EXAMPLES IN THE BILINGUAL DICTIONARY

by

Michael Toope

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 fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of M.A. in Translation

ISBN 0-612-15769-5

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Acknowledgements

First of all, I owe an enormous debt of gratitude to my thesis director Dr. Roda Roberts. I thank her for giving me the opportunity to learn about the practical side of lexicography through working on the Bilingual Canadian Dictionary (BCD), and for allowing me to conduct all of my research for this thesis at the BCD office. Most importantly, I thank her for all of her patience and encouragement, her valuable advice, and for the immense amount of her own personal time that she spent helping me with this project.

Further, I would like to thank BCD revisors Johanne Blais and Nathalie Occélus for their invaluable help in analyzing French examples, and for their encouragement. Special thanks to Nathalie for translating the abstract of this thesis.

In addition, I thank all my co-workers at the BCD. I chose to write this thesis at the BCD offices because of the cheerful and energetic atmosphere provided by the people who work there. Your encouragement was very helpful to me. I also thank classmate Leslie-Ann Chang for convincing me to enroll in the Masters program, and for being a steady source of support throughout.

Finally, I thank my parents, sister and Monique Caron for their constant love and support throughout this and all my other endeavours.

ABSTRACT

Of all the components of the bilingual dictionary microstructure, examples usually take up more space than all others combined. This means that there is a de facto consensus that examples are essential. However, despite this consensus, existing bilingual dictionaries are inconsistent in their exemplification of lexical items and the current literature in the field does not provide any explanation of this inconsistency. In fact there is no exhaustive or systematic study of examples in bilingual or unilingual lexicography. This thesis attempts to fill this gap. It analyzes several aspects of examples, with special attention to the role they perform in bilingual dictionaries and the importance of their presentation to highlight their functions.

RÉSUMÉ

Parmi les composantes de la microstructure des dictionnaires bilingues, les exemples occupent, de façon générale, plus de place que toutes les autres réunies. C'est dire qu'il existe un consensus de facto à l'effet que les exemples sont essentiels. Toutefois, malgré ce consensus, les dictionnaires bilingues existants font preuve d'un manque de constance dans leur présentation des lexèmes et la littérature actuelle dans le domaine ne fournit aucune explication de ce manque d'uniformité. En fait, il n'existe pas d'étude systématique détaillée des exemples, que ce soit en lexicographie bilingue ou unilingue. La présente thèse tente de combler cette lacune. Elle analyse plusieurs aspects des exemples, en portant une attention particulière au rôle qu'ils jouent dans les dictionnaires bilingues et à l'importance de leur présentation dans la mise en relief de leurs fonctions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Presentation of the topic

Examples — phrases or sentences that show the lemma in context and their translations — are one of the means by which bilingual lexicographers present information about a lemma. The lexicographer may first present information by such means as semantic and grammatical indicators, lists of equivalents in the target language, and typographical symbols that warn the user when a lemma has special stylistic characteristics and when it appears in special syntagmatic structures. Examples reinforce this information by showing how it all works together in a concrete context.

Of all the components of bilingual dictionary microstructure, examples usually take up more space than all others combined. The space allotted to examples constitutes a de facto consensus that they are essential, apart from the literature supporting their use. The enormous amount of space allotted to examples in bilingual dictionaries and consequently, the enormous amount of effort lexicographers expend to find, select, modify, translate, arrange etc. examples leads to one central question: what role do examples perform to justify their ample presence in bilingual dictionaries? In an effort to respond to this question, a number of ancillary issues must also be addressed, such as the form of examples and sub-entries, types of examples, and presentation of examples.

Specific reasons for this study

1 Inconsistencies in the use of examples in existing bilingual dictionaries

One reason for this study is that, despite the general consensus that dictionary examples are very useful, existing bilingual dictionaries are inconsistent in their exemplification of lexical items. This inconsistency manifests itself in several ways. First, there is a discrepancy between the importance attributed to examples by bilingual dictionary prefaces and the large amount of space devoted to them on the one hand, and their actual functions on the other hand. In other words, while it is generally true that bilingual dictionaries give many examples, it is equally true that some of the examples they give do not seem to illustrate anything useful about the lemma. For example, to illustrate the lemma *bellows*, HA[1] gives the example

> **it's bellows to mend with me**
> c'est ma poitrine qui n'est pas solide

This example is an archaic and incomprehensible fixed expression that does not illustrate anything of interest about the lemma *bellows*, nor about how it may be translated.

Second, bilingual dictionaries do not exemplify all lemmas, although it is not always clear why some are exemplified and others are not. For example RCS[2] includes several examples in the entry for *discount*, among them:

> **to give a discount**
> faire une remise

---

[1] Harrap's Standard French and English Dictionary.

[2] Le Robert & Collins Dictionnaire Français-Anglais Anglais-Français Senior.

to buy at a discount
acheter au rabais

However, *rebate*, a synonym for some senses of *discount*, does not have any examples in its entry in RCS. Sometimes, even within the entry for a given lemma some senses are exemplified and others are not. For example, the OXHA[3] entry for *filer* does not illustrate the sense 'suivre'[4] and merely provides a translation equivalent, although it does provide examples for other senses of *filer*.

Third, bilingual dictionaries vary the way examples are arranged and presented from one lemma to another; they highlight some complex lexical items — items such as collocations, compounds and fixed expressions — among the examples, but leave others unmarked. For example, in the entry for *barre*, RCS gives the compound *barre du tribunal* as an unmarked example, but *barre de mesure* is both marked as a compound and placed in the compounds zone of the microstructure.

2 Inadequate literature on examples

The inconsistencies outlined above are not explained in the current literature in the field. There is no exhaustive or systematic study of examples in bilingual or unilingual lexicography. Most of the literature on examples consists of short chapters or articles or, more often, a few pages of a chapter or article. Many of the more in-depth articles deal

---

[3] The Oxford-Hachette French Dictionary.

[4] In fact, HA is the only dictionary to give an example for this sense. OXHA does not include the sense 'suivre'. LAR2, (Grand Dictionnaire Français-Anglais / Anglais-Français) which does include the sense 'suivre', does not illustrate it with an example.

specifically with examples in unilingual dictionaries and the applicability of their claims to bilingual lexicography is not always clear. Some authors' views of what constitutes an example are not shared by others, and these idiosyncratic views of the form of the example do not match the practice evident in current French-English bilingual dictionaries. For example, Zgusta considers that a context word accompanying a TL equivalent constitutes an example, whereas the examples in the bilingual dictionaries studied in this thesis have an SL phrase or sentence and its translation. The literature is also divided on whether collocations, compounds, and fixed expressions are examples.

The literature does suggest that bilingual dictionary examples perform a number of functions. Jacobsen *et al* claim that "examples, if judiciously selected, can demonstrate collocational, stylistic, syntactic, morphological, and cultural features of words and phrases."[5] Al-Kasimi says that "examples can serve to illustrate the semantic range or distribution of a word."[6] Creamer adds that examples help to clarify the meanings of lexical items and thereby act as a supplement to sense indications.[7] Winter suggests that examples help dictionary users to choose among equivalents.[8] However, these statements are generally not well explained. In addition, explanations of the functions of examples are sometimes

---

[5] Jane RosenKilde Jacobsen, James Manley, Viggo Hjørner Pederson, "Examples in the Bilingual Dictionary," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography Vol. 3., ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1989) 2787.

[6] Ali M. Al-Kasimi, Linguistics and Bilingual Dictionaries, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977) 90.

[7] Thomas Creamer, "Beyond the Definition: Some Problems With Examples in Recent Chinese-English and English-Chinese Bilingual Dictionaries." The Dictionary and the Language Learner, ed. Anthony Cowie (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1987) 243.

[8] Christine Winter, "Bilingual Dictionaries: Between Language and Speech," Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics, eds. Pierre J. L. Arnaud and Henri Béjoint (London: Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1992) 47.

complicated by the fact that they are illustrated by examples that have a different form than those studied in this thesis. For example, Jacobsen *et al* discuss a broad range of functions of examples, but they consider examples to be only TL phrases or sentences showing the TL equivalent.

Objectives

On the basis of dictionary analysis as well as analysis of the pertinent lexicographic literature on examples, three objectives emerged for this thesis.

1 Clarification of concepts related to examples

The literature review reveals that many of the concepts that must be dealt with in a study of examples have not been clearly defined: opinion varies greatly from one author to the next. One goal of this study is to define the concepts that are essential to discussion of bilingual dictionary examples. To this end, this study will define key concepts such as the form of examples and sub-entries, and will distinguish between special types of examples such as collocations, compounds and fixed expressions.

2 Functions of examples

Given the importance of examples in dictionary entries in terms of space allocation, it is clear that they are deemed to have a number of functions. While the literature does suggest a number of categories of functions, these functions are not well illustrated. This study will

clearly identify and illustrate the functions of examples, citing examples from existing bilingual dictionaries.

3 Presentation and arrangement of examples

However illustrative examples may be, their value is considerably reduced if users are unable to access them quickly and focus effectively on the information provided. Bilingual dictionaries frequently group all examples for a headword together, leaving the user to sort through them to determine what they illustrate. This study will examine ways of enhancing the presentation and arrangement of examples, paying particular attention to how these aspects can be used to highlight the functions of examples.

Methodology

Analysis, of both the theoretical literature and of examples found in existing bilingual dictionaries, is the primary method of research. This study will synthesize the theoretical claims for examples, and analyze examples that appear in existing bilingual dictionaries to see how well they correspond to the theoretical claims made for them. In addition, the analysis of examples will show that they perform other functions that are not discussed in the theoretical literature.

Presentation of bilingual dictionaries analyzed

The four bilingual (English-French) dictionaries analyzed in this thesis are briefly described below from the points of view of their date of publication, their size, their target

audience, the lexicographic methods used, and their main characteristics. The information presented is based mainly on claims made by each dictionary in it's introduction.

1 Harrap's New Standard French English Dictionary

- Size and date of publication

This four volume dictionary was completed in 1979. The French-English half was published in 1972; the English-French half in 1979. This edition constitutes a major revision of the Heath's Standard French and English Dictionary the French-English part of which was published in 1934 and the English-French part in 1939.

- Target audience

The preface to the 1934-39 edition says that the aim was to help "'everyman' to read, understand, and even translate, his foreign newspaper, from the editorials to the advertisements." The preface to the 1972-79 edition gives no indication of its intended audience and is presumed to be the same.

- Methodology

— The basic nomenclature, entry structure, and translations were provided by the first (1934-39) edition, but modernized in this edition. Modern technical words have been added, as have modern colloquial or idiomatic expressions. Archaic expressions and obscure proper nouns have been deleted.

— The French-English part and English-French part were compiled separately with the latter appearing 7 years after the former.

— The translations used in the French-English part (i.e. the English TL equivalents) were the starting point in establishing an English-French nomenclature, and the French-English entries were reversed to provide the initial translations of the English lemmas.

— The nomenclature was established by studying unilingual dictionaries and reading SL books and periodicals, etc.

• Main features

HA's distinguishing feature is its large nomenclature, established primarily by including a large number of compounds, many of which now seem very technical or otherwise obscure.

HA rarely provides the user with adequate information to help distinguish among the many translations it offers. There are no sense indications and unclear sense divisions. And, while field labels are used for sense discrimination, HA contains too many field labels in obscure technical areas (Locksm = Locksmithery; Husb = Animal Husbandry; Hatm = Hatmaking).

2 Le Robert & Collins Dictionnaire Français-Anglais Anglais-Français Senior

- Size and date of publication

RCS is a one volume collegiate size dictionary published in 1993. It is the 3rd edition of a dictionary published first in 1978, and in second edition in 1987. It adds 40 000 items to the nomenclature of the second edition, particularly in the fields of business, geography, ecology, computing, medicine and the European Community.

- Target audience

Only the first (1978) edition gives a direct indication of the target audience: "those with an academic or professional commitment — teachers at all levels, translators, students of French or English, as the case may be — through business people whose affairs demand an ability to conduct discussion or correspondence in both languages, to the large numbers of people who are interested in the language, literature and culture of the other and know that only the best possible dictionary is a good enough tool."

- Methodology

There is little information available about the methodology used to compile the dictionary.

— The basic nomenclature and microstructure were established in the earlier editions. This edition has added new words, and expands entries for older words to encompass new senses.

— All information provided about the lemma is verified by SL lexicographers, and all translations are verified by TL lexicographers.

• Main features

— RCS provides sense indications, actants, referents, field and register labels, typographical markers separating compounds from other examples, etc, to help the user distinguish among the information given. However, these means of discrimination are applied inconsistently: some entries are very clearly presented, others less so.

— RCS claims to include some items of North American English and Canadian and Belgian French, but the European influence is very evident, in the choice of lemmas and especially in the choice of examples.

3 The Oxford-Hachette French Dictionary : French-English / English-French.

• Size and date of publication

The Oxford-Hachette is a single volume collegiate size dictionary. Its first (and so far only) edition was published in 1994.

- Target audience

The target audiences are native English speakers trying to understand, write or speak French, and native French speakers trying to understand, write or speak English. The dictionary targets both advanced and intermediate users: translators, students at all levels, teachers and business people.

- Methodology

— Lexicographers worked in bilingual pairs: a lexicographer would work only on items in his native language, then pass the item on to his foreign language counterpart for translation. Lexicographers could thus constantly consult with each other to ensure accuracy of translation.

— The dictionary is corpus based: it reflects the usage illustrated in its corpus and all its examples are drawn from the corpus. Translations were verified in the TL corpus.

- Main features

— Only one or two equivalents are listed. Other equivalents are given only in the translations of examples.

— OXHA provides sense indications, actants, referents, field and register labels, typographical markers separating some collocations and fixed expressions from other examples, etc, to help the user distinguish among the information given. However, these means of discrimination are applied inconsistently: some entries are very clearly presented, others less so.

- Most English compounds are given indexed as separate entries, while only hyphenated French compounds are separate entries.
- North American and British English are both represented, and labels are given when a usage is restricted to one region.
- Usage notes are given for classes of words that always appear in similar structures (dates, time, etc.).

4 Larousse: Grand Dictionnaire Français-Anglais / Anglais-Français

- Size and date of publication

LAR2 is a two volume dictionary (one volume for French-English, and one for English-French) published in 1993. The Larousse publishing company has published at least one other bilingual French-English dictionary (a single volume edition in 1981). The 1993 Larousse dictionary studied here does not appear to be a revised edition of its predecessor.

- Target audience

The target users are professional, academic, specialist and non-specialist users of French and English.

- Methodology

No information was available about the methodology used to compile the dictionary.

- Main features

— LAR2 provides sense indications, actants, referents, field and register labels, typographical markers separating some collocations and fixed expressions from other examples, etc, to help the user distinguish amongst the information given.

— North American English, and Swiss, Belgian, and Canadian French items and usage are given, and labels are used when necessary to distinguish regional usage.

Outline

The thesis is divided into six chapters.

Chapter 1: The form, length, types and sources of examples, will discuss different ways of defining the form of examples and will explain why this thesis considers the form of examples to be an SL phrase or sentence and its translation, while other authors define the form of examples differently. It will discuss the relative merits of phrasal and sentence length examples. It will distinguish between two broad categories of examples, free combinations and restricted examples. It will also compare the merits of examples drawn from a corpus with those constructed or modified by a lexicographer.

Chapter 2: General functions of examples, will first explain the difference between explicit statements and examples. It will demonstrate how examples are frequently a necessary reinforcement of the information first presented through explicit statements. The bulk of this chapter will discuss the general functions of examples, primarily free combinations, which are suggested by the literature without being adequately demonstrated.

Here, the semantic, grammatical and stylistic functions of free combinations will be explained through analysis of examples in existing bilingual dictionaries.

Chapter 3: Specific functions, examines both translation and cultural functions of examples. Translation functions involve the ways in which examples help users to select an equivalent. Cultural functions involve the cultural values that may be present in the corpus of examples included in a dictionary, and the problems such cultural values may pose for users.

Chapter 4: Restricted examples, consists of four major sections: 1. sub-entries; 2. collocations; 3. fixed expressions; 4. compounds. Since the term *sub-entry* is frequently used in the literature concerning restricted structures such as collocations, fixed expressions, and compounds, the first part of this chapter will define how it is used in this thesis. The sections on collocations, fixed expressions and compounds will define their formal characteristics, examine their importance to translators, and discuss their presentation.

Chapter 5: The arrangement and number of examples, will first discuss ways of ordering and arranging examples in order to facilitate retrieval of the information they contain. It will then examine how the semantic and grammatical complexity of a lemma and the number of restricted structures in which it appears affect the number of examples that should be given.

Chapter 6: Analysis of Bilingual Canadian Dictionary examples, will analyze examples that have been given in entries for the forthcoming Bilingual Canadian Dictionary (BCD). The analysis will show how difficult the task of selecting, modifying and translating examples can be. Despite the emphasis on careful selection of examples, some BCD examples seem uninformative, or have been incorrectly classified. This chapter will suggest

how they may be altered to render them more useful, or replaced by more informative examples.

There are by two appendices: Appendix 1 will define and explain the categories used to analyze examples in four existing bilingual dictionaries; Appendix 2 will outline the role of corpora in lexicographic analysis. At the end of the thesis is a glossary defining key terms used in the discussion of examples.

I hope that this thesis will not only bring together information on dictionary examples scattered through many publications, but that it will add to the sum total of that information by the analysis it contains of actual dictionary examples.

CHAPTER 1: THE FORM, LENGTH, TYPES AND SOURCES OF EXAMPLES

1.1 TYPICAL FORM OF EXAMPLES FOUND IN FRENCH-ENGLISH BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES

A bilingual dictionary example generally takes one of the two following forms:

1. An example may be a grammatically complete SL sentence that includes the lemma, along with a translation of the whole SL sentence. The following example from the RCS entry for *franchir* demonstrates this form of example:

> **il lui reste 10 mètres à franchir**
> he still has 10 meters to go

2. An example may be a verbal or non-verbal SL phrase that includes the lemma, along with a translation of the whole SL phrase. The following example from the OXHA entry for *franchir* demonstrates an example that is a verbal phrase:

> **franchir un cap difficile**
> to get through a difficult period

The following example from the OXHA entry for *ennemi* demonstrates an example that is a non-verbal phrase:

> **ennemi héréditaire**
> traditional enemy

The two forms of example outlined above are those typically found in four French-English bilingual dictionaries, Le Robert & Collins Dictionnaire Français-Anglais Anglais-Français Senior (1993), the Larousse Grand Dictionnaire Français-Anglais / Anglais-Français (1993), The Oxford-Hachette French Dictionary (1994), and Harrap's Standard French and English Dictionary (1972)[1].

---

[1] Henceforth, Le Robert & Collins Dictionnaire Français-Anglais Anglais-Français Senior Troisième Édition will be referred to with the code RCS, Larousse Grand Dictionnaire Français-Anglais / Anglais-Français with LAR2, The Oxford-Hachette French Dictionary with OXHA, and Harrap's Standard French and English Dictionary with HA. Full bibliographic references for each dictionary are given in the bibliography.

1.1.1 Literature review: form of examples

The forms defined above are so typical of bilingual dictionary examples that they are included in the definition of examples provided by Van Scherrenburg: "an example is any phrase or sentence in the SL that illustrates the use of a single word, compound or idiom, along with its translation."[2] Al-Kasimi provides a similar definition: "any phrase or sentence that illustrates the use of the item defined or translated," that "should be translated into the user's native language."[3] He insists on the importance of translating the examples: if they are not translated "they will become useless or time-consuming because they very probably will contain some other words whose meaning is unknown to the user."[4]

The definitions of examples provided here raise several points. First, both definitions of examples cover not only form, but also function. However, Jacobsen *et al* point out that the function of examples is a complex issue, suggesting that "examples cannot be defined in terms of function" because there is much overlap between the function of examples and explicit information in the dictionary entry. Instead, they insist that first, examples "must be defined formally."[5] Following their suggestion, I will leave the issue of the functions of examples to a later stage and concentrate here primarily on their form.[6]

Second, in both Van Scherrenburg's and Al-Kasimi's definition of example, the SL

---

[2] Daniel Van Scherrenburg, "The Arrangement of Information in the General Bilingual Dictionary," diss., University of Ottawa, 1990, 10.

[3] Al-Kasimi 88 & 96.

[4] Al-Kasimi 96.

[5] Jacobsen *et al* 2784.

[6] In this section, statements on the functions of examples are discussed only where they reveal an author's views on the form of examples.

and TL halves of the example are inseparable. In bilingual lexicography it is not sufficient to refer to the "SL example" or the "TL example" for a given lemma. The SL and TL halves of the example are closely linked functionally, and must be considered to be a unit formally. If the primary focus of the bilingual dictionary is translation, then the primary function of the bilingual dictionary example is to exemplify translation. A definition of the form of an example must logically include both its SL and TL halves.

However, despite the seemingly obvious definition of the form of examples presented above, most definitions of the form of examples that appear in the literature are unclear. Some authors provide vague statements that do not specifically state that the form of the examples must include both an SL phrase or sentence and a TL phrase or sentence. Others give relatively explicit definitions of the form of examples but propose a model that is fundamentally different from the one proposed in this thesis and practised in the aforementioned bilingual dictionaries.

Thomas Creamer, for instance, does not address the subject of the form of examples directly. He states that "the primary use of an example is to demonstrate the use of a word in its natural environment," that "an example can be either a few words, a sentence pattern or a complete sentence," and that one of its functions is "showing various ways the entry can be translated in context."[7] Although he does not explicitly state that the bilingual dictionary example includes both an SL phrase or sentence and a TL phrase or sentence, the examples Creamer uses to illustrate his discussion confirm the fact that examples, for him, do contain both.

---

[7] Creamer 241.

Other authors explicitly state that examples do not include both SL phrases and sentences and TL phrases and sentences. This is because they assume all bilingual dictionaries have their macrostructure and microstructure organized according to either the dominant language of the intended user, or the secondary language of the user. Where examples are concerned this means that either the lemma or the equivalent would be exemplified, but not both. For example, in a dictionary geared for an L1 user for a given language pair L1 and L2, the dictionary user's native language competence would enable her/him to concoct correct sentences and phrases for an L1 lemma or equivalent. The dictionary would provide examples only for the L2 lemma or equivalent. In this type of dictionary, the form of examples, as defined by Carla Marello, would be as follows: "any phrase or sentence that *via mention* illustrates the sense and collocation of the translation(s) of an entry in the L1-L2 section and the use and collocation of the entry in the L2-L1 section."[8] However, there is a distinct difference between what Marello says an example should look like and what she observed in her study of Italian bilingual dictionaries. The following dictionary entry cited by Marello clearly shows SL phrases and sentences completely translated into TL phrases and sentences:

> **colazione** *f.* **1** *(del mattino)* breakfast: **una c. all'italiana e una all'inglese,** a continental breakfast and an English one **2** *(di mezzogiorno)* lunch; luncheon: **Vieni a c. domani,** come to lunch tomorrow; **la c. offerta dall'ambasciatore,** the luncheon offered by the ambassador. • **c. affrettata,** quick lunch ; **c. alla forchetta** (stand-up) buffet lunch ; **c. di lavoro,** working luncheon ; **c. sull'erba,** picnic ; **fare c.** *(la prima)* to have breakfast, to breakfast; *(a mezzogiorno)* to have lunch, to lunch

[8] Carla Marello, "Examples in Contemporary Italian Bilingual Dictionaries" The Dictionary and the Language Learner, ed. Anthony Cowie (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1987) 226.

Marello concluded that in the seven dictionaries she studied

> true examples are always translated into the target language. Compound words are sometimes and only partially (and very differently) translated...Pure idioms and proverbs are, if possible, translated.[9]

Marello finally proposes a model entry that is arranged according to the Van Dale model.[10] The examples in this model entry for the verb *to answer* clearly have both SL phrases and sentences and their translations:

> 1.1 to answer the bell, door, letter, the phone *rispondere al campanello, alla porta, a una lettera, al telefono;* to answer a blow with a blow *ribatterre colpo su colpo;* to answer (to) the helm *ubbidire al timone, sentire il timone;* this ship wouldn't answer her rudder *la nave non rispondeva al timone;* answering machine *segreteria telefonica*[11]

This model entry appears to contradict Marello's initial definition of the form of an example.

Ladislav Zgusta also recommends a form of exemplification that differs from the one proposed in this thesis. Zgusta believes that, in the bilingual dictionary, an example may consist of an actant that accompanies the TL equivalent. For the entry "[Chin.] *shen-ju,* [Eng.] *to soak (through), to penetrate* (eg. liquids, capital)," Zgusta considers the actant "capital" to

---

[9] Marello 235.

[10] The "Van Dale" series of Dutch bilingual dictionaries incorporates a radically different microstructure from that common to the French-English bilingual dictionaries studied in this thesis. To a large extent, grammatical relationships between the lemma and other elements determine the presentation. Kromann *et al* describe the Van Dale microstructure as follows: "In the dictionary entries the way each lemma combines with lexical units of other parts of speech is systematically reflected. [...] The structure of the [verb] entry looks fairly typical at first glance : I stands for intransitive, II for transitive and III for reflexive, but the structure within each of these categories is determined by a strictly grammatical principle according to which the figure 1.0 indicates the ability to combine with substantives, 2.0 with adjectives, 3.0 with verbs, 4.0 with pronouns, 5.0 with adverbs, 6.0 with prepositions, etc. The digit after the point in the code refers to the meaning number." Hans Peder Kromann, Theis Riiber, Poul Rosbach, "Grammatical Constructions in the Bilingual Dictionary," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography Vol. 3, ed F.J. Hausmann, (Berlin, Walter De Gruyter, 1989) 2771.

[11] Marello 233.

be an example. However, "liquids" is not. He explains the difference between them in the following way:

> The word liquids can be considered a gloss without any further discussion: it is used here as an abstraction, as the hyperonym of all designations of different liquids; the word *liquid* itself will occur only rarely in a concrete context. But on the other hand, the word *capital* is much more concrete, because it does not seem to have hyponyms: therefore it could be considered an *example* of context, exemplifying a case of a typical combination of words in which the English equivalent can occur.[12]

For Zgusta, such examples should appear only in the TL, since "the gloss should be given in the language familiar to the user, the example naturally in the language foreign to him."[13] However, the "language foreign to" the user could be either the SL or the TL, and Zgusta admits there is considerable overlap between his formal categories of "gloss" and "example". The issue of whether an actant is considered a gloss or example is determined by the dictionary user's first language. Zgusta explains, using the following dictionary entry:

> [Eng.] *to realize,* [Fr.] (1) a) *réaliser* (un projet, une espérance); b) *convertir* (des biens), *en espèces, réaliser* (un placement), *liquider* (sa fortune), *mobiliser* (une indemnité); c) *réaliser* (des bénéfices), *gagner* (une fortune)..., etc.
>
> The French words in the parentheses can be considered either glosses (if it is a dictionary intended for Frenchmen) or examples (if the dictionary intends to help Englishmen to produce French sentences)... if it is an example, it tells the Englishman: in contexts where French *projet* occurs, French *réaliser* has a meaning equivalent to Eng. *to realize*, and can be used as its translation.[14]

---

[12] Ladislav Zgusta, Manual of Lexicography, (The Hague: Mouton, 1971) 336.

[13] Zgusta 337.

[14] Zgusta 337.

The rather tenuous distinction that Zgusta establishes between gloss and example is based on his analysis of an existing bilingual dictionary.[15] However, when he goes on to discuss how exemplification may appear in a hypothetical bilingual dictionary he discusses only examples proper (i.e. not actants or glosses).

In "a dictionary designed to help the user to produce sentences in the (foreign) target language," (i.e. an L1-L2 dictionary) Zgusta says the examples should be "typical, free combinations."[16] What Zgusta calls multiword lexical units and idiomatic expressions are not considered examples in such a dictionary, since they "will frequently have their own lexical equivalents [...] and will be indicated in their respective entries."[17] In other words, Zgusta suggests that in an L1-L2 dictionary, multiword lexical units and idiomatic expressions may be presented as separate entries in the dictionary and not as examples within an entry for one of their component lexical items.

On the other hand, in "a dictionary designed to help the user comprehend texts in the source language" (an L2-L1 dictionary) Zgusta suggests that multiword lexical units and idiomatic expressions may be presented differently: as lemmas provided with their own entry, or as sub-entries under one of their component lexical items. Zgusta provides the following explanation for this difference in treatment:

> It is probably not necessary to discuss in detail that a designative lexical group like Russ. *zeleznaja doroga* [...] will have [as] its Eng. equivalent *railway*, irrespective of whether it is treated in an entry of its own or in a subentry located within the entry of either of the words, or both.[18]

---

[15] Zgusta drew his example for *to realize* from HA.

[16] These include some of what are considered compounds in this thesis—those that are not one-word or hyphenated.

[17] Zgusta 337.

[18] Zgusta 338.

While Zgusta claims that multiword lexical units and idiomatic expressions placed within the entry for one of their constituent components are really sub-entries and therefore not examples, on the other hand he suggests that examples should show "both free combinations... and set ones."[19] However, he feels that the latter, given their nature, do not need to be presented in the form of a full sentence, for their meaning "should be dealt with by equivalents and by the apparatus of glosses, etc."[20]

Jacobsen *et al* propose a form of exemplification similar to the actant type described by Zgusta for passive or decoding dictionaries:[21]

> *Passive* or *decoding* dictionaries, since they go from the foreign language to the language of the user, either do not need examples at all in our sense,[22] or in some cases need a rather more subtle kind of example — a type whose function is more difficult to describe.[23]

---

[19] Zgusta employs the term *free combination* for any combination of words in which the meaning of the combination is absolutely derivable from the meanings of its component lexical items.

Zgusta employs the term *set combination* as a generic term to designate what he further classifies as *multiword lexical units*, *set or idiomatic expressions* and *set groups of words*.

Zgusta's category of multiword lexical units includes such combinations as *Good day!*, *so as to*, *old girl*, *sea angel*, *guinea pig*, *cold feet*, *black market*, *pomme de terre*, *give up*, *elementary school*, *revenir à ses moutons*. These multiword lexical units have referential meaning. Some of these combinations, such as *black market* and *pomme de terre* demonstrate what are considered compounds in this thesis, but are not compounds according to Zgusta's own narrow definition of compounds. For Zgusta, compounds belong to the morphological sphere and are distinct from multiword lexical units. In Zgusta's terms, compounds have specific orthographic features; they are orthographically single words or hyphenated.

Zgusta's category of set or idiomatic expressions includes such expressions as *to drop a brick*, but also some of the combinations included under the category of multiword lexical units such as *cold feet*, *give up* and *revenir à ses moutons*. These combinations share one characteristic: they have figurative meanings. Set groups of words includes proverbs and sayings and literary quotations.

It is unclear whether Zgusta believes the above items dô in fact or do not constitute examples.

[20] Zgusta 338.

[21] According to them, *active* dictionaries, which they prefer to call *encoding* dictionaries as they go from the language of the user to the foreign language, "do not need exemplification of SL lemmas and sub-lemmas, since the competent dictionary user may be supposed to be able to furnish such examples himself." Jacobsen *et al* 2786.

[22] For them only free combinations seem to constitute "true" examples.

[23] Jacobsen *et al* 2786.

The type of exemplification that Jacobsen *et al* then outline is similar to SL actants for the lemma:

> As an illustration, consider the following... "**cross**[...]gå over (fx *the street, a bridge, the frontier);* [...]" Superficially, the examples here seem to be illustrating the headword. Does this invalidate our definition of *example* as a supplement to the equivalent? In terms of sheer physical position in the entry, obviously not, since this placing could be an arbitrary decision. The essential point is that the examples do not primarily illustrate the "use" of the headword. They are there to show *in what circumstances* the headword may be translated by the equivalent *gå over*. They are thus still essentially supplementary to the equivalent.[24]

While both Zgusta and Jacobsen *et al* view actants as examples, there is a difference between them: Zgusta considers actants for the TL equivalent to be examples, whereas Jacobsen *et al* consider actants for the SL lemma to be examples. Jacobsen *et al* do not propose that examples consist only of actants, they merely prefer such brief examples: "there is no need to give a whole sentence where a brief phrase (or a single collocable word) will do."[25]

The above literature review shows that there is a variety of opinion on what form examples may take. First, examples may be SL sentences or phrases together with their translation. This first model, suggested by Van Scherrenburg, Al-Kasimi and Creamer, is the one practised in the most recent bilingual dictionaries for the language pair French and English. According to the second model,[26] proposed by Marello, examples are phrases or sentences that illustrate only collocations. In contrast to the first model, Marello restricts the content and function of the example. Another difference in Marello's theoretical model,

---

[24] Jacobsen *et al* 2786.

[25] Jacobsen *et al* 2788.

[26] The second and third models assume an orientation of the dictionary macrostructure and microstructure according to the dominant or second language of the user.

although not in her practical model, is that she would present examples in only one language: the language of the equivalent in the L1-L2 section, and the language of the lemma in the L2-L1 section. The third model, suggested by Zgusta and Jacobsen *et al*, recommends examples in the form of actants. Jacobsen and Zgusta differ from each other in that Jacobsen *et al* would provide actants as examples only for the equivalent, whereas Zgusta would provide actants as examples only for the lemma.

1.1.2 Definition of the form of examples used in this thesis

Model 1, which is used by the bilingual French-English dictionaries mentioned earlier, has the merit of simultaneously serving the needs of both an L1 and an L2 user. Whether the user is decoding or translating from L1 to L2 or from L2 to L1, the lexical item that is sought by the user will always be fully exemplified. Therefore, this is the model that I have adopted for the purposes of this thesis. In other words, an example here is always considered to be an SL phrase or sentence and its translation.

1.2 LENGTH OF EXAMPLES

Despite the various differences of opinion between lexicographers concerning the form that examples should take, the preceding literature review demonstrates a certain consensus that examples may be either phrases or complete sentences. However, it is not clear why lexicographers sometimes choose phrase examples over those that are complete sentences, and vice versa. For example, for the transitive verb *to work* RCS illustrates the sense "manoeuvre" with the following complete sentence:

he worked the rope gradually through the hole
il est petit à petit arrivé à faire passer la corde dans le trou

OXHA on the other hand, illustrates the same sense of *to work* with a verbal phrase that is accompanied by SL actants:

to work sth into
introduire qch dans [*slot, hole*]

In addition, both phrasal examples and complete sentences are often used to illustrate the same sense of a lemma within a single entry. For example, for the verb *courir*, OXHA illustrates the sense "se presser" with the following examples, the first of which is a complete sentence, and the second a verbal phrase:

elle court sans arrêt
she's always rushing about,
she's always on the go

en courant
hastily, in a rush

1.2.1 Literature review: length of examples

There is little information on the relative merits of phrase-length and complete sentence examples in the literature on bilingual lexicography. For the most part, lexicographers merely describe the length of examples they find in existing dictionaries. For example, Winter finds that "most of the time, examples in bilingual dictionaries are not even entire or well-formed sentences but just noun or verb phrases. The headword is sometimes inserted into a minimal context that suggests a specific meaning."[27] However, she does not

[27] Winter 46-47.

discuss the issue of whether phrasal examples or sentence examples are better.

Meyer would include sentence length examples, or even multiple sentence examples in her prototype explanatory-combinatory bilingual dictionary: "the Examples Zone provides examples, generally in the form of one or more sentences, illustrating the meaning and collocations of the lexeme in question."[28] Yet the advantages of such long examples over phrases that also show meaning and collocation are unclear.

Jacobsen *et al* are slightly more prescriptive than other lexicographers on the subject of the length of examples. They say that "for reasons of space, examples should be as few, as brief and as illustrative as possible" and that "there is no need to give a whole sentence where a brief phrase (or a single collocable word) will do."[29] However, they do admit that often more than a micro-context is needed if an example is meant to illustrate a feature at sentence level or above, although they do not specify what features must be illustrated at a sentence level.

Zgusta also seems to prefer shorter examples, though he does not preclude the use of sentence-length examples. He links the issue of the length of examples to that of the size of the dictionary: a larger dictionary may include longer examples. The source of examples also plays a role in determining their length. If the lexicographer constructs the examples based on his or her own knowledge and that of informants, then the examples should be "very short, for example, only the verb — its object, the adjective with the substantive or vice

---

[28] Ingrid Meyer, "Towards a New Type of General Bilingual Dictionary," diss., University of Montreal, 1986, 191.

[29] Jacobsen *et al* 2787-2788.

versa."[30] Zgusta gives some examples of typical constructed examples: for *incipient*: *incipient decay*; for *signal*: *signal victory, defeat*. On the other hand, corpus examples may be kept in the form of complete sentences if it is the "policy of the dictionary to quote sentences which are grammatically complete."[31] Nevertheless, Zgusta recommends that examples that are drawn from a corpus should be edited to remove extraneous information, and Zgusta implies that they may be reduced all the way down to "a verb and its object" for example, because "even the shortest exemplification [...] is very useful."[32]

Zgusta acknowledges that it is "sometimes difficult to quote the example in a short general form; in such a case an example can have a less general form."[33] The less general form would presumably include sentences. However, Zgusta warns that

> this does not mean that sentences should be freely quoted as examples if it please the lexicographer. Quite apart from the consideration of space, it should be understoood that a sentence is always too strongly over-specific; much of its content is irrelevant to the matter at hand [...] By this over-specificity, the sentence, or a long, sentence-like example, suggest [sic] somehow a restricted validity of what is exemplified. The lexicographer should, therefore, try to exemplify generally valid phenomena by short contexts.[34]

He suggests two criteria for determining whether to use phrasal or sentence examples. First, phrasal examples may be adequate for demonstrating typical objects of verbs or the adjectives that commonly co-occur with nouns and vice-versa. Second, complete sentences may be permissible in large dictionaries where space is not at a premium, and when the dictionary

---

[30] Zgusta 267.

[31] Zgusta 265.

[32] Zgusta 265. The issue of sources of examples will be dealt with in depth in another section.

[33] Zgusta 342.

[34] Zgusta 342.

has a policy of using complete sentences. However, Zgusta clearly feels that phrases are superior to sentences on the grounds that sentences contain too much information that is specific to one particular sentence and therefore do not help the user to generalize to other possible constructions with the lemma.

Kharma, on the other hand, is explicit about the advantages of sentence length examples: "the use of 'full sentences' rather than phrases or sentence fragments is vital, because only in complete sentences can the grammatical information provided about the lexical item be of any use at all."[35] But Kharma does not illustrate this statement with a demonstration of how sentence examples are so advantageous compared to phrasal examples. Moreover, Kharma's statement comes in the context of a discussion of a bilingual learner's dictionary and therefore its relevance to this discussion of examples in general bilingual dictionaries must be considered carefully. For example, phrasal examples may not be sufficiently explicit for second language learners who may need the extra information — such as a subject, setting etc. — contained in sentence length examples in order to understand them. Indeed, Zöfgen suggests that this extra information is precisely what bilingual learners' dictionaries must provide, if the grammatical, collocational and other elements the lexicographer is trying to exemplify are to be made clear to the user. Zöfgen says that in bilingual learners' dictionaries

[35] Nayef N. Kharma, "Contextualization and the Bilingual Learner's Dictionary", LEXeter '83 Proceedings, ed. R.R.K. Hartmann (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984) 200.

