

Iwasaki Linguistic Circle

c/o Kenkyusha Limited
11-3 Fujimi 2-Chome
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102-8152
Japan

Shigeru Takebayashi, Chairman

A Comparative Analysis of the Two American Learners' Dictionaries

— *NHD* and *RHWD*

HIDEO MASUDA KYOHEI NAKAMOTO
TETSUO OSADA ATSUSHI KOBAYASHI
SHIGERU YAMADA YOSHIAKI TAKANO

1 Introduction	(1)
2 'The First Wave of American-oriented Learners' Dictionaries	(2)
3 Entries	(9)
4 Pronunciation	(20)
5 Definition	(26)
6 Examples	(37)
7 Grammar and Usage	(43)
8 Conclusion	(55)

1. Introduction

It was in the early 1960s when the English taught in Japanese schools switched from British to American English. I still remember the day when I opened my new English textbook as a 9th grader. For two years we had been taught English that was based on British English. It was now American English that we were studying; American spelling, American pronunciation, American vocabulary, and American grammar. However, it is not true to say that the English taught in Japanese schools all shifted to American English immediately. Even now a mixture of British and American English (tilted heavily towards American English) prevails in Japanese schools. Although American English is favored for political, economic, and

1999年6月20日印刷 1999年6月29日発行

編集兼発行者 岩崎研究会 代表者 竹林 滋
振替口座 00140-2-8737

〒102-8152 東京都千代田区富士見 2-11-3 株式会社研究社内 (電話 03-3288-7711)

印刷所 研究社印刷株式会社

geographical reasons, British English has survived for various reasons. Good learners' dictionaries that are based on British English may be one of the main reasons for it. For many years Japanese students as well as teachers have been consulting British dictionaries, specifically *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, (first published in 1948) by Hornby, whose experience in teaching English in Japan led him to compile a dictionary for students learning English as a foreign language. Since then many learners' dictionaries based on British English have been published and welcomed in Japan. The most successful among them may be *LDCE*³, *OALD*⁵, and *COBUILD*². However, not all readers are happy about the situation. Many people have been waiting for dictionaries to be published for learners of American English for the reasons stated above. Therefore, the new learners' dictionaries that are based on American English are very welcome to Japanese teachers as well as to the learners.

The present critical essay tries to clarify the features of *The Newbury House Dictionary of American English* (abbreviated to *NHD*) and *Random House Webster's Dictionary of American English* (abbreviated to *RHWD*) by analyzing and comparing them. Comparison is also made with British learners' dictionaries to examine whether their American counterparts have succeeded in reaching the standard that British dictionaries have achieved and whether they are able to produce any originality.

Five aspects of the dictionaries — entries, pronunciation, definition, examples, and grammar and usage — are examined from the perspective of Japanese learners/teachers of English.

2. The first wave of American-oriented learners' dictionaries

Both *NHD* and *RHWD* are called 'American-oriented' learners' dictionaries of American English, as opposed to 'British-oriented' counterparts like *LDAE* and *OSDAE*. When our linguistic circle thoroughly reviewed the latter two, it was hoped that the American lexicography, with its cherished history of 'college dictionaries', would pay much more attention to EFL dictionary markets worldwide (Higashi et al. 1986: 91). We would thus be able to celebrate the (rather late) arrival of the new American-oriented learners' dictionaries.

The British-oriented dictionaries, especially *LDAE*, are said to have been commercially successful in the United States since they were first published in 1983. However, it should be pointed out that they are still intolerably British in some respects (cf. Ilson 1986: 65ff). For this reason at least, we should celebrate the publication of the two American-oriented works.

What indeed is an 'American-oriented learners' dictionary of American English? To answer this seemingly simple question, the following four questions should be posed first: (1) What are the distinctive features of American (general-purpose) dictionaries?, (2) What are the distinctive features of (foreign) learners' dictionaries?, (3) How different are ESL dictionaries from EFL ones?, and (4) What is American English? The rest of this section is devoted to answering these questions one by one in order to facilitate our analysis of *NHD* and *RHWD*.

2.1. Distinctive features of American general-purpose dictionaries and those of foreign learners' dictionaries of English

Summarised below are some design features shared by American general-purpose dictionaries or AGPDs (Ilson 1986, Algeo 1990, Béjoint 1994: 48ff)¹⁾:

- (1) Word coverage
 - (a) AGPDs tend to boast of many entries (see also Landau 1984: 84–88).
 - (b) AGPDs usually include proper names either in the main word list or in appendices.
 - (c) AGPDs tend to ignore obsolete or archaic words.
 - (d) AGPDs are not particularly generous in their treatment of Briticisms.
 - (e) Until recently AGPDs tended not to include taboo words or ethnonyms.
- (2) Entry structure
 - (a) AGPDs tend to have separate articles for noun compounds.
 - (b) On the other hand, AGPDs tend to treat different parts-of-speech items in one main entry.
- (3) Orthographic syllabification is usually shown.

- (4) Respelling systems are used to indicate pronunciations.
- (5) Encyclopaedic definitions are not unusual.
- (6) In polysemous entries, the most common or frequently occurring senses appear first.
- (7) Synonym essays and usage essays are usually given.
- (8) Usage labels
 - (a) American English is usually shown unmarked.
 - (b) The label 'formal' is not used.
- (9) AGPDs are full of pictorial illustrations.
- (10) AGPDs usually have long appendices, which most often give encyclopaedic information.

Note that these are typical characteristics of AGPDs — there are exceptions, of course.

Now, let us compare the above features with those of monolingual learners' dictionaries or MLDs.²⁾ Béjoint (1994: 73) enumerates six characteristics of MLDs:

- (1) The language described is the usual, everyday variety, not the formal or literary.
- (2) Preference is given to the quality of the treatment of words rather than to the quantity of words.
- (3) Particular care is taken in the treatment of the more frequent words.
- (4) The obligatory or preferred syntactic patterns of verbs (at least) and sometimes nouns and adjectives, the countability or uncountability of nouns, the irregular forms of plurals, comparatives, conjugations, etc. are all indicated.
- (5) Pronunciation is indicated by means of the IPA.
- (6) Many examples, sometimes authentic but always representative of normal, everyday usage, are given.

The comparison of these two lists bring the following findings:

- (I) Contrasting features
 - (a) The number of entries — quantity is important in AGPDs, while quality is more important in MLDs.
 - (b) Pronunciation systems — respelling systems are prevalent among AGPDs, while the IPA is obligatory in MLDs.
- (II) Shared features

Word coverage — obsolete or archaic words are not included in AGPDs, nor are formal or literary terms in MLDs.

- (III) The features not mentioned in the MLD list
 - (a) Encyclopaedic entries.
 - (b) Poor coverage of Briticisms, taboo words, and ethnonyms.
 - (c) Analytic macrostructure.
 - (d) Treating different parts-of-speech items in one main entry.
 - (e) Syllabification.
 - (f) Encyclopaedic definitions.
 - (g) Frequency-based sense ordering.
 - (h) Synonym essays and usage essays.
 - (i) Usage labels: 'American' unmarked, 'formal' not used.
 - (j) Pictorial illustrations.
 - (k) Encyclopaedic appendices.
- (IV) The features not mentioned in the AGPD list
 - (a) Focus on frequent words.
 - (b) Grammatical information.
 - (c) Copious example sentences and phrases.

At first sight, AGPDs and MLDs belong to totally different categories, but they do not seem to be perfect strangers to each other. Contrasting features are not so many, and the two types of dictionary are rather similar in their vocabulary coverage. Moreover, Béjoint's list for MLDs is obviously incomplete. Some of the 11 features that are mentioned in the AGPD list but not in the MLD list, i.e. (III), are shared by British EFL dictionaries (e.g. (c), (e), (g), (h), and (j)), and others could be introduced in them (e.g. (a), (f), and (k)).

That being so, what will interest us when reviewing the two brand-new American-oriented MLDs? There are two questions that emerge from opposing views:

- Q1: To what extent do *NHD* and *RHWD* preserve the tradition of American lexicography?
- Q2: To what extent do *NHD* and *RHWD* satisfy the necessary conditions of MLDs?

It should be noted that since *RHWD* is "based on the Random House family of dictionaries" (*RHWD*: viii), it seems highly probable that it in-

herits some features of the Random House series, especially its college edition. It should also be noted that if *RHWD* is a direct descendant of *RHD* and *RHCD/RHWCD*, then it is a descendant of *ACD*, which is renowned as one of the best college dictionaries, and consequently a descendant of Thorndike's school dictionary (Algeo 1990: 1999). Considering the fact that "Thorndike's ideas are very similar to those put forward by Sweet . . . , which were later used by the compilers of [British] dictionaries for foreign students" (Béjoint 1994: 47), we should not be surprised if we find some similarities between *RHWD* and British MLDs. Then, another question is posed:

Q3: How different are *NHD* and *RHWD* from both British MLDs and British-oriented American learners' dictionaries (i.e. *LDAE* and *OSDAE*)?

2.2. Intended users: EFL or ESL?

Let us move on to the third question posed at the beginning of this section, which is now re-numbered:

Q4: How different are ESL dictionaries from EFL ones?

The two abbreviations 'ESL' and 'EFL' are often used interchangeably as in the introductory guide in *RHWD* (p. viii): "[*RHWD*] is designed for anyone who is learning or studying English as a *second* or *foreign* language" (emphasis added). It seems that *NHD* also uses the two terms interchangeably, for it was compiled by "ESL and EFL teachers" (p. vii). Still, the present author wonders if the two terms are interchangeable, and he doubts if ESL dictionaries should exactly be the same as their EFL counterparts.

In fact, Prof. Dalgish, chief editor of *RHWD*, admits that "learners will . . . vary in the degree of first-language literacy that they bring to the learning process. Moreover, learners will be in varying educational contexts: some will be in English as a second language situations, others in English as a foreign language situations, and others in bilingual settings, to mention a few" (Dalgish 1995: 330). There is a country like the United States which is a typical melting pot on the one hand, but on the other

hand there is a country like Japan where the illiteracy rate in the first language is amazingly low (but unfortunately the literacy rate in English is not necessarily very high!). Can one and the same dictionary satisfy the needs of these quite different user groups at once? The present author does not expect a positive answer.

Perhaps lexicographers are in a dilemma — Prof. Dalgish continues: "Learners' dictionaries that home in too narrowly on any of these considerations will not have a lucrative market; trying to appeal to all such categories will almost inevitably dilute any strengths that a solid focus would bring" (Dalgish 1995: 330). He is also in such a dilemma — his *RHWD* is "An ESL Dictionary for Learners of English as a Second Language" (front cover), but it also gives Japanese users a special gift: the Japanese translation of "How To Use This Dictionary To Learn American English" (pp. xxii–xxiv), together with its Spanish and Chinese translations. When he says *RHWD* is "a bridge to more advanced reference books used by native speakers of English" (*RHWD*: viii), he intends his dictionary to be used by ESL learners, or probably ESL learners *in* the United States. Such an idea as regarding MLDs, whether for ESL users or EFL, only as a 'bridge' to dictionaries for native speakers is open to discussion (cf. Stein 1990: 402, Zöfgen 1991: 2897, Nakamoto 1994: 3–4). In the meantime let us wait for the results from our analysis of *NHD* and *RHWD*, which is made from the viewpoint of Japanese users, teachers, and lexicographers.³⁾

2.3. What is American English?

This is another seemingly easy question with a simple answer: American English is the English spoken in America. If this is true, here is another question: Is American English the same as the language originating in America? Not necessarily so.

'American English' should be looked at from both diachronic and synchronic perspectives. Diachronically, 'Americanisms'⁴⁾ are "words and meanings originating in American English" (Algeo 1988: xviii), and therefore they are not necessarily used exclusively in America today because "many of them have spread to use in English worldwide" (Algeo 1988: xviii).

On the other hand, the term 'American English' is usually used in MLDs in its synchronic sense as in the explanation: "[*RHWD*'s] primary focus is *current* American English" (*RHWD*: viii, emphasis added). Thus, they are not necessarily words and meanings originating in American English — some of them (like *diaper*) originate in British English (or even Latin and Greek).

If MLDs do not usually give etymological information which is not regarded as a necessary feature of MLDs by Béjoint (see 2.1.), then just telling the learner which words and meanings are Americanisms and not specifying which are current American words and meanings may not be very helpful.⁵⁾

Is that all the MLD lexicographer should think about American English?

Before concluding this section, here is one more question to be answered:

Q5: Is 'American English' an English used exclusively, or chiefly, or usually, etc. in America?

Let us use the term 'American English' in its synchronic sense here. There are at least two fundamental jobs every MLD lexicographer should do. First, s/he should mark American English as such, especially when "information on British English is also provided" (*RHWD*: viii) in the dictionary. In this sense the MLD should not follow the AGPD, in which American English is usually shown unmarked (see 2.1.). Second, s/he should tell the learner to what extent the word or meaning to be explained is 'American'. In other words, s/he should show whether the word/meaning is 'variety-specific', 'variety-favored', or 'variety-neutral' (Benson et al. 1986: 42). Needless to say, reliable linguistic data is essential to make these tasks meaningful.

Incidentally, the present author, who teaches English at several universities in Tokyo, must confess that he is still uncertain which variety of Englishes should be taught in the classroom. It is often said that in Japan American English should be taught instead of British and other varieties. However, RP is still influential and thus "many ELT practitioners have

regarded it and continue to regard it as the only model which should be offered to foreign learners" (McArthur 1989: 57). Naturally, it comes first in British-oriented EFL dictionaries. Besides, satellite broadcasting is now available in Japan not only from the United States but from the United Kingdom. British English may not be very important for an ESL learner in the United States, but it is probably more important for an EFL learner in other countries including Japan (see 2.2.). This discussion should arouse our natural curiosity about the two dictionaries to be reviewed, both of which are named dictionary of "American English", so in which sense and to what extent are they 'American' dictionaries? (K. Nakamoto)

3. Entries

3.1. Number of Entries

To begin our discussion on entries, we first look at the numerical aspect of the entries in both dictionaries. In order to see about how many linguistic forms are included as entries in the dictionaries, we have selected every fortieth page of each dictionary from page 1 onwards as sample material, and have thus obtained 26 pages out of *NHD* and 22 pages out of *RHWD*. However, it must be noted here that a page is devoted to "full-page contextual illustration" in the sample material of *RHWD*; since we did no modification to our sampling method, the actual number of pages on which explanation is done by text is 21. Each sample material represents about 2.6% of each dictionary. The result of our analysis is shown in Table 3.1, in which each figure represents the estimated number derived by calculation, the actually counted numbers of which are given within the

Table 3.1

	<i>NHD</i>	<i>RHWD</i>
Headwords	21,123 (547) [48.9%]	28,035 (718) [57.5%]
Derived Forms	5,638 (146) [13.1%]	6,169 (158) [12.7%]
Idioms and Phrasal Verbs	6,178 (160) [14.3%]	3,944 (101) [8.1%]
Inflected Forms	10,233 (265) [23.7%]	10,581 (271) [21.7%]
Total	43,172	48,729

parentheses. The figures in brackets show the percentage of the number in question in comparison with the "Total" number of entries.

The number of entries mentioned on the back cover of *NHD* is "more than 40,000." As far as our research is concerned, the figure contains not only the number of headwords, derived forms, and idioms, including their variants, but also that of inflected forms (including their variants). *RHWD*, on the other hand, does not mention the number of entries contained in the dictionary.¹⁾ As Table 3.1 shows, *RHWD* contains about 7,000 more headwords (variants included) than *NHD*. But *NHD* has 1.6 times more idioms and phrasal verbs than *RHWD*.

3.2. The Vocabulary

3.2.1. In order to check whether the dictionaries include minimum basic vocabulary, we made reference to *CLEJD*, where words and phrases considered as basic for the learners are explicitly marked in terms of four levels; we picked out all the 422 such basic words and phrases from those which begin with the letter "t" in *CLEJD*. As a result, the comparison yielded nothing more than a trivial conclusion that both the dictionaries, on the whole, satisfy the minimum standard for being intermediate learner's dictionaries in view of the basic vocabulary required. However, one thing must be noted here concerning contracted forms, such as **that'd**, **there's**, **they'll**, and so on. *CLEJD* lists 23 examples of such contracted forms for **that**, **there**, **they**, and **this**, but only **they'd**¹ (for *they would*), **they'd**² (*they had*), **they'll** (*they will*) and **they've** (*they have*) are included in *RHWD*, and none of these contracted forms are found in *NHD*. In passing, among four intermediate learner's American English dictionaries, that is, *LDAE*¹, *OSDAE*, *NHD*, and *RHWD*, only *NHD* lacks information on the contracted forms of [pronoun + auxiliary] construction. If the dictionaries are designed to help intermediate learners do some passive decoding activity, it may be plausible to claim that they ought to include such contracted forms in that those contracted auxiliaries, though contracted, might play important roles in the course of decoding.

