© Euralex Bulletin

# EURALEX BULLETIN

## Vol. 6 No. 2 Winter 1989

### Editor:

### Robert Ilson, 58 Antrim Mansions, Antrim Road, London NW3 4XU, England

## Table of Contents

# Verbatim Award

The Executive Board is happy to announce that Laurence Urdang has generously provided funding for an annual VERBATIM AWARD, open to EURALEX members, to be administered by EURALEX for the purpose of supporting lexicographical work of any kind, including training. The annual amount available is £1,500 sterling; an individual award may vary in size from the full £1,500 to £250.

Applications will be screened and awards conferred by a Verbatim Award Selection Committee consisting of the President and two immediate past Presidents of the Association, currently:

Professor A. Zampolli
Istituto di Linguistica Computazionale
Via della Faggiola 32
56100 Pisa
Italy

Professor N. E. Osselton
Department of English Language
University of Newcastle
Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU
England

Professor G. Stein
c/o Survey of English Usage
University College London
Malet Street
London WC1
England

The key annual dates of the application process are as follows:

August 1       receipt of applications for the following year
October 1      notification of results
after January 1    presentation of award(s)

*APPLICATIONS ARE NOW INVITED FOR THE 1990 VERBATIM AWARD* available on or after January 1 1991; these should take the form of a letter giving details of the amount applied for and the purpose to which this would be put, together with a curriculum vitae and a list of the candidate's qualifications. Applications should be sent simultaneously to each of the members of the Selection Committee named above, to reach them by August 1 1990.

EURALEX membership application forms may be had from the Treasurer:
Professor F. E. Knowles, Department of Modern Languages, University of Aston, Aston Triangle, Birmingham B7 7ET, England.

# The Secretary Writes

B. T. S. Atkins (OUP)

Dear Fellow ....................s,
Perhaps someone can suggest a dignified synonym of 'lexicography-freak' and fill an
obvious gap in the vocabulary of EURALEX? Clearly what binds the membership
together is an interest in lexicography. Yet a fly on the wall of our conferences,
particularly of our General Meetings, might wonder whether the Association could if
challenged reach a consensus definition of the 'lexicography' in its title.

For career lexicographers, to whom lexicography means 'dictionary-making', it
represents their daily bread and involves doing their best within extreme constraints of
time, space and funding. Most love their craft, and rightly resent the fact that dictionary
compiling is so often freelance (with attendant lack of job security) and badly paid
(reducing one's incentive to stay in the job and causing frequent changes in colleagues
and work practices). Despite these hasards, career lexicographers are in my experience
*more* concerned than anyone else in the field of lexicography that their dictionaries
should be good dictionaries. But they are also the realists of the lexicographical world
and know that at base a dictionary is a commercial product. If it takes too long or costs
too much to create, or is too big to hold or too difficult to use, then it won't sell and they
won't eat.

I feel that at EURALEX congresses and other meetings the career lexicographers are
*under*-represented. Their voice is not heard where it should be. I am aware that this is
partly because if you are writing dictionaries all day, and are not somewhere you can easily
find scholarly publications, you find it difficult to keep up with academic writing on the
subject, far less contribute to it. However I think that there is more to it than that. It's
difficult to find a term to cover theoretical, applied and computational linguists without
implying that lexicographers are not linguists. For the purposes of the moment, however, I
shall refer to the former as 'linguists'. Lexicographers feel disadvantaged ('de-skilled' in
the jargon of today) in a gathering of linguists. If you go to conferences where your daily
occupation is discussed in terms which you don't understand (and this is the case for
lexicographers at linguistic and even, alas, lexicographical conferences) then you feel you
have nothing to offer. I have sat through papers whose titles led me to believe they were
addressing lexicographical matters and felt like a plumber with U-bend problems at a
gathering of theoretical physicists. It often takes more courage than I have got to say "I
don't understand" or, worse still, "if I *do* understand, then I don't think you're right".

