. Yet, there are only a few words like "bull" and "sales pitches" that give some clues about the informality of the contexts. The topics covered deal with the general political or economic situation.

QUEENS

1885778, ..anting to do the same thing with him: __ certainly she was fed up with him __ but th. chil..
2114596, ..he other levels of this and other organizations. Some are "fed up" with being left behind..
3930243, ..apons while people everywhere are starving. And Antoine is fed up with the church. "It is ..
6141750, ..ackintosh, Dexter wrote: Bill Mackintosh - my favourite. Fed up with being a civil serva..
6835208, ..he members of the quintet, it failed. Davis and Roach were fed up with Parker's vagaries a..
6841143, ..d the quintet before it broke up. Or perhaps he was simply fed up with waiting for the end..
26178714, ..ion was an inauspicious one for a young man seeking work. "Fed up," as he later described ..

The fact that **fed up** appears twice in quotes indicates that the phrase is not considered neutral. On the other hand, the lack of contractions or of informal context words seems to indicate that this phrase is not very informal.

lemon

ECP

2521563, .. looking at buying a used vehicle, and doesn't want to buy a lemon," she says. "The custom..
86455114, ..tion is fairly obvious. "You don't want to get caught with a lemon." And that means taking..
117824963, ..ion it is, said Armstrong. "It's like buying a car that's a lemon, said Lethbridge. Leth..
261078571, ..in matters of personal style. The Tories are about to pick a lemon. ID NUMBER: 9305200045..
455275833, ..flat tires courtesy of the free trade agreement. The car's a lemon, and all the slick sale..
646612844, ..etect all the hidden problems and never getting stuck with a lemon. However, lately I hav..

There were not many examples of this sense of lemon, but they contain nonetheless some clues about the register of the word. Some occurrences are direct speech and there are also several contractions ("doesn't", "that's", "the car's"), clues to indicate a certain informality.

QUEENS

14814601, ..alian film I've seen, I'm told by everyone that this was a lemon, a melon, and every other..
19112533, ..ry inflexible when dealing with what is obviously a freak "lemon". Douglas Auld - Guelph, ..
19112856, .. result of damaged valve-stem seals. According to the book Lemon-Aid, this is a common pro..

The fact that lemon appears in quotes in one example, is used in a sentence with a first person subject in another, and is part of a pun in the title of a book in the next points to the fact that this sense of the word is certainly informal.

fag²

ECP

19458496, ..or. Tonight through Saturday: Penny Arcade: Bitch, Dyke, Fag Hag, Whore (performance art..
41217718, ..before they know what the slurs mean, children learn that "fag," "queer" and "fairy" are a..
76077648, ..d two other men came by and called one of Rix's friends a "fag." A shouting match ensued, ..
81868393, ..red ribbon.' "You know, 'make the fags happy.' Well, this fag's not happy. I'm not fooled..
93692185, .. said, reported her son was harassed, punched and called a fag. Others told her another ho..
97570457, ..red ribbon.' "You know, 'make the fags happy.' Well, this fag's not happy. I'm not fooled..
112895900, .. a gay- rights spokesman. "I've been sort of like the only fag in Alberta who'll go on TV..
119304445, ..alent-night program than the playlist at the Rock and Roll Fag Bar. Like so much slick Ca..
152346074, ..r with Aaron and the gay street kids. 'I was the ultimate fag hag.' Many of their pals w..
189722515, ..auseates me when I hear them call each other bitch, whore, fag, nigger, spic, retard or ki..
206799137, ..om a secondary school who decided one night to 'beat up a fag.' I've observed signs of ..

222771836, .. issue even from the youngest child -- not when "homo and "fag are common, if misunderstoo..
 223793831, ..an call your average seven-to-ten-year-old is a sissy or a fag," says Feehan. "The notion ..
 223793901, ..Feehan. "The notion is that somehow if you're a sissy or a fag you're like those women and..
 258267875, ..ed at Angrignon Park for the express purpose of "getting a fag," Bernier said. The leader..
 273410758, ..ers people think we are' Aaron is gay. He's been called a fag, queer, homo and confused. ..
 273411262, .. "Sometimes at school the guys will say things like, 'Some fag did this and some fag did t..
 273411284, ..the guys will say things like, 'Some fag did this and some fag did that,' and I'm forced t..
 397433280, .. (unless you mean lesbian), sister (unless you mean dyke), fag (unless you mean homosexual..
 447686845, .. series of vignettes tackling various social issues from 'fag bashing' and the controver..
 600352029, ..moment (Rock) was a legendary movie star, the next, a dead fag." Maybe it's a loss of inno..
 625785452, ..bull who bit the hands that fed him, or the "mean Southern fag" who could out-bitch anyone..
 651817869, ..Kissy Suzuki Suck, Love's Legacy for Dyke Dates, Drag on a Fag, and Clean Fun with Sally A..
 655607556, ..counted the number of times DeLaria said the words 'dyke, fag or queer' in her show and ..
 660956746, ..re, 142 George St. Miller, a self-styled 'loud obnoxious fag,' kicks things off with hi..
 716419211, ..n to a pulp in Calgary because some guys want to beat up a fag. Or just being targeted for..
 785527098, ..g understood and accepted, in a social environment where 'fag' and 'lezzie' are seldom..

In almost all occurrences, the word **fag** is in quotes which points to the fact that it is an offensive term since the writer is distancing himself or herself from the idea of calling anyone such a name; these quotation marks are not necessarily a clue of the register, however. The context words ("lezzie", "homo", "dyke", "nigger", etc) are also revealing but again they point more to the offensive nature of the word than to its register.

QUEENS

2468713, ..ccidentally saw program notes describing him as a "Commie fag sympathizer." His latest al..

As in the ECP, the example of the word in this sense is in quotes and is obviously part of an insult, which again points more to the offensive nature of the word than to its register.

fuck

ECP

397901650, ..us) and I'm just swimming along! Yes. I have a new hit! So fuck the past!" That's Bette. ..
 611501811, ..sed Tory as he left, sarcastically commenting: "Thanks for fucking up the campaign, pal." ..

Not surprisingly, given the nature of the corpus consulted, there are few occurrences of this word. However, in each case, it is part of direct speech.

QUEENS

1711038, ..ckly for the bundle of letters, reads the one on the top. FUCK OFF. His last message. She..
3426592, ..h. It had the desired effect. There were groans, a loud "Fuck that shit" from one of his..
3440871, ..ng classroom! You prick, you sick fucking bastard, get the fuck out!" When all of the st..
6645413, ..ith a girl and said, ' That bitch ain't nothing.' I didn't fuck until I was eighteen. I ma..
6645491, ..ghteen. I made all As, and I got out of school and said, ' Fuck it!' I didn't make my own..
6647227, ..s seem to have no basis in truth. His claim that "I didn't fuck until I was eighteen" is p..

All the examples are part of direct speech. Some of the context words are fairly vulgar also ("shit," "prick," "bastard" and "bitch").

6.3 *Conclusion on corpus use for register labeling*

The corpus offers invaluable help in determining compounds, collocations and fixed expressions and can also reveal information about the currency, frequency and geography of use. It is also useful, to some degree, in helping to determine register.¹

From the brief examination of the examples above, the corpus can give some clues about general register differences. These clues can be listed as follows:

- a) Words which occur most frequently in direct speech or in sentences where the subject is the first or second person are generally of an informal register, while words that appear almost always in contexts whose point of view is the objective third person are generally of a more formal register.
- b) There also seem to be some domains which are more prone to using informal or formal words; sports, subjective political commentary, pop culture are more often written about in an informal register while articles about international politics and the fine arts have a

¹ Although a corpus taken from newspaper articles is perhaps an improvement over the traditional strictly literary corpus, since it is less likely to lead the lexicographer to recording idiolectal use, it would be a delusion to think that a newspaper corpus is truly an objective record of language use, however. Usage in newspapers is constrained by editorial policies which are in turn dictated by economic and political forces.

stronger tendency to use words of more formal registers.

c) Other words in the contexts can also reveal a great deal about the register of a given word: the occurrence of "hédonisme" and "ébrété" along with **faconde** seemed to show formality, while the use of "bull" and "sales pitches" within contexts for **fed up** seemed to show informality.

d) In English, the number of contractions can also offer a clue to informality, mostly because contractions tend to be used in conversation and informal writing. The six contexts for **lemon**, for instance, have three contractions, which seems to indicate an informal use.

e) Although we did not include frequency of occurrences in the analysis above, the number of occurrences for a word or expression can also provide a clue to register. The frequency of words like **famineux** (133 examples in the PCF, 9 in the MOND) and **fed up** (1398 examples in the ECP, 21 examples in QUEENS) may show a shift towards a neutral register. Frequency must be taken into consideration with some caution, however, since **foutre**, for example, occurs 221 times in the PCF and 18 times in the MOND but is nonetheless more informal than **famineux**. Frequency, then, can be taken into account only as one of many factors to help the lexicographer interpret the corpus results.

Yet, exceptions to the general tendencies noted above can easily be found. For instance, there are several sports contexts, which normally tend to be more informal, which use **sans coup férir**. There are also examples of contractions within contexts for more formal words, such as "He's burning to give Canada the biggest **fecund** growth" or "it's one of these **felicitous things**." Even context words can be deceiving since, in the example "Davis and Roach were **fed up** with Parker's vagaries," "vagaries" is fairly formal though **fed up** is

fairly informal. It is obvious that the more contexts the lexicographer has at his or her disposal, the easier it will be for him or her to form a general idea of the more common use of the word in question.

As we have seen in previous chapters, the boundaries between registers are not clear and discrete, and corpus analysis only reinforces the idea of the "inherent fuzziness of registers." (Hatim and Mason, 1990: 51) The corpus can help the lexicographer decide that a word is more formal than neutral, or that it is considered offensive or that it is becoming accepted as a neutral word (**to fire**, for instance). There are definite textual clues that show that **faramineux** is less informal than **foutre**, for example. But corpus analysis really can only confirm the lexicographer's intuition since the contexts must always be interpreted, an obviously subjective task.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

7.1 *Main points of the thesis*

This thesis has revealed a number of important points concerning register and register labeling in dictionaries.

- a) Usage restrictions (of which register labeling is a subcategory) have played an important role in English and French dictionaries since the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They were manifested in one of two ways: by the exclusion of words deemed too "low" or vulgar and by the addition of usage labels. (Chapter 1)
- b) However, the specific study of register only began in the second half of the twentieth century with the advent of sociolinguistics. The term "register" is of recent origin and the concept it conveys is still somewhat hazy and prone to being designated by a variety of terms (style, usage, valeurs d'emploi, etc). (Chapter 2)
- c) From the point of view of lexicography, certain sociolinguistic studies of register are of particular interest: Halliday's separation of dialect and register (user and use) and his subdivision of register into the categories of field, tenor and mode; the further precisions brought to Halliday's theory by Gregory and Carroll, as well as Chilton and their interest in typologies of situations; Biber's framework of speech situation components. (Chapter 2)
- d) Though sociolinguistic theories have some relevance for register studies in lexicography, the two disciplines look at register from different perspectives: for sociolinguistics, register analysis is text-dependent, with a great deal of emphasis on field and concentrates on grammatical and phonological features, while in lexicography, register analysis is mostly

limited to individual words, is generally separated from field and mostly concerns itself with the dimension of formality. (Chapter 2)

e) Lexicographers themselves have not had much to contribute to the study of register.

Theoretical documentation on this topic is sparse in lexicography. And while some dictionary front matters do broach the topic, it is generally for the purpose of presenting a list of register labels, which are often undefined or poorly defined, and which vary from one dictionary to the next. (Chapter 3)

f) Analysis of dictionary entries of a number of words that are non-neutral (marked) in register reveals that while there is little absolute consistency in register labeling, there are nonetheless very few cases of total discrepancy. However, the dictionaries, especially the monolingual English dictionaries, vary in the amount of labeling and in the designation of the labels. (Chapter 4)

g) Comparison of register labeling in monolingual and bilingual dictionaries reveals that the latter label more than monolingual English dictionaries but less than the French monolingual dictionaries. (Chapter 4)

h) Analysis of the BCD methodological documentation reveals that this bilingual dictionary project is making a special effort to provide not only a list of labels to its lexicographers, but also certain criteria for determining the register of both headwords and equivalents. (Chapter 5)

i) However, analysis of a few BCD entries shows how difficult register labeling really is and to what extent it can be subjective. (Chapter 5)

j) To avoid too much subjectivity, the use of corpus analysis for determining register seems

to be a promising avenue. But, there are gray areas between labels (*inf* and *very inf*, for instance) which the corpus cannot completely clarify. (Chapter 6)

Although register labeling in dictionaries could doubtlessly, in some cases at least, be improved by careful corpus analysis on the one hand, and on the other hand, by an effort on the part of the editors to both explain their register symbols and labels and to pay closer attention to discrepancies from entry to entry, it must be admitted in conclusion that it is the nature of reducing many registers to a few labels which is in itself problematic. Despite this basic difficulty, which seems destined to remain unsolvable in the foreseeable future, there are certainly some suggestions to be made to help lexicographers decide on register labels and to improve the consistency of register labeling in dictionaries in general, and more particularly in the BCD.

7.2 *Recommendations for register labeling in the BCD*

7.2.1 *What levels of register should the BCD label?*

As we have seen, dictionaries sometimes differ as to what registers to label, especially registers at the higher level. While the French monolingual dictionaries are often in agreement and seem to have a fairly wide consensus on the neutral register, and provide labels for any item that is "above" or "below" this neutral register, three of the five English dictionaries surveyed in Chapter 4 do not label words belonging to the higher registers, as if any word above *informal* is part of the "normal" language and can be used in any situation (words like **firmament** or **forswear**). Any competent English speaker, however, knows that

"sky" and "firmament" are not interchangeable in all situations, just as "flick" and "movie" are not interchangeable. Bilingual dictionaries, like monolingual French dictionaries, tend to label words both above and below the neutral level, and the BCD's decision to follow this practice is a sensible one, since at least one of the languages in a bilingual dictionary will be the user's second language for which he or she will need some guidance.

7.2.2 *How many labels should the BCD use?*

Jean Quirion (1995: 347) states that "the reduction of the number of labels could lead to some consensus in labeling...[The users] basically need to know if a given word is neutral, high standard or low standard. Beyond this point, association or connotation is a matter of nuances or personal judgment." His suggestion to use, in essence, only two register labels, one high, one low, has its merits since it would do away with some of the zones of conflict (we have already seen how changes in the BCD tend to occur where a word is borderline *inf/very inf* or *fml/lit*). Quirion, however, is specifically referring to monolingual dictionaries. Bilingual lexicography rests heavily on monolingual lexicography (the LAR2, the OXHA and the RCSS are all tied to and published by makers of monolingual dictionaries) and until monolingual lexicography steps in the direction of so greatly reducing the number of its labels, it is unlikely that bilingual lexicography will be able to do so without a great deal of protest on the part of the users. Labels, after all, are a convention and, like all conventions, work insofar as they are generally accepted and understood. The convention may change and hopefully will change but perhaps not because of bilingual dictionaries. If, however, Canadian monolingual lexicography heeds Quirion's advice in the

next decade, then the BCD should follow suit by all means.