3.2.2. Apart from the notion of the basic vocabulary, we also carried out a direct comparison of entries between *NHD* and *RHWD*. We checked,

Table 3.2

	<i>NHD</i>	<i>RHWD</i>
Total Number of Words and Phrases	162	301
Single Words	88 [54.3%]	261 [86.7%]
Hyphenated	28 [17.3%]	13 [4.3%]
Root and Affixal	0 [0%]	29 [9.6%]
Abbreviated	0 [0%]	14 [4.7%]
Contracted	1 [0.6%]	8 [2.7%]
Compound Words and Phrases	74 [45.7%]	40 [13.3%]

one by one, the main entries in the section "t" in both dictionaries to establish what kind of words are missing and what kind of words are more likely to be included in each dictionary. Table 3.2 shows the numerical result of the analysis, in which the total number of words and phrases which are included in one dictionary but missing in the other is shown at the top.

Figures within brackets indicate the percentage of the number in question as compared with the total.

One prominent aspect of the result is that "Root" and "Affixal" morphemes, such as **-tact-**, **-tail-**, and **trans-** are only observable in *RHWD*. Information of this kind would help learners understand the way English words are formed in general, in that in each entry, *RHWD* gives brief etymological information together with an array of sample words in which the root or the affix is used.

"Abbreviated" words are those which end in a period, like **tbls.** for *tablespoon* or *tablespoonful*, and **Thurs.** for *Thursday*. And "Contracted" forms involve those in which a portion of a word is replaced with an apostrophe, thus, we have **'tis**, **'tho'**, and so on. The four contracted forms of [pronoun + auxiliary] pattern we discussed in the previous subsection, such as **they'd**, fall into this category. The only contracted form which is found in *NHD* but missing in *RHWD* is **'til**.²⁾

Note that almost half of the *NHD* vocabulary missing in *RHWD* is made up of compound words and phrases, and to take into consideration our previous indication that *NHD* contains 1.6 times more idioms and

phrasal verbs than *RHWD*, it may be plausible to claim that *NHD* is more likely or positive in including compounds as (main) entries than *RHWD*. On the other hand, more than 85% of *RHWD* vocabulary which is not listed in *NHD* is made up of single words.

A closer look at this, so to speak, complementary distribution of words further reveals that *RHWD* is somehow more technically flavored than *NHD* in that about 58 examples out of 250, where the number of root (or affixal) forms, abbreviated forms, and contracted forms are excluded, are technical or archaic terms in one way or another. For example, we have medical terms: **thrombus**, **tonsillectomy**; names of plants: **tamarind**, **taro**, **trefoil**; names of animals, fishes, and birds: **tapir**, **tarpon**, **turtle-dove**; musical terms: **turning fork**, **tremolo**, **ti**; religious terms: **Torah**, **Trinity**; archaic words: **thee**, **thou**, **troth**; and other technical terms, such as **tautology** and **theorem**. On the other hand, we have only 9 examples out of 161 *NHD* vocabulary items which can be considered technical without question. These are, **Taurus**, **teleprocessing**, **therapeutics**, **thermonuclear**, **topiary**, **transcendentalism**, **triglyceride**, **tympanum**, and **typology**. And the majority of the *NHD* vocabulary items, especially the compounds, relate rather to the household, thus, we have **table wine**, **time card**, **traffic jam**, and such.

Names of country are not included in either of the dictionaries, but *RHWD* contains names of nationality and language so that **Taiwanese**, **Tanzanian**, **Thai**, **Tunisian**, and **Turkish** are confirmed in the section "t." *NHD* does not provide this type of vocabulary in the main A-Z part, but it has a list of countries, nationalities, and languages in its appendix 3.

3.2.3. As the titles of the dictionaries indicate, *NHD* and *RHWD* are dictionaries of American English. In this subsection, we briefly examine how American these dictionaries are in terms of the entries included. Here we have made reference to *CLEJD* again. We have picked out whatever entries in the section "t" are labeled as either "American English," "Mainly American English," "Informal American English," or "American Slang" in *CLEJD*.³⁾ As a result, we get 123⁴⁾ entries in all. Table 3.3 shows the number of such "American" entries included in the four intermediate learner's American English dictionaries.

Table 3.3

<i>NHD</i>	<i>RHWD</i>	<i>LDAE</i> ¹	<i>OSDAE</i>
52	43	33	24

As is obvious from the table, although the number of 52 itself does not seem high in that more than half of the sample entries are still left unlisted, it is plausible to claim that *NHD* is, in a sense, more American than any other dictionaries in terms of the type of entries included. 15 examples including **temblor**, **tush**, **teeter-totter**, etc., are only found in *NHD*, while the number of those which are only confirmed in *RHWD*, *LDAE*¹, and *OSDAE* are 5 (**thrift institution**, **thunderhead**, **tie one on**, **toe the mark**, and **trundle bed**), 4 (**take-out**, **toll-free**, **track meet**, and **triplex apartment**), 4 (**pick up the tab**, **ten-gallon hat**, **on the ticket**, and **tractor-trailer**), respectively.

3.3. Presentation of Inflected Forms

In this subsection, we will mainly look at the manner in which entries are presented in both dictionaries. The notion of entries here includes not only "headwords" but also "inflected forms," "derived forms," and "variant forms" of any sort. On the whole, both the dictionaries lack consistency in the way that they present these forms, and thus, there is strong possibility that the information so provided will leave learners in some confusion.

3.3.1. Although it is not clearly mentioned, *NHD* shows the plural forms of nouns if the inflectional patterns do not observe the regular rule.⁵⁾ Thus, in accordance with the "GUIDE TO THE DICTIONARY,"⁶⁾ (henceforth, referred to as the "GUIDE") for nouns, such as **bush**, **church**, **lens**, **box**, **buzz**, and **enemy**, the dictionary presents their plural forms. Although the "GUIDE" says nothing on the [-o ⇒ -oes] pattern, *NHD* shows plurals of the *o*-ending nouns which follow the pattern, such as **echo**, **potato**, and **hero**. As far as the result of our research on *NHD* is concerned, we have found no cases in which irregular plural forms, which are not generated by the simple suffixation of *-s*, are missing from the dictionary. However, although the regular plural suffixation is to be ap-

plied, *NHD* gives plurals for the abbreviated nouns, such as **piano**, **dynamo**, and **photo**, and several other cases of inconsistency must be pointed out among those which observe the regular suffixation. For example, *NHD* shows the plural form of **chimney** on one hand, but no plural forms are given for other nouns which follow the [-y ⇒ -ys] pattern, such as **boy**, **toy**, **monkey**, and **valley**, on the other. The same is true for the *o*-ending nouns. *NHD* gives **ghettos**, but it does not show plurals for other foreign nouns like **solo** and **torso**. And although headwords like **kangaroo** and **cameo** are accompanied by their plurals, **bamboo** and **studio**, which also end in *o* preceded by a vowel, are not. The information being redundant rather than being deficient, the inconsistency of this type may not necessarily cause confusion. However, if the presentation of the redundant information is meant to help the less confident learners in generating plurals, it may be plausible to claim that the dictionary should give some inflectional information not only on those *f*-ending nouns which observe [-f ⇒ -ves] pattern as **thief**, for example, but also on those which observe the regular rule as **belief**, the plural form of which is not shown in the article.

RHWD, on the other hand, does not explain anything about the formation of plurals in its "Guide to the Dictionary," (henceforth, referred to as the "Guide") and the dictionary seems to presuppose some grammatical knowledge of the basic irregular patterns of plural formation. Indeed, for the nouns which end in *sh*, *ch*, *x*, or *z*, *RHWD* does not show their plural counterparts.⁷⁾ Thus, *RHWD* users cannot rely on such a simple principle as the one employed in *NHD* that they simply add *-s* automatically to the headword whenever its plural form is not shown in the article. Rather, they are required to decide what inflectional pattern the headword observes. This is quite a burden for non-advanced learners. Obviously, this may lead the learners into some confusion. For example, the dictionary does not show the plural forms for **epoch**, **monarch**, and **stomach**, which do not follow the [-ch ⇒ -ches] pattern as is observed in the case of **church**. Plural forms generated by the [-y ⇒ -ies] pattern are shown, but the treatment of [-y ⇒ -ys] pattern is somewhat different. *RHWD* gives plurals of the [-y ⇒ -ys] pattern if the *y* is preceded by *e*, such as **chim-**

neys, **monkeys**, and **valleys**, but it does not if the *y* is preceded by *a* (**play**) or *o* (**boy**, **toy**).

Animal names can have zero plural forms. *RHWD* indicates the possibility of the zero form in three ways. If the noun only has the zero plural, the dictionary just shows the same spelling as the headword after the label *pl.*, as in **deer**. In those cases where the headword has both the inflected and the zero forms, plurals are shown in either of the following ways⁸⁾:

salmon: **-ons**, (*esp. when thought of as a group*) **-on**

flounder²⁾: (*esp. when thought of as a group*) **-der**, (*esp. for kinds or species*) **-ders**

This type of information looks helpful for learners who have not yet fully understood the notion of collectivity, but since no indication is given on the difference between these two manners of presentation, we do not know for sure whether or not the order of listing is designed to imply that the notion of **flounder** is much more likely to be thought of as a group than kinds or species while that of **salmon** is not. *NHD* shows zero forms together with their inflected counterparts, but it does not provide any further information concerning which to use in a specific context.

RHWD has an appendix which lists irregular and alternate plural forms of nouns, but the information is somehow incomplete in that **cactus**, **criteria**, **louses**, and **moneys**, which are given in the A-Z main part, are missing in the diagram even if their singular counterparts are shown in the list.

3.3.2. Inconsistency can be observed also in the manner of presenting inflected forms for verbs in both dictionaries.

The "GUIDE" in *NHD* claims that it shows all the irregularly⁹⁾ inflected forms of the verbs. When they are listed, the array follows the order "past tense, past participle (if different from past tense), gerund (= present participle), third person singular." And if there are more than two forms for one category, the variants are conjuncted by non-boldfaced *or*:

hide (1) / | *v.* **hid** / |, **hidden** / | or **hid**, **hiding**, **hides**¹⁰⁾

However, the rule is violated for some verbs:

sew / | *v.* **sewed** or **sewn** / |, **sewing**, **sews**

Here, the learners may conclude that **sew** has two possible inflected forms for not only the past participle but also for the past tense, which is not actually the case. No inflectional diagram is given for **hurt** and **set** although these verbs do not follow the regular rule, and **apply** is accompanied only by its *-ing* form. **beat**, **become**, **begin**, **blow**, **break**, and **see** lack their irregular past participle forms in their inflectional diagrams. For **swing**, the dictionary gives the form **swang** as its past tense.¹¹⁾

In its appendix 4, *NHD* provides a list of irregular verbs, but the use of this list may rather disturb the understanding of the irregular inflections of verbs. First of all, the list gives wrong information; **begin**, **bite**, and **blow** do not change their forms for the past tense and the past participle in the list. Secondly, variant forms shown in the A-Z main part are not given in the appendix 4 except for **hang**.¹²⁾

RHWD says nothing particular in its "Guide" on the presentation of inflected forms of verbs. In general, the dictionary seems to give inflectional diagrams if the verbs do not follow the regular rule. Inflected forms are listed in the order "past tense, past participle (if different from past tense), gerund (= present participle)." The third person singulars are not given even if the regular rule is not applicable. If variant forms are possible, variants are conjuncted by the non-boldfaced *or*. However, as in *NHD*, the manner of presentation is rather inconsistent, and, thus, may cause some confusion among learners. For some verbs, the distinction is not made between the past tense and the past participle:

get () / v., **got** () / or **got·ten** () / **get·ting**, n.

As is shown above, since "**got** or **gotten**" is given for **get**, the learners may misunderstand that **get** has two possible variants for both the past tense and the past participle.

RHWD also has an appendix which lists irregular forms of verbs. But the diagram is incomplete in that some variant forms are missing even if they are shown in the body part.

3.3.3. According to the "GUIDE," *NHD* gives the comparative and superlative forms of adjectives when they accept the *-er* and *-est* suffixation, or when they have irregular forms. Thus, when only periphrastic forms

are possible for an adjective (adverb), no explicit information is given in the article. This might mislead the learners if an adjective they are looking up is the one which is not usually used in a comparative or a superlative structure, such as **main** and **perfect**, for *NHD* does not have a systematic method of indicating such information. Irregular forms are given for adjectives like **good**, **well**, **bad**, and **many**, but **ill** is left unmarked. Some adjectives, such as **old**, **late**, and **far**, have two types of inflectional pattern. *NHD* gives four possible forms for **far**, **later** and **latest** for **late**, but no information is given on the comparatives and superlatives for **old**.

The "GUIDE" explains that the inflectional rule is applicable "if the adjectives are of one syllable, or if they are of two syllables and the second syllable ends in a *y* preceded by a consonant," while Quirk et al. (1985: 462) claim that the inflected forms are possible not only for *y*-ending adjectives but also for *ow-*, *le-*, *er-*, *ure-*ending ones when they are of two syllables and these endings are preceded by a consonant. *NHD* gives inflected forms only for those which end in *y* with one exception; that is **gentle**, which ends in *le*. Thus, in *NHD*, adjectives like **narrow**, **simple**, **clever**, **mature** are considered to have periphrastic forms. The treatment on these adjectives resembles *LDAB*¹, which gives no inflected forms for *ow-*, *le-*, *er-*, *ure-*ending adjectives including **gentle**. The prudential attitude toward the inflected forms is also observable when we look at the treatment of those adjectives, for which Quirk et al. (1985: 462) admit the possibility of being both the periphrastic and the inflected forms, such as **quite**, **common**, **solid**, **cruel**, **wicked**, **polite**, **pleasant**, and **handsome**. Although *AHD* gives inflected forms for all of these adjectives, *NHD* has inflected forms only for **quiet** and **polite**.¹³⁾ One remark must be made on the manner of showing the comparative and superlative forms in *NHD*. When a headword contains the adjective item and the adverb item in its article, it is only the first listed item which is given the inflected forms. For a dictionary to be considered user-oriented, inflectional information should be presented for each part of speech whether or not inflected forms to be shown happen to be the same in the end.¹⁴⁾

The "Guide" in *RHWD* mentions nothing particular on the presentation of the comparative and superlative forms of adjectives and adverbs

except that the dictionary shows the inflected and irregular forms. Since *RHWD* does not indicate whether or not an adjective (adverb) is normally used in the comparison, the same type of confusion might occur as the one we have pointed out for *NHD*. The attitude of *RHWD* toward the inflected forms is more positive than *NHD* in that it gives inflected forms for those which end in *ow*, *le*, *er*, and *ure*, and for some of those which are claimed in Quirk et al. (1985: 462) to have both the inflected and the periphrastic forms, that is, **quiet**, **common**, **cruel**, **polite**, and **handsome**. *RHWD* also shows inflected forms for **soon**, **fast**, and **hard**. *RHWD* gives even **liker** and **likest**¹⁵ for **like** although they are labeled "(Poetic)." However, the presentation of inflected forms in *RHWD* lacks consistency. *RHWD* shows inflected forms of a headword before it gives definitions and examples. When a headword contains several parts of speech, the dictionary first arrays all parts of speech labels for the headword in the same order in which the dictionary gives definitions and examples, and inflected forms are given after the corresponding parts of speech:

much () | | *adj.*, **more** () | | **most** () | | *n.*, *pron.*, *adv.*,
more, **most**.

When adjectival definitions and adverbial definitions are given next to each other, the presentation of inflected forms observes the following manner:

hard () | | *adj.* and *adv.*, **-er**, **-est**.

