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1. Introduction

This is a critical review of Collins COBUILD English Dictionary for Advanced Learners (abbreviated to COBUIL D). Five people have joined to analyze the new edition and compare it with other major learners' dictionaries as well as the previous editions. We have focused our attention on (1) Headwords, Superheadwords, and Frequency Bands; (2) Pronunciation; (3) Definition; (4) Examples; (5) Usage; (6) Grammar and (7) Pragmatics.

We have sampled the new dictionary to find how many, and what kind of words, definitions, examples, etc. have been newly added or revised. We have also surveyed the dictionary to find what kind of changes and improvements have been made in usage, grammar, and pragmatics.
In the new edition, the title of the dictionary has been slightly altered. The new title seems to suggest that the new edition has incorporated a larger number of entries and more refined kinds of definitions, more information on usage, grammar, and pragmatics for "advanced learners." Naturally, we want to know in what respects the dictionary is improved and enriched for them.

On this matter, no information is given in the Introduction to the new edition. However, it says that the Bank of English on which the dictionary is based "now contains around 400 million words of English," instead of 20 million words in the 1980s for the first edition, and 200 million words in the 1990s for the second edition. The spoken component in the corpus has been steadily increased and makes up a total of 20 million words.

Efforts have been made to cover more information on American English. The Introduction (p. xi) says:

For this edition, the coverage of American English has been greatly extended, and the advice of experts together with evidence from our extensive US corpora, we have made a large number of additions that feature meanings and usages that are characteristic of American English, to ensure a more comprehensive coverage of that variety.

The increased number of words in the corpus, and the wider coverage of American English, together with other improvements explained in the Introduction, may account for the revised title of the dictionary.

The overall survey gives an impression that the changes to the definitions, examples, and grammatical information in the new edition are relatively minor. No change has been made to pronunciations. On the other hand, a substantial number of new headwords have been added (but not as many as the dictionary boasts). Usage information has been enriched and is given in small capitals within square brackets after the definition. Also, pragmatic information has been reorganized and its specific function is given in the Extra Column so that learners can identify it more clearly. We believe these changes contribute to easier access to the dictionary.

We are afraid that previous editions of COLLINS dictionaries have not attracted Japanese users as much as they deserved.

The fact that COLLINS came out last among the three most highly praised learners' dictionaries put out by British publishers may have been the reason why it is less popular than two of its rivals, namely OALD and LDCE. Another reason for the smaller circulation could be that COLLINS is regarded as a dictionary for encoding rather than decoding. Definitions that exemplify typical grammatical structures such as subjects, verb patterns, objects, etc. and collocations in a full sentence are very informative and useful for writers. For many Japanese readers, however, a conventional definition in brief wording makes it easier to identify the meaning they want. This goes against the belief of the editors and lexicographers of the dictionary who emphasize the importance of full sentence definitions.

More emphasis has been placed on reading than writing in schools and universities in Japan. Although the necessity for encoding is recognized and students are encouraged to write and speak in English, only slow steps have been taken in this direction. This is an unhappy situation, since English is used almost every sphere of global activity, but it is the status quo in the use of English dictionaries in our country. We hope that the efforts made to facilitate easier access to the dictionary attract larger numbers of readers as well as writers.

2. Headwords, Superheadwords, and Frequency Bands

This section discusses the differences found in COLLINS in comparison with the previous edition of the dictionary, concerning its headwords (2.1), superheadwords (2.2), and frequency bands (2.3). We will refer back to some problems pointed out in the analyses of former editions (Kojima et al. 1989 and Masuda et al. 1997) whenever necessary and see if they have improved or not. As well as reviewing any disadvantages, we will also pay attention to other problems concerning superheadwords and frequency bands in particular.

2.1. Headwords

In this subsection, we will compare COLLINS and COLLINS in terms of (1) the presentation of entries, (2) the numerical changes of entries, (3) new entries and deleted entries.
2.1.1. Method of presentation

The overall headword presentation style in this new edition of the COBUILD dictionary is the same as in the previous edition. For example, headwords are presented in bold face, one letter protruded into the left side margin. Symbols used to show the run-ons and phrasal verbs (• and ►, respectively) are still employed in COBUILD although the symbol for cross references (11111) has been replaced by a black solid arrow (for ordinary cross reference) and a double-line arrow (for cross reference to additional information).

A major improvement in terms of the entry presentation is that inflected forms are now put in parentheses so that users can recognize a headword and its inflected forms more easily than in the previous edition, in which inflected forms are demarcated from the headword only by the use of commas when no pronunciation is presented, for example, for compounds. Compare the 2 editions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fag /fag/ fags</td>
<td>fag /fag/ (fags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fag end, fag ends; also spelled fag-end</td>
<td>fag end (fag ends) also fag-end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faggot /fag/ faggots.</td>
<td>faggot /fag/ (faggots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fahrenheit /færənhaɪt/</td>
<td>Fahrenheit /færənhaɪt/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fail /feɪl/ fails, failing, failed</td>
<td>fail /feɪl/ (fails, failing, failed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The introduction of parentheses for inflected forms also results in the disappearance of the (sometimes) fluctuating use of periods in the line of headwords. In COBUILD2, we find inconsistency in that the headwords fag end, faggot, and Fahrenheit have a period at the end of the line while the headword lines for fag and fail do not end with a period. On the contrary, COBUILD3 has totally abandoned the use of a period at the end of the headword line so that this inconsistent use of the period no longer exists.

In spite of the improvement mentioned above, the nesting problem pointed out in the analysis of the former edition (Masuda et al. 1997: 24) remains unsolved in the new edition. Run-ons of the same word-form are put separately under the different senses of the headword, thus causing a word-finding problem on the part of dictionary-users. For example, we still can find four run-on adverbs positively under the senses 1, 4, 6, and 10 of the adjective positive whereas the same adverb is set up as an independent headword with two distinctive senses. There seems no need to run on if the word in question is also treated as a headword.

2.1.2. The number of headwords

Although the back cover proudly announces that this dictionary carries over 110,000 references in this edition, which means an increase of about 35,000 references compared to the previous edition, we cannot accept this claim uncritically, the reason for which has already been pointed out in the analyses of the former editions such as Kojima et al. (1989: 46) and Masuda et al. (1997: 20).

The introduction to this edition also claims that it has increased the size of the dictionary and, at the same time, improved the style of presentation (COBUILD3: x). It is true that the book itself has become a little larger, but the total number of pages has decreased by more than 120 pages from 1951 to 1824. Even if the increase in the number of lines per page (approximately from 164 to 170 lines on average) is taken into account, we cannot naïvely agree that “a lot of space for new and additional entries” has been made for this edition.

In order to roughly estimate the increase in the number of headwords in this edition, we carried out a sampling test, extracting entries from every 50 pages of the new edition, which amounts to 36 pages and comparing them with the equivalent parts of the previous edition. The result of the sampling test is shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd ed.</th>
<th>3rd ed.</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total pages</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>-127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of headwords in the sampling</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of words per page</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total number of headwords</td>
<td>32,230</td>
<td>33,798</td>
<td>1,568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As this result shows, COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} is estimated to carry an average of 18.53 words per page, which means an increase of 0.86 words compared with the previous edition. And the estimated total number of headwords in the present edition is 33,798 words, presumably resulting in an increase of more than 1,500 words in the entire volume. However, we cannot be convinced that this figure justifies the dictionary’s claim for “thousands of new words and meanings” on its back cover.

2.1.3. Headwords newly adopted

Now we shall go on to look at new entries in COBUILD\textsuperscript{3}. In the 36-page sampling used above, 35 new headwords are found. 9 headwords among them (divorcé, divorcée, homeboy, home field, homegirl, Pvt., rejigger, stuffed animal, stuffed toy, teakettle, witness stand) are labeled either as [AM] or [mainly AM]. This means that they are (mainly) used in the American variant of English. This result substantiates the dictionary’s claim that “the coverage of American English has been greatly expanded” (COBUILD\textsuperscript{3}: xi).

The most noticeable point in the choice of new entries is that COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} is quite willing to adopt words related to information technology (henceforth, IT).\textsuperscript{9} Aside from the newly adopted entries listed in the introduction to this new edition such as chat room, dot-com, WAP, e-business, telemarketing, and electronic publishing (COBUILD\textsuperscript{3}: x), we can find new entries such as homepage, keypad, keystroke in our sample. In order to evaluate this dictionary’s sensitivity to IT-related terminology, let us look at the tables on page 7, which show the different treatment of IT-related words among 4 dictionaries: COBUILD\textsuperscript{3}, COBUILD\textsuperscript{2}, OALD\textsuperscript{9}, and LDOCE\textsuperscript{9}. Table 2 shows whether the recently coined prefix e- (meaning “electronic”) and words with this prefix are adopted in each dictionary or not. Additionally, Table 3 shows, in the same manner, the difference of adoption in terms of the word web (meaning the World Wide Web) and its compounds.

As expected, COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} carries the most IT-related words in comparison with the previous edition and the other two dictionaries. This is partly because it is a more recent publication. But this could also mean that COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} reflects the most up-to-date states of word uses, at least in the field of computer technology.

2.1.4. Deleted Headwords

Here we briefly pay attention to the words deleted in the new edition. In the sample, only 4 headwords found in the 2nd edition have disappeared in the new edition: cowling, gay liberation, GCE, and key word. Although this result may not be extensive enough to make persuasive generaliza-
tions, we can at least say that COBUILD\(^3\) has the tendency to delete
terms which have specialized meanings in a certain respect. The use of the
word *cowling* could be limited to a context related to the field of aeronau-
tics or hobby modeling because it means a part of an airplane. The phrase *gay liberation* refers to a specific political movement which was popular at
a certain period of time. Likewise, *GCE* is the word used exclusively in the
British educational system. Finally, *key word* is used mainly in the field of
language teaching according to the definition given in COBUILD\(^2\). In this
respect, the dictionary’s claim that it “gives priority to the English of most
general utility worldwide” (COBUILD\(^3\): xi) can be justified.

2.2. Superheadwords

In this subsection, we focus on the system of superheadwords, which
was first introduced in the previous edition and can now be regarded as
one of the distinguishing features of the COBUILD dictionary.

2.2.1. The list of superheadwords

The same 96 words are given the superheadword status as in COBUILD\(^2\).
The explanations provided for each subsections of superheadwords re-
main almost unchanged except for slight changes in the cases of *out* and
*still*. Although the second subsection of *out* was only described as “adja-
ctive uses” in COBUILD\(^2\), the description of “ADVERB USES” has been
added in the new edition. In the case of the superheadword *still*, the third
subsection is now described as “EQUIPMENT” instead of “apparatus” as
in the previous edition. Another change to be noted is that *like* is divided
into three parts with the addition of the subsection “NOUN USES AND
PHRASES”.

2.2.2. The format

The noticeable change in the presentation of superheadwords is that a
kind of menu system was introduced. In the newly adopted menu system,
a superheadword is placed in the center of the top line of an enclosed box
whose side lines are indented from both margins by a couple of spaces,
and the grammatical or semantic explanations of individual subentries are

It is clear from this change of presentation that the new edition has tried to
be more user-friendly. Although in the previous edition, the users did not
know how many subsections were listed under a superheadword until the
end of the entry in question, the newly employed menu tells them how a
multi-section entry is divided into subsections, and it also gives them
some information about the differences of grammatical categories or some
information about phrasal verbs. In this way, COBUILD\(^3\) seems to have
tried to bridge the gap between external access and internal access in that
users can find different senses or uses of a word (internal structure) as soon
as they look up a superheadword (external structure).

This way of presentation seems innovative at first glance, but a similar
method had already been adopted in monolingual learners’ dictionaries
such as LDOCE\(^3\) as well as in English-Japanese dictionaries published in
Japan (cf. Kenkyusha’s LIGHTHOUSE series). The menu system em-
ployed in LDOCE\(^3\) can be regarded as much more detailed and user-
friendly than the one in COBUILD\(^3\) with every paragraph heading pro-
vided in the menu (cf. LDOCE\(^3\): 1246: for *run*). On the other hand,
LIGHTHOUSE\(^3\) is a bit more pedagogical than COBUILD\(^3\) in that it
provides the users with some information of semantic extensions through
the process of metaphor and/or metonymy and helps them to comprehend
a more schematic meaning of a word, even if the list is not always
exhaustive. Although we have to admit that the principal role played by
the menu for the superheadwords in COBUILD\(^3\) is different from those

---

**Example:**

**light**

1. BRIGHTNESS OR ILLUMINATION
2. NOT GREAT IN WEIGHT, AMOUNT, OR INTENSITY
3. UNIMPORTANT OR NOT SERIOUS

(COBUILD\(^3\): 896)
of LDOCE and LIGHTHOUSE, the menu in COBUILD leaves much to be improved. This disadvantage is closely connected with the problems to be discussed below.

2.2.3. Inconsistent adoption of superheadwords

We can say that the introduction of the menu system discussed above is the reflection of COBUILD's efforts to improve the usability of the superheadwords, but unfortunately, there is no improvement in the policy of adopting superheadwords in the current edition. As was mentioned in the analysis of the previous edition (Masuda et al. 1997: 23f.), the application of superheadwords is still somewhat unreasonable. The problem is that some of the subsections under some superheadwords are based on the difference of grammatical classes while others are divided in terms of semantic difference. Nearly half of the superheadwords are classified into subsections exclusively on the basis of the grammatical distinctions, i.e. different classes of speech. And about a third of them are subdivided according to the semantic differences. However, the principle of dividing subsections of other superheadwords is rather arbitrary. For example, while the verbs go, hold, and make have a subsection for phrasal verb uses, the verbs set and take don't. In addition, the word run is not given the status of superheadword, which seems quite unreasonable considering its semantic diversity and a large number of different phrasal verbs.

The entry wound has two subsections, one is for the past tense form of the verb wind and the other is for the word denoting "injury". The decision to give this entry superheadword status is certainly reasonable because there is a difference of pronunciation between these two subentries. However, resorting to the difference of pronunciation as the basis for giving the superheadword status is unsatisfactory. This is because COBUILD does not treat the inflected forms of the verb lie as independent headwords. The users of this dictionary will not be able to find the past tense form of the verb lie unless they know it is an inflected form of lie. This is incongruous with the dictionary's overall principle of giving the status of independent headword to the inflected forms of irregular verbs.

