Two bilingual English and French and English and German dictionaries and two multilingual dictionaries dealing with English, French, German and Italian with a peculiar macro- and microstructure will be considered in order to highlight their efforts to spare space and to help foreign learners of such languages. The first dictionary-Williams Smith, A French Dictionary, on a plan entirely new (1814)-tried to help English learners to reproduce the pronunciation of French words, the second-A.F Inglott Bey, A dictionary of English Homonyms pronouncing and explanatory translated into Italian and French (1899)-arranged homonyms in three languages and explained them, the third-Neues Universal-Wörtbuch der deutschen, englischen, französischen und italienischen Sprache (1856)-insisted on comparison among languages and the fourth-Max Bellows’ Dictionary of German and English English and German (1912)-tried to have both sections English-German and German-English on the same page and to exploit different types to distinguish parts of speech plus masculine, feminine and neuter gender. The paper will explore suggestions for more innovative format in electronic bilingual dictionaries of the XXI century, since electronic dictionaries on Cd-Rom developed the search window, but did not venture to reinvent the electronic microstructure profile. During the XIX and XX century printers and lexicographers reflected upon improvements in printing layout above all when they aimed to meet the claims of middle-class buyers, asking for effective, pocket-size, not too expensive lexicographic tools.

0. Introduction

During the XIX and XX century printers and lexicographers reflected upon improvements in printing layout above all when they aimed to meet the demands of middle-class buyers, asking for effective, pocket-size, not too expensive lexicographic tools.

In this paper, a bilingual English and German dictionary and two multilingual dictionaries dealing with English, French, German and Italian with particular macro- and microstructures will be considered in order to highlight their efforts both to save space and to help foreign learners of these languages.

The following dictionaries were used:


- The *Neues Universal-Wörtbuch der deutschen, englischen, französischen und italienischen Sprache* (1856), which insisted on space-saving by exploiting common Latinate words.

- Max Bellows’ *Dictionary of German and English English and German* (1912), which tried to have both English-German and German-English sections on the same page and to exploit different types so as to distinguish part of speech and masculine, feminine and neuter gender forms.
It will be argued that these are interesting not only from the point of view of the history of particular micro- and macro-structure design, but also because they might suggest more innovative formats for electronic bilingual dictionaries of the XXI century.

1. A dictionary of English Homonyms translated into Italian and French

A. F. Inglott Bey’s trilingual dictionary of homonyms is dedicated to Viscount Cromer, consul generale in Egypt. In the trilingual preface to *A dictionary of English Homonyms pronouncing and explanatory translated into Italian and French* (1899 London: Kegan Paul), Inglott Bey tried “To better enable students of the English language to grapple with the difficulty presented by Homonymous words, especially in writing under dictation”. The translations into French and Italian of every English homonym are supposed to help foreigners speaking such mother tongues when studying the English language.

There are around 7 or 8 groups of homonyms per page, arranged in two columns, for a total of about 1450-1500 groups. Bold is used for the headword (in this case C, see fig. 1) and italics for its homophones Sea and See; See verb is given first because it is considered more frequent than the homograph noun which indicates the seat of the Pope)

- C, letter, sé. A letter of the alphabet
- Lettera dell’alfabeto
- Lettre de l’alphabet
- Sea, n. sé A large body of water; the ocean; the main.
- Mare
- Mer
- See, vt, sē. To perceive by the eye; (n) the seat of episcopal power; the seat of the Pope, or his court of Rome.
- Vedere; (n) sede episcopale, la sede papale o la corte del Papa
- Voir; (n) le saint siège, la cour de Rome

![Figure 1 - Inglott Bey (1899) entry for C](image)

The micro- and macrostructure of Inglott Bey’s dictionary represent even today an interesting and innovative way of providing useful information about the existing discrepancy between the phonological and graphematic aspect of English. Whilst this could only be a paper edition, most contemporary dictionaries are also published in an electronic format containing the audio patterns of all the headwords. This feature has lead to the abandoning of the International Phonetic Alphabet transcriptions from both the electronic and printed versions. We will not discuss here the unwelcome side effects of such a move – to reinforce recorded pronunciations for the ear with IPA transcriptions for the eye would not harm the students, but would, on the contrary, help them to pinpoint similar sounds carried by different spellings. Instead, by maintaining that alongside Inglott Bey’s way of grouping headwords, electronic dictionaries pronunciations might signal with a special sign the presence of homophones headwords in the dictionary so that by clicking on that sign the user might see the entry and its microstructure.