In such circumstances, you very quickly come to the conclusion that what you do all
day long has little to do with what is being discussed, and hence that you have little to
learn from theoretical linguists in particular and indeed the academic world in general.
You begin to think neurotically of 'the others' as people who complain because the
dictionaries that you write – to be sold often for less than the cost of the conference
banquet – do not contain an exhaustive description of every word in the language. Or
who imply that bilingual dictionaries cannot be good unless they are totally reversible,
which might delight a computer but would prove so complex and redundant that no
human user would touch them. Or who present you with a description of, but no hint of a
solution to, problems that you have been aware of all your professional life. In a word,
you come away convinced that many non-career-lexicographers lose sight of the
dictionary user, and that as the user is your principal (perhaps unique) concern, you will
get no practical help from the linguists.

And yet, we do need help. We need informed advice on how to select a useful and consistent word list, how to decide whether an item should be a headword or not, what to do with phrasal verbs, how to know whether you are looking at an 'idiom' or simply a 'collocation', where to put phrases which should clearly be stowed away under several headwords (any half-way reasonable cross-referencing policy for most dictionaries would squeeze out W X Y & Z) ... the great problems may never be solved. But I believe that better ways of analysing the language and setting it out for the dictionary user can and must be found. I also believe that they will not be found by practical lexicographers alone.

Many – perhaps most – EURALEX members are not practical lexicographers. For them, 'lexicography' means much more than simply 'dictionary-making', as is shown by their publications and our current discussion on the relevance to 'practical lexicography' of papers on topics within lexicology, theoretical linguistics and applied linguistics. As a practical lexicographer, I see a need for a clear theoretical basis for our work. Yet theoretical lexicography must be distinct from lexicology, though they will share some areas of study; similarly, it must be distinct from linguistics proper. If lexicography (theoretical and practical) is to declare its independence as a discipline in its own right, equal to but distinct from both lexicology and linguistics (sister to the former, perhaps, and daughter to the latter), who better than EURALEX members to give it a firm identity? I leave it to others better qualified than I am to define the word anew.

In the past three or four years I have had a chance to work with linguists, to offer them the commercial lexicographer's problems and attempt with them to find an acceptable solution to one or two of them, 'acceptable' in that it will work in a dictionary and not offend linguistic principles too much. I made my first approach to linguists because I knew that alone I would never solve any of my lexicographical problems: many of them were enunciated by Samuel Johnson and have been moved forward little if at all since then, though sometimes the interim solutions have changed radically. (One such case is the problem of standard and non-standard language: to be quoted as an acceptable authority in Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language* you had to be dead, whereas in some current dictionaries you have to be alive.) My experience of working with linguists is that this *is* helpful, in that discussion with someone with a clear view of theoretical matters (and with patience to listen) does let you see more clearly how some difficult areas of lexicography could be handled better; for me, it has also been very enriching, in that I have learnt an enormous amount about the way language works which helps me in practical lexicography; and perhaps my academic colleagues have sometimes found it rewarding, in that they have a clearer view of what dictionary compiling is all about, and certainly of the problems that lexicographers have in cramming the abundant, overflowing, exuberant, living language between the covers of a tiny book that has to stand up in the market place.

While nothing can replace a one-to-one collaboration between linguist and lexicographer, something at least can be done to start building more bridges between the two communities. The most persistent complaints heard from the career lexicographers at EURALEX conferences are that there are too many individual papers, not always immediately relevant to dictionary-writing. My experience on conference organizing committees suggests that this is easily remedied: not enough career lexicographers offer papers. If we relied on them alone the conference would flash past in a morning. One of my reasons for writing this letter is to urge lexicographers to come out of the closet. Only we know all our lexicographical problems in minute detail, and only we can enumerate all the constraints under which we work. What we have to say is not only valid and interesting, but essential if linguists are to be able to address theoretical points in a way that will facilitate a practical application and if lexicography is to develop and expand.

Scholarly publications are very daunting, at least to those who don't write them and rarely read them. I'd like to devise a non-daunting way of presenting our lexicographical problems to the theoretical lexicographers, from whose knowledge and skills we often cannot benefit because they are in many cases unaware of the scope and complexity of these problems. Practical lexicographers, to whom the upper echelons of linguistics might be on another planet, complain that theoretical linguists couch their thoughts in excessively difficult language. Perhaps this is a good place to make a plea to linguists at lexicographical conferences to relate what they have to say explicitly to lexicography, to suggest solutions as well as recount problems, and to make their points as far as possible in clear language. Some of the best linguists, of course, do this all the time.

