Word Groups in Bilingual Dictionaries: *OHFD* and After

Richard Wakely *(University of Edinburgh, 60 George Square, Edinburgh EH8 9JU, Scotland)*, **and Henri Béjoint** *(Université Lumière, 86 rue Pasteur, 69365 Lyon Cedex 7, France)*

1. Introduction

Most language learners acquire a dictionary early in their studies, usually a bilingual one.[1,2] They also own a course book, various reference books other than dictionaries, sometimes a monolingual L2 dictionary and usually a grammar book. The question of what such volumes can and should include and of how this information should be presented is of both practical and theoretical interest. We will speak here principally of bilingual dictionaries.

The last thirty years, and especially the last ten, have seen the appearance of many new and revised bilingual French-English dictionaries. Such dictionaries, like their predecessors, contain information that can be considered as 'non-lexical', such as lists of proper names, tables of weights and measures, proverbs with explanations or possible equivalents, etc. They now also include activity sections, for example on letter writing, essay writing, cultural information with explanations (rather than translations) for terms such as *IUT, ITV,* as well as large amounts of grammatical detail. Some of this information appears locally, i.e. under or close to a particular entry, but other types appear as blocks, in tabular or boxed form, either within the text (at an appropriate or random point) or separate from it, usually at the beginning, at the end, or in the middle of the volume.

More and more often, dictionaries now include some of this extra information in the form of usage notes, which can be either local or general. Local notes serve to attract the attention of the user to a particular problem of usage: they look at one word in order to stress or explain facts that a normal entry would not bring out sufficiently clearly. This is particularly useful in the case of high-frequency words, such as *for,* for which a note might say: 'take care with the translation of *for* into French, as it can be *pendant, depuis, pour* and even nothing' and provide rules and examples. General notes treat in one place a

---

[1]   The authors have both known Sue Atkins for a number of years. A key period of professional involvement with her was the early 90s, when work on the *Oxford-Hachette French Dictionary* (Corréard & Grundy, 1994, henceforward *OHFD*) was well underway.

[2]   The first part of this article includes text adapted from a previous piece, Wakely (1996).

point or points relating to several headwords or entries. These do not necessarily have to be separated out so as to appear in tabular or boxed form. It is quite possible to cross-refer to one word in a set from the others, so that there is a long, full entry for (say) *September* with short entries and a cross-reference from each of the other words for months (an approach used in Atkins et al, 1993). Such general notes are of greatest use if there are a large number of points that can be made that are common to the members of the set.

Both types of notes have been used in dictionaries since at least the 1980s. One of the most famous early examples of a dictionary with local notes is the 1969 edition of the *American Heritage Dictionary,* which gives the opinion of its usage panel on difficult questions of correctness. General notes have been used in Longman dictionaries, among others, for the explicit comparison of a certain number of synonyms, and local notes have been used in the *Penguin Wordmaster Dictionary*, which has various comments, including anecdotes on the origins of words (e.g. *hippopotamus*). *COBUILD* also has local usage notes in the form of boxed language entries.

2. The Oxford-Hachette project

During work on the *Oxford-Hachette French Dictionary* (*OHFD*, Corréard & Grundy, 1994) under the guidance of Sue Atkins, it became clear that certain areas of translation difficulty would best be handled in one, and only one, place for a group of lexical items, rather than repeated for each item or treated in the entry for one member of the set. Showing learners the similarities between the words would help them (so we hoped) to master the use of the whole set in one go. This led to the creation of general lexical usage notes which were added to the other types of notes already present in the volume: local grammar notes relating to some of the entries for grammatical words, and activity notes in the centre of the book.