However, as is usually the case for *RHWD*, not all the articles follow this pattern:

ill () | | *adj.*, **worse** () | | **worst** () | | *n.*, *adv.*
well¹ () | | *adv.*, *adj.*, *comparative* **better**, *superlative* **best**, *interj.*

In the case of **ill**, inflected forms are missing after the *adv.* label. Thus, learners might wonder whether or not the irregular forms **worse** and **worst** are applicable to **ill** when it is used as an adverb. It must be noted here also that labels *comparative* and *superlative* are not confirmed for adjectives and adverbs other than **well**¹. *RHWD* seems to have a tendency to show more variant forms in its array of inflected forms compared with

NHD.¹⁶ However, compare the way in which variants are given for **old** and **late** below:

old () | | *adj.*, **old·er**, **old·est** or **eld·er**, **eld·est**, *n.*
late () | | *adj.*, **lat·er** or **lat·ter**, **lat·est** or **last** () | | *adv.*, **lat·er**, **lat·est**.

The unsystematic use of conjunction *or* might not correctly convey to the learners the alignment attributed between a comparative form and a superlative form, namely that a certain comparative variant can be paired with a certain superlative variant, but not with another.

3.4. Presentation of Derived Forms

In *NHD*, some derived forms are shown at the end of items, parts of speech of which are thought to be semantically (or, etymologically) the origins of the derivation. Thus, **printable**, for example, is given at the end of verb item of **print** rather than the noun item. However, there are other cases in which derived forms are simply shown at the end of the articles regardless of their derivational history. Thus, **editorially**, which is given as the derived form of **editorial**, is shown at the end of the article where the adjective item precedes the noun item. **disconnection** is given as the derived form of the adjective **disconnected**, but the word should be shown within the article headed by the verb entry **disconnect** as long as it is listed in the dictionary.

In *RHWD*, derived forms are all arrayed at the end of each article. Thus, as we have pointed out, the derivational relationship is not clear as to which item in the article is semantically (or, etymologically) connected with the derived form. However, it must be noted here that the treatment of derived forms is rather more considerate than that of *NHD* in that *RHWD* gives their inflected forms when their inflectional patterns are not of the regular type. For example, the noun **causality**, which is given as a run-on entry for the adjective **causal**, is accompanied by its plural ending **-ties**, and the past tense (and the past participle) and the gerund endings are given for the verb **tap dance**, a run-on entry for the noun **tap dance**. The comparative and superlative endings are given for adjectives when

they observe the inflectional rule; thus, **wheezy**, a run-on entry for **wheeze**, is followed by **-ier** and **-iest**. (T. Osada)

4. Pronunciation

4.1. Overview

4.1.1. Both *NHD* and *RHWD* are titled "Dictionary of American English" and it is a matter of course that the pronunciations given are those heard in the United States. *NHD* declares in its "Guide to the Dictionary" (p. xii) that it shows the pronunciations "used by speakers of the most common American English dialects." *RHWD* does not mention the type of pronunciation that they give, but it is obvious that it gives the pronunciations that are common in the United States.

4.1.2. *NHD* employs a transcription system based on the IPA, while *RHWD* employs two systems, i.e. the diacritical system and the IPA-based system, providing each entry with the two types of symbol. Both dictionaries present IPA-based symbols between slashes and, in *RHWD*, diacritical symbols are put in parentheses before IPA-based symbols:

NHD **green** /grɪn/
RHWD **green** (grēn) /grɪyn/

The diacritical system employed in *RHWD* is the same as that found in *RHD*². The reason for employing the two types of symbol is that the diacritical system "is designed to focus learners on *English* sound-spelling correspondences" while "many learners are already familiar with the IPA pronunciation system" (Guide to the Dictionary, p. ix). *RHWD* seems to intend that its transcription should serve as a "bridge" from the IPA-based system, with which many learners are familiar, to the diacritical system, which *RHWD* considers to be desirable and "standard in most American monolingual dictionaries." (p. viii)

4.1.3. The vowel symbols employed in *NHD* and *RHWD* are shown in Table 4.1. The framework used here is from the "standard lexical sets" in Wells (1982: 122) with some modification (cf. Akasu et al. 1996: 20). Slashes for the IPA-based symbols are left out while the diacritical symbols of *RHWD* are put in parentheses as in the dictionary.

Table 4.1

	<i>NHD</i>	<i>RHWD</i>		<i>NHD</i>	<i>RHWD</i>
KIT	ɪ	(i)	NURSE	ɜr	(ûr) ɜr
DRESS	ɛ	(e)	NEAR	ɪr	(ēr) ɪər
TRAP	æ	(a)	SQUARE	ɛr	(âr) ɛər
BATH	æ	(a)	START	ɑr	(âr) ɑr
PALM	ɑ	(ă)	NORTH	ɔr	(ôr) ɔr
LOT	ɑ	(o)	FORCE	ɔr	(ôr, ôr) ɔr, ɔwr
CLOTH	ɔ	(ô, o)	CURE	ur	(oor) ur
THOUGHT	ɔ	(ô)	happy	ɪ	(ē) iy
STRUT	ʌ	(u)	habit	ɪ	(i) ɪ
FOOT	ʊ	(oo)	comma	ə	(ə) ə
FLEECE	i	(ē)	letter	ər	(ər) ər
GOOSE	u	(oo)	manUal	u	(oo) uw
FACE	eɪ	(ā)	regUlar	ə	(ə) ə
PRICE	aɪ	(ī)			
CHOICE	ɔɪ	(oi)			
MOUTH	au	(ou)			
GOAT	ou	(ô)			

The consonant symbols are not listed here because they are essentially the same with those used in other materials. For minor differences of the consonant symbols, see 4.3.1.

4.2. Transcriptions of vowels

4.2.1. In this chapter, we examine the IPA-based transcriptions of vowels in the two dictionaries. The diacritical transcriptions in *RHWD* have already been discussed in Dohi et al. (1991: 27) as an analysis of the pronunciation system of *RHD*² and so they are not discussed here.

4.2.2. The most striking differences between the two dictionaries are the symbols employed for the vowels which appear in the lexical set FLEECE and GOOSE. In *NHD*, these vowels are transcribed as /i/ and /u/, while *RHWD* gives /iy/ and /uw/.

The transcriptions in *RHWD* are based on the analysis in which these vowels are phonemicized as a combination of a vowel and a glide. The transcriptions of this kind, which reflect the fact that these vowels are often

diphthongized in American speech, have been popular in the United States since the era of American structural linguists. They can still be seen nowadays in some pronunciation coursebooks. The dictionaries and textbooks published in Japan, on the other hand, employ /i:/ and /u:/ for those vowels, so that most of the Japanese learners of English are not at all familiar with the transcriptions /iy/ and /uw/ and must be puzzled by them.

The use of the symbols /i/ and /u/ for the vowels in the lexical sets FLEECE and GOOSE, as in *NHD*, has been discussed several times (cf. Higashi et al. 1986). From the phonological point of view, the use of /i/, /u/ for the vowels in FLEECE and GOOSE and /ɪ/, /ʊ/ for the vowels in KIT and FOOT is fully adequate. For pedagogical purposes, however, it is desirable that the former two vowels, which are relatively long, be transcribed with a length mark, i.e. /i:/ and /u:/, even though it is redundant phonologically. This is especially preferable for those learners whose native language has a phonemic opposition between long and short vowels, because those learners, given the notations without a length mark, will miss the relative length of the vowels in English. This is also true of the use of /ɔ/ for the vowel found in the lexical set THOUGHT in both dictionaries.

4.2.3. For most of the speakers in the United States, there is no longer a distinction between the vowels which appear in the lexical sets LOT and PALM (and also THOUGHT for many speakers).

Both *NHD* and *RHWD* distinguishes the THOUGHT vowel from the other two.

For the vowels for the lexical sets LOT and PALM, *NHD* transcribes them into the same symbol /ɑ/, while *RHWD* distinguishes them as in *RHD*² and gives the symbols /ɒ/ and /ɑ/ respectively. As far as American speech is concerned, the distinction between these two vowels seems to be unnecessary, at least in learner's dictionaries. There is another problem in *RHWD*. The symbol chosen for the LOT vowel, i.e. /ɒ/, is an IPA symbol that denotes a low back round vowel, usually employed for the LOT vowel in RP. The use of this symbol for the unrounded American LOT vowel is erroneous and will mislead the learners, especially those who are familiar with the dictionaries published in Britain.

4.2.4. For transcribing the five diphthongs which appear in the lexical sets FACE, PRICE, CHOICE, MOUTH and GOAT, *NHD* employs sequences of two vowel symbols, i.e. /eɪ/, /aɪ/, /ɔɪ/, /aʊ/ and /oʊ/ respectively. This convention is established in EFL/ESL dictionaries published in Britain and it is quite a reasonable choice.

RHWD transcribes these five diphthongs with sequences of a vowel symbol and a semi-vowel (or glide) symbol, i.e. /ey/, /ay/, /ɔy/, /aw/ and /ow/. Although they are less difficult to understand than /iy/ and /uw/, Japanese learners may feel somewhat uncomfortable with them.

4.2.5. Both *NHD* and *RHWD* employ /ɜr/ for the vowel that appears in the lexical set NURSE. This vowel is phonemicized as a mid central vowel followed by a consonant /r/, and its transcription as /ɜr/ (or sometimes as /ər/) is fairly common in some dictionaries, including *CIDE* and *LDAE*^{1,1)} This is, however, rather problematic in that the transcription /ɜr/ (or /ər/) gives learners an impression that they should pronounce a mid central non-rhotic vowel /ɜ/ (or /ə/) first and then the consonant (semi-vowel) /r/. The result is that they will pronounce it as a diphthong at best, like the ones found in the lexical sets NEAR, SQUARE, START, etc., which is wrong. The situation is that the NURSE vowel is a mid central rhoticized (i.e. r-colored) monophthong. In order to get rid of such a serious misunderstanding, it is strongly recommended that this vowel not be transcribed with a sequence of symbols but with one vowel symbol which implies rhoticity, i.e. /ɜ:/ or /ə:/ (or, more preferably, with a length mark, i.e. /ɜ:/ or /ə:/).

4.2.6. *NHD* gives /ɪr/, /ɛr/, /ɑr/ and /ʊr/ for the vowels (or diphthongs) which appear in the lexical sets NEAR, SQUARE, START and CURE. Although this is phonologically adequate, pedagogically it is not. Since the pre-vocalic /r/ and the post-vocalic /r/ give different acoustic impressions to learners (the former is more consonant-like and the latter more vowel-like), it is more preferable to employ the symbol /ə/ for the second element of those vowels, so that their characteristics as diphthongs are better understood.

In *RHWD*, the transcriptions of the vowels in START and CURE are the same as in *NHD*, while the vowels in NEAR and SQUARE are transcribed as /ɪər/ and /ɛər/ respectively. The symbol /ə/, which is phonologically redun-

dant, stands for a glide which is heard in these vowels. By employing /ɪər/ and /eər/, *RHWD* distinguishes the pronunciations of **ferry** (fēr'ē) /'feriɪ/ and **fairy** (fâr'ē) /'færiɪ/ (in *NHD*, both words are transcribed as /'feri/, implying that they are homophones). In the same way, **mirror** and **weary** is transcribed as (mir'ər) /'mɪrər/ and (wēr'ē) /'wiəri/ (in *NHD*, /'mɪrər/ and /'wiəri/) respectively.

4.2.7. As to the vowels which appear in the lexical sets NORTH and FORCE, *NHD* does not distinguish them and transcribes both as /ɔr/, while *RHWD* gives the latter /owr/ as well as /ɔr/, corresponding to the diacritical transcriptions (ōr) and (ôr) respectively. Since this distinction is decreasing in the United States, learner's dictionaries no longer need to make a distinction between them. To make matters worse, the notation /owr/ is totally inadequate. This transcription inevitably leads learners to believe that the vowel in FORCE is a kind of triphthong like [ouə]. It is possible to phonemicize this vowel as the GOAT vowel (transcribed as /ow/ in *RHWD*) followed by the consonant /r/, but employing /owr/ in a dictionary is improper, inclining too much towards phonological analysis (or too automatic a translation from the diacritical system). It should be abandoned.²⁾

4.3. Transcriptions of consonants

4.3.1. For transcriptions of consonants, only a few statements are needed.

In both dictionaries, the IPA-based symbols for consonants are essentially the same. The only difference is a typographical one: the use of ligatures /tj/ and /dʒ/ for the affricates in *NHD* (not in *RHWD*).

Both dictionaries employ /y/ for the initial sound of *yes*, which would be transcribed as /j/ in the original use of the IPA.

4.3.2. Since in practice *NHD* and *RHWD* are the first EFL/ESL dictionaries from publishers in the United States, it is natural that we expect them to include some information about what is called "voiced t", one of the most typical characteristics of American speech. Regrettably, they do not say anything about this, except that *NHD* mentions it as a general feature in the "Guide to the dictionary" (p. xiv). It explains that /t/ is

voiced "after a vowel or /r/ and before an unstressed vowel or a syllabic /l/" and asserts that this phenomenon "is considered predictable and is not represented by a special symbol." The situation is more complicated, however, as was pointed out in Akasu et al. (1996: 22). Even if the editors of this dictionary consider that learners should know only the most typical circumstances where /t/ is voiced, it would be more user-friendly to indicate the possibility of voicing in each entry. The two learner's dictionaries from British publishers, i.e. *CIDE* and *LDAE*³, are far more satisfactory as they indicate t-voicing.

4.4. Transcriptions of syllabic consonants

4.4.1. The transcriptions of syllabic consonants are shown in Table 4.2. Notice that *RHWD* (but not *NHD*) employs a diacritic /,/ to indicate the syllabicity of consonants.

When /l/ or /n/ is preceded by a homorganic stop, neither dictionaries put /ə/ between the two consonants.³⁾ This is quite an adequate decision because in these contexts /l/ and /n/ are almost always syllabic. On the other hand, both dictionaries put /ə/ in all the other cases. Although less often than in the cases above, /ə/ is also sometimes dropped in these contexts, and it is preferable to indicate the possibility of dropping /ə/ in one way or another. After all, trying not to pronounce /ə/ in these circumstances will bring about better results for foreign learners.

Table 4.2

	<i>NHD</i>	<i>RHWD</i>		<i>NHD</i>	<i>RHWD</i>
people, chapel	/pəl/	/pəl/	button	/tɪ/	/tɪ/
table, symbol	/bəl/	/bəl/	sudden	/dn/	/dn/
rifle, beautiful	/fəl/	/fəl/	lesson	/sən/	/sən/
little, metal	/tl/	/tɪ/	season	/zən/	/zən/
middle, idol	/dl/	/dɪ/			
final	/nl/	/nɪ/	rhythm	/ðəm/	/ðəm/
wrestle, pencil	/səl/	/səl/	prism	/zəm/	/zəm/
puzzle, hazel	/zəl/	/zəl/			
uncle, nickel	/kəl/	/kəl/			
single, legal	/gəl/	/gəl/			

4.4.2. In intervocalic positions, the symbols /t/, /d/, /n/, /tn/, /dn/ in *NHD* cause some ambiguity. For example, the word **analyst** (which is trisyllabic) is transcribed as /'ænlɪst/ and the users will misunderstand that it is dissyllabic and that the consonant /l/ is non-syllabic.⁴⁾ In *RHWD*, **analyst** is transcribed as /'ænlɪst/. It is certain that the use of the diacritic /,/ eliminates the ambiguity as found in *NHD*, but we are afraid that this symbol causes difficulties because most learners are not familiar with it. It is preferable that the word be transcribed as /'ænlɪst/.

4.5. Stress

4.5.1. Both *NHD* and *RHWD* admit secondary stresses after the primary stress, as other American dictionaries do, except when the secondary stress immediately follows the primary. Only in dissyllabic words does *NHD* (but not *RHWD*) indicate a secondary stress immediately after the primary.

Compound adverbs such as **downstairs** and **underground** are double-stressed in *RHWD*, while only some of them are double-stressed in *NHD*. In addition, numerals such as **thirteen** and **fourteen** are all double-stressed in *RHWD*, while there are some careless discrepancies in assigning stress patterns to those numerals in *NHD*.⁵⁾

RHWD, as in *RHD*², provides all the compounds with stress patterns, which is helpful for learners. *NHD* gives no stress patterns to the two-word entries including hyphenated words. Indicating stress patterns of compound words, irrespective of whether they are solid, hyphenated or separate, seems to be a "must" in learner's dictionaries nowadays and it is very much hoped that all the two-word entries will be provided with indications of stress.