Developing a more complex indexing system of pronunciation files, one might possibly also signal phonological false friends. At the moment false friends are registered in bilingual dictionaries at the graphematic level, and mainly for their semantic aspects. The bilingual Italian-English Ragazzini in its 2008 edition introduced false friends, but failed to stress the fact that each English loanword is inevitably a false friend from the point of view of pronunciation. As Pulcini has noted “Today, then, Anglicisms tend to be pronounced according to the English model. However, the divergence of the English and Italian sound systems and the irregularity of the spelling-pronunciation correspondence in English are the source of minor phonetic adjustments, and adapted or hypercorrected pronunciations.” (Pulcini 2002: 157). Since the second half of the XXth century English words are introduced into Italian as loans without any graphic change, but they undergo heavier phonetic adaptations when they enter in derivatives. Thus ‘As to morphology, derivatives such as *filmino* should be considered the output of the assimilation process of borrowings (i.e. adapted anglicisms) rather than false anglicisms, since
the resulting form has no equivalent in English. Hence, the adding of suffixes is a linguistic process which adjusts the borrowing to the structural patterns of the Italian language. False anglicisms may only be adapted in pronunciation in order to comply with the phonological system of Italian.’ (Furiassi and Hofland 2007: 348). In any case electronic versions ought to take the opportunity to inform the user that when the word **Suspense** is a headword in the Italian-English part of the dictionary it is not pronounced as in the English-Italian section. The Oxford Paravia (2006) maintains IPA transcriptions, as in Figures 2 and 3.

![Figure 2 - Oxford Paravia (2006) the Italian entry for the word Suspense](image-url)

"**Suspense**

[saspenz], [sus.pans]

f. inv.

**Suspense**: *mantiene re la* ~ to maintain the suspense; *carico
di* ~ suspenseful."
Figure 3 - Oxford Paravia (2006) the English entry for the word *Suspense*
2. No less than 12 common dictionaries in one

The anonymous dictionary *Neues Universal-Wörerbuch der deutschen, englischen, französischen und italienischen Sprache* (1856 Stereotypie und Druck von Trowitzsch & Sohn in Berlin) also displays a headword form that deserves attention.

In the Preface of the *Neues Universal-Wörerbuch* we read:

“an entirely new plan: all four languages are arranged (promiscuously) under one general alphabet, so that to each German, English, French or Italian word are appended the synonymous expressions in the other three languages.

As, however, there are many words (more particularly in the English, French, and Italian languages), which bear a strong (orthographical) resemblance to each other, differing often only in the last syllable, it has been found advisable to denote each language by a certain sign; thus the figure 1 indicates that the word above which it is placed is German; 2 denotes English; 3 French; and 4 Italian.

Where the Italian Industria, f.4, Kunstfleiss, m., Gewerbsamkeit, f., Gewerbfleiss, m.1; industry, diligence2; industrie, f.3; is immediately followed by the French word Industrie, we, have referred the reader to the preceding word Industria 4. [...] much space has been gained; and we are thus enabled without enlarging the size beyond that of a common pocket-dictionary, to give a more copious selection of words, than is to be found in any other of the same size.

We feel sure, that every one who makes use of this universal-dictionary will find it to be highly useful and practical; the more so when he considers, that this one small volume, arranged in this manner, supplies the place of no less than 12 common dictionaries.”

The “promiscuous” macrostructure was not a novelty in itself as, in 1811, Don Felipe Fernández had already published *The first dictionary of two languages under a single alphabet English and Spanish* (J. McCreery, London). The *Neues Universal-Wörerbuch* however maximized the gain in printed space, since Latinate words were similar in at least two of the four languages.

In a way electronic bilingual dictionaries on Cd-Rom have revamped “promiscuous” macrostructure. Nowadays, multilingual pocket dictionaries such as the Zanichelli Courseau *Lingue per l’Europa* follow an essentially classic structure, as if they were simply a sequential collection of language-driven reindexed versions of a single, big multilingual database. Such a choice, apparently good for its tendency to maintain a standard structure that is well known to the user, reveals all its weakness when we consider the real number of entries it may offer in view the size limitations of the pocket edition. However, should an electronic dictionary organize a lexical database in the same way as the *Neues Universal-Wörerbuch*, the outcome could be a major improvement in the dictionary itself in terms of power of usage without affecting its user friendliness. Indeed, following this model, the user would be allowed to choose his or her own personal version of the same dictionary simply by selecting a specific filter. The basic filtering approach would show all the multilingual lemmas in a single alphabetic order, a feature which would not only help the general user to think about the differences and similarities of the lexical structure of the represented languages, but would also help professional users, such as translators, to more easily access the requested word pairs. In addition, the advanced filtering level would provide the user with the same multilingual microstructure as in the basic level, but also the additional option of selecting and displaying only those lemmas belonging to a specific language.