Within the present context of register labeling for the BCD, it seems preferable to limit register symbols to four (two above the neutral level and two below). In other words, we suggest that the " symbol be omitted because, though it is defined as "extremely informal" in the methodology, it can be confused with the commentary label *vulg* as we saw in the entry *beaver*; "extremely informal" is also difficult to define (how much more more informal is it than "very informal"?) and can only add confusion to the already ambiguous task of assigning register labels. Besides, if the formal registers are represented by two symbols, which is presently the case, then the informal registers should be marked by only two as well. Since register labeling systems are artificial methods of classifying a multitude of real life situations, the systems should at least reflect a balance between the different clines of formality. To weigh the informal end of the spectrum more heavily than the formal one only reinforces the long-held notion that informality is in some way "bad" while formality is "good", a judgmental and prescriptive attitude from which modern lexicography is trying to extricate itself.

7.2.3 *On what basis should words be labeled?*

The BCD methodology proposes that monolingual dictionaries and the corpus should serve as a guide to register labeling. While both these criteria are logical, more guidance is required in their application.

a) Monolingual dictionaries

It has already been noted that monolingual English dictionaries, especially American dictionaries, do not label the higher registers. Thus, BCD lexicographers have to rely on the COCO to determine the more formal words. However, in terms of the more formal registers for English words, the COCO labels perhaps somewhat excessively to serve as a source for a bilingual dictionary like the BCD whose target audience is sophisticated language users; therefore, the lexicographers and the revisers should consult the corpus to verify the accuracy of the labels found in the COCO.

The French monolingual dictionaries do mark the higher registers and are more consistent in their labeling than are the English monolingual dictionaries, and can therefore better serve as a guide for French words. However, lexicographers must bear in mind that the definitions for the BCD symbols for the more formal registers do not precisely match the labels used either in the COCO (*written English, formal and literary*) or in the French dictionaries (*l. écrite, l. soutenue, l. soignée, littéraire, poét*). The ++ symbol, which, according to Roberts's article, represents "la langue écrite élégante" used in "situations solennelles", can encompass literary¹ and poetic language as well as ritual language, while the definition, in the same article, for + ("surtout dans la langue écrite, dans des contextes administratifs ou officiels") is also broad enough to encompass the labels *written, formal, l.*

¹ The NPR defines *littér* as a label "qui désigne un mot qui n'est pas d'usage familier, qui s'emploie surtout dans la langue écrite élégante" (xxvi). The COCO, on the other hand, merely says, "used mainly in novels, poetry, and other forms of literature" (xxi).

écrite, *l. soutenue* and *l. soignée*². Since the BCD has adopted a system of symbols, it can avoid the problems of having to decide whether a word is *formal* or *written*.

For the informal registers, the monolingual dictionaries tend to be more consistent about labeling, although they are not always consistent about what label to use. And, although the English dictionaries show a larger discrepancy than do the French dictionaries, the fact that all the dictionaries do label the more informal registers means that the lexicographers and the revisers can base their decision on several dictionaries.

However, the more informal registers, represented by the symbols ' and " in the BCD (the symbol ~ will not be discussed here for the reasons outlined above), present more of a problem because the source dictionaries use many ambiguous labels (*slang* and *pop*) besides the obvious labels such as *inf/fam* and *very inf/trés fam*.

The label *slang* is defined in the RHWEB as "often metaphorical; vivid, playful and elliptical. Much slang is ephemeral, becoming dated in a relatively short time, but some slang terms find their way into the standard language. Slang terms are used in formal speech and writing only for special effect." (RHWEB, 1992: xxiii) The AH2, however, points out that "most slang originates in the specialized conversations of particular groups, in which usage reinforces group identity and develops into private codes that may later gain wide acceptance." (AH2, 1976: 28) In both of these definitions, factors other than level of formality are at play, such as time, belonging to a group and the metaphorical quality of the word itself. The fact is that general language dictionaries treat general language and are

² The monolingual French dictionaries do not define *l. soutenue* or *l. soignée*. The COCO defines *formal* as a label that designates words "used mainly in official situations, or by political and business organizations, or when speaking or writing to people in authority". (xx)

often not even aware of the linguistic peculiarities of any given group (especially since these groups are generally marginalized), so that by the time these words are recorded within a general dictionary, they are no longer slang. If we look at the dictionary charts, we see that *floozy* or *freebie*, both labeled *slang* by some of the dictionaries, are not words used by only certain groups of people and are therefore not *slang* but *informal* or *very informal*. The problem is that the label *slang* is understood differently by each dictionary (and presumably, every user) and unless dictionaries specify to which group a particular slang word corresponds (the way the PR and the NPR specify *arg mil*, *arg scol*, *arg des spectacles*), then labels of formality are more appropriate. The BCD, as we saw earlier in the entries, does in fact attempt to transform the label *slang* found in various monolingual dictionaries into a register label denoting a level of formality. In the case of *lemon*, the lexicographer interpreted *slang* in the GAGE as " (very informal) while the reviser interpreted it as " (informal). Since there are many factors besides formality which enter into labeling a word *slang* (the "vivid" aspect, for instance), it is not possible to declare that *slang* always equals *inf* (or *very inf*). The interpretation of the label on the level of formality will have to be done on a case by case basis. Since the COCO does not use the label *slang*, it can give clues to the formality of the word and the corpus should also be carefully checked for clues. In the case of *lemon*, for example, the corpus seems to indicate that the word is not very informal and the COCO labels the sense *inf*.

We have already discussed the label *pop* in the front matters of the French dictionaries and how it was often placed within register labels though, if taken literally, the label indicates social class rather than level of formality. Except for the NPR, however, the

label *pop* seems to be generally used to indicate that a word or a sense is more informal than *fam*, not that only city dwellers of little education use it (se *farcir qch*, for instance, is qualified as *pop* by the DFC, the LEX and the PR, although this word is used by the journalists of newspapers like *Le Devoir*, who surely have more than a modicum of education). But the interpretation of *pop* as very informal is compromised by the fact that, in most cases where the other dictionaries use the label *pop*, the NPR uses the label *fam*. The basic problem for the BCD is that, of the French dictionaries, only the RQ2 uses the label *très fam* so that, in effect, there is only one direct monolingual source for the " symbol. The lexicographer will therefore not be able to rely solely on the monolingual French dictionaries to differentiate clearly between informal and very informal. The bilingual dictionaries can be of invaluable assistance here, but once again, the corpus should be carefully examined for clues.

b) Corpus use

Although the corpus may be used as a guide to register labeling, as recommended in the BCD methodology, the corpus is never indicated as a source code for a register label. Moreover, in the BCD meetings where corpus analysis is frequently discussed, the specific use of the corpus for register labeling has not yet been examined.

It is therefore suggested that a series of clues for determining register from contexts be drawn up. Although a more thorough study should be undertaken, the results from Chapter 6 suggest that the following clues should be considered, among others:

- a) words in quotes, which often mean that the word is not accepted as neutral language;
- b) direct speech, whose prevalence often indicates lower registers;

- c) subjects in the first or second person, whose prevalence again tends to mean lower registers;
- d) the topics under discussion, where sports, political commentary and pop culture are often written about in more informal registers, while international politics and "high" culture are more often linked to higher registers;
- e) the frequency of contractions in English, which is linked to a more conversational style and is therefore a sign of a more informal register;
- f) the register of other context words, which is perhaps the most important clue of all.

Once this is done, the corpus should be used more often to justify the selection of a particular label because, as we have seen, the dictionaries are often in some disagreement. Although, the corpus can rarely be used by itself to assign a label, it can show that a word is used mostly in conversation, for instance, and this evidence can be weighed against the labels offered by the dictionaries.

Finally, the corpus should be used not only by the lexicographers but also by the revisers, at every stage of revision. Though our survey of BCD entries was limited, it did show that as entries progress through a number of revisions, the labels seem to become more extreme. The corpus is invaluable in that it shows how a word is used currently and, in terms of register, it can reveal if a word has slowly been edging towards the neutral, for instance (e.g. *famineux*, or *to fire*), a shift of which the reviser or the lexicographer may not be aware.

7.3 *General Conclusion*

If the BCD pursues the recommendations made here and establishes the system of verification of label consistency that is in the planning stages, then it should be more coherent in its register labeling than other current monolingual and bilingual dictionaries and their predecessors.

However, as pointed out earlier, the question of register is a delicate one. The issue of subjectivity can never be ruled out, for the interpretation of labels in other dictionaries and of the corpus contexts is itself dependent on the individual lexicographer or reviser.

Although scholars like Landau, Rey and Tournier may point out the necessity of descriptive dictionaries, a completely objective system of register labeling has not yet been developed because lexicographers cannot feasibly let go of their subjective viewpoints. Nonetheless, great progress towards a more objective view of usage has been made in the last thirty years of lexicography, and the increased availability of corpus databases as well as increased sophistication in the use of these databases will help foster this trend. However, any register labeling system, by its very nature, simplifies the overwhelmingly complex reality of language use in situation.³ As we have seen in the preceding chapters, it is hard to pinpoint the exact register of any given word, even in terms of the single dimension of formality, and this inherent fuzziness is hardly likely to be resolved once and for all.

³ Although Preston, Cassidy and others have devised frameworks to help identify correlations between situational features and linguistic features, the application of these frameworks to lexicography are too impractical and time-consuming for the time being to appeal to cost-conscious dictionary publishers (or even to the BCD project, whose funding is guaranteed for only a limited amount of time).

Appendices

Appendix 1: Dictionary Abbreviations

AH2	<u>American Heritage Dictionary</u> , 2nd College Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.
AH3	<u>American Heritage Dictionary</u> , 3rd College Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992.
BELN	<u>Dictionnaire nord-américain de la langue française</u> . Montréal: Beauchemin, 1986.
COCO	<u>Collins Cobuild English Dictionary</u> , 2nd edition. London: HarperCollins, 1995.
COD	<u>Concise Oxford Dictionary</u> , 8th ed. Oxford: OUP, 1990.
COLL	<u>Collins English Dictionary</u> . Glasgow: Collins, 1986.
DC	<u>Dictionnaire canadien/The Canadian Dictionary</u> . Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1962.
DFC	<u>Dictionnaire du français contemporain</u> . Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1966.
EXL	<u>Dictionnaire des expressions et locutions</u> . Paris: Robert, 1985.
FUN	<u>Funk and Wagnalls Canadian College Dictionary</u> . Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside, 1989.
GAGE	<u>Gage Canadian Dictionary</u> . Toronto: Gage, 1983.
GL5	<u>Grand Larousse</u> , en 5 volumes. Paris: Larousse, 1987.
GL7	<u>Grand Larousse de la langue française</u> , en sept volumes. Paris: Larousse, 1986.
GR	<u>Grand Robert de la langue française</u> . Paris: Le Robert, 1987.
HA	<u>Harrap's Standard French and English Dictionary</u> , 4 vols. London: Harrap, 1972 & 1980.
HASH	<u>Harrap's Shorter French-English Dictionary</u> . London: Harrap, 1991.

HRW	<u>Compact Dictionary of Canadian English</u> . Toronto: Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1976.
LAR	<u>Dictionnaire français-anglais</u> . Paris: Larousse, 1981.
LAR2	<u>Grand dictionnaire français-anglais, anglais-français</u> . Paris: Larousse, 1993.
LEX	<u>Lexis, Dictionnaire de la langue française</u> . Paris: Larousse, 1987.
LOC	<u>Dictionnaire français-anglais de locutions et expressions verbales</u> . Paris: Larousse, 1973.
LONG	<u>Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English</u> . Harlow, England: Longman, 1987.
MULTI	<u>Multi dictionnaire des difficultés de la langue française</u> . Montréal: Éditions Québec/Amérique, 1988.
NPR	<u>Nouveau Petit Robert</u> . Paris: Robert, 1993.
OALD	<u>Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary</u> , 4th ed. Oxford: OUP, 1989.
OXF	<u>Concise Oxford French Dictionary</u> . Oxford: OUP, 1980.
OXHA	<u>Oxford-Hachette French Dictionary</u> . Oxford: OUP, 1994.
OXR	<u>Oxford Reference Dictionary</u> . Oxford: OUP, 1986.
PEN	<u>Penguin Canadian Dictionary</u> . Markham/Mississauga: Penguin/Copp Clark Pitman, 1990.
PL	<u>Petit Larousse illustré</u> . Paris: Larousse, 1991.
PLUS	<u>Dictionnaire du français Plus</u> . Montréal: CEC, 1988.
PR	<u>Le Petit Robert</u> . Paris: Robert, 1991.
RC	<u>Robert & Collins, Dictionnaire français-anglais/anglais-français</u> . Paris/London: Le Robert/HarperCollins 1987.
RCS	<u>Robert & Collins Senior, Dictionnaire français-anglais/anglais-français</u> . Paris/London: Le Robert/HarperCollins 1993.
RCSS	<u>Robert & Collins Super Senior, Dictionnaire français-anglais/anglais-français</u> . Paris/London: Le Robert/HarperCollins 1995.

- RH Random House Dictionary of the English Language. New York: Random House, 1987.
- RHWEB Random House Webster's College Dictionary. New York: Random House, 1992.
- RM Robert Méthodique. Paris: Robert, 1988.
- RQ Dictionnaire québécois d'aujourd'hui. Saint-Laurent, Québec: Dicorobert, 1992.
- RQ2 Dictionnaire québécois d'aujourd'hui. Saint-Laurent, Québec: Dicorobert, 1993.
- WEB3 Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language. Boston: Merriam-Webster, 1986.