Complaints about parallel sessions are trickier ones to deal with. A relative newcomer to the business of planning conferences, I am always naively surprised to find that the organizer with final responsibility for the success or failure of the conference (and no conference can be called successful if it bankrupts either the Association or the host institution) is reluctant to reduce the number of short papers, and indeed anxious to multiply the parallel sessions. This is in part because of a laudable belief that voices should be heard, but the more cogent argument for a plethora of papers is that it guarantees enough participants to avoid a deficit when the books are balanced. Few people can afford to shoulder the full costs of attendance at conferences (even EURALEX conferences), and institutions, when they do contribute, normally make such a contribution contingent upon having a paper accepted.

How can we make it feasible to hold international conferences with more practical sessions, workshops and the like? How can we get lexicographers to write about their work, as well as to write dictionaries? In fact, how can we gain credibility, let alone respectability, for practical lexicography when university teachers whose 'free' time for many years has been spent as lexicographers on major new dictionaries are told by interviewing boards that they have not published enough? (This has happened to several colleagues of mine.)

It would be good to have, between the international Congresses, many more local, small-scale meetings to discuss practical lexicography and related topics, and EURA-LEX must support and promote these as best it can (though there are no funds to give the sort of support that is most needed). The Association of course is dependent on inidividual members to organize these. It has been suggested that publishing houses frown on discussions between their lexicographers and those of their competitors. I believe that, sadly, this is sometimes the case, although publishers' reluctance to encourage (and finance) attendance at meetings is more likely to be for reasons of cost and deadlines than fear of industrial espionage.

My principal reason for writing this letter is to encourage others to do the same. If EURALEX is to function in a way that its members find interesting and relevant, then members have to make sure that the Association knows what their views are. The discussion session at the end of the General Meeting at Budalex was for me one of the best parts of the whole conference. This open letter is an attempt to continue and widen that discussion.

# Aston Technical English Corpus (ASTEC)

Peter J. Roe (Aston University)

1. The purpose of this paper is to present the broad defining criteria used in the creation of the ASTEC corpus, to suggest likely areas for future exploitation and to consider possible initial analyses of the data.

Primary focus:

The English which mediates the rapid international promulgation of contemporary research in areas covered by the BSI ROOT Thesaurus.

Primary Intended Output:

A guide for the creators (native and non-native) of text (for spoken and written delivery) designed to promulgate the results of current research.

Chief Forms of Output:

a. a computer database providing illustrative examples of realisations of form, function and meaning;

b. a reduced database in the form of a printed guide;

c. an intensive training programme aimed at both reading and writing skills based on the objective data provided by the research.

General areas of exploitation. The following is a list of potential areas of development from which future selections can be made in the light of current interests and developments:

a. the description of scientific text;

b. contribution to the theory of formal semantics; genre analysis; structure of knowledge-fields; morpho-syntactic analysis; stylistics; lexicography; translation of technical documents;

c. contribution to computational linguistics; development of procedures and software;

d. providing attractive fields for investigation by postgraduate students; possible link with LSU MSc in ELT/ESP;

e. hopefully forming a significant part of a larger national/international corpus.

2. The scope of the corpus was more narrowly defined, at least in the short term, as follows:

a. focus on UCD Class 6 (Applied Sciences, Medicine, Technology);

b. avoiding overlap with social systems (eg management, education);

c. restricting the documents covered, initially at least, to:

contributions to Journals which satisfy the above criteria of focus,

abstracts of such documents,

lectures, oral communications to conferences,

Doctoral Theses;

d. determining the choice of fields to be covered through a consideration of the relevant technical Journals falling within a. above (preferably using a "whole journal" approach rather than selecting articles from a large number of publications).

3. Journals vary according to focus eg from *Nature* or *Scientific American*, very broad, to *Kidney*, very narrow. Sets of journals were identified so as to exclude areas outside the scope of the corpus, but narrow enough to generate a range of topics each served by its

own narrow-focus journals. Preliminary analysis of the Aston Library current periodicals list showed that of over 2,000 titles, nearly a quarter are classed under UCD Class 6.