> "patterns", which guide in the generation of sentences, need to be rounded out by implicit information about the proper use of a word; this should be accomplished with example sentences (and their complete translation into the foreign language). Examples should be chosen so as to enable the learner both to recognize grammatical usage and to situate the item in a context which highlights particular problems of its contextualization and of its pragmatic effect. As this type of dictionary is concerned with what is common to all speakers of a language, the examples ought to present the information in contexts of activity which illustrate use in the commonest types of everyday situations. In this sense they are prototypes of current language use.[36]

The very reasons that make sentence length examples valuable in bilingual learners' dictionaries also render them valuable to the users of general bilingual dictionaries. Although users of general bilingual dictionaries may be assumed to be more knowledgeable about their second language than learners, and therefore may be better able to grasp the elements implicit in a phrasal example, exemplification in complete sentences could be a welcome reinforcement of their intuition. While grammatical usage, and "problems of contextualization" and "pragmatic effect" do not necessarily pose the same difficulties for general bilingual dictionary users as they might for users of bilingual learners' dictionaries, they remain important issues that sentence length examples may be able to address more adequately than phrasal examples.

If there is little information on the relative merits of phrase and sentence examples in the literature on bilingual lexicography, the same is true of the literature on unilingual lexicography. Martin, like Zgusta, links the length of examples to their source, and he also

---

[36] Ekkehard Zöfgen, "Bilingual Learners' Dictionaries," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography Vol. 3, ed. F. J. Hausmann *et al* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989) 2898.

suggests that corpus sentences exemplifying a lemma may be heavily edited, for example, down to a verb and its object.[37]

Fox does not seem to be in favor of such short examples, but, like Zgusta, she sees problems with complete sentence examples: they often give the impression of being unnatural constructions because they are crammed full of information that would not normally appear in a single sentence. Fox says that

> one reason why dictionaries have not in the past helped learners to use natural language is that most of the examples given have been full sentences, prepared for being presented in isolation rather than being thought of as extracts from a text. For a sentence that is being looked at in isolation to make sense, it has to contain much more information than you are likely to find in real language where sentences do not occur alone but come before or after other sentences, and so are a small part of a longer text. A sentence which is being used in isolation, then, usually has no loose ends and is completely fleshed out, so that readers are left in no doubt as to exactly what is meant. This means that there must be a specified subject, which, if human, probably does something to someone for a reason.[38]

However, such "packed" sentences are, according to her, unnatural and would not fit into coherent text. Yet, more natural (i.e. less "packed") sentences may not be specific enough. She illustrates this point with the example sentence *The teacher used to cane me when I behaved badly*. Fox says "it is very unlikely that this would be the first sentence in a text — it plunges too quickly into its theme, and leaves the readers puzzled. Who is the teacher? Why are we hearing about the speaker's schooldays?"[39] In other words, for this example to

---

[37] Robert Martin, "L'exemple lexicographique dans le dictionnaire monolingue," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography Vol. 1, ed. F. J. Hausmann *et al* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989) 600.

[38] Gwyneth Fox, "The Case for Examples," Looking Up, ed. J. M. Sinclair (London: Collins, 1987) 141.

[39] Fox 141.

be coherent, it would need to be preceded by a sentence such as *Have I ever told you how unhappy I was at school?* and followed by other remarks. While Fox clearly brings out the problems of sentence examples, she does not, however, negate their utility. Indeed, most examples in the Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary,[40] the dictionary project that Fox was editor for, are in fact complete sentences, despite their drawbacks.

Fox's complaints about the 'unnaturalness' of some sentence length examples are addressed by Cowie. He says that

> largely for reasons of economy, most examples are isolated and self-sufficient phrases and sentences. The key word here is "self-sufficient". Whereas naturally occurring sentences often only reveal their full meaning by reference to some wider context, the dictionary example cannot usually afford to look outside itself for complete elucidation.[41]

In other words, dictionary examples are inherently unnatural because they appear in isolation. The lexicographer must therefore select examples carefully to ensure they are not too detailed and therefore too unnatural to be of use to the user. Cowie as well as Laufer[42] suggests that complete sentence examples have the advantage of being able to perform several functions simultaneously. Cowie says "the advantage of full-sentence examples is that they can be used to illustrate grammatical patterning and to provide sufficient context for meaning and stylistic

---

[40] Hereafter, this dictionary is referred to with the code COCO. A full reference is given in the bibliography.

[41] A.P. Cowie, "The Language of Examples in English Learners' Dictionaries," Lexicographers and their Works, ed. R.R.K. Hartmann (University of Exeter, 1989) 59.

[42] Laufer feels that "a correct and natural use of a word in a sentence [...] will necessarily bring out the grammatical, pragmatic and collocational characteristics of the word." Batia Laufer, "Corpus-Based versus Lexicographer Examples in Comprehension and Production of New Words", Euralex 92 Proceedings I-II, Part I, ed. Tarja Salini-Talonen, (Tampere: Studia Translatologica, 1992) 72.

level to be clearly established."[43] However, unlike Laufer who feels that occasionally more than one sentence may need to be used for exemplification, Cowie concludes that "the need for economy of statement" obliges lexicographers "to take the sentence as the standard illustrative unit," and "meaning and pattern must be established within those modest limits."[44]

While clearly in favor of sentence length examples, Cowie points out that phrases may also be multi-functional: "whether they opt for sentences or short phrases, editors will generally have to take account of more than one function at a time."[45] He further suggests that phrasal examples may be useful for illustrating collocations. Phrasal examples would list "nouns or verbs to illustrate limited collocability" of a lemma.[46] Cowie demonstrates this type of phrasal example with an example from the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary[47] (the collocation is underlined): for the lemma *book*, keep/make/open a book (on sth). i.e. to take bets (on a match, race, etc.).

1.2.2 When to use phrase and sentence examples

This review of the lexicography literature on the relative merits of phrase and sentence examples does not reveal any clear conclusions about when each is most appropriate, but some trends do emerge.

---

[43] Cowie, "Language of Examples" 57.

[44] Cowie, "Language of Examples," 63.

[45] Cowie, "Language of Examples" 57.

[46] Cowie, "Language of Examples" 63.

[47] A full reference for this dictionary is given in the bibliography.

1 Phrasal examples

Phrases are sufficient to show which lexical items commonly co-occur with the lemma in question: for instance, the typical direct objects of verb lemmas *(déménager - meubles)*, and common adjectives used with nouns *(jeune fille)*. Some suggest that corpus examples should be edited of all other information to show such common combinations. In addition, some believe that collocations are best illustrated in phrase form; the restricted nature of the collocation may be obscured by extraneous information if it is given within a complete sentence.

2 Sentence examples

Several authors feel that sentence examples have the merit of performing several functions at once, although one notes that phrasal examples may also be multi-functional. Sentences can simultaneously show grammatical, semantic, and stylistic elements and provide models of how a lemma or equivalent may be properly integrated into a natural construction.

Al-Kasimi provides perhaps the most useful statement on the length of examples: He says that examples "should be brief and informative."[48] By informative he means "they should really illustrate the use of the word and enhance the user's understanding of its grammatical behaviour, semantic range, stylistic affiliations, or all of these."[49] The key element of Al-Kasimi's statement is the juxtaposition of "brief" and "informative." In other

[48] Al-Kasimi 96.

[49] Al-Kasimi 96.

words, there is no absolute rule about the proper length of examples. The proper length is that which is needed to illustrate one or several elements of a lemma. For some elements of some lemmas, sentences and, on rare occasions, even multiple sentences may be required. For others, phrases will suffice. Lexicographers should strive for short examples, primarily phrases, heeding Zgusta's warning that long examples can be over-specific and that this extraneous information may distract the user from the useful information they contain. However, sentence length — or longer — examples can be used when an element of a lemma cannot be adequately illustrated in a phrase.

1.2.3 Limitations of phrases and sentences

But is a single, isolated phrase or sentence really able to illustrate anything useful about a lemma or equivalent? For translators, the utility of dictionary examples in this form is open to appraisal because translators rarely translate phrases or sentences in isolation. In addition, it is unlikely that a dictionary example would closely match a phrase or sentence that appears in a text to be translated.[50] These issues raise two important questions which may be addressed from the perspective of translation theory. The first question concerns comprehension: how do translators analyze the meaning of an SL phrase or sentence? The second question concerns translation: what is the basic unit of translation?

---

[50] Here I am talking about free combinations, because restricted examples — collocations, fixed expressions and compounds — will frequently occur in any text to be translated and will often require dictionary searches because they function as a unit and therefore cannot be analyzed componentially. These will be more closely examined in a later chapter.

1.2.4 Phrases and sentences and comprehension

Some translation theorists feel that, within the body of a text, an individual sentence does not function as an independent unit. Instead, its meaning and function in text is contingent upon what precedes and follows that sentence, and also upon a number of extralinguistic factors. Jean Delisle claims that "the translator analyzes discourse, not just words or sentences"[51] and that "words and sentences are always open to interpretation according to the situational parameters that define the communicative situation; they take on an additional dimension."[52] In other words, Delisle feels that the meaning of a lexical item when it is used in a text is determined by a number of factors that are external to the individual sentence in which it appears.

Peter Newmark accepts the precepts of the interpretive approach to translation put forward by Delisle, but he seems to suggest that this approach is only one of several useful techniques. He feels that discourse analysis involves mostly analysis of the "connections between sentences."[53] He explains that "if the connections are explicit, there is no problem," and discourse analysis comes into play only when the translator needs to fill in the "logical gaps, the missing verbs or noun-case implications which can be discovered only considering the previous or subsequent sentences." He feels that "discourse analysis may be mainly an essential point of reference for (a) establishing the significance of all connectives

---

[51] Jean Delisle, Translation: An Interpretive Approach, trans. Patricia Logan and Monica Creery (University of Ottawa Press: 1988) 51.

[52] Delisle 56.

[53] Peter Newmark, Approaches to Translation, (Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd., 1988) 32. All subsequent citations in this paragraph are from this same page.

including pronouns, and (b) clarifying semantically undetermined expressions." In most other cases, the sentence can suffice for comprehension.

While Delisle seems to suggest that an individual sentence is not the basic unit of comprehension, and while Newmark implies that it is, Maurice Pergnier suggests that the sentence is in fact the basic unit for comprehension. He says that

> la phrase opère dans l'ensemble de son texte un découpage regroupant certains éléments sémantiques entre eux, et les séparant d'autres éléments sémantiques qui constitueront d'autres phrases.[54]

1.2.5 Phrases and sentences and translation

Is the sentence then the basic unit of translation as well? There has been much debate on this question. On the one hand, Vinay and Darbelnet's "unité de traduction" was more or less limited to the phrase level.[55] On the other hand, Delisle considers that

> equivalences established on a word-for-word or on a sentence-for-sentence basis are the product of a strictly linguistic analysis (a transcoding operation); those that arise from the dynamics of discourse are the product of interpretation (a translating operation).[56]

Since "semantic transfer between languages" works best when it transfers "the meaning of the message in a given context,"[57] Delisle suggests that a single sentence in isolation (such

---

[54] Maurice Pergnier, Les fondements sociolinguistiques de la traduction 2e édition, (Paris, Diffusion Librairie Honoré Champion, 1980) 148-149.

[55] J.P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet, Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: Méthode de traduction, (Montréal: Beauchemin, 1973). In their glossary (p. 16), Vinay & Darbelnet define "unité de traduction" as "le plus petit segment de l'énoncé dont la cohésion des signes est telle qu'ils ne doivent pas être traduits séparément: ex.: "prendre son élan", "demain en huit", "battre à coups précipités". A more detailed discussion of "unité de traduction", with further examples, starts on p. 36 of Stylistique comparée.

[56] Delisle 52.

[57] Delisle 47.

as a bilingual dictionary example) cannot be adequately translated. Finally, Newmark asserts that "discourse analysis may be only a marginal aspect of translation theory since the sentence is usually the basic translation unit, and often has a coherent appropriate meaning."[58] Newmark describes the minimum and maximum translation units for different types of texts as follows: expressive texts (literature and authoritative texts, for example) have a small unit of translation, ranging from a minimum length of a word up to a maximum length of a collocation; informative texts (scientific and technical reports and textbooks, for example) have a medium unit of translation, ranging from a collocation up to a sentence; only vocative texts (polemical writing, publicity, notices, laws and regulations, propaganda and popular literature, for example) have larger units of translation, ranging from a paragraph up to the whole text.[59] Newmark's comments suggest that phrases and sentences may indeed be adequate for most translation purposes.

The lack of consensus about basic units of comprehension and translation revealed above points to some of the limitations implicit in the use of phrases and sentences to illustrate elements of lemmas and their translations. However these limitations do not negate the utility of dictionary examples. The lexicographer must simply take care not to select ambiguous examples that would require a larger context for clarification. In fact, while the larger context is sometimes useful to clarify the specific semantic nuance of a lexical item in a given context, most often, the lexical item's meaning can be discerned from a simple

---

[58] Newmark 32.

[59] Newmark 15.

phrase or sentence.[60] Furthermore, meaning is only one element of lemmas and equivalents that examples illustrate. However, the lexicographer must be prepared to give longer examples when these are deemed necessary, as in the case of connectives, whose function can only become clear when more than a single sentence is involved.

1.3 TYPES OF EXAMPLES

So far, dictionary examples have been considered according to their form and length as sentences or phrases. However, examples can also be divided into two broad types on the basis of their characteristics.

1.3.1 Free combinations and restricted examples

Dictionary examples may be classified as either free combinations or restricted examples. As their designations suggest, free combinations and restricted examples are to a certain extent opposing concepts and one cannot be fully defined without contrasting it with the other. The following paragraphs will outline the formal characteristics of free combinations, and will then define some characteristics common to all categories of restricted examples.

---

[60] For example, BCD lexicographic research assistants analyze one line (64 character) contexts drawn from a corpus prior to preparation of a dictionary entry. For most lemmas, they are usually able to match such short contexts with senses of the lemma for all but a very few contexts.

1.3.2 Characteristics of free combinations

Zgusta describes free combinations as groups of words that are "combined in a meaningful way in sentences according to the communicative intention of the speaker; these combinations may vary from one sentence to another, just as the speaker's communicative intention varies, too."[61] He adds that they are "created by the speaker *ad hoc*, on the spur of the moment, for the purpose of the statement he just intends to utter."[62] The semantic characteristics of free combinations are what distinguishes them most clearly from restricted examples: "their meaning is absolutely derivable from the meaning of the single combined words."[63] Their function in larger units of text also distinguishes them from restricted examples: "they cannot be considered to be wholes (or units), or to be members of the system of language as wholes (i.e. as complex units), because they are elicited only by the concrete necessity of what the speaker intends to actually say."[64] In other words, a free combination is unlikely to frequently recur in a corpus of text because it is constructed to fill the needs of a specific communication situation.[65] Some additional formal characteristics can be added to this list: free combinations allow the substitution of any of their components: *let's go for a walk — let's go for a beer*; a change in the order of their components: *for supper on Thursday we had steak - on Thursday we had steak for supper*; the subtraction of

---

[61] Zgusta 140.

[62] Zgusta 140.

[63] Zgusta 140.

[64] Zgusta 140.

[65] In contrast, a restricted construction will usually recur in a corpus with greater frequency than any given free combination.

one or more components: *Jack plays squash with Peter every Thursday — Jack plays squash with Peter*; and the addition of other components: *we are going shopping — we are going shopping before we go to the movie*. While such reconfigurations of the structure of free combinations will frequently change their meaning, they will not change their idiomaticity, nor their grammaticality.[66]

Zgusta identifies two common types of free combinations. First, there are attributive free combinations, usually noun + adjective combinations or verb + adverb or adverbial clause combinations as follows: for the noun *wet: wet sand, wet feet;* for *sand: dry sand, yellow sand;* for *speak: speak quietly, speak in a loud voice;* for *agreeably: smile agreeably, live agreeably.*[67] Second are completive combinations such as: *carry: carry wood, carry a burden, carry a bride over the threshold; wood: burn wood, pick up wood, sell wood*, etc. However, free combinations are not limited to such short and simple phrases. They also include complete sentences like those used above to illustrate how sentences may be reconfigured (*let's go for a walk - let's go for a beer*, etc.).

According to Jacobsen *et al*, "free syntagms" (i.e. free combinations) constitute "true" examples because they allow the user to generalize to other constructions.[68] The authors explain that "a non-idiosyncratic example enabling the user to generate free syntagms provides more information than a sub-entry giving an idiom + equivalent, and more of a

---

[66] Zgusta 142.

[67] Zgusta 140.

[68] Jacobsen *et al* 2787.

basis for generalization."[69] Winter agrees that free combinations, which "represent occurrences of the word in context," present "patterns for use and further linguistic production."[70] She suggests that free combinations may be "minimal contexts" that "help the user to understand the meaning of the SL lemma and to select the best suitable equivalent in the foreign language."[71] Winter believes that such examples should be "chosen for their representative value;" the free combinations should show how the lemma is typically used and not show obscure, though correct, uses that are particular to a given author.[72] The free combination should "encourage the user to generalise, the translated example is not only meant to specify semantic equivalence, it can also appear in an entry to entail further contextual equivalents."[73]

In summary, free combinations are constructions created to fill the needs of a specific communication situation and will therefore not recur with significant frequency in a corpus. Their meaning is derivable from the meanings of their component lexical items. They allow lexical and syntactic reconfigurations that change their meaning but do not remove their grammaticality or idiomaticity.

---

[69] Jacobsen *et al* 2787.

[70] Winter 46.

[71] Winter 47.

[72] Winter 47.

[73] Winter 47.

1.3.3 Characteristics of restricted examples

A number of lexicographers distinguish free combinations from another category of constructions. Jacobsen *et al* distinguish between free combinations (which they call "free syntagms") and "idiosyncratic" structures such as collocations and fixed expressions. But they do not consider restricted or "idiosyncratic" constructions to be examples; instead they see them as a distinct category of information in the microstructure.[74] Nevertheless, other lexicographers do see them as a type of example, and since most bilingual dictionaries treat them as such, this thesis will include them in the category of restricted examples.

However, lexicographers are not all in agreement about what this second type of example would include. Winter sees a category of restricted examples that is made up of "multiword lexical units, set phrases that are highly specific, unpredictable and often impossible to adapt."[75] But Marello seems to imply that, while idioms, compound nouns and proverbs fall into this category, collocations do not.[76] In this thesis, collocations as well as fixed expressions and compounds are considered to be restricted examples, for they share several characteristics.

These characteristics constitute what Henri Béjoint calls their 'codedness'. Béjoint identifies several criteria that help determine whether or not a complex lexical item is 'coded'

---

[74] Jacobsen *et al* 2787. The authors say that "a completely idiosyncratic syntagm is more suitable for presentation as a sub-entry (sub-lemma + a translation equivalent which is as far as possible a corresponding fixed syntagm in the TL) than as an *example*."

[75] Winter 46.

[76] Marello 230.

(i.e. restricted).[77] First is the restricted item's frequency. Béjoint explains that its "frequency in a corpus [is] evidence of the fact that it is indeed used by the language of the community at large," and that the item is not merely part of the idiolect of an individual.[78] Second is the complex item's "syntagmatic rigidity" which means that it allows "no (or very little) syntactic or lexical variation," and belongs to the language user's competence because "it is stored as a unit, produced as a 'ready-made' whole and decoded without any analysis of its constituents."[79] A third criterion for determining the codedness of complex lexical items[80] is that in order for them to be considered 'coded' (restricted), they "must also fit into a precise slot in the immediately superior unit (thus 'words' fit into phrases, 'phrases' fit into sentences, etc.)."[81] In other words, complex items function in larger constructions such as phrases and sentences the same way as do simple items. Béjoint acknowledges that collocations do not meet all the criteria of codedness because their meanings *are* analyzable from the meanings of their component items. However, he argues that the component items in collocations constitute sememes that are to a certain extent 'bound' to each other, and therefore, collocations may be considered 'coded'.[82]

---

[77] Henri Béjoint, "'Codedness' and Lexicography," Lexicographer's and Their Works, ed. Gregory James (University of Exeter: 1989) 2.

[78] Béjoint 2.

[79] Béjoint 2. Béjoint applies these comments to both simple lexical items and complex items. In other words, simple lexical items cannot be decomposed into their component graphemes and phonemes any more than complex items can be analyzed through their component lexical items.

[80] Béjoint calls them "multi-word syntactically rigid sequences".

[81] Béjoint 3.

[82] Béjoint 3-4.

In summary, restricted examples are combinations of lexical items that allow little or no lexical variation and that recur in a corpus more frequently than chance would allow. Their meaning cannot usually be analyzed from the meaning of their individual components,[83] and they function as a unit within larger constructions.

Both free combinations and restricted examples play an important role in dictionary entries since they both illustrate the use of the lemma. However, their functions are somewhat different, as will be seen in chapters 3 and 4.

1.4 SOURCES OF EXAMPLES

Dictionary examples, whether they are free combinations or restricted examples, are drawn from one of two principal sources: a corpus or the lexicographer's/informant's linguistic knowledge. This section will begin by briefly defining the term *corpus*, and distinguishing the two main roles of corpora in lexicography, one of which is to constitute a source of examples to be included in the dictionary. This section will then examine three types of examples that derive from the two sources outlined above, will discuss the merits of each and will propose that modified citations are the optimal source of examples.

1.4.1 Definition of corpus

MacArthur defines *corpus* as "a body of texts, utterances, or other specimens considered more or less representative of a language, and usually stored as an electronic database," and adds that "computer corpora may store millions of running words, whose

[83] The exception is collocations. This will be explained in more depth in the section on collocations.

features can be analyzed by means of *tagging* (the addition of identifying and classifying tags to words and other formations), and the use of concordancing programs."[84] Computerization speeds access to the information the corpus contains: among other things, it enables linguists to obtain the number of occurrences for a given lexical item in the corpus and to see some or all of the contexts.

1.4.2 The role of corpora in lexicographic analysis

Al-Kasimi clearly distinguishes two functions of corpus examples. First are "those examples of usage which are collected and analyzed by the editor and his assistants for the basis of their definitions or translations."[85] Second are "those examples which appear in the articles of the dictionary to illustrate the usage of the entry."[86] This second function of corpus examples will be dealt with in this chapter.[87]

1.4.3 Types of examples

On the basis of the two sources of examples presented above, three types of examples can be identified. They may be citations that are taken directly from the corpus without any modification by the lexicographer; they may be citations that are modified by the lexicographer, usually by shortening them; or they may be constructed by the lexicographer based on his or her intuition (or that of informants) about the lexical item in question.

---

[84] "Corpus," The Oxford Companion to the English Language, ed. Tom McArthur (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992) 265-266.

[85] Al-Kasimi 89.

[86] Al-Kasimi 89.

[87] The first function of corpus examples is a complex topic requiring in-depth study and is not dealt with in this thesis. However, it is briefly outlined in Appendix 2.

1.4.4 Unmodified citations

The corpus may provide direct citations which can be included in the entry without modification. Indeed, there now seems to be a general trend to provide as examples phrases or sentences which have actually been used in writing or speech.[88] Al-Kasimi, Jacobsen *et al*, Zgusta and Landau all suggest that citation examples have definite advantages. Zgusta feels that the citation example has "the great advantage that it has a highly factual character: evidence can be produced that the word in question really was used in a certain passage by a certain author."[89] Landau expands on this notion of the authority of citation examples by saying: "actual usage has the weight of authority behind it. It provides documentation for the definition, which is really only an interpretive claim made by the lexicographer."[90] Cowie suggests that the value of such authority to the user of the dictionary is that the examples may then be trusted as "authentic models of usage."[91]

While all these authors cite the merits of citation examples, Fox is perhaps the only one to go so far as to claim that "authentic examples are almost always superior to made-up ones."[92] Like Zgusta and Landau, she bases her claim on the authority of such examples. She suggests that citations should not be modified at all by the lexicographer, because their

---

[88] Al-Kasimi 92. Al-Kasimi made this claim in the mid 1970s and it is even more true today. While Winter (46) observes that "unlike most monolingual dictionaries, bilingual ones very seldom use quotations as examples," the 1994 Oxford-Hachette dictionary is corpus-based, although it is difficult to tell whether examples were taken without modification from the corpus.

[89] Zgusta 265.

[90] Landau 166.

[91] A.P. Cowie, "Language as Words: Lexicography", An Encyclopedia of Language, ed. N.E. Collinge, (London & New York: Routledge, 1985) 680.

[92] Fox 143.

use of pronouns instead of nouns and of linking words like *and* and *therefore* lend them more authenticity than more determinate modified or constructed examples that might exclude such items. Fox says that

> real text examples [...] are not neat little isolated wholes. They carry a lot of loose ends — they follow on from what has been said and they lead in to what will be said. They show all the features of normal discourse — features such as the use of pronouns rather than nouns, of linking words such as *and*, *therefore*, of forcing the reader's attention back to what has been said by the use of such words as *that* and *this*. All of these are features which are usually ignored, or dealt with very sketchily, in dictionaries.
>
> Real text examples show very clearly that sentences are not complete units in themselves, but that they depend for much of their meaning on what has gone before and what will come after.[93]

Although some may feel that such examples are far too dependent upon the larger context from which they are drawn to be intelligible to users, Fox argues instead that "to help learners in their production of language," examples should contain such words as *the*, *that*, and pronouns, whose use and meaning may not be obvious from the information in the example. Fox claims that such examples are best able to stimulate the user's intuition about the use of the lemma: "the example should have the potential for being taken further, for acting as a springboard from which learners can take off and begin to work out for themselves how little areas of language should work."[94]

However, other lexicographers feel that citations should be modified when necessary, so that the example may be clear and stand on its own, and not require reference to the larger context from which it was drawn for interpretation. Minaeva feels that unmodified citation examples may be "overloaded with irrelevant extralinguistic information" and as

---

[93] Fox 144.

[94] Fox 145.

such, "are hardly illustrating."[95] While Cowie concedes that "naturally occurring sentences often only reveal their full meaning by reference to some wider context," he believes that "the dictionary example cannot usually afford to look outside itself for complete elucidation."[96] He also feels that "the use of authentic data places on the compiler the additional burden of selecting (or even editing) examples so that meaning, syntax and style are effectively illustrated."[97] While Cowie may be correct in suggesting that the selection and modification of corpus examples can be onerous tasks, they remain an important means of obtaining helpful examples.

1.4.5 Modified citations

Several authors maintain that corpus citations that are modified by the lexicographer are the best source of examples. Jacobsen *et al* note that "often an authentic example can be abbreviated or paraphrased without losing any of its illustrative value."[98] Generally speaking, modification of corpus examples involves shortening the phrase or sentence found in the corpus, usually by removing information that may distract from the element the lexicographer wishes to illustrate. As Zgusta says, "probably the best thing to do is to quote [...] a reduced part of a passage in a text from which those parts that are irrelevant are

---

[95] Ludmilla Minaeva, "Dictionary Examples: Friends or Foes?" Euralex '92 Proceedings I-II Part 1. ed. Tarja Salini-Talonen (Tampere: Studia Translatologica, 1992) 78. For a fuller description of some of the types of extralinguistic information that can render unmodified citations unhelpful, see my section on the cultural functions of examples.

[96] Cowie, "Language of Examples" 59. Cowie complains that the meaning of pronouns and other elements "can only be established by referring outside the context itself."

[97] Cowie, "Language of Examples" 59.

[98] Jacobsen *et al* 2788.

omitted."[99] Zgusta would permit such shortening to go so far as eliminating all but "the verb with its object."[100] Martin demonstrates how this shortening may occur, as he reduces a citation down to just a verb and a direct object pronoun:

> *Brénugat passa deux longues journées à déménager ses meubles* [...] on peut former, par élimination du nom propre et des circonstants, *Il déménagea ses meubles*, puis par de nouvelles réductions: *Il déménage ses meubles, déménager ses meubles, déménager qch.*[101]

Martin says that such shortening produces examples that are "un type abstrait, libéré de toute incidence situationelle."[102] However, one could argue that *déménager qch* is too abstract to be useful in a bilingual dictionary.[103] Since bilingual dictionary users are typically less skilled in one language than the other, examples consisting merely of a verb accompanied by an indefinite pronoun as in the example above may not provide the user with enough information. Therefore, in bilingual dictionaries, the user may be better served with phrasal examples that are slightly more specific, for example, *déménager ses meubles* in the case presented above. The rationale for including more specific phrasal examples such as *déménager ses meubles* and their translations is that they may suggest to the user other, similar specific constructions incorporating the lemma in question.

Other modifications are also possible, such as adding a subject or direct or indirect object that is found elsewhere in the broader context, changing the tense, replacing a proper

---

[99] Zgusta 265.

[100] Zgusta 265

[101] Martin 600.

[102] Martin 600.

[103] This issue is discussed in more detail in the section on the length of examples.

noun by a pronoun, or reordering clauses. For example, the following example from the BCD entry for *passeport* shows how the subject was changed from a proper noun in the original corpus example to a more generic common noun in a later version:

original:

> **le ministère du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche a mis en vente des passeports qui donneront droit à des réductions intéressantes dans les parcs**
> the Quebec ministère du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche is selling coupons/passes that will yield significant savings in the parks

edited version:

> **le ministère a mis en vente des passeports qui donnent droit à des réductions intéressantes dans les parcs**
> the ministry is selling passes/passports that give significant discounts in parks

The following example from the BCD entry for *grittily* shows how the elements from an original corpus example may be reordered, shortened, and made more general:

original:

> **[...] Hill Street Blues and St. Elsewhere, two grittily realistic, frequently ribald and quite excellent drama series [...]**

edited version:

> **these excellent drama series are grittily realistic**
> ces excellentes séries dramatiques sont extrêmement réalistes

An example from the entry for *grittiness* shows how the tense may be changed from the original corpus version:

original:

> **[...] their early buildings had a grittiness that was hard to take**

edited version:

> **these buildings have a grittiness that is hard to take**
> il est difficile d'aimer la rudesse de ces immeubles

Such changes are often necessary to render the examples clear and concise.

However, Cowie demonstrates one of the problems that may occur when lexicographers modify examples: lexicographers may go too far in their efforts to make examples concise, and may end up rendering them artificial with "too much [...] packed into a sentence for it to carry complete conviction." He uses the following example for the lemma *operational* to illustrate his point:

> **When will the newly designed aircraft be operational?**

He explains why this example is awkward:

> Here, operational, which has end focus, will be interpreted as 'new' information. Conversely, the newly designed aircraft is in a position associated with 'given' information (information the reader is presumed to possess already). Yet modification of that initial noun phrase is more characteristic of new than of given. Why then should it be modified at all? In normal discourse, the fact that the aircraft was newly designed would probably be established in an earlier clause, thus
>
> **"It's a newly designed aircraft." "When will it be operational?"**[104]

Although Cowie maintains that this longer example is too long for inclusion in a dictionary, he does conclude that it sounds more natural.

Fox feels that any effort to modify citations will inevitably render them unhelpful because, once modified, they will no longer resemble phrases and sentences that one might find in text and will thus mislead the user:

---

[104] Cowie, "Language of Examples" 60.

> We have learned what happens when we sit and intuit how words are used — we are likely to get it wrong. We also know that as soon as we start playing around with examples, making them more 'accessible' or more 'regular', we are liable to take the life out of them, or worse, mislead the user of the dictionary. Something as simple as the changing of a present tense for a past, the substituting of one word for another, the adding of a proper name rather than a pronoun, can ruin the whole feel of the example and destroy its authenticity. The sentence is still well formed, but it no longer seems natural to a sensitive native speaker.[105]

While it is true that great care must be taken when modifying examples to avoid the pitfalls outlined by Fox, it is equally true that the examples must be able to stand on their own. The lexicographer must exercise judgement in providing examples that are at once clear and intelligible to users, that illustrate a semantic, grammatical or other element of the lemma, but that remain plausible.

1.4.6 Constructed examples

Despite the many advantages of citations (whether modified or unmodified) and the relative ease with which they may be obtained through computer corpora, lexicographers still often construct examples. They may do this because there are simply no citations available that illustrate important elements of the lemma in question, or because it is dictionary policy.[106]

Al-Kasimi states that constructed examples have two advantages: "first, they can be tailored to serve their major functions of illustrating the grammatical and semantic usage of the word, and secondly they can be briefer than the actual quotations and easier to

---

[105] Fox 148.

[106] Drysdale 213; Landau 166.

understand."[107] Zgusta suggests that users may be better able to extrapolate other uses of the lemma from constructed examples: he says examples can be constructed in such a way that "they invite analogical applications by the user of the dictionary [...] and consequently they have great generative power."[108] Laufer argues that examples constructed by the lexicographer have greater pedagogical value, especially in learners' dictionaries, than those found in a corpus. In fact, in an experiment conducted with learners of English, Laufer found that examples constructed by lexicographers were more useful than authentic ones in the comprehension and production of new words.[109]

Cowie and Laufer both feel that constructed examples are superior to authentic citations, particularly for productive purposes. Laufer suggests that little of "real life communication is an exact duplicate of what has been previously said or written", and that the purpose of examples is to help dictionary users employ the lemma "in sentences never heard before or never produced before."[110]

However, despite the superiority that Cowie claims for constructed examples, he warns that they can "sacrifice linguistic naturalness to explanatory fullness."[111] He cites the following example of an awkward invented example given for the lemma *forestall*:

---

[107] Al-Kasimi 92.

[108] Zgusta 267.

[109] Laufer 75-76.

[110] Laufer 76.

[111] Cowie, "Language of Examples" 58-59.

> the thieves arranged to steal the woman's jewels, but her servant girl forestalled them by running away with the jewels herself [112]

As Cowie notes, the incident described in the example seems contrived, and Drysdale points out that "reliance on made-up examples involves the risk of creating some sentences that are forced and artificial, whether awkwardly stilted or inappropriately colloquial."[113] Laufer, however, questions "the argument that lexicographer-made examples are not natural enough."[114] According to Laufer,

> lexicographers who are educated native speakers of the language are bound to have correct intuitions about their mother tongue, about the grammaticality of the word, its typical use and its typical environment. These intuitions are not necessarily less correct than the intuitions of those language users who are represented in the corpus and are therefore not less reliable.[115]

Jacobsen *et al* agree with Laufer's claim that the lexicographer can construct examples that are "appropriate and effective models of vocabulary use."[116]

Both Drysdale and Minaeva feel that the best solution is to use a mixture of citation examples which reflect actual usage, and constructed ones designed to illustrate specific elements of a lemma.[117] As Minaeva points out, the main objective of examples is to impart information to the user, and if a constructed example is the best way to do so in a

---

[112] Cowie drew the example from the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. A full reference for this dictionary is given in the bibliography.

[113] Drysdale 213.

[114] Laufer 24.

[115] Laufer 72.

[116] Laufer 76. Jacobsen *et al* (2788) feel that "for a competent bilingual dictionary maker (ambiguities intended) it should be quite possible to coin examples illustrating well-established usage."

[117] Drysdale 213-214; Minaeva 77.

given situation then one should be used. She dismisses the debate over the use of unmodified citations or constructed examples as follows:

> lexicographers still argue about which examples — authentic or invented — are preferable. [...] The debate, however, is artificial because authentic sentences taken in isolation may sound awkward, whereas invented ones may adequately illustrate the word's meaning. [...] the common lexicographic practice is the use of naturally occurring contexts at the early stages of compiling a learner's dictionary.[...]
>
> Having established the semantic structure of the word, the lexicographer concentrates on "illustrative phraseology," that is, word-combinations and sentences used in the dictionary entry to show how the word actually functions in speech. At this stage the prescriptive approach dominates over the descriptive one; the lexicographer strives to choose or make up examples which would meet the user's difficulties.[118]

In recent years, the debate over the advantages and disadvantages of citations and constructed examples has been getting fuzzier, with the more generalized use of corpora in lexicography. For even lexicographers who do not use corpus citations as examples now use corpus evidence to help them construct examples. Indeed, today the distinction between a modified citation example and a constructed example that is based on corpus evidence is a fine one. In fact, some of the more radical procedures used to modify citations, such as changing the order of clauses, or adding direct or indirect objects may be better classified as ways of constructing examples. And when Manley says that the lexicographer may find that "the example in the citation is a misuse, creative or otherwise, of a perfectly current phrase, and can abstract from the context to produce a normative version of it,"[119] one is left wondering whether such an example should be considered a modified example or a constructed one.

---

[118] Minaeva 77. My underlining.

[119] James Manley, "Processing Excerpts for the Bilingual Dictionary," Symposium on Lexicography II: Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Lexicography May 16-17, 1984 at the University of Copenhagen, eds. Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen and Arne Zettersten (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985) 251.

The important issue is that the examples included in a dictionary be clear and informative. When citations from the corpus meet these criteria, they may be included without modification. Frequently, however, corpus citations will have to be modified to ensure they are clear and informative. When necessary, lexicographers may construct examples, although this procedure works best when it is based on corpus evidence. The ultimate criterion is that the examples presented serve definite functions.

CHAPTER 2: GENERAL FUNCTIONS OF EXAMPLES

2.1 INTRODUCTION TO FUNCTIONS OF EXAMPLES

The importance of the functions of examples is clearly revealed by the fact that many definitions of examples include a statement of function. Van Scherrenburg says that "an example is any phrase or sentence in the SL that illustrates the use of a single word, compound or idiom, along with its translation."[1] Al-Kasimi provides a similar definition: "any phrase or sentence that illustrates the use of the item defined or translated."[2] Hence, both Van Scherrenburg and Al-Kasimi propose a function of examples — that examples illustrate usage — within their definitions of examples. My own definition of the form of the example implicitly contains an indication of function. When I state that the example must include both an SL phrase or sentence plus its translation, a TL phrase or sentence, I imply that one of the functions of examples is to demonstrate translation.

Many statements have been made about the functions of examples, both in unilingual and bilingual dictionaries. While there are obvious distinctions between the main function of the unilingual dictionary, which is to provide the meaning of the lemmas, and the main function of the bilingual dictionary, which is to provide equivalents for SL lemmas, nevertheless, statements about the functions of examples that appear in the literature of unilingual lexicography are often equally valid for the functions of examples in bilingual dictionaries and will be used where applicable in this and subsequent chapters.

---

[1] Van Scherrenburg 10.

[2] Al-Kasimi 96.

2.1.1 Types of functions of examples

Jacobsen *et al* bring out five major functions of examples when they say that "examples [in bilingual dictionaries], if judiciously selected, can demonstrate collocational, stylistic, syntactic, morphological, and cultural features of words and phrases."[3] Examples also have a semantic function in both unilingual and bilingual lexicography. So far, the functions of examples in unilingual and bilingual dictionaries are very similar. However, in addition, we may also posit a translation function for examples in bilingual dictionaries because examples demonstrate ways to translate the lemma. Peter Newmark says

> one translates words that are used in context, that is, words that are lexically conditioned and constrained by collocation and connotation, grammatically by syntax, intonationally by word-order, sometimes phonetically by assonance, alliteration, onomatopoeia, and moreover they are referentially bound; one does not normally translate words in isolation, or assume they are being used in their primary sense, unless they appear randomly.[4]

Dictionary examples show how words are used in context and how they may be translated in context. In general, the translation of an SL example demonstrates the collocational, stylistic, syntactic, morphological, cultural and semantic characteristics of the TL equivalent to the same extent as the SL example does for the lemma.

