

An Investigation of the Problems  
that Young Learners of English  
Have Using Bilingual Dictionaries

Peter Beech

submitted in partial completion of the  
MSc degree in Teaching English,  
Aston University

Aston University  
Language Studies Unit

An Investigation of the Problems that Young Learners of  
English Have Using Bilingual Dictionaries

Peter Beech

November 1997

MSc in Teaching English

## Abstract

This project examines the question of whether young Greek learners can find a correct translation equivalent for words they look up in their English-Greek dictionaries. Several different dictionaries were used and it was expected that variations in the quality of dictionaries would be a significant factor. We therefore focus on the features that distinguish the Oxford English-Greek Learner's Dictionary, which was used for the majority of the look-ups, from its competitors.

Of the 718 look-ups, 92 failed to produce an adequate translation. The most significant cause of failure, accounting for 54 cases, is that students reported finding a translation which is equivalent to some sense of the headword, but not the sense which was required in their context. Particular difficulty was experienced with derivatives, which, together with compounds, account for a significant proportion of the failures to locate an entry.

Apart from the 92 look-ups which were judged to be unsuccessful, many more produced translations which were inadequate because they failed to convey the sense of the word with sufficient accuracy to permit discrimination between near synonyms. The OEGLD was better than its rivals in that respect, as it provides a large number of examples to support the translations.

Learner training is necessary to overcome the tendency to select the wrong translation when several senses of a polysemous word are translated in one entry. Many such errors could also be overcome by improved dictionary design, particularly the integration of features from monolingual and bilingual dictionaries, which could best be achieved in electronic form.

“The value of a work must be estimated by its use: it is not enough that a dictionary delights the critic, unless at the same time it instructs the learner.”

(Samuel Johnson, quoted in Carter (1987): 125)

# Contents

## Chapter One - Introduction

1.1 Monolingual versus bilingual dictionaries	1
1.2 Review of previous research	3
1.3 Description of the survey	
1.3a Method of data collection	6
1.3b Dictionaries used in the project	9

## Chapter Two - Results of the Survey

2.1 Introduction to the results	10
2.2 Successful searches	15
2.3 Categorisation and analysis of unsuccessful look-ups	
2.3a The word was not located	
2.3ai The word is not contained in the dictionary	17

2.3aii The word is contained in the dictionary but the student failed to locate it	22
2.3b The word was located but in a wrong meaning	
2.3bi Because the dictionary translation is inaccurate	24
2.3bii The student misread the translation	25
2.3biii The wrong sense of a polysemous word was found	27
2.3c The word was located with a basically correct sense but the translation was not entirely satisfactory	33
2.4 Categorisation and analysis of inadequate translations	37
 <u>Chapter Three - Proposals Based on the Results</u>	
3.1 Learner training	41
3.2 Bridging the gulf	43
3.3 Future dictionaries	47
 <u>Chapter Four - Conclusion</u>	 50

References	53
Appendix One - Survey Form	59
Appendix Two - Complete List of the 718 Look-ups	60
Appendix Three - Description of the Dictionaries Used	
A3.1 The selection of headwords	73
A3.2 The treatment of entries	79
A3.3 List of headwords in FR-	86

## Chapter One - Introduction

### 1.1: Monolingual versus bilingual dictionaries

It is generally believed that while bilingual dictionaries may be useful in the early stages, more advanced learners should use monolingual dictionaries. As cited in Carter (1987: 126), “Baxter (1980) concludes that prolonged dependency on bilingual dictionaries probably tends to retard the development of second language proficiency...”. The main reason for the bias against the bilingual dictionary is that it reinforces the belief that for each word in the L1 there is an equivalent in the L2, and vice versa. An additional reason is that the learner browsing through a monolingual dictionary will benefit from the incidental exposure to the target language. However, as Béjoint & Moulin testify (1985: 3), “The superiority of the monolingual over the bilingual is not as obvious as many of us would think or say. According to Ellegard (1978: 240-241), the main advantage of the monolingual dictionary is that, as it is commercially more profitable, it can offer more for the same price. It does indeed offer more information on syntax, according to recent research by T. Herbst. It also obviously includes more words in the foreign language (all things being equal). Apart from that, the only difference is that for each lexical unit the monolingual dictionary gives a definition while the bilingual dictionary gives equivalents.”

Thus their relative usefulness depends on how accurate and comprehensible the monolingual’s definition is, and on how closely the bilingual’s equivalents equate. As Scholfield (undated: 85) points out, “there is no reason in principle why English-L1 BDs [bilingual dictionaries] should not be as good as good monolingual English dictionaries in the information they contain”. While it is generally assumed that the definitions in monolingual dictionaries are at least as accurate as the translations in their bilingual counterparts, it is not certain that they are understood. As Carter (1987: 127) remarks, even in the case of monolingual learner’s dictionaries with restricted defining vocabularies, there is no guarantee that the words used will be known by the learner. On the other hand, whatever the limitations of the bilingual dictionary, at least the learner knows the words on the right hand side. The question remains whether the



bilingual succeeds in producing translations that are satisfactory. This project sets out to examine that question by surveying our learners' use of several English-Greek dictionaries.

## 1.2: Review of previous research

There have been many surveys collecting data about what kinds of information students look for in dictionaries, ownership of and attitudes towards dictionaries, coverage of lexis from various registers, the effect of dictionary use on performance, and the “sociology of dictionary look-up situations” (Knowles & Roe 1995-96: unit 7, pages 11-19). Research has also been undertaken into dictionary users’ reference skills and dictionary consultation heuristics (op. cit., pages 19-28). One finding of previous research, whether with monolingual or bilingual dictionaries, is that users are primarily interested in meaning, and secondarily in syntactic information and synonyms, with much less interest being expressed in the other kinds of information a dictionary may provide (Jackson 1988: 197).

Given the dissatisfaction with definitions described in Quirk’s 1973 study of native speakers (reported in Béjoint 1994: 143), it is questionable whether monolingual learner’s dictionaries are successful in conveying meaning. Béjoint concludes from his own 1981 study (op. cit.: 147) that as students are not interested in the additional kinds of information provided in learner’s dictionaries, native speaker dictionaries could serve them almost as well, but this overlooks the fact that learner’s dictionaries differ not only in offering additional information, but also in the style of the definitions. Whether definitions of any kind are the best method of showing meaning is unclear, as the results of various studies conflict (Béjoint 1994: 165). In particular, there is no conclusive evidence for the purported superiority of monolingual over bilingual dictionaries.

Atkins & Knowles (1988) set out three main aims for their study: “We hoped to find out something about how effective dictionaries are in carrying out various operations...; whether bilingual and monolingual dictionaries are equally effective aids.... We also hoped to find out something about how dictionaries fail students...” They note (p.385) that any conclusion regarding the correlation between monolingual dictionaries and high achievement and between bilingual dictionaries and low achievement “would almost certainly depend on the quality of the particular

dictionaries used; it seems probable that the distinction between a pocket dictionary offering single-word translation equivalents and a more serious bilingual dictionary would be more significant than the rather crude distinction between all monolinguals on the one hand and all bilinguals on the other”.

The poor quality of bilinguals is evidenced by Atkins & Varantola’s description (1997: 28-29) of the search for an appropriate translation for ΑΡΥΑΛΙΝΗ, which is given as INSTRUMENT, MEDIUM, VEHICLE, FACILITIES: “The four English words are by no means even partially synonymous.... They are certainly different enough to support some semantic differentiation.... Probably the most useful way of giving that type of information is in example sentences.”

Indeed the corresponding entry of the Greek-English volume of the Oxford English-Greek Learner’s Dictionary has one sense given as MEDIUM, VEHICLE, MEANS, WAY supported by thirteen examples. Cowie (1989: 55) points out that examples have “two major functions - that of clarifying a sense and that of distinguishing between related senses.” In order for both of those functions to be fulfilled adequately it may well be necessary to have a large number of examples, and on that criterion the OEGLD scores highly.

However good the dictionary is, the learners must have the skill to use it effectively. As Atkins & Varantola state (1997:1), “There are two direct routes to more effective dictionary use: the first is to radically improve the dictionary: the second is to radically improve the users. If we are to do either of these things - and obviously we should try to do both - the *sine qua non* of any action is a very detailed knowledge of how people use dictionaries at present.” But while several of the findings of the above studies provide “detailed knowledge of how people use dictionaries at present”, it seems that no previous studies have looked at the results of the dictionary lookups that students naturally perform in their own learning situation using their own dictionary. In the present project, the range of dictionaries used was relatively small, and there was a clear preference for the OEGLD, which meant it was possible to conduct a detailed study of the dictionary itself in parallel with the processing of the students’ data. It was felt that the knowledge acquired would be most useful if it pertained to the

natural situation of the learners, rather than an artificial selection of items to look up, with the proviso that there should be a sufficient quantity of data to allow significant patterns to emerge. However, unlike the participants in Atkins & Varantola's study, the learners in the present project were not asked to rate their own satisfaction with the result of the lookup, as that was considered to be an unreliable indication (cf. Béjoint 1994: 147). The methods by which the data were collected and analysed form the topic of the following section.

## 1.3: Description of the survey

### 1.3a: Method of data collection

In contrast to the studies described in the previous section, the intention in the present project was to investigate the degree of success with which students used dictionaries during their learning activities. This meant that, firstly, each student would use whatever dictionary he used habitually, and in fact one participant used two different dictionaries during the period in which he was supplying data. Secondly, it meant that students were not prompted to look up certain words, or given specially-designed tasks to do, but were simply asked to record the dictionary look-ups which they made during the normal course of their language learning activities.

The students were asked to complete a survey form, which is reproduced in Appendix One, each time they did an activity for which they used a dictionary. They provided a reference such as book title and page number on each form so that we could trace the original context in which they had encountered the word. They also recorded which dictionary they had used for the look-ups. They were told that they should record each word that they looked up in the form in which they had encountered it, and the translation which they had found from their dictionary that corresponded to the sense of the word as used in that context. On some occasions they reported not finding the word, or not finding any suitable translation for it, as will be discussed in section 2.3a. Occasionally, students recorded more than one translation. A total of 718 valid lookups were recorded, and these are listed in Appendix Two.

During the period of the data collection, a data base was constructed using dBase III Plus for the storage and manipulation of the data. The fields in the data base were:

Name; Date; Class;

Dictionary used;

Type of task;

Word sought; Word found; Result;  
Number of meanings; Rank sought; Rank found;  
Reason for failure

The Result field in the data base was a logical field which stored a binary evaluation of the search as a success or a failure. The evaluation depended solely on whether the translation which the student had found in the dictionary was appropriate in the context in which the word had been encountered. In order to establish this, for each look-up reported the researcher examined both the original context and the entry for the word in whatever dictionary the student had been using. In the case of polysemous words the number of senses given for the word was also recorded, along with the number of the sense of the translation selected, and the number of the sense that should have been selected.

As we will see in section 2.3b.iii, by far the most common reason for failing to produce a correct translation was that students selected the wrong word from amongst the various translations of polysemous words. In the majority of such cases, they noted the first translation given without regard to its appropriacy in the context. The last field in the data base provided space (a maximum of 240 characters) for a preliminary evaluation of the reason for the failure of those look-ups that did not produce a correct result. The use of dBase III Plus allowed the manipulation of all the data to produce reports like the one that constitutes Appendix Two, or of parts of the data, so that look-ups could be arranged not just in alphabetical order of the word looked up, but also according to any of the other variables specified as fields.

The students who supplied the data were studying General English as a Foreign Language at levels between Pre-intermediate and the level of the Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency in English, and were aged between eleven and seventeen. A breakdown of the proportion of successful look-ups made by each student, and also by each class of students is provided in section 2.1. The initials of each student as well as the class he belonged to are also provided in the full list of look-ups in Appendix Two. It should be noted that in that appendix the OEGLD is referred to by the initials of its editors (SH).

An indication of the types of tasks that these learners were working on can be gained from section two of the references, which lists the books that they used. The coursebooks used were *Generation 2000, level 3, Reward Intermediate, First Certificate Passkey, Focus on First Certificate, Focus on Advanced English, Proficiency Masterclass*, and a series of grammar books. There was also a book of passages for translation used by one individual who was preparing for university entrance examinations, together with past examination papers for these examinations as well as the Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency in English. Look-ups were recorded of words encountered in extensive reading as well as intensive study. As well as the breakdown of searches according to individual student and class, the proportion of successful look-ups according to task type is also analysed in section 2.1. The final section of Chapter One is a brief description of the dictionaries used in the project, an area that is covered more extensively in Appendix Three.

### 1.3b: Dictionaries used in the project

As can be seen in section 2.1, a total of eight different dictionaries were used in the survey. By far the most popular was the Oxford English-Greek Learners Dictionary, which is based on the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. This was used for 449 of the 718 look-ups reported. Throughout the present analysis we will be giving special emphasis to this dictionary, both because it is the most popular amongst our students and because we believe that we can make a useful distinction of a category of hybrid dictionary which combines features of the monolingual and the bilingual.

The dictionaries ranged in size from the Collins Gem, with 345 small pages to the Penguin-Hellenews with 926 pages. The OEGLD, with 839 pages, was amongst the largest. It contains 31,000 headwords, as against 63,000 in the OALD. About a quarter of this reduction is achieved through economy in the treatment of compounds and derivatives, the rest through omission of less common words. In general, its entries are also briefer, often because it distinguishes fewer senses of the headword, and also because it provides less information on usage. As in any bilingual dictionary, brevity is also promoted through the provision of translation equivalents rather than definitions. The average length per entry in the OEGLD is therefore about one third less than in the OALD, but this is still more than twice the length of any of the other bilinguals used in this project. A much more detailed examination of the dictionaries used in the survey, again with particular emphasis on the OEGLD, may be found in Appendix Three.



## Chapter Two - Results of the Survey

### 2.1: Introduction to the results

For each word that the students reported having looked up, the original context in which they had encountered it was located so that the sense in which the word was used could be ascertained, and it could be judged whether the word found was an acceptable translation. Where necessary, a monolingual Greek dictionary was used to aid that judgement. In those cases where the translation recorded by the student was judged to be incorrect, the dictionary entry was scrutinised to discover the reason for the failure. The explanation of the failure was then added to the data base which had been designed for the storage and manipulation of the data reported on the survey forms.

As will be seen in section 2.3, the production of incorrect translations was sometimes due to error on the part of the student, sometimes due to deficiencies in the dictionary. In all cases the evaluation of correctness depended on the demands of the context in which the student encountered the lexical item and which inspired the look-up. Where the dictionary translation succeeded in producing a correct understanding of the meaning in the text, the lookup was judged to be successful. Thus, for example, MIST translated as ΟΜΙΧΛΗ was regarded as correct, as it is irrelevant to the understanding of the original context that this particular dictionary gives the same translation for MIST as it does for FOG, without any further distinction.

Similarly, CONDITION translated as ΚΑΤΑΣΤΑΣΗ was accepted as correct; even though a more felicitous translation of WEATHER CONDITIONS would be achieved with ΚΑΙΡΙΚΕΣ ΣΥΝΘΗΚΕΣ, it is the Greek idiom rather than the English one which is not expressed, and the native speaker of Greek will automatically supply that deficiency. On the other hand, if the purpose of the original context, which might be a vocabulary exercise, is to establish such distinctions as obtain between FOG and MIST, IMPERSONATOR and IMITATOR or even AROMATIC and SPICY, then failure to do so was regarded as critical. Thus FIT translated as ΤΑΙΡΙΑΖΩ was

classified as a failure because it implies that FIT is about suitability in terms of colour or pattern rather than size, which is false in the context of trying on clothes.

Of the 718 look-ups reported, 626 produced a correct result and 92 were incorrect. In the tables that follow, these figures are analysed for each student, for each class, for each type of task, and for each dictionary. The table below shows for each individual student the number of incorrect results produced, the total number of look-ups reported, and the number of incorrect results as a percentage of the total.

NAME	INCORRECT	TOTAL	%INCORRECT
AK	0	22	0.00
AS	9	50	18.00
BP	1	11	9.09
BT	4	21	19.04
CB	10	73	13.69
CT	2	26	7.69
DP	9	29	31.03
EP	3	9	33.33
JH	15	168	8.92
JK	2	6	33.33
KF	0	7	0.00
LV	1	86	1.16
MG	3	15	20.00
ML	0	2	0.00
MT	2	16	12.50
OT	4	45	8.88
PP	8	43	18.60
PS	1	8	12.50
VG	18	81	22.22
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>12.81</b>

Three students (AK, KF, and ML) were successful in all their searches, but these were relatively few. Apart from these three, by far the most successful was LV, who reported just one mistake in the course of 86 look-ups, compared to her classmate CB, who produced 10 mistakes in 73 look-ups. Both of these were using the OEGLD for a variety of tasks at the level of the Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency in English.

The students who did better than the overall percentage of 12.81% incorrect look-ups included representatives of all classes and the individual variations seem to be more significant than groupings according to the level of study. The table below shows for each class of students the number of incorrect results produced, the total number of

look-ups reported, and the number of incorrect results as a percentage of the total. The classes are:

C = Pre-intermediate

D = Intermediate

F = Approximately the level of the Cambridge First Certificate

P = Approximately the level of the Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency.

CLASS	INCORRECT	TOTAL	%INCORRECT
C	20	211	9.47
D	8	54	14.81
F	49	247	19.83
P	15	206	7.28
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>12.81</b>

It can be seen from this table that while there are great differences between the rate of success from one class to another, the differences are not systematic. If one were tempted to base conclusions on the fact that the highest level students have the lowest rate of failure, it would be necessary to explain also why students at the next highest level have so many unsuccessful look-ups.

The next table shows for each type of task the number of incorrect results produced, the total number of look-ups reported, and the number of incorrect results as a percentage of the total.

TASK	INCORRECT	TOTAL	%INCORRECT
GRAMMAR EXERCISE	12	193	6.21
READING TEXT	30	239	12.55
TRANSLATION	4	45	8.88
VOCABULARY EXERCISE	46	241	19.08
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>12.81</b>

Translation was recorded as a separate category, but not further analysed as only one student was doing it (OT). For each of the other three task types there is a substantial amount of data as these are tasks that most students in most classes have been engaged in and in the course of which they have reported dictionary look-ups. That

also means that the effect of the variety of ability between the students is largely neutralised, and so the data can be interpreted with more confidence. It would thus seem that it is much easier for these students to find correctly the meanings of the words that occur in their grammar exercises than it is to find the meanings of the words occurring in the texts they read, with the words that are encountered in vocabulary exercises being even more difficult. Of all the incorrect results produced in the course of 718 look-ups, half occurred in the 241 look-ups inspired by vocabulary exercises, one fifth of which were unsuccessful.

The following table shows for each dictionary used the number of incorrect results produced, the total number of look-ups reported, and the number of incorrect results as a percentage of the total.

DICTIONARY	INCORRECT	TOTAL	%INCORRECT
ATLANTIS	2	26	7.69
BOSTON PRESS	1	33	3.03
DIVRY'S	3	11	27.27
COLLINS GEM	13	135	9.62
MICHIGAN PRESS	10	38	26.31
PENGUIN HELLENEWS	7	19	36.84
TA NEA	0	7	0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>13.38</b>
OEGLD	56	449	12.47
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>12.81</b>

While there are some variations in the success with which the different dictionaries were used, these are just as likely to be attributable to the individual users as to the choice of dictionary. The overall pattern suggests that there is no significant difference between the failure rate of those using the OEGLD and the average failure rate of those using the other dictionaries. However, it should be noted that the data are skewed to a certain extent by one individual (JH) who reports a total of 168 look-ups, 33 with the Boston Press dictionary, and 135 with the Collins Gem. If we remove his figures from the comparison, then the picture is rather different:

DICTIONARY	INCORRECT	TOTAL	%INCORRECT
ATLANTIS	2	26	7.69
DIVRY'S	3	11	27.27

MICHIGAN PRESS	10	38	26.31
PENGUIN HELLENEWS	7	19	36.84
TA NEA	0	7	0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>21.78</b>
OEGLD	56	449	12.47
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>14.18</b>

The percentage of incorrect searches for all the other dictionaries now rises to 21.78%. It seems that this prodigious dictionary-consulter is rather more adept than his peers, or perhaps that he tends to search for simpler words. Certainly variations between individuals play an important part, though this individual was three times as successful in using the Boston Press Dictionary as he was with the Collins Gem. Any conclusions which we may wish to base on these figures must therefore be very tentative, and in order to have a firmer base for definite conclusions it would be necessary to conduct more strictly controlled research in which the variables might be isolated.

## 2.2: Successful searches

As is clear from the previous section, the purely quantitative analysis of the data is inconclusive. The main focus of our analysis therefore will be on the specific look-ups, so that we can identify the reasons why learners fail to find the correct meanings in their dictionaries. Section 2.3 pursues the analysis of the reasons for the unsuccessful searches. As a preliminary to that, the present section looks at two of the searches which have succeeded in producing the correct meaning.

Clearly, the great majority of the lookups were successful, and most of them will be ignored as they do not provide us with any special insights. We will mention here just two examples of lookups which were successful, in order to illustrate the resourcefulness which is required for students to make effective use of their dictionaries.

CB searched in the OEGLD to find SETBACK. Looking in the alphabetical ordering of headwords, one finds that SETBACK is not there. There are, however, two headword homographs SET, covering a total of over two pages. On examining the first of these, we find it divided into 13 senses, with the thirteenth division being for phrases with adverbs and prepositions. The fourth of these is SET BACK, which is given in three verbal senses. And following on from these we find ~-back, in the sense that we are searching for. That a foreign learner should get so far as extracting that meaning is a testament to her persistence and ingenuity. We may note in passing that had she attempted to find the word in the OALD, she would have found that the related nominal senses are not given with the phrasal verbs, but are on the following page; and that while SET-BACK and SET BOOK are listed (eventually) under the first headword SET, SET PIECE comes under the third, while SET SQUARE has separate headword status.

VG searched for GIVE THE GAME AWAY and would have had to examine a whole page filled mainly with idiomatic expressions and phrasal verbs to realise that the expression she was searching for was not there. At least the OALD has a note that

“most idioms containing GIVE are at the entries for the nouns or adjectives in the idioms”, which could save people hunting vainly. Turning to GAME, we find that the OEGLD divides the first of the five headwords GAME into five senses. Although the first of these contains many idiomatic expressions, it is under the fourth sense that we find the expression we are seeking. The OALD makes things easier by grouping all the idioms together in a single alphabetical listing.

The problems illustrated by these difficulties are notorious, but should not be regarded as intractable. In the next section we turn to a range of further difficulties that have caused our students to fail to understand the required meanings, before we examine some proposals to help overcome such failures.

## 2.3: Categorisation and analysis of unsuccessful look-ups

### 2.3a: The word was not located

#### 2.3a.i: The word is not contained in the dictionary

Of the 92 lookups that resulted in failure, 19 failed because the student judged that the particular sense of the word being sought is not given in the dictionary that was being used, and so left the Word Found column on the survey form blank. We can subdivide those cases where the item really is not present into four categories:

1. Cases where the lexeme does not occur at all (4).
2. Cases where the lemma is given as a headword, but the required sense is not included in the translations (4).
3. Derivatives which are not specified, and which the student failed to deduce (1).
4. Compounds which are not specified, and which the student failed to deduce (6).

These four categories together account for fifteen of the nineteen cases where students reported finding no satisfactory translation. The remaining four instances are due to the students' failure to locate the item, and are dealt with in section 2.3a.ii.

Examples of the cases where the lexeme is not present in the dictionary are those which might be considered to be beyond the scope of the size of dictionary being used, or which refer to ideas or artefacts relating to social, cultural or technological developments more recent than the period which the dictionary aims to cover. Such words are DREADLOCKS, REGGAE, HABITAT, and PAGER. The first two presumably had not yet impinged sufficiently on anglophone consciousness to merit inclusion; though they are both now present in the OALD, they were not in the OEGLD. HABITAT has also become much more frequent in current usage, due to increased interest in environmental issues, but while it was in the OEGLD it was not included in the slightly smaller (896 pages for English-Greek and Greek-English combined) Atlantis Dictionary. Finally PAGER is an example of a coinage referring



to an invention too recent to have been included in the first edition of the OEGLD, and a prime candidate for inclusion in the new edition.

There were also four instances in the data of words which, although their homographs existed as lemmata in the particular dictionary being consulted, were not actually present in the senses required by their respective contexts.

BEAM in the sense of “to give a broad and happy smile” was located by a student using the OEGLD, but was not to be found by a student using the Michigan Press dictionary. Although this dictionary distinguishes seven senses for the headword BEAM, the student correctly concluded that none of them was appropriate for the present context.

