

Exploring Space

Exploring Space:
Spatial Notions in Cultural,
Literary and Language Studies; Volume 2:
Space in Language Studies

Edited by

Andrzej Ciuk and Katarzyna Molek-Kozakowska

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

Exploring Space: Spatial Notions in Cultural, Literary and Language Studies;
Volume 2: Space in Language Studies,
Edited by Andrzej Ciuk and Katarzyna Molek-Kozakowska

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2010 by Andrzej Ciuk and Katarzyna Molek-Kozakowska and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-2144-6, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-2144-5

CONTENTS

Preface	x
Acknowledgements	xiii
Part I: The Use of Space in Dictionaries: Lexicography	
Chapter One.....	2
Noun and Verb Codes in Pedagogical Dictionaries of English as a Space-saving Tool: What has Changed? <i>Anna Dziemianko</i>	
Chapter Two	13
Telegraphic Style of Definitions in the <i>Concise Oxford Dictionary</i> <i>Małgorzata Kamińska</i>	
Chapter Three	24
Towards the Efficient Use of Space in <i>The Chambers Dictionary</i> <i>Mariusz Kamiński</i>	
Chapter Four	34
Navigating Dictionary Space: The Findability of English Collocations in a General Learner's Dictionary (LDOCE4) and Special-purpose Dictionary of Collocations (OCD) <i>Robert Lew and Magdalena Radłowska</i>	
Chapter Five	48
Space-saving Devices in Abridged Dictionaries: <i>American Heritage</i> <i>College Dictionary</i> (2004) as a Test Case <i>Mirosława Podhajecka</i>	

Part II: Conceptualizing and Expressing Spatial Notions: Linguistics and Rhetoric

Chapter Six	62
On Electromagnetic “Space” and Linguistic Valuation	
<i>Marek Kuźniak</i>	
Chapter Seven.....	75
On the Development of Epistemic Meaning in English and Polish:	
A Shift in the Semantic Space of <i>threaten</i> and <i>promise</i>	
<i>Maja Lubańska</i>	
Chapter Eight.....	93
The Rhetoric of Space in Political Discourse: Spatial Metaphors	
in Selected Speeches of the European Commission	
<i>Katarzyna Molek-Kozakowska</i>	
Chapter Nine.....	104
The Role of the Semantic Space in the Analysis of the <i>FYR</i> Concept	
in Old English	
<i>Agnieszka Wawrzyniak</i>	
Chapter Ten	117
<i>Place</i> and Religious Language	
<i>Urszula Wieczorek</i>	
Chapter Eleven	125
The Rhetorical Situation as Mental Spaces Enacted by the Rhetor	
<i>Jan Zalewski</i>	

Part III: Space in the Communicative Encounter: Discourse Studies and Translation

Chapter Twelve	136
Psychological Distance in Father-Son Conflicts Presented in 20 th Century	
American Drama	
<i>Joanna Bobin</i>	
Chapter Thirteen.....	146
Distance and Proximity in Diminutive Semantics and Pragmatics	
<i>Dorota Gorzycka</i>	

Chapter Fourteen	156
Axes of Social Distance in Everyday Communication: A Diachronic Study	
<i>Anna Jaskólska</i>	
Chapter Fifteen	166
Various Spatial Dimensions for Translating Multilingual Films	
<i>Paweł D. Madej</i>	
Chapter Sixteen	177
Exploring Sequential Relationships in Learner Discourse	
<i>Renata Povolná</i>	
Chapter Seventeen	189
Social Distance in Translating for Confined Space: A Case Study	
of the Polish Subtitles for <i>The Queen</i> by Stephen Frears	
<i>Izabela Szymańska</i>	
Part IV: Space-related Mechanisms of Language Learning:	
Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Learning	
Chapter Eighteen	202
The Concept of Space in FL Pronunciation Learning	
<i>Małgorzata Baran-Lucarz</i>	
Chapter Nineteen	213
Aspects of Pronunciation Development in Foreign and Second	
Language Contexts	
<i>Anna D. Biedrzyńska</i>	
Chapter Twenty	224
The Differences in the Perception of Praat-based Vocalic Contrasts	
in Different Age Groups	
<i>Łukasz Furtak</i>	
Chapter Twenty-One	236
The Relationship between Levels of Self-perceived FL Abilities	
and Study Procedures in the FL Classroom Space	
<i>Ewa Piechurska-Kuciel</i>	