Appendix 2.a: Register of English words in monolingual dictionaries

	AH2	AH3	RHWEB	COCO	GAGE
fab: fabulous	not listed	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>slang</i>
fabulous: extremely pleasing	<i>inf</i>	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
"face the music"	<i>slang</i>	not listed	no label	<i>inf</i>	not listed
factotum	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
fade: to meet the bet of in a game of dice	<i>slang</i>	<i>Games</i>	sense not listed	sense not listed	not listed
faeces, feces	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
fag: a cigarette	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf (Br)</i>	<i>slang</i>
fag: a male homosexual	<i>slang</i>	<i>offensive slang</i>	<i>slang (disparaging and offensive)</i>	<i>inf and offensive</i>	<i>slang</i>
faggot: male homosexual	<i>slang</i>	<i>offensive slang</i>	<i>slang (disparaging and offensive)</i>	<i>very inf and offensive</i>	<i>slang</i>
"I fail to see..."	not listed	not listed	not listed	<i>formal</i>	not listed
fair: the weather is fair	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
the fair sex	not listed	not listed	<i>often offensive</i>	<i>old-fashioned or humorous</i>	no label
fair shake: fair chance	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	not listed	<i>inf</i>
fairy: male homosexual	<i>slang</i>	<i>offensive slang</i>	<i>slang (disparaging and offensive)</i>	<i>offensive</i>	<i>slang</i>
fait accompli	no label	no label	<i>French</i>	<i>formal</i>	no label
"eyes fall on smthg"	no label	no label	no label	<i>written English</i>	not listed
fall for	<i>inf</i>	no label	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>slang</i>
fall guy	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>slang</i>
fallacious	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
falsehood: a lie	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
false: i.e., falsies	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	not listed	<i>inf</i>
familial	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
famished: hungry	sense not listed	sense not listed	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
fanatic: a football fanatic	no label	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>	not listed

	AH2	AH3	RHWEB	COCO	GAGE
a fancy	no label	no label	no label	<i>literary</i>	no label
fancy: a fancy house	no label	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>	no label
fanfare: spectacular public display	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	no label	no label
fanny: buttocks	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>a rude word used in American English</i>	<i>slang</i>
fantabulous	not listed	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	not listed	not listed
fantastic: great	<i>inf</i>	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
farewell	no label	no label	no label	<i>old-fashioned or literary</i>	no label
far-out	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label
fart	<i>vulg</i>	<i>vulgar slang</i>	<i>vulg</i>	<i>inf which some find offensive</i>	<i>vulg</i>
"fart around"	<i>vulg slang</i>	not listed	<i>slang</i>	<i>very inf</i>	not listed
fast lane	not listed	<i>inf</i>	no label	not listed	not listed
fast track	not listed	<i>inf</i>	no label	no label	not listed
"fat chance"	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	no label	<i>inf, used mainly in spoken English</i>	<i>slang</i>
fat cat	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	not listed	<i>slang</i>
fathend	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	no label	not listed	<i>slang</i>
fatuous	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
faux pas	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
to faze	no label	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
feckless	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
fecund	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
fed(s)	not listed	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf (American)</i>	<i>slang</i>
fed up	no label	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>slang</i>
feed: a large meal	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	not listed	<i>inf</i>
"to feel up"	<i>vulg slang</i>	<i>vulgar slang</i>	<i>slang (vulgar)</i>	not listed	not listed
feelgood: as in movie	not listed	not listed	<i>inf</i>	no label	not listed
to feign	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
felicitous	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
felicity	no label	no label	no label	<i>literary</i>	no label

	AH2	AH3	RHWEB	COCO	GAGE
femme, fem: woman who adopts female role in lesbian relationship	not listed	<i>inf</i>	<i>slang</i>	not listed	not listed
fence: receiver of stolen goods	no label	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>	no label
"on the fence"	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	not listed	<i>inf</i>
fence sitter	no label	<i>inf</i>	not listed	not listed	not listed
fender bender	not listed	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	not listed	not listed
fess: confess	not listed	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	not listed	not listed
fetid	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
flat	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
fiddlestickel	no label	no label	no label	<i>impolite, old-fashioned</i>	no label
fleed day	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	no label	no label
fifty-fifty	<i>inf</i>	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
figure on	not listed	<i>inf</i>	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
figure out	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
to filch	no label	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>	no label
fin de siècle	no label	no label	no label	<i>written English</i>	no label
fine: very well	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	not listed	<i>inf</i>
to finger: to inform on	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>slang</i>
fink	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	not listed	<i>slang</i>
to fire: discharge from a position	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>
firearms	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
firewater	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	no label	not listed	<i>humorous</i>
firmament	no label	no label	no label	<i>literary</i>	no label
"to have a fit"	not listed	not listed	no label	<i>inf</i>	no label
fix: drug injection	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
to fix: to get even with	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
fixty	no label	no label	no label	<i>written English</i>	no label
flagellation	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
flak	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>

	AH2	AH3	RHWEB	COCO	GAGE
flake: oddball	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	sense not listed	sense not listed
flaky: eccentric	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>showing disapproval</i>	sense not listed
flappable	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	not listed	not listed
to flash: to expose oneself	sense not listed	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	sense not listed	sense not listed
"to flash s.o. a smile"	not listed	not listed	not listed	<i>written English</i>	not listed
"her eyes flashed"	not listed	not listed	not listed	<i>literary</i>	not listed
fleshy	no label	no label	no label	<i>inf, showing disapproval</i>	no label
flatfoot: a person with flat feet	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	not listed	not listed	sense not listed
flatfoot: a policeman	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	not listed	<i>slang</i>
"I am flattered to accept..."	not listed	not listed	no label	<i>in formal situations</i>	not listed
to flaunt: disobey (to flout)	<i>non-standard</i>	<i>usage problem</i>	no label	sense not listed	sense not listed
flick: movie	<i>inf</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	not listed	<i>slang</i>
flip: impertinent	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	<i>shows disapproval</i>	<i>inf</i>
to flip out	not listed	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf</i>	not listed
flivver: an old car	no label	not listed	<i>older slang</i>	not listed	<i>slang</i>
floozy	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>fairly old-fashioned, shows disapproval</i>	<i>slang</i>
flu	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>
fluke	no label	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
to flunk	no label	<i>inf</i>	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
fly: hip, cool (or Br. sense, mentally alert)	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	sense not listed	not listed
foe	no label	no label	no label	<i>written English</i>	no label
Foggy Bottom: U.S. Dept of State	not listed	no label	<i>facetious</i>	not listed	not listed
footfall	no label	no label	no label	<i>literary</i>	no label
footale	not listed	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
forbear	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label

	AH2	AH3	RHWEB	COCO	GAGE
forefather	no label	no label	no label	<i>literary</i>	no label
foreign: a foreign object	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
forewear	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal or literary</i>	no label
forthcoming	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
fount: a fount of knowledge, etc	no label	no label	no label	<i>literary</i>	no label
frame: a frame-up	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf</i>	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed
frame-up	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>slang</i>
to frazzle	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	not listed	<i>inf</i>
to freak	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	no label	<i>inf</i>	not listed
freaking: intensifier	not listed	<i>slang</i>	not listed	not listed	not listed
freaky: frightening	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	no label	<i>inf</i>	<i>slang</i>
freebie	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>slang</i>
free lunch	not listed	<i>slang</i>	no label	not listed	not listed
French kiss	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	no label	not listed	not listed
fridge	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	no label	<i>inf</i>
to frig: to have sex with	<i>vulgar slang</i>	no label	<i>vulgar</i>	not listed	not listed
frog: a Frenchman	<i>offensive slang</i>	<i>offensive slang</i>	<i>slang (disparaging and offensive)</i>	<i>inf use which some find offensive</i>	<i>derogatory slang</i>
fruit: a male homosexual	<i>slang</i>	<i>offensive slang</i>	<i>slang (disparaging and offensive)</i>	sense not listed	sense not listed
fruity: eccentric	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	sense not listed	sense not listed
fuck (and family)	<i>obscene</i>	<i>obscene</i>	<i>vulgar</i>	<i>rude and offensive word which you should avoid using</i>	not listed
fulcrum	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
fulminate	no label	no label	no label	<i>formal</i>	no label
fun, adj	not listed	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>	<i>inf</i>
funk: panic, depression	<i>inf</i>	no label	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>

	AH2	AH3	RHWEB	COCO	GAGE
funk: music	<i>slang</i>	<i>Mus.</i>	no label	no label	sense not listed
funky:related to the music	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	no label	no label	<i>inf</i>
funny farm	not listed	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang (offensive)</i>	not listed	not listed
fuzz: police	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>slang</i>	<i>old-fashioned, inf</i>	<i>slang</i>

Appendix 2.b: Register of French words in monolingual dictionaries

	DFC	LEX	PR	NPR	RQ2
fabricateur: (de fausse monnaie)	sense not listed	sense not listed	<i>mod (et péj)</i>	<i>mod et péj</i>	not listed
fabriquer: faire, avoir telle ou telle occupation	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	sense not listed	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fabuleusement	no label	no label	<i>mod</i>	<i>mod</i>	no label
fabuleux: du domaine de l'imagination	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>
façade: figure	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	not listed
"face de rat"	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop (inj)</i>	<i>pop (inj)</i>	<i>fam (injura)</i>	not listed
face: aspect sous lequel se présente une chose	no label	<i>littér</i>	<i>fig</i>	<i>fig</i>	no label
facétieux	no label	no label	<i>vx ou littér</i>	<i>vx ou littér</i>	no label
faconde	no label	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér (souvent péj)</i>	<i>littér (aujourd'hui souvent péj)</i>	<i>littér</i>
fada	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>région.</i>	<i>région.</i>	not listed
fadasse	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fadé	not listed	<i>arg</i>	<i>pop et iron</i>	<i>fam et iron</i>	not listed
fafiot	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam, vieilli</i>	not listed
fagoter	<i>fam et péj</i>	<i>fam et péj</i>	<i>fig et cour</i>	<i>fig et cour</i>	<i>péj</i>
"le sexe faible"	not listed	not listed	<i>plaisant</i>	<i>plaisant</i>	<i>péj</i>
faignant, feignant	<i>plus fam.</i>	<i>plus fam</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
"faire un enfant à une femme"	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	not listed
faire pipi, caca	not listed	not listed	<i>fam (l. enfantine)</i>	<i>fam (l. enfantine)</i>	<i>fam</i>
s'en faire	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	no label
faisan: homme malhonnête	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam, arg</i>	<i>arg</i>	sense not listed
faiseur: homme peu scrupuleux	<i>fam et péj</i>	<i>fam et péj</i>	<i>péj</i>	<i>vx ou littér</i>	sense not listed

	DFC	LEX	PR	NPR	RQ2
fait: attrapé par la police	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fallacieux: fait pour induire en erreur	<i>l. soutenue</i>	<i>l. soutenue</i>	<i>vx ou littér</i>	<i>vx ou littér</i>	<i>littér</i>
falot: conseil de guerre	not listed	<i>arg mil</i>	<i>arg mil</i>	<i>arg mil</i>	not listed
faizar: pantalon	not listed	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	not listed
famélique	no label	<i>littér</i>	no label	no label	<i>littér</i>
fameusement: très	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	no label
fan	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>anglic</i>	<i>anglic</i>	<i>fam</i>
fana	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fange: boue	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>
famineux	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
"se farcir qch": s'envoyer, se taper	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
"se farcir qn": (sexuel)	not listed	not listed	not listed	<i>vulg</i>	sense not listed
farfelu	no label	no label	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fat: vaniteux	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	no label	no label	<i>vieilli</i>
fathme: femme musulmane	not listed	<i>pop</i>	no label	no label	not listed
"fatiguer la salade"	not listed	no label	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	not listed
fauché: sans argent	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
faucher: voler	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
"la faute à qn"	not listed	not listed	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	not listed
fayot: haricot	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>en Acadie</i>
fayot: sous-officier rengagé	sense not listed	<i>arg</i>	<i>arg mil et péj</i>	<i>arg mil</i>	sense not listed
fécond: qui produit abondamment (terre)	no label	no label	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	sense not listed
femelle: femme mauvaise	sense not listed	<i>pop et péj</i>	<i>pop et péj</i>	<i>pop et péj</i>	<i>injurieux</i>
fendard: pantalon	not listed	not listed	<i>arg</i>	<i>arg</i>	not listed
"se fendre la gueule"	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	not listed	<i>fam</i>	not listed
"sans coup férir"	1 sens <i>l. soignée</i>	1 sens <i>l. soignée</i>	2 sens; 1) <i>vx</i> , 2) <i>mod</i>	2 sens; 1) <i>vx</i> ; 2) <i>mod</i>	1 sens no label

	DFC	LEX	PR	NPR	RQ2
"fermer la bouche (à qn)"	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	no label	no label	not listed
"la fermer"	not listed	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fermer: enfermer	sense not listed	sense not listed	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	sense not listed
"être fêru de qch"	1 sens <i>l. soignée</i>	1 sens <i>l. soignée</i>	1 sons no label	2 sens; 1) vx, 2) <i>mod</i>	1 sens no label
"poser ses fesses"	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>loc fam ou pop</i>	<i>loc fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
"botter les fesses à qn"	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>loc fam ou pop</i>	<i>loc fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
feu: pistolet	sense not listed	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
"feu (ma tante)"	<i>littér ou humoristique</i>	<i>littér, humoristique</i>	<i>littér ou plaisant</i>	<i>littér ou plaisant</i>	<i>littér</i>
"être dur de la feuille"	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
feuj: juif	not listed	not listed	not listed	<i>verlan</i>	not listed
fil	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>vx ou plaisant</i>	<i>vx ou plaisant</i>	<i>vx</i>
fiasco	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	no label	no label	no label
ficelé: habillé	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam et péj</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
ficelle: galon d'officier	<i>arg mil</i>	<i>arg mil</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	sense not listed
ficher: lancer, jeter	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	sense not listed	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
"ficher le camp"	<i>pop</i>	not listed	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fichtre	not listed	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fichtrement	not listed	<i>fam</i>	no label	<i>fam, vieilli</i>	<i>fam</i>
fitty-fitty	not listed	<i>fam</i>	<i>angl, fam</i>	<i>angl, fam</i>	not listed
"figurez-vous"	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>cour</i>	no label	no label
filer: partir en toute vitesse	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
filer: donner, passer	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
filasse: grosse fille	not listed	<i>pop et péj</i>	<i>péj</i>	<i>péj</i>	not listed
"file de ses oeuvres"	<i>l. soutenue</i>	<i>l. soutenue</i>	no label	no label	not listed
finl: qui a des bornes	<i>littér</i>	<i>philos</i>	<i>philos</i>	<i>philos</i>	no label
fiole: tête	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam et vieilli</i>	<i>fam</i>
firmament	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>poét</i>

	DFC	LEX	PR	NPR	RQ2
fleton	appellation familière	appellation familière	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fletot: élève de 1 ère année d'Ecole navale	not listed	<i>arg mil</i>	<i>arg mil</i>	not listed	not listed
fixer: se donner de la drogue	sense not listed	<i>pop</i>	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed
flag: flagrant délit	not listed	not listed	not listed	<i>arg</i>	not listed
flagada: qui a perdu de la force	not listed	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	not listed
flambé: ruiné	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	no label
flambeur: joueur qui joue gros jeu	not listed	<i>arg</i>	<i>arg</i>	<i>arg</i>	<i>fam</i>
"en rester comme deux ronds de flan"	not listed	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
flanquer: jeter	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
flemme	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
"perdre sa fleur": perdre sa virginité	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	not listed	not listed	not listed
fleurer: exhaler une odeur	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>
flic	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
flicard	not listed	<i>pop</i>	(under flic) <i>pop</i>	<i>arg</i>	not listed
flingue: fusil	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
flop	not listed	not listed	<i>arg des spectacles</i>	<i>arg des spectacles</i>	<i>fam</i>
flotte: pluie, eau	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
flouze ou flouze: argent	not listed	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	not listed
"faire du foin": du scandale, du bruit	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
foire: endroit où règne grand bruit	sense not listed	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
"faire la foire"	not listed	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>très fam</i>
foireux: qui a la diarrhée	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>vulg</i>	<i>vulg</i>	sense not listed
foireux: peureux, lâche	sense not listed	sense not listed	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam et vieilli</i>	sense not listed
"des foies"	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>

	DFC	LEX	PR	NPR	RQ2
foison: grande abondance	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>vx</i>	<i>vx</i>	not listed
foncer: aller très vite	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	no label	no label	<i>fam</i>
for: le for intérieur	no label	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	no label
formidable: remarquable	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i> (emploi critiqué)	<i>courant</i>	<i>fam</i>
formide: abrég. de formidable	not listed	not listed	<i>abrég. pop</i>	<i>abrég. fam</i>	not listed
fort, adverbe de quantité	...emploi limité surtout à la langue écrite...	...dans la langue écrite...	(avec un verbe, rare dans la langue parlée)	(avec un verbe, rare dans la langue parlée)	(rare dans la langue parlée)
fossile: personne avec habitudes démodées	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
coup de foudre	1 sens no label	1 sens no label	2 sens, 1) <i>vx</i> , 2) <i>mod</i>	2 sens, 1) <i>vx</i> , 2) <i>mod</i>	1 sens no label
fouetter: avoir très peur; sentir mauvais	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	sense not listed
fouille: poche	sense not listed	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	sense not listed
fouillis: désordre	no label	no label	<i>fam</i>	no label	<i>fam</i>
fouler: "ne pas se fouler"	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fourbe	<i>l. soignée</i>	<i>l. soignée</i>	no label	<i>vieilli</i>	no label
fourbi: fatras	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fourguer: vendre des objets volés	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>arg</i>	<i>arg</i>	sense not listed
foudre, nm: sperme	not listed	not listed	<i>vulg</i>	<i>vulg</i>	not listed
foudre: posséder sexuellement	sense not listed	<i>pop</i>	sense not listed	<i>vieilli et trivial</i>	sense not listed
foudre: syn. de ficher	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>vulg</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
foutu	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
frangin	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
franglais	not listed	<i>fam</i>	no label	no label	no label
trappe: voyou	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam et péj</i>
frérot	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fric	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fric-fac: cambriolage	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam et vieilli</i>	not listed

