Languaging-up the Dictionary Maker:

neologisms and dictionaries

Marcel Thelen – Peter Starren

1. General

In this article we will discuss a project on neologisms that we carried out at the Dutch State School of Translation and Interpreting in Maastricht. The aim of the project is to test a method for analyzing semantic developments in neologisms and to see what dictionaries do with neologisms. The project consists of an analysis of 47 words and phrases in 13 different dictionaries. The total number of items of analysis (given and/or not given in these dictionaries) is 631. The words and phrases we analyzed are: *asquish, action painter, action painting, aerobics, backup, biathlon, body-builder, conventional wisdom, crack up, crash course, decompress, deselect, dramedy, ecology, encounter group, euphenics, Eurobond, extralinguistic, fallout, feedback, fingerprint, floating voter, free university, geep, generate, genetic engineering, gofer, greenhouse effect, hangup, happening, hatchback, hawk, headhunt, headhunter, hothouse effect, the tip of the iceberg, immunodeficiency disease, in-crowd, in-depth, interface, irrelevant, jet-fatigue, jet-lag, jet syndrome, job-hop, kiss of life*, and *kneeroom*. We used the following dictionaries:

1. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English* (COD), 1964 (reprinted with corrections);
2. *The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (ALD), 1968 (second edition/ninth impression);
3. *K. Ten Bruggencate Engels Woordenboek, Engels-Nederlands* (Bruggencate), 1970 (second impression of seventeenth edition);
4. *Dictionary of New English 1963-1972* (Barnhart), edited by Cl. Barnhart *et al.*, 1973;
5. *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English. Volume 1: Verbs with Prepositions & Articles* (Idioms 1), edited by A. Cowie & R. Mackin, 1975;
6. *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary, Unabridged* (Webster's), 1979;
7. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (LDoCE), 1981 (reprinted with corrections);
8. *Collins English Dictionary* (Collins), 1982 (sixteenth impression);
9. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (OALD), 1982 (sixteenth impression);
10. *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English. Volume 2: Phrase, Clause & Sentence Idioms* (Idioms 2), edited by A. Cowie *et al, 1984*;
11. *Van Dale Groot Woordenboek Engels-Nederlands* (Van Dale), 1984;
12. *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary* (Cobuild), 1987;
13. *The Longman Register of New Words. Volume 1* (Ayto), edited by J. Ayto, 1989.

2. Dictionaries used

The number of dictionaries we used is completely arbitrary, as our intention was not to give an exhaustive and conclusive analysis but rather to set up a method of analysis. On purpose, however, we included monolingual learners' and non-learners' dictionaries as well as bilingual or translation dictionaries, because we wanted to see which type of these dictionaries is the best help for students of translation at the Dutch State School of Translation and Interpreting in Maastricht. We categorized the dictionaries used in the following way:

A) Monolingual Learners' Dictionaries:

ALD (dict. nr. 2)
Cobuild (dict. nr. 12)
Idioms 1 (dict. nr. 5)
Idioms 2 (dict. nr. 10)
LDoCE (dict. nr. 7)
OALD (dict. nr. 9)

B) Monolingual Non-learners' Dictionaries:

Ayto (dict. nr. 13)
Barnhart (dict. nr. 4)
COD (dict. nr. 1)
Collins (dict. nr. 8)
Webster's (dict. nr. 6)

C) Bilingual or Translation Dictionaries:

Bruggencate (dict. nr. 3)
Van Dale (dict. nr. 11)

We did not make a distinction between dictionaries of American English and dictionaries of British English (since nearly all of the above dictionaries contain both American English and British English), nor between dictionaries with «established» words and phrases and dictionaries with new words and phrases, because we felt that this would be too detailed a distinction in view of the small number of dictionaries we used. The same goes for the distinction between idiomatic and non-idiomatic dictionaries. In fact, the idiomatic dictionaries we used are somewhat strange in this collection of dictionaries, on the one hand because we selected the items to be analyzed at random which means that it was purely by chance that we picked out idioms and that their number turned out to be rather small, and on the other hand because these dictionaries were helpful in a few cases only due to the fact that they contain idioms rather than non-idiomatic language. We nevertheless kept them in our collection of dictionaries. Dictionary number 5 (Idioms 1) was the least helpful

due to the nature of items incorporated in it, and therefore we decided to keep it in our survey, but not to include it in our actual analysis.

3. Selection of words and phrases

The words and phrases were selected at random. The only «criterion» for selection was that they should be in use today. The point of departure for the actual selection was Barhnart (1973), i.e. we selected our items from this dictionary and only then looked up these items in the other dictionaries. Initially, we intended to take Ayto (1989) as a second point of departure and to compare the two methods, but then we decided to drop the latter, not only for practical reasons, but also because we felt that the first method was more promising. Of course, the two methods differ in scope and nature. Not only will the words and phrases (to be) selected be different (at least, in most cases), but also the conclusions to be drawn. The first method can give an answer to such questions as: «how many of the items selected are eventually incorporated in 'established' dictionaries?», «how long does a neologism take to be incorporated in 'established' dictionaries?», and «does the meaning (definition) of a neologism change from 'Dictionary of New Words' to 'established' dictionary?». Both the first and the second method may explain why and in what way neologisms in a 'Dictionary of New Words' are new and the reasons for their incorporation in such a dictionary.

As mentioned before, because we selected our items at random, it was by pure chance that we also selected idioms. As a result their number is small and, therefore, they are perhaps negligible.

4. Principles underlying the analysis

In our analysis we made a strict distinction between FORM and MEANING, and gave MEANING priority over FORM, basing ouserveles on the model of translation formulated in Larson (1984). Thus, we treated neologisms from the point of a translator/student of translation. FORM only served as a point of «first recognition» of a possible relatedness between dictionary items. The semantic analysis itself is based on a model of grammar that was developed by Alinei (1974, 1980a, and 1980b) and applied and worked out somewhat further by Thelen (1980, 1983a, 1983b, 1987a, 1987c, and 1990), and that is called **A Two-Cycle Model of Grammar (TCM)**.