Chapter Twenty-Two.....	248
Sharing a Common Neural Space: Second Language Learning and its Neurological Consequences	
<i>Arkadiusz Rojczyk</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Three.....	258
Space for Self-handicapping and Defensive Pessimism as Protective Strategies in Achievement Context	
<i>Aleksandra Więckowska</i>	
Part V: Space as a Teaching Resource: Methodology of Foreign Language Teaching	
Chapter Twenty-Four	270
Conceptualizing Classroom Space	
<i>Danuta Gabryś-Barker</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Five.....	282
The Space to Fill: Investigating the Aspects of the Multiple Choice Structure Recognition Cloze Task as Used on the Matura Exam	
<i>Anna Konieczna</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Six.....	296
Diagnosing Collocation Awareness of Advanced Learners of English as Exemplified by <i>space</i> Collocations	
<i>Elżbieta Krawczyk-Neifar</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Seven	306
CLIL Classrooms in Poland and in Germany: A Comparative View from the Observer	
<i>Katarzyna Papaja</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Eight	316
Learners' Perspective on the Role of Error Correction in the Foreign Language Classroom: The Importance of Space, Technique and Timing	
<i>Miroslaw Pawlak</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Nine	326
Reading Space in a Foreign Language Classroom	
<i>Liliana Piasecka</i>	

Chapter Thirty	336
Creating the Space for Growth in Language Tasks for Young Learners in the Learning-centred Approach <i>Katarzyna Rokoszevska</i>	
Contributors	347
Editors	358

PREFACE

The notion of space is as old as the history of human thought. Spatial categories used to predominantly connote immensity, unfathomableness, indeterminateness, or unlimitedness. However, with the passage of time, our perception of space has been substantially modified. Inhabitable space has proved to be insufficient and to have flexible borders, and even outer space, once beyond human reach, has turned out to be conquerable. The space of knowledge has been expanded considerably, although it has also remained impenetrable at points. As is commonly noted, now space seems to be “shrinking” proportionally to the increase in speed and the spread of technology. Consequently, any explorations into the notion of space inevitably reveal oppositions, paradoxes, ambiguities and unresolved questions related to our various perceptions of space.

If we follow the meanders of thought on the nature of space as an ontological-epistemological concept, we will encounter the ancient Greek myth about the creation of the universe. Here, the world emerged out of Chaos. Space was soon betrothed to time, and both generated an insatiable human desire to fathom and order the universe. In Western culture, one of the pioneers of this endeavor was Democritus, “the father of modern science”, who formulated an atomic theory for the cosmos, and for whom space was a vacuum. The renowned Greek philosopher Aristotle claimed that space, likewise time, was a “quantity”, i.e., it was a whole dividable into parts. Moreover, it was a “multiplicity”—a countable amount of parts in a continuum. To mention other influential conceptions of space, Bernardino Telesio, an Italian philosopher and natural scientist, regarded space as a system of relations between things. Isaac Newton created a theory of absolute space, whereas his contemporary, Gottfried Leibnitz, was the author of a theory of relative space. For Immanuel Kant, the knowledge of space was “synthetic”; by contrast, Ludwig Wittgenstein, in his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, introduced the notion of logical space and the “ensemble of possible states”.

Apart from the philosophy of space (and time), which has greatly influenced modern science, certain spatial categories have penetrated and shaped Western culture and the humanities. The present book demonstrates how the notion of space can be treated as a common axis for research in such diverse disciplines as literary studies, linguistics and cultural studies,

and how it has inspired a variety of analyses of textual, linguistic and cultural phenomena from the perspective of English Studies. *Exploring Space: Spatial Notions in Cultural, Literary and Language Studies* falls into two volumes and is the result of the 18th PASE (Polish Association for the Study of English) Conference organized by the Institute of English of Opole University and held at Kamień Śląski in April 2009.

The first volume embraces cultural and literary studies and offers papers on narrative fiction, poetry, theatre and drama, and post-colonial studies. The texts and contexts explored are either British, American or Commonwealth. The second volume refers to English language studies and covers papers on lexicography, general linguistics and rhetoric, discourse studies and translation, second language acquisition/foreign language learning, and the methodology of foreign language teaching. The book aims to offer a comprehensive insight into how the category of space can inform original philological research; thus, it may be of interest to those in search of novel applications of space-related concepts, and to those who wish to acquire an update on current developments in English Studies across Poland.

By exploring various space-related categories, such as distance, proximity, territory, locality and movement, the contributors to both volumes of this book have managed to show that space is a powerful concept capable of conveying human experiences and perceptions across cultural, linguistic and temporal boundaries. It is not to say that space is treated here only in metaphorical terms. In fact some contributions have focused on very physical spaces: from the representations of particular localities (i.e., London or Dublin) in literary texts, to spatial arrangements on stage in theatrical performances; from space-related aspects of dictionary-making and film-subtitling, to classroom spaces that enhance English language learning.

The notion of space has also turned out to be instrumental to insightful analyses of the domain of human psychology. Some contributors have chosen to explore the human psyche with a range of space-related categories: from “neural” and “mental” spaces in our cognitive processing, to spaces that enable emotional “self-discovery”, “growth,” or, on the contrary, psychological “confinement” or “self-handicapping”. This is why some studies in this collection treat space as liberating, blissful and identity-enhancing, whereas others point to its oppressive, sinister or alienating aspects, which only confirms the inherent paradoxes of this concept.