Similarly, a student searching in the Penguin dictionary for SEVERE concluded that none of the translations given could collocate with WEATHER. Although this dictionary distinguishes six senses of SEVERE, with one or two translations for each, the logic of the division into senses is obscure. A student searching for that sense in the OEGLD would have found as examples ~WINTER and ~STORM to disambiguate the required sense.

On the other hand, the student searching in the OEGLD for GENUINELY in the context of “parents genuinely don’t understand” correctly concluded that neither of the translations given for GENUINE were appropriate for the context as they were given with the examples SIGNATURE / PEARL / PICTURE, and the adverb is not given at all.

Likewise, the student searching for CRACK realised that none of the explanations given fit the sense of “She started selling crack at the age of 13”, which is another candidate for inclusion in the updated OEGLD.

Only in one case did a student not come up with any translation at all due to the absence from the dictionary of a derivative. This was the derivative CARER, which

ought to be fairly transparent despite the proliferation of minor sense distinctions for the verb CARE.

The most numerous words for which students recorded finding no translation were the compounds; there are six instances where students noted the absence from their dictionaries of the compounds which they were searching for. In the Collins Gem, a small dictionary with 345 pages for the English-Greek section, the entry for BACK covers nearly a whole column. The student searching here for BACKPACKER, however, discovered that although several compounds and derivative forms are given, the particular one being sought was one of the victims of the economy of space. Neither is it to be found at PACK, and given that the synthesis of the two elements in the compound produces a new lexical item which is hardly transparent, it is not possible for the student to divine its meaning.

On the other hand, the student searching in the OEGLD for GUNTOTING could have been more successful if she had realised that this is a compound and persevered in her search. GUNTOTING is not given, although space is made for eleven other compounds, including the presumably less common GUN-CARRIAGE and GUNROOM. However, TOTE is explained as “carry, esp. a gun”.

The remaining four instances of absence from the dictionaries are compounds formed with bound morphemes, which happen in all four instances to be prefixes, OMNI-, UN-, and, in two cases, RE-. OMNIPRESENCE was not found in the OEGLD because not only is the compound itself not given, but neither is the prefix included as a headword. The only recourse for the student would be to make use of the translations of the four words in OMNI- that are given (OMNIBUS, OMNIPOTENCE, OMNISCIENCE and OMNIVOROUS) and draw her own conclusion as to the meaning of the prefix.

In the other three cases, the prefixes are given as headwords, but students failed to locate them, because the entries for the prefixes are not contiguous with the alphabetical position of the compounds being sought. Thus UNPLUGGED is not found, because the entry for the prefix UN- in OEGLD is nine pages before UNPL- .

In the case of such a productive prefix, the student should realise that it is indeed a prefix, and so then look at the entry for PLUG.

It might be argued that unless all such compounds are to be given headword status, which would be a great waste of space, it might be preferable not to give any of them headword status, thus avoiding confusion. Such excision, however, would not overcome the problem that the headword UN- would not appear at the point where a student searching for UNPLUGGED would be looking; apart from the other compounds there are many other words such as UNCLE, UNCTION and UNDER which would intervene. Unless the student is equipped with the knowledge that UN- is a prefix with its own headword entry at the appropriate place in the alphabetical ordering, he is not going to be able to find it. Furthermore we must take account of the need to specify such words as do not exist without the prefix, or whose meaning is not simply negated by the prefix, like UNACCOUNTABLE, UNADULTERATED, or UNCONSCIONABLE. Perhaps most seriously, such an approach would demand of the user the sophistication to realise that, contrary to appearances, UNANIMOUS is not a compound in UN-. If such demands seem reasonable, we should be chastened by the failure of native speakers to come to terms with INFLAMMABLE.

A similar problem is posed by the prefix RE-. The data include three searches for the word REDECORATE. The search using the Boston Press Dictionary was successful, but the other two failed. In the OEGLD the prefix itself is given, but it is seven pages distant from RED- and was not located by the student. The choice of compounds that are given headword status is eclectic; REFILL presumably is chosen by analogy with the noun, but REANIMATE and RESTOCK seem less useful than REDECORATE. The Atlantis Dictionary is similarly eclectic, and the inclusion of headwords such as REDELIVER, REDEMAND and REDEPOSIT diminishes the likelihood of the user realising that it may not be appropriate to look for a particular compound as a headword and that he should instead look for each of the elements that form it.

Of the total of 92 unsuccessful searches, a significant proportion, 15, failed because the lexical item being sought was not there to be found. This is a deficiency which can never be completely overcome because of limitations of space in a dictionary aimed at

a particular market where size and cost must be balanced, and because it is impossible for any book which requires time to produce ever to be completely up to date. However, a certain number of these failures might have been overcome if compounds such as those in RE- and UN- were given more systematic treatment, including the use of frequency counts to establish criteria for inclusion as headwords. Even when the required lexical item is contained in the dictionary, the entries must be arranged in such a way that students will be able to find the correct sense of the word that they are looking for, and once again derivatives and compounds cause particular problems, as we will see in the next section.

2.3a.ii: The word is contained in the dictionary, but the student failed to locate it.

In four cases the required lexical item was not located although it was present in the dictionary being used. Given the difficulties with derivatives and compounds noted in the previous section, it is understandable that these items proved difficult to locate even when they were given in the dictionary. In the OEGLD, one student failed to find **INTERRUPTION** under the headword **INTERRUPT**, even though it is printed in bold and translated.

Another failed to find **FORGERY**, which is more understandable for two reasons. Firstly, the arrangement of entries for **FORGE** is more complex, with three headword entries, and the required sense is the second of the two senses distinguished for the second headword. Secondly, although given a pronunciation, a part of speech label and three translations, the word itself is not given in full, but is reduced to ~RY.

This space-saving device may also account for another student's failure to locate ~PLACE under **FIRE**, though it is really not the fault of the dictionary. More than half of the entry for **FIRE** is composed of various compounds, all shown with the swung dash to represent **FIRE**, with the second element printed in a bold typeface of the same size as, and only slightly lighter than, that used for the headwords. As 32 such compounds are listed and translated, it is unlikely that the user would fail to notice them; having noticed their presence, there is no reason to fail to locate the one being sought.

In contrast, the predicament of the student searching, also in the OEGLD, for **HAVE HER WAY** is more intractable. This expression is not given at **HAVE**, but is included in the form of **HAVE/GET ONE'S OWN~** in the entry for **WAY**. However, only a particularly determined student would read through more than a page of dense type to find it in the middle of the seventh sense.

The difficulty of locating the required headword, or the required sense within an entry can be daunting in such cases, and this problem overshadows any other defects in the dictionary, because however good the translations are, they can only be used if students are able to find them. There are many problems with the alphabetical ordering of headwords, some of which are touched on in section 2.4, and may be alleviated by thematic organisation of entries, but the difficulties such as those mentioned above with words in UN- and RE-, the difficulties with compounds and phrases are likely to be overcome only by electronic dictionaries. This is a topic that we will look at in section 3.3; in the following section we find examples of the most inexcusable fault in a dictionary, which is to be inaccurate in the specification of meaning.

## 2.3b: The word was located but in a wrong meaning

### 2.3b.i: Because the dictionary translation is inaccurate

Of the 92 look-ups that resulted in failure, three failed because the dictionary translation was simply wrong.

A student searching in the Michigan Press dictionary for HOST found ΞΕΝΟΔΟΧΟΣ, which means HOTELIER, whereas in the context which prompted the look-up it is clear that the host is offering hospitality in his own home.

A student searching in the Penguin dictionary for ILLUSION found ΠΑΡΑΙΣΘΗΣΗ. Penguin is idiosyncratic in giving as the first among many translations a word which actually means HALLUCINATION or DELUSION rather than ILLUSION, and which is not included in the entries for ILLUSION in any of the other dictionaries.

A student searching in the Collins Gem dictionary for SEVERAL found ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΣ. It is ironic that the context that prompted the lookup has “several other similar robberies”, as the hapless student is confronted with the claim that SEVERAL is used as an adjective meaning DIFFERENT or SEPARATE, or as a pronoun meaning SOME.

It is a minimum requirement that any dictionary should be correct in the denotational meaning of its translation equivalents, and these examples from three different dictionaries indicate that this requirement is not always met.

### 2.3b.ii: The student misread the translation

In three cases, carelessness on the part of the student produced incorrect results due to misreading the dictionary.

A student using Divry's dictionary searched for ACCELERATE and reported finding ΕΠΙΤΥΓΧΑΝΩ. In fact the dictionary correctly gives the meaning of ACCELERATE as ΕΠΙΤΑΧΥΝΩ, but the student has mistaken it for the similar-looking but unrelated ΕΠΙΤΥΓΧΑΝΩ, which means SUCCEED. While such carelessness is clearly the fault of the student, it is an understandable consequence of tiny print and a relentless black / white ratio.

In a similar way, a student using the Collins Gem, searching for EDGE, misread the rather uncommon word ΠΑΡΥΦΗ, which is the correct translation, for the more common ΚΟΡΥΦΗ, which means PEAK.

Another kind of misreading stems from confusing the translation of the headword with other words used in the example. Looking for URGENT in the Penguin dictionary, a student reported finding ΑΝΑΓΚΗ, which is used to translate NECESSITY in the example *urgent necessity*.

While the dictionaries cannot be held responsible for these errors, there are clearly improvements that could be made to improve the legibility of entries. Apart from the obvious solution of using larger print and clearer fonts, which has its inevitable cost in terms of the size of the book, the use of colour, which has already been implemented by electronic dictionaries, could be included in printed ones. The use of three colours would permit easy discrimination of headwords, translations and examples, and could also greatly enhance the visibility of the guide words discussed in section 3.2.

Error on the part of the students is also responsible for what is by far the most frequent cause of mistaken translations reported in the survey. More than half of the unsuccessful look-ups, or 7.5% of the total number of look-ups, resulted in failure



because the students noted the wrong sense of a polysemous word. This error is the topic of the following section.

### 2.3b.iii: The wrong sense of a polysemous word was found

Of the 92 look-ups that resulted in failure, 54 failed because the sense that was noted by the student, although it was a sense of the word being sought, was not the correct sense to fit the context which prompted the look-up. It seems that students are unaware that a word may have several different senses, and that it is therefore necessary as they read the dictionary entry to bear in mind the context in which it is used. Many of the errors in this category are the result of noting whatever translation is given first in the dictionary. As instances of this error are so numerous, we will not analyse all of them, but will take a few examples.

A student looked up ADMISSION in the context of “admission of guilt”, and found ΕΙΣΟΔΟΣ, which means ADMISSION in the sense of ENTRY.

A student looked up TEND in the context of “people tend to ignore regulations”, and found ΦΡΟΝΤΙΖΩ, which means TEND in the sense of CARE FOR.

A student looked up GROOM during an exercise practising vocabulary connected with weddings, and found ΙΠΠΟΚΟΜΟΣ, which means the groom who looks after horses. Another student, using the OEGLD, found the correct translation, ΓΑΜΠΡΟΣ, but that dictionary fails to explain which sense of ΓΑΜΠΡΟΣ is GROOM, as the same Greek word also means SON-IN-LAW.

A student looked up MAINTAIN and, given two words which translate respectively the two senses of CONSERVE and BELIEVE, chose the wrong one.

Two students looked up PLEDGE in the sense of “pledge your loyalty” and both found PLEDGE in the sense of PAWN.

A student looked up GET AHEAD in the intransitive sense “If you aren’t well organised, you’ll never get ahead”, and found ΞΕΠΕΡΝΩ, which is equivalent to the transitive sense of OVERTAKE or SURPASS.

A student looked up GLAD in the Collins Gem and found ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΟΣ. The dictionary gives two translations without marking them as separate senses, when they are in fact quite different; the word found means GLAD in the sense of PLEASANT (*glad tidings*), while the sense intended in the context is the more usual one of PLEASED.

A student looked up DRAUGHT in the Penguin dictionary and found ΕΛΞΗ, which means DRAUGHT in the sense of PULLING or TRACTION, whereas in the context it was used to mean CURRENT OF AIR.

There are also numerous examples in the data of instances where students have noted translations that belong to a different word class from the word as it appears in the context that prompted the lookup. In most of these cases the meaning of the word found is otherwise basically correct, but there are other cases where there is a semantic as well as a syntactic mismatch between the word being sought and that found, and in some instances the meaning depends on the precise form of the word.

A student looked up CHIEF as an adjective being used to describe EFFECT and found ΑΡΧΗΓΟΣ, which means CHIEF in the sense of LEADER.

A student looked up CROP in the context of “the potato crop is picked” and found ΠΕΡΙΚΟΠΤΩ, which means CROP in the sense of CUT.

A student looked up DESERT in the context of “the Nevada Desert” and found ΕΓΚΑΤΑΛΕΙΠΩ, which means DESERT in the sense of ABANDON.

Compounds are a source of difficulty, partly due to lack of initiative on the part of the students. Having established that BREATH TAKING was not to be found in his dictionary, a student simply recorded what he found, which was the verb BREATHE.

Another source of error is the process of lemmatisation: Knowles & Roe (1995-1996: unit 5, p.3) find that “The formal advantages of reduction and entry compaction by lemmatisation are ... most certainly vitiated by the loss of discrimination in ‘meaning’ and in functional load.” Thus in Carter’s (1987: 6-7) example, lemmatisation deprives students of the facility to access definitions from the word-form they actually encounter unless it happens to be orthographically identical with (BRING) or contiguous to (BRINGS) the lexeme (BRING). Lemmatisation also deprives us of discrimination of the meaning of various word classes. As Landau (1984: 91) points out, “some participles seem to have slightly different shades of meaning when used adjectivally in some contexts than one could impute to them by simply knowing their verbal meanings.” Sinclair (1991:46) takes this point a stage further: “We must note that the classification of DECLINING as verbal is a misleading convention...” Nor is the loss of meaning discrimination confined to participles: Moon (1987: 94-95) states that “The corpora show that common derivatives such as the adverbs in -LY and the nouns in -NESS are frequently associated with some rather than all possible senses. LAMELY is normally only used in the sense associated with lame excuses, rather than anything to do with limps and legs...”

There are several instances in the data of confusion caused by participle forms in ~ED. A typical example is the error caused by the treatment in the OEGLD of ABANDONED. While several examples are given of the verbal sense of ABANDON (= ΕΓΚΑΤΑΛΕΙΠΩ), the required adjectival sense of the participle is not specified. The translations given at ~ED mean CORRUPT or PROFLIGATE, and so the student is left with the impression that this form is not used in the sense of DESERTED, whereas in the Greek-English volume the appropriate sense is given (ΕΓΚΑΤΑΛΕΙΜΕΝΟΣ = ABANDONED).

A student searching in the Michigan Press Dictionary for AFFECTED in the sense of INFLUENCED found ΔΙΑΤΕΘΕΙΜΕΝΟΣ, which means DISPOSED, because this is the only translation given specifically for the form in ~ED.

Searching for IMPRESSED, in the sense of FEELING ADMIRATION, she found a translation corresponding to the sense of STAMPED, again because this is the only translation given specifically for the form in ~ED.

However, even if the participle form specified in the dictionary has the meaning which matches the original context, the student may overlook it. A student searching in the OEGLD for DETERMINED chose the first sense given for DETERMINE, although the correct translation for her context is the third one, which is also the only meaning given for the derivative ~ED.

There are also examples in the data of similar confusion caused by forms with the suffix -ING. Although in the Michigan Press Dictionary the entry for DUCK has seven senses, including “bend to avoid a blow”, which was the meaning required by the context, the student found a separate entry for the headword DUCKING, the definition of which, fittingly, is “a wild duck chase”.

Once again, in contrast to the error of choosing whatever meaning is specified as a participle form, there is an example of choosing the wrong verbal sense even though the participle form given in the dictionary had the correct meaning for the student’s context. A student searching in the OEGLD for STUNNING found the meaning as KNOCK SOMEONE UNCONSCIOUS, although the exercise which she was doing specifies the word class as adjective. The form ~ING is given with the required translation, but the student failed to notice it.

A student looking in the OEGLD for EMPLOYER found EMPLOY and apparently failed to notice that at the end of the entry ~ER and ~EE are both given and translated (in reverse alphabetical order). She therefore selected the first translation given for the verb EMPLOY, and mistakenly added the past participle suffix to give the equivalent of EMPLOYED. We must conclude that even when students have the ability to modify the headword translation to produce a derivative that fits the context, there is no guarantee that they will do so correctly.

Phrases are another source of error. A student who encountered the phrase IN CHARGE OF in a vocabulary exercise failed to realise that the meaning inheres in the phrase rather than in the separate words. On his survey form he reported looking for CHARGE, and he recorded the meaning in the sense of PRICE. In this case the presence at the end of the entry of IN ~ OF proved to be irrelevant, as the student never realised that that was what he should have been looking for.

If the sense being sought is not contained in the dictionary, there is a danger that a student will select a translation of another sense. In the Collins Gem, CONTRACT is not given in the sense required by the context “Marley contracted cancer”, so the student selected the meaning of CONTRACT in the sense of AGREE, an example of ignoring very strong contextual clues to arrive at an impossible interpretation.

A student looked up THROUGH, to decode the meaning of “when his alarm clock went off at 7 o’clock he slept right through it”. He failed to realise that SLEEP THROUGH is a phrasal verb, which he would not have found anyway in the Collins Gem, and found ΕΞΑΙΤΙΑΣ, which means THROUGH in the sense of BECAUSE OF.

A student using the OEGLD found the phrasal verb GET THROUGH, but then carelessly selected the first of the three translations given. The context has “I’ve been trying to get through for ages, but the line is always engaged”, which clearly corresponds to the second sense given in the dictionary, which includes the example “I rang him up several times but couldn’t ~ through”.

Two students looked up PAY OFF in the sense of SUCCEED, and rather than concluding that the use of the expression as it occurs in that context is not included in their dictionary, they noted the sense of COMPENSATE, which is clearly inappropriate.

An interesting contrast obtains between the results of three individuals searching for “scrape through an exam”. DP, using the Michigan Press dictionary recorded finding the meaning of SCRAPE in the sense of SCRATCH. Although the dictionary

specifies twelve senses of the headword, it does not cover the one required here. PP, using the OEGLD, notes a translation which means CREAK. The failure to locate the correct sense is particularly disquieting as the example that OEGLD gives for the fifth sense of SCRAPE is virtually identical to the context in which the student met it, but she evidently did not read as far as the fifth sense. The third student, AS, did succeed in finding that meaning.

The tendency in these dictionaries to have a single entry for all homographs contributes to errors which stem from failing to note the field or domain of the discourse in which words are used with particular senses. A student using the Michigan Press Dictionary searched for BEND in the context of “bend the rules”, and finds ΚΟΜΠΙΟΣ, a noun which is usually translated as KNOT, and which apparently is a sense of BEND in nautical speech communities. Field labels are not given in this dictionary; but then it is unlikely that a student who ignores word class labels would notice them even if they were provided. As an example of this, a student using the Collins Gem looked for BRIGADE and found ΤΑΞΙΑΡΧΙΑ. It is to the credit of this very small dictionary that this error could easily have been avoided, as BRIGADE in the sense found has the field label MIL, and the entry is completed with a cross reference to FIRE, which the student overlooked.

Apart from these cases where the denotational meaning of the translation does not correspond to the sense intended in the original context, there are several other cases where the translation is not entirely satisfactory. In the following section we will look at the results look-ups which were judged to be unsuccessful because they do not specify the required meaning with sufficient accuracy or delicacy, and then in section 2.4 we will look at some further points arising in this connection from other look-ups which were accepted as successful but were not completely adequate.

2.3c: The word was located with a basically correct sense, but the translation was not entirely satisfactory

In thirteen cases, look-ups were judged to have failed because the translation recorded was not entirely satisfactory, even though it might be the best available. One reason for this is that there are words which have no exact equivalent in the second language due to differences in concepts and artefacts.

Thus a student looking for REDUNDANCY used as shorthand for “redundancy pay” in “I was dismissed and offered redundancy” found the only translation in the OEGLD is equivalent to REDUNDANCY in the sense of something that is superfluous, without having any particular connection with employment.

Similarly, the gregarious Greeks have no equivalent of PRIVACY as in “This ceremony takes place in the privacy of the bride’s home”. The two translations noted by the student using the OEGLD mean respectively LONELINESS and QUIET, while the other alternative provided means SECRETIVENESS.

This problem is not inherent in the bilingual dictionary as such, but in the exclusive use of translations rather than explanations. In the OEGLD there are entries which overcome the lack of an equivalent, as in:

λάζος nm [11B] long sharp knife

However, this style is used very little, and instead translations are given which may lead users into error.

Another more subtle failing is that the translations given are inadequate for the purposes of discriminating between near-synonyms. Thus a student searching in the Collins Gem for FIT in the context of “I tried on the coat, but it didn't fit”, found ΤΑΙΡΙΑΖΩ, which may sometimes be equivalent to FIT, but in this context would be taken to mean MATCH or SUIT.



A student searching in the Penguin-Hellenews Dictionary for HAZARD found ΚΙΝΔΥΝΟΣ, which is the standard translation for DANGER. While the OEGLD is unable to proffer a more satisfactory translation, at least the examples allow the user to distinguish between the two words, by showing the typical use of each.

On the other hand, the user of the OEGLD would be in the same position as the user of the Penguin-Hellenews Dictionary on looking up HURRICANE. The translation given in both is cognate with TYPHOON, whereas the point of the exercise was to distinguish between these and other similar words.

In the OEGLD, INTERMISSION is given as ΑΝΑΠΑΥΛΑ, which is usually translated (as in the companion Greek-English volume) as RESPITE, REST or RELAXATION, and the student chose this translation in preference to ΔΙΑΚΟΠΗ, which is given first, and which in the Greek-English volume is given as BREAK, PAUSE, INTERMISSION.... The fault in this case stems from the fact that if the translations are not marked as belonging to distinct senses, the student may assume that they are interchangeable.

There are four examples in the data of lookups which produced translations with a meaning which, though basically correct, fail to convey all the meaning of the English word. Thus the student searching for GET ROUND TO in the OEGLD found ΚΑΤΑΦΕΡΩ, which is not completely satisfactory as it simply means MANAGE, without the idea of “finding time” which is implicit in the phrasal verb.

Similarly, the translation ΞΕΧΝΩ, which means FORGET, for GET OVER is basically correct in a general, decontextualised way. However, it is highly improbable in the context of “I don't know if she'll ever get over her husband's death”.

A common deficiency which emerges in the data is the failure to capture the full power of a word, which is often bound up with its connotational associations. With one exception, these were not classified as unsuccessful lookups, as the translations found give sufficient information for the student to correctly understand the use of the word in the context in which he met it, which was the working definition of a

successful look-up. The single exception is due to the fact that the student searching for HAUL OFF in the OEGLD, finding that the phrasal verb is not given recorded the sense of HAUL as TPABΩ, which simply means PULL, and fails to capture the flavour of the context “hauled off in handcuffs”.

Another way in which the translation may differ from the original word is in its collocational restriction. Thus a student looking for SPRINKLE in the OEGLD found KATABPEXΩ, which does indeed mean SPRINKLE, but is restricted to sprinkling with water, and is therefore an incorrect translation for a context which has “sprinkle with sugar”.

The criterion of substitutability was not strictly applied, and is less relevant in a bilingual than a defining dictionary, but the following example shows how it may be important. The student looking up GET ACROSS in the OEGLD found ΓΙΝΟΜΑΙ ΚΑΤΑΝΟΗΤΟΣ, which actually means MAKE MYSELF UNDERSTOOD. While the student has identified the correct sense of the phrasal verb, this is given in a form which, inserted into the context of the student's exercise, would produce “He has a talent for making himself understood the most complicated ideas”.

In the last two of the thirteen look-ups that failed because of various inadequacies in the translation, the failure is due to the proliferation of translations which purport to correspond to a single sense of a word. A student looking up INEPT in the OEGLD found within the first sense three translations ranging in meaning from UNFIT to UNBECOMING to ABSURD. While the translations are not so inaccurate as to be judged wrong, none is really adequate in the context which prompted the search, “inept at the social graces”. But our major criticism is that they cover a wide variety of meanings and contexts without any indication to the student that that is the case.

This is even more apparent in the second example, where a student searched in Divry's Dictionary for REGION and selected the translation XΩΠΑ, which usually means COUNTRY. Looking at the entry for XΩΠΑ in the Greek-English section of the same dictionary we find COUNTRY, LAND, PLACE, REGION. As no attempt is made to indicate that the four words have different meanings, the student assumes that they are synonymous.