4. The most widely represented fields are as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 61 | Medical Sciences | 157 Titles |
| 62 | Engineering and Technology | 182 Titles |
| 66 | Chemical Technology | 73 Titles |
| 67 | Various Industries | 27 Titles |
| 69 | Building Materials etc | 10 Titles |

5. The most popular subdivisions are:

| | |
|---|---|
| 610 | Medicine 72, including Cancer 11, Neurology 11, Physiology 7 |
| 614 | Public Health 11 |
| 615 | Pharmacology 41, including Drugs Research 7 |
| 617 | Ophthalmology (mainly) 33 |
| 620 | Engineering General 21, including Materials Science 8 |
| 621C | Civil Engineering 34, including Concrete 4 and Irrigation 4 |
| 621E | Electrical Engineering 83, (very diffuse, but including esp. Electronics, Power Applications, Communications) |
| 621M | Mechanical Engineering 32, including Machine Design 4 |
| 621P | Production Engineering 11 |
| 660 | Chemical Engineering 44, including Petrochemicals 5, Energy 6, Ceramics 3 |
| 669 | Metallurgy 29, including Corrosion 4, Heat Treatment 5, Welding 3 |
| 678 | Polymers and Macromolecules 22 |
| 690 | Building 10 |

NOTE: Subdivisions of 621 above are not standard UDC.

6. The basic structural element of the corpus is the 'node'. By a 'node' is meant a collection of documents of whatever genre falling within a given subject area or 'field'. Nodes are by nature 'nested', broader fields subsuming narrower fields. (The UDC corresponds essentially to a hierarchy of nested nodes, although it is unlikely that the nodes in the corpus will match UDC nodes exactly, at least after the decimal point. The number of nestings or 'levels' generated by the corpus is an empirical question, but it is anticipated that eventually it will prove possible to establish four levels eg as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Level 0 | TECHNOLOGY UDC 6 ( = whole corpus) |
| Level 1 | MEDICAL SCIENCES UDC 61, ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY UDC 62, 66, 67 69 |
| Level 2 | Pharmacology, Civil, Electrical, Mechanical and Chemical Engineering |
| Level 3 | To be decided after levels 1 & 2 have been established. Likely candidates: Cancer, Neurology, Drugs Research, Communications |

7. Initially all documents are being classified only as level 0. Thereafter they will be subclassified on the basis of linguistic evidence as this becomes available. Initial assumptions about genre will be restricted to the four groups mentioned at 2.c above, further subclassifications being made on the basis of linguistic evidence. Each document will be given a filename tagged for the Node Level and assumed genre, and for source and date of submission. Other considerations are as follows:

Corpus size:   At Level 0 (whole corpus) $\pm 5$ million words
Level 1 > 2 million words

At Level 2 and beyond, any potential node to be investigated must exceed 100,000 words, and an established node will probably be several times this size.

Ambiguity: It is anticipated that some documents will be ambiguous at one level or another as far as allocation to a node is concerned eg Medical Imaging or Robotics etc. This would form an interesting field of investigation.

Data Storage: Documents will be stored line by line as ASCII strings. Non-linear text and non-standard symbols will be reduced to one symbol for 'expression' and another for 'equation' as appropriate.

Data Entry: As a general rule, text is being sought supplied in machine readable form. However, experience has shown that most journals have not yet adopted the appropriate technology, which forces the adoption of the next best alternative, namely the optical scanning of text. So far use has been made of the University's Kurzweil scanner, supplemented by necessary keyborad entry and editing, to enter articles from the BMJ. This is a time-consuming process, as clean text can require anything from 30 minutes to 1 hour per 1000 words, including text preparation and editing.

8. The initial analytic procedure proposed for investigating the corpus will be informed by the work of Sinclair (esp the COBUILD project – see 'Looking Up' Collins 1988), Roe, Phillips and Yang over the period 1975–1988. In particular it focuses attention on what distinguishes one sub-corpus from another, or, in terms of what has been proposed above, what distinguishes one node from another. Areas in which distinctive features (notional, functional, organisational etc) of a node might best be sought can be suggested by divergences of its lexical frequencies and distribution from a given point of reference, here the 'parent' node. However, it is stressed that this 'atomic' analysis of lanaguage is seen only as evidence for 'molecular' macrostructures. The COBUILD corpus would constitute an ideal reference point or parent node for the ASTEC corpus as a whole. The initial stages in the proposed procedure are as follows:

Word Frequency Lists (WFLs):
Edited text is being stored line by line and used to construct WFLs for each node identified.