While it is theoretically possible to select each example to illustrate a given feature, examples are generally multifunctional and "provide several types of information at once."[5] This is partly due to space restrictions in printed dictionaries.[6] It is also partly due to the

---

[3] Jacobsen *et al* 2786.

[4] Newmark 135.

[5] Jacobsen *et al* 2783-84.

[6] It is impossible to provide a separate example to illustrate every use of a word or its equivalent.

fact that there is a great deal of overlap between the various categories of functions of examples. For example, it is hard to clearly distinguish collocational functions from semantic functions since a lemma often takes on a special meaning within a collocation. As Margaret Cop says, "a collocator realizes its full semantic identity in collocation, i.e. together with its base."[7] This can be clearly seen in the example from LAR2, "**franchir le mur du son** to break through the sound barrier", which shows the use of the lemma *franchir* within a collocation. In this example, the lemma *franchir* is used metaphorically in a way that is not predictable from the sense indication and context words provided by LAR2: [outrepasser - ligne, limite, date].

2.1.2 Overlap between examples and explicit statements

If there is overlap between the different functions of examples, there is also overlap, according to Jacobsen *et al*, between examples and "many of the *explicit* categories of information provided in the entry."[8] Examples may therefore be considered implicit representations of information often given elsewhere in the dictionary entry through explicit statements. As Al-Kasimi says:

> illustrative examples should not be intended to take the place of grammatical or semantic statements, but they should illustrate them only. In other words, illustrative examples are just examples, a pedagogical device and no more. However abundant these illustrative examples may be, or skillfully employed,

---

[7] Margaret Cop, "Collocations in the Bilingual Dictionary," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography Vol. 3, ed. F. J. Hausmann *et al*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989) 2775-2776. Cop cites Franz Josef Hausmann, "Un dictionnaire des collocations est-il possible?" Travaux de linguistique et de littérature, 17/1. 1979, 187-195.

[8] Jacobsen *et al* 2783-84.

> they certainly do not amount to a descriptive statement in the sense of an economical and explicit formulation of explicit facts.[9]

For example, in the OXHA entry for *enemy*, the explicit information at the beginning of the entry provides the irregular plural form of *enemy*. The first example in this entry reinforces this explicit statement by using the irregular plural in a phrase.

> **enemy I** (*pl* **-mies**) gen, fig ennemi/-e *m/f*; **to make enemies** se faire des ennemis

The example may be said to demonstrate information about the lemma or equivalent in a concrete form within a typical context, whereas the explicit statement, "(*pl*-**mies**)," presents this information in an abstract form, divorced from any context of usage.

According to Thomas Creamer, examples can not only reinforce information given in an explicit manner elsewhere, but can also supplement it. He states that:

> examples can supplement and extend the definition, often with great economy of means. An extra burden is placed on the definition without an example. Furthermore, in definitions lacking examples, it is more difficult for a user to bring to bear his or her knowledge of a word in context to help clarify meanings.[10]

The OXHA entry for ennemi shows how examples can extend the meaning of the lemma suggested by the sense indication. Sense 3 appears as follows:

> 3 (élément nocif) **la censure est l'ennemi de la liberté** censorship is the enemy of a free society; **l'alcool est l'ennemi de votre foie/santé** alcohol damages your liver/health

Both examples show the use of ennemi in a metaphorical sense which is only vaguely indicated in the sense indication.

---

[9] Al-Kasimi 91

[10] Creamer 243.

These examples reveal that, despite a certain overlap between explicit information and examples, there is, as Zgusta puts it

> no mere re-statement or repetition, because the examples, being more concrete than the definition, which should be rather general, always add some new information. So for instance, if we read, after the definition of Eng. *beautiful* "giving pleasure or delight to the mind or senses", also the examples *beautiful face, flower, voice; beautiful weather, music*, we certainly gain much information, though these examples indicate nothing that is not covered by the definition and not everything that is covered by it.[11]

However, examples are frequently used as the only means of presenting an element of a lemma or equivalent, as will be demonstrated further throughout this chapter.

2.1.3 Presentation of functions of examples

As indicated in 2.1.1 above, examples, and more particularly free combinations, have a number of different functions. For the sake of clarity of presentation, these functions have been subdivided into two main categories: general functions, applicable to most examples in both unilingual and bilingual dictionaries, and specific functions, which pertain primarily to examples in bilingual dictionaries. The most important general functions are semantic, grammatical and stylistic. Specific functions are translation and culture related. For instance, examples help choose between equivalents or help suggest other equivalents.

General functions are the focus of this chapter. However, since, as previously mentioned, there is a great deal of overlap among the various functions of examples, they cannot always be clearly dissociated from specific functions. For instance, general semantic functions of examples cannot be completely separated from the function of helping to choose

---

[11] Zgusta 264.

between equivalents. In some bilingual dictionaries, explicit definitions are not given and examples often provide the only indication of the senses of the lemma.[12] The user can therefore determine which equivalent is appropriate for a given sense of a lemma only by examining all of the examples. However, where possible, specific functions will be treated in a separate chapter (Chapter 3).

Another point that must be made at this stage is that the question of functions of examples and that of their presentation are often intertwined. This is because the functions of particular examples often become evident only when the examples are properly arranged and ordered. Hence, in this chapter as well as the following ones, the discussion of functions will inevitably lead to questions related to presentation.

2.2 SEMANTIC FUNCTIONS

Perhaps the most important general function of examples is the semantic function. Dictionary examples show semantic elements of the lemma and, in the case of bilingual dictionary examples, of equivalents as well. Examples help the user to understand the specific meaning of the lemma and to select the equivalent most suitable to the sense in question.[13]

---

[12] Examples indicate senses of the headword only implicitly. Lexicography rarely employs "defining contexts" that are sometimes used in terminology. A "defining context" is an example that specifies several specific characteristics of the concept designated by a lexical item. Dubuc provides an example of a defining context for the term *weaving*: "weaving is a method of producing cloth by interlacing two or more sets of yarn at right angles to each other". Robert Dubuc, Manuel pratique de terminologie, 2e édition (Linguatech, 1985) 62. A corpus-based general language dictionary such as the Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary gives an example that is less explicitly defining, but which still gives some semantic information about the lexical item *weaving*: "painting, weaving and other types of craft work." This last example implicitly shows that *weaving* falls into the general semantic field covered by *crafts* and that it is a co-hyponymn of painting.

[13] Winter 47.

Some authors suggest that the examples supplement and reinforce defintions: Al-Kasimi feels that examples in bilingual dictionaries should not take the place of definitions but "should illustrate them only."[14] While he concedes that "illustrative phrases may serve as another device of meaning discrimination," he warns that this method of discriminating senses is not ideal; that it is "space consuming"; and that, "if illustrative examples are not used efficiently and effectively, they will be useless" for distinguishing the sense of a lemma.[15]

2.2.1 Examples as a means of distinguishing different senses

Since the bilingual dictionaries studied in this thesis are not systematic or consistent in defining[16] their lemmas and certainly do not provide definitions for every sense of every lemma, by default, examples often play a major role in presenting semantic features of a lemma. The OXHA entry for *franchir* shows how the examples may provide the only means of distinguishing among the senses of a lexical item in bilingual dictionaries. OXHA does not

---

[14] Al-Kasimi 91.

[15] Al-Kasimi 70.

[16] 'Definitions' in bilingual dictionaries are frequently quite different from those in unilingual dictionaries. Bilingual dictionary 'definitions' are often less specific than those in unilingual dictionaries; they may encompass a greater number of semantic nuances of the lemma under one 'definition' than would be done in a unilingual dictionary. Bilingual dictionary 'definitions' are usually shorter than their unilingual counterparts; frequently a short phrase or even a single synonym for the lemma will suffice. For these reasons, it is inaccurate to call the defining information in bilingual dictionaries 'definitions'; it is more accurate to call such information "sense indications." Bilingual dictionary "sense indications" provide some clues to the meaning(s) of the lemma but do not always provide the same rigourous description of and distinction between meanings found in uilingual dictionaries. For example, OXHA provides the sense indication "élément nocif" in its entry for *ennemi*. This sense indication corresponds to but is less explicit than the more elaborate definition given in Le Petit Robert: "toute chose qu'un homme ou un groupe juge contraire à son bien." Henceforth, this thesis will refer to defining information in bilingual dictionaries as "sense indications."

include sense indications for *franchir*, which is a polysemous item, and all equivalents and examples are placed in one group. The entry appears as follows in OXHA:

> **franchir** *vtr* to cross [*fossé, ligne d'arrivée, seuil, montagne, océan*]; to get over [*mur, barrière, clôture*]; to cover [*distance*]; **franchir un obstacle** lit. to clear an obstacle; fig. to overcome an obstacle; **le perchiste a franchi les six mètres** the pole vaulter cleared six metres; **franchir la barre des 10%** to pass the 10% mark; **franchir un cap difficile** to get through a difficult period; **l'équipe a franchi le cap des quarts de finale** the team got past the quarter finals; **franchir le cap de la cinquantaine** to turn fifty; **l'entreprise a franchi un cap décisif en rachetant son rival** buying up its rival was an important turning point for the company.
> IDIOMES **franchir le pas** to take the plunge.

A careful analysis of these examples can lead the user to identify the following senses of *franchir* (a chart follows on the next page):

	EXAMPLE	SENSE SUGGESTED
1	**franchir un obstacle** lit. to clear an obstacle; fig. to overcome an obstacle	lit. passer par-dessus fig. surmonter, vaincre
2	**le perchiste a franchi les six mètres** the pole vaulter cleared six metres	passer par-dessus
3	**franchir la barre des 10%** to pass the 10% mark	aller au-delà de
4	**franchir un cap difficile** to get through a difficult period	surmonter, vaincre
5	**l'équipe a franchi le cap des quarts de finale** the team got past the quarter finals	surmonter, vaincre
6	**franchir le cap de la cinquantaine** to turn fifty	aller au-delà de
7	**l'entreprise a franchi un cap décisif en rachetant son rival** buying up its rival was an important turning point for the company	surmonter, vaincre
8	IDIOMES **franchir le pas** to take the plunge	no sense of *franchir* is suggested because in idioms, the senses of individual lexical items are subsumed in the sense of the idiom as a whole

However, OXHA's presentation forces the user to guess which sense an example may be illustrating and to intuit whether an example shows a literal or figurative use of the lemma.[17] Users' needs are much better served if sense indications are given and examples are matched with these sense indications. In this way, users can find the information required more quickly because it will not be necessary for them to read every example in the entry to find one that matches their needs. Instead, users can scan the sense indications to find one

[17] The first example has two alternative translations and they are labelled "lit" and "fig", but five other examples in this entry show metaphorical uses of *franchir*. The user must interpret the examples and their semantic nuances.

matching their needs, and then read only the examples within that sense division.[18] Thus, matching examples with sense indications makes information more accessible to users.

Borrowing sense indications from Le Petit Robert,[19] the examples from the OXHA entry might be better presented as follows.[20] Sense indications are given in italics within brackets:

> 1 (*passer par-dessus [un obstacle] en sautant, en gravissant, etc.*) **franchir un obstacle** to clear an obstacle.
>
> 2 (*Fig. surmonter, vaincre [une difficulté]*) **franchir un obstacle** to overcome an obstacle.
>
> 3 (*aller au dela de [une limite]*) **le perchiste a franchi les six mètres** the pole vaulter cleared six metres; **franchir la barre des 10%** to pass the 10% mark; **franchir le cap de la cinquantaine** to turn fifty; **franchir un cap difficile** to get through a difficult period; **l'équipe a franchi le cap des quarts de finale** the team got past the quarter finals; **l'entreprise a franchi un cap décisif en rachetant son rival** buying up its rival was an important turning point for the company.
>
> 4 (*traverser [un passage]*) No OXHA examples match this sense.

---

[18] However Drysdale, says that in learners' dictionaries "in the case of entries with many meanings [...] it is much easier for a student to scan an entry looking for an example showing a context similar to the one he wants than it is for him to wade through a long sequence of abstract definitions." P.D. Drysdale, "The Role of Examples in a Learner's Dictionary," The Dictionary and the Language Learner, ed. Anthony Cowie (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1987) 216-217. While his point may be valid, it does not negate the utility of grouping examples under their appropriate sense indications; whether the user finds the information he or she needs by first scanning the definitions and then the examples or vice versa, at some point the user will need to confirm what he or she found in the definition or example with its counterpart, either an example or a definition respectively.

[19] A full reference is given in the bibliography.

[20] Assuming for the moment that semantic criteria are the only ones bearing upon the placement of examples.

5 (*aller d'un bout à l'autre de*) No OXHA examples match this sense.

IDIOMES **franchir le pas** to take the plunge.

If examples are matched with sense indications as has been done above, the user can spend less time analysing the sense of every example in the entry and may focus his or her attention on those examples within the appropriate sense division.

2.2.2 Examples as a means of specifying semantic nuances and demonstrating the lemma's range of application

Even when bilingual dictionaries provide definitions, examples are no mere re-statement or repetition because the definitions may be very short and may include just a synonymous word. Often, bilingual dictionary definitions are generalisations that encompass a variety of related semantic nuances.[21] In such cases, the examples will provide specific instances of some of the nuances of the lemma or one of its senses, and demonstrate the lemma's range of application. For instance, the first sense division of the LAR2 entry for *franchir* appears as follows:

> [passer par-dessus - barrière, mur] to get over *(insép)*[22] **il a franchi le fossé d'un bond** he jumped over the ditch; □ **franchir un obstacle** fig to get over an obstacle; **franchir une difficulté** to overcome a difficulty; **franchir le pas** to take the plunge.

---

[21] Creamer 238, and Zgusta 264. Creamer recommends that definitions "be written broadly enough to include occurrences which are related in meaning and exclude others which are not. If a definition is written too narrowly, accompanying examples may confuse rather than clarify the meaning. Confusion may also result if the definition is written too broadly."

[22] The preface to LAR2 says that insép "shows that the object of a phrasal verb cannot come between the verb and the particle, e.g. *I looked after him* **BUT NOT** *I looked him after.*"

Here, as in many bilingual dictionaries, the range of application is at least partially indicated by the actants *barrière* and *mur*, which are commonly used with *franchir* in the sense of *passer par-dessus*. However, here, as in many cases, it is often impossible to give all possible actants. In such cases, the examples can serve to illustrate other words that might commonly appear in the same structure as the lemma. In the example

> **il a franchi le fossé d'un bond**
> he jumped over the ditch

the direct object *fossé* is similar to those given as actants; *fossé* may be considered a co-hyponym of the actants.

The three remaining examples in this sense division show metaphorical nuances of this sense of *franchir*:[23]

> **franchir un obstacle**
> *fig.* to get over an obstacle.
>
> **franchir une difficulté**
> to overcome a difficulty
>
> **franchir le pas**
> to take the plunge.

The brief sense indication "passer par-dessus" in LAR2's sense division does not indicate clearly enough to the user that the sense in question may be literal or metaphorical or both. In fact, the concrete actants that follow the sense indication give the impression that this sense is always literal, which is not so. In such cases, only the examples demonstrate both the literal and metaphorical sense. Of course, if they are accompanied by a label such

---

[23] It is easy to see why the example "**franchir un obstacle** fig to get over an obstacle" is included in this sense division: the collocate *obstacle* bears some semantic resemblance to the actants provided with the sense indication. For instance, *obstacle* may be considered a superordinate of *barrière, mur*. However, the inclusion of the fixed expression "**franchir le pas** to take the plunge" in this sense division is less obvious.

as *Lit.* or *Fig.*,[24] which tells the user whether the example represents a literal or a metaphorical use of the lemma, then their illustrative value becomes even clearer. However, the symbol □ before the three metaphorical examples discussed here simply indicates that they are "more set" than those that precede it, with no indication that they illustrate metaphorical use.[25] Indeed, bilingual dictionaries typically give many more examples of metaphorical senses of a lemma than they label as such. For example when all the examples from all four dictionaries for the lemmas *franchir, to drink (vt), enemy* and *ennemi* are considered together, RCS gives 9 metaphorical examples but labels only 3 of them as metaphorical; OXHA gives 10 metaphorical examples but labels only 2 as such; HA gives 11 but labels only 2; LAR2 gives 13 but labels only 2. The burden of distinguishing between literal and metaphorical senses of the lemma is particularly heavy for the examples when bilingual dictionaries do not provide any sense indications or systematic labels, which is often the case.[26]

It may be useful to label all metaphorical examples as such, or to group examples showing either literal or metaphorical senses of a lemma together. For example, where a given sense indication gives rise to both literal and metaphorical examples, the dictionary could use a standard ordering principle such as literal examples always before metaphorical examples within sense divisions. In this manner, the user would know where to find literal or

---

[24] *Lit.* in this case means *literal.* But *Lit.* is also used to designate *Literary. Fig.* designates *figurative*, a category of information I prefer to call metaphorical.

[25] "□ Separates expressions which are not set (given before the symbol) form more fixed expressions." LAR2 XI.

[26] OXHA provides sense indications for only for *ennemi*; LAR2 only for *franchir* and *ennemi*. RCS and HA provide no sense indications for the words examined.

metaphorical examples, and the dictionary would not need to label every example. Such labelling or grouping may save the user time as he or she searches among the examples for information matching his or her translation situation.

In this section, the discussion of semantic functions of examples has focussed primarily on free combinations. It is also possible to speak of the semantic functions of collocations since the individual meanings of lemmas remain when they appear in such restricted structures. However, in collocations, the meanings of the lemma are frequently restricted or nuanced in a particular way through their juxtaposition with the other items in the collocation. Collocations will be treated in more detail in Chapter 4 on restricted examples rather than here because of the more complex nature of the semantic relationship between their component items.

2.2.3 Examples as a means of illustrating geographical variations in meaning

Examples can also show meaning that is particular to a geographic region. For example, the BCD entry for *fleuve* gives one Canadian sense, "le Saint-Laurent" and the English equivalent for this sense is *the St. Lawrence (river)*. In this sense, *fleuve* may or may not be capitalized and, if it is not capitalized, then it bears no obvious graphc differences from its use in other senses. This means that when *fleuve* takes on the function of a proper noun to designate the *Saint-Laurent* it may still have the same form as in other senses (i.e. it is not capitalized). An example is useful to show that in Canada, *fleuve* (not capitalized) can designate one particular river. The example given by the BCD is

> **le fleuve est une des merveilles du monde**
> the St. Lawrence is one of the wonders of the world

In the SL sentence, *fleuve* could designate any one of a number of the world's rivers because it is not necessarily marked by capitalization. The translation demonstrates that the lemma in this context does designate a particular river: *le Saint Laurent*.

2.3 GRAMMATICAL FUNCTIONS

While the lexicographic literature overall seems to focus more particularly on the semantic functions of examples, their grammatical functions may be more important to second language learners and users.

2.3.1 Examples as models of correct usage

Documentation on learners' dictionaries says that examples provide models of correct usage. When authors speak of correct usage, they most often mean that examples show typical and correct grammatical patterns. Fox says that examples constitute a "characteristic environment" for the item in question and that they allow the user to "gain insight into how to use the word for themselves." [27] She affirms that lexicographers must choose examples that

> show words in their most typical contexts, most frequent grammatical structures, and with other words that are often used at the same time in the same sentence. This is because the very choosing of an example gives it a special status. The fact that it has been printed in the dictionary shows that it has been deliberately chosen, and therefore the user of the dictionary is

---

[27] Fox 138. Fox suggests that, in the interests of presenting examples that are appropriate models, the lexicographer may have to include example sentences that are longer or more complex than most; examples should reflect what is typical for a given lemma: "If a word typically occurs in a sentence that is grammatically complex or alongside vocabulary items that are infrequent, it would be misleading of a dictionary to present that word in a very simple clause or sentence with easy vocabulary".

> entitled to regard it as a suitable model, and to make use of features in the example on the assumption that they are not misleading.[28]

Drysdale shares Fox's belief that examples "provide students with many varied and easily accessible models and demonstrations of words in actual use."[29] Such models demonstrate grammatical elements of lemmas:

> [examples can] show such grammatical possibilities as nouns that are both count and non-count (cf. *a dozen fine blooms* and *apple tree in bloom*), adjectives that are restricted to attributive or predicative position, or are followed by particular prepositions (*susceptible to flattery*), or verbs, especially auxiliaries, with irregular forms and special functions (*He will come, won't he?*)[30]

Drysdale thus demonstrates that examples are particularly useful to illustrate grammatical irregularities (such as a noun that is both count and non-count: *bloom*) or to illustrate other grammatical particularities of a given lemma (such as the negative *won't* for the auxiliary *will*).

Cowie claims that examples perform an encoding function by "helping the user to select correct grammatical pattern(s) for a given word or sense."[31] He adds that examples illustrate "the various syntactic constructions in which entry words are used."[32] According to Cowie it is particularly important to show grammatical patterns for verbs: "ideally, all the patterns in which a verb appears should be illustrated by means of separate sentences."[33]

---

[28] Fox 140.

[29] Drysdale 215.

[30] Drysdale 217.

[31] Cowie, "Language of Examples" 57.

[32] Cowie, "Language of Examples" 61.

[33] Cowie, "Language of Examples" 61.

Since space requirements would prevent such elaborate exemplification, Cowie says that examples should use an oblique stroke to show alternate grammatical patterns for parts of example sentences. He illustrates this claim with the following examples for the lemma *argue*:

> **he argued for / against the proposed tax cuts**
>
> **I would argue that / it could be argued that sending men to the moon is a waste of money**[34]

This first example shows the different prepositions that may used with the lemma; the second example shows syntactic patterns that would be required to express a message in the active or passive voice.

In bilingual dictionaries, the translations of examples provide models of how the lexical equivalents for the lemma may be used in a typical and grammatically correct context. The translations of examples thus have an encoding function. However, the SL parts of examples in bilingual dictionaries may also perform the same encoding function since one cannot predict where users will look to find information to help with encoding. Users may look in entries for the SL lemma, and in entries for one of the TL equivalents, especially when they are translating into their second language and cannot rely on their own intuition about how to use the equivalent. For example, a francophone translating into English may look up *franchir* in RCS and find that *to clear* is one of the listed equivalents. However, since *to clear* is not used in any of the translations of the examples for *franchir*, the user may attempt to verify this equivalent by looking at the examples for *to clear* in its entry on the

---

[34] Cowie, "Language of Examples" 61.

English side of the dictionary. Here, the user will find that, in the first example for *to clear* in the sense "get past or over", *to clear* is translated by *franchir*:

> **the horse cleared the gate by 10 cm**
> le cheval a sauté *or* a franchi la barrière avec 10 cm de reste *or* de marge

The user then has a model of how to use *to clear* and is better able to judge if it is an appropriate equivalent for his or her translation situation.

2.3.2 Examples, explicit statements and grammatical information

Al-Kasimi says that examples enhance the user's "understanding of the grammatical [...] rules governing the usage of the word by showing these rules in action."[35] Thus, according to him, examples are not intended to replace explicit grammatical statements; instead, they serve as a reinforcement and demonstration of information given in explicit statements. But, Zgusta believes that grammatical indications can be given by an explicit statement or by an example or a combination of both. Zgusta weighs the benefits of the various means of presenting grammatical information and adds that the explicit statement "has the advantage that it is more general so that the single concrete cases can easily be subsumed. The example, on the other hand, has the advantage that it is more specific and therefore can be more 'telling'. Frequently the examples are given in a form which implies a certain generality."[36] The discussion of the grammatical functions of examples may be subdivided into syntactic functions and morphological functions.

---

[35] Al-Kasimi 91.

[36] Zgusta 341.

2.3.3 Syntactic functions

Syntax may be broadly defined as "the way in which words are arranged to show relationships of meaning within (and sometimes between) sentences."[37] Syntax includes study of "the way in which words combine into such units as phrase, clause, and sentence. The sequences that result are referred to in linguistics as syntactic structures."[38] Examples demonstrate the typical syntactic structures in which lemmas and their equivalents appear.

Winter says that "minimal contextualisation," by which she means examples in the form of noun or verb phrases, "aims at pointing out any structural differences in the use of equivalents." She adds that "the selection of examples will then be made on a syntactic basis rather than on a semantic one: examples allow the user to make sure that a specific structure can or cannot just be transposed into the foreign language."[39] In other words, Winter suggests that examples demonstrate whether or not a specific syntactic structure can be translated word for word from one language to another and remain idiomatic and grammatical. While restricted examples can almost never be translated word for word, some free combinations may be translated in this manner. The following example from the RCS entry for *franchir* shows how the syntactic structure is unchanged from one language to the other for some free combinations:

> **le coureur a franchi la ligne d'arrivée**
> the runner crossed the finish line."

---

[37] David Crystal, The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language, (Cambridge University Press, 1987) 94.

[38] "Syntax," The Oxford Companion to the English Language, ed. Tom McArthur (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) 1016.

[39] Winter 47.

However, the next example from the OXHA entry for the verb "to drink" shows a syntactic structure in the target language that differs from that of the source language:

> **you can drink some red wines chilled**
> certains vins rouges se boivent frais

This example demonstrates that when the general "you" (in the sense of "one") is used in English, it is often translated using the reflexive form of the verb. Thus, the translation takes on a totally different syntactic structure from that of the SL: in this example, the direct object in the SL, *red wine*, becomes the subject, *vins rouges*, in the TL.

2.3.4 Morphological functions of examples

Bilingual dictionary examples may also demonstrate the morphological variations of lemmas and equivalents. It is not derivational morphology that is the focus of such examples, since the derivations of lemmas are either treated as separate lemmas in dictionaries and therefore exemplified in the same way as any other lemma, or are merely listed near the end of an entry, often without exemplification. However, the presentation of inflectional morphology, which studies "the way in which words vary (or 'inflect') in sentences, such as singular/plural or past/present tense,"[40] and which is of great importance to second language users, constitutes an important function of examples.

Although lemmas and equivalents are first presented in lemmatized form in the dictionary microstructure, their inflected forms also need to be shown. The inflection of a

---

[40] Crystal, Cambridge Encyclopedia 90.

lemma or equivalent can be given in explicit statements at the beginning of an entry, be demonstrated through examples, or be presented using a combination of these means.

Examples are a good way of demonstrating the regular patterns of inflection — such as the addition of "s" to English nouns to form the plural — which are generally not explicitly presented in the entry. However, even where an irregular inflectional variation of a given lemma or equivalent is presented explicitly, examples constitute a particularly useful way to reinforce the explicit statement of variation.

Some typical inflectional features that may be demonstrated with examples are irregular plurals, irregular conjugations of verbs, irregular past forms and past participles of verbs and irregular feminine forms of French adjectives. The following paragraphs will discuss how some of these inflectional features are treated for selected lemmas in existing bilingual dictionaries.

2.3.4.1 Irregular plurals

In the RCS, OXHA, HA and LAR2 entries for *ennemi(e)*, there is no explicit grammatical statement regarding the equivalent *enemy*. Examples provide the only indication that the English equivalent *enemy* takes an irregular form in the plural, as in the following example given by all four dictionaries:

se faire des ennemis
to make enemies (for o.s.)

Even when *enemy* is the lemma, only OXHA and LAR2 present its irregular plural in an explicit statement at the beginning of the entry; OXHA does so as follows:

enemy I *n* (*pl* **-mies**) **1** gen, fig ennemi/-e *m/f*

However, both these dictionaries still feel the need to render the information given by the explicit statement, such as "(*pl* **-mies**)" in OXHA, more concrete by demonstrating it in a phrase:

> **to make enemies**
> se faire des ennemis.

RCS and HA rely solely upon the examples to indicate the irregular plural form of *enemy* in the *enemy* entry.

2.3.4.2 Irregular verb forms

Bilingual dictionaries generally treat French verb lemmas differently from English verb lemmas. When French verbs are lemmas, the user is usually referred to conjugation tables located elsewhere in the dictionary for the inflected forms. When English verbs are lemmas, the past form and past participle form are usually given in an explicit statement at the beginning of the entry. Thus the treatment of French verb lemmas forces the user into an extra step, i.e. searching for the inflected forms in the conjugation tables. Unless the dictionary has space to give the inflections in an explicit statement at the beginning of the entry,[41] examples seem to be the most direct way to illustrate irregular verb forms.

The following paragraphs will discuss how bilingual dictionaries have treated the irregular inflections of the French verb *jeter*, and of the English verb *to drink*.

---

[41] HA gives gives the inflectional irregularity of *jeter* in an explicit statement at the beginning of the entry: (je jette, n. jetons, je jetterai). The user is thus immediately informed of the inflectional irregularity without being sent on a time-consuming query in the conjugation tables. HA reinforces the explicit statement by showing the irregularity in 2 examples.

a. Irregular conjugation: the French verb *jeter*

The French verb *jeter* conjugates in the same way as other French verbs ending in "-er" except that the *t* is doubled before a mute *e*. RCS, OXHA and LAR2 each indicate that *jeter* involves a special type of conjugation by typographically highlighting a number that refers the dictionary user to a conjugation table elsewhere in the dictionary.[42] In OXHA, this reference to the conjugation table is the only indication of the irregularity in the inflection of *jeter*; none of the 28 examples in this entry demonstrate the irregularity.

RCS and LAR2 go further than OXHA by reinforcing the information given by the reference to the conjugation tables by showing the irregular inflection in the examples. However, both RCS and LAR2 show only the doubling of the *t* in the present tense, third person singular. The user may or may not be able to predict that this irregularity recurs in other tenses of *jeter*, such as when future and conditional endings are added to the infinitive form. Since both RCS and LAR2 give a high number of examples for *jeter* (RCS: 61; LAR2: 52), several of these could have illustrated the other irregular forms of the verb while at the same time illustrating other elements.

---

[42] The OXHA entry for *jeter* refers the user to the conjugation tables with the following marker at the beginning of the entry: "[20]". However, OXHA uses letters and numbers to highlight several different features of headwords within its microstructure and the significance of *this* number would be incomprehensible to the user unless he or she had very carefully read the preface. In any case, referral to the conjugation tables still involves an extra step for the user. Exemplification of the irregular inflection may be one means of obviating this extra task.

b. Irregular past forms and past participles: the English verb *to drink*

While bilingual dictionaries give the past form and the past participle form in explicit statements at the beginning of the entries for English verb lemmas,[43] such statements do not show the user the typical syntactic structures in which each of these morphological variants appears. Therefore, examples may be particularly useful for distinguishing the uses of past forms and past participle forms of irregular verbs and can be used to demonstrate how they may be translated.

The RCS entry for the lemma *to drink* (transitive) shows only the past participle form in an example:

> **this wine should be drunk at room temperature**
> ce vin se boit chambré

The example demonstrates that the past participle is preceded by an auxiliary verb to form the passive and that this construction can be translated by a reflexive verb. But its translation does not reveal the most typical rendering of the past participle *drunk*. The typical rendering — *bu* — is given by a similar example in LAR2:

> **red Burgundy is best drunk at room temperature**
> le bourgogne rouge est meilleur bu chambré

LAR2 also gives an example that shows the past form of *to drink*:

> **he drank himself into a stupor**
> il s'est soûlé jusqu'à l'hébétude

The example demonstrates that the past form *drank* can be followed by a reflexive pronoun; however, other examples with the past (e.g. **when he drank coffee, he was irritable**) would have shown other ways of rendering the English simple past.

[43] For example, for the headword *to drink*, RCS distinguishes the past form and the past participle form in an explicit statement as follows: (vb: pret drank, ptp drunk).

Thus, in general, bilingual dictionary examples do not seem to illustrate well either how a given verb form is used in English or, more importantly, the ways in which it can be rendered in French.[44]

2.3.4.3 Irregular feminine forms of French adjectives

Examples are used to introduce or demonstrate irregular feminine forms of French adjectives. While entries for French adjective lemmas seem to consistently indicate the irregular feminine form in an explicit statement at the beginning of the entry, this is not the case for French adjectives that are given as equivalents for English adjective lemmas.

Even when the feminine form of a French adjective lemma is given in an explicit statement, exemplification of this inflection is still useful: it reminds the user of the basic grammatical rule of concord between noun and adjective. For example, the RCS entry for *heureux* explicitly states the feminine form at the beginning of the entry: (-euse), and then adds one example to show the feminine form:

il a *ou* c'est une heureuse nature
he has a happy *ou* cheerful nature

This example demonstrates that the adjective must agree in gender with the noun in the complement, even though the feminine form has been indicated in the explicit statements.

However, in the RCS entry for the English adjective *happy*, no feminine form is indicated explicitly for the equivalent *heureux*. Instead, two examples provide this indication:

---

[44] Of course the bilingual dictionary is not a substitute for a grammar. But there are few bilingual grammars, and in any case, when a large number of examples are given, there is no reason why more grammatical information cannot be included in the examples.

she was happy to be able to help
elle a été heureuse *or* contente de pouvoir aider

happy ending
fin heureuse

These examples should be adequate for a careful dictionary user to identify the irregular feminine form of the equivalent.

2.4 STYLISTIC FUNCTIONS OF EXAMPLES

In addition to semantic and grammatical functions, bilingual dictionary examples can demonstrate stylistic elements of a lemma and how these elements may be translated. According to Al-Kasimi, one major function of examples is "to indicate — largely by the other words in them — something of the stylistic value of the entry."[45]

Ludmilla Minaeva says that examples can show the "stylistic and sociolinguistic connotativeness of the illustrated word;" however she also contradicts this statement by saying that examples "should be as free as possible from sociolinguistic connotations."[46] She warns that examples given in unilingual learners' dictionaries "should be unambiguous and stylistically neutral, [they] should be made to give the foreign user of the dictionary as clear an idea as possible of the way in which he can use the word in his own speech."[47] Minaeva also warns against the use of unmodified corpus examples because they can "either puzzle the

---

[45] Al-Kasimi 91.

[46] Minaeva 79-80.

[47] Minaeva 78.

user because of the abundance of irrelevant sociolinguistic information or sound funny (because of its stylistic colouring) when used by a foreigner."[48] Drysdale notes that dictionary editors exhibit "a pedagogic tendency to exemplify only what will be accepted as good usage,"[49] and claims that dictionary editors do not exploit the stylistic functions of examples as much as they might.

While there is some debate on whether examples illustrating stylistic elements are appropriate for all dictionaries or suitably exploited, there is little doubt that examples can and do have stylistic functions.

2.4.1 Stylistic elements

However, the literature is not clear on exactly what stylistic elements examples can illustrate. This is confirmed by Al-Kasimi, who acknowledges that it is difficult to precisely define the stylistic elements of a lemma although he claims that examples are the most feasible method of illustrating such elements.[50] In addition, it is not clear exactly what Minaeva means by such terms as "stylistically neutral" or "stylistic colouring."

Gwyneth Fox gives an example of the stylistic information that a dictionary example may provide. Fox shows how an example can demonstrate a literary or poetic usage of a

---

[48] Minaeva 79.

[49] Drysdale 217-218. However, the prescriptive tendency of dictionary editors noted by Drysdale may be restricted to learners' dictionaries. Contemporary corpus-based general language dictionaries and general bilingual dictionaries strive to portray the headword as it is used, and not an arbitrary standard of usage.

[50] Al-Kasimi 91.

word, an element that the sense indication and other explicit statements would not impart with the same clarity:

> a word which could reasonably have been explained without using an example is the word *hawk*, defined as a large bird with a short hooked bill, sharp claws, and very good eyesight. Hawks catch and eat small birds and animals but the example that was chosen ('a hawk hovered, motionless, in the blue sky') suggests that frequently the word is used in language with a slightly poetic quality, information which is well worth imparting to the reader.[51]

Fox also suggests another stylistic function of examples: that examples can show the typical lexical and grammatical environment of the lemma. Fox says that "if a word typically appears in a sentence which is grammatically complex or alongside vocabulary items that are infrequent, it would be misleading of a dictionary to present that word in a very simple clause or sentence with easy vocabulary."[52] While this statement pertains to a large degree to the grammatical functions of examples, it does illustrate some aspects of the stylistic functions of examples: the degree of grammatical complexity of a construction and the co-occurrence of the lemma with infrequently employed lexical items do reveal some elements that Al-Kasimi might term the "stylistic value" of the lemma.

Drysdale states that examples are used to indicate appropriate registers and stylistic levels. He suggests that examples may illustrate slang or professional jargon, and may be used to suggest that a lemma or a given sense of a lemma is limited to a given field of application.[53]

Landau says that examples can convey a great deal of information on the "variety of usage" of a lemma, which includes such concepts as "degree of formality, humorous or

---

[51] Fox 138.

[52] Fox 138.

[53] Drysdale 217.

sedate context."[54] Landau identifies nine categories of style information given by general dictionaries in explicit statements in the form of labels:

1. Currency or temporality: *archaic, obsolete*
2. Frequency of use: *rare*
3. Regional or geographic variation: *U.S., British, Canadian, Australian;* sometimes regional areas within a country are specified
4. Technical or specialized terminology: *astronomy, chemistry, physics,* etc. these are called *field labels.*
5. Restricted or Taboo usage: *vulgar, obscene*
6. Insult: *offensive, disparaging, contemptuous*
7. Slang: *slang*
8. Style, functional variety, or register: *informal, colloquial, literary, poetic, humorous*
9. Status or cultural level: *nonstandard, substandard, illiterate*[55]

Since many of these labels seem to overlap to some degree (e.g. *vulgar, obscene, offensive, disparaging*), and since there is a surfeit of such abstract labels, presentation of stylistic information only through the use of such labels may tend to confuse the user. On the other hand, Landau points out that examples should not be the only means of indicating a style element because the absence of any qualifying label would suggest that the example showed standard usage.[56]

While the above statements do reveal some of the stylistic elements of lemmas that may be profitably included in bilingual dictionaries, it seems that the stylistic functions of examples are not well understood. That is perhaps because the concept of style itself is open to interpretation. Crystal and Davy mention at least four concepts of style: (a) style may refer to all or some of the language habits of one person; (b) style may refer to all or some

---

[54] Sidney I. Landau, Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography, (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1984; Cambridge University Press, 1989) 166.

[55] Landau 175.

[56] Landau 190.

of the language habits shared by a group of people at one time or over a period of time; (c) style may refer to the effectiveness of a mode of expression; (d) style may refer solely to literary language.[57]

In this thesis, style is taken to refer to "situationally linked variation" in speech or writing.[58] In other words, for each utterance, writers or speakers consciously or unconsciously choose a set of linguistic elements that are appropriate to their context from all the possibilities of a language.[59] For example, the following sentences show alternative ways of describing the same action:

He mounted his nag.
He mounted his horse.
He mounted his steed.

