

An Analysis of *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, Fifth Edition

YASUO ICHIKAWA TAKASHI KANAZASHI
HIROKO SAITO TAKAHIRO KOKAWA
KAZUO DOHI

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to examine and analyze, based mainly on a comparison with the fourth edition (henceforth *OALD*⁴) and other similar EFL dictionaries, how the fifth edition of *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (henceforth *OALD*⁵) has been revised. In the preface of *OALD*⁵ it is stated that the new edition is compiled on the basic editorial principle originally established by A S Hornby, in that it is designed to meet the needs of users to develop both their receptive and their productive skills. It is also stated that *OALD*⁵ has introduced a number of significant innovations such as the use of the British National Corpus and the introduction of the 3500-word defining vocabulary. We will naturally consider, from the viewpoints not only of non-native teachers of English or lexicographers but also of the users of this dictionary, how these innovations have contributed to the improvement of the new edition. We will also consider how the results of the extensive editorial staff changes and reduction and the 100-page decrease in total entries are reflected in the new edition.

2. Entries

2.1. This section mainly deals with changes in entry organization and entry numbers and with other improvements to entries in this revision. For a quick survey, we shall look at every 50 pages abstracted from *OALD*⁵ as a sample (henceforth sample⁵) and the corresponding pages in *OALD*⁴ (henceforth sample⁴). It is said that the volume of *OALD*⁴ showed

an increase of 50% over *OALD*³. Takahashi et al. (1992: 62) examined this more closely and calculated that the number of lines had increased 52.5%, but that the increase was 14.5% for entry numbers and that the rest of the space had been allotted to expanding existing entries.

*OALD*⁴ contained 1492 pages. The number of pages in *OALD*⁵ has decreased, by exactly 100 pages, to 1392. Even though the number of lines has increased from 72 to 73–77 per column, this is no compensation for the decrease in pages. The number of headwords, derivatives¹⁾, and compounds²⁾ in sample⁵ is 806 (including abbreviations and affixes). This number in sample⁴ was 843, from which 106 words have been deleted and to which 69 have been added to make the total number 806, which shows a decrease of 43 words (4.4%). We might wonder if the dictionary has become poorer in content with the decrease in the number of pages.

2.2. If there is something new to compensate for the decrease in volume, it will be the 16-page "Language study pages", the 8-page "Maps and geographical information", and the 8-page "Cultural information". Some information in "Language study pages" in *OALD*⁵ and "USING THE DICTIONARY — A PRACTICAL GUIDE", "USING THE DICTIONARY — A DETAILED GUIDE TO THE ENTRIES" in *OALD*⁴ overlap. What is really new in the new edition is the latter two, "Maps and geographical information" and "Cultural information". They are printed in full color, and might well be included in the encyclopedic version (i.e. *OALDE*).

At the foot of every page, we find notes for some of 12 verb patterns such as "[V] = verb used alone", "[Vn] = verb + noun", "[V. to inf] = verb + to infinitive". In the same place it says "For more help with verbs, see Study pages **B4–8**." It is surely a waste of space to print the same thing every four pages, and it would have been better to put these verb patterns in order at the beginning of Study page **B4**, thereby giving each column two more lines and saving (or making better use of) nearly 40 pages.

1) Those in the derivatives section.

2) Those in the compounds section.

2.3. Although entry organization underwent major change in the previous revision (*ibid.*, p. 63), it has hardly changed this time. The page layout is practically the same as in the previous edition. For example, headwords are presented in large boldface, projecting by one letter to the left. And it was in the previous revision that derivatives and compounds ceased to be run on and started to be given new lines after the symbols ▷ and □ respectively, which practice *OALD*⁵ continues.

However, some minor visual changes can be found. The symbols ▷ and □, followed by derivatives and compounds, have become ► and ■, perhaps to make them stand out more. Idioms and phrasal verbs, which were not distinguished in *OALD*³, were clearly distinguished in *OALD*⁴ by putting (idm) and (phr v) before them. In *OALD*⁵ these symbols have become **IDM** and **PHR V**. This also serves to avoid any change of line between phr and v, which occurred in *OALD*⁴.

2.4.1. Compounds may be solid (unbroken), hyphenated, or separate, and their treatment has been a matter of controversy.

In p. xvi–xvii, *OALD*⁴ explained how to look up compounds, from which we could learn what to do if a compound did not have a separate entry. On p. ix, *OALD*⁵ claims the merit that “compounds spelt with hyphens or as separate words are listed alphabetically in the headword entry, after the symbol ■. Compounds spelt as unbroken single words appear as headwords.” **Schoolfellow** and **weathercock** are thus headwords in *OALD*⁵, but in *OALD*⁴ both were compounds listed in the headword entry. If users were to look up these words in *OALD*⁴, they might find that there were no such words as **schoolfellow** between the headwords **school**² and **schooner** or **weathercock** between the headwords **weather**² and **weave**, and abandon their search. Another way of presenting compounds in the dictionaries is to do what *MCD* has done: “entries are all contained in a single list, so that you may locate the word you want as easily as possible. There are no separate sections for special kinds of words, such as names of persons and places. Entries are listed alphabetically letter by letter, *whether they consist of a single word or of two or more different words.*” [my italics]

Since it is difficult to decide which of the three is the best way for different kinds of user, the way to treat compounds has yet to be standardized.

2.4.2. Derivatives, unlike headwords, are sometimes not fully treated. Most headwords have definitions and examples, but some derivatives lack either or both of these.

Out of 260 derivatives in sample⁴, 37 have been deleted or ceased to be a derivative¹⁾. 17 of these had neither definition nor example. If the meaning of a derivative is easy to infer from the definition of the headword, it is hardly worth defining the derivative. In sample⁴ there were 7 such words²⁾, whose definitions were easy to infer and which did not have examples. It is not a blemish on *OALD*⁵ that those 7, along with 17 which had neither definitions nor examples, were deleted.

On the other hand, 23 derivatives have been added to sample⁵, to total up to 246. This is a decrease of 14 words (5.4%) from the 260 in sample⁴. Among the 23, only 6 have neither definitions nor examples. It is sometimes worth including examples for active use, even if the meaning of the derivative is easy to infer. There are 4 such cases in sample⁵.

2.4.3. One of the major changes in this revision is the increase in words with the negative prefix **un-**. The number of such words in *OALD*⁴ was 485, from which 44 have been deleted and to which 246 have been added, to give a total in *OALD*⁵ of 687. Since the volume of the dictionary has been reduced by 4 or 5%, this increase from 485 to 687 (41.6%) is remarkable.

Of the **un-** words deleted in this revision, nearly half (19 words, 43.2%) were derivatives with neither definitions nor examples, which are assumed to be the least important words in dictionaries. The reason for the deletion

1) **Inbreeding** was in the derivatives section under the headword **inbred** in *OALD*⁴, but not in *OALD*⁵. This is certainly an improvement because **inbreeding** is a derivative of **inbreed**, not of **inbred**.

2) Such words are: **dowser**, **inaugurator**, **lowbrow n.**, **patrimonial**, **pauperism**, **suppliant**, **tiller**. For example, the definition of **dowser** is “person who does this [**dowse**² v.]; diviner.” Whether the meaning of a particular derivative is easy to infer or not, however, differs from person to person.

might be that these words could be easily inferred from their opposites as well as from the headwords. *OALD*⁵ has a smaller percentage of such "least important words" because, although *OALD*⁴ and *OALD*⁵ have exactly the same number (73), the latter contains more words with **un-**. It is justifiable to say from these facts that *OALD*⁵ treats the words with **un-** much more generously than *OALD*⁴. Probably some of these have come to be recognized as words in their own right, not merely as negative forms of other words, principally because they are more frequently used than before. Their frequency could be determined by the use of the 100-million-word British National Corpus and the 40-million-word Oxford American English Corpus, as *OALD*⁵ says on the dust jacket. Before *OALD*⁵, *COBUILD*¹ (1987) made use of an 18-million-word corpus and contains a large number of **un-** words, which at that time made the dictionary quite unique (cf. Higashi, 1992: 462).

With regard to words with other negative prefixes than **un-**, however, no remarkable change has been made. For example, the number has decreased (typically with **dis-**) or stayed about the same (**ir-**).

2.5. There is one thing which we might regard as regrettable: the disappearance of syllabication. However neat-looking it may be, it represents a decrease in the practical usefulness.

The treatment of abbreviations has been improved. There were some cases in *OALD*⁴ in which an abbreviation and another word were spelled exactly the same because of the omission of periods after abbreviations. Takahashi (1992: 65–66) says that they should be distinguished by superscript numbers, like **fig**¹ (noun, soft sweet fruit), **fig**² (abbreviation for figure etc.), and they are indeed so distinguished in *OALD*⁵.