In TCM, the grammar is doubted into a **Lexical Cycle** and a **Sentence Cycle**. The two cycles have identical rules and categories, which differ in scope only. The Lexical Cycle generates lexical items, and the Sentence Cycle sentences. The basic principle of TCM is that a lexical item in fact is a shortcut of an underlying conceptual-syntactic structure (called **Internalized Sentence** or **Phrase**). The categories in this **Internalized Sentence** are identical to the grammatical/syntactic categories of an actual sentence (called **Externalized Sentence**) in which this lexical item is present. The internalized Sentence of *piano*, for example, could be:

INSTR ‹...› /*WH SB ‹human› PD ‹play› OB ‹music›*/
(where INSTR = Instrument, WH indicates relativization, SB = Subject, PD = Predicate and OB = Direct Object)

which means that there is an instrument on which a human being makes music. The underlining means that the part in question can actually occur, next to the lexical item *piano* itself, in an Externalized Sentence: «John is very fond of the piano on which he plays classical music». The Internalized Sentence of *music hall* could be:

LOC ‹...› */WH SB ‹human› PD ‹play› OB ‹music›/*
(where LOC = Locative, Location)

and that of *pianist:*

SB ‹human› */WH PD ‹play› OB ‹music›/.*

All these Internalized Sentences can —via a reversed application of transformations— be «reduced» to one and the same abstract conceptual-syntactic structure (called **Lexical System**):

SB ‹human› PD ‹play› OB ‹music›.

All those lexical items belong to this same Lexical System whose Internalized Sentences have at least ‹human› as Subject and ‹play› as Predicate. This Lexical System belongs to several larger conceptual fields (called **Lexical Domains**): ‹human›, ‹play› and ‹music›, i.e. in general all those lexical items belong to one and the same Lexical Domain whose Lexical System(s) have one conceptual-semantic feature in common, irrespective of its place and function in the structure of the respective Lexical Systems.

The elements ‹human›, ‹play›, etc. are axiomatic conceptual-semantic features/components, i.e. features/components that, for the sake of analysis, are treated as primitives by axiom. Moreover, they are not distinctive features, but prototypical features. Together with conceptual-syntactic categories these axiomatic features form the input for the Lexical Cycle. The output of the Lexical Cycle, i.e. lexical items, forms the input for the Sentence Cycle.

Another important aspect of TCM is that of **Componential Analysis**, coupled with the notions of **Exchange of Functions** and **Taxonomy**. Lexical items are grouped together in taxonomies, i.e. hierarchical structures with, from top to bottom, a hyperonym-hyponym or whole-part relation between the lexical items in question. Every lexical item generated by the Lexical Cycle can be decomposed into smaller conceptual-semantic components (Componential Analysis). An already generated lexical item can function as a conceptual-semantic component at a next lower level in a taxonomy (Exchange of Functions). What is important for TCM is that taxonomies are related to other taxonomies by means of the construct of Lexical System. This means, for example, that the taxonomy of «pianos» —via the Lexical System of SB ‹human› PD ‹play› OB ‹music›— can be related to that of «playing», and that of «places for music», etc.

The above principles of Conceptual-syntactic Categories, Lexical Systems, Taxonomies, and Lexical Domains are the four basic TCM principles for structuring the (theoretical) lexicon. TCM takes dictionary definitions to be approximations of Internalized Sentences and, therefore, as the starting point for the structuring of the lexicon.

Although TCM requires a considerable number of data in order to be able to try and structure (well-defined parts of) the lexicon, and although in this project we only analyzed a relatively small number of data without even intending to structure the lexicon, we found that the basic principles of TCM, especially those of Lexical System, Lexical Domain and Internalized Sentence, are very useful for the study of neologisms and the comparison of dictionaries on this point. The above could mean, however, that there is a serious drawback to our project: some of the Lexical Systems and Lexical Domains we postulated for items can only be called «axiomatic» in the true sense. We can easily refute such criticism, because in the first place we are interested in a method rather than in conclusive results.

The items selected from Barnhart served as items of comparison. Every item from the other dictionaries (the compared item) with which the Barnhart item of comparison was compared was analyzed and categorized by means of the following criteria:

	FORM		MEANING
same form/same meaning		+	
same form/approximate meaning	+		≈
same form/different meaning	+		≠
approximate form/same meaning	±		=
approximate form/approximate meaning	±		≈
approximate form/different meaning	±		≠
item of comparison NOT GIVEN		–	

where **same meaning** = same overall meaning
i.e. the compared item in question has exactly the same overall meaning as the item of comparison (whether or not resulting from a reversed application of transformations to the internalized Sentence or Phrase of the compared item), i.e. the compared item in question belongs to the same Lexical System as the item of comparison, and thus to the same Lexical Domain;

approximate meaning = related overall meaning
(a reversed application of transformations does not yield the same overall meaning), i.e. the item in question belongs to the same Lexical Domain;

same form = the item in question has the same spelling, the same compounding and belongs to the same grammatical category, though there may be a difference in grammatical subcategory (e.g. as with verbs: transitive vs intransitive);

approximate form = there is a difference in grammatical category, spell-

ing, and/or compounding, but the form of the item of comparison is still recognizable/can still be derived.

Even in cases where (on the basis of these principles) the meaning of a compared item is labelled the same (i.e. with the symbol «=») as that of the item of comparison, may a precise semantic analysis yield meaning differences. This means that there may be a (meaning) difference in conceptual-semantic content of a conceptual-syntactic category that is only of minor importance for the definition of the Lexical System in question, e.g.:

body-building: ... to make the muscles **grow**
... to make the muscles **conspicuous.**

5. Items of comparison vs. compared items

For a survey of the labelling of items, see Appendix (A), and for their semantic analysis see Appendix (B). Another example is *to crack up*. In Barnhart it is defined as:

«to cause to laugh or to laugh uncontrollably; convulse with laughter».

We analyzed it as follows:

LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹cause›
EVENT ‹[SB ‹human› PD ‹laugh› (CAUSE ‹joke›)]›
and/or
SB ‹human› PD ‹laugh› MANN ‹uncontrollably› (CAUSE ‹joke›)
IS: */SB ‹...›/* PD ‹...› */EVENT ‹...›/*
and/or
/SB ‹...›/ PD ‹...› MANN ‹...›
LD: ‹laughing›, ‹joking›

where LS = Lexical System, IS = Internalized Sentence, LD = Lexical Domain, and MANN = Manner. The other symbols speak for themselves.