	DFC	LEX	PR	NPR	RQ2
fricoter: manigancer une affaire	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fridolin: Allemand	not listed	<i>pop et péj</i>	<i>fam et péj</i>	<i>fam et péj</i>	not listed
fringues	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
frisson: léger mouvement qui se propage par ondulation	sense not listed	no label	<i>poét</i>	<i>poét</i>	<i>poét</i>
froc: pantalon	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
from(e)gi; from(e)ton: fromage	not listed	<i>arg</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>var fam</i> (sous fromage)	not listed
frotteur: frôleur	not listed	<i>psychopathol</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	not listed
frousse	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
frusques: vêtements	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fumiste: qui ne fait rien sérieusement	no label	no label	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
furax	not listed	<i>fam</i>	<i>arg scol et fam</i>	<i>arg scol et fam</i>	<i>fam</i>
fuiller: dépenser	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>pop et vieilli</i>	sense not listed
fustiger	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>	<i>littér</i>
futuriste: qui évoque un monde fantastique	<i>fam</i>	<i>fam</i>	no label	no label	no label

Appendix 2.c: Register of English words in bilingual dictionaries

	HASH ¹	LAR2 ²	OXHA	RCSS	DC
fab: fabulous	<i>fam, old-fashioned</i> sensass	<i>inf, dated</i> sensass	<i>fam</i> sensas(s) (<i>inf</i>)	<i>very inf</i> sensass (<i>inf</i>), terrible (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
fabulous: extremely pleasing	<i>fam</i> prodigieux	<i>inf</i> génial	<i>fam</i> sensationnel (<i>inf</i>)	<i>inf</i> fabuleux, formidable (<i>inf</i>), sensass (<i>inf</i>)	sense not listed
"face the music"	no label faire front	<i>inf</i> faire front	not listed	no label braver l'orage, la tempête	not listed
factotum	no label factotum	no label factotum	no label factotum	no label factotum	not listed
fade: to meet the bet of in a game of dice	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed	not listed
faeces, feces	<i>Physiol.</i> fèces	no label fèces	no label fèces	no label fèces	not listed
fag: a cigarette	<i>fam</i> sèche, clope	<i>inf</i> clope	<i>fam</i> clope (<i>inf</i>)	<i>very inf</i> sèche (<i>very inf</i>)	<i>fam</i> cigarette
fag: a male homosexual	<i>péj, slang</i> pédé, pédale	* <i>inf/fam, péj</i> pédé	<i>fam, inj</i> pédé (<i>inf, offensive</i>)	<i>very inf, pej</i> pédé (<i>very inf</i>)	sense not listed
faggot: male homosexual	<i>péj, slang</i> pédé, pédale	* <i>inf/fam, péj</i> pédé, tapette	<i>pop, inj</i> pédale (<i>very inf, offensive</i>)	<i>very inf, pej</i> pédé (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
"I fail to see..."	no label je ne vois pas...	no label je ne vois pas...	no label je ne vois pas...	no label je ne vois pas...	not listed
fair: the weather is fair	no label beau temps	no label beau	no label beau	no label beau	no label beau, ensoleillé
the fair sex	<i>lit, arch</i> le beau sexe	not listed	<i>hum</i> le beau sexe	no label le beau sexe	not listed
fair shake: fair chance	not listed	<i>inf</i> tr. of ex.	not listed	no label tr. of exp.	not listed
fairy: male homosexual	<i>péj</i> pédé, tapette, tante	* <i>inf/fam, péj</i> pédé, tapette	<i>pop, inj</i> tapette (<i>offensive</i>)	<i>very inf, pej</i> pédé (<i>very inf</i>), tapette (<i>very inf</i>)	sense not listed
fait accompli	not listed	no label fait accompli	not listed	not listed	not listed

	HASH ¹	LAR2 ²	OXHA	RCSS	DC
"eyes fall on smthg"	not listed	no label mon regard est tombé	not listed	no label ses yeux sont tombés..	not listed
fall for	<i>fam</i> tomber amoureux de	no label tomber amoureux de, se laisser prendre par	no label tomber amoureux de	<i>inf</i> tomber amoureux de	<i>fam</i> tomber amoureux, se laisser prendre
fall guy	not listed	<i>inf</i> pigeon	<i>fam</i> bouc émissaire, pigeon (<i>inf</i>)	<i>very inf</i> bouc émissaire, pigeon (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fallacious	no label trompeur	no label fallacieux	no label erroné	no label fallacieux	not listed
falsehood: a lie	no label mensonge	<i>fml</i> mensonge	no label mensonge	no label mensonge	no label mensonge, fausseté
false: i.e., falsies	<i>fam</i> base rembourrée, coussinot	<i>inf</i> soutien-gorge rembourré	<i>vieilli, fam</i> faux seins	<i>very inf</i> soutien gorge rembourré	not listed
familial	not listed	no label familial	not listed	not listed	not listed
to be famished: hungry	<i>fam</i> mourir de faim	no label être affamé	<i>fam</i> avoir faim, avoir la fringale (<i>inf</i>)	<i>exp. inf</i> je meurs de faim	no label j'ai une faim de loup
fanatic: a football fanatic	no label fanatique	no label fanatique	no label fanatique	no label fanatique	no label fanatique
a fancy	no label fantaisie...	no label caprice, fantaisie	no label many equivs, no label	no label caprice, fantaisie...	no label caprice, fantaisie, illusion
fancy: a fancy house	no label fantaisie	no label for this sense recherché	<i>fam, péj</i> snobinard (<i>inf</i>)	<i>péj</i> belle maison (in an ex.)	sense not listed
fanfare: spectacular public display	sense not listed	no label avec roulements de tambour, éclat	sense not listed	sense not listed	not listed
fanny: buttocks	<i>slang</i> derrière	<i>inf</i> fesses	<i>fam</i> fesses	<i>offensive</i> cul (<i>offensive</i>), fesses (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fantabulous	not listed	<i>inf</i> chic, chouette	not listed	<i>very inf</i> super-chouette (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fantastic: great	<i>fam</i> formidable	<i>inf</i> fantastique, sensationnel	<i>fam</i> formidable	no label formidable etc	sense not listed

	HASH ¹	LAR2 ²	OXHA	RCSS	DC
farewell	no label adieu	no label adieu	no label adieu	no label adieu	no label adieu
far-out	<i>fam</i> avant-garde	<i>inf</i> bizarre, avant- garde, génial	<i>fam</i> avant-garde	<i>inf</i> d'avant garde, super (<i>inf</i>), génial	not listed
fart	<i>slang</i> pet	* <i>inf/fam</i> pet	<i>pop</i> pet (<i>very inf</i>)	<i>offensive</i> pet (<i>offensive</i>)	not listed
"fart around"	<i>slang</i> déconner	* <i>inf/fam</i> gaspiller/ perdre son temps, glander	<i>pop</i> faire l'andouille (<i>very inf</i>)	<i>offensive</i> glandouiller (<i>very inf</i>), glander (<i>offensive</i>)	not listed
fast lane	no label la vie à cent à l'heure	no label (exp) vie excitante	no label la vie à cent à l'heure (<i>inf</i>)	no label vivre à cent à l'heure (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fast track	not listed	no label expl./ gloss	no label promotion accélérée	no label ultra- rapide	not listed
"fat chance"	<i>fam</i> mal barré	<i>inf</i> tu parles!	<i>fam, iron</i> tu crois au père Noël (<i>inf</i>)	<i>inf</i> tu parles...(<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fat cat	<i>fam</i> richard	<i>inf</i> richard	<i>fam</i> huile (<i>inf</i>)	no label gros richard (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fathead	<i>fam</i> imbécile	<i>inf</i> imbécile	<i>fam</i> débile (<i>inf</i>)	<i>inf</i> idiot, cruche (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fatuous	no label imbécile	no label sot, niais	no label stupide	no label imbécile, etc	not listed
faux pas	no label	no label bévue, gaffe	<i>sout</i> impair	no label impair, bévue, gaffe	not listed
to faze	<i>fam</i> déconcerter	<i>inf</i> déconcerter, dérouter	<i>fam</i> dérouter	<i>very inf</i> déconcerter	not listed
feckless	no label incapable, étourdi	no label incapable, irresponsable	no label irresponsable	no label inepte, etc	not listed
fecund	not listed	no label fécond	<i>littér</i> fécond	no label fécond	not listed
fed(s)	<i>fam</i> flic	<i>inf</i> expl./ gloss	<i>inf</i> agent fédéral, fédé (<i>inf</i>)	<i>inf</i> expl./ gloss	not listed

	HASH ¹	LAR2 ²	OXHA	RCSS	DC
fed up	<i>fam</i> en avoir assez/ plein le dos	<i>inf</i> en avoir marre	<i>fam</i> en avoir marre (<i>inf</i>)	<i>inf</i> ~n avoir assez, en avoir marre (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
feed: a large meal	<i>fam</i> repas	<i>inf</i> repas	<i>fam</i> bouffe (<i>inf</i>)	<i>inf</i> ex. bien boulotté (<i>inf</i>), bouffé (<i>very</i> <i>inf</i>)	<i>fam</i> repas
"to feel up"	<i>slang</i> peloter	<i>inf</i> peloter, tripoter	<i>fam</i> tripoter (<i>inf</i>), peloter (<i>inf</i>)	<i>very inf</i> peloter qn (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
feelgood: as in movie	not listed	<i>inf</i> (exp.) qui donne la pêche	no label faussement assurant	not listed	not listed
to feign	no label feindre	no label feindre	<i>sout</i> feindre	no label feindre	no label feindre
felicitous	no label heureux	<i>fml</i> heureux	<i>sout</i> heureux	no label heureux	not listed
felicity	<i>formal and lit</i> félicité	<i>fml</i> félicité	<i>sout</i> félicité	no label félicité	not listed
femme, fem: woman who adopts female role in lesbian relationship	not listed	not listed	<i>fam</i> lesbienne (qui joue le rôle passif)	<i>very inf</i> homosexuel passif	not listed
fence: receiver of stolen goods	<i>slang</i> receleur	* <i>inf/fam</i> receleur	<i>fam</i> receleur	<i>inf</i> receleur, fourgue	no label receleur
"on the fence"	no label ménager la chèvre et le chou	no label rester neutre	no label ne pas prendre position	no label ménager la chèvre et le chou	no label être indécis, hésiter
fence sitter	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed
fender bender	<i>fam</i> la tôle froissée	<i>inf</i> petit accrochage	<i>fam</i> accrochage	<i>inf</i> accrochage, tôle froissée (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fease: confess	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed
fetid	no label fétide, puant	no label fétide	no label fétide	no label fétide, puant	no label fétide
fiat	not listed	no label décré	<i>sout</i> décré	no label décré	not listed
fiddlesticks!	<i>old-fashioned</i> balivernes	<i>inf, dated</i> balivernes, sornettes, bon sang de bonsoir	<i>vieilli, fam</i> flûte alors (<i>inf</i>)	<i>inf</i> quelle blague (<i>inf</i>)	not listed

	HASH ¹	LAR2 ²	OXHA	RCSS	DC
field day	no label s'en donner à cœur joie	<i>inf</i> s'en donner à cœur joie	no label several equivs, no labels	<i>inf</i> s'en donner à cœur joie	no label grand jour
fifty-fifty	no label several equivs	no label moitié-moitié, fifty-fifty	no label moitié-moitié, fifty-fifty (<i>inf</i>)	no label moitié-moitié	no label moitié-moitié
figure on	<i>fam</i> compter sur	<i>inf</i> compter sur	<i>fam</i> s'attendre à	no label compter sur, etc	not listed
figure out	<i>fam</i> calculer, résoudre	no label arriver à comprendre	no label trouver	no label arriver à comprendre	no label se monter, se chiffrer
to filch	no label chipper	<i>inf</i> piquer	<i>fam</i> chipper (<i>inf</i>), voler	<i>inf</i> voler, chipper (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fin du siècle	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed
fine: very well	no label très bien	no label bien	no label très bien	no label très bien	no label bien
to finger: to inform on	<i>slang</i> balancer qn.	* <i>inf/fam</i> balancer, donner	sense not listed	<i>very inf</i> moucharder (<i>inf</i>), balancer (<i>very inf</i>)	<i>pop</i> moucharder, vendre, doubler
fink	<i>fam</i> balance, indic	<i>inf</i> mouchard	<i>pop, péj</i> mouchard (<i>péj</i>)	<i>very inf</i> mouchard (<i>inf</i>), indic (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
to fire: discharge from a position	<i>fam</i> virer, saquer	<i>inf</i> virer	no label, renvoyer, virer (<i>inf</i>)	<i>inf</i> renvoyer, flanquer à la porte (<i>inf</i>), vider (<i>inf</i>)	no label congédier, renvoyer
firearms	no label arme à feu	no label arme à feu	no label arme à feu	no label arme à feu	no label arme à feu
firewater	<i>fam</i> gnôle...	<i>inf</i> gnôle	<i>fam</i> gnôle (<i>inf</i>)	<i>inf</i> alcool, gnôle (<i>inf</i>)	<i>hist</i> eau-de-vie
firmament	not listed	<i>arch</i> or <i>lit</i> firmament	<i>littér</i> firmament (<i>littér</i>)	no label firmament	no label firmament
"to have a fit"	<i>fam</i> piquer une crise	no label faire une crise	<i>fam</i> piquer une crise (<i>inf</i>)	<i>inf</i> piquer une crise (<i>inf</i>)	sense not listed
fix: drug injection	<i>slang</i> piqûre de drogue	<i>drugs slang</i> dose, fix	<i>fam</i> shoot (<i>argot</i> des drogués, <i>inf</i>)	<i>drugs slang</i> piqûre, piquouse	sense not listed