(A. Kobayashi)

5. Definition

Both *NHD* and *RHWD* explain little about definitions. *NHD*, for example, simply says in one place, "The definitions are composed in an easy-to-understand, limited vocabulary," (Foreword: vii) and in another, "Meanings are given in simple English that is easy to understand." (Guide to the Dictionary: xv) Although it refers to limited vocabulary for the

writing of the definitions, *NHD* does not describe it as *LDCE*³ and *OALD*⁵ do¹⁾. It does not offer any explanation for the order of definitions, that is, whether the sense order is based on frequency, or on some other principles. The sense order of *RHWD*, as is described in the Guide to the Dictionary (xii), is "Usually, the most common or frequently occurring meanings appear first among the definitions." It does not refer to limited defining vocabulary or other features of its definitions except that they are displayed in small capital letters when they serve as cross references.

We believe definitions in learners' dictionaries should differ from those of the conventional monolingual dictionaries in several ways. Strevens (1987: 77), with reference to *OALD* and *LDCE*, finds the main differences in the LD "the use of controlled and simplified language in framing definitions, in deference to the learner's reduced command of English; copious use of citations and examples to support the bare definition; the inclusion of much information about differences between British and American usage, etc."

Our main concern, therefore, is to compare and analyze the definitions of *NHD* and *RHWD* and examine them to clarify the measures adopted to serve the non-native English learners. Needless to say, they must also contain "exact definitions and paraphrases of the concepts", as Lipka (1990: 31) points out.

5.1. Sense order

First, we will compare *NHD* and *RHWD* to examine how they arrange the order of senses of the headword. We will also compare them with some British learner's dictionaries which have had long experience in this field of study, so they will serve as model dictionaries for EFL. Comparison with *OSDAE* and *LDAE*²⁾ will be interesting, because as *OSDAE* puts it (Preface: vii), they are prepared 'to serve learners of American English.' In the process, we will find out if the senses are properly ordered.

5.1.1. As mentioned above, *RHWD* says that it gives the most commonly used meanings first. Although *NHD* says nothing about the sense order, it seems to have employed a similar policy as well. To illustrate, the defini-

Table 5.1

<i>NHD</i>	<i>RHWD</i>
1 kind, friendly, pleasant:	1 pleasing; agreeable; delightful:
2 pretty, attractive:	2 kind; thoughtful:
3 proper, well-behaved:	3 requiring or showing great skill, care, or tact:
4 pleasing, enjoyable:	4 fine; subtle:
5 refined; discriminating:	

tion of **nice** is compared (illustrative examples are omitted) in Table 5.1.

Although the sense divisions of the two dictionaries are different, both seem to give what they think the most common meanings first.

Nice is known to have developed various senses through its history. The sketchy semantic flow of *nice* given in *OED*² is 'foolish' → 'fastidious' → 'particular, precise' → 'fine; subtle, delicate' → 'agreeable, delightful' → 'kind, considerate, pleasant.'

While all the senses in *NHD*, and the definitions 1, and 2 of *RHWD* are most commonly used meanings in the Present Day English,³ the definitions 3, 4, and 5 of *RHWD* are less common, older meanings of *nice*. *COBUILD*² lists the fourth sense of *RHWD*, but all the other listed meanings are similar to those of *NHD*. *NHD* seems to have limited its senses to those that are most commonly used in present day English, but excluded less frequent meanings. Words used in the definition are easy ones.

Generally, the defining vocabulary in *RHWD* is more difficult than that of *NHD*. The target users of *NHD* seem to be intermediate rather than advanced learners. *RHWD* seems to target more advanced learners than *NHD*⁴.

5.1.2. Naturally, sense order in *NHD*, and *RHWD* reflects the American usage and differs from the British one in British dictionaries. Simplified definitions of **film** (noun) in *RHWD* are compared with those of *NHD*, *LDCE*³, and *OALD*⁵ in Table 5.2⁵.

LDAE lists the third sense of *RHWD* as the first sense, and the first sense of *RHWD* comes as the second sense. Here, *LDAE*'s sense order does not seem to reflect American English⁶. In *OSDAE*, the order is the same as that of *NHD*. In *LDCE*³ and *OADE*⁵ the sense 1 is labeled as *especially BrE*. Also, *LDCE*³ gives the sense 4 *BrE* 'a metal container with

Table 5.2

<i>RHWD</i>	<i>NHD</i>	<i>LDCE</i> ³	<i>OALD</i> ⁵
1 a thin layer or coating:	1	5	3
2 a thin haze, blur, or mist:	—	—	—
3 a roll or sheet of thin plastic for taking photographs	2	3	2
4 MOTION PICTURE	3	1 (<i>BrE</i>)	1 (<i>BrE</i>)
5 a. the motion-picture industry	—	—	—
b. motion picture as a form of art or entertainment	—	2	—

film in it that you put inside a camera to take photographs.' British dictionaries label both British usage and American usage. American dictionaries, on the other hand, do not give these labels. In this respect, British dictionaries are user-friendlier. Ilson (1986: 62) recognizes a similar imbalance in the coverage of British vocabulary in American college dictionaries.

5.2. Sense division and scope of coverage

When the entry has more than one word class, dictionaries like *LDCE*³ set up an independent headword for each word. Many dictionaries list several word classes in one entry. They group word classes as subentries. This treatment is reasonable when the entry has several senses. If several word classes are mixed up in a long series of definitions separated only by numbers, users will take more time to find the meaning they are looking for. Maybe, different word classes can come together if the entry is a simple one with one or two senses. *NHD* employs this policy in entries like **ad lib** (*v.n.adj.*), **drawl** (*v.n.*), **jaundice** (*n.v.*), **neigh** (*n.v.*), **sniff** (*v.n.*), etc. The definition, however, should be improved to cover the senses of each word class of these entries. *RHWD* separates definitions of different word classes even in simple entries with only a few senses. When transitive and intransitive meanings of a verb are similar, they are often covered by one definition.

RHWD's typefaces should be changed when two or more than two word classes are defined under the entry. The same typefaces for all word classes are inconvenient because readers will not know where the new word classes begin. If each word class is emphasized with the bold face or

if it begins with the new paragraph, readers will be much helped.

5.2.1. *RHWD* covers considerably a wider scope of definitions than *NHD*. For example, it offers eight senses for **taste** (noun); *NHD* gives only three for the same word. We have already compared the headword *film* in four dictionaries, and found that *RHWD* gives more senses than the British advanced learners' dictionaries.

It seems that large parts of definitions of *RHWD* are handed down from its parent Random House Dictionaries. Sometimes, *RHWD* simplifies the definitions, and omits some senses. In *RHWD*, **baby** has four senses instead of five of *RHWD*. Further, the last sense is subdivided into two instead of five. But in the process of simplification, the subdivision became meaningless. The fourth definition of **baby** in *RHWD* is: 'Informal. a. (sometimes disparaging and offensive). a girl or woman. b. something that requires one's attention or of which one is esp. proud.' Here, there is no reason to classify the two senses into one group.⁷⁾

5.2.2. The sense division of an entry like *take* is very complex. In *RHWD*, the senses of this verb are divided into 48, then follow phrasal verbs and other expressions from 49–65. In *NHD*, definition is from 1–19, and phrasal verbs and other expressions follow from 20–57.

Naturally, some senses of *take* in *RHWD* are missing from *NHD*. Major senses missing are: the definition 17 (to carry with one), 19 (to use as a means of transportation), 30 (to make (a video, etc.) (of)), 31 (to write down), 32 (to apply oneself to; study). None of these senses could be deduced from the definition 1–19 of *NHD*. We believe these senses are very important for a learners' dictionary⁸⁾, and should be included in the definition. At least, they are more important than the definition 15 of *NHD*, '(for a man) to have sex with a woman.' On the other hand, there are some senses that are not included in advanced learners' dictionaries. The definitions 4 (to happen), 6 (to experience), 11 (to become part of), 14 (to defeat), 16 (to acknowledge), 17 (to disagree), and 18 (to control, manage) in *NHD* do not seem to correspond to senses in *RHWD*. On what bases do the lexicographers decide to include and/or omit the senses in the entry?

It is understandable that a dictionary that targets intermediate learners

has to limit the scope of definitions. However, it should cover all major senses of important verbs like *take*.

5.2.3. *Take* and several other verbs like *make*, *get*, *do*, etc. are difficult entries to define because the meaning of these verbs is almost void by itself. *Take* generates a variety of similar but distinct meanings when combined with other words. This explains why dictionary definitions are different from each other. If a dictionary tries to list every possible sense that is derived from these combinations, its definitions will be infinitely long. It will be better to abstract a few central meanings and give phrases and collocations from which learners might infer the particular meanings.

Anyway, something must be done to alleviate the burden of finding the meaning that learners want from 48 senses. Entries with multiple meanings can more easily be read if they are properly grouped. A good example for sense grouping is offered in *LDCE*^{3,9)} A dictionary that targets learners should not impose an unnecessary burden on them by giving fine sense distinctions as Dalgish (1995: 235) suggests.

5.3. Information incorporated in the definition

Although the dictionary size of *NHD* is smaller than that of *RHWD*, definition in terms of lines devoted to explain each entry is nearly the same. Both dictionaries give about three lines per one main entry. *NHD* usually provides a full sample sentence for each definition (for analyses of illustrative examples, see Section 6). It also devotes a fairly large part of its space to bold face phrasal verbs and other expressions. *RHWD* allots its space more to definitions. Definitions are sometimes followed by a full sample sentence, but more often a phrase or nothing explains them. As a result, *RHWD* has more space to make subtle divisions of senses and sub-senses whereas *NHD* makes broader divisions, and sometimes leaves out senses that it thinks unimportant or unnecessary.

Perhaps, dictionaries for native English speakers do not need various pieces of extra-linguistic information such as encyclopedic¹⁰⁾ and pragmatic explanations in the definitions, because native speakers are supposed to know this information. They do not need linguistic information for word combinations either. They know what sorts of adverbs, adjectives,

nouns, verbs, prepositions, etc. are combined to form idioms, collocations, and the typical phrases. For dictionaries that target non-native learners, however, those pieces of information, whether they are linguistic or extra-linguistic, are vitally important.

We will examine what kind of information *RHWD* and *NHD* provide, or do not provide, and what measures they adopt to help learners understand the meaning of the word.

5.3.1. Selectional restrictions are very important information for learners. Both dictionaries give such information mainly in parentheses like; **blond** (of a person) having light-colored hair¹¹⁾ (*RHWD*), and **plump** (referring esp. of woman and children) round in shape, chubby or full-figured¹²⁾ (*NHD*). *NHD* seems to give more pieces of information on selectional restrictions here than *RHWD*, although the advantage is marginal. For example, it defines **handsome**: good-looking, attractive (usu. of a man)¹³⁾. (For collocational information see 6.2.2.)

5.3.2. *RHWD* gives more detailed explanation on extralinguistic information than *NHD*. To illustrate, the definition for **door** is compared. (*NHD*): 1. a movable panel to permit entrance to or exit from a building, room, vehicle, etc. (*RHWD*): 1. a movable barrier of wood, glass, or metal for opening and closing an entrance way, cupboard, cabinet, or the like, usually turning on hinges or sliding in grooves. 'A movable panel' in *NHD*, and 'a movable barrier' in *RHWD* are both 'genus' of the door. 'To permit entrance to or exit,' and 'for opening and closing' are the 'differentia' and show the function of the door. Both definitions have nearly the same meaning, but 'for opening and closing' in *RHWD* is easier to understand and is a more common expression than 'to permit entrance to or exit from' in *NHD*. Also, readers can infer more common combinations of words: 'open/close a door,' from *RHWD*, whereas *NHD* deduces, 'enter/exit from a door.' (Of course, it does not cause serious problems because readers can find the common combinations in the illustrative examples. Still, if the target readers for *NHD* are intermediate learners, it should use expressions which are more common and easier to understand.)

Besides the two major components of the definition, *RHWD* gives information on the most common material of the door: wood, glass, or metal.

Table 5.3

	<i>NHD</i>	<i>RHWD</i>	<i>LDCE</i> ³	<i>OALD</i> ⁵
document	○	×	×	×
feedback	○	×	×	○
flame	○	×	×	×
workstation	○	○	×	×
import	○	×	○	×
lurk	○	×	×	×
folder	×	×	○	×
navigate	×	×	×	×
surf	×	×	○	×
vaccine	×	○	○	×
virus	×	○	○	○

Since expressions like 'turn on hinges,' and 'slide in grooves' are closely related to a door, they are useful for intermediate as well as advanced learners.

5.3.3. Technical terminology from various fields of science and technology has enriched English vocabulary. Incorporating technical terms is one of the main features of learners' dictionaries. One of the features listed on the back cover of *NHD* says, "business and computer terms like CEO, download, and laptop illustrate words and concepts drawn from the worlds of commerce and technology."

Many new computer-related technical terms have been invented, but perhaps many more everyday words have come to obtain computer-related senses. We will discover whether these senses are included in *NHD*, and *RHWD*. *LDCE*³ and *OALD*⁵ are examined for comparison. Results are illustrated in Table 5.3. Entries from *document* to *lurk* are chosen from the list at the Appendixes of *NHD*. Entries from *folder* to *virus* are chosen from outside the list of *NHD*.¹⁴⁾

5.3.4. Pragmatic information including labels and notes in parentheses such as 'approving, disapproving, offensive, insulting, humorous, etc.' in the definition can be very useful for non-native learners of English. Since evaluations of words vary from language to language, learners will be greatly helped by the information. Learners' dictionaries should include as many pieces of information on them as possible. A good example will be

entries like **lady**. This word is usually used as a polite/respectful way of referring to a woman. However, we feel that there are cynical or offensive senses in the adjective use of the word in combinations like *a lady clerk, a lady doctor, a lady helper, a lady mayor*, etc., and also in nouns such as *a cleaning lady, a wash lady, and ladies of the night*. Learners should be advised whether these combinations are a natural, polite way of referring to or addressing women, or whether they should refrain from using them.

The definition of **lady** is (*NHD*) 1 (polite word for) a woman, esp. of good social standing. Naturally, learners will think that from this definition, the above combinations are just as polite, unless they consult the entries like **bag lady**. *RHWD* gives better definitions for the offensive senses of **lady**. The definition 4 says: This word is used as a term of address for a woman, **a.** as a polite term; usually in the plural, **b.** as an offensive term (usually in the singular). Also, the definition 9 (adjective) gives: *Sometimes Offensive. female: a lady cabdriver*.

Slender and **slim** have approving senses as shown in *LDCE*³ and *OALD*⁵. For example, in *LDCE*³ **slender** is defined as: 2 thin or slight; light and graceful. In *OALD*, it is defined as: (*approv*) (of people or their bodies) thin esp in attractive or graceful way. **Slim** is defined with a similar approving sense: 1 someone who is slim is attractively thin (*LDCE*³); 1 (*approv*) not fat or thick (*OALD*⁵). Definitions with approving senses for those words are useful both because they indicate that they have the pragmatic information and because they help discriminate the differences of senses from words like **thin, lean, skinny**, etc.

In *NHD*, **slender** and **slim** are defined as: 1 thin, slim; and 1 thin, slender respectively. Learners cannot learn from these definitions that **thin** is 'a general word to describe people who have little or no fat on their bodies, but it often sounds a little negative.' Whereas, 'If you want to make clear that someone is thin in a pleasant way, you say they are **slim** or (less common) **slender**.'¹⁵ In *RHWD* part of this sense is given. **Slender** is defined as: 2 thin or slight; light and graceful, but **slim** is not given the approving sense. 1 slender, as in the width around one's body or form.

Generally speaking, American learners' dictionaries are not very eager to give information on word evaluations.

5.3.5. As for the inclusion of vulgar and taboo senses, learners' dictionaries on both sides of the Atlantic differ considerably in their treatment. Most taboo words are excluded from the entry in *NHD* and *RHWD*. We believe that dictionaries should include that meaning rather than omitting it when an everyday word has a taboo sense. Otherwise, learners may use that word unwittingly. *NHD* does not include obscene sense of **cock, screw, pussy, prick**, etc. *RHWD*'s definition includes a taboo sense of **pussy**, but taboo senses of other words are excluded. British learners' dictionaries such as *OALD*⁵ and *LDCE*³ incorporate all the above stated vulgar senses with labels to notify that they are vulgar/taboo.

Words with offensive senses against homosexuals are listed with labels to notify that they are offensive. This is a better treatment.