In LDoCE, Collins, OALD, Idioms 2, and Cobuild, however, a definition of «to tell a joke» is given. This was analyzed as:

LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹tell› OB ‹joke› MANN ‹...›
LD: ‹joking›.

Ayto, finally gives the definition of «to smoke the drug crack», which we analyzed as:
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹take› OB ‹drugs›
LD: ‹drugs›, ‹drug taking›.

Because in LDoCE, Collins, OALD, Idioms 2, and Cobuild *crack* is given (without *up*) we labelled the compared item «±» for «approximate form», and «≈» for approximate meaning. As can be seen, the compared item (in these dictionaries) belongs to

the same Lexical Domain as the item of comparison in Barnhart, viz. ‹joking›, but its Lexical System is different, viz. SB ‹human› PD ‹tell› OB ‹joke› MANN ‹...›, instead of SB ‹human› PD ‹cause› EVENT ‹[SB ‹human› PD ‹laugh› (CAUSE ‹joke›)]› and/or SB ‹human› PD ‹laugh› MANN ‹uncontrollably› (CAUSE ‹joke›). That is why we labelled *crack* in these dictionaries as «≈». The situation is different with the compared item in Ayto: it belongs to a completely different Lexical Domain, viz. ‹drugs›, or ‹drug taking›. Therefore we labelled it «≠» for «different meaning». Its form was labelled «+» for «same form». In this way, we analyzed and labelled all 47 items.

6. Notes on use, style, etc. in the dictionaries used

For each item of comparison and each compared item we wrote down the «circumstantial» information given in the respective dictionaries, i.e. grammatical information, register, style, etc., that is not part of the definition. For a sample of this information, see Appendix (C). Then we compared all these bits of information.

7. Sources of the dictionaries used

Initially, we wanted to follow a similar procedure as with notes on use, style, etc., for the sources given in the various dictionaries. This turned out to be rather difficult, because only in Barnhart and Ayto sources are given for every item separately. In the other dictionaries whole, undifferentiated lists of sources are given in their introductory parts, so that it was not possible to trace a source for every single item. Therefore, we decided to cancel this part from our project.

The only thing to be said here is that the two dictionaries mentioned use a variety of sources (English as well as American) of all possible types, including books, newspapers, etc.

8. Results

Before we actually discuss some of the results of our project, we should emphasize that, because of the very small number of dictionaries and items analyzed, these results can only be called tentative, and not statistically significant.

As mentioned before, the items from Barnhart have been labelled «items of comparison», and the items from the other dictionaries «compared items». We divided the time span in which the dictionaries appeared into two major parts: the time before Barnhart and the time after Barnhart (see Appendices (D) and (E)). When we look at the time before Barnhart, we see that 32 compared items (notably in COD, ALD, and Bruggencate), resemble, one way or the other, items in Barnhart (or putting it differently, that 32 items of comparison from Barnhart already existed before they were actually incorporated in this dictionary). The least interesting of these items —from the point of semantic development— are, of course, those with the same form and the same meaning: *feedback* (COD), *hawk* (Bruggencate), and *in-depth* (Bruggencate). It is striking though that these items were incorporated in Barnhart as being new words, whereas they are not. The most interesting of the other 29 compared

items are 1) those that have the same form (as the item of comparison) and an approximate meaning, 2) those that have an approximate form and the same meaning, and 3) those that have an approximate form and an approximate meaning. These items are respectively:

1) *ecology* (COD, ALD, Bruggencate), *fingerprint* (COD, ALD, Bruggencate), *generate* (COD, ALD, Bruggencate), *happening* (COD, ALD, Bruggencate), *irrelevant* (COD, ALD, Bruggencate);
2) *asquish* (Bruggencate), *backup* (Bruggencate), *floating voter* (COD, ALD, Bruggencate);
3) *fallout* (Bruggencate), *feedback* (Bruggencate).

Of these items, those under (2) are the least interesting, simply because they have the same meaning. The reason for Barnhart to incorporate these items as new words may have been their «new» FORM. More interesting are the other two groups, i.e. (1) and (3). These Barnhart items of comparison clearly differ somehow in meaning from the corresponding compared items, and therefore Barnhart was correct to incorporate them as new. The semantic development that took place here (see Appendix (B)) can be described as follows:

a) the Lexical System of the item of comparison is different from that of the compared item, and a generalization of axiomatic features (the conceptual-semantic content) has taken place: *ecology, fingerprint, fallout, feedback*;
b) the Lexical System of the item of comparison is different from that of the compared item, and a specialization of axiomatic features (the conceptual-semantic content) has taken place: *generate, happening, irrelevant.*

Because of the small number of dictionaries involved here, it did not make much sense to say anything about the three types of dictionary in this respect.

When we look at the time after Barnhart (Appendix (E)), we see the following. First take all the cases where the meaning of the compared items incorporated in the various dictionaries is exactly the same as that of the item of comparison, irrespective of FORM. Their total number per type of dictionary is:

Monolingual Learners' Dictionaries (4 dicts.)	**46 (average per dictionary: 11.5)**
Monolingual Non-learners' Dictionaries (3 dicts.)	**40 (average per dictionary: 13.3)**
Bilingual or Translation Dictionaries (1 dict.)	**30 (average per dictionary: 30)**

If at all significant, one might conclude from these total numbers that Monolingual Learners' Dictionaries do better as far as the incorporation of new words is concerned, but when one looks at the average numbers per type of dictionary, one is lead to conclude that Bilingual or Translation Dictionaries do better. When one looks at the various dictionaries individually, then Van Dale comes out best.

More interesting in this respect are 1) those cases where the meaning of the compared items incorporated in the various dictionaries is only an approximation of that of the item of comparison (irrespective of FORM), and 2) those cases where the meaning of the compared items incorporated in the various dictionaries is completely different (again, irrespective of FORM). The situation is the following:

1) approximate meaning

Monolingual Learners' Dictionaries (4 dicts.)	**21 (average per dictionary: 5.25)**
Monolingual Non-learners' Dictionaries (3 dicts.)	**11 (average per dictionary: 3.6)**
Bilingual or Translation Dictionaries (1 dict.)	**3 (average per dictionary: 3)**

2) different meaning

Monolingual Learners' Dictionaries (4 dicts.)	**5 (average per dictionary: 1.25)**
Monolingual Non-learners' Dictionaries (3 dicts.)	**6 (average per dictionary: 2)**
Bilingual or Translation Dictionaries (1 dict.)	**2 (average per dictionary: 2)**

It appears that, on the whole, Bilingual or Translation Dictionaries (in this case Van Dale) are more precise when it comes down to incorporating new meanings, and as far as this is concerned, they are more helpful to students of translation than any other dictionary. For the semantic analysis of these items we refer to Appendix (B).