We also cannot understand why lot is not divided into subsections while deal has two subsections. Just the same as deal, lot has quantifier uses as well as noun uses.

The words Miss and miss are put under the same superheadword regardless of their orthographical difference (only the former has its initial letter capitalized). If this difference of spelling can be ignored, it is quite unreasonable why May (the name of the 5th month of the year) and may (auxiliary) should not be treated under the same superheadword.

In addition, explanations given in the menu are sometimes confusing. For example, the second subsection of the word lie is described as "THINGS THAT ARE NOT TRUE", although lie in this sense can be used as a verb as well as a noun. There is always a possibility that a user can overlook its verb use in this sense because of the description "THINGS".

2.3. Frequency Bands

We now turn our attention to Frequency Bands, another outstanding feature of the COBUILD dictionary. In this subsection, we will see if there are any changes in the frequency rating of the words given 4 and 5 bands in the previous edition. Through an overall survey of the words included in these two bands, we will be able to point out some problems of frequency information in COBUILD.

2.3.1. Usefulness of frequency information

The first question to be raised concerning the frequency bands adopted in COBUILD is the discrepancy between the frequency labeling of the words and the levels of the users' English proficiency. As the title clearly shows, COBUILD is compiled mainly for the use of advanced learners, which necessarily means that most of the (potential) users of this dictionary have already acquired some basic vocabulary of English. It follows that if users find a certain word labeled with 5 bands, the information that the word is among the most frequently used words would not be so meaningful to them because they are expected to have already acquired some knowledge about the use and meaning of it. What advanced-level learners of English need most is not limited to the labeling which tells...
them whether a certain word is frequently used or not. They also need to know, for example, whether the word they want to use is used in the spoken variant of English more frequently than in the written one or vice versa, or in which sense the word is used more often.13

The frequency information of the headwords, however, is quite helpful to language researchers in general, not to mention lexicographers in that, by comparing the different frequency rating between the two editions of the same dictionary, they can grasp changing states of the language from the numerical point of view. In this sense, it is not a waste of time and space to take a careful look at the differences in the frequency rating between the two editions of the COBUILD dictionary. First, let us compare the two editions in terms of the number of words in the frequency bands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Bands</th>
<th>Total Number of Words</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆◆◆◆◆◆</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>the, and, of, to, like, go, paper, return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆◆◆◆◆</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>argue, bridge, danger, female, obvious, sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆◆◆◆◆</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>aggressive, medicine, tactic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆◆◆◆</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>accuracy, duration, miserable, puzzle(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆◆◆</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>abundant, crossroads, fearless, missionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers given in Table 4 are based on the introductions to both editions (COBUILD2: xiii and COBUILD3: xlii). It seems that the changes are limited to the higher 3 bands, and the numbers of words in lower 2 bands remain the same. But as we will see below, the figures given in the 2nd edition are rough estimates. Therefore, we cannot obtain any meaningful result by just comparing the numbers on this table.

2.3.2. Words labeled with 5 bands

Now we go on to a closer examination of words labeled with 5 bands, the total number of which is "approximately 680 words" (COBUILD3: xlii) (679 words, to be exact). In comparison with the previous edition, it seems that about 20 words have been downgraded. However, the number of 5-band words has actually increased. As is apparent in the list presented in COBUILD3 (xlii-xliv), each superheadword is counted only once regardless of how many subsections it has. On the contrary, in COBUILD2, each subsection of superheadwords seems to have been counted separately. If we excluded the same word forms counted more than once, the total number of the 5-band words in COBUILD2 would be 664. Thus, we can claim that there is indeed an increase of 15 words in this band. Look at Table 5 to validate this claim.

Table 5 Adjusted numbers of 5-band words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number in the 2nd ed.</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment for multiple counting in the 2nd ed.</td>
<td>-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in the 3rd ed.</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in the 3rd ed.</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number in the 3rd ed.</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While 10 words were excluded from the most frequently used word list of the previous edition, 25 words were raised to the 5-band status, of which 19 words are calendric terms covering the names of 12 months of the year and 7 days of the week. A kinship term husband is also included in this list while wife had already been ranked in the most frequent band in the previous edition. A color term yellow, which was a 3-band word in COBUILD2, is also included among the most frequently used words. Other words raised to this status are best, hold(3), Miss(3), and sixteen.

The words excluded from the 5-band list are: don, don't, er, grey, newscaster, oh, seek, sir, stock, and would-be. The fact that three of them (don, don't, would-be) have no band in COBUILD can be regarded as one of the refinements of frequency rating thanks to the expansion of the corpus, although it possibly suggests that there could have occurred some
sort of error in the frequency counting of the previous edition.

2.3.3. Words labeled with 4 bands

*COBUILD* says that the number of words labeled with 4 bands is “approximately 1040 words” (xlii) (but it turned out to be 1044 words, to be exact), which could mean a decrease of about 160 words from the previous edition. But the actual number of a decrease does not correspond to this figure for the reason stated in the previous subsection, i.e. multiple-counting of subsections of superheadwords.

The most noticeable change concerning the 4-band list is that adjectives of nationality as *Japanese* and *Korean* are downgraded to band 3, which account for the largest part of those excluded from the 4-band word group. The other headwords whose frequency decreased from the 4-band to 3-band level are proper nouns: *Gulf, Olympic,* and *Wall Street.*

When we turn our attention to the words newly included in the 4-band list, we can find that 8 words have moved up into the 4-band list. Among them are 3 color terms: *orange, pink,* and *purple.* 2 ordinal numbers have also been upgraded from the 1-band to the 4-band group (hundredth and sixteenth). In addition, a kinship term *uncle* has now gained the status of 4-band word. The other words are *cream* and *navy.* Conversely, 4 words seem to have decreased their frequency in the corpus and have moved down from the 5-band to 4-band group: *grey, oh, sir,* and *stock.*

2.3.4. Points to be improved

The survey of the words included in the 4-band and 5-band groups reveals that the frequency bands still need to be improved in order to meet the users' demand. The first point to be noted is that, to our regret, the frequency information about individual senses of a headword is still not given in *COBUILD*, which is the disadvantage pointed out in the analysis of the previous edition (Masuda et al. 1997: 26). Take, for example, the word *run.* *COBUILD* gives us the information that this word is one of the most frequently used words. However, considering the fact that this dictionary lists different senses in the order of their frequency, we cannot help wondering how frequent the use of, for example, the 42nd sense of *run.* Is *run* in this sense used frequently enough to be included among 5-band words? The same question arises when we look up *run-ons.* For example, the adverb *positively* is nested in the entry of the adjective *positive,* which has 4 bands. This is quite confusing to users because the independent headword *positively* has only 1 band. Is there such a wide gap in terms of frequency between the nested *positively* and the headword *positively?*

In addition, we doubt if the inclusion of cardinal and ordinal numbers into higher bands is necessary. Considering the fact that the target users of this edition are advanced learners of English, the information that numbers are among the most frequently used words would not be so meaningful. The same can be said of calendric terms. In fact, *LDOCE* does not give any frequency information for these kinds of words.

Another question concerning the frequency information is the *COBUILD*'s treatment of proper nouns. The word *US* is included in band 5, and band 4 lists such proper nouns as *BBC, City* (the financial district of London), *UK, United Nations* (as well as its abbreviation, *UN*). These words are excluded from the subject of frequency rating in *LDOCE* with the exception of *City,* which is treated under the headword *city.* In addition to these proper nouns, 13 adjectives of nationality are given the 4-band status. We do not intend to deny the fact that these words are used very frequently, but we still wonder whether simply listing them alongside other high-frequency words is appropriate enough to give the users helpful information about English. These words are, more or less, encyclopedic entries, and their frequency quite often depends not on the importance of the words themselves but on the degree of the topicality of their referent in the real world. The adjective *Lebanese,* for example, is included among the 4-band words, but is this word more important for advanced learners of English than a 3-band word, say, *medicine?* The answer to this question is definitely in the negative, and this inconsistency in the frequency rating seems to have come from the mechanical counting of word uses by the computer-based corpus.

Related to the question raised above is the inclusion in band 4 of numerous words often used in the fields of politics, economics, and
international affairs. Obviously, COBUILD reveals the propensity for these kinds of words in the higher frequency bands. For example, the abbreviations Co. and Corp. are included in the 4 band list while neither of them have frequency graphs in LDOCE.\(^\text{18}\)

We have to conclude that the high rating in the frequency of these words is also the result of automatically obtained data through the use of the computer corpus. The size of the Bank of English, the corpus used in the compiling of COBUILD dictionaries, was dramatically expanded during these six years, i.e. between the publication of the previous edition and the current one. It could naturally mean that the data collected during this period of time are exclusively from the source focusing mainly on current affairs in the world. This, in turn, leads to a situation in which the more topical the referent of a word is, the more often it is taken up in the media or by the general public. This results in the frequent appearances of the word in question in the corpus, which will finally be reflected in the frequency information. (Kozaki)

3. Pronunciation
3.1. Transcription system

As far as the transcription system is concerned, there is no change from the previous edition. The pronunciation guide section on p. xxxviii (henceforth the Guide) of the current edition is a verbatim copy of the previous one. Pronunciation keys are provided by using phonetic symbols adapted from those of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), and systematic vowel differences between RP and General American are explained in the Guide and left unmarked in the main body of the dictionary. For example, the pronunciation key for the short “o” vowel is /ə/, and the Guide states the vowel quality in General American English is /æ/. To show non-systematic differences, General American pronunciation is provided after code AM (e.g. /kænt/, AM kjant/ for can’t).

The present edition retains the strong prescriptive orientation of the previous edition. As is stated in the Guide, the basic principle is “If you pronounce it like this, most people will understand you.” Thus, COBUILD provides only one pronunciation key for the majority of its entry words, and when more than one pronunciation is common in British English, an alternative pronunciation is provided. For General American, only one pronunciation is given. There seems to be little revision concerning pronunciation keys to individual entry words. In fact, some misleading pronunciation keys that we pointed out in our review of the previous edition remain unchanged. The keys for issue and ate are /ɪsjuː, ɪʃu:/ and /et, ɛt/, respectively, indicating /ɪsjuː/ and /et/ are possible General American pronunciations.

In the apparent absence of revisions in terms of the transcription system or pronunciation keys for individual entry words, the reader is referred to our review of the previous edition for the use of superscript /r/ (Section 3.2) and treatment of weak forms (Section 3.4). The following two features, however, are unique to COBUILD and worth mentioning here again. The first is its clever use of italicized vowel symbols to show possible vowel reduction as in accept /əkˈsent/. This convention saves space and provides an accurate description of vowel reduction. The other is the treatment of stress shift. When a syllable bearing primary stress comes after a secondary stressed syllable as in disappointing /dɪˈspɑːntɪŋ/, both vowel symbols are underlined, indicating that depending on a context in which the word occurs, the first syllable may bear the primary stress as in “a disappointing result.” The guide contains a concise explanation of stress shift under the heading of “Words in Context.”

3.2. Comparison of COBUILD and LPD pronunciation entries

Presented in the remainder of this section is a comparison of pronunciation entries between COBUILD and the Longman Pronunciation Dictionary (LPD, 2nd edition). LPD presents the results of three opinion polls concerning preferred pronunciations of selected lexical items for both British (2 polls) and General American English (1 poll). The results are given in the form of bar charts, which makes it easier to identify these words. Pronunciations given for such words in LPD and the pronunciation keys for the same words in COBUILD were compared to examine (1) possible conditions under which more than one RP pronunciation is given in COBUILD, (2) possible conditions under which one pronuncia-
tion is selected from several possible pronunciations for RP and (3) the adequacy of General American pronunciation description.

Of the 139 words to which LPD shows multiple British pronunciations and the results of the opinion poll(s), 49 have two pronunciations, and 90 have only one in COBUILD. When two pronunciations are given in COBUILD, these words tend to have high frequency and/or there is little preference for one pronunciation over the other in LPD. Such words include: ate, chance, economic, either, exit, falcon, financial, issue, kilometer, mall, nephew, poor, sandwich, yours, etc. There are a few exceptions, however. Of the 49 words with two pronunciations, 4 (equinox, falcon, schism, and subsidence) have no black diamond (i.e. not in the top five frequency bands), and there are rather strong preferences for equinox (92% of the poll respondents preferred /ekwinnks/ over /i:kwinnks/) and schism (71% preferred /skizm/ over /sizm/, the latter being a traditional pronunciation).

Let us now turn to the 90 words for which COBUILD has only one pronunciation. There seems to be no criterion based on word frequency in determining whether to show one or two pronunciation keys. One might consider it reasonable to give alternative pronunciations to high frequency words, but this is not the case. For example, real has five diamonds (i.e. in the most frequent band) in COBUILD and the LPD poll results show little preference (55% /ri:/, 45% /rɛl/), but COBUILD only has /ri:/.

For another five-diamond word sure, /ʃʊr/ (54%) is the only pronunciation in COBUILD and /ʃər/ (46%) is not mentioned.

In most of the cases, though, a single pronunciation key given in COBUILD is the one that is preferred by a higher percentage of opinion poll respondents in LPD as in real, and sure. But there are some cases where the opposite is true. For such words, COBUILD tends to choose a less preferred pronunciation that is more traditional (i.e. supported by the older generations). For newspaper (4 diamonds), for example, /njuːs-/ (43%, traditional) is the only pronunciation given in COBUILD in spite of the fact that /njuːz-/ (57%, preferred by young people) is the first entry in LPD. The same is true for primarily, and salt. COBUILD only shows more traditional /prɪmərɪli/ (49%) and /sɔːlt/ (43%) and suppresses /pəmərɪli/ (51%) and /sɔlt/ (57%). This conservative criterion manifests itself in such entry words as schism, nephew and questionnaire, for which much less preferred, but nonetheless more traditional pronunciations (/sɪzm/ 29%, /neɪʃuː/ 21% and /ˈkeɪʃənər/ 6%) are given as second alternative pronunciations.