Words with other discriminatory senses should be treated in a similar way. **Cripple** is described as 'an offensive word for someone who is physically unable to use arms or their legs properly' in the first definition of *LDCE*³. In *OALD*⁵, it is labeled as (*sometimes offensive*). No word is given in *NHD* to show that this entry has an offensive sense. *RHWD* says it is '1. *Sometimes Offensive*.' *NHD* should include warning in the definition or in the parenthesis against using the word carelessly.

5.4. Improvements to be made

We have already mentioned some shortcomings in the definitions in *NHD* and *RHWD*. We also have suggested improvements.

From now on, we will focus on some other types of problematic definitions in *NHD* and *RHWD* that should be improved.

5.4.1. Definitions of *NHD* are sometimes bizarre and sometimes out of lexicographical tradition. For example, **ear** is defined as '1 one of the two organs for hearing and balance, located on either side of the head.' The definition itself may not be wrong. However, the usual definition of **ear** is 'the organ of hearing.' Even if it functions as the organ for balance, this function is ignored in most dictionaries. Various body organs have two or more than two functions. *Nose* can be an organ for articulation as well as for respiration and olfaction, but only the latter senses are given in dictionaries, including *NHD* and *RHWD*. *Mouth* is more closely related to

articulation, but no definition is given for this sense in *NHD*, although it gives speech-related senses in bold face phrases, which will be mentioned soon. We think *mouth* should be defined with a speech-related sense because in our understanding, the mouth is more closely related to speech than the ear is to the balance. This can be exemplified by the bold face phrases in *NHD* such as **by word of mouth, to have a big mouth, to open one's big mouth**, etc. that are all related to speech. No phrases can be found that show that 'ear' is related to the balance. Rather, they are all related to hearing: **to be all ears, to go in one ear and out of the other, to have a good or tin ear**, etc. *RHWD* gives speech-related senses in the definitions of **mouth**: 3. the opening in the face thought of as the source of speaking, and 4. talk, esp. loud, empty, or boastful talk, or disrespectful talk or language.

The first definition of **fat** (noun) in *NHD* is 'the layer of flesh under the skin.' This is a very strange definition because it lacks the most important attribute (differentia) of fat, i.e. 'greasiness.' Or, the genus itself may be changed to 'GREASY substance' just like one given in *OALD*⁵: 1 (a) a white or yellow greasy substance in the bodies of animals and humans, under the skin. *RHWD* gives this sense as the second definition 'animal tissue containing much of this substance.' The first sense is 'an oily substance found in certain animal tissue and plant seeds, and used in cooking . . .'¹⁶

5.4.2. Sometimes, *NHD* does not give a definition at all. The seventh definition of **make** is: to make, (syn.) to enact. Kuhn (1980: 115–121) would say that this is another case of 'a definition that does not define.' **Blue** is defined just as '1 having the color of,' but it does not say what color it is. Also, **yellow** is defined as 'a primary color, such as the yellow of a lemon.' This is against one of the basic principles of the definition: 'the definition must not contain the word to be defined unless it is defined in some other place.' Lexicographers of *NHD* should be more careful to observe the principles of defining proposed by Zgusta¹⁷ and Landau (1984: 124–132).

5.4.3. Definitions of function words are often difficult because they have little lexical content. In many cases, it will be better to explain how a particular function word is used rather than to give semantic explanations.

NHD is unsatisfactory because in many cases definitions of function words are too dependent on meanings, and the amount of information is often far too small. For example, *NHD* gives only 24 lines for the description of **that** including the pronunciation, the definitions, examples, bold face phrases, and the usage note. Three word classes are recognized; the pronoun, the adverb, and the conjunction. For the pronoun, it gives only one definition, and five bold face phrases. The definition goes 1 'referring to s.t. specific (but not nearby).'¹⁸ The adverb has a short definition: 'so; as much as,' and the conjunction is not defined, but an example is given followed by the usage note that explains the difference of **that** and **which** used as a relative pronoun.

RHWD gives far better descriptions. It gives a total of 61 lines, including four word classes. They are the pronoun, the adjective, the adverb, and the conjunction. Each word class has more detailed descriptions. For example, the pronoun contains five definitions, all of which begin with parentheses that explain how the word is used. Other word classes are provided with similar explanations.

Even *RHWD* may be not enough. *LDCE*³ gives a total of 140 lines, including four word classes, each of which is given independent headword status.¹⁹ The figure also includes the usage note on spoken-written differences, grammar, and the punctuation. Anyway, *NHD* should devote more space to the description of the function words. (H. Masuda)

6. Examples

Together with definitions, examples constitute the central part of learners' dictionaries. Currently, the EFL dictionary is so geared as to transcend receptive use associated with the traditional alphabetical dictionary and to be useful for (some) productive purposes. This fact makes the role of examples all the more important and demanding. One of the key characteristics of the latest generation of EFL dictionaries, published in the U.K. in 1995, is use of large corpora, which is clearly reflected in the shape of examples provided. How about examples in *NHD* and *RHWD*, which have just come onto the market to join the ranks of the British-made EFL dictionaries with some 50-year tradition behind them?

This section tries to examine examples of *NHD* and *RHWD* comparatively in number, length, presentation of grammar and collocation, and special devices, and also with those in the foregoing EFL dictionaries, where necessary.

6.1. Number and Length

Generally, *NHD* uses space generously for examples, while *RHWD* does so economically. *NHD* seems to make it a rule to provide at least one full-sentence example (often of more than one clause) for each entry or sense, but *RHWD* provides as few or as little as is minimally necessary. Many cases are observed in which the former presents one sentential example or more whereas the latter gives just a phrasal example or nothing:

extemporaneous . . . *adj.* not written down, unrehearsed: *The politician made some extemporaneous remarks before his formal speech.* (*NHD*)

adj. spoken or performed without preparation; impromptu: *an extemporaneous speech.* (*RHWD*)

pawnbroker . . . *n.* a person who makes loans with interest against the value of personal values: *The pawnbroker offered me 50 dollars for my watch.* (*NHD*)

n. [*count*] one whose business is lending money at interest on personal property deposited with the lender until claimed later. [no examples] (*RHWD*)

However, this is not the case where exemplification of grammar is involved (see 6.2.1.).

NHD's sentential-example principle makes its examples easy to understand in that they are self-contained with contextualization and explanatory with exemplification and without difficult vocabulary items. With all these characteristics associated with the invented example, there should be no problem in establishing that *NHD* uses that kind of example:

wily . . . *adj.* . . . *He is a wily old man who likes to take advantage of people.*

run . . . *v.* . . . **5** . . . *I have to run now; I'm late for a meeting.*

6 . . . *She runs errands, like taking her daughter to dance class on Saturday morning.*

31 . . . **to set up** . . . **b.** . . . *The police had an undercover agent invite the criminal to a hotel for a phony buy; they set him up.*
outsourcing¹⁾ . . . *n.* . . . *We have a policy of outsourcing; for example, we once had our accounting department do our payroll, but now an outside specialist does it.*

Many classic examples of the invented example are included, which seem to be specially made for the dictionary entry. Examples of *NHD* are likely to have been so prepared as to make for maximally smooth understanding of the meanings of items in question by the user, almost at the expense of other functions examples are supposed to fulfill (see 3. and 3.1.). Pushing this aspect rather too far, examples of *NHD*, including excessive contextualization, are self-contained but inevitably lengthy. As a result they suffer some of the criticisms addressed not only to the invented example but also to the citation (unnaturalness, lengthiness, obscurity of points at issue, etc.; cf. Hausmann and Gorbahn 1989: 45). The last two can obscure or take away from the examples of *NHD* the important property of signaling referential clues to the user.

In contrast, *RHWD* adopts an economical or rather stingy approach in its provision of examples:

24. look up . . . **b.** . . . [*~ + obj + up*]: *looking words up in the dictionary.*

c. . . . [*~ + obj + up*]: *to look him up next time.*

wicked . . . **5.** . . . *has a wicked tennis serve.*

miss¹ . . . *v.* **1.** *to fail to hit: [*~ + obj*]; missed the first pitch.*

mirror . . . *n.* . . . **1.** . . . *looked in the mirror to comb her hair.*

cow¹ . . . **1.** . . . *The cows were kept for their milk.*

sheep . . . **1.** . . . *Sheep are grown for their wool and meat.*

12 crack up . . . **c.** . . . [*no obj*]: *He cracked up at the sight of her in those old frumpy pajamas.*

There are some phrase examples initiated by a verb in *-ing* rather than the conventional infinitive with or without *to*, which, without having much obvious significance in itself, may slightly puzzle the user. Some "quasi-sentential" examples are found, from which allegedly meaningless subjects have been omitted. Top priority seemingly on the economy of space, they can result in awkward, or worse, unhelpful and uninformative examples

which are deprived of information on selectional restriction, context, and even extra-linguistics²). In *RHWD* the majority of examples do not take a complete sentence form and the sentential examples consist predominantly of one clause. Consequently, examples portraying useful contexts for learning purposes toward successful future production of items concerned (like their rival's at **run 5** above) are hard to come by. Despite a few demanding vocabulary items (e.g. 'frumpy' in that at **crack up**) cropping up, a general survey leads to the conclusion that *RHWD* basically employs invented examples too.

6.2. Information on Grammar and Collocation³

Presentation of grammatical and collocational information is one of the major responsibilities due to examples (Drysdale 1987, etc.). Although grammatical codes and definitions also come into play here, it is examples that can most clearly and powerfully exhibit into what constructions an item can enter and with what other words it is likely to keep company. Accordingly the rest of this section examines examples of the two dictionaries and also other comparable dictionaries⁴.

6.2.1. Even a limited investigation should suffice to show that *RHWD*'s examples give better coverage of grammar than *NHD*'s and that the former does nearly as well as other leading EFL dictionaries like *LDCE*² and *OALD*⁴. A few of the examples follow. *RHWD* indicates the exclusively attributive or predicative use of adjectives explicitly by means of examples plus codes, while *NHD* does so implicitly only by examples⁵:

awake . . . *adj.* . . . *The baby is awake now and wants to eat.* (*NHD*)
adj. [*be + ~*] **4.** . . . *I was awake all night.* (*RHWD*)

Generally, *RHWD* lists more grammatical patterns with the same meaning than its rival. As far as the example below is concerned, with clever use of parentheses *RHWD* does even better than *OALD*⁴:

provide . . . *v.* **1.** . . . *Parents provide their children with food, clothes, and shelter.* (*NHD*, emphasis added)
v. . . . **1.** . . . [*~ + obj + for + obj*]: *to provide benefits for employees.* [*~ + obj (+ with) + obj*]: *to provide employees (with) benefits.* (*RHWD*,

emphasis added)

v **1** [*Tn, Tn·pr, Dn·pr*] ~ **sb (with sth)**; ~ **sth (for sb)** . . . *The firm have provided me with a car.* ○ *Can you provide accommodation for thirty people?* . . . (*OALD*⁴, emphasis added)

RHWD exhibits more of various constructions into which an item can enter than *NHD*. In the following sense of **occur**, *RHWD* is on a par with *LDCE*²:

occur *v.* **3** *phrasal v. insep. to occur to s.o.* . . . *It suddenly occurred to me that I knew how to solve that problem!* (*NHD*, emphasis added)
v. [*no obj*] . . . **3.** [*not: be + ~ -ing; usually: ~ + to + obj*] . . . *An idea just occurred to me.* [*~ + to + obj + that clause*]: *The thought occurred to me that we should save money.* [*It + ~ + to + obj + (that) clause*]: *It never occurred to me (that) we would not have enough money.* . . . (*RHWD*, emphasis added)

occur to sbdy. *phr v* [*T no pass.*] (of an idea) to come to (someone's mind): *Didn't it occur to you that he might be late?* | *The possibility that she might be wrong never even occurred to her.* | *It suddenly occurred to me that we could use a computer to do the job.* (*LDCE*², emphasis added)

Both *NHD* and *RHWD* show separability of phrasal verbs equally well through examples and other means:

12 *phrasal v. sep. to pay s.o. or s.t. off:* . . . **b.** . . . *I finally paid off the 30-year mortgage on my house. || I paid it off.* (*NHD*)
9. *pay off* . . . **b.** . . . [*~ + off + obj*]: *He paid off the debt.* [*~ + obj + off*]: *He paid the debt off.* (*RHWD*)

6.2.2. The tables are turned when it comes to provision of information on lexical collocation. *NHD* outperforms *RHWD* by a fairly considerable margin:

bring . . . *v.* . . . **3** to cause to happen, (syn.) initiate: *He brought the conversation to a close (the water to a boil, grief to his parents).* (*NHD*)
3. to cause to occur or exist; produce: [*~ + obj*]: *The medicine brought rapid relief.* [*~ + obj + obj*]: *All his money couldn't bring him happiness.*
4. [*~ + obj + to + obj*] . . . to cause to come into a particular position, state or condition: *The jokes and funny scenes brought laughter to the*

audience. (RHWD)

deprive. . . . 1 . . . *The military dictatorship deprived people of their freedom (rights, peace of mind, etc.).* (NHD)
 . . . *to deprive a child of affection.* (RHWD)

NHD supplies additional possible collocations in parentheses. A comparative look at **bring** above, where RHWD applies finer sense discrimination than NHD, confirms the observation in 6.2.1. and illustrates the point being made in this section⁶). In the case of **control** (n.), where RHWD just has "have control over," "be under control," and "at the controls," NHD offers in addition "be in control of," "go/get/be out of control," and "take control of" through their examples⁷). It is true that NHD contains a wealth of lexical collocations but some do not look as useful as the others:

Kleenex . . . *Please use Kleenex to wipe their eyes (nose, glasses, etc.).*
unbelievable . . . *That story (explanation, statement, etc.) is unbelievable.*

6.3. Special Devices

As was touched upon above, NHD and RHWD employ brackets in some of the examples for indication of further collocational possibilities (6.2.2.) and optional items (6.2.1.) respectively. NHD also uses brackets for the latter purpose:

prejudiced . . . *The defendant's mother was not allowed to be a witness because the judge thought she would be prejudiced (in her son's favor).*

RHWD encloses glosses in brackets following examples which can be difficult to understand or confusing, as in some other EFL dictionaries:

catch . . . 5. . . *He was caught with his guard down (= He was not prepared).*
err . . . 2. **err on the side of** . . . *It is better to err on the side of punctuality (= It is better to be early than late).*

There are some other devices in use. NHD uses "(or)" to introduce an alternative in examples:

postscript . . . *She added a postscript (or) a P.S. at the bottom of her letter.*

Characteristically, the dictionary sometimes takes care of two different

parts of speech of a headword item in a single entry, without setting up separate sub-entries. In cases like this the indication of part(s) of speech is attached to the item(s) appearing in the example(s):

optimum . . . *n.adj.* . . . *the best outcome (use, condition, etc.) possible:*
The <n.> optimum that we can expect is a 7 percent return on money invested. || That is the <adj.> optimum rate possible at this time.

In RHWD, as has been seen so far, some examples are preceded by grammar codes in square brackets. Identification of (un)countability of nouns, in senses where both are possible, is affixed to the examples by the same means:

equity . . . *n.* . . . 2. . . [*noncount*]: *The landlord has more than \$35,000 equity in that building.* [*count*]: *Since they paid off their mortgage, they now have an equity equal to the value of the house.*

(S. Yamada)

7. Grammar and Usage

7.1. Grammar

7.1.1. Grammatical information provided by RHWD and NHD will be discussed in this section. As S.I. Laudau (1984: 88) says, it is necessary for any ESL dictionary to contain sufficient grammatical help, because it greatly benefits foreign learners who try to use English. In order for them to take full advantage of it, it should also be accurate and clear. It can, therefore, be said that both the quantity and the quality of the grammatical information are among the essential factors in determining the value of an ESL dictionary.

Some aspects of grammar, i.e. inflections and derivations of nouns, adjectives and verbs, in RHWD and NHD have already been dealt with in section 3. It has also been pointed out there that we can find unsystematicity of, and deficiencies in, the presentation of inflected and derived forms. We will deal in detail with other types of grammatical information on nouns, adjectives, and verbs.