The choice of either *nag*, *horse* or *steed*, each of which designates the same underlying concept, is a style choice.[60] While stylistic elements are difficult to identify, and while a single text may display a range of styles, it is still patently obvious to the native speaker when an inappropriate style has been used. For this reason, dictionaries must provide stylistic information about lemmas and examples are one way to present this information. Examples can illustrate, for example, whether the lemma or equivalent is used in formal, neutral or informal contexts, and whether the lemma or equivalent represents international or regional usage.

---

[57] David Crystal and Derek Davy, Investigating English Style, (Harlow (Essex): Longman, 1969) 9-10.

[58] Jenny Cheshire, "Register and Style", International Encyclopedia of Linguistics, Vol. 3, ed. William Bright (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) 324.

[59] Crystal, Cambridge Encyclopedia 66.

[60] D. Birch, "Style: Definitions", The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics Vol. 8, ed. R.E. Asher (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1994) 4375.

2.4.2 Formality

One way to distinguish among styles is to classify words on a scale of formality. A scale of formality can be divided into at least three general categories: informal, neutral and formal.[61] In the above example, *nag* could be considered the informal term, *horse* the neutral term, and *steed* the formal term.

To a certain extent, such rankings are subjective because, like all stylistic elements, formality is determined by a combination of several factors — topic, setting, relationship between interlocutors[62] — and different people will have a different understanding or interpretation of these extra-linguistic factors that influence style.[63] In lexicography, this subjectivity is demonstrated by the fact that the same lexical item is often given different stylistic labels from one dictionary to the next.[64] For example, the adjective *chié(e)* (sense: "réussi") is marked as very informal in RCS, vulgar or taboo in OXHA, and very colloquial

---

[61] Roberts says "quelles que soient les situations linguistiques, on retrouve au moins les trois niveaux suivants: un parler soutenu, qui tend à ressembler au parler cultivé, utilisé dans la couche qui jouit de prestige intellectuel, une langue courante qui tend à suivre les usages du parler populaire et des parlers patois. Roda Roberts, "Marques de registre dans les dictionnaires bilingues," (in press). Roberts cites J. Dubois *et al*, *Dictionnaire de linguistique*. Paris: Larousse, 1973.

[62] Cheshire 324.

[63] Landau illustrates the problems of subjective interpretations of formality in his discussion of insult: "Many citations for terms of insult in fiction do not at all support the judgement that they are offensive, since they are used among intimates who share the same prejudices. The citation file is thus of limited use in providing a basis for determining which words are offensive. The lexicographer is compelled to use his own experience moderated of necessity by his own moral views, whether consciously or not." (Landau 188).

[64] P.A. Messalar notes that "on est frappé de voir que, bien souvent, les marques de niveau de langue diffèrent d'un dictionnaire monolingue à l'autre dans des cas identiques." P.A. Messalar, "Les marques "*familier*" et "*populaire*" envisagées des points de vue lexicologique et lexicographique," Cahiers de lexicologie: Revue internationale de lexicologie et de lexicographie Vol. L111, (1988-II) 91. Part of the problem is that there is no standardised terminology for designating the stylistic categories into which lexical items may be grouped. For example, Landau distinguishes *taboo, vulgar, obscene, offensive etc.* as different stylistic categories whereas another lexicographer might not see any substantial distinction between such labels.

in LAR2. But it is the complex interplay of several factors that makes determining the "level" of formality difficult, and not merely the subjectivity of the lexicographer. Roberts summarizes some of the factors that must be considered as follows:

> En règle générale, plus les locuteurs sont liés, plus les mots utilisés sont familiers, et moins ils se connaissent, plus les mots utilisés sont formels. Mais les niveaux de formalité sont aussi reliés à la distinction oral/écrit [...]. Dans la langue écrite le niveau est généralement plus formel que dans la langue orale. Enfin, les niveaux de formalité dépendent aussi des situations de communication.[65]

However difficult the task of labelling the degree of formality of a lemma or equivalent may be, the formality level of lexical items is of critical importance to a translator because accurate translation demands a match of style elements from one language to the other. Thus, labelling the formality level of lexical items is an important element of bilingual dictionary entries.

However, labelling is not the only nor perhaps the best way of showing the level of formality. Examples in which the formally marked lexical item is combined with other similarly marked items can have a greater impact than a mere label. The utility of examples for demonstrating style elements of a lemma can be illustrated from bilingual dictionary entries for *filer*. In these dictionaries, *filer* appears in examples showing both neutral and informal registers. For example, OXHA gives an example showing *filer* (intransitive) in a neutral register[66] after the following field labels, sense indication and actant:

> Naut. Pêche. (se dérouler) [*cordage*] **laisser filer un câble/une ligne** to play out a cable/line

---

[65] Roberts, "Marques de registres dans les dictionnaires bilingues," (in press) 12.

[66] Senses and examples that have neutral register are generally not marked in any way.

Senses of *filer* that belong to an informal register are usually marked with a typographical sign. For example, the sense "s'en aller" is marked * for informal by RCS. However, the information provided by this sign is rendered more concrete by two of the examples which demonstrate clearly that in this sense, *filer* has an informal register:

file dans ta chambre
off to your room with you[67]

allez, file, garnement
clear off pest*

In both of these examples, the informal register of the lemma is made clear by the use of the familiar second person singular. However, the other examples that RCS gives for this sense of *filer* do not contain any grammatical elements that confirm the register of the lemma so directly:

le voleur avait déjà filé
the thief had already made off*

il faut que je file
I must dash *ou* fly*

Perhaps the most useful aspect of these examples is their translations, which are informal in every case. When working into another language, especially into a second language, one of the greatest problems one faces is finding the right register. The translation of examples such as those given above provides guidance in informal usage. Given the complex combination of factors that determine a lemma's register, it is important that stylistic elements be demonstrated in examples so that the user may compare how the lemma

[67] RCS uses the same sign (*) to mark equivalents and translations of examples, though this third example the equivalent is not marked informal.

(or equivalent) is used in an example similar to his or her own translation situation. Thereby, the user can make his or her own judgement on its stylistic appropriateness.

At the same time, an exact match of style is not always possible and, in some cases, it may be desirable to give alternative translations — each showing a different register — of an example where the SL phrase or sentence may be interpreted as neutral or informal. The larger context in which the example sentence might appear may determine whether the lemma is best translated by a neutral or informal equivalent. For example, the RCS entry for the lemma *estomac* gives two translations for the example **avoir mal à l'estomac**: to have a stomach ache *ou* tummy ache*.[68] *Stomach ache* is appropriate whether the subject is an adult or a child; *tummy ache* is appropriate in humourous/ironic contexts or if the subject is a small child.

Perhaps the best indicator of the register of a lexical item, particularly if it is a formal or informal item, is its co-occurrence with other lexical items of the same or similar register. Examples can therefore best demonstrate the register of a lemma by showing it in phrases or sentences that incorporate other words of the same register. The RCS entry for *chié(e)*, marked as very informal, contains one such example:

> **c'est chié comme bled!**
> it's a bloody dump *ou* damned hole.

In this ironical use of *chié(e)*, it is accompanied by *bled* which is itself labelled informal within its own entry in RCS.

---

[68] The marker * signifies that the second translation has an informal register.

2.4.3 Geographical variations in style

Examples and their translations may show stylistic variations in the use of lemmas or equivalents (or of collocations containing them) that stem from the geographic context. For example, the French collocation *en huit* has different translations in British English and in North American English. For example, RCS gives the following example to illustrate this collocation:[69]

> **lundi/samedi en huit**
> *(Brit)* a week on Monday/Saturday
> *(Brit)* Monday/Saturday week
> *(N. Am)* a week from Monday/Saturday[70]

OXHA, on the other hand, gives only the British translation of *en huit* and does not label it to indicate that it shows a regional style:

> **je pars mardi en huit**
> I'm leaving a week on Tuesday

One may wonder whether the difference in British and North American translations is one of style or of grammar. On the surface, it appears that the only differences between the British and North American translations are of word order ('Saturday week' versus 'week from Saturday') and the choice of preposition ('week on' versus 'week from Saturday'). However, since all the translations are deemed correct, the variations they present are

---

[69] Collocations will be explained in greater detail in the chapter 4 on restricted examples.

[70] I present this example differently from how it is presented in RCS. For example, they use the label Am to indicate American usage wheras I use the label N. Am. to indicate North American usage. I also separate each translation, while RCS gave them in abbreviated form: "a week on *ou* from Monday/Saturday."

"options," i.e. stylistic, rather than "servitudes."[71] And since these variations are characteristic of a linguistic community in a given area, they may not be understood by speakers of the same language in another geographic community. Hence, to help the user choose the translation preferred by a given regional audience, it is essential that the dictionary indicate which translation is appropriate. Examples combined with labels seem the best way of doing so.

2.5 CONCLUSION: GENERAL FUNCTIONS OF EXAMPLES

This chapter has outlined the general functions of examples in bilingual dictionaries, and has illustrated these functions by citing examples from existing dictionaries. While all the major categories of general functions have been touched upon, not all possible sub-functions within each category have been dealt with. For example, it may be possible to find examples that will illustrate every grammatical rule in a language. I considered it sufficient to illustrate how examples illustrate some irregularities in grammatical rules, under the assumption that such irregularities constitute the greater difficulty for second language users.

The general functions presented in this chapter apply mainly to free combinations. For example, with regard to semantic functions, free combinations illustrate the senses of the lemma whereas two types of restricted examples, compounds and fixed expressions, do

---

[71] i.e. grammatical. The terminology here is that of Vinay & Darbelnet in Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. They define "servitude" as "cas où le choix, la forme et l'ordre des mots sont imposés par la langue," (14) and "option" as "le contraire de servitude. Il ya a option lorsqu'une langue a le choix entre deux constructions de même sens." (12).

not.[72] However, some general functions do apply to restricted examples; this was the case with the style choices implicated in geographical variations in collocations. In addition, other general functions may also apply to restricted examples. For example, restricted examples may have an informal or formal register that would need to be indicated through labelling and other means.[73] Before elaborating on the subject of restricted examples in chapter 4, chapter 3 will now discuss some specific functions of examples, namely translation functions and cultural functions.

[72] Of course there are some polysemous restricted examples that need special treatment. This will be discussed in chapter 4 on restricted examples.

[73] The other means would involve sub-entries which will be discussed in chapter 4 on restricted examples.

CHAPTER 3: SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS OF EXAMPLES

3.1 DEFINITION AND TYPES OF SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS OF EXAMPLES

This chapter will discuss the specific functions of examples. Specific functions, as mentioned previously, are functions which are not present in all or most dictionary examples but which pertain more specifically to bilingual dictionary examples. Specific functions can be broadly divided into two categories: translation functions which are revealed only when the SL and TL parts of an example are carefully compared, and cultural functions which involve values that are specific to a given culture.

Specific functions, while different from general functions, are closely related to them. For example, the semantic functions of examples are involved in the specific function of helping the user to choose between equivalents.

While many of the general functions of examples discussed in the previous chapter were widely acknowledged in the lexicographic literature,[1] this is not the case for translation functions. This chapter will enumerate some translation functions of examples that became evident through the analysis of examples in existing dictionaries and through my own experience in translating examples as a lexicographic research assistant. While the literature does yield some discussion of the cultural functions of examples, they are not well illustrated in the context of bilingual lexicography. The findings on cultural functions of examples will be applied to bilingual dictionaries.

---

[1] But they were not well explained, a lacuna chapter 3 attempted to fill.

3.2 TRANSLATION FUNCTIONS OF EXAMPLES

Bilingual dictionary examples perform a number of translation functions. Examples show how equivalents may be integrated into an appropriate context. They illustrate context-specific equivalents that would not appear in the list of more generally applicable equivalents. They can demonstrate that a lemma may be translated not by a single TL lexical item but instead by a phrase or other formulation of the information expressed in the SL part of the example. Examples may suggest other equivalents that are not presented at all in the entry. This section will illustrate many of these functions of examples.

3.2.1 Use of common equivalents

The primary function of examples in bilingual dictionaries seems to be to show how equivalents are used in the TL. The translations of examples demonstrate how equivalents that are often first presented in a list at the beginning of the microstructure may be integrated into a TL structure. Equivalents presented in such a list are those that are most common, i.e. the most frequent translations of a lemma in a given sense. For example, the RCS entry for *jeter* gives for the sense "lancer" the equivalents *to throw, to fling, to hurl*. The following examples show typical phrases and sentences where *jeter* may be translated by these equivalents, and how these equivalents may be integrated into a TL sentence:

il a jeté son agresseur à terre
he threw his attacker to the ground

elle lui a jeté son cadeau à la tête
she threw *ou* hurled his present at him

3.2.2 Provision of supplementary equivalents

Bilingual dictionaries frequently use examples to supplement equivalents provided in the equivalents list. The dictionary may list one common equivalent before the examples, and then may provide examples that show not only this listed equivalent but also another common equivalent at the same time. For example, the RCS entry for *courir* gives for the sense "se précipiter" the listed equivalent *to rush*. However, several examples show this listed equivalent and another common equivalent, *to run*, presented side by side as alternate translations of the lemma:

> **courir chez le docteur**
> to rush *ou* run to the doctor's/for the doctor
>
> **spectacle qui fait courir tout Paris**
> show that all Paris is rushing *ou* running to see

Other examples within this sense division show the common but unlisted equivalent *to run* used alone:

> **elle m'a fait courir**
> she had me running all over the place.

3.2.3 Help in selecting context-appropriate equivalents

It is not enough for dictionaries merely to present a number of equivalents in a list because such equivalents are not always interchangeable: the context in which the lemma appears will often determine which equivalent is appropriate. Therefore, examples are essential to demonstrate typical contexts in which one common equivalent is preferred over another. For example, for the verb *to drink*, both RCS and LAR2 list *boire* and *prendre* as equivalents. However, the range of contexts in which they may be used synonymously is

limited. Unfortunately, this does not become obvious to the user, since RCS does not use the equivalent *prendre* in any of its examples for the lemma *to drink*. This deficiency may lead the user to assume that *prendre* may also be used to translate the lemma in any example where *boire* is used. This is not the case, as can be illustrated using the following examples from RCS:

> **would you like something to drink?**
> voulez-vous boire quelque chose?
>
> **give me something to drink**
> donnez-moi (quelque chose) à boire

If *prendre* were substituted for *boire* in the first example the example would remain idiomatic. However, if *prendre* were substituted for *boire* in the translation of the second example the translation would be not only unidiomatic, but incomprehensible.

3.2.4 Addition of context-specific equivalents

Delisle says that bilingual dictionaries provide equivalents "for the most common significations of the words in each language, but they certainly do not explore all the semantic possibilities of words used in context."[2] While it is true that bilingual dictionaries do not and cannot explore all the semantic possibilities of words in context, they do in fact frequently attempt to give some equivalents that are not widely applicable. Such equivalents may be termed context-specific equivalents because they are an apt translation for the lemma only when the lemma appears within a specific SL context. Consider the following example found in the RCS entry for *jeter* in the sense division for "lancer":

---

[2] Delisle 48.

(*Naut*) **le navire a été jeté à la côte**
the ship was driven towards the coast

This example shows the lemma translated by *to drive*, an equivalent which is not included in the general list of equivalents nor used in any other translations. In this example, the subject *navire* influences how *jeter* may be interpreted. The most likely equivalent for *navire* in this context is *ship*, and since it would not be idiomatic to use the listed equivalents for *jeter* (one would not likely say that a ship had been *thrown, flung or hurled*), another, context-specific equivalent for *jeter* is necessary, in this case *to drive*. The equivalent given for the lemma in this example is not likely to be used except within such a specific context.

3.2.5 Suggestion of indirect translation procedures

The specific nuances that accrue to a lemma when it appears within the context of a phrase or sentence often render it inappropriate or difficult or even impossible to translate the lemma with a simple one-to-one or 'direct' lexical equivalent. In such cases, 'indirect' translation procedures, such as transposition, modulation, expansion, paraphrase etc. are required. Examples can illustrate typical contexts in which such translation procedures may be necessary, and how the translation per se could be configured.

For example, LAR2 gives one example for *franchir* where the translation shows a double transposition (or change in grammatical category), also termed the *chassé-croisé*. In this example, the verb *franchir* is translated by a preposition and the noun *bond* is translated by a verb.

il a franchi le fossé d'un bond
he jumped over the ditch

The translation of the following example from the OXHA for *to drink* shows modulation, (or change in point of view):

> **you can drink some red wines chilled**
> certain vins rouges se boivent frais

The translations of the following example from the RCS entry for *courir* and the OXHA entry for *to drink* show expansion, (the expanded parts are underlined):

> **courir à la catastrophe**
> to rush headlong into disaster

> **what are you drinking?**
> qu'est-ce que vous voulez boire?

The translation of the following example from the RCS entry for *courir* (in the sense "se précipiter") shows contraction, (the contracted part is underlined):

> **courir partout pour trouver qch**
> to hunt everywhere for sth.

The juxtapostion of *courir* and *trouver* influences how *courir* may be interpreted: the signification of each verb is influenced by its close proximity to the other. In effect, together, the two verbs designate a concept that is appropriately translated by the single English verb *to hunt*.

Paraphrase, or restatement in other words, is frequently used to translate SL fixed expressions or simply idiomatic, often metaphorical uses of a lemma. This method is illustrated by the following example from the OXHA entry *to drink*, (the part paraphrased in translation is underlined):

> **don't listen to him, it's the drink talking**
> ne l'écoute pas, l'alcool lui fait dire n'importe quoi

3.2.6 Conclusion: translation functions

Bilingual dictionaries obviously cannot provide examples to demonstrate all possible context-specific equivalents. In fact, such a practice would be impractical, both from the perspective of the production of the dictionary, and from the user's perspective: the lexicographers producing the dictionary would likely not have the resources to perform such a task and few users would be willing to wade through the mass of examples that would have to be included. Instead, the dictionary entry must include a variety of examples: some that show the listed equivalents, some that introduce unlisted but still common equivalents, others that introduce context-specific equivalents and still others that show other translation methods.[3]

The bilingual dictionary user would hopefully understand the basic precept of dictionary use that an entry does not contain all solutions to the translation problems posed by a given lemma. Instead, the information in the entry should trigger the user's own intuition. For example, referring back to the examples cited from the RCS entry for *jeter*, we see that the lemma is most commonly translated by *to throw, hurl, fling*. However, some examples such as

> (*Naut*) **le navire a été jeté à la côte**
> the ship was driven towards the coast

remind users that in specific contexts, other equivalents than the most common ones are possible and even necessary. They should extrapolate from this example that the context they need to translate may require an equally unique equivalent for the lemma, an equivalent useful only in the specific context they have before them.

---

[3] Of course, some lexical items are not as grammatically or semantically complex as others and therefore do not need such elaborate exemplification.

3.3 CULTURAL FUNCTIONS OF EXAMPLES

An important parameter of all communication situations is the cultural context in which the communication occurs. In translation from one language into another, at least two cultural contexts play a role in the communication process: that of the linguistic community represented by speakers of the SL and that of speakers of the TL.[4] If there is a close connection between a message and the cultural context of its production, then the translator may be considered an intermediary between the cultural groups of the SL and the TL.[5] The translator interprets the SL message, considering the cultural context in which it was produced, and re-expresses this message in the TL, endeavouring to make the translation fit the TL cultural context.

Cultural context is reflected in dictionary examples in several ways. First, it is reflected by the fact that certain lexical items are culture-specific: they have meanings that are specific to a particular cultural context. When such items are the lemma, a key function of the examples is to illustrate the cultural values designated by the culture-specific lemma and to show how such elements may be translated. When culture-specific items appear in examples but are not the lemma, their role is more complicated. A non-lemmatic culture-specific item in an example can help illustrate a culture-specific lemma, provided that the non-lemmatic culture-specific item is explained elsewhere in the dictionary. However, a non-

---

[4] The subject matter, and temporal parameters may draw other cultural contexts into the communication situation. For example, if a translator is translating from French to English a text about German history, then this subject matter will impose an additional cultural context on the process of translation.

[5] Roda P. Roberts, "Translation: An Act of Communication," Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics, Bulletin of the CAAL, Proceedings, 12th annual Symposium held at Carleton University, Ottawa, eds. Guy Connolly, Jacques D. Girard, Bernard Landriault, Autumn, 1981, Vol. 3 No. 2: 151-152.

lemmatic culture-specific item may also render the example confusing to the user because it may not be understood. The problems posed by such culture-specific items will be addressed in more detail in section 3.3.2, Examples with culture-specific elements in bilingual dictionaries.

Cultural context as it pertains to dictionary examples is not limited to individual culture-specific lexical items. Examples reveal the values of the linguistic communities from which they are drawn in more subtle ways. Most examples represent models of both grammatically and politically 'correct' usage upon which users may safely model their own writing and speech. Examples showing nonstandard usage are frequently marked so that users may avoid such usage in inappropriate situations. Cultural context is also revealed by the types of examples that are included and excluded in dictionaries: newer dictionaries seem less likely, for example, to include examples showing women in negative, stereotypical roles. Cultural context and the selection of examples will be discussed in more detail in section 3.3.4, Examples and ideology.

3.3.1 Literature review: cultural functions

Despite the importance of cultural context in translation, the literature on bilingual lexicography has little to say about the cultural functions of examples. Al-Kasimi gives a vague statement that is typical of those few authors that raise the issue. According to him, examples "can be selected purposefully to give the dictionary user some notions of the foreign culture he is dealing with. The culture can be illustrated, to a great extent, by the

quotations cited in the bilingual dictionary."[6] He later adds that "illustrative examples can be so selected or made up as to reflect the culture and patterns of thinking and social behaviour of the speakers of the target language."[7] These statements by Al-Kasimi are not supported by a demonstration of just what cultural notions examples may illustrate nor how examples can show TL patterns of thinking or social behaviour. However, Al-Kasimi does raise one important point: that examples demonstrate cultural features in both the SL and TL, i.e., of both lemmas and their equivalents.

Kharma gives an equally vague statement regarding the cultural functions of bilingual dictionary examples. He suggests that contextualization of lexical items includes "giving the necessary stylistic and cultural uses/senses of the item, e.g. whether the item is used formally, informally, colloquially, regionally, slang, taboo etc."[8] He adds that this information is helpful to the user "not only for understanding the connotation of the item when it occurs in a text, but for learning how to 'use' it himself when he has to."[9] There are two problems with these statements that render them unhelpful for understanding the cultural functions of examples. First, it is unclear if Kharma would highlight such elements through examples or through the use of labels. Second, elements such as formal, informal, colloquial etc. are more likely to be considered elements of style than of culture; in fact, this thesis

---

[6] Al-Kasimi 92.

[7] Al-Kasimi 94.

[8] Kharma 204.

[9] Kharma 204.

discusses such elements in the section on the stylistic functions of examples.[10] However, Kharma, like Al-Kasimi, does suggest that cultural connotations are important for decoding an SL text and for encoding in the TL.

Jacobsen *et al* include cultural functions among their list of functions of bilingual dictionary examples: "examples, if judiciously selected, can demonstrate collocational, stylistic, syntactic, morphological, and cultural features of words and phrases."[11] However, like other authors, they provide no illustration of what they mean by cultural features. But they do make an important point by asserting that cultural elements play a role in determining the number of examples to be given for a lemma:

> Cultural distance between the languages involved also plays a role. A bilingual dictionary of two languages from very different cultures will need many examples illustrating cultural/encyclopædic factors, whereas if the non-linguistic background of the two languages is largely the same, fewer examples are needed.[12]

While many works on bilingual lexicography indicate, however vaguely, the importance of the cultural functions of examples, Marello stands apart by questioning the "need for examples to represent the foreign culture in the L1-L2 section."[13] She feels that this need is not great "because in production users are more likely to need examples which translate their culture into the L2 culture and language. An Italian user does not look for examples in the Italian-English part, which represent English culture; he is more likely to use examples which help him in expressing Italian culture in English."[14]

---

[10] Admittedly, the concepts designated by such terms as *style* and *culture* are not easily defined. Each term may designate a wide variety of elements, depending on the point of view of a given author.

[11] Jacobsen *et al* 2787. My underlining.

[12] Jacobsen *et al* 2788.

[13] Marello 234.

[14] Marello 234.

The literature on unilingual learners' dictionaries (i.e. dictionaries intended for foreign language learners) also yields a few comments on the cultural functions of dictionary examples. Unfortunately, some of these comments are no more specific than those taken from documentation on bilingual lexicography. Hausmann, for example, says that learners' dictionaries should "verbaliser copieusement les traits sémantiques dans des phrases riches en ambiance culturelle."[15] While he does provide an example for *bagou* — **il était étourdi par le bagou de la concierge qui le poursuivait jusque dans l'escalier** — to illustrate his statement, what he means by "ambience culturelle" nevertheless remains vague.

However, discussions of the cultural content of examples are more substantial, if somewhat negative, for they warn of the problems such content may pose for comprehension. In a review of COCO, for example, Amy Chi Man-Lai cites several instances where COCO uses examples containing proper nouns to illustrate lexical items.[16] COCO illustrates the item *subpoena* with the following example:

A House committee tried to serve a subpoena on Harry Truman

Man-Lai points out that the user needs a considerable understanding of the cultural context in order to correctly interpret the example. Of the two proper nouns in the example (House and Harry Truman), only *house* has its own entry in the dictionary. In definition 3.4 of the *house* entry, the user is clearly told that "the *House* is often used to refer specifically to one of

---

[15] Franz Josef Hausmann, "Les dictionnaires pour l'enseignement de la langue étrangère: français," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography Vol. 2, F.J. Hausmann ed., (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1989) 1387.

[16] Amy Chi Man-Lai, "A critical user-oriented review of the *Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary*: definitions and examples," Thinking Language: Issues in the Study of Language and Language Curriculum Renewal. eds. Kitty P.Y. Wong and Christopher F. Green (Language Centre, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, 1995) 49.

these groups, for example the House of Commons, the House of Lords or the House of Representatives." In addition, COCO provides separate entries for *House of Commons*, *House of Lords*, *House of Representatives*. However, to be able to identify the *House* in this example from the entry for *subpoena* as the *House of Representatives*, the user has to know who Harry Truman is (an American President) before he or she can make the link between *House* and *House of Representatives*. For translation purposes, the user would also have to know which *House* was being referred to.

The tendency to use culture-related proper nouns, pointed out by Man-Lai, has also been criticized by Minaeva. However, Minaeva also shows that an example may be difficult to understand not just because it contains proper nouns, but because it contains other lexical items whose use is restricted to one particular cultural community where the language of the dictionary is used; she cites the following example for the lemma *similarly* in COCO: **You should notify any change of address to the Bonds and Stock Office. Similarly, savings certificates should be registered with the Post Office.**[17] This example contains several elements that are particular to British English: the proper noun *Bonds and Stocks Office*, *savings certificates*, the collocation *to notify to*, and the concept of "registering" an investment (assuming *savings certificates* are an investment of some sort) at the Post Office. None of these British elements are explained in their own entries in the dictionary, nor are they marked as being particularly British in this example. Examples such as these lead Minaeva to conclude that "to use these dictionaries to the best advantage, one should possess

---

[17] Minaeva 78. Minaeva shortens the example that appeared in COCO. She cites only "*Similarly, savings certificates should be registered with the Post Office.*" I have cited the complete example as it appears in COCO.

a considerable amount of background knowledge because illustrative word-combinations and sentences abound in sociolinguisitic information."[18] In fact, both Minaeva and Man-Lai warn that when culture-specific information appears in dictionary examples, it may at best distract the user, or worse, mislead him or her.

However, Minaeva concedes that there is some justification for including such culture-specific information in examples:

> it could be suggested that sociolinguistically determined sentences should be included in learners' dictionaries because the student of English must be aware of the social customs and institutions of English speaking countries.[19]

The implications of this statement for bilingual dictionary examples will be assessed in the following section.

3.3.2 Examples with culture-specific elements in bilingual dictionaries

Minaeva's argument in favor of including culture-specific information in examples in learners' dictionaries can be adapted as follows to justify its inclusion in bilingual dictionaries: sociolinguistically determined sentences should be included in bilingual dictionaries because the translator or other bilingual dictionary user must be aware of the social customs and institutions of the SL countries and must know how to render such sentences with a culturally appropriate version in the TL.

Culture-specific examples are particularly appropriate for a lemma whose use and designation is limited to a particular cultural group or geographic region. The Canadian

---

[18] Minaeva 78.

[19] Minaeva 78.

French lexical item *motoneige*, which has the sense "petit véhicule pour circuler sur la neige," and is translated as *snowmobile* or *skidoo*, is one such lemma.[20] Even if the concept designated by the lemma *motoneige* can be made clear by a simple sense indication and a list of equivalents, an example such as the one given by the BCD to illustrate this lexical item may include sociolinguistic information that actually helps explicate the lemma:

> **la motoneige a remplacé les traîneaux à chiens dans le Grand Nord**
> the snowmobile/skidoo has replaced dog sleds in the Far North

This BCD example for *motoneige* contains precisely the type of information that has been criticized in other examples above: it has a culture-specific item (*traîneaux à chiens*) and a proper noun (*Grand Nord*) that may or may not be comprehensible to the user. However, such an example is justified here because the whole entry for *motoneige* is labelled as being particular to Canada, and perhaps the best way to illustrate the specifically "Canadian" cultural elements designated by this lemma is to link it to other typically Canadian cultural elements in an example. Of course, these other culture-specific items must be fully explained in other entries in the BCD, so that the foreign user may properly decipher the example.[21]

3.3.3 Examples and cultural norms

Whether dictionary examples specifically include cultural elements or not, they do demonstrate cultural norms. This is what Dubois implies in his discussion of dictionaries and correct usage. Dubois asserts that dictionaries and, consequently examples, provide models of correct usage, but suggests that the notion of what constitutes correct usage is somewhat

---

[20] The information on *motoneige* comes from the BCD entry for this item.

[21] To date, *traîneau à chiens* and *Grand Nord* have not been treated in the BCD.

subjective. The notion of 'correct' usage may be interpreted from a linguistic standpoint: [il renvoie] "à une norme linguistique, plus ou moins étroite (est-ce que j'emploie ce mot avec le sens de celui des « autres » locuteurs?)"[22] But, as Dubois points out, 'correct' may also be interpreted from a cultural standpoint: "il renvoie à une norme culturelle (est-ce que j'emploie ce mot dans la « situation » qui convient?)."[23]

Examples thus function as models of usage in two ways. First, Dubois suggests, they provide a "contexte linguistique [qui] implique un jugement de grammaticalité (la phrase est-elle syntaxiquement possible, correcte, grammaticale?)". Second, examples provide a "contexte culturel [qui] implique un jugement d'acceptabilité (la phrase est-elle vraie, fausse, dans une culture donnée?)."[24] According to Dubois, verbs, adjectives and adverbs are usually the categories of lemmas involved in *contextes linguistiques*, whereas nouns are more often the lemmas involved in *contextes culturels*,[25] although these categories are certainly not mutually exclusive. Dubois' awareness of the important cultural role played by dictionaries is summed up in the following statement: "le dictionnaire est utilisé pour *maîtriser* les moyens d'expression ou *compléter* une information sur la culture."[26]

Examples presenting cultural norms can be found in the entry for the lexical item *speaker*, in the sense of the person who presides over proceedings in legislative

---

[22] Jean Dubois et Claude Dubois. Introduction à la lexicographie (Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1971) 12.

[23] Dubois 12.

[24] Dubois 88.

[25] Dubois 88-89.

[26] Dubois 12.

assemblies.[27] RCS, OXHA, HA and LAR2 all use examples to indicate that, in this sense, *speaker* is used as a title and must therefore be capitalized, and OXHA and HA demonstrate by the following example that *the Speaker* must be addressed in a formal manner:

> **Mr. Speaker**
> Monsieur le Président

While the information presented in this example would be much clearer if a longer context were provided, the example is nonetheless informative, as it presents usage which, while common, is particular to a specific cultural context and therefore not predictable by those unfamiliar with that cultural context.

3.3.4 Examples and ideology

Examples may also show the ideological persuasions of the lexicographers who compile a dictionary and of the cultural community in which the dictionary is produced. Dubois says that this subjectivity may appear in the dictionary

> d'une manière inconsciente, par le *choix* ou la *fabrication* des *exemples* : d'une manière ou d'une autre, les exemples qui ont à la fois une fonction linguistique et une signification culturelle engagent l'éthique et l'esthétique des lexicographes. Ils forment un ensemble d'assertions sur le monde, qui impliquent une idéologie, celle d'une communauté à laquelle le lexicographe s'identifie, mais aussi une manière personnelle de juger les phrases et les messages qui s'y trouvent.[28]

If examples are taken from a corpus, then they obviously represent typical usage in a language community. However, the lexicographer is inevitably called upon to make a selection. Those examples that he or she chooses may well carry an implicit ideological message, as Beaujot points out:

---

[27] At least in Canada, Great Britain, the United States, Australia and New Zealand.

[28] Dubois 54.

> l'ensemble discontinu des exemples est d'une efficacité idéologique d'autant plus grande que tout exemple paraît gratuit; l'idéologie s'y déploie avec une candeur comparable à celle des exemples et exercices de ces manuels de grammaire et d'arithmétique, d'où la leçon morale n'est jamais absente.[29]

Beaujot's suggestion that questions of ideology in examples arise not just from the nature of the lemma in question, but also from the lexicographer's selection of examples, is illustrated by an example from dictionary entries for the item *femelle*. The 'ideologically acceptable' example — *la biche est la femelle du cerf* — has been repeated from dictionary to dictionary, whereas the 'ideologically unacceptable' although perfectly correct example — *le cerf est le mâle de la biche* — is never found in entries for *mâle*.

While Beaujot thus seems to imply that ideology is reflected both by the examples actually presented in dictionaries and by those not chosen, Dubois suggests that the ideology of a dictionary may be revealed more by what the examples omit than by what they actually illustrate.[30] For example, ideology may be reflected in a policy to omit examples that touch on sensitive political issues, examples that show literary usage, or examples that show language that some may consider highly offensive. Yet, it may be impossible to follow such a policy for some lexical items and still demonstrate the item's actual use in the language: some items will naturally and frequently occur in contexts that may be politically sensitive, literary, or offensive, and such elements may need to be illustrated with examples.

---

[29] Jean-Pierre Beaujot, "Dictionnaire et idéologies", Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography Vol. 1, F.J. Hausmann *et al* eds., (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989) 84.

[30] "C'est plutôt dans les rejets que se manifeste cette intervention du lexicographe." Dubois 54. Dubois speaks primarily of the removal of examples from dictionaries when they are revised for re-edition long after their first publication. But it seems that if examples would be removed from a dictionary for ideological reasons on re-edition, then they would also be excluded for such reasons from a first edition.

Examples in bilingual dictionary entries for the lemma *femme* suggest that there may be some ideological factors influencing the selection of examples. This is apparent especially when the examples that are given in HA are compared with those given in RCS, OXHA and LAR2. HA was published in 1972 whereas the other three have been published or revised since 1993. During the time between the publication of HA and that of the other three bilingual dictionaries, there has been some small evolution in attitudes towards the role of women in Western societies, and this change in attitudes is reflected in the differences in examples included in HA in 1972, and in those included and excluded in the 1990s.

HA gives several examples that may be deemed politically incorrect by contemporary standards because they seem to portray women in a negative, stereotypical way that would not likely be accepted in contemporary public discourse:

ses femmes
his womenfolk, the women of his family

elle est plus femme que sa soeur
she's more of a woman than her sister

sa femme est une bonne femme de ménage
his wife is a good housekeeper

une bonne femme
a simple, good natured (old) woman

While such examples may still be considered an accurate representation of the linguistic usage of *femme*, they are no longer 'politically' acceptable for inclusion in contemporary dictionaries. Indeed, as the following examples show, the three bilingual dictionaries of the 1990s not only exclude such explicitly sexist examples, but also include other examples that

directly reflect women's struggle to overcome such stereotyping. Consider the following two examples, from RCS and LAR2 respectively:

les droits de la femme mariée
the rights of married women *ou* a married woman

la libération / les droits de la femme
women's liberation / rights

In addition, RCS, OXHA and LAR2 all give a collection of compounds that also reflect evolving atitudes:

femme d'affaires
businesswoman

la femme objet
woman as a sex object/sex object

femme de tête
strong-minded, intellectual woman

femme-prêtre
woman priest

femme battue
battered woman

femme-cadre
executive woman

femme-ingénieur
woman engineer

femme policier
police woman

Such examples may be said to portray a different ideology from that prevalent in HA. Nonetheless, each of the three more recent dictionaries still includes a few examples that can be criticized from the point of view of political correctness:

femme de mauvaise vie
loose woman

femme de petite vertu
woman of easy virtue

femme facile
easy woman

While these examples do not appear in HA, they nonetheless present a kind of negative judgement similar to that presented in the examples cited previously from HA (**elle est plus femme que sa soeur** / she's more of a woman than her sister, etc.). Such 'negative' examples may be said to represent what Beaujot calls the "corpus d'exemples dont l'autorité, depuis les premiers dictionnaires, est reconnue: les reprendre est signe d'allégiance [...] Ainsi se trouve conforté de génération en génération un des stéréotypes les plus tenaces de l'idéologie dominante."[31]

Hence, the inclusion of certain types of examples may perpetuate stereotypes. The lexicographer has to balance the need to reflect linguistic usage and the need to ensure a lack of ideological bias.

3.3.5 Conclusion: specific functions

This chapter has grouped together two specific functions of examples: translation functions and cultural functions. Translation functions are specific because they show how examples play a very direct role in helping the dictionary user to solve his or her translation problems: they demonstrate various ways the lemma may be translated in context. Cultural

---

[31] Beaujot 84.

functions are specific because they play a role in assisting users with a very specific translation problem: examples illustrate the meanings, use and translation of culture-specific items. Examples also have cultural functions that have less direct bearing upon the user's specific translation problems: examples suggest ideological norms of the linguistic communities that contribute to the dictionary's production.

CHAPTER 4: RESTRICTED EXAMPLES

4.1 GENERAL FUNCTIONS AND RESTRICTED EXAMPLES

The functions of examples discussed in the previous chapters pertain primarily to free combinations. While such functions may also apply to restricted examples (i.e. compounds, fixed expressions and collocations), they do so in a more limited way. The reason for this is that restricted examples function as a unit and, to a certain extent, have the same status as an individual lexical unit. For example, compounds and fixed expressions often, if not always, have a global meaning in which the sense of each individual lemma disappears while collocations severely restrict the meanings of their component items; restricted examples have neutral, formal or informal register just as do individual lexical items. Because restricted examples function as semantic and grammatical units, they cannot be 'freely' translated. Not all and sometimes none of the listed equivalents for a given lemma can be used to render it when it is part of a restricted example; the same is true of words that co-occur with that lemma in a restricted example. Thus, while restricted examples have an important translation function, it is not the same as that of free combinations with which they are generally grouped in most bilingual dictionaries.