Finally, a large proportion of papers in this collection investigate various social implications and cultural specificities of spatial notions. By

applying space-related categories to the analysis of social communication and rhetorical expression, for example, some contributors have demonstrated how the “*topos*” of space can be used to guide our evaluations of and engagement in social reality. Space has also been shown to inform certain national, religious, moral, aesthetic and epistemological conceptualizations that are still pervasive in the English-speaking world despite its cultural openness and hybridity. Thus, some contributions shed new light on long-standing spatial dichotomies, such as public and domestic spaces, urban and rural landscapes, homeland and diasporic communities, and Western and Eastern geographies.

A conclusion that can be drawn from these studies is that space is by no means a homogeneous category. That is why spatial notions should not be taken for granted, as any attempt at defamiliarizing them makes us discover new meanings in canonical literary texts, linguistic structures and popular cultural phenomena, for example. This is also what this collection hopes to achieve.

—Andrzej Ciuk
Katarzyna Molek-Kozakowska

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors wish to thank the PASE Board, particularly its Chair, Aleksandra Kędzierska, for entrusting the Institute of English of Opole University with the task of organizing the 18th PASE Conference, as well as the President of the ESSE Board, Fernando Galván, for his encouragement and support. We owe special thanks to the reviewers of the contributions to this collection: Marek Błaszak, Ilona Dobosiewicz, Jacek Gutorow, and Ryszard Wolny for volume one, and Janusz Malak, Liliana Piasecka, Ewa Piechurska-Kuciel, Tadeusz Piotrowski and Jan Zalewski for volume two. We also wish to express our gratitude to Elżbieta Szymańska-Czaplak, Jarosław Kujath, Tadeusz Lewandowski, Marlena Marciniak, Damian Picz, Tomasz Sutarzewicz and Przemysław Wilk for their active support and wholehearted involvement in preparing the conference and the present book.

PART I:
THE USE OF SPACE IN DICTIONARIES:
LEXICOGRAPHY

CHAPTER ONE

NOUN AND VERB CODES IN PEDAGOGICAL DICTIONARIES OF ENGLISH AS A SPACE-SAVING TOOL: WHAT HAS CHANGED?

ANNA DZIEMIANKO

1. Introduction

The aim of the paper is to present a diachronic analysis of the development of noun and verb codes in pedagogical dictionaries of English. In particular, an attempt is made to investigate the distribution of codes in the microstructure and examine their form.

To achieve the aims of the study, the latest as well as the earliest editions of all the major pedagogical dictionaries of English were consulted (OALDCE7, LDOCE5, COBUILD6, CALD3, MEDAL2, OALDCE1, LDOCE1, COBUILD1, CIDE, MEDAL1).¹ In each volume, entries for over 100 headwords, nouns and verbs, were analyzed. The sample consisted of 60 nouns and 56 verbs cited by Quirk et al. (1985) as typical examples of the major sub-classes of these two parts of speech.

With respect to nouns, the codes for countable, uncountable, reclassifiable and collective nouns were paid attention to. Of these, only reclassifiable and collective nouns might need some explanation. Reclassifiable nouns can be used uncountably and countably with a semantic shift so as to denote “a kind/type/form/ of”, “an appropriate unit

¹ The first edition of OALDCE, published in Tokyo in 1948, was in fact titled *Idiomatic and syntactic English dictionary*. Reprinted photographically, it was published in the same year as *A learner's dictionary of current English*. In 1952 it was retitled *The advanced learner's dictionary of current English*. In 1974 the word *Oxford* was added to the title (Cowie 1978, 139). For the sake of consistency, the standard acronym OALDCE is used also with reference to the first edition as well.

of”, “a sort/brand of” (e.g., *beer/a beer*) (Quirk et al. 1985, 248, 298-299). Singular collective nouns, in turn, allow both singular and plural concord with the verb (e.g., *the audience is/are enjoying the show*) (Leech and Svartvik 1994, 40).

The main categories of verbs were considered in the analysis (Quirk et al. 1985, 1171):

- intransitive verbs, which do not require any objects,
- copular verbs, which need subject complement,
- ergative verbs, which can be used transitively and intransitively with a change in subject-verb relationship,
- monotransitive verbs, which need a direct object—a noun phrase or a clause,
- complex transitive verbs, which are followed by an object and an element which is not an object: nominal, adjectival, clausal object complement or adjunct,
- ditransitive verbs, which need two objects, an indirect object and a direct object, which can be a noun phrase or a clause.