7.1.2. First, we will examine the treatment by RHWD and NHD of the countability and uncountability of nouns. Both dictionaries, like others of

the same kind, tell the readers whether a noun or a sense of a noun is countable, uncountable, or both. *RHWD* uses the grammar code [*count*] when it is countable, and [*noncount*] when uncountable. If it is both countable and uncountable, the code [*count*] is put immediately before the countable example phrase or sentence, and [*noncount*] appears just before the uncountable one.¹⁾ *NHD*, on the other hand, basically applies [U] to an uncountable noun or sense of a noun, and a countable one is left unmarked, i.e. the countability is indicated by the absence of a grammar code.²⁾ But if a noun or a sense of one is both countable and uncountable, then the code [C; U] is attached to it. And when the sense of a noun with more than one is countable and another is uncountable, the codes [C] and [U] are applied to their respective senses. Both *RHWD* and *NHD* provide the grammar codes to run-on derivative nouns as well as main entries. Moreover, they, like other ESL dictionaries, also give the readers information on whether a particular noun is what Quirk et al. (1985: 297–304) call a singular or a plural invariable one, whether a particular noun is used only with a singular or a plural verb, whether a particular noun is always or usually preceded by the definite article, etc.

As for the presentation of these types of information, *RHWD* is highly systematic in its own way, whereas *NHD* is not. The latter dictionary, for example, fails to apply the grammar code [U] to many uncountable nouns like **backgammon**, **baseball**, **bronchitis**, **meat**, **midnight**, **teamwork** and **terrorism**, to mention only a few.³⁾ This may cause a serious problem for the dictionary users, because they are supposed to take a noun without the grammar code [U] as a countable noun. The unsystematicity of *NHD* is also detected in the presentation of grammatical information on singular invariable nouns. If we take nouns denoting sciences as an example, we can find at least four different patterns: **economics** *n.* [U] *used with a sing. v.*, **macroeconomics** *n.* [U], **mathematics** *n.* [U] *pl. used with a sing. v.*, **physics** *n. pl. used with a sing. v.* Although *NHD* has some other types of similar inconsistency, we do not think it necessary to enumerate them.

We have two more points to mention as to the treatment of nouns by *RHWD* and *NHD*; one is that of collective nouns, and the other is that of grammatical collocation or complementation of nouns. In British English a

collective noun used in the singular is followed either by a singular or a plural verb, while in American English a singular verb is the usual one that follows it. This fact is not incorporated in either *RHWD* or *NHD*, although the former carries a usage note to that effect under the main entry **collective noun**. Both dictionaries indicate collective nouns like **audience**, **family**, **team**, etc. as ordinary countable nouns. This cannot be said to be a problem in itself because both claim to be the dictionary of "American English," yet many earnest foreign learners certainly hope to discover linguistic fact, which *LDCE*³ shows with pertinent grammar codes with regard to frequently used, important collective nouns.

The other point on which to make a comment is about grammatical collocation or complementation of nouns. Many nouns are typically followed by a particular preposition, a *to*-infinitive, a *that*-clause, etc. This kind of information is abundantly provided by *OALD*⁵ and *LDCE*³ with the relevant grammar codes, which we can see by looking up **claim**, **doubt**, **familiarity**, **relationship**, etc. *RHWD* gives it only rarely; *NHD*, not at all. It seems to be true that there is no problem if it is contained in example phrases or sentences, and it can indeed be said that both dictionaries have much information of this kind incorporated in them. But the problem is that in this case foreign learners cannot judge whether or not the combination found in an example is a frequent and typical one. If this kind of information is given by using a grammar code, it helps them greatly because it is very important to them when they try to use English.

7.1.3. We will proceed to the discussion of grammatical information on adjectives, but it will be focused only on *RHWD*, because *NHD* provides nothing except for irregular, confusing and many, if not all, regular comparative and superlative forms.

RHWD tells the users, as other major ESL dictionaries do, whether an adjective is exclusively used attributively, predicatively, or postpositively. It applies to run-on derivative adjectives as well as main entries. The grammar codes used are [*before a noun*], [*be + ~*], and [*after a noun*], respectively. This information is very useful for foreign learners, but the code [*be + ~*] could be misleading, because the adjectives used only predicatively can function as an object complement as well as a subject

complement. Moreover, a subject complement can follow not only a form of the verb *be* but also other kind of link verbs like *appear*, *grow*, *remain*, etc. *LDCE*³ uses the code [not before noun]; *CIDE*, [after v]. Therefore, we would propose that *RHWD* adopt [after a verb] as the grammar code for those adjectives which are restricted to predicative position.

Next, grammatical information on the comparison of adjectives will be examined. One of the important classifications of adjectives is into gradable and nongradable ones, the former having comparison as one of their syntactic characteristics. Many adjectives form their comparison by inflection, many others take periphrastic forms, and a small group of adjectives can take both inflectional and periphrastic forms. These facts are reflected in ESL dictionaries in varying degrees. *RHWD* only shows the comparative and superlative forms of the adjectives whose comparison is realized by inflection. It is true of run-on derivative adjectives as well as main entries. The problem here is that this information, because gradable adjectives which can be compared and nongradable ones which cannot are not distinguished by *RHWD*, might mislead the dictionary users into believing that all the adjectives without inflectional forms can take periphrastic forms. What *RHWD* can do to let the users avoid this misunderstanding is to make a clear distinction, as some ESL dictionaries do, between gradable and nongradable adjectives. If this distinction is made, they can feel confident that the adjectives with no inflectional forms given and the code indicating gradability applied can take periphrastic forms. For instance, *COBUILD*² uses the grammar code "ADJ-GRADED" for the gradable adjectives with nongradable ones unmarked; *CIDE*, [not gradable] for nongradable adjectives with gradable ones unmarked. The users will benefit greatly if *RHWD* follows suit and distinguishes the two types of adjectives by adopting some relevant grammar code. Moreover, they will find it highly useful if the adjectives taking both inflectional and periphrastic forms are marked as such. So far, this has not been done by any dictionary as far as the present author knows.

Before proceeding to the grammatical information on verbs, we will make a brief comment on complementation of adjectives. They are frequently followed by a prepositional phrase, a *that*-clause, a *to*-infinitive,

etc. With some adjectives, the complementation is obligatory. Information of this kind is highly important to ESL learners. *RHWD* shows it with the grammar codes like [*be* + ~ + *about*], [~ + (*that*)*clause*], and [~ + *to* + *verb*]. The amount of this kind of information provided by *RHWD* seems to be rather small as compared with that in *LDCE*³ and *OALD*⁵. For example, these two dictionaries indicate the complementation patterns of **absent**, **adequate**, **agreeable**, **alive**, **ambitious**, etc., to which *RHWD* does not attach any codes. This fact applies to many other adjectives, too.

7.1.4. Our next topic is grammatical information on verbs. First, let us see how it is treated by *NHD*. Unlike other ESL dictionaries, and general monolingual dictionaries for that matter, it does not distinguish transitive and intransitive verbs.⁴⁾ They are simply labeled "v." without any further grammatical information except for irregular and confusing conjugations. Since foreign-born learners need detailed information on grammar, especially on verbs, and, as S.I. Landau (1984: 30) remarks, they "have some familiarity with the pedagogical tools of foreign-language instruction," ordinary ESL dictionaries do not only make a distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs, but they also indicate various syntactic patterns of verbs. If *NHD* is to be of full service to the readers as an ESL dictionary, the conditions must be satisfied that at least one transitive or intransitive example phrase or sentence be given according to whether the verb takes an object or not; that if it has both transitive and intransitive uses, at least two examples, one transitive and the other intransitive, be provided; and that if it has two or more syntactic patterns, the same number of examples illustrating them be given. Unfortunately, we have to say that *NHD* leaves much to be desired. To give just one instance, although **drink 1** and **teach 1** can be used intransitively as well as transitively, each of them has only one example sentence that indicates the transitive use. This kind of insufficiency applies to many other verbs. In the cases like this, the learners have no way of knowing that these two verbs have the two types of use, and may mistakenly be led to believe that they are transitive verbs.

RHWD, on the other hand, distinguishes transitive and intransitive verbs. Transitivity and intransitivity are basically indicated with the grammar codes [~ + *obj*] and [*no obj*], respectively, the swung dash standing for

the verb concerned. Not only does this apply to main entries but it is also true of run-on derivative verbs. If an intransitive verb is followed by an important element like a prepositional phrase, an adverb, a *to*-infinitive, etc., it is marked with the relevant code like [\sim + *for* + *obj*], [\sim + *around*], [\sim + *to* + *verb*], etc. A transitive verb which takes a complex structural pattern is provided with the pertinent code like [\sim + *obj* + *into* + *obj*], [\sim + *obj* + *obj*], [\sim + *that clause*], [\sim + *obj* + *to* + *verb*], [\sim + *obj* + *verb-ing*], etc. When a verb or a sense of a verb has two or more syntactic patterns, the codes are placed immediately before their respective example phrases or sentences. These types of grammatical information are so valuable for ESL learners that they must not be opaque or ambiguous. The present author believes that, in terms of the intelligibility of grammar codes, *RHWD* ranks highest in that all the items used for them are spelled out except for "*obj*" representing "object." But this is a double-edged sword as a dictionary must always struggle with lack of space in order to provide as much information as possible.

There are two serious problems with *RHWD*'s presentation of the grammar codes for verbs.⁵⁾ The first is that the code [\sim + *to* + *verb*] is ambiguous because it is applied to both transitive and intransitive verbs. For instance, we can find "[\sim + *to* + *verb*]: *They stopped to say hello.*" in **stop 3** and "[\sim + *to* + *verb*]: *She likes to play baseball.*" in **like² 1**. The same is true of the code [\sim + *verb-ing*], which you can confirm by looking up **come 1** and **hate 2**, for example.⁶⁾ Since *RHWD* makes a clear distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs elsewhere, these two codes provide the fly in the ointment unless it disambiguates them by adopting the codes like [I: \sim + *to* + *verb*] vs. [T: \sim + *to* + *verb*] and [I: \sim + *verb-ing*] vs. [T: \sim + *verb-ing*].⁷⁾ The second problem is that the treatment of the object complement is both wrong, or at least vague, and unsystematic. It is wrong in that the object complement, if it is a noun, is represented as the object in many cases. For instance, we can find "[\sim + *obj* + *obj*]: *They named their baby Frederick.*" in **name 4**. Thus, the code [\sim + *obj* + *obj*] becomes ambiguous because it also refers to a completely different syntactic pattern exemplified by a sentence like *She handed me the note*, which can correctly be provided with the code [\sim + *obj* + *obj*]. The problem is further that the

object complement is expressed by another code "*noun*," which means that the presentation of the sentence pattern <S + V + O + C> is unsystematic because it is indicated by the two different grammar codes [\sim + *obj* + *obj*] and [\sim + *obj* + *noun*]. If we look up **call 8** and **9**, for instance, we can find "[\sim + *obj* + *obj*]: *My friends call me Ray.*" and "[\sim + *obj* + *noun*]: *She called me a liar.*", respectively. *RHWD* uses the code "*adjective*" when the object complement or the subject one is an adjective, and "*noun*" when the subject complement is a noun.⁸⁾ Moreover, *CIDE*, for example, adopts the code [T + *obj* + *n*] for a sentence like *They've called the twins Katherine and Thomas*. It follows from these facts that it is considered to be better for *RHWD* to universally apply the grammar code "*noun*" to the object complement if it is a noun. This method will eliminate both the ambiguity and the unsystematicity in this respect, with the code [\sim + *obj* + *obj*] being solely attached to ditransitive verbs.

RHWD, like others of its kind, gives the readers useful information on the voice and the aspect of verbs. It tells them whether a verb is usually used in the passive or active voice, and whether it is usually used in the progressive aspect or not used that way. A grammar code like [*usually*: *be* + \sim -*ed*] is attached to a passive verb; the code [*not*: *be* + \sim -*ing*], to one which does not take the progressive form. These two codes are provided fairly abundantly, whereas only rarely are the other two given, i.e. [*no passive*] and [*usually*: *be* + \sim -*ing*] referring respectively to a verb which is not used in the passive voice and one which is usually used in the progressive aspect. The code [*no passive*] seems to stand out in a peculiar way from the other three, and so it should be [*not*: *be* + \sim -*ed*] in order to be in harmony.

The treatment of phrasal verbs by *RHWD* and *NHD* remains to be discussed. Both dictionaries enter prepositional and phrasal-prepositional verbs as phrasal verbs. *RHWD* applies the grammar code [*no obj*] to intransitive phrasal verbs like **run along**, codes like [\sim + *after* + *obj*] and [\sim + *up* + *to* + *obj*] to intransitive and phrasal-prepositional verbs like **look after** and **look up to**, respectively, and in the case of transitive phrasal verbs like **call off**, in most of which the adverb particle can follow as well as precede the object noun phrase, codes like [\sim + *off* + *obj*] and [\sim

+ *obj* + *off*] are placed immediately before their respective illustrative examples.⁹ *NHD*, on the other hand, presents them as “*phrasal v. to run along*,” “*phrasal v. incep. to look after s.o. or s.t.*,” “*phrasal v. insep. to look up to s.o.*,” and “*phrasal v. sep. to call s.t. off*,” respectively.

The problem with *NHD*'s presentation of phrasal verbs is, as is often seen elsewhere, that it is inconsistent. To cite just one example, when a phrasal verb has intransitive as well as transitive separable uses, *NHD* employs at least three different ways to show them: “*phrasal v. sep. to take (s.t.) off*,” “*phrasal v. sep. to blow s.t. up*,” and “*phrasal v. to drop off/ phrasal v. sep. to drop s.o. or s.t. off* (entered separately).” Only the last seems to be satisfactory with the other two being self-contradictory because the separability and the intransitivity do not match up. However, *NHD* has merit here. By using the abbreviations “*s.o.*” and “*s.t.*,”¹⁰ it can help the readers to recognize with ease what kind of object the phrasal verb takes. The users of *RHWD*, on the other hand, cannot realize it readily, because it adopts “*obj*” which does not specify the nature of the object. Moreover, *NHD* can save plenty of space by employing the grammar code “*phrasal v. sep.*,” in which case it does not necessarily have to give two illustrative examples to each separable phrasal verb in order to indicate the separability, while *RHWD* just has to do it, which takes up much space. Another problem with the latter dictionary is that many separable transitive phrasal verbs like **bring about**, **mop up**, **show off**, etc. are presented as if they were inseparable with only the code of the type [*~* + *about* + *obj*] and a corresponding example being given. In these cases, the readers might well be misled to the false conclusion that the particle used is not an adverb which is usually accented, but a preposition which is not. We would propose, therefore, that *RHWD* specify, as *LDAE*¹ does, the part of speech of the particle in the code instead of repeating the particle itself. This method will bring great benefit to the dictionary as well as its users in that the latter can get useful guidance on the stress pattern, and the former can save space because, in many cases, one example suffices even for separable phrasal verbs, the users being able to understand by the word-class code “*adv.*” or “*adverb*” that they are usually separable.

7.1.5. The last item we have to examine concerning grammatical infor-

mation is that on idioms. It is true that both *NHD* and *RHWD* enter a good many of them, which the foreign learners certainly find very useful, yet there is room for improvement in both of them. *NHD* is inconsistent in the treatment of the object in idioms containing a transitive verb or a preposition. Sometimes it is indicated with the abbreviations “*s.o.*” and/or “*s.t.*”; at other times it is not. Thus, we can find **to give s.o. *heat**, **to get to the *bottom of s.t.**, etc. on the one hand, and **to bring to *life**, **to turn one's *back on**, etc. on the other.¹¹ Unless the object is marked with one or the other, or both, of the abbreviations, not only does the inconsistency assert itself but the learners are often left confused as well. This applies particularly in the case of a prepositional object. If it is not clearly indicated, they may come under the false impression that the “*on*” in the last idiom cited, for example, is an adverb, and so does not take an object, because it often happens that they actually come across idioms like **to get a *move on**, **to *work things through**, etc. in which “*on*,” “*through*,” etc. are adverbs.