The Oxford-Hachette team selected a certain number of lexical sets for which the information would be given in outlined boxes with cross-references from appropriately chosen items. We ended up with 45 sets for English, 40 for French (for the lists, see pp. 1919 and 1920 of *OHFD*). A quick look at *OHFD* will soon discover a few, e.g. p. 478 'Les mesures de longueur', or p.1150 'Date'. We then selected the information that would have to be included in each set. In this, we tried to be 'fair' to each lexical set, giving as much information as was practically possible within the constraints of the dictionary format, while also using a similar template in all the notes, which we thought would make them easier to use.

3. The *OHFD* Usage Notes

3.1. The lexical sets

There are many areas of vocabulary that can be considered as constituting lexical sets: ranks in the army, jobs, signs of the zodiac, games, feelings, adjectives for wine or the weather, or verbs used in cookery books. McArthur (1986: 145) mentions lexical sets as being somewhere half way between the individual lexeme and the lexical domain (or semantic field). Most vocabulary books use such groupings as a means of maximising acquisition by linking words to more general concepts. In dictionaries and in course books aimed both at children or at FL learners of the elementary to intermediate stages, it is common to find words grouped with others in the same semantic field by means of illustrations, e.g. 'common animals', 'the rooms in the house', etc. These, though very different from what we are discussing here, nonetheless illustrate the point that central treatment can appear appropriate for a number of reasons and in a number of different volumes.

It was clear to us, right from the start, that there were limits to the areas which could usefully be covered in the dictionary. The sets that we decided to treat in the *OHFD* Usage Notes were chosen because they had a sufficient number of items, and because of the amount of useful morphological and syntactic information that they would carry. Some were rejected, like the names of flowers, plants, animals and precious stones, because they would have had too little of such information: the structures that such words enter into are few in number and easy to master. But there is obviously no clear cut-off point between the 'rich' sets and the less rich; there is, rather, a cline of usefulness.

The sets that we decided to treat in our Usage Notes were both closed (e.g. 'Days of the week', 'French departments', 'Military ranks and titles', 'Months of the year', 'Points of the compass', 'Seasons', 'Signs of the Zodiac', 'US states') and open (e.g. 'Games and sports', 'Illnesses, aches and pains', 'Musical instruments', 'Shops, trades and professions', 'Towns and cities') – though the distinction between the two types is not always clear, as in the case of planets, or colours, or islands, or again of subjects taught at school. In all cases, any new items that are introduced are almost certain to behave in the same way as existing items: for example, a newly independent state, *Euphonia*, will behave like *Rumania, Bulgaria* and *Slovakia* by entering into structures such as 'to go to ---; to live in ---; the population of ---' and so on. Most notes exist in both directions, but not all, and the contents of the notes that do exist in both

directions do not of course consist of simple translations where only the order of languages is reversed.

The *OHFD* Usage Notes mostly concern nouns, a point that raises a question that would need extensive examination in its own right. It is not clear from a theoretical point of view whether this is 'naturally' the case. Maybe it is true that there are more noun sets which are both stable as to the syntactic structures into which they can enter and also which contain a sufficient number of items that are worth studying than there are sets of verbs and adjectives. Benson (1989: 6) also raises the question of part of speech in relation (mainly) to collocations. Although verbs with semantic similarities tend to have syntactic similarities as well as nouns, these seem to be fewer than one might suppose. If this is correct, then the structural information for verbs is best placed within individual entries (*demander à qqn de faire qqch* under *demander* and *prier qqn de faire qqch* under *prier*).[3]

Finally, the *OHFD* Usage Notes contain reasonably frequent words, a feature that is in sharp contrast with local usage notes in other dictionaries, which are mostly about rare, difficult words.

The general headings of the *OHFD* Usage Notes were of an encyclopaedic (i.e. thematic) nature, with titles such as 'Time', 'Place', 'Measurements', 'Social roles', etc. These were titles for the authors; the dictionary users only met the next level down, where 'Time' (for instance) appeared only under headings such as 'Days of the week', 'Months of the year', 'The Clock', etc. Similarly, 'Place' appeared in the dictionary in its divisions, e.g. 'Towns and cities', 'Countries and continents', 'Rivers', 'Lakes' or 'Oceans and seas'.