The fact that they are generally put together with free combinations in bilingual dictionaries and not treated as individual entries despite their special status as language units in their own right seems to be for practical reasons. First, presenting restricted examples within the entries for their component items takes up less space. Second, one type of restricted example, the collocation, does illustrate the senses of components and is therefore

best presented within the appropriate sense division of these component items. Third, general bilingual dictionaries are constructed on a semasiological basis whereby the entry for an individual lexical item is built up from an analysis of its meanings and uses: each restricted example constitutes one special type of use of a lexical item. Therefore, the logic of the semasiological approach to lexicographical analysis dictates that such examples be presented within the entries for their component items and not as separate entries. Restricted examples are given within the entries of bilingual dictionaries to indicate to the user the most frequent combinations in which a lemma may appear.

The special status of restricted examples as a type of unit is not negated by their presentation along with free combinations provided this status is highlighted through labelling and/or grouping and/or special treatment. They must be labelled and arranged in such a way that the user is warned of their special status, and does not misuse and mistranslate them. In addition, if they are presented as sub-entries — i.e. presented not only with their translation but also within one or more sentence examples — they have added value in that their meaning, grammatical function and stylistic value are more easily illustrated.

This chapter will define sub-entries, a key term in discussions of restricted examples. It will differentiate between the three types of restricted examples: collocations, compounds and fixed expressions, and will highlight problems in their presentation.

4.2 SUB-ENTRIES

Much of the literature on restricted examples, i.e. collocations, fixed expressions, and compounds, discusses their treatment as sub-entries. However, it is not always clear what

form sub-entries take nor how they function. In addition, there is little consensus between authors on exactly what constitutes a sub-entry. The following paragraphs attempt to define the form and function of sub-entries since they are essential to the discussion of restricted examples that follows.

4.2.1 Literature review: sub-entry

The term sub-entry is often used to designate any piece of information within a dictionary entry that describes the form and function of a complex lexical item that incorporates the lemma — such as a collocation, a compound, or fixed expression — but that does not describe the lemma itself.[1] Complex lexical items impose restrictions on the meanings and use of each of their component lexical items and any information a dictionary gives about them applies only to the complex item and is not generalizable to the meanings and use of the headword as it might appear in free combinations; hence the name restricted example. For example, the RCS entry for the lemma *ball* gives the following compounds:

ballcock
robinet à flotteur

ballpark
stade de baseball

It is impossible to generalizse about *ball* from these translations because the information they provide is specific to the SL compounds, of which *ball* is a component.

---

[1] F. J. Hausmann and H. E. Wiegand. "Theory of Monolingual Lexicography I: Components and Structures of Dictionaries," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography, Vol. 1, eds. F.J. Hausmann *et al* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989) 329.

Sub-entries therefore present specific constructions that include the lemma and that are placed in the microstructure of the entry for the lemma. According to Manley *et al*, such phrases constitute "an entry within the entry."[2] Hausmann and Wiegand note that such complex items should ideally be treated as individual lemmas because "they are linguistic signs," which means the component lexical items of the complex item work together to designate a single referent.[3] Hausmann and Wiegand add that alphabetical order is the "only ordering principle which all users may be reasonably expected to master easily" and therefore even complex items should be placed in their alphabetical position in the overall macrostructure of the dictionary.[4] However, since most printed dictionaries are restricted space-wise, "for practical reasons they are traditionally treated in the microstructure" as sub-entries.[5]

Some dictionaries simply mark such complex lexical items by using typographical means. Others place these complex items in a separate section within the entry. Still others use a combination of both methods to distinguish sub-entries from free combinations. For example, the RCS entry for the lemma *barre* includes a separate section for compounds: the compound *barres parallèles* is both marked with the symbol ▸ and grouped with other compounds in a separate section at the end of the RCS entry for *barre*.

---

[2] James Manley, Jane Jacobsen, Viggo Hjorner Pederson, "Telling lies efficiently: Terminology and the Microstructure in the Bilingual Dictionary," Lexicographica Series Major: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Lexicography May 14-16, 1986 at the University of Copenhagen, eds. Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen and Arne Zettersen (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag) 287 & 291.

[3] Hausman and Wiegand 329. This is true for compounds and fixed expressions, but not for collocations as will be explained later in this chapter. However, collocations may also be treated as sub-entries.

[4] Hausmann and Wiegand 329.

[5] Hausmann and Wiegand 329.

Zgusta sees sub-entries as a way for the lexicographer to avoid two problems. First, sub-entries allow the lexicographer to avoid grouping complex lexical items together with free combinations. This is important because the user should be warned not to generalize from the complex items. Second, sub-entries allow the lexicographer to avoid listing the complex items as full entries of their own, thereby saving space.[6]

Jacobsen *et al* assert that sub-entries, which they define as "idioms, collocations and other syntagms with their translation equivalents," are not examples. While they feel that in unilingual dictionaries, "there is considerably more justification for seeing sub-entries as exemplifications of the lemma,"[7] they claim that in bilingual dictionaries,

> the majority of sub-entries provide one-to-one translation equivalents. They *exemplify* nothing. A related problem is that there is no distinction between *examples* which truly exemplify (in the sense that one can generalize from them) and those that present instances of contexts in which the word in question can be used, but from which one cannot generalize.[8]

Despite Jacobsen *et al*'s hesitation about according the status of examples to sub-entries, a review of the literature suggests that the term sub-entry is sometimes used in ways that appear synonymous with the term *example* as it is used in this thesis. *Sub-entry* sometimes merely designates a way of highlighting and grouping specific types of examples and is not really distinct from examples.

---

[6] Zgusta 268.

[7] They do not enumerate these justifications.

[8] Jacobsen *et al* 2783.

4.2.2 Definition of sub-entry

For the purposes of this thesis, not all complex lexical items are considered sub-entries. Here, the term *sub-entry* designates a way of presenting restricted examples that are first marked as such and/or placed in a special zone of the microstructure. Sub-entries show the 'lemmatized' form of the restricted example, followed by its most common translation(s). Explicit semantic or grammatical statements may follow if they are necessary. The sub-entry concludes with one or more sentences that show how the restricted example may be translated in context. The RCS entry for *ball* contains several sub-entries, among them:

> **ballpark** (*US*) stade de baseball; (*fig*) **in the ballpark*** dans cet ordre de grandeur; **in the ballpark of*** aux alentours de, environ; **we're in the same ballpark*** on arrive à peu près à la même somme, on n'est pas très éloignés l'un de l'autre; **ballpark figure*** chiffre approximatif

This sub-entry first presents the lemmatized form of the compound, a geographic label, and its most common translation. This is followed by several slightly larger restricted examples incorporating the compound *ballpark*.

Not all complex lexical items require treatment in sub-entries. Sub-entries are usually reserved for those that are polysemous, or that themselves often appear in restricted constructions. This is the case for *ballpark* in RCS. It is used in different senses in restricted examples such as the compound *ballpark figure* and the collocation *in the ballpark*.

4.3 COLLOCATIONS

Collocations are the least 'restricted' of the restricted examples. They will therefore be treated first.

4.3.1 Definition and description of collocations

Collocations may be defined as "groups of words that tend to co-occur [...] because the items are often used together."[9] "Some words 'go together' almost automatically with certain words, whereas they resist combination with other words."[10] While collocations are not fixed in that they allow some variability in their form, they constitute nevertheless an idiomatic unit that does not allow free substitution of elements. For example, in French, *on rédige une dissertation*, not écrit. Moreover, collocations with similar meanings cannot be freely substituted one for the other. For example, the verb *franchir* appears in two collocations that have similar metaphorical meanings:

franchir la barre de
franchir le cap de

Barre and *cap* are both collocates of *franchir* that metaphorically designate a limit or obstacle. Yet despite the similar referents of the collocates, each collocation is an arbitrary unit, which cannot be used interchangeably with the other. For example, it is incorrect to say *franchir la barre de la soixantaine*, since *cap* is the correct collocate of *franchir* in contexts

---

[9] Roda P. Roberts, "A Bilingual Dictionary Intended for Translators/Interpreters." Coming of Age: Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference of the American Translators Association, ed. Deanna Lindberg Hammond, (Washington, D.C., 1989) 75.

[10] Bilingual Canadian Dictionary: Bilingual Dictionary Methodology for Research Assistants. Version 6 (University of Ottawa, June 1993) 18.

referring to age. While the individual elements of the collocation retain their meaning, the collocation as a whole is inviolable in as much as it represents correct or common usage in a given context.

Collocations are normally classified as grammatical collocations or lexical collocations. Grammatical collocations typically consist "of a dominant word (noun, adjective, verb) and a preposition or grammatical structure such as an infinitive or clause."[11] Some examples of grammatical collocations are *to come into, to come under, a joy to behold*[12]: *to come into* and *to come under* both show the verb *to come* in combination with prepositions; *a joy to behold* shows the noun *joy* in combination with a verb in the infinitive. Lexical collocations may consist of "nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs."[13] Some common lexical structures of collocations are the following:

v + n	franchir le cap
	franchir la barre de
	franchir un obstacle
	franchir le mur du son
v + prep + n	to drink to sb's health
v (reflex) + n	to drink oneself to death

[11] Morton Benson, Evelyn Benson and Robert Ilson, eds. The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English: A Guide to Word Combinations, (Amsterdam J. Benjamin Pub., 1986) xxxvi.

[12] These examples of grammatical collocations are taken from The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English: A Guide to Word Combinations.

[13] Roda P. Roberts, "Phraseology: State of the Art," L'Actualité Terminologique 26.2 (1993) 5.

adj + n	deadly enemies
adv + adj	strongly opposed

Both Roberts and Peter Newmark bring out the fact that the collocates within a lexical collocation

> define and delimit each other by eliminating at least some of their other possible meanings; the defining may be mutual and equally balanced, but more often it is closer for one collocate than for the other. Thus 'to pay attention' is a collocation, since it reduces the number of senses in which 'pay' can be used to one. The word 'attention' is not so radically affected, but it excludes 'attention' in the sense of 'care, solicitude'. 'To buy a hat' is not a collocation, since it does not appreciably delimit the sense of 'buy' or 'hat'.[14]

The meanings of the individual lexical items within a collocation are retained, but they take on nuances through their relationship with other lexical items in the collocation.[15]

4.3.2 Importance of collocations in bilingual dictionaries

Patrick Drysdale asserts that a major function of examples in unilingual dictionaries is "to show [...] typical collocations," and that "the value of this function is immeasurable."[16] However, he does not explain why collocations are so important. The same is true of Jacobsen *et al* who stress the importance of collocations in bilingual dictionaries.

---

[14] Newmark 114.

[15] Words take on nuances in context, but this is especially true when words occur in collocation.

[16] Drysdale 217.

Newmark's comments reveal that part of the interest of collocations for translators, one major class of users of the bilingual dictionary, is their restriction of the meaning of at least one of the collocates. The translator may not translate each lexical item within the collocation individually because, as Newmark suggests, collocations eliminate "at least some of their other possible meanings."

Another reason for the importance of collocations in the bilingual dictionary is that translators strive above all for idiomaticity. "Failure to observe [collocational] combinations is a violation of idiom."[17] The translator may violate idiom if he or she fails to identify a SL structure as a collocation, or if he or she fails to use, or incorrectly uses, a TL collocation. And, as Roberts points out, "collocations do not automatically match from one language to another (for instance, a severe winter is rendered by un hiver rigoureux in French, and not by a word-by-word translation of each element of the SL collocation such as un hiver sévère)."[18] Newmark remarks that collocations are especially problematic for translators when they are translating into their non-dominant language of a given language pair. Newmark says that the translator

> knows that he cannot usually write more than a few complex sentences in a foreign language without writing something unnatural and non-native, any more than he can speak one. He will be 'caught' every time, not by his grammar, which is probably suspiciously 'better' than an educated native's, not by his vocabulary, which may well be wider, but by his unacceptable or improbable collocations[...] A foreigner appears to go on making mistakes however long he lives in his adopted country, possibly because he has never distinguished between grammar and lexicology. An educated native speaker

---

[17] Bilingual Canadian Dictionary: Bilingual Dictionary Methodology for Research Assistants. Version 6, June 1993: 18.

[18] Roberts, "A Bilingual Dictionary Intended" 76.

> will also make mistakes in collocation, particularly if he is under the influence of interference, but he will correct himself intuitively.[19]

The correct interpretation and use of collocations is therefore essential to accurate translation. Collocations are an essential part of the bilingual dictionary because "incorrect collocations have a comical effect on the NL (native language) receiver while correct ones are accepted as "passwords" to NL fluency in a foreign language."[20]

4.3.3 Presentation of collocations in bilingual dictionaries

In such dictionaries, collocations are usually presented either as phrases in isolation or as part of larger examples. For example, LAR2 presents the collocation *franchir le cap* in isolation, with the translation "to reach a milestone *ou* turning point." Roberts calls this form of presentation the 'lemmatized form' and notes that this form has the disadvantage of "obliging users [...] to have enough syntactic knowledge to correctly lemmatize the unit they wish to look up."[21] In other words, a user faced with a context showing this collocation in a conjugated form may be unable to find the collocation in the dictionary if they did not know the infinitive form of *franchir*.

Both RCS and OXHA present the same collocation — *franchir le cap* — within sentences:

---

[19] Newmark 180.

[20] Cop 2775-2776. Cop cites Maria Korosadowicz-Strużyńska: "Word Collocations in FL Vocabulary Instruction." Studia Anglica Posnaniensia 12. 1980, 109-120.

[21] Roberts, "Phraseology" 7. Roberts cites Burger, H. "Phraseologismen im allgemeinen einsprachigen Wörterbüch". Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. eds., F. J. Hausmann *et al* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989) 593-599.

> **le pays vient de franchir un cap important**
> the country has just passed a major turning point (RCS)
>
> **l'équipe a franchi le cap des quarts de finale**
> the team got past the quarter finals (OXHA)
>
> **l'entreprise a franchi un cap décisif en rachetant son rival**
> buying up its rival was an important turning point for the company (OXHA)[22]

The advantage of presenting collocations, as well as other restricted examples, with an example sentence is clearly brought out by Robert Martin in the following terms: "l'exemple peut illustrer aussi les conditions pragmatiques dans lesquelles telle locution ou telle expression est usitée."[23] However, Roberts warns that presenting collocations (or fixed expressions) exclusively within larger units of text "has the disadvantage of not identifying them clearly for the user," and suggests that a combination of both forms of presentation — lemmatized form and sentence form — may be an appropriate solution.[24] This is in fact what Martin proposes when he says

> ainsi pour *joindre les talons*, défini par «Approcher les pieds l'un de l'autre de manière que les talons se touchent, la pointe des pieds tournée en dehors».... L'appartenance de cette pratique à l'urbanité militaire ressort de l'exemple cité: *Des soldats s'arrêtent brusquement*, joignent les talons *et saluent*.[25]

Whatever method of presentation is used, the problem in existing bilingual dictionaries is that collocations are often not at all or not sufficiently highlighted among the

---

[22] However, neither RCS nor OXHA identify *franchir le cap* as a collocation.

[23] Martin 603.

[24] Roberts, "Phraseology" 7. While this recommendation comes within the context of phraseology provided in terminological dictionaries, it is also a possible solution to the problems of presenting collocations and fixed expressions in bilingual dictionaries.

[25] Martin 603.

examples provided for a given lemma. Christine Winter points out one problem caused by this lack of differentiation between collocation-examples and other types of examples:

> The user has to decide whether the undifferentiated examples are representative or specific and he/she has to keep in mind the fact that his/her tendency toward generalisation can be dangerous. He/she constantly stands between two poles: the first a precise occurrence, a set phrase that is simply a limited piece of information; and the second, a representative occurrence, a real pattern for linguistic production.[26]

This lack of differentiation presents a problem because "a set phrase, cannot be used as a pattern for further production or for analogical composition. It represents nothing but itself, its specificity being the main ground for its presence in the dictionary."[27] Where collocations are concerned, specificity may refer to the restricted patterns of usage they demonstrate, as well as to the specific items that enter into combination.

4.3.4 Improved presentation of collocations in bilingual dictionaries

The presentation of collocations thus poses a problem. Winter warns that if collocations and fixed expressions are not adequately distinguished from other types of examples, the dictionary user might fall "into the trap of overgeneralisation." To counter this tendency, Winter suggests that

> bilingual lexicography should find a way to differentiate the [...] different types of examples and put them into distinctive categories. A mere diacritical mark or an abbreviation [...] can be used in both parts of the dictionary [...] to distinguish phraseological units from genuine examples of speech. Whenever

---

[26] Winter 49.

[27] Winter 49.

> meeting the 'set-phrase symbol', the user would be warned not to draw any conclusions in terms of meaning or grammatical use.[28]

When Winter says markings would warn the user not to draw any conclusions, she presumably means that the markings would warn the user not to generalize from constructions marked in this manner because the information they contain is specific to them alone and cannot not be used for translating or producing other constructions. In other words, marking reminds the user that these constructions are common but are not predictable from the general rules of the language.

Another way of clearly distinguishing collocational examples from other types is to make a clearcut division in the dictionary microstructure whereby such examples would be set apart from others. A collocation zone could be included within each entry — or even within each sense division of an entry for polysemous words — and distinguished from other examples by a diacritical marker or abbreviated word as suggested by Winter. This method of placing collocation examples in a separate marked zone in the entry is similar to what OXHA does with its IDIOMES zone. The following illustration shows how all the examples actually appear in the OXHA entry for *franchir*.

> **franchir un obstacle** lit to clear an obstacle; fig to overcome an obstacle; **le perchiste a franchi les six mètres** the pole vaulter cleared six metres; **franchir la barre des 10%** to pass the 10% mark; **franchir un cap difficile** to get through a difficult period; **l'équipe a franchi le cap des quarts de finale** the team got past the quarter finals; **franchir le cap de la cinquantaine** to turn fifty; **l'entreprise a franchi un cap décisif en rachetant son rival** buying up its rival was an important turning point for the company.
>
> IDIOMES **franchir le pas** to take the plunge.

---

[28] Winter 49.

The next illustration shows how these same examples would be presented if the collocations were separated from the free combinations and grouped together:

> **le perchiste a franchi les six mètres** the pole vaulter cleared six metres.
>
> COLLOCATIONS **franchir un obstacle** lit to clear an obstacle; fig to overcome an obstacle; **franchir la barre des 10%** to pass the 10% mark; **franchir un cap difficile** to get through a difficult period; **l'équipe a franchi le cap des quarts de finale** the team got past the quarter finals; **l'entreprise a franchi un cap décisif en rachetant son rival** buying up its rival was an important turning point for the company; **franchir le cap de la cinquantaine** to turn fifty.
>
> IDIOMES **franchir le pas** to take the plunge.

Through this method of presentation the dictionary user can easily locate collocations within the microstructure. If the entry is divided into separate sense divisions, then collocations should be matched with the sense of the lemma which they illustrate, but still distinguished from other examples by means of markers and/or placement.

Sub-entries may be used to present those collocations that are polysemous or that may be translated in several different ways depending on the context. As noted earlier, when collocations are presented within complete sentences as is the case with *franchir* above, it may not be clear to the user which portion of the sentence is in fact a collocation, and since the user's translation situation is unlikely to be identical to the example in the dictionary, it is important to highlight the restricted structure to bring it to his or her attention. For example, the whole sentence "l'équipe a franchi le cap des quarts de finale" is not a collocation; only "franchir le cap" is a collocation. OXHA finds it necessary to exemplify this collocation in three examples yet it does not identify it as such in any of the examples it provides. It might be better to first present the collocation in lemmatized form: *franchir le cap (de)* followed by

the more generally applicable translations: "to get through/past" and then follow with sentences showing how it might be translated differently when it appears in a larger context. If the OXHA entry was arranged so that the collocations were presented as sub-entries it would appear as follows:

> **le perchiste a franchi les six mètres** the pole vaulter cleared six metres.
>
> COLLOCATIONS
> **franchir un obstacle** lit to clear an obstacle; fig to overcome an obstacle;
> **franchir la barre (de)** to pass/to get over: **franchir la barre des 10%** to pass the 10% mark;
> **franchir le cap (de)** to get through/past: **franchir un cap difficile** to get through a difficult period; **l'équipe a franchi le cap des quarts de finale** the team got past the quarter finals; **l'entreprise a franchi un cap décisif en rachetant son rival** buying up its rival was an important turning point for the company; **franchir le cap de la cinquantaine** to turn fifty.
>
> IDIOMES **franchir le pas** to take the plunge.

This form of presentation shows explicitly which structure is the collocation and how it may integrated into longer structures.

4.4 FIXED EXPRESSIONS

Fixed expressions allow less variability in their form than do collocations. They should, therefore, be easier to define and identify. However, this is not the case largely because there is no agreement on what is meant by the various terms used to discuss them. Linda Verstraten says that "there seems to be no consensus on the meaning of terms like *idiom, expression, phrase,* etc," and she notes that these terms are used more or less

interchangeably in the literature.[29] Bruno Lafleur notes a similar confusion of terms in French. Lafleur says "j'appelle donc *locutions idiomatiques* ce que d'autres appellent idiotismes, gallicismes, clichés, locutions françaises, locutions métaphoriques, proverbiales, familières, populaires, ou vulgaires."[30]

4.4.1 Definition and description of fixed expressions

Benson provides a concise definition of "idiom" that helps clarify some aspects of what is meant by the term "fixed expression" in this thesis. For Benson, an idiom is "a relatively frozen expression whose meaning does not reflect the meanings of its component parts."[31] Benson provides the following examples to demonstrate what he means by idiom: *to have an axe to grind, to have one's back to the wall, in the black, a busman's holiday, when the chips are down.*

Fixed expressions are best described by their major characteristics. The first is their very limited variablity. Verstraten points out that

> the stability of the unit can be tested by trying to replace one or more elements by possible synonymns. Most fixed [expressions] do not allow such replacements at all, or they lose their meanings as units.[32]

---

[29] Linda Verstraten, "Fixed Phrases in Monolingual Learner's Dictionaries," Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics. eds. Pierre J.L. Arnaud and Henri Béjoint (London: Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1992) 29.

[30] Bruno Lafleur, introduction, Dictionnaire des locutions idiomatiques françaises 2e ed. (Ottawa: Éditions de Renouveau Pédagogique, 1991) viii.

[31] M. Benson, "Collocations and Idioms," Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning, ed. Robert Ilson (Oxford: Published in association with the British Council by Pergamon Press, 1985) 66.

[32] Verstraten 29.

However, Benson notes that "some idioms allow lexical variability," as in *to jump* (or *climb* or *get*) *on* (or *aboard*) *the bandwagon*.[33] The second is that fixed expressions do not allow changes in the word order.[34] Verstraten takes fixed expressions and replaces their component lexical items or alters their order to show that such changes cause them to lose their idiomaticity: 'beat around the shrub', 'span and spick'. However, she points out that some limited syntactic transformations are possible:

some steam was blown off at the party (blow off steam)[35]

Some morphological variability is also possible for fixed expressions[36]. Verb forms may vary as in *they have—had an axe to grind*. Other items in the expression may also inflect: *to have an axe—axes to grind*.

The definition of fixed expression that will be used in this thesis closely follows the models provided in the preceding paragraphs and is, in effect, a summary of claims made by those authors. Fixed expressions have specific semantic and formal characteristics. Semantically, fixed expressions function as a semantic unit and their meaning(s) cannot be derived from analyzing the meanings of the component lexical items. Fixed expressions are usually metaphors; within the expression, some of the component lexical items have particular metaphorical meanings that they have only when they are used in that expression. Formally, fixed expressions rarely allow substitutions for any of their component lexical

---

[33] Benson 66.

[34] Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. 518.

[35] Verstraten 30. Verstraten drew this example from B. Fraser, (1970). "Idioms within a transformational grammar," *Foundations of Language*, Vol. 6, pp. 22-43.

[36] Benson 66.

items, and they do not allow a change in the order of any items. In addition, only very limited morphological variations are permitted: for example, verbs may change number and tense.

While fixed expressions are more 'rigid' than collocations, these two types of restricted examples are similar in that they both show habitual word combinations where there is a special relationship between the elements of the word combination and their nature and functions are alike. Rosamund Moon implies that it is often difficult to distinguish between collocations and fixed expressions since "the set of fixed expressions is an open one, according to how lexical fixedness is judged or determined, and the extent to which a lexically fixed collocation must be considered semantically opaque in order to count as a 'fixed expression'."[37] For Moon, fixed expressions fall into three categories:

> First, there are anomalous collocations. These are collocations which may be considered aberrant with respect to the lexicon as a whole: either because they are grammatically ill-formed (for example, *at large, by and large, through thick and thin, see you*) or because they are 'cranberry' idioms (...) in the sense that one component word is fossilised within that particular collocation and no longer found outside it (for example, *kith and kin* and *from afar*, where *kith* and *afar* are the fossilised elements).
>
> Secondly, there are formulae such as proverbs, slogans, quotations, catchphrases, gambits and closed-set turns: institutionalised or conventionalised stretches of language which are almost certainly stored and produced holistically, and which can be decoded compositionally, word by word, but which may be considered idiomatic because of a mismatch between their compositional values and their overall pragmatic function. Examples include *Half a loaf is better than none, You've never had it so good, Shut your mouth!* and so on.

---

[37] Rosamund Moon, "Textual Aspects of Fixed Expressions in Learners' Dictionaries," Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics. eds. Pierre J.L. Arnaud and Henri Béjoint (London: Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1992) 13.

> Thirdly, there is the group of fossilised or frozen metaphors, the so-called pure idioms (...). The metaphor may be retrievable, as in the case of *skate on thin ice*, or completely opaque, as in the case of *kick the bucket* (= 'die') or *spill the beans* (= 'reveal a secret'). Such metaphorical expressions can be seen as cultural schemata, as short-hand ways of describing particular sorts of experiences or of conveying particular evaluations. They are like proverbs in this respect: not simply fusions of individual words, but also fusions of words with outlooks and opinions which are institutionalised in both language and culture.[38]

In general, these definitions show that there may be varying degrees of 'fixedness' in fixed expressions; Moon feels that some can be analyzed componentially while others not at all. Verstraten sees a similar range of 'fixedness' as does Moon: "their meanings can be compositional, partly compositional and partly non-compositional or completely non-compositional."[39] Benson makes a similar distinction between idioms on one hand, and proverbs and sayings on the other. While Benson includes both "idioms" and "proverbs and sayings" under the rubric "fixed expressions," proverbs and sayings differ from idioms because they have literal or nearly literal meaning and convey folk wisdom as in the saying *an apple a day keeps the doctor away*. Proverbs and sayings also differ in the degree to which their components are fixed. Benson says that "proverbs are usually more frozen than idioms, that is they allow less grammatical and lexical variability."[40] Benson adds that idioms often represent parts of sentences whereas proverbs are usually complete sentences in themselves. Roberts summarizes the relationship between fixed expressions and collocations,

---

[38] Moon 14. The paragraphing is mine.

[39] Verstraten 29.

[40] Benson 66.

saying that "la ligne de démarcation entre les combinaisons libres, les collocations et les expressions idiomatiques n'est pas nette, car il s'agit d'un continuum." [41]

4.4.2 Importance of fixed expressions in bilingual dictionaries

Eugene Nida suggests that fixed expressions (more particularly, idioms) are particularly problematic for the translator because they are

> typically constructed on quite normal grammatical patterns of phrase structure, but the meaning of the whole [...] is not simply the sum of the meanings of the parts, nor can one segment the meaning (in the many cases where it is complex) and assign a definable portion of the meaning to each grammatical piece (*e.g.* a morpheme). In other words [fixed expressions] are expressions in which the semantic and grammatical structures are radically different. [...] One must treat the entire expression as a semantic unit, even though in the surface structure of the grammar it obeys all of the rules applicable to the individual pieces.[42]

Nida raises two issues that make fixed expressions problematic for translators. First, fixed expressions follow normal grammatical patterns. The translator may not recognize that a construction is a fixed expression and may translate it as if the component lexical items had the same meanings and functions they would have in a free combination. Second, the translator may recognize that he or she is faced with a fixed expression, but may not understand its meaning since the meaning will not be available from analysis of the component lexical items. A third problem, not brought out clearly above, is that fixed

---

[41] Roda P. Roberts, "Le traitement des collocations et des expressions idiomatiques dans les dictionnaires bilingues." (University of Ottawa, in print, 1995) 3.

[42] Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber, The Theory and Practice of Translation. (Linden: E.J. Brill, 1969) 45-46.

expressions are rarely translated word for word. For all these reasons, fixed expressions should be an important component of bilingual dictionaries.

4.4.3 Presentation of fixed expressions in bilingual dictionaries

Indeed, fixed expressions are found in all the bilingual dictionaries analyzed in this thesis. However, their presentation leaves something to be desired.

An analysis of the treatment of eight fixed expressions by four existing French-English dictionaries showed that no fixed expressions were presented within a context longer than a single sentence. Moreover, when the results for all four dictionaries were combined, fixed expressions were presented only in lemmatized form 11 out of a possible 32 times,[43] and only in sentence form 8 out of 32 times. Fixed expressions were presented in both lemmatized form and sentence form (i.e. as sub-entries) 13 out of 32 times. Of the 21 fixed expressions that were presented within sentences, 5 were made into sentences by the addition of little more than a subject or object pronoun and hence do not really provide much more information about the contextualization of the fixed expression or its translation than do those presented in lemmatized form. For example, HA presents the fixed expression *dans de beaux draps* in following sentence:

> **nous voilà dans de beaux draps**
> this is a nice mess

[43] 8 expressions multiplied by 4 dictionaries equals 32.

However, 9 fixed expressions were illustrated by more than one sentence example within a single dictionary. For example, RCS presents the fixed expression *to draw the line* in 4 distinct sentences:

> *(fig)* **I draw the line at scrubbing floors**
> je n'irai pas jusqu'à *ou* je me refuse à frotter les parquets
>
> **I draw the line at murder**
> *(personally)* je n'irai pas jusqu'au *ou* je me refuse au meurtre; *(as far as others are concerned)* je n'admets pas *ou* je ne tolère pas le meurtre
>
> **we must draw the line somewhere**
> il faut se fixer une limite, il y a des limites *or* une limite à tout
>
> **it's hard to know where to draw the line**
> il n'est pas facile de savoir où fixer les limites

Moon suggests that fixed expressions be presented in dictionaries as parts of larger textual units:

> It is arguable that fixed expressions are the most difficult part of the vocabulary of a language for learners to acquire fully. Dictionaries and other reference materials may begin to address this problem by treating fixed expressions not as isolated units but as integral parts of higher level units, making significant contributions to a discourse in terms of structure and interpersonal involvement. The exercise of classifying the functions of fixed expression[s] has lexicographical and pedagogical importance. It can lead to better understandings [sic] of the ways in which fixed expressions are used both at a propositional level and hyperpropositional level, and both linguistically and extralinguistically. When presenting information about fixed expressions, dictionaries need to explain and show meaning and usage, evaluative orientation and function. [...] It is clear that at all levels, the actual usage of fixed expressions in text should be considered and analysed, if we are to move towards better descriptions of fixed expressions in dictionaries.[44]

If fixed expressions function in text as lexical units and if they must be translated as units, then they may require exemplification within larger sentences or phrases to the same extent

---

[44] Moon 25-26.

as this is necessary for simpler lexical units.[45] However, fixed expressions are generally not presented in contexts longer than a single sentence in existing bilingual dictionaries.[46] And in many cases they are presented alongside free combinations and collocations with little to distinguish them, which may make it difficult for a user to identify them.[47]

4.4.4 Improved presentation of fixed expressions in bilingual dictioanries

To better identify fixed expressions in the dictionary microstructure, they should be marked or set apart from other examples in the same manner as has been described for collocations. The fixed expressions examined above were marked or labelled as restricted examples only 7 out of a possible 32 times.

If fixed expressions are to be presented in sentences or larger constructions, their exact lexical form (their 'lemmatized' form) should also be indicated because, as already noted, translators may have problems identifying all the lexical components of an expression when it appears in text. Such presentation would constitute a sub-entry, with the exact lemmatized form of the expression and its most common translation given first, followed by longer examples showing how the expression may be integrated into a larger constructions. For example, the example *I draw the line at scrubbing floors* helps to disambiguate the metaphor expressed by *to draw the line*: the metaphor means to refuse to perform some

---

[45] Some fixed expressions are complete sentences to begin with. These fixed expressions may require exemplification within a larger context such as two or three sentences.

[46] To date, such elaborate exemplification of fixed expressions is usually restricted to specialized dictionaries of fixed expressions. Most paper bound GBD's would resist this type of exemplification for fixed expressions because of space restrictions and because of the extra production time and expense that this type of exemplification would require. Electronic dictionaries may remove the problem caused by space restrictions.

[47] Roberts "Phraseology" 7.

action and *scrubbing floors* is the specific action that is being refused in this example. The following shows this fixed expression presented as a sub-entry:

> EXP **to draw the line** *(to impose a limit or restriction)* se fixer des limites; **I draw the line at scrubbing floors** je n'irai pas jusqu'à *ou* je me refuse à frotter les parquets; **I draw the line at murder** (*personally*) je n'irai pas jusqu'au *ou* je me refuse au meurtre; (*as far as others are concerned*) je n'admets pas *ou* je ne tolère pas le meurtre; **we must draw the line somewhere** il faut se fixer une limite, il y a des limites *or* une limite à tout; **it's hard to know where to draw the line** il n'est pas facile de savoir où fixer les limites

In this sub-entry, the restricted example is marked as a fixed expression by the label EXP, it is presented in lemmatized form so that the user may identify the exact components, it is provided with a meaning indication, followed by a common and widely applicable translation. This information is followed by larger contexts illustrating other nuances of the fixed expression.

While it is unnecessary to fully exemplify fixed expressions in the entries for more than one of their significant component lexical items,[48] they should be cross-referenced in the entries for any other significant component item. This is important since it is difficult to predict which component item a user might use to search the expression. Cross-referencing will lead the user to the information he or she seeks; a lack of cross-referencing may lead him or her to assume that the dictionary does not contain the expression. Of the eight fixed expressions examined, only three were placed under the entry for more than one of their

[48] In other words, they should not be placed in entries for grammatical words, nor in entries for multi-purpose verbs such as *to have - avoir, to be - être,* etc.

component lexical items. Cross-references were placed under other component lexical items in only one case, and that was in RCS.[49]

Fixed expressions, if properly cross-referenced to make them accessible, and if adequately treated to make their use clear, play an important role in bilingual dictionaries.

[49] The fixed expressions analyzed were *to bring up the rear, to draw the line, to have (take) a shot at, to face the music, avoir affaire à qn, ne pas être dans son assiette, être dans de beaux draps, se casser la tête.* The dictionaries used were RCS, OXHA, HA, LAR2.

4.5 COMPOUNDS

The last category of restricted examples consists of compounds.

4.5.1 Definition and description of compounds

Crystal defines compound as "a linguistic unit composed of two or more elements, each of which could function independently in other circumstances."[50] He adds that compounds consist "of a combination of stems, such as *washing machine*." Hartmann and Stork say that a *compound word* is "the combination of two or more words to form a new word. Most frequently two nouns are joined to form compounds, e.g. *typewriter, apple-tree,* but other parts of speech may also occur in compounds, e.g. *flyover, nevertheless, blue-eyed, overtake, forget-me-not,* etc."[51]

There is, however, less agreement on exactly what constitutes a *composé* in French. Dubois *et al* define a *composé* as "un mot contenant deux, ou plus de deux, morphèmes lexicaux et correspondant à une unité significative: *chou-fleur, malheureux, pomme de terre.*"[52] Phelizon describes composition as a process by which "plusieurs mots se soudent jusqu'à n'en plus former qu'un seul. On a coutume à distinguer deux grands types de compositions : la composition populaire et la composition savante."[53] Phelizon demonstrates

---

[50] "Compound," An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages, ed. David Crystal, (Oxford, UK, and Cambridge, Mass, Blackwell Publishers) 1992.

[51] "Compound word," Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. eds. R.R.K. Hartmann and F.C. Stork (New York, Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, 1972).

[52] "Composé," Dictionnaire de linguistique et des sciences du langage. eds. Jean Dubois *et al* (Paris: Larousse, 1994).

[53] "Composition," Vocabulaire de linguistique, ed. Jean-François Phelizon (Paris: Éditions Roudil, 1976).

that *composition populaire* may take place "par coordination" as in the compound *chaud-froid*, or "par subordination" as in *pot-au-feu*. *Composition savante* involves Latin and Greek roots, and generates such compounds as *arboriculture* and *pédiatrie*.[54] Mounin's definition of *composé* would exclude *malheureux* and the *compositions savantes*, althougn he acknowledges that such lexical items were traditionally considered compounds. Mounin says

> traditionnellement, un composé est une unité lexicale formée soit par association de deux lexèmes (*porte-parapluie, poisson-scie*), soit par adjonction d'un préfixe à une base lexicale (*redire*). La tendance actuelle serait plutôt de ne considérer comme composé que les unités pouvant figurer de façon autonome dans les phrases, du type *poisson-scie*, ce qui exclut les formes à préfixe comme *in-, re-, dis-*, etc.[55]

The problem of defining *composé* is further complicated by the fact that a distinction is often made between *composé* and *syntagme*. Jean-Claude Boulanger defines a *syntagme* as "un groupe de mots séparés par des blancs, syntaxiquement liés et identifiant une notion unique dans un domaine déterminé du savoir."[56] This definition is very similar to those offered for *composé* from a certain point of view: like *composés*, the *syntagme* "s'oppose au terme simple constitué d'un seul mot graphique."[57] However, unlike *composés*, the rubric *syntagmes* does not include "deux mots ou plus reliés par un trait d'union."[58] Boulanger adds that the syntagme can consist of "une structure de base binaire" such as "*banc de neige,*

---

[54] "Composition," Vocabulaire de linguistique, ed. Jean-François Phelizon (Paris: Éditions Roudil, 1976).

[55] "Composé," Dictionnaire de la linguistique, ed. Georges Mounin (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1974).

[56] Jean-Claude Boulanger, "Le statut du syntagme dans les dictionnaires généraux monolingues," Méta: Journal des traducteurs. 34.3 (septembre 1989) 360.

[57] Boulanger 360.

[58] Boulanger 360.

permis de conduire, pluies acides" but may also be complex and "[peut] dériver d'une structure modèle élémentaire par l'intermédiaire d'une expansion déterminative: ex. *papier couché à haut brillant, station mobile terrestre, stabilisation par gradient de gravité.*"[59] Both types of *syntagmes* could be encompassed under definitions of *composé* offered by other authors. Boulanger acknowledges the confusion of designations for these types of lexical items: "le terme *syntagme* semble le choix des Québecois tandis que les Français lui préfèrent souvent la forme *composé*."[60] He highlights the tenuousness of the distinction between *composé* and *syntagme* by citing one definition of *syntagme* that employs *composé* in the definition: "les entrées formées de plusieurs mots graphiques (simples ou composés) non reliés."[61]

For the purposes of this thesis, compound lexical items are combinations of two or more lexical items that have independent grammatical and semantic functions in the language when they are used separately, but which have a single referent when used in combination.[62] For example, the lexical items *tea* and *pot* are used independently within phrases and sentences. They are also used together to produce the compound *teapot* where *tea* functions as a determiner of *pot*. *Pot*'s sense of "container" is modified because of its juxtaposition with *tea*: the compound designates a specific example of one type of *pot*.