2. Distribution of verb codes

Distribution of verb codes is presented schematically in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of verb codes

	OALDCE7	LDOCE5	COBUILD6	CALD3	MEDAL2	OALDCE1	LDOCE1	COBUILD1	CIDE	MEDAL1
After the headword									+	
Before the definition	+	+		+	+	+	+		+	+
Before/after examples	+		+	+					+	
Extra column								+		

As can be seen, today, verb codes are usually embedded into the entry block. They typically precede or follow relevant examples. However, when a monosemous verb or a sense of a polysemous verb is associated with only one pattern, the verb code precedes then the definition for the verb (sense). In MEDAL2 and LDOCE5, verb codes are given only before

definitions, and pattern illustrations, which in these dictionaries are used in place of codes, are interspersed among examples. In the last edition of COBUILD there is no extra column, introduced in the first edition. Instead, COBUILD6 adopts the strategy of alternating codes and examples.

Distribution of verb codes was different in the earliest editions of the dictionaries. In the past, even when a few patterns were possible for a given verb sense, the codes for the patterns were all bunched together before the definition., and dictionary users were to match the codes with relevant examples on their own. In the first edition of COBUILD, codes were placed in the extra column beside the entry block. It is only in CIDE that verb codes were given in the vicinity of examples. In this dictionary, codes were placed also before definitions, and when a verb required an object, this fact was additionally acknowledged by means of a function label for the object placed immediately after the headword.²

3. Distribution of noun codes

Table 2 summarizes the distribution of noun codes in the consulted dictionaries.

Table 2. Distribution of noun codes

	OALDCE7	LDOCE5	COBUILD6	CALD3	MEDAL2	OALDCE1	LDOCE1	COBUILD1	CIDE	MEDAL1
Before the definiton	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+
Before/after examples		+							+	
Extra column								+		

As the table shows, noun codes are, and were, usually placed before the definition. This positioning of noun codes can be problematic in the case of reclassifiable nouns. When the countable and uncountable uses represent different senses, each definition is preceded by a relevant code. However, when the different senses are not distinguished, the codes representing countability and uncountability are still placed together before one definition. As a result, dictionary users are left to their own

² This point resurfaces below.

devices to match the codes with examples. In LDOCE5 noun codes are occasionally given also before examples. This distribution is typical of codes for collective nouns, in the case of which the representation of verb concord is shown symbolically before illustrative sentences. In CIDE, noun codes quite often follow examples. This is for instance the case when both countable and uncountable uses are possible for a given noun (sense). Then, codes representing countability and uncountability each follow one example at a time. Also, the variability in verb number after collective nouns is represented symbolically after the example(s) where it is illustrated. In COBUILD1, in turn, noun codes, like verb codes, are positioned in the extra column.

4. Form of verb codes

Table 3 presents codes for selected verbs representing the aforementioned verb categories. The codes come from the most recent editions.

Table 3. Verb codes (the latest editions)

Class	Verb	OALDCE7	LDOCE5/ MEDAL2	COBUILD6	CALD3
Intrans.	<i>arrive</i>	V	I	v	I
Ergative	<i>stop</i> (<i>sb/sth</i>)	V, VN	I, T	v, v n	[I OR T]
Copular	<i>seem</i> (<i>nice</i>)	linking verb V- ADJ	linking verb	V-LINK v adj	[L]
Monotr.	<i>decide</i> <i>to do</i> <i>sth</i>	V to inf	T decide to do sth	v to-inf	[I OR T] [+ to INFINITIVE]
Compl.T.	<i>watch</i> <i>sb</i> <i>doing</i> <i>sth</i>	VN –Ing	T watch sb/sth do/doing sth	v n -ing	[I OR T] [+ OBJ + -ing VERB]
Ditrans.	<i>remind</i> <i>sb that</i>	VN (that)	T remind sb (that)	v n (that)	[T] [+ (that)]

In OALDCE7 and COBUILD6, only formal categories of linguistic description are used in verb codes, and there is only one verb symbol, [V]. The same symbols represent the patterns of verbs which belong to different classes. The use of one symbol for the verb instead of a few for different verb classes appears to benefit dictionary users (Aarts 1991, 223). Notions like *transitive* and *intransitive* are said to be difficult to language learners and are often misinterpreted. Also, the major verb classes presuppose a rather advanced knowledge of verb categorization (Aarts 1999, 23). The codes in the two dictionaries are also quite transparent; it is possible to tell at a glance what syntactic structure a given code represents without the need to read the explanation of symbols in the outside matter.

The same holds for the codes in CALD3, which are still quite lucid and clear, even though they feature verb symbols for transitive, intransitive and linking verbs as well as the label for the functional category of the object. Unfortunately, the use of the transitive verb symbol and the object label may cause problems, since the former stands for the verb with its nominal object in some codes, but not in others. This is apparently the case in the code for *remind sb that*, where [T] symbolizes *remind sb*, but not in the one for *watch sb doing sth*, where [T] represents just *watch*, and [obj] should be taken to occupy the place of *sb*. It also seems that the coding system in CALD3 is the most space-consuming. The words *infinitive* or *verb*, used there in codes, can well be abbreviated without any loss on the side of transparency. In fact, in [*ing VERB*], like in the code for *watch sb doing something*, the word *verb* seems to be completely redundant; in this combination, it does not add any information which is not conveyed by *-ing* itself.