3.2. The contents

The *OHFD* Usage Notes were designed to help learners to acquire what we may call 'vocabulary-in-use' more effectively by bringing to their attention, from a contrastive viewpoint, the syntactic and other structural similarities of lexical items. They were aimed at the encoder, that is the person working in the direction L1 $\Rightarrow$ FL/L2, and thus seeking correct usage in a target language which is not the native language. Whether or not the decoder's task is the easier one (moving from unknown to known), the policy decision was taken to target

---

[3] For verbs, we are used to ways of giving structural information using codings. For instance, Carter (1989: 35-6) in a section on 'Grammar and the Dictionary', points out that both the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English and COBUILD use codes (25 and 96 respectively) which relate especially to aspects of the grammar such as a verb and its arguments, (V+O+O) for example.

the Notes, like the *OHFD* overall, at the encoder. Noreiko (1995) saw this clearly when comparing *OHFD*, which he describes as a 'dictionnaire de thème', with Larousse (1993), a more traditional 'dictionnaire de version'.[4]

Our Usage Notes contained all the information that we thought would be useful for the encoder. Here are a few examples:

(i) 'Days of the Week': the note handles matters such as:

- *on Monday = lundi; on Mondays = le lundi, with examples of cases where French does use the plural, as in:*

- *most Thursdays = presque tous les jeudis, etc., and a remark saying that, since le lundi means on Mondays, French prefers to use ce rather than le in:*

- *the Monday in question = ce lundi-là.*

(ii) 'Countries and Continents': here the note points out that two English words, *to* and *in*, have the same translation for any one item in French, but that the French form varies *(en, au, aux)* according to whether the word is masculine or feminine, singular or plural, begins with a vowel or a consonant, etc. Other Notes handle similar matters for French provinces and departments, Swiss cantons, etc. Another sub-section stresses the need to use the definite article with names of countries, regions, etc.

There was nothing really surprising or original in the contents of the notes. The information was mostly the same, for example on dates, as in *COBUILD* (see. p.357 DATE). As it turned out, many of our points were about the use of articles and prepositions. But on the other hand, in many cases we had the impression that the information that we wanted to convey was not readily available, though much of it – if not all of it – is somewhere buried in dictionaries and grammar-books.

3.3. The metalanguage

As our notes were for the encoding user, the metalanguage was French for the notes about English words and English for the notes about French words. We noted that there seemed to be no agreed terminology or metalanguage that is concise, accurate, clear and comprehensible to the average learner. We contented ourselves with demonstrating patterns mostly by giving examples and using only a limited range of terms such as *subject, object, gender, preposition, construction*, etc., i.e. expressions chosen from the general area of received

---

[4] Interestingly, the latter includes notes giving cultural information (e.g. on Canal + and Minitel) which is more useful for decoding.

terms. Whether this is sufficient or whether learners could profit from a few more is difficult to know. Among our suggestions: (i) a verb *to pattern* and its verbal noun *patterning*; these could be used to say things like '*hiver* and *été* pattern like *automne*' or 'the patterning is similar as between expressions of length and those of height'. (ii) *prepositional collocation* as in 'prepositional collocation is similar as between countries and continents'.

3.4. The place of the notes

The notes were placed next to one lexical item that was used in the title of the note. We tried to choose the word that the users would be most likely to look up spontaneously if they were looking for information on a word belonging to a lexical set: for example, the note 'Les jeux et les sports' was on p. 449 next to the entry for *jeu*, which was on p. 448, 'Les points cardinaux' was on p. 621 next to *point* on p. 620-2, 'Games and sports' was on p. 1282 like *game*, and 'Musical instruments' was on p. 1481 like *musical* and *music*. In some cases, we had to change the title of the note (choosing between, for example *disease*, *illness*, *health*, etc.) in order to make sure that the notes would be distributed evenly along the pages of the dictionary: in our first draft, we had about 20 notes in letter C but none after P!