For figures on Notes on use, style, etc., we refer to Appendix (C). A discussion of these would take up too much space here. We think that these figures speak for themselves.

9. Conclusions

The results we achieved and the interpretations we gave to them may seem simple repetitions of what has long been said and known about neologisms and their semantic development. Yet we feel that the method we applied in our project may be useful for a student of translation/a translator to assess the changed meaning in neologisms in the act of translating. Besides, it proved useful for comparing various dictionaries on the point of neologisms. Therefore, we think that this method is very useful and deserves elaboration.

The semantic analysis we formulated for our items of investigation may not yet be precise enough and be in need of further specification. This may be due to the small number of items and to the fact that they were selected at random. A first pre-selection of more items in well-defined parts of the lexicon may yield better results.

Of all the dictionaries we analyzed, the Bilingual or Translation Dictionary Van Dale comes out best in the field of neologisms, not only because it incorporates more items of comparison (= neologisms) than the other dictionaries, but also because it is stricter as far as their meaning is concerned. This is not at all surprising since it does not have to give monolingual meaning definitions but foreign language equivalents only. Of the monolingual dictionaries, the Monolingual Learner's Dictionary Cobuild scores best. For a student of translation, these two dictionaries seem to be the best help when it comes down to translating neologisms, and this in the following order: first Van Dale, then Cobuild.

10. Epilogue

Again, these results are tentative and pertain only to the dictionaries and data we analyzed. Yet we hope that they may be useful for lexicographers.

APPENDIX (A): labelling of items

	1964 1	1968 2	1970 3	1973 4	1975 5	1979 6	1981 7	1982 8	1982 9	1984 10	1984 11	1987 12	1989 13
asquish	–	–	±/=	+	–	±/=	–	±/=	–	–	±/=	–	–
action painter	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
action painting	–	–	–	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	–
aerobics	–	–	–	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	+	+	–
backup	–	–	±/=	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	+/≠
biathlon	–	–	–	+	–	+	–	+	–	–	+	–	–
body-builder	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	±/=	–	–	+	+	–
conventional wisdow	–	–	–	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	+	+	–
crack up	–	–	–	+	–	+	±/≈	±/≈	±/≈	±/≈	+	±/≈	+/≠
crash course	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	±/=	±/=	+	+	+	–
decompress	–	–	–	+	–	+	+	+	+/≠	–	+/≠	±/≠	+
deselect	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+/≠
dramedy	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
ecology	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈	+	–	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈	–	+/≈	+/≈	–
encounter group	–	–	–	+	–	±/=	+	+	–	–	+	–	–
euphenics	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Eurobond	–	–	–	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
extralinguistic	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	– fa
llout	–	–	±/≈	+	–	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈	–	+	+/≈	–
feedback	+	–	±/≈	+	±/=	+	+	+/≈	+/≈	–	+	+	–
fingerprint	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈	+	–	+/≈	+/≈	+	+/≈	–	+	+/≈	–
floating voter	±/=	±/=	±/=	+	–	±/=	+	±/=	±/=	–	+	+	–

free university	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
geep	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
generate	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈	+	–	+/≈	+/≈	+	+/≈	–	+/≈	+/≈	–
genetic engineering	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	+	+	–
gofer	+/≠	–	+/≠	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	+/≠	–	+
hangup	–	–	–	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	+	–
greenhouse effect	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	+	+	–
happening	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈	+	–	+/≈	+	+	+/≈	–	+	+/≈	–
hatchback	–	–	–	+	–	+	+	+	–	–	+	+	–
hawk	–	–	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
headhunt	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
headhunter	+/≠	+/≠	+/≠	+	–	+/≠	+	+/≠	+/≠	–	+	+/≠	–
hothouse effect	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
the tip of the iceberg	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	+	+	+	–
immunodeficiency disease	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
in-crowd	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
in-depth	–	–	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
interface	–	–	+/≠	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	–
irrelevant	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈	+	–	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈	–	+/≈	+	–
jet fatigue	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
jet-lag	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	+	+	–
jet syndrome	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
job-hop	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
kiss of life	–	–	+/≠	+	–	–	–	+/≠	+/≠	+	+	+	–
kneeroom	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

APPENDIX (B): semantic analysis of items of comparison and compared items

Note: for this analysis the *Dictionary of New English* (Barnhart) is the point of departure. For the other dictionaries goes that —if they give the Barnhart items at all in whatever form— only the differences from Barnhart are recored.

asquish, «squishing»
LS: SB ‹floor› PD ‹produce› OB ‹(squishing, splashing) noise›
IS: */SB.N. ‹floor›/* WH IS[PD ‹produce› OB ‹(squishing, splashing) noise›]
LD: ‹...›

action painter, «an artist who produces action paintings»

action painting, «a style of painting emphasizing spontaneous expression by splashing or dripping paint on the canvas or by using broad, vigorous brush strokes»
LS: SB ‹human, artist› PD ‹produce› OB ‹painting›
MANN ‹by splashing or dripping paint on the canvas
or by using broad, vigorous brush strokes›
IS: SB ‹human, artist› */WH PD ‹...› OB ‹...› MANN ‹...›/* (**action painter**)