(Kanazashi)

3. Pronunciation

3.1. The Phonetics Editor for *OALD*⁵ is Michael Ashby¹⁾ of University College London, taking over the work from A. C. Gimson and Susan

1) The writer of this section was fortunate enough to be able to meet Mr Michael

Ramsaran in *OALD*⁴. The previous edition based its pronunciations on *EPD*⁴, which itself was edited by A. C. Gimson and, after his death, by Susan Ramsaran (both taught phonetics at University College London). However, the copyright of *EPD* was transferred to Cambridge University Press from Dent in 1991, thereby severing its connection with Oxford University Press. Consequently, we can see in *OALD*⁵ changes made by the new editor and which do not necessarily conform with *EPD*, in order to update the dictionary and to make it more systematic.

3.2.1. Here, as in *OALD*⁴, Gimson's system of using the length mark (:), as well as separate forms for qualitative differences (e.g. /i:/ vs. /ɪ/) has been maintained.¹⁾ This of course carries redundancy, but is easier for foreign learners to follow.

3.2.2. One change in the notation is the use of /i/ instead of /ɪ/ for the weak vowel at the end of a word as in **happy**.

The high front vowel in this position becomes neutralized, so in theory any of the symbols /i:/, /ɪ/, or /i/ could be used, but taking into consideration the fact that the British pronunciation has recently changed from [ɪ] to a higher [i] (but not as strong or long as [i:]), the trend is to use the symbol /i/ in this position.

3.2.3. Yet another change made in the latest edition is the use of /i/ and /u/ instead of /ɪ/ and /ʊ/ for weak vowels before another vowel as in **association** /ə.səʊsi'eɪʃn/ and **actual** /'æktʃuəl/, or in pre-consonantal position when the realization can vary among [ɪ], [i], [ə], or [u:], [ʊ], [ə]. Therefore, distinction is made in this dictionary between **elicit** /i'lisɪt/ ([i:], [ɪ], or [ə] or an intermediate sound is possible) and **illicit** /i'lisɪt/ (only [ɪ] is possible here).

Ashby in August 1995. Comments about his views on pronunciation in a learner's dictionary were of great help in analysing *OALD*⁵ and some of the views are introduced below. However, our interview was an informal one and not recorded, and any misinterpretation or lack of explanation in this paper is entirely my responsibility.

1) See Takahashi et al. (1989) for a detailed explanation concerning the changes made in the notation system from Lewis' system to Gimson's.

3.3.1. For the diphthong in words like **go**, *OALD*⁵ still uses the schwa symbol for the first component, giving /əʊ/. Even when the *US* form is given separately as in **momentarily** /'məʊməntəri/; *US* .məʊmənt'eri/, /əʊ/, and not /ou/, is used. The use of /əʊ/ instead of /ou/ is a phonemic notation based on RP, and even if we are told that /əʊ/ is realized as [ou] in accents other than British, the symbol does seem odd to students who are used to the American pronunciation and the /ou/ notation. In this dictionary, separate symbols are used for the American form only when it is unpredictable; otherwise, when the conversion is predictable, only the British form is given. For example, the British /ɒ/ is mostly realized as an unrounded and longer [ɑ:] in American English, but since this is predictable, *OALD*⁵ gives only one form: **hot** /hɒt/. However, in some words the British /ɒ/ is pronounced as [ɑ:] and because this is not predictable, both forms are given:¹⁾ **dog** /dɒg; *US* dɑ:g/. According to this system, the diphthong in **go** belongs to the predictable group, and that is why only one form is given. This space-saving system is a sound one, though perhaps not user-friendly. There will be a further discussion of this matter in 3.4 below.

3.3.2. Returning to /əʊ/, in the case of Japanese learners, the symbol /ə/ is somehow associated with the open, [ʌ]-like sound like the /ə/ at the end of China, and so this notation not only looks unfamiliar, but can induce a wrong pronunciation. If only one form must be given, could it not be /ou/ and not /əʊ/? *LDCE*³ gives two forms, /əʊ/ and /ou/, for British and American pronunciation respectively, for all words with this diphthong.

3.4.1. As was briefly mentioned above in 3.3.1, this dictionary is, as far as pronunciation transcriptions go, centered around the British variety. The American form is not given unless the difference is of the lexically incidental kind; otherwise, the American pronunciation must be worked

1) This information is given in the notes about pronunciation on the inside of the back cover, but not all possible British to American pronunciation conversion rules are mentioned. Students will have to know the correct pronunciation of the sample words in the Consonants and Vowels List, and refer to it each time they are in doubt.

out by rule¹⁾. The possibility of the "linking r" of British English is always shown with the /r/ in parentheses: **father** /'fɑ:ðə(r)/, but the pre-consonantal r-sound of American English is not transcribed and must be worked out from the spelling: **card** /kɑ:d/.

3.4.2. In fact, according to Ashby,²⁾ the main concern was to record the *system* of the pronunciation of the general type of British English, and not to record precise pronunciations of different varieties of English. The task of a learner's dictionary, he believes, is to give *guidance for production* and not to list the many possible variants one may or may not come across. Moreover, although the term "General British" which appears in the explanatory note inside the back cover is not new — it was first introduced by Windsor Lewis³⁾ and can also be seen in *OALD*⁴'s "Detailed Guide" — the concept that the term implies seems to be wider for *OALD*⁵ than for *OALD*⁴:

"The British English form is that which has been called Received Pronunciation (RP) or General British".

("Models of pronunciation," *OALD*⁴: p. 1547.)

"The first pronunciation given in the dictionary is that of younger speakers of General British (**Brit**). This includes RP (Received Pronunciation) and a range of similar accents which are not strongly regional".

("British and American pronunciation," *OALD*⁵: inside back cover.)

According to Ashby, his idea of General British encompasses those accents that share the same phonemic system as that used in *OALD*⁵ but may not necessarily sound like RP. The forms given in the dictionary should be considered to be phonological forms (as opposed to phonetic forms) and the user should work out the realizational form according to the rules of the accent he or she wishes to speak with. For example, on being given

1) The vowel in words like **hurry** is pronounced with /ʌ/ in British English but with /ɜ:/ in American English. This is sometimes difficult to predict, but in *OALD*⁵ the American form is not mentioned at all.

2) This was communicated to the writer during the interview.

3) See *CPD* (1972), p. xiv.

/gəʊ/ for **go**, an RP speaker can say [gəʊ] and a Cockney speaker [gɑʊ], and in the same way, one wishing to sound American can say [gou].

3.4.3. As the concept of a “standard” pronunciation is no longer fashionable, this is an ideal solution as to what stance a learner’s dictionary should adopt, but it needs getting used to since the learner (especially a foreign student) usually expects a more “ready-to-use” form in a dictionary.

3.5. Although *OALD*⁵’s aim is not to record numerous variants of pronunciation, it does give more than one form where a popular second (or third) choice exists. In the pronunciation note on the inside the back cover, it is recommended that the first pronunciation cited should be used by the learner. On checking in *OALD*⁵ all of the 99 words¹⁾ taken up by Wells in his opinion poll for *LPD*, it was found that in all but nine cases the order of variant forms cited in *OALD*⁵ follows the order of popularity calculated by Wells. The ones that do not agree are: **resource**, **schism**, **salt**, **poor**, **graph**, **inherent**, for segments, and **controversy**, **formidable**, **subsidence** for placement of stress. Of these, most are cases where the order of pronunciation forms does not agree with *LPD*’s poll merely as the result of a compromise to save space by collapsing the British and American forms together, or where the difference in the percentage of people voting for the first and second choices was very small anyway. However, for **schism**, *OALD*⁵ gives /sɪzɪz/ as the only form, but according to Wells’ poll, “[t]he traditional ’sɪz- is being displaced, except perhaps among the clergy, by ’skɪz-. BrE poll panel preference: ’skɪz- 71%, ’sɪz- 29%” (*LPD*).

3.6.1. In *OALD*⁴, stress marks were given for most of the idioms but only partly for phrasal verbs. A welcome improvement in *OALD*⁵ is the marking of stress for all phrasal verbs, which may sometimes seem redundant to native speakers of English but not to learners. It is in the nature of phrasal verbs that the main stress may shift and differ from the citation

1) Wells used 100 words, but of these, **Glasgow**, being a place name, does not appear in *OALD*⁵ and had to be excluded from our comparison.

form when such verbs become part of a longer phrase or sentence: e.g. **.come ’back**, but **We .came back ’early**. That this may happen is explained in the pronunciation note at the end of the dictionary. For other stress shifts (e.g. **.well-’known**, but **.well-known ’actors/’facts**, etc.), the shift is shown on the actual examples.

3.6.2. Information pertaining to intonation, even where it may distinguish the meaning of the word or expression (e.g. ↘ Sorry = Forgive me. vs. ↗ Sorry = Excuse me, could you repeat what you said?), has not been included in *OALD*⁵. It is true that it is difficult and sometimes impossible to incorporate intonation in a printed dictionary, but in order for the learner’s dictionary to be a guide to better production of a language, suprasegmental information including intonation is an important and necessary field for future improvement.