---

[59] Boulanger 360-361.

[60] Boulanger 360.

[61] Boulanger 360.

[62] Pei and Gaynor emphasize that the combination has a single referent: compounds are "composed of two or more words, the combination of which constitutes a single word with a meaning often distinct from the meanings of the components." "Compound word," A Dictionary of Linguistics, eds. Mario A. Pei and Frank Gaynor (New York: Philosophical Library, 1954).

Orthographically, compounds may appear as a solid form such as *teapot* and *blackbird*, *portemanteau* and *portefeuille*; as a hyphenated form such as *body-blow* and *mother-in-law*, *point-virgule* and *garde-robe*; or as an open form such as *army depot* and *coffee cup*, *mauvaise herbe* and *barres parallèles*.[63] However, some compounds may appear in more than one of these forms, depending upon the stylistic preferences of the writer: *air conditioner* may also appear as *air-conditioner*. Others may show a combination of forms: *one-parent family* and *parent-teacher association*.

Most compounds fall into one of three grammatical categories. First are compound adjectives that most often consist of adjectives, adverbs or nouns that combine with nouns and present or past participles: *grey-haired*, *low-paid*, *good-looking*, *sourd-muet*, *nouveau-né*.[64] Second are compound nouns that often consist of two nouns: *address book*, *can opener*, *water-skiing*, *bracelet-montre*, *point-virgule*; other combinations are also common: in French there are verb + noun combinations such as *chauffe-eau*, *garde-robe*, adjective + noun combinations such as *grand-père*, *petite-fille*; in English there are verb + preposition combinations such as *come-on*, *cover-up*. Another type of compound noun — one that is more common in French than in English — also incorporates prepositions: *point of view*, *Secretary of State*, *tasse à thé*, *mal de tête*. Third are compound verbs which usually consist

---

[63] "Compound word," The Oxford Companion to the English Language, ed. Tom McArthur (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) 245.

[64] *Sourd-muet* and *nouveau-né* also function as noun compounds. Thiele notes that in French, "les adjectifs composés, par rapport aux formations préfixales et suffixales, jouent un moindre rôle dans l'ensemble adjectival. Les composés adjectivaux sont nettement moins nombreux que les composés nominaux." Johannes Thiele, La formation des mots en français moderne. trans. André Clas (Montréal: Les presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1987) 128.

of a noun and a verb: *baby-sit, hitch-hike, proof-read, chain-smoke.*[65] However, compound verbs are not common in French.[66]

Toman sees two broad categories of relationship between the component lexical items that make up compounds: determination and coordination.[67] In determination, "there is a modifier [...] and a modified element." Toman explains that

> this classification is based on the semantic intuition that the modified part of a determinative compound names a set of denotata, while the modifier restricts it to a subset. Thus *boat* in *steamboat* names a set of denotata called 'boats'; *steam* restricts it to a subset, namely 'boats driven by steam'.[68]

Toman says that in coordinative (or copulative) compounds, no element is subordinate to another. Instead, two or more sets of denotata designated by the component lexical items of the compound are juxtaposed. According to Toman, the hyphenated portion of *mother-child relationship* constitutes a coordinative compound. Thiele's example of a "composé copulatif" — *montre-bracelet* = *bracelet-montre* — demonstrates that the components have equal semantic status because their order is reversible.

Grundstrom notes a similar relationship between *déterminé* and *déterminant* that is outlined above by Toman's determination relations. However, Grundstrom seems to suggest

---

[65] This classification of English compounds is derived from John Sinclair *et al* ed. Collins Cobuild English Grammar. (London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1990) 24-28, 83, 171.

[66] Thiele (156) notes that "il n'est pas facile de répondre à la question concernant l'existence de verbes composés en français contemporain qui soient analysables synchroniquement par le locuteur. En tout cas, il existe des composés substantif + verbe, par exemple saupoudrer, bouleverser, colporter, maintenir, etc., qui ne peuvent être classés comme composés que dans une perspective diachronique. Le locuteur actuel ne reconnaît plus ici que la formation avec un constituant nominal et un constituant verbal, et pour lui, le radical verbal n'est plus construit."

[67] Jindrich Toman, "Compounding", International Encyclopedia of Linguistics. Vol.1, ed. William Bright (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992) 286.

[68] Toman 286.

that the category of coordinative (copulative) compounds is not easily defined. He asserts that there are a large number of compounds such as *salade-tomates* where "les rapports syntaxique et sémantique entre les composants ne sont pas marqués du tout, bien que ces rapports soient souvent très différents d'un mot composé à un autre."[69] Grundstrom claims that, in these cases, "c'est au locuteur et à l'auditeur de comprendre, par moyen du contexte et de leur connaissance du monde, comment les constituants vont ensemble." Others claim that it is virtually impossible to state a fixed set of relations between the components of compounds because often, "it is not clear on what grounds some of the various features of an element are regarded as relevant to the relation and others are not."[70]

The problems in precisely categorizing the relationships between the component lexical items of compounds are fundamental to the problem translators may have in identifying and translating compounds in a foreign language text.

4.5.2 Compounds and translation

As mentioned above, compounds, like fixed expressions, usually have a single referent. Grevisse explains that

> un mot, quoique formé d'éléments graphiquement indépendants, est *composé* dès le moment où il évoque dans l'esprit, non les images distinctes répondant à chacun des mots composants, mais une image unique. Ainsi les composés *hôtel de ville, pomme de terre, arc de triomphe* éveillent chacun dans l'esprit une

---

[69] Allan W. Grundstrom, L'analyse du français, (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983) 114.

[70] G.P.J. Wamelink-van Lint, "Compounds, Semantics and Pragmatics," The Encyclopedia Of Language and Linguistics, Vol.2. ed. R.E. Asher (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1994) 658.

> image unique, et non les images distinctes d'*hôtel* et de *ville*, de *pomme* et de *terre*, d'*arc* et de *triomphe*.[71]

The individual lexical items in the compound do not retain the referents they have when they are used on their own.

This may cause compounds — particularly open compounds — to pose problems for translators because the latter may not recognize a combination of lexical items as a compound and may mistakenly assume that each lexical item designates different referents when in fact they work together and designate a single referent.[72] Also, some compounds may appear to be ambiguous to those working with their second language. For example, a non-native speaker of English may have trouble determining whether *witch doctor* is "a doctor who resembles a witch, a doctor who is a witch or a doctor who detects witches."[73] Sometimes, knowledge of the cultural setting is necessary to determine the referent of an ambiguous compound: in British English, a *flower girl* is "a girl or woman who sells flowers in a street or market," whereas in North American English it is "a little girl who carries flowers at a wedding."[74] Ambiguity may also arise when the impact of each lexical item

---

[71] Maurice Grévisse, Le bon usage. huitième éd. (Gembloux (Belgium): Editions J. Duculot, 1964) 92.

[72] H. Chuquet and M. Paillard, Approche linguistique des problèmes de traduction anglais-français. (Paris: Ophyrs, 1987) 186-187. This is true mainly for those working with compounds in their second language.

[73] Chuquet and Paillard 187.

[74] Chuquet and Paillard 187. Collins Dictionary of the English Language Second Edition, and Random House Webster's College Dictionary both explain the British and North American senses of *flower girl*, however the Gage Canadian Dictionary does not give the compound at all. Collins, a British publication, gives two senses of *witch doctor* that correspond to two of the three above. However, the North American dictionaries, Gage and Random House Webster's, each give only one sense of *witch doctor*. Full references for these dictionaries are given in the bibliography.

within the compound on other lexical items is unclear: *modern history section* might be interpreted as *modern, history section*, or as *modern history section*.

While a unilingual SL dictionary may solve the problems of interpreting the senses of foreign language compounds, their treatment in bilingual dictionaries can eliminate the need for such consultation. However, not all meanings of compounds are found in bilingual dictionaries. For example, only one of the three possible meanings of *witch doctor* cited above is reflected in translations in bilingual dictionaries: *sorcier*. Similarly, *flower girl* which is not listed in RCS, is translated only as *demoiselle d'honneur* in OXHA, and only as *marchande de fleurs* in HA; LAR2 alone gives both translations. Hence the user would have to consult a unilingual dictionary to verify the senses of the foreign language lexical item before he or she could find a translation equivalent. And even if the compound was included in the bilingual dictionary, the user would first have to locate it which is not always an easy task.

4.5.3 Presentation of compounds in bilingual dictionaries

Since compounds function semantically and grammatically in the same way as simple lexical items, bilingual lexicographers must decide whether to present them as lemmas and to treat them in their own entry, or to treat them within the entry of one of the component lexical items. If the latter approach is adopted, the lexicographer must determine whether the compounds are presented as sub-entries or as examples of one of their component lexical items. At this stage it may be useful to examine what existing bilingual dictionaries claim to

do with compounds in their prefaces, and to compare this with how compounds are actually presented in their entries.

RCS

RCS says that it places all compounds in a separate, marked section at the end of each entry for a lemma, with one exception: solid French compounds are treated as individual lemmas.[75] Compounds are indexed under the entry for the first element in the compound: *ball game* is included in the entry for *ball*. Within the compound section, each compound is a marked with a ▸ and is usually treated with an TL equivalent only. For example, in the entry for *câble*, the compounds section gives

câble d'amarrage
mooring line.

While the paragraph above summarizes the statements RCS makes about compounds in its preface, some further conclusions can be drawn from analysis of a sample entry RCS provides to explain its microstructure. For example, in the entry for *ball* some compounds are not only treated with equivalents as shown above but also exemplified in phrases or sentences within the compound section of the entry. These example phrases usually demonstrate metaphorical senses of the compound whereas the equivalent listed immediately after the compound usually applies only to its literal sense. For example, for the lemma *ball*, the compound section gives

[75] RCS notes that some English compounds are also treated as individual headwords "for practical reasons" and cites the headword *careless*, which is presumably treated as a headword because it is polysemous.

ballpark
stade de baseball

The metaphorical senses of the compound are presented in examples:

in the ballpark
dans cet ordre de grandeur

in the ballpark of
aux alentours de, environ

we're in the same ballpark
on arrive à peu près à la même somme
on n'est pas très éloignés l'un de l'autre

ballpark figure
chiffre approximatif

Some compounds are not provided with equivalents. Instead, translations of these compounds are presented only in examples. For example, RCS labels as offensive the compound *balls-up* and provides translations only within examples:

he made a balls-up of the job
il a salopé le boulot

the meeting was a balls-up
la réunion a été bordélique *or* un vrai bordel

The RCS entry for *ball* provides one compound — *balls-up* — that falls into more than one grammatical category: both noun and verb.[76] Its treatment within the entry for *ball* when it functions as a noun has been shown above. When it functions as a verb, it is treated as a sub-entry[77] that has a list of equivalents and example phrases.

---

[76] RCS provides cross-references to guide the user when compounds are indexed in more than one place.

[77] This may be because there is no entry *to ball*.

Still other compounds are not labelled as such by RCS and are instead presented as examples within the entry for *ball*:

ball of fire
globe de feu

ball of lightning
éclair en boule

ball and chain
boulet

From this review it seems that RCS treats compounds in three general ways. First, compounds are treated as special examples within the entry for one of their component lexical items and placed in a separate compounds section. Second, polysemous compounds or compounds that fall into more than one grammatical category are treated with examples as would any other lemma. The problem with these types of compounds lies in RCS's confusing practice of sometimes exemplifying them within the compounds section of one of their component lexical items and other times treating them as distinct sub-entries. Third, compounds are sometimes treated as ordinary phrasal examples of one of their component lexical items.

OXHA

OXHA treats French and English compounds differently. The preface states that non-hyphenated French compounds are given in a separate section at the end of the entry for one of the component lexical items, usually the first. This section of the entry is set off from the rest of the examples by the symbol ■. However, it appears that this special place in the microstructure is reserved only for open compounds: in the OXHA entry for *barre* this

symbol precedes open compounds such as *barre d'accouplement, barre d'appui, barre de commande*. Solid French compounds such as *portefeuille* and *portemanteau*, and hyphenated French compounds such as *chauve-souris* are treated as separate lemmas.

English compounds, on the other hand, are supposedly always treated as lemmas and "are found in their proper place within the overall alphabetical order of lemmas."[78] While this is in fact the case, some are also presented as unmarked examples within the entries for one of their component lexical items. For example, OXHA treats *stock option*, *call option* and *put option* as individual lemmas in their respective alphabetical locations, but it also gives them as unmarked examples within the entry for *option*. This may lead to some confusion over whether some lexical items are indeed compounds or simply phrasal examples. This confusion is increased when one of them, *stock option* is translated differently when it is treated as a lemma: *option d'achat de titres*; and when it is given as an example in the entry for *option*: *option de souscription*.

HA

HA outlines some vague criteria for the indexing of compounds based on their orthographic form. The preface suggests that solid compounds and some hyphenated compounds are treated as individual lemmas, whereas other hyphenated compounds and open compounds are included within the entries for one or more of their component lexical items. These claims are more or less supported by analysis of entries. For example, open

---

[78] OXHA xv.

compounds such as *ball game*, and *ball lightning* are included within the entry for *ball*, and the solid compound *ballboy* is treated with its own entry.

However, there remains the problem of discriminating compounds from simple phrasal examples within the microstructure: HA distributes compounds seemingly randomly amongst the examples. Its reason for doing so is made clear in the preface: HA considers that when a compound consists of "one noun prefaced by another used attributively, such "words" are listed with the attributive uses of the first noun" as examples.[79] Hence, *back door* is placed under the entry for the adjective *back*. Therefore, in HA, compounds as they are defined in this thesis may appear as individual lemmas or as examples within the entry for one of their component lexical items.

LAR2

LAR2's preface states that English compounds are treated as individual lemmas. This claim is supported by an analysis of the various compounds with *ball*: each appears in its alphabetical location. The only indication of how LAR2 treats French compounds comes in its explanation of its symbols: LAR2 indicates that □ precedes examples that are "more fixed" than others that are not marked with this symbol. Analysis of examples marked with this label shows that they include compounds.[80] For example, within the entry for *barre*, the following compounds are marked

---

[79] HA viii.

[80] The symbol □ also indicates collocations and fixed expressions. As already noted in the section on collocations, LAR2 says that the symbol □ "separates expressions which are not set (given before the symbol) from more fixed expressions."

□**barre de chocolat**
chocolate bar

□**barre de soustraction/fraction**
subtraction/fraction line

It is important to note here that LAR2 does not place examples marked with this symbol in a special zone within the entry. Instead, these compounds are distributed among the other examples within each sense division. The symbol simply indicates that they are a special type of example (i.e. "more fixed"). In addition, some examples within the LAR2 entry for *barre* are unmarked but are in fact compounds:

MUS: **barre (de mesure)**
bar line

barres asymétriques/parallèles
asymetric/parallel bars

From this review it appears that LAR2 considers French compounds to constitute simply another type of phrasal example.

This sampling of the treatment of compounds in existing bilingual dictionaries reveals two important inconsistencies. First, some dictionaries treat French compounds differently from English compounds. Second, certain lexical items are grouped or labelled as compounds in one dictionary but as simple phrasal examples in another. These inconsistencies suggest that lexicographers are not sure which lexical items constitute compounds, and that they are not sure if compounds are examples.

These problems are not unique to English-French bilingual dictionaries. Marello notes that Italian compound nouns[81] are often "mixed up with examples" in bilingual dictionaries.

[81] Also idioms and proverbs.

She explains that "compound nouns in Italian are often formed by lexicalised phrases such as *giacca a vento* (anorak), *guardia del corpo* (body guard) [...] and Italian traditional lexicography has never dealt with them in a separate section."[82] Marello notes a different treatment for the non-Italian compounds: "in the English-Italian section or in the French-Italian part each dictionary is guided by different criteria" and she enumerates several procedures used by various dictionaries to group and/or label French or English compounds and fixed expressions.

Marello does not propose any specific treatment of compounds. However, when Marello realigns an existing bilingual dictionary entry according to the microstructure of the Van Dale dictionaries, "composites and routine formulae where the lemma has a peculiar meaning, and cannot be distributed under the numbered sense divisions" are indicated to the user by a typographical marker.[83] Presumably, compounds fall into this category of "peculiar" meanings of the lemma and would be so marked.

Creamer sees some technical compounds as both a type of example that appears within the microstructure of one of its component lexical items, and as lemmas that require treatment with their own entries. He proposes a test lexicographers can use to determine if a compound should be treated within its own entry: if the sense of the compound is so technical that a field label would be needed, then it should be treated as a lemma and possibly also as an example within the entry for one of its component items.[84] Creamer prefers treating compounds as lemmas because if compounds are presented only as examples

---

[82] Marello 230.

[83] Marello 233.

[84] Creamer 243.

within the entries for one or more of their component lexical items then "the look-up process becomes more difficult" presumably because the user will not know under which component item the compound has been placed.[85]

Creamer advises that when the same compounds are listed in more than one place — i.e. both as a lemma and as an example within an entry for one of the component items — the lexicographer must ensure that the treatment is the same in both places. This last point is of particular relevance given that this study found that OXHA placed the compounds *stock option, put option, call option* within the entry for *option* and also treated them as individual lemmas, thus following Creamer's recommendations, but that OXHA translated these compounds differently in each location; Creamer says that "needless confusion results from this disjointed translation," even if "both renderings are acceptable."[86]

Zgusta seems to feel that because "it is not always easy to decide what is a [compound] and what is not," lexicographers often equivocate by treating them in several ways.[87] However, Zgusta sees two possibilities. First, the lexicographer may "not list them as special entries of their own," and may thus treat them as examples of one of their component lexical items. This is often the case with the compounds in HA where many of them are mixed in with other types of examples. Zgusta favors a second method whereby the lexicographer treats compounds as sub-entries that are typographically highlighted, but are inserted "among the examples of the free combinations." The lexicographer may then add

---

[85] Creamer 242.

[86] Creamer 243.

[87] Zgusta 268. Zgusta uses the term "multi-word lexical unit" to designate what this thesis calls compounds.

any grammatical and meaning indicators that are necessary to distinguish the sub-entry from the main entry. Zgusta says that sub-entries are useful for treating compounds because they "tend to need an exemplification of their own and sometimes they even have their own polysemy."[88]

4.5.4 Improved presentation of compounds in bilingual dictionaries

The treatment of compounds must be standardised because the variations in treatment for the various orthographic forms of compounds outlined in this section will only lead to confusion among a dictionary's users. First, lexicographers must determine precisely what combinations of lexical items are in fact compounds. The most practical criterion seems to be the fact that the combination designates a single referent; defining compounds exclusively according to their orthographic form seems arbitrary. Second, all compounds, regardless of form, should be treated in the same way: either as separate lemmas or as a special type of example that is labelled or marked as such within the entry for their first component lexical item. The important issue regarding the placement of compounds is that they all be treated in the same way: the user must not be forced to waste time looking within the entry for a component lexical item when the compound is actually presented as a separate lemma, and vice versa. The retrieval can be aided by placing cross-references to the appropriate entry in the entries for the other component lexical items.[89] Compounds that are polysemous, or that

---

[88] Zgusta 268.

[89] Excluding grammatical words: *point de vue* would obviously not be placed under nor cross-referenced in the entry for *de*.

themselves appear within other restricted examples should be treated as sub-entries within the entry for their first component lexical item.

4.6 CONCLUSION: RESTRICTED EXAMPLES

Restricted examples are problematic from the point of view of the lexicographer, and from that of the bilingual dictionary user. Lexicographers frequently fail to identify restricted examples as such. When they do identify them, they are often uncertain if restricted examples should be treated as examples or as lemmas. This uncertainty is revealed by the inconsistent treatment of such examples in bilingual dictionaries. The problems in the identification and presentation of restricted examples stem from the fact that their functions and the differences between the various categories of restricted examples are not always clear. Lexicographers' problems with restricted examples have a direct and unfortunate bearing upon bilingual dictionary users. The user will have difficulty locating such examples in the dictionary because of the inconsistencies in their presentation outlined in this chapter. Even if the user locates the restricted example he or she seeks, its presentation may be so unclear as to render the information given unhelpful.

This chapter has attempted to outline the characteristics of restricted examples and to distinguish among three main categories of them, specifically collocations, fixed expressions and compounds. It has highlighted some problems in the ways such examples have been treated in existing bilingual dictionaries and suggested ways in which their treatment may be improved and their functions made more obvious.

CHAPTER 5: ARRANGEMENT AND NUMBER OF EXAMPLES

5.1 ARRANGEMENT, NUMBER, FUNCTIONS AND TYPES OF EXAMPLES

There is a close link between the suitable arrangement and number of examples and the functions and types of examples outlined in the preceding chapters. For example, if the user seeks a translation for a given lexical item when it is used in a particular sense, his or her search is aided if examples are arranged according to the semantic divisions used to present the item. Similarly, if an item appears in a large number of restricted structures, then the number of examples given in its entry will have at least that many restricted examples, in addition to free combinations. This chapter will first outline some principles for arranging examples and will follow with a discussion of the factors that influence the number of examples to be given for a lemma.

5.2 IMPORTANCE OF ARRANGING EXAMPLES

Arranging examples in a systematic way helps speed the user's access to the information he or she seeks. It is important to separate different types of examples to help the user to avoid wasting time reading through examples that are not relevant to his or her translation problems. It is also important that dictionaries follow the same principles for arranging examples for all lemmas, although this is not the case in existing bilingual dictionaries.[1] In fact, in an analysis of entries for *franchir, ennemi, enemy,* and *to drink*, this

[1] Such principles should be clearly explained in the preface and should be easily intuited from the way the entry is structured. For example, the microstructure could include labels or typographical markers to signal the beginning of a given category of examples. Of course, not all lemmas have the same degree of semantic or grammatical complexity, and therefore not all categories of examples will be filled for each lemma.

study could determine no overriding principle in the arrangement of the examples. Often, the entries were not divided into specific sense divisions, and free combinations and restricted examples were mixed together. In such entries, the onus is on the user to interpret all the information in the entry in order to find the information he or she seeks.

The first part of this chapter will examine how examples may be arranged within an entry so as to make the user's consultation as simple as possible. Methods of ordering free combinations within a sense division, and of ordering restricted examples within their respective categorical groupings will be appraised. Consideration will also be given to the indexing and cross-referencing of restricted examples, and especially to the problem of selecting one component item of a restricted structure for indexing purposes.

5.2.1 Arrangement of free combinations

Free combinations may be arranged by grouping them according to the sense of the lemma that they illustrate. This procedure is followed for some entries in existing bilingual dictionaries, but not for all. This is primarily because bilingual dictionaries do not organize the entries for every lemma into specific sense divisions, even for many items that are polysemous.[2] Even when bilingual dictionaries do structure entries with specific sense divisions, the sense indications provided show that these divisions are often more general than those found in unilingual dictionaries, and encompass a wide range of semantic nuances. Therefore, it may be necessary to make further efforts to arrange free combinations, even within a given sense division.

---

[2] See the discussion of OXHA's presentation of examples in the entry for *franchir* in the section on semantic functions.

Free combinations may be arranged according to the categories of literal, metaphorical, and technical or specialized uses of a lemma. While such categorizations will sometimes require entirely separate sense divisions, with examples grouped accordingly, they may be useful even within a single division in bilingual dictionaries, which often group senses together. Van Scherrenburg notes that dictionaries do seem to use these categories for arranging examples,[3] although they do so inconsistently. It may be useful for dictionaries to label each of these three groups within the microstructure: for example, the label LIT could introduce the group of literal examples in a given sense, FIG or MET those that are figurative or metaphorical, and SPEC or TECH those that represent specialized or technical contexts. Such a practice would be in keeping with the practice of labelling or typographically highlighting restricted examples.

Van Scherrenburg considers the possibility of arranging examples according to the semantic relationship among words with which the lemma combines.[4] For example, for the lemma *to run*, in the sense 'to operate', all examples that have a type of vehicle as the direct object of *run* would be placed together. Van Scherrenburg notes, however, that this method of arranging will not work for other senses of this same lemma. In the sense 'organize, manage', there is no semantic relationship amongst the typical direct objects of *run*.[5] Therefore this arrangement technique cannot be applied systematically. But it may still be a

---

[3] Van Scherrenburg 77-78.

[4] Van Scherrenburg 78-79.

[5] Van Scherrenburg 79.

useful means of arranging some of the examples in some entries, particularly for verbs that have a large number of possible direct objects.

Van Scherrenburg discusses other ways of arranging examples that have to do with the grammatical class of the words with which the lemma combines.[6] Such methods of arrangement may in fact result in unnecessary complexity because they may divide examples into too many discrete sub-categories. Examples cannot show every possible item that co-occurs with the lemma and it seems unnecessary to make special efforts to arrange examples primarily according to the class of co-occurring items because the user will rarely find the exact phrase or sentence he or she is translating in the dictionary. The user must generalize from examples showing the lemma used in the same sense as in his or her own translation situation. For this reason, it may be sufficient to distinguish the examples illustrating literal, metaphorical and specialized or technical nuances of free combinations within a sense division.

5.2.2 Arrangement of collocations

Like free combinations, collocations may also be arranged according to the senses of the lemma. As mentioned earlier, the sense of the lemma may still be distinguished when it appears in collocations, and therefore collocations may be placed in a labelled or marked section within the appropriate sense division.

If there are several collocations within the same sense of an item, they may be ordered by one or a combination of the following methods: alphabetically according to the

---

[6] For a full explanation of these procedures, see Van Scherrenburg's thesis.

first item in the collocation; according to the grammatical category of the component items (for example, those beginning with a verb appear first); by grouping synonymous collocations together.[7]

5.2.4 Arrangement of fixed expressions and compounds

Unlike free combinations and collocations, fixed expressions and compounds may not be arranged according to any senses of the lemma because they function as semantic units and their precise and full meaning(s) cannot be derived from analyzing the meanings of the component items. Both may be placed in a separate marked section of the microstructure.

When there is more than one fixed expression or compound for a given lemma, they should be ordered as systematically as possible, and the methods outlined above for ordering collocations may be used. The ordering methods for fixed expressions used by the Bilingual Canadian Dictionary, for example, include placing all those beginning with the lemma before those beginning with another lexical item. Of those fixed expressions that do not begin with the lemma, those beginning with a verb will precede others in the BCD. Those compounds where the lemma is in fact the first item are ordered alphabetically according to the first letter of the second item in this dictionary.

The treatment of compounds and fixed expressions in which the lemma is not the first item leads to a problem common to all restricted examples: that of which component item(s) to use to index restricted examples.

---

[7] Roberts "Le traitement des collocations" 27.

5.2.5 Indexing restricted examples

Roberts states that "idéalement, du point du vue de l'usager, les collocations et les expressions idiomatiques se retrouveraient sous tous les mots qui les composent,"[8] but space restrictions in paper-bound dictionaries prevent this ideal from being carried out in lexicographic practice for every restricted example.[9] The lexicographer must ultimately choose one item for indexing (excluding, for example, prepositions and other grammatical words).[10] The choice of which content item to use for indexing is somewhat arbitrary, but it should be consistent for all restricted examples of the same type. For example, the Bilingual Canadian Dictionary places all collocations, compounds and fixed expressions under the entry for their first content item. The lexicographer may also give a cross reference in the entries for the other content items of restricted examples to direct the user to the location of the full explanation of the restricted example. For example, the fixed expression *to kick the bucket* would be presented in the entry for *kick*, but the entry for *bucket* would have a cross reference referring the user to the entry for *kick*.

---

[8] Roberts "Le traitement des collocations" 16.

[9] Some restricted examples are found in more than one entry: RCS gives the collocation *franchir le cap* in entries for both *franchir* and *cap*. However, a given restricted example is not always treated the same way in its various locations: as already noted, OXHA treats the compounds *call option, put option, stock option* both as separate entries which reflects their status as compounds, and as unmarked examples within the entry for *option*, as if they were simply free combinations.

[10] Grammatical collocations are fairly easily indexed. For example, collocations such as *to come into, to come under* et cetera will be indexed under the verb *to come*. It would be impractical to index such specific collocations under the entries for prepositions because prepositions have such a variety of functions that illustrating specific collocations in prepositional entries would simply overcrowd them.

5.3 NUMBER OF EXAMPLES

If there is no consensus in existing bilingual dictionaries about how examples should be arranged, there is also none over how many examples should be provided for a given lemma. For example, when the total number of examples provided for a given lemma is compared among the four bilingual dictionaries used in this study, there is often a wide variation in the number of examples given from one dictionary to the next. The following chart summarizes the differences in numbers of examples provided for just two lemmas:

LEMMA	Number of examples in each dictionary			
	RCS	OXHA	HA	LAR2
enemy	9	8	11	8
drink	9	6	14	11

5.3.1 Factors influencing the number of examples

The difference in numbers of examples is partly attributable to the different overall sizes of the dictionaries. The larger the dictionary, the more likely it is to contain a greater number of examples. Of the four dictionaries examined, HA is the largest (4 volumes), followed in size by LAR2 (2 volumes), and then by RCS and OXHA, which are of comparable size (1 volume).

The number of examples to be given for a lemma depends also on the semantic and grammatical complexity of the lexical item in question; items that are more complex generally require a greater number of examples than those that are less complex. Creamer points out that "the 'complexity' of a word may be indicated by the number of definitions

required to define it properly. The more complex a word the greater the need for examples."[11] For example, for the lemma *jeter* vt, RCS gives 9 sense divisions and one paragraph of restricted examples with a total of 65 examples. For *to work* vt, RCS gives 5 sense divisions with a total of 27 examples. For *to drink* vt, RCS gives one sense division, with a total of 9 examples.

Another factor influencing the overall number of examples is the number of restricted structures in which the lemma frequently appears; all restricted structures that are current and occur frequently in a corpus should be represented in the entry for at least one of their component items. For example, the OXHA entry for *franchir* has six restricted structures among a total of eight examples; four illustrate the collocation *franchir le cap*, one illustrates the collocation *franchir la barre* and one illustrates the fixed expression *franchir le pas*.[12] The remaining two examples are free combinations. In its entry for *to err*, LAR2 gives two examples, one of which is a restricted structure: the proverb *to err is human (to forgive divine)*.[13]

Jacobsen *et al* claim that the number of examples is influenced by the cultural difference between the languages included in the dictionary. They feel that "a bilingual dictionary of two languages from very different cultures will need many examples illustrating cultural/encyclopædic factors, whereas if the non-linguistic background of the two languages

---

[11] Creamer 244.

[12] However, only *franchir le pas* is marked as a restricted structure.

[13] This proverb is marked as a restricted structure.

is largely the same, fewer examples are needed."[14] This factor is not as relevant in the context of English-French bilingual dictionaries, since the English and French cultures cannot be said to be "very different."

Kromann distinguishes between the numbers of examples that are necessary in different types of bilingual dictionaries. He feels that in an active dictionary[15] it is necessary to give examples illustrating grammatical elements and restricted structures, along with their translations. However, he feels that such information need not be illustrated in a passive dictionary,[16] because the users' linguistic competence would make it unnecessary.[17] In bi-functional dictionaries,[18] Kromann states that "the demands on the active dictionary's construction descriptions must be given priority over those of the passive dictionary."[19] In other words, bi-functional dictionaries must illustrate grammatical elements and restricted structures of lemmas and also show how such elements are translated, just as is done in active dictionaries. This is because bi-functional dictionaries target native users of both languages represented in the dictionary. For example, the French-English side of a bi-functional bilingual dictionary may be used by anglophone users to translate from French

---

[14] Jacobsen *et al* 2788.

[15] Kromann (2772) defines an active dictionary as one "designed for encoding a native-language text as an equivalent text in the foreign language."

[16] Kromann (2772) defines a passive dictionary as one "designed for decoding a foreign language text into an equivalent text in the native language."

[17] Kromann 2772.

[18] Bi-functional dictionaries simultaneously serve the encoding and decoding needs of users from both of the language groups represented in the dictionary. This type of dictionary is much more common than the solely active or passive type, at least for the language pair French-English; RCS, OXHA, HA, LAR2, and the forthcoming Bilingual Canadian Dictionary are of this type.

[19] Kromann 2772.

(their second language) into English (their first language); what Kromann calls the passive function. However, the same side of the dictionary may also be used by francophone users to translate from French (their first language) into English (their second language); what Kromann calls the active function. Kromann feels that the active function requires more exemplification than the passive, and therefore bi-functional bilingual dictionaries must be structured as active dictionaries, even though this means they will give more examples than Kromann feels is necessary for the passive function. Since all the English-French dictionaries analyzed are bi-functional, a greater number of examples is to be expected.

However, it is impossible to suggest an ideal number of examples to give for an item. For instance, one cannot say that every sense of every item can be adequately exemplified with the same number of examples as all others. Creamer suggests that lexicographers may be guided by native language informants and unilingual dictionaries in selecting an appropriate number of examples.[20] However, while the informants may assist the lexicographer to exclude unilingual dictionary examples that are atypical, the sum total of unilingual dictionary examples may not illustrate at all elements of a lemma that would be of great importance in a bilingual dictionary entry.[21] The final arbiter of how many examples are appropriate for a given item is the judgement of the lexicographer. Of course, this judgement is based on the linguistic evidence — from existing dictionaries, from the corpus, as well as evidence derived from his or her own linguistic intuition. Practical concerns will also influence how many examples can be included for each lemma: each example included increases both the dictionary's production time and its size.

---

[20] Creamer 244.

[21] This is particularly true of grammatical elements, such as irregular inflections, which may quite safely be presumed to be familiar to native speakers of the language of a general unilingual dictionary.

5.3.2 Too many examples

While Kharma proposes that lexicographers should "give as many examples as is practically possible,"[22] they must take care not to go to extremes. They must not provide too many examples for a given lemma, because a surfeit of information may be as distracting to the user as insufficient information.[23] However, the arrangement of the examples can significantly mitigate problems posed by a large number of examples: if all free combinations are matched up with the senses they illustrate, and collocations, fixed expressions and compounds are labelled and grouped as such, then the users may more rapidly locate the information they seek, without having to read through every example in the entry.

5.3.3 No examples

Dictionaries often do not give any examples for a particular item. Presumably, the reason for not giving examples is that the sense and use of the item and its equivalent is assumed to be transparent. By transparent, I mean that the sense of the item takes on no nuances that are not predictable from the sense indication, when it is given,[24] and that its usage is predictable from the general grammatical rules of the language.

Technical terms, which frequently have a single referent and a limited field of application, are one type of item that is often not exemplified in general bilingual

---

[22] Kharma 200.

[23] Creamer (244) says "it can be especially difficult for the bilingual lexicographer to strike a balance between too many and too few examples."

[24] Even in bilingual dictionaries such as RCS and OXHA that do often provide sense indications, 'transparent' items are rarely supplied with such indications.

dictionaries.[25] For example, OXHA gives no examples for such technical terms as *neurovascular* and *rain chart*, preferring instead to simply provide translation equivalents.[26] However, Marello notes that it may be useful to exemplify such items when the TL equivalent does not have the same range of application as the lemma.[27]

Technical terms are by no means the only types of lexical items that go without exemplification in bilingual dictionaries. Many general language items are also not exemplified; for instance, OXHA gives no examples for the items *migrate*, *admirable*, *cloudy*. Sometimes specific senses of non-specialized items are not exemplified either, even when all other senses of the item are exemplified. For example, the RCS entry for *filer* gives no examples for the sense "suivre", even though all other senses in this entry are exemplified.

Marello identifies both derivatives and nouns as categories of items that are frequently unexemplified in bilingual dictionaries. She speculates that nouns are often unexemplifed simply because they are "the most numerous class of entries;"[28] the lack of examples for such items presumably results from a policy decision to save space. Marello, like Kromann cited previously, feels that derivatives should be exemplified since they "very often pose problems of collocation."[29]

---

[25] Marello 229. Marello explains that such items are not exemplified because they rarely pose problems of collocation. This is in keeping with her definition of examples, because she considers only collocations to be examples. Marello adds that it is not just monosemous technical terms that are unexemplified, but also technical or specialized senses of polysemous items.

[26] Respectively, *neurovasculaire* and *carte pluviométrique*.

[27] Marello 229.

[28] Marello 229.

[29] Marello 229.

The decision not to give any examples for certain types of items or for certain senses of items may be based on an evaluation of user needs. Marello feels that a dictionary whose overall structure is oriented towards native speakers of only one of the languages represented in the dictionary may be able to forego examples in the L2-L1 section, presumably because the users' own linguistic competence would render exemplification superfluous.[30] In many cases, however, the decision not to give examples for certain types of items is primarily based on practical considerations. Both dictionary production time and space will be saved if examples are omitted in certain cases.

However, Zgusta claims that "exemplification is always useful" and that examples "always add some new information,"[31] and this thesis has attempted to validate these claims. While it may be argued that monosemous items and items that generally do not appear in complex structures may need fewer examples than other, more complex items, there is still much to be gained by providing at least one example for all items or for all senses of polysemous items.[32]

---

[30] Marello 229. Marello does not explain why they may forgo exemplification.

[31] Zgusta 264.

[32] Al-Kasimi (96) says "each separate meaning of every entry should be illustrated by one citation at least."

CHAPTER 6: ANALYSIS OF BCD EXAMPLES

6.1 RATIONALE FOR ANALYSIS OF BCD EXAMPLES

The Bilingual Canadian Dictionary project, realizing the important role played by examples in a bilingual dictionary, has made it a policy to present a large number of them in a manner intended to facilitate their retrieval. This chapter will present the results of an analysis of examples included in entries for the Bilingual Canadian Dictionary. The purpose of the analysis is to explain why specific BCD examples have been included in their respective entries and why they have been presented in the manner in which they are found.

The BCD is still in production, and the analysis is therefore based on entries that are not yet in their final version.[1] The fact that the entries are not yet finalized yields certain advantages. It enables me to explain how and why examples have been changed from one stage of revision to the next, and to suggest further changes for later versions. Another advantage is that I am able to observe problems in the presentation of restricted examples and to suggest ways their presentation may be changed in later versions.

---

[1] In the production of entries for the BCD, lexicographic assistants do the initial research on an item and compile the first draft of an entry. The entry then goes to the in-house revisors for editing. The entry will pass back and forth between the assistant and the in-house revisors as many as five times, and during this process the revisors review all the information in the entry and recommend changes which the assistant will implement. After this stage, the entry passes on for further editing by a panel of professors associated with the BCD project. Generally speaking, the total number of stages of revision required varies with the complexity of the lexical items. For example, a monosemous item with a fairly concrete referent that appears in no restricted constructions and that has obvious TL equivalents will likely require a less elaborate revision process than a more complex item.

6.1.1 Examples and BCD methodology

At this point it is important to set out the principles that govern the selection of examples for the BCD. First, the BCD plans to include at least one example for each sense of every lemma. There are however certain exceptions to this first principle, such as names of flora and fauna, of Indian tribes and of languages, etc. Second, an example should ideally add new information about the lemma that is not given elsewhere in the entry through other means such as explicit grammatical or semantic indications. This 'new' information added by the example can be semantic, grammatical/structural, collocational or stylistic in nature. Such new information may apply both to the lemma and to the TL equivalent.