As far as the description of American pronunciation is concerned, there seems, unfortunately, to be much room for improvement. When two RP pronunciation keys are given and one of them is not an acceptable American pronunciation as in ate and issue mentioned above, the lack of a separate American English entry gives the reader the impression that both are acceptable American pronunciations. This was the case not only for the two words just mentioned but for many other entries such as been, crescent, mall, nephew, questionnaire, sandwich. One possible solution would be to introduce a new code such as RP, and put the common pronunciation first and introduce the one that is only acceptable for RP after this code, for example, /mæl, RP mæl/. There are also cases where by far the most dominant American pronunciations are not properly shown. For example, pronunciation keys for baptize and booth are /ˈbæptɪz/ and /bəʊθ/, respectively, missing General American /bæptɪz/ and /bʊθ/. A thorough revision of American pronunciation would make COBUILD a better reference source for learners of American English. (Takagi)

4. Definition
4.1. Overview
4.1.1. Extent of the survey

We have compared definitions in the second and third editions of COBUILD and counted the definitions that have been added, deleted, or changed in the new edition. Table 1 shows the results of the count. The count is based on every one hundred pages of both editions (figures in parentheses represent the second edition).
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Added</th>
<th>Deleted</th>
<th>Changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>backrest—backwards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burglary—burning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparable—compassionate leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design—delicacy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embassy—embroil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flint—float</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H—hack</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ineradicable—infantile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like-minded—limit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morale—more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overeat—overhaul</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerblue—powerline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reinforced concrete—rejoinder</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seduce—see</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spice—spin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher—tear</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undersea—undertake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2. We have found seventeen new definitions in the survey. Fifteen of them are definitions for the new lexical units that have been incorporated in the third edition. They include headwords like deism, delayed action, delaying tactic, deli, deliberative, embolism, morale booster, morale-boosting, reinvent, rejigger, tea dance, teakettle, team player, and underspend. The remaining two new definitions have been added because of the sense subdivision of in extremis and teapot. Only one definition in the second edition has been deleted. We estimate that about 10% of the definitions have been changed. In most cases, the changes are partial ones. We will elaborate on the changes later. The remaining 90% of the definitions are unchanged. We can say that the revisions made in the third edition are not very extensive as far as the definitions are concerned. Since most of the definitions remain the same, the problems pointed out in our review of COBUILD also remain. For the sake of space, therefore, we will concentrate mainly on the changes in the new edition. See Masuda et al. (1997: 30–43) for the problems that are not dealt with here.

4.2. Definition Sentences

4.2.1. Aims of the new edition

We begin from the prefatory material to find the aims of the new edition. Then, we will carry out surveys to find the nature and extent of the changes in the definitions in the third edition from A–Z sections by comparing them with the definitions in major learner’s dictionaries as well as those in COBUILD. Finally, we will propose some improvements.

4.2.1.1. We can see no major changes in the policy of sentence definitions as set out in the Preface. Definitions are written in full sentences as they have been since the first edition. The reason for full English sentences in the definitions is explained on p. xiii.

For some users who expected the brief traditional definitions, COBUILD definitions were so generous that they seemed almost wasteful. But when you look closely at the way the definitions are phrased you will see that every word is chosen to illustrate some aspect of the meaning . . . . Hence there is no apology for full sentence definitions — far from it.

The definition guide section on p. xviii also says:

. . . the definitions (or explanations, as we often call them) are written in full sentence. . . . We have chosen to explain words in the way because we think that this makes them much easier to read and understand. It also enables us to give a lot of information about the way a word or meaning is used by speakers of the language.

4.2.1.2. The defining style explained in the Guide to the Definition section remains virtually the same as that of the second edition as regards the use of bold face, information about collocates and structures, information about the grammatical structure, information about context and usage, and other kinds of definition.

4.2.1.3. Subdivisions of the definition can be found more easily in the new edition because they are given in squared digits such as 1, 2, and
4.2.2. New Definitions and the Deleted Definition

There are seventeen new definitions and one deleted definition. As we have mentioned above, new lexical units account for fifteen of the new definitions. The remaining two new definitions come from sense subdivisions of in extremis and teapot.

4.2.2.1. The following are some of the newly incorporated definitions:

**delayed action**: A delayed action mechanism causes a delay on the device it is fitted to, so that it does not work as soon as you switch it on or operate it.

**deliberative**: A deliberative institution or procedure has the power or the right to make important decisions. [FORMAL]

**reinvent**: To reinvent something means to change it so that it seems different and new. 1 If someone is trying to reinvent the wheel, they are trying to think of a new way of doing something that has been done in the same way for a very long time.

**team player**: If you refer to someone as a team player, you mean that they work well with other people in order to achieve things.

4.2.2.2. In the third edition, additional definitions have been added to in extremis and teapot (as a tempest in a teapot):

**in extremis**

COBUILD$: If someone or something is in extremis, they are in a very difficult situation and have to use extreme methods.

COBUILD$: 1 If someone or something is in extremis, they are in a very difficult situation and have to use extreme methods. 2 You can say that someone is in extremis when they are very ill and likely to die.

**teapot**

COBUILD$: A teapot is a container with a lid, a handle, and a spout, used for making and serving tea.

COBUILD$: 1 A teapot is a container with a lid, a handle, and a spout, used for making and serving tea. 2 If you describe a situation as a tempest in a teapot, you think that a lot of fuss is being made about something that is not important.

4.2.2.3. In the sampling, one definition has been deleted. In the second edition, spigot used to have two definitions. In the third edition, it has only one.

**spigot**

COBUILD$: 1 In British English, a spigot is a type of valve that controls the flow of a liquid from one source to another. 2 In American English, a spigot is a faucet or tap.

COBUILD$: A spigot is a faucet or tap. [AM]

We suppose that the additions and the deletion are the result of the larger corpus that reflects more accurate language use.

4.2.3. Changes in the Definitions

From the comparison of definitions in the second and third editions, we have found that quite a considerable number of definitions are shorter than those in the second edition, as the Preface declares. The reason for shorter definitions explained in the Preface (xiii) is: “In this third edition, we have worked hard on simplifying the wording in definitions even further, and reducing the length and complexity of definitions in order to make them easier to understand.” For beginners and intermediate learners, easy definitions are welcome. However, for advanced learners, informative definitions are often more desirable than easy but less informative ones. Easier and shorter definition sentences can end up conveying a reduced amount of information. For this reason, we will examine whether examples have been shortened and made easier without informational loss.

4.2.3.1. There are some minor changes. Readers must be attentive to find them. Here is one illustration.

**voyeurism**

COBUILD$: If you describe someone’s behaviour as voyeurism, you disapprove of them because you think they enjoy watching other people’s sufferings or problems.

COBUILD$: If you describe someone’s behaviour as voyeurism, you disapprove of them because you think they enjoy watching other people’s
suffering or problems.

We wonder if “sufferings” in the second edition and “suffering” in the third edition have the same meaning or not. Although COBUILD\(^3\) gives no sense distinction between the uncountable form of the word and the plural form, \(OALD^6\) gives a sense subdivision to the two forms of the word. \(LDCE^3\) does not explicitly distinguish two senses, but it seems that the word has two senses.

\(OALD^6\)

1 [U] physical or mental pain:

Death finally brought an end to her suffering. This war has caused widespread human suffering.

2 (sufferings) [pl.] feelings of pain and unhappiness:

The hospice aims to ease the sufferings of the dying.

\(LDCE^3\) [countable, uncountable] physical or mental pain and difficulty, or an experience of this: the suffering of innocent people during a war

The definition of \(OALD^6\) suggests that sense 1 has an abstract meaning whereas sense 2 is more concrete. In \(LDCE^3\), the first half of the definition corresponds to sense 1 of \(OALD\) and the latter half to sense 2. If so, the change in the third edition seems unnecessary.\(^{20}\)

4.2.3.2. The changes in the definitions of \textit{woe} and \textit{blast out} are a little more conspicuous.

\textit{woe}

\(COBUILD^2\): 2 You can refer to someone’s problems or misfortunes as their \textit{woes}.

\(COBUILD^3\): 2 You can refer to someone’s problems as their \textit{woes}.

The omission of “misfortunes” in the third edition may not affect the whole; nevertheless it still represents a loss of information.

\textit{blast out}

\(COBUILD^2\): If something is blasting out music or noise, or if music or noise is blasting out, loud music or noise is being produced.

\(COBUILD^3\): If music or noise is blasting out, loud music or noise is being produced.

In \textit{blast out}, the first part of the definition in the second edition has been deleted. However, the deletion means that an important piece of grammatical information has been lost from the definition. The definition in the second edition indicates explicitly that the subject can be a piece of equipment such as a loudspeaker that produces music; also, it can be music that is being produced. In the third edition, the second subject remains in the definition but the first subject can be retrieved only from the example.

It is difficult to judge whether simplification of the definition in these cases is an improvement or not.

4.2.3.3. Many definitions have been shortened and modified in an effort to make them easier to read. For example, the fifth definition of \textit{hack} in the third edition has been shortened by uniting the two “because clauses” that explain the reasons for the disapproval.

\textit{hack}

\(COBUILD^2\): 5 If you refer to a politician as a \textit{hack}, you disapprove of them because they have gained power by being loyal and obedient to their party and not because they are particularly talented or popular.

\(COBUILD^3\): 5 If you refer to a politician as a \textit{hack}, you disapprove of them because they are too loyal to their party and perhaps do not deserve the position they have.

In the process of unification, however, the reasons for the disapproval have been weakened. We prefer the longer definition in this particular case.\(^{21}\)

4.2.3.4. In the case of \textit{blazing}, a very important piece of information has been blurred. Many defining sentences in \textit{COBUILD} begin “If you use . . . to describe . . . ” Definitions in this type of phrasing show the selectional restriction of the headword. Learners will understand that \textit{blazing} is strongly associated with weather, and not with, say, a meal. Thus, they will use the word to write a sentence such as “The weather was blazing hot” but they will not write a sentence like “The stew was blazing hot.”

\textit{blazing}

\(COBUILD^2\): 1 You use \textit{blazing} or \textit{blazing hot} to describe the weather when it is very hot and sunny.

\(COBUILD^3\): 1 \textit{Blazing} sun or \textit{blazing hot} weather is very hot.

\(OALD^6\): 1 (also blazing hot) extremely hot:

\(LDCE^3\): 1 extremely hot
From the simplified definition in the third edition, learners will understand that "blazing sun" and "blazing hot weather" are typical expressions, but they may be not so certain that "blazing hot stew" is unidiomatic and not acceptable.

We do not mean to denigrate the shortened definition because it is still much more informative than that of OALD6 and LDCE3.

4.2.3.5. As part of the same effort, the seventh definition of power in the third edition has been simplified.

**power**

*COBUILD²:* 7 The **power** of something is the physical strength or the electronic capability that it has to move or affect things.

*COBUILD³:* 7 The **power** of something is the ability that it has to move or affect things.

Obviously, "the ability" is shorter than "the physical strength or the electronic capability" and learners may think the explanation easier to understand. However, a specific sense of the definition in the second edition, i.e. electronic capability, is lost in the third edition. As a result, the definition becomes rather too general and vague.²²

4.2.3.6. There are quite a few definitions that have been changed and made easier to understand, if not shorter. Compare the second sense of **flip side** in the second and third editions.

**flip side**

*COBUILD²:* 2 The **flip side** of an argument or idea is the opposite argument or idea.

*COBUILD³:* 2 The **flip side** of a situation consists of the less obvious or less pleasant aspects of it.

The definition of **tea leaf** has also been improved. Although the definition of **tea leaf** in the second edition was not in the wrong, it was a strange definition. People usually think of **tea leaves** as dried leaves that they use to make tea rather than leaves that are left after the tea has been drunk. The definition in the third edition is shorter, and easier to understand. Moreover, it accords better with common sense.²³

**tea leave**

*COBUILD²:* **Tea leaves** are the small pieces of dried leaves that are left in a teapot or a cup after the tea has been drunk.

*COBUILD³:* **Tea leaves** are the small pieces of dried leaves that you use to make tea.

4.2.3.7. According to the Style of Presentation section of the Introduction to the first edition of **COBUILD** (p. xvi), "The wording of each explanation shows the basic word class . . . An entry for a transitive verb like **conceal** will begin, 'If you conceal something, you: . . . ' This suggests that the verb in this sense is typically used with a human subject and a wide range of direct objects . . . "

For learners who use a dictionary for encoding, this type of information is quite useful. However, some definition sentences have been changed in a way that blurs the syntactic information such as the typical subjects and objects.

The twelfth sense of **top**, for example, is used as a transitive verb. In the second edition, the definition sentence indicates that the sentence begins either with a human subject (someone), or with a non-human subject (something). In the third edition, these pieces of information are not overtly indicated.

**top**

*COBUILD²:* 12 If someone or something **tops** a list, poll, or chart, they are mentioned or chosen more times than anyone or anything else.

*COBUILD³:* 12 To **top** a list means to be mentioned or chosen more times than anyone or anything else.

Typical objects such as "poll and chart" have also been deleted from the definition sentence. The definition of the verb in the form "to top a list . . . " suggests a wide range of subjects and a very limited object. We consider simplification of the definition by omitting important syntactic information should be avoided.

4.2.3.8. Another kind of information has been lost in the case of **comparison** (e.g. stand or bear ~).

**comparison**

*COBUILD²:* 5 If you say that someone or something **stands or bears comparison with someone or something else**, you mean that they are as good, or almost as good.
**COBUILD**: If someone or something **stands or bears comparison**
**with another person or thing**, they are as good, or almost as good.

In this particular definition, the first part of the clauses ("if you say that . . . , you mean . . .") has been deleted. This goes against one of **COBUILD**’s previous policies because "the words 'if you say that . . .' very often signal metaporic, figurative, and other non-literal meanings," (page xvi) and because the shortened definition does not say that the phrase **stand or bear comparison** expresses ones judgment rather than being an objective statement.

However, not all the definitions that begin in the form “If you say . . . you mean . . .” have been changed. In fact, most of them remain the same. For example, the definition of the third sense of **bleat** in the new edition is the same as that in the second edition.

**bleat**

If you say that someone **bleats** about something, you mean that they complain about it in a way which makes them sound weak and irritating.

We have the impression that these changes have been made rather inconsistently to give space for new lexical units.