(Saito)

4. Definitions, usage labels and pictorial illustrations

4.1. Definitions

4.1.1. Defining vocabulary

Probably the greatest change that has occurred to *OALD* definitions in this revision is the introduction of a controlled defining vocabulary of 3,500 words. It has often been pointed out that *OALD*’s definitions, with their unrestricted vocabulary, were more ’advanced’ than its Longman competitor, which had adopted a limiting approach with the Longman Defining Vocabulary of (approximately) 2,000 words. This year another EFL dictionary (*CIDE*) appeared on the market, featuring a controlled vocabulary (as it claims) of under 2,000 words (*CIDE*’s count excludes all derivatives, and if they are included the number will probably exceed 3,500). We made a comparison of all the defining vocabulary (DV) beginning with A among these three dictionaries to look into the nature of the new *OALD*’s word stock. The number of words in the DV list is 247 (*OALD*⁵), 139 (*LDCE*³) and 240 (*CIDE*), the total number appearing in any of them being 333. Among them there are 78 words that are used only in *OALD*⁵, including such words as *absurd*, *accompany*, *accumulate*, *ac-*

knowledge, alter, assemble and astomish. *OALD*⁵ lacks four words (*abbreviation, accidental, advanced* and *apartment*) used in the other two, and three more words (*actress, afford* and *as opposed to*) are used only in *LDCE*³. 83 words are found only in *CIDE*, many of which are derivatives such as *atomically, arched* and *attacker*. *OALD*'s DV includes many synonyms and near-synonyms such as *aid, assist* and *help* as well as *alter* and *change*, which the DV's of *LDCE* and *CIDE* rarely do. It appears that while *LDCE*'s and *CIDE*'s restriction aims at reducing the DV to a minimum (in a sense comparable to C. K. Ogden's Basic English), *OALD*'s idea is to eliminate words thought to be too hard words for learners. In any case, it must have been the use of the computer in dictionary compilation, which became widespread in the 1980s, that made it possible to readily and thoroughly restrict a dictionary's defining vocabulary.

4.1.2. Definitions

Presumably, or at least in part, because the vocabulary used for definition came to be restricted, the number of words per definition has increased from the fourth to the fifth edition. Our sample count revealed that the average number of words used in the definitions of 52 entries between **abbot** and **aboard** in *OALD*⁴ is 7.6, while the corresponding part in *OALD*⁵ (43 entries) required the Oxford lexicographers to use 9.3 words on average. An increase of more than 20% in word numbers must have obliged them also to contrive more space to accommodate this, as we shall see later.

There are a number of formal changes in the style of definition, which may all be regarded as improvements. Up to the fourth edition, there was no infinitive marker 'to' at the beginning of a verb definition. In *OALD*⁵, all verb definitions have that marker, so that the user can readily identify the following word as a verb. Also, in the previous edition definite and indefinite articles before nouns in definitions were often omitted. This resulted in a concise, but incomplete English phraseology in definitions, and learners doubtless experienced difficulty filling in the gaps. In the new edition articles are always presented, offering learners more natural target language explanations.

The third sense of **make** was defined as 'create (sth); establish' in *OALD*⁴, and as 'create or establish sth' in *OALD*⁵. This example explicates two important changes in the presentation of objective complementation. The parentheses in which objective semantic collocations etc were presented in *OALD*⁴ are omitted in *OALD*⁵. This has eliminated the inconsistency between the optionality of compliments etc in the definiens and the definienda pointed out in Takahashi et al. (1992: 109ff.) Also, the word 'sth' denoting the generalized object of transitive verbs is now presented after all the verbs in a definition have been itemized, so that transitive verbs are more readily and naturally understood as such.

While definitions themselves changed very extensively between the third and fourth editions of *OALD* (see Takahashi et al. 1992: 100ff.), the change this time has been probably more drastic, largely due to the introduction of the restricted defining vocabulary. Firstly, many definitions have been rewritten so as to make them easier, even when the original expressions in the previous edition did not contain any words outside the restrictive vocabulary boundary of *OALD*⁵. Thus,

[4]¹⁾ shorten (a word, phrase, etc) . . . (s.v. **abbreviate**) is rephrased into

[5] to make a word, phrase etc shorter. . .

even though 'shorten' appears in the list of the Defining Vocabulary (p. 1417ff.) (See also s.v. **abdicate** and **abandoned** in *OALD*⁵.) In the same vein, when one or more of the synonyms presented as part of the definition in *OALD*⁴ might be regarded as too difficult for learners, they may now be omitted as in:

[4] . . . forsake; desert

[5] . . . ; to desert sb/sth (s.v. **abandon**; see also s.v. **abess, abase**).

Secondly, when more clarity and ease of understanding may be achieved, *OALD*⁵ has often reorganized and improved the definitions in *OALD*⁴.

1) [4] and [5] denote the fourth and the fifth editions of *OALD* respectively.

- [4] give up completely (esp sth begun) (s.v. **abandon** *v.* 2)
 [5] to stop doing or being involved in sth, or to stop sth happening, esp before it is finished. (s.v. **abandon** *v.* 2)

In this case, the phrase after 'esp' is extended to make a clause and is probably more readily understandable for more elementary learners. Also, the definition of **abacus** in *OALD*⁵ may be said to provoke a more graphic and accurate image of the apparatus than its predecessor.

- [4] frame with beads that slide along parallel rods, used for . . .
 [5] a frame holding a set of parallel rods along which small balls are pushed. It is used for

The amount of information given in the definitions is in some cases increased, as in the following examples,

- [4] (of wind, noise, pain, etc) make or become less
 [5] (of wind, noise, pain, etc) to become less intense (s.v. **abate**)
 [4] shorten (a word, phrase, etc), esp by omitting letters
 [5] to make a word, phrase, etc shorter by omitting letters or using only the first letter of each word (s.v. **abbreviate**)

but in other cases is reduced:

- [4] part of the body below the chest and diaphragm, containing the stomach, bowels and digestive organs.
 [5] the part of the body below the chest, containing the stomach, bowels, etc. (s.v. **abdomen**)

All in all, *OALD*⁵ appears to have cut down on space by drastically reducing more difficult or less important information in the definitions.

With the "easy-to-understand definitions, written within a defining vocabulary of 3,500 words" (from the back-cover blurb of *OALD*⁵), *OALD*'s definitions may have come to assume the more user-friendly aspect rather characteristic of one of its major competitors, *LDCE*. Although some advanced users might miss the *OALD*'s distinctive way of definition using concise but somewhat elevated wording, probably handed down from the *COD/POD* tradition, we must say that *OALD*'s latest approach, however untraditional in the Oxford family of dictionaries, is a welcome one for the whole range of users, especially for elementary and intermediate learners

of English. *OALD*'s future concern may be how to distinguish itself from other EFL dictionaries including *LDCE* that use controlled defining vocabulary.

4.1.3. Divisions and arrangement of senses

The number and arrangement of senses in polysemous entries, especially in very large entries, has not changed very much in this revision. We surveyed the entry for **make** (*v.*) and found that its structure is about the same in *OALD*⁴ and *OALD*⁵. The senses of a very large entry came to be grouped together in the fourth edition, and that practice has been continued in *OALD*⁵. The grouping of senses and the 'headlines' of each sense group do not differ in the two editions, except that in *OALD*⁵ the headlines have come to be printed in lower-case boldface. The division and arrangement of senses of the same entry, including subdivisions using letters ((a), (b), (c), . . .), have all been carried over into the fifth edition with only minor changes caused by a number of deletions and by separation and integration of senses. The changes include one subdivision (sense 13 'add up to (sth)' in *OALD*⁴ into 13(a) and 13(b) in *OALD*⁵), one integration (senses 20(a), (b), (c) in *OALD*⁴ into a single division 18 'to manage to reach or go to a place or position' in *OALD*⁵, reducing the number of lines from 13 to 9) and four deletions (sense 16 (a cricket term), 17(c) (a term used in card games), 18 (labelled as 'sl[ang] sexist') and 24 'eat or have (a meal)' in *OALD*⁴¹). This tendency is also observable in middle-sized entries such as **drive** (*v.* as well as *n.*). Thus we may presume that, with regard to the division and arrangement of senses of established major items, the British National Corpus has not been used so extensively as might have been expected².

There are quite a few changes, however, in the arrangement and division of rather small entries. For instance, at **abbreviation**, the first sense

1) Here, too, we may see the bold streamlining of entries in *OALD*⁵ by omitting marginal senses used in rather special fields or registers.

2) This fact should maintain the great contrast between the *OALD* and *COBUILD* dictionaries, the latter of which claims to have based almost all the information in the dictionary on its original corpus from the very beginning of production of the first edition (See Moon (1987: 86ff.)).

('abbreviating or being abbreviated') and the second ('shortened form of a word, phrase, etc.) have been interchanged. In *OALD*⁵ it seems that countable senses are in principle presented before uncountable senses. Also, in the entry for **liquor**, where the British sense preceded the American in *OALD*⁴, the order has been reversed, while in many other entries that have both British and American senses there are no changes in arrangement. At **film**, the order of senses was 1. (thin coat or covering)¹⁾, 2. (photographic film) and 3. (movie) in *OALD*⁴. In *OALD*⁵, the order is 1. (movie), 2. (photographic) and 3. (thin coat or covering).