Lemmatisation:
The original intention was to collect all morphemic variants, with frequencies, under the appropriate headword and append them in recoverable form. Recent work by Sinclair (personal communication) suggests that this generalisation may obscure important data. The relevance of this claim will be investigated.

Lexical Deviation Lists:
Each WFL will be compared for relative frequencies with that of the node one level higher. (It is hoped to compare the Level 0 node with the Cobuild WFL). Comparisons across two levels may also be indicated. Items significantly more preponderant (to be determined empirically) will be listed.

Concordances of Significant Headwords:
For each of these significant headwords a concordance of all its occurrences in the node will be constructed using n words before and after the headword. (The optimal value of n, to be determined empirically, is expected to vary depending on the nature of the generalisations being investigated. The significance of sentence boundaries occurring within this range will also be considered.) This sub-corpus will be analysed as above to produce a further WFL which will be compared with that of the main node to produce a list of significant collocates (with frequencies).

Associative Lexical Groups:

    Each of these significant collocates will either already have its own list of collocates by virtue of its being a significant headword in its own right, or be made the subject of such a list. These files will facilitate investigation into the formal definition of lexis by mutual collocational relationships, and the description of the structure and organisation of corpus text from micro to macro level. The definition of procedures to be used at this later stage of investigation must await the results of earlier analyses, but the work of Phillips 1982 represents a useful point of departure.

9. The general implications for hardware and software are as follows:

Software Considerations:

    The most highly-favoured system for text processing of this nature appears to UNIX, which seems set for widespread future development. The same applies to the related C programming language. The initial WFLs and concordances proposed above for the early stages of the investigation can be handled by existing software; but new software will need to be developed for the identification of eg associative lexical groups, and for a user-friendly interface for an illustrative/instructional database. One by-product of the project could be a new suite of portable procedures for text analysis.

Hardware:

    It was envisaged that even a modest implementation of UNIX would require at least 2mb of CPU and more than that amount of HD storage. The raw corpus would take up around 25mb, and the proposed derived files probably the same amount again. The analysis of the full 5 million word corpus, and subsequent cluster and factor analysis applications, will probably require a mainframe computer, and the UNIX system recently commissioned on the Aston mainframe seems ideal, with data being dumped on tape when not in use. But for the sake of flexibility, future portability and sheer convenience, the use of a suitable desk-top PC was clearly indicated. Both IBM and Apricot claimed to be able to meet the required specification with recently announced machines. In particular, the Apricot Qi 350i seemed a strong contender. In the event, however, an Archimedes 140 with a UNIX environment resident on its 60mb disk, was acquired. This has already turned out to be inadequate for storage purposes, although otherwise sufficiently fast and sophisticated, and a further hard disk will be essential. To this must be added the fact that once it became apparent what the UNIX facilities could achieve, other rival claims on storage space appeared, including half a million words of the LSU's own Distance Learning package.

10. Next Steps. In order to identify 'high-level' documents (ie in terms of node level) it is proposed to examine the distribution of citations in the most likely candidates. The more widely a journal is cited in other journals, the more general its coverage and influence are likely to be Permission to store and process text has already been received from a number of journals identified in this way, and work on storing text from the British Medical Journal (BMJ) has already begun.

11. Current Problems. The main stumbling block to progress is the speed at which the corpus can be stored on computer. To this end both extra storage and extra hands to do the storing, editing and initial analysis will be required in order to make it possible to proceed to the main research objectives of the project.

# The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language

Reuven Merkin (Academy of the Hebrew Language)

'Materials for the Dictionary – Series I' has been published in the form of a microfiche. This publication covers all works written in Hebrew from the close of the Biblical canon to the end of the Tannaitic era (200 BCE–300 CE) and includes the texts themselves, edited according to the most reliable manuscripts, together with concordances, grammatical lists and frequency lists.