RHWD has a similar problem: the treatment of the object in idioms with a transitive verb in them is unsystematic, so that at least four different ways of presenting it appear in the dictionary: “**beat someone to the *draw**,” “**take or bring (someone) to *task**,” “**know by *sight**, [*know* + *obj* + *by* + *~*],” and “**take (something) in *stride**, [*take* + *obj* + *in* + *~*].” The first pattern seems to be simple and the best. As for the second and the fourth, the parentheses may be taken to mean the possibility of the word within them being omitted. The code “*obj*” in the third pattern is vague in that it does not specify the nature of the object, i.e. whether it refers to the animate or the inanimate. In the grammar code of the fourth, as well as the third, there is a redundant repetition of the words making up the idioms. Another type of unsystematicity is to be observed in the presence or absence of the code [*no obj*] before a certain group of idioms. It is applied, for instance, to those like **touch *base**, **go to *bed**, **make *money**, etc., while **play *ball**, **go to *town**, ***take place**, etc. lack it. Still another type of inconsistency can be detected in the use of the swung dash. Although it is basically employed to represent the whole idiom, as the “Guide to the Dictionary” says, exceptions abound in which

it refers to the main entry under which an idiom is entered. Thus, we can often find a code like [*put + obj + to + ~*] to be preceded by idioms like **put (someone or something) to *shame**, which is the exception to the rule that makes the code [*~ + obj*] follow many idioms like ***turn one's back on**. The problems mentioned here can be settled by inserting "**someone**" and/or "**something**" in idioms themselves to represent the object of a transitive verb or a preposition, instead of applying inconsistent grammar codes, which contributes also to the specification of the nature of the object.

7.2. Usage

7.2.1. The information on usage contained in *RHWD* and *NHD* will now be examined. We will deal first with usage labels, and then with usage notes. According to Pyles and Algeo (1970: 128–129), let us suppose that usage labels are classified into the following five categories: status or level (e.g. nonstandard, substandard), style (e.g. formal, informal, slang), currency (e.g. rare, archaic, obsolete), locality (e.g. American, British), field (e.g. psychology, chemistry, linguistics). *RHWD* carries labels of all the five kinds; *NHD*, all but those of status. Moreover, the former dictionary adopts a unique label "*Baby Talk*" indicating the use by small children and their parents, etc.; the latter, "*lit.* (i.e. literally)" as supposedly against "*fig.* (i.e. figurative)." The way *RHWD* applies a certain kind of label to certain relevant items is almost identical with that of *RHWCD*. As a whole, *RHWD* is less generous in applying usage labels than *NHD*, which sometimes gives them to run-on derivatives as well.¹²⁾ The problem that the two dictionaries have is that they do not give the definition of the labels in the front-matter pages, without which ESL learners may find some of them useless, or at least too vague to get the benefit intended. Only important points will be discussed hereafter.

With regard to status, *RHWD* provides the label "*Nonstandard*" to a few words and senses like **ain't**, **lay¹ 19**, **learn 5**, etc., whereas *NHD* carries no such labels, which means that it enters almost no nonstandard items. Both of these policies can be justified because whether to give the information on status or not depends upon each dictionary's compiling principles. If emphasis is laid on the necessity of knowledge on the part of

ESL learners that they should avoid employing certain words and senses which native speakers of English often use, then *RHWD*'s policy is to be justified; that of *NHD*, by the emphasis upon the importance of allotting more space to other kinds of information essential for ESL dictionaries.

As for the style labels, *RHWD* carries "*Slang*," "*Informal*," "*Offensive*," "*Disparaging*," "*Vulgar*," and "*Literary*," the first two being applied far more often than the others; *NHD*, "*slang*," "*infrml.* (i.e. informal)," "*frml.* (i.e. formal)," "*pej.* (i.e. pejorative)," "*vulg.* (i.e. vulgar)," "*litr.* (i.e. literary)," the first three greatly outnumbering the others in the frequency of application. Two points are to be noticed readily concerning the way these labels are provided. One is that *NHD* attaches the label "*infrml.*" to many words and senses which are given the label "*Slang*" or which are left unmarked by *RHWD*. The other point is that *NHD*, like others of its kind, adopts the label indicating formality, while *RHWD* does not. If we accept the idea that formal language does not occur in the United States except on very rare occasions, as S.I. Landau (1984: 207) observes, then *RHWD*'s policy of rejecting the label "*Formal*" is not without reason. However, this practice seems to be more like that of a general monolingual dictionary, and *NHD*'s policy will certainly be the one more suitable for an ESL dictionary. If *RHWD* indicates formal words and senses as such, the users can refrain from employing them in an informal situation.

The currency label adopted by *NHD* is "*old usage*" alone, whereas *RHWD* provides "*Older Use*" and "*Archaic*," the difference between them being unclear as it gives no explanation in the front-matter pages, but according to *RHWCD*, the former means a word or a sense "commonly used in the early part of the 20th century; now heard primarily among older members of the population," and the latter indicates one which was "current roughly up to 1900, but now employed only as a conscious archaism." The locality label used by *NHD* is "*Brit.*" alone; *RHWD* adopts "*Brit.*," "*Australian*," "*South Africa*," etc., the first label having by far the highest frequency of use. Both dictionaries leave American usage unmarked except that *RHWD* has labels showing such regional dialects within the United States as "*Western U.S.*," but the readers may expect them to apply, as other ESL dictionaries such as *LDCE*³ and *OALD*⁵ do,

a label like "Am." or "U.S." to words, senses and expressions that belong only to American English. *NHD*'s unique label "lit." does not seem to make sense, or is at least a white elephant. A sense of a word or expression is either literal or figurative, and the dictionary marks the latter with the label "fig.," so that all the senses without it are literal by definition. The label "lit." is, therefore, meaningless, and not only that but takes up some space as well. Furthermore, it is applied inconsistently and only partially.

7.2.2. Usage notes contained in *NHD* and *RHWD* will be discussed here. The number of those appearing in the former is much larger than that in the latter. Those which are provided in the latter dictionary deal mainly with grammatical information on words whose usages require special attention, and sometimes with semantic differences between related or seemingly synonymous words. Many notes given by *RHWD* are also to be found in *RHWCD*, and the contents of those in the two dictionaries agree to a great extent, although those of the ESL dictionary are somewhat abridged and simplified in many cases. On the other hand, there are also many usage notes which *RHWD* covers but which *RHWCD* does not. These are ones that are not necessary for native speakers but that benefit foreign learners greatly. For example, a usage note under the main entry **because** shows them the grammatical difference in use between the conjunction *because* and the group preposition *because of*; one under **midnight** gives them a comment to the effect that the word is not usually used with the definite article.

Usage notes given by *NHD* explain, as its "Foreword" proudly declares, "shades of meaning, cultural references and important grammatical information." Although those with the first and the third kinds of information contained in them are also found in *RHWD*, and in other ESL dictionaries, for that matter, those carrying the information on cultural aspects, the number of them being fairly numerous, are unique to *NHD* as far as the present author knows. We can find this kind of usage notes under the main entries **barbecue**, **baseball**, **melting pot**, etc., the last of which, for example, describes the reason why the phrase "melting pot" which has been the image of American society until recently is being replaced in part by the phrases "tossed salad" or "mosaic." (Y. Takano)

8. Conclusion

When learners consult a dictionary, they are looking for various pieces of information. Then, what sort of information should an EFL dictionary offer? What differences are there between the information in EFL dictionaries and in dictionaries for native users? And, how should it be presented? Some of the questions are answered in British learners' dictionaries. The answers they found include: (1) Building English corpus to find out the right entries and proper scope of definitions based on word frequency. (2) Adopting IPA to represent the right pronunciation. (3) Using restricted vocabulary to write the definitions that are easy to understand. (4) Giving as many full sentence examples as possible. (5) Incorporating information on stylistic labels, word combinations, grammar, usage, pragmatics, etc. in the dictionary. (6) Giving full-blown pictorial illustrations.

These features together with other features of EFL dictionaries have made British learners' dictionaries very popular in Japan.

We have found, however, neither *NHD* or *RHWD* utilize these achievements fully. Nor have they succeeded in providing originality in their dictionary making very much¹⁾. Following are the results of our survey of the two dictionaries. We have pointed out some shortcomings which we hope will prompt improved new editions of American learners' dictionaries.

8.1. Entries

The total number of entries calculated for *RHWD* exceeds the one for *NHD* by about 5,500 in accordance with its physical priority. However, *NHD* contains 1.6 times more idioms and phrasal verbs than *RHWD*. Minimum basic vocabulary provided in *CLEJD* is largely contained in both dictionaries, and the number of entries regarded as American English is rather high, especially in *NHD*, compared with *LDAE*¹ and *OSDAE*. However, both the dictionaries must deal with their inconsistency in their manner of presenting inflected forms for nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs, especially as such inconsistency, which is observable even for the basic vocabulary, might mislead learners to some confusion.

8.2. Pronunciation

NHD gives pronunciation using the IPA-based system, while in *RHWD* pronunciation is given both with the diacritical system and the IPA-based system. For the transcription of vowels, those in *NHD* seems to be more familiar for Japanese learners of English except that a length mark is not used at all. Both dictionaries inadequately transcribe the vowel in nurse as /ɜr/, since this vowel is not a diphthong, but a monophthong. For syllabic consonants, *RHWD* uses a diacritic indicating syllabicity (though it is feared that many learners will not understand it). For indication of stress, *RHWD* is far more satisfactory than *NHD*, especially for its thorough indication of compound stress.

8.3. Definition

Using restricted defining vocabulary has come to be one of the main features of major British learners' dictionaries. *NHD* has followed the trend saying that definitions are written "in an easy-to-understand, limited vocabulary," though it does not bother to list the defining vocabulary.

RHWD seems to have inherited most parts of its definitions from its parent dictionaries. Easy words and phrasing are the tradition of Random House Dictionaries. Naturally, *RHWD*, which targets advanced learners, uses more difficult words to write the definitions than *NHD*.

Sense order and scope of coverage are based on frequency and importance. *NHD*, a dictionary for beginners and intermediate learners, has limited its definitions to the minimum, and has excluded less frequent and older senses.

Sense flow in *RHWD* is sometimes awkward. This, we assume, comes from mechanical omission of (sub)senses of the parent dictionary on which *RHWD* is based.

Like many ESL dictionaries, *RHWD* gives full-blown pictorial illustrations, but they are not very attractive or informative compared with the ones in *LDCE*³. *NHD* gives, though not full-blown, pictorial illustrations as well. Although most illustrations are useful, some of them such as the picture of *egg*, *leaf*, and *rope* do not seem to add any information to the definition.

NHD will be required to improve its definitions. There are many senses that are not covered in entries like *take*. It should rewrite some of the definitions so that they are well balanced because some definitions contain unnecessary information while others lack necessary pieces of information. There should be no definitions that do not define.

RHWD's definitions are better balanced and more sufficiently defined than *NHD*. Effort should be made, however, to make the definitions more readable by changing the typeface for different word classes. We hope there will be something original in the definition of the second version of *RHWD*. The present edition is just an average ESL dictionary and does not seem to contain anything that is uniquely *RHWD*'s.

8.4. Examples

The overall value of a dictionary can not be properly estimated without taking into consideration its target usership, the purposes and the contexts in which it is to be used. Components of a dictionary can not be properly assessed without looking at them in relation to the other parts. For example, *RHWD* may be less to blame for its uninformative quasi-sentential examples and limited presentation of collocational possibilities through examples, considering that it is principally addressed to ESL students²⁾ with constant exposure to the language, and that definitions containing information on selectional restriction compensate for the inadequacy of collocational information in examples to some extent.

NHD, intended for intermediate or below students, generously uses space for examples, which are long (sentential) but easy, and self-contained and explanatory. *RHWD*, which is for advanced students, gives less space for examples probably to make room for other purposes (e.g. more headwords and subsenses to be included)³⁾, though it exhibits various grammatical constructions through examples.

Examples in each dictionary, put together according to distinct principles, have distinct features, and are not without success. On the whole, however, they are neither well-balanced nor well-integrated parts of the dictionaries yet. Both dictionaries ought to adopt a more flexible and effective approach. *NHD* should make better use of space allocated for ex-

amples without sticking slavishly to the sentential-example principles. There are many (sub)entries in which provision of various specimens and combinations is welcomed by the reader over a single lengthy example including some not-to-the-point elements. On the other hand, *RHWD* should be more generous with supplies of examples to better exploit their potential, especially examples as learning aids and referential clues.⁴⁾ For both purposes more lexical collocations should be covered by examples. Depending on the item, typical context should be portrayed by the example to enable the student to use as well as to understand the item properly.

8.5. Grammar and Usage

The results gained from the examination of grammatical and usage information given in *RHWD* and *NHD* suggest, on the whole, that the former can be counted among the respectable ESL dictionaries, while there seems to be much room for improvement in *NHD*. *RHWD* contains almost all the features that are expected of an ESL dictionary, though it does not add anything new except for the highest possible degree of intelligibility by spelling out, instead of abbreviating or clipping, almost all the terms used in grammar codes. However, it must weigh the advantages and disadvantages of the pursuit of intelligibility attained only by taking up much precious space, which could be allocated to other kinds of important information. Anyway, *RHWD* will make a valuable ESL dictionary if it removes the unsystematicity and the deficiencies pointed out above. *NHD*, on the other hand, lacks the total amount of grammatical information required of a usable ESL dictionary. With phrasal verbs, idioms and the information on usage, it will be satisfactory if it rids itself of the above-mentioned deficiencies as well as simple errors. We hope that *NHD* will add in the second edition those kinds of detailed grammatical information on content words, especially on verbs, that are provided by other major ESL dictionaries.

NOTES

Section 1

We wish to thank Prof. Nobuyuki Higashi and Prof. Rober H. Thornton for reading and suggesting improvements. All errors that remain are our responsibility.

Section 2

1) Categorised here as 'general-purpose dictionaries' are 'unabridged dictionaries', 'large desk dictionaries', and their abridged versions, i.e., 'college dictionaries' (cf. Algeo 1990: 1997ff).

2) Although it is necessary to consider whether EFL dictionaries should have different aims and therefore different design features from those for ESL users (see 2.3.), the term 'monolingual learners' dictionaries' (MLDs) is here used in its broader meaning, subsuming both EFL and ESL dictionaries.

3) Incidentally, it would also be interesting if we were to discuss 'user-friendliness' from two contrasting viewpoints: one from the AGPD user and the other from the MLD user. Should user-friendly features of AGPDs necessarily differ from those of MLDs?

4) The term *Americanism* is ambiguous as in *NWD*'s definition (sense 2): "a word, phrase, or usage *originating in or peculiar to* American English" (emphasis added). Here it is used in its diachronic sense.

5) But this does not mean etymological information is simply a white elephant in MLDs, in which etymology has been, and still is, quietly playing an important role. For instance, in MLDs, as in AGPDs, etymological criteria are usually applied to separate homographs (cf. Dalgish 1995: 331). Besides, it is one thing to say that the learner should be exposed to current English, and it is another thing to say that s/he could learn something from a brief history of a particular word.

Section 3

1) Most of the imported learner's dictionaries distributed through Japanese publishing houses are accompanied by illustrative material designed to suit Japanese consumers. And as a matter of fact, some numerical information, which differs from the one we obtained, is given in the booklet to *RHWD*. However, since the booklet itself is not published by Random House, Inc., we do not take that illustrative material into consideration here.

2) It must be noted here, however, that the fact that *NHD* does not have any abbreviated or contracted forms in Table 3.2 does not necessarily mean that the dictionary itself contains none of these types. Figures in the table only show the number of words which are found in one dictionary but not in the other. Thus, even if we are to find an abbreviated form in one dictionary, it will not count if the same form is also observable in the other.

3) In order not to step into the area of meaning, one thing we kept in mind in selecting such entries was to exclude those which have other non-American-specific definitions.

4) Of these, 49 entries are not included in either of the four dictionaries in Table 3.3.

5) In this section, the regular plural formation rule refers only to the pattern in which suffix *-s* is added to the original noun with no other morphological modification; other patterns are considered irregular.

6) The "GUIDE" explains several patterns in which the plural formation is not done by the simple addition of the suffix *-s*. The illustration covers the cases where the noun ends in *sh*, *ch*, *s*, *x*, and *z*, to which *-es* is added, and the cases where the noun ends in a *y*

preceded by a consonant, in which the *y* is changed to an *i* and *-es* is added.