It may be claimed as a justification of this style that the list of translations provides a point of access for the student, providing words which he might otherwise be unaware of, and which he can then check in a monolingual dictionary to find further details of their precise meaning. In our experience this is not the case; even students using a good bilingual dictionary which provides examples of meaning and use for each of the translations often fail to take note of them, and students using such dictionaries as merely provide lists of words without the means to discriminate between them are most unlikely to supply the deficiency. In addition to the cases where the look-up was judged to have been unsuccessful, there are several more examples in the data of look-ups that illustrate weaknesses in this regard, and some others that illustrate methods for overcoming some of these problems. These will be examined in the following section.

## 2.4: Categorisation and analysis of inadequate translations

As Knowles (1986: 11) points out, “In their endeavours bilingual lexicographers must, of course, focus their treatment on denotational meaning equivalence whilst remaining highly sensitive to the demands of connotational, collocational, associative, and stylistic meaning as well.” Clark (1993), expands upon the stylistic aspect of meaning: “Different terms serve to mark formality versus informality, directness versus indirectness, pretentiousness versus bluntness, distance versus solidarity, politeness versus indifference or rudeness, and so on”, while Martin (1984), cited in Carter (1987: 65) includes syntactic dissonance as a factor in the inappropriate use of a lexical item. In section 2.3 we examined those cases where the learner, through his own fault or that of the dictionary, failed to locate the correct denotational meaning, but there are many other cases where the translation found was not completely satisfactory, even though it was accepted as correct.

Often the translations are not completely equivalent to the word being sought, but in the OEGLD that deficiency is often compensated for by the examples. Thus WARM is translated as ΖΕΣΤΟΣ, which fails to distinguish it from HOT, but the example *It was ~ but not hot* serves to make the distinction. Similarly, the student finding ΠΡΟΚΑΛΩ as the translation of EVOKE might confuse it with PROVOKE, but the examples of typical collocates *admiration / surprise / a smile* make the distinction.

However, there many instances where the OEGLD fails to distinguish between near-synonyms. OPULENT is translated as ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟΣ, ΑΦΘΟΝΟΣ, while AFFLUENT is translated as ΑΦΘΟΝΟΣ, ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟΣ. LUDICROUS is given only as ΓΕΛΟΙΟΣ, ΑΣΤΕΙΟΣ, with no further explanation or examples to distinguish LUDICROUS from FUNNY. Despite Stavropoulos’ claim not to give long lists of undifferentiated near-synonyms, the entry for ΓΕΛΟΙΟΣ begins: LAUGHABLE, RIDICULOUS, LUDICROUS, ABSURD, PREPOSTEROUS, GROTESQUE, before some of these are differentiated by grouping in examples. Even so, the OEGLD usually does a much better job than the smaller dictionaries; the Collins Gem fails to make the distinction

between HOAX and JOKE, FAMINE and HUNGER, ASSASSINATION and MURDER.

Whitcut remarks (1985: 79), "...the foreigner's needs will usually be at a simpler level than the native's: coast / beach / shore / seaside as against transient / evanescent / ephemeral / fleeting. Here, as so often in language learning, the foreigner is perhaps grappling with the problem of making a new distinction, not recognised by his or her mother tongue, which may have only one word for coast and shore." In fact the OEGLD does not make a good job of distinguishing coast / beach / shore / seaside. SEASIDE is not even given, and for each of the other three words the same equivalent is given in first position. While there is some information in the notes and examples which helps to distinguish the senses, it would be better to reduce the proliferation of words offered that are simply not equivalent. Just as each of the English words has a referent more or less distinct from that of the others, as indicated in the picture at COAST in the OALD, so does each of the Greek words, and the effect of giving three or more supposed equivalents for each headword is to cause unnecessary confusion.

As Hatch & Brown (1995: 119) state, "Not only do languages differ in the number of terms they use for a concept, but the range of meaning of each term may cover the concept in different ways." We should thus accept that it is not always possible for a bilingual dictionary to convey exactly the fine shades of meaning required to distinguish between near-synonyms. This means that students should realise that there are types of exercises for which the use of a bilingual dictionary is not appropriate.

As long as dictionaries are organised alphabetically, these problems will persist, but students should be made aware of the limitations of each type of dictionary, and select an appropriate kind, or combination of reference works for each task. The OALD has taken a step in the direction of thematic organisation, with many notes disambiguating near-synonyms, and a list of which is provided in an appendix. Apart from the traditional thesaurus, there are now many reference works such as the Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English, The Oxford Learner's Wordfinder Dictionary, and the bilingual Cambridge Word Routes English-Greek, in which the 450 word groups are organised by topic and concept, with near-synonyms differentiated in Greek.

A particular difficulty in conveying the precise shade of meaning arises in the case of words whose denotational meaning is supplemented by connotation. For example, COLLABORATION is translated in the OEGLD as ΣΥΝΕΡΓΑΣΙΑ, which is literally equivalent but which is commonly used to mean COOPERATION, without any of the Vichy flavour that attaches to the English word. On the other hand, the OEGLD is usually able to indicate the connotation of a word through the choice of examples. The translation ΧΩΡΙΣΤΑ for ASUNDER means no more than SEPARATE, but the examples *drive asunder* and *tear asunder* aid understanding of the meaning and exemplify characteristic collocations. The translation ΚΡΥΒΟΜΑΙ for LURK corresponds to the core lexical item HIDE, but is supported by the examples *He was ~ing in the dark* and *some suspicion still ~ed in his mind*, while the examples for HIDE are more suggestive of innocent fun than of shadowy intent. Apart from the examples, the use of a second or third translation can also help to give a more complete idea of connotation. The translation of MURKY, ΣΚΟΤΕΙΝΟΣ, corresponds to the core lexical item DARK, but a second translation, ΖΟΦΕΡΟΣ, is also given, which gives a fuller idea of the meaning. Similarly, OBSCURE is also translated firstly as ΣΚΟΤΕΙΝΟΣ, but the additional translation ΔΥΣΝΟΗΤΟΣ, together with an example of each of the two senses help to clarify the meaning. Thus the OEGLD is largely able to overcome the problem of connotational meaning, either by the use of examples or by giving two or more translations which between them cover the range of meaning.

A more frequent failing in the OEGLD is the inadequate provision of collocational information, which leads us to agree with Nattinger & DeCarrico's observation (1992: 181) that “a lexical phrase approach has a great deal to offer the practice of lexicography”. Indeed, as Carter (1987: 36-37) points out, “some words can only be differentiated by citing their normal collocability range, for example *strong tea* - \**powerful tea*”. Willis (1990: 40), quoting Hanks (1987) reinforces the case for the provision of such information: “...when we ask how the word is typically used rather than how it might possibly be used, we can generally discover a relatively small number of distinct patterns.” If the number of typical collocates is indeed small, it would be reasonable for a dictionary to exemplify them, as Willis implies that COBUILD does. Once again the problem is that of space; for example the OALD in

the entry for GRIEVANCE shows the typical collocates *air* and *harbour / nurse*, but these are not given in the OEGLD.

The provision of a translation which conveys more or less correctly the denotational meaning is the most we can expect from the pocket bilingual dictionaries, but larger volumes with space for longer entries often succeed in discriminating near-synonyms, and may also give some indication of connotation and style as well as providing information on typical collocates. Even these dictionaries, however, are not able to compete with the larger monolingual learner's dictionaries, and so it is important that learners should realise that there are some cases where the use of the bilingual is not appropriate.

## Chapter Three - Proposals Based on the Results

### 3.1: Learner training

As we saw in the previous section, there are many subtle ways in which the translation equivalents may be unsatisfactory even if the denotational meaning is conveyed accurately. These are issues which can only be addressed by improvements in the dictionaries themselves, or by getting learners to realise that there are cases where the use of a bilingual dictionary is not appropriate. However, in the majority of cases where the word found is completely wrong, the cause is not a deficiency in the dictionary, but the learner's failure to use it properly. The remedy for these errors is more effective learner training.

As the difficulties in locating the correct sense of a polysemous word indicate, the most important aspect of such training would be increasing awareness of the fact that many dictionary entries cover several different senses of a headword, and that it is necessary to compare the various translations with the context in which the word was found to see which meaning fits. Unfortunately it seems that this is the kind of strategy which dictionary workbooks tend not to cover; as Knowles & Roe (1995-96: unit 7, page 8) point out, "The telling criticism of [workbooks such as *Use your Dictionary, for the OALDCE*] has been made that, rather than being organised in terms of learners' strategies, they tend to progress through a language-oriented gamut of topics, showing off what the dictionary has to say about sound, spelling, grammar, etc. It is in fact only by developing retrieval skills and imparting basic lexicographical knowledge to learners that success in dictionary use can be facilitated."

These criticisms certainly appear to be true of the worksheets produced for the fourth edition of the OALD; only the first of the five sets is really about familiarisation with the use of the dictionary, with one worksheet for the macrostructure and one for the microstructure. For the fifth edition, in addition to the booklet of nine worksheets, there are also two sets of practice sheets, which are rather more practical. The first set has some interesting awareness-raising activities, especially sheet six, on the



appropriate choice of near synonyms according to register, but it is only in the second set that we find activities designed to teach learners how to actually use the dictionary. Sheets fifteen to seventeen, with their focus on finding the right definition are especially relevant, but they are not given the prominence that is required in order to tackle this major difficulty.

Knowles & Roe (*ibid.*) suggest an algorithm composed of seven steps for the retrieval of information. According to the data produced in the survey, our learners seem to have particular difficulty with stage e: “If there are multiple senses or homographic entries, reduce them by elimination”. It should be a simple matter to overcome some of the cruder errors arising at this stage, such as when learners settle on a homograph that belongs to a different word class from that demanded by the context, or when they fail to read beyond the first sense in the entry for a polysemous lemma. On the other hand, it may sometimes prove that the task of selecting the correct sense and integrating the sense of the translation into the original context is beyond the cognitive abilities of our young learners.

As Stark (1990: 26) points out, “We expect workbooks to facilitate mastery of the reference processes involving both the macrostructure and the microstructure of the dictionary.” In fact the worksheets we have examined offer only a cursory examination of the macrostructure, occupied mainly with finding the correct place in the alphabetical ordering, and an even less adequate treatment of the microstructure of individual entries. While it is not surprising that no learner training materials are available for the small bilingual dictionaries used in the project, some such materials would be a welcome accompaniment to the forthcoming edition of the OEGLD, and the indications are that if the publishers of the dictionary do not produce them, there will be a need to produce in-house materials to train our learners in the effective use of their dictionaries.

### 3.2: Bridging the gulf

As Atkins has pointed out (1985: 22), by varying the proportion of monolingual and bilingual features in a hybrid dictionary we can “bridge the present gulf between the bilingual and the monolingual”. Béjoint (1994: 39) describes many intermediate subtypes which in various ways combine features of the monolingual and the bilingual. Laufer & Melamed (1994) provide an overview of the development of this new kind of dictionary, and remark (p. 566) concerning the preference of learners for bilingual dictionaries, “If this is the consumer reality, then a hybrid dictionary which contains the two types of information (monolingual and bilingual) seems to be the most appropriate product of the lexicographer’s effort.” They conclude (p. 572-573) that the hybrid dictionary is much more useful than the traditional bilingual or monolingual, particularly in the hands of unskilled users.

Béjoint (1994: 73) notes that the Oxford Student’s Dictionary for Hebrew Speakers described by Laufer & Melamed is “an exact reproduction of the original English edition, with Hebrew equivalents added on to each entry and sub-entry (Reif 1987: 146).” However, he is not quite accurate when he states that “There are similar dictionaries for Japanese, Greek, Brazilian Portuguese, Arabic, Polish, Italian, Norwegian, Chinese, etc.” The Israeli dictionary contains English definitions for each sense of each headword, as in a monolingual dictionary, with a single-word translation appended to the definition of each sense, whereas the Oxford English-Greek Learner’s Dictionary (1977), does not give definitions, but only translations. The distinguishing feature of the OEGLD in comparison with most small bilinguals is that it gives examples in English which are also translated into Greek.

The bilingualised dictionaries seem to have two distinct sets of advantages compared with the OEGLD. Firstly, as the definitions are in English, all the advantages of a monolingual accrue. Secondly, as described by Osselton (1995: 128): “...the gloss gives the foreign learner a rapid identification tag for the term he is concerned with (or the initial assurance that he has pitched on the sense he wants) before he takes in the more detailed information provided in the monolingual text.” As the gloss enables the

quick and easy selection of the appropriate sense of the headword, learners are more likely to avoid the selection of the wrong sense, which was the most common source of error in our project. Although such glosses (in Greek) are used in OEGLD, they are neither frequent nor prominent.

The value of glosses seems to have been appreciated also by the publishers of monolingual dictionaries; a brief indication of the sense can help learners to find the definition they require even if this indication is in English, as long as it stands out from the main text of the entry. Thus Cambridge University Press boast in their 1997 ELT Catalogue (p.6) that the Cambridge International Dictionary of English is “the first dictionary to devise guide words which help to distinguish immediately between different senses of the same word”, and Longman boast in their 1997 ELT Catalogue (p.63) in connection with the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English that “Signposts, a major breakthrough in dictionary design, get you where you want to be - fast. These simple subheadings of the main word break the definition up into manageable chunks so that the student doesn’t have to read all the definitions before finding the meaning they want.”

Another virtue of the hybrid dictionary, and of the better bilinguals, is that it is specifically intended for learners of a particular target language, whereas simple bilinguals often attempt to serve the needs of native speakers of both languages. As Landau (1984: 8-9) points out, the decision as to which language is regarded as the target language “will effect not only the kind of translation equivalents he [the lexicographer] provides and the fullness of the equivalents, but the choice of entries themselves”. Thus in Jackson’s example (1988: 175-176), “The entry for *inform* in the English-German bilingual dictionary is constructed with translation into German in mind. German glosses constitute the definitions, and the distinctions of meaning that are made reflect the different translations of those meanings in German”.

The OEGLD is produced for Greek learners of English, and the Greek-English volume is considerably larger than the English-Greek, with 1019 pages as against 839, and a considerably larger format. Most of the difference in size is accounted for by the amount of detail with which each headword is treated in the respective volumes. To take an admittedly extreme example for the purposes of illustration, in the English-

Greek volume, LASCIVIOUS is given a single-word translation, a three-word example (*a ~ smile*), and the derivation ~LY run-on and not translated. The equivalent word (ΛΑΓΝΟΣ) in the Greek-English volume is translated:

“lustful, lewd, lascivious, salacious, prurient, (*για άντρα*) lecherous, (*για γυν.*) wanton, fml lubricious”, and is given four examples, each in both languages.

Thus the English-Greek volume provides the minimal information that is required for decoding, the Greek-English the much fuller information required for encoding.

Despite the indication “fml” in the above excerpt, the metalanguage in both volumes is in Greek. As Atkins (1985: 20) points out, the bilingual dictionary should select the metalanguage according to who needs the guidance to distinguish between the various translations, but the OEGLD in all cases uses Greek. Thus at ΚΕΙΜΗΛΙΟ we have four groups of translations, three of which have a clarifying note in Greek:

relic

(οικογενειακό) heirloom

(ενθύμιο) memento, souvenir, keepsake

(τρόπαιο) trophy.

In this way, the Greek learner is able to select the appropriate English word for the meaning he intends. On the other hand, the English learner seeking the Greek translation of trophy is presented with two senses, corresponding to the two senses distinguished in OALD (though in reverse order):

1. τροπαίον

2. βραβείο, κύπελλο (*αγώνων*).

As the note is in Greek, the English user will not know which is the hunting and warring sense and which is the sporting sense; in fact the note is to elucidate for Greek users the use of the word κύπελλο (cup) in a sporting rather than a drinking sense. We can see from the above examples that the pair of dictionaries support the Greek

learner of English, and that the imbalance between the two volumes is a natural consequence of this; even though the number of words required for encoding would, for any individual, normally be fewer than those required for decoding, the amount of information required about each word is significantly greater.

As Stavropoulos states in the Prologue (p.iv), the OEGLD is distinguished from its competitors in that it is not restricted to translation, but makes use also of examples of the use of the English words in context, which are also translated. His second claim is that the different meanings of the English words are not conveyed through a lengthy collation of Greek words, but are distinguished and numbered in a way that gives the student an accurate and clear picture of the semasiological complexity of each word. This is certainly one area where it is necessary to make improvements, and OEGLD's claim to have done so is largely justified. This point is taken up again in the Introduction (p.xiii), where Stavropoulos explains the principle of using as few as possible Greek words in the rendering of each sense of the English words in order not to create pointless confusion for the student. He goes on to note that perhaps in this way the complete semasiological range of the English word is not always covered with its finer shades of meaning, but that the editors judged that the literal meaning and clarity were more essential than fine distinctions, for which they depended more on the example phrases. While OEGLD is not a hybrid bilingualised dictionary in the sense described by Laufer & Melamed and Osselton, it is clear from the foregoing that it is a significant step in that direction, most notably in its reliance on examples to complement the translation equivalents. If learners were trained to make full use of this valuable feature, it is much more likely that they could locate the desired translation than they did in the data we have examined. But the integration of monolingual features into the bilingual dictionary is just one of many ways in which it could be improved.

### 3.3: Future dictionaries

Although Oxford University Press are soon to publish a new edition of the OEGLD, it seems that this will be basically similar to the original 1977 edition with minor alterations. As the Editorial Director of ELT Dictionaries at OUP describes it (personal communication), “Greek-speaking English editors based in Oxford marked up the English text, recommending additions or deletions and amending examples where appropriate before it was sent to Dimitris” [the editor of the first edition, now deceased]. According to Dimitris Stavropoulos’ brother George, who has taken over the work, (personal communication) the new edition will be thoroughly revised and updated to account for changes in the English language, and also changes in the spelling of many words in Demotic Greek. It seems clear that however extensive the revisions we should expect reform rather than revolution, and in particular George Stavropoulos stated that he is against the idea of an electronic version of the dictionary.

This is unfortunate, as the advantages of electronic dictionaries over their printed counterparts are enormous. In the OALD on CD-ROM, the problem of pronunciation and phonetic symbols is solved through the provision of spoken pronunciation of all headwords. The problem of the grammatical codes is solved because a click on an abbreviation referring to a grammatical feature calls up an explanation. Even the problem of the defining vocabulary is greatly diminished, as a click on any word in a definition calls up a definition for that. And as stated in the OUP Greece ELT catalogue 1997 (p.37), “Three search levels make it easy to access information, and allow students to find items or combinations of items virtually impossible to find in the printed book”.

The great advantage of having a variety of search methods is that every user can use the dictionary at the level appropriate for his competence. This might mean simply looking up headwords as in the printed version, but there is enormous scope to exploit the dictionary in new ways. For example, as the manual for the OED2 on CD-ROM informs us (p.10), “You can limit your search to a particular section of the entry, such as the etymology or the quotations, or you can limit it by date or part of

speech. More complex searches combining queries by the use of Boolean operators can be constructed using the query language.” On the other hand, applications such as small translation dictionaries are often much simpler in their design, and offer a more modest range of facilities.

Another benefit of the electronic products is that the pressures of physical size are greatly reduced, so that Oxford can produce on a single disk the Reference Shelf which contains sixteen texts, including a monolingual learner’s dictionary, bilingual dictionaries and ESP dictionaries. It is easy to imagine how such reference works could be integrated, as it is already common for a dictionary to be integrated with a thesaurus (as in the Collins Electronic Dictionary). A further development is illustrated by COBUILD direct, an on-line service which includes access to the COBUILD English Dictionary, making it unnecessary to distribute and sell disks, and so overcoming the requirement to fit all the required information within the confines of a certain physical space. This is a considerable benefit as even a CD-ROM only has a certain storage capacity, and the OED2 on CD-ROM comes close to occupying the current standard of 650MB, even though it consists entirely of text, without any of the much more space-consuming audio, pictures or video.

It seems that with the technology now available, a dictionary really can be all things to all men. We can imagine a dictionary which is essentially monolingual, but in which the entries can be accessed by equivalent words in a variety of other languages. We could then switch between displaying a monolingual entry, perhaps with bilingual glosses for quick discrimination of senses, or a list of near synonyms arranged and defined so as to clarify the differences between them, and in each case we would have a sufficient number of examples to exemplify the range of meaning, collocation and syntax. Apart from the choice of languages displayed, filters could customise the range of information displayed according to the preferences of each user, and modify the screen format, menus and commands available accordingly. This principle has already been adopted in the Collins Electronic Dictionary, which has the option to include or exclude etymology and pronunciation in the display, and the task which remains is to extend that principle of choice to a range of bilingual elements which could be integrated with the essentially monolingual dictionary. As Dodd (1989: 91)

wrote almost ten years ago, “A computer data base is almost infinitely extensible, and so there is more scope for the inclusion of extra material on any item. In particular, it becomes possible to envisage in co-existence in the same database definitions produced in several styles for the same words.”

This being the case, there is no technical reason why they should not also include glosses in several languages. As Knowles (1990: 1657) states, “The process of merging several machine-readable dictionaries into a conglomerate repository of structural lexical information is a further problem which urgently requires solutions (Hess / Brustkern / Lenders 1983); the difficulties confronting this justifiable aspiration to merge machine-readable dictionaries apply with particular force to the task of welding and melding the two halves of a bilingual dictionary into a unified structure, simultaneously levelling out any informational tilt between the two sides of the dictionary.” When such a conglomeration is achieved, the distinction between monolingual and bilingual might finally be overcome, with a single lexicographical work being offered in the form of on-line access to a data base combining all the advantages of both types with none of the disadvantages.



## Chapter Four - Conclusion

Despite the widely-held belief that monolingual dictionaries are somehow better for learners than bilinguals, the evidence is inconclusive. If the basic criterion for usefulness depends on the ability of the student to understand from the dictionary the meaning sought, we must discover both whether the student can in fact locate and understand the definition, and whether the definition is accurate. The present survey examined our students' use of a range of bilingual dictionaries in order to determine whether they met those criteria. A more strictly controlled experiment would be required to explore variations in the success rate according to the dictionary used and the individual student. Furthermore, as the survey was confined to decoding activities using only the English-Greek volume, it is not possible to generalise to the effectiveness of the dictionaries used in encoding activities, which would require a parallel study. Neither is it possible for us to relate the results of the project to the use of the monolingual learner's dictionary.

There are, however, certain conclusions that may be based on our data. Firstly, it seems that learners are more likely to be successful when using a dictionary with fewer headwords, as these can give more extensive treatment to the headwords that are included. Secondly, in order to benefit from longer entries, students must be trained to look at all the entry, and not just the first part. The most common type of error was finding a sense of the lexeme that was not appropriate for the context. Guide words may be useful in allowing the user to scan the entry quickly to find the required sense of the headword. Thirdly, students must realise that the bilingual dictionary may not be an appropriate place to seek guidance on fine discrimination between near synonyms. This problem could be alleviated if the alphabetical ordering of the dictionary could be supplemented by thematic treatment.

Of the 718 look-ups examined, 92 produced a result which was clearly incorrect, and several more which were accepted as providing the correct denotational meaning were judged not to be entirely satisfactory in other respects. This indicates that there is a lot of room for improvement. Of the nineteen words which could not be located, almost

half were derivatives or compounds. It is notable that in three of these cases the word was specified in the dictionary, but the students failed to find it. It seems that whatever policy a dictionary adopts with regard to the specification of these items, they always cause difficulty. However the majority of the unsuccessful look-ups were cases where the headword was given more than one translation and the student noted the wrong one, often failing to notice that the translation selected could not possibly fit the context in which the word was encountered.

The question then arises of whether the student, having completed the survey form and returned to his text, continued to think the word was being used in the sense that he had found, or whether he somehow modified his opinion. In order to be sure it would be necessary to conduct the survey under more controlled conditions, perhaps by monitoring the look-ups or asking the students to report their own evaluation. On the evidence we have, it seems that the dictionary skills of certain students could be dramatically improved with a minimum of training, so that at least they would be aware that a dictionary entry often explains many different senses of a word, and it is necessary for them to search for the correct one.

One of the most intractable problems we noted for the bilingual dictionary is that some words, such as REDUNDANCY and PRIVACY simply do not have an adequate translation. If the editorial policy were flexible enough to allow definitions rather than translation equivalents in such cases, this would be overcome. The impossibility of finding exact translations for many words becomes apparent when we try to discriminate between near synonyms. Often the better dictionaries are able to convey such distinctions through the judicious use of examples, but as long as they insist upon translations rather than explanations they cannot succeed in distinguishing exactly the same nuances of meaning as the words they aim to translate. In such cases we would expect the monolingual dictionary to do a better job, although it would require another study to determine how far any particular learner is capable of understanding the definitions in any particular monolingual dictionary.