IS: */SB ‹human, artist› ‹‹'S››/* PD ‹...› */‹‹OF›› OB ‹...›/* MANN ‹...› (**action painting**)
LD: ‹painting›

aerobics, «a system of building up the body by means of exercises which develop the use of oxygen by the body»
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹build up, develop & strengthen› OB ‹body›
MEANS ‹exercises which develop the use of oxygen by the body›
IS: MEANS ‹...› */WH SB ‹...› PD ‹...› OB ‹...›/*
LD: ‹training of body›

backup, «one kept in reserve as a substitute or for assistance»
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹keep in reserve›
OB ‹something› GOAL ‹substitute, assistance›
IS: OB ‹...› */WH PD ‹...› PASSIVE SB ‹...›/*
LD: «general»
DICT. 13:
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹copy› OB ‹computer data› SOURCE ‹disk›
DEST. ‹storage device› GOAL ‹security›
IS: */SB ‹...›/* PD ‹...› */OB ‹...› SOURCE ‹...› DEST. ‹...›/*
LD: ‹computers›

biathlon, «a sports event combining a contest in cross-country skiing and file shooting»
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹participate in, take part in› EVENT ‹sport event›
IS: EVENT ‹...› */WH SB ‹...› PD ‹...› /*
LD: ‹sports›

body-builder, «a person who develops and strengthens the body by systematic exercise and diet»
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹build up, develop & strengthen› OB ‹body›
MEANS ‹systematic exercise and diet›
IS: SB ‹...› */WH PD ‹...› OB ‹...› MEANS ‹...›/*
LD: ‹training of body›, ‹sports›

conventional wisdom, «the generally accepted attitude or opinion; popular belief»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹beliefs›

crack up, «to cause to laugh or to laugh uncontrollably; convulse with laughter»
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹cause› EVENT ‹[SB ‹human› PD ‹laugh› (CAUSE ‹joke›)]›
and/or
SB ‹human› PD ‹laugh› MANN ‹uncontrollably› (CAUSE ‹joke›)
IS: */SB ‹...›/* PD ‹...› */EVENT ‹...›/*
and/or
/SB ‹...›/ PD ‹...› MANN ‹...›
LD: ‹laughing›, ‹joking›

DICTs. 7, 8, 9, 10, 12:
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹tell› OB ‹joke› MANN ‹...›
LD: ‹joking›
DICT. 13:
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹take› OB ‹drugs›
LD: ‹drugs›, ‹drug taking›

crash course [not in DICT. OF NEW ENGL.]
«def.» in DICT. 3: «spoed-»
def. in DICT. 7: «marked by a very great effort to reach quickly the desired results»
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹take› OB ‹course›
IS: OB ‹...› */WH PD ‹...› PASSIVE SB ‹...›/*
or
/OB.N. ‹...›/ WH IS ‹short, intensive, ...›
LD: ‹studying›, ‹education›

decompress [not in DICT. OF NEW ENGL.]
def. in DICT. 13: «to rid oneself of feelings of tension and anxiety»
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹remove› OB ‹(pressure,) feelings of tension and anxiety› SOURCE ‹human›
where SB ‹...› ≡ SOURCE ‹...›
IS: */SB ‹...›/* PD ‹...› OB ‹...› SOURCE ‹...›
LD: ‹psychology›, ‹removing pressure›
DICT. 9, 11, 12:
LS: e.g. SB ‹human› PD ‹reduce› OB ‹pressure, compression› LOC ‹human, sth.›
IS: */SB ‹...›/* PD ‹...› OB ‹...› */LOC ‹...›/*
LD: ‹technology›, ‹reducing pressure, compression›

deselect, «to discharge (a trainee) during training»
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹discharge› OB ‹trainee› TIME ‹during training›
IS: */SB ‹...›/* PD ‹...› */OB ‹...› TIME ‹...›/*
LD: ‹selection procedures for jobs›, ‹application procedures›
DICT. 13:
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹exclude, ban,...› OB ‹something›
IS: ...
LD: «general»

dramedy [not in DICT. OF NEW ENGL.]
def. in DICT. 13: «a television comedy-drama»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹television›

ecology, «any balanced or harmonious system»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹systems›

DICTs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12:
LS: ... «biological systems»
IS: ...
LD: ‹systems›

encounter group, «a group of people taking part in sensitivity training»
LS: SB ‹group of people› PD ‹participate in, take part in›
EVENT ‹sensitivity training›
IS: SB ‹...› */WH PD ‹...› EVENT ‹...›/*
LD: ‹psychology›, ‹psychiatry›, ‹sociology›

euphenics, «a science dealing with ways of improving the human race by technological means, such as organ transplantation, prosthetics, and genetic engineering»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹medicine›, ‹genetic engineering›

Eurobond, «a bond issued by an American or other non-European corporation for sale in European countries»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹economics›

extralinguistic, «outside the province of language or linguistics»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹language›, ‹linguistics›

fallout, «a by-product or residue of something, usually unexpected»
LS: SB ‹something› PD ‹produce› OB ‹(unexpected) by-product›
IS: OB ‹...› */WH PD ‹...› PASSIVE SB ‹...›/*
LD: ‹by-products («in general»)›
DICTs. 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12:
LS: SB ‹nuclear power plant, atom bomb› PD ‹produce› OB ‹(descent of) radiation›
IS: OB ‹...› */WH PD ‹...› PASSIVE SB ‹...›/*
LD: ‹(nuclear technology) by-products›

feedback, «a reciprocal effect of one person or thing upon another; a reaction or response that modifies, corrects, etc., the behavior of that which produced the reaction or response»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹reciprocal influence/information/modifying reaction («in general»)›
DICTs. 3, 8, 9:
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹reciprocal influence/information/modifying reaction (in technology)›

fingerprint, «a distinctive identifying mark, trace, or impression»
LS: SB ‹something› PD ‹have› OB ‹identifying characteristic›
IS: OB ‹...› */WH SB ‹...› PD ‹...›/*
LD: ‹identifying characteristics («of fingers»)›
DICTs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 12:
LS: SB ‹finger› PD ‹have› OB ‹identifying characteristics›
IS: OB ‹...› */WH SB ‹...›* PD ‹...› /
LD: ‹identifying characteristics ("of fingers")›

floating voter, «a voter who is not committed to any political party, candidate, or issue; an undecided voter»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹voting›, ‹elections›

free university, «an independent college or university organized chiefly by students to study subjects of interest to them without the usual academic restrictions of grades or credits»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹university›

generate, «to derive or produce (a grammatical sentence) from more basic forms by a set of rules of operation and transformation»
LS: SB ‹...› PD ‹produce› OB ‹sentence/structure› ...
IS: */SB ‹...›/* PD ‹...› */OB ‹...› .../*
LD: ‹producing (in linguistics)›
DICTs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12:
LS: SB ‹...› PD ‹produce› OB ‹...›
IS: */SB ‹...›/* PD ‹...› */OB ‹...›/*
LD: ‹producing (other than in linguistics)›