- 7) For nouns ending in *s*, such as **lens** and **gas**, *RHWD* shows their plurals.
- 8) For **reindeer**, *RHWD* employs different manner:
reindeer: -deer, (occasionally) -deers
- 9) In this section, the regular inflectional rule of a verb refers to the pattern in which *-ed* is added to the original verb for the past tense and the past participle, *-ing* for the gerund and the present participle, and *-s* for the third person singular. Other inflectional patterns are considered irregular.
- 10) Pronouncing symbols are inserted between slashes "/" or parentheses "(")" in the actual dictionary descriptions. However, in this section, for the sake of saving space, we omit all such information concerning pronunciation.
- 11) *OED*² gives **swang** as a possible past tense form, but it is accompanied by the label "rarely," and *AHD*, which usually provides as many variant forms as possible, does not show the form. And it must be noted here that Appendix 4 of the dictionary, which lists the irregularly inflected forms of verbs, gives the "swing, swung, swung" pattern.
- 12) However, there is inconsistency here, too. Although the appendix shows **hanged** as its past participle, in the article headed by **hang**, **hanged** is labeled as the past tense form.
- 13) In *LDAE*¹, only **cruel** has inflected forms. *NHD* and *LDAE*¹ also share the prudential attitude toward several other adjectives or adverbs, such as **fast**, **hard**, **soon**, and **often**, for which *AHD* and *OSDAE* give the inflected forms.
- 14) The same remark can be made about the presentation of *-es* suffixed forms of verbs and nouns. *NHD* does not show the plural form of a noun when the *-es* suffixed form of the headword is given in its verb item even if it is the noun that is listed as the first item of the headword.
- 15) **liker** and **likest** are not listed even in *AHD*, which seems to show every inflected form of adjectives (adverbs) possible.
- 16) For example, although labeled as "(Slang)," *RHWD* gives even **badder** and **baddest** for **bad**, for which *AHD* has only **worse** and **worst**.

Section 4

- 1) In the new edition of *LDAE* (*LDAE*²), the symbol /ə/ is employed. It is commended as the most preferred transcription for that vowel (except that it lacks the length mark /:/).
- 2) In Higashi et al. (1986), the use of /o˞r/ in *LDAE*¹ was severely criticized on the same ground and in its new edition, *LDAE*², it has been abandoned. *LPD* gives /ɔ˞r/ as well as /ɔ˞r/ to the FORCE vowel.
- 3) In *NHD*, the final syllables of the words **capital**, **hospital**, **mental** and **vital** are transcribed as /təl/, while in the words **crystal**, **hostel**, **hostile**, **mantel**, **mantle** and **pistol** the final syllables are transcribed as /-təl/. In the same way, the final syllables of **anal**, **banal**, **channel**, **final** and **journal** and those of **criminal**, **kennel**, **panel**, **penal**, **tunnel** are transcribed as /-nəl/ and /-nəl/ respectively. It is not clear on what grounds the distinctions have been made.
- 4) The word **analyze** is transcribed as /'ænləɪz/ in *NHD*. As the symbol for the secondary stress denotes the syllable boundary, the syllabicity of /l/ is barely implied. Most learners, however, will not understand the syllabicity of /l/ from this transcription. For this same reason, the use of a hyphen for the syllable boundary in *LDAE*² as in /'ænl-ɪst/ does not seem to be practical, for all the effort to avoid ambiguity.
- 5) In *NHD*, some compound adverbs such as **downstairs** are double-stressed (/ ' _ ' _ /)

while others such as **underground** are finally-stressed (/ _ ' _ /). The numerals **fourteen**, **fifteen**, **seventeen** and **nineteen** are indicated as / _ ' _ / while **thirteen**, **sixteen** and **eighteen** as / _ ' _ /.

Section 5

- 1) According to *LDCE*³, definitions are written within a defining vocabulary of 2000 words. *OALD*⁵'s defining vocabulary is 3500. The problems for using restricted vocabulary is discussed in Béjoint (1994: 64), but its importance should be recognized.
- 2) For comparison of definitions of *LDAE* and *OADA*, see Higashi et al. (1986: 96-111).
- 3) The most common sense seems to be "pleasant" since all the first definitions in major EFL dictionaries include this sense; 'pleasant, agreeable,' in *OALD*⁵, 'pleasant, attractive or enjoyable,' in *LDCE*³, and 'attractive, pleasant, or enjoyable,' in *COBUILD*². Although *OALD*⁵, *LDCE*³, and *LDAE* include an ironic sense of nice 'bad, unpleasant,' the American counterparts do not. In *LDAE*², it is dropped. Is the ironical sense less frequently used in American English?
- 4) All the words of *NHD* in the Table 5.1 are listed in the defining vocabulary of *OALD*⁵, but *subtle* and *discriminatory* in *RHWD* are not.
- 5) The dashes in Table 5.2 signify that there are no corresponding definitions.
- 6) In *LDAE*² the sense order is changed, but the first sense in American dictionaries still comes last.
- 7) In *RHD*² it is divided into six subsenses: **5. Informal a. Sometimes Disparaging and Offensive.** a girl or woman, esp. an attractive one. **b.** a person of whom one is deeply fond; sweetheart. **c.** (sometimes cap.) an affectionate or familiar address (sometimes offensive when used to strangers, casual acquaintances, subordinates, etc., esp. by a male to a female). **d.** a man or boy; chap; fellow. **e.** an invention, creation, project, or the like that requires one's special attention or expertise or of which one is especially proud. **f.** an object; thing.
 We can see the sense relationships in this subdivision, but not in *RHWD*.
- 8) Incidentally, one of the missing senses 'carry with one' is the first sense of *OALD*⁵ and *LDCE*³. Other senses that are not included in *NHD* are included in them.
- 9) It is not based on abstracted meaning of *take*. It divides the senses into 11 groups according to the context in which the word is used.
- 10) According to Béjoint (1994: 31) and others, most American dictionaries are encyclopedic. We welcome that. However, the treatment can go wrong in entry selections and the definitions. See, for example, the headword **Kodak** in *NHD*.
- 11) *OALD*⁵ gives a more informative explanation for **blond** (also, esp. of a woman **blonde**). It suggests that either a woman or a man can have hair of that color, but the word is more often applied to a woman especially when it is spelled blonde.
- 12) *RHWD* does not include this selectional restriction.
- 13) Selectional restrictions on **pretty** and other related words are given in the USAGE NOTE of **handsome**, but they should be written in each entry word.
- 14) Obviously, Table 5.3 indicates that *NHD* is not very keen to include the computer-related senses.
- 15) See *LDCE*³'s USAGE NOTE of **thin**.
- 16) In *WCD*¹⁰, it is defined as '1: animal tissue consisting chiefly of cells distended with greasy or oily matter.'

17) The principle 3 says: 'The defined word may not be used in its definition, nor may derivations or combinations of the defined word unless they are separately defined.' (Cited from Landau)

18) In *OALD*⁵ **that** (pronoun) has four definitions: **1** (used for referring to a specific person or thing, esp when he, she or it is not near the speaker or as near the speaker as another). **2** (used for referring to sb/sth already mentioned, known or understood). **3** (used esp in the plural for specifying particular people or things). **4** (used for specifying sth/sb of a particular type):

19) *OALD*⁵ gives five word classes and a total of 87 lines.

Section 6

- 1) *RHWD* does not include this among its headword list.
- 2) In the example of **miss**¹, for instance, who missed the first pitch, playing what (sport)?
- 3) Collocation can be broken down into two categories: grammatical and lexical. In this section, however, the former is discussed under grammar for convenience.
- 4) On the assumption that both *NHD* and *RHWD* use invented examples (see 6.2.), those dictionaries on the same principle were consciously chosen for comparison.
- 5) *RHWD* has "[before a noun]" for attributives. Likewise, *LDCE*² and *OALD*⁴ have "[A]" and "[F]", and "[attrib]" and "[pred]" respectively.
- 6) *LDCE*² offers much more varieties than *NHD* does for this sense of "bring."
- 7) *NHD* also gives "in control," "out of control," "(to get, have, or keep) under control," and "to take control" in bald between the sense numbers and the definitions.

Section 7

- 1) The grammar code [*count*; *noncount*] can sometimes be found. The present author has spotted it under the main entry **bombardment**. In the case of run-on derivative nouns, it is more freely adopted. See **misjudge** and **tempt** for example.
- 2) This method is the same as that which is employed by *OALD*⁵.
- 3) It is true, as S.I. Landau (1984: 89) suggests, that it would be a difficult problem for native speakers of English to decide whether a particular noun is countable or uncountable, because they can make almost any noun plural. However, since the nouns cited are usually marked uncountable by other major ESL dictionaries, they seem to be simple errors.
- 4) Interestingly, this is a feature shared by many children's dictionaries like *Merriam-Webster's Elementary Dictionary* (1994) in which a verb is simply marked "**vb**" and *The American Heritage Children's Dictionary* (1994) in which it is marked "**verb**."
- 5) There are also some minor problems, but we do not comment on them here, just hoping that they will be dealt with in the second edition.
- 6) These two features are shared by *OALD*⁵, *COBUILD*², and *CIDE*.
- 7) Interestingly, in **trouble 4** we can find the code [*no obj*; ~ + *to + verb*], which seems to be a simple error but serves as a clue to the solution. *LDAE*¹, by the way, uses the codes like [T + *to-v-ing*], [I + *v-ing*], etc.
- 8) As far as the present author knows, there is one exception. In **remain 1**, the subject complement is marked "**obj**."
- 9) The "Guide to the Dictionary" shows the code "[~ + *obj + prep*.] OR [~ + *prep*. + *obj*]" where the phrasal verb and its code are explained. This is certainly wrong and the first "*prep*." must be "*adv*." or "*adverb*"; the second, "*prep. adv*." or something like that.

Also, though the swung dash is usually used to represent the main-entry verb, we can sometimes see it used to stand for the entire phrasal verb, which can be confirmed by looking up those under **go** and **grow**, for example.

10) A similar method is employed by *LDCE*³, *OALD*⁵, etc.

11) The asterisk means that the word with it is the main entry under which the idiom in question is entered.

12) In examining the application by *RHWD* and *NHD* of usage labels and usage notes, the entries covered are those beginning with B, M and T, and some others that are important in terms of usage problems, which amount approximately to 17% of all the pages for the former dictionary and 15% for the latter.

Section 8

- 1) *RHWD* lists root entries. This is a new attempt to show the etymology which is absent in British learners' dictionaries.
- 2) It is definitely addressed to EFL students in Japan, China, and Spanish-speaking countries, too, at least, since the translations of the instructions in these languages are included.
- 3) This creates the impression that the dictionary is more receptively oriented.
- 4) In preparing examples for both dictionaries, more emphasis should be placed on this aspect of referential aid. *NHD*, with fewer subsenses of polysemous items, is "referenceable" even if it is not particularly well-marked. But the device mentioned in Note 7 of Section 6 makes consultation easier. *RHWD*, with highly polysemous entries, is not necessarily referenceable in spite of the bracketed grammar codes in front of some examples, which are supposed to help reference. They have the following shortcomings to be corrected. First, they are not typographically salient enough. Second, "obj[ect]" should be further divided into personal and nonpersonal as in *LDCE*² and *OALD*⁴. Third, adverbials like the underlined part below should also be included in the indication and the code should be attached to each example where variants may occur:

put . . . 10. [~ + *obj*] to apply to a use or purpose: *She put her knowledge to good use.*
(emphasis added)

DICTIONARIES

ACD: *The American college dictionary*. New York: Random House, 1947.

The American heritage children's dictionary. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1994.

AHD: *The American heritage dictionary of the English language*, 3rd ed. Houghton Mifflin, 1992.

CIDE: *Cambridge international dictionary of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

CLEJD: *College lighthouse English-Japanese dictionary*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1995.

*COBUILD*²: *Collins COBUILD English dictionary*, New ed. London: HarperCollins, 1995.

*LDAE*¹: *Longman dictionary of American English: A dictionary for learners of English*. Harlow: Longman, 1983.

*LDAE*²: *Longman dictionary of American English*, New ed. Harlow: Longman, 1997.

*LDCE*²: *Longman dictionary of contemporary English*, New ed. Harlow: Longman, 1987.

*LDCE*³: *Longman dictionary of contemporary English*, 3rd ed. Harlow: Longman, 1995.

- LPD: *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary*. Harlow: Longman, 1990.
- Merriam-Webster's elementary dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: Merriam-Webster, 1994.
- MWCD¹⁰: *Merriam Webster's collegiate dictionary*, 10th ed. Springfield, Mass.: Merriam-Webster, 1993.
- NHD: *The Newbury House dictionary of American English: An essential reference for learners of American English and culture*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 1996.
- NWD³: *Webster's new world dictionary of the American English*, 3rd college ed. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1988.
- OALD⁴: *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English*, 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- OALD⁵: *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English*, 5th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- OED²: *The Oxford English dictionary*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- OSDAE: *Oxford student's dictionary of American English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- RHD¹: *The Random House dictionary of the English language*. New York: Random House, 1966.
- RHD²: *The Random House dictionary of the English language*, 2nd ed. New York: Random House, 1987.
- RHCD¹: *The Random House dictionary of the English language*, College ed. New York: Random House, 1968.
- RHCD²: *The Random House college dictionary*, Revised ed. New York: Random House, 1975.
- RHWCD: *Random House Webster's college dictionary*. New York: Random House, 1991.
- RHWD: *Random House Webster's dictionary of American English*. New York: Random House, 1997.

REFERENCES

- Akasu, K., et al. 1996. "An Analysis of *Cambridge International Dictionary of English*." *Lexicon* No. 26. 3-76.
- Algeo, J. 1988. "The English language: Variation, the dictionary, and the user," in *Webster's new world dictionary of American English*, Third college ed. ed. by Neufeldt, V. et al. New York: Simon & Schuster. xvii-xxiv.
- Algeo, J. 1990. "American lexicography," in *Dictionaries: International encyclopedia of lexicography*. Vol. 2. ed. by Hausmann, F.J. et al. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 1987-2009.
- Béjoint, H. 1994. *Tradition and innovation in modern English dictionaries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Benson, M., et al. 1986. *Lexicographic description of English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dalglish, G.M. 1995. "Learners' dictionaries: Keeping the learner in mind," in *Cultures, ideologies, and the dictionary: Studies in honor of Ladislav Zgusta*. (Lexicographia Series Maior 64). ed. by Kachru, B. B. and Kahane, H. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 329-338.
- Dohi, K., et al. 1991. "The Random House Dictionary, Second Edition no bunseki." [An

- Analysis of *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language*, Second Edition]. *Lexicon* No. 21. 1-176.
- Drysdale, P.D. 1987. "The role of examples in a learner's dictionary," in *The dictionary and the language learner: Papers from the EURALEX seminar at the university of Leeds, 1-3 April 1985*. (Lexicographica Series Maior 17.) ed. by Cowie, A. P. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 213-233.
- Higashi, N., et al. 1986. "Gakushu-yo amerika-eigo jisho no hikaku to bunseki: LDAE to OSDAE." [A comparative analysis of the two dictionaries of American English —LDAE and OSDAE]. *Lexicon* No. 15. 48-170.
- Hausmann, F. J., and Gorbahn, A. 1989. "COBUILD and LDOCE II: A comparative review." *International journal of lexicography* 2.1. 44-65.
- Ilson, R. 1986. "British and American lexicography," in *Lexicography: An emerging international profession*. ed. by Ilson, R. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 51-71.
- Kuhn, S. 1980. "The art of writing a definition that does not define," in *Theory and method in lexicography*. ed. by Zgusta, L. Drive: Hornbeam Press. 115-121.
- Landau, S. I. 1984. *Dictionaries: The art and craft of lexicography*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Lipka, L. 1990. *An outline of English lexicology*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- McArthur, T. 1989. "The background and nature of ELT learners' dictionaries," in *Learners' dictionaries: State of the art*. ed. by Tickoo, M.I. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Center. 52-64.
- Nakamoto, K. 1994. "Monolingual or bilingual, that is not the question: The 'bilingualised' dictionary." *Lexicon*. No. 24. 1-16.
- Palmer, F.R. 1987. *The English verb*, 2nd ed. Harlow: Longman.
- Pyles, T. and Algeo, J. 1970. *English: An introduction to language*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Quirk, R., et al. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Quirk, R. and Stein, G. 1990. *English in use*. Harlow: Longman.
- Sinclair, J. 1987. "Grammar in the dictionary," in *Looking up*. ed. by Sinclair, J. London: HarperCollins. 104-115.
- Stein, G. 1990. "From the bilingual to the monolingual dictionary," in *BudaLEX '88 Proceedings: Papers from the EURALEX third international congress*. eds. by Magay, T. and Zigany, J. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado. 401-407.
- Strevens, P. 1987. "The effectiveness of learners' dictionaries," in *Studies in lexicography*. ed. by Burchfield, R. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 76-93.
- Wells, J.C. 1982. *Accents of English 1: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zöfgen, E. 1991. "Bilingual learner's dictionaries," in *Dictionaries: International encyclopedia of lexicography*. Vol. 3. ed. by Hausmann, F.J. et al. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 2888-2903.