The full microfiche includes:

**(A) The sources** (13 microfiches): The Book of Ben Sira, the Dead Sea Scrolls (excluding the Biblical texts), the Mishna, the Tosefta, Sifra, Sifre Bemidbar and Devarim, Sifre Zutta, the Mekhilta of R. Ishmael, the Mekhilta of R. Shim'on bar Yohai, Seder Olam Rabba, epigraphic texts and coins, and some other small works.

**(B) Concordances** (83 microfiches) containing lexical entries together with their contexts in the sources:

1. Lexical entries arranged according to the alphabetical sequence of their roots.
2. Aramaic words.
3. Greek and Latin words.
4. Proper names.
5. Names of literary compositions mentioned in the sources.
6. Abbreviations mentioned in the sources.
7. Words without lexical entries.

**(C) Grammatical lists and frequency lists** (10 microfiches):

1. The entries arranged in alphabetical sequence of their roots with indication of their frequency.
2. The verbs according to their binyanim and their grammatical forms within each binyan.
3. The nouns according to their morphological structure.
4. The entries arranged in descending order of frequency.

Attached to the microfiche is a booklet containing instructions for use and key to symbols, an index of entries referring the user to the relevant microfiche, an index of roots and of nouns accorded root status, and indices of sources (a) in alphabetical order and (b) in chronological order.

# EURALEX Colloquium Proceedings

M. Snell-Hornby (Universität Wien)

The Proceedings of the EURALEX Colloquium held at Innsbruck from 2–5 July 1987 are now available as a Special Monograph of *Paintbrush, A Journal of Poetry, Translations and Letters* (General Editor Ben Bennani, Northeast Missouri State University). The volume is called *Translation and Lexicography* and has been edited by Mary Snell-Hornby and Esther Pöhl. It is being distributed by John Benjamins, Amsterdam, to whom further enquiries should be addressed.

# BudaLEX '88 Proceedings

**BudaLEX '88**

*Papers from the EURALEX 3rd International Congress, Budapest, September 1988*

Edited by Tamás Magay & Judit Zigány
Publisher: Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

This volume will appear in the spring the spring of 1990, and will cost approximately US$48, with a 10% discount for EURALEX members. Prospective purchasers are invited to write for an order form and details of payment methods to the publishers:

<div align="center">

BudaLEX Volume,
Akadémiai Kiadó,
P.O. Box 24,
1363 Budapest,
Hungary.

</div>

# EURALEX Workshop on Dictionary Assessment and Criticism

Janet Whitcut (Freelance)

This event took place at St Catherine's College, Oxford, on 17 September 1989, in response to the demand that EURALEX should engage itself in more 'practical' work. It was organised by B. T. S. Atkins and Gabriele Stein, supported by R. F. Ilson and R. R. K. Hartmann. The main thrust was towards the assessment of dictionaries with the aim of suggesting possible guidelines to assist dictionary reviewers. There is to be a section at Málaga next year on dictionary assessment, where actual published reviews may be considered, and we hope then to look at a draft of the guidelines. (We shall also discuss etymologies, pronunciations, and foreign words.)

Five topics were first introduced: a) the dictionary as a product. This involves blurb writing, jacket design, marketing, and the publisher's statements about word-count (a matter never standardized), headword and sense ordering, and inclusion policy – technical terms (increasingly popular today), world English, synonyms, usage notes. b) selection and presentation of lexical items. 'What is a word?' Where do we put proper names, abbreviations, compounds, runons, idioms? How do we handle function words? c) semantic information; conveyed in bilinguals chiefly by translation, in monolinguals by synonymy, analytical definition, pictures, exemplification, usage notes. The level of vocabulary and syntax must be appropriate to the target audience, striking the right balance between accuracy and clarity. d) grammatical information. This is for encoding, conveyed by labels or codes and – perhaps most usefully – by exemplifcation. e) lexical relationships. Runons, synonyms and antonyms, collocation, hyponymy, lexical fields.

The 120 participants then divided themselves into 15 groups of eight, each to discuss one topic in connection with one sort of dictionary: a) monolingual for native speakers b) monolingual for learners c) bilingual. Five reporters summarized their conclusions:

The choice of items should involve a corpus, an important though fallible basis.