Such features have in fact already been implemented into Le Grand Robert Collins électronique, a 2003 electronic edition of the Robert&Collins French-English bilingual dictionary, which organises lemmas in a similar way to that of the *Neues Universal-Wörerbuch*.

As concerns the stylistic and graphical choices adopted to help the user distinguish the language each lemma belongs to, it is interesting to note that the above mentioned French-English electronic edition dictionary does not use specific fonts, but simply adopts two different colours to mark the lemmas: green for French, orange for English.
The teaching trend known as intercomprehension (see www.eurocom-frankfurt.de where the method is explained in twelve different Romance languages) has mostly stressed hearing intercomprehension among speakers of Romance languages and reading; Stegmann (2000) illustrates 5000 words of international lexis based on Latinate words with the 500 words which belong to all the Romance languages, their phonemic correspondences and their graphic and pronunciation correspondences. Should one decide to prepare a lexicographic tool for reading purposes, the macrostructure of the Neues Universal-Wörerbuch might suggest what an intercomprehension dictionary might look like, if, instead of numbers, we should decide to exploit colours. If intercomprehension between Germanic languages is to be fostered, the Bellows dictionary, described in section 3, has something more to tell us and its suggestions might well be applied to couples of Romance languages.

3. German-English and English-German divisions concurrently on the same page

In 1873, a self-employed Gloucester printer, John Bellows, printed Le Vrai dictionnaire de poche, français-anglais anglais-français, avec les deux parties imprimées sur la même page for the publishers Leroux of Paris and Trübner of London. Bellows’ dictionary was brought to the attention of lexicographers by Roger Steiner (1982) and a fourth edition, revised by Bellows’ grandson, was published by Longman in 1951.

In 1912, John’s son, Max Bellows, published a Dictionary of German and English English and German (Logmans, Green & co. London). In the introduction Max Bellows acknowledged that he followed the arrangement of his father’s work and in a page titled The copyright he specified: “the copyright of this dictionary includes the following strictly original points: I - the distinguishing of masculine, feminine and neuter genders by different types II - the arrangement of both the German-English and English-German divisions concurrently on the same page III - the manner of arranging the conjugation of German verbs, and the reference where necessary, by numbers or by distinguishing letters to such conjugations from the text of the dictionary; also the manner of arranging the declensions of German nouns, and the reference to these by numbers from the text” Bellows’ copyright protected also less unusual features.
Bellows’ pages did not display a single alphabetical order but were divided into two sections.

Figure 5 - Bellows (1912)

In the upper part there were German-English articles, in the lower one English-German articles. Many bilingual dictionaries with German maintained Gothic type for German words until after the second World War. Bellows’ dictionary was innovative since German words were written in Latin font as were the English ones. His decision might have been influenced by the fact that his articles were crammed with other typographical tricks to save space and convey grammatical indications. He used a vertical stroke in many words to avoid frequent repetition in compounds of such words, he had substantives headwords printed in capitals, adjectives in bold small font, feminine words in italics and neuter in Roman type.

In order to make the fullest use of the dictionary, the reader was advised to devote time and attention to a study of the pages inside the front cover and immediately after the introduction. Tables 32 for SHALL und WILL, 33 SHOULD und WOULD. EXAMPLES of the Verb CAN, all at page 24 of the front matter, are good sketches of comparative grammar. Bellows used German to explain English sentences with modals and gave their German translations. He did less with dürfen, können, mögen, showing more attention to their conjugation than to their use in sentences.
Bellows also left a final page for adding words missing from the dictionary.

The *Dictionary of German and English English and German* uses an interesting, innovative combination of graphic elements to provide lexical and morphological information. Furthermore, the particular organization of the macrostructure, which allows the user to read the lemmas of both languages, could be taken as a cue to better organise screen display.

Electronic bilingual dictionaries rely too much on the fact that by clicking any word in the microstructure, you access the article dealing with a given word, but do not exploit all the opportunities that the electronic support might offer.