In order to overcome the deficiencies in our learners' use of the dictionary, action is required on two fronts. Firstly, they must be trained to use the dictionaries that they

have more effectively. Secondly, we must take note of the defects in the dictionaries and try to overcome them. Now that computers are common in most classrooms and many homes, it is easier than ever to provide access to dictionaries which can present our students with information in whatever form suits them best, whether that is monolingual, bilingual, or a combination of the two.

15,000 words

## References

### 1. Dictionaries

*The Atlantis Dictionary English-Greek, Greek-English* (undated) Athens: Atlantis

*The Boston Press English-Greek Dictionary* (undated) Athens: Boston Press

*Collins English Dictionary and Thesaurus (Electronic Version)* (1992) Glasgow: HarperCollins

**Crowther, J** (1995) *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Fifth Edition* Oxford: Oxford University Press

*Divry's New English-Greek and Greek-English Dictionary* (1944/1962) New York: D. C. Divry INC.

**Giannokopoulou, G et al.** (undated) *To Μικρό Michigan Press Αγγλο-Ελληνικό* Athens: Κουτσούμπος

**Hionides, H et al.** (1987) *Collins Gem Greek Dictionary* Glasgow: HarperCollins

**Hornby, A S & Ruse, C** (1991) *Oxford First Certificate Dictionary for Greece* Oxford: Oxford University Press

*Τα Νέα Αγγλο-Ελληνικό Λεξικό* (undated) Athens: Τα Νέα

*Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary* (1983) Oxford: Oxford University Press

**Simpson, J & Weiner, E** (1992) *The Oxford English Dictionary, Second Edition on CD-ROM* Oxford: Oxford University Press

**Stavropoulos, D N** (1988) *Oxford Greek-English Learner's Dictionary* Oxford: Oxford University Press

**Stavropoulos, D N** (1991) *Oxford English-Greek Greek-English Learner's Pocket Dictionary* Oxford: Oxford University Press

**Stavropoulos, D N & Hornby, A S** (1977) *Oxford English-Greek Learner's Dictionary* Oxford: Oxford University Press

**Sinclair, J et al.** (1996) *Collins COBUILD Learner's Dictionary* London: HarperCollins

**Sykes, J B** (1976) *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English, Sixth Edition* Oxford: Oxford University Press

*Τεγόπουλος-Φυτράκης Ελληνικό Λεξικό* (1993) Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Αρμονία

**Vassiliades, G et al.** (1975/1981) *Penguin-Hellenews English-Greek Dictionary* Athens: Hellenews-Paidia

## 2. Other books used by participants in the project

**Abbs, B & Freebairn, I** (1991) *Blueprint Two Workbook*. Harlow: Longman.

**Glovanos, G & Stuart, D** (1991) *Greek-English & English-Greek Translation Passages*. Athens: Sussex Press.

**Granger, C & Beaumont, D** (1994) *Generation 2000 Workbook 3*. Oxford: Heinemann.

**Gude, K & Duckworth, M** (1994) *Proficiency Masterclass Student's Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**John, R** (ed.) (1983) *Experiences of Terror*. Glasgow: Collins.

**Kenny, N** (1996) *First Certificate Passkey Student's Book*. Oxford: Heinemann.

**O'Connell, S** (1987,1993) *Focus on First Certificate Student's Book*. Walton-on-Thames: Nelson.

**O'Connell, S** (1992,1993) *Focus on Advanced English Student's Book*. Walton-on-Thames: Nelson.

**Pagoulatou-Vlachou, V** (1988) *Functional Grammar 2*. Athens: Express Publishing.

**Pagoulatou-Vlachou, V** (1988) *Functional Grammar 3*. Athens: Express Publishing.

**Pagoulatou-Vlachou, V** (1992) *CPE Use of English 1*. Athens: Express Publishing.

**Pagoulatou-Vlachou, V** (1995) *FCE Use of English 1*. Athens: Express Publishing.

**Pye, D & Greenall, S** (1995) *Reward Intermediate Practice Book*. Oxford: Heinemann.

**Swan, D** (ed.) (1991) *Round the World in Eighty Days*. Harlow: Longman.

**Tsopanagos-Venizelou, E & Fox, C** (1994) *Generation 2000 Companion 3*. Oxford: Heinemann.

**University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate** (June 1993-June 1995) *Examination Papers for the Certificate of Proficiency in English*.

**Walton, R** (1994) *Focus on Advanced English Grammar Practice*. London: Nelson.

**Πανελλαδικές Εξετάσεις** (1976-1993) *Θέματα Αγγλικής Φιλολογίας*. Αθήνα : Μέδουσα-Σελας.

[**Greek national matriculation examinations** (1976-1993) *Papers for English Philology*. Athens: Medusa-Selas.]

### 3. Works on Lexicography and Linguistics

**Atkins, B** “*Monolingual and Bilingual Learner’s Dictionaries: a comparison*” in Ison (1985)

**Atkins, B & Knowles, F** “*Interim Report on the EURALEX / AILA Research Project into Dictionary Use*” in Magay, T & Zigány, J (1988)

**Atkins, B & Varantola, K** (1997) “*Monitoring Dictionary Use*” International Journal of Lexicography, vol. 10 no. 1 Oxford: Oxford University Press

**Béjoint, H** (1994) *Tradition and Innovation in Modern English Dictionaries* Oxford: Clarendon Press

**Béjoint, H & Moulin, A** “*The Place of the Dictionary in an EFL Program*” in EURALEX Seminar Leeds (1985)

**Carter, R** (1987) *Vocabulary: Applied Linguistic Perspectives* London: Routledge

**Clark, E** (1993) *The Lexicon in Acquisition* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

**Cowie, A P** “*The language of examples in English Learners’ dictionaries*” in James, G (1989)

**Dodd, W S** “*Lexicomputing and the dictionary of the future*” in James, G (1989)

**Hatch, E & Brown, C** (1995) *Vocabulary, Semantics and Language Education* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

**Hausmann, F J et al.** (eds.) (1990) *An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography, vol. 2* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter

**Ison, R** (ed.) (1985) *Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning* Oxford: Pergamon Press

**Jackson, H** (1988) *Words and Their Meaning* London: Longman

**James, G** (ed.) (1989) *Lexicographers and their works* Exeter: University of Exeter Press



- Knowles, F** (1986) *Computational Lexicography and Lexical Databases*
- Knowles, F** “The Computer in Lexicography” in Hausmann, F J et al. (eds.) (1990)
- Knowles, F & Roe, P** (1995-96) *Lexical Studies* Aston University
- Landau, S** (1984) *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Laufer, B & Melamed, L** “Monolingual, Bilingual and ‘Bilingualised’ Dictionaries: Which are More Effective, for What and for Whom?” in Martin et al. (1994)
- Magay, T & Zigány, J** (eds.) (1988) *BudaLEX ‘88 Proceedings* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó
- Martin, W** et al. (eds.) (1994) *EURALEX 1994 Proceedings* Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit
- Moon, R** “The Analysis of Meaning” in Sinclair (1987)
- Murray, K** (1977) *Caught in the Web of Words: James Murray and the Oxford English Dictionary* New Haven: Yale University Press
- Nattinger, J & DeCarrico, J** (1992) *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching* Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Osselton, N** (1995/1997) *Chosen Words: Past and Present Problems for Dictionary Makers* Exeter: University of Exeter Press
- Scholfield, P** (undated) *The Role of Bilingual Dictionaries in ESL / EFL: A Positive View*
- Sinclair, J** (ed.) (1987) *Looking Up* London: Collins
- Sinclair, J** (1991) *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation* Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Stark, M** (1990) *Dictionary Workbooks* Exeter: University of Exeter Press
- Whitcut, J** “Usage notes in Dictionaries: the needs of the learner and the native speaker” in Ilson (1985)
- Willis, D** (1990) *The Lexical Syllabus* London: Collins

## Appendix One: Bilingual Dictionary User's Survey

Please use a separate form for each piece of work: e.g. if you use your dictionary to find words while you are writing a composition, list together on one form only the words used for one composition.

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Dictionary used:

*(Tick box)*

- Stavropoulos & Hornby  Greek - English  
 Other *(State which)* \_\_\_\_\_  English - Greek

### Type of task:

- Composition  Reading text  
 Translation  Other \_\_\_\_\_

### Reference:

*(e.g. book & page number)*

Word looked up	Word found	<i>(please leave this column blank)</i>

## Appendix Two: Complete List of the 718 Look-ups

WORDSOUGHT	WORDFOUND	RESULT	NAME	CLASS	DICT
ABANDON	ΕΓΚΑΤΑΛΕΙΠΩ	T	BP	D	SH
ABANDONED	ΔΙΕΦΘΑΡΜΕΝΟΣ	F	BT	D	SH
ABSTRACT	ΑΦΗΡΗΜΕΝΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
ACCELERATE	ΕΠΙΤΥΓΧΑΝΩ	F	EP	F	DIV
ACCEPTANCE	ΑΠΟΔΟΧΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
ACCIDENT	ΑΤΥΧΗΜΑ	T	CT	C	AT
ACCRUE	ΠΡΟΚΥΠΤΩ	T	LV	P	SH
ACCURACY	ΑΚΡΙΒΕΙΑ	T	LV	P	SH
ACCUSE	ΚΑΤΕΓΟΡΩ	T	VG	F	SH
ACHIEVE	ΚΑΤΟΡΘΩΝΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
ACUTE	ΕΝΤΟΝΟΣ	T	OT	P	SH
ADDICT	ΚΥΡΙΕΥΜΕΝΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
ADHERENCE	ΠΡΟΣΚΟΛΗΣΗ	T	LV	P	SH
ADJUST	ΠΡΟΣΑΡΜΟΖΩ	T	OT	P	SH
ADJUST	ΠΡΟΣΑΡΜΟΖΩ	T	LV	P	SH
ADMIRE	ΘΑΥΜΑΖΩ	T	MT	C	SH
ADMIRE	ΘΑΥΜΑΖΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
ADMISSION	ΕΙΣΟΔΟΣ	F	VG	F	SH
ADOPTIVE	ΘΕΤΟΣ	T	OT	P	SH
AFFECTED	ΔΙΑΤΕΘΕΙΜΕΝΟΣ	F	DP	F	MIC
AFFECTIONATE	ΣΤΟΡΓΙΚΟΣ	T	OT	P	SH
AFFLUENT	ΑΦΘΟΝΟΣ, ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟΣ	T	PP	F	SH
AFFLUENT	ΑΦΘΟΝΟΣ, ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟΣ	T	AS	F	SH
AFFLUENT	ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟΣ, ΑΦΘΟΝΟΣ	T	DP	F	MIC
AID	ΒΟΗΘΗΜΑ	T	LV	P	SH
ALLURE	ΣΑΓΙΝΕΥΩ	T	CB	P	SH
ALONGSIDE	ΠΛΕΥΡΙΣΜΕΝΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
ANVIL	ΑΜΟΝΙ	T	CB	P	SH
ANXIOUS	ΑΝΗΣΥΧΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
APPAL	ΤΡΟΜΑΖΩ	T	OT	P	SH
APPLY	ΥΠΟΒΑΛΛΩ ΑΙΤΗΣΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
AREA	ΠΕΡΙΟΧΗ	T	CT	C	AT
ARGUMENT	ΕΠΙΧΕΙΡΗΜΑ	T	BT	D	SH
ARGUMENT	ΦΙΛΕΡΗΣ	T	JH	C	BP
ARROGANT	ΑΛΛΑΖΩΝ	T	AK	F	SH
ARSON	ΕΜΠΡΗΣΜΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
ARTICULATE	ΕΥΚΡΙΝΗΣ	T	OT	P	SH
ASHAMED	ΝΤΡΟΠΙΑΣΜΕΝΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
ASLEEP	ΚΟΙΜΙΣΜΕΝΟΣ	T	BT	D	SH
ASSASSINATION	ΔΟΛΟΦΟΝΙΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
ASSAULT	ΚΑΚΟΠΟΙΗΣΗ	T	LV	P	SH
ASSUME	ΘΕΩΡΩ	T	OT	P	SH
ASSUME	ΥΠΟΘΕΤΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
ASUNDER	ΧΩΡΙΣΤΑ	T	CB	P	SH
ATTEMPT	ΑΠΟΠΕΙΡΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
ATTEND	ΠΑΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
AUTHOR	ΣΥΓΓΡΑΦΕΑΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
AUTHORITY	ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ	T	AS	F	SH
AWARD	ΒΡΑΒΕΙΟ	T	JH	C	GEM
BACKPACKER		F	JH	C	GEM
BAD-TEMPERED	ΚΑΚΟΔΙΑΘΕΤΟΣ	T	OT	P	SH
BAIL	ΧΡΗΜΑΤΙΚΗ ΕΓΓΥΗΣ	T	CB	P	SH

BAN	ΑΠΟΓΟΡΕΥΩ	T	PP	F	SH
BAZAAR	ΠΑΖΑΡΙ	T	LV	P	SH
BAZAAR	ΠΑΖΑΡΙ	T	CB	P	SH
BE HOOKED	ΕΧΩ ΠΑΘΟΣ	T	AS	F	SH
BE HOOKED	ΕΧΩ ΠΑΘΟΣ, ΜΑΝΙΑ	T	PP	F	SH
BE WARY OF	ΦΥΛΛΑΓΟΜΑΙ ΑΠΟ	T	OT	P	SH
BEAM	ΛΑΜΨΗ ΙΚΑΝΟΠΟΙΗΣ	T	VG	F	SH
BEAM		F	DP	F	MIC
BECOME	ΓΙΝΟΜΑΙ	T	MG	D	SH
BELLYACHE	ΚΟΙΛΟΠΟΝΟΣ	T	ML	P	DIV
BEND	ΚΑΜΠΤΩ	T	PP	F	SH
BEND	ΚΑΜΠΤΩ	T	AS	F	SH
BEND	ΚΟΜΠΟΣ	F	DP	F	MIC
BETRAY	ΠΡΟΔΙΔΩ	T	VG	F	SH
BIT	ΤΡΥΠΑΝΙ, ΚΟΜΜΑΤΙ	T	MT	C	SH
BLAB	ΦΛΥΑΡΩ	T	VG	F	SH
BLADE	ΛΕΠΙΔΑ	T	CB	P	SH
BLAME	ΚΑΤΗΓΟΡΩ	T	CT	C	AT
BLAME	ΚΑΤΗΓΟΡΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
BLEND	ΑΝΑΜΕΙΓΝΥΩ	T	LV	P	SH
BLOCKADE	ΑΠΟΚΛΕΙΣΜΟΣ	T	AS	F	PEN
BLOW	ΦΥΣΑΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
BOAST	ΚΑΥΚΩΜΑΙ	T	LV	P	SH
BOIL	ΒΡΑΖΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
BOROUGH	ΔΗΜΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
BRAVERY	ΘΑΡΡΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
BREAK THE SPELL	ΛΥΝΩ ΤΑ ΜΑΓΙΑ	T	CB	P	SH
BREATH TAKING	ΑΝΑΠΝΕΩ	F	JH	C	GEM
BREEZE	ΑΝΕΜΟΣ	F	AS	F	PEN
BRIGADE	ΤΑΞΙΑΡΧΙΑ	F	JH	C	GEM
BRIGHT	ΛΑΜΠΡΟΣ	T	JH	C	BP
BRUISE	ΜΕΛΑΝΙΑ	T	CB	P	SH
BULK	ΟΓΚΟΣ	T	AK	F	SH
BUNGALOW	ΚΑΜΠΑΝΑ	T	AS	F	PEN
BUTT IN	ΑΝΑΚΑΤΕΥΟΜΑΙ	T	PP	F	SH
CANCELLED	ΜΑΤΑΙΩΘΗΚΕ	T	VG	F	SH
CARBON	ΑΝΘΡΑΚΑΣ	T	EP	F	DIV
CARER		F	OT	P	SH
CASHIER	ΤΑΜΙΑΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
CATCH	ΠΙΑΝΩ	F	MG	D	SH
CEILING	ΤΑΒΑΝΙ	T	BT	D	SH
CELEBRATE	ΓΙΟΡΤΑΖΩ	T	MG	D	SH
CELEBRATE	ΕΟΡΤΑΖΩ	T	BT	D	SH
CENSOR	ΛΟΓΟΚΡΙΤΗΣ	T	CB	P	SH
CEREMONY	ΤΕΛΕΤΗ	T	BT	D	SH
CEREMONY	ΤΕΛΕΤΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
CHAIN	ΑΛΥΣΙΔΑ	T	AK	F	SH
CHAIN	ΔΕΣΜΑ	T	CB	P	SH
CHALLENGE	ΠΡΟΚΛΗΣΗ	T	OT	P	SH
CHALLENGE	ΠΡΟΚΛΗΣΗ	T	AS	F	SH
CHALLENGE	ΠΡΟΚΛΗΣΗ	T	DP	F	MIC
CHALLENGE	ΠΡΟΣΚΛΗΣΗ Σ'ΑΓΩΝΑ	T	PP	F	SH
CHARGE	ΚΑΤΕΓΟΡΩ	T	VG	F	SH
CHARGE	ΤΙΜΗΜΑ, ΤΙΜΗ	F	JH	C	GEM
CHARITY	ΦΙΛΑΝΘΡΩΠΙΚΟ ΙΔΡ	T	JH	C	GEM
CHASE	ΚΥΝΗΓΩ	T	JH	C	GEM

CHIEF	ΑΡΧΗΓΟΣ	F	VG	F	SH
CHOPPY	ΚΥΜΑΤΩΔΗΣ	T	PP	F	SH
CHUCKLE	ΚΑΓΧΑΖΩ	T	AS	F	SH
CHURCH	ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ	T	MT	C	SH
CIRCLE	ΚΥΚΛΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
CLARITY	ΚΑΘΑΡΟΤΗΤΑ	T	LV	P	SH
CLASSIFIED	ΜΙΚΡΕΣ ΑΓΓΕΛΙΕΣ	T	OT	P	SH
CLASSIFY	ΤΑΞΙΝΟΜΩ	T	JK	F	SH
CLENCH	ΣΦΙΓΓΩ	T	VG	F	SH
CLIFF	ΓΚΡΕΜΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
CLUTCH	ΑΡΠΑΖΩ	T	CB	P	SH
COLLABORATION	ΣΥΝΕΡΓΑΣΙΑ	T	LV	P	SH
COMBINE	ΣΥΝΔΥΑΖΩ	T	JH	C	BP
COMEDIAN	ΚΩΜΙΚΟΣ	T	MG	D	SH
COMMIT	ΔΙΑΠΡΑΤΤΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
COMMODITY	ΕΙΔΟΣ	T	PP	F	SH
COMMODITY	ΕΙΔΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
COMMUTER	ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟ ΠΟΥ ΠΗΓ.	T	VG	F	SH
COMPARE	ΣΥΓΚΡΙΝΩ	T	AK	F	SH
COMPENSATE	ΑΠΟΖΗΜΙΩΝΩ	T	LV	P	SH
COMPETE	ΣΥΝΑΓΩΝΙΖΟΜΑΙ	T	JH	C	GEM
COMPLEX	ΠΟΛΥΠΛΟΚΟ	T	JH	C	GEM
COMPLEXION	ΧΡΩΜΑ	T	KF	F	TN
COMPOSE	ΣΥΝΤΑΣΣΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
COMPULSIVE	ΤΥΡΡΑΝΙΚΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
COMPULSORY	ΥΠΟΧΡΕΩΤΙΚΟΣ	T	JK	F	SH
CONDITION	ΚΑΤΑΣΤΑΣΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
CONDUCT	ΔΙΑΓΩΓΗ	T	LV	P	SH
CONFERENCE	ΔΙΑΣΚΕΨΗ	T	OT	P	SH
CONFOUND	ΑΝΑΣΤΑΤΩΝΩ	T	LV	P	SH
CONGESTION	ΣΥΜΦΟΡΗΣΗ	T	CB	P	SH
CONSCIOUS	ΣΥΝΕΙΔΗΤΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
CONSIST	ΑΠΟΤΕΛΟΥΜΑΙ	T	AS	F	SH
CONSOLIDATION	ΣΤΑΘΕΡΟΠΟΙΗΣΗ	T	PP	F	SH
CONSOLIDATION	ΣΤΑΘΕΡΟΠΟΙΗΣΗ	T	VG	F	SH
CONSTANT	ΣΤΑΘΕΡΟΣ	T	AS	F	PEN
CONSUME	ΚΑΤΑΝΑΛΩΝΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
CONTRACT	ΣΥΜΦΩΝΩ	F	JH	C	GEM
CONVEY	ΑΠΟΔΙΔΩ	T	LV	P	SH
COOLANT	ΨΥΚΤΙΚΟΣ	T	EP	F	DIV
COST	ΚΟΣΤΟΣ	T	MG	D	SH
COUNCIL	ΣΥΜΒΟΥΛΙΟ	T	JH	C	GEM
COUP	ΠΡΑΞΙΚΟΠΗΜΑ	T	VG	F	SH
CRACK		F	CB	P	SH
CRADLE	ΚΟΥΝΙΑ	F	CB	P	SH
CRIME	ΕΓΚΛΗΜΑ	T	CT	C	AT
CROOK	ΑΠΑΤΕΩΝΑΣ	T	JH	C	BP
CROP	ΣΟΔΕΙΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
CROP	ΠΕΡΙΚΟΠΤΩ	F	JH	C	BP
CROWDED	ΓΕΜΑΤΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
CUDDLE	ΑΓΚΑΛΙΑΖΩ ΤΡΥΦΕΡ	T	VG	F	SH
CUISINE	ΜΑΓΕΙΡΕΙΟ	T	JH	C	GEM
CURB	ΣΥΓΚΡΑΤΩ	T	VG	F	SH
CURTAINS	ΚΟΥΡΤΙΝΑ	T	MT	C	SH
CUSHIONS	ΜΑΞΙΛΑΡΙΑ	T	AK	F	SH
CUSTOMS	ΕΘΥΜΑ	T	MG	D	SH

CUT DOWN	ΚΟΒΩ	T	MT	C	SH
DAGGER	ΣΤΙΛΛΕΤΟ	T	LV	P	SH
DEAF	ΚΟΥΦΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
DEBRIS	ΣΥΝΤΡΙΜΜΑΤΑ	T	LV	P	SH
DELAY	ΑΝΑΒΑΛΛΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
DELIGHTED	ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΜΕΝΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
DELIVERY	ΠΑΡΑΔΟΣΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
DEPICT	ΑΠΕΙΚΟΝΙΖΩ	T	LV	P	SH
DESERT	ΕΡΗΜΙΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
DESERT	ΕΓΚΑΤΑΛΕΙΠΩ	F	JH	C	GEM
DESPERATELY	ΑΠΕΛΠΙΣΜΕΝΑ	T	OT	P	SH
DETERIORATE	ΧΕΙΡΟΤΕΡΕΥΩ	T	CB	P	SH
DETERMINED	ΚΑΘΟΡΙΣΜΕΝΟΣ	F	PP	F	SH
DEVELOP	ΑΝΑΠΤΥΣΣΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
DEVELOPMENT	ΑΝΑΠΤΥΞΗ	T	OT	P	SH
DIG	ΣΚΑΒΩ	T	JH	C	BP
DIGNITARY	ΑΞΙΩΜΑΤΟΥΧΟΣ	T	BP	D	SH
DISCLOSE	ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΠΤΩ	T	PP	F	SH
DISCLOSE	ΦΑΝΕΡΩΝΩ	T	DP	F	MIC
DISMISS	ΑΠΟΡΡΙΠΤΩ	T	OT	P	SH
DISPEL	ΔΙΩΧΝΩ	T	LV	P	SH
DISPLAY	ΕΚΘΕΣΗ, ΕΠΙΔΕΙΞΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
DISSOLUBLE	ΔΙΑΛΥΤΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
DISTINCTIVE	ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΙΣΤΙΚΟ	T	JH	C	GEM
DIVIDE	ΜΟΙΡΑΖΩ	T	PS	D	MIC
DODGE	ΑΠΟΦΕΥΓΩ	T	AS	F	SH
DODGE	ΞΕΓΕΛΩ	T	DP	F	MIC
DODGE	ΠΑΡΑΜΕΡΙΖΩ	T	PP	F	SH
DRASTICALLY	ΔΡΑΣΤΙΚΑ	T	PP	F	SH
DRAUGHT	ΕΛΞΗ	F	AS	F	PEN
DREADLOCKS		F	JH	C	GEM
DROUGHT	ΞΗΡΑΣΙΑ	T	EP	F	DIV
DUCK	ΣΚΥΒΩ ΓΡΗΓ ΑΠΟΦ	T	PP	F	SH
DUCKING	ΚΥΝΗΓΙ	F	DP	F	MIC
EACH	ΕΚΑΣΤΟΣ	T	CT	C	AT
EARTHQUAKE	ΣΕΙΣΜΟΣ	T	CT	C	AT
EDGE	ΚΟΡΥΦΗ	F	JH	C	GEM
EFFECT	ΕΠΙΔΡΑΣΗ	T	VG	F	SH
EFFECTIVE	ΑΠΟΤΕΛΕΣΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
EFFICIENT	ΙΚΑΝΟΣ, ΔΡΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ	F	BT	D	SH
ELECT	ΕΚΛΕΓΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
ELSE	ΑΛΛΟΣ	T	CT	C	AT
EMOTIONAL	ΣΥΝΑΙΣΘΗΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ	T	OT	P	SH
EMPLOY	ΧΡΗΣΙΜΟΠΟΙΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
EMPLOYER	ΑΠΑΣΧΟΛΗΜΕΝΟΣ	F	MT	C	SH
ENGAGED	ΑΡΡΑΒΩΝΙΑΣΜΕΝΟΣ	T	BT	D	SH
ENTER	ΜΠΑΙΝΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
ENTERTAINMENT	ΠΕΡΙΠΟΙΗΣΗ	T	BT	D	SH
ENTRANCE	ΕΙΣΟΔΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
ENTRANCED	ΦΕΡΝΩ ΣΕ ΕΚΣΤΑΣΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
ENVIRONMENT	ΠΕΡΙΒΑΛΛΟΝ	T	AK	F	SH
EPIC	ΕΠΟΣ	T	BP	D	SH
EROSION	ΔΙΑΒΡΩΣΗ	T	LV	P	SH
ESCAPE	ΔΡΑΠΑΤΕΥΩ	T	JH	C	BP
EVADE	ΑΠΟΦΕΥΓΩ	T	PP	F	SH
EVADE	ΑΠΟΦΕΥΓΩ	T	DP	F	MIC