It is also important to explain how examples are presented within BCD entries. Free combinations, which may be phrases or complete sentences, are grouped according to the sense of the lemma they illustrate and follow the sense indication[2] for a sense division.[3] Collocations, which are presented in lemmatized form, are also grouped according to the senses of the lemma which they illustrate. Within a sense division, free combinations are distinguished from collocations by typographical markers: one asterisk (*) precedes the free combinations, two (**) precede the collocations. Fixed expressions are generally presented in lemmatized form in a separate, marked section of the microstructure that follows all sense

---

[2] The BCD does not employ 'definitions' but does use 'sense indications' which were defined in chapter 2.

[3] The 'sense divisions' within the BCD do not represent all the subtle semantic nuances that are found in unilingual dictionaries; an individual BCD 'sense division' may encompass a slightly wider range of nuances than those in unilingual dictionaries. In addition, the BCD excludes certain senses deemed too technical, regional, etc.

divisions.[4] Compounds are also usually presented in lemmatized form and, like fixed expressions, they are presented in a separate, marked section that follows the sense divisions. The following is the final version of the BCD entry for *métro*, which illustrates the BCD presentation of examples.

> **métro** *nm* **1** *(chemin de fer urbain ; ensemble des installations de ce moyen de transport)* subway (system), (rail) rapid transit (system); *[Montréal, Paris]* Métro *(CD)* metro, subway; *[Londres]* underground. * **le ~ de Toronto** the Toronto subway (system); **la station de ~ Radisson** Radisson Métro station; **je l'ai rencontré dans les couloirs du ~** I ran into him in the subway. ** **prendre le ~** to take the subway; **billet/ticket de ~** subway ticket. **qv bouche, ligne, rame, réseau, station**
>
> **2** *(train de métro)* (subway) train. * **j'ai raté mon ~** I missed my train.
>
> **3** *(station de métro)* subway/metro/Métro station, Métro stop. * **il habite près du ~ Laurier** he lives near the Laurier Métro station.
>
> ***(exp)*** **~, boulot, dodo** *the monotonous daily cycle of the urban worker: subway ride, work, sleep.*
>
> ***(cmp)*** **~ aérien** elevated railway; *[NY, Chicago]* el *(US)*, elevated *(US)*.

6.1.2 Choice of examples and format of analysis

The examples that follow were chosen from among entries suggested by lexicographic assistants and revisors, from among entries that I had worked on myself, and from reading a great number of entries stored in the BCD lexicographic data base. The criteria I used for selecting examples are as follows. First, I chose examples that had undergone changes through several stages of revision to show how and why changes are made. Second, I chose

---

[4] The senses of polysemous fixed expressions are generally clarified solely by listing the various translations appropriate to each sense of the expression. When this does not sufficiently clarify the senses of the fixed expression, they may also be accompanied by commentary labels such as "pos" or "neg" to indicate that the expression is normally used in a positive or negative way. If such labels still cannot clarify the senses of the expression, short sense indications may be used.

examples that seemed particularly poor to demonstrate the problems posed by atypical examples, and how they may be changed for later versions. Third, I chose examples that were a particulary good illustration of the sense and use of the lemma to demonstrate the 'ideal' example. Fourth, I chose restricted examples that seemed misclassified or otherwise poorly presented, to demonstrate how difficult it is to properly classify and present them in a clear fashion.

The following analysis will examine first a number of free combinations, then several restricted examples. The analysis will proceed example-by-example. Each example will be presented as follows: (a) lemma illustrated by the example, (b) sense of the lemma illustrated by the example, (c) initial source of the example,[5] (d) different 'versions' of the example, and (e) analysis of the example, first in the SL, then, if necessary, in the TL. Since several of the examples examined here were selected before the BCD corpus was greatly augmented in 1995,[6] where necessary, I propose new corpus examples to replace inadequate ones that have been given in entries. The study of individual examples will conclude with general statements based on these observations of BCD examples.

---

[5] If the initial source is the corpus, but the first version of the example has already been edited, then the full, unedited original corpus example is cited at this point, before the dictionary example is given.

[6] With the smaller corpus available in previous years, there was a much narrower selection of corpus examples to choose from. The augmented corpus (over 310 million words) now frequently yields more examples, and makes the selection of a 'typical' example of the usage of a lemma easier.

6.2 FREE COMBINATIONS IN THE BCD

1 patio

sense:	"terrasse"
source:	dictionary
version 1:	**papa transporte le barbecue sur le patio** Dad moves the barbecue onto the patio
version 2:	same as 1
version 3:	**les invités sont réunis sur le patio pour le barbecue** the guests are gathered on the patio for the barbecue
version 4:	**les invités bavardent sur le patio** the guests are chatting on the patio

Analysis:

The first version was taken directly from a dictionary without changes. Subsequent versions are modifications of this first example by the revisors. In all versions, *sur* gives the preposition that normally precedes *patio*, i.e. grammatical information. In versions one through three, *barbecue* provides a typical object found on a *patio* and thereby helps provide a setting for the lemma. In versions three and four, *invités* also helps to provide a setting because it suggests a typical activity that takes place on a *patio*, i.e. a social gathering. While it is unclear why *barbecue* was dropped from version four, the final version has the advantage of being shorter, but the semantic associations of the lemma are less clearly shown than in version three.[7]

[7] This example was discussed at a meeting of all Ottawa BCD lexicographic assistants and revisors. There was agreement that version three was superior to version four, but there was some question as to the idiomaticity of *sont réunis....pour*.

2 **patio**

sense:	"cour intérieure"
source:	dictionary
version 1:	**en Espagne, beaucoup de maisons ont un patio** in Spain, many houses have a patio
versions 2 & 3	same as 1
version 4:	**en Espagne, beaucoup de maisons ont un patio, au centre duquel se trouve un jet d'eau** in Spain, many houses have a patio, in the middle of which is a fountain

Analysis:

The first version was taken directly from a dictionary. *En Espagne* suggests that this type of *patio* is a feature common to Spanish architecture. *Maison* suggests that *patio* is a component of a house. In version four, the phrase *au centre duquel se trouve un jet d'eau* has been added to make the concept of *patio* clearer. However, it is unclear from the evidence in the French dictionaries whether *jet d'eau* is an essential characteristic of such *patios*.

The entry for *patio* has returned from another stage of revision by professors and they add several comments criticizing this example: "l'exemple peut laisser entendre que les patios ne se retrouvent qu'en Espagne. Il faudrait peut-être parler de maisons de style espagnol. Par exemple *beaucoup de maisons de style espagnol cachent un patio au centre duquel* .... Par ailleurs, le jet d'eau est-il essentiel? Les gens ici [Université Laval] ne le croient pas.[8] L'essentiel est la cour intérieure, et peut-être certains éléments d'architecture identifiés comme espagnols."

[8] However, when this example was discussed at an Ottawa BCD meeting, several people felt that *jet d'eau* represented an essential characteristic.

The corpus now yields examples for this sense of *patio* such as *le patio central qui tient lieu de salle d'exposition*; *ruissellement frais du bassin dans le patio*, that were unavailable when this entry was first compiled. They add elements that support the sense indication given in the BCD entry: the first adds *central* which reinforces the idea of a *cour intérieure*, and the second adds *bassin* which reinforces the idea that *patios* have a fountain. However, they are not much better than the example given in the entry.

Perhaps the example given in the BCD could be reworded according to the suggestions of the professors, replacing *En Espagne*, with *de style espagnol*, The phrase including *jet d'eau* could be dropped even though there is some corpus and anecdotal evidence to suggest the information added is accurate. *Jet d'eau* makes the example lengthy without adding anything substantial to justify the length; it has no bearing on the structure immediately surrounding *patio*, and it adds nothing to help clarify the concept of *cour intérieure*. The revised version would be

> **beaucoup de maisons de style espagnol cachent un patio**
> many Spanish style houses have a central patio

This version makes the sense of the lemma clearer.

3 **passeport**

sense:	"laissez-passer"
source:	corpus
version 1:	**le ministère du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche a mis en vente des passeports qui donneront droit à des réductions intéressantes dans les parcs** the Quebec ministère du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche is selling coupons/passes that will yield significant savings in the parks
version 2:	**le ministère a mis en vente des passeports qui donnent droit à des réductions intéressantes dans les parcs** the ministry is selling passes/passports that give significant discounts in parks
versions 3 & 4:	same as 2
version 5:	**le ministère vend des passeports qui donnent droit à des réductions intéressantes dans plusieurs parcs** the ministry is selling passes/passports that give significant discounts in several parks

Analysis:

The first version of this example appears exactly as it was found in the corpus. Subsequent versions reflect modifications made by the revisors.

The full name of the ministry was dropped after the first version because it provides information that is too culturally specific, and in any case, names of government departments change too frequently to record one such name in a dictionary. *Les parcs* is changed to *plusieurs parcs* to make the context more general (i.e. *les parcs* poses the questions of which ones and where). *Donneront* is simplified to the present tense to render the example more

'actualized'. *A mis en vente* underwent a twofold change: substitution of the synonymous and simpler *vendre*, and a change of the tense of the verb from the passé composé to the present. Both changes result in an economy of words and simplify the structure, thus making the fourth version clearer and shorter. Although the example does not illustrate the sense of the lemma directly, it does demonstrate a typical setting: one uses a *passeport* in *parcs*. It also suggests semantic nuances: *passeports* are sold and possession of one garners the holder *des réductions*.

The translation of the example is also informative because it illustrates both the common equivalent for this sense, *pass*, and a less common yet synonymous equivalent (for the sense "laissez-passer"), *passport*.

4 passeport

sense:	"livre donnant des conseils"
source:	corpus
original corpus example:	Les amateurs de culture peuvent toutefois s'en remettre aux valeurs sûres que constituent les nombreux musées de la Montérégie. Une vingtaine d'entre eux se sont regroupés en un organisme de soutien, Montmusée, qui publie un passeport culturel permettant au visiteur de s'y retrouver
version 1:	**Montmusée, un organisme de soutien des musées de la Montérégie, publie un ~ culturel permettant au visiteur de s'y retrouver** Montmusée, a support group for the museums of the Montérégie region publishes a brochure which helps visitors find their way around the various sites
versions 2 & 3:	This example dropped from versions 2 and 3

versions 4 & 5: **on vient de publier un ~ culturel qui permet aux visiteurs de se retrouver parmi les différents musées de la région**
a cultural passport which gives visitors information about the museums in the region has just been published

Analysis:

The first version attempted to keep as much as possible of the structure of the original corpus example, which had the net effect of sacrificing clarity. The translation of the first version also uses an equivalent for *passeport* (*brochure*) that does not express the same concept as the original *passeport culturel.*

Versions four and five reveal that the revisors constructed an example based on the evidence in the original corpus example. The fourth version eliminates the lengthy context -specific subject of the original that would be meaningless to most users. *Publier* helps illustrate the sense: it links *passeport* to *livre*, a key word in the sense indication. The impersonal structure with *on* allows the translation to begin with *cultural passport*, the equivalent of the key SL phrase *passeport culturel*, thus drawing the user's attention quickly to the essential information. However, the example may still need to be reworked, given that a key part of the translation suggested here, *cultural passport*, is awkward and is not attested in the English corpus.

5 **barguiner**

sense:	"marchander"
source:	dictionary
version 1:	**à force de barguiner, j'ai réussi à lui faire baisser son prix** I got him to lower his price by bargaining/haggling with him
version 2:	**à force de barguiner, j'ai réussi à le convaincre de baisser son prix** I convinced him to lower his/her price by bargaining/haggling (with him)
version 3 & 4:	**à force de barguiner, je lui ai fait baisser son prix de moitié** I made him cut his price in half by bargaining (with him)
version 5:	**à force de barguiner, je lui ai fait baisser son prix de moitié** I made him/her cut his/her price in half by bargaining (with him/her)

Analysis:

The first version is taken from a dictionary without changes. The second version makes the minimal changes necessary to avoid copying directly from the original source. The third version is a further modification of the original dictionary example (version one), which has been simplified by the removal of *ai réussi à* on the one hand, and made more specific by the addition of *de moitié* on the other. The example helps illustrate the sense of the lemma because *baisser son prix* provides a typical (desired) result of the action of *barguiner*.

The translations of this example must also be considered. The addition of *de moitié* enables a more idiomatic translation (*cut his price in half*) that is closer to the informal

register of *barguiner*.[9] It is unclear why *haggling* was dropped from the translation after the second version.[10] Versions three and four place *with him* in brackets to indicate that translation of the pronoun *lui* is optional. Version five adds *him/her* to reflect the fact that the person represented by the pronoun *lui* may be male or female.[11]

6 aîné

sense:	"frère plus âgé qu'un autre enfant"
source:	corpus
versions 1 & 2:	**l'aîné a 68 ans, et le benjamin, 47** the older/elder brother is 68 years old, the younger 47

Analysis:

The example appears exactly as it was found in the corpus. It helps illustrate the sense of the lemma (and equivalents) through the juxtaposition of the antonyms *aîné/benjamin* and *older* or *elder/younger* and because the use of actual ages helps to distinguish the antonyms.

This example is, in many respects, ideal: the usage of the lemma is typical, the sense is clear, and it is brief.

---

[9] *Barguiner* has been marked informal in the BCD entry.

[10] *To haggle* is listed as an equivalent for *barguiner*, (i.e. it is given in the explicit information).

[11] BCD policy is to be gender-neutral, whenever possible. However, by keeping both the masculine and feminine pronouns *him/her*, the BCD demonstrates very clearly its efforts to conform to political correctness through the use of gender inclusive language.

7 **bûcher**

sense:	"frapper"
source:	corpus
versions 5 & 6:	**les Flyers bûchaient les Canadiens** the Flyers were hitting the Canadiens

Analysis:

This example, and, in fact, the sense *frapper* appear for the first time in the fifth version of the entry. The entry says that this example was taken from the corpus. The example must have been significantly altered by the lexicographic assistant or revisor because I was unable to retrieve the original context with a corpus search.

The example does not present the sense of the lemma clearly. It assumes users will know that the Flyers and Canadiens are hockey teams, and why one would *bûcher* the other. However, this assumption is unfounded, as a quick informal survey of BCD lexicographers revealed. If the example is to be retained, it should be supplemented with extra information to help situate the action and explain its significance, for example: *les Flyers ont bûché les Canadiens durant tout le match de hockey et ont gagné 6-1* The Flyers were hammering the Canadiens throughout the hockey game and won 6-1. The addition of *match de hockey, gagné* and the score *6-1* links the example to the field of sports. *Gagné* also suggests that, in this context, *bûcher* implies dominance of one team over the other. However, even with these additions, the example may be unclear because it retains proper nouns which may be unknown to users as subject and direct object.

The corpus now yields an example which, with minor changes, more clearly illustrates the sense and use of *bûcher*. The corpus example is *Tous ont reconnu, sur le vidéo, les deux épais en uniforme qui bûchent sur des jeunes avec leur bâton*, which may be modified to read as follows:

> **le vidéo montre les deux épais en uniforme qui bûchent sur les jeunes avec leur bâton**
> the video shows the two uniformed goons battering the youths with their batons.

This example adds grammatical information: the preposition *sur* that follows *bûcher* (which is not translated), and semantic information: *bâton* is a weapon designed for hitting. This example also illustrates the informal register of *bûcher* by showing it in a sentence with another item that also has an informal register: *épais*.

8 chicoter

sense:	"tracasser"
source:	corpus
original corpus example:	**il n'a pas toujours l'air dans son assiette, comme si quelque chose le chicotait vraiment**
version 1:	**il n'a pas l'air dans son assiette, comme si quelque chose le chicotait vraiment** he didn't seem to be himself as if something was bothering him
versions 2 & 3:	**il n'avait pas l'air dans son assiette, comme si quelque chose le chicotait** he didn't seem to be himself as if something was bothering him

Analysis:

The first version of the example removes only *toujours*, which does not add anything useful when the sentence is taken out of its original context. Version two changes the tense of *avoir* to make the example grammatically correct (i.e. same tense as *chicotait*). The example is potentially problematic because it assumes the user will understand the collocation *avoir l'air de* and the fixed expression *ne pas être dans son assiette*. If these elements are understood then the example well illustrates the sense of *chicoter* because the meaning of *ne pas être dans son assiette* — ne pas se sentir bien (physiquement)[12] — is similar to that of *chicoter*. In addition, the example helps indicate the register of *chicoter* because *ne pas être dans son assiette* is at the same register level (slightly informal).

9 porte-bagages

sense:	"dispositif d'un véhicule destiné à recevoir des bagages"
source:	corpus
original corpus example:	Ajoutons également les deux soeurs Tempo et Topaz, édition Max, qui offre un groupe d'options comme une peinture deux tons, un porte-bagages de coffre, des jantes en aluminium à sept rayons et des pneus de haute performance
version 1:	**la voiture offre un groupe d'options comme une peinture deux tons, un porte-bagages de coffre et des pneus de haute performance** you can choose a range of options for your car including two-tone paint, a trunk rack and high performance tires

[12] Le Petit Robert.

Analysis:

The lexicographic assistant replaced the complex and context-specific subject in the original, *les deux soeurs Tempo et Topaz, édition Max*, with the clearer *voiture*, and eliminated the phrase *des jantes en aluminium à sept rayons* which is too technical.

La voiture, coffre, peinture deux tons and *pneus* help illustrate the sense of the lemma by linking it to the field of vehicles indicated in the sense indication. While *peinture* and *pneus* are not essential, they do indicate other car options, of which *porte-bagages* is only one. However, if a shorter example is desired, the example may be shortened to

> **cette voiture est munie d'un porte-bagages de coffre** [13]
> this car has a trunk rack.

10 débarcadère

sense:	"emplacement d'un port ou d'une côte permettant le débarquement ou l'embarquement"
source:	corpus
version 1:	**des villes neuves et blanches encerclant de leurs débarcadères d'énormes bassins pouvant accueillir des centaines de bateaux de plaisance** new white cities surrounding their wharves with huge lakes that can accommodate hundreds of pleasure boats

Analysis:

The example appears exactly as it is found in the corpus. It is unclear and both its subject and structure render it confusing. The subject *villes neuves et blanches* is meaningless outside the larger original context. The structure *encerclant de leurs débarcadères [...]* is

[13] *Offrir* is changed to *être muni de* to render the example more idiomatic.

also unusual. The example represents atypical usage, precisely the type of information the BCD strives not to illustrate.[14] Despite its atypicality, the example still contains elements that support the sense of the lemma, specifically *bassins* and *bateaux de plaisance*, which, in part, account for its selection for a first draft of the entry.

This entry has not yet been revised, but there is no obvious way to modify the example to make it clearer. It is perhaps better to reject this example in favor of shorter ones that illustrate the sense of the lemma more clearly. For example, the corpus now yields *débarcadère du ferry, débarcadère du quai de Baie-Comeau, débarcadère de chaque lac, débarcadère pour passagers*. These examples add grammatical information: that *débarcadère* is followed by the preposition *de*, and sometimes by *pour*. They each add semantic information that helps support the sense indication: *ferry, quai de Baie Comeau, lac, passagers* link *débarcadère* to the words *port* and *côte* in the sense indication, and *passagers* to the words *débarquement* and *embarquement*.

11 décrocheur

sense:	"élève/étudiant qui abandonne ses études"
source:	dictionary for versions 1-3; corpus for version 4
versions 1-3:	**cours de rattrapage pour jeunes décrocheurs** remedial course for young dropouts

[14] In fairness to the assistant who selected this example, I must note that this entry was compiled several years ago when the BCD corpus was still quite limited. It is possible that at that time this was the only corpus example available.

version 4: **il y a davantage de décrocheurs à l'université qu'au niveau secondaire**
more students drop out of university than out of high school

Analysis:

This sense of *décrocheur* is illustrated with a single example. The first three versions of the entry used a dictionary example which was rejected in favor of a corpus example in version four.

The dictionary example given in versions one through three adds semantic information that links the lemma to keywords in the sense indication: *cours de rattrapage* is in the same field as *élève/étudiant* and *études*. It also shows the lemma translated by the common listed equivalent. It is unclear why it was dropped from the entry.

The example that replaces it in version four appears exactly as it is found in the corpus. In this example, *université* and *niveau secondaire* help illustrate the sense: they link *décrocheur* to *elève* and *étudiant* in the sense indication. The example also shows that the lemma, a noun, is frequently translated by a verb. The use of the noun *dropout* to translate the above example would result in an unidiomatic or awkward translation: 'there are more dropouts at the university level than at the high school level' is probably about the best that could be done.

It may be useful to provide two examples for this sense, one showing the lemma translated by a verb and another showing it translated by a noun. The example that was originally used in versions one through three may be used to demonstrate a context in which the lemma may be translated by a noun. The corpus also suggests a new example: **à peu près de la moitié des décrocheurs complètent leurs études secondaires un jour ou l'autre**

in which the lemma may be translated by a noun, as follows: nearly half of all dropouts eventually finish high school. In this new corpus example, *études secondaires* links *décrocheur* to the sense indication.

6.3 RESTRICTED EXAMPLES IN THE BCD

1 passeport

type:	collocation
sense:	"laissez-passer"
source:	corpus
version 1:	**cette année, le passeport de saison, pour le ski seulement, coûtait 625$ par personne** this year, the season pass for skiing alone cost $625 per person
versions 2 & 3:	**passeport de saison** season's pass
versions 4 & 5:	**passeport de saison** season('s) pass

Analysis:

The first version shows the example exactly as it appears in the corpus. The example was originally given in the form of a complete sentence because it was erroneously assumed to be specific to the field of 'skiing', and because the restricted nature of *passeport de saison* was not recognized. It is given in lemmatized form in the collocations zone in subsequent versions to highlight its restricted nature. In the fourth version a change has been made to the

equivalent because the English corpus shows that both *season pass* and *season's pass* occur with significant frequency.

2 loyer

type:	collocation
sense:	"prix de la location d'un local d'habitation"
source:	dictionary (for *hausse*) and corpus (for *augmentation*)
version 1:	in compounds zone: **hausse de loyer** rent increase/hike
version 2:	in collocations zone: **hausse/augmentation de loyer** rent increase/hike

Analysis:

The collocation was incorrectly identified as a compound in the first version: *hausse de loyer* is not a compound because the senses of the component items can be clearly distinguished. The synonymous *augmentation de loyer* has been added in the second version because additional corpus evidence shows it also occurs frequently.

3 **article**

type:	fixed expression
source:	corpus
version 1:	in the fixed expressions section:
	it's the genuine article! du vrai du vrai! ça c'est du vrai!

Analysis:

The lexicographic assistant noted that she was not sure how to present this fixed expression, because it is most often used in more complex sentences and not in the simple form given above. For example, the corpus now has *Asian clogs are produced from inferior wood but are hard to distinguish from the genuine article because they frequently bear "made in Holland" labels.*

It may be best to present this fixed expression as a sub-entry. In other words, it may first be presented in simple form with the most obvious equivalents as it appears above (version one), but in addition, it may also be presented within larger contexts.

The corpus suggests that this expression may have two senses, and if so, it is particularly useful to illustrate these senses of the expression within larger contexts. The corpus suggests the sense 'authentic': **Asian clogs made from inferior wood are hard to distinguish from the genuine article because they often bear "made in Holland" labels,**[15] and the sense 'superlative': **Jacques Villeneuve is the genuine article — a racing phenomenon in the making; or when it comes to 4x4 utility vehicles, Grand Cherokee**

[15] A shortened version of the original corpus example.

presents itself as the genuine article. These two distinct senses are also suggested by several English dictionaries.[16] It may be useful to include sense indications within the sub-entry for this fixed expression, should these two nuances be attested more explicitly with further analysis.

4 cadeau

type:	fixed expression
source:	dictionary
version 1:	**c'est pas un cadeau: je vous dis que mon père comme professeur c'était pas un cadeau** I'm telling you it wasn't easy when your father was a teacher
version 2:	**c'est pas un cadeau: mon père comme professeur c'était pas un cadeau** it wasn't easy having my father as a teacher
version 3:	**c'est pas un cadeau:** *(chose)* it's not easy *ou* no picnic; **mon père comme professeur c'était pas un cadeau** having my father as a teacher was no picnic

[16] Collins Cobuild English Dictionary, New Edition (1995) confirms both senses, "authentic" and "superlative," with the following explanation of *the genuine article*: "If you describe something as the genuine article, you are emphasizing that it is genuine, and often that it is very good. *The vodka was the genuine article.* Longman Language Activator (1993) gives an explanation of *the genuine article* that also supports the sense "superlative": "something such as a car, painting, or piece of furniture or clothing, that really is made, produced, or designed by a famous and admired person or company [*n phrase*]. *He owns a 1947 Ferrari — the genuine article. The thing about imitations is that they make you appreciate the genuine article.*" Full references for these dictionaries are given in the bibliography.

version 4: **c'est pas un cadeau:** *(chose)* it's not easy *ou* no picnic, *(personne)* he *(etc)* is not easy to get along with; **mon père comme professeur c'était pas un cadeau** having my father as a teacher was no picnic

Analysis:

The first and second versions of this example present the fixed expression in lemmatized form in the SL, but fail to give a translation of this form. Version one also illustrates this fixed expression within a longer context. The longer context is shortened in version two: *je vous dis que* is dropped because it adds nothing. The translation of the longer context is also improved: the section *when your father was* is changed to *having my father as*, making the translation less awkward.

Version three provides two translations for the lemmatized form of the expression. It also gives the referent *chose* to indicate that these translations apply in contexts where the subject is an inanimate object. The translation of the longer context is changed again in version three to make it more idiomatic. Version four offers a third translation of the lemmatized form of the expression — he *(etc)* is not easy to get along with — that is preceded by the referent *personne* to indicate that this translation applies when the subject is human.

The presentation of the fixed expression is very similar to the sub-entry form of presentation of fixed expressions suggested earlier in this thesis. The exact components of the fixed expression are made clear by presenting it first in lemmatized form. The semantic nuances could be made clearer by providing sense indications, but the use of the referents *chose* and *personne* helps to specify when each of the various translations is appropriate. The

longer context containing the fixed expression shows how it may be translated in one typical context. The user is well armed to extrapolate to other uses of and translations for the expression because he or she is given both explicit information (its form, the most obvious translations), and implicit information (the context-specific information provided by the longer context).

5 cadeau

type:	collocation
sense:	"chose qu'on offre"
source:	dictionary
version 1:	in free combination zone of sense "chose qu'on offre": **cela me ferait plaisir de vous faire un petit cadeau** it would give me pleasure to give you a little something in exp zone: **je lui ai fait cadeau de la monnaie** I let him keep the change
version 2:	in free combination zone of sense "chose qu'on offre": **faire cadeau d'un livre** to give a book; **cela me ferait plaisir de vous faire un petit cadeau** I would like to give you a little something in exp zone: **je lui ai fait cadeau de la monnaie** I let him keep the change; **ne pas faire cadeau d'un sou** *(Fam)* to drive a hard bargain; **il ne lui a pas fait de cadeau** he didn't let him off easily/lightly = he didn't spare him; **ils ne font pas de cadeaux (les examinateurs)** they don't mark easy

version 3	in free combination zone of sense "chose qu'on offre": **faire cadeau d'un livre** to give a book; **cela me ferait plaisir de vous faire un petit cadeau** I would like to give you a little something in exp zone: **je lui ai fait cadeau de la monnaie** I let him keep the change; **ne pas faire cadeau d'un sou** *(Fam)* to drive a hard bargain; **il ne lui a pas fait de cadeau** he didn't let him/her off easily *ou* lightly = he didn't spare him/her; **ils ne font pas de cadeaux (les examinateurs)** they're not easy markers
version 4:	same as 3. Note: version 4 has been edited but the corrections have not yet been implemented into a fifth version. The corrections seem to indicate that in the fifth version, the lemmatized form **faire cadeau de qch à qn** will be presented as a collocation within the sense "chose qu'on offre."

Analysis:

The analysis of these examples will focus on general problems related to their presentation rather than on the specific changes from version to version because, despite the changes, several fundamental problems remain in the fourth version.

First, these examples illustrate three distinct restricted structures: 1. *faire un cadeau (à qn)*, 2. *faire cadeau de qch (à qn)*, and 3. *ne pas faire de cadeau (à qn)*, and the entry does not clearly indicate the distinctions. Second, the exact component items of each restricted structure are not clearly identified because they are always presented within larger contexts. Third, they are improperly classified as either free combinations or fixed expressions (in fact *faire cadeau de qch (à qn)* appears in both zones) when all three are collocations.

Each of these collocations should be placed in the collocations zone of the sense "chose qu'on offre." They should be presented in lemmatized form so that the user may clearly identify the exact components of each.[17] However, each collocation may be translated in a variety of ways depending on the larger context in which it appears, and therefore each may need to be presented as a sub-entry. As a sub-entry, each collocation would first be presented in lemmatized form, with its most common translation, and then be followed by sentences showing some of the different ways it can be translated in context.

6.4 CONCLUSION: BCD EXAMPLES

This chapter has attempted to illustrate some of the practical problems involved in the selection and presentation of examples for a bilingual dictionary. It has shown that free combinations frequently undergo extensive changes from their original form in the corpus through their various stages of revision. Such changes are necessary in order to present new information about the lemma's meaning and use in as clear a way as possible. It has also shown that the revision process involves constant referral back and forth between earlier and later versions of an example: at times the latest version is not the best. This chapter has demonstrated that the corpus is frequently essential for determining 'typical' usage, and that a return to the corpus evidence often turns up better examples than those originally selected. This chapter has also demonstrated that mistakes are sometimes made in classifying restricted examples and has shown that some restricted examples are so complex as to require presentation as sub-entries.

---

[17] Indeed, the corrections to the fourth version seem to indicate that at least one of these collocations will be presented in lemmatized form as a collocation in the fifth version of the entry. The corrections to the fourth version have not yet been implemented and therefore it is impossible to say with precision exactly how the next version of the entry will appear.

CONCLUSION

Meeting the objectives of the thesis

The main objective of this study was to determine what role examples play in bilingual dictionaries and thus to justify the ample space they are given, and the time lexicographers spend in their selection, modification, translation and arrangement, etc. Examples have many roles which may be summarized under two general categories: they reinforce information about the lemma given by other means; they introduce new information about the lemma. The space taken up by examples, and the time necessary for their compilation is justified if lexicographers take care to give examples that reinforce and clarify difficult elements of lemmas first expressed in explicit statements and do not merely give examples that repeat information presented clearly elsewhere. Examples are also justified if they introduce new and typical elements of a lemma in a clear manner, and do not illustrate complex and atypical usage.

One specific objective of this study was to explore problems in the use of examples in existing bilingual dictionaries. These problems include the following: many examples do not seem to illustrate anything useful; some lemmas or senses of lemmas are not illustrated with any examples, while the majority are so illustrated; the presentation and arrangement of examples often changes from one entry to the next. This study has attempted to illustrate these and other types of problems with examples from existing bilingual dictionaries, and to indicate why such problems may render dictionary examples, and sometimes even whole dictionary entries, unhelpful to users.

Another specific objective was to review the literature on examples. The literature did not often yield a consensus on specific topics concerning examples and had very little to say about certain issues, such as the translation functions of examples and the number of examples. However, the categories of functions of examples and the types of examples that it suggested did provide a general framework for the analysis of examples. The wide variety of opinion exhibited in the literature suggested that a number of concepts essential to a discussion of dictionary examples had not been clearly defined. This study reviewed definitions of such terms as example, sub-entry, free combination, collocation, fixed expression and compound in an effort to clarify, at least within the parameters of this study, what such terms designate. The issues that were neglected in the literature have been given more attention here.

Caveats

One danger in a study such as this is that the case for examples may be overstated. While examples are very useful, they are not the only means of presenting information about a lemma, nor are they necessarily the simplest or clearest means of presenting such information; explicit statements in the form of actants, referents, labels, lists of equivalents, etc., can be a more concise and direct way of presenting such information. However, examples remain an important supplement to and reinforcement of the explicit statements.

Another danger is that, by discussing the individual functions of examples in discrete sections, I may have given the impression that the various functions of examples operate independently of each other: one example gives semantic information, another stylistic, etc.

This is not the case. As noted early on, examples are multi-functional: a single example may simultaneously give semantic, grammatical, stylistic, etc. information. The various functions were discussed in discrete sections for the sake of simplicity. This study may be enhanced through more attention to overlap between the various categories of functions.

Another danger arises from the fact that just four dictionaries, for the single language pair French-English, provided the data for analysis. One reason for this relatively small sample is my own linguistic competence: I could not carry out a significant analysis of examples in languages I do not read. Another reason is the time factor: a larger sample would have required an impractical lengthening of the project. These weaknesses are, in part, mitigated by the fact that three of the four dictionaries (RCS, OXHA, LAR2) are very recent publications by publishing houses with lengthy traditions in bilingual lexicography, and therefore, to a certain extent, may represent the best that French-English bilingual lexicography has offered to date. The fourth, older dictionary (HA), was included because of its long term and widespread popularity and influence within the fields of translation and language learning.

This study could have been enhanced through a more developed comparison of examples in older French-English bilingual dictionaries with those in the contemporary ones. The older dictionary (HA) was included partly because it is an example of the state of the art of a previous generation of bilingual dictionaries. Therefore, where HA differs from the practice of the more contemporary dictionaries, some conclusions may be drawn about the evolution of the use of examples in bilingual lexicography. However, this study did not

endeavour to undertake such a diachronic analysis of examples; indeed, the goal was to analyze current practice with a view to helping improve it.

Basic principles related to dictionary examples

It is hoped that this study may assist in the production of the Bilingual Canadian Dictionary. Examples included in BCD entries were analyzed in an effort to apply the findings of this study to an ongoing bilingual lexicography project. This analysis revealed that many of the problems with examples found in other, existing bilingual dictionaries have been addressed in this new project, but that some problems common to examples in existing bilingual dictionaries remain in BCD examples. So, in conclusion, I would like to present a list of features which the BCD lexicographer, or any bilingual lexicographer for that matter, should bear in mind when selecting, modifying and analyzing examples.

1 Form

- Examples should consist of an SL phrase or sentence and its translation

2 Length

- Phrases or short sentences are best. However, in rare cases, longer sentences or even multiple sentences may be used when this will clarify an element of a lemma.

3 Types

- Examples should consist of both free combinations and all current restricted examples.

4 Sources

- Examples may be drawn from a corpus and, when necessary, modified by the lexicographer. Or, they may be constructed by a lexicographer with assistance from SL informants and corpus evidence.

5 General functions

- Examples are multifunctional: a single example will frequently illustrate more than one element of a lemma.

- Examples overlap with explicit statements: they frequently serve to reinforce in a concrete way an element already expressed in an explicit statement.

- Examples illustrate the senses of the lemma but they are not a replacement for sense indications. In fact, examples should be grouped with the sense indication that they illustrate.

- Examples illustrate grammatical elements of the lemma: they may illustrate its inflections and the grammatical constructions in which it appears. Examples are

particularly useful to illustrate grammatical irregularities that are not easily described solely with explicit statements. Examples also show how specific grammatical constructions may be translated.

- Examples provide models of correct usage.

- Examples illustrate stylistic elements of the lemma and show how such elements may be translated. Examples are particularly useful to illustrate the register of the lemma when they show it juxtaposed with another lexical item of the same register.

6 Specific functions

- Examples help choose between listed equivalents: they show when these equivalents may be used interchangeably and when one is preferred over another. Examples also add context-specific equivalents which may be used to translate the lemma in a very limited number of contexts. Examples illustrate indirect translation procedures that may be used when the lemma appears in a complex grammatical structure and cannot be translated by a single, direct equivalent.

- Examples may illustrate cultural values and institutions of the linguistic communities represented in the dictionary, particularly through the use of proper nouns, or nouns that are specific to a region. However, such cultural elements can easily be

incomprehensible to users and should be used only if they are transparent within the example, or are explained elsewhere in the dictionary.

- Examples have the potential to illustrate negative cultural or gender stereotypes: lexicographers must balance the need to illustrate linguistic usage with that of being politically correct.

7 Restricted examples

- All restricted examples in which a lemma appears should be given in the entry.

- Restricted examples should be presented in lemmatized form so that users may easily identify their exact components.

- Restricted examples should be categorized as either collocations, fixed expressions, or compounds. Each type of restricted example should be presented in a distinct, labelled zone of the microstructure: collocations should be placed in a marked zone within the appropriate sense divisions of the lemma; fixed expressions and compounds should be placed in separate zones at the end of the microstructure. Restricted examples that are polysemous or that themselves appear in complex structures may be presented as sub-entries that include sentence examples illustrating the restricted structure.

8 Arrangement and number of examples

- Free combinations and collocations should be arranged so that they match up with the sense divisions of the lemma. Free combinations may be further arranged by

separating literal and metaphorical ones. Within a sense division, collocations should be labelled and placed separately from the free combinations. Fixed expressions and compounds should be placed in separate, labelled zones of the microstructure. Restricted examples may be further arranged by placing those that begin with the lemma before others.

- All restricted examples that are current should be given. The number of free combinations to be given depends upon the complexity of the lemma: those that appear in a wide variety of grammatical structures, and that have a large number of semantic nuances will need more examples than simpler ones. However, it is both impossible and undesirable to illustrate every grammatical element and semantic nuance pertaining to a lemma: such a plethora of information would impede the user rather than help him or her. The number of examples should be restricted to those needed to show what is typical, with the user left to extrapolate from these typical examples to other uses.

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF *FRANCHIR, ENNEMI, DRINK, ENEMY*

This appendix presents the results of an analysis of examples included in entries for the lemmas *franchir, ennemi, to drink (transitive verb) and enemy* in RCS, OXHA, LAR2 and HA.[1] The purpose of this analysis was to observe some general trends in how each bilingual dictionary uses examples. The observations described here cannot be termed a definitive portrait of how each dictionary uses examples because such a small sample of entries was used. Nevertheless, the four entries were compared across a wide number of categories of information, and some patterns do emerge.

The four lemmas chosen for analysis were selected because they show what may be called a medium level of semantic and grammatical complexity.[2] In other words, the entries chosen contained enough examples to yield some interesting data, but not so many examples that an analysis would be slowed by incessant counting of one element or another.

The entries were analyzed in seventeen different categories. The categories are defined where they are not clear from the heading.

---

[1] The information contained in this appendix presents the results of analyses of examples that were carried out in early stages of this project. Not all the information presented here has been dealt with explicitly in the main body of the thesis.

[2] Less complex lemmas have few examples and therefore yield little data for analysis. On the other hand, more complex lemmas yield so many examples that even fewer entries could have been examined, or those entries chosen could only have been analyzed in a more limited manner than I have done here.

1 Number of examples

HA gives the largest number of examples when the totals for each of the four words are combined: 43. LAR2 is second with 36 examples. RCS has 34 and OXHA 31. RCS and OXHA give approximately the same number of examples in total for all four words considered together, but their ranking relative to each other varies when the numbers of examples for individual words are compared.