	HASH ¹	LAR2 ²	OXHA	RCSS	DC
to fix: to get even with	sense not listed	<i>inf</i> régler son compte	<i>fam</i> régler son compte	<i>inf</i> régler son compte	sense not listed
fixity	no label détermination	no label fixité	no label détermination	no label fixité	not listed
flagellation	no label flagellation	no label flagellation	no label flagellation	no label flagellation	not listed
flak	<i>fam</i> critique	<i>inf</i> critiques	<i>fam</i> critique	<i>inf</i> critiques	not listed
flake: oddball	<i>fam</i> barjo	<i>inf</i> barjo	<i>fam</i> toqué (<i>inf</i>)	<i>very inf</i> un drôle d'oiseau (<i>inf</i>)	sense not listed
flaky: eccentric	<i>fam</i> barjo	<i>inf</i> barjo, loufoque	<i>fam</i> toqué (<i>inf</i>)	<i>very inf</i> bizarre, excentrique	not listed
flappable	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed
to flash: to expose oneself	no label s'exhiber	<i>inf</i> s'exhiber	<i>fam</i> faire l'exhibitionnisme	<i>very inf</i> s'exhiber	sense not listed
"to flash s.o. a smile"	no label lancer un sourire	no label lancer un sourire	no label lancer	no label lancer un sourire	not listed
"her eyes flashed"	not listed	no label ses yeux ont lancé des éclairs	no label lancer des éclairs	not listed	not listed
flashy	no label voyant, tapageur	<i>inf</i> tapageur, tape-à-l'oeil	<i>fam, péj</i> tape-à-l'oeil, etc	no label tapageur, tape-à-l'oeil, etc	no label criard, voyant
flatfoot: a person with flat feet	sense not listed	not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed	not listed
flatfoot: a policeman	<i>old-fashioned, fam</i> agent de police	not listed	<i>fam, vieilli</i> poulet (<i>old-fashioned, inf</i>), policier	<i>very inf</i> flic (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
"I am flattered to accept..."	not listed	no label je suis flatté...	not listed	no label je suis flatté...	not listed
to flaunt: disobey (to flout)	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed
flick: movie	not listed (Br. flicke)	not listed (Br. flicke)	not listed (Br. flicke)	not listed (Br. flicke)	not listed
flip: impertinent	<i>fam</i> léger, désinvolte	<i>inf</i> désinvolte	no label désinvolte	no label désinvolte	not listed

	HASH ¹	LAR2 ²	OXHA	RCSS	DC
to flip out	<i>slang</i> sortir de ses gonds	<i>inf</i> piquer une crise, être emballé	<i>fam</i> se mettre en rogne (<i>inf</i>), perdre la boule (<i>inf</i>)	<i>very inf</i> se mettre en rogne (<i>inf</i>), devenir dingue (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
flivver: an old car	not listed	not listed	<i>fam, vieilli</i> guimbarde (<i>inf</i>), vieille voiture	<i>very inf</i> tacot (<i>inf</i>), guimbarde (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
floozy	<i>slang</i> poufiasse	<i>inf</i> traînée	<i>fam, péj</i> poufiasse (<i>very</i> <i>inf</i>)	<i>very inf</i> poule (<i>inf</i>), poufiasse (<i>very</i> <i>inf</i>)	not listed
flu	<i>med fam</i> grippe	no label grippe	no label grippe	no label grippe	<i>fam</i> grippe
fluke	<i>fam</i> coup de veine, chance	<i>inf</i> coup de bol/ pot	no label coup de veine (<i>inf</i>)	no label coup de chance, de veine (<i>inf</i>)	no label coup de chance
to flunk	<i>fam</i> se faire coller, recaler	<i>inf</i> se planter	<i>fam</i> rater (<i>inf</i>), sécher sur (<i>inf</i>), etc	<i>inf</i> être recalé (<i>inf</i>), être collé (<i>inf</i>)	<i>fam</i> rater
fly: hip, cool	sense not listed	sense not listed	<i>fam</i> chic	sense not listed	not listed
foe	<i>lit</i> ennemi, adversaire	<i>lit or fml</i> ennemi, adversaire	<i>littér</i> ennemi	<i>lit</i> ennemi, adversaire	no label ennemi
Foggy Bottom: U.S. Dept of State	not listed	no label expl./ gloss	<i>fam</i> (explication)	not listed	not listed
footfall	no label pas	no label bruit de pas	no label pas	no label pas	not listed
footsie	<i>fam</i> faire du pied	<i>inf</i> faire du pied à qn	<i>fam</i> faire du pied à qn	<i>very inf</i> faire du pied à qn	not listed
forbear	<i>lit</i> s'abstenir de	<i>fml</i> s'abstenir	<i>sout</i> s'abstenir	no label s'abstenir	* <i>arch or lit</i> s'abstenir de
forefather	no label aïeul	no label ancêtre	no label ancêtre	no label aïeux (<i>lit</i>), ancêtres	no label ancêtre, aïeux
foreign: a foreign object	<i>med</i> corps étranger	no label corps étranger	sense not listed	<i>med</i> corps étranger	sense not listed
forswear	no label renoncer	<i>fml</i> abjurer	<i>sout</i> renoncer à	<i>fml</i> renoncer à, abjurer	not listed
forthcoming	no label prochain, etc	not listed	no label prochain, etc	no label prochain, etc	no label prochain, etc

	HASH ¹	LAR2 ²	OXHA	RCSS	DC
fount: a fount of knowledge, etc	<i>lit</i> source	<i>lit</i> source	<i>littér</i> source	<i>lit</i> source	not listed
frame: a frame-up	<i>slang</i> coup monté	sense not listed	<i>fam</i> coup monté	sense not listed	sense not listed
frame-up	<i>slang</i> coup monté	<i>inf</i> coup monté	not listed	<i>very inf</i> coup monté, machination	<i>slang</i> coup monté
to frazzle	not listed	<i>inf</i> tuer, crever	<i>fam</i> calciner	<i>inf</i> étreinter (<i>inf</i>), crever (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
to freak	no label several equivs	* <i>inf/fam</i> flipper, perdre les pédales	<i>fam</i> piquer une crise (<i>inf</i>)	not listed	not listed
freaking: intensifier	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed
freaky: frightening	not listed	<i>inf</i> bizarre, insolite	<i>fam</i> bizarre	<i>inf</i> bizarre, original	not listed
freebie	<i>fam</i> cadeau	<i>inf</i> fleur	<i>fam</i> cadeau	<i>very inf</i> faveur, extra	not listed
free lunch	no label tr. of exp.	no label tr. of exp.	(under lunch) no label	not listed	not listed
French kiss	no label patin	no label baiser profond	<i>fam</i> patin (<i>very inf</i>)	no label baiser profond, patin (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
fridge	<i>fam</i> frigo	no label frigidaire	no label frigo (<i>inf</i>)	no label frigo (<i>inf</i>)	<i>fam</i> réfrigérateur
to frig: to have sex with	not listed	sense not listed	not listed	sense not listed	not listed
frog: a Frenchman	<i>offensive slang</i> français	* <i>inf/fam</i> terme injurieux... (expl)	<i>fam, inj</i> français	<i>very inf, pej</i> français	not listed
fruit: a male homosexual	<i>offensive slang</i> pédé	* <i>inf/fam</i> pédé, tante	<i>pop</i> pédé (<i>very inf</i>)	<i>very inf</i> pédé (<i>very inf</i>), tapette (<i>very inf</i>)	sense not listed
fruity: eccentric	no label toqué, cinglé	sense not listed	<i>fam</i> dingue (<i>inf</i>)	sense not listed	not listed
fuck (and family)	<i>vulg</i> baiser, foutre	** <i>vulgar</i> baiser, etc	<i>vulg</i> baiser, etc (<i>vulg</i>)	<i>offensive</i> baiser (<i>offensive</i>)	not listed
fulcrum	no label pivot, couteau	no label pivot, point d'appui	<i>littér</i> point d'appui, pivot	no label pivot, point d'appui	no label point d'appui
fulminate	no label fulminer	<i>fml</i> fulminer	no label fulminer	no label fulminer	not listed

	HASH ¹	LAR2 ²	OXHA	RCSS	DC
fun, adj	<i>fam</i> tr. of exp.	<i>inf</i> rigolo, marrant	no label marrant (<i>inf</i>), rigolo (<i>inf</i>)	<i>very inf</i> marrant (<i>inf</i>), rigolo (<i>inf</i>), amusant	not listed
funk: panic, depression	<i>old-fashioned,</i> <i>slang</i> frousse	<i>inf dated</i> frousse, trouille	<i>fam, vieilli</i> trouille (<i>inf</i>)	<i>inf, old-</i> <i>fashioned</i> trouille (<i>very</i> <i>inf</i>)	<i>fam</i> frousse, trac
funk: music	<i>mus.</i> funk	<i>mus</i> funk	<i>mus</i> funk	<i>mus</i> funk	not listed
funky:related to the music	<i>mus</i> funky, funk	<i>mus</i> funky	<i>fam</i> funky (<i>inf</i>)	sense not listed	not listed
funny farm	<i>slang</i> maison de fou	<i>inf euph</i> maison de fous	<i>fam</i> cabanon (<i>inf</i>)	<i>very inf</i> asile de fous (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fuzz: police	<i>slang</i> flic	* <i>inf/fam</i> les flics	<i>fam</i> les flics (<i>inf</i>)	<i>very inf</i> la flicaille (<i>very</i> <i>inf</i>), les flics (<i>inf</i>)	not listed

¹ For the all the dictionaries included here, the labels are in French or English, according to how each dictionary presents the labels.

² Since the LAR2 uses both symbols and labels, one star or two stars marks the words followed by a symbol rather than the label.

Appendix 2.d: Register of French words in bilingual dictionaries

	HASH	LAR2	OXHA	RCS8	DC
fabricateur: (de fausse monnaie)	no label counterfeiter, forger	no label counterfeiter	sense not listed	no label counterfeiter	sense not listed
fabriquer: faire, avoir telle ou telle occupation	<i>fam</i> to do	<i>fam</i> to do, to cook up	<i>inf</i> tr. of ex (to do)	<i>fam</i> to do, to be up to	sense not listed
fabuleusement	no label fabulously	no label fabulously, fantastically	no label fabulously	no label fabulously fantastically	not listed
fabuleux: du domaine de l'imagination	no label mythical, legendary	no label fabulous, mythical	no label mythical	no label fabulous	no label fabled, imaginary
façade: figure	<i>fam</i> tr. of exp	* <i>fam/inf</i> mug, face	<i>very inf</i> tr. of exp. (<i>pop</i>)	<i>très fam</i> tr. of ex.	sense not listed
"face de rat"	not listed	* <i>fam/inf</i> dog	<i>inf</i> rat face (<i>fam</i>)	<i>très fam</i> rat face (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
face: aspect sous lequel se présente une chose	sense not listed	no label side	no label side	no label face	not listed
facétieux	no label facetious	no label facetious, humorous	no label mischievous	no label facetious, impish, etc	not listed
faconde	no label volubility, garrulousness (<i>péj</i>)	<i>littér and péj</i> fluency, flow of words	<i>formal</i> loquacity	<i>littér</i> volubility, loquaciousness	not listed
fada	<i>fam</i> screwy, crazy	<i>fam, dial</i> cracked, nuts	<i>inf</i> crazy (<i>fam</i>), nuts (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam, dial</i> cracked (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fadeuse	<i>fam</i> insipid, bland, etc	<i>péj</i> insipid, tasteless, bland	<i>inf</i> dull, tasteless	<i>péj</i> tasteless, insipid	not listed
(être) fadé	<i>fam</i> to beat them all, to take the cake	not listed	not listed	<i>très fam, iron.</i> priceless, first-class	not listed
fatiot	<i>arg</i> banknote	not listed	<i>very inf</i> bill, money, dough (<i>pop</i>)	<i>très fam, vieilli</i> (bank)notes	not listed

	HASH	LAR2	OXHA	RCSS	DC
fagoter	<i>péj</i> to rig, deck out	<i>fam, péj</i> tr. of ex.	<i>inf</i> to do up (<i>fam</i>)	<i>péj</i> to dress up, rig out (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
"le sexe faible"	no label the weaker sex	not listed	not listed	listed under sexe, no label the weaker sex	not listed
faignant, feignant	<i>fam</i> (v. fainéant)	no label (v. fainéant)	not listed	no label, (v. fainéant)	not listed
"faire un enfant à une femme"	<i>fam</i> to make or get s.o. pregnant	no label to have a child with	not listed	<i>fam</i> to get s.o. pregnant (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
faire pipi, caca	not listed	not listed	not listed	<i>lang. enfantin</i> to go to the john (<i>inf</i>); to do a pooh (<i>lang.</i> <i>enfantin</i>)	not listed
s'en faire	no label tr. of ex.	no label to worry	no label to worry	no label to worry	no label to worry
falsan: homme malhonnête	<i>arg</i> crook	<i>fam, péj</i> crook, con-man	sense not listed	<i>vieilli</i> shark	sense not listed
faiseur: homme peu scrupuleux	sense not listed	<i>péj</i> swindler, etc	sense not listed	<i>vieilli</i> shark	no label quack
fait: attrapé par la police	sense not listed	sense not listed	<i>inf</i> done for	sense not listed	not listed
fallacieux: fait pour induire en erreur	no label fallacious, etc	no label deceptive, misleading, etc	no label fallacious, etc	no label fallacious, etc	not listed
falot: conseil de guerre	<i>mil</i> court martial	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed	not listed
falzar: pantalon	<i>arg</i> pants	* <i>fam/inf</i> pants	<i>very inf</i> pants	<i>très fam</i> pants	not listed
famélique	no label half-starved, ill- fed	no label scrawny, half- starved	no label emaciated, scrawny	no label scrawny, scraggy	no label starving, half- starved
fameusement: très	not listed	no label very, really	no label remarkably	<i>fam</i> remarkably, really	not listed
fan	<i>fam</i> fan	no label fan	no label fan	<i>fam</i> fan	not listed
fana	<i>fam</i> fanatic, freak	<i>fam</i> fan	<i>inf</i> fanatic	<i>fam</i> crazy (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fange: boue	<i>littér</i> mud, mire	<i>littér</i> mire	no label mud, mire	<i>littér</i> mire (<i>lit</i>)	no label filth, muck, mire

	HASH	LAR2	OXHA	RCSS	DC
faramineux	<i>fam</i> phenomenal	<i>fam</i> huge, tremendous	<i>inf</i> colossal, staggering	<i>fam</i> staggering (<i>inf</i>), fantastic (<i>inf</i>), mind- boggling (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
"se farcir qch": s'envoyer, se taper	<i>arg</i> to get landed, stuck with	<i>fam</i> to have to put up with	<i>inf</i> to get stuck with (<i>fam</i>)	<i>très fam</i> to get stuck, landed with (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
"se farcir qn": (sexuel)	sense not listed	<i>** vulg</i> to screw	<i>very inf</i> to ball (<i>pop</i>)	<i>injurieux</i> , <i>indécent</i> to make it with (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
farfelu	<i>fam</i> weird, way-out	<i>fam</i> crazy, strange, cranky	<i>inf</i> harebrained (<i>fam</i>), ditsy (<i>fam</i>), etc	<i>fam</i> cranky, eccentric	not listed
fat: vaniteux	no label conceited, self- satisfied	<i>littér</i> bumptious, conceited, etc	no label conceited	<i>vieilli</i> conceited, smug	no label conceited, foppish
fathma: femme musulmane	not listed	<i>péj</i> a North African woman	not listed	no label gloss/ expl	not listed
"fatiguer la salade"	no label to toss	<i>dial</i> to toss	no label to toss	no label to toss	not listed
fauché: sans argent	<i>fam</i> broke	<i>fam</i> broke, cleaned out	<i>inf</i> broke (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> flat-, dead broke (<i>inf</i>)	<i>fam</i> broke
faucher: voler	<i>fam</i> to swipe, to pinch	<i>fam</i> to pinch, to swipe	<i>inf</i> to pinch (<i>fam</i>)	<i>très fam</i> to pinch (<i>inf</i>), swipe (<i>inf</i>)	<i>fam</i> to swipe
"la faute à qn"	not listed	<i>fam</i> tr. of ex.	<i>very inf</i> tr. of ex	<i>fam</i> tr. of ex.	not listed
fayot: haricot	<i>arg</i> kidney bean	<i>fam</i> bean	<i>inf</i> bean	<i>fam</i> bean	<i>fam</i> kidney bean
fayot: sous-officier rengagé	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed
fécond: qui produit abondamment (terre)	no label fruitful	<i>littér</i> tr. of ex	no label fertile	<i>littér</i> fruitful, rich, fecund (<i>lit</i>)	no label fruitful, fertile
femelle: femme mauvaise	<i>arg péj</i> female	<i>* fam/inf, péj</i> female	sense not listed	<i>très fam, péj</i> female (<i>very</i> <i>inf, pej</i>)	sense not listed
fendard: pantalon	not listed	not listed	<i>very inf</i> pante	<i>très fam</i> pante	not listed