genetic engineering, «**1** the scientific alteration of genes or genetic material to produce desirable new traits in organisms or to eliminate undesirable ones.
2 any form of human intervention in hereditary processes to alter the character of nature of an organism»
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹alter› OB ‹genetic material›
GOAL ‹produce desirable new traits in organisms/to eliminate undesirable ones›
IS: */SB ‹...› ‹‹'S››/* PD ‹...› ‹‹OF›› OB ‹...› */GOAL ‹...›/*
LD: ‹biotechnology›

geep, «the offspring of a goat and a sheep»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹animals›

greenhouse effect, «the absorption and retention of the sun's infrared radiation in the

earth's atmosphere, resulting in an increase in the temperature of the earth's surface. The greenhouse effect is due to the accumulation of carbon dioxyde and water vapor often caused by a cold-air mass trapping a warm-air mass underneath it much as the glass of a greenhouse traps underneath it the air that is heated by the sun»

LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹geophysics›

gofer, «an office assistant whose duties include running errands for the staff»

LS: SB ‹office assistant› PD ‹go for› OB ‹errands› BENEFICIARY ‹staff›
IS: SB ‹...› */WH PD ‹...› OB ‹...› BENEFICIARY ‹...›/*
LD: ‹working›
DICTs. 2, 3, 11:
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹take› OB ‹food›
IS: OB ‹...› */WH PD ‹...› PASSIVE SB ‹...›/*
LD: ‹eating›

hangup, «**1** a psychological or emotional problem. **2** any problem or difficulty, especially that causes annoyance or irritation»

LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹problems›

happening, «a spontaneous or improvised public performance, display, spectacle, or the like, often involving the audience or spectators»

LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹(artistic) event›
DICTs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 12:
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹event («in general»)›

hawk, «a person who favors war or advocates military solutions in a conflict. To be or act as a hawk; be hawkish»

LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹politics›, ‹government›

headhunt, «to recruit executives for a corporation [v.t., v.i.]; an instance of headhunting»

headhunter, «one who engages in headhunting, as a personnel agent or management consultant»

LS: **Lit.**: SB ‹human› PD ‹hunt (for)› OB ‹heads›, «hunt (for) people, kill them and separate their heads from their bodies»
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹recruit› OB ‹executives› BENEFICIARY ‹corporations›
IS: */SB ‹...›/* PD ‹...› */OB ‹...› BENEFICIARY ‹...›/* (**headhunt, v.t.**)
/SB ‹...›/ PD ‹...› OB ‹...› */BENEFICIARY ‹...›/* (**headhunt, v.i.**)

/SB ‹...› ‹‹'S››/ PD *‹...› /‹‹OF›› OB ‹...› /BENEFICIARY ‹...›/* (**headhunt**, n. from v.t.)
/SB ‹...› ‹‹'S››/ PD ‹...› ‹‹OF›› OB ‹...› */BENEFICIARY ‹...›/* (**headhunt**, n. from v.i.)
SB ‹...› */WH PD ‹...› OB ‹...› BENEFICIARY ‹...›/* (**headhunter**, n. from v.t.)
SB ‹...› */WH PD ‹...›/* OB ‹...› */BENEFICIARY ‹...›/* (**headhunter**, n. from v.i.)

LD: ‹recruiting executives›
DICTs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12:
LS: **Lit.**: SB ‹human› PD ‹hunt (for)› OB ‹heads›, «hunt (for) people, kill them separate their heads from their bodies»
LS: SB ‹human› PD ‹kill› OB ‹human› MANN ‹...›
IS: SB ‹...› */WH PD ‹...› OB ‹...›/* (**headhunter**)
LD: ‹killing›

hothouse effect, see **greenhouse effect**

the tip of the iceberg, «a small or superficial part of something; that which appears only on the surface»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ?

immunodeficiency disease, «any disease caused by a deficiency in the immunity mechanism of the body»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹diseases›

in-crowd, «an exclusive set or circle of acquaintances; a group of insiders; clique»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹groups of people›

in-depth, «going deeply into a subject; very thorough; comprehensive»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹studying›

interface, «something that serves to connect or coordinate different systems; the boundary joining any two parts, persons, or things»
LS: SB ‹something› PD ‹connect› OB ‹systems, parts, persons, things›
IS: SB ‹...› */WH PD ‹...› OB ‹...›/*
LD: ‹separating›
DICT. 3:
LS: SB ‹something› PD ‹separate› OB ‹...›
IS: SB ‹..› */WH PD ‹..› OB ‹..› /*
LD: ‹separating›

irrelevant, «having no bearing on issues that are current»
LS: ... «contemporaneity»
IS: ...
LD: ‹«anything»›
DICTs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11:
LS: ... no mention of «contemporaneity»
LD: ‹«anything»›

jet-lag, jet-fatigue, jet syndrome, «the symptoms of an upset of the body clock»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹flying›, ‹diseases›, ‹aeroplanes›

job-hop, «to go from job to job; change jobs frequently»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹working›, ‹jobs›

kiss of life, «an act that gives back life; something that revitalizes»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: **Lit.**: ‹medicine›, ‹health care› («mouth-to-mouth resuscitation»)
LD: ‹«general»›, ‹economics›, ‹politics› («giving an impulse»)

kneeroom, «enough room in front of a seat of an automobile, airplane, etc., to keep one's knees in a natural, comfortable position when seated»
LS: ...
IS: ...
LD: ‹automobiles›

APPENDIX (C): Notes on use, style, etc.

Note: for reasons of space only a sample is given here. For more information, contact the authors.