4.2.3.9. We noted in the review of the previous edition of **COBUILD** that the lexicographers of the second edition were making efforts to avoid awkward noun-pronoun agreement. For example, they tried to avoid the awkwardness of using plural personal pronouns with reference to a singular antecedent in the definition of **pretender** in the second edition. We also praised the use of plural nouns and corresponding plural personal pronouns instead of a singular noun with "he or she" as its pronoun.

The preference for the plural noun and the plural pronoun correspondence just stated above may not be applied consistently, as the next example shows.

**float**

**COBUILD**: If a company director **floats** his or her company, he or she starts to sell shares in it to the public.

**COBUILD**: If a company director **floats** their company, they start to sell shares in it to the public.

In the definition paragraph of **director**, the noun in question is given in the plural form.

**director**

**COBUILD**: The **directors** of a company are its most senior managers, who meet regularly to make important decisions about how it will be run.

The fluctuation may indicate that the question of noun-pronoun agreement in the definition sentences remains unsettled among lexicographers.

### 4.3. Suggestions for Improvements

#### 4.3.1. Superheadwords and menus

We would like to propose some changes to the presentation of definition paragraphs. We have found that users are not very happy about the way **COBUILD** presents the definitions for long entries. This is because users cannot find the meaning they want quickly. Most learners consult a dictionary to find the meaning of the unfamiliar words/phrases that they come across while reading. They also look up words/phrases in a dictionary when they want to confirm syntactic information while writing. Naturally, they want to do things quickly. If they cannot find the information they want easily, they will be frustrated. This often happens when learners are looking up long entries in the dictionary.

Learner’s dictionaries such as **OALD 6** and **LDCE 3** try to solve the problem by giving so called “shortcut” and “signpost” respectively at the top of the definition paragraphs for long entries. In addition, **LDCE 3** lists “menus” for longer entries so that learners can very easily find out which paragraph they should read.

4.3.1.1. To help learners find the meaning they want quickly, **COBUILD** employed “superheadwords” for entries with several subentries and words with many subsenses. **COBUILD** has created “a menu at the top of each of these superheadwords.” The menus look like the ones in **LDCE 3**, but they are considerably different. Most of the menus in **COBUILD** divide entries according to their grammatical functions. The menus in **LDCE 3** list several sense groups in the entry.

4.3.1.2. The menu for **live**, for example, has two grammar-based sections in **COBUILD**: **live** (1) VERB USES and **live** (2) ADJECTIVE USES. **Live**
used as a verb) is defined in ten paragraphs. *LDCE* gives separate entry status for different parts of speech of the same word, so the menu does not divide the word on a grammar basis. In *LDCE*, the menu for the verb *live* has seven sense-based sections: **1. In a place/time**, **2. Live in a particular way**, **3. Be alive**, **4. Sexual relationship**, **5. Live for a reason**, **6. In your mind**, and **7. Other meanings**.

Since longer sections such as 1, 2, and 3 have further sense subsections (signposts), learners can quickly decide to which paragraph within the subsections they should proceed. Let us take an example. Suppose a Japanese student wants to know whether it is possible to replace 'grow' in the sentence "Cactuses can grow in hot and very dry desert" with 'live'. The construction of "a plant (subject) + live (verb)" is not obvious for Japanese learners. A student who consults *LDCE* will read the menu of *live* and will decide 1 should include the wanted information. The student will also notice that among the four signposts of 1: 1. In a place/home 2. Plant/animal 3. At a particular time 4. To be kept somewhere, 2 is the right one to read, and will be happy to find the definition "a plant or animal that lives in a particular place grows there or has its home there."

Students who consult *COBUILD* will read the definition of *live* from the beginning and will eventually come across the fourth paragraph. It reads: "To live means to be alive. If someone lives to a particular age, they stay alive until they are that age." However, they will be not sure if this definition can be applicable to plants unless they find the second illustrative example, "A perennial is a plant that lives indefinitely."

We can understand the reason why most students are tempted to consult *LDCE* rather than *COBUILD*.

4.3.1.3. Many long entries in *COBUILD* do not have menus at all. *Work* has 41 paragraphs, but they all come within one long entry. Similarly, *way* with its 93 paragraphs does not have a menu. Other basic headwords such as *come, day, eye, know, open, place, put, run, say, see, time, word*, etc. have no menus, either.

4.3.1.4. Some long entries in *COBUILD* have menus that give sense-based sections. *Make* has six sense groups in the menu: 1. Carrying out an action; 2. Causing or changing; 3. Creating or producing; 4. Link verb uses; 5. Achieving or reaching; 6. Stating an amount or time and 7. Phrasal verbs. Six sections in *COBUILD* may be not enough since there are fifteen sections in *LDCE*. Nonetheless, they are still helpful. We wonder why the lexicographers of the third edition do not offer more menus like the one in *make*. We hope that the next edition gives a much larger number of menus that are sense based. The menus should be more detailed with many sense sections. Hopefully, there also should be something like signposts. They can help learners easily access the wanted information for each longer entry.

4.3.1.5. The definition styles of *COBUILD* are oriented toward encoding rather than decoding. The *COBUILD*-style definition sentence with typical subjects and objects may be unnecessary for decoding dictionaries because they are contextually evident. Many learners' dictionaries like *OALD* and *LDCE* do not offer usually these pieces of information for this reason. Instead, they give more entries, finely divided sense distinctions, etc. If the editors of *COBUILD* are thinking of increasing the number of headwords and definitions by shortening the definition paragraphs, or by reducing the amount of information, *COBUILD* will look more like a conventional dictionary. (Masuda)

5. Examples

5.1. Overview

5.1.1. Aims of the revision of examples in the new edition

The Introduction to the dictionary does not give full explanation of the aims of the revision of examples. It briefly notes on page ix that "For the third edition, we have again used the vast resource of the Bank of English to update many of the definitions and examples in the book. . . ."

5.1.1.1. The explanation of Examples on page xiv of the third edition does not differ significantly from the explanation of Examples in the second edition except that it says "there are about 105,000 examples" instead of 100,000 examples in the second edition.

5.1.1.2. Table 1 shows the result of the survey of examples conducted on
Table 1 indicates that seventeen examples have been added. New lexical units account for most of the new examples, but there are a few additions. Thirteen examples in the second edition have been replaced with new ones in the third edition. That is, there are thirty new examples in total. The percentage of new examples in the third edition is estimated at about 3%. The percentage of all the changes to examples, including revised or deleted ones added is estimated at about 4%. The changes in the new edition are very small. We can say, therefore, that most problems with examples pointed out in the review of the second edition still remain. For this reason, we concentrate our survey on the examples that have been replaced with older ones and those that have undergone changes. For problems with examples, see Masuda et al. (1997: 48–53)

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>examples</th>
<th>new</th>
<th>deleted</th>
<th>revised</th>
<th>replaced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>backrest—backwards</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burglary—burning</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparable—compassionate leave</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design—delicacy</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embassy—embroil</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flint—float</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H—hack</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ineradicable—infantile</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like-minded—limit</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morale—more</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overeat—overhaul</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerblue—powerline</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reinforced concrete—rejoinder</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seduce—see</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spice—spin</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher—tear</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undersea—undertake</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.3. In the second edition, all the examples in the first edition were replaced with new ones. The reason for the replacement is explained on the page xxii of the Example section of the Guide to the Dictionary Entries of the second edition:

Because this is a completely new edition of the dictionary, we have chosen examples which we have never used before in any of our dictionaries or other reference books. This makes the dictionary a valuable resource for both students and teachers.

Apparently, a different policy on examples has been adopted in the third edition. Most examples used in the second edition are used again in the new edition. Using the same examples causes some problems which we will discuss later.

5.2. Examples added and deleted

5.2.1. New examples

As we have mentioned, new lexical units incorporated in the third edition account for most of the new examples. Here are some of them.

delayed action: For all we know, there may be delayed action bombs in the dam. . . . a type of delayed-action parachute.
deliberative: . . . a deliberative chamber like the House of Commons.
reinvent: [1] They have tried to reinvent their retail stores. He was determined to reinvent himself as a poet and writer. [2] Some of these ideas are worth pursuing, but there is no need to reinvent the wheel.
reinvention (nested in reinvent): . . . a reinvention of the styles of the 1940s.

5.2.2. Deleted examples

A few examples in the second edition have been deleted. For example, Burmese had two example phrases, but in the third edition, there is no example. Two example phrases of mordant have been reduced to one in the third edition.

Burmese

COBUILD: 1 . . . the Burmese ambassador. 2 . . . more than 5,200 Bur-
COBUILD²: no example

**mordant**

COBUILD²: ... *his mordant wit* ... a mordant sense of humour.

COBUILD¹: ... *a book in which he discussed with a mordant wit the nasty racism of little middle class English children.*

Loss of examples in place names generally does not affect informational value very much. Advanced learners can easily understand these phrases without consulting a dictionary. Therefore, the deletion is justifiable. Likewise, the reduction of two similar phrases in *mordant* does not cause users any trouble because the example in the third edition is much more informative.

### 5.3. Changes and replacements in examples

#### 5.3.1. Minor changes

Among the 997 examples surveyed, there are only seven examples that have undergone changes. Moreover, those changes are not very important ones. For instance, one of the examples of the second sense of *compare* in the second edition was "Some commentators compared his work to that of James Joyce." In the third edition the first word, "some" is omitted but the rest remains the same. Similarly, "She flits from one dance partner to another" in the second edition (in *flit*) has been changed to "She flits from one partner to another" omitting "dance" in the third edition.

#### 5.3.2. Replaced examples

Thirteen examples have been replaced in the third edition. The reason for the replacement may be that the examples in the second edition were too specific and became outdated.

**embattled**

COBUILD²: 2 The commander of British forces in Bosnia was yesterday stranded close to the embattled town of Zepce.

COBUILD³: 2 Both sides say they want to try to reach a political settle-

ment in the embattled north and east of the island.

**embody**

COBUILD²: 2 Albanian Radio has given details of a new draft constitution which embodies reforms first called for by President Ramiz Alia . . .

Mr Clinton is outspoken in his support for a multilateral trading system embodied by the GATT.

COBUILD¹: 2 UK employment law embodies arbitration and conciliation mechanisms for settling industrial disputes.

In the British system the executive is supposedly embodied by the Crown and the legislative by Parliament

**overhaul**

COBUILD: The win kept alive Becker's challenge to overhaul Stefan Edberg as the world No. 1

COBUILD: Argentina need to beat Peru by at least four goals to overhaul Brazil and reach the final itself.

**power**

COBUILD²: 1 . . . a power struggle at the top of Albania's ruling Communist Party.

COBUILD²: 1 . . . a political power struggle between the Liberals and National Party.

#### 5.3.2.2. We appreciate the efforts to renew the examples in these ways, but authentic examples are very specific by nature. As long as they are authentic examples chosen from the corpus, they will remain specific in terms of names, places, and/or time of events. If the dictionary needs both authentic and the most updated examples, all the examples should be replaced with new ones chosen from the latest collection in the corpus. If lexicographers modify the examples so that they can stand firm and free from the place/event context, they will look like examples invented specifically for the dictionary.

### 5.4. For improvement

In the new edition, we have estimated that about 4% of the examples have been changed. This may cause some problems because authentic examples are necessarily specific in terms of names and events; they tend
to become outdated very quickly. In the third edition, outdated examples have been cleverly replaced with ones that are more general. However, we believe that a dictionary that uses authentic examples chosen from the corpus should renew all the examples every time a new edition is published, as it was done in the second edition. The explanation of Examples on page xxii of the second edition says, "This makes the dictionary a valuable resource for both students and teachers, showing how the words have been used in books, newspapers, magazines, broadcasting, and conversation." (Masuda)

6. Usage

In this section, the usage information provided by COBUILD\(^3\) will be discussed. By "usage information" we mean the information about any limitations on the use of words or senses with respect to locality, field, style, and so forth. This kind of information is usually given by means of usage labels and usage notes in ordinary dictionaries, but COBUILD\(^3\) carries usage notes only rarely, if ever.\(^29\) We will therefore focus our attention on usage labels, which will be dealt with by comparing them diachronically with those in COBUILD\(^2\) and synchronically with those in OALD\(^6\).

For this discussion, the present author checked all the usage labels in ninety pages in total (the first thirty pages of A, L, and W sections), which account for approximately five percent of the whole A-Z pages of the dictionary. What follows is based on the findings derived from the examination of the usage information in the ninety pages.

6.1. The presentation of usage information

The way COBUILD\(^3\) presents usage information differs greatly from that adopted by COBUILD\(^2\). We can locate and understand the information in the former dictionary faster and more easily than that in the latter. In general, as seen in the examples below, the second edition gave it usually at the end, and sometimes at the beginning, of the definition in the form of a phrase\(^29\) as if it were part of the definition, whereas the third edition employs usage labels as other major dictionaries do including OALD\(^6\), placing them in principle immediately after the definition and before the example(s) if any, in small capitals within square brackets.

affiliation 1

COBUILD\(^2\): If one group has an affiliation with another group, it has a close or official connection with it; a formal use.

COBUILD\(^3\): If one group has an affiliation with another group, it has a close or official connection with it. [FORMAL]

leader 4

COBUILD\(^2\): In British English, the leader of an orchestra is the most senior violin player, who acts as a deputy to the conductor.

COBUILD\(^3\): The leader of an orchestra is the most senior violin player, who acts as a deputy to the conductor. [BRIT]

The usage information in COBUILD\(^3\), in comparison with that in COBUILD\(^2\), is easily and clearly recognizable as such, and is more user-friendly.