3.5. Additional benefits

The main advantage of usage notes is that they give more information than in individual entries, in a more easily accessible form, and that they bring out the similarities between words belonging to a set. They also have other advantages. One is that they permit the use of a type of metalanguage that is not normally used in dictionaries. A usage note makes it possible for the lexicographer to introduce means of expression that are not allowed in the context of the entry proper. For example, the lexicographer can address the dictionary user directly; examples from *OHFD* are: 'When referring to a temporary state, the following phrases are useful', 'Not all English colour terms have an exact equivalent in French', 'Note that French does not use capital letters for months', 'Usage is sometimes uncertain; doubtful items should be checked in the dictionary', and many others. Such style has not been used in dictionaries since the eighteenth century, though it is normal in grammar-books.

Also, the Usage Notes shorten all the entries for the individual members of the lexical set: instead of having a long entry for (say) *September*, the user will find a short entry and be referred to the note on 'Months of the Year' for the finer points of usage. This is especially important since the words treated in our

notes tended to be frequent words with longish entries, and since it has been proven experimentally that the average user is unable to use long entries properly (Tono, 1984).

4. The Lexis/Grammar distinction

Usage notes such as those in *OHFD* raise a certain number of interesting linguistic and lexicographical questions. How many words in languages like English or French can be usefully described in sets? Why? What sort of words are most likely to share syntactic and semantic properties?[5] What exactly is a set? How far do the members of a set share morphological and syntactic properties? How far does this sharing have to go for the note in a dictionary to be useful? And what, by contrast, belongs in the grammar-book or course book? The verbs corresponding to colour adjectives in French are a good example of this type of problem: it is possible to say *rougir, bleuir, jaunir, verdir, noircir, blanchir*, but not **grisir* or **orangir*; also, some verbs are transitive (*blanchir qqch*) and others are not (*?verdir qqch*). For hair, one can say *blondir* or *brunir* or *noircir*, but not **châtainir*. Should such details be treated in a note? Is there not a certain danger in indicating similarities that do not apply to all the members of the set?

4.1. Semantics and syntax

The fact that words sharing semantic properties also exhibit a certain amount of similarity in morphological and syntactic behaviour has been known for quite a long time. The idea has long been used in the teaching of foreign languages, but has recently come to the fore in various linguistic publications. One early example is Wierzbicka, who was writing at a time when the debate about the relative importance (and indeed the very existence) of semantics in linguistics was still raging. Her point was not that there is no such thing as syntax, but that syntactic and semantic questions were intimately linked. Frawley (1994: 73) refers to her 'view that all grammatical forms have direct semantic correlates, and even the most idiosyncratic grammatical phenomena are manifestations of an underlying semantic regularity' and to the following of her principles: 'There is no autonomous syntax; grammatical descriptions that fail to show meaning are incomplete (if not inaccurate)'. This supports those who have claimed, in the very different sphere of lexis for teaching purposes, that there is no clear

---

[5] This is a question of both theoretical and practical interest: is it the case that high frequency word sets will, ceteris paribus, be the ones to provide numerous common patterns while low frequency sets will provide few?

dividing line between *mots grammaticaux* and *mots lexicaux*; any such distinction can only be made for practical purposes and has little theoretical basis. We are back to *le français fondamental*: high frequency items (such as prepositions) are 'structural' rather than 'lexical'.[6] Levin (1991: 210-1), discussing English verbs of sound (e.g. *whistle, whine, groan, grunt, snort*, etc.) says: 'Verbs fall into classes on the basis of shared meaning components, and the members of these classes have in common a range of properties concerning the expression and interpretation of their arguments'. She concludes that the meaning imposes restrictions on (for example) the choice of possible subjects. According to Atkins & Levin (1995: 96), 'even slight shades of meaning may affect syntactic behaviour'. More recently, Apresjan (Apresjan, 2000) examined the consequences for the lexicographer of the grouping of words along semantic lines for the treatment of syntactic information.