Probably one of the most interesting changes concerns lexical items relating to modern technology and devices, especially computers. The promotions and demotions of senses, as we might call them, in the entries for **interface** and **monitor** may reflect interesting changes that have occurred in the real world.

interface	4th ed.	5th ed.
(surface common to two areas)	1. ²⁾	—
(user interface of a computer)	—	1. (a)
(computer interface between two systems)	2.	1. (b)
(place where two subjects, etc meet)	3.	2.
monitor	4th ed.	5th ed.
(device used for monitoring)	1.	1.
(listener to a foreign radio programme)	2.	4.
(video or television screen)	3. (a)	2. (a)
(computer screen)	3. (b)	2. (b)
(pupil with special duties)	4.	3.
(kind of large lizard)	5.	—

The corpus used for the new edition must have played an important and useful role in deciding entry structure and content of such items.

1) Parentheses show that the content is not a word-for-word transcription from the original text but an adapted description by the present author.

2) The numbers denote the sense number in each edition, and the hyphen (-) indicates that no relevant sense is given.

4.1.4. Encyclopedic information in definitions

It was pointed out in Takahashi et al. (1992: 104–106) that encyclopedic information in *OALD* is reduced whenever it is revised or reprinted. This is partly true in the revision from *OALD*⁴ to *OALD*⁵. Among the five adjective forms derived from biographical names studied in the same paper, three more headwords (**Newtonian**, **Parthian shot** and **Shakespearean**) have disappeared (**Shavian** had already disappeared in *OALD*⁴), leaving only **Rabelaisian** as an independent entry. *OALD* has an encyclopedic edition (*OALDE*, 1992), and OUP probably intends users to consult this. On the other hand, for some culture-specific items such as *Hallowe'en* and *Thanksgiving (day)*, more information has been added to the descriptions in *OALD*⁴.

[4] 31 October, the eve of All Saints' day.

[5] 31 October, when according to ancient tradition the spirits of dead people rise from their graves. (s.v. **Hallowe'en**)

As there is no entry or information anywhere about *All Saints' day* either in *OALD*⁴ or in *OALD*⁵, the description in *OALD*⁵ is decidedly more informative. Also, in view of the fact that in *OALD*⁵ such culture-bound items as *Michaelmas term*, which did not appear in *OALD*³ or in *OALD*⁴, are entered and explained, encyclopedic information in the new edition is not necessarily reduced. Rather, it has been selectively enriched and made no less informative in that, for some word items, more useful information is given than in *OALD*⁴ within the limits of dictionary definitions, not of encyclopedia explanations¹⁾.

4.2. Usage labels

In Takahashi et al. (1992: 81ff.) it was noted that *OALD*⁴ had achieved a rather dramatic improvement in label presentation over the third edition both in terms of its system and the actual application of labels. The new edition appears to have taken over this fairly systematized, well-balanced practice and to have carried out no major changes in the actual labelling.

1) The respective roles of dictionaries, *encyclopedic* dictionaries and encyclopedias would be an interesting subject of future study.

In order to attest this point, we made a sample survey of every fifty pages on labelling in *OALD*⁵, starting from p. 50 (accounting for 2.01% of the total A-Z text of the dictionary) and compared all the labels presented there with the corresponding items in *OALD*⁴. Also, the system of labelling explicated in both editions was studied.

4.2.1. The system of labelling

The overall system of labelling has not changed through the revision from the fourth to the present edition of *OALD*, except that a new label, "techn(ical)" has been introduced in the new edition. This label, though differently abbreviated (typically as "tech"), has been used in *OALD*'s competitors such as *LDCE*² (1987) for years. Incidentally, in *LDCE*² there were only three concrete field labels ("law", "med[ical]" and "naut[ical]") and all other specialist fields were labelled as "tech". Thus in *LDCE*² the label "tech" was mainly used as a substitute for other field labels. In *OALD*⁵ the case is slightly different. The label is coexistent in *OALD*⁵ with other field labels such as "architecture" (e.g. for **apse**), "finance" (**debit**) and "physics" (**quantum**). It may be used alone (**circumscribe**, **continental drift**) or with another label ("formal or techn" s.v. **excitation** and **contiguous**). It is obviously a style label, showing that a word is mainly used in a particular style or register within the context of a particular specialist field. As far as we can see from our sample survey, it is not applied to an item which already had a particular field label in the previous edition: in such cases, basically the same concrete field labels are used. The label "techn" seems to have been used only for items that had no field label in *OALD*⁴ or that have undergone a change in labelling. If this is really the case, it follows that there is an inconsistency in the actual application of this newly-introduced label, which might lead to some confusion among users.

There is one remarkable improvement concerning label presentation in *OALD*⁵, however. In Takahashi et al. we suggested that EFL dictionaries should attach as much importance and prominence to labelling as they do to other information categories such as grammar and pronunciation, and present an elegant one-page table of the labelling system in a readily visible

place such as the inside of the front/back cover. This idea has been put into practice both in *OALD*⁵ and the new edition of *LDCE* (*LDCE*³), undoubtedly to the great benefit and convenience of users.

4.2.2. The application of labels

In our surveyed portion, there were 324 information units (entries, senses, idioms, phrasal verbs, etc) that are labelled in *OALD*⁵. We compared all of them with the corresponding items and labels in *OALD*⁴, and examined how they have or have not changed in the latest revision. We could also see how stylistically charged items have been added or omitted by checking the comings and goings of labelled items in the two editions. However, in comparison with the drastic changes from the third to the fourth editions, the alterations are rather minor and here we shall comment briefly on the prominent changes only.

Ten labels have been omitted, while 35 are newly applied in the latest edition. Among the labels added, those indicating rather high levels of formality ("fml" (7 instances), "techn" (2) and "law or fml" (1)) outnumber informality labels ("infml" (3)). Concerning regional labels, 14 "Brit(ish)" or "esp Brit" labels have been added, while only one "US" label was identified as a new addition in our survey. Labelling in *OALD*⁴, though much improved over the third edition, was still inclined to the marking of "informal" and "American English," indicating the *OALD*'s orientation toward formal or British English as an unmarked norm. In this regard it may be argued that the fifth edition has achieved a more balanced application of formality and regionality labels.

When we consider the additions and omissions of labelled items (entries and so on) between *OALD*⁴ and *OALD*⁵, we find far more omitted items (45) than newcomers (19). Labelled items are by definition stylistically marked, and are likely to be omitted when the need for more space for other information is pressing. Thus in *OALD*⁵, presumably in order to make room for the longer definitions using the restricted defining vocabulary (see 4.2.1), a number of labelled (i.e. charged) items seem to have been deleted.

4.3. Pictorial illustrations

Except for a very few instances, the fifth edition uses the same pictures as *OALD*⁴. Our inspection revealed only a very small number of additional pictures (e.g. one for **pulley**) and no replaced drawings. On the other hand, some pictures have been omitted, while many others have undergone partial reduction and adjustment presumably in order to produce more space for text information. For instance, the two knots in *OALD*⁴ have been reduced to one in *OALD*⁵ (s.v. **knot**), and one of the musical instruments has been turned over so that the height of the whole picture space is lessened (s.v. **lute**). Also, in many instances the blank space on both sides of a single illustration is cut off and the full-column width of the picture space has been reduced to half-column size. If we compare the illustrations in the two editions, efforts to reduce redundant space are widely observed. Some illustrations for items rather specific or unique to some cultures or areas of the world and therefore presumed to be unfamiliar to some peoples, for example pictures of angels (s.v. **angel**) and a kangaroo (s.v. **kangaroo**), have disappeared while other pictures of a similar kind (e.g. ones for **bears** or **kiwi** bird) remain².

(Kokawa)

5. Examples and collocations

5.1. According to the information given on the jacket, the number of examples in *OALD*⁵ is 90,000, which is roughly a 10% increase over that of *OALD*⁴, which has 81,500. In order to judge the reliability of this figure we counted the examples in 250 entries, every ten of which were randomly chosen from near the middle of the pages covering every letter of the alphabet (to be exact, we chose five entries from x and z, and ten entries from every other letter).³ The result is shown in Table 1. We also counted

1) Exceptions include the pictures for *aircraft* and *arm positions* (s.v. **arm**), where puzzlingly different drawings showing totally the same images as those in *OALD*⁴ are used.

2) What pictures to include in language dictionaries is an interesting question that has great relevance to the presentation of encyclopedic information, and which awaits further discussion in the future.