6.2. The usage labels used

COBUILD\(^2\) and COBUILD\(^3\) are also very different in the number of usage labels used,\(^20\) the latter having far more than the former. The second edition showed usage information by means of thirteen labels: American, British, formal, informal, journalism, legal, literary, medical, offensive, old-fashioned, spoken, technical, and written. All of these labels are retained and eight new ones are added in the third edition: computing, dialect, humorous, military, rude, trademark, very offensive, and very rude. The labels American and British in the second edition are abbreviated to [AM] and [BRIT] respectively in the third edition, and the usage labels in both editions are often modified by the term "mainly" as in [mainly BRIT], [mainly FORMAL], [mainly SPOKEN], and so forth.\(^31\)
6.3. The validity of the usage labels

6.3.1. Careful consideration should be given to the validity of the usage labels adopted by COBUILD. In order to do it, that is, to examine whether necessary labels are lacking, whether unnecessary ones are included, and whether there are any problematic labels, we will begin by seeing what types of labels COBUILD has. Usage labels that often appear in various kinds of dictionaries can be classified into seven categories: locality, currency, temporality, field, medium, style, and status labels. The following table indicates how COBUILD classifies label types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>types of labels</th>
<th>individual labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>locality</td>
<td>AM*, BRIT*, DIALECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currency</td>
<td>OLD-FASHIONED*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporality</td>
<td>COMPUTING, JOURNALISM*, LEGAL*, MEDICAL*, MILITARY, TECHNICAL*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field</td>
<td>SPOKEN*, WRITTEN*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style</td>
<td>FORMAL*, HUMOROUS, INFORMAL*, LITERARY*, OFFENSIVE*, RUDE, TRADEMARK, VERY OFFENSIVE, VERY RUDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.2. We will now check the types of usage labels and the individual labels belonging to them in terms of their validity. First of all, a glance at the table above may make us wonder why currency and status labels are not employed. In the case of ESL dictionaries like COBUILD, the labels such as “nonstandard” showing the status of words or senses are not necessary. The users of such dictionaries, who are learning English as nonnative speakers, hope to get a working knowledge of standard English, and they do not have to know about nonstandard usage. Moreover, we can expect that native speakers, when communicating with them, usually take care not to use nonstandard English. ESL dictionaries, therefore, would do better to exclude words and senses to which status labels have to be attached.

The absence of currency labels like “rare” in COBUILD, which are employed in OALD, can also be fully justified. The inclusion or exclusion of the labels indicating currency depends on the ESL-dictionary editor’s attitude toward rarely used words or senses. On the one hand, native speakers of English do use them even if the frequency of their use is low, because they are part of standard English. If the editor judges that foreign learners should know them as receivers of messages even though they do not use them themselves, then the inclusion of currency labels makes sense. On the other hand, foreign-born ESL learners can expect native speakers to employ more frequently used words, and so do not have to bother to remember words or senses with a low frequency. If the editor thinks that way, the exclusion of the labels indicating currency from his or her dictionary is just as reasonable. It follows therefore that the two different approaches, that is, the presence of currency labels as in OALD and their absence as in COBUILD, are both justifiable in the case of ESL dictionaries.

6.3.3. As to the locality labels in COBUILD, [DIALECT], which was absent in the second edition and which is employed in OALD as well, seems to be a little problematic, or at least not so helpful to ESL learners. The other two locality labels, [AM] and [BRIT], which indicate national variation, are highly important to them in that the United States and the United Kingdom are the most influential of the English-speaking countries, and so the knowledge of words or senses used (almost) exclusively by either of the two nations is not at all useless. However, the label [DIALECT] hardly means anything except that a word or sense with the label is not commonly used everywhere in the English-speaking world. Therefore, few foreign learners of English would find it necessary or useful for ESL dictionaries to enter dialectal words or senses. Those ESL learners to whom they are indispensable must have a high level of English proficiency and should be ready to consult a general monolingual dictionary intended for native speakers. For ESL dictionaries, it would be better to use the space in order to provide the readers with more important information,
instead of entering dialectal usage. Fortunately or unfortunately, as the front matter of COBUILD\(^3\) (p. xi) states that “Dialect words are seldom featured,” no words or senses with the label [DIALECT] can in fact be found in the ninety pages mentioned at the beginning of this section.

In passing, a comment must be made on the treatment of American English by COBUILD\(^3\). Although the second edition focused on British English as its front matter (p. xx) stated, that in the third edition (p. xi) asserts with pride that “the coverage of American English has been greatly extended.” We will verify at this point whether or not the third edition’s assertion is true. First, in the ninety pages of COBUILD\(^3\) mentioned earlier, we can find twenty-two new words and senses labeled either [AM] or [BRIT] which were not entered in COBUILD\(^2\). Of these, fifteen items have the label [AM], while the number of those labeled [BRIT] is only seven, which is less than a half. Second, there were, in the second edition, many instances in which a British word or sense was entered without its American equivalent although there is one. In the third edition, however, when a British word or sense is entered, its American equivalent is given, if there is one, in the ticked box. Judging from these two facts together with others we will not go into here, it can be said for certain that COBUILD\(^3\) has the right to claim that it has put far more emphasis on American English than the second edition.

6.3.4. COBUILD\(^3\) as well as COBUILD\(^2\) employs [OLD-FASHIONED] as a temporality label. There is nothing wrong with it; in fact, it is necessary for an ESL dictionary to provide foreign learners with information about old-fashioned words and senses. Although they tend to be used mainly by older people and youngsters may seldom use them, ESL learners as recipients of messages can derive great benefit from the knowledge of them.

OALD\(^6\) uses as temporality labels not only “old-fashioned,” but it also employs “old use” which indicates that words or senses with the label are no longer used in contemporary English. The present author is of the opinion that an ESL dictionary does not have to enter obsolete expressions, which we may come across only in literature written before the twentieth century. No foreign learners with excellent English ability who want to read a nineteenth-century novel would ever try to consult an ESL dictionary instead of one for native speakers. Thus, the COBUILD dictionaries’ attitude toward temporality labels, that is, the adoption of the label [OLD-FASHIONED] alone, may be more reasonable than that of OALD\(^6\).

6.3.5. The field labels in COBUILD\(^3\) seem to be very problematic, firstly because of their unsystematic presentation, secondly because the amount of information conveyed has been decreased in some cases compared with COBUILD\(^3\), and thirdly because the field label [TECHNICAL] does not mean much or it is too vague. While COBUILD\(^3\), by comparison with the second edition, has a highly systematized method of providing usage information on the whole, there is much room left for improvement in the presentation of information on specialized fields. It employs at least three ways of doing it as the following examples show.

**accrue 1**
If money or interest accrues, it gradually increases in amount over a period of time. [TECHNICAL]

**account 2**
In business, a regular customer of a company can be referred to as an account, especially when the customer is another company.

**acquirer**
In business, an acquirer is a company or person who buys another company. [TECHNICAL]

In the first example, the field label alone is given after the definition; in the second, the labeling phrase alone is placed at the beginning of the definition; and in the third, both of them are applied. This seems to be too unsystematic and some kind of consistency may be desired.

Another problem in the presentation by COBUILD\(^3\) of information about field is that we can find some instances where the second edition gave us more information than the third does, as the following examples show.
A wadi is a river in North Africa and Arabia which is dry except in the rainy season; a technical term in geography.

The second edition provides us with two pieces of information: first that "wadi" is a technical term, and second that it is used in geography, while the third edition gives us only one of them. Such decrease in useful information would be detrimental at least to some extent to the benefit of dictionary users.

A third problem with the field labels in COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} is the label [\textsc{technical}]. It is too generic to tell us much about a word or sense with it except that it is not usually used in our daily lives. The present author's proposal is that the dictionary give up applying the label [\textsc{technical}] all together, and that it adopt, as \textit{Oald}\textsuperscript{6} does,\textsuperscript{30} many more relevant labels designating a variety of specific specialized fields, if necessary, in addition to [\textsc{computing}], [\textsc{legal}], [\textsc{medical}], [\textsc{journalism}], and [\textsc{military}] which are already employed.\textsuperscript{30} If this proposal is accepted, we will be able to solve the two other problems as well that were aforementioned.

6.3.6. Our next topic for discussion is the style labels in the third edition. Since many different labels belong to this type, we will pick out only the important ones and give them careful consideration. First of all, let us think about the absence of a style label "slang" in COBUILD\textsuperscript{1}. The two labels, [\textsc{formal}] and [\textsc{informal}], which are indispensible to foreigners in the process of learning English, can be grouped together to constitute a subcategory relating to formality, to which often belongs another label "slang" in some other ESL dictionaries including \textit{Oald}\textsuperscript{6}. If this proposal is accepted, we will be able to solve the two other problems as well that were aforementioned.

6.3.7. The last item we have to consider concerning the validity of usage labels in COBUILD\textsuperscript{1} is about those describing medium, that is, [\textsc{spoken}] and [\textsc{written}]. Although the information on words and senses that are (chiefly) used in either spoken or written language is greatly helpful to ESL learners, the present author is not fully convinced of the validity of the two medium labels employed in the third edition. The front matter gives us some knowledge of the Bank of English on which the dictionary is based: that it consists of four hundred million words; that it is divided into fifteen components, one of which is that for spoken English, within which twenty million words of informal speech are entered; that two-thirds of it consists of media English, that is, newspapers, magazines, radio and TV; and so forth. Nevertheless, it is not certain whether the size of the spoken
component and that of the written component are (about) the same, or whether all the data in the spoken component comes from impromptu, natural speech, that is, whether part at least of the data in it is gotten from scripted language being spoken. If the size of the spoken component is far smaller than that of the written counterpart, there would be a possibility that the reliability of the label [written] could be low, that of [spoken] remaining high. It is because expressions that are at first found only or chiefly in the written component may begin to be entered into the spoken component as its size grows larger. And if the data in the spoken component contains a certain amount of scripted speech, which is not actual but believed usage as Quirk and Stein (1990: 244) states, the reliability of the label [spoken] could be low in some cases. The present author thinks it would be better if COBUILD had provided its readers with enough information by which to judge the reliability of the labels [spoken] and [written] accurately.

6.4. The compound labels used

We will now discuss what might be called compound labels in COBUILD as well as OALD. The labels that have been dealt with so far are what we might call single-unit labels, one of the two kinds of dictionary usage labels, the other being compound labels. A single-unit label is one with a single usage label within a pair of square brackets giving us a piece of usage information on the relevant word or sense, whereas a compound label is one with more than one usage label within a pair of square brackets providing us as many bits of usage information on the word or sense to which it is attached. Although the majority of labels in COBUILD as well as in COBUILD and OALD are single-unit ones like [brt], [formal], and [spoken], compound labels such as [am, formal] and [informal, spoken] do appear frequently. In theory, we could work out a compound label like [am, old-fashioned, informal, humorous, spoken] that consists of as many as five units representing four types of usage information, which would be unreal when practical utility is taken into consideration. Realistically, only two- or at the most three-unit compound labels can serve the practical purpose. In fact, almost all the compound labels in COBUILD as well as COBUILD are two-unit ones with a three-unit label [am, informal, offensive], for instance, appearing as a rare exception in the third edition, while OALD applies three-unit labels far more generously though their actual frequency is relatively low. As to the number of compound labels attached to the relevant words or senses as well as that of different combinations of various individual labels to form compound labels, OALD has much more of them than the two editions of the COBUILD dictionaries. By far the most common combination of individual labels in the formation of compound labels is that of a locality label and another one from a different type such as [brit, written] and [am, informal] in all the three dictionaries.

6.5. The application of usage labels by COBUILD and COBUILD

We will proceed to examine how far COBUILD has been revised in terms of the application of usage labels as compared to COBUILD. The author counted the words and senses, in the ninety pages mentioned at the beginning of section 6, which satisfy the conditions that they are entered in both COBUILD and COBUILD, and that single-unit labels which are employed in the second edition as well as the third are attached to them in COBUILD and/or COBUILD. It was found that their total number is five hundred and forty-eight, of which there are four hundred and eighty-eight cases, that is almost ninety percent, where both editions apply the same label. Of the remainder, that is a little more than ten percent, there are forty-seven instances where only the third edition attaches a label, twelve in which only the second edition applies a label, and one where COBUILD gives the label [old-fashioned] to a sense to which the second edition attaches the label "literary." Where the forty-seven label additions in COBUILD are concerned, the label [brt] heavily outranks the others, there being twenty instances of it, followed by eight instances of the label [formal], six instances of the label [spoken], and so forth. Of the twelve label deletions by the third edition, five instances of the label [brt], two instances of the labels [technical] and [written], and so forth can be found.
The main reason for the additions and deletions of labels by COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} is that the size of the Bank of English on which it is based has doubled since 1995 when the second edition was published,\textsuperscript{42} which has made it necessary to revise the application of usage labels. Another, hopefully minor, reason may be that the mistaken omission and attachment of labels in COBUILD\textsuperscript{2} has been corrected in the third edition. All in all, the fact that the overwhelming majority of labels remain unchanged would be indispensable to the continuity between the two editions of the same dictionary. In fact, a dictionary cannot be dependable which makes too many changes in the application of usage labels each time its new edition appears.

### 6.6. The reliability of the usage labels applied

Our last topic for discussion in this section is the extent to which the usage labels are reliable that are actually applied to the relevant words, which we will consider by comparing those in COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} and OALD\textsuperscript{6}. The author counted the number of monosemous headwords, in the aforementioned ninety pages, which satisfy the conditions that they are entered in both COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} and OALD\textsuperscript{6}, and that single-unit labels which are adopted in both the dictionaries are applied to them in COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} and/or OALD\textsuperscript{6}. The number was found to be two hundred and sixteen in all, of which ninety-eight words, that is approximately forty-five percent of the total, are provided with the same labels in both of the dictionaries. The remaining one hundred and eighteen words can, here too, be classified into three categories: one in which only the words in COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} have a label, the number of words belonging to this category being twenty-four; another where only the words in OALD\textsuperscript{6} have a label, the number being seventy-two; and the other in which the two dictionaries apply different labels to the same words, the number being twenty-two. The main items indicating the different attitudes of COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} and OALD\textsuperscript{6} toward the application of usage labels are presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>labels applied</th>
<th>COBUILD\textsuperscript{3}</th>
<th>OALD\textsuperscript{6}</th>
<th>number of words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FORMAL</td>
<td>no label</td>
<td>formal</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIT</td>
<td>no label</td>
<td>BrE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD-FASHIONED</td>
<td>no label</td>
<td>written</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no label</td>
<td>formal</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no label</td>
<td>BrE</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no label</td>
<td>written</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no label</td>
<td>informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL</td>
<td>no label</td>
<td>formal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITTEN</td>
<td>no label</td>
<td>written</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITERARY</td>
<td>no label</td>
<td>written</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMAL</td>
<td>technical</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITERARY</td>
<td>written</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference in the labeling attitude between the two dictionaries is that they depend on different corpora for the analysis and description of the English language, and that they differ in the criteria by which to attach usage labels to the relevant words. In general, although it is only natural that dictionaries adopt different approaches in their application of labels, the users are certain to get confused when more than half of the instances are those, as in COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} and OALD\textsuperscript{6}, where a word or sense in one dictionary has one usage label and that in another dictionary has a different label. In such cases, reliability of dictionaries in terms of usage labels actually attached to the relevant words or senses could be said to be low, as the users are at a loss as to which one to rely on for the accurate information on the style, locality, and so forth of words and senses. A consoling fact about COBUILD\textsuperscript{3} and OALD\textsuperscript{6} is that there are no instances where a word is given the label [FORMAL] in one dictionary and informal in the other, or [spoken] in one and written in the other. (Takano)

### 7. Grammar

There are no prominent differences between the grammatical notation used in COBUILD\textsuperscript{2} and COBUILD\textsuperscript{3}. The following section gives an
overview of the grammatical information offered in COBUILD3.