EVADING	ΑΠΟΦΥΓΗ	T	DP	F	MIC
EVE	ΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΗ	T	BP	D	SH
EVIDENCE	ΕΝΔΕΙΞΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
EVOKE	ΠΡΟΚΑΛΩ	T	CB	P	SH
EXACERBATE	ΕΠΙΔΕΙΝΩΝΩ	T	LV	P	SH
EXAMINE	ΕΞΕΤΑΖΩ	T	CT	C	AT
EXECUTIVE	ΔΙΕΥΘΥΝΤΗΣ	T	OT	P	SH
EXECUTIVE	ΕΚΤΕΛΕΣΤΙΚΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
EXHALE	ΕΚΠΝΕΩ	T	VG	F	SH
EXHAUSTED	ΕΞΑΝΤΛΩ	T	MG	D	SH
EXPAND	ΕΥΡΥΝΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
EXPANSION	ΕΠΕΚΤΑΣΗ	T	LV	P	SH
EXPLORE	ΕΞΕΡΕΥΝΩ	T	OT	P	SH
EXTINCT	ΣΒΗΣΜΕΝΟΣ	T	CT	C	AT
EXTREMIST	ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ ΑΚΡΩΝ	T	LV	P	SH
FAIL	ΑΠΟΤΥΧΑΙΝΩ	T	JH	C	BP
FAIRLY	ΑΡΚΕΤΑ	T	OT	P	SH
FAKE	ΨΕΥΤΙΚΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
FAMINE	ΠΕΙΝΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
FATAL	ΘΑΝΑΤΟΦΟΡΟΣ	T	KF	F	TN
FEEL	ΑΙΣΘΑΝΟΜΑΙ	T	CT	C	AT
FELLOW	ΣΥΝΤΡΟΦΟΣ	T	KF	F	TN
FELLS	ΑΓΟΝΟΣ ΛΟΦΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
FENCE	ΦΡΑΧΤΗΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
FEVER	ΠΥΡΕΤΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
FIANCE	ΑΡΡΑΒΩΝΙΑΣΤΙΚΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
FINE	ΕΠΙΒΑΛΛΩ ΠΡΟΣΤΙΜΟ	T	JH	C	BP
FIREPLACE	ΤΟΠΟΘΕΤΩ	F	MG	D	SH
FIT	ΤΑΙΡΙΑΖΩ	T	OT	P	SH
FIT		F	JH	C	GEM
FLANK	ΠΛΕΥΡΑ	T	CB	P	SH
FLATTENED	ΕΠΙΠΕΔΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
FLEE	ΤΡΕΠΟΜΑΙ ΣΕ ΦΥΓΗ	T	LV	P	SH
FLUENTLY	ΕΥΧΕΡΩΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
FLUID	ΡΕΥΣΤΟΣ	T	AS	F	PEN
FOCUS ON	ΣΥΓΚΕΝΤΡ ΠΡΟΣΟΧΗ	T	OT	P	SH
FOR	ΓΙΑ	T	BT	D	SH
FORECAST	ΠΡΟΓΝΩΣΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
FORGERY		F	LV	P	SH
FOUNDATION	ΙΔΡΥΣΗ	T	LV	P	SH
FRAGRANT	ΕΥΩΔΙΑΣΤΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
FRAUD	ΑΠΑΘΗ	T	LV	P	SH
FRAUD	ΑΠΑΘΗ	T	LV	P	SH
FREAK	ΠΕΡΙΕΡΓΟ ΦΑΙΝΟΜ	T	JH	C	GEM
FRENZY	ΤΡΕΛΛΑ, ΠΑΡΑΛΗΡ	T	CB	P	SH
FRIES	ΤΗΓΑΝΗΤΟΣ	T	JH	C	BP
FRY	ΤΗΓΑΝΙΖΩ	T	JH	C	BP
FUR	ΓΟΥΝΑ	T	JH	C	BP
GAMBLE	ΠΑΙΖΩ ΧΑΡΤΙΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
GAMBLING	ΧΑΡΤΟΠΑΙΞΙΑ	T	AS	F	SH
GAME AWAY	ΧΑΛΩ ΤΗ ΔΟΥΛΕΙΑ	T	VG	F	SH
GANG UP	ΣΥΝΑΣΠΙΖΟΜΑΙ	T	VG	F	SH
GENUINE	ΓΝΗΣΙΟΣ	T	PP	F	SH
GENUINE	ΓΝΗΣΙΟΣ	T	AS	F	SH
GENUINELY		F	OT	P	SH
GET ABOUT	ΚΥΚΛΟΦΟΡΩ	T	VG	F	SH

GET ACROSS	ΓΙΝΟΜΑΙ ΚΑΤΑΝΟΗΤ	F	VG	F	SH
GET AHEAD	ΞΕΠΕΡΝΩ	F	VG	F	SH
GET ALONG	ΤΑ ΠΑΩ ΚΑΛΑ	T	VG	F	SH
GET ON	ΤΑ ΠΑΩ ΚΑΛΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
GET OVER	ΞΕΧΝΩ	F	VG	F	SH
GET ROUND TO	ΚΑΤΑΦΕΡΩ	F	VG	F	SH
GET THROUGH	ΤΕΛΕΙΩΝΩ	F	VG	F	SH
GIGGLE	ΝΕΥΡΙΚΟ ΓΕΛΙΟ	T	VG	F	SH
GIGGLE	ΝΕΥΡΙΚΟ ΓΕΛΙΟ	T	DP	F	MIC
GIGGLE	ΧΑΧΑΝΙΖΩ	T	AS	F	SH
GLAD	ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΟΣ	F	JH	C	GEM
GLOVES	ΓΑΝΤΙΑ	T	PS	D	MIC
GRAPES	ΣΤΑΦΥΛΙ	T	PS	D	MIC
GRASP	ΠΙΑΝΩ, ΣΦΙΓΓΩ	T	VG	F	SH
GREAT	ΜΕΓΑΛΟΣ	T	OT	P	SH
GRIN	ΜΟΡΦΑΣΜΟΣ	T	VG	F	SH
GRIN	ΠΛΑΤΥ ΣΑΡΚΑΣ ΧΑΜ	T	AS	F	SH
GRIN	ΣΑΡΚΑΣΤΙΚΟ ΓΕΛΙΟ	T	DP	F	MIC
GRIND	ΤΡΙΒΩ	T	VG	F	SH
GRIP	ΣΦΙΓΓΩ, ΠΙΑΝΩ	T	VG	F	SH
GROOM	ΓΑΜΠΡΟΣ	T	MG	D	SH
GROOM	ΙΠΠΟΚΟΜΟΣ	F	BT	C	SH
GROW	ΚΑΛΛΙΕΡΓΩ	T	PS	D	MIC
GROW	ΦΥΤΡΩΝΩ	F	MG	D	SH
GRUDGE	ΤΣΙΓΚΟΥΝΕΥΟΜΑΙ	T	LV	P	SH
GRUDGINGLY	ΑΠΡΟΘΥΜΑ	T	LV	P	SH
GUFFAW	ΘΟΥΡΥΒΩΔΕΣ ΓΕΛΙΟ	T	DP	F	MIC
GUFFAW	ΧΑΧΑΝΟ	T	VG	F	SH
GUFFAW	ΧΑΧΑΝΟ	T	AS	F	SH
GUNTOTING		F	CB	P	SH
GUSTY	ΘΥΕΛΛΩΔΗΣ	T	PP	F	SH
HABITAT		F	CT	C	AT
HAMLET	ΧΩΡΙΟΥΔΑΚΙ	T	LV	P	SH
HANDCUFFS	ΧΕΙΡΟΠΕΔΕΣ	T	CB	P	SH
HARD CASH	ΜΕΤΡΗΤΑ	T	OT	P	SH
HARPOON	ΚΑΜΑΚΙ	T	AS	F	PEN
HARPOON	ΚΑΜΑΚΙ	T	JH	C	BP
HARPOON	ΚΑΜΑΚΙ	T	CT	C	AT
HARSH	ΣΚΛΗΡΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
HAUL OFF	ΤΡΑΒΩ	F	CB	P	SH
HAVE HER WAY		F	OT	P	SH
HAZARD	ΚΙΝΔΥΝΟΣ	F	AS	F	PEN
HEATWAVE	ΠΕΡΙΟΔΟΣ ΚΑΥΣΩΝΑ	T	EP	F	DIV
HEIR	ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
HERITAGE	ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΙΑ	T	VG	F	SH
HESITATION	ΔΙΣΤΑΓΜΟΣ	T	AK	F	SH
HIDE	ΚΡΥΒΩ	T	VG	F	SH
HIDING	ΚΡΥΨΩΝΑ	T	PS	D	MIC
HIKER	ΠΕΖΟΠΟΡΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
HILL	ΛΟΦΟΣ	T	CT	C	AT
HOARSE	ΒΡΑΧΝΙΑΖΩ	T	LV	P	SH
HOAX	ΑΣΤΕΙΟ	T	JH	C	GEM
HOLLOW	ΚΟΙΛΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
HONOUR	ΥΠΟΔΗΨΗ	T	KF	F	TN
HORIZON	ΟΡΙΖΟΝΤΑΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
HOST	ΞΕΝΟΔΟΧΟΣ	F	PS	D	MIC



HOSTILE	ΕΧΘΡΙΚΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
HUGE	ΠΕΛΩΡΙΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
HURRICANE	ΤΥΦΩΝΑΣ	F	AS	F	PEN
IDEALLY	ΙΔΑΝΙΚΑ	T	OT	P	SH
IDENTIFY	ΑΝΑΓΝΩΡΙΖΩ	T	PP	F	SH
IGNORE	ΑΓΝΟΩ	T	AK	F	SH
ILLEGALLY	ΠΑΡΑΝΟΜΑ	T	JH	C	BP
ILLITERACY	ΑΝΑΛΦΑΒΗΤΙΣΜΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
ILLUSION	ΠΑΡΑΙΣΘΗΣΗ	F	AS	F	PEN
ILLUSIONS	ΠΛΑΝΗ	T	VG	F	SH
IMPACT	ΣΥΓΚΡΟΥΣΗ	T	LV	P	SH
IMPERSONATOR	ΥΠΟΔΥΟΜΕΝΟ	T	JH	C	GEM
IMPRESS	ΕΝΤΥΠΩΣΙΑΖΟΜΑΙ	T	PP	F	SH
IMPRESSED	ΕΝΣΦΡΑΓΙΣΤΟΣ	F	DP	F	MIC
IMPULSE	ΩΘΗΣΗ	T	LV	P	SH
INADVERTENT	ΑΠΡΟΣΕΚΤΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
INAUSPICIOUS	ΔΥΣΟΙΩΝΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
INCOHERENT	ΑΣΥΝΑΡΤΗΤΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
INDELIBLE	ΑΝΕΞΙΤΗΛΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
INEDIBLE	ΜΗ ΦΑΓΩΣΙΜΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
INEPT	ΠΑΡΑΛΟΓΟΣ	F	CB	P	SH
INFANTICIDE	ΒΡΕΦΟΚΤΟΝΙΑ	T	CB	P	SH
INFLUENCE	ΕΠΙΔΡΑΣΗ	T	AS	F	SH
INFLUENCE	ΕΠΙΡΡΕΑΖΟΜΑΙ	T	PP	F	SH
INFLUENCED	ΕΠΙΔΡΑΣΗ	T	DP	F	MIC
INHIBITION	ΑΝΑΣΤΟΛΗ	T	CB	P	SH
INNATE	ΕΜΦΥΤΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
INSULATE	ΑΠΟΜΟΝΩΝΩ	T	CB	P	SH
INTELLECTUAL	ΔΑΙΝΟΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
INTERMISSION	ΑΝΑΠΑΥΛΑ	F	VG	F	SH
INTERRELATED	ΣΥΓΚΕΝΙΚΟΣ	T	OT	P	SH
INTERRUPTION		F	BP	D	SH
INTERSPERSE	ΣΚΟΡΠΙΖΩ	T	PP	F	SH
INTERSPERSE	ΣΚΟΡΠΙΖΩ ΕΔΩ ΚΑΙ	T	VG	F	SH
INTERVAL	ΔΙΑΣΤΗΜΑ, ΔΙΑΛΛΕΙ	T	VG	F	SH
INTERVENE	ΜΕΣΟΛΑΒΩ	T	CB	P	SH
INTIMACY	ΣΤΕΝΗ ΣΧΕΣΗ	T	LV	P	SH
INTRUDER	ΠΑΡΕΙΣΑΚΤΟΣ	T	PP	F	SH
INTRUDER	ΠΑΡΕΙΣΑΚΤΟΣ	T	VG	F	SH
INVADE	ΕΙΣΒΑΛΛΩ	T	CB	P	SH
INVESTIGATE	ΕΡΕΥΝΩ	T	VG	F	SH
ISOLATE	ΑΠΟΜΟΝΩΝΩ	T	PP	F	SH
ISOLATE	ΑΠΟΜΟΝΩΝΩ	T	VG	F	SH
ISSUE	ΘΕΜΑ	T	OT	P	SH
JAM	ΣΥΝΘΛΙΒΩ	T	MT	C	SH
JEOPARDY	ΚΙΝΔΥΝΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
JOIN UP	ΠΑΩ ΦΑΝΤΑΡΟΣ	T	VG	F	SH
JOKE	ΑΣΤΕΙΟ	T	CT	C	AT
JOYRIDING	ΒΟΛΤΑ ΚΛΕΜ. ΑΜΑΞΙ	T	LV	P	SH
JUSTIFY	ΔΙΚΑΙΟΛΟΓΩ	T	AS	F	SH
KEEN	ΟΞΥ, ΕΝΘΟΥΣΙΩΔΗΣ	T	VG	F	SH
KEEP	ΚΡΑΤΑΩ	T	MG	D	SH
LASH	ΔΕΝΩ ΣΦΙΧΤΑ	T	CB	P	SH
LEAD	ΚΑΘΟΔΗΓΗΣΗ	T	DP	F	MIC
LEAD	ΟΔΗΓΩ	F	PP	F	SH
LEAP	ΠΗΔΩ	T	CB	P	SH

LEGACY	ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΙΑ	T	LV	P	SH
LIAR	ΨΕΥΤΗΣ	T	JH	C	BP
LIBEL	ΔΥΣΦΗΜΙΣΗ	T	LV	P	SH
LIFE-SAVER	ΝΑΥΑΓΟΣΩΣΤΗΣ	T	VG	F	SH
LIKELY	ΠΙΘΑΝΟΣ	T	PS	D	MIC
LINEN	ΛΙΝΟ	T	JH	C	BP
LINK UP	ΕΝΩΣΗ	F	VG	F	SH
LOOM	ΚΥΡΙΑΡΧΩ	T	LV	P	SH
LOYALTY	ΠΙΣΤΗ	T	AS	F	SH
LOYALTY	ΠΙΣΤΗ	T	PD	F	MIC
LUDICROUS	ΑΣΤΕΙΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
LURK	ΚΡΥΒΟΜΑΙ	T	CB	P	SH
LURK	ΚΡΥΒΟΜΑΙ	T	LV	P	SH
MAINTAIN	ΔΙΑΤΗΡΩ	T	LC	P	SH
MAINTAIN	ΔΙΑΤΗΡΩ	F	EP	F	DIV
MAKE GREAT STRI	ΣΕΙΜΕΙΩΝΩ ΠΡΟΟΔΟ	T	OT	P	SH
MANUSCRIPTS	ΧΕΙΡΟΓΡΑΦΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
MATS	ΨΑΘΑ	T	BP	D	SH
MATTER	ΘΕΜΑ	T	CT	C	AT
MEAL	ΓΕΥΜΑ	T	PS	D	MIC
MEANESS	ΚΑΚΙΑ	T	LV	P	SH
MEET UP	ΣΥΝΑΝΤΙΕΜΑΙ ΠΑΡΕΑ	T	VG	F	SH
MERCHANDISE	ΕΜΠΟΡΕΥΜΑΤΑ	T	PP	F	SH
MERCHANDISE	ΕΜΠΟΡΕΥΜΑΤΑ	T	AS	F	SH
MIRROR	ΚΑΘΡΕΦΤΗΣ	T	MT	C	SH
MISQUOTE	ΠΑΡΑΠΟΙΩ	T	LV	P	SH
MIST	ΟΜΙΧΛΗ	T	JH	#####	GEM
MODEST	ΜΕΤΡΙΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
MONITOR	ΠΑΡΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΩ	T	AS	F	SH
MOODINESS	ΙΔΙΟΤΡΟΠΙΑ	T	OT	P	SH
MOSQUE	ΤΖΑΜΙ	T	BP	D	SH
MOTIVATION	ΚΙΝΗΤΡΟ	T	OT	P	SH
MOUNT	ΜΟΝΤΑΡΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
MUD	ΛΑΣΠΗ	T	CB	P	SH
MULTIPLY	ΠΟΛΛΑΠΛΑΣΙΑΖΩ	T	CB	P	SH
MURKY	ΣΚΟΤΕΙΝΟΣ	T	VG	F	SH
MUTTER	ΜΟΥΡΜΟΥΡΙΖΩ	T	LV	P	SH
NAP	ΥΠΝΑΚΟΣ	T	VG	F	SH
NEON-LIT	ΦΤΙΑΓΜΕΝΟ ΑΠΟ ΦΩΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
NEPHEW	ΑΝΗΨΙΟΣ	T	AK	F	SH
NETWORK	ΔΙΚΤΥΟ	T	CB	P	SH
NIECE	ΑΝΗΨΙΑ	T	AK	F	SH
NIGHTMARE	ΕΦΙΑΛΤΗΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
NOD	ΝΕΥΜΑ	T	KF	F	TN
NURSE	ΝΤΑΝΤΑ, ΝΟΣΗΛΕΥΩ	T	MT	C	SH
OBEY	ΥΠΑΚΟΥΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
OBSCURE	ΣΚΟΤΕΙΝΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
OBSTRUCTION	ΠΑΡΕΜΠΟΔΗΣΗ	T	CB	P	SH
OCCURENCE	ΓΕΓΟΝΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
ODD MAN OUT	ΑΥΤΟΣ ΠΟΥ ΠΕΡΙΣΕΥ	T	OT	P	SH
OFFSPRING	ΑΠΟΓΟΝΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
OMIT	ΠΑΡΑΛΕΙΠΩ	T	JH	C	BP
OMIT	ΠΑΡΑΛΕΙΠΩ	T	MT	C	SH
OMNIPRESENCE		F	CB	P	SH
OPERATION	ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΑ	T	OT	P	SH
OPULENT	ΑΦΘΟΝ, ΠΛΟΥΣΙ ΒΛΑΣ	T	PP	F	SH

OPULENT	ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟ, ΑΦΘΟΝΟ	T	DP	F	MIC
OPULENT	ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟΣ, ΑΦΘΟΝΟΣ	T	AS	F	SH
OUTRAGE	ΒΙΑΣΜΟΣ, ΠΡΟΣΒΟΛΗ	T	LV	P	SH
OVEN	ΦΟΥΡΝΟΣ	T	AK	F	SH
OVER-WORK	ΠΑΡΑΔΟΥΛΕΥΩ	T	BT	D	SH
PACE	ΒΗΜΑΤΙΣΜΟΣ	T	OT	P	SH
PAGER		F	CB	P	SH
PAIN	ΠΟΝΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
PAIR UP	ΚΑΝΩ ΠΑΡΕΑ	T	VG	F	SH
PART	ΜΕΡΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
PASS	ΠΕΡΝΩ	T	CT	C	AT
PASSION	ΠΑΘΟΣ	T	AK	#####	SH
PATIENT	ΑΣΘΕΝΗΣ	T	CT	C	AT
PATTERN	ΣΧΕΔΙΟ	T	JH	C	GEM
PAY OFF	ΑΠΟΖΗΜΙΩΝΩ	F	PP	F	SH
PAY OFF	ΑΠΟΖΗΜΙ ΑΠΟΛΥΩ	F	VG	F	SH
PEAK	ΑΙΧΜΗ	T	CB	P	SH
PEAK	ZENITH	T	LV	P	SH
PEEL	ΞΕΦΛΟΥΔΙΖΩ	T	JH	C	BP
PENETRATE	ΤΡΥΠΩ	F	CB	P	SH
PERCEIVE	ΑΝΤΙΛΑΜΒΑΝΟΜΑΙ	T	LV	P	SH
PERVERSION	ΔΙΑΣΤΡΕΒΛΩΣΗ	T	CB	P	SH
PHENOMENON	ΦΑΙΝΟΜΕΝΟ	T	JH	C	GEM
PIER	ΑΠΟΒΑΘΡΑ	T	OT	P	SH
PILE	ΣΤΟΙΒΑ	T	LV	P	SH
PILLOW	ΜΑΞΙΛΑΡΙ	T	MG	D	SH
PLAIN	ΠΕΔΙΑΔΑ	T	LV	P	SH
PLATEAUX	ΟΡΟΠΕΔΙΑ	T	LV	P	SH
PLATFORM	ΕΞΕΔΡΑ	T	CT	C	AT
PLEDGE	ΔΕΣΜΕΥΣΗ	T	DP	F	MIC
PLEDGE	ΕΝΕΧΥΡΙΑΖΩ	F	PP	F	SH
PLEDGE	ΕΝΕΧΥΡΟ	F	AS	F	SH
PLENTY	ΑΦΘΟΝΙΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
PLUG	ΕΝΤΟΝΗ ΔΙΑΦΗΜΙΣΗ	T	LV	P	SH
POETRY	ΠΟΙΗΣΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
POLISH	ΣΤΙΛΒΩΝΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
POMPOUS	ΠΟΜΠΩΔΗΣ	T	LV	P	SH
POOR	ΑΞΙΟΛΥΠΗΤΟΣ	T	OT	P	SH
POP	ΜΠΑΙΝΩ ΞΑΦΝΙΚΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
POSSESS	ΚΑΤΕΧΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
POSTPONE	ΑΝΑΒΑΛΛΩ	T	JK	F	SH
POTENTIALLY	ΕΝΔΕΧΟΜΕΝΟ	T	VG	F	SH
PREDECESSOR	ΠΡΟΚΑΤΟΧΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
PREFER	ΠΡΟΤΙΜΩ	T	CT	C	AT
PREPARATION	ΠΡΟΠΑΡΑΣΚΕΥΗ	T	JH	C	BP
PREPARE	ΠΡΟΕΤΟΙΜΑΖΩ	T	AK	F	SH
PREVALENT	ΚΥΡΙΑΡΧΟΣ	F	VG	F	SH
PREVALENT	ΚΥΡΙΑΡΧΟΣ	F	PP	F	SH
PRIORITY	ΠΡΟΤΕΡΑΙΟΤΗΤΑ	T	LV	P	SH
PRIVACY	ΜΟΝΑΞΙΑ, ΗΣΥΧΙΑ	F	BT	D	SH
PROFLIGATE	ΣΠΑΤΑΛΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
PROJECT	ΤΕΧΝΙΚΟ ΕΡΓΟ	T	OT	P	SH
PROTECT	ΠΡΟΣΤΑΤΕΥΩ	T	CT	C	AT
PROVIDE	ΕΞΑΣΦΑΛΙΖΩ	T	OT	P	SH
PROVIDE	ΕΞΑΣΦΑΛΙΖΩ	T	OT	P	SH
PROWL	ΠΕΡΙΦΕΡΟΜ Ζ.ΛΕΙΑΣ	T	CB	P	SH