Many course books or grammar-books contain descriptions of the morphological and syntactic similarities of words belonging to sets. An example in French is the similarity of verbs like *empêcher, dispenser, dissuader*, a similarity that is both semantic ('stopping') and structural *(+ qqn de faire qqch)* (Adamson et al, 1980: 145). Other works give similar information, for example on the way the exact sense of verbs varies in relation to the constructions they enter into *(manquer, monter, laisser)*. Some further examples in grammar-books widely used in Britain include (and see further, Wakely, 2001):

— *adjectives whose meaning varies according to their position relative to the noun (Lang & Perez, 1996: 42-4)*

— *list of quantifiers along with details of whether they are followed by* de *or* du/de la/des *(Byrne & Churchill, revised Price, 1993: 230-44)*

— *the distinction in meaning and use between members of pairs of time expressions such as* matin/matinée *(Hawkins & Towell, 1996: 26).*

4.2. Grammar-books and dictionaries

The distinction between semantics and syntax has practical consequences in terms of what information belongs in a dictionary and what belongs in a grammar-book. The question has a long history (see Mitchell, 1998) and has been hotly debated, at least by lexicographers. Grammar books have always contained lexical information, e.g. by referring to 'Verbs of Emotion; of Saying and Believing' in a chapter on the French Subjunctive, or when they deal with

---

[6]   But does the terminology not follow the statistics rather than being guided by theory; and where is the dividing line?

the precise meaning of verbs such as *devoir, pouvoir, savoir, vouloir* in relation
to tense. Similarly, dictionaries have always had some amount of syntactic
information, and they are currently evolving towards the inclusion of more and
more information that would have been considered as grammatical a few
decades ago. Correspondingly, the tendency among theoretical linguists seems
to be that what belongs in the grammar-book and what belongs in the dictionary
are so closely linked as to be hard to distinguish. Hudson (1988: 287) says:

> We all have dictionaries on our shelves,... These dictionaries [...] have various
> structural characteristics. One is that they distinguish between 'the dictionary' and
> 'the grammar', the latter being either printed in summary as an appendix, or left out
> altogether. I think it is at least partly because of this institutionalised distinction that
> so many theoretical linguists are convinced that human language has a similar
> organisation: it consists of a set of rules plus a lexicon.

. And further, we read: 'In practice [lexicographers] must often be faced with
unanswerable questions about what information to include in their dictionary
and what to leave out on the grounds that it belongs rightly in a grammar'.
(Hudson, 1988: 294). Hudson goes on to applaud the inclusion of grammatical
information in dictionaries such as the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary
English*, and of lexical information in grammars such as Quirk et al (1972). He
says (1988: 305) that 'there is no point in asking where the boundary between
the dictionary and the grammar "really" lies; there is no such boundary in our
minds, so it is only a practical convenience if publishers invent one'.[7]

Therefore, when lexicographers include syntactic information in their
dictionaries, they are simply following a general principle according to which all
practical boundaries between dictionary and grammar book have little or no
theoretical foundation. So the resolution of questions of what should be included
in a volume has to be based on practical considerations: the publishers are
concerned to make their product as easy to consult but also as multi-purpose as
possible. It would be a poor dictionary that omitted translations for 'ON the
television', 'AT the chemist's' (i.e. information on appropriate use of
prepositions) or for 'run down the road, dash out of the house' (i.e. the problem
of translating English verb of motion + particle expressing manner or direction)

---

[7] He also points out that dictionaries have difficulty with morphology not linked to similarity of
form (e.g. I and me). Lexical units are not discrete entries (except for practical convenience -
you have to divide things up for ease of consultation). He says (1988: 299): 'If the relevant
field is meaning, then the transitive "stand" is grouped with "tolerate", but if it is morphology,
then the transitive and intransitive "stand" should be treated together'.

and such 'grammatical' questions are of necessity included in a work whose prime purpose is to give lexical information.