WORDS / PHRASES	NOTES ON USE, STYLE, ETC.
asquish	1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13: item not given; 3,6, 8, 11: no notes 4) a-: prefix now freely added to verbs to yield predicate adjectives with rather more vivid effect than the participle in -ing, and especially to verbs that denote some picture activity, motion, or sensation. Adj.
action painter	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13: item not given 4) no notes

action painting	1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 13: item not given 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12: no notes 4) compare DRIP PAINTING
aerobics	1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13: item not given 4) n. Also used attributively. [from the adjective aerobic, applied to organisms that thrive only in the presence of oxygen...] 11) <mv.; ww. vnl. enk.; ook attr.> 12) N. UNCOUNT
backup	1, 2, 5, 10: item not given 3) Am.; zn. & bn. 4) n. 6) n. 7) n. 8) n. Chiefly U.S. [also] (as modifier) 9) n. (colloq.) 11) <fl> <telb. zn.> 12) N. UNCOUNT 13) verb
biathlon	1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13: item not given 4) n. 6) n. 8) n. Sport 11) <telb. zn.> <sport>
body-builder	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13: item not given 4) n. 8) body building: n. 11) <fl> <telb. zn.> 12) N. UNCOUNT
conventional wisdom	1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13: item not given; 4, 6: no notes 11) 1.1 [= adj. combined with noun] 12) PHR: USED S/O/C

where the numbers indicate the various dictionaries

Total number of "NO NOTES" : 32

Number of "NO NOTES" in the various dictionaries:

1) COD	2
2) ALD	0
3) Bruggencate	10
4) Barnhart	5
5) Idioms 1	0

6) Webster's	3
7) LDoCE	2
8) Collins	2
9) OALD	4
10) Idioms 2	0
11) Van Dale	3
12) Cobuild	1
13) Ayto	0
TOTAL	32

Number of "NO NOTES" per type of dictionary:

Monoligual Learners' Dictionaries	7
Monolingual Non-learners' Dictionaries	12
Bilingual or Translation Dictionaries	13
TOTAL	32

Types of Notes:
a) grammatical (total: 202)
b) register (total: 20)
c) style (total: 25)
d) language variety (total: 13)
e) explanatory information (total: 27)

Types of notes in the various dictionaries:

DICTIONARY	a	b	c	d	e	TOTAL
1) COD	6	2	0	0	3	11
2) ALD	7	1	0	0	0	8
3) Bruggencate	3	2	0	2	0	7
4) Barnhart	32	1	5	5	14	57
5) Idioms 1	2	0	1	0	1	4
6) Webster's	19	3	2	0	2	26
7) LDoCE	18	1	2	1	0	22
8) Collins	26	3	3	1	0	33
9) OALD	15	0	3	0	0	18
10) Idioms 2	6	0	1	0	2	9
11) Van Dale	31	7	7	3	2	50
12) Cobuild	31	0	0	0	0	31
13) Ayto	6	0	1	1	3	11
TOTAL	202	20	25	13	27	287

Types of notes per type of dictionary:

TYPE OF DICTIONARY	a	b	c	d	e	TOTAL
Monolingual Learners' Dictionaries	79	2	7	1	3	92
Monolingual Non-learners' Dictionaries	89	9	11	7	22	138
Bilingual or Translation Dictionaries	34	9	7	5	2	57
TOTAL	202	20	25	13	27	287

APPENDIX (D): item of comparison already existing before Barnhart

1: given in Barnhart

item of comparison	dict.	labelling
asquish	3	±/=
backup	3	±/=
ecology	1	+/≈
	2	+/≈
	3	+/≈
fallout	3	±/
feedback	1	+
	3	±/≈
fingerprint	1	+/≈
	2	+/≈
	3	+/≈
floating voter	1	±/=
	2	±/=
	3	±/=
generate	1	+/≈
	2	+/≈
	3	+/≈
gofer	1	+/≠
	3	+/≠
happening	1	+/≈
	2	+/≈
	3	+/≈
hawk	3	+
headhunter	1	+/≠
	2	+/≠
	3	+/≠

in-depth	3	+
interface	3	+/≠
irrelevant	1	+/≈
	2	+/≈
	3	+/≈
kiss of life	3	+/≠

Dict. 1:		Dict. 2:		Dict. 3:	
+/≈	5x	+/≈	5x	+/≈	6x
+	1x	+	0x	+	2x
±/=	1x	±/=	1x	±/=	3x
+/≠	2x	+/≠	1x	+/≠	4x
±/≈	0x	±/≈	0x	±/≠	1x
total	9x	total	7x	total	16x

Dict. 1 = COD (= monolingual non-learner's dictionary)
Dict. 2 = ALD (= monolingual learner's dictionary)
Dict. 3 = Bruggencate (= bilingual or translation dictionary)

2: not given in Barnhart

item of comparison	dict.
crash course	3

Dict. 3 = Bruggencate (= bilingual or translation dictionary)

APPENDIX (E): items of comparison incorporatrd later

item of comparison	6 yrs 1979 nr.6	8 yrs 1981 nr.7	9 yrs 1982 nr.8	nr.9	11 yrs 1984 nr.10	nr.11	14 yrs 1987 nr.12	16 yrs 1989 nr.13
asquish	±/=		±/=			±/=		
action painter								
action painting	+	+	+	+		+	+	
aerobics	+					+	+	
backup	+	+	+	+		+	+	+/≠
biathlon	+		+			+		
body-builder			±/=			+	+	
conventional wisdom	+					+	+	
crack up	+	±/≈	±/≈	±/≈	±/≈	+	±/≈	+/≠
crash course		+	±/=	±/=	+	+	+	
decompress	+	+	+	+/≠		+/≠	±/≠	+
deselect								+/≠
dramedy								

ecology	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈	+/≈		+/≈	+/≈	
encounter group	±/=	+	+			+		
euphenics								
Eurobond	+							
extralinguistic								
fallout	+/≈	+/≈	+/=	+/≈		+	+/≈	
feedback	+	+	+/=	+/≈		+	+	
fingerprint	+/≈	+/≈	+	+/≈		+	+/≈	
floating voter	±/=	+	±/=	±/=		+	+	
free university						+		
geep						+		
generate	+/≈	+/≈	+	+/≈		+/≈	+/≈	
genetic engineering			+			+	+	
gofer	+					+/≠		+
greenhouse effect			+			+	+	
hangup		+	+	+		+	+	
happening	+/≈	+	+	+/≈		+	+/≈	
hatchback	+	+	+			+	+	
hawk	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
headhunt								
headhunter	+/≠	+	+/≠	+/≠		+	+/≠	
hothouse effect						+		
tip of the iceberg			+		+	+	+	
immunodef. disease								
in-crowd							+	
in-depth	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
interface	+	+	+	+		+	+	
irrelevant	+/≈	+/=	+/≈	+/=		+/=	+	
jet fatigue								
jet-lag			+			+	+	
jet syndrome								
job-hop								
kiss of life			+/≠	+/≠	+	+	+	
kneeroom								