3) We picked up common entries both in *OALD*⁵ and *OALD*⁴ and counted the number of examples including those of run-on entries. The entries we chose are: **amazon** —

the number of examples of ten basic verbs¹ and ten function words² and their results are given respectively in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1

<i>OALD</i> ⁴			<i>OALD</i> ⁵		
phrase	sentence	total	phrase (same)	sentence (same)	total (same)
670	674	1344	700 (405)	746 (379)	1446 (793)

Table 2

<i>OALD</i> ⁴			<i>OALD</i> ⁵		
phrase	sentence	total	phrase (same)	sentence (same)	total (same)
144	821	965	139 (110)	850 (586)	989 (696)

Table 3

<i>OALD</i> ⁴			<i>OALD</i> ⁵		
phrase	sentence	total	phrase (same)	sentence (same)	total (same)
147	311	458	139 (110)	329 (195)	468 (305)

From the above tables, we can see that the number of examples of ordinary entry words in *OALD*⁵ has increased 7.58%. However, the increase in the case of basic verbs is 2.49% and of function words only 2.18%. Judging from these figures, the 10% increase in examples boasted of on the jacket might be regarded as an exaggeration.

5.2. On the basis of the figures shown in the above tables, we can see that 54.84%, 70.37%, and 65.17% of the examples are the same as those in *OALD*⁴. The average of these percentages is 63.46%, which shows that

ambit, blanket — blaze¹, collector — collocate, dire — dirge, Entryphone — environs, flesh — flick, gloss² — gluten, herbaceous — hereafter, infertile — infinitive, join — Joneses, kid¹ — kilo-, lied — lifeboat, midsummer — mighty, nexus — niche, opera — opinion, pocket — poetic, queer — queue, represent¹ — reprobate, snack — snare, tilth — times, unionist — universal, vertex — vessel, whinney — whirlwind, x¹ — -xion, yes — yield, zero — zinc.

1) The ten basic verbs we chose are: **be**^{1,2}, **have**^{1,2,3}, **give**¹, **take**¹, **go**¹, **come**¹, **make**¹, **get**, **hold**¹, **keep**¹.

2) The ten function words we chose are: **on**¹ (*prep*), **for**¹, **with**, **can**², **may**¹, **will**¹, **how**, **what**¹, **which**, **that**^{1,2,3,4,5}.

36.54% of the examples in *OALD*⁵ are either new or rewritten. Furthermore, according to the explanation in the preface that nearly 9,000 examples are newly added in *OALD*⁵, it can be surmised that 10% of the total examples are new and 26.54% rewritten. Our next job should be to examine in what way the examples have been rewritten and what sort of examples have been deleted and newly added. However, before moving on to examine alterations to examples, we will look at the formal or stylistic changes made in the presentation of examples in *OALD*⁵.

5.2.1. The following formal or stylistic changes are recognized in the way examples are given in *OALD*⁵: (1) In phrase examples, commas that were used to separate collocational phrases have been changed into oblique strokes, and *etc.*, which was sometimes put at the end of phrase examples, has been left out. (2) Sentence patterns that used to be given before the definition are put before the examples, making it clear the correspondence between a sentence example and its sentence pattern. (3) The glosses of the example are put in parentheses, making clear that they are not parts of the example, but glosses or explanations. (4) Idiomatic phrases of the example are printed in bold type. (5) Phrase examples are usually given before sentence examples. (6) The semicolon in the example has been changed to a dash or colon. (7) The label [attrib] in front of a phrase example has been omitted in *OALD*⁵.

5.2.2. With respect to the role that examples play in the dictionary, the jacket has the following brief explanation: "This dictionary contains over 90 000 corpus-based examples designed to help you use English words and phrases correctly and appropriately." However, it may be safe to believe that the examples in *OALD*⁵ are designed also to meet the learning needs mentioned in the detailed guide in *OALD*⁴, that is, "they help learners to understand the meanings of words, they provide models for them to imitate when writing or speaking and they illustrate the grammatical patterns in which words are used." Let us now see how some of the examples have been changed or modified in *OALD*⁵. Examples are rewritten in one of the following ways: (1) The content of the example has been made up-to-date

or brought more into accord with present-day society: *Someone's been (and gone) and eaten my porridge!* → *Someone's been and parked in front of the entrance!* <be¹ IDM >¹⁾ / (fig) *After years of hard work and poverty, he finally snapped,* ie had a nervous breakdown, fell ill, etc. → *After months of stress and worry, . . . (ie was unable to endure it any more).* <snap¹ 1 > (2) Some examples have been rewritten to improve or correct the content of the example, making them easier to understand: *Always keep your driving licence in a safe place.* → *Keep your passport. . . .* <keep¹ 4 > / *The umpire gave the batsman out (leg before wicket).* → *He was given offside by the referee.* <give¹ 18 > / *The culprit will be whipped when he is found.* → *Prisoners were whipped to get confessions out of them.* <whip² 1 > There are also rewritten examples that contain a small but user-friendly correction: *have an easy/hard life* → *have an easy | a hard life* <life 10 > / *snappy on her feet* → *be snappy on one's feet* <snappy > / *The world is round.* → *The earth . . .* <be¹ 6 > (3) The content of the example has been changed, making the meaning of the entry word or the idiom clearer and easier to understand: *You're very cool with your brother, but with your friends you really come to life.* → *When the discussion turned to literature, she suddenly came to life.* <life IDM > / *All his promises were snares and delusions.* → *He fell victim to the sensual lures and snares of city life.* <snare > (4) Examples have been modified to better fit a definition of the entry word or a label indicating register: *He was had up for exceeding the speed limit.* → *. . . for drunken driving.* <have³ IDM > / *I'm of the opinion that he is right.* → *. . . that we should take a risk.* <opinion IDM > (5) The content of the example has been made more concrete by disambiguation of a word in the example, for instance, by changing pronouns to common nouns or adding qualifiers to nouns: *The officer directed them to advance.* → *. . . directed his troops . . .* <direct² 5 > / *'Yes?' 'I'd like 2 tickets, please.'* → *'Yes?' ' . . . two tickets to Brighton, please.'* <yes 4 > / *She has now held the post of Prime Minister longer than anyone else this century.* → *Mrs Thatcher . . .* <hold¹ 8 > (6) The addition of a word or phrase to the example sometimes contributes to the clarification of the meaning of the example or the definition of the entry words: *It*

1) The notation 'A → B' indicates that A is rewritten as B. Dots are used to save space and represent identical parts of the sentence.

is impossible to say with any (degree of) accuracy how many are affected. → ... how many people ... <accuracy> | That box is bigger than this. → ... than this one. <that¹ 1> | in a querulous tone → ... tone of voice <querulous> | She was accosted by a complete stranger. → ... accosted in the street by ... <accost> (7) One of two similar examples has been changed to a different type of example: *The signpost points in a westerly direction.* → *We looked in the direction of the sea.* <direction 1> | *I'm so envious of you getting an extra day's holiday.* → *I'm so envious.* — *I wish I had your talent.* <envious>

In these cases, as there are other examples including the expression 'in a northerly direction' or 'be envious of', a similar expression has been changed to a different one. (8) Some sentences have been changed to fit different sentence patterns: *This machine operates night and day.* → *How does this machine operate?* <operate 1> (9) Phrase examples have sometimes been altered into sentence examples, and vice versa: *a letter for you* → *There's a letter for you.* <for¹ 1> | *famous for its cathedral* → *The town is famous for.* ... <for¹ 5> | *She has the ability to keep calm in an emergency.* → *keep calm* ... <keep¹ 1> | *The course book has twenty units.* → *a course book with twenty units* <unit 1> (10) Examples have sometimes been rewritten to provide better models for more general or daily use of the language: *Much British humour depends on ambiguity.* → *A lot of humour* ... <ambiguity> | *She's directly responsible to the Minister.* → ... *to the boss.* <directly> | *You'd better get a second opinion before you let that man take out all your teeth.* → *If you don't mind, I'd like a second* (ie somebody else's) *opinion before I make the decision.* <opinion 3> (11) Collocational elements have been added, making the examples more informative: *the British Ambassador to Greece* → *the newly appointed British Ambassador to Greece/in Athens* <ambassador> | *a course in midwifery* → *do/take a* ... <midwifery> | *a queue of cars at the traffic-lights* → *join a queue* ... <queue> | *cobra and other dangerous snakes* → *a snake coiled up in the grass* <snake> (12) Situational or contextual elements have been added to make examples more lively and sophisticated: *The train goes there direct.* → *You don't have to change trains. The 10.40 goes direct.* <direct adv> | *Put more life into your work.* → *The show's very flat — put some more life into it.* <life 9> (13) A lot of examples have been Americanized. This

seems to reflect the editors' recognition of the importance of American English based on the great influence the U. S. has in the world: *The Queen was represented at the funeral by the British ambassador.* → *The Pre-sident was represented (at the funeral) by the Vice-president.* <represent¹ 3> | *The Prime Minister will be giving a press conference tomorrow morning.* → *The President* ... <give¹ 12> | *He has a house in London and a cottage near the sea.* → ... *in Boston and a beach house on the coast.* <have² 1> | *The film had us all sitting on the edges of our seats with excitement.* → *The movie* ... <have³ 8> | *She gave me a lift as far as the station.* → ... *a ride* ... <give¹ 5> | *Here's a five-pound note — you can keep the change.* → ... *a five dollar bill* ... <keep¹ 4> | *Is this the train for Glasgow?* → *Is this the bus for Chicago?* <for¹ 4> | *Who's the MP for Bradford?* → ... *the congresswoman for this district?* <for¹ 8> (14) Some examples have been de-Anglicized: *a representative collection of British insects* → ... *of European insects* <representative 1> | *They are on holiday in the Lake District.* → ... *in Italy.* <be¹ 3> | *We're taking a cottage in Devon for a month.* → ... *in Brittany* ... <take¹ 14> | *We got to London at 7 o'clock.* → ... *San Diego* ... <get 15> (15) What might be considered the editors' conscience or sensitivity to political correctness is reflected in the examples, making the examples less prejudiced and problematic: *The old woman crossed the road at a snail's pace.* → *The traffic was moving.* ... <snail IDM> | *special difficulties unique to blind people* → *psychological processes unique to humans* <unique 2> | *With Italians it's pronunciation that's the problem.* → *With these students* ... <with 10> | *He joined the army of his own accord.* → *He came back* ... <accord¹ IDM>