PUT UP	ΣΗΚΩΝΩ	T	MT	C	SH
QUEUE	ΟΥΡΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
RADIATION	ΑΚΤΙΝΟΒΟΛΙΑ	T	AK	F	SH
RADIATOR	ΚΑΛΟΡΙΦΕΡ	T	CB	P	SH
RAISE	ΣΗΚΩΝΩ	F	JK	F	SH
RATE	ΤΙΜΗ	T	CB	P	SH
RATHER	ΜΑΛΛΟΝ	F	JH	C	GEM
RATTLE	ΚΟΥΔΟΥΝΙΖΩ	T	AK	F	SH
RAVAGE	ΛΕΗΛΑΤΩ	T	CB	P	SH
RECOGNIZE	ΑΝΑΓΝΩΡΙΖΩ	T	JH	C	BP
REDECORATE	ΣΤΟΛΙΖΩ ΠΑΛΙ	T	JH	C	BP
REDECORATE		F	MT	C	SH
REDECORATE		F	CT	C	AT
REDUNDANCY	ΠΛΕΟΝΑΣΜΟΣ	F	CB	P	SH
REFRESHMENT	ΑΝΑΨΥΧΤΙΚΟ	T	BP	D	SH
REFUSE	ΑΠΟΡΡΙΜΑΤΑ, ΑΡΝΟ	T	MT	C	SH
REGGAE		F	JH	C	GEM
REGION	ΧΩΡΑ	F	EP	F	DIV
REGISTRY OFFICE	ΛΗΞΙΑΡΧΙΟΝ	T	BT	D	SH
RELEASE	ΑΠΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΩΝΩ	T	CT	C	AT
RELEASE	ΑΦΗΝΩ	F	PP	F	SH
RELEASE	ΑΠΑΛΛΑΓΗ	F	DP	F	MIC
REMOTE	ΜΑΚΡΙΝΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
REPHRASE	ΔΙΑΤΥΠΩΝΩ	T	JH	C	BP
REPORT	ΑΝΑΦΕΡΩ	T	CT	C	AT
REQUEST	ΑΙΤΗΜΑ	T	AS	F	PEN
RESCUERS	ΣΩΤΗΡΕΣ	T	VG	F	SH
RESOLUTION	ΑΠΟΦΑΣΗ	F	OT	P	SH
RESPECT	ΣΕΒΑΣΜΟΣ	T	AK	F	SH
RETIRED	ΑΠΟΣΥΡΘΕΙΣ	T	JH	C	BP
REVEAL	ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΠΤΩ	T	VG	F	SH
REWRITE	ΞΑΝΑΓΡΑΦΩ	T	MT	C	SH
RICH	ΒΑΡΙΑ, ΛΙΠΑΡΑ	T	PP	F	SH
RIGID	ΣΤΕΡΕΟΣ	T	EP	F	DIV
RIVAL	ΑΝΤΙΠΑΛΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
ROAM	ΤΡΙΓΥΡΙΖΩ	T	CB	P	SH
ROUTE	ΔΡΟΜΟΛΟΓΙΟ	T	AS	F	PEN
ROUTE	ΠΟΡΕΙΑ	T	VG	F	SH
ROW	ΣΕΙΡΑ	T	CB	P	SH
RUMOUR	ΦΗΜΗ	T	AS	F	SH
RUSH	ΤΡΕΧΑΛΑ	T	VG	F	SH
SAFE	ΑΒΛΑΒΗΣ	T	CT	C	AT
SAGA	ΜΕΓΑ ΕΠΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
SCARCITY	ΕΛΛΕΙΨΗ	T	OT	P	SH
SCISSORS	ΨΑΛΙΔΙ	T	CB	P	SH
SCRAPE	ΜΟΛΙΣ ΠΟΥ ΠΕΡΝΩ	T	AS	F	SH
SCRAPE	ΤΡΙΖΩ	F	PP	F	SH
SCRAPE	ΓΡΑΤΣΟΥΝΙΣΜΑ	F	DP	F	MIC
SCREAM	ΣΚΟΥΖΩ	T	BT	D	SH
SCREEN	ΠΑΡΑΠΕΤΑΣΜΑ	T	AK	F	SH
SEE OFF	ΣΥΝΟΔΕΥΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
SELECT	ΔΙΑΛΕΓΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
SELF-EMPLOYED	ΑΝΕΞΑΡΤΗΤΟΣ	T	AK	F	SH
SENTENCE	ΑΠΟΦΑΣΗ, ΠΟΙΝΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
SET OFF	ΞΕΚΙΝΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
SETBACK	ΟΠΙΣΘΟΔΡΟΜΙΣΗ	T	CB	P	SH

SETTLEMENT	ΑΠΟΙΚΙΣΜΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
SEVERAL	ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΣ	F	JH	C	GEM
SEVERE		F	AS	F	PEN
SEWAGE	ΝΕΡΑ ΥΠΟΝΟΜΩΝ	T	CB	P	SH
SHADE	ΙΣΚΙΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
SHED	ΑΠΟΒΑΛΛΩ	T	VG	F	SH
SHINY	ΛΑΜΠΕΡΟ	T	JH	C	GEM
SHIRK	ΑΠΟΦΕΥΓΩ ΔΟΥΛΑ	T	PP	F	SH
SHIRK	ΑΠΟΦΕΥΓΩ ΣΧΟΛΕΙΟ	T	AS	F	SH
SHIRK	ΦΥΓΟΠΟΝΟΣ	T	DP	F	MIC
SHIRKING	ΥΠΕΚΦΥΓΗ	T	DP	F	MIC
SHORE	ΑΚΤΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
SHOW	ΔΕΙΧΝΩ	T	PP	F	SH
SHRINE	ΙΕΡΑΣ ΤΟΠΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
SHRINK	ΜΠΑΙΝΩ	T	VG	F	SH
SHUT	ΚΛΕΙΣΤΟΣ	T	JH	C	BP
SHUT UP	ΣΩΠΑΙΝΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
SIESTA	ΜΕΣΙΜΕΡΙΑΝΟΣ ΥΠΝ	T	VG	F	SH
SIGH	ΑΝΑΣΤΕΝΑΖΩ	T	VG	F	SH
SIGHT	ΑΝΤΙΚΡΥΖΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
SIGNIFICANTLY	ΣΗΜΑΝΤΙΚΑ	T	PP	F	SH
SIMILAR	ΟΜΟΙΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
SINCE	ΑΠΟ	T	BT	D	SH
SKILL	ΙΚΑΝΟΤΗΤΑ	T	AK	F	SH
SLAUGHTER	ΣΦΑΞΙΜΟ ΖΩΩΝ	T	CB	P	SH
SLIGHT	ΛΕΠΤΟ	T	BP	D	SH
SLIM	ΛΕΠΤΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
SLIP	ΓΛΥΣΤΡΙΜΑ	F	VG	F	SH
SLUMP	ΚΑΜΨΗ	T	AS	F	PEN
SLUMP	ΣΩΡΙΑΖΟΜΑΙ	T	CB	P	SH
SMIRK	ΧΑΖΟ ΓΕΛ ΑΥΤΑΡΕΣΚ	T	VG	F	SH
SMIRK	ΧΑΖΟ ΧΑΜ ΑΥΤΑΡΕΣΚ	T	AS	F	SH
SMIRK	ΧΑΜΟΓΕΛΩ ΨΕΥΤΙΚΑ	T	DP	F	MIC
SNEER	ΓΕΛΩ ΠΕΡΙΦΡΟΝΙΤΙΚΑ	T	VG	F	SH
SNEER	ΕΙΡΩΝΙΚΟ ΓΕΛΙΟ	T	DP	F	MIC
SNEER	ΧΛΕΝΑΖΩ	T	AS	F	SH
SNIGGER	ΚΡΥΦΟΓΕΛΟ	T	AS	F	SH
SNIGGER	ΚΡΥΦΟΓΕΛΩ	T	VG	F	SH
SNIGGER	ΥΠΟΥΛΟ ΓΕΛΙΟ	T	DP	F	MIC
SNOOZE	ΥΠΝΑΚΟΣ	T	VG	F	SH
SOB	ΚΛΑΙΩ ΜΕ ΛΥΓΜΟΥΣ	T	CB	P	SH
SOFT	ΜΑΛΑΚΗ.	T	JH	C	BP
SOLICITOR	ΝΟΜΙΚΟΣ ΣΥΜΒΟΥΛ	T	LV	P	SH
SPARCELY	ΑΡΑΙΑ	T	CB	P	SH
SPARSE	ΑΡΑΙΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
SPEECH	ΛΟΓΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
SPICY	ΑΡΩΜΑΤΙΩΔΗΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
SPIRITS	ΨΥΧΕΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
SPOT	ΛΕΚΕΣ	T	AK	F	SH
SPRINKLE	ΚΑΤΑΒΡΕΧΩ	F	VG	F	SH
SPURN	ΑΠΟΡΡΙΠΤΩ	T	ML	P	DIV
STAGGER	ΤΡΙΚΛΙΖΩ	T	VG	F	SH
STAND-BY	ΠΑΡΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΩ	F	VG	F	SH
STARE	ΚΑΡΦΩΤΗ ΜΑΤΙΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
STATE	ΑΝΑΦΕΡΩ	T	JH	C	BP
STATUS	ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΚΗ ΘΕΣΗ	T	AK	F	SH

STEP	ΒΗΜΑΤΙΖΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
STEPLADDER	ΣΚΑΛΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
STICKY	ΓΛΟΙΩΔΗΣ	T	VG	F	SH
STING	ΤΣΙΜΠΩ	T	VG	F	SH
STOCKBROKER	ΧΡΗΜΑΤΙΣΤΗΣ	T	CB	P	SH
STOCKINGS	ΓΥΝΑΙΚΕΙΕΣ ΚΑΛΤΣΕΣ	T	MG	D	SH
STONE	ΛΙΘΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
STRAIT	ΤΟ ΣΤΕΝΟ	T	LV	P	SH
STRANGER	ΞΕΝΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
STRETCH	ΕΚΤΕΙΝΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
STROKE	ΧΑΙΔΕΥΩ	T	VG	F	SH
STUNNING	ΡΙΧΝΩ ΑΝΑΙΣΘΗΤ	F	VG	F	SH
SUBSCRIBE	ΣΥΝΕΙΣΦΕΡΩ	F	AS	F	SH
SUBSCRIBE	ΣΥΝΕΙΣΦΕΡΩ ΟΙΚΟΝ	F	PP	F	SH
SUBSCRIBE	ΥΠΟΓΡΑΦΩ	F	DP	F	MIC
SUBSTITUTE	ΥΠΟΚΑΤΑΣΤΑΤΟ	T	AS	F	SH
SUCCEED	ΕΠΙΤΥΓΧΑΝΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
SUCH	ΤΕΤΟΙΟΣ	T	BT	D	SH
SUFFERING	ΒΑΣΑΝΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
SUPERB	ΥΠΕΡΟΧΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
SURFBOARD	ΣΑΝΙΔΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
SURPRISING	ΕΚΠΛΗΚΤΙΚΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
SURRENDER	ΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΩ	T	VG	F	SH
SWARM	ΣΜΗΝΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
SWAY	ΕΠΗΡΕΑΖΩ	T	AS	F	SH
SWAY	ΤΑΛΑΝΤΕΥΟΜΑΙ	F	PP	F	SH
SWAYED	ΚΥΡΙΡΧΙΑ	F	DP	F	MIC
SWIFT	ΤΑΧΥΣ	T	CB	P	SH
TACKLE	ΑΝΤΙΜΕΤΩΠΙΖΩ	T	PP	F	SH
TALE	ΔΙΗΓΗΜΑ	T	JH	C	BP
TANK	ΔΕΞΑΜΕΝΗ	T	JH	C	BP
TAX EVASION	ΦΟΡΟΔΙΑΦΥΓΗ	T	LV	P	SH
TEAM UP	ΚΑΝΩ ΚΟΙΝΗ ΠΡΟΣΠΑΘ	T	VG	F	SH
TELL OFF	ΜΑΛΩΝΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
TEMPER	ΔΙΑΘΕΣΗ	T	JH	C	GEM
TEND	ΦΡΟΝΤΙΖΩ	F	JK	F	SH
TENSE	ΣΕ ΥΠΕΡΕΝΤΑΣΗ	T	VG	F	SH
TERM	ΠΕΡΙΟΔΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
TERRACE	ΤΑΡΑΤΣΑ	T	LV	P	SH
TERRITORY	ΕΔΑΦΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
THOROUGH	ΛΕΠΤΟΜΕΡΗΣ	T	OT	P	SH
THREAT	ΑΠΕΙΛΗ	T	JK	F	SH
THROUGH	ΕΞΑΙΤΙΑΣ	F	JH	C	GEM
THROUGHOUT	ΠΑΝΤΟΥ	T	JH	C	GEM
TIGHTLY	ΣΦΙΧΤΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
TITTER	ΑΝΟΗΤΟ ΓΕΛΙΟ	T	DP	F	MIC
TITTER	ΠΝΙΧΤΟ ΓΕΛΙΟ	T	AS	F	SH
TITTER	ΠΥΚΤΟ ΓΕΛΙΟ	T	VG	F	SH
TOE	ΔΑΧΤΥΛΟ ΠΟΔΙΟΥ	T	JH	C	BP
TORNADO	ΣΙΦΟΥΝΑΣ	T	AS	F	PEN
TORRENTIAL	ΚΑΤΑΡΑΚΤΩΔΗΣ	T	PP	F	SH
TRACE	ΙΧΝΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
TRADITIONAL	ΛΑΙΚΟΣ, ΠΑΡΑΔΟΣΙΑ	T	BT	D	SH
TRADITIONAL	ΠΑΡΑΔΟΣΙΑΚΟΣ	T	MG	D	SH
TRANSPORT	ΜΕΤΑΦΕΡΩ	T	JH	C	BP
TREMOR	ΤΡΕΜΟΥΛΙΑΣΜΑ	T	VG	F	SH

TROUSSEAU	ΠΡΟΙΚΑ	T	BP	D	SH
TROUSSEAU	ΠΡΟΙΚΙΑ	T	BT	D	SH
TRY ON	ΔΟΚΙΜΑΖΩ	T	JH	C	GEM
TUNE	ΚΟΥΡΑΙΖΩ	T	BT	D	SH
TUNE	ΚΟΥΡΑΙΖΩ	T	BP	D	SH
TURNIP	ΓΟΓΓΥΛΙΟΝ	T	AS	F	PEN
TYPHOID	ΤΥΦΟΣ	T	AS	F	PEN
TYPHOON	ΤΥΦΩΝΑΣ	T	AS	F	PEN
UNDERNEATH	ΚΑΤΩ ΑΠΟ	T	JH	C	GEM
UNFORTUNATELY	ΑΤΥΧΑ	T	JH	C	BP
UNKNOWN	ΑΓΝΩΣΤΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
UNLOADED	ΞΕΦΟΡΤΟΜΕΝΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
UNPLUGGED		F	CB	P	SH
UNPRECEDENTED	ΑΝΕΥ ΠΡΟΗΓΟΥΜΕΝΟ	T	EP	F	DIV
UNWIND	ΧΑΛΑΡΩΝΩ	T	VG	F	SH
UPSET	ΑΝΑΤΡΕΠΩ	F	VG	F	SH
URGENT	ΑΝΑΓΚΗ	F	AS	F	PEN
USURP	ΣΦΕΤΕΡΙΖΟΜΑΙ	T	LV	P	SH
VALID	ΕΓΚΥΡΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
VALUABLES	ΤΙΜΑΛΛΗ	T	OT	P	SH
VEIL	ΠΕΠΛΟ	T	MG	D	SH
VEIL	ΠΕΠΛΟΣ	T	BT	D	SH
VIGILANCE	ΕΠΑΓΡΥΠΝΗΣΗ	T	LV	P	SH
VITAL	ΖΩΤΙΚΟΣ	T	LV	P	SH
VULNERABLE	ΤΡΩΤΟΣ	T	VC	F	SH
WAR	ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ	T	JH	C	BP
WARE	ΕΙΔΗ	T	PP	F	SH
WARE	ΕΙΔΗ	T	AS	F	SH
WARM	ΖΕΣΤΟΣ	T	MT	C	SH
WARSHIP	ΘΩΡΗΚΤΟ	T	KF	F	TN
WASTELAND	ΕΡΗΜΗ ΧΩΡΑ	T	CB	P	SH
WAVE	ΚΟΥΝΗΜΑ ΧΕΡΙΟΥ	T	JH	C	GEM
WEALTHY	ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟΣ	T	PP	F	SH
WEALTHY	ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟ	T	DP	F	MIC
WEIGH	ΖΥΓΙΖΩ	T	MT	C	SH
WELFARE	ΕΥΜΕΡΙΑ	T	CB	P	SH
WELL-OFF	ΤΥΧΕΡΟΣ	T	PP	F	SH
WHALE	ΦΑΛΛΑΙΝΑ	T	CT	C	AT
WHALE	ΦΑΛΛΑΙΝΑ	T	JH	C	BP
WHIRLWIND	ΑΝΕΜΟΣΤΡΟΒΙΛΟΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
WHISTLE	ΣΦΥΡΙΖΩ	T	KF	F	TN
WHISTLE	ΣΦΥΡΙΧΤΡΑ	T	JH	C	GEM
WHOLESALE	ΧΟΝΔΡΕΜΠΟΡΙΟ	T	AK	F	SH
WIDE	ΠΛΑΤΥΣ	T	JH	C	GEM
WIFE	ΣΥΖΗΓΟΣ, Η	T	CT	C	AT
WINDMILL	ΑΝΕΜΟΜΥΛΟΣ	T	CB	P	SH
WISDOM	ΣΟΦΙΑ	T	LV	P	SH
WORK OUT	ΛΥΝΟΜΑΙ	T	OT	P	SH
WRIGGLE	ΣΥΣΤΡΕΦΟΜΑΙ	T	VG	F	SH
YIELD	ΑΠΟΔΙΔΩ	F	VG	F	SH

## Appendix Three: Description of the Dictionaries Used

### A3.1: The selection of headwords

The learners who participated in the collection of data for this project used eight different dictionaries, details of which are given in the references. In order to compare the coverage and treatment of entries, we have conducted an analysis of the section containing headwords in FR- in several dictionaries. (cf. Jackson 1988: 162). We begin with the COBUILD Learner's dictionary as a standard for comparison with the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. We also look at the Concise Oxford Dictionary, which is intended for native speakers, as an indication of the word stock from which the Learner's dictionaries must select. After the OALD, we look at two smaller dictionaries in the Oxford range. Having thus established the standards for comparison, we turn to the bilingual dictionaries which were used by the learners.

The Oxford English-Greek Learner's dictionary, which has 839 pages of 12.5 x 19 cm, is compared with its monolingual cousins, and we also look briefly at the pocket edition, although this was not used in the survey. We then look at the Penguin-Hellenews Dictionary, which has 926 pages of 14 x 20.5 cm and contains by far the most headwords of all the bilinguals, surpassing even the COD. We also look at the Michigan Press Dictionary, which in 700 pages of 12.5 x 18 cm includes almost as many headwords as the COD. Representing the middle of the size range we then have Divry's, which has 238 pages of 10 x 17 cm in the English-Greek section, and finally we look at the smallest of all the dictionaries used, the Collins Gem, which has 345 pages of 7.5 x 11 cm. The complete lists of the headwords which form the basis of the present discussion are to be found at the end of Appendix Three.

Before looking at members of the Oxford family, we begin, by way of comparison, with the COBUILD Learner's Dictionary, which is the same type and size as the OALD. The former has 176 headwords in FR-, while the latter has 143, a difference of 33. This difference results from 65 words accorded headword status in COBUILD but not in the OALD, and 32 which are given as headwords in the OALD but not



COBUILD. The lemmata which are headwords in COBUILD but not the OALD are mainly compounds such as FREE AGENT, FREE-FLOATING and FREEPHONE, most of which are also given in the OALD, but in the special compounds section of the entry rather than as headwords. On the other hand, the reason why the OALD has 32 headwords not given as such in COBUILD is partly because it gives separate headword entries for homographs, and partly due to the inclusion of some less frequent words such as FRIABLE, FRICASSEE and FRICATIVE. While there are significant differences in policy between the two publishers, the similarities are much more striking. Both have obviously selected their words on the basis of frequency in their corpora, and so we find that the words are familiar, with very few that would be unknown to an educated native speaker, and also they reflect modern discourse with coinages such as FREUDIAN SLIP and FRUIT MACHINE.

The OALD contains 87 fewer headwords in our sample section than the native-speaker Concise Oxford Dictionary, which aims at a more complete coverage and contains more uncommon words. However, the OALD has 29 headwords that are not in the COD. This is due to:

- 1) new loan-words or concepts: FROMAGE FRAIS, FREEFONE, FREEPOST,
- 2) words which are defined within entries in the COD being given independent headword status in the OALD: FRAMEWORK, FREEHOLD, FRENCHMAN, FROSTBITE
- 3) derivatives given headword status: FREEZING, FRESHEN, FRETTED.

The rather smaller Oxford First Certificate Dictionary, with 100 headwords in FR-, still covers most of the words in the OALD, albeit in much less detail. The reduction in the number of headwords is achieved mainly by not giving headword status to compounds such as FREEHAND, which are nonetheless included and defined. Also, this edition has slightly fewer of the less common words. On the other hand it has 11 headwords additional to those in the OALD, mainly as a result of differentiating more distinct meanings of homographs such as FRACTURE, FRAGMENT and FREAK.

The Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary, with 70 headwords in FR-, omits a handful of less common words, such as FRACTIOUS, FRIZZ, FRIZZLE, FROND and

FRUMP. Most of the reduction, however, is achieved by the omission of derivatives which are headwords in the FC Dictionary, such as FRANTICALLY, FREEZER and FREEZING.

Turning now to the bilinguals in the Oxford family, the OEGLD has 95 headwords in FR-, about the same number as in the FC Dictionary, and 48 less than the OALD. The omissions include FRAGRANCE, FRAMEWORK, FRANCOPHONE, FRAZZLE, FREAK2, -FREE (suffix), nine compounds with FREE, and again derivatives such as FRANTICALLY, FREEZER and FREEZING. There are, however, eight lemmata given headword status in the OEGLD but not the OALD, including the derivative forms FRAUDULENT and FRUSTRATION, and also FRIZZLE, FROWSTY, and FROWZY, which presumably were in the earlier edition of the OALD on which the OEGLD is based, and which are among the very few words included which learners are unlikely ever to need.

The pocket edition of the OEGLD has 71 headwords in FR-, one more than its monolingual counterpart, but they are not the same words. Additional headwords in the bilingual are those not frequent enough for inclusion in the OLPD: FRACAS, FRACTIOUS, FRAGRANT, FRANC, FRANKINCENSE, FRATRICIDE, FRENETIC, FRICASSEE, FRIPPERY, FRIZZLE, FROWSTY, FROWZY. It seems rather erratic to include FRIZZLE, FROWSTY and FROWZY in a headword list restricted to so few items. Conversely, the headwords in the monolingual but not the bilingual are mainly derivatives and additional senses of homographs: FRANCHISE, FRANK2, FRET2, FRET3, FRIED, FRIGHTEN, FRIGHTFUL, FRITTER2, FRONTIER, FROZE and FROZEN.

On the whole the differences between the headword list for any given size of dictionary in the above comparisons is relatively minor, and the similarities are more striking than the differences. With the exception of the COD, the native speaker looking at these dictionaries finds that virtually all the words are well-known, the justification for their inclusion self-evident, and additionally that the recent publications have captured the living language with expressions such as FREEBIE, FRENCH FRIES and FRUIT MACHINE.