No doubt later dictionaries will go further still in the same direction. People, as they progress in language study, tend to buy bigger and better dictionaries rather than bigger and better grammar books, and it is in their dictionaries that they will expect to find the information that they need, be it lexical or grammatical. Ilson (1992: 277) says that '... if there were to be a work that contained **all** the facts about a language, that work would resemble a dictionary more than a grammar'. This is the case for reasons of extensive coverage and, we like to think, for the reasons which led to the Usage Notes: lexical items enter into patterns and a dictionary can show this.

5. The book

After we had been working on the Usage Notes for some time, it was suggested to us that we might also write a small reference book which would attempt to develop the same ideas further, with increased amounts of explanation and with encouragement to the learner to study each area systematically. It is well known that learners, when consulting dictionaries, tend to disregard any useful, general information and to 'home in' on the problem of the moment. Béjoint (1988: 139) observed that: 'Dictionaries are not normally used for the systematic acquisition of linguistic knowledge; they are used for finding an *ad hoc* solution to a particular problem of comprehension or production'. But whereas learners *consult* dictionaries, we hoped that they would *study* the book. The result of our cogitations and further work was *French Usage* (Wakely & Béjoint, 1996).

5.1. Similarities and differences

There are several similarities between the *OHFD* Usage Notes and the book. Apart from the obvious point that, in both, each note or section treats in one place several points relating to a set of lexical items, both are clearly aimed at conscious acquisition for production and not just comprehension or reception, i.e. there is no idea that the items listed should be acquired for passive use via 'incidental learning' (see Wesche & Paribakht (eds), 1999). Thus, while we take the point, made cogently by Meara (1980: 224), that much research, for example in word count projects like that which led to *le français fondamental*, concentrates on what needs to be *taught*, rather than how vocabulary is *learnt*, both the Usage Notes and *French Usage* aim to encourage people to do more than simply consult them.

Despite such similarities with the Usage Notes, the reference book presents several different features. First of all, such reference books are unidirectional (French for English speakers in this case) and not bilingual. This is similar to (say) reference books on verbs: they too offer only French verb tables and not both French and English ones. Secondly, we were able to extend the range of areas covered. While working on the Notes in the *OHFD*, we had been obliged to shorten our original list of areas for study for reasons of space. Now, in the reference book, we were able to reintroduce omitted areas such as *Weather* (p.72) and *Meals* (p.202) (and see also Wakely & Béjoint, 1996: viii). Thirdly, in addition to giving extra detail, we were able to distinguish more clearly between words in the same set where these presented differences. For example, in the *OHFD*, under *Seasons*, learners are presented with **au** *printemps* in close proximity with **en** *été/ hiver/ automne*, but this distinction is made explicit in the book by an explanatory sentence (Wakely & Béjoint, 1996: 10). Fourthly, we were able to be barefacedly thematic (though treating words, not the world). In the *OHFD*, we clearly had to respect the alphabetical macrostructure and insert Usage Notes wherever seemed appropriate, with cross-references from individual entries. In the book, by contrast, the structure could be presented as thematic from the start, with no need to follow an alphabetical order even in the index. In addition, and more importantly, areas of vocabulary which, in the dictionary, had been handled separately, could now be grouped together under major headings. Examples of this are *Time,* grouping *Days of the Week; Months of the Year; Seasons* and three others, and *Place,* grouping *Nationalities and languages; Countries and continents; Regions; Islands* and six others. Finally, in each section, a list of useful words is included, thus giving multiple examples and not just model words. Clearly, for closed sets such as *Continents*, the whole list is given; for other, open and 'pattern-rich' sets, such as *Islands*, a large selection of suitable items is included.