It can be said that the examples rewritten in *OALD*⁵ have, on the whole, been improved in the sense that they seem to meet the above mentioned learning needs more adequately. However, there are cases where alterations seem to be made not for improvement but for the sake of alteration itself, that is, the original examples can be considered to be much better: *The journey from London to Oxford takes about an hour and a half.* → ... *from the airport to the university* ... <take¹ 18> There are many other examples that contain small changes that cannot necessarily be regarded as improvements: *She's very blasé about parties.* → ... *about exams.* <blasé> |

advertising directed mainly at young consumers → ... *at women* <direct² 4> | *Could you xerox this letter please, Paula?* → ... , *Louise?* <xerox> | *Can I borrow this record?* 'Yes, of course.' → '... this book?' '...' <yes 1> | *Do you get 'The Times' or the 'Guardian'?* → ... *the 'Telegraph' or ... ?* <get 6> | *Don't get your new trousers dirty!* → ... *dress...* <get 10>.

5.2.3. New examples are naturally added in the following situations. With respect to entry words, new examples are given in three cases: (1) They are provided where *OALD*⁴ gives only definitions of the word but no examples. (2) They are provided where new entry words are added or new definitions of the entry word are given in *OALD*⁵. (3) They are additionally provided where there were already examples in *OALD*⁴. In the case of (1) and (2), new examples are given to make the meaning of the entry word clearer and to show how a word with a certain meaning is used. In the case of (3), new examples are added to show further usage of the word. With respect to run-on entries, examples are newly given in the following two cases: (1) New examples are provided where *OALD*⁴ gives neither definitions nor examples. In this case, examples do a double job, i.e. to exemplify the meaning of run-on entries with the help of the definition given in the main entries and to demonstrate the use of run-on entries. (2) New examples are provided at the expense of the definition of run-on entries in *OALD*⁴. In this case as well, examples do a double job. Needless to say, the space occupied by new examples must be recovered elsewhere because the total space in *OALD*⁵ is more limited than in *OALD*⁴. This is done partly by omitting examples regarded as less suitable. Unfortunately, however, examples such as '*Traffic in Britain keeps to the left*, ie drives on the left-hand side of the road.' <keep¹ 1>, which shows cultural background and therefore can be regarded as just as good as others, are sometimes deleted.

5.3. We have already seen that glosses or explanations of the example are put in parentheses, but it must also be mentioned that glosses themselves are sometimes improved, making the meaning of examples easier to understand: *the College of Cardinals*, ie the whole group of them, esp as advisers

and electors of the Pope → ... (ie as a group, when electing or advising the Pope) <college 5> | *a direct train*, ie that goes to a passenger's destination without stopping beforehand → *There's a direct train from London to Leeds* (ie It may stop at other stations but one does not have to change trains). <direct¹ 1> | *operations research*, ie study of business operations to improve efficiency in industry → ... (ie the study of business operations in order to improve their efficiency) <operation 3>. There are some examples where glosses have become easier to understand and this is obviously connected with the introduction of the defining vocabulary: *We hit* (ie encountered) *several snags while still at the planning stage.* → *We hit* (ie were faced with) *several snags at the planning stage.* <snag 1> In some other cases, glosses are added to make example sentences easier to interpret: *You're kidding!* → *You're kidding (me)* (ie I don't believe you)! <kid²> Unfortunately, however, useful glosses are sometimes omitted: *I am to* (ie I have been told to) *inform you that ...* → *I am to phone them once I reach the airport.* <be² 3>

5.4. In *OALD*⁴ collocations in phrase examples were shown in three ways, i.e. by separating a list of words by commas with or without *etc* and by oblique strokes. The distinction was made in terms of open-endedness, closeness and limitation of the combined words. However, in *OALD*⁵ those distinctions have been abolished and collocations are only shown by the use of oblique strokes. Considering that the distinction in the citation of collocations in *OALD*⁴ was too rigid and some problems existed about its validity or reliability, the change in the presentation of collocations seems to be appropriate.¹⁾ However, some explanations are still needed especially with respect to the difference in the strength of the collocational relation between words, for example, in the case of verb-noun combinations and adjective-noun combinations. Collocational elements have actually been added in some examples, as mentioned above, and this should be regarded as an improvement.

(Ichikawa)

1) See Takahashi et al. (1992: 128ff)

6. Grammar and usage notes

6.1. Recent trends in the presentation of grammatical information

Since its first edition, *OALD* has indicated syntactic patterns of verbal constructions using codes. *LDCE*¹ had more complicated and comprehensive patterns not only for verbs but also for nouns and adjectives. *LDCE*² gave more user-friendly mnemonic codes. (cf. *COBUILD*¹.) By showing patterns in written-out form, *LDCE*³ makes information more easily accessible, following the way of its sister *LLA*. The mainstream EFL dictionaries published in Britain in the late 80s and 90s have endeavored to show grammatical information in a more easily decodable form.

6.2. Grammar

In this article we are concerned only partly to discuss how syntactic information of verbs is presented and whether systematic treatment is given. There is a statement about syntactic information in the preface: "... the British National Corpus... has enabled us... to present a wholly accurate picture of the syntactic patterns of today's English."¹ But this says nothing about how information is presented, unlike the explicit statement in *LDCE*³ that it "is organized on the basis of frequency" (p. xvii). *OALD*⁵ is considered to show not only corpus-based but also potential patterns or information.

*OALD*⁵ has partly revised the coding system for the verb patterns. The Detailed Guide in *OALD*⁴ has been drastically changed into the form of Study pages B following *OWD*. But unlike *OWD*, no indication of [T] (for transitive verbs) and [I] (for intransitive verbs) is given, despite the fact that they are explained on Study pages B4–8. The other codes [L], [C], [D] are also done away with. As a result, 32 patterns have been changed to 28, including the new ones [V. speech], [Vadv] and [Vnadv], with 7 patterns changed or deleted: In/pr, It, Tni, Cn· n/a, Cn· g, Dn· pr, and Dn· t.

Following the recent trend, the codes have become more transparent

1) *OALD*⁵, *LDCE*³ and *HEED* are all said to be related with the British National Corpus.

and mnemonic and are put in front of examples, as in *LDCE*² (cf. **modify**). This does not mean that they enable users to decode all the patterns correctly.¹ It is also important whether *OALD*⁵ provides a comprehensive and explicit description. This area leaves something to be desired, as the following examples show. The pattern Cn· n/a (corresponding to [Vn-n/adj], if any) is deleted, and the pattern [V-n/adj] is not given. Do users realize that the verb **taste**² (2) is used only in the [V-adj] pattern, or that the verb **denounce** can also be used in the [Vn-adj] pattern? (Compare the codes in *CIDE*: [L only + adj] and [+ obj + n/adj], for instance.) This causes misunderstanding, as the patterns in *OALD*⁵ are only applicable to the examples cited.

How are the following classified?: (1) The fact is (that) . . . , (2) The question is whether . . . , and (3) All you can do is (to) help me. They cannot be classified as [V. *that*], [V. *wh*] and [V. *to* inf] respectively, for the verbs in the coded patterns take clauses as objects and they are transitive verbs by definition (see B5–8). In (3) or **help**¹ (1) no pattern such as [V. inf (no *to*)] or [I. inf (no *to*)] is found.² In **seem** and **appear** *OALD*⁵ shows [V. *to* inf] but are they transitive? The codes are reshuffled so as to make them user-friendly, but the serious problem still remains that examples are given codes in accordance with the surface syntactic forms they take. Consider "He came running" and "He finished reading it." They are labeled as [V. *ing*].³ As "running" cannot be considered an object, why are they not labeled as [I. *ing*] and [T. *ing*]? On Study page B7 the explanation is found that "An '-*ing* clause' is a clause containing a PRESENT PARTICIPLE." It includes such a use as "She never stops talking". The blurred definitions of 'present participle' and 'verbal noun' (or 'gerund') make it difficult to get a good grasp of them.⁴ In 'You can't stop our going/ us (from) going',

1) It is to be noted that more examples should be given instead of [also . . .] as it does not seem to be of much use in decoding, much less in production.