When the numbers of examples for each of the four words are considered individually, HA gives the highest number of examples for three of the four words and the lowest number of examples for one of the four. LAR2 gives the second highest number of examples for three of the four words (tying RCS for second for one word, and tying OXHA for second for one word) and the third highest for one of the four. RCS ranks second for two words (tying LAR2 for second for one word), third for one word and fourth for one word. OXHA gives the highest number of examples for one word, ties LAR2 for second highest for one word, and gives the fourth highest total for two words.

2 Number of free combinations, collocations, fixed expressions, compounds

The examples that were counted as free combinations in this section are those in which every lexical item within the example is freely substitutable. In other words, free combinations that include collocations are counted as exemplifying collocations. OXHA gives the greatest proportion of free combinations: 58% of its total examples. HA is second at 47%. LAR2 is third at 44%. RCS gives the smallest proportion of its total examples as free combinations at 40%.

HA gives the highest total number of collocations presented either in phrasal form or within free combinations with 15. RCS and LAR2 both give 13 collocations. OXHA gives 8. As a proportion of each dictionary's total number of examples, RCS ranks first with 43%, LAR2 is second with 36%, HA is third with 34% and OXHA fourth with 25%.

HA and LAR2 tie for the most fixed expressions; 6. RCS gives 4 and OXHA gives 3. As a proportion of each dictionary's total number of examples, LAR2 gives the greatest proportion with 17%, HA is second with 14%, RCS is third with 13% and OXHA is fourth with 10%.

The number of compounds will be briefly examined, although this is more difficult to calculate since each dictionary has different and, at times, unclear policies regarding indexing of compounds. Some compounds appear in clearly marked sections of the entry, some are scattered amongst other examples in the entry, some have their own entry. The compounds included in this calculation are those that appear anywhere within the main entry for the headword in question, either scattered amongst all the examples for the headword in question, or placed within a special compounds zone of the entry microstructure. The entry words examined do not give rise to many compounds. RCS gives the most compounds with 3. HA gives 2, twice as many as LAR2, which gives 1. OXHA does not give any compounds for the words examined. Proportions in relation to the total number of examples have not been calculated here because of the different indexing policies for compounds.

Preliminary Conclusion

HA, which has the highest total number of examples, seems to achieve this ranking on the basis of compounds and fixed expressions.

3 Presentation of fixed expressions and collocations

Each of the four dictionaries presents fixed expressions either as complete sentences for example: **he drinks all his wages**, or as verbal phrases in the infinitive, i.e. without subjects or conjugated verbs, for example: **to drink sb under the table**. HA gives 6 fixed expressions, 4 in phrase form and 2 in sentence form. LAR2 also gives 6 fixed expressions, 3 in phrase form and 3 in sentence form. RCS gives 4 fixed expressions, 2 in sentence form and 2 in phrase form. OXHA gives 3 fixed expressions, 2 in phrase form and 1 in sentence form. RCS and LAR2 adopt the most balanced approach to presenting fixed expressions; each gives an even number of fixed expressions in phrase and sentence form.

Collocations, like fixed expressions, may be given in phrase form, for example: *franchir un cap*. However, they may also be presented within a free combination, for example: **le pays vient de franchir un cap important.**[3] RCS, and OXHA both show collocations within free combinations more frequently than do HA and LAR2. RCS presents a total of 13 collocations, six in phrase form and seven within free combinations. OXHA gives a total of eight collocations, six within free combinations and two in phrase form. HA gives a total of 15 collocations, 11 in phrase form and four within free combinations. LAR2 provides a total of 13 collocations, 9 in phrase form and 4 within free combinations. RCS

[3] Sometimes a collocation is a phrase that is integrated into a larger phrase, for example: «ne pas réussir à franchir la barre de», which shows the collocation «franchir la barre de».

uses the most balanced approach in the presentation of collocations, with a roughly even number in phrase form and in sentence form.

4 Sentence examples

RCS and LAR2 are tied for the highest proportion of examples that are complete sentences: 47%. OXHA follows at 39%. HA has the smallest proportion of examples that are complete sentences: 26%.

Inversely, HA has the highest proportion of examples that are verbal phrases: 53%, closely followed by RCS at 50%, then OXHA at 48%. LAR2 has the smallest proportion of examples that are verbal phrases: 39%.

The remaining examples are non-verbal phrases such as noun + adverb or noun + adjective free combinations as in the following example for *enemy* from OXHA:

the enemy within
l'ennemi intérieur

HA has the highest proportion of examples that consist of non-verbal phrases: 21%. LAR2 and OXHA have similar proportions of non-verbal phrases: 14% and 13% respectively. RCS has the smallest proportion of examples that are non-verbal phrases: 3%.

5 Use of actants instead of or with examples

Actants are context words that fit directly into a typical structure in which the lemma may appear. Within verb entries, actants may be typical noun subjects or typical objects of the lemma. Within noun entries, actants may be typical noun complements of the lemma. As a general principle, actants are given with equivalents specifically to avoid the need for

examples. For example, the following list of equivalents (with actants in italics) precedes the examples zone in the RCS entry for *franchir*:

> *obstacle* to clear, get over; *fossé* to clear, jump over; *rue, rivière, ligne d'arrivée* to cross; *seuil* to cross, step across; *porte* to go through; *distance* to cover; *mur du son* to break (through); *difficulté* to get over, surmount; *borne, limite* to overstep, go beyond

In every case, the actant can be used in a sentence with the lemma; in the case of *franchir*, each actant is a direct object of the verb. The use of actants as presented above constitutes a substitute for examples and not an example per se.

However, actants are sometimes used with phrasal examples to make them more precise. This is the case in the following example from the RCS entry for *franchir*: *[chiffres, vote]* **ne pas réussir à franchir la barre de**. For the lemma *ennemi*, RCS gives the following example with an actant:

> **être ennemi de qch**
> *[personne]* to be opposed to sth, be against sth

However, neither OXHA, HA nor LAR2 give actants with examples for the four words studied.

6 Verbs in examples

The analysis in this category deals with two separate groups of verbs: 7.1 verbs that are lemmas; 7.2 non-lemma verbs. Before each of these categories is discussed, it is important to recall that some examples for lemmas that are not verbs do not contain any verb. A verbal example for a non-verb lemma resembles the following example for *ennemi*: **se faire des ennemis**. A non-verbal example for a non-verb lemma resembles the following example for *ennemi*: **ennemi public numéro un**.

6.1 Verbs that are lemmas

When the lemma is a verb, it is presented in one of four ways in the examples. Examples from *franchir* illustrate the ways in which verbs that are lemmas may be presented. First, verbs may be conjugated with a subject or subject pronoun as in the following example: **sa renommée a franchi les frontières.** Second, verbs may be in the infinitive with no subject, for example: **franchir la barre des 10%.** Third, verbs may be in the infinitive as a secondary verb in a natural construction, for example: **il lui reste 10 mètres à franchir.** Fourth, verbs may be in the infinitive as a secondary verb in an example where the main verb is not conjugated, for example: **ne pas réussir à franchir la barre de.**

OXHA shows the verb lemma conjugated in 35% of its total examples for verbs. LAR2 shows the verb lemma conjugated in 33% of its total examples for verbs. 27% of the verb lemmas are conjugated in RCS, and 19% in HA.

HA shows the verb lemma in the infinitive with no subject in 69% of its total examples for verbs. OXHA shows the verb lemma in the infinitive in 50% of its total examples for verbs. RCS shows the verb lemma in the infinitive in 39% of its examples and LAR2 does so in 38% of its examples.

RCS shows the verb lemma in the infinitive as a secondary verb in a natural construction in 39% of its total examples. OXHA does so in 21% of verb examples, LAR2 in 19% and HA in 8%.

RCS gives one example where the verb lemma is in the infinitive in a construction where the main verb is also in the infinitive. OXHA, HA and LAR2 give no examples in this category.

6.2 Non-lemma verbs

The verbs in examples for lemmas that are not verbs are presented in two different ways. Examples from entries for *enemy* demonstrate the ways in which non-lemma verbs are presented. First, verbs may be conjugated with a subject as in the following example for *enemy*: **he is his own worst enemy**. Second, verbs may be in the infinitive with no subject, for example: **to make an enemy of sb**.

OXHA and LAR2 both give 5 examples where the verb is conjugated with a subject. RCS and HA both give 4. As a proportion of their total number of verbal examples for lemmas that are not verbs, LAR2 and HA both show the verb conjugated with a subject in 50% of the examples, OXHA in 38% and RCS in 36%.

OXHA gives 8 examples where the verb is in the infinitive with no subject. RCS gives 7; LAR2 gives 5; HA gives 4. As a proportion of their total number of verbal examples for lemmas that are not verbs, OXHA shows the verb in the infinitive in 62% of the examples, RCS in 58%, and both HA and LAR2 in 50%.

In general, lemmas that are not verbs are presented in verbal examples much more frequently than they are presented in non-verbal examples in RCS, OXHA, and LAR2; the reverse is true for HA, which is slightly more likely to show lemmas that are not verbs in non-verbal examples than it is to show them in verbal examples. RCS gives verbal examples for 91% of its total examples for lemmas that are not verbs. OXHA gives verbal examples for 76% of its total examples for lemmas that are not verbs. LAR2 does so in 67% of examples and HA in 47%.

7 Grammatical particularities

RCS, OXHA and LAR2 show the feminine form of the lemma or equivalent in examples. Since, in each of the four dictionaries, the explicit grammatical information presented for the four words already gives the feminine form of the lemma or equivalent, the example merely reinforces information given elsewhere.

All four of the dictionaries present the irregular plural form of the lemma in examples. However, since only OXHA and LAR2 give the irregular plural form of the lemma as explicit grammatical information, only in those two dictionaries is information on this grammatical particularity repeated through the examples. None of the four dictionaries give the irregular plural of the equivalent as explicit grammatical information along with the equivalent. However, each of the four dictionaries presents this information implicitly through examples.

8 Literal versus metaphorical meaning in examples

When all the examples from all four dictionaries for the lemmas *franchir, to drink (vt), enemy* and *ennemi* are considered together, RCS gives 9 metaphorical examples but labels only 3 of them as metaphorical; OXHA gives 10 metaphorical examples but labels only 2 as such; HA gives 11 but labels only 2; LAR2 gives 13 but labels only 2. Technical meanings appear only in HA.

9 Feminization of SL examples

LAR2 is also the only dictionary to give a feminine pronoun in an example when it would be equally illustrative in masculine form:

I made an enemy of her
je m'en suis fait une ennemie

All other dictionaries use only masculine pronouns, even when gender is irrelevant to the illustration of the lemma or equivalent. The OXHA entry for "*to drink*" gives an example that has a masculine subject and that would be equally illustrative of the lemma and equivalent if feminine:

he's had nothing to drink all day
il n'a rien bu de toute la journée

10 Arrangement and ordering

Within an entry, examples are often presented in several distinct groups, with each group offset by a number or letter, in each of the four dictionaries. Unfortunately, it is frequently unclear what criteria were used to determine which examples should be placed together in a particular group. In general, examples with literal meanings precede those with metaphorical meanings.

11 Examples and sense indications

Sense indications were provided for some senses of some of the lemmas analyzed in OXHA and LAR2. For example, the third sense of the OXHA entry for *ennemi* contains a sense indication and is structured as follows:

> 3 (élément nocif) **la censure est l'ennemie de la liberté** censorship is the enemy of a free society; **l'alcool est l'ennemi de votre foie/santé** alcohol damages your liver/health

The first sense division of the LAR2 entry for franchir contains a sense indication and is structured as follows:

> [passer par-dessus - barrière, mur] to get over *(insép)*; **il a franchi le fossé d'un bond** he jumped over the ditch

While OXHA and LAR2 do not follow this structure for every sense of every lemma, neither RCS nor HA provide sense indications for any of the four lemmas studied. The HA entry for *ennemi* begins as follows:

> **1.** *s.* enemy; *Lit:* foe; **ennemi No. 1,** enemy No. 1; **ennemis à mort,** bitter enemies

The RCS entry for *to drink* begins as follows:

> *wine, coffee* boire, prendre; *soup* manger. **would you like something to drink?** voulez-vous boire quelque chose? **give me something to drink** donnez-moi (quelque chose) à boire

Therefore, examples are matched with sense indications for some entries in OXHA and LAR2, but not in RCS or HA.[4]

12 Cultural information

Only HA has examples that are particular to a specific usage or culture. The following example shows British usage:

> **franchir le salon**
> to cross, pass through, the drawing room

The compound lexical item *drawing room* in the translation is British usage. The following

[4] However, RCS does provide sense indications for other lemmas, whereas HA does not.

example shows a collocation particular to British culture:

> **we drink the King**
> nous buvons à la santé du Roi

The SL sentence "we drink the King" is a collocation uncommon in Canada, and is presumably restricted to British English. Here, one more often uses the collocation *to drink to* in a context where one refers to making a toast.

13 Register matches between SL and translation of examples

The register of the SL example is matched in its translation in most cases in all dictionaries. HA had the highest number of discrepancies: 5/43 or 12%. One example of a mismatch in register between the SL and the translation follows:

> **to drink oneself into debt, out of a job**
> s'endetter à force de boire; se faire renvoyer pour ivrognerie

In this example from the HA entry for *to drink*, the register of the SL is slightly informal whereas the register of translation is neutral.

14 Alternative translations

Alternative translations are two or more translations provided for any one example. Alternative translations seem to fall into four types.

The first type of alternative translation provides a different translation for only one lexical item. The lexical item may or may not be the lemma. For example, the two translations for the following example from the RCS entry for *ennemi* are alternative translations:

être ennemi de qch
to be opposed to sth, be against sth

In this case, only the equivalent each translation uses for the lemma is changed. The RCS entry for *enemy* provides another example where just one lexical item of the second translation is different from the first:

to make enemies
se faire ou s'attirer des ennemis

In this case, the equivalent for the lemma remains unchanged, while the accompanying verb varies.

The second type of alternative translation provides different structures, but the meaning remains the same. The RCS entry for *enemy* provides a typical example of this type of alternative translation:

he is his own worst enemy
il est son pire ennemi; il n'a de pire ennemi que lui-même

The first two types of alternative translation both involve synonymy. Where just one lexical item is replaced in alternative translations, the substituted lexical items are usually synonymous within the context of the example, as is seen with *se faire* and *s'attirer des ennemis*. In cases where the structure of one translation is completely altered in the alternative translation(s), the end result is two different yet synonymous structures as is seen with **il est son pire ennemi** and **il n'a de pire ennemi que lui-même**. HA shows synonymy in alternative translations in 30% of its total number of examples, RCS does so in 23%, and OXHA shows synonymy in one translation. LAR2 does not show synonymy in alternative translations of examples.

The remaining two types of alternative translations do not involve synonymy. The third type of alternative translation is provided when the SL example can be interpreted in different ways, either because it has both literal and metaphorical meanings, or because it can be interpreted from more than one point of view. The following example for *franchir* from OXHA demonstrates how an example can be interpreted both literally and metaphorically:

> **franchir un obstacle**
> lit to clear an obstacle;
> fig to overcome an obstacle

The following example from the RCS entry for *franchir* demonstrates how an example may be interpreted from more than one point of view:

> **franchir le cap de la soixantaine**
> to turn sixty,
> to pass the sixty mark

The fourth type of alternative translation provides a possible but not a necessary expansion of the translation. Brackets are placed around one or more lexical items of the translation to indicate that the bracketed portion may or may not be used, upon the discretion of the dictionary user. The HA entry for *franchir* demonstrates this type of alternative translation:

> *Av.* **franchir le mur du son**
> to break (through) the sound barrier

The two translations for this example are: 1. to break the sound barrier; and 2. to break through the sound barrier.

When all types of alternative translations are considered together, HA gives the most examples with alternative translations in 40% of its examples. RCS is second with 37% of its examples having alternative translations. LAR2 gives alternative translations for 5% of its examples and OXHA follows at 3%.

15 Translations using unlisted equivalents for the lemma

Translations of examples often introduce an equivalent for the lemma that is not included in the list of equivalents at the beginning of the entry. These listed equivalents are usually the most common equivalents for the lemma; they are the equivalents that will be used to translate the lemma in most of the typical structures and contexts in which the lemma may appear. Many of the examples that follow the list of equivalents show these typical structures and contexts, and the translations of the examples show how some of the listed equivalents function in the TL structure and context.

However, translations of examples may include previously unlisted equivalents, sometimes along with a listed equivalent, and sometimes on their own. Section 1(*b*)[5] of the HA entry for *franchir* provides an example where a listed equivalent and an unlisted equivalent are both used as alternative translations of the same example. The entry lists "to pass through, to cross" as equivalents in section 1(*b*). This section is illustrated by

> **franchir le canal**
> to pass, go, through a canal

The unlisted equivalent "to go through" is provided alongside a listed equivalent.

Even when there is only a single translation of an example, an unlisted equivalent may be used. For example, the RCS entry for *franchir* lists a large number of equivalents:

> *obstacle* to clear, get over; *fossé* to clear, jump over; *rue, rivière, ligne d'arrivée* to cross; *seuil* to cross, step across; *porte* to go through; *distance* to cover; *mur du son* to break (through); *difficulté* to get over, surmount; *borne, limite* to overstep, go beyond

However, the following example from that entry does not use any of these listed equivalents in the translation:

---

[5] The significance of the numbering and lettering of various sections of the entry is unclear.

il lui reste 10 mètres à franchir
he still has 10 meters to go

Unlisted equivalents may be used for those SL structures and contexts for which the most common equivalents for the lemma are inadequate. A structural or semantic particularity of an SL example may require an equivalent for the lemma that is more restricted in its application. For example, some examples, such as the following, require indirect translations that involve a change in the part of speech of the lemma in translation.

il a franchi le fossé d'un bond
he jumped over the ditch

In these special cases the equivalent is not included with the list of equivalents that are applicable in more general contexts.

Some dictionaries seem to prefer presenting equivalents for lemmas through examples instead of through a long list of equivalents before the examples. For example, in the OXHA entry for *franchir*, only three equivalents are listed before the examples.[6] However, the limited number is more than compensated for by the translations of the eight examples that follow, which use only unlisted equivalents.

Each of the four dictionaries uses unlisted equivalents in the translations of examples. HA does so most frequently: in 58% of its examples. RCS and OXHA use unlisted equivalents in the translations of examples with roughly equal frequency: in 43% and 42% respectively. LAR2 uses unlisted equivalents least frequently: in 36% of its examples.

[6] Lexicographic policy for OXHA limited the number of listed equivalents to approximately 3. (Information presented by B.T. Atkins [lexicographical advisor to OXHA] to R.P. Roberts).

16 Translation mode

Translation mode refers to the technique adopted to perform the translation of the SL example. Dictionary examples are relatively short phrases or sentences, and they often have simple structures and meaning. These phrases or sentences, removed from any larger context, have relatively fixed interpretations. Elaborate translation techniques are therefore not usually necessary and the examples can be translated more or less literally, sometimes with one to one equivalence for each lexical item within the example. The following example from the RCS entry for *enemy* demonstrates this translation mode:

corruption is the enemy of the state
la corruption est l'ennemie de l'État

In this example there is one to one correspondence between each lexical item in the SL and the TL.

Some examples may have more complex meanings, or structures that are particular to the SL, and must be translated in an indirect way. The indirect translation techniques, which include categories such as transposition and modulation, are sometimes used in the translation of dictionary examples. The following example from the HA entry for *franchir* demonstrates one type of indirect translation, the *chassé-croisé*:

franchir le fossé d'un saut
to jump over the ditch;
to jump clean over the ditch

Explanatory translation is another type of indirect translation used for dictionary examples. Explanatory translations are needed in cases where the SL example may have a slightly ambiguous meaning. The following example from the LAR2 entry for the transitive verb *to drink* demonstrates an explanatory translation:

what are you drinking tonight?
que voulez-vous boire ce soir?

The implied meaning of the SL may not be self-evident to a user whose first language is not English. The translation adds *voulez-vous* to make the meaning explicit for such a user.

Fixed expressions are almost always translated by indirect translation. They may be matched, for example, with a TL fixed expression that has more or less the same meaning as the SL example: this type of translation is what Newmark calls cultural equivalence. The following example from the RCS entry for the transitive verb *to drink* demonstrates this type of indirect translation:

to drink sb under the table
faire rouler qn sous la table

Both the SL and the TL are fixed expressions with more or less equivalent meanings.

LAR2 uses indirect translation modes in three examples, using each of the three techniques outlined above once. RCS has one example of *chassé-croisé* and one example of cultural equivalence. HA has one example showing *chassé-croisé*. OXHA shows no indirect translation methods used to render examples for any of the four words examined.

17 Feminization of translations of examples

Only LAR2 feminizes translations of examples that are gender neutral in the SL. LAR2 does so in one example:

on ne lui connaissait aucun ennemi
she had no known enemy

The four dictionaries typically make examples that are gender neutral in the SL masculine in translation. The following example from RCS demonstrates how a gender neutral SL example is made masculine in the TL:

sa renommée a franchi les frontières
his fame has crossed frontiers

Appendix 2: The role of corpora in lexicographic analysis

Corpus analysis is a complex subject that demands in-depth study. The following briefly outlines some of the steps involved in corpus analysis, and suggests the significance of corpus analysis to the overall goal of lexicographic description of lexical items.

Corpora serve as a source of various types of information about the lemma, information on which the lexicographer bases his or her entry. For example, the corpus sample will provide semantic data: it will indicate the relative frequency of the senses of the item, and will also indicate which senses are no longer current and any new senses that the item has acquired.[7] The corpus sample will also provide grammatical data: it will show syntactic structures in which the item occurs and will show the morphological variations that are most frequent. The corpus sample may also indicate the register of the item: whether it is used in formal, informal, or neutral contexts. If a corpus is subdivided into regional sub-corpora, it will also show if any element of an item is particular to a region, or universal. However, Crystal warns that "all corpora, whatever their size, are inevitably limited in their coverage and always need to be supplemented by data derived from the intuitions of native speakers of the language, through either introspection or experimentation."[8]

While corpus analysis allows the lexicographer to determine those elements of the item that are most common, and therefore may need to be represented in the dictionary entry

---

[7] This information is provided indirectly through the combined analysis of both the corpus and existing dictionaries. In other words, senses found in existing dictionaries may not be exemplified in the corpus, suggesting that such senses are no longer current. On the other hand, the corpus may show contexts that do not match up with the senses provided in existing dictionaries, suggesting therefore that the item has acquired a new sense.

[8] Crystal, Cambridge Encylopedia 411.

for that item, not every element of a lemma that is discovered or confirmed through corpus analysis will or even can be presented in explicit form in the entry for that item. In fact, some elements found in the corpus will be presented in the dictionary only implicitly through examples. The corpus itself presents many instances of use and therefore constitutes a valuable source of examples.

GLOSSARY

actant: Actants are context words that may appear in the structure immediately surrounding the lemma; they are structurally dependent on the lemma. For example, with verb lemmas, actants will frequently consist of a noun that indicates the typical subjects or direct objects of a verb. For noun lemmas, an actant could be a noun complement.

collocation: Collocations are groups of lexical items that frequently co-occur in a variety of grammatical patterns, such as (but not restricted to) verb + noun: *franchir le cap*, verb + preposition: *to go away*, adjective + noun: *deadly enemies*, adverb + adjective: *strongly opposed*. While collocations are not fixed, in that they allow some variability in their form, they constitute nevertheless an idiomatic unit that does not allow free substitution of elements. While the meanings of the component lexical items are somewhat restricted through their juxtaposition with others within the collocation, the meaning of each item is still apparent.

compound: Compound lexical items are combinations of two or more lexical items that have independent grammatical and semantic functions in the language when they are used separately, but which have a single referent when used in combination: *tea* + *pot* = *teapot*. Orthographically, compounds may appear as a solid form such as *teapot* and *blackbird*, *portemanteau* and *portefeuille*; as a hyphenated form such as *body-blow* and *mother-in-law*, *point-virgule* and *garde-robe*; or as an open form such as *army depot* and *coffee cup*,

mauvaise herbe and *barres parallèles*. However, some compounds may appear in more than one of these forms, depending upon the stylistic preferences of the writer: *air conditioner* may also appear as *air-conditioner*. Others may show a combination of forms: *one-parent family* and *parent-teacher association*.

entry: An entry is a dictionary description of a lemma. It consists of the lemma and information in all the zones of the microstructure that pertain to that lemma.

equivalent: An equivalent is a TL word that may be used to translate a lemma. Equivalents are often presented in lists near the beginning of an entry or near the beginning of a sense division. Some are presented only within the translations of examples.

example: A bilingual dictionary example is a verbal or non-verbal phrase or a grammatically complete sentence that includes the lemma and is translated.

explicit statements/information Explicit statements consist of brief, often abbreviated statements that give a variety of information about the lemma. Explicit statements include, but are not limited to, abbreviations that indicate the grammatical category of a lemma (n, adj, adv, vt, etc), the gender of the lemma (for French: m, f, and sometimes mf) or other grammatical information (NonC for instance, to indicate noncount nouns, or numbers that refer the user to conjugation tables for irregular verbs); labels that indicate the country or region where a lemma is used, symbols that indicate the lemma's register, sense indications,

the list of equivalents, actants and referents that accompany certain equivalents or examples. Some form of brief explicit statement can be used to express virtually any element of a lemma that it is deemed necessary to highlight for users.

fixed expression: Fixed expressions are phrases or sentences which have specific semantic and formal characteristics. Fixed expressions function as a semantic unit and their meaning(s) cannot be readily derived from analyzing the meanings of the component lexical items. Fixed expressions are usually metaphors; within the expression some of the component lexical items take on particular metaphorical meanings that they have only when they are used in that expression. Formally, fixed expressions rarely allow substitutions for any of their component lexical items, and they do not allow a change in the order of any items. In addition, only very limited morphological variations are permitted: for example, verbs may change number and tense. Some examples of fixed expressions are *to kick the bucket, to draw the line, dans de beaux draps.*

free combination: Free combinations are constructions created to fill the needs of a specific communication situation and will therefore not recur with significant frequency in a corpus. Their meaning is derivable from the meanings of their component lexical items. They allow lexical and syntactic reconfigurations that change their meaning but do not remove their grammaticality or idiomaticity.

lemma: A lemma is the lexical item that is being described by a dictionary entry.

lemmatized form A lemma is in lemmatized form when it is uninflected. The lemmatized form is used to index the lemma in its alphabetical location within the macrostructure. Restricted examples may also be presented in lemmatized form within the microstructure of the entry for one of their component items. The lemmatized form of restricted examples consists of just its component items, with no additional items to form a context for the restricted example.

macrostructure: The macrostructure of a dictionary is its overall organizational structure. Planning of the macrostructure involves the selection the items to be described in the dictionary, the ordering and placement of lemmas, (i.e. are derivatives placed within the entry for their root form or explained in their own entries?) It also involves cross referencing between entries for complex lexical items (collocations, fixed expressions and compounds) that may be indexed in more than one entry.

microstructure: The microstructure of a dictionary is the organizational structure of an individual entry. It involves the types of information to be included in a dictionary entry, and placement of these different types of information within the entry. For example, the microstructure may be broken down into a series of zones, each of which would include one or more of the following types of information: the lemma, geographic and stylistic labels, the sense indication, equivalents, free combinations, collocations, fixed expressions, compounds, etc. Individual entries will not necessarily use all zones of the microstructure and will instead use only those that pertain to the lemma being described in the entry.

restricted example: Restricted examples are combinations of lexical items that allow little or no lexical variation and that recur in a corpus more frequently than chance would allow. Except for collocations, their meaning cannot usually be analyzed from the meaning of their individual components, and they function as a unit within larger constructions. The three types of restricted example are collocations, fixed expressions, compounds.

sense indication: A sense indication is the defining information given in a bilingual dictionary. It differs from a 'definition' in a unilingual dictionary because it is often less specific; sense indications in bilingual dictionaries may encompass a greater number of semantic nuances than would a 'definition' in a unilingual dictionary. Bilingual dictionary sense indications are usually shorter than unilingual dictionary definitions: frequently a short phrase or even a single synonym for the lemma will suffice. Sense indications provide some clues to the meaning(s) of the lemma but do not always provide the same rigorous description of and distinction between meanings as do definitions in unilingual dictionaries. For example, OXHA provides the sense indication "élément nocif" in its entry for *ennemi*. This sense indication corresponds to, but is less explicit than the more elaborate definition given in Le Petit Robert: "toute chose qu'un homme ou un groupe juge contraire à son bien."

sub-entry: A sub-entry is a way of presenting restricted examples that are polysemous, or that cannot be clearly presented solely in lemmatized form. A sub-entry would include the lemmatized form of the restricted example, a sense indication when necessary, the most common translation(s) of the restricted example, followed by one or more sentences which show how the restricted example may be translated when it appears within a larger context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Theoretical Works

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

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.

Béjoint, Henri. "'Codedness' and Lexicography," Lexicographers and Their Works. Ed. Gregory James. University of Exeter: 1989. 1-4.

Benson, M. "Collocations and Idioms," Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning. Ed. Robert Ilson. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1985. 61-68.

Birch, D. "Style: Definitions", The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Ed. R.E. Asher. Vol. 8. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1994. 4375-4383.

Boulanger, Jean-Claude. "Le statut du syntagme dans les dictionnaires généraux monolingues," Méta: Journal des traducteurs. 34.3 (septembre 1989). 360-369.

Cheshire, Jenny. "Register and Style," International Encyclopedia of Linguistics. Ed. William Bright. Vol. 3. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992. 324-327.

Chi Man-Lai, Amy. "A critical user-oriented review of the *Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary*: definitions and examples," Thinking Language: Issues in the Study of Language and Language Curriculum Renewal. Ed. Kitty P.Y. Wong and Christopher F. Green. Language Centre, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, 1995. 45-55.

Chuquet, H. and M. Paillard, Approche linguistique des problèmes de traduction anglais-français. Paris: Ophyrs, 1987.

Cop, Margaret. "Collocations in the Bilingual Dictionary," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol. 3. Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 2775-2778.

Cowie, A.P. "Language as Words: Lexicography," An Encyclopedia of Language. Ed. N.E. Collinge, London Routledge, 1985. 671-700.

---. "The Language of Examples in English Learner's Dictionaries," Lexicographers and their Works. Ed. R.R.K. Hartmann, University of Exeter, 1989. 55-65.

Creamer, Thomas. "Beyond the Definition: Some Problems With Examples in Recent Chinese-English and English-Chinese Bilingual Dictionaries," The Dictionary and the Language Learner. Ed. Anthony Cowie. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1987. 238-245.

Crystal, David. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

---. An Encyclopedic Dictionary Language and Languages. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers 1992.

---, and Derek Davy. Investigating English Style. Harlow (Essex): Longman, 1969.

Delisle, Jean. Translation: An Interpretive Approach. Trans. Patricia Logan and Monica Creery. University of Ottawa Press, 1988.

Drysdale, P.D. "The Role of Examples in a Learner's Dictionary," The Dictionary and the Language Learner. Ed. Anthony Cowie. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1987. 213-223.

Dubois, Jean et Claude Dubois. Introduction à la lexicographie. Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1971.

---, *et al* ed. Dictionnaire de linguistique et des sciences du langage. Paris: Larousse, 1994.

Dubuc, Robert. Manuel pratique de terminologie. 2e édition. Montréal: Linguatech, 1985.

Fox, Gwyneth. "The Case for Examples," Looking Up. Ed. J.M. Sinclair. London: Collins, 1987. 137-149.

Grevisse, Maurice. Le bon usage. 8e éd. Gembloux (Belgium): Éditions J. Duculot, 1964.

Grundstrom, Allan W. L'analyse du français. Lanham: University Press of America, 1983.

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

Hausmann, Franz Josef. "Les dictionnaires pour l'enseignement de la langue étrangère: français," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al*. Vol. 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 1386-1390.

---, and H.E. Wiegand. "Component Parts and Structures of General Monolingual Dictionaries: A Survey," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography, Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol. 1, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 328-360.

Jacobsen, Jane RosenKilde, James Manley and Viggo Hjørner Pederson. "Examples in the Bilingual Dictionary," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann. Vol. 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 2782-2789.

Kasssühlke, Rudolf. "Linguistic and Cultural Interpretations of Bible Translation," Translation: Apllications and Research. Ed. Richard W. Brislin. New York: Gardner Press, Inc., 1976. 279-299.

Kharma, Nayef N. "Contextualization and the Bilingual Learner's Dictionary," LEXeter '83 Proceedings. Ed. R.R.K. Hartmaan. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984. 199-206.

Kromann, Hans Peder, Theis Riiber and Poul Rosbach. "Grammatical Constructions in the Bilingual Dictionary," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann. Vol. 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 2770-2775.

Landau, Sidney I. Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Laufer, Batia. "Corpus-Based versus Lexicographer Examples in Comprehension and Production of New Words," Euralex 92 Proceedings I-II, Part I. Ed. Tarja Salini-Talonen. Tampere: Studia Translatologica, 1992. 71-80.

Manley, James. "Processing Excerpts for the Bilingual Dictionary," Symposium on Lexicography II: Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Lexicography May 16-17, 1984 at the University of Copenhagen. Ed. Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen and Arne Zettersten. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985. 245-254.

---, Jane Jacobsen and Viggo Hjorner Pederson. "Telling lies efficiently: Terminology and the Microstructure in the Bilingual Dictionary," Lexicographica Series Major: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Lexicography May 14-16, 1986 at the University of Copenhagen. Ed. Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen and Arne Zettersen. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1986. 281-302.

Marello, Carla. "Examples in Contemporary Italian Bilingual Dictionaries," The Dictionary and the Language Learner. Ed. Anthony Cowie. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1987. 224-237.

Martin, Robert. "L'exemple lexicographique dans le dictionnaire monolingue," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Vol. 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 599-607.

McArthur, Tom, ed. The Oxford Companion to the English Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

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.

Meyer, Ingrid. "Towards a New Type of General Bilingual Dictionary." Diss. University of Montreal, 1986.

Minaeva, Ludmilla. "Dictionary Examples: Friends or Foes?" Euralex '92 Proceedings I-II Part 1. Ed. Tarja Salini-Talonen *et al.* Tampere: Studia Translatologica, 1992. 77-80.

Moon, Rosamund. "Textual Aspects of Fixed Expressions in Learners' Dictionaries," Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics. Ed. Pierre J.L. Arnaud and Henri Béjoint. London: Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1992. 13-27.

Mounin, Georges, ed. Dictionnaire de la linguistique. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1974.

Newmark, Peter. Approaches to Translation. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.

Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Linden: E.J. Brill, 1969.

Pei, Mario A. and Frank Gaynor, ed. A Dictionary of Linguistics. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954.

Pergnier, Maurice. Les fondements sociolinguistiques de la traduction. 2e édition. Paris: Diffusion Librairie Honoré Champion, 1980.

Phelizon, Jean-François. Vocabulaire de linguistique. Paris: Éditions Roudil, 1976.

Roberts, Roda P. "A Bilingual Dictionary Intended for Translators/Interpreters." Coming of Age: Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference of the American Translators Association, October 11-15 1989, Washington D.C. Ed. Deanna Lindberg Hammond. Washington, D.C., 1989. 71-78.

---. Bilingual Canadian Dictionary: Bilingual Dictionary Methodology for Research Assistants. Version 6. University of Ottawa. June 1993.

---. "Marques de registre dans les dictionnaires bilingues," University of Ottawa, n.p., n.d.

---. "Phraseology: State of the Art," L'Actualité Terminologique: Bulletin du bureau de traduction. 26.2 (1993): 4-8.

---. "Le traitement des collocations et des expressions idiomatiques dans les dictionnaires bilingues." University of Ottawa, in print, 1995.

---. "Translation: An Act of Communication," Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics, Bulletin of the CAAL, Proceedings, 12th annual Symposium held at Carleton University, Ottawa, Ed. Guy Connolly, Jacques D. Girard, Bernard Landriault. 3.2 (Autumn, 1981): 151-163.

Sinclair, John, *et al*, ed. Collins Cobuild English Grammar. London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1990.

Thiele, Johannes. La formation des mots en français moderne. Trans. André Clas. Montréal: Les presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1987.

Toman, Jindrich. "Compounding," International Encyclopedia of Linguistics. Ed. William Bright. Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992. 286-288.

Van Scherrenburg, Daniel. "The Arrangement of Information in the General Bilingual Dictionary." Diss. University of Ottawa, 1990.

Verstraten, Linda. "Fixed Phrases in Monolingual Learner's Dictionaries," Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics. Ed. Pierre J.L. Arnaud and Henri Béjoint. London: Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1992. 28-39.

J.P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet, Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: Méthode de traduction. Montréal: Beauchemin, 1973.

G.P.J. Wamelink-van Lint, "Compounds, Semantics and Pragmatics," The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Ed. R.E. Asher. Vol. 2. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1994. 657-659.

Winter, Christine. "Bilingual Dictionaries: Between Language and Speech," Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics. Ed. Pierre J.L. Arnaud and Henri Béjoint. London: Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1992. 41-51.

Zgusta, Ladislav. Manual of Lexicography. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

Zöfgen, Ekkehard. "Bilingual Learners' Dictionaries," Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Ed. F.J. Hausmann *et al.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. 2892-2903.

2. Dictionaries

Bilingual

Atkins, Beryl T., Alain Duval and Rosemary C. Milne. eds. Le Robert & Collins Dictionnaire Français-Anglais Anglais-Français Senior. Troisième Édition. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 1993.

Carney, Fay. ed. Grand Dictionnaire Français-Anglais / Anglais-Français. 2 Vols. Paris: Larousse, 1993.

Corréard, Marie-Hélène and Valerie Grundy. eds. The Oxford-Hachette French Dictionary: French-English / English-French. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Mansion, J.E. ed. Harrap's Standard French and English Dictionary. 4 Vols. London: Harrap, 1972.

English

Avis, Walter S., ed. Gage Canadian Dictionary. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing Corporation, 1983.

Benson, Morton, Evelyn Benson and Robert Ilson. eds. The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English: A Guide to Word Combinations. Amsterdam: J. Benjamin Pub., 1986.

Costello, Robert B., ed. Random House Webster's College Dictionary. New York: Random House, 1991.

Cowie, A.P. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. 4th Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Hanks, Patrick *et al*, eds. Collins Dictionary of the English Language. Second Edition. London: Collins, 1979.

Sinclair, John. ed. Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary. London: Collins, 1987.

--- ed. Collins Cobuild English Dictionary. New Edition. London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1995.

Summers, Della. ed. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. New Edition. Harlow: Longman, 1987.

---. ed. Longman Language Activator: The World's First Production Dictionary. Harlow: Longman, 1993.

French

Lafleur, Bruno. Introduction. Dictionnaire des locutions idiomatiques françaises. 2e éd. Ottawa: Éditions du Renouveau Pédagogique, 1991. ii-xxii.

Rey-Debove, Josette et Alain Rey. eds. Le Nouveau Petit Robert: dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française. Nouvelle édition remaniée et amplifiée. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 1993.

INDEX