Function words are best shown in contrast: particles in collocation. Headword relating should be so managed, by cross-referencing, that *bathos* does not decouple *bath* from *bathrobe*. As for proper names, it is hard to justify including *Johnsonian* but not *Johnson*.

All selection of information depends on the competence of the intended user, but publishers may find it uneconomic to tailor dictionaries very precisely for one group. Decisions are made on this basis as to the splitting of homographs, sense-ordering, and the hierarchy of subsenses.

Grammatical information must probably be coded, though codes are hard for beginners, who must inevitably start with a bilingual dictionary. Codes should be readily visible, inside the cover or on a bookmark, and each example should closely follow its code. Verbs have been given far more attention than the other parts of speech.

The inclusion of lexical relationships again depends on the user. For the native speaker they may belong in a thesaurus rather than a dictionary. They entail various cross-referencing strategies to mitigate the rigours of alphabetical ordering.

Reviewers should understand how space is allocated in a dictionary, since to say more *about any one headword means having fewer of them. They should pay attention to the* publisher's explicit claims, which do not lie, but a list of guidelines would help them to recognize bad points. Such a list could be sent out with review copies, and also to teachers, booksellers, and anyone else who prescribes dictionaries for others. But reviewers have their own public to consider. We should not require them to be too technical.

In five years, electronic dictionaries will be a commonplace in homes and offices.

Richard Thomas of Collins responded to all this from a publisher's standpoint. He said that publishers do take account of feedback from reviews, as also from market research, advisory panels, and (presumably) angry letters. Better dictionaries do indeed sell better. But at some point one must call a halt to the successive improvements and actually print it.

# Forthcoming Events 1990–91

David Blair (Macquarie), Reinhard Hartmann (Exeter), R. F. Ilson (UCL)

4–6 January 1990 *Maastricht*: (1st Part of) Colloquium on Translation and Meaning. Info: Marcel Thelen, Rijkshogeschool, Opleiding Tolk-Vertaler, P.O. Box 964, NL-6200 AZ Maastricht, The Netherlands

5–10 March 1990 *San Francisco*: (24th) Annual Conference of TESOL. Info: TESOL Central Office, 1118 22nd Street N.W., Suite 205, Washington DC 20037, U.S.A.

19–24 March 1990 *Exeter*: (4th) International Lexicography Course. Info: Dr. Reinhard Hartmann, Dictionary Research Centre, University of Exeter, Exeter EX5 4QH, U.K.

15–21 April 1990 *Thessaloniki*: (9th) World Congress of the International Association of Applied Linguistics (AILA). Info: Professor Stathis Efstathiadis, P.O. Box 52, Aristotle University, GR-54006 Thessaloniki, Greece

15–21 April 1990 *Dublin*: (24th) International Conference of IATEFL. Infor: IATEFL, 3 Kingsdown Chambers, Kingsdown Park, Tankerton, Whitstable, Kent CT5 2DJ, U.K.

3–5 May 1990 *Copenhagen*: (5th) International Symposium on Lexicography. Info: Ms. Charlotte Jespersen, Department of English, Njalsgade 84, University of Copenhagen, DK-2300 Copenhagen, Denmark

6–9 June 1990 *Pittsburgh*: (28th) Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Info: Don Walker (ACL), Bellcore, MRE 2A 379, 445 South Street, Box 1910, Morristown, NJ 07960–1910, U.S.A.

9–13 July 1990 *Barcelona*: International Pragmatics Conference. Info: University of Antwerp (Linguistics – IPA), Universiteitsplein 1, B-2610 Wilrijk, Belgium

21–26 July 1990 *London*: (4th) World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies (inc. Use of Computers). Info: Dr. J. I. Press, University of London (Queen Mary College School of European Lang. & Lit.), Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, U.K.