	HASH	LAR2	OXHA	RCSS	DC
"se fendre la gueule"	<i>fam</i> to laugh one's head c'f	* <i>fam/inf</i> to split one's sides	<i>very inf</i> to split one's sides (<i>fam</i>)	<i>très fam</i> to laugh one's head off, to split one's sides (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
"sans coup férir"	no label without meeting any resistance, obstacle	<i>littér</i> without any problem or difficulty	no label meeting no resistance	no label without meeting any opposition	not listed
"fermer la bouche (à qn)"	not listed	<i>fam</i> to shut sb up	not listed	not listed	not listed
"la fermer"	<i>arg</i> shut up, etc	* <i>fam/inf</i> tr. of ex.	<i>very inf</i> to shut up (<i>fam</i>)	<i>très fam</i> shut up (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
fermer: enfermer	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed
"être fêru de qch"	no label smitten	no label to be keen on, highly interested in	no label to be very keen on smthg	<i>fml</i> to be passionately interested in	no label to be very much struck with
"poser ses fesses"	<i>arg</i> to park one's backside	<i>fam</i> to sit down somewhere	<i>inf</i> to park oneself (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> tr. of ex.	not listed
"botter les fesses à qn"	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed
feu: pistolet	sense not listed	<i>fam</i> gun, rod	<i>inf</i> shooter (<i>fam</i>), piece (<i>fam</i>), gun	<i>arg crime</i> gun, gat (<i>very inf</i>), rod (<i>very inf</i>)	sense not listed
"feu ma tante"	no label late	<i>sout</i> late	<i>fml</i> late	<i>fml</i> late	no label late, deceased
"être dur de la feuille"	<i>fam</i> hard of hearing	not listed	not listed	<i>fam</i> to be hard of hearing	not listed
feuj: juif	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed
fil	<i>vieilli et hum.</i> fiel	<i>hum</i> pooh	<i>old-fashioned</i> pooh	<i>archaic, hum</i> bah, pooh	no label shame
fiasco	no label flop	no label fiasco, flop	no label fiasco	no label fiasco	no label failure, flop (<i>fam</i>)
ficelé: habillé	<i>fam</i> got up	sense not listed	sense not listed	no label got up (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
ficelle: galon d'officier	sense not listed	<i>arg mil</i> officer's stripe	sense not listed	<i>arg mil</i> stripe (of officer)	sense not listed

	HASH	LAR2	OXHA	RCSS	DC
ficher: lancer, jeter	<i>fam</i> to chuck, etc	<i>fam</i> tr. of ex.	<i>inf</i> to chuck (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> to chuck (<i>inf</i>)	<i>fam</i> to throw
"ficher le camp"	<i>fam</i> clear off	<i>fam</i> scram, push off, etc	(under camp) <i>inf</i> to split (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> clear off (<i>inf</i>), etc	not listed
fichtre	<i>fam</i> , <i>vieilli</i> good gracious, etc	<i>vieilli</i> gosh!	<i>inf</i> goodness me!	<i>vieilli</i> gosh (<i>inf</i>)	no label Good Lord!, Goodness!
fichtrement	<i>fam</i> awfully, frightfully	<i>vieilli</i> darn	<i>inf</i> , <i>old-</i> <i>fashioned</i> darned (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> , <i>vieilli</i> darned (<i>inf</i>)	<i>fam</i> awfully, terribly
fifty-fifty	no label half and half, fifty-fifty	no label fifty-fifty, half and half	not listed	<i>fam</i> fifty-fifty (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
"figurez-vous"	no label to imagine	no label tr. of ex.	no label tr. of ex.	no label tr. of ex.	no label to imagine
filer: partir en toute vitesse	<i>fam</i> to dash, rush off	no label to dash, run	<i>inf</i> to rush	<i>fam</i> tr. of ex.	sense not listed
filer: donner, passer	<i>fam</i> to slip, give s.o. smthg	<i>fam</i> to give	<i>inf</i> to give	<i>très fam</i> tr. of ex.	sense not listed
fillesse: grosse fille	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed
"fils de ses oeuvres"	no label self-made man	no label self-made man	not listed	<i>fml</i> self-made man	not listed
fini: qui a des bornes	no label finite	<i>math & phil</i> finite	<i>math</i> finite	<i>math, philos,</i> <i>ling</i> finite	sense not listed
fiole: tête	<i>arg</i> skull	* <i>fam/inf</i> mug	<i>inf</i> bonce (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> face, mug (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
firmament	<i>littér</i> firmament, sky	<i>littér</i> firmament (<i>lit</i>)	no label firmament	<i>littér</i> firmament (<i>lit</i>)	no label firmament
fiston	<i>fam</i> son, youngster	<i>fam</i> son	<i>inf</i> sonny (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> son, lad	not listed
fistot: élève de 1 ^{ère} année d'Ecole navale	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed
fixer: se donner de la drogue	sense not listed	<i>arg</i> <i>drogue</i> to shoot up	sense not listed	sense not listed	sense not listed
flag: flagrant délit	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed
flagada: qui a perdu de la force	<i>fam</i> limp	<i>fam</i> pooped, washed-out	<i>inf</i> whacked (<i>fam</i>), exhausted	<i>fam</i> dog-tired (<i>inf</i>), washed-out (<i>inf</i>)	not listed

	HASH	LAR2	OXHA	RCSS	DC
flambé: ruiné	<i>fam</i> done for, his goose is cooked	<i>fam</i> tr. of ex.	<i>inf</i> done for (<i>fam</i>)	<i>très fam</i> finished	<i>fam</i> done for, finished, washed up
flambeur: joueur qui joue gros jeu	<i>arg</i> big-time gambler	no label big time gambler	no label big-time gambler	no label big-time gambler	not listed
"en rester comme deux ronds de flan"	no label to be flabbergasted	<i>fam</i> to be flabbergasted	<i>inf</i> to be dumbfounded	<i>fam</i> you could have knocked him down with a feather (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
flanquer: jeter	<i>fam</i> to throw, pitch, chuck	<i>fam</i> to fling, to throw, to chuck	<i>inf</i> to throw sthg to the ground	<i>fam</i> to fling to the ground	no label to fling, to throw, to chuck (<i>fam</i>)
flemme	<i>fam</i> laziness, idleness, slacking	<i>fam</i> idleness, laziness	<i>inf</i> laziness	<i>fam</i> laziness	not listed
"perdre sa fleur": perdre sa virginité	not listed	<i>vieilli</i> to lose one's virtue	not listed	not listed	not listed
fleurer: exhaler une odeur	<i>littér</i> to smell, to be fragrant	<i>littér</i> to smell of	no label to be fragrant with	<i>littér</i> to have the scent of, smell sweetly of	not listed
flic	<i>fam</i> cop	<i>fam</i> cop	<i>inf</i> cop (<i>fam</i>), policeman	<i>fam</i> cop (<i>inf</i>)	<i>fam</i> cop
flicard	not listed	not listed	not listed	<i>très fam</i> cop (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
flingue: fusil	<i>fam</i> shooter, rod	* <i>fam/inf</i> piece, gat	<i>very inf</i> gun, piece (<i>fam</i>)	no label gun, rifle	not listed
flop	not listed	<i>fam</i> flop	<i>inf</i> flop	<i>fam</i> flop (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
flotte: pluie, eau	<i>fam</i> water, rain	<i>fam</i> water, rain	<i>inf</i> rain, water	<i>fam</i> rain, water	<i>fam</i> rain, water
flouze ou flouze: argent	<i>arg</i> bread, dough, cash	* <i>fam/inf</i> dough	<i>very inf</i> dough (<i>fam</i>), money	<i>très fam</i> bread (<i>very</i> <i>inf</i>), dough (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
"faire du foin": du scandale, du bruit	<i>arg</i> make a fuss, to kick up a row	<i>fam</i> to make a din, to kick up a fuss	<i>inf</i> to make a hell of a racket (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> to kick up a fuss (<i>inf</i>)	not listed

	HASH	LAR2	OXHA	RCSS	DC
foire: endroit où règne grand bruit	<i>fam</i> bedlam	sense not listed	<i>inf</i> bedlam	<i>fam</i> bedlam (<i>inf</i>)	<i>fam</i> chaos, mess
"faire la foire"	<i>fam</i> to celebrate, to go on a spree	<i>fam</i> to live it up	<i>inf</i> to live it up (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> to whoop it up (<i>inf</i>) to go on a spree	not listed
foireux: qui a la diarrhée	<i>vulg</i> suffering from the runs	<i>** vulg</i> shitty	sense not listed	sense not listed	no label diarrhetic
foireux: peureux, lâche	<i>fam</i> scared, chicken	<i>fam</i> yellow-bellied, chicken	<i>very inf</i> coward, chicken (<i>fam</i>)	<i>très fam</i> yellow (bellied) (<i>very inf</i>), chicken (<i>very inf</i>)	no label scared, jittery
"des fois"	<i>fam</i> sometimes, now and then	<i>fam</i> sometimes	<i>inf</i> sometimes	<i>fam</i> sometimes	not listed
foison: grande abondance	<i>arch</i> abundance, plenty	<i>littér</i> galore, plenty	no label aplenty	no label abundance	not listed
foncer: aller très vite	<i>fam</i> to speed along, to surge ahead	<i>fam</i> to speed along	<i>inf</i> to tear along (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> to tear along (<i>inf</i>), etc	no label to be really going/ flying
for: le for intérieur	no label the conscience	no label in one's heart of hearts	no label in one's heart of hearts, deep down	no label in one's heart of hearts, deep down inside	not listed
formidable: remarquable	<i>fam</i> tremendous, great, fantastic	<i>fam</i> great, wonderu!	<i>inf</i> great, fantastic (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> great (<i>fam</i>), fantastic (<i>fam</i>), etc	<i>fam</i> wonderful, terrific
formide: abrégé. de formidable	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed	not listed
fort, adverbe de quantité	no label tr. of ex.	sense not listed	no label very much	<i>littér</i> greatly	not listed
fossile: personne avec habitudes démodées	<i>fam</i> an old fossil	sense not listed	(not clear: litt, fig - fossil)	sense not listed	sense not listed
coup de foudre	no label love at first sight	no label love at first sight	no label love at first sight	no label love at first sight	not listed
fouetter: avoir très peur; sentir mauvais	<i>arg</i> to be scared stiff, to stink	<i>* fam/inf</i> to reek, stink; to wet o.s.	<i>very inf</i> to stink (<i>fam</i>); to be scared stiff (<i>fam</i>)	<i>très fam</i> to be scared stiff (<i>inf</i>); to reek, stink	sense not listed
fouille: poche	sense not listed	<i>* fam/inf</i> pocket	<i>very inf</i> pocket	<i>très fam</i> pocket	sense not listed

	HASH	LAR2	OXHA	RCSS	DC
fouillis: désordre	no label jumble, mess, muddle	no label jumble	no label mess	no label jumble, muddle	no label mess, jumble, muddle
fouler: "ne pas se fouler"	<i>fam</i> to take things easy	<i>fam</i> to not strain o.s.	<i>inf</i> to not strain o.s., to not kill o.s. (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> to not overtax oneself, strain oneself	no label to exert o.s.
fourbe	no label cheat, rogue, etc	<i>littér</i> cheat, treacherous person	no label deceitful	no label deceitful, etc	no label knave, cheat
fourbi: fatras	<i>fam</i> tr. of ex	<i>fam</i> paraphernalia	<i>inf</i> shambles (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> mess, gear (<i>inf</i>)	<i>fam</i> paraphernalia, goods and chattels
fourguer: vendre des objets volés	not listed	<i>arg crime</i> to fence	<i>very inf</i> to flog (<i>fam</i>), to sell smthg off	<i>arg crime</i> to fence (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
foutre: sperme	not listed	<i>** vulg</i> come	<i>vulg</i> come (<i>vulg</i>), sperm	<i>indécent,</i> <i>injurieux</i> come (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
foutre: posséder sexuellement	sense not listed	sense not listed	<i>vulg, old-</i> <i>fashioned</i> to fuck (<i>vulg</i>)	sense not listed	sense not listed
foutre: syn. de ficher	<i>vulg</i> tr. of ex.	<i>* fam/inf</i> tr. of ex.	<i>very inf</i> tr. of ex.	<i>très fam</i> tr. of ex.	[in slang expressions, more informal than ficher] tr. of ex.
foutu	<i>vulg</i> bloody awful, ruined, done for, etc	<i>* fam/inf</i> screwed up, ruined, etc	<i>very inf</i> fucking (<i>vulg</i>), bloody awful (<i>pop</i>)	<i>très fam</i> damned (<i>very</i> <i>inf</i>), fucking (<i>offensive</i>)	(under foutre) tr. of ex.
frangin	<i>fam</i> brother	<i>fam</i> brother, bro	<i>inf</i> brother	<i>fam</i> brother	not listed
franglais	<i>fam</i> franglais	no label franglais	no label franglais	no label franglais	not listed
frappe: voyou	<i>arg</i> yob	<i>* fam/inf</i> hooligan, hoodlum	<i>very inf</i> hoodlum (<i>fam</i>)	<i>péj</i> tough guy	sense not listed
frérot	<i>fam</i> brother	<i>fam</i> little brother	<i>inf</i> kid brother (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> kid brother (<i>inf</i>), little brother	not listed
fric	<i>arg</i> dough	<i>fam</i> cash, money	<i>inf</i> dough (<i>fam</i>), money	<i>très fam</i> bread (<i>very</i> <i>inf</i>), dough (<i>very inf</i>), etc	not listed

	HASH	LAR2	OXHA	RCSS	DC
fric-frac: cambrionage	<i>arg</i> burglary	* <i>fam/inf</i> burglary, break-in	<i>inf</i> break-in	<i>fam</i> break-in	not listed
fricoter: manigancer une affaire	<i>fam</i> to plot	<i>fam</i> to cook up	<i>inf</i> to cook up (<i>fam</i>)	<i>fam</i> to cook up (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fridolin: Allemand	<i>arg, terme inj.</i> Fritz, Jerry, Kraut	not listed	not listed	<i>très fam</i> Kraut (<i>very inf</i>), Jerry (<i>very inf</i>), Fritz (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
fringues	<i>fam</i> togs, gear	<i>fam</i> gear, clobber	<i>very inf</i> gear (no label)	<i>fam</i> clothes, togs (<i>inf</i>), threads (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
frisson: léger mouvement qui se propage par ondulation	no label rippling	<i>littér</i> ripple	no label rustling, rippling	no label quivering	sense not listed
froc: pantalon	<i>arg</i> trousers	<i>fam</i> pants	<i>very inf</i> pants	<i>très fam</i> pants	not listed
from(e)gi; from(e)ton: fromage	not listed	<i>fam</i> cheese	<i>very inf</i> cheese	<i>très fam</i> cheese	not listed
frotteur: frôleux	sense not listed	<i>fam</i> pervert	not listed	not listed	not listed
frousse	<i>fam</i> fear, fright	<i>fam</i> fright	<i>inf</i> fright	<i>fam</i> scared	no label fear
frusques: vêtements	<i>fam</i> togs, clobber	<i>fam</i> togs, gear	<i>inf</i> gear (<i>fam</i>)	<i>péj</i> gear (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fumiste: qui ne fait rien sérieusement	<i>fam</i> skiver, shirker	<i>péj</i> shirker	<i>inf, péj</i> laggard	<i>fam</i> shirker	no label humbug
turax	<i>fam, hum</i> furious, livid	<i>fam</i> livid, hopping mad	<i>inf</i> mad (<i>fam</i>), hopping mad (<i>fam</i>)	<i>très fam</i> livid, hopping mad (<i>inf</i>)	not listed
fueller: dépenser	sense not listed	<i>fam</i> to blow	sense not listed	<i>fam</i> to blow (<i>very inf</i>)	not listed
fustiger	<i>littér</i> to give s.o. a dressing down	<i>littér</i> to censure, criticize harshly	no label to castigate, lambast	<i>littér</i> to flay, denounce, censure	not listed
futuriste: qui évoque un monde fantastique	no label futurist	no label futurist	no label futurist	no label futurist	not listed