LDOCE5 and MEDAL2 are similar inasmuch as they offer codes for verb classes only. The dictionaries feature pattern illustrations, or collocations, which are obviously a space-consuming substitute for the traditional method of encoding verb patterns. Pattern illustrations appear to confirm Nesi's (2000, 74) claim that an economical alternative to grammar coding has not yet been found.

Table 4 presents verb codes in the earliest editions of the major pedagogical dictionaries. MEDAL1 is not taken into consideration because the system of verb codes in this edition is the same as in the last one, discussed above.

Table 4. Verb codes (the earliest editions)

Class	Verb	OALDCE1	LDOCE1	COBUILD1	CIDE
Intrans.	<i>arrive</i>	P 21	IØ	V: USU + A	I
Ergative	<i>stop</i> (<i>sb/sth</i>)	P 1; P 21	T1, IØ	V OR V- ERG	(obj) [I], [T]
Copular	<i>seem</i> (<i>nice</i>)	P 22	L7	V + C	[L (+ to be)]
Monotr.	<i>decide</i> <i>to do</i> <i>sth</i>	P 2	T3	V + to-INF	(obj) [+ to infinitive]
Compl.T.	<i>watch</i> <i>sb</i> <i>doing</i> <i>sth</i>	P 6	V4	V + O	(obj) [T + obj + v-ing]
Ditrans.	<i>remind</i> <i>sb that</i>	P 12	D5	V + O, USU + REPORT- CL	obj [T] [+ obj + (that) clause]

As can be seen, codes in OALDCE1 are just alphanumeric references to the explanation of verb patterns in the outside matter of the dictionary. They show only the numbers at which verb patterns are explained. As such, they are completely opaque, it is impossible to infer any information on the components of verb complementation from their form alone. The only way to figure out what a code means is to look it up in the outside matter. The codes are not mnemonic, either; there is nothing in their structure which could make it possible to recall, rather than immediately realize, what a given code stands for.

In LDOCE1 different verb classes are represented by different verb symbols which are supposed to be easily associated with them (Procter 1976, 315). Yet, the mnemonic value of [V] is doubtful, as it tends to be associated with verbs in general, but in LDOCE1 it designates a specific category of verbs which need “a 2-part DIRECT OBJECT. The first part is a nounlike expression, and the second is an infinitive with or without *to*, an *ing* form or a past participle” (LDOCE1, xxxi).³ Nonetheless, the verb coding system in this dictionary is mnemonic because the numbers which follow verb symbols have the same meaning regardless of the verb symbol which precedes them. It is this one-to-one correspondence between a

³ The dictionary does not explain what ‘nounlike’ means.

number and its meaning, independent of any other symbols in codes, that the editor of the dictionary considers the greatest advantage of the coding system and a memory aid (Procter 1976, 316). The numbers which can be seen in the codes in Table 4 have the following meaning: Ø—no complement or object, 1—one or two noun or pronoun objects or complements, 3—a *to*-infinitive, 4—an *-ing* form, 5—a *that*-clause, 7—an adjectival complement.

Undoubtedly, the use of symbols which have the same meaning irrespective of the context in which they occur can aid their retention. Yet, while the symbols cannot be denied some mnemonic value, they are anything but transparent. They are largely incomprehensible to dictionary users, since their form alone does not reveal their meaning. The syntactic patterns the codes represent can be fully comprehended only with the help of the outside matter, where the symbols used in them are explained. Unfortunately, such explanations are hardly ever read. All their shortcomings notwithstanding, there is no doubt that the codes in OALDCE1 and LDOCE1 are significant achievements. They reveal differences between verb classes, represent complementation patterns in much detail and, no less importantly, take up little space.

The codes in COBUILD1 are more transparent, but also more space-consuming. They consist of a few letters which represent both formal and functional categories. COBUILD1 has symbols for the object [O] as well as the functional categories of adjunct [A] and complement [C], but they seem to be far from immediately comprehensible to dictionary users. Some other characters used in codes are not fully explicit, either. The symbol [REPORT-CL] stands for any reported clauses introduced by *that*, a *wh*-word and *if* (COBUILD1, 1227), and is thus more confusing than the more descriptive labels representing each of the clauses separately. It is also worth noting that the code for *watch sb doing sth* is incomplete, since it does not show that the object is to be followed by *-ing* participle complementation.

While COBUILD1 uses one straightforward verb symbol [V] to represent the main verb classes, the symbol is additionally modified to designate ergative verbs [V-ERG]. However, the code for ergative verbs seems to be superfluous; the term *ergative* is most probably unfamiliar to foreign learners.