Let’s suppose that we organise an electronic bilingual edition with the spatial distribution of the Bellows dictionary structure on the screen. Since we have an electronic access to macrostructure, we need not follow the alphabetical order twice, as he did, thereby obtaining two alphabetical lists where only by chance headwords of one language have semantic ties with headwords of the other. We might program it so that when looking up a bilingual entry, e.g. *affrancare* in the Italian-English section, we would see the entry and the entry of the first, second and third suggested translation, as they appear in the English-Italian section. In cases where the entry shows a meaning discrimination, as in our example *liberare*, we might also give the entry for that word. Of course to have three or four related articles readable simultaneously (not alternatively readable) it would necessarily be a small sized dictionary, as was Bellows’; in our tentative screen display we used the Ragazzini (2008) large bilingual dictionary glosses, cutting them after the first two or three meanings. Using such a disposition, as we have tried to demonstrate in fig. 4, would certainly ease the double check of chosen translations that teachers recommend when teaching students how to use a bilingual dictionary. Of course the possibility of clicking on any word will also be active.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affrancare v. t.</th>
<th>to free v. t.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (liberare) to free, to set free, to deliver, to release; to emancipate: affrancare uno schiavo [un popolo], to free a slave [a people] (…)</td>
<td>1 liberare; mettere in libertà: All the prisoners were freed; tutti i prigionieri furono liberati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberare v. t.</th>
<th>to deliver v. t.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to free; to set free; to release; to liberate; to deliver (left): liberare un prigioniero, to release (to set free) a prisoner; liberare un ostaggio, to release (o to free) a hostage; liberare uno schiavo, to free a slave; (…)</td>
<td>1 consegnare, recapitare, distribuire, trasmettere (un messaggio); rilasciare (un certificato): (fin) to deliver stock, consegnare titoli; to deliver goods [letters], consegnare merce [lettere]; to deliver the mail, distribuire la corrispondenza (…)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>to free v. t.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 affrancare, emancipare: to free slaves, emancipare gli schiavi (…)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>to deliver v. t.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 form.: liberare, salvare: May God deliver us!, Dio ce ne scampi e liber!; to deliver from bondage, liberare dalla schiavitù (…)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 - Tentative screenshot comprehensive of both *affrancare* and its translation plus meaning discrimination *liberare*

Vincenzo Lo Cascio Groot elektronisch Woordenboek Italiaans-Nederlands Nederlands-Italiaans (2005) is, to our knowledge, one of the most innovative bilingual electronic dictionaries from the point of view of screen display, giving particular prominence to the semantic network and collocations to which the specific lemma belongs. For an image of the screenshot of *Groot elektronisch Woordenboek Italiaans-Nederlands Nederlands-Italiaans* (2005), we refer to what is reproduced in Lo Cascio - Nijpels (2006, p. 547) and in Lo Cascio (2007 pp. 31 and 32) where the disposition of information is largely commented.

Its innovativeness is not surprising because it is not the digital version of a printed dictionary, but the fruit of a bilingual database. See also Bogaards P. Hannay M: 2004: innovative design is related to a specific plan for new type of bilingual dictionary.
In addition, the modern technology and the internet may represent the contemporary counterpart of the white pages which the dictionary user could fill in with his or her own entries. Indeed, since most electronic editions need to be installed onto the user’s personal computer and run from the PC hard disk, an innovative feature would be the automatic update of the dictionary itself directly from the web. Last, but not least, as regards leaving some spare space for the user’s own lexicographic entries, it should be noted that a similar feature is, again, already made available in the Lo Cascio Italiaans-Nederlands Nederlands-Italiaans dictionary by selecting the option *Mio Dizionario*.

4. Conclusion

Some benefit can be derived from the close study of these old printed dictionaries. Though the appeal of their printed pages is not comparable to that of some of the dictionaries studied by Paul Luna (2004), they do propose ways to group words in order to enhance memorization techniques in vocabulary teaching and they can suggest some improvements for the microstructure profiles in CD-Rom versions of printed dictionaries. At the moment, electronic Cd-Rom versions of printed bilingual dictionaries exploit colour, but do not use fonts or innovative spatial distribution of different part of the microstructure on the screen display. Recent discussion on displaying information in printed and electronic bilingual dictionaries has mainly concentrated on finding means to inform about collocation: dictionaries of the type and size we mentioned here did not provide space for that type of information, but larger XIX century bilingual dictionaries were tackling collocational issues through, what at that time, was thought to be the role of authors quotations and of the lists of commented synonyms (see Marello forthcoming).
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