The Penguin-Hellenews Dictionary, although much shorter than the COD, has 87 headwords which are not given that status in the COD, while the COD has 69 not given in the Penguin-Hellenews. The great majority of the additional headwords in the Penguin-Hellenews are compounds and derivatives, or indeed derivatives of compounds (FREE-HANDED). Combinations with FREE account for 21 of the additional headwords, but this is actually far fewer than those itemised in the COD under the headword FREE. Some of the choices of headwords seem a little eccentric; the Penguin-Hellenews has FRANCOPHILE and FRANCOPHOBE but not FRANCOPHONE. In particular some of the derivations are slightly far-fetched, such as FRAGMENTAL and FRUMENTACEOUS. But on the whole the additional headwords are items that may be genuinely useful, such as FRANKLY, FRESHEN, and FROSTBITE. On the other hand those words which occur in the COD and not the Penguin-Hellenews are mainly uncommon lexical items such as FRAP, FRAENULUM and FRATCHY. The major defect of this dictionary is not the choice of headwords, but that the expansion of the headword list has entailed very cursory treatment for some words, the most extreme example being FROM with a single-line entry.

The Michigan Press dictionary, with its 203 headwords in FR- is unsatisfactory in both the selection and treatment of headwords. This dictionary is twenty per cent smaller than the OEGLD (based on multiplication of page size by number of pages) but includes almost as many headwords as the COD, and the proportion of obscure words contained here is actually greater than in the COD. Words given here but not in the COD include FRACTED, which in the OED2 has only one citation, from 1828, FRETTY, FRORE and FROWARDNESS. FRITH is given five nominal senses, where the OED2 has only four, two of which are marked obsolete. There can be no justification for the inclusion in a learner's dictionary of words marked obsolete in the OED. Furthermore, where the OALD has interesting fruit-based compounds and idioms such as FORBIDDEN FRUIT, FRUIT CAKE and FRUIT SALAD, the Michigan Press has FRUCTIFEROUS, FRUGIFEROUS and FRUCTUOUS. It also includes a headword FRUSTRUM, which can only be a misspelling of FRUSTUM. Notwithstanding this remarkable proliferation of headwords, the OEGLD has twelve

headwords not present here, mainly homographs of headwords that are given, but also FRANKFURTER, FRENETIC and FROZE.

Divry's has 99 headwords in FR- as against 95 in the OEGLD, and we would naturally expect them to be quite similar, but Divry's contains 24 headwords not in the OEGLD, and the OEGLD contains 20 not in Divry's. Nine of the extra headwords in the OEGLD are accounted for by homographs of existing headwords. Six are derivations: FRIENDLY, FRIENDSHIP, FRIGHTEN, FRIGHTFUL, FRONTAGE and FRONTAL. It also has the prefix FRANCO-, FREEBOOTER, FREEMASON, FRIDGE, and FROWSTY. Divry's is highly inconsistent in its treatment of derivations; despite the omission of the relatively common ones listed above, it does include FRACTIONAL, FRAGILITY, FRIED, FRIVOLITY, FROLICKER, FROLICKY, FROZEN and FRUITY. While FRIED and FROZEN are useful additions, it is difficult to see the logic in giving headword status to FROLICKY but not FRIENDLY. As James Murray is quoted as saying, "The subject is endless & exhaustless, boundless & bottomless..." (Murray 1977: 192). Where the OEGLD has FRANCO-, Divry's has FRANCE. It also includes several other fairly useful items: FRAGRANCE, FROND, FRUITY and FRYING PAN. For the rest, the additional headwords are composed of proper nouns (which are included for no apparent reason, as their inclusion is not systematic) and infrequent words such as FRESHET, FROWARD and FRUSTUM.

Finally we turn to the smallest dictionary of all those used in the survey, the Collins Gem, which has 63 headwords in FR-, slightly fewer than the Oxford Pocket Dictionaries. In contrast to the Michigan Press and Divry's dictionaries, this is a representative of a major British publisher, and so, even though it is at the bottom of their range we should expect a higher standard. Although the net number of headwords is eight fewer than in the OEGLD Pocket, it contains ten headwords which are not headwords in that work, whereas the latter contains eighteen headwords not in the Gem. There are no great surprises amongst the differences: the extra words in the Gem are mainly derivatives, and the extra words in the OEGLD Pocket are mainly words too infrequent to be necessary in this size of dictionary, although the omission of FRAUGHT and FRENETIC is rather questionable.

We can conclude from our examination of the lists of headwords that the coverage of the monolingual learner's dictionaries with about 150 headwords in FR- is quite adequate. Extrapolating from this sample section, we arrive at a figure of 60,000 (COBUILD) or 63,000 (OALD) references, and as the headword list in each case is based on frequency of occurrence in corpora, this would appear to be about the optimum number for a Learner's dictionary, although the two larger titles in the COBUILD range of dictionaries illustrate the possible benefits of fuller treatment. When a dictionary expands this list as in the case of the Michigan Press dictionary, there is likely to be little benefit for most learners, and if the expansion is achieved at the expense of adequate treatment of each entry, it is not worth the sacrifice. A judicious reduction in the number of headwords can be achieved and so free up space for fuller treatment of the items that are included. A reduction to about 100 headwords in the sample section of headwords in FR- translates into a total number of between 31,000 (OEGLD) and 40,000 (Oxford First Certificate) headwords in the whole volume. No very frequent words are sacrificed, and the main victims are compounds, which may still be included in a more space-saving form even if they are not accorded headword status. A further reduction to about 70 headwords in our sample corresponds to 17,000 (Oxford Learner's Pocket and Collins Gem) or about 25,000 (OEGLD pocket). At this level not only compounds but also derivatives are sacrificed, and also some fairly frequent words such as FRENETIC are omitted, meaning that this size of dictionary is really inadequate for all but the most casual user.

### A3.2: The treatment of entries

Having examined the lists of headwords, we must now consider the treatment of single headwords. As space does not permit analysis of the entries in all the dictionaries, we will restrict ourselves to a comparison of the OEGLD with the OALD. In particular, we will be interested to see if there are deficiencies in the bilingual which might support the claim that monolinguals are superior. Clearly we cannot expect such detailed entries in the OEGLD, as it contains only 839 pages, as against 1428 in OALD, which also has a 25% larger page size. The reduction is achieved partly by reducing the number of headwords, but also by restricting the treatment of the headwords that are retained.

As we noted above, the OALD has 143 headwords in FR-, and the OEGLD has 95. This section in the OALD covers 371 column-centimetres, as against 160 in the OEGLD, so each headword entry in the OALD covers an average of 2.59 column-centimetres, compared with 1.68 for the OEGLD. This is not an unreasonable degree of compression, although when we exclude less common words which tend not to require such long definitions, the average length of definitions should increase. Thus the COD, albeit with slightly smaller print, fits its 230 headword entries into 340 column-centimetres, its average length of 1.47 cm being shorter than that of the OEGLD. On the other hand, all the other bilinguals have much shorter entries: Penguin-Hellenews has 248 headwords in 202 column-centimetres, an average of 0.81 cm; Michigan Press has 203 headwords in 133 column-centimetres, an average of 0.65 cm; Divry's has 99 headwords in 33 column-centimetres, an average of 0.33 cm; and Collins Gem has 63 headwords in 38 column-centimetres, an average of 0.6 cm. It must be noted that these last two also have much narrower columns than the others.

Comparing the content of the entries in the OALD and the OEGLD, we find that several kinds of details are omitted from the latter. The entry for FRACAS in the OALD shows the American as well as the British pronunciation and plural. Where the OALD has a definition and example, the OEGLD has just two single-word translations. At FRACTIOUS, on the other hand, the OEGLD has the run-ons ~LY and ~NESS not given in the OALD. At FRACTURE, the OALD provides much fuller

information on usage, and distinguishes between the countable and uncountable senses of the noun. On the other hand, the OEGLD notes that the word belongs to the medical domain. At FRAGILE, as at FRIVOLOUS, the OALD distinguishes two numbered senses, where the OEGLD gives a single translation, but allows the variety of the senses to be inferred from the examples of collocate nouns, *china / health / happiness*. The OALD aids discrimination between near-synonyms with the note “compare FRAIL”. At FRAIL, the OEGLD specifies the comparative and superlative forms, and supplies four translations supported by three examples corresponding to the three senses distinguished in the OALD. At FRANK, the OEGLD exemplifies the usage by a truncated example, “*well, to be quite ~*”. The derivative ~LY is only translated, whereas the OALD has a note on its discourse function. At Frankincense the OALD is more encyclopaedic, telling us not only what it is, but also its use, especially in religious ceremonies. In the OEGLD this shared cultural knowledge is assumed, and a single-word translation suffices. At FRANTIC, the OALD notes that it is used especially of fear or anxiety, so it is rather misleading of the OEGLD to give as examples *~ joy, ~ with joy, ~ applause, ~ efforts*. At the first homograph FRAY the OALD notes that its use is jocular, while the OEGLD claims that it is literary. For the second FRAY, both give an example of the metaphorical use with TEMPER, but only the OALD gives examples of the literal sense. There are many headwords for which the OEGLD inexplicably has the senses arranged in the opposite order to the OALD, as at FRINGE and FRISK.

Turning now to some of the longer entries, we find that at FREE many of the sense distinctions made in the OALD have been collapsed in the OEGLD. The OEGLD distinguishes six main senses, and compounds are listed alphabetically within each sense, so *~ AGENT* is after *~ WHEEL*, whereas the OALD has just one alphabetical list of all the compounds, making it much easier to find them. Where the OALD distinguishes nine senses, the OEGLD groups them according to the translation, making six senses, which in this case at least means that it gives a less coherent account of the word. Sense one in the OEGLD combines any use that corresponds to ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΣ, and thus conflates *free citizens / state / church* (sense one in the OALD) with “*leave one end of the rope free*” (sense six in the OALD). Sense two in the OEGLD is FREE FROM (ΑΠΙΛΛΑΓΜΕΝΟΣ), corresponding to sense four in

the OALD, and examples of this meaning are *free from errors / anxiety*, but FREE AGENT is also included under this sense. OEGLD sense three (ΔΩΠΕΑΝ) corresponds to sense five in the OALD, and uses the same example, *free tickets*. OEGLD sense four (ΜΗ ΑΠΑΣΧΟΛΗΜΕΝΟΣ) covers OALD 7a and 7b, with the examples *Is this seat ~?* and *I'm usually ~ in the morning*, but also includes **have one's hands ~** and **give sb / have a ~ hand**, the latter of which does not belong in that sense, but seems to have been entered there because both idioms include HAND, a further argument for putting all the compounds and idioms together in a single alphabetical list. Finally, OEGLD sense five (ΓΕΝΝΑΙΟΔΩΠΟΣ) corresponds to OALD sense eight, and OEGLD sense six (ΑΘΥΠΟΣΤΟΜΟΣ, ΤΟΛΜΗΠΟΣ) corresponds to OALD sense nine. The progression from one sense to the next is basically similar between the two works, and to a certain extent the various translations might be regarded as a justification of the sense distinctions. The reduced clarity in the OEGLD stems mainly from the attempt to combine senses and compress them into less space, rather than from the difference in approach of the bilingual lexicographer.

Similarly at FREEZE, the reordering of senses illustrated in the chart below makes for a less coherent account of the word in OEGLD:

<u>Sense number in OEGLD</u>	corresponds to	<u>Sense number in OALD</u>
1		2a
2		1a
3		2b
4		4a
5		3a & 3b
6		6 & 7

The third sense in the OEGLD corresponds both to sense 2b of FREEZE and also to the separate headword FREEZING in the OALD. Where 2b has the verbal sense “to be or feel very cold”, the separate headword FREEZING is expressed as an adjective “very cold indeed; feeling too cold”. 2b naturally follows on from 2a, but this development is disrupted by the re-ordering of senses in the OEGLD. OALD sense 4b



is an extension of 4a, “stop moving”, in the specific context of being ordered by the police. Sense 5 is the sense of freezing a frame of a film. Both of these are omitted from the OEGLD. As noted for FREE, the compounds in the OEGLD are listed in separate alphabetical orderings for each sense. Having one single list as in the OALD is generally more convenient, but may produce some anomalies; having established a separate headword FREEZING, it would seem more logical to locate FREEZING-POINT there, but in fact it is at the end of the article on FREEZE.

A major difference in approach is illustrated by the treatment of FREQUENCY. The entire entry in the OEGLD consists of the headword, pronunciation, part of speech label with the indication “countable, uncountable” and the single-word translation ΣΥΧΝΟΤΗΣ. It is questionable whether this single word covers all the range covered by the fifteen-line definition in the OALD, which distinguishes two senses, each with two subsenses. In the Greek-English volume, the adjective ΣΥΧΝΟΣ is given very brief treatment, while the noun ΣΥΧΝΟΤΗΤΑ is given six lines though only two translations, FREQUENCY and INCIDENCE are provided. This reflects the policy of the OALD which treats the adjective as less complex (the noun has the additional sense of RADIO FREQUENCIES), and less fundamental. In the English-Greek volume this policy is reversed, with the noun being given only a single-word explanation and the adjective given six lines. If a single word is adequate for the noun, why not also give a single word for the adjective, as in the pocket edition? There is no apparent rationale for this inconsistency, and even if we conclude that the single-word translation does cover all the complexity of the English word, that information should be made explicitly available. As the usage note specifies that there are countable and uncountable senses, we should be informed as to what those senses are. Conversely, there are words for which we accept that a single-word translation is sufficient, as we noted for FRANKINCENSE, a further example being FRIGATE.

The section that we have taken as the sample for our study contains three further examples of relatively lengthy entries, at FRESH, FROM and FRONT. In the case of FRESH, the reordering of senses leads to the kinds of infelicities in the development of the meaning of the word which we have already noted. The OEGLD begins by combining the OALD's senses two and three, and continues by combining senses four

and six, omitting five. At that point, the OEGLD breaks with the ordering of the OALD, treating senses eight and nine before seven. The ordering in the OALD seems more logical; being fresh after sleep (OALD 7) is closely related to a fresh complexion (OALD 6), but the flow of development of the meaning is disrupted in the OEGLD. Criticism must also be made of the treatment in the OEGLD of sense three (1a in the OALD). The OEGLD omits the usage note that in this sense the adjective is usually attributive, and also omits the examples of which that is most likely to be true; we could probably say “the news is fresh”, but probably not “the start he made was fresh”. This is exactly the kind of information on usage which is required by foreign learners, and there is no justification for its excision from the bilingual dictionary. Similarly at FROWN, the examples in the OEGLD (~ *on gambling/ a suggestion*) are not so informative as to usage as those in the OALD, where the second example reflects the common use of the passive in “*Gambling is frowned upon by some religious groups*”.

Turning to FRONT, the differences in treatment between the two dictionaries are not so significant, though where the OALD has 1a and 1b, the OEGLD has 1 and 2, and OALD sense two is demoted to sense five in the OEGLD, while OALD senses four and five have been combined as sense four in the OEGLD. A much more radical difference of approach is evidenced in the treatment of FROM. The OALD distinguishes thirteen senses, which are treated as one in the OEGLD. From the point of view of translation, this is perfectly reasonable, as in all the examples given the translation is the same. As can be seen from the chart below, the range of examples given is not quite coterminous with those given in the OALD:

<u>Example in OEGLD</u>	corresponds to	<u>Sense number in OALD</u>
1		4
2		8
3		10
4		11
5		2
6		2
7		1

However, contrary to our remarks on the treatment of FREE, in the case of FROM the ground is covered quite adequately in a quarter of the space. The use of translation is clearly expedient in the case of the notoriously difficult function words, assuming of course that a satisfactory translation is available in the target language. A similar technique is employed for FRIEND, which is divided into six senses in the OALD but just one in the OEGLD. Of sense four it might be suggested that it is an example of metaphorical usage (“I’ve come to rely on my dictionary like an old friend”) rather than a distinct sense of the word in itself. As for the other five, the decision to collapse them into one appears strange when we note that the corresponding article (ΦΙΛΟΣ) in the Greek-English volume is divided into five senses, though not the same ones as in the OALD.

In the section covering words in FR-, only two headwords were discovered for which the translation is of dubious accuracy. The entry for FRIAR may be translated as “monk in a monastic order”, and makes no attempt to distinguish FRIAR from MONK, whereas the OALD makes the distinction that “friars work with people in the community rather than living in a monastery”, and has the note “compare MONK”. In the Greek-English volume, ΚΑΛΟΓΕΡΟΣ is translated firstly as MONK and then (περιπλανώμενος) FRIAR, indicating that a friar is an itinerant monk. ΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ is also translated firstly as MONK and then (τάγματος) FRIAR, indicating that a friar is a monk who is a member of an order. This second entry, like that in the English-Greek volume, gives the impression that a monk does not belong to a monastic order, and that doing so is the distinguishing feature of a friar.

The other example of dubious translation stems from the tendency to offer as many translations as possible for each headword. The word ΜΙΟΠΝΤΟΥΠΑ, which is given as one of the translations for FRILL is also given as one of the translations for FRIEZE. In the Greek-English volume it is translated as EDGE, EDGING, BORDER, FRAME, and it is in fact a barely-assimilated cognate of BORDER. In the

monolingual Τεγόπουλος-Φυτράκης Greek dictionary, the word is defined as (in my translation):

1. The hem of a piece of cloth
2. An embroidered band
3. Border (as in flower bed).

It might possibly be offered as a translation of FRILL, but certainly not of FRIEZE. This proliferation of translations of dubious accuracy is one of the most deplorable features of bilingual dictionaries, but this is a contingent failing which could be eradicated. In the above analysis we have discovered various kinds of faults, but there is no reason to suspect that any of them is inherent in this kind of dictionary. For the most part the failings are the result of lack of space, which precludes the specification of alternative pronunciation as in the case of FRACAS, or the distinction of countable and uncountable senses of nouns as in the case of FRACTURE. Another consequence of lack of space is the absence of cross-references, or indeed of illustrations which could be used to disambiguate near-synonyms. While there are cases of oversimplification, as in the case of FREQUENCY, these are not endemic, and are counterbalanced by entries such as FRIGATE and FRANKINCENSE, where a single word is completely adequate. Perhaps the most serious defect is the absence of sufficient authentic examples, carefully chosen to illustrate typical collocations (as in FRANTIC) and usage (as in FROWN). In tandem with this, the other major task facing the lexicographer is to give a systematic account of the various senses of polysemous words, either through distinguishing various senses on the basis of evidence in corpora, or perhaps as in the entry for FROM taking the position that many highly productive words should not be treated as polysemous. Whatever faults have been found here are thus a result of limitations of space rather than the bilingual approach to lexicography, though the OEGLD devotes on average twice as much space to each entry as any other of the bilingual dictionaries used in this project, and that difference is likely to be critical.

### A3.3: Lists of headwords in FR-

#### A. Headwords in Fr- in the COBUILD Learner's Dictionary

FR  
FRACAS  
FRACTAL  
FRACTION  
FRACTIOUS  
FRACTURE  
FRAGILE  
FRAGMENT  
FRAGMENTARY  
FRAGRANCE  
FRAGRANT  
FRAIL  
FRAILTY  
FRAME  
FRAMEWORK  
FRANC  
FRANCHISE  
FRANCHISEE  
FRANK1  
FRANKFURTER  
FRANKINCENSE  
FRANTIC  
FRATERNAL  
FRATERNITY  
FRATERNIZE  
FRATRICIDAL  
FRAUD  
FRAUDSTER  
FRAUDULENT  
FRAUGHT  
FRAY  
FREAK  
FREAKISH  
FREAKY  
FRECKLE  
FREE  
FREE AGENT  
FREE AND EASY  
FREEBIE  
FREEDOM  
FREEDOM FIGHTER  
FREE ENTERPRISE  
FREE FALL  
FREE-FLOATING  
FREEFONE  
FREE-FOR-ALL  
FREE FORM  
FREEHAND  
FREEHOLD  
FREE KICK  
FREELANCE  
FREELOADER  
FREE LOVE  
FREELY

FREEMAN  
FREE-MARKETEER  
FREEMASON  
FREEPHONE  
FREEPORT  
FREEPOST  
FREE-RANGE  
FREESIA  
FREE SPIRIT  
FREE STANDING  
FREESTYLE  
FREETHINKER  
FREEWAY  
FREEWHEEL  
FREEZE  
FREEZE-DRIED  
FREEZE-FRAME  
FREEZER  
FREEZING  
FREEZING POINT  
FREIGHT  
FREIGHTER  
FRENCH BEAN  
FRENCH DOOR  
FRENCH DRESSING  
FRENCH FRIES  
FRENCH HORN  
FRENCH WINDOW  
FRENETIC  
FRENZY  
FREQUENCY  
FREQUENT  
FRESCO  
FRESH  
FRESH AIR  
FRESHEN  
FRESHER  
FRESHMAN  
FRESHWATER  
FRET  
FRETWORK  
FREUDIAN  
FREUDIAN SLIP  
FRI  
FRIAR  
FRICTION  
FRIDAY  
FRIDGE  
FRIED  
FRIEND  
FRIENDLESS  
FRIENDLY  
-FRIENDLY  
FRIENDLY SOCIETY  
FRIENDSHIP  
FRIEZE  
FRIGATE  
FRIGGING  
FRIGHT

FRIGHTEN  
FRIGHTENING  
FRIGHTFUL  
FRIGID  
FRILL  
FRILLY  
FRINGE  
FRINGE BENEFIT  
FRINGED  
FRIPPERY  
FRISBEE  
FRISK  
FRISSON  
FRITTER  
FRIVOLITY  
FRIVOLOUS  
FRIZZ  
FRIZZY  
FRO  
FROCK  
FROCK COAT  
FROG  
FROGMAN  
FROGMARCH  
FROGSPAWN  
FROING  
FROLIC  
FROM  
FROND  
FRONT  
FRONTAGE  
FRONTAL  
FRONT BENCH  
FRONT BURNER  
FRONTIER  
FRONT LINE  
FRONT MAN  
FRONT-PAGE  
FRONT-RUNNER  
FROST  
FROSTBITE  
FROSTED  
FROSTING  
FROSTY  
FROTH  
FROWN  
FROZE  
FROZEN  
FRUGAL  
FRUIT  
FRUIT CAKE  
FRUIT COCKTAIL  
FRUITFUL  
FRUITION  
FRUITLESS  
FRUIT MACHINE  
FRUIT SALAD  
FRUITY  
FRUMPY

FRUSTRATE  
FRY  
FRYING PAN  
FRY-UP

**176 HEADWORDS**

B. Headwords in Fr- in the Concise Oxford Dictionary

FR  
FR  
FR  
FRA  
FRABJOUS  
FRACAS  
FRACTION  
FRACTIONAL  
FRACTIONATE  
FRACTIOUS  
FRACTO  
FRACTURE  
FRAENULUM  
FRAENUM  
FRAGILE  
FRAGMENT  
FRAGMENTARY  
FRAGMENTATION  
FRAGRANCE  
FRAGRANT  
‘FRAID  
FRAIL1  
FRAIL2  
FRAILTY  
FRAISE  
FRAKTUR  
FRAMBOESIA  
FRAME1  
FRAME2  
FRANC  
FRANCHISE  
FRANCISCAN  
FRANCIUM  
FRANCO-  
FRANCOLIN  
FRANCOPHONE  
FRANC TIREUR  
FRANGIBLE  
FRANGIPANE  
FRANGIPANI  
FRANGLAIS  
FRANK1  
FRANK2  
FRANK3  
FRANK4  
FRANKENSTEIN  
FRANKFURTER  
FRANKINCENSE



FRANKLIN1  
FRANKLIN2  
FRANK-PLEDGE  
FRANTIC  
FRAP  
FRAPPE  
FRASS  
FRAT1  
FRAT2  
FRATCHY  
FRATE  
FRATER  
FRATERNAL  
FRATERNITY  
FRATERNIZE  
FRATRICIDE  
FRAU  
FRAUD  
FRAUDULENT  
FRAUGHT  
FRAULEIN  
FRAUNHOFER  
FRAXINELLA  
FRAY1  
FRAY2  
FRAZIL  
FRAZZLE  
FREAK1  
FREAK2  
FREAKED  
FRECKLE  
FREE1  
FREE2  
-FREE  
FREEBIE  
FREEBOOTER  
FREEDOM  
FREEMARTIN  
FREER, FREEST  
FREESIA  
FREEZE  
FREEZER  
FREIGHT  
FREIGHTAGE  
FREIGHTER  
FRENCH  
FRENCHIFY  
FRENETIC  
FRENULUM, FRENUM  
FRENZY  
FREQUENCY  
FREQUENT1  
FREQUENT2  
FREQUENTATIVE  
FRESCO  
FRESH  
FRESHER  
FRESHET  
FRET1