Appendix (E): items of comparison incorporated later

	6 yrs 1979 nr. 6	8 yrs 1981 nr. 7	9 yrs 1982 nr. 8	nr. 9	11 yrs 1984 nr. 10	nr. 11	14 yrs 1987 nr. 12	16 yrs 1989 nr. 13
+	14	14	17	6	5	29	19	2
+/≈	6	5	4	7	0	3	5	0
+/≠	1	0	2	3	0	2	1	3
±/=	3	0	4	2	0	1	0	0
±/≈	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
±/≠	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
tot.	24	20	28	19	6	35	27	5

Dict. 6 = Webster's (= monolingual non-learner's dictionary)

Dict. 7 = LDoCE (= monolingual learner's dictionary)

Dict. 8 = Collins (monolingual non-learner's dictionary)`

Dict. 9 = OALD (= monolingual learner's dictionary)

Dict. 10 = Idioms 2 (= monolingual learner's dictionary)

Dict. 11 = Van Dale (bilingual or translation dictionary)

Dict. 12 = Cobuild (= monolingual learners' dictionary)

Dict. 13 = Ayto (= monolingual non-learner's dictionary)

Number of items of comparison incorporated later in

	monolingual learners' dicts.	monolingual non-learners' dicts.	bilingual or translation dicts.
	nrs. 7,9,10,12	nrs 6,8,13	nr.11
+	44 (aver. 11)	33 (aver. 11)	29 (aver. 29)
+/≈	17 (aver. 4.25)	10 (aver. 3.3)	3 (aver. 3)
+/≠	4 (aver. 1)	6 (aver. 2)	2 (aver. 2)
±/=	2 (aver. 0.50)	7 (aver. 2.3)	1 (aver. 1)
±/≈	4 (aver. 1)	1 (aver. 0.3)	0 (aver. 0)
±/≠	1 (aver. 0.25)	0 (aver. 0)	0 (aver. 0)
tot.	72	58	35
aver.	18	19.3	35

References

The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (1968), second edition/ninth impression. Edited by A. S. Hornby, E. V. Gatenby & H. Wakefield. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ALINEI, M. (1974), *La Struttura del Lessico.* Bologna: il Mulino.

ALINEI, M. (1980a), «Lexical Grammar and Sentence Grammar. A Two-Cycle Model». In: *Quaderni di Semantica. An International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Semantics,* 1980/1, 33-95. Bologna: il Mulino.

ALINEI, M. (1980b), «The Structure of Meaning Revisited». In: *Quaderni di Semantica* 1980/2, 289-305. Bologna: Il Mulino.

K. Ten Bruggencate Engels Woordenboek, Engels-Nederlands (1970), second impression of seventeenth edition. Edited by R. W. Zandvoort, J. Gerritsen & N. E. Osselton. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff NV.

Collins English Dictionary (1982), reprinted and updated. Edited by P. Hanks. London/Glasgow: Collins.

Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary (1987). Edited by J. Sinclair. London/Glasgow: Collins.

The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English (1964), fifth edition/reprinted with corrections. Edited by H. W. Fowler & F. G. Fowler. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Dale Groot Woordenboek Engels-Nederlands (1984). Edited by W. Martin & G. A. J. Tops. Utrecht/Antwerp: Van Dale Lexicografie.

Dictionary of New English 1963-1972 (1973). Edited by Cl. L. Barnhart. London: Longman Group Limited.

LARSON, M. (1984), *Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. Lanham/New York/London: University Press of America, Inc.

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (1981), reprinted with corrections. Edited by P. Procter *et al.* Burnt Mill/Harlow Essex: Longman Group Limited.

The Longman Register of New Words. Volume 1 (1989). Edited by J. Ayto. Burnt Mill/Harlow Essex: Longman Group Limited.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (1982), sixteenth impression. Edited by A. S. Hornby *et al.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English. Volume 1: Verbs with Prepositions & Articles (1975). Edited by A. Cowie & R. Mackin. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English. Volume 2: Phrase, Clause & Sentence Idioms (1984). Edited by A. Cowie *et al.*

THELEN, M. M. (1980), «Some Remarks on Alinei's Syntactic Model for the Generation of the Lexicon: the Lexical System of ‹eating›». In: *Quaderni di Semantica* 1980/2, 245-285. Bologna: Il Mulino.

THELEN, M. M. (1983a), «Function and Structure of the Lexicon in a Two-Cycle Model of Grammar. A Comparison with Other Models». In: *Quaderni di Semantica* 1983/1, 144-158. Bologna: Il Mulino.

THELEN, M. M. (1983b), «Function and Structure of the Lexicon in a Two-Cycle Model of Grammar». In: *Quaderni di Semantica* 1983/2, 326-345. Bologna: Il Mulino.

THELEN, M. M. (1987a), «TCM: A Two-Cycle Model of Grammar. Categories and Features in the Lexicon». In: *Quaderni di Semantica* 1987/1, 186-201. Bologna: Il Mulino.

THELEN, M. M. (1987c), «TCM: A Two-Cycle Model of Grammar. Some Extensions of Alinei's Original 1980 Formulation». In: R. Crespo, B. Dotson Smith & H. Schultink (eds.), *Aspects of Language. Studies in Honour of Mario Alinei. Volume II: Theoretical and Applied Semantics*, 493-507. Amsterdam: Editions RODOPI BV.

THELEN, M. M. (1987d), «A Two-Cycle Model of Grammar, and the Structure of the Lexicon». Paper read at the XIVth International Congress of Linguists, East-Berlin, 10-15 August 1987.

THELEN, M. M. (1990), «From Interpretation to Re-expression of Meaning in the Translation Process». In: Thelen, M. & B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.) (1990), *Translation and Meaning. Part 1*. Proceedings of the Maastricht Session of the 1990 Maastricht-Lódz Duo Colloquium on «Translation and Meaning», Held in Maastricht, The Netherlands, 4-6 January 1990. Maastricht: Euroterm Maastricht.