The classes of intransitive, transitive and linking verbs have their symbols in CIDE, but verbs which can be followed by a clause are not described as transitive. The functional label *object*, represented by the abbreviation [obj], performs two functions. When given after the headword, it indicates the complementation-taking properties of the verb,

but when incorporated in codes following examples, it denotes a sentence constituent. CIDE does not use any abbreviations to represent full infinitives and *that*-clauses. The labels [*to infinitive*] and [*(that) clause*] are needlessly long, especially in comparison with their shorter counterparts employed in the other dictionaries, which are no less transparent.

Overall, the dictionaries discussed above incorporate opaque, mnemonic and transparent coding systems. The codes in COBUILD1 and CIDE are more transparent than those in OALDCE1 and LDOCE1, since it is possible to infer verb complementation structure from the codes themselves, without the assistance of the outside matter. The codes in LDOCE1 are mnemonic, mainly because the meaning of symbols does not change depending on the context in which they occur. Nonetheless, in LDOCE1 and OALDCE1, codes for different patterns are clearly different, even though not immediately comprehensible. On the other hand, the transparency of the coding systems in the other volumes, including the latest editions, often coupled with the rejection of codes for monotransitive, complex transitive and ditransitive verbs, results in blurring the distinctions between underlyingly different complementation patterns. Yet, the transition from mnemonic to transparent coding systems is no doubt commendable as it boosts the accessibility of verb codes to dictionary users. The reduced accuracy of codes and their more space-consuming form are the price for clarity (Rundell 1998, 330).

5. Form of noun codes

Information on the codes for countable (C), uncountable (U), reclassifiable (R) and collective (Cl.) nouns in all the selected dictionaries is presented in Table 5.

As can be seen from the table, the COBUILD dictionaries have the most space-consuming noun codes. For one thing, the dictionaries use abbreviations, and not one-letter symbols, for countable and uncountable nouns. For another, they feature [N-MASS] and [N-VAR] with reclassifiable nouns, and only sometimes show explicitly that such nouns are countable and uncountable.⁴ Also, codes for collective nouns make it clear that the nouns can be followed by singular and plural verbs.

In the other dictionaries, there are one-letter symbols for countable and uncountable nouns. In OALDCE1, LDOCE1 and OALDCE7, [C] appears in the entry only when in at least one sense a noun is not countable; if

⁴ This happens when the two uses represent different senses.

nouns are not coded in any way, their countability should be taken for granted. In the remaining dictionaries, countability is no longer unmarked—all nouns are coded as a matter of routine. In the dictionaries under discussion reclassifiable nouns are simply presented as both countable and uncountable. Like COBUILD1 and COBUILD6, OALDCE7, LDOCE5, CALD3 as well as CIDE explicitly indicate the patterns of collective nouns, but the codes are shorter; there are abbreviations, the plus sign and/or the slash. LDOCE1, by contrast, has the more opaque, though less space-consuming code [GC] for countable group nouns. The variability in verb concord with collective nouns is not represented by means of codes in either edition of MEDAL, where only [C] and [U] are used.⁵

Table 5. Noun codes (the latest and the earliest editions)

		OALD CE7	LDOCE 5	COBUILD6	CALD3	MED AL2
C	<i>book</i>	C	C	N-COUNT	C	C
U	<i>applause</i>	U	U	N- UNCOUNT	U	U
R	<i>cake</i>	C, U	C, U	N-VAR	C OR U	C, U
Cl .	<i>committee</i>	[C+sing ./pl. v.]	[C also+plural verb BrE]	N-COUNT with sing or pl verb	C;+SIN G/PL VERB	C
		OALD CE1	LDOCE 1	COBUILD1	CIDE	MED AL1
C	<i>book</i>	-	C	N COUNT	C	C
U	<i>applause</i>	U	U	N UNCOUNT	U	U
R	<i>cake</i>	C, U	1 C, 2 U	N COUNT ► N UNCOUNT (N MASS)	U, C	C, U
Cl	<i>committee</i>	-	GC	N COUNT: VB CAN BE SING OR PL	C;+sing/ pl v	C

⁵ The information that a collective noun “can be followed by a singular or plural verb” is given in full after its definition in the entry.

6. Conclusions

Encoding syntactic information on nouns and verbs has substantially improved since the time where the first pedagogical dictionaries of English were published. Positive developments have been identified in both the distribution of codes and their form. Alternating verb codes and examples is highly commendable, since in this way the dictionary user can immediately see how the patterns represented in codes work in practice. Nonetheless, such positioning of codes remains desirable in the case of nouns, especially—reclassifiable and collective ones. In particular, it seems that when a given noun sense is characterized by different patterns of syntactic behavior, matching relevant codes with examples would be welcomed by dictionary users. Besides, the accessibility of verb codes has improved, and now they are clearer to dictionary users than those in the earliest dictionaries. Nonetheless, more transparent codes have developed at the expense of accuracy and space. The most space-consuming verb codes have been identified in CALD3 and CIDE. It seems that some space could have been saved there with the help of standard, but no less transparent abbreviations and simple typographic devices. COBUILD6 and COBUILD1, by contrast, feature the most space-consuming noun codes. Paradoxically, such codes are not necessarily clearer.⁶ In these dictionaries, excessively long codes serve to represent the syntax of collective nouns, but also in this case, greater length does not entail any obvious gain on the side of clarity. Presumably, abbreviations and typographic signs can perform the same function as lengthy codes. However, only empirical investigation can prove this hypothesis.