2) cf. C. Mair. 1995. "Changing patterns of complementation, and concomitant grammaticalization, of the verb *help* in present-day British English." *The verb in contemporary English: Theory and description*, eds. B. Aarts and C. F. Meyers, pp. 258–272. Cambridge: CUP.

3) It should be noted that the pattern is often mistakenly shown [V. *in*].

4) See the paper by Francis concerning the similar change of grammatical presentation in *COBUILD*².

three patterns [V.n *ing*], [Vn. *ing*] and [Vnpr] are shown. This is different from the explanation on Study page B8, which does not make a distinction between “stop our going” and “stop us going”.¹⁾ A more consistent and careful treatment of grammar and explanation or definition in the entry is desirable.

Take the pattern [V. *to inf*] again. The misleading explanation on Study page B7 and in the entry **to**² (1) makes no sense, as the code is shown not only in the case of **to**² (1) but also in the cases of **to**² (4) and **to**² (5): **stop**¹ (4b) and **wake**¹ (1a), for example. For [Vn. *inf* (no *to*)] there is no explicit grammatical connection indicated in **make**¹ (7a) and **hear** (1). In connection with information about passivization, a more careful treatment is desirable for transitive verbs.

Two new patterns [Vadv] and [Vnadv] are referred to. They both have [adv(erb)]. It is thought to be shown when obligatory, as in “Where do you live?” Admitting that grammatically correct patterns can be given, it is quite doubtful whether the distinction between [adv] and [pr(ositional phrase)] can be always clearly drawn, as the verbs concerned are used with either [adv] or [pr]. (Compare the code in *LDCE* and *CIDE*: [+adv/pr].) Not all examples are given the codes, as in **keep**¹ (4d) or **stay**¹ (1a). The lack of the code, as in **lodge**² (4), lessens the value of the information. In the construction <V + one’s [the] way + adv/pr> five different patterns are shown: [Vnadv] in **edge**² (2a), [Vnpr] in **nose**² (1), [Vnp] [Vnpr] in **push**¹ (2), treatment as a **PHR V** in **elbow** and no indication in **find**¹ (4). The way of indicating patterns in front of examples does not always cover other potentialities. It should be recognized that codes enable users to generalize from a specific case into grammatical cases. (cf. *CIDE*, p. xi.) Wrong or misleading presentation, as in **sit** (1a), must be avoided. A more careful and comprehensive treatment should have been given.

In the treatment of phrasal verbs, clearer patterns are now given, but

1) In *OALD*³, the two patterns are shown: “. . . prevent us/our getting married”, and “. . . stop our going/us (from) going . . .” This does not make it clear which pattern is the more frequent corpus-based fact. If the use of the possessive form before -ing is less frequent, and if the corpus-based facts are given priority, the order of examples should be taken into account in presentation. Also there is no reference to formality.

little syntactic information is provided (cf. **rely on/upon**). As to word order, an improvement is seen, as Study page A3 refers to the case where an object is a pronoun with a verb and a particle separated. Inseparable phrasal verbs are written like **look after sb**, while separable ones are like **tear sth up**. But there is still room for improvement. How do users know the difference between separable phrasal verbs and those where verbs and particles are always separated? *OALD*⁵ has a sister *ODPV*, but the former does not make good use of the latter. *OALD*⁵ follows the way of presentation and the explanations of *OWD*. As a result, the fact that verbs and particles should not be separated is wrongly indicated in a case like **let sth out** (1), while the opposite fact that they must be separated is not clear in a case like **get sb down**. The former editor Cowie says (1993, p. 38) that phrasal verbs are difficult for learners, and that is why a more careful and detailed analysis and treatment like that of *ODPV* should have been done (cf. *LLA* and *LDCE*³).

Concerning the use of parentheses, misleading presentation must be avoided. Compare the different patterns of [Vn-adj] and [V.n *to inf*] in **believe** (2), **consider** (2) and **imagine** (1). In **give**¹ (2a) no pattern [Vnn] is indicated where the parenthesis is omitted. It is also to be wondered whether a dot is necessary when verbs have clauses as objects except in cases like [V.n *to inf*], [Vn. *to inf*] and [V.n *ing*], [Vn. *ing*]. (cf. *OALD*⁴.)

The use of the British National Corpus and the Oxford Corpus has certainly made it possible to partially improve grammatical information and usage description.¹⁾ For instance, look at the verbs with only the preposition *into* shown: **persuade** (1); **frighten**, **scare** and **shame**. They were also shown with a preposition *out of* in *OALD*⁴. See the elaborate idiomatic phrase **if not**. It remains questionable whether the corpus has been carefully looked into. No information about negative use is found in

1) Revising all the examples as in *COBUILD*² can not be considered a good way of showing typical patterns or collocations. Comparison of *OALD*⁵ and *LDCE*³ in the entry **risk** (*v*), for example, makes it clear that a future *OALD* should make a more detailed analysis of the corpus. Needless to say, analysis of corpora not only by native speakers of English but also by nonnative lexicographers or linguists is thought to be more productive of description.

cases like **materialize** (1) and **live sth down**, while a usage note is found in cases like **quarrel** (2) and **quarrel with sth**. How frequently is the usage of **want**¹ (6) 'lack' found in the corpus?¹⁾ (*LDCE*³ lists it, whereas *COBUILD*² and *CIDE* do not.) *OALD*⁵ sometimes has verb patterns not found in most other dictionaries, such as [V.n *ing*] in **recall** (1), and [Vn. *wh*] in **warn** (1); whereas it does not contain information found in most others, as in [V] in **forget** (1). *OALD*⁵ has more verb patterns in **bet** including the misleading pattern [Vnn], while *COBUILD*² has more explicit patterns in **take** (18a) 'need or require (the specified time . . .)'.²⁾ Information seems to be principally based on corpora but patterns are not always the same in the dictionaries cited. Even if a piece of information is not found in *OALD*⁵, it does not always mean that it is nonexistent.

6.3. Usage notes

A small survey shows that there have been no drastic changes in this area. *OALD*⁵ has more than 200 notes, with 17 left out and 38 added. Some have been arranged (from 14 to 11) like **gender**. (cf. **take sb out of themselves**.) *OALDE* has more. Some are quite similar to those in *OWD* (**afraid**, **allow**). Some new notes show basic usage (**age**, **awake**, **date**), and some contain encyclopedic information. Special attention is paid to the usage of modals. But a principle about what to list in usage notes seems not to have been established. There are some unnecessary notes for learners, as under **sensuous**, or misplaced notes like **user-friendly**.

(Dohi)

7. Concluding remarks

*OALD*⁵ has been published only six years after its predecessor. Since *OALD*⁴ was published, a detailed analysis of the corpora seems to have been made and its results, together with other contrivances, must have

1) cf. J. Aarts and F. Aarts. 1995. "Find and want: a corpus-based case study in verb complementation." *The verb in contemporary English: Theory and description*, eds. B. Aarts and C. F. Meyer, pp. 159–182. Cambridge: CUP.

2) In *OALD*⁵ no parentheses are shown. The overall impression is that they should be more carefully used in the traditional way of indicating senses.

been made use of in this revision because we can recognize traces of editorial effort in almost every aspect of the new edition. However, as might be expected from the relatively short period of time allowed for the revision, the new edition cannot be regarded as having undergone substantial changes.

The volume of the dictionary has slightly decreased in this revision, and so has the number of entries. However, *OALD*⁵ includes some encyclopedic information printed in full color, instead. Some minor changes have been made in the treatment of compounds and derivatives, but the most prominent change concerning entries is the increase in words with the negative prefix **un-**. This is assumed to have been a result of the use of the corpus, which apparently showed a high frequency of such words.

Concerning the pronunciation shown in *OALD*⁵, there have been some minor changes in the transcription of weak vowels but otherwise the new edition retains the system used by the previous edition. *OALD*⁵ bases its pronunciation on British English, which can be said to be a conservative stance when other British learner's dictionaries are eagerly incorporating American, Canadian and Australian English information, including pronunciation, into their newest editions. However, the forms of pronunciation within British English covered by *OALD*⁵ are by no means conservative: recent trends and changes have been captured, and placement of stress in idioms and phrasal verbs is adequately shown.