7.1. Types of Grammar Information

7.1.1. According to the explanation in the front matter (p. xxv), the types of grammar information in COBUILD3 are: 1) the word class of the word, 2) restrictions or extensions to its behaviour, 3) the patterns that the word most frequently occurs in. The word class is printed in upper case, the structure pattern is printed in a combination of upper and lower case, and the restrictions and extensions are printed in lower case. The word is printed in italics when used within a pattern. A slash is used to separate alternatives.

The patterns are given immediately after the word class for all word classes except verbs. The verb patterns are given next to the examples and in the same order as the examples. The grammar information is printed in the extra column.

In short, the types of grammar information and grammar notation in COBUILD3 is almost the same as those in COBUILD2.

7.1.2. The notations used for ‘word classes’ and ‘words and abbreviations used in patterns’ in COBUILD3 are exactly the same as those in COBUILD2. On this bases we can surmise that the lexicographers in charge of grammar information in the COBUILD project considered the grammar notation system employed in COBUILD2 efficient in denoting the language facts.

In fact, the grammar notation system in COBUILD2 was highly evaluated in some of the critiques that analyzed and compared the presentation of grammar information in COBUILD2 with that in the other learner’s dictionaries published in the memorable year 1995 (cf. Bogaards 1996, Herbst 1996, Aarts 1999).

7.2. Presentation of Structural Patterns

7.2.1. In the process of analyzing the corpus data for the compilation of COBUILD2, editors observed that almost every word sense seemed to be associated with a certain structural pattern (Sinclair 1987: 109). This helped the editors sort out structural patterns to be featured for certain word senses.

One of the criticisms of COBUILD1 was the arrangement of the examples, which were not given in the same order as the patterns in the extra column. In COBUILD3, the examples and their corresponding patterns were presented in the same order, although some small slips remained (cf. Masuda et al. 1997: 52, Herbst 1996: 332, Aarts 1999: 20).

7.2.2. The presentation of verb patterns in the extra column was even further improved in COBUILD3. In this edition, the patterns are not only given in the same order as the examples but are shown next to the corresponding examples. Compare the first sense of the verb believe in COBUILD2 and COBUILD3:

believe /bɪljv/ believes, believing, believed

If you believe that something is true, you think that it is true; a formal use. You can say 'I believe' to indicate that you are not completely sure that what you are saying is accurate or to make a statement sound more factual and less emotional. Experts believe that the coming drought will be extensive... I believe you have something of mine... The main problem, I believe, lies elsewhere... We believe them to be hidden here in this apartment... 'You've never heard of him?'—'I don't believe so.'

Fig. 1 The excerpt of the entry for believe 1 in COBUILD2

believe /bɪljv/ (believes, believing, believed)

If you believe that something is true, you think that it is true, but you are not sure. [FORMAL] Experts believe that the coming drought will be extensive... I believe you have something of mine... The main problem, I believe, lies elsewhere... We believe them to be hidden here in this apartment... 'You've never heard of him?'—'I don't believe so.'

Fig. 2 The excerpt of the entry for believe 2 in COBUILD3

The example sentences are exactly the same in both COBUILD2 and COBUILD3. The patterns are shown in four lines for this sense in both editions. However, we notice that there are two lines skipped between the pattern V that and V n to-inf in COBUILD3, while there is no such gap in COBUILD2. The editors added this gap so that the pattern could be
placed alongside the corresponding example. In order to show the pattern $V \text{ n to-inf}$ next to the example sentence 'We believe them to be hidden here in this apartment', the two lines that show the example sentences with the pattern $V \text{ that}$ were left blank.

This device is an innovation newly introduced in COBUILD$^3$, and there is no question that this helps users understand more clearly.

### 7.3. Verb Codes in COBUILD$^3$

#### 7.3.1. Aarts (1999) pointed out that the verb codes in OALD$^5$ and COBUILD$^2$ were virtually the same (p. 29). She selected 22 verbs and compared their structural patterns between the following pairs: OALD$^6$ and OALD$^5$; LDOCE$^5$ and LDOCE$^3$; COBUILD$^1$ and COBUILD$^2$. She also listed the verb codes shown in CIDE, but she made no comparisons with CIDE since only the first edition has been published.

#### 7.3.2. The change of verb codes from COBUILD$^1$ to COBUILD$^2$ was quite drastic. The codes using function labels were all replaced with the codes using category labels. This change of codes made the codes in COBUILD$^2$ much more explicit and hence much easier for readers to decipher. Mnemonic codes for verb patterns were first devised in OALD$^4$, and in the following edition they were revised and became even more explicit. The verb codes of COBUILD$^2$ are similar to those in OALD$^5$, since both dictionaries use category labels.

#### 7.3.3. A new edition of OALD was published in 2000. In a critique that analyzes OALD$^6$ from various perspectives (Akasu et al. 2001), the verb codes of OALD$^6$ are compared with those of OALD$^5$. Although there are some changes between the two editions, the codes themselves are almost the same. Therefore, we decided to compare the verb codes of OALD$^6$ and COBUILD$^3$, using the same method employed by Aarts (1999):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copular</th>
<th>OALD$^6$</th>
<th>COBUILD$^3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. become angry/president</td>
<td>V-ADJ, V-N</td>
<td>V adj; V n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>OALD$^6$</th>
<th>COBUILD$^3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. faint</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monotransitive</th>
<th>OALD$^6$</th>
<th>COBUILD$^3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. admire sb/sth</td>
<td>VN</td>
<td>V n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. believe (that ...)</td>
<td>V (that)</td>
<td>V that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. doubt (whether sth is true)</td>
<td>V wh-</td>
<td>V whether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. wonder (what to do)</td>
<td>V wh-</td>
<td>V wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. refuse (to leave)</td>
<td>V to inf</td>
<td>V to-inf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. enjoy (singing)</td>
<td>V -ing</td>
<td>V n/ing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. want (sb to do sth)</td>
<td>VN to inf</td>
<td>V n to-inf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. hate (sb doing sth)</td>
<td>VN -ing</td>
<td>V n -ing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ditransitive</th>
<th>OALD$^6$</th>
<th>COBUILD$^3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. send (sb sth)</td>
<td>VNN</td>
<td>V n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. teach (sth to sb)</td>
<td>VN</td>
<td>V n to n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. promise (sb that ...)</td>
<td>VN (that)</td>
<td>V n that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ask (sb whether...)</td>
<td>V wh-</td>
<td>V n wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. show (sb how to...)</td>
<td>V wh-</td>
<td>V n wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. advise (sb to do sth)</td>
<td>VN to inf</td>
<td>V n to-inf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex transitive</th>
<th>OALD$^6$</th>
<th>COBUILD$^3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. drive (sb mad)</td>
<td>VN-ADJ</td>
<td>V n adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. elect (sb chairman)</td>
<td>VN-N</td>
<td>V n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. know (sb to be a liar)</td>
<td>VN to inf</td>
<td>V n to-inf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. make (sb do sth)</td>
<td>VN inf</td>
<td>V n inf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. set (sb thinking)</td>
<td>VN -ing</td>
<td>V n -ing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. get (sth repaired)</td>
<td>VN-ADJ</td>
<td>V n-ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there is a difference in use of capital letters and small letters the table above shows that the verb codes in the two dictionaries are virtually the same.
7.4. Abbreviations of Word Classes

7.4.1. The abbreviations in the special entries of COBUILD\(^1\) were newly devised at the behest of the editor in chief, who lamented that there was a "lack of an adequate terminology for talking about language" due to "the demise of traditional grammar" (Sinclair 1987: 105).

7.4.2. The abbreviations used for grammar notations were revised and increased in number in the following edition. Although the abbreviations are explicit, some lexicographers pointed out that the users might still find it difficult to interpret the abbreviation in COBUILD\(^2\) (Masuda et al. 1997: 59f., Aarts 1999: 23).

7.4.3. Despite the problem indicated above, COBUILD\(^3\) uses the same abbreviations for the 74 "word classes" it defines. The "words and abbreviations used in patterns" are also the same as those used in COBUILD\(^2\). According to the list in the front matter, there are 56 such words and abbreviations in COBUILD\(^3\) (p. xxiv).

This suggests that the editors of COBUILD\(^3\) were confident that, the grammatical codes used in COBUILD\(^3\) would provide much richer grammatical information than those used in other learner's dictionaries, once the users got accustomed to them.

7.4.4. COBUILD\(^3\) was the first learner's dictionary to present the definitions in full sentences. The innovation is handed down to COBUILD\(^3\), and helps to provide the users with additional grammatical information on entry words such as collocations.

According to the explanation in the front matter (p. xviii), the definitions in COBUILD\(^3\) explain the words as they occur in their typical grammatical structure or structures. In other words, as Herbst comments in his analysis of COBUILD\(^2\), the definitions themselves serve as generalized example sentences illustrating the words that they explain (Herbst 1996: 326). Herbst was writing about the definitions in COBUILD\(^2\), but the statement also holds true for those in COBUILD\(^3\), as the definitions in the two editions are largely the same.

Therefore, the grammatical codes in the extra column are supported not only by the examples but also by the sentence definitions themselves, which illustrate the structural patterns of the words (op. cit. p. 332).

The lucidity of the sentence definitions in COBUILD\(^3\) compensate for the intricacy of its grammar notation. (Takahashi)

8. Pragmatics

In the previous installment, Masuda et al. (1997) pointed out that COBUILD\(^2\) uses a PRAGMATICS label in the extra column to indicate that a given word sense implies pragmatic information. COBUILD\(^3\) also points out word senses that imply pragmatic information using special labels in the extra column, although the labels have undergone drastic modification.

8.1. Pragmatic Information in COBUILD\(^2\)

Before examining the pragmatic information in COBUILD\(^3\), we will briefly review how pragmatic information is presented in COBUILD\(^2\).

8.1.1. In its front matter, COBUILD\(^2\) offers the following explanation on its method for indicating pragmatic information (p. xxxiv):

For every word sense where there is pragmatic information which is important for correct use, we

(a) show this in the extra column with the word PRAGMATICS and

(b) include additional information in the definition about how, when, and why the word or expression is used.

8.1.2. COBUILD\(^2\) classifies pragmatic information into six types according to its functions. They are: (1) Functions, (2) Discourse organizers, (3) Speaker/hearer relationship, (4) Attitudes and feelings, (5) Emphasis and (6) Expressing certainty and uncertainty.

8.1.3. The PRAGMATICS label is used to indicate all of the six information types listed above. Therefore, the label only denotes the existence of pragmatic information implied in the given word sense; the type of the information becomes clear only when the dictionary user reads through the definition of the word sense in question.

This was an inconvenience that the users of COBUILD\(^2\) had to put up
with, and the new edition of the dictionary attempted to overcome this disadvantage.

8.2. The Number of Pragmatic Labels in COBUILD³

8.2.1. In the last installment, Masuda et al. (1997) estimated that there were approximately 4,300 pragmatic labels in COBUILD², or 2.2 labels per page.

The number of pragmatic labels in COBUILD² was estimated in a similar way. The survey was conducted using a sample of 182 pages (about 10% of the dictionary pages). According to the survey count, there were 2.7 pragmatic labels per page in the third edition. This means that there are about 4,925 pragmatic labels in COBUILD³.

8.2.2. The above figures show that there is an approximately 14% increase in the number of pragmatic labels in COBUILD³.

8.3. The Types of Pragmatic Information in COBUILD³

8.3.1. COBUILD² used the [PRAGMATIC] label to indicate six information types that the given word senses implied. However, this practice burdened the dictionary users with some inconvenience, as discussed in 8.1.3.

8.3.2. COBUILD³ tried to overcome this difficulty by reorganizing the classification of pragmatic information.

COBUILD³ classified the pragmatic information into six categories according to its functions: (1) Attitudes (approval, disapproval), (2) Emphasis, (3) Feelings, (4) Formulae, (5) Politeness and (6) Vagueness.

COBUILD³ does not use the label [PRAGMATIC] for all of the information types; instead, the function of each information category is used as a label. Thus, the name of the information category is abbreviated so that it can fit into the extra column.

The pragmatic labels themselves have become self-explanatory and easy to understand; the users no longer need to refer to the definition in order to decide which type of pragmatic information the label in question designates.