References

- Aarts, Flor. 1991. OALD, LDOCE and COBUILD: Three learner's dictionaries of English compared. *Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain* 17, 211-226.
- . 1999. Syntactic information in OALD5, LDOCE3, COBUILD2 and CIDE. In: *The perfect learners' dictionary* (?), ed. T. Herbst, K and Popp, 15-32. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag
- Cowie, Anthony P. 1978. The place of illustrative material and collocations in the design of a learner's dictionary. In *In honor of A. S. Hornby*, ed. P. Strevens, 127-139. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

⁶ See [N-VAR] and [N-MASS].

- Leech, Geoffrey and Jan Svartvik. 1994. *A communicative grammar of English*. London, New York: Longman.
- Nesi, Hilary. 2000. *The use and abuse of EFL dictionaries: How learners of English as a foreign language read and interpret dictionary entries*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Procter, Paul. 1976. The design of a dictionary for language teaching and learning. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Congress of Applied Linguistics*, ed. G. Nickel, 309-317. Stuttgart: HochschulVerlag.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (eds.). 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London, New York: Longman.
- Rundell Michael. 1998. Recent trends in English pedagogical lexicography. *International Journal of Lexicography* 11, 315-342.

Dictionaries

- CALD3. 2008. *Cambridge advanced learners' dictionary*. 3rd edition. ed. E. Walter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CIDE. 1995. *Cambridge international dictionary of English*. ed. P. Procter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- COBUILD1. 1987. *Collins COBUILD English language dictionary*. 1st edition. ed. J. Sinclair. London, Glasgow: Collins.
- COBUILD6. 2008. *Collins COBUILD advanced English dictionary*. 6th edition. Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning, Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers.
- LDOCE1. 1978. *Longman dictionary of contemporary English*. 1st edition. ed. P. Procter. Harlow: Longman.
- LDOCE5. 2009. *Longman dictionary of contemporary English*. 5th edition. ed. M. Mayor. Harlow: Pearson Longman.
- MEDAL1. 2002. *Macmillan English dictionary for advanced learners*. 1st edition. ed. M. Rundell. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- MEDAL2. 2007. *Macmillan English dictionary for advanced learners*. 2nd edition. ed. M. Rundell. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- OALDCE1. 1948. *The advanced learner's dictionary of current English*. 1st edition. ed. A. Hornby. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- OALDCE7. 2005. *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English*. 7th edition. ed. S. Wehmeier. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CHAPTER TWO

TELEGRAPHIC STYLE OF DEFINITIONS IN THE *CONCISE OXFORD DICTIONARY*

MAŁGORZATA KAMIŃSKA

First published in 1911, *Concise Oxford Dictionary (COD)*¹ was admired as a “marvel of condensation, accomplished by skilful hands” of the brothers Henry and Francis Fowler (*COD11*, vii). The book was issued in a small format (12.5 x 18.9 cm)² but the most characteristic features of the condensation were noticeable on a page of the main body. They included nesting of derivatives and compounds, which was by no means innovative in British lexicography (Simpson 1990, 1960), and the adoption of the telegraphic style of definitions to the degree which was unprecedented in the history of dictionary making. This paper presents the features of the telegraphic style, or the telegraphese, as the first editors called it, and the changes in the style of definitions introduced in successive editions of the *COD*. Let us begin the presentation with the first edition of the dictionary.

1. *COD1*

Describing the “peculiarities” of the dictionary, the Fowlers explained in the preface that “space must be saved [...] by the severest economy of expression—amounting to the adoption of telegraphese—that readers can be expected to put up with”. Incidentally, as Allen (1986, 1) points out, the Fowlers mentioned the word *telegraphese* in the preface but they forgot to include it in the main body of the dictionary. The extract above shows that

¹ Since the dictionary is commonly known as the *COD* (from the initial letters of the title), I have decided to use this abbreviation in the paper. However, it should be noted that recently the title has been changed into *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, with the actual abbreviation being *COED*.

² as measured on the edges of the cover

the editors made it clear that the comprehensibility of definitions depended on the user's skills, and emphasised that it was the user who took an active part in the process of reception of definitions.

Evidently, it was the policy of saving space that made definitions difficult to read for the average user. One of the space-saving techniques consisted in the omission of articles, both definite and indefinite, for example:

burglar "One who breaks into house by night with intent to commit felony";
burn "Small stream";
Florida "State in U.S.".