*OALD*⁵'s choice of defining vocabulary is more a matter of shifting and eliminating excessively hard words than *LDCE*'s and *CIDE*'s minimalist approach. Some formal inconsistencies in the presentation of definitions such as the use of parentheses have been streamlined, and definite and indefinite articles as well as the infinitive marker 'to' are added so that users are presented with more natural target language explanations. Many definitions have been rewritten and reorganized and have achieved greater clarity and understandability. The number of words used per definition has increased, partly due to the introduction of controlled vocabulary, requiring an effort on the part of the OUP lexicographers to create more space for the longer definitions. Some information in the definitions has been increased, while other information, in cases where user's needs are

presumed to be more limited, has been left out. A small number of senses have also been deleted. Some of the space for illustrative drawings has been cleverly reduced. All in all, *OALD*⁵ has cut down on space drastically and used the newly created space for easier, more informative but also longer definitions. However, some culture-specific pictorial illustrations have been deleted, the wisdom of which is questionable. The number and arrangement of senses in large entries has not changed much, but in many smaller entries changes have been made apparently to reflect changes in the real world. Encyclopedic information has been partly reduced, and partly enriched. As for labeling, the overall system has not changed from *OALD*⁴ except that a new label, "techn(ical)" has been introduced, which seems to have been applied only to new items. The one-page table of the labeling system presented on the inside of the front cover should be given much credit. Concerning the actual application of labels, more "British" and "formal" labels are used to make the labeling in *OALD*⁵ more balanced. Quite a few labeled (i.e. stylistically marked) items have been left out in the new edition, presumably to make room for the new style of definition.

As mentioned in section 5, it can be surmised that 10% of the examples in *OALD*⁵ are newly added and roughly 27% of them are rewritten. It can be said that new examples have been added to convey necessary information and a lot of examples have been rewritten to make them achieve a number of desired purposes. It seems safe to say that the rewritten examples are, on the whole, very much improved. With respect to collocations in phrase examples, the way of indicating them has been simplified, and therefore the strict distinction based on open-endedness and closeness among them has been lost in *OALD*⁵. However, they seem to exemplify the collocational nature of words to an extent which contributes well to the basic purposes of an EFL dictionary.

Information and description have been partially improved with respect to grammar and usage notes. *OALD*⁵ has become easier to decode (as the codes have been changed), and handy to use, compared with other larger-sized dictionaries. However, more remains to be done. More comprehensive and systematic grammatical description should be given. The bound-

aries between [I] and [T] have become blurred, and this causes some verbs to be given confusingly misleading patterns. More attention should be paid to systematic grammar, clearer explanation of grammatical terms and the Study pages, and comprehensiveness and consistency of syntactic patterns. The treatment of phrasal verbs needs improvement to ensure that no confusion arises out of its lack of precision.

Five EFL dictionaries published in 1995 are all more or less products of corpus-based research. More research will doubtless be carried out and incorporated into future dictionaries. For this purpose, more careful and precise analysis of corpora will have to be made for syntactic information to be connected with senses. It can be safely said that the most traditional dictionary, *OALD*, which strangely still bears the name of AS Hornby, is no longer person-centered and has now taken its first step toward making more comprehensive and sophisticated corpus-based description available. It is to be hoped that future versions of *OALD* will show a more lexicographically accurate description of facts observed in the corpus within a theoretical and systematic framework, with user-friendliness always kept in mind.

DICTIONARIES

- CIDE* *Cambridge International Dictionary of English*. Cambridge: CUP, 1995.
- COBUILD*¹ *Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary*. London & Glasgow: Collins, 1987.
- COBUILD*² *Collins COBUILD English Dictionary*. London: HarperCollins, 1995.
- COD*⁹ *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- CPD* *A Concise Pronouncing Dictionary of British and American English*. OUP, 1972.
- EPD*¹⁴ *English Pronouncing Dictionary*, 14th ed. CUP, 1991.
- HEED* *Harrap's Essential English Dictionary*. Edinburgh: Harrap, 1995.
- LDCE*¹ *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Harlow: Longman, 1978.
- LDCE*² *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, New edition. Harlow: Longman, 1987.
- LDCE*³ *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, 3rd ed. Harlow: Longman, 1995.
- LLA* *Longman Language Activator: The World's First Production Dictionary*. Harlow: Longman, 1993.

- LPD *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary*. Harlow: Longman, 1990.
 MCD *Macmillan Contemporary Dictionary*. New York: Macmillan, 1979.
 OALD³ *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, 3rd ed. Oxford: OUP, 1974.
 OALD⁴ *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, 4th ed. Oxford: OUP, 1989.
 OALD⁵ *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, 5th ed. OUP, 1995.
 OALDE *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, Encyclopedic edition. Oxford: OUP, 1992.
 ODPV *Oxford Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs*. Oxford: OUP, 1993.
 OWD *Oxford Wordpower Dictionary*. Oxford: OUP, 1993.
 POD⁸ *The Pocket Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, 8th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

REFERENCES

- Akkerman, E. 1989. An independent analysis of LDOCE grammar coding system. In *Computational lexicography for natural language processing*, ed. by B. Boguraev and T. Briscoe, 65–83. Longman.
 Battenburg, John D. 1991. *English monolingual learners' dictionaries: A user-oriented study*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
 Bejoint, Henry. 1994. *Tradition and innovation in modern English dictionaries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 Bolinger, D. 1990. Review: *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, Fourth edition. *International Journal of Lexicography*. Vol. 3. No. 2: 133–45.
 Cowie, A. P. 1987. Syntax, the dictionary and the learner's communicative needs. *The dictionary and the language learner: Papers from the EURALEX seminar at the University of Leeds, 1–3 April 1985*, ed. by A. P. Cowie, 183–92. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
 —. 1989. Information on syntactic constructions in the general monolingual dictionary. In *Dictionaries: An international encyclopedia of lexicography* Vol. 1, ed. by F.J. Hausmann et al., 588–92. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
 —. 1990. Language as words: Lexicography. In *An encyclopaedia of language*, ed. by N. E. Collinge, 671–700. London: Routledge.
 —. 1993. Getting to grips with phrasal verbs. *English Today*. Vol. 9. No. 4: 38–41.
 Francis, Gill. 1994. Grammar teaching in schools: what should teachers be aware of? *Language Awareness*. Vol. 4. No. 3 & 4: 221–36.
 Groan, Denis J. 1991. Dictionaries of English: a decade of development. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*. Vol. 23. No. 1: 37–50.
 Herbst, Thomas. 1989. Grammar in dictionaries. In *Learners' dictionaries: State of the art*, ed. by M. L. Tickoo, 94–111. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
 —. 1990. Dictionaries for foreign language teaching: English. In *Dictionaries: An international encyclopedia of lexicography* Vol. 2, ed. by F.J. Hausmann et al., 1379–85. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

- Higashi, Nobuyuki. 1992. Eikoku no jisho [Dictionaries in Britain]. In *Sekai no jisho [Dictionaries of the world]*, ed. by S. Takebayashi et al., 439–72. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
 Ilson, R. 1990. Present-day British lexicography. In *Dictionaries: An international encyclopedia of lexicography* Vol. 2, ed. by F.J. Hausmann et al., 1967–83. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
 Lemmens, Marcel and H. Wekker. 1986. *Grammar in English learners' dictionaries*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
 —. 1991. On the relationship between lexis and grammar in English learners' dictionaries. *International Journal of Lexicography*. Vol. 4. No. 1: 1–14.
 McArthur, Tom. 1992. *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford: OUP.
 McCorduck, Edward S. 1993. *Grammatical information in ESL dictionaries*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
 Miyai, Shoji et al. 1995. An analysis of the *Longman Language Activator; The World's First Production Dictionary*. *Lexicon* 25: 26–76.
 Moon, Rosamund. 1987. The analysis of meaning. In *Looking up: An account of the COBUILD project in lexical computing*, ed. by J. Sinclair, 86–103. London & Glasgow: Collins ELT.
 Quirk, R et al. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Harlow: Longman.
 Rundell, Michael. 1995. The word on the street. *English Today*. Vol. 11. No. 3: 29–35.
 Rundell, M and P. Stock. 1992. The corpus revolution. *English Today*. Vol. 8. No. 2: 9–14, Vol. 8. No. 3: 21–32, and Vol. 8. No. 4: 45–51.
 Shimizu, Atsuko et al. 1990. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, New edition no bunseki (2) [An analysis of *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, New edition (Part 2)]. *Lexicon* 19: 30–171.
 Sinclair, John. 1987. Grammar in the dictionary. In *Looking up: An account of the COBUILD project in lexical computing*, ed. by J. Sinclair, 104–15. London & Glasgow: Collins ELT.
 Strevens, P. 1987. The effectiveness of learners' dictionaries. In *Studies in lexicography*, ed. by R. Burchfield, 76–93. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 Takahashi, Kiyoshi et al. 1992. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, 4th edition no bunseki [An analysis of *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, 4th edition]. *Lexicon* 22: 59–189.
 Weiss, Helen. 1991. Review: *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, 4th edition. *Anglia*. Band. 109. Heft. 1/2: 133–40.
 Wekker, Herman. 1991. English grammar and dictionaries for foreign learners. In *Language: usage and description: Studies presented to N.E. Osselton on the occasion of his retirement*, ed. by I. Tieken-Boon van Ostade and J. Frankis, 101–10. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

We would like to thank Professor Paul E. Davenport for giving us invaluable comments.