Glossary

cultural level: language variety determined by the innate characteristics of the speaker (age, region, social class). Term used by John Kenyon. [Related to user-related variety of language.]

field: one of the three components of register which represents the content of what is being said, but is not necessarily limited to subject matter. Term used by M.A.K. Halliday.

functional variety: language variety determined by its function, i.e. its role in different situations. Term used by John Kenyon. [Related to register, use-related variety of language, situational variation, style.]

label: a dictionary component that restricts various elements of a dictionary entry to a certain field, register, geographical region or temporal period, or warns the user of the potential effect on his or her listener. [Related to symbol.]

language variety: a set of variations within a language that are either used by an individual or shared by a group of speakers and are either the product of the social or demographic characteristics of the speaker or speakers, or are associated with different situations in which the speaker or speakers find themselves. [Related to register, cultural level, functional variety, situational variation, use-related variety of language, user-related variety of language.]

mode: one of the three components of register which represents how something is said, e.g. written or oral. Term used by M.A.K. Halliday.

norm: prescribed standard usage. [Related to standard, usage.]

register: a variation in language (a variation in lexical items, in the case of lexicography) chosen by the speaker according to the situation (which can be described and analyzed according to several dimensions, including those of field, tenor and mode) in which he or she finds himself or herself. [Related to functional variety, use-related variety of language, situational variation, style.]

situation: the set of extralinguistic (social, physical) elements in which an act of speech takes place.

situational variation: language variation determined by the situation in which the speaker finds himself or herself. [Related to register, functional variety, use-related variety of language, style.]

standard: an approved variety of language that is promoted by the various institutions of a community. [Related to norm, usage.]

style: the variation that occurs in language in different situations, this sense is used especially in applied linguistic fields. Also used in other contexts to designate idiolectal patterns (especially in literature). [Related to register, functional variety, use-related variety of language, situational variation.]

symbol: a usage label in graphic form. [Related to label.]

tenor: one of the three components of register which represents the relation between the addresser and the addressee. Term used by M.A.K. Halliday.

usage: communal and individual language habits. It is sometimes interpreted to mean the standard variety of a language. [Related to language variety, norm, standard.]

use-related variety of language: a language variety that marks "the differences in the type of language selected as appropriate to different types of situation." (Halliday *et al*, 1968: 87). Term used by M.A.K. Halliday. [Related to register, functional variety, situational variation, style.]

user-related variety of language: a language variety that marks the differences in the type of language selected according to the innate characteristics of the speaker (age, region, social class). Term used by M.A.K. Halliday. User-related varieties are also called dialects. [Related to cultural level.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 Theoretical works

- Algeo, John. "American Lexicography," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 1987-2009.
- . "The Image of the Dictionary in the Mass Media:USA," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 34-38.
- Al-Kasimi, Ali M. Linguistics and Bilingual Dictionaries. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977.
- Anderson, James D. The Development of the English-French, French-English Bilingual Dictionary. A Study in Comparative Lexicography. Supplement to Word 28,3, (Dec. 1972), Monograph no.6.
- Atkinson, Dwight and D. Biber. "Register: A Review of Empirical Research," Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register. Ed. D. Biber and E. Finnegan. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. 351-385.
- Auger, Pierre. "Le marquage des termes, une pratique incontournable de l'approche socioterminologique," Université Laval, Sainte-Foy, Québec, n.p., n.d.
- Beaujot, Jean-Pierre. "Dictionnaire et idéologies," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 79-88.
- Biber, Douglas. "An Analytical Framework for Register Studies," Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register. Ed. D. Biber and E. Finnegan. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. 31-56.
- Biber, D. and E. Finegan. "Introduction: Situating Register in Sociolinguistics," Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register. Ed. D. Biber and E. Finnegan. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. 3-10.
- Brandon, Edgar Ewing. Robert Estienne et le dictionnaire français au XVI^e siècle. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1967.
- Bright, William, ed. International Encyclopedia of Linguistics. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

- Card, William, *et al.* "Dimensions of Usage and Dictionary Labeling," Journal of English Linguistics. 17 (1984). 57-69.
- Cardinal, Pierre et J.-P. Joussetin. "Les marques d'usage dans les dictionnaires et les besoins des usagers," Université du Québec à Hull, n.p., n.d.
- Cassidy, Frederic G. "Toward more objective labeling in dictionaries," Studies in honor of Albert H. Marckwardt. Ed. J. Alatis. Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 1972. 49-56.
- Cheschire, Jenny. "Register and Style," International Encyclopedia of Linguistics. Ed. William Bright. Vol 3. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992. 324-327.
- Chilton, Paul. "On the Theory of Register," Nottingham Linguistic Circular. 7.2 (December 1978). 113-130.
- Collison, R.L. A History of Foreign-Language Dictionaries. London: André Deutsch Limited, 1982.
- Corbin, Pierre. "Les marques stylistiques/diastratiques dans le dictionnaire monolingue," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 673-680.
- Crystal, David. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992.
- . A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. 3rd edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992.
- Darot, Mireille. "Usage de la langue: le registre familier," Le français dans le monde. 25.196 (octobre 1985). 78-80.
- Eble, Connie. "Slang: Variations in Dictionary Labeling Practices," LACUS Forum. 11 (1984). 294-297.
- Enkvist, Nils E. "On defining style: An essay on applied linguistics," Linguistics and Style. Ed. J. Spencer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Ferguson, Charles A. "Dialect, Register, and Genre: Working Assumptions About Conventionalization," Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register. Ed. D. Biber and E. Finnegan. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. 15-30.

- Finegan, Edward and D. Biber. "Register and Social Dialect Variation: An Integrated Approach," Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register. Ed. D. Biber and E. Finnegan. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. 315-347.
- Friend, Joseph H. The Development of American Lexicography 1798-1864. The Hague: Mouton, 1967.
- Gates, Edward. "Should a dictionary include only the 'good' words," Lexicographica. Series Major: Symposium on Lexicography V. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1992. 265-280.
- Glatigny, Michel. "Les commentaires normatifs dans le dictionnaire monolingue," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 700-704.
- Gilbert, Pierre. "Différenciations lexicales," Le français dans le monde. 69 (décembre, 1969). 41-47.
- Gorcy, Gérard. "Différenciation des significations: problèmes et méthodes," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 905-917.
- Gove, Philip B. "The Dictionary's Function," The Role of the Dictionary. Ed. P. Gove. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967. 1-8.
- . "Usage in the Dictionary," The Role of the Dictionary. Ed. P. Gove. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967. 51-57.
- Gregory, Michael and Susanne Carroll. Language and situation: language varieties and their social contexts. London/Boston: Routledge, 1978.
- Halliday, M.A.K., McIntosh, A. and Stevens, P. The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1968.
- Halliday, M.A.K. Explorations in the Functions of Language. London: Edward Arnold, 1973.
- . Language as social semiotic. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1978.
- Hartmann, R.R.K. "Style Values: Linguistic Approaches and Lexicographical Practice," Applied Linguistics. II.3 (1981). 263-273.
- Hatim, B. and I. Mason. Discourse and the Translator. London: Longman, 1990.

- Hausmann, Franz J. and Herbert E. Wiegand. "Component parts and structures of General Monolingual Dictionaries," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 328-360.
- Hausmann, Franz J. "La lexicographie bilingue anglais-français, français-anglais," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 2956-2960.
- Herbst, Thomas. "Dictionaries for Foreign Language Teaching: English," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 1379-1385.
- Hymes, Dell. Language as a Human Problem. Ed. Morton Bloomfield and Einar Haugen. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1974.
- . Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.
- Joos, Martin. The Five Clocks. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1967.
- Kenyon, John. "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English," College English. 10 (1948). 31-36.
- Landau, Sidney. Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Marckwardt, Albert. "Dictionaries and the English Language," The Role of the Dictionary. Ed. P. Gove. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967.
- Matthews, M.M. A Survey of English Dictionaries. New York: Russell and Russell, 1966.
- Matoré, Georges. Histoire des dictionnaires français. Paris: librairie Larousse, 1968.
- Messalar, P.A. "Les marques '*familier*' et '*populaire*' envisagées des points de vue lexicologique et lexicographique," Cahiers de lexicologie: Revue internationale de lexicologie et de lexicographie. L111 (1988-II): 91-106.
- Mikkelsen, Hans K. "'What did Scerba actually mean by 'active' and 'passive' dictionaries?'," Lexicographica. Series Major: Symposium on Lexicography V. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1992. 25-40.
- Milroy, James and Milroy, Lesley. "Language in society: Sociolinguistics," An Encyclopedia of Language. Ed. N.E. Collinge, 1990. 485-513.

- Nida, Eugene A. Language Structure and Translation. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975.
- Niedoba, Arlette. Text prepared for the Table ronde sur les marques en lexicographie. Montréal, septembre, 1994.
- Ostiguy, L. and C. Tousignant. Le français québécois: Normes et usages. Montréal: Guérin Universitaire, 1993.
- Peng, Fred C.C. "On the concepts of 'style' and 'register' in sociolinguistics," Language Topics: Essays in honour of Michael Halliday. Ed. R. Steele and T. Threadgold. Vol.2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1987. 261-279.
- Preston, Dennis. "Distinctive Feature Labeling in Dictionaries," Papers of the Dictionary Society of North America. 1977. 78-93.
- Quémada, Bernard. Les dictionnaires du français moderne 1539-1863. Paris: Didier, 1967.
- Quirion, Jean. "How can usage labels better label usage," Connections: Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference of the American Translators Association, November 8-12 1995, Nashville, Tennessee. Ed. P. Krawutschke. Medford (NJ): Information Today, Inc., 1995. 341-349.
- Read, Allen W. "Competing lexicographical traditions in America," The History of Lexicography: Papers from the Dictionary Research Centre Seminar at Exeter, March 1986. Ed. R.R.K. Hartmann. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1986. 197-206.
- Rey, Alain. "Norme et dictionnaires (domaine du français)," La norme linguistique. Ed. E. Bédard and J. Maurais. Gouvernement du Québec, 1983. 541-568.
- Rickard, Peter. "Le «Dictionnaire» franco-anglais de Cotgrave (1611)," Cahiers de l'Association internationale d'études françaises. 35 (1983). 7-22, 267-269.
- Roberts, Roda P. "Marques de registre dans les dictionnaires bilingues," Québec: Office de la langue française, in press.
- . Bilingual Canadian Dictionary: Bilingual Dictionary Methodology for Research Assistants. Version 7. University of Ottawa. May 1996.
- . "Grant proposal for the BCD project". University of Ottawa, 1990.
- Rousseau, Louis-Jean, dir. Les marques lexicographiques. Office de la langue française, Gouvernement du Québec, n.d.

- Smalley, Vera E. The Sources of A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues by Randle Cotgrave. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1948.
- Smith, P.M. "Henri Estienne et Cotgrave," Le Français Moderne. 48 (1980). 246-255.
- Stein, Gabriele. The English Dictionary before Cawdrey. Lexicographica Series Major 9. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985.
- Stubbs, Michael. "Language in Education," An Encyclopedia of Language. Ed. N.E. Collinge. London/New York: Routledge, 1990. 551-589.
- Svénson, Bo. Practical Lexicography. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Thiboutot, Sylvie. Inventaire des pratiques en matière de marques d'usages en France, au Québec et ailleurs. Thesis, Université de Sherbrooke, 1994.
- Tournier, Michel. "Des dictionnaires de 'langue' aux inventaires d'usages," Études de linguistique appliquée. 85-86 (janvier-juin 1992). 53-60.
- Wells, Ronald A. Dictionaries and the Authoritarian Tradition: A Study of English Usage and Lexicography. The Hague: Mouton, 1973.
- Wolk, Anthony. "Linguistic and Social Bias in *The American Heritage Dictionary*," College English. 33 (1972). 930-935.
- Zgusta, Ladislav. Manual of Lexicography. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.
- . Lexicography Today. An annotated bibliography on the theory of lexicography. Lexicographica. Series Major. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1988.
- . "The Role of Dictionaries in the Genesis and Development of the Standard," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 70-79.

2 Dictionaries

- American Heritage Dictionary. 2nd College Edition. Ed. M. Berube. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.
- American Heritage Dictionary. 3rd College Edition. Ed. R. B. Costello. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992.

- Collins Cobuild English Dictionary. 2nd edition. J. Sinclair. London: HarperCollins, 1995.
- Collins English Dictionary. Ed. P. Hanks & al. Glasgow: Collins, 1986.
- Dictionnaire canadien/The Canadian Dictionary. Ed. J. P. Vinay et al. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1962.
- Dictionnaire du français contemporain. Ed. J. Dubois. Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1966.
- Dictionnaire québécois d'aujourd'hui. Ed. J.-C. Boulanger. Saint-Laurent, Québec: Dicorobert, 1993.
- Gage Canadian Dictionary. Ed. W. Avis et al. Toronto: Gage, 1983.
- Grand dictionnaire français-anglais, anglais-français. Ed. F. Carney et al. Paris: Larousse, 1993.
- Harrap's Shorter French-English Dictionary. Ed. J. Goldie et al. Bromley: Harrap, 1991.
- Lexis, Dictionnaire de la langue française. Ed. Jean Dubois et al. Paris: Larousse, 1987.
- Le Nouveau Petit Robert. Ed. A. Rey et J. Rey-Debove. Paris: Robert, 1993.
- Oxford English Dictionary. [CD-ROM]. 2nd edition. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Oxford-Hachette French Dictionary. Ed. M. H. Corrêard et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Le Petit Robert. Ed. A. Rey et J. Rey-Debove. Paris: Robert, 1991.
- Random House Webster's College Dictionary. Ed. R. B. Costello & al. New York: Random House, 1992.
- Robert & Collins Senior, Dictionnaire français-anglais/anglais-français. Ed. A. Duval et al. Paris/London: Le Robert/HarperCollins, 1993.
- Robert & Collins Super Senior, Dictionnaire français-anglais/anglais-français. Ed. A. Duval et al. Paris/London: Le Robert/HarperCollins, 1995.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language. Ed. P. Gove. Boston: Merriam-Webster, 1986.