8.3.3. Following are summaries of the meanings of the pragmatic labels in COBUILD³, based on the explanation given in the front matter (p. xxii-xxiii):

(1) **Attitudes**
- Two labels come under this information type: approval and disapproval. These labels are assigned to words and expressions that express the attitude of the speaker or writer towards the person or thing chosen as a topic: e.g. *broadminded* [approval], *busybody* [disapproval]

(2) **Emphasis**
- This label is used to indicate that the given word or expression emphasizes the point that the speaker or writer is making: e.g. *breathtaking*

(3) **Feelings**
- This label indicates the feelings of the speaker or writer about something, or towards someone: e.g. *blimey*, *babe*

(4) **Formulae**
- This label is assigned to words and expressions that are rather fixed and used on particular occasions, such as greetings or apologies: e.g. *sorry*, *bon voyage*

(5) **Politeness**
- This label is used to indicate that the given words and phrases are used as polite or even euphemistic expressions: e.g. *elderly*

(6) **Vagueness**
- This label is assigned to words and expressions that are used to indicate how certain the speaker or writer is about the truth or validity of his or her statements. This type of pragmatic information is called 'hedging' or 'modality' in conventional grammar: e.g. *presumably*

8.4. The Comparison of Pragmatic Labels in COBUILD² and COBUILD³

In the front matter of COBUILD³ (p. xxxiv-xxxvii), each function type of the pragmatic information is explained using corresponding examples. In the next section, we will look up the example word senses given for each function type in COBUILD² to see how they are labeled in COBUILD³.
8.4.1. Functions

8.4.1.1. Firstly, the words that are used in order to get someone do something are considered to have this pragmatic function in COBUILD; for example, words used in cases of orders, persuasion, or advice. The words suppose and advise are given as examples. Following are the entries for these two words in COBUILD:

suppose: 7 You can use ‘do you suppose’ as a polite way of suggesting or requesting that someone does something.

advise: 4 If an official document states that you are advised to do something, it is telling you the correct or appropriate thing to do.

As shown in the seventh word sense of suppose, the label is given as politeness in COBUILD. This label is explicit and the user can see that the phrase is used as a polite expression at the first glance. On the other hand, in the entry for advise, the pragmatic label is no longer assigned to the phrase. The reason for this is unclear.

8.4.1.2. Secondly, this type of pragmatic information comprises words that express feelings. An example given in COBUILD is the word hate. COBUILD gives the following corresponding entry for the word:

hate: 3 You can use hate in expressions such as ‘I hate to trouble you’ or ‘I hate to bother you’ when you are apologizing to someone for interrupting them or asking them to do something.

In the above example, the label politeness is attached to the entry. This label enables the users to understand clearly that the verb hate is used as a part of a polite expression.

8.4.1.3. Thirdly, a response to a request or question also comes under this function type. An example provided in COBUILD is the verb ask.

ask: 9 You reply ‘don’t ask me’ when you do not know the answer to a question, usually when you are annoyed or surprised that you have been asked.

In this case, the label feelings is attached to the entry.

We can see from above that although the example word senses were once classified into the same pragmatic information category, they are classified rather differently in COBUILD.

8.4.2. Discourse Organizers

According to the explanation in COBUILD, discourse organizers are “words and phrases which help to organize speech or writing so that it is easy for hearers or readers to understand” (p. xxxv). The examples given are the words story and happen. The following are their entries in COBUILD:

story: 9 In British English, you use to cut a long story short to indicate that you are going to state the final result of an event and not give any more details. In American English, you say to make a long story short.

happen: 5 You use as it happens in order to introduce a statement, especially one that is rather surprising.

There are no labels assigned to the above two entries. This suggests that a function type corresponding to discourse organizers does not exist in COBUILD. The other examples of discourse organizers referred to in the last installment (Masuda et al. 1997: 65) also appear without pragmatic labels in COBUILD. See the phrases added to this and added to that in the entry for add and bring.

8.4.3. Speaker / hearer Relationship

This is a function of the category that comprises words and phrases that “are chosen by a speaker because of the relationship or feelings they have
towards the person they are speaking to" (p. xxxvi). The example given is the word *son*. COBUILD³ gives the following entry:

**son**: Some people use *son* as a form of address when they are showing kindness or affection to a boy or a man who is younger than them. [feelings]

The labels for the words that were judged to have this function in COBUILD² vary in COBUILD³. The following are other vocatives (with their labels in the parentheses): dad (COB² phi; COB³ phi), mom (COB² phi; COB³ phi), darling (COB² PRAGMATICS; COB³ [feelings]), sir (COB² PRAGMATICS; COB³ politeness), madam (COB² PRAGMATICS; COB³ politeness), mate (COB² phi; COB³ phi).

### 8.4.4. Attitudes and Feelings

Although there is the word ‘feelings’ in the name of this pragmatic category, entries that are regarded to have this function are defined as words and expressions that are used “to express your attitude to the person or thing that you are talking about” (p. xxxvi). According to the explanation in COBUILD³, words that express feelings belong to the type mentioned in 8.4.1.2.

Two adjectives are given as examples for this type in COBUILD³: plain-spoken and pig-headed. The following are the corresponding entries in COBUILD³.

**plain-spoken**: If you say that someone is plain-spoken, you mean that they say exactly what they think, even when they know that what they say may not please other people [approval].

**pig-headed**: If you describe someone as pig-headed, you are critical of them because they refuse to change their mind about things, and you think they are unreasonable [disapproval].

One of the improved features of COBUILD³ is that it marks words that show attitudes with the labels [approval] / [disapproval]. With the aid of these two labels, the users immediately know that the word in question not only expresses attitudes of speakers or writers, but also whether their attitudes towards someone or something are positive or negative.

### 8.4.5. Emphasis

The words and expressions considered to have this pragmatic function are used to emphasize the point that the speaker or the writer is making. The examples given for this category in COBUILD² are scot-free and fact. COBUILD³ gives the following entries:

**scot-free**: If you say that someone got away scot-free, you are emphasizing that they escaped punishment for something that you believe they should have been punished for [emphasis].

**fact**: You say the fact remains that something is the case when you want to emphasize that the situation must be accepted [emphasis].

This function type is the only one used in both COBUILD² and COBUILD³. It seems that the label [emphasis] is assigned to all entries whose definition contains the verb ‘to emphasize’ in COBUILD³.

### 8.4.6. Expressing Certainty and Uncertainty

This is a pragmatic function of the category that comprises words and expressions that “allow speakers and writers to show how certain they are about the truth or validity of their statements” (p. xxxvii). The examples for this type are guess and actuality. Following are their entries in COBUILD³:

**guess**: You say I guess to show that you are slightly uncertain or reluctant about what you are saying [vagueness].
actuality: 1 You can use **in actuality** to emphasize that what you are saying is true, when it contradicts or contrasts with what you have previously said.

The name of this function type seems to have been changed to **vagueness** in **COBUILD**. Referring to other examples, it seems that most of the words and phrases judged to have this pragmatic function in **COBUILD** are labeled **vagueness** in **COBUILD**. There are examples such as **apparently, maybe**, **probably** and **suppose**.

8.4.7. **Summing-up**

**COBUILD** and **COBUILD** both use the same number of function types for pragmatic information. The function types themselves, however, are rather different in the two editions.

**COBUILD** explains the functions of pragmatic information in considerable length and with some ambiguity. For example, in the case of *attitudes and feelings*, the words and expressions regarded to have this function do not include words and expressions that denote the speaker's feelings.

Contrary to the function types for pragmatic information in **COBUILD**, the names of function types in **COBUILD** are succinct and self-explanatory. For example, the function type *expressing certainty and uncertainty* is called *vagueness* in **COBUILD**.

Using succinct names for pragmatic labels is indispensable for **COBUILD**, since it adopts the new principle of presenting explicit pragmatic labels in the extra column. This saves the users from having to decide on their own what kind of pragmatic information is implied in a given word sense.

There are three function types newly introduced in **COBUILD**; *formulæ*, *feelings* and *politeness*. A function type that is common in both **COBUILD** and **COBUILD** is *emphasis*. On the other hand, three function types in **COBUILD** are completely done away with in **COBUILD**, namely: *functions*, *discourse organizers* and *speaker/hearer relationship*.

### 8.5. Presentation of Pragmatic Information in **COBUILD**

#### 8.5.1. Use of Semicolons

Masuda et al. (1997) argued in the last installment that it is convenient to enclose pragmatic information in parentheses to distinguish it from the word definition. In fact, this method has been applied in various dictionaries, the latest example being **OALD**. **COBUILD**, however, does not adopt this convention. Instead, it uses a semicolon to separate the pragmatic information from the word definition, especially when the pragmatic information had something to do with "the speaker's viewpoint" (Masuda et al. 1997: 67). It may be worth checking whether the use of semicolons changed in **COBUILD**.

8.5.1.1. In **COBUILD**, there are cases where pragmatic information after a semicolon is omitted. As **COBUILD** uses self-explanatory pragmatic labels, the pragmatic information after a semicolon becomes redundant. Take the adjective **balanced** as an example:

**COBUILD**: 3 Someone who is **balanced** remains calm and thinks clearly, even in a difficult situation; used showing approval. [PRAGMATICS]

**COBUILD**: 3 Someone who remains calm and thinks clearly, even in a difficult situation. [approval]

As the above two citations show, the pragmatic information placed after a semicolon in **COBUILD** (in this case, *used showing approval*) was omitted in the entry for the word in **COBUILD**. The information after the semicolon became redundant, as the label [approval] clearly conveys the same meaning as the omitted text. The omission of pragmatic information after a semicolon is most noticeable with the words that have approval or disapproval labels attached. There are also other examples such as **cliché**, **discerning**, **narcissism**, **reasoned**, and **simple-minded**.

8.5.1.2. There are cases, however, where the redundancy is left as it is. This happens when pragmatic information is not placed after a semicolon, but incorporated in the word definition. Take the adjective **stout** as an...
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example:

**COBUILD**: 3 If you use **stout** to describe someone’s actions, attitudes, or beliefs, you approve of them because they are strong and determined **PRAGMATICS**.

**COBUILD**: 3 If you use **stout** to describe someone’s actions, attitudes, or beliefs, you approve of them because they are strong and determined **approval**.

In this case, the pragmatic implication is conveyed in the phrase “you approve of them” in the definition. In **COBUILD**, this phrase plays an important role in conveying the word’s positive meaning. In **COBUILD**, however, the phrase is redundant in that it restates what is already clearly indicated by the label, namely, that the adjective is used with a positive meaning. There are other examples such as **anarchist**, **conceited**, **plump**, **rock-solid**, **timely**.

8.5.1.3. There seems to have been some effort to eliminate this redundancy, for parts of definitions are either omitted or rewritten wherever possible. Take the noun **gall** as an example:

**COBUILD**: 1 You can use **gall** to refer to someone’s behavior when you disapprove of it because it is bold or risky, or does not show enough respect for someone or something **PRAGMATICS**.

**COBUILD**: 1 If you say that someone has the **gall** to do something, you are criticizing them for behaving in a rude or disrespectful way **disapproval**.

In **COBUILD**, the phrase “when you disapprove of it” in the definition is omitted and the whole definition is rewritten so that there is no overlap with the label **disapproval**. Unfortunately, there do not seem to be many similar cases.

8.5.2. Consistency of Pragmatic Information

In the last installment, Masuda *et al.* (1997) pointed out that there was some inconsistency in the presentation of pragmatic information in **COBUILD**. It was indicated, for instance, that forms of address such as **darling**, **madam**, **sonny** and **sir** had pragmatic labels, while words such as **daddy**, **mummy** and **honey** did not even though they are also used as forms of address (cf. 8.4.3.).

In **COBUILD**, the latter three still do not have any pragmatic labels, and we can see that this inconsistency remains unresolved. In this edition, the word **sonny** does not have the pragmatic label attached, either. We have no clear idea why the label was removed.

It was also pointed out in the last installment that while the phrasal verb **push in** had a pragmatic label, there was no pragmatic label for **push around**. The phrasal verb **push around** is still presented without a pragmatic label in **COBUILD**.

The last installment also pointed out that the third sense of the adjective **rotten** did not have a pragmatic label. In **COBUILD**, it does.

Being consistent in presenting pragmatic information may not be an easy task. The editors of **COBUILD**, like the editors of **COBUILD** before them, clearly tried to provide as much pragmatic information as possible, as the importance of learning the pragmatic conventions is emphasized in the front matter of this edition.

To resolve the inconsistency, lexicographers must carefully check each word sense. As the number of references increases, the task will grow even more laborious.

8.6. Explanation of Pragmatic Information

The last installment suggested that in **COBUILD**, it might have been more appropriate to present the explanations on pragmatic information on special pages similar to the Language Notes in **LDOCE** (Masuda *et al.* 1997: 68).

Reading the explanation of pragmatic information in the front matter of **COBUILD**, we notice that the general explanation given in **COBUILD** is almost the same as that given in **COBUILD**. In fact, the only real
difference is the last four lines of the fourth paragraph on page xxii, which are newly added in *COBUILD*\(^2\). Another minor change is that the verb to praise on the fifth line of page xxiii in *COBUILD*\(^2\) used to be the verb to complain in *COBUILD*\(^1\).

The whole explanation of pragmatic information in *COBUILD*\(^3\) is just two pages long, including the excerpts from the dictionary entries. There are only one or two lines of explanation for each pragmatic label. To us, this seems rather brief.

It is difficult, for example, to know the criteria or standards used for the pragmatic labeling of each entry. Let’s take the words guess and actuality as examples. The words are classified in the function category ‘expressing certainty and uncertainty’ in *COBUILD*\(^2\).\(^{47}\) Although they belong to the same category in *COBUILD*\(^2\), they are labeled differently in *COBUILD*\(^3\). These examples were discussed before in 8.4.6., but we cite the entries again:

**guess:** 6 You say I **guess** to show that you are slightly uncertain or reluctant about what you are saying. \[vagueness\]

**actuality:** 1 You can use **in actuality** to emphasize that what you are saying is true, when it contradicts or contrasts with what you have previously said. \[emphasis\]

The function category ‘expressing certainty and uncertainty’ apparently seems to have been remodeled into the category ‘vagueness’ in *COBUILD*\(^3\). In fact, the phrase I **guess** is assigned the label **vagueness**. The phrase **in actuality**, however, is assigned the label **emphasis**. The phrase **in actuality**, however, is assigned the label **emphasis** instead of **vagueness**. It is not difficult to infer why the label **emphasis** was assigned to this phrase. *COBUILD*\(^3\) has the tendency to label a word [phrase] sense **emphasis** if the verb “to emphasize” is used in the definition of the word sense. The procedure seems almost automatic.

Even if we take this tendency into consideration, the labeling of the phrase **in actuality** is awkward. As this phrase is often used to denote the speaker's certainty about what he or she is saying, it is natural to assert that the label **vagueness** fits the phrase best. It is not clear why the label **emphasis** has the precedence over the label **vagueness**. Did the lexicographers in charge of pragmatic information judge that the usage of the phrase to emphasize one’s statement is more important than its usage to denote the certainty of one’s statement? How was this decision made?