As stated above, restrictions of space limited the scope of the Usage Notes, whereas in *French Usage* we were able to include more sets of items. But it is interesting to note that we found that the areas which had not been handled in the dictionary usually furnished us with fewer patterns of general usefulness; so the dictionary actually *does* contain the most useful areas. There is no cut-off point as one moves from highly productive areas to less productive ones, but the general tendency, namely that items in a given semantic field present interesting common patterns, is maintained. There is of course no point in teaching items simply because they enter into similar patterns, but we believe that we have avoided the rare or the technical.

5.2. Practice

Throughout, we have been concerned to encourage learners to link grammar and lexis, and to feel that reference (as opposed to course-) books are not divided into two discrete categories called 'dictionaries' and 'grammar books'. But this needs to be 'rammed home' by practice and the Usage Notes in the *OHFD*, and even more so *French Usage*, would probably have been better if they had included exercises, as is the case for, for example, Duffy (1999). However, the fact remains that learners own and use dictionaries, whereas far lower numbers own and use more specialised reference books. Hundreds of thousands of people, in fact probably millions, use the *OHFD*, whereas volumes such as *French Usage* normally reach at best some tens of thousands. So where a dictionary can find the space to study such questions, it should do so, which is not to deny the usefulness for many people of reference books such as ours.

6. Conclusion

Our main innovation in the dictionary was the form of the Usage Notes: most of the information in our notes had never been presented before in such a form in a bilingual dictionary. Such notes, although they oblige the user to take an extra step by referring to a single location for various headwords, give broader information than isolated entries. Pedagogically, the aim is clear and the approach also saves space. The users may still perversely prefer the simple point-by-point approach, with repeated information, but we believe that they need to be weaned off such a restricted line. That is, in any case, an approach that has always been used for such information as verb morphology: no modern dictionary gives full verb tables for each verb at its actual entry.

OHFD has been reasonably successful, but it remains to be seen whether this attempt to instruct for later, rather than being content with enlightening on one point, will meet with user approval in the long run. Our notes assume (with some justification) that at least some learners are willing to spend extra time to learn more, and *French Usage* assumes that some of them even wish for further information. The fact that our notes have been included in smaller versions of the first and second editions of OHFD and have just been used again in the latest edition indicates that the publishers think that the idea was sound – if only commercially.

Since our work in the early to mid 1990s, we have noted some further items or elements that have been included in bilingual dictionaries. For example, *Harrap's Shorter*, 6th edition, gives highlighted information on problems associated with faux amis; for some entries the volume also gives the most usual

translation. These are local notes, with only an occasional cross reference to the grammar·in the middle.[8] The 3rd edition of the *OHFD* has notes placed·in the middle of the volume with a section on e-mail and the internet; the same middle section contains a section on linking expressions such as *hence* and *therefore*. Other (local) notes include cultural information, e.g. on *Bonfire Night*. Thus we may·be witnessing an evolution of the bilingual dictionary towards an all-purpose·self-teaching book including all sorts of information that might be ·needed·by the users, and going far beyond the areas of meaning and basic syntax that were the·domains of·the traditional bilingual dictionary.

There remains some research to be carried out, both in linguistics (how far·do the semantic and similarities go between the members of a set?) and in metalexicography, i.e. what information notes should include, how this information is best presented, and many other questions.

References

Adamson, R. et al (1980). *Le Français en Faculté*, 1st edition, London: Hodder & Stoughton.

American Heritage Dictionary: The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (1969). Boston: American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc.

Apresjan, J. (2000). *Systematic Lexicography*, Oxford:·Oxford University Press.

Atkins, B.T.S. et al (eds.) (1993). *The Collins-Robert French Dictionary*, 3rd edition, Glasgow: HarperCollins and Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert.

Atkins, B.T.S. and Levin, B. (1995). 'Building on a corpus: A linguistic and lexicographical look at some near-synonyms', *International Journal of Lexicography* 8/2: 85-114.