2–9 August *Beograd*: (12th) World Congress of the International Federation of Translators ('Translation: a creative profession'). Info: FIT Congress, Kičevska 9, YU-11000 Beograd, Yugoslavia

28 August–1 September 1990 *Benalmádena (Málaga)*: (4th) EURALEX International Congress. Info: (Academic Programme) Prof. Manuel Alvar, CELEX, Sancha de Lara, 11-4 Derecha, 29015 Málaga, Spain; (Other Matters) EURALEX-VOX Congress Secretariat, c/o Viajes Iberia Congresos, Avda. Diagonal 523, 08029-Barcelona, Spain

8–11 September 1990 *Balatonszabadi*: Computational Lexicography. Info: Júlia Pajzs, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Linguistics Institute, Budapest Pf 19, Hungary 1250.

21–23 September 1990 *Sheffield*: Language and Computers. Info: Moira Monteith, Sheffield City Polytechnic (English), 36 Collegiate Crescent, Sheffield S10 2BP, U.K.

11–13 October 1990 *Łódź*: (2nd Part of) Colloquium on Translation and Meaning. Info: Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, University of Łódź (English), Kościuszki 65, PL-90514 Łódź, Poland

10–12 May 1991 *Innsbuck*: International Conference: New Departures in Contrastive Linguistics/Neue Ansätze in der kontrastiven Linguistik. Info: Prof. Dr. Manfred Markus, Institut für Anglistik, Universität Innsbruck, Innrain 52/III, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria.

# EURALEX International Congress

EURALEX-VOX, the Fourth EURALEX International Congress, will be held in Málaga (Benalmádena), Spain, from Tuesday August 28 (19.00 hrs) to Saturday September 1 (evening), 1990.

The academic programme will include a Round Table on the theme of the relationship between linguistics and lexicography; three workshops (on Dictionary Assessment, Computational Lexicography, and Corpus Lexicography); parallel sessions of individual papers; computer demonstrations; poster sessions; and impromptu workshops.

Proposals relating to all aspects of lexicography will be welcomed, but the principal topics of the Congress are bilingual lexicography, computational lexicography, and Ibero-American lexicography. The official Congress languages are Spanish, English, French, German, Italian and Russian; no simultaneous interpretation will be available.

Individual presentations should be timed to last 30 minutes, followed by a ten-minute

discussion period. Abstracts (minimum 2 and maximum 3 pages) should be sent to the Lecture Programme Organizer, who is responsible for the academic content of the Congress:

Professor Manuel Alvar,
CELEX, Sancha de Lara 11-4 Derecha,     Tel: 34-52-22-56-14
29015 Málaga, Spain.                    Fax: 34-52-22-77-98

Deadline for receipt of abstracts  : November 30 1989
Acceptance/rejection mailed by     : February 15 1990

Further information on all congress arrangements except the academic programme may be had from the Secretariat:

EURALEX-VOX,
c/o Viajes Iberia Congresos,            Tel: 34-3-322-64-62;
Avda Diagonal 523,                      Fax: 24-3-322-66-39
08029 Barcelona, Spain.                 Telex: 81204 ibero

Programme Committee: M. Alvar (Málaga), B. T. S. Atkins (Oxford), F. E. Knowles (Aston), N. E. Osselton (Newcastle), M. Snell-Hornby (Vienna), A. Zampolli (Pisa).

---

ERRATA: those who received the First Circular sent out in September will note in the above some corrections of errors in that circular, specifically: ending now evening not noon on Saturday 1; change of dates relating to abstracts receipt and notification of results; six not two official languages; Ibero-American Lexicography as one of the principal themes; Corpus Lexicography as the third workshop. The Congress organizers apologise for these errors.

# ERASMUS European Training Course in Lexicography

An ERASMUS-funded project on the design of a European Training Course in Lexicography (probably a one-year postgraduate Diploma with taught, practical and project components) is currently in progress. Suggestions on the content of such a course and descriptions of existing courses elsewhere are invited, to Dr. Reinhard Hartmann, Dictionary Research Centre, University of Exeter, Exeter EX4 4QH, England.

# Notes

Material for *The EURALEX Bulletin* should be submitted in duplicate.
    Publications received by the editor of *The EURALEX Bulletin* are eligible for review or listing in *The International Journal of Lexicography*.
    Individual members of EURALEX, or of the Dictionary Society of North America, are entitled to subscribe to *The International Journal of Lexicography* for half the stipulated price.