### 8.7. Tentative Suggestions for Improvement

Following are some tentative suggestions for improvement of pragmatic labels in the future editions of *COBUILD*.

#### 8.7.1. Firstly, it may benefit the users if the future edition of *COBUILD*

offers a more detailed explanation of the pragmatic information and its use of pragmatic labels. It would be of use if the criteria for pragmatic labeling were clearly stated.

#### 8.7.2. Secondly, it may be better to consider the possibility of giving

more than one pragmatic label to a word sense. The pragmatic information associated with a word sense is not always simple enough to denote with only one pragmatic label. It would be convenient if multiple pragmatic labels were given for a word sense if necessary. For example, if multiple pragmatic labels were allowed, the above-mentioned phrase **in actuality** could have been marked with two labels: **vagueness** and **emphasis**. Assigning more than one pragmatic label to a word sense would be beneficial to users, but of course it would also be difficult for the *COBUILD* dictionaries to adopt. *COBUILD* uses its extra column to offer this type of information, thus it has very limited space in which to add the information. One solution would be to put the pragmatic information into inexplicit codes, but this would be less convenient for the users.

#### 8.7.3. Thirdly, the variety of pragmatic labels could be increased to offer

more detailed information on pragmatic convention. For instance, it is difficult for non-native speakers to understand figurative expressions in a foreign language. As an example of a figurative expression in English, *OALD*\(^6\) gives the following sentence (See the inside of the front cover of the dictionary):

> He didn't want to cast a shadow on their happiness.
In this case, to cast a shadow means ‘to spoil.’ COBUILD\(^3\) does not mention this figurative use in its entry for cast. It would have been better if it did, and the label such as [figurative] would have been of use. (Takahashi)

9. Conclusion

9.1. Introduction

We have analyzed Collins COBUILD English Dictionary for Advanced Learners, Third Edition from seven points of view: headwords and frequency bands; pronunciation; definition; example; usage; grammar; pragmatics. The main points of the analysis are the following.

9.2. Headwords and Frequency Bands

Overall, no fundamental change in terms of headwords, superheadwords, and frequency bands can be found in COBUILD\(^3\) in comparison with COBUILD\(^2\). As regards headwords, we greatly appreciate the sensitivity of the new edition to recent developments in information technology, although there still remain problems concerning the treatment of run-ons. The expansion of IT-related words in the entries is definitely an advantage of COBUILD\(^3\) over other learners’ dictionaries.

The introduction of the menu system for superheadwords can be regarded as an improvement in that the menu will certainly be of much help to users. The decision to employ superheadwords, however, still seems have been made ad hoc. Hopefully, a consistent principle will be introduced in the next edition.

With respect to frequency bands, the expansion of the corpus seems to have resulted in a refinement of frequency information. In light of the problems pointed out above about the frequency rating of this dictionary, however, we have to add that depending blindly on computer-based data does not always give the best results in the realm of dictionary making. Therefore, we must keep in mind that lexicographers’ raison d’etre lies in an area where computers fall short.

9.3. Pronunciation

The new edition retains the previous edition’s prescriptive principle on which suggested pronunciations are given. It attempts to give a single pronunciation model for non-native learners to follow, and alternative pronunciations are given only sparingly for RP alone. This is a reasonable choice for a dictionary for non-native learners of English, and this feature, together with the clever use of italicization for vowel reduction and the description of stress shift, makes COBUILD\(^3\) a good reference for RP. Although General American pronunciation is given, its description leaves much room for improvement, and we suggest that thorough revision in this respect would make COBUILD\(^3\) a better reference for General American.

9.4. Definition

There are no fundamental changes in the structure of definition sentences. They are presented in full sentences in the same way as previous editions: sentences show typical subjects, verb patterns, objects, and collocations. There are a few new definitions, shortened and easier definitions, and improved definitions. Some shorter and easier definitions, however, have lost some parts of their informational value. It is hard to say whether shorter and easier definitions are better than their longer but more informative counterparts. Most of the definition sentences have suffered no change. We believe this is because the lexicographers of COBUILD\(^3\) have felt no need for the change. We also consider that definition sentences are very informatively constructed. However, we think that the manner of presentation of the definitions for longer headwords should be improved. Since the new edition has introduced menus for longer headwords, it should be improved so that learners can find the sense subdivisions they want more easily in the next edition. In addition, there should be many more menus.

9.5. Examples

There are no fundamental changes in the way examples are presented. In fact, only a small number of examples has been renewed. The vast majority of them are the same as those in the second edition. Although choosing new examples from the huge corpus takes time and it must be
difficult work, we believe that all the examples should be renewed. Authentic examples chosen from the corpus constitute one of the major features of the COBUILD dictionary.

9.6. Usage

The usage information in COBUILD3 is easier to spot than that in COBUILD2, as it is presented in the third edition in small capitals within square brackets, whereas in the second edition it was given in the form of a phrase as if it were part of the definition. The number of different kinds of usage labels has been increased to twenty-one in COBUILD3 from thirteen in the second edition. COBUILD3 has put far more emphasis on American English than the second edition, which focused on British English.

Currency and status labels are not employed in COBUILD3, which is justifiable, as is the lack of a label indicating slang expressions, which other ESL dictionaries often adopt. Labels like [DIALECT] and [TECHNICAL] which are a little too vague, as well as others like [JOURNALISM] and [MILITARY] which are peculiarly technical, do not seem to be very helpful to ESL learners. The labels describing insult and taboo expressions are divided into two levels, but ESL dictionary users may expect them to be simplified. For the medium labels [SPOKEN] and [WRITTEN] to be accurate and significant, the size of spoken and written components in the Bank of English on which COBUILD3 is based should be (relatively) the same, and all the data in the spoken component should consist of natural speech that is not scripted.

As far as the words and senses we have examined are concerned, almost ninety percent of the labels applied by COBUILD2 remain unchanged in the third edition, which is natural because they are two editions of the same dictionary. When a comparison of the application of labels to the relevant monosemous headwords was made between COBUILD2 and OALD6, it was found that in approximately fifty-five percent of instances the two dictionaries attach different labels to the same words, which makes their reliability decrease, since users cannot decide with confidence that the labels applied are reliable.

9.7. Grammar

The grammar notation of COBUILD3 is almost the same as that in COBUILD2, but the verb patterns are arranged differently in the extra column. In COBUILD3, the verb patterns are presented in the same order as the example sentences and also shown next to the corresponding examples.

The verb patterns in COBUILD3 proved to be virtually the same as those in OALD6. Verb patterns consisting of category labels now seem to be in the mainstream; in fact, LDOCE3 also adopts them.

The grammar codes in COBUILD3 are quite numerous, and this may make them difficult to decipher in spite of their explicitness. However, it may be that the complexity of the grammar notation in COBUILD3 is counterbalanced by the clarity of its sentence definitions.

9.8. Pragmatics

The pragmatics in COBUILD3 may be the only feature that has been drastically changed from COBUILD2. The number of pragmatic labels has been increased throughout COBUILD3, and a system for labeling word senses using self-explanatory labels has been introduced. Thus, users no longer need to judge by themselves what sort of pragmatic information is implied in the entry.

However, the explanations of the pragmatic information and its system of labeling are rather brief in COBUILD3. This makes it difficult to grasp the system used for labeling the word senses in the dictionary.

COBUILD dictionaries are unique in having devised pragmatic labels to help users understand the use and meaning of words and expressions. It would be even better if the types of labels were increased and the labeling was made more consistent throughout future editions of COBUILD.

NOTES

1) In dictionary analyses, the terminology main entry is often used to refer to the individual word forms presented as index of alphabetical word list. In this analysis, however, we will use the term "headword" following the definition by Hartmann (2001).
2) This fluctuating uses/disuses of periods can also be found in prepositions and phrasal verbs.
3) A more serious word-finding problem occurs on the CD-ROM version of this dictionary because users are very unlikely to see the nested adverbs unless they know adverbs are often nested separately from the independent headword of the same word form.

4) On the back cover of the previous edition is written a statement that touts "Coverage of over 75,000 references."

5) Both COBUILD and COBUILD include divorcee, the headword spelled without the diacritic.

6) The compound information technology itself was first adopted in COBUILD.

7) The triangle means that the word in question is not treated as a headword but is included in the examples under the entry of the prefix e-.

8) LDOCE has the headword web, but it does not cover the sense of the World Wide Web.

9) The notational difference concerning the use of capital letters is due to the change referred to in 2.2.2. below.

10) Hartmann (2001: 66) explains external access and internal access as follows:

External access can be achieved by such devices as alphabetic macrostructure (supported by running heads and other guidewords) and separate indexes; internal access can be helped by section marks (such as numbered senses) indicating specific search target sections inside the microstructure.

11) The fourth subsection of close, which is used for a proper noun with a capital C, is also treated as the same entry as the other subsections. The same is true of the 6th subsection of right, which is used in British titles.

12) For lack of time and perseverance on the part of the author of this section, we have to tolerate the following problems: (a) the use of uninformative wording in the definitions, (b) inconsistent information on collocations, (c) definitions that did not define, etc. As for (a), the use of "mean" in the definition sentence of ruin: "To ruin something means to severely harm..." The same definition sentence remains in the third edition. We believe that it would be more informative if subjects such as "you" and "the storm" were used. Thus, the defining sentence would be, "If a storm ruins something, it severely harms..."

As for (c), he cited compound headword hay fever as an example. The definition sentence in the second edition was, "If someone suffers from hay fever, their nose, throat, and eyes become inflamed, usually because they are allergic to the pollen of some grasses or flowers."

The definition lacked the "genus proximum" (Zgusta 1971: 252) In the third edition, the definition has been slightly altered, but the definition style remains the same. "If someone is suffering from hay fever, they sneeze and their eyes itch, because they are allergic to grass or flowers."

20) CIDE gives two uncountable and one countable illustrative example for this word without the definition. MED gives one uncountable and one countable examples. Both dictionaries seem to support OALD.

21) Even so, compared with LDOCE the third edition is much more informative. LDOCE: 2 an unimportant politician OALD: 2 (disapproving) a person who does the hard and often boring work for an organization, especially a politician

22) OALD gives this sense: 11 energy that can be collected and used to operate a machine, to make electricity, etc: nuclear / wind / solar power / engine power

23) Other dictionaries do not list tea leaf as a lexical item. MED gives the following explanation in tea: [uncount] a hot brown drink made by pouring boiling water onto the dried leaves of the tea bush. The leaves are called tea leaves and can be bought in small paper bags called tea bags that are put into a cup or teapot. This definition supports that tea leaves are used to make tea.

24) The enrichment of the superheadwords was suggested in the Introduction to the second edition. Although the promise was kept and extended, we don't think the superheadwords are yet satisfactory.

25) Major problems with the examples pointed out by Nakamoto included (a) difficult words, (b) unclear contexts, (c) entries with no examples, etc.

26) We are afraid that the omission of "dance" gives an impression that "she is a promiscuous woman."

27) The same argument has been offered in Landau (2001: 307).

28) COBUILD presents a usage note in one of three ways. It is placed either immediately after the definition, in the gray-colored box, or in the ticked box. For the examples of usage notes, see actor and what 7, lay and well, aerodynamics and learn, respectively.

29) From now on till the end of this section, the phrases used in COBUILD to show usage information will be called "labels" for convenience sake.

30) We are dealing here with the labels which are mentioned and explained in the front matter of the two dictionaries.

31) Henceforth, we will not pay attention to the modifying term "mainly."

32) Pyles and Algeo (1970: 128-129) and S.I. Landau (2001: 217-218) classify usage labels into five and eight categories respectively, and COBUILD as well as COBUILD divides them into only two, that is, "geographical" and "style," but the present author believes it is the best to group them into seven types for our purpose here, although the style labels might be subclassified.

33) The labels with an asterisk are those which appear in COBUILD as well as COBUILD.

34) Although the locality labels mentioned in the front matter of COBUILD are only [AM] and [SW], the label [DIALECT] somehow being classed as a "style" label, others like [AUSTRALIAN], [NORTHERN ENGLISH], and [SCOTTISH] can also be found in the A-Z pages.

35) See advert, aerodrome, lacquer, ladder, wagon, and weal for example.

36) OALD uses "chemistry," "finance," "geology," "music," "politics," and "sport," to
name only a few.

37) It would be doubtful whether the last two labels, [JOURNALISM] and [MILITARY], are really necessary for ESL learners.

38) On this point, the introduction to LDCE\textsuperscript{3} says, "All the recordings used are of natural speech, not radio or TV programmes or language that is in any way scripted."

39) Sometimes we can also find, in all the three dictionaries, what could be called alternative labels like \{FORMAL or LEGAL\}, \{OLD-FASHIONED or HUMOROUS\}, and so forth with the word "or" connecting the two units, instead of a comma which means "and."

40) On a few rare occasions, we can find what might be called complex labels like \{AM; also BRIT, INFORMAL\} in all three dictionaries which means "the word or sense with the label belongs to American English as a whole and informal British English."

41) When the labeling phrases like "in business" and "technical in business" in the second edition are changed into the label \{TECHNICAL\} in the third, or "technical in medicine" into \{MEDICAL\}, they are considered here to represent the same usage information.

42) As for the detailed account of the increase in the size of the Bank of English, see the front matter of the two dictionaries.

43) In the quoted entries, the pronunciation, style label, example sentences [phrases], and all notes in the extra column other than the pragmatic labels are omitted. This convention is followed throughout this section.

44) This mark (\dagger) is used to indicate that no labels are provided for a word sense in question.

45) The following is an excerpt from the front matter of COBUILD\textsuperscript{1} (p. xxii):

Different languages use different pragmatic strategies. In order to use a language effectively, and be successful in achieving your goals, you need to know what the pragmatic conventions are for that particular language. It is therefore important that learners of English are given as much information as possible about the ways in which English speakers use their language to communicate.

46) According to the back covers of COBUILD\textsuperscript{1} and COBUILD\textsuperscript{3}, the number of references increased from 75,000 in COBUILD\textsuperscript{1} to 110,000 in COBUILD\textsuperscript{3}.

47) See p. xxxvii of COBUILD\textsuperscript{1}.
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