FRET2  
FRET3  
FREUDIAN  
FRI  
FRIABLE  
FRIAR  
FRIARY  
FRIBBLE  
FRICANDEAU  
FRICASSEE  
FRICATIVE  
FRICTION  
FRIDAY  
FRIDGE  
FRIEND  
FRIENDLY  
FRIENDSHIP  
FRIER  
FRIESIAN  
FRIEZE1  
FRIEZE2  
FRIG1  
FRIG2  
FRIGATE  
FRIGHT  
FRIGHTEN  
FRIGHTFUL  
FRIGID  
FRIJOLES  
FRILL  
FRILLY  
FRINGE  
FRIPPERY  
FRIPPET  
FRISBEE  
FRISCO  
FRISIAN  
FRISK  
FRISKET  
FRISSON  
FRIT  
FRIT-FLY  
FRITH  
FRITILLARY  
FRITTER1  
FRITTER2  
FRITTO MISTO  
FRITZ  
FRIVOL  
FRIVOLOUS  
FRIZZ  
FRIZZLE1  
FRIZZLE2  
FRL  
FRO  
FROCK  
FROE, FROW  
FROEBEL  
FROG1

FROG2  
FROG3  
FROG4  
FROGGY  
FROLIC  
FROM  
FROND  
FRONDEUR  
FRONT  
FRONTAGE  
FRONTAL1  
FRONTAL2  
FRONTIER  
FRONTISPIECE  
FRONTLET  
FRONTOGENESIS  
FRONTON  
FRORE  
FROST  
FROSTY  
FROTH  
FROTTAGE  
FROU-FROU  
FROW1  
FROW2  
FROWARD  
FROWN  
FROWST  
FROWSTY  
FROWZY  
FROZEN  
FRS  
FRSE  
FRUCTIFEROUS  
FRUCTIFICATION  
FRUCTIFY  
FRUCTOSE  
FRUCTUOUS  
FRUGAL  
FRUGIVOROUS  
FRUIT  
FRUITARIAN  
FRUITER  
FRUITERER  
FRUITFUL  
FRUITION  
FRUITLESS  
FRUITLET  
FRUITY  
FRUMENTY  
FRUMP  
FRUSTRATE1  
FRUSTRATE2  
FRUSTULE  
FRUSTUM  
FRUTESCENT  
FRUTEX  
FRUTICOSE  
FRY1

FRY2  
FRYER, FRIER

**230 HEADWORDS**

C. Headwords in Fr- in The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary

FR  
FR  
FRACAS  
FRACTION  
FRACTIOUS  
FRACTURE  
FRAGILE  
FRAGMENT  
FRAGRANCE  
FRAGRANT  
FRAIL  
FRAME1  
FRAME2  
FRAMEWORK  
FRANC  
FRANCHISE  
FRANCO-  
FRANCOPHONE  
FRANK1  
FRANK2  
FRANKFURTER  
FRANKINCENSE  
FRANTIC  
FRATERNAL  
FRATERNITY  
FRATERNIZE  
FRATRICIDE  
FRAUD  
FRAUGHT  
FRAY1  
FRAY2  
FRAZZLE  
FREAK1  
FREAK2  
FRECKLE  
FREE1  
FREE2  
-FREE  
FREEBIE  
FREEDOM  
FREEFONE  
FREEHAND  
FREEHOLD  
FREELANCE  
FREELoader  
FREEMAN  
FREEMASON  
FREEPOST  
FREESIA  
FREESTYLE  
FREETHINKER

FREEWAY  
FREEZE  
FREEZER  
FREEZING  
FREIGHT  
FREIGHTLINER  
FRENCH  
FRENCHMAN  
FRENETIC  
FRENZY  
FREQUENCY  
FREQUENT1  
FREQUENT2  
FRESCO  
FRESH  
FRESHEN  
FRESHMAN  
FRESHWATER  
FRET1  
FRET2  
FRETSAW  
FRETTE  
FREUDIAN  
FRI  
FRIABLE  
FRIAR  
FRICASSEE  
FRICATIVE  
FRICTION  
FRIDAY  
FRIDGE  
FRIED  
FRIEND  
FRIENDLY  
FRIENDSHIP  
FRIES  
FRIESIAN  
FRIEZE  
FRIGATE  
FRIGGING  
FRIGHT  
FRIGHTEN  
FRIGHTFUL  
FRIGID  
FRILL  
FRINGE  
FRIPPERY  
FRISBEE  
FRISK  
FRISSON  
FRITTER1  
FRITTER2  
FRIVOLOUS  
FRIZZ  
FRO  
FROCK  
FROG  
FROGMAN  
FROGMARCH

FROING  
FROLIC  
FROM  
FROMAGE FRAIS  
FROND  
FRONT  
FRONTAGE  
FRONTAL  
FRONTIER  
FRONTISPIECE  
FROST  
FROSTBITE  
FROSTING  
FROSTY  
FROTH  
FROWN  
FROZE  
FROZEN  
FRUCTOSE  
FRUGAL  
FRUIT  
FRUITERER  
FRUITFUL  
FRUITION  
FRUITLESS  
FRUITY  
FRUMP  
FRUSTRATE  
FRY1  
FRY2  
FRYER, FRIER

**143 HEADWORDS**

D. Headwords in Fr- in the Oxford First Certificate Dictionary

FRACTION  
FRACTIOUS  
FRACTURE1  
FRACTURE2  
FRAGILE  
FRAGMENT1  
FRAGMENT2  
FRAGRANCE  
FRAGRANT  
FRAIL  
FRAME1  
FRAME2  
FRANCHISE  
FRANK1  
FRANK2  
FRANKFURTER  
FRANTIC  
FRANTICALLY  
FRATERNAL  
FRATERNITY  
FRATERNIZE  
FRAUD

FRAUGHT  
FRAY1  
FRAY2  
FREAK1  
FREAK2  
FREAK3  
FRECKLE  
FREE1  
FREE2  
FREE3  
FREEDOM  
FREEZE1  
FREEZE2  
FREEZE-DRY  
FREEZER  
FREEZING  
FREIGHT  
FRENETIC  
FRENZY  
FREQUENCY  
FREQUENT1  
FREQUENT2  
FRESH  
FRESHEN  
FRET1  
FRET2  
FRET3  
FRI  
FRIAR  
FRICTION  
FRIDAY  
FRIDGE  
FRIED  
FRIEND  
FRIENDLY  
FRIENDSHIP  
FRIEZE  
FRIGATE  
FRIGHT  
FRIGHTEN  
FRIGHTFUL  
FRIGID  
FRILL  
FRINGE1  
FRINGE2  
FRISK  
FRITTER1  
FRITTER2  
FRIVOLITY  
FRIVOLOUS  
FRIZZ  
FRIZZLE  
FRO  
FROCK  
FROG  
FROLIC  
FROM  
FROND  
FRONT1

FRONT2  
FRONTAGE  
FRONTAL  
FRONTIER  
FROST1  
FROST2  
FROSTY  
FROTH  
FROWN1  
FROWN2  
FROZE  
FROZEN  
FRUGAL  
FRUIT1  
FRUIT2  
FRUITION  
FRUMP  
FRUSTRATE  
FRY

**100 HEADWORDS**

E. Headwords in Fr- in the Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary

FRACTION  
FRACTURE  
FRAGILE  
FRAGMENT  
FRAGRANCE  
FRAIL  
FRAME  
FRANCHISE  
FRANCO-  
FRANK1  
FRANK2  
FRANKFURTER  
FRANTIC  
FRATERNAL  
FRATERNITY  
FRATERNIZE  
FRAUD  
FRAUGHT  
FRAY  
FREAK  
FRECKLE  
FREE  
FREEMASON  
FREEZE  
FREIGHT  
FRENCH  
FRENZY  
FREQUENCY  
FREQUENT1  
FREQUENT2  
FRESCO  
FRESH  
FRET1  
FRET2



FRET3  
FRIAR  
FRICTION  
FRIDAY  
FRIDGE  
FRIED  
FRIEND  
FRIEZE  
FRIGATE  
FRIGHT  
FRIGHTEN  
FRIGHTFUL  
FRIGID  
FRILL  
FRINGE  
FRISK  
FRITTER1  
FRITTER2  
FRIVOLITY  
FRIVOLOUS  
FRO  
FROCK  
FROG  
FROLIC  
FROM  
FRONT  
FRONTIER  
FROST  
FROTH  
FROWN  
FROZE, FROZEN  
FRUGAL  
FRUIT  
FRUITION  
FRUSTRATE  
FRY

**70 HEADWORDS**

F. Headwords in Fr- in the Oxford English-Greek Learner's Dictionary

FRACAS  
FRACTION  
FRACTIOUS  
FRACTURE  
FRAGILE  
FRAGMENT  
FRAGRANT  
FRAIL  
FRAME1  
FRAME2  
FRANC  
FRANCHISE  
FRANCO-  
FRANK1  
FRANK2  
FRANKFURTER

FRANKINCENSE  
FRANTIC  
FRATERNAL  
FRATERNITY  
FRATERNIZE  
FRATRICIDE  
FRAUD  
FRAUDULENT  
FRAUGHT  
FRAY1  
FRAY2  
FREAK  
FRECKLE  
FREE1  
FREE2  
FREEBOOTER  
FREEDOM  
FREEMASON  
FREEZE  
FREIGHT  
FRENCH  
FRENETIC  
FRENZY  
FREQUENCY  
FREQUENT1  
FREQUENT2  
FRESCO  
FRESH  
FRET1  
FRET2  
FRET3  
FRIABLE  
FRIAR  
FRICASSEE  
FRICTION  
FRIDAY  
FRIDGE  
FRIEND  
FRIENDLY  
FRIENDSHIP  
FRIEZE  
FRIGATE  
FRIGHT  
FRIGHTEN  
FRIGHTFUL  
FRIGID  
FRILL  
FRINGE  
FRIPPERY  
FRISK  
FRITTER  
FRIVOLOUS  
FRIZZ  
FRIZZLE  
FRO  
FROCK  
FROG  
FROLIC  
FROM

FRONT  
FRONTAGE  
FRONTAL  
FRONTIER  
FRONTISPIECE  
FROST1  
FROST2  
FROSTY  
FROTH  
FROWN  
FROWSTY  
FROWZY  
FROZE  
FRUGAL  
FRUIT  
FRUITION  
FRUSTRATE  
FRUSTRATION  
FRY1  
FRY2

**95 HEADWORDS**

G. Headwords in Fr- in the Oxford English-Greek Pocket Dictionary

FRACAS  
FRACTION  
FRACTIOUS  
FRACTURE  
FRAGILE  
FRAGMENT  
FRAGRANCE  
FRAGRANT  
FRAIL  
FRAME1  
FRANC  
FRANCO-  
FRANK  
FRANKINCENSE  
FRANTIC  
FRATERNAL  
FRATERNITY  
FRATERNIZE  
FRATRICIDE  
FRAUD  
FRAUGHT  
FRAY  
FREAK  
FRECKLE  
FREE  
FREEMASON  
FREEZE  
FREIGHT  
FRENCH  
FRENETIC  
FRENZY  
FREQUENCY  
FREQUENT1

FREQUENT2  
FRESCO  
FRESH  
FRET  
FRIAR  
FRICASSEE  
FRICTION  
FRIDAY  
FRIDGE  
FRIEND  
FRIEZE  
FRIGATE  
FRIGHT  
FRIGID  
FRILL  
FRINGE  
FRIPPERY  
FRISK  
FRITTER  
FRIVOLITY  
FRIVOLOUS  
FRIZZLE  
FRO  
FROCK  
FROG  
FROLIC  
FROM  
FRONT  
FROST  
FROTH  
FROWN  
FROWSTY  
FROWZY  
FRUGAL  
FRUIT  
FRUITION  
FRUSTRATE  
FRY

**71 HEADWORDS**

H. Headwords in FR- in Penguin-Hellenews Dictionary

FRABJOUS  
FRACAS  
FRACTION  
FRACTIONAL  
FRACTIONATE  
FRACTIONIZE  
FRACTIOUS  
FRACTURE  
FRAGILE  
FRAGILITY  
FRAGMENT  
FRAGMENTAL  
FRAGMENTARY  
FRAGMENTATION  
FRAGRANCE

FRAIL1  
FRAIL2  
FRAILTY  
FRAISE  
FRAME1  
FRAMED BUILDING  
FRAME-HOUSE  
FRAMER  
FRAME-SAW  
FRAME-UP  
FRAMEWORK  
FRAMING  
FRANC  
FRANCHISE  
FRANCISCAN  
FRANCIUM  
FRANCO-  
FRANCOLIN  
FRANCOPHILE  
FRANCOPHOBE  
FRANC TIREUR  
FRANGIBLE  
FRANGIPANE  
FRANGIPANI  
FRANGLAIS  
FRANK1  
FRANK2  
FRANK3  
FRANKENSTEIN  
FRANKFURTER  
FRANKINCENSE  
FRANKISH  
FRANKLIN1  
FRANKLY  
FRANKNESS  
FRANTIC  
FRAPPE  
FRASS  
FRATERNAL  
FRATERNITY  
FRATERNIZE  
FRATRICIDAL  
FRATRICIDE  
FRAU  
FRAUD  
FRAUDULENCE  
FRAUDULENT  
FRAUGHT  
FRAULEIN  
FRAY1  
FRAY2  
FRAZIL  
FRAZZLE  
FREAK1  
FREAKISH  
FREAK-OUT  
FRECKLE  
FREE1  
FREE-AND-EASY

FREEBOARD  
FREEBOOTER  
FREEBORN  
FREEDMAN  
FREEDOM  
FREE-HAND  
FREE-HANDED  
FREE-HEARTED  
FREEHOLD  
FREELANCE  
FREE-LIVER  
FREELY  
FREEMAN  
FREEMARTIN  
FREEMASON  
FREEMASONRY  
FREE-RANGE  
FREESIA  
FREE-SPOKEN  
FREESTONE1  
FREESTONE2  
FREETHINKER  
FREE-WHEEL  
FREE-WILL  
FREEZE  
FREEZE-DRY  
FREEZER  
FREEZE-UP  
FREEZING  
FREIGHT  
FREIGHTAGE  
FREIGHTER  
FRENCH  
FRENCHIFY  
FRENETIC  
FRENZIED  
FRENZY  
FREQUENCE  
FREQUENCY  
FREQUENT1  
FREQUENT2  
FREQUENTATION  
FREQUENTATIVE  
FREQUENTED  
FREQUENTLY  
FRESCO  
FRESH  
FRESHEN  
FRESHER  
FRESHET  
FRESHLY  
FRESHMAN  
FRESHNESS  
FRESHWATER  
FRET1  
FRET2  
FRETFUL  
FRET-SAW  
FRETWORK

FREUDIAN  
FRIABILITY  
FRIABLE  
FRIAR  
FRIARY  
FRIBBLE  
FRICASSEE  
FRICATIVE  
FRICTION  
FRIDAY  
FRIDGE  
FRIEND  
FRIENDLY  
FRIENDSHIP  
FRIEZE1  
FRIEZE2  
FRIG1  
FRIGATE  
FRIGATE-BIRD  
FRIGE  
FRIGHT  
FRIGHTEN  
FRIGHTFUL  
FRIGID  
FRIGIDIRE  
FRIGIDITY  
FRIGORIFIC  
FRILL  
FRILLING  
FRILLY  
FRINGE  
FRIPPERY  
FRISK  
FRISKET  
FRISKY  
FRIT  
FRITH1  
FRITH2  
FRITILLARY  
FRITTER1  
FRITTER2  
FRIVOL  
FRIVOLITY  
FRIVOLOUS  
FRIZZ1  
FRIZZ2  
FRIZZLE1  
FRIZZLE2  
FRIZZY  
FRO  
FROCK  
FROCK-COAT  
FROG  
FROG-HOPPER  
FROGMAN  
FROG-MARCH  
FROGGY  
FROLIC  
FROLICSOME

FROM  
FROND  
FRONDESCENCE  
FRONT  
FRONTAGE  
FRONTAL  
FRONTIER  
FRONTISPIECE  
FRONTLET  
FRONT-PAGE  
FRONTWARD  
FROST  
FROSTBITE  
FROSTED  
FROSTING  
FROSTY  
FROTH  
FROTHY  
FROU-FROU  
FROWARD  
FROWN  
FROWST  
FROWSTY  
FROWZY  
FROZE  
FROZEN  
FRUCTIFEROUS  
FRUCTIFICATION  
FRUCTIFY  
FRUCTOSE  
FRUCTUOUS  
FRUGAL  
FRUIT  
FRUITARIAN  
FRUIT-CAKE  
FRUITER  
FRUITERER  
FRUITFUL  
FRUITILY  
FRUITINESS  
FRUITION  
FRUITLESS  
FRUITY  
FRUMENTACEOUS  
FRUMENTY  
FRUMP  
FRUSTRATE1  
FRUSTRATION  
FRUSTUM  
FRUTEX  
FRUTICOSE  
FRY1  
FRY2  
FRYER  
FRYING-PAN

**248 HEADWORDS**



I. Headwords in Fr- in the Michigan Press English-Greek Dictionary

FRACAS  
FRACTED  
FRACTION  
FRACTIONAL  
FRACTIONATE  
FRACTIONATION  
FRACTIONIZE  
FRACTIOUS  
FRACTIOUSNESS  
FRACTURE  
FRAGILE  
FRAGILITY  
FRAGMENT  
FRAGMENTARY  
FRAGMENTATION  
FRAGRANCE  
FRAGRANT  
FRAIL  
FRAILNESS  
FRAILTY  
FRAME  
FRAMER  
FRAMEWORK  
FRANC  
FRANCE  
FRANCHISE  
FRANCIUM  
FRANCIZATION  
FRANCIZE  
FRANCO  
FRANCOPHILE  
FRANGIBILITY  
FRANGIBLE  
FRANK  
FRANKINCENSE  
FRANKNESS  
FRANTIC  
FRATER  
FRATERNAL  
FRATERNITY  
FRATERNIZATION  
FRATERNIZE  
FRATRICIDAL  
FRATRICIDE  
FRAUD  
FRAUDULENCE  
FRAUDULENT  
FRAUGHT  
FRAY  
FRAZZLE  
FREAK  
FREAKISH  
FREAKISHNESS  
FRECKLE  
FRECKLY  
FREE  
FREEBOOTER

FREEBOOTING  
FREEDMAN  
FREEDOM  
FREEHOLD  
FREEHOLDER  
FREEMAN  
FREEMASON  
FREEMASONRY  
FREER  
FREEZE  
FREEZER  
FREIGHT  
FREIGHTAGE  
FREIGHTER  
FRENCH  
FRENCHIFY  
FENCHMAN  
FRENCHWOMAN  
FRENZY  
FREQUENCE  
FREQUENCY  
FREQUENT  
FREQUENTATION  
FREQUENTATIVE  
FREQUENTER  
FRESCO  
FRESH  
FRESHEN  
FRESHENER  
FRESHMAN  
FRESHNESS  
FRESHWATER  
FRET  
FRETFUL  
FRETFULNESS  
FRETTY  
FRETWORK  
FRIABILITY  
FRIABLE  
FRIAR  
FRIARY  
FRIBBLE  
FRICASSEE  
FRICATIVE  
FRICTION  
FRICTIONAL  
FRIDAY  
FRIDGE  
FRIEND  
FRIENDLESS  
FRIENDLESSNESS  
FRIENDLINESS  
FRIENDLY  
FRIENDSHIP  
FRIEZE  
FRIGATE  
FRIGHT  
FRIGHTEN  
FRIGHTFUL

FRIGHTFULNESS  
FRIGID  
FRIGIDITY  
FRIGORIFIC  
FRILL  
FRILLIES  
FRILLY  
FRINGE  
FRIPPERY  
FRISK  
FRISKINESS  
FRISKY  
FRIT  
FRITH  
FRITTER  
FRIVOL  
FRIVOLITY  
FRIVOLLER  
FRIVOLOUS  
FRIVOLOUSNESS  
FRIZZ  
FRIZZINESS  
FRIZZLE  
FRIZZY  
FRO  
FROCK  
FROG  
FROGGERY  
FROGMAN  
FROLIC  
FROLICKER  
FROLICSOME  
FROLICSOMENESS  
FROM  
FRONDESCENT  
FRONDIFEROUS  
FRONT  
FRONTAGE  
FRONTAL  
FRONTIER  
FRONTIERMAN  
FRONTISPIECE  
FRONTLESS  
FRORE  
FROST  
FROSTINESS  
FROSTY  
FROTH  
FROTHINESS  
FROTHY  
FROWARD  
FROWARDNESS  
FROWN  
FROWST  
FROWSTY  
FROWZY  
FRUCTIFEROUS  
FRUCTIFICATION  
FRUCTIFY

FRUCTUOUS  
FRUGAL  
FRUGALITY  
FRUGIFEROUS  
FRUGIVOROUS  
FRUIT  
FRUITAGE  
FRUITARIAN  
FRUITER  
FRUITERER  
FRUITERESS  
FRUITFUL  
FRUITFULNESS  
FRUITION  
FRUITLESS  
FRUITLET  
FRUITY  
FRUMENTY  
FRUMP  
FRUMPISH  
FRUSTRATE  
FRUSTRATION  
FRUSTRUM  
FRUTESCENT  
FRUTEX  
FRUTICOSE  
FRY  
FRYER

**203 HEADWORDS**

J. Headwords in Fr- in Divry's English-Greek Dictionary

FRACAS  
FRACTION  
FRACTIONAL  
FRACTIOUS  
FRACTURE  
FRAGILE  
FRAGILITY  
FRAGMENT  
FRAGRANCE  
FRAGRANT  
FRAIL  
FRAME  
FRANC  
FRANCE  
FRANCHISE  
FRANGIBLE  
FRANK  
FRANKFURTER  
FRANKINCENSE  
FRANKLIN  
FRANTIC  
FRAPPE  
FRATERNAL  
FRATERNITY  
FRATERNIZE

FRATRICIDE  
FRAUD  
FRAUDULENT  
FRAUGHT  
FRAY  
FRAZZLE  
FREAK  
FRECKLE  
FREDERICA  
FREDERICK  
FREE  
FREEDMAN  
FREEDOM  
FREEZE  
FREIGHT  
FRENCH  
FRENETIC  
FRENZY  
FREQUENCY  
FREQUENT  
FRESCO  
FRESH  
FRESHET  
FRET  
FRIABLE  
FRIAR  
FRICASSEE  
FRICTION  
FRIDAY  
FRIED  
FRIEND  
FRIEZE  
FRIGATE  
FRIGHT  
FRIGID  
FRILL  
FRINGE  
FRIPPERY  
FRISK  
FRITTER  
FRIVOLITY  
FRIVOLOUS  
FRIZZ  
FRIZZLE  
FRO  
FROCK  
FROG  
FROLIC  
FROLICKER  
FROLICKY  
FROM  
FROND  
FRONT  
FRONTIER  
FRONTISPIECE  
FROST  
FROTH  
FROWARD  
FROWN

FROWZY  
FROZE  
FROZEN  
FRUCTIFY  
FRUGAL  
FRUIT  
FRUITION  
FRUITY  
FRUMP  
FRUSTRATE  
FRUSTRATION  
FRUSTUM  
FRY  
FRYING PAN

**99 HEADWORDS**

K. Headwords in Fr- in Collins GEM Greek Dictionary

FRACTION  
FRACTURE  
FRAGILE  
FRAGMENT  
FRAGRANCE  
FRAGRANT  
FRAIL  
FRAME  
FRANCE  
FRANCHISE  
FRANK  
FRANTIC  
FRATERNAL  
FRATERNITY  
FRATERNIZE  
FRAUD  
FRAUDULENT  
FRAY  
FREAK  
FRECKLE  
FREE  
FREEZE  
FREEZING  
FREIGHT  
FRENCH  
FRENZY  
FREQUENCY  
FREQUENT  
FRESCO  
FRESH  
FRET  
FRIAR  
FRICTION  
FRIDAY  
FRIDGE  
FRIED  
FRIEND  
FRIEZE

FRIGATE  
FRIGHT  
FRIGID  
FRILL  
FRINGE  
FRISKY  
FRITTER  
FRIVOLITY  
FRIVOLOUS  
FRIZZY  
FRO  
FROCK  
FROG  
FROLIC  
FROM  
FRONT  
FROST  
FROTH  
FROWN  
FROZE  
FRUGAL  
FRUIT  
FRUSTRATE  
FRUSTRATION  
FRY  
**63 HEADWORDS**