What was characteristic of *COD1* was the omission of genus words in some definitions of multi-word lexical units, which made the definitions incomplete in Aristotelian terms. Thus, *definiens*, or the defining phrase, was no longer substitutable for *definiendum*, or the word defined, for example:

burn away "to nothing, to extinction";
burn down "less vigorously as fuel fails";
flock-bed "stuffed with ff.";
hard winter "with, without, much frost";
maiden name "(before marriage)";
winter quarters "esp. to which troops retire for w.".

Such definitions required from the user some effort: in order to understand them, one had to refer to the part of the unit defined and treat it as the genus of the definition. For example, in order to formulate a complete definition of *burn down* above, one had to add the head of the compound being defined, i.e. "burn", to the definition proper provided in the dictionary. As a result, the complete definition was as follows: "burn less vigorously as fuel fails". The missing information, i.e. the sense of "burn", could be located in the same entry. Sometimes in order to formulate a complete definition, the user had to add the whole unit being defined, for example, *ears burn* "when one is talked of". The feature of omitting genus words remained in the *COD* down to the fifth edition, and to a lesser degree it could also be observed in *COD6* and *COD7* (my unpublished doctoral dissertation).

Omissions were frequent in contexts in brackets. Typically the contexts were introduced with the preposition "of", for example, *maiden* "(of female animals) uncoupled", *maieutic* "(Of Socratic mode of inquiry)".

obstetric, ...". However, sometimes the preposition was omitted, which might have been confusing to the inexperienced user who wondered how to relate the bracketed information to the definition proper, for example:

burn "give, make to give, light (lamp, candles, gas, oil, &c.)" (*COD1*).

Changes towards user-friendliness and easier comprehensibility were carried out as late as *COD6*, where both contexts mentioned above were preceded by "of".

Another feature of the telegraphese was that a single definition could refer to more than one lexical category of the lemma. With this aim in view, several techniques were used. One of them was to mention a few hyperonyms, each of which being of different lexical category; for example, in the definition of *burlesque*:

burlesque *a. & n., &v.t.* "Imitative, imitation, imitate, for purpose of deriding or amusing".

This definition appeared in the *COD* down to its seventh edition. The same effect was achieved by the use of brackets which suggested that the user could extract more than one sense out of a single definition. The brackets contained appropriate suffixes (as in *burlesque* below) or the whole words which carried a part of information on a related sense (as in *rabblement* below). As is seen in the latter definition, the addition of a related sense by means of brackets could involve a change in the lexical category of the word defined:

burlesque *a. & n.* "bombast(ic), mock-serious(ness)";
rabblement "(Tumult as of) a rabble".

Such a type of definitions was retained in the dictionary down to *COD7*.

Numerous abbreviations were a characteristic feature of Fowler's definitions. When a headword was used within the body of the entry, either as a word in a definition or as a sub-head, it was given in an abbreviated form, for example "*f.*" for *flock*, "*w.*" for *winter* (see the examples below). A double initial suggested the plural form, e.g. "*ff.*" for *flocks*. The abbreviations in the form of initial letters frequently appeared in definitions of multi-word lexical items, for example:

f.-bed "stuffed with *ff.*";
w. quarters "esp. to which troops retire for *w.*".

In *CODI* the conjunction “and” was hardly typed in the conventional way (“and”): it was rather expressed by means of the abbreviation “&”. The definition of *winter* below has also months given in abbreviated forms:

winter “Season between autumn & spring, three or four coldest months of year (in northern latitudes Nov. or Dec. to Jan. or Feb., or , Astron., from Dec. solstice to March equinox”.

The use of the abbreviation “&c” was also a space-saving option. It was used for broadening the meaning, without the need to enumerate other items within a given semantic field, as in *flock* “Lock, tuft, of wool, cotton, &c”. As opposed to “&c”, other abbreviations such as *esp*(ecially) and *usu*(ally) narrowed the meaning.

The use of commas is also worth mentioning. They were frequently used to separate hyperonyms (genus words) from each other, which made the definitions even briefer, though sometimes unnatural (see example below). In later editions, the commas were replaced by conjunctions “or”. As is seen in the definitions below, commas were also used to separate genus words from the rest of the definitions:

burn “put, be put, to death by fire”;
burn “Consume, waste, by fire”.

However, the omission of the conjunction “or” in a number of definitions did not suggest that they were not used at all. On the contrary, they sometimes appeared several times in a single definition, for example:

race “genus or species or breed or variety of animals or plants”.

From another point of view, the use of conjunctions “or” in the definition above also saved space because the conjunctions joined words or senses together into a single definition. Otherwise, the editor would have distinguished separate senses or sub-senses.

It is worth mentioning that some features of definitions described in this paper are not unique to the *COD* but could be found in other monolingual dictionaries as well, especially those addressed to native users. For example, a typical definition in *CODI* had a form of a brief analytical phrase which saved space much better than the discursive one. Understandably, sometimes the editors decided to use a single word, i.e. a near-synonym. Both types of definitions were commonly used in a popular