Béjoint, H. (1988). 'Psycholinguistic evidence and the use of dictionaries by L2 learners', in: M. Snell-Hornby (ed.), *Zürilex '86 Proceedings*, Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 139-148.

Benson, M. (1989). 'The Structure of the Collocational Dictionary', *International Journal of Lexicography* 2/1: 1-13.

Byrne, L.S.R. and Churchill, E.L. (1993). *A Comprehensive French Grammar*, 4th edition revised by Price, G., Oxford: Blackwell.

Carter, R. (1989). Review of the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* and of *COBUILD, International Journal of Lexicography* 2/1: 30-43.

COBUILD: Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary (1987). London and Glasgow: Collins.

Corréard, M.-H. and Grundy, V. (eds.) (1994). *The Oxford-Hachette French-English/English-French Dictionary*, Oxford: OUP and Paris: Hachette. ---- revised by Ormal-Grenon J.-B. and Pomier N. (eds.)(2001), 3rd edition. Oxford: OUP and Paris: Hachette.

---

[8] The introduction to the volume also includes notes on e-mail and on the internet.

Duffy, J.H. (1999). *Using French Vocabulary*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Frawley, W. (1994). Review of Wierzbicka, A. (1988), *The Semantics of Grammar*, Amsterdam and Philadephia: John Benjamins, *International Journal of Lexicography* 7/1: 73-8.

Harrap's Shorter Dictionary English-French / French-English; Dictionnaire Anglais-Français / Français-Anglais, (2000). 6th edition. Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap.

Hawkins, R. and Towell, R. (1996). *French Grammar and Usage*, London: Arnold.

Hudson, R. (1988). 'The Linguistic Foundation for Lexical Research and Dictionary Design', *International Journal of Lexicography* 4/1: 287-312.

Ilson, R. (1992). 'BudaLEX Presidential Debate 1988: Part 4', *International Journal of Lexicography* 5/4: 275-277.

Lang, M. and Perez, I. (1996). *Modern French Grammar: a Practical Guide*, London: Routledge.

Larousse French-English, English-French Dictionary (1993). Paris: Larousse.

Levin, B. (1991). 'Building a Lexicon: the Contribution of Linguistics', *International Journal of Lexicography* 4/3: 205-26.

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (1978). Harlow: Longman.

McArthur, T. (1986). *Worlds of Reference*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mair, V.H. (1991). 'Brief Desiderata for an Alphabetically Ordered Mandarin-English Dictionary', *International Journal of Lexicography* 4/2: 79-98.

Meara, P. (1980). 'Vocabulary Acquisition: a Neglected Aspect of Language Learning', *Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts,* 13: 211-246.

Mitchell, L. (1998). 'Pedagogical Practices of Lexicographers in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth Century England', in: T. Fontenelle et al (eds.), *EURALEX'98 Proceedings*, Liège: Université de Liège, 619-29.

Noreiko, S. (1995). Review of four *Larousse French-English English-French* dictionaries, *Journal of French Language Studies* 5/1: 131-35.

Penguin Wordmaster Dictionary (1987). Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Quirk, R. et al (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, London: Longman.

Tono, Y. (1984). 'On the Dictionary User's Reference Skills', Bachelor of Education Thesis, Tokyo Gakugei University.

Wakely, R. and Béjoint, H. (1996). *French Usage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Wakely, R. (1996). 'Patterns in Vocabulary: Some Recent Developments in Lexicography', in: R. Adamson (ed.) *Ça m'inspire: New Directions in French Language Studies*, Association for French Language Studies/University of Dundee, 235-252.

Wakely, R. (2001). 'The Study and Acquisition of Lexis', in: Peacock, N. (ed.), *Tous azimuts I: Directions in French Language Studies,* Glasgow: University of Glasgow French and German Publications, 33-71.

Wesche, M. and Paribakht, S.T. (eds)(1999). *Incidental L2 Vocabulary Acquisition: Theory, Current Research, and Instructional Implications*, Special number, 21/2, of *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.