DICTIONARY INDEX

- American Heritage Dictionary 49-51, 190, 230
 - AH2 50, 54, 55, 61, 68, 70, 75-82, 98, 99, 101-103, 123, 156, 185, 190, 193
 - AH3 51, 54, 55, 70, 75-82, 99, 101-103, 118-121, 190, 193
- Bilingual Canadian Dictionary 2, 5, 73, 94, 123, 229
 - BCD 2, 5, 6, 123-128, 130, 131, 133, 138, 140, 141, 144, 150-154, 156-158, 180, 181, 182-189, 229
- Collins COBUILD 53, 190, 231
 - COCO 53-55, 61, 62, 67-70, 75-78, 80-82, 98, 99, 101-103, 106-108, 118-122, 135, 137, 138, 141, 146, 148, 154, 156, 184-186, 190, 193
- Dictionarie French and English 20
- Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues 21, 230
- Dictionary of the English Language 18, 45, 78, 192, 231
- Dictionnaire canadien 65, 190, 231
 - DC 65-69, 94-97, 104-107, 109, 110, 120, 122, 123, 141, 145-148, 152, 153, 190, 205, 214
- Dictionnaire comique 13
- Dictionnaire des Halles 12
- Dictionnaire du français contemporain
 - DFC 56, 57, 60, 61, 68, 70, 83-89, 100, 102, 103, 106, 107, 109, 135, 136, 141, 187, 190, 199
- Dictionnaire québécois d'aujourd'hui
 - RQ2 59, 60, 68, 69, 87-90, 104-106, 109, 187, 192, 199
- Encyclopédie 14
- English Dictionary 7, 8, 16-18, 20, 30, 190, 230, 231
- Gage Canadian Dictionary 54, 190, 231
 - GAGE 54, 55, 68, 69, 79-82, 104, 105, 132, 133, 135, 139-143, 145-148, 186, 190, 193, 231
- Glossographia 15
- Grand Dictionnaire Larousse 63
 - LAR2 63, 66, 67, 73, 91-95, 97-103, 106, 110, 113, 129, 131, 133-136, 139-144, 146, 148, 151-153, 182, 191, 213, 214
- Harrap's Shorter Dictionary 62
 - HASH 62, 66-68, 73, 91-95, 97-100, 102, 103, 107, 109, 110, 190, 214
- Lesclairssiment de la langue francoyse 20
- Lexis 49, 56, 191, 231
 - LEX 56-58, 60, 70, 83-89, 100-103, 107, 109, 117, 118, 120, 123, 126, 132, 135, 136, 137, 139, 141, 187, 191, 199
- New English Dictionary 17, 18
- New Pocket Dictionary 22
- New World of English Words 15, 17
- Nouveau Petit Robert 2, 58, 191, 231
 - NPR 58-62, 68, 70, 83-90, 100-103, 106, 109, 117, 118, 120, 139, 140, 154, 184, 186, 187, 191, 199

Oxford Hachette 63
OXHA 63, 66, 67, 69, 73, 91-93, 95, 97-100, 102, 103, 106, 110, 111, 113-115, 117,
118-122, 125, 129, 131, 133-136, 139-144, 146-148, 151-153, 156, 163, 182,
191, 205, 214
Petit Robert 2, 57, 58, 191, 231
PR 57-61, 70, 83-89, 100-103, 106, 107, 109, 132, 135, 136, 138, 139, 141, 145, 146,
147, 169, 186, 187, 191, 199
Random House Webster 52, 192, 231
RHWEB 52-55, 69, 70, 75-78, 80-82, 99, 101-103, 106-108, 118, 122, 126, 136, 138,
143, 146, 185, 192, 193
Robert Collins Senior 64
RCS 66, 135, 136, 139, 141, 148, 152, 153, 191
Robert Collins Super Senior 64
RCSS 64-68, 73, 91-95, 97-103, 106, 108, 110-122, 125, 129, 131, 133, 134, 139,
142, 143, 144, 146, 151-153, 182, 191, 205, 214
Royal Dictionary 22
Thesaurus 9, 142
Treasurie of the French Tong 20
Universal Etymological English Dictionary 18

WORD INDEX

- archaic 9, 10, 21, 43, 54, 65, 66, 68, 97, 217
 - arch* 77, 93, 96, 102, 105, 205, 209, 211, 220
- argot 56, 60, 61, 63, 64, 68, 86, 92, 209
 - arg* 57-60, 63, 64, 66, 83-87, 89, 92-94, 102, 103, 107, 109, 117, 139, 140, 152, 186, 199-204, 214-222
- barbarous 16, 17, 19, 21
- channel 36, 37, 45, 48, 68
- combination of labels 74, 77, 81, 84, 88, 93, 96, 101, 104
- consistency 6, 74, 75, 80, 82, 83, 87, 88, 90, 91, 95, 98, 103, 104, 108, 110, 117, 154, 180, 181, 189
- corpus 5, 129, 131-144, 146, 148, 150, 155-158, 163, 175-178, 180, 181, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 189
- cultural level 223, 224
 - cultural levels 31, 43, 46, 49, 228
- derogatory 54, 79-81, 197
- dialect 30, 34, 35, 46-49, 52, 54, 68, 179, 226, 227
 - dialects 26, 28, 29, 32, 224
- dictionary front matter 42, 49, 69
 - dictionary front matters 70, 180
- dictionary prefaces 70, 180
- discrepancy 69, 74, 77, 81, 84, 93, 94, 102, 103, 105, 107, 108, 117, 119-122, 138, 154, 180, 185
- equivalent 63, 64, 94, 110, 113-115, 117, 119-121, 126, 133, 140, 144, 145, 148, 150, 158
 - equivalents 1, 9, 20, 73, 74, 90, 110, 111, 113, 114, 117, 119-122, 126, 133, 137, 138, 140, 142, 146-150, 154, 180
- familier 2, 10, 12, 14, 24, 44, 56-58, 60-64, 67, 68, 125, 184, 226, 228
 - fam* 59, 63, 66, 83-95, 97, 98, 100, 102-109, 111, 112, 114-122, 132-137, 139, 140, 143, 146-148, 152, 153, 185, 187, 199-222
- field 32, 34-38, 40, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52-55, 57, 59, 61-63, 66-68, 71, 75, 79, 85, 91, 99, 105, 109, 112, 124, 142, 179, 180, 195, 209, 223
- fixed language 13, 17
- formal 20, 28-30, 38, 45, 50-55, 64, 65, 68, 76, 77, 97, 108, 113, 125, 131, 142, 158-162, 176-178, 183-185, 193-197, 208, 214
 - fml* 62, 64, 66, 91, 92, 97-100, 105, 112, 113, 122, 141, 142, 152, 153, 182, 206, 208, 211, 212, 217, 218
- formality 27, 30, 40, 46, 68, 69, 131, 160-162, 177, 180, 183, 185, 186, 189
- functional variety 223, 224
 - functional varieties 30, 31, 43, 46, 49, 228
- general dictionaries 1, 3, 4, 10, 13, 15, 50
- geographical 24, 43, 53-55, 66, 68, 78, 124, 223
- hard words 15-17
- informal 2, 10, 38, 43, 47, 49-55, 61, 63, 67, 68, 75, 77, 80, 97, 125, 137-139, 143, 144, 154, 158, 165, 168, 172-174, 176-178, 181, 183, 185-188, 221
 - inf* 66, 75-82, 90-99, 102-109, 111, 112, 114-121, 132, 133, 136, 137, 140, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 152, 153, 181, 182, 185, 186, 193-198, 205-222
- language variation 5, 25-27, 42, 45, 47, 223

language variety 5, 25, 30, 37, 41, 48, 86, 223, 224
 language varieties 3, 5, 26, 27, 34, 43, 46, 51, 58, 63, 227
 langue écrite 56-58, 60, 61, 68, 83, 125, 184, 203
 lexicography 2-5, 7, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, 41-43, 46-49, 69, 73, 107, 128, 156, 179, 180, 182, 183, 189, 223, 225-230
 literary 43, 52-55, 59, 62, 64-68, 76, 77, 108, 125, 158, 161-163, 176, 184, 194-197
 lit 63, 64, 90, 93, 96-99, 102, 105, 108, 109, 112, 118, 121, 122, 131, 151, 153, 163, 182, 205, 208, 209, 211, 212, 215, 216, 218
 littér 58-60, 64, 66, 82-85, 87-89, 91, 100, 105, 108, 111-114, 118, 121, 131, 141, 142, 184, 199-204, 207, 209, 211, 212, 214, 222
 "low" word
 "low" words 11-14
 marque d'usage 57
 marques d'usage 50, 57, 59-61, 226
 marque stylistique
 marques stylistiques 3, 30, 50, 56, 57, 60-62, 226
 mode 12, 32, 34-38, 40, 44-46, 48, 125, 160, 179, 223
 monolingual dictionary 10, 98, 99, 144, 148-151
 monolingual dictionaries 1, 5, 9, 15, 50, 61, 67-70, 73, 80, 82, 84, 87, 88, 98, 101, 106, 107, 108, 110, 117, 119, 120, 122, 126, 131, 132, 136-139, 141-143, 146, 148-151, 153, 180-186, 228
 neologism
 neologisms 11, 12, 21
 niveau de langue 57, 61, 66, 67
 niveaux de langue 3, 30, 44, 47, 50, 56-64, 66, 67
 nonstandard 47, 50, 52-54
 non-standard 8, 31, 51, 54, 55, 61, 62, 67-69, 77, 78, 196
 norm 8, 31, 223, 224
 norme 25, 43, 229
 normes 58, 229
 norms 3, 13, 24, 35, 36, 40, 48
 obsolete 17, 21, 22, 54, 66, 68, 140
 offensive 52-55, 61, 64, 66, 68, 75-77, 79, 80, 92, 93, 98, 102, 103, 115, 117, 118, 138, 144, 152, 153, 175, 178, 193, 194, 197, 198, 205-207, 212, 221
 old-fashioned 53, 54, 62, 66, 68, 77, 93, 97, 102, 118, 146, 153, 193-196, 198, 205, 208, 210, 213, 217, 218, 221
 pejorative 63, 66, 68, 125
 pej 57-60, 62-64, 66, 83, 85, 86, 88, 89, 92, 93, 97, 103, 115, 117, 125, 149, 199, 200, 201, 203-206, 209-212, 214-216, 221, 222
 péjoratif 60, 68
 poetic 23, 25, 43, 52, 54, 64, 162, 184
 poet 43, 57-60, 84, 88, 89, 105, 108, 130, 131, 150, 184, 201, 204
 populaire 2, 9, 56-58, 60-63, 67, 68, 165, 228
 pop 58-60, 66, 83, 85-87, 89, 90, 92, 95, 96, 102, 103, 107, 109, 115, 117, 118, 122, 127, 132, 133, 135-140, 152, 176, 185-188, 199-205, 207, 209, 212, 214, 216, 221
 prescriptive attitude 183

purism 11
 purist 11, 13, 14, 18
 purity 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 23
 regional 7, 20, 26, 31, 39, 50-52, 54, 57, 62, 66, 109
 register 1-7, 18, 24, 26, 29-35, 37-50, 53-55, 60, 61, 63-70, 73, 74, 76, 77, 79-81, 84, 85, 88, 89, 92, 95-98, 100, 106-111, 113, 114, 117, 122-129, 131, 140-143, 147, 148, 150, 154-160, 163-166, 168, 174-177, 179-183, 186-189, 223-227, 229
 register labeling 4-7, 42, 48, 67, 70, 73, 107, 123, 124, 126-128, 155, 156, 176, 179-181, 183, 187, 189
 register labels 2, 5, 7, 43, 44, 54, 55, 60, 66-68, 70, 73, 76, 80, 81, 84, 88, 92, 100, 106, 109, 110, 124-128, 150, 156, 180-183, 186
 situation 1, 8, 25, 28-36, 38-49, 51, 53, 57, 58, 65, 86, 124, 160, 163, 168, 173, 179, 181, 189, 223, 224, 227
 situation types 34, 35, 40
 situational variation 30, 36, 39, 223, 224
 slang 2, 16, 38, 45, 46, 50, 52-55, 62, 63, 66, 68, 75-82, 92-97, 99, 102-105, 107, 109, 118, 119, 127, 133, 140, 144, 145, 148, 153, 163, 185, 186, 193-198, 205, 206, 207-209, 211-213, 221, 226
 social group 8, 25, 28-30, 59, 69, 86
 socio-economic class 27-29
 sociolinguistics 3-5, 26, 27, 39, 41, 48, 179, 225, 228, 229
 soignée 56, 87, 100, 108, 184, 185, 200, 201, 203
 soutenu 44, 57, 58, 64
 soutenue 56, 57, 60, 61, 68, 87, 108, 184, 185, 200, 201
 spoken 20, 21, 24, 41, 53, 54, 56, 68, 77, 194
 standard 8, 9, 13, 14, 18, 22, 25, 31, 37, 49-55, 61, 62, 65, 67-69, 77, 78, 123, 182, 185, 190, 196, 223, 224, 230
 status 3, 38, 46, 47, 50-55, 61, 68, 69, 85, 89, 130, 132, 134, 135, 139, 141, 142, 144, 145, 147
 style 3, 12, 14, 17, 23, 24, 28-30, 37-39, 43, 46-48, 50-56, 59, 61, 62, 64, 66-69, 148, 162, 163, 164, 169, 174, 179, 188, 223, 224, 226, 227, 229
 taboo 10, 14, 18, 19, 23, 24, 63, 66, 68, 69
 temporal 7, 24, 50-52, 54, 57, 59, 61, 65, 66, 68, 109, 223
 tenor 32, 34-38, 40, 44-46, 48, 125, 179, 223, 224
 theoretical lexicography 43, 69
 très familier 44, 56, 60, 63, 64, 68, 125
 très fam 59, 66, 91, 93, 97, 103, 107, 112, 114, 116, 118, 119, 136, 143, 148, 152, 153, 185, 187, 200, 202, 214-222
 usage 3, 5, 7-16, 18-20, 23-25, 30-32, 37, 42, 45-51, 54, 55, 57, 59-61, 69, 77, 78, 124, 125, 126, 156, 176, 179, 184, 185, 189, 196, 223, 224, 226, 227, 229, 230
 usage labels 7, 14, 24, 49, 69, 124, 126, 179, 229
 use-based 33, 43, 47, 49
 use-related varieties of language 56, 57
 user-based 45, 47, 49
 user-related varieties of language 32, 62
 user/use 32, 44
 valeur d'emploi 61
 valeurs d'emploi 59, 60, 179

variant

variants 27-30, 45

very informal 63, 68, 76, 125, 139, 165, 173, 183, 186, 187

very inf 66, 75, 77, 80, 92-95, 102, 107, 111, 112, 115-120, 133, 136, 140, 143, 144,
148, 152, 153, 181, 182, 185, 186, 193, 194, 205-222

vieilli 62, 85-87, 89, 93, 97, 103, 105, 118, 199-204, 206, 208, 210, 211, 213-219

vulgar 9-11, 18, 19, 22, 23, 50, 52, 54, 62, 63, 66, 68, 75, 97, 125, 127, 135, 144, 145, 167,
176, 179, 194, 197, 212

vulg 57-60, 76, 77, 84, 87, 92, 93, 97, 98, 100, 102, 109, 117, 119, 125, 127, 136,
138, 144, 149, 152, 153, 183, 194, 200, 202, 203, 212, 216, 220, 221

written 9, 20, 24, 41, 48, 53, 54, 56, 68, 76, 123, 150, 154, 162, 176, 184, 185, 188, 193,
195, 196, 223